

THE ROBBER CHURCH

PATRICK HENRY OMLOR



THE ROBBER CHURCH
by Patrick Henry Omlor
The Collected Writings 1968-1997

AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM

FOREWORD

by Fr. Lawrence S. Brey

Tricesimo Anno Tenebrarum! In the 30th year of darkness! In my Foreword (dated March 12, 1968) to Patrick Henry Omlor's *Questioning The Validity of the Masses Using the New, All-English Canon* (commonly abbreviated as "QTV") I spoke of a new era of *darkness* launched on Sunday, October 22, 1967. On that "Black Sunday" the new, all-English canon -- produced by the International Committee on English in the Liturgy (ICEL) -- made its debut in the United States. It was, as it were, the "*et tenebrae facta sunt*" of Calvary once again. It is now 1997, the 30th Year of Darkness, truly an unhappy anniversary, a tragic milestone.

As is doubtless known by many of the readers of this present collection of Omlor's works, the purpose of QTV was to demonstrate his invalidity thesis; that is, the *probable* invalidity of "masses" using the ICEL's English-language canon. The invalidity thesis is based on the ICEL's defective *sacramental form* for the Holy Eucharist; to wit: the words for consecrating the Precious Blood.

In QTV the author demonstrated the ICEL's destructive mutilation of the sacramental form by rendering "for you and for many unto the remission of sins" as "for you and for all men so that sins may be forgiven." It was the "*pro multis*" argument that is now so well known. Most tellingly did the ICEL's Innovators verify the Italian saying that translators are traitors: "*Traduttori : Traditori!*"

Within a short time after the initial appearance of *Questioning The Validity...*, it would be found in the hands of priests and laymen, families and youths, all of whom, by the way, went through a great re-learning process at the time. Previously many of us hardly ever thought about or even knew about *Quo Primum*, the Catechism of the Council of Trent, *De Defectibus*, or St. Thomas's *Summa Theologica* and its discussion of the sacramental form of the Holy Eucharist. QTV became a handbook, a *vade mecum*, for those who now hoped to expose and inform others about the ICEL's forgery of Christ's Words in the wine-consecration.

THIRTY YEARS have passed since Black Sunday, and soon it will be thirty years since the "Emerald Sunday" of March 17, 1968, when QTV was first released. In precision, logic, brevity and freedom from encumbering frills Patrick Henry

Omlor's writings stand out among most others on the subject. These are qualities that characterized the writings and method of St. Thomas Aquinas, the role model for theologians and thinkers, and the nemesis of the obfuscators.

The theological documentation and reasoning in QTV led to a *strong* probability of invalidity, and that is all that the author contended at the time. But in retrospect, by re-studying and continually researching the matter, applying new insights and considering the FRUITS of this mutilated mass, one realizes that the conclusion becomes not just probable but all the more certain.

"By their fruits you shall know them (Matth. 7:16)," Our Lord assured us. Who is unable to see the great spiritual drought since the late 1960s, a great withholding of graces? The "curve of evil" that began with the death of Pius XII has risen acutely since the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, the great bulwark against evil, was tampered with.

Behold the Principle of Causality in operation. What we have been witnessing in the abominations of the past three decades, and continue to witness day in and day out, is nothing else then "cause and effect." "Take away the Mass and you take away the Church" ("*Tolle Missam : Tolle Ecclesiam*") has ever been the key strategy on the agenda of the enemies of the Church.

The heresiarch Martin Luther said, "When the Mass is destroyed, the papacy will topple." Indeed the converse of that is equally true, if not even more so. The axiom, "*Tolle Missam : Tolle Ecclesiam*" could also be formulated thus: "*Tolle Papam : Tolle Missam : Tolle Ecclesiam*" : Take away the Pope and you take away the Mass *and* the Church.

This latter half of the 20th century has seen the destructive acceleration of the age-old struggle against the Rights of God and the Divine Order of Things. The late and much revered Father Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp., traced the long thread of revolt against God and the Supernatural Order, in what he aptly styled the "theology of history." In this cosmic struggle the Church and the Mass are more and more viewed as the prime targets for destruction.

In this our day the *coup de grace* fell upon the Mass, and it was *made to SEEM* as though the church herself had dealt the blow as part of the Vatican II "renewal and reform." But verily, "*An enemy hath done this* (Matth. 13:28)," as in the parable of the Wheat and the Cockle. The Catholic Church as hijacked by the swarm of infesters and infectors who entered through John XXIII's "open window," and those usurpers, complete with ecclesiastical trappings, took over the commanding heights of the church, occupied her structures, and "did the deed."

Yes, it was the foul deed of "The Robber Church," the label Patrick Omlor once devised to designate the counterfeit entity that nowadays poses as and purports

to be the Catholic Church. “The Robber Church,” by the way, is a term derived metaphorically from the other appellation “The Robber Council,” the name given by Pope St. Leo the Great to the bogus council held at Ephesus in the year 449.

As an aside: By no means was there ever any “autodemolition” of the Church, as Paul VI once suggested. Such talk of the Church’s “self-destruction” is “offensive to pious ears,” being an utter impossibility for the indefectible Catholic Church, “the holy and immaculate spouse of Christ, without wrinkle or blemish.”

Immediately after Black Sunday the largely anti-Catholic secular press rejoiced that the Church had now “come of age” with the ICEL’s new, all-English thing. Typical was the lead editorial in the *Milwaukee Journal* entitled (yes!). “*Ite, Missa Est*” : “Go, the Mass is ended.” Yes, ENDED! There was more literal truth in that editorial title than was generally realized at the time.

It should be kept in mind that QTV, Omlor’s early pamphlet *Has The Church The Right?*, and the majority of the issues of his journal *Interdum* dealt with the “*pro multis*” invalidity problem in the all-English Canon of October 1967. It was not until about eighteen months later (April 1969) that Paul VI promulgated his *Novus Ordo Missae* (New Order of the Mass).

That *Novus Ordo Missae* was a radical reconfiguration of the entire Mass, with many more changes and, *most serious of all*, further meddling with the form for the wine-consecration by the deletion of the words “the mystery of faith,” which were moved outside the consecration form to serve as an introduction to an inappropriate acclamation by the people.

In his subsequent writings Mr. Omlor addressed the invalidating defect of intention of the FRAMERS of the *Novus Ordo Missae*, based on principles laid down by Pope Leo XIII in his Bull *Apostolicae Curae* (1896). And in his recent short book. *No “Mystery of Faith” : No Mass*, he demonstrated the invalidating effect of Paul VI’s deletion of the words “the mystery of faith” from the wine-consecration form, simultaneously pointing out the inescapable corollary that a *true, bona fide* successor of St. Peter could not possibly promulgate and officially approve a “Mass” that is patently invalid.

Mr. Silvio Mattacchione, an established publisher of books of the highest quality, is to be congratulated for taking the initiative in producing the present, much desired collection of Omlor’s works written over a period of thirty years. Mr. Mattacchione has thus released anew some rays of light and truth in order to help penetrate through the gloom of those THREE DECADES OF DARKNESS.

Perusing the pages of this *Opera Omnia* will enable the reader to trace through and analyze the assault upon the Mass and the concomitant tide of destruction wreaked upon Catholicism by the agents of the Robber Church. Doubtless this golden handbook of *ad rem* theological hammering will serve as a antidote

against the damage already inflicted and continuing to be inflicted daily by the onslaughts of the Modernist Innovators. May it also serve as a beacon of light and hope by opening many more eyes to the brutal realities of the bogus "New Mass" and the other crimes of the Robber Church.

In my Foreword to QTV, penned those many years ago. I noted that Mr. Omlor had zeroed in on the crowning defect of the ICEL's English Canon, the substantial defect of form of the Consecration of the wine, and the theological conclusion that such a "consecration" is rendered invalid, perforce rendering invalid such a Mass. I advised that Omlor's assertion would be most reprehensible if not backed up by the soundest theology and documentation. But I went on to say, "likewise reprehensible would it be to *ignore the possibility* of invalidity if concrete evidence of form mutilation can be produced."

In the conclusion to that Foreword I observed that in supporting even the pursuance and study of this grave problem I was laying my head on the block. I will conclude this new Foreword to this newly published anthology with the same thought and convictions and the same final words: "For the Mass and its integrity and particularly the Consecration and the Most Holy Sacrifice and Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord, form the very heart and center of my priesthood and of the Faith I swore to profess, guard and defend 'to the last breath of my life.'" This must be a common *auto de fa* for all the faithful Catholics rallying to the defense of the Mass and the Church as the 20th century rapidly draws to a close.

L.S.B.

July 1, 1997

Feast of the Most Precious Blood

QUESTIONING THE VALIDITY
Of The Masses
Using The New, All-English Canon

By Patrick Henry Omlor
Foreword By A Roman Catholic Priest

DEDICATION

OUR LADY OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

A PRAYER

O Virgin Mary, our Lady of the Blessed Sacrament, - thou glory of the Christian people, joy of the universal Church - salvation of the whole world, pray for us, and awaken in all believers a lively devotion toward the Most Holy Eucharist, so

that they may be worthy to partake of the same daily.

An indulgence of 500 days (Pius X, Audience, Dec. 9, 1906; S.C. Ind., Jan. 23, 1907; S.P. Ap., Dec. 12, 1933). From THE RACCOLTA.
CONTENTS

Foreword by Father Lawrence S. Brey
Preface by The Author

Part

- 1 **INTRODUCTION**
Concerning Father De Pauw's letter ... The Critical Point of Inquiry.
- 2 **THE NECESSITY OF PROPER, DETERMINATE FORMS FOR SACRAMENTS**
Necessity of Specific, Determinate Matter ... Necessity of a Specific, Determinate Form Even Greater.
- 3 **THE PROPER FORM FOR THE SACRAMENT OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST**
The Consecration of the Bread ... The Consecration of the Wine.
- 4 **THE NEW "FORM" INTRODUCED VIA THE ALL-ENGLISH CANON**
Text of the New Form ... Some Preliminary Observations.
- 5 **HOW DOES CHANGING THE FORM INVALIDATE A SACRAMENT?**
Changes Caused by Omission of Words ... Changes Caused by Additions of Words ... Changes Caused by Substitution of Words ... The Criterion We Must Use.
- 6 **NECESSITY OF USING OUR LORD'S WORDS FOR THE EUCHARIST**
The Source of Power in These Words ... Our Lord's Words in the Ancient Form ... Putting Words into Our Lord's Mouth.
- 7 **THE NEW "FORM" DESTROYS THE SENSE OF THE PROPER FORM**
Two Distinct Aspects of Christ's Death ... The Aspect of Sufficiency ... The Aspect of Efficacy ... The Ancient, Established Form Conveys the Sense of Efficacy ... The New "Form" Conveys the Sense of Sufficiency ... Summary and Conclusion.
- 8 **WHAT IS MEANT BY "THE REALITY" OF A SACRAMENT?**
Three Distinct Elements in a Sacrament ... Baptism As An Example.
- 9 **WHAT IS "THE REALITY" OF THE SACRAMENT OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST?**

The Three Elements ... Examples To Illustrate "The Reality" of The Eucharist.

- 10 **THE UNIQUE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE EUCHARIST AND THE MYSTICAL BODY**
All Sacraments Related to The Mystical Body ... Unique Relationship of The Most Blessed Sacrament ... The Words of Pope Pius XII ... Summary and Preview.
- 11 **WHO BELONGS TO THE MYSTICAL BODY?**
The One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church ... The Visible Church Is Necessary ... Unbelievers and Unbaptized Persons Are Not Members ... Heretics, Schismatics, Apostates Automatically Excluded ... Loyalty and Adherence to the Pope Required ... Conclusion.
- 12 **THE NEW "FORM" SUPPRESSES WHAT IS ESSENTIAL, AND SIGNIFIES FALSELY**
Christ Could Not Have Said.- "for All Men"...Sacraments Must Contain What They Signify and Signify What They Contain ... External Rite of The Eucharist Must Signify The Mystical Body ... An Opinion ... The New "Form" Signifies Falsely ... Identical Wording Not Required ... The Doctrine of the Apostles ... The Alexandrine Liturgy ... The Canons of Hippolytus . . . "De Sacramentis" of the Pseudo-Ambrose ... Eastern Liturgies in General ... Gallican and Mozarabic Rites ... Summary ... Conclusion.
- 13 **ANSWERING SOME OBJECTIONS**
APPENDIX 1 A COMPARISON OF THE CONSECRATION PRAYERS AS FOUND IN:
(1) The Original Latin; (2) The Literal English Translation from the Latin; (3) The New All-English Canon; (4) The Anglican Schismatics' "Book of Common Prayer"
APPENDIX 2 "LEX CREDENDI: LEX ORANDI"
APPENDIX 3 ANSWERING SOME MORE OBJECTIONS
APPENDIX 4 INVALID CONSECRATION OF THE WINE INVALIDATES OR AT LEAST CASTS DOUBT UPON THE CONSECRATION OF THE BREAD
APPENDIX 5 A SOLEMN DECREE OF THE ECUMENICAL COUNCIL OF FLORENCE
APPENDIX 6 A LETTER, OF POPE INNOCENT III
APPENDIX 7 A REPLY TO MONSIGNOR BANDAS
EPILOGUE *by Rev. Lawrence S. Brey*

FOREWORD

by Rev. Lawrence S. Brey

Was October 22, 1967 the most ominous and frightening day in the two-

thousand-year history of the Catholic Church, and certainly in the history of the Church in the United States of America? Did that day see a legalized contradiction of hitherto inviolate decrees and norms guarding the Canon of the Mass? Did it possibly even bring a new era of darkness into the world, the extinguishing of the true sacrificial and sacramental Eucharistic Christ from the majority of our churches?

During the early days of agitation for the introduction of the vernacular into the Mass, and even during the climax of the movement, when the matter was debated at the First Session of Vatican Council II (1962), Catholics were always assured that even if the vernacular should be introduced, *the Canon would remain untouched*, in its centuries-old, inviolate Latin form. And rightly so, for *The Canon* is the heart and center and essence of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. But since the 1963 Liturgy Constitution's granting of *permission* to employ the vernacular in *some* parts of the Mass, a literal cascade of subsequent changes and increased vernacularization has now culminated in the introduction of the new, "English Canon," yielding what is, in effect, an all-vernacular Mass, (notwithstanding Article 36 of that same Constitution and the decrees of the Council of Trent). Thus, that which was heretofore and for thirteen centuries considered *inviolate* has now been touched and disturbingly altered. Something ominously different from the Canon we have always known now occupies the heart and center of our Catholic Worship.

Not since the introduction of the vernacular *in parts of the Mass* in 1964, has so much protest, with so many intense misgivings, been engendered, as has been by the introduction of this new, English Canon. How, infinitely more thundering this protest would be were it not for the fact that the clergy and the faithful have been gradually "conditioned" by change after change in recent years, - perhaps to the point of expecting change as the order of the day and the "mind of the Church"!

There are three main classes of objections to the new, English Canon: (1) That it contains many omissions, mistranslations and distortions, which offend against Catholic reverence, piety, and the integrity of the Faith. (2) That it is illicit, i.e., in violation of enduring and unrescinded decrees and teachings of previous Councils and Popes. (3) That it is invalid, i.e., that because of some radical mutilation it no longer confects or produces the true Sacrifice and Sacrament of the Eucharist. Such an alleged invalidity is by far *the gravest* and most crucial of all the objections, though this view is not shared by many or most of the Canon's critics. It is to the question of the *validity* of the "new Canon" - in the light of a mutilation of the Form of Consecration - that Patrick Henry Omlor devotes this treatise, "*Questioning the Validity*." We will come back to this shortly.

Regarding the first two objections to the new Canon - the faultiness of its translation and its alleged illicitness - much has been said and written already. A cursory study of the new Canon reveals approximately 50 omissions, 50 vague

or inaccurate or distorted translations of phrases, words or clauses; and five or more additions of words or phrases not heretofore in the Canon. In addition, three references to *key dogmas* (the Divine Maternity of Mary, the Perpetual Virginity of Mary, and the Divinity of Christ) have been deleted from places where they had been *explicitly* incorporated in the text of the Canon. Other doctrines, too, are deemphasized or bypassed by way of omissions and mistranslations. A highly respected American theologian has stated that he would "never touch" the new Canon, and that "true priests and laymen will feel bound in conscience to continue to use the Latin (Canon), the sure norm of orthodoxy."

Regarding the allegation that the new Canon is in violation of several teachings and anathema-sanctioned canonical decrees of the Council of Trent, and of later documents of the Magisterium, much also has been heretofore presented, and the citations have yet to be refuted conclusively. For example: the new Canon embodies violations of Trent's prohibition of an all-vernacular Mass, and of the Canon being said aloud; also an implicit repudiation of Trent's upholding the relevance and piety of the ceremonies and external signs used in the Mass; and the Tridentine doctrine of the Integrity and Perfection of the traditional Roman Canon. "The Catholic Church," declared Trent, "in order that the Holy Sacrifice may be offered ... in a dignified and reverent way, established the sacred Canon many centuries ago, so pure and free of all error that nothing is contained in it which does not in the greatest way inspire sanctity and certain piety, and raise the mind ... to God ... (The Canon consists) of our Lord's very words, and of prayers received from Apostolic tradition or piously ordained by the holy Pontiffs." Adrian Fortescue observed: "The Council of Trent ordered that 'the holy Canon composed many centuries ago' shall be kept pure and unchanged." It was the pure Canon restored by St. Pius V, remaining as it was in the days of St. Gregory I (6th century), and in fact going back far beyond his time into the mists of the Church's first centuries. Further, the new English Canon is in apparent violation of the Bull *Quo Primum* (1570) of St. Pius V, binding "in perpetuity," as well as in violation of the Apostolic Constitution, *Veterum Sapientia* (1962) of Pope John XXIII, and Article 36 of the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* (1963).

So much for the first two classes of objections to the new English Canon: the gross defects in its translation, and its apparent illicitness. They are weighty and substantiated. *But as reprehensible and disturbing as they are, and thoroughly justifying the NON-use of this new Canon, they are not nearly so frightening and catastrophic as are the implications of a third objection, namely, that the new English Canon is INVALID..* Some have made this charge on the basis of the deletion of certain key dogmas from the Canon, other mistranslations of the text, and the concomitant introduction of a so-called "New Eucharistic Theology," which in effect denies transubstantiation and the sacrificial nature of the Mass. However, given an accurately translated form of Consecration, the invalidity of a Mass using the new English Canon would, in spite of those factors, hinge on a defect of Intention on the part of a given priest-celebrant. If a priest's intent, in consecrating, is contrary to the "intention of the Church," then such a

consecration would indeed be invalid. But if, in consecrating, he, has the intention of "doing what the Church does (in consecrating) then his consecration will be valid - even if personally he be a heretic, or have no true Faith in the Eucharist or the true nature of the Mass. Thus, defect of intention, but not defect of faith, would be *the* factor invalidating his consecration - *even if he used the traditional Latin Canon!*

But there is a more *clear-cut* criterion on which arguments for or against the validity of the "new Canon" can be based, and that is whether the *form* of the Sacrament as it is rendered in the new "translation" (i.e., the words of Consecration), is *valid* or *invalid*. "Matter" and "form" are the essential components of the rite of a sacrament. Improper matter *or* a defective form does indeed invalidate the Sacrament. In the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist the *matter* is the bread and the wine, and the *form* consists of the words of Consecration. Since the new Canon (obviously) does not touch upon the *matter*, it is to the "new" *form* that we must look for possible defects and/or mutilations. Even more necessary than the specific matter (the "thing": *res*) is the *specific form* (the "words": *verba*), for the form is the "*determining element*" of the matter. Thus a change in the *verba* and their intent and meaning could imply the "determining" of the *res* in a manner other than that intended by Christ.

"*Ideas have consequences!*" an American philosopher so sagely observed. And, as words convey ideas, we must *look to the words!*

To this end, Patrick H. Omlor has contributed his efforts in this present treatise. To date, his is the first such study, to my knowledge, to demonstrate systematically and to document the thesis that the new, English Canon is invalid by reason of defect of form - specifically, by reason of a mutilation in the English rendering of the Form for the Consecration of the Wine. I have thoroughly read and studied his manuscript, and I sincerely feel that, his study is worthy of serious consideration. It may well be crucial in solving the problem of the new English Canon. And by the very fact the question of the validity of the form *has been raised*, and apparently on genuine grounds, the issue *must* be thoroughly studied and resolved. For in the Sacraments, and above all in the Mass, nothing less than absolute certainty, or the *medium certum*, must be the norm governing their rites.

"We must see whether a change of words destroys the essential sense of the words," writes St. Thomas Aquinas, "because then the sacrament is clearly rendered invalid. (*Summa Theologica*, III, Q. 60. Art. 8) *Are there* mutilations in the new English form of Consecration, and do they destroy the "*essential sense*" of the words? The author of this treatise answers these questions affirmatively, in view of the deviations occurring in the "new form" for the consecration of the wine.

The author demonstrates that these mutilations *delete the vital concept* of the

Eucharist's relationship to the *Mystical Body of Christ*, that they *delete the intended efficacy and purpose* of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, and that they are a *falsification of Christ's words of Institution*, which falsification distorts His intention and purposes in instituting and confecting the Sacrifice and Sacrament. He demonstrates that, as a necessary consequence, the form has been *substantially or essentially mutilated*; and that therefore the form has been rendered invalid; and, finally, that therefore any Masses using this new "English Canon" are invalid.

To support his thesis Mr. Omlor draws heavily on the teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas and the documents of the Magisterium of the Church, particularly the Council of Trent. Of especial importance are the passages he quotes from "*The Catechism of the Council of Trent*," a compendium of *official* Catholic doctrine which enjoys a unique and authoritative status - The Trent Catechism is "guaranteed to be orthodox by the Catholic Church and her supreme head on earth" says Dr. John Hagan of the Irish College in Rome.

St. Thomas Aquinas, as an authority on Eucharistic theology, deserves profound respect. Indeed, the Angelic Doctor received the singular endorsement of Christ Himself: "*Bene scripsisti de Me, Thoma!*" - "You have written well of Me, Thomas!" - words issuing from the Crucifix on the Altar before which Thomas was praying in Naples, a year before his death. Only shortly before this had he completed his treatise on the Eucharist. St. Thomas Aquinas is in a special way the Theologian of the Eucharist. It was he who was commissioned by the Pope to compose the Office and Mass for the Feast of Corpus Christi. Before appealing to contemporary theologians to "justify" the new, English Form of Consecration, *must we not first study most carefully the teachings of the Angelic Doctor on this most vital of matters?* "*Bene scripsisti de Me, Thoma!*"

The charge of invalidity of the new "English Canon" is a grave charge indeed; one that may not be made lightly or recklessly, and one that must be either totally refuted or totally substantiated. Most reprehensible, most irresponsible, and most harmful to souls would it be to make such a charge, or even raise the question publicly, if there were no reasonable foundation for such a charge or doubt. Likewise reprehensible would it be to *ignore the possibility* of invalidity if concrete evidence of form mutilation can be produced. As shall be shown, such evidence *has been produced*. This present treatise is a systematic study of these mutilations and their bearing on the *entire* form, and therefore on the entire Mass.

In practice, the very raising of questions or doubts about the validity of a given manner of confecting a sacrament - if this question is based on an apparent defect of matter or form - would necessitate the strict abstention from use of that doubtful manner of performing the sacramental act, *until the doubts are resolved*. In confecting the sacraments, all priests *are obliged* to follow the "*medium certum*."

From all appearances, a real mutilation *has indeed* been incorporated into the form of consecration in the new English Canon, a mutilation that conveys an apparent mutilation of *meaning and concept*. **BUT, THE CHURCH NEVER CONTRADICTS HERSELF!** The Church never contradicts herself, as Christ never contradicts Himself. For some ominous reason, present ecclesiastical developments, highlighted by the introduction of the new English Canon, seem to have slipped out of the hands of the Church's *Magisterium!* Was October 22, 1967, the beginning of an age of new darkness on the earth, and the harbinger of an unprecedented crisis within the Church? Was the Blessed Virgin's indication that *the Rosary and Her Immaculate Heart* would be our "*last and final weapons*" a hint that somehow the Holy Mass would at some point become no longer available to most Catholics?

The very fact that a question (let alone a certainty) has been raised concerning the validity of the new *English* Canon and consecration form *thoroughly vindicates* the Church's traditional, *absolute insistence* that the essential forms of the sacraments *always be pronounced only in the original Latin*, as they appear *inviolably* in the *Roman Ritual, Roman Missal, and Roman Pontifical*. This insistence was aimed at preventing the *very crisis which has now arisen!* That is to say, it was aimed at safeguarding *absolutely* the integrity, essence and intent of the forms from the danger of invalidating mutilations.

Secondly, it vindicates the Church's insistence on the use of the teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas and Scholastic Philosophy, the "*ancilla theologiae*" (handmaid of Theology).

Thirdly, and above all, it vindicates the Church's insistence on the teachings of the Magisterium in these matters pertaining to the Sacraments, and especially the decrees of the Sacred Council of Trent and the Tridentine Catechism.

Can it be that we are now at last experiencing the ultimate and most fearsome consequences of abandoning these *three Providential instruments*, in favor of vernacularism, muddled thinking and "new theology"? Do we now find in imminent danger of destruction the very heart and essence of our religion, the Holy Mass? With each of the gradual and growing changes and vernacularizations of the Mass since 1963, the proponents of change always assured us: "It's still the *Mass!*" Has the time now come (or, if not, will it soon be coming?) when, in truth, this can no longer be said?

I have written this Foreword, but what, exactly, is my position? It is *not a position of unqualified and precipitous endorsement* of Mr. Patrick Omlor's arguments and conclusions. Rather is it a call to intense mutual study of his thesis, and a serious examination of the very real mutilations introduced in the form of Consecration and their bearing on the validity of the Mass, *If Mr. Omlor is wrong in his thesis and arguments, let him be refuted beyond the shadow of a doubt!* If

he is correct, may effective measures be taken *immediately* to restore the Mass, and place it back into the hands of the Magisterium. Or may God Himself intervene! If the matter remains in doubt, unsolved, then the only course of action is to take the *pars tutior*, indeed the "*medium certum*."

While considering the author's request that I write and sign this Foreword, I wavered and prayed and made no immediate decision. What finally decided the matter for me was my recollection of Our Lord's words: "Every one therefore that shall confess me before men, I will also confess him before my Father who is in heaven. But he that shall deny me before men, I will also deny him before my Father who is in heaven." (Matthew: 10,32-3) For the Mass and its integrity and particularly the Consecration and the Most Holy Sacrifice and Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord, form the very heart and center of my priesthood and of the Faith I swore to profess, guard, and defend "to the last breath of my life."

Fr. Lawrence S. Brey
March 12, 1968
Feast of St. Gregory the Great

PREFACE

This little monograph embodies the presentation of a case against the validity of the new "form" presently being used for the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist. It was on October 22, 1967, that this new "form" originally came into use in the United States, along with the new English Canon of the Mass.

That the arguments presented herein are beyond question or challenge I do not claim. Assuredly they will not be the "last word" on the subject.

"You must not so cling to what we have said," St. Anselm advised his disciple, "as to abide by it obstinately when others with more weighty arguments succeed in overthrowing ours and establishing opinions against them." When more weighty arguments (either for or against mine) are advanced, I will welcome them. And I will take as my own these words of the same great St. Anselm: "If there is anything that calls for correction I do not refuse the correction."

What I have striven for is clarity. Each paragraph of this monograph is numbered uniquely, so that all who wish to question or rebut any particular point, or many points, may with ease refer to what I have written. Not only will this aid my sincere opponents in citing chapter and verse against me, but it will also point up the insincerity of all *blanket* criticisms that avoid citing *specifics*.

Patrick Henry Omlor
Redwood City, California.
March 7, 1968

Feast of St. Thomas Aquinas

Six Ways To Violate the Form of A Sacrament:

"NIL FORMAE DEMAS, NIL ADDAS, NIL VARIABIS, TRANSMUTARE CAVE, CORRUMPERE VERBA, MORARI."

"Omit nothing of the form, add nothing, change nothing; Beware of transmuting, corrupting, or interrupting the words."

(Quoted from J. M. Hervé's "*Manuale Theologiae Dogmaticae*")

1) INTRODUCTION

Concerning Father De Pauw's Letter

1. In a 28-page, printed letter, dated December 25, 1967, Father Gommar A. De Pauw raised the question whether the Masses being said using the new all-English Canon are valid. On page 20 of this letter, there appears the following opinion: "IF, therefore, a priest, even though he sinfully and illegally uses the new all-English-Canon, unequivocally assures you - AND YOU SHOULD PUT EVERY PRIEST YOU KNOW TO THIS TEST! - that he positively believes in the SACRIFICIAL nature of the Mass and in the dogma of TRANSUBSTANTIATION AS DEFINED BY THE COUNCIL OF TRENT, and that he still positively intends to use his uniquely priestly powers to bring the living Jesus Christ present upon our altars, then that priest is still offering VALID Masses ..." (Emphasis in the original)

2. According to the foregoing opinion, there are two criteria for determining whether any given, particular Mass is valid. And by virtue of Father De Pauw's use of the word: *and*, it is implied that *both* criteria must be answered affirmatively. The first criterion pertains to the faith of the priest, while the second concerns his proper intention.

3. Now, firstly, regarding the required faith of the priest, St. Thomas Aquinas teaches, "But if his faith be defective in regard to the very sacrament that he confers, although he believe that no inward effect is caused by the thing done outwardly, yet he does know that the Catholic Church intends to confer a sacrament by that which is outwardly done. Wherefore, his unbelief notwithstanding, he can intend to do what the Church does, albeit he esteem it to be nothing. And such an intention suffices for a sacrament: because as stated

above the minister of a sacrament acts in the person of the Church by whose faith any defect in the minister's faith is made good." (*Summa Theologica*, Part III, Q. 64, Art. 9).

4. Therefore, from the above it would seem that the priest's *faith* in the sacrament of the Most Holy Eucharist is not required for the validity of the Masses he offers.

5. And, secondly, St. Thomas discusses "Whether the Minister's Intention is Required for the Validity of a Sacrament?", in *Summa Th.*, III, Q. 64, Art. 8. As is generally known, the Angelic Doctor's method of exposition consists in first posing a number of "Objections," which he subsequently answers, after he has expounded the question at length. In the aforementioned article, the following "Objection" is posed. "*Obj. 2.* Further, one man's intention cannot be known to another. Therefore if the minister's intention were required for the validity of a sacrament, he who approaches a sacrament could not know whether he has received the sacrament."

6. His *Reply Obj. 2* contains the following: "On this point there are two opinions... " St. Thomas next proceeds to discuss the first of these opinions, and exposes its flaws. Then he takes up the second of these opinions in the following manner: "Consequently, others with better reason hold that the minister of a sacrament acts in the person of the whole Church, whose minister he is; while in the words uttered by him, the intention of the Church is expressed; and that this suffices for the validity of the sacrament, *except the contrary be expressed* on the part either of the minister or the recipient of the sacrament." (Emphasis added.)

7. Thus it would seem that there is no necessity for a layman explicitly to interrogate the priest concerning the latter's intention.

The Critical Point of inquiry

8. On page 16 of the aforementioned letter Father De Pauw correctly claims that they are guilty of "unilaterally changing the established form of a sacrament." The sacrament to which he refers, of course, is the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist.

9. Although Father De Pauw mentions it *only casually and in passing*, it seems that this point is really the crux of the matter. For if the wording in the *proper, established* form of a sacrament is so altered that the essential meaning of the words is changed, then the sacrament is *automatically* rendered invalid, as will be demonstrated. For as St. Thomas teaches, "Some heretics in conferring sacraments do not observe the form prescribed by the Church: and these confer neither the sacrament nor the reality of the sacrament."(*Summa Th*, III, Q. 64, Art. 9)

10. As a consequence, both of Father De Pauw's criteria - as well as *all other questions* - are really beside the point *if* the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist has been *automatically rendered invalid* by virtue of a defect in the form introduced in the new, all-English Canon of the Mass. And the investigation of this question is the purpose of this present monograph.

2) THE NECESSITY OF PROPER, DETERMINATE FORMS FOR SACRAMENTS

Necessity of Specific, Determinate Matter

11. As everyone knows for any sacrament to be administered validly, it is necessary that the proper *matter* be used; for example, water for Baptism, bread and wine for the Holy Eucharist.

12. St. Thomas Aquinas explains why *specific determinate* things are required for the proper matter of the sacraments: "Since, therefore, the sanctification of man is in the power of God Who sanctifies, it is not for man to decide what things should be used for his sanctification, but this should be determined by Divine institution. Therefore in the sacraments of the New Law, by which man is Sanctified according to 1 Cor. vi. 11, "*You are washed, you are sanctified,*" we must use those things which are determined by Divine institution." (*Summa Th.* , III, Q. 60, Art. 5)

13. Thus no mere man may dare attempt to arrogate to himself the right to change the *proper matter*, of a sacrament, for "we must use those things which are determined by Divine institution."

Necessity of a Specific Determinate Form Even Greater

14. Now if a specific, determinate *matter* is required for the validity of a sacrament, greater still is the necessity of a specific, determinate *form*. "And therefore in order to insure the perfection of sacramental signification it was necessary to determine the signification of the sensible things (*i.e., the matter*) by means of certain words." (*Summa Th.* III, Q. 60, Art. 6)

15. "As stated above, in the sacraments the words are as the form, and sensible things are as the matter. Now in all things composed of matter and form, the determining principle is on the part of the form. ... Consequently, for the being of a thing the need of a determinate form is prior to the need of determinate matter ... Since, therefore, in the sacraments determinate sensible things are required, which are as the sacramental matter, *much more is there need in them of a determinate form of words.*" (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 60, Art. 7,

emphasis added).

16. And so, similarly as above, mere men may not dare usurp the right to *change the proper form* of a sacrament.

3) *THE PROPER FORM FOR THE SACRAMENT OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST*

The Consecration of the Bread

17. According to St. Thomas Aquinas, the proper form for the consecration of the bread consists of the words: *This is My body.* (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 78, Art. 2).

18. Prior to the introduction of the all-English Canon on October 22, 1967, the form used during the Mass was: *For this is My body.* This new Canon, however, omits the conjunction, *for*; and this particular word, according to St. Thomas, "is set in this form according to the custom of *the Roman Church*, who derived it from *Peter the Apostle.*" (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 78, Art. 2, emphasis added). It was put in the form "on account of the sequence with the words preceding," the Angelic Doctor continues, "and therefore it is not part of the form." (*Ibid.*)

19. Although the omission of the word *for* in the consecration of the bread does not affect the validity of the sacrament, those who are responsible for this omission seemingly exhibit a callous disregard for a Tradition of the *Roman Catholic Church*, a Tradition dating from the very beginnings of Christianity. Indeed a Tradition "derived from Peter the Apostle."!

20. Interestingly, the Angelic Doctor also observes, "Thus in the form of the Eucharist,-- *For this is My body*, the omission of the word *for* ... does not cause the sacrament to be invalid; although perhaps he who makes the omission may sin from negligence or contempt." (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 60, Art. 8).

The Consecration of the Wine

21. According to "*THE CATECHISM By Decree of THE HOLY COUNCIL OF TRENT*," published by command of Pope Saint Pius V: "We are then firmly to believe (*certo credendum est*)," that the form for the consecration of the wine "consists in the following words: *This is the chalice of my blood, of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many, to the remission of sins.*" (Part II, chap. 4, par. 21) And immediately below in par. 22, we read: "Concerning this form no one can doubt (*Verum de hac forma nemo dubitare poterit*) ... it is plain that no other words constitute the form (*perspicuum est, aliam formam constituendam non esse*)."

22. There are other theology books which either state (or at least imply) that the words *This is My blood* alone constitute the form. This certainly would seem to be incorrect for several reasons. First of all, as just noted, a catechism by, decree of *an Ecumenical Council* (and not a "pastoral" one either) has declared otherwise.

23. The second reason is by the authority of long-established usage. For in practically all missals, both those used by the priest (altar missals) and those used by the faithful, we always find italicized or set in bold print the entire form: *Hic est enim Calix ... in remissionem peccatorum*.

24. And finally, thirdly, we should believe that the *entire* form given in paragraph 21 above is the *necessary and proper form*, because the integrity of the expression demands it. "Some have maintained," says St. Thomas, "that the words *This is the chalice of My blood* alone belong to the substance (that is, the essence or necessary part - *Auth.*) of the form, but not those words which follow. Now this seems incorrect, because the words which follow them are determinations of the predicate, that is, of Christ's blood; consequently they belong to the integrity of the expression."

25. He continues, "And on this account others say more accurately that all the words which follow are of the substance of the form down to the words, *As often as ye shall do this* (but *not including* these words -- *Auth.*)." Otherwise, why would the priest continue holding the chalice until the completion of *all* these words? "Hence it is that the priest pronounces all the words, under the same rite and manner, namely, holding the chalice in his hands." (*Summa Th.* III, Q. 78, Art. 3).

26. *To show why each clause and phrase is necessary*, the Angelic Doctor explains them one by one. "Consequently it must be said that all the aforesaid words belong to the substance of the form; but that by the first words, *This is the chalice of My blood*, the change of the wine into blood is denoted..." It is important to note that St. Thomas says that the transubstantiation is *denoted*, but he does *not* say that it actually *occurs*, upon the completion of this clause.

27. Continuing, "but by the words which come after is shown the power of the blood shed in the Passion, which power works in this sacrament, and is ordained for three purposes. First and principally for securing our eternal heritage, ... and in order to denote this, we say, *of the New and Eternal Testament* .

28. "Secondly, for justifying by grace, which is by faith,...and on this account we add, *The Mystery of Faith*.

29. "Thirdly, for removing sins which are the impediments to both of these things, ... and on this account, we say, *which shall be shed for you and for many unto the forgiveness of sins.*" (Quotations in paragraphs 26-29 from *Summa Th.*,

III,Q.78, Art. 3).

30. To summarize this part: The proper form for the sacrament of the Most Holy Eucharist - *all of which* is necessary for its validity - is:

This is My body, This is the chalice of My blood, of the New and Eternal Testament, the Mystery of Faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the forgiveness of sins."

4) THE NEW "FORM" INTRODUCED VIA THE ALL-ENGLISH CANON

Text of the New Form

31. When the new, all-English Canon made its debut upon the American scene last October, there were some Catholics who showed immediate concern that the very words of the Consecration had been changed.

32. The new text reads: "This is my body. This is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant - the mystery of faith. This blood is to be shed for you and for all men so that sins may be forgiven."

Some Preliminary Observations

33. That the new phraseology is not the same as the ancient form is immediately evident. In some places a synonym (more or less) replaces the former word; for example, the commonplace word *cup* appears instead of the word *chalice*. And *shall be shed* becomes rendered as: *is to be shed*.

34. But the alteration we shall analyze most carefully is the one that occurs in the final words. *For you and for all men so that sins may be forgiven* has been substituted for: *for you and for many unto the forgiveness of sins*.

35. If the above substitution is *not a mere translation*, but involves an *essential change in meaning*, then the sacrament has clearly been rendered invalid, as shall be shown, using St. Thomas as an authority.

36. For a plain understanding of what is to follow we must comprehend the language of St. Thomas. When he uses the expression, "substantial part of the sacramental form," or simply, "substance of the form," what is meant is the *necessary part* of the form. The alteration we are going to examine, as outlined in paragraph 34 above, occurs in the "*substance of the form*," as was shown above in paragraphs 24, 25 and 29, quoting St. Thomas.

37. By "essential sense of the words," it should be understood that St.

Thomas means, "*the basic meaning of the words.*"

5) HOW DOES CHANGING THE FORM INVALIDATE A SACRAMENT?

Changes Caused by Omission of Words

38. The *omission* of words in the form of a sacrament does not always invalidate the sacrament. But the sacrament remains valid *if and only if* the words left out do not belong to the *substance* of the form; that is, the essence or necessary part of the form. Thus we saw in paragraph 20 above that the omission of the word *for* in the form: *For this is My body*, does not invalidate the sacrament, because the word *for* is not in the *substance* of the form.

39. But it goes without saying that if the *substance* of the form is altered by the omission, then the sacrament is invalidated. As St. Thomas says: "Now it is clear, if any substantial part of the sacramental form be suppressed, that the essential sense of the words is destroyed; and consequently the sacrament is invalid." (*Summa Th.*, III, Q.60, Art. 8).

Changes Caused by Addition of Words

40. If words are *added* to the form of a sacrament, and these words introduce a change in the basic meaning (*essential sense*) of the form, then the sacrament is necessarily invalid. Thus the form for baptism used by the Arians was: "*I baptize thee in the name of the Father Who is greater, and of the Son Who is less.*"

41. Another example of the addition of words which would render a sacrament invalid would be: "*I baptize thee in the Name of the Father ... etc., and of the Blessed Virgin Mary.*" That is, if by saying this one intended to place the Mother of God on a par with the Blessed Trinity.

42. If the words added *involve no change of sense*, then the sacrament remains valid. Thus the Greeks use the form: *The servant of God, N ... is baptized in the name of the Father, etc.*

Changes Caused by Substitution of Words

43. The type of change which we are concerned with in the present discussion is one of *substitution*. For the newly-introduced form has substituted, *for you and for all men so that sins may be forgiven*, for the words: *for you and for many unto the forgiveness of sins*. Now a substitution always necessarily involves an omission *and* an addition; for the standing phrase is omitted and the new phrase is added.

44. A *substitution* is permissible if the part inserted is exactly equivalent to the part taken out. The form we use for the Sacrament of Confirmation contains: *I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation*. But some say: *I confirm thee with the chrism of sanctification*. St. Thomas explains, "Holiness is the cause of salvation. Therefore it comes to the same whether we say *chrism of salvation* or of *sanctification*." (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 72, Art. 4) However, to substitute the word *faith* instead of *salvation*, for example, would most probably render the sacrament invalid.

The Criterion We Must Use

45. Let us consider the following teaching of the Angelic Doctor: "The other point to be considered is the meaning of the words. For since in the sacraments, the words produce an effect according to the sense which they convey, as stated above, we must see whether the change of words destroys the essential sense of the words: because then the sacrament is clearly rendered invalid." (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 60, Art. 8).

46. That the change of words introduced in the new "form" has destroyed the "essential sense" of the words in the ancient, established form will be clearly demonstrated below in Part 7. But first of all, one more preliminary topic will be treated in the next part (6).

6) *NECESSITY OF USING OUR LORDS WORDS FOR THE EUCHARIST*

The Source of Power in These Words

47. From some examples given above it was seen that as regards the sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation a slight variation in wording is permissible, provided that the essential sense of the words of the form is not affected. But in the sacrament of the Most Holy Eucharist a special case presents itself. Here there must be no variation whatsoever.

48. In all the sacraments *except the Holy Eucharist* the minister has an act to perform in addition to pronouncing the required words of the form. For example, pouring water in Baptism, anointing with chrism in Confirmation, and in Holy Orders the imposition of hands, etc., which constitute the matter of that sacrament. But in the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist the priest has *no act* to perform *except the pronouncing of the necessary words*. (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 78, Art. 1).

49. Moreover, the power of the form of this sacrament is derived *solely* from the fact that the words spoken by the priest are the *exact words* of Our Lord. "But

the form of this sacrament is pronounced as if Christ were speaking in person, so that it is given to be understood that the minister does nothing in perfecting this sacrament, except to pronounce the words of Christ." (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 78, Art. 1).

50. "Ambrose says (*De Sacram.* iv): 'The consecration is accomplished by the words and expressions of the Lord Jesus. ... (W)hen the time comes for perfecting the sacrament, the priest uses no longer his own words, but the words of Christ.'" (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 78, Art. 1).

Our Lord's Words in the Ancient Form

51. It cannot be doubted that the ancient, established form for the consecration of the wine comprises the words of our Lord. But inasmuch as there are always those pseudo-Catholics who relish questioning everything - the revered Traditions of the Church and Holy Scripture not excluded - the following proofs are presented.

52. *Proof from Holy Scripture.* As St. Thomas observes, "Nevertheless nearly all these words can be culled from various passages of the Scriptures." (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 78, Art. 3). In point of fact, the only words of this form which are not to be found in the Holy Scriptures are the following: (a) *and eternal*, and (b) *the Mystery of Faith*.

53. But Tradition reveals to us that these words, *and eternal* and *the Mystery of Faith* were also from Our Lord. "The words added, namely, *eternal* and *mystery of faith*, were handed down to the Church by the apostles, who received them from Our Lord." (*Ibid.*)

54. And, elsewhere in discussing the question, "Whether the Words Spoken in This Sacrament Are Properly Framed?" (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 83, Art. 4), the Angelic Doctor makes this observation, "We find it stated in *De Consecr.*, dist. 1, that 'James, the brother of the Lord according to the flesh, and Basil, bishop of Caesarea, edited the rite of celebrating the Mass.'"

55. To summarize: The words which had always been used for the form of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist were *the words of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ*, as proved from Holy Scripture and Tradition. These words were used by the Apostles themselves. It is by virtue of these words that the form for this sacrament *derives its power and efficacy*.

Putting Words into Our Lord's Mouth

56. The new "form" for the consecration of the wine alleges that Our Lord said: "to be shed for you and for *all men* ... etc." There is *no* evidence - either in Holy Scripture or in the Traditions handed down - that Our Lord actually said this

when instituting the Holy Eucharist.

57. Moreover, *all the evidence* is that He did *not* say: "for all men," when instituting the Most Holy Sacrament. St. Matthew (26,28) writes that He said, "*for many.*" And also St. Mark (14,24) records that Our Lord said, "*for many.*" But *nowhere* in Holy Scripture - neither in St. Paul nor the Evangelists - do we find that Our Lord said, "for all men." Now whom are we to believe? Are we to believe St. Mark and St. Matthew, *who was actually there* at the Last Supper (and both of whom were *divinely inspired* to write what they wrote)? Or, are we to believe an "enlightened" clique of mid-twentieth-century Modernists and Innovators?

58. Even in ordinary writing or oratory, careful scholars are diligent in using the *exact words* of another person whenever attributing to him a quotation. *How much more diligence is demanded when attributing a direct quotation to Jesus!* "It is not lawful to add even words to Holy Scripture as though such words were a part thereof, for this would amount to forgery." (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 60, Art. 8).

59. Now, the authors of this new Canon boldly claim that Our Lord *said something* that He clearly and obviously *did not say*. (In Part 12 it will be shown that Our Lord *could not* have said what they claim He did.) The text of this new Canon reads precisely: "He... gave the cup ... *and said:*". The "quotation" *immediately following* includes the *bogus phrase*: "for all men so that sins may be forgiven." *THIS IS A FORGERY*, and those who are responsible for it must be deemed guilty of a deliberate deception, unless they can prove that they are merely completely inept and most culpably negligent.

60. It might be remarked, in passing, that the phrase *for you and for all men* grammatically is inelegant in that it is redundant. By analogy, a speaker does not single out one person in a group and say, 'This is for you and for all in this room,' but rather would he say, "This is for you and for all *others* in this room." For it is obvious that the person who is singled out is automatically included in "all in this room." Thus the Innovators even go so far as to attribute inferior rhetoric to Our Lord.

61. From the foregoing it is clear that, by tampering with the words of Our Lord, our Modernists are endangering the *very source of the power* of this sacrament.

7) *THE NEW "FORM" DESTROYS THE SENSE OF THE PROPER FORM*

Two Distinct Aspects of Christ's Death

62. In order to comprehend clearly that the new "form" being used involves a

change of essential sense (basic meaning) from the ancient and *proper* form, we must consider two distinct aspects of the Passion and Death of Our Divine Lord.

63. The first aspect is that of *sufficiency*, that is, for what and for whom did Christ's Passion *suffice*? The second aspect is that of *efficacy*, that is, for what and for whom was Christ's Passion *efficacious* (effective)?

The Aspect of Sufficiency

64. It is a truth of our Faith that Christ died for all men without exception. "And He is the propitiation for our sins:" and not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world. (1 John 2,2). Another truth of our Faith is that not all men are saved, but some indeed suffer eternal damnation.

65. Hence we can say that Christ's Passion is the *sufficient* cause of the salvation of all men. In the words of St. Thomas, "Christ by His Passion delivered us from our sins causally - that is, by setting up the cause of our deliverance, from which cause all sins whatsoever, past, present, or to come, could be forgiven: just as if a doctor were to prepare a medicine by which all sicknesses can be cured even in the future." (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 49, Art. 2).

66. And this is the meaning of the truth, "Christ died for all men." His Passion is *sufficient* for the salvation of all, "from which cause all sins ... *could* be forgiven."

The Aspect of Efficacy

67. Now we are led to consider another truth of our Faith. Although it is related to the truth discussed just above, this other truth is *not the same* truth as above, but a distinct truth. Just as the doctrines of the Immaculate Conception, Virgin Birth, Perpetual Virginity and Divine Maternity are *distinct truths*, defined at different times - although they are intimately related insofar as they all derive from the singular role of the Most Blessed Virgin Mary in God's Redemptive Plan.

68. This other truth we are led to consider is that the *efficacy*, or effectiveness, of Christ's Passion is not communicated to all men, but only unto those who are actually saved; that *is, to the elect*. This truth is closely connected with the doctrine of man's free will, a mystery, and with the doctrine of the *Mystical Body of Christ*, also a mystery.

69. These two distinct aspects of Christ's Passion and Death (each conveying its own particular truth) - to wit, the standpoints of *sufficiency* and *efficacy* - are clearly *distinguished* in this passage from a decree of the Council of Trent: "But, though He died for all, yet all do not receive the benefit of His death, but those only unto whom the merit of His passion is communicated." (*Session VI*, Ch. 3).

The Ancient, Established Form Conveys the Sense of Efficacy

70. It will now be made quite clear that the ancient and *proper* form of the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist refers to the shedding of Christ's Precious Blood from the standpoint of *efficacy* only. This form terminates with these words: *which shall be shed for you and for many unto the forgiveness of sins.*

71. A first observation is that the word *unto* - (which in Latin is the preposition "*in*" followed by a noun in the accusative case) - means *to, towards, or leading up to*; and thus this word *unto* in itself conveys the sense of effectiveness or efficacy.

72. Secondly, the words *for many* are selective in their connotation, as opposed to *for all men*, which phrase denotes universality. At this point it will be most instructive to rely once again upon the lucid teaching of the Angelic Doctor. The following argument is drawn from *Summa Th.*, III, Q. 78, Art. 3; - and this particular article is very much to the point of our discussion, for the topic treated therein is: what is the proper form for the consecration of the wine?

73. According to his characteristic manner of exposition, St. Thomas at first suggests a number of "objections," and subsequently he demonstrates the errors contained in these "objections." The following objection is posed: "*Obj. 8. Christ's Passion sufficed for all; while as to its efficacy it was profitable for many. Therefore it ought to be said: Which shall be shed for all, or else for many, without adding for you.*"

74. For clarity's sake, let us examine this "objection" by rephrasing it. It may be reworded thus: The proper form for the consecration should treat of Christ's Passion from *either* the standpoint of sufficiency, *or* the standpoint of efficacy. Now to treat of it from the standpoint of sufficiency demands the form, *which shall be shed for all*. But if the standpoint of efficacy is what is meant, then the form should be simply: *for many*, without adding *for you* (which is redundant).

75. The subtle error in this "objection" is thus exposed and refuted by St. Thomas: "*Reply Obj. 8. The blood of Christ's Passion has its efficacy not merely in the elect among the Jews, to whom the blood of the Old Testament was exhibited, but also in the Gentiles...And therefore He says expressly, for you, the Jews, and for many, namely the Gentiles...*"

76. Beginning his reply, "The blood of Christ's passion has its *efficacy*," St. Thomas totally ignores the aspect of *sufficiency*, and thus he implies that it goes without saying that the proper sense of Christ's words here is that of *efficacy*. Moreover, his reply speaks only of "the elect." Thus, *for you* means not only the Apostles to whom Christ was speaking - and, in fact, Judas, *though present*, was not included in *for you* - , but it means all *the elect* among the Jews. *Not all the Jews*, but only "the elect" among the Jews. And this

phraseology, needless to say, denotes only the aspect of *efficacy*. And the phrase *and for many* encompasses the Gentiles; again it is understood, of course, that St. Thomas is referring only to *the elect* among the Gentiles.

77. Therefore according to the Angelic Doctor's explanation, the correct sense or meaning of the form for the consecration of the wine is: *which shall be shed for you* (the elect among the Jews) *and for many* (the elect among the Gentiles) *unto* (effecting) *the forgiveness of sins*. And from this it should be abundantly clear that this form denotes the shedding of Christ's Blood from the aspect of its efficacy, rather than its sufficiency.

78. "As Christ's Passion benefits all" says St. Thomas elsewhere, "... whereas it produces no effect except in those who are united with Christ's Passion through faith and charity, so likewise this sacrifice, which is the memorial of our Lord's Passion, has no effect except in those who are united with this sacrament through faith and charity ... Hence in the Canon of the Mass *no prayer is made for them who are outside the pale of the Church.*" (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 79, Art. 7, emphasis added).

79. But if no prayer is made *anywhere* in the Canon of the mass for those outside the Church, least of all should the words "for all men" be placed in the very form for the Consecration! For, as shall be explained later, this Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist is uniquely *the* Sacrament of the Mystical Body of Christ, of which Body *not* all men are members.

The New "Form" Conveys the Sense of Sufficiency

80. The "form" introduced in the new, all English Canon terminates thus: *is to be shed for you and for all men so that sins may be forgiven*. Unlike the ancient, established, and proper form, the above phraseology fails to convey the sense of *efficacy*, and denotes only the sense of *sufficiency*.

81. The very words, "so that sins *may* be forgiven," denote only the notion of possibility, for the verb "*may*" is the permissive form. To describe *sufficiency*, St. Thomas uses the words, "from which cause all sins ... *could* be forgiven." The word "*may*" is akin to "*could*", except that "*could*" is even stronger in that it denotes power, capability, or ability, and not mere possibility.

82. Secondly, as stated earlier, the phrase "for all men," by its universality, cannot denote anything but the aspect of *sufficiency*. Thus it is proved that the new "form" in no way Conveys the same meaning as the ancient and proper form.

83. It is important to note, in passing, that if the words *all men* had been substituted for the word *many*, without changing anything else, the "form" would have read: *which shall be shed for you and for all men unto the forgiveness of*

sins. This "form" is heretical. Since *unto* denotes efficacy, this "form" says that the benefits of Christ's Passion are actually communicated to *all men unto* the forgiveness of sins. And this is contrary to faith.

Summary and Conclusion

84. We have considered the Passion and Death of Christ from two standpoints, each of which contains a separate and distinct truth. Christ died for all men without exception so that all their sins may be forgiven. And this is the aspect of *sufficiency*. However, Christ's Passion is not profitable for all men, because we know *de fide* that not all men attain eternal salvation. Thus *many* men, but not all men, have communicated to them the benefits of His Passion *unto* the forgiveness of sins, and this is the aspect of *efficacy* or effectiveness.

85. The ancient and *proper* form for the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist uses Christ's own words and conveys the latter truth; namely, that of *efficacy*. The new "form" uses men's words and conveys the former truth; namely, that of *sufficiency*. And thus the Innovators, the authors of this change, have destroyed the essential sense of the proper form.

86. "For since in the sacraments, the words produce an effect according to the sense which they convey, as stated above, we must see whether the change of words destroys the essential sense of the words: because then the sacrament is clearly rendered invalid." (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 60, Art. 8).

8) *WHAT IS MEANT BY "THE REALITY" OF A SACRAMENT?*

87. Earlier in this monograph this quotation of St. Thomas was cited, "Some heretics in conferring sacraments do not observe the form prescribed by the Church: and these confer neither the sacrament nor the reality of the sacrament." What does the Angelic Doctor mean by "the reality" of a sacrament? For a clear understanding of what is to follow in this monograph, it is imperative that this fundamental concept - that is, "the reality" of a sacrament - be grasped.

Three Distinct Elements in a Sacrament

88. In the sacraments there are three distinct elements that must be regarded. (1) There is the element which is *sacrament only*; that is, the outward sign, or matter and form, considered by itself. In other words, the external rite of the sacrament. (2) Next there is the *reality of the sacrament* - this is what St. Thomas calls "*res sacramenti*" -; and by this is meant the crowning effect or principal fruit of the sacrament. In other words, "the reality" of the sacrament is the *grace proper* to the particular sacrament. It is that which *is signified* by the external rite, which is that which *signifies*. And (3) there is the element which

contains something of both the first two elements; that is, it contains something of the *sacrament* and something of the *reality*. This element we call "the reality and the sign." Consequently, it follows that this element both *signifies* and *is signified*.

Baptism As An Example

89. A clear insight into the meaning of the preceding paragraph can be gained by considering the Sacrament of Baptism as an example. (1) In Baptism the element which is *sacrament only* is the outward sign, namely, the pouring of the water. That is to say, the water *and* the washing, coupled, of course, with the recitation of the proper words which constitute the form of this sacrament. It is this element which *does the signifying*.

90. And (2) there is the element which is the *reality only*; that is, the chief fruit or grace proper to the Sacrament of Baptism. This crowning effect is the washing away of original sin (and, in the case of adults, actual sin also). In the words of St. Thomas, this chief effect - the reality of this Sacrament - is "inward justification." This inward justification *can be lost*. It is clear, then, that "the reality" is the element which *is signified*.

91. And, finally, (3) the element which is *both sacrament and reality*, sometimes called "the reality and the sign," is the Baptismal character imprinted on the soul. This character *cannot be lost*; it is indelible. It must be noted that this third element both *signifies* and *is signified*. First of all, it signifies (or is the sign of) the aforesaid inward justification. And, lastly, it is signified by the aforesaid outward washing.

9) *WHAT IS "THE REALITY" OF THE SACRAMENT OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST?*

The Three Elements

92. St. Thomas Aquinas teaches, "We can consider three things in this sacrament: namely, that which is sacrament only, and this is the bread and wine; that which is both reality and sacrament, to wit, Christ's true body; and lastly that which is reality only, namely, the effect of this sacrament." (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 73, Art. 6)

93. Now, what is "the effect of this sacrament," *the reality* of the Holy Eucharist? "Now ... the reality of the sacrament is the unity of the mystical body, without which there can be no salvation." (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 73, Art. 3).

94. *The key idea* in what is to follow is the unique relationship between the

Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist and the Mystical Body. Let us reiterate this idea, using the words of Abbé Anger: "In the Eucharist the sign is the consecrated species; the 'reality and the sign' is the true Body of Christ; and the 'reality' is the Mystical Body or the grace uniting the soul with Christ and with the members of Christ." (Anger-Burke, "*The Doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ*, According to the Principles of the Theology of St. Thomas," by Abbé Anger, and translated from the French by Rev. John J. Burke, C.S.P., S.T.D., p.107).

Examples To Illustrate "The Reality" of The Eucharist

95. We read in John (6,24): "Then Jesus said to them: Amen, amen I say unto you: Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you." But, since we believe that infants who have been baptized and who die before receiving the Eucharist are saved, how do we explain Christ's words: "Except you eat ... you shall not have life in you."?

96. This is answered as follows. By Baptism a person "is ordained to the Eucharist, and therefore from the fact of children being baptized, they are destined by the Church to the Eucharist; and just as they believe through the Church's faith, so they desire the Eucharist through the Church's intention, and, as a result, receive *its reality*." (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 73, Art. 3, emphasis added).

97. Therefore infants, though they do not receive the *sacrament* of the Eucharist, nevertheless receive *the reality* of the sacrament, namely, union with the *Mystical Body*.

98. Similarly, one who with the right disposition, though he be unable to receive Holy Communion, makes a "spiritual communion," thereby receives *the reality* of the sacrament, but not the sacrament itself.

10) THE UNIQUE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE EUCHARIST AND THE MYSTICAL BODY

All Sacraments Related to The Mystical Body

99. It is true that all the sacraments are related in some way to the Mystical Body, but the relationship thereto by the Eucharist is unique. "All the sacraments are instituted for the well-being of the Mystical Body ... (But) the Holy Eucharist, feeding all with nourishment divine, *seals the close union* both of the members with their Head and of the members with one another. ... The other sacraments give grace. The Holy Eucharist gives the very Author of grace. The other sacraments are rivers of grace. The Holy Eucharist is the source itself." (Anger-Burke, pp. 88-9, emphasis added).

100. "In the Catholic doctrine of the sacraments everything converges, everything looks towards the Eucharist, effective symbol of the unity of the Mystical Body." (Anger-Burke, p.163).

Unique Relationship of the Most Blessed Sacrament

101. The Blessed Sacrament is necessary for the unity of the Mystical Body. As St. Thomas says, "That there be a perfect union of Head and members a sacrament was necessary which would hold Christ, which would give us not merely a share in His powers but His own essential Self." (Quoted from Anger-Burke, p.106).

102. "The Holy Eucharist brings us to the very heart of our subject ... it is that by which the Mystical Body is actually constituted." (Anger-Burke, p. 104).

103. "This is the unity of Christ and His members, and of His members one with another. This is what theologians term 'the reality' of this sacrament. This is the fruit of the Holy Eucharist. (Anger-Burke, p. 117).

104. "The Holy Eucharist is the center of the doctrine of the Mystical Body ... The Holy Eucharist is called 'union with' and indeed that is what it effects ... By it we are united to Christ ... By it we are also united one to another and brought into one sole body." (Anger-Burke, p. 128).

105. And finally, "Everything touching the Eucharist leads us back to the Mystical Body." (Anger-Burke, p. 107).

The Words of Pope Pius XII

106. In his encyclical on the Mystical Body (*Mystici Corporis Christi*), Pope Pius XII could not have failed to mention this essential relationship of the Eucharist with the Mystical Body. "Nor is that enough; for in the Holy Eucharist the faithful are nourished and grow strong at the same table, and in a divine, ineffable way are brought into union with each other and with the divine Head of the whole Body."

107. And elsewhere in this same encyclical the Pontiff says, "It seems to Us that something would be lacking ... if We did not add here a few words on the Holy Eucharist, wherein this union during this mortal life reaches, as it were, a climax.

108. "Through the Eucharistic Sacrifice Christ Our Lord wished to give special evidence to the faithful of our union among ourselves and with our divine Head ... For here the sacred ministers act in the person not only of our Savior but of the whole Mystical Body."

Summary and Preview

109. The Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist bears a distinct and unique relationship to the Mystical Body of Christ. For "*the reality*" of this sacrament is the union of the Mystical Body. The other sacraments are also related to the Mystical Body, but not in the distinct, unique manner as is the Holy Eucharist. "*Everything touching the Eucharist leads us back to the Mystical Body.*"

110. But what is the Mystical Body? Who are the members of the Mystical Body? Do *all men* belong to the Mystical Body? In the form for the Most Blessed Sacrament - at the very moment of the Consecration - should the words "*for all men*" be brought in? By saying "*for all men*" instead of "*for many*," is some part of the *essential signification* of the sacrament suppressed or perverted? Does the phrase "*for all men*" run counter to the "*reality*" of this sacrament? These are some of the questions that shall be treated of in Parts 11 and 12.

11) *WHO BELONGS TO THE MYSTICAL BODY?*

111. To give an exhaustive treatment of the doctrine of the Mystical Body, which is a great mystery of our Faith, is not the purpose of this part. Nor is this author even capable of such a task. On the contrary, the purpose here is simply to get a concise, working "definition" of the Mystical Body; and, further, to ascertain whether "*all men*" can, in any sense, be considered to be members of the Mystical Body. All quotations in this part are from the encyclical, *Mystici Corporis Christi*.

The One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church

112. The Mystical Body consists *of the head* Who is Jesus Christ, God; and of *the members*, who are those united to the Head. "If we would define and describe this true Church of Jesus Christ - which is the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church - we shall find no expression more noble, more sublime or more divine than the phrase which calls it 'the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ'" (Pope Pius XII).

The Visible Church Is Necessary

113. "It was possible for Him personally, immediately to impart these graces to men; but He wished to do so only *through a visible Church* ... and thus through that Church dispensing the graces of the Redemption ... *Hence they err in a matter of divine truth*, who imagine the Church to be invisible, intangible, a something merely 'pneumatological', as they say, by which many Christian communities, though they differ from each other in their profession of faith, are united by a bond that eludes the senses." (Emphasis added.).

114. "For this reason We deplore and condemn the pernicious error of those who conjure up from their fancies an imaginary Church, a kind of Society that finds its origin and growth in charity, to which they somewhat contemptuously oppose another, which they call juridical."

Unbelievers and Unbaptized Persons Are Not Members

115. "Only those are really to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and *profess the true faith* and who have not unhappily withdrawn from Body-unity or for grave faults been excluded by *legitimate authority*." (Emphasis added.).

Heretics, Schismatics, Apostates Automatically Excluded

116. "For not every sin, however grave and enormous it be, is such as to sever a man automatically from the Body of the Church, as does schism, or heresy or apostasy."

Loyalty and Adherence to The Pope Required

117. "They, therefore, walk the path of dangerous error, who believe that they can accept Christ as the Head of the Church, while they reject genuine loyalty to His Vicar on earth."

Conclusion

118. From all the words of His Holiness Pope Pius XII cited in this Part, it is quite clear that *in no sense* can we consider that "*all men*" belong to the Mystical Body of Christ.

12) *THE NEW "FORM" SUPPRESSES WHAT IS ESSENTIAL, AND SIGNIFIES FALSELY*

Christ Could Not Have Said: "for All Men"

119. In Part 7, it was argued that the "form" of the Holy Eucharist included in the new, all-English Canon is defective; and by virtue of this defect in the form, which destroys the essential meaning of the true words of the proper form, the sacrament is rendered invalid.

120. From the *very choice of words* by which the new "form" assumes its invalidity - namely, the substitution: *for all men*, etc. - additional evidence of its invalidity may be adduced. For these ersatz words, "for all men" attack *the*

reality of the sacrament, which is the Mystical Body.

121. The Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist is *not* a sacrament "for all men"; it is *the sacrament* "for you and for many." "The additional words *for you and for many*," teaches *THE CATECHISM* by Decree of *THE HOLY COUNCIL OF TRENT*, "are taken, some from Matthew, some from Luke, but were joined together by the Catholic Church under the guidance of the Spirit of God."

122. "With reason, therefore, were the words *for all* not used," continues *THE CATECHISM*, "as in this place the fruits of the Passion are alone spoken of, and to the elect only did His Passion bring the fruit of salvation. And this is the purport of the Apostle when he says: *Christ was offered once to exhaust the sins of many*; and also the words of Our Lord in John: *I pray for them; I pray not for the world, but for them whom thou hast given me, because they are thine*."

123. *Always was this understood* to be the meaning of this form; that is to say, that the sense of *efficacy*, and *not sufficiency*, must be conveyed. St. Alphonsus writes, "The words *Pro vobis et pro multis* ("For you and for many") are used to distinguish the virtue of the blood of Christ from its fruits; for the blood of our Savior is of sufficient value to save all men, but its fruits are applicable only to a certain number and not to all, and this is their own fault. Or, as the theologians say, this precious blood is (in itself) sufficiently (*sufficenter*) able to save all men, but (on our part) effectually (*efficaciter*) it does not save all - it saves only those who co-operate with grace. This is the explanation of St. Thomas, as quoted by Benedict XIV." (St. Alphonsus de Liguori, *Treatise on THE HOLY EUCHARIST*).

124. As recorded in John (chs. 14-17), *immediately after* instituting the Holy Eucharist, Our Lord gave a lengthy discourse to the Apostles in which He expounded the doctrine of *His Mystical Body*. "I am the vine; you the branches." (John, 15,5) Significantly, Judas Iscariot was not present for this discourse, for he had already departed to betray The Master. *And herewith lies an idea of vital import!*: Jesus at this time *did not pray for all men*. "I pray for them: *I pray not for the world, but for them whom thou hast given me*." (John, 17,9). What further evidence is necessary to prove that our Lord *did not say* "for all men", as the authors of the new, bogus Canon *sacrilegiously* claim?

125. And since this new "form" contains a lie and a sacrilegious mutilation of the words of Christ as recorded in Holy Writ, *how can it conceivably* be a valid form for this Most Holy of Sacraments? "The Holy Ghost never inspires anything that is not conformable to Holy Writ. If there were the slightest divergence, that, alone by itself, would suffice to prove so evidently the work of the Evil One that were the whole world to assure me it was the Holy Ghost, I would never believe it." (Words of St. Teresa, quoted from *Christendom*, Feb. 1968) "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema." (Gal. 1,8).

*Sacraments Must Contain What They Signify
and Signify What They Contain*

126. In his Bull *Apostolicae Curae* (1896), Pope Leo XIII ruled Anglican Orders to be invalid on two counts: namely, by virtue of "defect in form" and "defect in, intention," either defect alone being sufficient grounds for invalidity.

127. "Moreover," the Bull states, "it is well known that the Sacraments of the New Law, being sensible signs which cause invisible grace, must both signify the grace which they cause and cause the grace which they signify. Now this signification, though it must be found in the essential rite as a whole, that is, in both matter and form together, belongs chiefly to the form."

128. One aspect of the Anglicans' defective form centered around a change they made, which change might at first sight seem to be only minor or *accidental* in nature. Nevertheless, Pope Leo ruled that this particular change *away from the proper, prescribed form* entailed the suppression of some of the essential signification of the sacrament.

129. This was the change referred to just above: In their "new form" for the Sacrament of Holy Orders, the Anglicans deleted any special reference to the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist. Included in their "form" however, was the phrase: *and be thou a faithful dispenser...of His Holy Sacraments*, and also: *Take thou authority... to minister the Holy Sacraments*.

130. The Pontiff decreed that by failing *explicitly to mention* the Holy Eucharist, this "form" failed to contain some signification essential for the sacrament of Holy Orders. "It is, then, impossible" said Pope Leo, "for a form to be suitable and sufficient for a sacrament if it suppresses that which it ought distinctively to signify."

131. The Anglican Hierarchy countered by claiming that their wording - to wit, "of His Holy Sacraments" - *automatically included* the Holy Eucharist. This argument was answered by the Catholic Bishops of England as follows: "(N)or, although the sacrifice is intimately connected with one of the Sacraments, do the words *be thou a faithful dispenser ... of His Holy Sacraments* draw special attention to that particular Sacrament, still less bring into prominence its sacrificial aspect." (*A Vindication of The Bull 'Apostolicae Curae'*).

External Rite of The Eucharist Must Signify The Mystical Body

132. The Bishops' *Vindication*, just quoted, also states: "The essential part (of the form) must contain within itself all that is essential to the due conveyance of *the grace or power* attached to the Sacrament." (Emphasis added.). Now the "grace or power" (that is, "*the reality*" or *grace proper*) of the Holy Eucharist is, as we have seen, the union of the Mystical Body. Therefore the Mystical Body must

be signified in the external rite of this sacrament.

133. But where is this signification to be found? First of all, in the *matter*, the bread and wine, the Mystical Body is symbolized. As many have observed (see, for example, *Summa Th.*, III, Q. 74, Art. 1), the many *members* of the Mystical Body, and their union, are signified by the many grains of wheat which compose the bread and the many grapes that go into the wine.

134. But Pope Leo has reminded us that the signification "belongs chiefly to the form"; and the Bishops' *Vindication* further states that the signification "must be found in the *essential part*, in the matter and form morally united together." Therefore we must attempt to discover *where in the form* of the Sacrament the Mystical Body is signified.

An Opinion

135. Some theologians, it must be noted, are of the opinion that the words "This is My Body. *This is the Chalice of My Blood*," and these words taken alone, "signify perfectly and effect the sacrament." A different opinion has been held by many others, notably St. Thomas and St. Pius V.

136. Now I would like to proffer *an opinion* on this subject. It seems that the words "*This is My Body. This is My Blood*," and these words alone, do *not* signify "*the reality*" of the Sacrament (The Mystical Body), but rather do they signify "*the reality and the sign*," which is Christ's *true* Body. And, needless to say, Christ is not the Mystical Body; He is the *Head* of the Mystical Body.

137. Therefore, "*This is My Body. This is My Blood*," alone, signify only The Head, Christ, but fail to signify *the members* of the Mystical Body. But the *whole* Mystical Body, Head *and* members, must be signified in the form for this Sacrament, as observed just above in par. 132. "But now there are many members indeed, yet one body." (I Cor. 12,20) And also: "Nor again (can) the head (say) to the feet: I have no need of you." (I Cor. 12,21).

138. As a consequence it seems evident that this latter signification, of the *members* of the Mystical Body, is to be found in the words, "*for you and for many*."

139. Most certainly this *exact* phraseology is not required to convey this signification (more on this below), and even simply the words "*for you*" would suffice to signify the members of the Mystical Body. And it is important to note well that *all Scriptural accounts* of the institution of the Holy Eucharist contain this signification of the members of the Mystical Body.

140. Thus Sts. Matthew and Mark record "*for many*." St. Luke records: "This is my body, which is given *for you*," and also "This is the chalice, the new testament

in my blood, which shall be shed *for you*." And, finally, we see that St. Paul also hands down a form which contains this essential signification: "Take ye, and eat: this is my body, which shall be delivered *for you*." (I Cor. 11,24).

The New "Form" Signifies Falsely

141. If the opinion stated above be correct, then the words, "*for you and for ALL MEN*," not only *fail to convey* this essential signification of the Mystical Body, but, on the contrary, *they signify falsely!*

142. It may be reiterated that this "form": *for you and for all men so that sins may be forgiven*, not only is not heretical, but, as stated earlier, it conveys *a certain, particular truth*. But in the context in which it has been placed, in the "form" for The Eucharist, it conveys *a falsehood*, and also an *implicit heresy*: the denial of the doctrine of The Mystical Body of Christ. A paradox indeed! And it is the work of the Father of Lies to *convey a falsehood by stating a truth!*

Identical Wording Not Required

143. One very elementary fact weighs quite heavily against those who assert that "*This is My Body. This is My Blood*," and these words alone, are all that is necessary to effect the Sacrament. If they could produce *just one example* of a liturgy (however ancient) whose form for consecration *actually uses only these words*, then their opinion could at least claim some justification. But *there is no such liturgy* on which they can rest their case. On the contrary, every liturgy universally accepted as having a valid consecration form contains additional words which *signify the Mystical Body*. And this fact weighs quite heavily in favor of my opinion. Some examples of these other liturgies are given below. But, before going ahead a point must be clarified.

144. After Pope Leo XIII had declared Anglican Orders invalid, the Anglican Hierarchy argued that there are liturgies which Rome has always acknowledged as having a valid form for the Sacrament of Holy Orders, but which do not employ the exact form used in the Roman Rite.

145. This objection was answered by the Catholic Bishops of England: "But you are also mistaken in thinking that matters have been left by Our Lord in so much uncertainty, and that there is no one definite form which has prevailed in the Catholic Church, both in the East and in the West. If, indeed, you mean merely that no *identical form of words* has always and everywhere been in use, but that, on the contrary, several different forms of words have been recognized by the Holy See as sufficient, you say what all will admit, and the Bull nowhere denies. ...The Bull, however ... is requiring, not that the form should always consist of the same words, but that it should always be conformed to *the same definite type*." (*Vindication of the Bull 'Apostolicae Curae'*; emphasis in the original).

146. Consequently, although there is some variation in the wording in the examples which follow next, it is quite clear that they all conform to the "same definite type"; that is to say, they all contain the essential signification of *The Mystical Body*. (The parenthesized comments are mine.).

The Doctrine of the Apostles

147. St. Justin Martyr does not give a text used for the eucharistic rite. But the *Doctrine of the Apostles*, a very ancient text, contemporary, at the latest, with St. Justin gives the following: "As to the Eucharist, we give thanks in this wise. First for the chalice: *We thank thee, our father, for the Holy Vine* (a reference to Christ, the Head of the Mystical Body: I am the vine) *of David ...* For the bread: *We thank thee, our Father ... As the elements of this bread, scattered on the mountains, were brought together into a single whole* , (a reference to the union of the members of the Mystical Body), *may Thy Church* (the Mystical Body) *in like manner be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom.*" And the passage which follows most certainly excludes the notion of "all men": "Let no one eat or drink of your Eucharist if he is not baptized in the Name of the Lord, for it was of this the Lord said, *Give not that which is holy to dogs.*" (Source: Msgr. L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution*, 1903, pp. 52-3).

The Alexandrine Liturgy

148. From the Euchologion of Sarapion, Bishop of Thmuis, a friend and correspondent of St. Athanasius, we have the following form: "Take ye and eat, this is My Body, which is being broken for you (the members of the Mystical Body) for remission of sins. ... (A)nd as this bread had been scattered on the top of the mountains and gathered together came to be one, so also gather Thy holy Church (the same symbolism of the union of the Mystical Body as found in the *Doctrine of the Apostles*) out of every nation and every country and every city and village and house and make one living Catholic Church." And for the chalice: "Take ye, drink, this is the new covenant, which is My Blood, which is being shed for you (the members of the Mystical Body) for remission of sins." (Source: Duchesne, *op. cit.*, p.77).

The Canons of Hippolytus

149. The so-called Canons of Hippolytus, dating from the third century, contain this form: This is my blood which is shed *for you* (the members of the Mystical Body). (Source: Joseph A. Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, v.2, p. 195). Although this has nothing to do with the authenticity and/or validity of Hippolytus' form, it is interesting to note (as does Jungmann elsewhere) that Hippolytus "allowed himself to be chosen by his followers as an anti-pope." But from the fact that he subsequently was martyred for the Faith, "we may rightly conclude that before his death he returned to the unity of the Church."

(Jungmann, *The Early Liturgy*, p. 53).

"De Sacramentis" of the Pseudo-Ambrose

150. Interestingly, the form given in *De Sacramentis*, dating from about the year 400, does not say "for you," but instead says simply "for many," which, of course, conveys the essential signification of the members of the Mystical Body. "Take ye all and eat of this: for this is My Body, which is broken for many (*pro multis*)."
(Source: Duchesne, *op. cit.*, p 178).

Eastern Liturgies in General

151. "Strangely enough," comments Rev. John O'Brien, "nearly all the oriental liturgies mention the mingling of water with the wine in the form of consecration." (John O'Brien, A.M., *A History of the Mass and Its Ceremonies in the Eastern and Western Church*, 1881, p. 333). Actually this is not strange at all, for this is a well-known symbolism of *The Mystical Body*. St. Thomas calls this to our attention in the following passage: "Thirdly, because this (*that is, the mingling of water and wine - Auth.*) is adapted for signifying the effect of this sacrament (*which effect, of course, is the union of the Mystical Body -Auth.*), since as Pope Julius says: *We see that the people are signified by the water, but Christ's blood by the wine.*" (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 74, Art. 6).

152. The *Armenian* form contains the following: "This is my Body, which for you and for many is given for remission and pardon of sins."

153. In the *Liturgy of St. Basil* we find: "This is my Body, which is broken for you unto the remission of sins." And for the wine: "This is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins."

154. The *Coptic Liturgy of St. Cyril* has: "For this is my Body, which shall be broken for you, and for many shall be given for the remission of sins." As O'Brien observes, "The form according to the Liturgy of St. James is almost word for word like this; and ... the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom differs hardly in anything from our own." (O'Brien, *op. cit.*, p. 335).

155. It is in an Ethiopic Liturgy, called the *Athanasian*, that we find a unique and perhaps the most eloquent signification of the Mystical Body." This bread is my Body, from which there is no separating. This cup is my Blood, from which there is no dividing." Clearly the Body "from which there is no separating" can mean *only the Mystical Body*. For since we are united to Christ's *true* Body only at the time of Holy Communion, it is incorrect to say of us that "there is no separating" from Christ's *true* Body.

Gallican and Mozarabic Rites

156. "In the ancient Gallican books," says Duchesne, "the account of The institution of the Eucharist is always omitted, or is merely indicated by the first words of it. The celebrant must have known it by heart. The following is the Ambrosian text: ... ". (Duchesne, *op. cit.*, p. 215). The forms of consecration of both bread and wine in the Ambrosian text are, of course, identical in wording to those of the Roman Rite.

157. For the consecration of the bread, the *Mozarabic Missal* adheres to the text of St. Paul (I Cor. 11,24), and thereby expresses the signification of the members of the Mystical Body through the words, "*for you*": This is my body which shall be delivered for you. And for the wine it has the familiar "for you and for many (*pro vobis et pro multis*).". (Source: Duchesne, *op. cit.*, p. 216).

Summary

158. We have seen that in instituting the Holy Eucharist Christ could not have said "*for all men*," for this would totally contradict His very last discourse to His Apostles, in which he expounded the doctrine of His Mystical Body and in which He said, *I pray not for the world*.

159. Also we have seen (par. 132) that the form for the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist *must* contain some essential signification of the whole Mystical Body, Head and members. That the *matter* of the Sacrament contains this symbolism was pointed out.

160. The author expressed his opinion that in the Roman Rite this vital signification of the members of the Mystical Body is to be found in the words, *for you and for many*. But by saying, *for you and for all men*, the new, all-English Canon thwarts this essential signification and at the same time actually *conveys a false signification*.

161. Against the opinion of those who aver that the words *This is My Blood*. *This is My Blood*, taken alone, suffice for the sacrament, the following evidence was submitted: (a) These words do not signify the Mystical Body, but Christ's true Body; (b) Every scriptural account of the Eucharist's institution contains some additional words referring to the Mystical Body; (c) No authentic and valid consecration form, anywhere, contains only the words *This is My Body*. *This is My Body*; and (d) All consecration forms accepted as valid contain words with signification of the Mystical Body. Numerous examples from different liturgies were cited as examples.

Conclusion

162. It is impossible for me to *prove* that my opinion, stated above, is correct. Neither can those in opposition to it *prove* the correctness of their opinions. The sacraments are great mysteries. God alone *knows* what is really essential for

effecting them. But for our salvation He has made known to us certain things, sufficient things. And that is why there is such supreme wisdom in this warning given by the Catholic Bishops of England: "(I)n adhering rigidly to the rite handed down to us we can always feel secure; whereas, if we omit or change anything, we may perhaps be *abandoning just that element which is essential.*" (*Vindication of the Bull 'Apostolicae Curae'*; emphasis added).

13) ANSWERING SOME OBJECTIONS

163. This Part will consist of the raising of some possible objections to or arguments against some of the points set forth in this monograph, followed by the author's attempt to answer the said objections or arguments.

First Objection

164. *Objection 1:* Taken as a whole, your monograph seems to lack balance, for you don't show both sides of the issue. Your arguments are based principally, either directly or indirectly, on the theology of St. Thomas. Even Anger's book from which you quote is based on St. Thomas' theology. Furthermore, your weightiest authority, "The Catechism of the Council of Trent," was ordered published by Pope Pius V, who, being a Dominican, was probably himself biased in favor of St. Thomas.

Reply to First Objection

165. *Reply Obj. 1:* My purpose in this monograph is not to "show both sides." It is up to the "Liturgical Commission" to attempt a defense of their new, bogus "Canon."

166. Secondly, until a noisy and dedicated clique of Modernists and "progressives" undertook the task of downgrading St. Thomas, he had always been regarded as the authority par excellence. In their encyclicals, decrees, etc., no Pope of memory has failed to quote the Angelic Doctor at one time or another. As to Pope Pius V, he is, of course, a canonized saint; and therefore it follows that his only "biases" were towards those things which are good.

Second Objection

167. *Objection 2:* Nevertheless, isn't it true that the position of St. Thomas which you have adopted (namely, claiming the necessity of all the words *This is the Chalice of My Blood...unto the forgiveness of sins*) is still only an opinion?

Reply to Second Objection

168. *Reply Obj. 2:* Yes; at least it was only an opinion when St. Thomas wrote it. *However*, much more weight was added to it when *The Catechism by Decree of THE HOLY COUNCIL OF TRENT*, an ecumenical council, adopted the same position. "The ecumenical councils," wrote Pope Leo XIII, "have always been careful to hold Thomas Aquinas in singular honor. In the councils of Lyons, Vienna, Florence, and the Vatican one might almost say that Thomas took part and presided over the deliberations and decrees of the Fathers." "But the chief and special glory of Thomas," continues the Pontiff, "one which he has shared with none of the Catholic Doctors, is that the Fathers of Trent made it part of the order of the conclave to lay upon the altar, together with the code of sacred Scripture and the decrees of the Supreme Pontiffs, the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas, whence to seek counsel, reason, and inspiration." (Encyclical letter *Aeterni Patris*).

Third Objection

169. *Objection 3:* Undoubtedly there has been no greater exponent and exegete of St. Thomas than the Dominican Cardinal Cajetan. Called a "lamp of the Church" by Pope Clement VII, Cajetan reputedly could quote the entire *Summa* from Memory. Yet Cajetan disagreed with St. Thomas *on this very point!* -namely, that all the words which follow *This is the Chalice of My Blood* are essential for the form.

Reply to Third Objection

170. *Reply Obj. 3:* Yes, and when Pope St. Pius V ordered Cajetan's works to be published in 1570, he commanded *this particular opinion* to be expurgated! *This was Christ acting through Peter.*

Fourth Objection

171. *Objection 4:* The "Catholic Dictionary and Encyclopedia" by Addis and Arnold states (p. 216): "Probably the mere words 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood' would suffice for validity."

Reply to Fourth Objection

172. *Reply Obj. 4:* Though it is difficult to agree even with "probably" let us assume, purely for the sake of argument, that this conjecture is correct. From time immemorial up until just recently all Roman Catholics everywhere always had *certainty* - the certainty of faith - that by the words of consecration *The Real Presence* of Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament was effected. Now are we to be satisfied with *probably*?

Fifth Objection

173. *Objection 5*: A very authoritative source, namely, Noldin's *Summa Theologiae Moralis*, states that *This is the chalice of My blood* or else *This is My Blood*, and these words *alone*, are necessary in the consecration of the chalice. "Et haec quidem *sola* in consecratione calicis sunt essentialia," (III, *De Sacramentis*, par. 120).

Reply to Fifth Objection

174. *Reply Obj. 5*: In Part 12 above, my opinion contrary to this was proffered; however let us assume, for argument's sake, that this opinion of Noldin is correct. Nevertheless the point is that in the present situation *it has no bearing* for the following reasons.

- (a) The priest does not say *only* these words, but he says more. And at least part of this "more" that he says in the new "form" is a mutation, or rather a *mutilation* of the *proper, established* form. Secondly,
- (b) as was pointed out earlier in the present monograph, a sacrament can very easily be invalidated by the *addition* of words, *even if all the necessary words are pronounced*.

175. Thirdly, (c) the mutilation in question (to wit, "for *all men so that, etc.*") is a forgery of Christ's words recorded in Holy Writ, which forgery conveys a meaning *totally foreign to and in conflict with* the true meaning of *the reality* of this sacrament, which is the union of the Mystical Body.

176. Furthermore (d) the same authority Noldin goes on to say in paragraph 122 that the words of consecration must be pronounced *without mutation either of the essential part or the incidental part*. "Verba consecrationis proferenda sunt *sine mutatione tum substantiali tum accidentali*," (Noldin's emphasis).

177. Also, (e) St. Alphonsus calls to our attention the following from the rubrics of the Missal: "If anyone abbreviates or changes something of the form of consecration, and the words do not signify the same thing, he does not consecrate the Sacrament." ("*Si quis autem aliquid diminueret vel immutaret de forma consecrationis, et verba idem non significarent, non conficeret sacramentum.*")

178. And, finally, therefore (f) even if we grant, for argument's sake, that the words *This is My Blood*, alone, would suffice for the consecration of the wine, it is amply manifest from all sources that the "essential part" (whatever it may be) *coupled with a mutation* at least places the validity of the sacrament in doubt. Moreover, it is also *universally* agreed that this is always a *grave* sin on the part of the priest. Thus St. Alphonsus states: "graviter tamen peccaret qui aliqua ex reliquis omitteret vel mutaret"; that is, "*nevertheless he would gravely sin who would omit or change anything of the remaining words.*" (By "remaining words" St. Alphonsus means here all those words which follow *This is the chalice of My Blood*.)

Sixth Objection

179. *Objection 6:* Even if the form is now invalid, as you are claiming, it would seem that the good intentions of the priest and the recipients would make up for this deficiency.

Reply to Sixth Objection

180. *Reply obj. 6:* That is absurd. If the "form" used for a sacrament is an invalid form, then *nothing* can make the sacrament valid, *as a sacrament*. According to the line of reasoning in this *Objection*, one may now receive the *sacrament* of Penance by merely having the good intention of going to Confession. The sacraments are held to be "*ex opere operato*" and if the aforesaid *Objection* were true, a sacrament would, no longer be a sacrament.

Seventh Objection

181. *Objection 7:* Your whole thesis is based on a fundamental misunderstanding. Don't you know that in the language of Holy Scripture the word "*many*" is often to be taken as meaning "ALL"? "According to the best authorities, and Pope Benedict XIV among others," says Rev. John O'Brien, "the word 'many' is here to be taken as meaning *all*, a mode of expression by no means uncommon in the Holy Scripture. St. Thomas Aquinas also interprets it in this way. If taken in any other sense it would hardly be possible to keep free of the Calvinistic error that our Lord died only for a certain class of persons." (O'Brien, *op. cit.*, p. 331).

Reply to Seventh Objection

182. *Reply Obj. 7:* This *TOTALLY* erroneous paragraph penned by Father John O'Brien is disturbing enough. Even *more disturbing* is the fact that the book wherein it appears was published in 1881 and *bears the Imprimatur* of John Cardinal McCloskey. Now, in the first place, Father O'Brien's claim would make a mockery of Saint Pius V and his *CATECHISM by Decree of THE HOLY COUNCIL OF TRENT*. The reader will recall that earlier in this monograph we quoted a passage from this *CATECHISM* which begins thus: "With reason, therefore, were the words *for all* not used." (!) Or wasn't this saintly Pope aware that the word *many* "is here to be taken as meaning *all*."??

183. That Father O'Brien would actually use Benedict XIV and St. Thomas as authorities to prove his point is *incredible!* Because they both held *exactly the opposite* of what Father O'Brien is trying to "prove." This quotation of St. Alphonsus (who has never been suspected of being a Calvinist) needs repeating here: "The words *Pro vobis et pro multis* ('For you and for many') are used to distinguish the virtue of the blood of Christ from its fruits; for the blood of our Saviour is of sufficient value to save all men, but its fruits are applicable only to a

certain number and not to all, and this is their own fault. ... *This is the explanation of St. Thomas, as quoted by Benedict XIV.*" (Emphasis added).

184. Readily is it granted that any "theologian" who has not grasped the fundamental difference between the aspects of *sufficiency* and *efficacy* most certainly would himself be prone to fall into "Calvinistic errors" as well as a whole host of *other* errors. *Witness the example of the all-English Canon.* Now in this present situation the majority of the American Bishops *clearly and obviously are tolerating* (and, indeed, in some cases *abetting*,) unorthodox theologians of this caliber. No truly *orthodox* Roman Catholic *who is desirous of saving his soul* can sit by idly and tolerate this assault *from within* upon THE Faith and upon the *One, True, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church.*

Eighth Objection

185. *Objection 8:* Don't the American Bishops have the right and the authority to introduce a new form for the consecration?

Reply to Eighth Objection

186. *Reply Obj. 8:* "As for the alleged right of local Churches to reform their rites freely, we are not aware in what quarter you have sought for illustrations of its exercise ... (T)o remodel the existing rites in the most drastic manner, is a proposition for which we know of no historical foundation, and which appears to us absolutely incredible. Hence Cranmer, in taking this unprecedented course, acted, in our opinion, with the most inconceivable rashness." (*Vindication of the Bull 'Apostolicae Curae'*.)

Ninth Objection

187. *Objection 9:* (This "objection" is placed within quotation marks because it comprises the exact words a certain Archbishop wrote to me after I had called to his attention the mutilation: *for all men, etc.* in the new consecration "form.") "*It is interesting to note here that the form of consecration used in the Mass goes back even beyond the Gospels to the primitive liturgy which was used in the Church before the Gospels and before the Epistles of St. Paul were written.*"

Reply to Ninth Objection

188. *Reply Obj. 9:* This is an old artifice, the Anglican Schismatics having used exactly the same pretext. "They knew only too well," said Pope Leo XIII, "the intimate bond which unites faith with worship, 'the law of belief with the law of prayer' (*lex credendi:lex orandi*) and so, *under the pretext of restoring it to its primitive form,* they corrupted the order of the liturgy in many ways, *to adapt it to the errors of the Innovators.*" (Bull *Apostolicae Curae*, emphasis added).

189. Elaborating further in the *Vindication of the Bull*, the English Bishops said, "It could not have been, as you seem to suggest, because the Reformers wished to go back to what was primitive, for *they cut out with an unsparing hand* the most ancient as well as the most modern portions of the *Catholic* rite." (Emphasis added).

Tenth Objection

190. *Objection 10*: What if the present Pope or some subsequent pope should declare that this new "form" is perfectly all right?

Reply to Tenth Objection

191. *Reply Obj. 10*: This no bona fide pope could do, for the Church never contradicts Herself. Any claim that the Pope himself has canonised this new "form" would have to be investigated carefully. Now *if it were true* that some pope, with full knowledge and understanding and consent, had approved it, then *faith* and *reason* would dictate to us that we had on our hands at best another Liberius, and at worst another Honorius. Let us hear Father Francis Clark, "The *only* formulae that *infallibly and necessarily* contain the essential significance of a sacrament are those which have been *canonised by being instituted by Christ* and *His Church* for that purpose. Such words, when *exactly reproduced*, are removed beyond the reach of ambiguity or private distortion."

192. "Where, however," Father Clark continues, "a new liturgical form is introduced and *no such canonised formula* is employed (*and since it signifies falsely, the form: "for all men so that, etc." cannot become canonised legitimately -Auth.*), there cannot be certainty of its validity until its credentials have been established, and it has been acknowledged, expressly or implicitly, by *the universal Church*." (Francis Clark, S.J., *Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention*, pp. 182-3, emphasis added).

Eleventh Objection

193. *Objection 11*: You cannot hold responsible all those priests who are using the new Canon. They are only obeying their Bishops.

Reply to Eleventh Objection

194. *Reply Obj. 11*: When *all* the Bishops of England were saying, "Aye, my Lord, my King" - save one, the courageous St. John Fisher - all those priests who followed into heresy and schism were, of course, "*only obeying their Bishops.*"

195. According to Cardinal Newman, on the eve of the Council of Nicaea, when all the world was "going Arian," *eighty per cent of the Bishops* were fully prepared *formally* to deny the Divinity of Christ. This wholesale apostasy was averted only

because Almighty God chose to raise up at that moment His instrument, that eloquent and incomparable soldier of Jesus Christ, St. ATHANASIUS.

196. A writer in *The Wanderer* (Feb. 22, 1968) repudiates comparisons between the conduct of our present-day Bishops and that of the 16th century English Bishops who were "an apostate Hierarchy" and "had *previously* broken off communications with Rome and were excommunicated." Perhaps this writer is awaiting a formal announcement in *The New York Times*. If our Bishops have *invalidated one of the seven sacraments instituted by Our Lord Jesus Christ*, they have thereby, in effect, denied that Sacrament. By denying this particular Sacrament one corrupts the dogmas of *The Real Presence, Transubstantiation* as defined by the Council of Trent, and the doctrine of *The Mystical Body of Christ*. St. Thomas Aquinas defines *heresy* as "a species of unbelief, belonging to those who profess the Christian faith, but corrupt its dogmas." (*Summa Th.*, II-II, Q. 11, Art. 1).

Twelfth Objection

197. *Objection 12*: Your arguments simply cannot be right. *It defies all reason* that so many Bishops, priests and laymen could go so far astray.

Reply to Twelfth Objection

198. *Reply Obj. 12*: That magnificent Pope of our own century, the intrepid Saint Pius X, warned us and *foretold* to us, "Their real aims, their plots, the line they are following are well known to all of you, ... What they propose is a *UNIVERSAL APOSTASY* still worse than the one which threatened the century of Charles (Borromeo), from the fact that it *creeps insidious and hidden in the very veins of the Church* and with extreme subtlety pushes erroneous principles to their extreme conclusions.

199. "But both have the same origin in 'the enemy who,' ever alert for the perdition of men, 'has oversowed cockle among the wheat' (Matt. 13, 25); *of both revolts the ways are hidden and darksome*, with the same development and the same fatal issue. ... Truly a spectacle full of sadness for the present and *of menace for the future* ... especially for those who foment with the most activity or who *tolerate with the most indifference* this pestiferous wind of impiety." (Encyclical letter *Editae Saepe*, May 26, 1910, emphasis added).

200. This same Saint Pius X, the humble Giuseppe Sarto, when congratulated by his Mother upon his appointment as Bishop of Mantua, replied to her: "Mother, you do not realize what it means to be a Bishop. I shall lose my soul if I neglect my duty." *May Almighty God raise up for us today Athanasiuses and John Fishers!*

Thirteenth Objection

201. *Objection 13: What course can a priest take? Can't he be forced under obedience to use the new Canon?*

Reply to Thirteenth Objection

202. *Reply Obj. 13: In all cases of doubt, the more certain course must be taken. The ancient form of consecration in Latin is by all means the most certain.*

203. No priest can be forced to use this new "Canon," He can always have recourse to the decree *Quo Primum*, issued on July 19, 1570, by Pope Saint Pius V, which states *inter alia*:

"We determine and order by this Our decree, to be valid *in perpetuity*, that *never* shall anything be added to, omitted from or changed in this Missal ...

"Specifically do We warn all persons in authority, of whatever dignity or rank, *Cardinals not excluded*, and command them as a matter of strict obedience *never* to use or permit any ceremonies or Mass prayers *other than the ones contained in this Missal ...* (This decree, in its entirety, is printed in every *official* altar missal.)

"*At no time in the future* can a priest, whether secular or order priest, *ever be forced* to use any other way of saying Mass. And in order *once and for all* to preclude any scruples of conscience and *fear of ecclesiastical penalties and censures*, We declare herewith that it is by virtue of *Our Apostolic Authority* that We decree and prescribe that this present order and decree of Ours is to last *in perpetuity*, and *never at a future date can it be revoked or amended legally ...*

"And if, nevertheless, *anyone would ever dare attempt* any action contrary to this order of Ours, *handed down for all times*, let him know that he has *incurred the wrath of Almighty God, and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.*"

THE END

APPENDIX 1 *A COMPARISON OF THE CONSECRATION PRAYERS
AS FOUND IN:*

- (1) *The Original Latin*
- (2) *The Literal English Translation from the Latin (Source: St. Joseph's Daily*

- Missal 1951)*
 (3) *The New, All-English Canon (Oct. 22, 1967)*
 (4) *The Anglican Schismatics'*
"Book of Common Prayer" (1549)

The symbol (*) denotes an omission. Numbers denote footnotes, which appear at the end of this Appendix.

ORIGINAL LATIN

LITERAL ENGLISH
TRANSLATION

Qui pridie quam
pateretur,

Who, the day before He
suffered,

accepit panem

took bread

in sanctas ac
venerabiles
manus suas,

into His holy
and venerable
hands,

et elevatis
oculis
in coelum

and having raised
His eyes
to heaven,

ad te Deum
Patrem suum
omnipotentem

unto Thee, O God,
His Almighty
Father,

tibi gratias
agens,

giving thanks
to Thee,

benedixit,

He blessed it,

Fregit,

broke it,

NEW ALL-ENGLISH
CANON -- 1967

BOOK OF COMMON
PRAYER -- 1549

The day before
he suffered

who, in the
same night that
he was betrayed,

he took bread,

(*)

and looking up to heaven,

to you, (*)
his almighty
father,

he gave you thanks
and praise,

(*)

He broke the bread,

took bread,

(*)

(*)

(*)

and when he had
blessed,

and given thanks,

he brake it,

ORIGINAL LATIN

deditque discipulis suis,

dicens:

Accipite, et
manducate
ex hoc omnes:

*Hoc est enim
Corpus meum.*

LITERAL ENGLISH TRANSLATION

and gave it to His disciples,

saying:

take ye all
and eat
of this:

*For this is
my Body.*

Simili modo

postquam coenatum est,

accipiens et
hunc praeclarum (4)
Calicem

in sanctas ac

In like manner,

when the supper was done,

taking also
this goodly
chalice

into His holy

venerabiles
manus suas:

item tibi
gratias agens

NEW ALL-ENGLISH
CANON -- 1967

gave it to his disciples

and said:

Take this
and eat it,
all of you;

(*) *this is my body*

(*)

When supper was ended,

he took the cup.

(*)

Again he gave you thanks
and praise,

ORIGINAL LATIN

benedixit,
deditque discipulis suis,
dicens:
Accipite,
et bibite

and venerable
hands,

again giving
thanks to Thee,

BOOK OF COMMON
PRAYER -- 1549

and gave it to his disciples,

saying,

Take
eat,

(*)³ this is my body,

which is given for you: do
this is remembrance of me.

Likewise

after supper

he took the cup, (4)

(*)

and when he had given thanks,

LITERAL ENGLISH TRANSLATION

He blessed it,
and gave it to His disciples
saying:
Take ye all
and drink

ex eo omnes:

*Hic est enim
Calix
Sanguinis mei,
novi
et aeterni
testamenti,
mysterium
fidei,
qui pro vobis
et pro multis
effundetur
in
remissionem
peccatorum.
Haec quotiescumque
feceritis,
in mei
memoriam
facietis.*

NEW ALL-ENGLISH
CANON -- 1967

(*)
gave the cup to
his disciples
and said:
Take this and
drink from it,
all of you;
(*) *this is
the cup
of my blood
the blood
of the new
and everlasting
covenant --
the mystery of
faith.
This blood is
to be shed for you*

of this:

*For this is
the chalice
of my blood
of the new
and eternal
covenant:
the mystery of
faith,
which shall
be shed for you
and for many
unto
the forgiveness
of sins.
As often as you shall do
these things,
in memory
of me
shall you do them.*

BOOK OF COMMON
PRAYER -- 1549

(*)
he gave it
to them,
saying,
(*)
Drink ye all
of this;
for this is
(*)
My blood

of the New
(*)
Testament,
(*)
which is shed
for you,

*and for all men
so that
sins may be
forgiven
Whenever
you do
this,
you will do it
in memory
of me.*

and for many,
for
remission
of sins:
Do this,
as oft as you shall
drink it,
in
remembrance
of me.

APPENDIX 2

"LEX CREDENDI: LEX ORANDI"

What people already believe is automatically and necessarily mirrored in the very words of the prayers they recite. This truism is one part of the principle: "*lex credendi: lex orandi*," the law of belief is the law of prayer. This principle works reversely also; that is to say, people can be *led* towards certain beliefs by means of the very prayers they are accustomed to saying. And that is why parents teach their small children The Hail Mary, for example, and The Apostles' Creed, even though these little ones do not yet fully understand everything they are praying. Now, whether or not these parents are familiar with the phrase, "*lex credendi: lex orandi*," they are nevertheless putting this principle into practice, for they are teaching their children to *pray* those things that they will ultimately come to *believe*.

EXAMPLE 1: *Using a "good" word for an evil purpose.*

To see how the 16th-century Heretics-Schismatics employed the principle, "*lex credendi: lex orandi*" in order to "move the simple from the superstitious opinions of the Popish Mass," (*Ridley*), we need look no farther than the example furnished by their taking up a very good and "pious" word, *spiritual*, in order to use it for a most evil purpose.

All the quotations which follow immediately below are taken from the writings of these 16th-century "Reformers." In every instance their use of the word "*spiritual*" denotes *the denial of the Real Presence* of Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament; body, blood, soul and divinity. This is because they are using the "good" word *spiritual*, and applying it to the *Sacrifice of the Mass* and to *The Eucharist*. (The reader is asked to bear with me through these examples which follow, for there is an important point to be made.)

(1) Wycliffe: "The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and *spiritual* manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith."

(2) Ridley: "He left the same in mystery to the faithful in the Supper, to be received after a *spiritual* communication, and by grace."

(3) Coverdale: "(W)e think not our Lord Jesus Christ to be so vile that He may be contained in corruptible elements. Again, lest the force of this most sacred mystery should be diminished, we must think that it is wrought by the secret and wonderful power of God, and that His Spirit is the bond of this partaking, which is for that cause called *spiritual*."

(4) Cranmer: "Although Christ be not corporally in the bread and wine ... He is effectually present, and effectually worketh, not in the bread and wine, but in the godly receivers of them, to whom He giveth His own flesh *spiritually* to feed upon."

(5) Again Cranmer in replying to Gardiner: "Therefore ... we do not pray absolutely that the bread and wine may be made the body and blood of Christ, but ...that therewith in spirit and in truth we may be *spiritually* nourished."

(6) Latimer: "Then we be assured that we feed upon Him *spiritually*."

(7) The Liturgy, of King Edward VI: "For us He hath not only given His body to death and shed His blood, but also doth vouchsafe in a sacrament and mystery to give us His said body and blood *spiritually*, to feed and drink upon."

"... (F)or then we *spiritually* eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood, then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us."

"He hath left in these holy mysteries as a pledge of His love, and a continual remembrance of the same, His own blessed body and precious blood, for us *spiritually* to feed upon, to our endless comfort and consolation."

(8) Grindall: "This is the *spiritual*, the very true, the only eating of Christ's body."

(9) Jewell: "Thus, *spiritually*, and with the mouth of faith, we eat the body of Christ and drink his blood."

(10) Beacon: "He is also eaten or received *spiritually* when we believe in Christ."

(11) "The Book of Common Prayer" (1549): "but also doth vouchsafe in a Sacrament and mystery to give us his said body and blood to feed upon them *spiritually*."

"Thou hast vouchsafed to feed us in these holy mysteries with the *spiritual* food

of the most precious body and blood of thy Son."

More examples could be given (there is no shortage of them), for indeed it is difficult to find *any one* of the 16th-century Heretics who *failed* to use the word "*spiritual*," when writing of the Sacrifice of the Mass and The Eucharist.

But this very pious-sounding word, "*spiritual*" did not fool those who were *true, orthodox* Catholics. Finally, the Fathers of the Council of Trent *condemned for all times* the *heresy* contained in this use of the word "*spiritual*": "If anyone says that Christ received in the Eucharist is received *spiritually* only, ... let him be anathema." (Canon 8, Session XIII).

THE NEW, ENGLISH CANON OF THE MASS MISTRANSLATES THE PRAYER "QUAM OBLATIONEM" TO IMPLY A *SPIRITUAL* OFFERING. This prayer, which *immediately precedes the Consecration prayers*, should read: "Do thou, O God, deign to bless what we offer, and make it approved, effective, right, and wholly pleasing in every way ... " The bogus, *heretical* "Canon" now reads instead: "Bless and approve our offering; make it *truly spiritual* and acceptable."

Obviously this is not just a "pious" use of the word *spiritual*. For at *no time* did this particular word *ever* appear in "the holy canon, which is so free from error that it contains nothing that does not in the highest degree savor of a certain holiness and piety." (Council of Trent, Ch. 4, Session 22.).

"Lex credendi: lex orandi." Here is "orandi": "*Bless and approve our offering; make it truly spiritual.*" Can "credendi" be far behind? Can it be very long before "the simple people are moved" away from the belief in *The Real Presence*?

EXAMPLE 2: *A Sacrifice of "Praise and Thanksgiving."*

In the new, English "Canon" we find in two places (that is, prior to the consecrations of both the bread and the wine) the *seemingly* uncalled-for insertion of the words: *and praise*. The original Latin reads simply, "gratias agens," *giving thanks*. Why does the new, English "Canon" say, "he gave you thanks *and praise*"?

It is true that the Mass is a sacrifice of *praise*, petition, *thanksgiving*, and atonement; but, obviously, that is beside the point here. The simple words, *giving thanks*, are quite proper and appropriate in this place, for they have their basis in Holy Writ. Four different accounts - to wit, Matt. (26,27); Mark (14,23); Luke (22,19) and I Cor. (11,24) -all have either "He gave thanks" or else "giving thanks." There is a special *meaningfulness* in these words, inasmuch as "giving thanks" is in Greek: *Eucharist*. Hence these very words, when recited by the priest just before the two consecrations, remind us of the Sacrament of the *Eucharist*.

There is *no* Scriptural account that makes mention that Our Lord on the occasion of instituting the Holy Eucharist gave thanks *and praise*. So, what is the explanation for this *change* made in the Canon of the Mass? Could it be another implementation of "*lex credendi:lex orandi*"?

As applied *to a sacrifice*, this particular phraseology -that is, the words "praise" and "thanksgiving," taken together - did, in fact, convey a *singular and especial significance* to the 16th-century Heretics-Schismatics. According to the scholarly Canon Estcourt, "Luther led the attack. *He denied the Catholic doctrine* of the Sacrifice of the Mass in *any other sense* than as the sacrifice of *praise and thanksgiving*." (E. E. Estcourt, *The Question of Anglican Ordinations Discussed*, p. 281, emphasis added).

But let us hear it from the Heresiarchs themselves. First of all, Luther: "The Mass may be called a sacrifice, *if it be understood* as a sacrifice of *praise and thanksgiving*, not of a work, nor propitiatory." (*De Usu Sacram, Euch. salutari*, emphasis added).

And by Cranmer, Luther's English counterpart, we are informed: "When the old fathers called the mass or supper of the Lord a sacrifice, they meant that it was a sacrifice of *lauds* (i.e., "praise") and *thanksgiving ... but they meant in no wise that it is a very true sacrifice for sin*." (Cranmer, *On the Lord's Supper*, emphasis added).

Thus to the Schismatics the Mass was a sacrifice of "*praise and thanksgiving*," which, in their argot, meant a *bare commemoration* of the Sacrifice of Calvary, or a *spiritual and symbolic* sacrifice. But *not a real sacrifice*, nor a sacrifice of *propitiation*. This point Cranmer made quite clear, "And yet have I denied that it is a sacrifice propitiatory for sin."

So well-known and infamous was the connotation the Schismatics had attached to the words "praise and thanksgiving" *when applied to the Sacrifice of the Mass*, the Fathers of the Council of Trent *once and for all times* pronounced this solemn curse on this *heresy*: "If anyone says that the Sacrifice of the Mass is one only of *praise and thanksgiving ... let him be anathema*." (Canon 3, Session XXII).

"Lex credendi: lex orandi." Here is "orandi": He gave you thanks *and praise*.

EXAMPLE 3: "*Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott*."

At the peak of his rebellion, Martin Luther penned the hymn, *Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott*. It was "the production," says the historian Ranke, "of the moment in which Luther, engaged in a conflict with a world of foes, sought strength in the consciousness that he was defending a divine (*sic*) cause which could never perish." "*Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott*" was called by Heine "The Marseillaise of

the Reformation."

This battle-hymn of rebellion *against the Catholic Church* is now appearing on "hymn cards" *in Catholic Churches*. (St. Thomas Aquinas Church in Palo Alto, California, for example.). And as *Catholics* sing this hymn, "A Mighty Fortress Is Our God," do they yet realize that they are echoing the great heresiarch in his *apostasy*, his rebellion *against the One, True, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Roman Church* which was founded by the *Son of God*?

"Lex credendi: lex orandi." Here is "orandi": *The Marseillaise of the Reformation*.

EXAMPLE 4: "And I will go in to *the table* of God." (New American version of Psalm 42, v. 4).

"The destruction of the altars was a measure *so distinct in its meaning* that we have *never been able to conceive how that meaning could be misunderstood*. The measure meant a bitter hatred of the Mass, and a hatred *directed against the Mass itself*, not merely against some obscure abuse ... Surely if these reformers *had desired only to remove an abuse*, but were full of reverence for the great Christian Sacrifice itself, they would not have destroyed and desecrated the altars, *and substituted tables in their place*, alleging as their reason, in unqualified terms, that 'the form of a table shall more move the simple from the superstitious opinions of the Popish Mass unto the right use of the Lord's Supper. *For the use of an altar is to make sacrifice upon it; the use of a table is to serve men to eat upon it.*' (Ridley's *Works*)." (Emphasis added).

The foregoing were the words of the *Roman Catholic Bishops of England* in 1898. (Source: *A Vindication of the Bull 'Apostolicae Curae'*, par. 38, titled "The Destruction of Altars").

"*The law of belief is the law of prayer.*"

APPENDIX 3 *ANSWERING SOME MORE OBJECTIONS*

REVEREND WM. G. MOST *of the Dept. of Latin and Greek at Loras College, Dubuque, Iowa, having read the First Edition of this monograph (published Mar. 1968), has raised some "objections."* This Appendix presents many of Father Most's arguments, followed by the author's attempt to answer them.

Objection A

Father Most states: "But the really critical defect in Omlor's work is in his handling of the words '*for many.*' He argues that this phrase is substantially

different from the phrase '*for all men.*' Now it does seem, at first sight, that these phrases are substantially different. However, there are two ways to find out what is the truth about them.

"The first way is the most essential way: to see *what the Magisterium of the Church teaches* ... Now Vatican II did authoritatively teach what this phrase means. In the decree on the missions, par. 3, the Council said, in explaining the words of Mark (10,45) ... '*The Son of man ... came that ... He might give His life as a redemption for many, that is, for all.*' In other words, the Council explicitly equates the phrase '*for many*' with '*for all*,' and does so precisely in the context of the redemption."

"He [Omlor] has shown himself not only deficient in scholarship, but, what is worse, lacking in respect for the Magisterium. Perhaps he had not seen the statement of Vatican II on '*many*.'"

Reply to Objection A

The above *Objection* appears first in this series of "objections," because it describes what Father Most calls "the really critical defect" in my work. Therefore at the very outset I would like to show that this so-called "really critical defect" does not exist at all. Then the other less critical "defects" (which should be easier to rebut) will be more readily laid to rest.

The word *many*, according to St. Augustine, "is sometimes used in Scripture for *all*," ("*The City of God*," Book XX, Ch. 23). Now *sometimes*, of course, does not mean *always*. Therefore from this *one particular example* in Holy Scripture in which Vatican II says that *many* is to be taken as meaning *all*, one cannot generalize that the "Council explicitly equates the phrase *for many* with *for all*" in every case.

But if the word *many* in Holy Scripture *sometimes* is to be taken as meaning *all*, and other times means precisely what it reads - namely, "many" as opposed to "all" -, how are we to know the meaning of this word "*many*" in any given passage of Holy Scripture? For Catholics the answer is this: the sole infallible guide to the interpretation of Holy Scripture is the Holy See.

As Father Most suggests, in doing research on the *sacramental form for the consecration of the wine* I must frankly admit that I somehow overlooked the Vatican II *decree on the Missions*. For if one wishes to learn the correct interpretation of the words "*for many*" in the form for the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, which are taken from Matt. (26,28), it seems that one does not ordinarily consult paragraph 3 of Vatican II's Decree on the Missionary Activity of the Church, where, as it turns out, an *entirely different* passage - namely, Mark (10,45) - is explained, though only in passing.

On the contrary, one ordinarily attempts to seek out the most authoritative source available which actually gives an explanation of the *passage in question*. Now, in our case, the passage in question is clearly expounded in "THE *CATECHISM* by Decree of THE HOLY COUNCIL OF TRENT". We find on p. 227 of this Catechism (the edition translated by John A. McHugh, O.P. and Charles J. Callan, O.P., published in 1934 by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc.), under the heading, *EXPLANATION OF THE FORM USED IN THE CONSECRATION OF THE WINE*, the following:

"The additional words for you and for many, are taken, some from Matthew, some from Luke, but were joined together by the Catholic Church under the guidance of the Spirit of God. They serve to declare the fruit and advantage of His Passion. For if we look to its value, we must confess that the Redeemer shed His blood for the salvation of all; but if we look to the fruit which mankind have received from it, we shall easily find that it pertains not unto all, but to many of the human race. When therefore (our Lord) said: For you, He meant either those who were present, or those chosen from among the Jewish people, such as were, with the exception of Judas, the disciples with whom He was speaking. When He added, and for many, He wished to be understood to mean the remainder of the elect from among the Jews or Gentiles.

"With reason, therefore, were the words for all not used, as in this place the fruits of the Passion are alone spoken of, and to the elect only did His Passion bring the fruit of salvation."

The original Latin text for the last paragraph just above, taken from a volume printed at the Propaganda Press in Rome (*Superiorum Permissu*) in the year 1839, reads as follows:

"Recte ergo factum est, ut pro universis non diceretur, cum hoc loco tantummodo de fructibus passionis sermo esset, quae salutis fructum dilectis solum attulit."

Let us examine the credentials of this Catechism. (All quotations in this paragraph are taken from the *Introduction* of the above-mentioned volume, translated by McHugh and Callan.) Pope Saint Pius V appointed "a number of expert theological revisors to examine every statement in the Catechism from the viewpoint of doctrine." (p.xxv). Pope Gregory XIII "desired even books of Canon Law to be written in accordance with its contents." (p.xxxiii). Pope Clement XIII said that "no other catechism can be compared with it," and he called it "a norm of Catholic teaching." (p. xxxiii). It was endorsed by Pope Leo XIII (to get closer to the present time) "for the richness and exactness of its doctrine," and this Sovereign Pontiff called it "a precious summary of all theology, both dogmatic and moral." (pp. xxxiii-xxxiv). Saint Pius X prescribed that pastors in instructing

the faithful "should use the Catechism of the Council of Trent." (p. xxxiv). St. Charles Borromeo was the president of the Catechism Committee and he "called to its service the greatest masters of the Latin tongue of that age." (p. xxv) "Besides the Supreme Pontiffs who have extolled and recommended the Catechism, so many Councils have enjoined its use that it would be impossible here to enumerate them all." (p. xxxiv)

But, it may still be argued, even so this Catechism, extraordinary though it is, is still not the Holy See Itself speaking. Very well then, let us see what was taught by *The Holy Father Himself* regarding the proper interpretation of these words *for many*, as found in the sacramental form for the consecration of the wine.

Pope Benedict XIV, adhering to St. Thomas Aquinas and the Catechism of the Council of Trent, *officially and authoritatively* interpreted the words *pro multis* ("for many") in Book II, Chapter XV, par. 11 of his work entitled "*De Sacrosancto Missae Sacrificio*". In order to understand his explanation clearly, beyond the shadow of a doubt, let us first recall that St. Thomas originally gave an explanation of these words *for many* (his explanation was discussed at length earlier in this monograph in pars. 73-77) in which he (Thomas) *explicitly refuted* the argument that the words "*for all men*" ought to be used instead of "*for many*."

Commenting on this, Pope Benedict XIV says.- "*And so, having agreed with the same Angelic Doctor, We explain those words for many accordingly, though it is granted that [sometimes] the word many, after a manner of speaking in the Holy Scriptures, may signify all.*" To illustrate his point the Pontiff next cites a certain example (from Romans 5) where without a doubt the word *many* does indeed signify *all*. (*Ubi sine dubitatione vox multi omnes significat.*)

Returning to the words *for many* in the passage in question (from Matt. 26, 28), the Pontiff explains: "Therefore We say that the Blood of Christ was shed for all, shed for all however *as regards sufficiency* (Benedict's emphasis: *quoad sufficientiam*), and for the elect only *as regards efficacy* (again Benedict's emphasis: *quoad efficaciam*), as the Doctor Thomas explains correctly: '*The blood of Christ's Passion has its efficacy not merely in the elect among the Jews, ... but also in the Gentiles ... And therefore He says expressly, for you, the Jews, and for many, namely the Gentiles* [End of quotation from Pope Benedict XIV.]

The above passage from St. Thomas, which I quoted earlier in this monograph (par. 75) and which Pope Benedict XIV quotes, saying that Thomas "explains correctly" (*bene explicat*) the words "for many" in the words of consecration used at Holy Mass, is taken from Thomas' *Summa Theologica*, III, Q. 78, Art. 3, Reply to Objection 8. It is important to observe that what Thomas is "*explaining correctly*" here is his *rebuttal of the claim that the words 'for all' ought to be used!* Thus we see that the Sovereign Pontiff Benedict XIV, the Vicar of Christ on earth and *the ultimate authority on the interpretation of Holy Scripture*, has quoted the Angelic Doctor in order to *teach us authoritatively* that the word "many" in this

particular instance is *not* to be taken as meaning "all men."

(Note: It was St. Alphonsus de Liguori who directed me to this passage from Benedict XIV. The following paragraph is taken from his treatise on "*The Holy Eucharist*". It may be found on p. 44 of the edition published by the Redemptorist Fathers, 1934, translated by Rev. Eugene Grimm, C.S.S.R.)

"The words Pro vobis et pro multis ('For you and for many') are used to distinguish the virtue of the blood of Christ from its fruits; for the blood of our Saviour is of sufficient value to save all men, but its fruits are applicable only to a certain number and not to all, and this is their own fault. Or, as the theologians say, this precious blood is (in itself) sufficiently (sufficenter) able to save all men, but (on our part) effectually (efficaciter) it does not save all - it saves only those who co-operate with grace. This is the explanation of St. Thomas, as quoted by Benedict XIV."

Objection B

Father Most states: "Omlor is so supremely confident that he has proved the invalidity of the English form of consecration that he rejects in advance any papal teaching that would approve such a Canon. Really, Omlor is here following a Protestant, not a Catholic principle. He makes himself the judge of the Pope, whose orthodoxy is to be determined by conformity to Omlor, instead of Omlor learning what is orthodox from the teaching of the Pope."

Reply to Objection B

In the *Preface* to this monograph I wrote: "That the arguments presented herein are beyond question or challenge I do not claim. Assuredly they will not be the 'last word' on the subject." Also I wrote: "I will take as my own these words of the same great St. Anselm: *If there is anything that calls for correction I do not refuse the correction.*" Consequently, to accuse me of being "*so supremely confident*" is gratuitous.

What Fr. Most is objecting to here is that I wrote (par. 191) that no bona fide pope could canonise the mutilated consecration "form," because the Church cannot contradict Herself. In saying this I most certainly am not making myself "the judge of the Pope," nor am I insisting that his "orthodoxy is to be determined by conformity to Omlor." On the contrary, I am insisting that the orthodoxy of *any* Catholic *is determined solely* upon the basis of his acceptance or nonacceptance of *all* the doctrines and traditional teachings - *without exception* - of the Roman Catholic Church. This is a Catholic, not a Protestant principle!

Now, the sacramental form for the Holy Eucharist *in our Roman Rite* has always

contained "*pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum*": "for you and for many unto the forgiveness of sins." For all these centuries the unchanged, traditional teaching of the Church, *explicitly* and *immutably* ratified by the Sovereign Pontiff Himself, has been this: *with reason, therefore, are the words "for all men" NOT to be used* instead of "for many." And this is the exact substitution that the Innovators of this "new rite" have made. Father Most's advice to learn "what is orthodox from the teaching of the Pope" would be more fittingly directed to these Innovators.

Let us digress a moment. *Modernism* is not just a heresy; it is, in the words of St. Pius X, *the synthesis of all heresies*, the ultimate aim of which is *universal apostasy*. A key dogma of the Modernists (who are still very much alive and in our midst today) is the so-called "evolution of doctrine." In describing this thoroughly heretical and subversive Modernist dogma, St. Pius X said: "*First of all, they lay down the general principle that in a living religion everything is subject to change, and must in fact be changed. In this way they pass to what is practically their principal doctrine, namely evolution.*" "*To the laws of evolution,*" continues Pius, "*everything is subject under penalty of death - dogma, Church, worship, the Books we revere as Sacred, even faith itself.*" "Thus, then, Venerable Brethren, for the Modernists, both as authors and propagandists, there is to be nothing stable, nothing immutable in the Church." (Encyclical *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*).

According to Cardinal Gibbons ("*Faith of Our Fathers*," Ch. XI), the decision of the Holy Father concerning the proper interpretation of Holy Scripture is "final, irrevocable and infallible." Now, inasmuch as the Sovereign Pontiff Benedict XIV has *infallibly* interpreted the Scriptural passage (Matt. 26, 28) used in the consecration at Holy Mass, even a Modernist would be hard put to explain this recent *complete reversal* in terms of "evolution of doctrine." This discussion of "*many*" and "*all men*" is not a fatuitous exercise, a mere quibbling over words. *Underlying this attempted change is an attack upon Holy Mother Church Herself.* And it must not go unchallenged!

For we are not discussing here a "disciplinary" matter (such as the rules for Holy Communion fast, Friday abstinence, etc), which may be changed. What is at stake here is a matter which, in its very nature, is unchangeable: the interpretation of Holy Scripture. Also at stake are the preservation of a *true* sacramental form and the validity of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

Amplly clear, then, should be the reason why no pope could possibly canonise the form: *for all men, etc.* For this would mean that his infallible interpretation of Holy Scripture would be in conflict with the infallible interpretation of Benedict XIV'S, which is a contradiction in terms. *The True Church never contradicts Herself!* Father Most is quite correct in saying that I "reject this in advance," just as I would most surely "reject in advance" the possibility that any bona fide pope would ever allow that '*I christen you William*' (for example) is a valid form for the

Sacrament of Baptism.

Objection C

Father Most: "His appeal to St. Thomas and the Catechism of the Council of Trent is insufficient by far to prove his case for two reasons: 1) Neither one explicitly states the invalidity of the English form of consecration - Omlor merely tries, for insufficient reason, to *infer* such a conclusion from the words of St. Thomas and the Catechism."

Reply to Objection C

No one could be expected to enumerate *explicitly* all *invalid* forms for a sacrament, since there is an infinitude of *invalid* forms. There is, however, only one *valid* form for any given sacrament. Concerning the form for the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, the *CATECHISM by Decree of THE HOLY COUNCIL OF TRENT* is quite explicit and emphatic:

"We are then FIRMLY TO BELIEVE [*"certo credendum est"* in the Latin text] that it consists in the following words: *This is the chalice of my blood, of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many, to the remission of sins.*" (P. 225, edition translated by McHugh and Callan, emphasis added). And two paragraphs later, on the same page, we read: "Concerning this form no one can doubt." [The original Latin text being: "*Verum de hac forma nemo dubitare poterit*"].

On page 151 of the same Catechism, under the heading "*The Sacraments in General*," we also read: "In this the Sacraments of the New Law excel those of the Old that, as far as we know, there was no definite form of administering the latter, and hence they were very uncertain and obscure. In our sacraments, on the contrary, the form is *so definite* that any, *even a casual deviation* from it renders the Sacrament *NULL*. Hence the form is expressed in the clearest terms, such as exclude the possibility of doubt." (Emphasis added)

From all the above, much may be "*inferred*," for quite sufficient reasons. However, concerning the invalidity of the English form of consecration we do not have to "*infer*" anything. Despite Fr. Most's assertion, the Trent Catechism (as pointed out several times earlier) actually does *explicitly* say: "With reason, therefore, were the words *for all* not used," which, of course, is what the new English "form" does use.

Objection D

Father Most, continuing with his second reason, states: "2) The approval of the

Church given to St. Thomas by no means asserts that he is free from all error. Most theologians not only admit errors in him, but even think he denied the Immaculate Conception. Similarly, the Catechism of the Council of Trent was never checked by the Council, nor issued by it."

Reply to Objection D

I reply that if Father Most is really confident about his reason 1) - namely, that my conclusions are erroneously "inferred" from St. Thomas and the Trent Catechism -, then why does he find it necessary to attempt to discredit them also? Is it possible that my appeal to these sources really isn't "insufficient by far to prove" my case? (Incidentally, I do not claim to have "proved" anything. My position is quite clearly stated in my *Preface* and Father Brey's is stated in his *Foreword*.)

Objection E

Concerning the new, English consecration "form," Fr. Most claims that "one can with equal ease think of the fact that the redemption was *sufficient* to forgive *all* sins, or the fact that it actually or *efficaciously* leads to forgiveness only in *some* men, in those who accept its fruits."

Reply to Objection E

Though it is not the case, let us assume (for argument's sake) that the new "form" actually does convey *both* sufficiency and efficacy. The "form" would then be automatically wrong, for the *proper* form should denote *efficacy only*. In explaining why "all men" should not be used, the Trent Catechism gives this reason: "in this place the fruits of the Passion are *alone* spoken of, and *to the elect only* did His Passion bring the fruit of salvation." (Emphasis added).

Secondly, if the new "form" does convey these two entirely different concepts, it is, by definition, *ambiguous*. Hence it cannot be a valid form, which *must be definite*, as stated above in *Reply to Objection C*.

But, finally, the new "form" actually denotes *sufficiency only* (as explained in par. 72 and in pars. 80-82 earlier in this monograph), because the phrase "all men," by its universality, cannot possibly denote "the elect only."

Objection F

Fr. Most: "[T]his form of consecration was approved ... (temporarily) by the Supreme Authority of Rome."

Reply to Objection F

This is an *ipse dixit*, presented entirely gratuitously without an iota of proof. In

reply, I will quote Owen Francis Dudley, "A gratuitous assumption is sufficiently met by a gratuitous denial." Six months after this "Canon" has been in use *Triumph* magazine can still report: "Rome is not just withholding its approval of the wretched version ... introduced in the Catholic Masses last fall; the ICEL [International Committee on English in the Liturgy] has now been put on notice that approval will *not* be forthcoming." (Apr. 1968, p. 7) (Granted, this is also an *ipse dixit*, but the burden of proof is solely on the Innovators.). Not only has *Triumph* not retracted this, but in the May issue (p. 37)a significant *ipse dixit* of Fr. Frederick McManus (Liturgy Director) is reported: "*Ultimately, the approval of the Holy See will probably be dispensed with, since it doesn't figure in the Constitution on the Liturgy.*" (!)

APPENDIX 4 *INVALID CONSECRATION OF THE WINE INVALIDATES
OR AT LEAST CASTS DOUBT UP ON THE
CONSECRATION OF THE BREAD*

By Rev. Lawrence S. Brey

1) INTRODUCTION. *Even if* the Consecration of the Wine is invalid by reason of defect of form, and therefore the entire Mass is invalid, does the priest nevertheless truly consecrate the *Bread* in such a Mass? Even if the wine does not become truly consecrated, would we not at least have validly consecrated Hosts, the true Eucharistic Body of Christ, provided that the Consecration of the Bread be performed using the proper matter and form? And therefore could not our people at least be certain they are receiving the true Body and Blood of Jesus at Communion time in such a Mass?

The answer to these questions is a qualified *no*, for one could not be *certain* that the hosts are truly consecrated; at least there is a real and practical *doubt*. In fact, some theologians hold with *certainty* that under such circumstances the bread is *not* validly consecrated.

2) NO SACRIFICE WITHOUT BOTH CONSECRATIONS. In the first place, the *Sacrament* of the Body and Blood of the Lord was given to us *only and exclusively* in the context of the *Sacrifice* of the Body and Blood of Christ. "As often as the sacrifice is offered, the consecration of both species is required, according to the Will and institution of Christ. For Christ at the Last Supper, consecrating each (both) species, commanded: 'do *this* in commemoration of Me' (Cf. I Cor. 11, 24-25)... (and) the very notion of sacrifice ... demands the consecration of both species." (*De Eucharistia*, Noldin-Schmitt, S.J., in "*SUMMA THEOLOGIAE MORALIS*," III Innsbruck, 1940).

For the Consecration re-enacts and commemorates the Sacrifice of the Cross, in that the separate consecration of both species produces the mystical separation

of Christ's Body and Blood. "The consecration of both species is required by Divine Law for the essence of the Sacrifice: this We know from Christ's very (words of) Institution, and from the precept and practice of the Church, so that it is necessary in order that a true representation of the Sacrifice of the Cross be had." (*Brevior Synopsis Theologiae Dogmaticae*, Tanqueray- Bord, Paris, 1952).

3) IF NO SACRIFICE, THEN NO SACRAMENT. Nor is there any indication anywhere that Christ willed the *Sacrament* of the Eucharist to be confected apart from the propitiatory *Sacrifice* of the Mass. Indeed, the notion of the *Sacrament* in the Eucharist, according to the Will of Christ, *cannot be separated from the notion of the Sacrifice.*" (Noldin-Schmitt, *loc. cit.*) Indeed, in practice, Church law absolutely forbids, without any exception, the consecration of only one species without the other. *Canon 817* of the Code of Canon Law states: "It is forbidden, even in extreme cases of necessity, to consecrate one species without the other ... " The *Roman Missal*, in its section, "De Defectibus," prescribes that a Mass interrupted after the Consecration of the Host (because of illness or death of the celebrant) *must* be continued by another priest, i.e., that the wine must be consecrated to complete and effect the Sacrifice (Cf. *De Defectibus*, X, 3).

4) CONSECRATION OF ONLY ONE SPECIES RENDERS VALIDITY AT LEAST DOUBTFUL. As for the validity of the Consecration of the Bread in a case where the Wine is for some reason not consecrated, theologians agree that such a Consecration of the Bread would be valid *only* if the celebrant had the intention of performing the second Consecration (that of the Wine), but had become incapacitated or for some reason unable to perform it. "One species is validly consecrated without the other, *if* the celebrant has the intention of offering sacrifice [but then is interrupted]... But it is never licit to consecrate one species if the celebrant foresees a defect in the other species, because from the Will of Christ the Consecration of the Eucharist must simultaneously be also the complete Sacrifice, which certainly would not be the case unless both species are consecrated." (*Epitome Theologiae Moralis Universae*, ed. Dr. Carolo Telch, Innsbruck, 1924.)

Thus, if the celebrant did *not* have the *intention of properly* consecrating the wine, the Consecration of the Bread would be in *doubt*. Some theologians, indeed, hold that it is *certain*, in such a case that the bread would *not* be truly consecrated. For, a priest not having the intention of consecrating the wine (or of properly consecrating it) would *ipso facto* not have the intention of offering the true Sacrifice or of consecrating according to the Mind of Christ.

5) DE LA TAILLE'S OPINION. *Maurice de la Taille, S.J.* is one such modern theologian of note, who believed that such a single consecration of bread (alone) would be *certainly invalid*. In his treatise on the Mass, he observes: "[T]he conclusion of St. Thomas stands: that the determination of the propitiatory virtue enters into the form of the second consecration [by means of the words: *which shall be shed for you and for many unto the forgiveness of sins*], but not of the

first [i.e., the consecration of the Bread]. Moreover, because in the Roman Canon no such determination of propitiatory intention is expressed over the Body, for this reason St. Thomas very rightly taught that our form of consecration in the Mass in respect of the Blood would be deficient, and so ineffective, if the rest of the words [i.e., *which shall be shed for you and for many unto the forgiveness of sins*] were not added." (De la Taille, "The Mystery Of Faith," Book II, p. 444, n. 1).

"But this which we have shown to be sufficient to indicate the propitiatory intention [i.e., the more determinate form: *which shall be shed for you and for many unto the forgiveness of sins*] is also absolutely necessary for the completion of the form: for, meantime, until this designation is given [expressing the purpose or end for which Christ shed His Blood], the formula does not yet express all that must be expressed, and so does not accomplish anything: for here in reality the effect and what is signified by the formula are indivisible." (De la Taille, *op. cit.*, p. 443, emphasis added)

"What then would happen," asks de la Taille, "if a priest, while consecrating the Body by the Roman rite, had the intention of pronouncing over the chalice only the words: *This is the chalice of my blood?* According to our argument *he would not so consecrate even the Body validly*. The reason is that no one consecrates the Body validly unless he has at least the intention of consecrating the Blood also ... because no one consecrates validly without having at least the implicit intention of offering sacrifice. But the priest who excludes the intention of applying this more determinate form, of which we have been speaking, in respect of the Blood, actually thereby *excludes the intention of valid consecration*, from what we have said above. Therefore he excludes the intention of offering the sacrifice. *Hence he does not even consecrate the Body validly.*" (De la Taille, *op. cit.*, pp. 444-5, n. 1, emphasis added).

6) THE CASE OF THE NEW ENGLISH CANON. Now, if the new English form of Consecration has been so mutilated (and this appears to be the case) as to change the meaning and intent of the form of consecration and to alter *substantially* the meaning of the *propitiatory element* of the form (by substituting "for all men so that ..."), thus invalidating the Consecration of the Wine, we have a situation tantamount to that described by de la Taille. The celebrant, even though he uses the complete (English) form of consecration, is thereby using a "form" with a *mutilated propitiatory element*, and therefore he neither truly intends to nor does he actually offer true Sacrifice. And thus his consecration of even the Bread is *doubtful*; and, according to some theologians (as we have seen), he *certainly does not* validly consecrate the Bread.

Adding more weight to this thesis is the following consideration: Such a "Mass" (involving only one consecration instead of the dual consecration) would be entirely foreign to the intent of Christ and His institution of the Sacrament and Sacrifice *via* the valid dual Consecration of Bread and Wine. Such a "Mass"

would indeed be a *sacrilegious monstrosity*. It is difficult to conceive that Christ would permit the presence of His Eucharistic Body to be effected under such circumstances.

7) CONCLUSION. *In practice*, then, those who are aware of the fact that there is *at least a real doubt* as to the valid consecration of hosts "consecrated" in Masses using the "new English Canon" (or any other "Canon" embodying similar mutilations of the Consecration form), could not in conscience participate in such a "Mass" or receive Communion with a host consecrated at such a Mass.

L.S.B.
May 5, 1968
Feast of St. Pius V

APPENDIX 5 *A SOLEMN DECREE OF THE ECUMENICAL COUNCIL
OF FLORENCE*

A decree of the Council of Florence, promulgated by Pope Eugene IV, sets forth "the form of the words, which in the consecration of the body and blood of the Lord the holy Roman Church *confirmed by the teaching and authority of the Apostles had always been accustomed to use.*"

It is clear that *neither pope nor council* can ever substantially change the matter or form of any of the seven sacraments, since these were established by Christ Himself. But, even if it is granted that some *minor* (i.e., "accidental") change of words in the form could be made, in order *lawfully* to make such a change - a minor, non-substantial change - it would require a *solemn* papal pronouncement or a solemn decree of an ecumenical council; that is to say, something of equal or greater authority than the aforementioned decree of the Council of Florence.

Needless to say, no such weighty authority has canonised the *change in the form* incorporated in the new vernacular "Canons." Nor can any *legitimate* authorization ever be forthcoming, for these changes are substantial and not merely "accidental." They are *mutilations*.

The aforementioned decree of the Council of Florence (1438-1445) follows:

"But since in the above written decree of the Armenians the form of the words, which in the consecration of the body and blood of the Lord the holy Roman Church confirmed by the teaching and authority of the Apostles had always been accustomed to use, was not set forth, we have thought that it ought to be inserted here. In the consecration of the body the Church uses this form of words: 'For this is My body'; in the consecration of the blood it uses the

following form of words: 'For this is the chalice of My blood, of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins''

APPENDIX 6A LETTER OF POPE INNOCENT III

When asked about the origin of certain words in the form for the Consecration of the Wine, Pope Innocent III replied by means of a letter in which he stated, "Therefore, we believe that the form of words, *as is found in the Canon, the Apostles received from Christ, and their successors from them.*"

But the form of words, as is found in the new, vernacular "canons," the present-day successors of the Apostles are willing to receive from the International Committee on English in the Liturgy!

Excerpts from Pope Innocent's letter follow:

[From the letter "Cum Marthae circa" to a certain John, Archbishop of Lyons, Nov. 29, 1202]

You have asked (indeed) who has added to the form of the words which Christ Himself expressed when He changed the bread and wine into the body and blood, that in the Canon of the Mass which the general Church uses, which none of the Evangelists is read to have expressed ... In the Canon of the Mass that expression, "*mysterium fidei*," is found interposed among His words ... Surely we find many such things omitted from the words as well as from the deeds of the Lord by Evangelists, which the Apostles are read to have supplied by word or to have expressed by deed ... From the expression, moreover, concerning which your brotherhood raised the question, namely "*mysterium fidei*," certain people have thought to draw a protection against error, saying that in the sacrament of the altar the truth of the body and blood of Christ does not exist, but only the image and species and figure, inasmuch as Scripture sometimes mentions that what is received at the altar is sacrament and mystery and example. But such run into a snare of error, by reason of the fact that they neither properly understand the authority of Scripture, nor do they reverently receive the sacraments of God, equally "ignorant of the Scriptures and the power of God" [Matt. 22:29] ... Yet "*mysterium fidei*" is mentioned, since something is believed there other than what is perceived; and something is perceived other than is believed. For the species of bread and wine is perceived there, and the truth of the body and blood of Christ is believed and the power of unity and of love ...

We must, however, distinguish accurately between three things which are different in this sacrament, namely, the visible form, the truth of the body, and the spiritual power. The form is of the bread and wine; the truth, of the flesh and blood; the power, of unity and of charity. The first is the "sacrament and not

reality." The second is "the sacrament, and reality." The third is "the reality and not the sacrament." But the first is the sacrament of a twofold reality. The second, however, is a sacrament of one and the reality (is) of the other. But the third is the reality of a twofold sacrament. Therefore, we believe that the form of words, as is found in the Canon, the Apostles received from Christ, and their successors from them ...

APPENDIX 7 A REPLY TO MONSIGNOR BANDAS

Certain errors and misleading statements about the "English Canon question" were made by Msgr. R. G. Bandas in his "Questions And Answers" column of 'The Wanderer' (Jan. 23, 1969). This Appendix contains comments upon several items which appeared in this column.

Item 1

Monsignor Bandas states: The decree on the new three Canons and Prefaces was issued on May 23rd, 1968, by the Sacred Congregation of Rites... The decree says that the Holy Father approved the three Canons and permitted them to be published and to be used."

"This revised English Canon as well as the three new Canons have been fully approved by the Holy See; the Latin text is in *Notitiae*, the official publication of the Commission on the Liturgy (May-June, 1968)."

Comment on Item 1

Some persons, priests and laymen alike, who have read earlier editions of "Questioning The Validity of the Masses using The New, All-English Canon," have said they are quite convinced regarding the factual evidence presented, and that a single obstacle hinders them from being *completely* convinced that the "English Mass" is invalid. This obstacle is that they have read, or heard, that the Pope has approved it.

From the very outset I have maintained that no bona fide pope could possibly ever approve this mutilated consecration form. This I still maintain. Despite the above misleading claim of Msgr. Bandas, and despite the miscellaneous similar claims of others, the truth is that the Holy Father has *never* approved of the phrase, "for you and for all men so that sins may be forgiven." Pope Paul, on the contrary, has approved *no deviation whatsoever* from these words, "for you and for many unto the remission of sins."

Let us now examine Msgr. Bandas' evidence. The decree of May 23, 1968, which he cites, says: "These texts ... the Supreme Pontiff Paul VI has approved and permitted to be published." ("Hos autem textus... Summus Pontifex Paulus PP. VI approbavit atque evulgari permisit."). Just what are "these texts" which the Holy Father has approved and permitted to be published? "These texts" are printed in the above-mentioned issue of *Notitiae*, where the decree of approval also appears. "These texts," it must be noted, are printed *in Latin*, and it goes without saying that the Holy Father's *explicit* approval pertains only to these Latin texts. His *implicit* approval would extend to *faithful* translations of them. Let us see what "*these texts*" contain.

Four "Eucharistic Prayers" (Canons) have been approved, and their texts appear on pp. 168-179. Atop page 168 we find the heading: Eucharistic Prayer I; and immediately below this heading there is one and only one line which reads simply, "Ut in Missali Romano" - *As in the Roman Missal!* Will any traditional, orthodox Roman Catholic criticize Pope Paul for approving the centuries-old Roman Missal? So much for the first Canon.

Next we look into the three *new* Canons - that is, Eucharistic Prayers II, III and IV. In all three cases we seek out this disputed phrase in the consecration form and what do we find? *All three times* (on pages 169, 172 and 178, respectively) we see printed in large boldface type the words: *qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum*. Is this not the same ancient form from the Roman Missal which "the Apostles received from Christ, and their successors from them," to quote Pope Innocent III?

One final question. What about that first English "Canon" that was foisted on English-speaking Catholics in October, 1967, and which is supposed to correspond now to "Eucharistic Prayer I"? Completely aside from the question of validity for a moment, and considering this English "Canon" as a whole from beginning to end, it is evident that these "great translators" couldn't even discover the meaning of "Ut in Missali Romano."

Item 2

Msgr. Bandas says: "The New Testament, as we know, uses the words 'many' and 'all' interchangeably; for example *Rom. 5:18,19*."

Comment on Item 2

Had Monsignor Bandas qualified this statement with the word *sometimes*, as St. Augustine correctly does, no one would disagree with him. But his statement, as it stands, implies that this is *always* or at least usually the case; and it is upon this unwarranted assumption that his "case" heavily relies. In point of fact, the instances when "many" in Holy Scripture means "all" are relatively few, and it is absurd to build a case upon that which is the exception to the rule.

One cannot go through Holy Writ automatically plugging in "all men" whenever the word "many" occurs without frequently obtaining disastrous results. For example, making this particular substitution in the Gospel of St. Luke (13,24) yields: Strive to enter by the narrow gate; for *all men*, I tell you, will seek to enter and will not be able. This is not "good news."

Father William G. Most earlier made the same erroneous claim that Msgr. Bandas makes here; and since on that occasion I made reply at length (refer back to Appendix 3, Reply to Objection A), I will now but summarize.

That the word "many" in the form for consecrating the wine means strictly "many" and is not to be taken here as meaning "all men" is unequivocally maintained and clearly expounded by all the following:

- (1) *The Catechism of the Council of Trent.*
- (2) St. Thomas Aquinas in *Summa Theologica*, Part III, Question 78, Article 4, Reply to Objection 8.
- (3) Pope Benedict XIV in "De Sacrosancto Missae Sacrificio," Book II, Chap. XV, par. 11, where he quotes verbatim the entire Reply of St. Thomas mentioned just above.
- (4) St. Alphonsus de Liguori in his treatise on *The Holy Eucharist* (p. 44 of Grimm's translation), where this brilliant and saintly Doctor of the Church cites both Thomas and Benedict.

These theological giants remain. No one seems able to find four equally compelling sources that maintain the opposite, nay, not even one! To find four equally compelling sources *period* is quite a task.

Item 3

Monsignor Bandas: "This formula [i.e., the English version of the form for consecrating the wine] is a translation from the Roman Canon except that for the word many' it substitutes the term 'all men.'"

Comment on Item 3

By stating that it is a translation "*except that*," Msgr. Bandas is here admitting that the words "all men" actually are *not* a translation, but, as he accurately says, a *substitution*.

Item 4

Monsignor Bandas: "To determine which rendering [i.e., "all men" or "many"] we are to prefer "

Comment on Item 4

What we "prefer" is totally irrelevant. What Our Lord said, as recorded in Holy Scripture, is all that is important. That Msgr. Bandas would make such a "Liberal-Modernist-mentality" statement is astonishing. If everyone is allowed to do what he "prefers," A will prefer this, B will prefer that, and C will prefer something else again. Some newbreed priests, I fear, will prefer no consecration form at all.

Item 5

Msgr. Bandas says: "The doctrine that the Blessed Savior offered the Sacrifice on Calvary for all men is clearly the teaching of the New Testament. Thus we read: ... 'He is a propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only but also for those of the *whole world*' (1 John 2:2)."

Comment on Item 5

This is quite true, but just what does it mean? Surely Msgr. Bandas will not hereby help prove his position to anyone who understands the distinction between the *sufficiency* and *efficacy* aspects of the Passion, a distinction clarified quite early in this monograph (see pars. 64-69).

Paragraph 64 reads as follows: "It is a truth of our Faith that Christ died for all men without exception. 'And He is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world.' (1 John 2:2). Another truth of our Faith is that not all men are saved, but some indeed suffer eternal damnation."

And in par. 69 I have quoted this one, single, elegant sentence from a decree of the Council of Trent (Session VI, Ch. 3) which clearly makes this important distinction: "But, though He died for all, yet *all do not* receive the benefit of His death *but those only* unto whom the merit of his passion is communicated." (Emphasis added.)

Item 6

Monsignor Bandas quotes his adversary: "The Catechism of the Council of Trent...makes a distinction which it is well to keep in mind: 'Looking to the *efficacy* of the Passion, we believe that the Redeemer shed His Blood for the salvation of *all men*;...'. (Emphasis added by Msgr. Bandas.).

Comment of Item 6

This is inferior merchandise! The passage Msgr. Bandas quotes here is from one of J. Donovan's earliest attempts at translating the Trent Catechism into English, and it contains a glaring fault. In this rendition the idea of *efficacy* is seemingly made to relate to *all men*. Of course, this is exactly wrong, for it is the *sufficiency* aspect of the Passion that encompasses all men, *not* the efficacy aspect.

It was Donovan's original ill-chosen translation of the Latin word "virtutem" to read "efficacy" that has created a problem here. Apparently Donovan himself soon realized the great confusion this would likely engender (or else someone pointed it out to him), for his later, corrected editions all have the word "virtue" in this place. (See, for example, the edition published by Jas. Duffy & Co., Dublin, 1908. In their translation McHugh and Callan give "value," which perhaps lends even more clarity to the correct meaning of this passage.)

Thus misled (even "trained theologians" sometimes get misled) -- and misled, moreover, on a vital distinction!--, Msgr. Bandas even italicizes the bogus word "efficacy" in order to stress his *erroneous* point. No wonder he then goes on to pen this confused remark: "(T)he words 'all men,' on the other hand, stress the efficacy-aspect [never!] of the Sacrifice of the cross and [?] its sufficiency to redeem every soul in the whole world."

All the foregoing, however, is not the main criticism I wish to make here, as it is leveled at his ignorance only. *Just two sentences beyond* the one quoted by Msgr. Bandas, the Trent Catechism goes on to say: "*With reason*, therefore, were the words 'for all' *not* used, as in this place the fruits of the passion are alone spoken of, and to the elect only did His Passion bring the fruit of salvation." (Emphasis added). Having brought forth the Trent Catechism and having quoted a (defective) passage from it, Monsignor Bandas has undoubtedly led unwary readers to the notion that somehow this Catechism lends weight to his arguments, whereas *in truth* it explicitly and most thunderously condemns them! This falls short of honest journalism.

Some Concluding Remarks

Those who are attempting to justify this mutilation of the very words of consecration have thus far succeeded only in setting up smokescreens of confusion; they have not faced up squarely to the real issues. Seemingly plausible "evidence" (from scriptural quotations, etc.) is advanced by them, but the *true significance* of this "evidence" (which eludes them) helps their case not a bit. It was not my original plan to write at such length in this Appendix, but now it even seems necessary to add somewhat more to it in order to explain some *elementary* but essential distinctions. Because most of this aforesaid confusion has arisen (and more will undoubtedly be created in the future) due to the fact

that vital theological distinctions are ignored.

Let us consider some examples of these distinctions, so carelessly disregarded. *Redemption* is *not* the same as *salvation*. Although *justification* is closely related to the *forgiveness of sins*, there is yet more to justification. Furthermore, justification and the forgiveness of sins are each completely different from *expiation* (atonement) and *propitiation*.

Some of these doctrines encompass all men; that is, they may be said to be related to the *sufficiency* aspect of Calvary. Others, however, fall under the *efficacy* aspect in that they pertain only to *many* and not to all men.

The word *redeem* means "pay the price for" or "buy back" or "ransom". Very eloquently does St. Peter bring to our minds this idea of *paying*: "You were not redeemed with corruptible things as gold or silver ... but with the precious blood of Christ." (I Pet. 1: 18-19). *Redemption* is absolutely universal: it applies to all men without exception. Every soul in hell now, including those that were there before Calvary, got *redeemed* on that first Good Friday. Christ's Death was sufficient *ransom* even for them. The *price* of His Blood was sufficient and superabundant. "We adore Thee, O Christ, and We bless Thee, because by Thy Holy Cross Thou hast *redeemed the world*" is to be taken quite literally.

Closely akin to redemption are the concepts: *propitiation*, *atonement* (or *expiation*). Our Lord's propitiatory, expiatory Sacrifice on Calvary was also universal in its scope, for He atoned for *all* the sins of *all* men, past, present and future.

All these truths - redemption, expiation, propitiation relate to the *sufficiency* aspect; they apply to all men. Thus can we properly understand: "And He is the *propitiation* for our sins and ... for those of the *whole world*." (I John 2:2) Likewise the meaning of this passage is quite clear: "... Who gave Himself a *redemption for all*." (I Tim. 2:6)

Two little side comments are appropriate here. First of all, it is easily seen that nothing startling whatsoever was "proved" by Rev. Wm. G. Most's earlier argument that in the passage from Mark (10,45): "... He might give His life as a redemption for many" the word *many* is to be taken as meaning all men. (Refer back to Appendix 3, Objection A.) Inasmuch as *redemption* does indeed pertain to all men, Fr. Most's assertion is surely acceptable; but, once again, so what is proved?

And the second aside concerns an "argument" presented by Msgr. Bandas in one place in his article. It simply cannot be argued, as does Msgr. Bandas, that since Calvary was for all men [*just what does this mean?*] and the Mass is the continuation of Calvary [*and again what does this mean?*], therefore the words "all men" may replace the word "many" in the consecration form! This is a

ludicrous oversimplification. Although each and every Mass is the unbloody continuation of Calvary, no single Mass can be equally beneficial to all men. There are some men, in fact, whose names cannot even be mentioned by the celebrant in the "Commemoration of the Living": "Hence were anyone to mention by name an infidel, a heretic, a schismatic, or an excommunicated person (whether a king, or a bishop, or any other), ... he would certainly violate the law of the Church." (De la Taille, *The Mystery of Faith*, v. II, p. 317). Lastly, most theologians hold that Masses absolutely *may not even be said* for certain classes of persons, for example, *excommunicati vitandi*. (De la Taille, *op. cit.*, p. 318)

Now, having mentioned some doctrines that pertain to all men (redemption, expiation, propitiation), let us next consider some that apply only to *many*. *Salvation* is not universal; only *many* and not all men are actually saved. Expressions such as "Christ The Saviour of the world" must not be taken literally as though His Passion and Death actually brought salvation to all." "He became *to all who obey Him* the cause of eternal salvation," we read in Heb. (5,9). Albeit it is God's will that all be saved - "This is good and agreeable in the sight of God our Saviour, Who wishes all men to be saved," (I Tim. 2:3-4) -, nevertheless there are some who habitually go against His will, disobey Him, and thus incur for themselves eternal damnation: "Therefore He hath mercy on whom He will; and whom He will, He hardeneth." (Rom. 9:18).

And where does *forgiveness of sins* fit into this picture? *Forgiveness* of sins must *not* be confused with *expiation* of sins. Although Christ on Calvary expiated all sins of all men, only *many* sins and *many* sinners are forgiven. Christ by His Passion set up the cause by which all sins *can* be forgiven or *could have been* forgiven (cf. St. Thomas, *Summa Th.*, III, Q.49, Art. 2); but *actual forgiveness* of all sins, past, present and future, most assuredly was not brought about thereby. Had His Passion accomplished this, then there would be no Hell and no Sacrament of Penance.

Even during His lifetime Jesus forgave the sins of many, but not of all. He forgave Mary Magdalen, but what of Herodias? No evidence at all exists that He forgave the thief crucified at His left, whereas without a doubt He justified St. Dismas at His right. Peter who denied Him was forgiven; but Judas who betrayed Him? In fine, as everyone knows, only those "*many*" who have *contrition* for their sins are forgiven.

Those malefactors who have tampered with Our Lord's words have, of course, disdained all these elementary but vital theological distinctions just discussed. They have attempted to wed in one and the same phrase the words "all men" (sufficiency) with the *forgiveness of sins* doctrine, which in actuality is related only to the aspect of efficacy. The proper, ancient form for consecrating the wine, using Our Lord's own words, refers to the *actual* forgiveness of sins: "This is ... My Blood ... which shall be shed for you and for many *unto the forgiveness of sins*."

When the Innovators replaced Christ's word "many" by their own words "all men," they necessarily had to change also the final phrase, *unto the forgiveness of sins*. For to say that Christ died for *all men unto the forgiveness of sins* is, in effect, to say that His Passion *actually brought about* the forgiveness of the sins of all men. And this, of course, clearly is undiluted *heresy*.

And therefore the entire meaning, or "essential sense," of Christ's own words was changed when the Innovators made *their* "form" read: "for you and for all men *so that sins may be forgiven*." What is conveyed by these words is the idea of the *potential* forgiveness of the sins of all men, which idea is opposed to the original meaning Christ clearly intended to convey which is that of the *actual* forgiveness of the sins of "many."

To illustrate just once more how confused one can get by ignoring these elementary theological distinctions, let us consider one final item from the column of Monsignor Bandas. He presents several examples of Mass prayers which purportedly lend "liturgical" support to his claims in defense of the use of the words "for all men." One such example of his is: "Lamb of God Who *takest away the sins of the world*." Now just exactly how this is supposed to constitute "evidence" that "all men" may replace "many" in the consecration form escapes me. These are the words of St. John the Baptist, announcing that Christ is the Sacrificial Lamb Who will *redeem* the world. The consecration form concerns the *forgiveness* of the sins of many, while "takest away the sins of the world" means *expiate* the sins of the world. Indeed, the phrase, "Lamb of God who *forgivest* the sins of the world" could be construed as heresy. And for this very reason it seems a likely candidate for incorporation into future versions of "English masses."

Patrick Henry Omlor
Menlo Park, California
February 11, 1969
Feast of Our Lady of Lourdes

EPILOGUE

The author of this book has invited me to add a few words by way of "Epilogue" to this new, enlarged third edition. But indeed, what is there to add? Certainly, in the way of argumentation and evidence there is virtually nothing I can add. As the Latin proverb says, *Qui nimis probat, nihil probat* ("he who proves too much proves nothing"). Therefore I will utilize this space allotted me to make but an observation, a suggestion, a reaffirmation and a supplication.

The observation is this: It should be pointed out that the *English* versions of the

three "new canons" (the "Anaphoras" introduced in the United States in January, 1969) all have the same mutilated consecration "form" as the original English "canon" (introduced in October, 1967): *for all men so that sins may be forgiven*. Consequently all the facts, arguments and evidence in this present monograph also apply with equal force against these three recently-introduced "English Canons."

Secondly, my suggestion is that the readers of this Monograph restudy it carefully, particularly the key, critical issues raised in Part 12. More and more it should become apparent that the essential concept of the Mystical Body is *not* signified in the words "for all men." It is undisputed that "*the reality*" of a sacrament *must* be signified in the sacrament, and it must be signified *chiefly* by the words of the form. If this signification should be deleted, then the sacrament *cannot* signify properly and it *cannot* be valid.

"*The reality*" of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, being the union of the Mystical Body, is signified in these words: "*for you and for many*." As St. Thomas says, "Now, in the celebration of this sacrament words are used to signify ... things pertaining to Christ's Mystical Body, which is signified therein." (Summa Th., III, Q. 83, Art. 5). And elsewhere, citing the authority of St. Augustine, the same Angelic Doctor states: "In the Sacrament of the Altar, two things are signified, *viz.*, Christ's true Body, and Christ's Mystical Body;" as St. Augustine says (*Liber Sent. Prosper.*)" (*op. cit.*, Q. 60, Art. 3). As was clearly demonstrated earlier in this monograph, "all men" are not members of Christ's Mystical Body, and hence these very words *all men* are contrary to the concept of the Mystical Body.

My reaffirmation is in regard to what I wrote (about a year ago) in the *Foreword* of this book. My conviction about the probable invalidity of these "English masses" has but grown stronger with each succeeding month. I cannot use a more forceful word than "probable," for no mortal (save by virtue of a private revelation) can say with *categorical certainty* whether they are valid or not. Yet the evidence indicates that the degree of probability in this case is extremely high and could conceivably lead to practical certainty. *God alone* knows precisely whether we are now entering those times spoken of by Abbe Charles Arminjon in 1881, citing the prophecy of Daniel:

"Daniel, speaking of the signs which will announce the end of the justice of God and the fall of kingdoms,...tells us: '*You will recognize the great calamities are near, when you will see the abomination of desolation in the holy place and when the perpetual sacrifice will cease.*' At the time of the final desolation, there will be a certain period when the unbloody sacrifice will no longer be celebrated over the entire extension of the earth. Then there will no longer be a mediator between the justice of God and man. The crimes and blasphemy will no longer have a counterbalance; this

will be the moment when the skies will be filled like a tent which no longer has a traveler to shelter."--From Conference Eight.

Although it is true that God alone knows, it is also true that He has given each of us an intellect with which to reason. And not one scintilla of evidence or proof of the validity of the changed, mutilated "form" has been thus far advanced to oppose and counterbalance the mountain of still unrefuted evidence that it is invalid. Finally, in all honesty, since the "new words" are so patently contrary to the words of Christ as found in Scripture, in 2000 years of liturgical usage and in the solemnly defined Form; and since the "new words" likewise delete a profound mystery (the Mystical Body) so intimately bound up with and expressed in the essence of the Eucharistic Sacrifice - *how could they conceivably* constitute the valid Form, and how, indeed, could the Innovators and their accomplices escape "the wrath of Almighty God, and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul," invoked by St. Pius V on anyone who would ever have the audacity to change the Roman Missal or the Holy Mass, let alone tamper with its very heart and essence, the Canon and Consecration?

"Take away the Mass: take away the Church" (*tolle missam, tolle ecclesiam*) has ever been the program of the Ancient Enemy. As more and more clearly we recognize that the *Mass* is the heart at which Christ's present-day crucifiers aim, we should likewise realize that the Heart of the solution is *Mary*. In the midst of the present almost *universal apostasy* foretold by Pope St. Pius X, the key to our perseverance in the days ahead is the Ever Virgin *Mary* and in our living in absolute consecration to her Immaculate Heart. Thus, finally, my supplication is to her, our "sole refuge" and our last and "final weapon!" REGNET JESUS PER REGNUM MARIAE!

Rev. Lawrence S. Brey
February 19, 1969
Ash Wednesday

HAS THE CHURCH THE RIGHT?

By Patrick Henry Omlor

First published in The Voice, Canandaigua, NY
October 1969

A Critical Question

In many quarters of the orthodox Catholic camp the belief is held that the "English Canon Masses" are invalid, or at least very probably invalid. The primary theological basis for doubting the validity of the English versions is that

the Innovators and "translators" (so-called), in their unbelievable temerity, dared to introduce an alteration in the very form for consecrating the chalice. These words of Our Lord Himself, which He used in instituting the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, constitute the very essence of the Mass. Therefore when the words, "for all men," were substituted in place of "for many" in the final clause "which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins," it was the existence itself of the Mass that was being tampered with.

Due to this mutilation of the meaning of Christ's words, the implications and consequences of this particular substitution are profound indeed. But it is not my present purpose to review all the theological evidence pointing to the conclusion that this tampering with the form has in fact rendered it invalid. Rather I wish to discuss here but one single aspect of the whole question, namely, whether or not this innovation, "for all men," has been sanctioned by the Holy See. For this seems to be a critical question many are asking.

This question, however, was answered long before it was even asked, because it is the unalterable teaching of the Magisterium that not even the Church Herself--that is, no pope, no bishop, nor even all the bishops acting either individually or collectively, nor a council--has the right or the power to "innovate anything touching on the substance of the sacraments." To understand how this teaching applies to the present case under discussion it is necessary to know what is meant by "the substance of a sacrament," and this will be explained shortly.

The Church Has Spoken

Regarding this limitation of the rights and powers of the Pope and the Church there are at least four clear-cut pronouncements of the Magisterium; and all four may be found in Denzinger's *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, the most authoritative compendium of definitions and declarations relating to matters of faith and morals.

(1) In the letter, *Super quibusdam* (Sept. 29, 1351), Pope Clement VI taught: "(T)he Roman Pontiff regarding the administration of the sacraments of the Church, can tolerate and even permit different rites of the Church of Christ... always without violating those things which pertain to the integrity and necessary parts of the sacraments."

(2) The Council of Trent, Session XXI, Chap. 2: "It (the Council) declares furthermore that this power has always been in the Church, that in the administration of the sacraments, without violating their substance, she may determine or change whatever she may judge to be more expedient for the benefit of those who receive them or for the veneration of the sacraments, according to the variety of circumstances, times and places."

(3) Pope St. Pius X in the letter, *Ex quo, nono* (Dec. 26, 1910): "(I)t is well known that to the Church there belongs no right whatsoever to innovate anything touching on the substance of the sacraments."

(4) And, finally, on Nov. 30, 1947, Pope Pius XII issued the apostolic constitution, *Sacramentum Ordinis*, which reiterates and clarifies this same principle: "(A)s the Council of Trent teaches, the seven sacraments of the New Law have all been instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord, and the Church has no power over the 'substance of the sacraments,' that is, over those things which, with the sources of divine revelation as witnesses, Christ the Lord Himself decreed to be preserved in a sacramental sign."

Forceful and unmistakably clear is the language of St. Pius X: "no right whatsoever." And Pius XII's words, "no power," are equally unequivocal. These prohibitions, be it noted, refer to "the substance" of the sacraments.

Substance vs. Ceremony

Before going into the meaning of "substance" of a sacrament, it may perhaps be useful to consider some aspects of the sacraments that do not fall under this concept. In his bull, *Apostolicae Curae*, Pope Leo XIII lays down an important distinction: "In the rite for the performance and administration of any sacrament a distinction is justly made between its 'ceremonial' and its 'essential' part, the latter being usually called its 'matter and form.'" Thus, although the Church is forbidden to change, or even touch, the matter or form of any sacrament, She may indeed change or abolish or introduce something in the nonessential rites, or "ceremonial" parts, used in the administration of the sacraments, such as processions, prayers or hymns before or after the actual words of the form are recited, etc.

But every Catholic should know that not even the Pope can rule (for example) that alcohol may be used instead of water as the matter of the Sacrament of Baptism; or that the words, "I christen you, William," may be used as the form instead of, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Innovations such as these would be examples of touching, or violating the substance of a sacrament.

Substance of a Sacrament

As is generally explained by theologians, the substance of a sacrament consists of those elements of the sacrament which are absolutely necessary in order to have the sacrament; viz., the matter and the form. By the matter is meant the

specific, determinate, sensible thing or things used in the external rite of the sacrament; for example, water in Baptism, bread and wine in the Holy Eucharist. The form is the sequence of specific, determinate words pronounced by the minister of the sacrament. "The word," says St. Augustine, "is joined to the element, and it becomes a sacrament."

Addis and Arnold's Catholic Dictionary comments thus: "The Council of Trent defines that though the Church may change rites and ceremonies, it cannot alter the 'substance' of the sacraments. This follows from the very nature of a sacrament. The matter and form have no power in themselves to give grace. This power depends solely on the will of God, Who has made the grace promised depend on the use of certain things and words, so that if these are altered in their essence the sacrament is altogether absent."

Our present inquiry, related specifically to the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, is whether or not this substitution of the words "for all men" in place of "for many" in the consecration form constitutes a forbidden violation of the substance of the Sacrament. And therefore we should also consider a certain distinguishing feature of this Sacrament; namely, that it was instituted in specie. As we read in The Catholic Encyclopedia (V. XIII, p. 299, 1913 ed.): "Christ determined what special graces were to be conferred by means of external rites: for some sacraments (e.g. baptism, the Eucharist) He determined minutely (in specie) the matter and form: for others He determined only in a general way (in genere) that there should be an external ceremony, by which special graces were to be conferred, leaving to the Apostles or to the Church the power to determine whatever He had not determined, e.g. to prescribe the matter and form of the Sacraments of Confirmation and Holy Orders." Since the Holy Eucharist was instituted in specie (and all theologians agree upon this), Our Lord Himself at the Last Supper having specified the exact words of the form, there was absolutely nothing left to the Church to determine in this respect.

Form of The Holy Eucharist

The matter of the Holy Eucharist is twofold, namely, bread and wine; and similarly the form is twofold. Here we are concerned only with the form of the latter consecration. "With regard to the consecration of the wine," teaches the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "it is necessary ... that the priest know and understand well its form. We are, then, firmly to believe that it consists in the following words: 'FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT, THE MYSTERY OF FAITH, WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS.' . . . But of this form no one can doubt."

A word is in order on the great authority of the Catechism of the Council of Trent,

also known as the Roman Catechism. The Council of Trent in a solemn decree guaranteed the authenticity of the sacramental forms laid down in this Catechism: "the form will be prescribed for each of the sacraments by the Holy Council in a catechism, which the bishops shall have faithfully translated into the language of the people and explained to the people by all parish priests." (Session XXIV, Chap. 7). Throughout the four hundred years of this Catechism's existence its use has been enjoined by numerous popes and councils. A comparatively recent papal recommendation was that of Pope St. Pius X in his encyclical *Acerbo Nimis*, wherein he ordered all the faithful to learn the Roman Catechism and to follow it.

Likewise a decree of the Council of Florence specifies the same identical form: "In the consecration of the blood the Church uses this form of words: 'FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD . . . WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS.' "

Many theologians of great authority, including St. Thomas Aquinas, the Salmanticenses, and all the earlier Thomists unanimously up to Cajetan, held that all these words (including, of course, the altered words, "for many") are necessary for validity and hence belong to the "substance of the Sacrament."

Other theologians, however, are of the opinion that not all these aforesaid words are essential for the validity of the Sacrament, but that the first words, "This is the Chalice of My Blood," would suffice for validity. St. Bonaventure and Cajetan are perhaps the outstanding authorities of this school of opinion. But even the Cajetan Thomists admit that these latter words which are under discussion (viz., "which shall be shed for you and for many . . .") do indeed belong to the substance of the form, even though they deny their necessity for validity. That is to say, they distinguish between what is of the substance and what is of the essence, or necessity. Hence they assert that these latter words, while not essential for the validity of the Sacrament, are nevertheless necessary for the integrity or completeness of the form and therefore belong to "the substance." Although this distinction seems contrary to the mind of St. Thomas, nevertheless the point is made that virtually all theologians admit these disputed words to belong to the substance of the Sacrament, according to their own interpretation of "substance."

What has the Church said officially on this matter? It goes without saying that She has never as yet defined what words are absolutely essential for consecrating the wine, for otherwise the controversy would have been settled. Certain clear indications, however, as to what is "the mind of the Church" have been given to us; for example, the decree of the Council of Florence cited above. And the mind of the Church is that, in the absence of an actual *de fide* definition, the entire form (and not just the words: "This is the Chalice of My Blood") must be treated as though it is of the substance of the Sacrament.

Indisputable evidence that this is indeed the "mind of the Church" is furnished by Chapter V of *De Defectibus*, which is a section of the official rubrics accompanying St. Pius V's Roman Missal, and this is perhaps the closest thing to an actual "definition" of the Church on this subject: "The words of consecration, which are the form of this Sacrament, are these: 'FOR THIS IS MY BODY; FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD, OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT, THE MYSTERY OF FAITH, WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS.' If anyone omits or changes anything in the form of the consecration of the Body and Blood, and in this change of words the words do not mean the same thing, then he does not effect the Sacrament. If words are added which do not alter the meaning, then the Sacrament is valid, but the celebrant commits a mortal sin in making such an addition." Considering that the penalty of mortal sin attaches to making even minor changes which do not even alter the meaning, who can question that the Church is certainly treating the entire form as though it is all of the substance of the Sacrament?

Definition of Pius XII

In attempting to form a correct judgment on this issue it would be unwise to overlook the definition of "substance" which Pope Pius XII has laid down. Without going into the question of "validity," he defines the substance as "those things which, with the sources of divine revelation as witnesses, Christ the Lord Himself decreed to be preserved in a sacramental sign." Does our disputed phrase fulfill this definition? The first requirement, that we have the testimony of divine revelation, is undeniably fulfilled, for we find these words, "which shall be shed for many," in Holy Writ in the Gospels of both Sts. Matthew and Mark. And if any words in the form of any sacrament fulfill the other condition of Pius's definition namely, that "Christ the Lord Himself decreed them to be preserved in a sacramental sign"--, none fulfill it more perfectly than do the words of Christ in instituting this Sacrament; for after pronouncing them over the elements of bread and wine Our Lord explicitly ordered: "Do this in commemoration of Me."

Additional insight into this whole matter may be gained by consulting once again *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (loc. cit.): "The Council of Trent declared that the Church had not the power to change the 'substance' of the sacraments. She would not be claiming power to alter the substance of the sacraments if she used her Divinely given authority to determine more precisely the matter and form in so far as they had not been determined by Christ." What is here implied is that if the Church should alter those things explicitly "determined by Christ," then she would thereby be usurping this power.

Dealing With Absurdities

A certain argument of a very absurd nature (apparently invented by the Innovators of the I.C.E.L.) has been making the rounds. This ludicrous contention is that "many" and "all men" amount to the same thing, and therefore nothing has really been changed at all! Aside from the fact that any child with the use of reason knows the difference between "many" and "all," this argument leaves the following embarrassing question unanswered, If "many" and "all men" are legitimately interchangeable in this place, then why did the Catechism of the Council of Trent explicitly reject this very substitution? "With reason, therefore," teaches the Roman Catechism, "were the words 'for all men' NOT used, as in this place the fruits of the Passion are alone spoken of, and to the elect only (i.e., 'for many') did His Passion bring the fruit of salvation."

And why did at least two Doctors of the Church, St. Thomas Aquinas (Summa, 111, Q.78, Art.3) and St. Alphonsus Mary de Liguori (Treatise on the Holy Eucharist), also take pains to point out the theological reasons why "all men" is improper in this place? Why did the Sovereign Pontiff Benedict XIV (De Sacrosancto Missae Sacrificio, Bk. 11, Ch. XV, par. 11) ratify the teaching of St. Thomas on this point, asserting that the Angelic Doctor "explains correctly" Christ's use of "for many" as opposed to "for all men"?

A variation of the Innovators' nonsensical argument (and this rests solely on linguistic sleight of hand) goes like this: Our Lord really meant to say "all men," but He was handicapped in speaking Aramaic, which doesn't have a special word for "all," but only an ambiguous term which can mean both "many" and "all." Of course, admittedly the I.C.E.L. presents it with greater finesse, On p. 34 of their pamphlet, The Roman Canon in English Translation, we read: "Neither Hebrew nor Aramaic possess (sic) a word for 'all.' The word rabbim or 'multitude' thus served also in the inclusive sense for 'the whole,' even though the corresponding Greek and the Latin appear to have an exclusive sense, i.e., 'the many' rather than 'the all'."

As a start let us reflect that the grammatical blunder in English in the first sentence inspires no great confidence in these experts' pretended proficiency in Hebrew and Aramaic. Their "facts" are no better, for their claim itself is absolutely false. As one would normally expect, Aramaic does indeed have a word for "all" as well as a completely different word for "many." In point of fact, even to this day Masses of the Maronite Rite still employ the ancient Aramaic words which mean strictly and unambiguously "for many." Of course, the categorical proof that this whole pedantic "explanation" is just a heap of semantic hanky-panky lies in the fact that St. Mark, who is one of the two sources of "for many," actually wrote in Greek! Viewed in its entirety, this I.C.E.L. pamphlet appears as nothing more than a handy little catalogue of specious excuses

designed to explain away all the meddling of this sinister outfit.

Interim Summary

Before continuing let us briefly review the case as presented thus far. The Magisterium has pronounced on at least four separate occasions that the substance of the sacraments is an area that is untouchable, even by the Church Herself. These words in the consecration of the wine, "which shall be shed for you and for many . . .," are considered by most theologians to belong to the substance of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist; that is, the two principal "schools" that have studied and debated this issue most extensively both (each according to its own interpretation of the term) claim these words to be "of the substance." Since these are the words of Our Lord Himself, which He used in instituting this Sacrament in specie, they should perforce be considered untouchable. The Church, although never defining this matter de fide, has always treated these words as though they are of the substance. Finally, if we adhere to the definition of "substance of a sacrament" which Pius XII handed down, we find a cogent argument that these words are undeniably of the substance of the Sacrament. From all this it seems amply clear that these words which have been altered must be given the benefit of the doubt, at the very least, that they belong to the untouchable substance of the Sacrament.

The Original Question

The question posed earlier was: Has the Pope approved of these words, "for all men" to be used instead of "for many"? In his recent apostolic constitution, dated April 3, 1969, Paul VI stated: "We wish that the words be pronounced thus ... over the chalice: 'Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei ... qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.'" Speaking officially, therefore, the Holy Father has permitted no change in Our Lord's words.

But another fact is to be reckoned with. The selfsame mutilation in the English form appears in the same place in the Italian language canons; that is, "per tutti," the Italian equivalent of "for all men," is used. And, according to the recent report of a reliable eyewitness, Pope Paul VI himself has used this Italian version and these words: "per tutti." This would seem to be proof enough that this phraseology has the Pope's tacit approval at least, despite the fact that his official pronouncement rules out any such change! And so, just what is one to conclude from this?

In the first place, although this innovation may have originated elsewhere, nevertheless it may now be asserted that Pope Paul VI himself made this change, since he, the head of the Church, is aware of it and has apparently

accepted and endorsed it, at least in practice. And therefore, setting aside all emotions, there are from a strictly logical standpoint exactly two alternatives to consider: either Paul VI is in violation of the Magisterium, which seemingly yields him "no right whatsoever to innovate anything" in this regard; or he is not in violation of it.

One Alternative

Let us consider the second alternative first. To prove he is not in opposition to the Magisterium one must prove that these words, "for many," are not of the substance of this Sacrament. Clearly this cannot be proved, especially since the bulk of the evidence is to the contrary.

But one might be tempted to argue as follows: Paul VI has not only tolerated this change but he has even used it himself. Since he is the Pope, and since it is inconceivable that any pontiff would usurp powers that are not his--that is, touching the substance of a sacrament--, it automatically follows that these words simply cannot belong to the substance, due to the very fact that he has indeed touched them. Consequently, inasmuch as the Church has not heretofore defined whether or not these particular words belong to the substance, the fact that Paul has changed them is, in effect, tantamount to his defining that they are not of the substance.

Albeit the foregoing argument might seem to be a reassuring resolution of the problem, it simply cannot stand. Since when does Christ's true Church resolve important doctrinal matters this way? Who can produce just one example of the authentic Magisterium defining doctrine in a similarly round-about manner? Why, this very question has for centuries been studied and discussed by the greatest theologians and Doctors of the Church. And during all these centuries the Church saw fit to allow the status quo to remain, wisely declining to rule one way or the other. In that no one ever even dreamed of actually changing these words, a practical situation never arose to occasion Holy Mother Church to speak in Her solemn, authoritative voice. Nevertheless, as was demonstrated earlier, She, following the safest course, has always treated all the words of the form as though they all belong to the untouchable substance of the Sacrament.

Moreover, is it not true that many matters of lesser importance have first been studied exhaustively by able theologians appointed by the Holy See, and often with much open debate, before a final decision was rendered? Odd, is it not, that this all-important matter, always left untouched by the Church, should now be decided or "defined" wholly sub rosa, without discussion, without even being mentioned; but decided via the simple expedient of allowing notoriously heterodox "liturgy experts" to present the Church Militant with their "accomplished fact," followed by the Pope's "tacit" approval? Make no mistake

about it! God's Holy Church does not operate thus.

The Other Alternative

Taking up the first alternative, then, is it possible that Paul VI is in opposition to the Magisterium? At the very outset I wish to establish that this is not an improper question to ask. To raise such a question is not "attacking the Pope," nor is it trying to "be more Catholic than the Pope." When it comes to the sacraments, it is neither rash nor outside the realm of possibility to inquire whether a given pontiff might be arrogating power that is not rightfully his. For if such were an absolute, unheard-of impossibility, then why, I ask, did the Holy Ghost on at least four separate occasions arm His Church against precisely this possibility?* If it went without saying that no pontiff or council could ever conceivably usurp, then what was the point of the Magisterium's laying down this principle in the first place? Do not these pronouncements speak for themselves? Finally, is it being a "good Catholic" to ignore these Divinely inspired teachings at the exact moment when a situation demanding their application seems to present itself?

Now regardless of what Pope Paul VI may personally think, it still has not been decided with absolute certainty whether or not these words he has changed belong to the substance of the Sacrament, inasmuch as the Church still has not defined the matter (and this cannot be repeated too often). But let us assume that he holds the opinion they are not of the substance. Assuredly he is entitled to this opinion as a private theologian, and undoubtedly in his own conscience he does not believe that in making this change he is touching the substance of the Sacrament. NEVERTHELESS even Pope Paul VI himself does not know with certainty that they are or are not of the substance, since even he himself has not defined the matter! And therefore, in the absence of this clear and certain knowledge, he has neither the right nor the power to touch these words.

In Conclusion

Furthermore to make such a profound change without any clarification or explanation whatsoever in itself vitiates the teaching authority of the Church. We need only illustrate the procedure of the authentic Magisterium by means of an example. It will be recalled that in 1947 Pope Pius XII wished to determine more precisely the matter of the Sacrament of Holy Orders. (Incidentally, as an "in genere" sacrament Holy Orders, unquestionably was liable to determinations by

the Church.) It was only after extensive study that the Holy Father, prompted by the Holy Ghost, laid down his official teaching in the carefully worded apostolic constitution, *Sacramentum Ordinis*, in which he thoroughly expounded the subject.

*See *The Church has Spoken*

But to change the words of Christ Himself, words recorded in Holy Writ, words of the very heart of the Mass? And furthermore to introduce the exact mutilation expressly outlawed by the Roman Catechism? All this is done quietly and unannounced! All this we must accept without question because it has the Pope's tacit approval?

More is at stake here than just the validity of the Holy Sacrifice. You may ask how this is possible, for what more could there be? I answer that the very teaching authority of the Church is at stake. "It is a well-known fact that to the Church there belongs no right whatsoever to innovate anything touching on the substance of the sacraments." When the Magisterium is challenged with impunity on but a single point the entire authority of Holy Mother Church is thereby challenged. Mark this well! Once the precedent is established, She will be violated on each and every other front; this we witness even now. And how long before Her authority becomes reduced to an utter nullity? But the gates of hell will not prevail against Her, and it is only "in the sight of the unwise" that She "seemed to die."

INSIGHTS INTO HERESY

1. REVIEWING THE BASIC DEFINITIONS-- More and more frequently nowadays the word *heresy* seems to keep cropping up in our conversations and in our reading material. Most informed Catholics have a reasonably accurate idea of what heresy is, even though not too many may be familiar with St. Thomas', definition of it as "a species of unbelief belonging to those who profess the Christian faith, but corrupt its dogmas." The common understanding is that heresy is a *denial* of some truth(s) or dogma(s) which the Church proposes for our belief and to which we must fully assent in order to be saved. Such a denial is by definition a heinous affront to Almighty God, Who is Truth, and an attack upon His Church which His Divine Son founded as the Ark of Salvation which teaches us the truth and enables us to attain everlasting happiness. Though so sturdily built by these Divine Hands, this Ark has ever been the prey of the mutineers aboard, for *always* it is from within that heresies are born. It is Satan, the Father of Lies, who begets all heresies; but the midwives and the wet nurses are to be found among "those who profess the Christian faith" (as St. Thomas says), principally theologians, bishops and priests.

Heresy may be *material* or *formal*. A *material* heretic is one who adheres to error because of inculpable ignorance, mistaken judgment, or a failure to comprehend dogmas adequately. Inasmuch as free choice is absent, the material heretic does not deliberately assault the Church, and therefore there is no sinfulness attached. In *formal* heresy, on the other hand, what comes into play is *the will*, which inclines and directs the intellect to cling to that which the Church declares to be false. Men become formal heretics, because of their pride of intellect, or their tendency to rely too heavily on their own lights and insights, or their misguided religious zeal, or perhaps their delusions of being great religious leaders or "reformers." The mark of formal heresy is pertinacity, the obstinate refusal to recant one's errors even after their deviation from the teaching of the Church has been clearly pointed out. Heresy and humility are mortal enemies. Both cannot survive together in one and the same man; ultimately the one must destroy the other.

2. GETTING A CLOSER LOOK AT HERESY -- Just knowing some definitions really does not suffice to give one a vivid understanding of what heresy is. "Scratch a Russian," said Napoleon, "and you will find a Tartar." Without necessarily espousing this opinion of Russians in general, we can nevertheless accept the principle, because in order to see what underlies heresy a little "scratching" must be done. "Freedom of choice" and the "fundamental God-given right to choose" this or that or the other thing have become standard pieces of demagogic equipment for politicians, "liberal" editors, and revolutionaries in general. Now this is the very same stuff heresies are made of, for heresy always involves a choosing. The Catholic Encyclopedia explains it thus: "The right Christian faith consists in giving one's voluntary assent to Christ in all that truly belongs to His teaching ... the deposit of faith ... the sum total of truths revealed in Scripture and Tradition. The believer accepts the whole deposit as proposed by the Church; the heretic accepts only such parts of it as commend themselves to his own approval." Heresy, then, is an abuse of freedom of choice.

No one, I think, has explained this idea more clearly than Fr. Denis Fahey: "Heresy, as its Greek original proclaims, means selecting and choosing. It involves in its very essence a rupture of the harmonious equilibrium of two truths, both of which are taught in their purity by the Catholic Church. Heresy takes one aspect of the full harmonious synthesis of the Divine Plan and exaggerates it till the resultant affirmation involves the negation of the complementary aspect. It is the partial truth contained in a heresy which obtains acceptance for the error therein involved, because the human mind is meant for truth and cannot embrace error as such. What the Catholic Church condemns is, needless to say, the error or negation, not the affirmation."

In the above explanation there are four key ideas: (1) Heresy involves *two* truths

which, although distinct from one another, are related to one another in some way. (2) The heretic does not necessarily take the "negative approach." He is usually *affirming* something which in itself is absolutely true, namely, one of the two truths. (3) His affirmation becomes so forcible and *overemphasized* that gradually some aspects of this one truth become exaggerated so that the *other* truth begins to be *deemphasized* and then eventually altogether denied. (4) It is the *partial* truth of what the heretic is saying that gains him a following, because the human mind (enfeebled though it is by Original Sin) still, for the most part, is capable of recognizing and rejecting *unadulterated* error.

3. SEEING SOME EXAMPLES

"Americanism (the heresy)," Fr. Fahey points out, "is not condemned on account of its *assertion* of the necessity of the active and social virtues, but on account of its *negation* of the interior virtues of self-denial, humility, obedience. It is not judged worthy of reproof on account of its *affirmation* of the beauty of the natural virtues, but on account of its *negation* of the splendour of the supernatural ones."

The doctrine of original Sin and the dogma of the Immaculate Conception: these truths are both mysteries, and they are related to each other. Should we affirm the first truth (Original Sin) to the extent that we actually distort some aspect of it by exaggeration, we might end up questioning the Immaculate Conception. Suppose, for example, that we dwell one-sidedly on this sole aspect: Original Sin *by its very nature* is a sin of the race and must be universal in its scope. The *whole* human race *by necessity* inherited this sin from Adam, etc. Analyzing, scrutinizing and exaggerating this one single aspect (its universality by necessity), we might begin to wonder how Mary's being preserved from Original Sin does not somehow pull the rug out from under this aspect, which we have become so fond of dwelling upon. Original Sin is an affair of the race--this we know beyond a doubt! --, and if Mary was indeed a human being she *must* certainly have inherited this sin. If she didn't, then she must not have been purely human but quasi-divine (and this is just one other way of falling into error). Such is the perplexity of the man who, when dealing with mysteries, relies on reason alone unaided by faith.

Similarly, one could *overemphasize* the second truth, the Immaculate Conception, to the extent that he might end up denying some aspect of Original Sin. An atheist, will admit that Mary was conceived without Original Sin, simply because to his way of thinking there isn't any such thing.

4. TAKING SOME PRECAUTIONS

If starting out just affirming truths can so readily lead ultimately to heresy, one might wonder if the safest course isn't simply to stop studying the truths of our faith, or at least to avoid delving too deeply into them. Quite the contrary! Always, however, we must bear in mind that many of these truths are wrapped in mysteries. As our *faith* deepens, our understanding of these mysteries becomes greater; that is the key. The Apostles came to realize this, and their plea: "Lord, increase our faith" is a most excellent ejaculation which we ourselves would do well to repeat often. (Conversely, it is also a fact that as one's faith diminishes, so does his grasp of mysteries; that again is a key, the key to what is happening in high places in the Church today.)

Never will we stray from the sound teaching of the Church if we rely upon the Holy Ghost, Mary the Queen of Truth, and our special patron saints to aid us in our study. Always thinking in consonance with what the Church teaches, always assenting to what the Church demands, always following the sound Doctors approved by the Church: these are our safeguards.

On some mysteries it is advisable not to meditate too much. Many spiritual guides, for example, counsel not to ponder too inquiringly or too frequently on the mystery of predestination, especially if a person has a tendency to be scrupulous. And regarding transubstantiation, the Catechism of the Council of Trent warns: "But, in accordance with the principle very often repeated by the Fathers, the faithful are to be admonished not to inquire too curiously into the manner in which that change may be made, for it defies our powers of conception, nor have we any example of it in natural changes, nor in the work of creation itself. The change is to be learned *by faith* (emphasis added); the manner of that change is not to be made a subject of too curious inquiry. But ... pastors will ... fortify the minds of the faithful by reminding them that 'no word shall be impossible with God' (Luke:1,37)."

We must, moreover, never lose sight of the fact that the Father of Heresies always is attempting to sow the seeds of error and doubt in the minds of good Catholics. He can play havoc with our feeble intellects; and one of the favorite artifices of this Evil One is to convince us that *ours* isn't all that feeble after all!

Some there are (rationalists and atheists being good examples) who scoff at Catholics and their mysteries which, according to these scoffers, conflict with reason. This is absolutely untrue, for our supernatural mysteries *do not conflict* with reason; they are simply *above* reason. Take the most simple and unlearned Catholic, one whose reason is aided by a deep and lively faith. Such a person actually has such a highly developed reasoning power that he has reached the following conclusions: human reason because of our tainted nature is very fallible and unreliable, and consequently there simply *must* be some truths above and beyond its grasp. My inability to grasp them fully is to be ascribed to my imperfect reason and not to the fact that the mysteries "conflict with reason." The scoffer, the one who prides himself on his great prowess at reasoning, actually

has not yet even reached this *elementary* level of ability to reason!

5. THE TWO FACES OF HERESY

"The Jansenist tendency," says Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary*, "displayed itself in so many ways, in attempts to correct doctrines, devotions, discipline ... that it is no easy matter to decide where the reproach of Jansenism was deserved." And also: "It must be remembered that the work of the Jansenist writers was very far from being wholly evil. Arnauld and his friends defended many Catholic doctrines against the Calvinists." Let us now, touching on the fourth point in Fr. Fahey's analysis, consider why it is that there is always a partial truth in all heresies.

Obviously Satan will not take the trouble carefully to plant the seeds of heresy in a man's mind, and then allow him to start off in his "career" attacking every Catholic doctrine in sight. Such a course would gain the heretic no adherents whatsoever from among those who are still faithful Catholics, and these, of course, are the very ones Satan is after primarily, or at least the ones that offer him the greatest obstacles. So, if a heresy is to be successful it must be a good admixture of sound Catholic doctrine and error. It is the 1% error in the mixture that the Evil One will settle for, at least in the very beginning.

"In their writings and addresses," says St. Pius X of the Modernists, "they seem not infrequently to advocate now one doctrine, now another, so that one would be disposed to regard them as vague in their ideas ... Hence in their books you find some things which might very well be expressed by a Catholic, but on the next page you find other things which might have been dictated by a rationalist. When they write history, they make no mention of the divinity of Christ, but when they are in the pulpit they profess it clearly. Again, when they write history they pay no heed to the fathers and the councils, but when they catechize the people, they cite them respectfully."

What the heretic advances must always appear plausible. Since the deception is a gradual process, at the very outset his teachings must at least have the semblance of orthodoxy. It goes without saying that someone who tries to promote a palpable absurdity will scarcely be doing Satan's work. The Ancient Enemy knows that our darkened intellects are easy prey for his snares, but he also knows that there is a limit even to our stupidity. Several years ago, for example, some unsolicited literature arrived in the mail, postmarked Old Town, Maine. The sender's name was John Baptist Baker, and in perusing this literature it soon became clear to me that he believed himself to be the 20th century's John THE Baptist, His key "dogma" was that Fr. Coughlin is the third person of the Blessed Trinity. Too insane to fall under the category of blasphemy, this "dogma" certainly was not being used by Satan for the purpose

of spreading heresy -- not even in Maine.

Lastly, it would be a mistake to suppose that the heretic will exhibit no piety or good qualities whatsoever. Someone who is a great exponent of Our Lady, for example, or a great defender of traditional Catholicism might be such *only ostensibly*. If, although sounding orthodox enough, he is nevertheless subtly disseminating error and creating confusion, such a person can do incalculable harm. Many sincere adherents will see and hear only the wholesome things and fail to recognize the errors until they have become hopelessly enmeshed in them. "Discord of thought and will," according to St. Pius X, "is the sure mark of error." Needless to say, then, where there is discord and confusion there is also bound to be error; and unadulterated Catholic orthodoxy as well as true piety and devotion to the Mother of God are in reality far removed, regardless of the outward appearances.

6. AN IMPORTANT PAIR OF TRUTHS

Having seen above how heresies arise through the disturbance of the harmonious equilibrium existing between two related truths--affirming and overemphasizing one truth at the expense of the other--, let us now consider two truths which easily lend themselves to this pattern of heresy. A chief reason why this particular pair of truths is a likely target for Satan's efforts is that each truth is in itself a supernatural mystery, and fully reconciling how *both* are true at the same time is far, far above the grasp of reason. These two truths are: (A) Christ died for all men; (B) Not all men are saved, but only many.

7. TRUTH (A): CHRIST DIED FOR ALL MEN

When we say that "Christ died for all men," what we mean is that by His Death on the Cross Our Lord *redeemed* all mankind. Associated with this first truth, then, is a key word: *Redemption*. Going back to its original derivation, or etymology, we learn that this word *redemption* means literally a ransom, or buying back, or paying the price for. "You were not redeemed with corruptible things as gold or silver," says St. Peter, "but with the precious blood of Christ."

The sin of Adam was a "race" sin in that its effects are felt by the entire *human race*. Original Sin and all its consequences---namely, the darkening of the intellect, the weakening of the will, suffering and death, and, most serious of all, the loss of sanctifying grace -- are transmitted at birth, as though through the blood, to every man born into the world. By the very fact he is a human being each man is originally tainted with this sin, and he must carry with him throughout his lifetime its pernicious effects; and thus in every sense of the word Original Sin

is *hereditary*. Exactly why and how Adam's sin became an affair of the whole human race we cannot fully understand, as it is indeed, in a sense, a mystery.

Jesus Christ, the God-Man, by His Passion and Death "*purchased* for us the rewards of eternal life"; He *ransomed* us from the captivity, of the original sin (but not from its effects) and from all sin. That is to say, He as man could suffer and die as other men; but as God His Sacrifice was infinite, just as the required ransom was infinite. Because of the infinite dignity of The One Who is outraged by sin, all sin demands an infinite atonement or expiation. And so, the ransom, or Redemption, like Adam's original sin, was absolutely *universal* in its scope. Both were "race" acts having their effects--the one damaging, the other repairing--on the *collectivity* of mankind.

Some other key words associated with this first truth, then, are: *human race*, *collectively*, and *universally*. And next we come upon the word *sufficiency*. Christ's Death was sufficient remedy and ransom for all. No more (and, of course, no less) than some atoning act of the God-Man was needed to repair the infinite outrage of sin, as we have seen. "Christ by His Passion delivered us from our sins causally," says St. Thomas, "that is, by setting up the cause of our deliverance, from which cause all sins whatsoever, past, present, or to come, could be forgiven: just as if a doctor were to prepare a medicine by which all sicknesses can be cured, even in the future." Indeed "Christ died for all men," but only, as St. Thomas explains, in this sense of *sufficiency*.

No sooner did our first parents fall than God promised them He would send His Redeemer for the human race. This promise and its fulfillment by His only begotten Son were manifestations of the infinite *mercy* of God. Not owing us anything on this score, there was no Justice involved here, but only God's mercy. In fine, this first truth we have been discussing, that *Christ died for all men*, has these related sub-concepts: Redemption, human race, collectively, universally, infinite mercy, and sufficiency.

8. TRUTH (B): ONLY MANY ARE SAVED

Exploring the second truth, namely, that *only many men are saved*, we encounter a different set of key concepts. First of all, *salvation*. Not all men attain (or will attain) eternal happiness in heaven, or salvation, but only many. Salvation, therefore, in actuality does not pertain to the human race on a universal and collective basis, but it pertains to many *individual* souls on a *particular* basis. Even though Our Divine Redeemer ransomed all men, there are some men who, through their perverse failure to cooperate with God's Will and His grace, effectively nullify for themselves the benefits of this Purchase. Here again is a profound mystery beyond our ken: "the mystery of iniquity".

Suppose (by way of analogy) you have a friend who, for some reason, has been imprisoned. To obtain his release from his jail cell you generously go ahead and put up the required amount of bail; in other words, you pay the price of his ransom. You have done all that lay within your power and, inasmuch as you put up the correct amount, what you have done is sufficient for his obtaining his freedom (at least for the time being). You have thus "redeemed" your friend, and this was an act of "mercy" on your part because you did not owe this to him. Suppose, however, that he obstinately refuses to budge from his cell and chooses to remain right there in his misery instead of going free. Clearly your attempt to "save" him has not been at all *effective*. This is entirely his own doing and certainly not your fault; in fact it is an actual rebuff to your goodness. Lastly, just why he wishes to stay incarcerated is a "mystery" to you.

This analogy illustrates (among other things) the idea of *efficacy* or effectiveness. Christ's Death, though sufficient for all men in the sense noted above, is not efficacious or effective for the salvation of all, but only of many.

And finally, the attribute of God which is most closely associated with this second truth is His infinite *justice*. "Then shall the king say to them that shall be on his right hand: 'Come, ye blessed of my Father, possess you the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.' ... Then shall he say to them also that shall be on his left hand: 'Depart from me, you cursed, into everlasting fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels.'"

In contradistinction to the list of subconcepts related to truth (A) which were enumerated earlier, we have these key concepts related to this second truth (B), that *only many are saved*: Salvation, many souls, individually, particularly, infinite justice, and efficacy.

9. SUMMARY OF THE PRECEDING TWO SECTIONS

Now for each of these two main truths we have been discussing and contrasting there is ample support by way of passages that may be found in Holy Scripture. Of course, no matter how many passages we may find which speak about "all men" (and are thus referring to some aspect of the first truth), the fulness and integrity of the second truth are nowise diminished thereby. Never can these two truths conflict with each other, even though, because they are veiled in mystery, we are not able to reconcile them *fully*. What we must do is affirm both, without the exaggeration or diminution of either, just as the Council of Trent does in this single sentence which is elegant because of its terseness: "But, though He died for all, yet not all receive the benefit of His death, but those only unto whom the merit of His passion is communicated." In affirming both truths this decree also *distinguishes* between the two. The following table summarizes the gist of this discussion:

Column A

CHRIST DIED FOR ALL

REDEMPTION

of
the human race,
collectively,
universally,
showing God's
infinite *mercy*

and related to the
sufficiency aspect
of Christ's Death.

Column B

ONLY MANY ARE SAVED

SALVATION

of
many souls,
individually,
particularly,
showing God's
infinite *justice*

and related to the
efficacy aspect
of Christ's Death.

10. THE FIRST APPROACH TO HERESY: CALVINISM AND JANSENISM

The reason for studying these two truths in such detail in the preceding sections is that we now wish to show that there are basically two principal root heresies connected with them. That is, one can *overaffirm* either one of these two main truths (and the sub-concepts related to it) to the extent that all the subconcepts related to the other truth become dwarfed, and then finally this other truth is altogether denied.

In this section let us examine the consequences of magnifying truth (B), that *only many are saved*. As a start, we shall select from Column B the sub-concept *infinite justice*. To dwell too much on the thought of God's justice, weighing this idea from every angle and becoming entirely preoccupied with it, will eventually impress upon us a very twisted notion of a stern, relentless God; especially if we never balance our meditation with reflections on the complementary, attribute of God's mercy. In fact, in this process we would necessarily and correspondingly get a very stunted idea of the mercy of God. And once the harmonious equilibrium of these two attributes of God becomes disturbed (only in our minds, of course), all the other sub-concepts in Column B, as if by chain effect, become distorted by *overemphasis*, while their counterparts, the corresponding sub-concepts in Column A, again as if by chain effect, become distorted by *underemphasis*. Inevitably and finally truth (A) will be denied.

The whole process just described actually took place with the Calvinist and

Jansenist heresies. As was mentioned earlier (in passing), the Jansenists opposed the Calvinists on many points. On several ideas, however, the Jansenists actually followed and had a meeting of the minds with the Calvinists. Both denied the freedom of the will; both had perverted doctrines on predestination; and both arrived at precisely the same heretical denial of our truth (A), claiming that *Christ did not die for all men*. Though it is impossible to reconstruct the exact pattern of thought that led to this ultimate denial, it can be said with certainty that the origin may be traced to the affirming and then the *overaffirming* of some element in Column B, or perhaps some idea that belongs in Column B, but which we have overlooked.

We know, for example, that their overall view of things in general could be termed aptly a glum and pessimistic one. (Even today when we hear "Jansenist" the picture of an austere, unbending old sourpuss comes to our minds.) This mentality was undoubtedly the cause (in some cases) and the result (in other cases) of their thinking too frequently and one-sidedly about *hell*, and about God's *justice*, and about the truth that *only many are saved*. Now these are among the most awful and mysterious truths of our Faith, and unfortunately they became obsessions with these heretics of whom we are speaking.

Moving along in Column B, we can understand how the overemphasis of the *individual* soul's *particular* relationship with God is related to the above. True indeed that every soul does have a personal relationship--most vital it is!--with Almighty God, but we as Catholics must always be thinking in terms of the Mystical Body. Firstly, we must attend to the strengthening of the bond of *our own* union with Christ, the Head of the Mystical Body, and with all our fellow-members--in the Church Triumphant, the Church Suffering, and the Church Militant--, and this strengthening is effected principally through frequent reception of the true Body of Christ in the Holy Eucharist.

Our next most important task in life is to assist our fellow-members in the Church Militant in remaining steadfast and becoming even stronger members, and to do what we can to bring outsiders into the fold of the One True Faith. How does one go about fulfilling these vital obligations, especially today when they must be accomplished over the dead bodies of the "ecumenizers"? The answer lies herein: "Deep mystery this," says Pope Pius XII, "subject of inexhaustible meditation: that the salvation of many depends on the prayers and voluntary penances which the members of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ offer for this intention." These powerful tools not even the "ecumenizers" can thwart!

Getting back to our analysis, as a result of this exaggerated view of the importance of the individual soul's personal relationship with God (and this was manifested in the "private interpretation of Scripture," etc.), we still hear today the expression: "protestant individualism." Needless to say, this overemphasis produced a corresponding neglect of the "human race" aspect of Calvary, leading finally to a denial of the *universality* of the Redemption. They overlooked the

distinction between Redemption and Salvation, and erroneously equated the two. The false equating of these two truths can be done in one of two ways: (1) Take Redemption which embraces all men and make it the measuring stick for Salvation. To get Salvation to be "equal" we must enlarge its scope to include all men, and this is false. Or (2) take Salvation which excludes some men and make it the measuring stick for Redemption. To get Redemption to be "equal" we must reduce its scope to include *only* many. It was in this latter way that the presently discussed heresy erred. So obsessed with the idea of the *salvation of many*, they subtracted from the scope of Redemption, denying its universality.

Always so preoccupied with "the elect" (the Calvinists even formulated rules for detecting them while still on earth!), and stressing so much the *efficacy* aspect of Calvary, they denied the *sufficiency* aspect in the process. Not able to understand how any act of an omnipotent God could ever be *merely* sufficient, they also (and this was predictable) denied the concept of "sufficient grace." All grace coming from God is "sufficient grace" at first; that is, it merely enables the recipient to act. If this grace is followed by and indeed produces the action for which it was intended (and here man's free will enters the picture), then it becomes "efficacious grace." Otherwise it remains merely "sufficient." All this is perfectly analogous to the sufficiency and efficacy aspects of Christ's Death. A doctrine of the Calvinists and the Jansenists was: "it is impossible to resist divine grace." So, in effect they claimed that *all* grace is by definition *efficacious*, thereby, as we said above, denying sufficient grace.

Errors multiply quickly in systems of heresy. Having postulated one error, many others must subsequently be postulated to support it. Among the host of errors flowing from this basic heresy under discussion there was the denial of free will and a perverted doctrine of predestination. How these fit into the overall picture should be apparent to the reader.

When Lucifer first puts a man on the road to heresy he effectively robs him of his ability to reason logically; this he does by hamstringing reason's indispensable handmaid, which is *faith*. Then after having sent the heretic off on a set of false premises, the Evil One himself assumes the role of handmaid to reason. He returns to the unfortunate heretic his logic, and he aids him in constructing a perfectly logical system of error, each new error and denial flowing consistently and naturally from the preceding ones.

How the principle elucidated by Fr. Denis Fahey works--first affirming and then *overaffirming* one truth, followed by the negation of its complementary truth--should be clear from the discussion in this section. The Calvinist /Jansenists overemphasized everything listed in Column B: only many are saved, salvation, individual, particular, efficacy, God's justice. As each of these was blown out of proportion, its counterpart in Column A became underplayed. Once the toll was taken on something in Column A, the whole balance of the system became disturbed, almost as though a shock wave had gone through it, and everything in

this column became diminished in importance to the vanishing point until finally the key truth at the very top, that *Christ died for all men*, was shaken to the ground!

11. "FOR ALL MEN" SUBVERTS TRADITION

In a letter to the editor printed in *The Wanderer*, Monsieur Paul Poitevin of Paris, France, opposes the viewpoint of those who question the validity of the mutilation: "for all men," which the subversives substituted in the form for consecrating the wine in place of *for many (pro multis)*. Our Lord, in instituting the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, said: *This is My Blood ... which shall be shed for MANY*. Testimony to this form of words is given by the Gospels of both St. Matthew and St. Mark. But, aside from this proof from Holy Scripture, there is additional incontestable proof from the liturgical *tradition* of the Church that the words *for many* are the true ones, and not *for all men*.

Long before these Evangelists wrote, as the Holy Apostles traversed their divers paths --Peter to Antioch and then to Rome, Andrew to Greece and Asia Minor, Thomas into India, Simon into Egypt, etc.-- they quite certainly used and handed down these words, "*for many*," and *not* "for all men." That this was the case is evident from the very phenomenon of the different Churches--in Asia, in Africa, in Greece, in Rome, and in all those parts where Christianity first took root-- all *unanimously and without exception* (but in different languages, and this is an important point) using these words: *for many*. In no case and in no place were the words "for all men" ever used in consecrating the Holy Eucharist during Holy Mass.

This last statement is easily provable, not only from *all* the earliest liturgical texts still extant, but principally from the plain, simple and unquestionable fact that throughout nineteen centuries and right up to the very present (i.e., before the vernacular craze became epidemic) not a single rite of the Catholic Church, not the schismatic Eastern Orthodox Churches, not a single heretical Church even, ever used the words "for all men" in this place. Eight Eastern rites there are in communion with the Holy See, and, as of the first part of this century at least, there were eleven different languages used by these eight rites. Now, in *all* these rites and in *all* these languages, and also, of course, in the Latin of the Roman Rite, the formula reads *for many*.

Albeit many of the other prayers and ceremonies of the Mass differ greatly from liturgy to liturgy--(as Rev. Adrian Fortescue observed, "None of the Eastern Churches ever knew anything of our Roman liturgy. In this matter the different Churches followed their own traditions from the very beginning.")--, nevertheless while not even aware of what the other rites were doing, all the rites exhibited a remarkable unanimity on this particular point of using "for many."

Now, I ask, whence this universal and immemorial usage of the same identical phraseology? If the proper words are really "for all men," then why did these words not show up at *some* time, or in *some* language, or in *some* country, or in *some* rite? That is, why didn't they show up until 1967 A.D.? Discussing this *very topic*, namely, the form for consecrating the wine, Pope innocent III taught: "Therefore, We believe that the form of words, as is found in the Canon, the Apostles received from Christ, and their successors from them." It was in the year 1202 that Pope Innocent III wrote this, and indeed the "form of words" of which he spoke did *not* include the bogus "for all men.,," "*The Apostles received from Christ, and their successors from them*": THAT is whence this universal usage of the same identical formula *for many!*

But let us return to Holy Writ. St. Mark wrote his Gospel *at Rome and in Greek* (the early Christians, even those at Rome, spoke Greek primarily, and not Latin). It is noteworthy, moreover, that St. Mark is known as "the interpreter of St. Peter," and, according to St. Jerome, Mark wrote down what he had heard from Peter. After having read Mark's account, St. Peter himself approved it and with his authority published it to the Church to be read. All this we know from Tradition.

Beyond a doubt St. Mark knew well the word in Greek for *all*, for this word appears often enough in his Gospel. In point of fact, it appears in the very sentence immediately preceding the passage in question: "And they *all* (□□□□□§ drank of it. And He said to them: This is My Blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for *many*.(□□□□□□)." Although St. Matthew (who also records these same words *for many*) was one of The Twelve who were present at the Last Supper, St. Mark was not. How, then, did the latter know what words Christ spoke? (I am speaking now from a purely human viewpoint, for it goes without saying that God is the Author of Holy Scripture, and His scribe Mark wrote down *exactly* what the Holy Ghost wanted put down there.)

The answer is elementary: *unhesitatingly* St. Mark knew what words to write, for the simple reason that he had been saying Mass for at least ten years before he actually penned his Gospel. A reliable principle, stated by Fortescue, is applicable here: "A formula constantly heard would soon be considered the right one." Now, if "for all men" is really the correct formula, and if this formula had been constantly heard, and if St. Mark had used this formula in saying Mass, why didn't he write down this formula in his Gospel? And if Christ had really said "for all men," or if He had intended that His words should be construed to mean this, would not St. Peter, *of all people*, have been aware of this? And wouldn't he, Peter, have seen to it that Mark did set down correctly so important a point, in so important a place: the form for the Most Holy Sacrament?

(By the way, it is no use to argue that only Sts. Mark and Matthew record these words *for many*, while Sts. Luke and Paul omit them. As St. Thomas points out,

all the Evangelists did not necessarily intend "to hand down the forms and rites of sacraments, but to narrate the sayings and deeds of the Lord." What *is* important is that none records "for all men.")

12. "FOR ALL MEN" SUBVERTS SACRAMENTAL THEOLOGY AS EXPLAINED BY POPES, DOCTORS, AND TRENT

Aside from these historical, liturgical, and Scriptural proofs, there is an important *theological* reason why *for many* is the proper form. In this place Our Lord was referring to the *efficacy*, not the sufficiency, aspect of His Death. This is the explanation of Pope Innocent: III , Pope Benedict XIV , the Doctors St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Alphonsus , and the Catechism of the Council of Trent . Here, for example, is the exposition of St. Alphonsus: "The words *Pro vobis et pro multis* ('For you and for many') are used to distinguish the virtue of the blood of Christ from its fruits; for the blood of our Saviour is of sufficient value to save all men, but its fruits are applicable only to a certain number and not to all, and this is their own fault. Or, as the theologians say, this precious blood is (in itself) sufficiently (*sufficienter*) able to save all men, but (on our part) effectually (*efficaciter*) it does not save all-- it saves only those who cooperate with grace. This is the explanation of St. Thomas, as quoted by Benedict XIV." Thus St. Alphonsus Liguori.

Therefore these words *for many* in this place mean those for whom Christ's Blood was *efficaciously* shed; that is, the elect, those who when they die are *living* members of Christ's Mystical Body (a "living" member of the Mystical Body is any person in the state of sanctifying grace), and who will consequently remain *forever* in the Mystical Body, perhaps at first as members of the Church Suffering in purgatory, but ultimately as saints in the Church Triumphant. In studying this matter it is essential to bear in mind that in speaking these words *Christ was instituting the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist*, and this Sacrament is NOT for all men, but only for those *many* who are united to Him as members, living members, of His Mystical Body.

The heading atop Monsieur Poitevin's letter (mentioned earlier) reads: The Church Cannot Err on the Mass. Quite true! Could She have erred for over nineteen centuries in using *for many*? The reader is aware that we are not discussing here whether or not this mutilation: "for all men" is *invalid*. The lengthy theological argumentation along these lines has been presented elsewhere. That this change is wrong and that it is *subversive of Tradition* has been shown here. There are "traditional" Catholics who from the beginning have vehemently resisted the very supposition that this mutilation could even *possibly* be invalid. Will they agree at least that it is a flagitious departure from Tradition, these "traditional" Catholics? Why do they not oppose this innovation at least on that score, *instead of defending it*?

"They exercise all their ingenuity in diminishing the force and falsifying the character of tradition, so as to rob it of all its weight. But for Catholics, the Second Council of Nicaea will always have the force of law, where it condemns those 'who dare, after the impious fashion of heretics, to deride the ecclesiastical traditions, to invent novelties of some kind ... or endeavor by malice or craft to overthrow any of the legitimate traditions of the Catholic Church.'" Can't these "traditionalists" see that these words, penned by St. Plus X against the Modernists, apply with equal suitability and vigor against the present-day destroyers?

Instead of deriding and castigating those of us who *will not brook* such subversion of Tradition, why do not these "traditionalists" help us do battle against those malefactors who heap contempt on venerated customs, "*to destroy which is a species of heresy*," in the words of the Doctor St. Anselm ?

13. LITURGICAL TAMPERING TO PROMOTE HERESY

Knowing well the axiom that "the law of prayer is the law of belief," organized heretics always single out the liturgy as a prime area with which to tamper. Whenever *seemingly* pointless and uncalled-for innovations appear in the liturgy it is always a danger signal, because the truth is that they are never really pointless at all. On the contrary, such innovations are made with design. Just as Luther, Cranmer, the Jansenists, etc., all tampered with the liturgy in order to promote heresy, so also (I am convinced) this present change, "for all men," was introduced for the purpose of *promoting heresy*.

Although he is dead wrong in the ultimate point he is trying to make, Monsieur Poitevin does, however, illustrate the principle just stated, by showing how the Jansenists tried to change the liturgy to reflect one of their heresies. "Besides," he writes, 'I cannot understand how the *for all men* translation can raise the anger of Catholics accustomed to read in St. Paul that 'As by the fault of one man all men were condemned, by the sacrifice of one man all were procured a life-giving justification.'(Rom.5,18) In the 18th century France, bilingual Missals for the use of laymen, published by the Jansenists, gave for *pro multis*: *pour plusieurs*, that is, for a certain number, for some only .. and this, translation was considered as leading to heresy and rightly." Now, as regards these words *for many* one can wander from the path of truth in two ways, just as a tightrope walker can lose his balance by leaning too far either to the right or to the left. (This, incidentally, is analogous to the two ways of falling into heresy on a pair of truths, by exaggerating one or the other of them.)

M. Poitevin himself points out the first way one can err. This may be termed an error by way of *subtraction*. To bring home the point very clearly it will be

convenient to fall back upon Poitevin's native language. In the various French-language New Testaments I consulted I found two different ways that these words *for many* were expressed: *pour une multitude* and *pour un grand nombre*. Both these translations convey the proper meaning or sense of *for many*, the latter rendition meaning literally: "for a large number." Quite obviously the Jansenists' use of *pour plusieurs* (for a few, several, etc.) was a false rendering, from the evident fact that *few* is the antithesis of *many*. In point of fact a synonym in French for *plusieurs* is *un petit nombre* (a small number), which lucidly demonstrates its exact opposition to the correct *un grand nombre*. Thus for the Jansenists to say *pour plusieurs* diminished the scope of and took away from the concept of *many*, which is why I called it an error of *subtraction*.

Equally, wrong and dangerous is it to err by way of *addition*; and this is to fall off the other side of the tightrope, as it were. To say *all men* is to mutilate the meaning of *many* by adding to its scope. The truth, needless to say, is in between *plusieurs* and *all men*, in these divinely spoken words: "for *many*." Those of us who are still Catholics will never accept a counterfeited Holy Writ, no matter who "approves" the bogus wares. "The Holy Ghost," said St. Teresa of Avila, "never inspires anything that is not conformable to Holy Writ. If there were the slightest divergence, that, alone by itself, would suffice to prove so evidently the work of the Evil One that were the whole world to assure me it was the Holy Ghost, I would never believe it."

What is unjust and, in fact, a calumny in M. Poitevin's letter is his innuendo that by insisting on *for many* we are in the same category as the heretical Jansenists. What priest has ever fallen into heresy by pronouncing those sacred words, *pro multis*, while offering the Holy Sacrifice? What Catholic has become a heretic by studying and adhering to the teachings of the Popes and Doctors of the Church regarding these words *for many*?

Since M. Poitevin so readily grasps the Jansenist attack on orthodoxy by tampering with these words, subtracting from their meaning, why cannot he see the danger of adding to their meaning? Knowing the Jansenists and their heterodox tenets about the predestined and their denial that Christ died for all, no great genius is required to see what they were driving at with their *pour plusieurs*. His observation that this version "was considered as *leading to heresy*" is not quite correct. Rather should it be said that it *reflected* the heresies they were already promoting. What heresy, *already being promoted now*, does this present change of words "*For all men*" reflect?

THE VENTRILOQUISTS

By Patrick Henry Omlor

Who are the ones responsible for authoring the "English language" counterfeits

which are being passed off as "liturgy"? Who are responsible for tampering with Christ's Words of Institution of the Holy Eucharist? Who are these inventors of new, "ecumenical" rites, cunningly devised to supplant and therefore suppress the true and valid Catholic rites? The answer to these questions is no obscure mystery, for, as indicated on the published versions of these liturgical aberrations, the copyrights belong ("all rights reserved") to the International Committee on English in the Liturgy. Doubtless most *Interdum* readers are familiar with ICEL, which is the domestic branch of the network of international Subversives, all of whom labor tirelessly to spread apostasy and to destroy the faith of Catholics on a global basis. An excellent report on ICEL, covering its personnel, activities, and *modus operandi*, appeared some time back in *Triumph* magazine.

We have questioned the validity of tire "English Masses," not because of the fact they are in English instead of the traditional Latin, but because the "translation" (so-called) which the ICEL. has foisted upon us actually goes so far as to mutilate the Form of Consecration, which also happens to be the sacramental form for the Holy Eucharist.

The purpose of this present article is "to show the other side." We will present and then study the ICEL's *official* "explanation" why, after nineteen and a half centuries, Catholics are now expected to believe that Our Saviour's words at the Last Supper were, "This is . . . My Blood . . . shed *for all men*," instead of "*for many*," which has always been the correct translation of *pro multis*. However, before considering the actual "explanation" itself, let us take a good look at the person who clearly, appears to be the *impetus* behind this change.

Professor Joachim Jeremias

Without the slightest fear of contradiction we can assert that the original "discoverer," progenitor and prime mover of the "explanation" for changing Our Lord's words is one Professor Joachim Jeremias. In point of fact, in documenting this *official* "explanation" the ICEL cites Dr. Jeremias as its "authority" for making this particular change. Arid rightly so, because to him belongs due credit. Indeed as far back as January, 1963, an article in *The Expository Times* of Edinburgh mentioned this great discovery of Dr, Jeremias that Our Lord really said "for all men," noting that this interpretation harmonizes with the ideas of "the final salvation of all mankind from the powers of evil, sin and death."

This evil and dangerous doctrine of "the final salvation of all mankind," so absolutely at variance with the Church's teaching and so opposed to the clear teaching of Christ Himself, *is the actual cornerstone of the whole edifice of heresy* being promoted today under the guise of "ecumenism." Although this doctrine is not preached openly, explicitly, and in these precise terms (at least not yet on a wide scale), nevertheless it is believed by many; it is the *animus* of what parades as "ecumenism."

Who is Dr. Jeremias, the man whose idea was so powerful that it changed the Form of Consecration of the Mass? Born in 1900, Joachim Jeremias, a noncatholic, is the "distinguished occupant of the Chair of New Testament in the University of Göttingen." Although he started his career in writing some forty years ago, it was not until fairly recently that his "learned works and monographs" began receiving wide acclaim. Included among his books that have been translated into English are: *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, *The Prayers of Jesus*, and *Problems of the Historical Jesus*

His Approach to Scripture

It is not with the eyes of faith that Professor Jeremias approaches Holy Writ, but with the eyes of a critical grammarian, armed with his lexicons and many rules about aorist subjunctives, etc. As he himself tells us: "The investigation of the eucharistic words of Jesus themselves is best begun by discussing the problem of *literary criticism*. While "literary criticism" perhaps has its slot as a valid tool for investigating the meanings of the Sacred Writings, Catholics who wish to maintain a correct attitude towards the Holy Scriptures must ever be mindful of the condemnations and cautions given by the Supreme Authority of the Church. Thus loyal and orthodox Catholics are aware that in the "Syllabus of Errors of the Modernists" of Pope St. Pius X, the following proposition was *condemned*: "Those who believe that God is really the author of Sacred Scripture display excessive simplicity or ignorance" (No. 9). And in No. 12 of the same Syllabus the following is also *condemned*: "The exegete . . . must first put aside all preconceived opinions concerning the supernatural origin of Sacred Scripture, and must not interpret it otherwise than merely human documents."

It is certainly not evident that Dr. Jeremias looks upon Holy Writ as the authentic Word of God, nor upon the Evangelists as men singled out by God to be His scribes who, inspired by the Holy Ghost, wrote down exactly what God intended to be revealed to men. "We need not trouble ourselves in any detail," writes Jeremias, "over the question whether the... passages in which God is addressed as 'Father' in the prayers of Jesus are authentic or not." (P.O.J., p.57). (Note: The code, P.O.J., is used herein for *The Prayers of Jesus*, a published collection of essays by J. Jeremias, and the code, E.W.J., refers to his book entitled *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*.)

"Now it is very probable that parts of the passages in the gospels which mention Jesus' prayer are to be attributed to the editing of the evangelists." (P.O.J., p.76) Christ at the Last Supper did not really say everything that St. Paul records, for "Paul adds to the word over the wine" (E.W.J., p.115) But everyone will be relieved, we are sure, to learn that the phrase, "My Blood of the covenant," quite possibly was actually spoken by Our Lord because it passes all of Jeremias'

linguistic tests. "(T)he *possibility* (emphasis added) that Jesus spoke of the covenant at the Last Supper cannot be disputed" (E.W.J., p.195).

St. Matthew "has added," claims Dr. Jeremias, "on his own initiative" to what St. Mark wrote in 10:40 (P.O.J., p.44). Christ's parable of the cockle (Matt. 13:36-43) was obviously a fabrication of St. Matthew since it "bears such strong traces of Matthaean linguistic peculiarities" (P.O.J., p.31).

Unlike Dr. Jeremias, St. John has missed "the central point of Jesus' message," because of his "ignorance of the way in which the message was limited to the group of disciples" (P.O.J., p.53).

So much for Joachim Jeremias' attitude towards Sacred Scripture and the Evangelists. Next we move on to his "theology." Infected as he is with the Modernists' mentality, he has in his writings countless doctrinal errors, inimical to the Catholic Faith. Had his work appeared during the reign of St. Pius X (for example), and had there been even the slightest indications that Catholics were actually reading them, that august and saintly Pontiff would have summarily placed them on the Index of Forbidden Books. Ominous it is that this author is now cited as the "authority" for making over the Catholic liturgy.

The "Theology" of Dr. Jeremias

Any Catholic who understands the Mass should consider it an insult to his intelligence as well as an attack upon the Faith to be told by anyone that the "meal celebrations" (i.e., the Masses) of the early Christians were celebrated *without wine!* But nonsense such as this, when it comes from Dr. Jeremias' brilliant pen, apparently does not bother the ICEL Innovators, least of all does it discredit in *their eyes* their "great authority." The early Christians, explains the professor, who "were mostly from the poorer strata of society, did not always have wine available," and thus the practice of using only the bread "not only was frequent in the earliest period, but was actually the rule" (E.W.J., P. 115). Adduced as "evidence" to support this outrageous claim is, believe it or not, a passage from St. Paul's account of the Last Supper. In Our Lord's command: "This do ye, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of Me" (I Cor. 11:25), the phrase "*as often as you shall drink*" was, so Jeremias surmises, added by Paul, and what Paul meant by this insertion was this: *as often as you have the wine!* Which, of course, proves that they often *didn't* have wine, and therefore were forced to go ahead and celebrate under the one species of bread alone! All this, mind you, from the wizard whom the ICEL consulted to help on the translation of "*pro multis!*"

Not surprisingly, Jeremias attacks the doctrine of transubstantiation, not openly but by subtle inference. Numerous passages of his either say or imply that the

Words of Institution were spoken as a similitude (E.W.J., p. 202, pp. 223-25, e.g.). Moreover he even goes so far as to imply that St. Paul himself did not consider the "gift of the Eucharist" to be the *true Body and Blood of Christ*. "To share in the atoning death of Jesus," he writes, "and to become part of the redeemed community--*that is, according to Paul, the gift of the Eucharist*. This interpretation tallies with our exegesis even in detail" (E.W.J., p. 237). "As recipients of Jesus' gift the disciples are representatives of the new people of God" (ibid.).

Attacks The Divinity of Christ

When Dr. Jeremias speaks above of "the atoning death of Jesus," one must not mistakenly think that he means the *unique* expiatory Sacrifice of the Son of God according to Catholic teaching. "Every death has atoning power," he explains, "even that of a criminal if he dies penitent" (E.W.J., p.231). *Any* innocent death "offered to God has vicarious power of atonement for others," and thus Christ's Death "is the vicarious death of the suffering servant" (ibid.).

Referring to Our Lord as "the suffering servant of God" is a favorite theme of Professor Jeremias. Granted that the word *servant* is used allegorically in reference to The Messiah in a few places in the Old Testament; for Dr. Jeremias, however, the use of this term is only one of his many subtle ways of attacking the Divinity of Christ. To rebut this heresy we can do no better here than to repeat the words of Pope Adrian 1:

"O you impious, and you who are ungrateful for so many benefits, do you not fear to whisper with a poisonous mouth that He, our liberator, is ... a mere man subject to human misfortune, and what is a disgrace to say, *that He is a servant?* . . . Why are you not afraid, O querulous detractors, O men odious to God, *to call Him servant,* Who has freed you from the servitude of the devil? ... For, although in the imperfect representation of the prophet He was called *servant* (cf. Job 1:8ff.) because of the condition of servile form which He assumed from the Virgin ... we understand that this was said both historically of holy Job and allegorically of Christ. . . ." (Emphasis added.)

Can Joachim Jeremias be called a Christian? Does he believe that Jesus Christ is the only-begotten Son of God the Father, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, the Word made flesh? Or does he believe *only in the humanity* of Our Lord, that Jesus was a remarkable man who had a "special relationship" with God and who received a "full revelation" from God?

"None the less we can see from *the simile* (emphasis added: the 'simile' is

Christ's Words of Institution at the Last Supper) . . .that Jesus did expect a violent death" (E.W.J., P. 225). As *true God*, Jesus did not "expect" a violent death; from all eternity He knew what death the Son of Man would die. As St. John tells us, He even foretold the manner of His Death: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all things to Myself. Now this He said, signifying by what death He was to die."

When Our Lord said: "Do this for a commemoration of Me," what He actually meant, if we are to believe Professor Jeremias, was this: "Do this *so that God may remember me*" (E.W.J., P. 252 and P. 255).

Taking up the passage from Matt. 11, 27: "All things are delivered to Me by My Father," Dr. Jeremias explains it as meaning: "God has given me a full revelation" (P.O.J., p. 49). This "full revelation" was granted to Jesus *at some point in time*. Listen to Jeremias: "We do not know when and where Jesus received the revelation in which *God allowed him* to participate in complete divine knowledge--as a father *allows* his son to share in knowledge (emphasis added) . . . Perhaps we should think of the baptism" (P.O.J., p. 52). Now perhaps Joachim Jeremias may wish to conjecture that at Our Lord's baptism He received "the revelation," but *true Christians* believe:

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and *the Word was God*. The same was *in the beginning* with God. All things were made by Him: and without Him was made nothing that was made."

"Jesus' use of *abba* expresses a special relationship with God" (P.O.J., p. 62). "With the simple '*Abba*, dear father', the primitive church took over the central element of *Jesus' faith in God*" (P.O.J., p.65.-- Emphasis added. No further comment.)

"I confess to thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them to the little ones" (Matt. 11:25 and Luke 10:21). "Jesus counted himself among 'the little ones'," Dr. Jeremias tells us--and this is too much!--"He rejoices that he is the 'little one' of God, his beloved child, to whom the revelation has been given" (P.O.J., p. 52).

Could Jeremias Be Right About "All Men"?

The reader must not construe the foregoing discussion as a personal attack upon Professor Joachim Jeremias. It was merely a necessary exposition of the ideas, philosophy and theological thinking of the man who furnished the impetus behind the mutilation of the Consecration Form. The reason for giving so many quotations from his works is to obviate the frequently-repeated accusation of

"quoting out of context."

And yet, one may ask, isn't it possible at least, that, despite his demonstrable heterodoxy, he is nevertheless correct in his assertion that "all men" is the proper wording in the place in question? To see how he could be correct is difficult. There is simply too much Catholic teaching in favor of "*for many*": the words of Holy Scripture as they have always been understood, the universal liturgical Tradition of the Church, the teachings of several Popes, the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, which *explicitly rejects and repudiates* the "for all men" rendition, and, finally, the lucid explanations of several Doctors of the Church (e.g., Sts. Thomas Aquinas and Alphonsus).

Very forcibly to our minds come these words of St. Pius X, writing about the Modernists: "To hear them talk about their works on the Sacred Books, . . . one would imagine that before them nobody ever even glanced through the pages of Scriptures, whereas, the truth is that a whole multitude of doctors, infinitely superior to them in genius, in erudition, in sanctity, have sifted them, have thanked God more and more, the deeper they have gone into them, for His divine bounty in having vouchsafed to speak thus to men."

ICEL's Sole "Explanation"

As promised earlier, we will now with no further delay take up the ICEL's "explanation." It is not based on sacramental theology, nor on Holy Scripture as such, nor on Tradition. Neither does it invoke the authority of the Magisterium or that of the Doctors of the Church. But all this goes without saying, because, as mentioned just above, all these sources are opposed to the "all men" rendition. On precisely what grounds, then, do they stand in attempting to justify their unprecedented meddling with the FORM OF A SACRAMENT?

Philology is the answer! Yes indeed, it is from a so-called study of literary texts and linguistics that these great scholars have discovered that Our Lord at the Last Supper, in consecrating the wine, *really* said: This is ... My Blood ... shed *for all men*. "Proof" of this is offered on pp. 34-5 of the ICEL's booklet, *The Roman Canon in English Translation* . Here *in toto* is the learned "explanation":

Line 65: *Pro multis*

Neither Hebrew nor Aramaic possess a word for 'all'. The word *rabbim* or 'multitude' thus served also in the inclusive sense for the whole, even though the corresponding Greek and the Latin appear to have an exclusive sense, i.e., 'the many' rather than 'the all'.
CF.J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (New York, 1966), pp. 179-182, 229.

Let us make sure we understand this "explanation." Our Saviour spoke Aramaic, and not Latin or Greek. In the Aramaic language (and also in the Hebrew) there is not a single word meaning "all". *This indeed is the main plank of the argument.* "Neither Hebrew nor Aramaic possess (sic) a word for 'all'." Hence, infers the ICEL, anyone wishing to express in those languages the idea "all" was forced to use a word with a double meaning, a word which in some instances could be construed to mean "many" (the so-called 'exclusive sense'), and in other instances was construed to mean "all" (its so-called 'inclusive sense'). Thus handicapped by this linguistic impediment, a quirk of His native language, Our Lord was forced to employ this ambiguous word when He said: This is My Blood . . . shed for *all men*. For over nineteen centuries, all over the world and in a multitude of languages, this ambiguous word was incorrectly given its 'exclusive sense' of "many," but the 'inclusive sense' of "all" was what Our Lord actually meant.

The foregoing paragraph (which, for the sake of absolute clarity, is necessarily somewhat longer than the ICEL's terse "explanation"), is an accurate re-phrasing of their case. Merely to point out how slavishly the ICEL has followed Dr. Joachim Jeremias, we here reproduce the supporting excerpt which the ICEL cites from p, 179 of his book *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*:

15. 14-24 רבבותם ('many'). While 'many' in Greek (as in English) stands in opposition to 'all', and therefore has the exclusive sense ('many, but not all'), Hebrew *rabbim* can have the inclusive sense ('the whole, comprising many individuals'). This inclusive use is connected with the fact that Hebrew and Aramaic possess no word for 'all'.(See footnote 4)

Some Preliminary Comments

First of all, and *let this be stressed*, the above is the *sole explanation the ICEL has offered* for making this change to 'for all men.'" Every reasonable man will agree that if this, *the sole reason*, is exploded as being *absolutely groundless and founded on a falsity*, then the whole justification (pretext is a better word) for the "for all men" rendering has collapsed; and there remains no longer the slightest excuse for continuing to use this mutilated form, nor tolerating its use. Their Excellencies, the bishops in our country, are doubtless reasonable men.

Before proceeding in earnest with our demonstration, let us make several incidental observations:

(1) The chief piece of "evidence" (Exhibit A, as it were) in the ICEL's case is the word *rabbim* . which is a *Hebrew* word. Now whereas it is certain that the everyday language of Our Lord was *not Hebrew*, but Aramaic (a fact which

Jeremias himself notes on p. 196); and whereas there is absolutely no proof whatsoever that Our Lord spoke at the Last Supper in *Hebrew* (another fact attested to by Dr. Jeremias himself on p. 198); and whereas these words originally came down to us via St. Mark's Gospel, which that Evangelist wrote, *not in Hebrew* but in Greek;--therefore: how does the *Hebrew* word '*rabbim*' even begin to enter the picture at all?

(2) When expounding their "red herring" Hebrew word, *rabbim*, the ICEL Innovators are very emphatic (even bordering on clarity); but when they get around to the "corresponding Greek and Latin"--the Greek being what is *really* to the point-, they lapse into vagueness. The Greek word for *many* used by St. Mark, so they say, only "*appears*" to have the exclusive sense of "many." "Appears" indeed! In this assertion they are contradicted even by Jeremias, who concedes that "'many' in Greek (as in English) *stands in opposition* to 'all', and therefore *has the exclusive sense*" (cf. the excerpt presented earlier) .

But enough! These comments will seem somewhat superfluous anyway, once we have gotten around to *their main plank*, namely: In the Aramaic language there is not a single word meaning "*all*".

Cardinal Wiseman Exposes A Hoax

At this point it will be very instructive to study an earlier theological controversy into which "philology" became similarly intruded. The 16th-century "reformers," who denied the Real Presence of Our Lord in the Eucharist, when confronted with His words: "*This is My Body*," claimed that Our Lord really meant by these words: This *signifies* My Body. Some of the earliest of these deniers, including Calvin himself, concocted the absurd argument that in Hebrew (at that time it was generally thought that Our Lord spoke Hebrew) there simply is no word at all which means *signifies*. And so, Christ, having to make do with the language He spoke, was forced to use the expression: This *is* My Body, in order to convey the idea: This *signifies* My Body.

Cardinal Wiseman, writing much later, reviewed the case: "Calvin . . . and others argued against the Catholic interpretation of the Words of Institution, on the ground that Our Saviour spoke Hebrew, and not Greek; and that in the Hebrew language, there is not a single word meaning *to represent*. Hence they concluded, that any one wishing to express in that language that one object was figurative of another, he could not possibly do it otherwise than by saying that it *was* that thing. "

"Wolfius, after Hackspann," continues Wiseman, "rightly answered to this argument, that if the Hebrew had been ambiguous, the Evangelists, writing in Greek, a language in which the verb substantive was not ambiguous, would have

used a verb more accurately explaining to their readers what they conceived the meaning of Our Saviour's phrase to be." (And this is precisely the line of argument we presented in *Interdum* No. 1, explaining that St. Mark, the interpreter of St. Peter, most certainly would have written "all men," if that was what he and St. Peter believed Christ had really intended.).

Dependent as it was upon the supposed quirks of the Hebrew language, Calvin's argument was eventually derailed, because, as Cardinal Wiseman observed: "But this precise ground could be no longer tenable. For all philologers now agree that the language spoken by our Saviour could not be Hebrew, but Syro-Chaldaic." (Note: Syro-Chaldaic = Chaldeo-Syriac = Aramaic.)

But some fables never die. During Wiseman's day the protestant attack on the Real Presence was vigorously renewed, and-lo and behold! --Calvin's old argument was resurrected. Only now instead of Hebrew, it was Aramaic that was supposedly the "problem" language. "Such a shifting," noted the Cardinal, "as might suffice to continue a catching argument like this, was easily made; it could cost only a word; the change of a name; for few readers would take the trouble, or have it in their power, to ascertain whether Syro-Chaldaic, any more than Hebrew, had any such terms."

Some well-respected scholars did not hesitate to risk their very academic reputations on the promotion of this hoax. Again Wiseman:

"A good bold assertion, especially coming from a man who has a reputation for knowledge in the department of science to which it belongs, will go a great way with most readers; and a negative assertion no one can expect you to prove. If I assert that in a language there is no word for a certain idea; if I say, for instance, that in Italian there is no equivalent for our word 'spleen' or 'cant,' what proof can I possibly bring, except an acquaintance with the language? I throw down a gauntlet when I make the assertion; I defy others to show the contrary; and one example overthrows all my argument."

"However, no assertion could be, I suppose, too bold against *poper*y, and no art too slippery, to gain an argument against its doctrines. Dr. Adam Clarke, a man of some celebrity as an Orientalist, fearlessly cast his credit upon the assertion that Syro-Chaldaic affords no word which our Saviour could have used, in instituting a type of His Body, except the verb '*to be*.'

"These are his words:-'In the Hebrew, Chaldee and Chaldeo-Syriac languages, there is no term which expresses to *mean*, *signify*, or *denote*; though both the Greek and Latin abound with them. Hence the Hebrews use a figure, and say *it is*, for it

signifies"

Once advanced by an eminent scholar, this learned argument became parroted far and wide by many others. The above passage of Dr. Clarke was transcribed nearly verbatim by a certain Mr. Hartwell Horne, who touched it up a bit with a brilliant concluding remark: "Hence it is that we find the expression *it is* so frequently used in the sacred writings for *it represents*." A similarly brilliant claim, which we have heard often of late, is that *many* is frequently used in the Sacred Writings for *all*. This, of course, like Mr. Horne's remark, proves exactly nothing about the specific case at hand.

And thus the hoax spread. "It is no wonder," observed Cardinal Wiseman, "that other authors should have gone on copying these authorities, giving, doubtless, implicit credence to persons who had acquired a reputation for their knowledge of biblical and oriental literature."

All the excerpts we have quoted thus far from Cardinal Wiseman's pen, though they are in themselves plenty devastating, are actually only what might be thought of as His Eminence's "warm-up." Next comes his *coup de grace*. On page 287 of his book (from which we have been quoting) he displays a table which summarizes his findings. This tabular arrangement indicates *FORTY-FIVE different words in Aramaic* which Our Lord could have used if He had wanted to say: This *signifies*.(!) "And this is the Syriac language," the redoubtable Cardinal dryly concludes, "of which Dr. Clarke had the hardihood to assert that it had not one single word with this meaning."

The Cornerstone

Now, at length, let us hie ourselves back to the ICEL and the cornerstone of these Innovators' "explanation," namely, that *Aramaic has no word at all which means "all"*.

Just as certainly as Aramaic has a word for "certainly" (ܐܝܢܐ), and a word for "arrogance" (ܐܘܪܘܚܐ)--arrogance as in ICEL--, so also it has a word which unequivocally, and as opposed to the idea of "all", means "many"; and this word for "many" happens to be (ܣܘܓܘܬܐܝܢ) (*saggī ān*). And also the Aramaic language has a word for "all", as opposed to "many", and we are coming to that.

Although certain Hebrew texts are recognized as translations from an Aramaic original, there is in the entire Old Testament only a handful of places where *actual Aramaic passages occur*, notably certain sections from the Book of Daniel. And it so happens that "All the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing," which is from Daniel (4, 32), is one such passage where texts in the original Aramaic are extant. The Aramaic phrase for "all the inhabitants of the earth"--

and this is getting quite close to "all men," wouldn't you say?-is as follows; (). This passage illustrates exactly how the Aramaic word () (all) is used in an actual biblical phrase.

A series of volumes entitled *Porta Linguarum Orientalium* (The Gateway of Oriental Languages) has been published in Wiesbaden, Germany, by Otto Harrassowitz. Included as No. V in this series is a valuable little text, published in 1961, having been authored by Franz Rosenthal. This particular text, which bears the title, *A Grammar of Biblical Aramaic*, devotes an entire section to an explanation of the ancient Aramaic word for "all," "every," "everyone," etc. In the process of illustrating the uses of this particular word--which is the same word ()(*kol*) mentioned above, a variation of which is (*kolla*): "everyone"--this grammar text even furnishes as an example the expression in Aramaic for "*all mankind*"! A part of this section (i.e., XII) of this book, from pp 41-2, is photographically reproduced here, slightly reduced in size:

XII.

96. (unstressed) is a noun meaning "totality." Cf. (kóllā) "everything, everyone" D 2:40, 4:9, 18, 25. This form may also be used in a quasi-adverbial manner: "well-being completely" E 5:7.

Preceding a sg. noun without the article, it means "every, any." Preceding a determined noun in the sg., it means "entire, whole." And preceding a determined noun in the pl. or a collective sg. (i.e., "all mankind"), or being followed by the pl. of the pronominal suffix, or the relative pronoun, or the demonstrative pronoun used as a noun (. "all this"), it means "all."

What temerity! Oh, what unmitigated depravity! To dare to tamper with the Sacred Words of the Saviour Himself! To meddle with the sacramental form, the *unchangeable substance*, of the Most Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist! And this those arrogant Innovators have done, offering as their *sole reason* the absurd fraud that Aramaic has no word for "all"!

Indeed Joachim Jeremias and the ICEL's subversives must be reckoned as the world's greatest ventriloquists, as they have made their bogus words, "for all men," to be heard issuing forth from the lips of their tens of thousands of dummies. Oh, but we are told, this "form" simply must be valid because the bishops have approved it. *The Son of God will not be mocked again*. Mocked He was once, by a blind and ungrateful people. But never again by His own, though the blind and ungrateful are still among them.

How many of those unsuspecting priests--we mean those of the true and orthodox stripe would be "obediently following their bishops" and reciting this counterfeit "form" if they did but know the facts about "for all men"? If they did but know the "theology" of Professor Joachim Jeremias, their head ventriloquist?

RES SACRAMENTI

1. INTRODUCTION

Changing a Single Word

In the year 867, the "*Filioque*" controversy was touched off by Photius, who ultimately led the Byzantine Church into schism. Denying that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father *and the Son*, Photius accused the Latins of having corrupted the Creed by adding this word: *filioque* (and the Son). This dispute served as a theological wedge (at least it was the *ostensible* reason, but political motivations likewise entered the picture), a wedge which pried open the Great Eastern Schism, that horrendous rupture which still remains today after eleven hundred years.

This should make one ponder the importance words can have, yes, even a single word. Moreover we need only reflect that it is by means of words, and solely through words, that we are able to come to know our faith, and to express it. As St. Paul puts it: "Faith comes through hearing." Why has the Church always guarded so very jealously the words and formulas committed to Her custodianship by Her Divine Master? Precisely because She knows that it is always through words--the misuse of them--that heresy is able to take its toll of the Mystical Body of Christ.

Thus it is truly foreboding that the subversives -- the enemy is not "at the gates," but rather inside *tending* the gates -- should brazenly lay their hands on the form of a sacrament, should attempt to change the very words Christ Himself, the Son of God, used in instituting the Most Holy Eucharist, and this heinous crime is committed with impunity. But even more ominous is the fact that so few priests even ' seem to be aware of the change, or if aware are the least bit concerned about it. The false rendering of the word *multis* ("*many*") as "all men," a mutilation of the very Consecration Form, is by no means an inconsequential affair, for the *change in meaning* conveyed is laden with the most serious implications, from the standpoint of sacramental theology. At no time since the *Filioque* controversy began has so much spiritual danger been capsulated into a single word as is now the case with "*multis*."

Rev. James A. McInerney, O. P., writing in *The Wanderer*, indicates his disbelief "that a single word change in the English translation" can possibly invalidate the Mass. Obviously, however, in sacramental forms it is not the *quantity* of words altered that matters, but rather the significance of the change that is made. Is it possible to baptize with these words: "I *anoint* thee in the name of the Father ...etc.?" This is a "single word change." Most moral theologians, the Doctor St.

Alphonsus "Liguori" included, teach that if a priest were to say over the bread: "HIC est enim corpus meum (meaning "*Here* is My Body"), instead of "HOC est ... " ("*This* is ... "), then the consecration would be invalid. And this involves the absolutely minimal change of only *one letter* in a word!

Why This Battleground?

Knowing word manipulation to be one of their most potent weapons, the enemies of Holy Mother Church are always seeking to improve their techniques of semantic warfare. Present examples of such word manipulation are so numerous that it would be difficult even to begin cataloguing all of them. At this point the Satanic warfare against the Mystical Body has reached such proportions, is so advanced, so global, so permeating through every facet of doctrine, morals and discipline, that, if viewed from a purely human perspective, it would have to be granted that our enemies have already won. But we know that the Church is not merely a human institution; She was built by Divine Hands and She is indestructible; She is indestructible and cannot be overthrown by men, nor by powers and principalities.

However, this certain knowledge on our part of Her ultimate victory over the Powers of The Beast does not exempt us from the obligation of fighting. On the contrary, we are members of the Church *Militant*, and our very salvation depends upon how valiantly we fight. How well we all know that we by ourselves cannot emerge victorious from any battle, not even a skirmish--Satan can sift us as wheat--, but she who is Our Queen is now clad in her armor, "terrible as an army set in battle array"; she *alone* is the Vanquisher of All Heresies, but even so, she does expect her bungling troops at least *to be there* under her banner.

Just as the Church in an earlier era defended at a terrible price the one word, *filioque*; and, though foreseeing the schism that resulted, She refused to yield an iota of doctrine, so now we likewise throw down the gauntlet before the enemies of "the Faith of our Fathers" on this single word: *multis*.

On this word the stakes are very high indeed since the destruction of its true meaning (in the Form of Consecration has *at least jeopardized* the validity of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. But even if there were no question here about the validity of the "English Mass," this change is still an evil thing; it is a wanton tampering with the Sacred Words of Christ Himself; it is a serious attack on the immemorial liturgical tradition of *all the Rites* of the Church; it is contrary to the express prohibitions of the Magisterium regarding the touching of the substance of the sacraments; this change was introduced *sub rosa* for demonstrably fraudulent "reasons"; the motivations and impetus behind this innovation are questionable, for it has subtle heretical implications; in short: it has been the tool par excellence for the overthrow in one fell swoop of just about everything that we as Catholics, our souls bearing the indelible mark of the Sacrament of Confirmation, are *morally bound* to defend. *We cannot and will not tolerate it.*

"But though ... an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema."

But what do we hope to accomplish? Let us, above all, be realistic. At this point our most pressing task is to try to help divert as many as possible of our fellow-members of The Mystical Body of Christ away from this total, universal apostasy. The present apostatical movement is to *the religion of humanity*, and its ultimate destination is the worship of Antichrist. The only thing that effectively saves souls is the grace of God, but it is our duty to take all measures, spiritual and practical, to aid others in seeing what they must do in order to cooperate with that sufficient grace.

In this present maelstrom of heresy, perversion and apostasy, there has perhaps been no issue that has served more powerfully than this "for all men" controversy to make good, though hitherto apathetic, Catholics become aware of the terrible nature of the warfare we are all engaged in. The issue itself and exactly what is at stake are relatively easy to understand; except for those who are wilfully blind. The defenses of the subverters on this particular question, moreover, are so weak and their arguments and "reasons" so superficial, even manifestly absurd, that this alone has made not a few Catholics of good will realize that there is something radically and ominously wrong. Heartening it is that quite a few (relatively speaking, of course) courageous priests, once realizing the frightful magnitude of what has happened and is happening, have refused outright to use these doubtful "English Canons" with the palpable mutilation: "for all men." Almighty God has blessed them with the fortitude to say with that most valiant warrior for Christ, that model priest: "If the whole world goes Arian, then it is Athanasius against the world!"

The Scope of This Article

A Dominican priest who is a friend and collaborator of ours wrote the following to another Dominican theologian: "The arguments against Patrick Omlor's and Fr. Brey's position seem to be these: 1) The additional words of the form are not essential (i.e., the words in the wine consecration following: 'This is the chalice of My Blood'); 2) The words *for all men* do not really change the meaning; 3) The Church cannot err in a matter so important. These amount to quarreling in turn with both premises involved in the argument, then resorting to the extrinsic consideration of authority as a last refuge. The few with whom I have debated the question have invariably gone from one to the other of the three defences for their position, which in itself seems to betray the insecurity of their stand."

"Regarding the second point," he continues, "this of course is the dominant point of Patrick Omlor's position, namely that the change from *pro multis* to *pro omnibus* is indeed a change in the meaning of the form, which would almost seem self-evident. ... Anyway, I think Omlor ... (shows), in accord with St. Thomas' principles, that what is involved in the difference between the two

phrases is the designation of the *res sacramenti*. And the proof from Leo XIII which he gives for this -- the necessity of sacramental forms to include the grace of the sacrament -- I find air-tight."

It is imperative to comprehend thoroughly this pivotal concept of *res sacramenti* and also the definitive teaching of Pope Leo XIII, mentioned in the excerpt just quoted. Therefore we devote this issue of *Interdum* to an explanation of these topics. Whether or not our "proof" is "air-tight" the reader will be able to judge for himself.

II. SACRAMENTAL SIGNIFICATION IN GENERAL

Four Things Necessary for a Sacrament

Because the validity of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass is completely dependent upon the valid effecting of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, it behooves one to understand well the nature of *sacramental signification in general*, and the sacramental signification in the Holy Eucharist in particular; that is, if one is to grasp at all our reasons for seriously questioning the validity of the "English Masses." In that the Words of Consecration in the Mass are also the *form of the sacrament* of the Eucharist, it is evident that a substantial "defect of form" of the Sacrament invalidates *ipso facto* Masses employing this "form."

Four things are necessary for the validity of any sacrament: (1) the proper *matter* must be used; (2) the proper *form* must be recited; (3) the proper *minister* [for the given sacrament] must perform the rite; (4) the minister must have the *intention* of "doing as the Church does," that is, doing what the Church intends and wishes to accomplish by the sacrament.

Importance of the Form

The *matter* is the specific sensible thing or things used in the external rite of the sacrament; for example, water in Baptism, or chrism in Confirmation. The *form* is the sequence of specific words (the "formula") pronounced by the minister. It must be "morally united" with the matter; that is, the words must be recited in conjunction with the use of the matter and in the same setting or presence of the matter. "The word," says St. Augustine, "is added to the element (matter), and this becomes a sacrament."

Although all four of the aforementioned requirements are absolutely essential for validity, and if any one of them is absent or defective there is no sacrament at all, our discussion at present concerns the vital role of the form.

St. Thomas explains why the necessity of a specific sequence of words as the

form of a sacrament is more important even than specific matter: "As stated above, in the sacraments the words are as the form, and sensible things are as the matter. Now in all things composed of matter and form, the determining principle is contained in the form. ...Consequently, for the being of a thing the need of a determinate form is prior to the need of determinate matter ... Since, therefore, in the sacraments determinate sensible things are required which are as the sacramental matter, *much more is there need in them of a determinate form of words.*"

The Determining Principle

What does this mean: "the determining principle is contained in the form"? This means that the words recited determine the *end* or *purpose* for which the matter is being used. Water in itself, for example, signifies nothing in particular. It can be used for drinking, bathing, putting out fires, watering the lawn, washing clothes, etc. But when a person says the words, "I baptize thee ... etc.," as he pours water over the head of another person, the *purpose* for which that particular water is being used is clearly denoted. Thus the words, "I baptize thee," constitute the principle which determines unambiguously that *this* water is here being used to signify the cleansing from sin and the bringing to the state of justification.

Suppose I am out in the garage and suddenly shout, "Quick! Bring water!" This order contains no *determining principle* whatsoever, and therefore my wife (who is inside the house), though she has heard me, hasn't the slightest idea why I want water. A glass of water to quench my thirst? A basin of water to wash my hands? Or the garden hose to put out a fire?

A *determining principle* denotes purpose. And thus we should clearly understand the explanation of St. Thomas that in the sacraments the need of a specific form of words is more essential than specific matter, for "the determining principle is contained in the form."

The "Res Sacramenti"

Each of the seven sacraments has *special effects* for the soul of the recipient, and these effects, different for each sacrament, are in keeping with the purpose for which Christ instituted each sacrament. A variety of terms are used by theologians and spiritual writers to designate the "special effects" of a sacrament, but these terms all amount to the same thing. Hence we find these "special effects" referred to as: the sacramental grace, the crowning effect, the power or virtue of the sacrament, the *grace proper*, etc. Theologians often use the term, "*res sacramenti*" to denote the special effect of a sacrament, and this is generally translated as "the reality of the sacrament."

This special effect, the "*res sacramenti*," for each particular sacrament always must be signified or symbolized in the external rite of the sacrament. This point is very important, and we will be mentioning it again. The Supreme Pontiff Leo XIII laid down the following teaching, a fundamental principle of sacramental theology: "All know that the Sacraments of the New Law, as sensible and efficient signs of invisible grace, ought both to signify the grace which they effect, and effect: the grace which they signify. Although the signification ought to be found in the whole essential rite -- that is to say, in the matter and form -- it still pertains chiefly to the form; since the matter is a part which is not determined by itself, but which is determined by the form." And so, these basic premises should be borne in mind throughout the ensuing discussion: *A sacrament must signify the grace which it effects*; and this "*res sacramenti*" *must be symbolized in both the matter and the form*; and this signification, to employ the words of Pope Leo XIII, "pertains chiefly to the form."

The Res Sacramenti of Baptism

The *res sacramenti* of Baptism, its crowning effect, is, to use the words of St. Thomas, "inward justification " Or, in other words, the remission of original sin and, in the case of adults being baptized, actual sin also. Let us now see how this *res sacramenti* is signified in both the matter and the form of Baptism. First: of all the *matter*, which is water, is a substance that is often used as a cleansing agent, and thus the cleansing from sin, "inward justification," is thereby symbolized. It is to be noted, in accordance with the earlier explanation, that water does not necessarily signify cleansing, but the words of the form, the determining principle, give the *baptismal* water this signification. We know *a priori* that the *res sacramenti* is necessarily signified in the form, and it is easily seen that it is denoted by the following words: "I baptize thee," inasmuch as the word *baptize* means, as St. Thomas remarks, "to cleanse."

Although the words, "I baptize thee," alone by themselves, signify the *res sacramenti*, it must not be thought that the remainder of the form, namely, "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," is unnecessary for the validity of the sacrament of Baptism. The *res sacramenti* is not necessarily the *only* thing a sacramental rite must signify, as the following example of Confirmation will show. Considering Baptism, then, we have studied a lucid example of how the *res sacramenti* is signified in: (a) the matter of the sacrament, and (b) the form of the sacrament, thus illustrating and harmonizing with the principle of Pope Leo XIII cited earlier.

The Res Sacramenti of Confirmation

Confirmation is the sacrament for those who have come of age or matured as Catholics. As St. Thomas remarks, "Confirmation is to Baptism as growth to birth." In another of his articles the Angelic Doctor says: "For in Baptism he receives power to do those things which pertain to his own salvation, forasmuch

as he lives to himself: whereas in Confirmation he receives power to do those things which pertain to the spiritual combat with the enemies of the Faith." And in still another place he says, "In this sacrament the fulness of the Holy Ghost is given for the spiritual strength which belongs to the perfect age." Confirmation, then, we may define as "the sacrament by which we receive the Holy Ghost and His gifts, making us fully grown in the supernatural life. By this sacrament we become soldiers of Jesus Christ and defenders of the Mystical Body."

The *matter* of Confirmation is chrism, which is a mixture of olive oil and balm (balsam). The *form* is: "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost."

The very word *confirmation* implies that there is already something there to be confirmed or strengthened. We now ask the crucial question: what is the *res sacramenti*, that: special grace of the sacrament of Confirmation? It is the bestowal of the Holy Ghost and His gifts for *spiritual strength in the combat*.

According to the Catechism of the Council of Trent, there are three things signified in this sacrament:

(1) "the divine power, which, as a principal cause, operates in the sacrament," and this is "sufficiently declared by the concluding words of the form: 'In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'"

(2) "the strength of mind and soul which is imparted by the sacred unction to the faithful unto salvation," and this is the *res sacramenti*. This is signified in the form "by the words immediately preceding them (i.e., those words given in (1) above--Ed.): 'I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation.'" Finally, a third thing is signified, and we continue to quote the Roman Catechism:

(3) "and next, the sign impressed on him who is to engage in the warfare of Christ." And this is denoted, "the third, by the words with which the form opens: 'I sign thee with the sign of the cross.'"

From the above it is seen that, in addition to two other things, the *res sacramenti* is, as it indeed *must* be, signified in the form of the Sacrament. What remains (although less important to our discussion) is to see how the *res sacramenti* is symbolized in the *matter* of the sacrament.

It is fitting that the matter of Confirmation, namely chrism, should be a compound substance; that is, a mixture of substances. "But this sacrament is given," says the Angelic Doctor. "that we may receive the fulness of the Holy Ghost, Whose operations are manifold, according to Wisd. vii. 22, *In her is the Holy Spirit,...one, manifold*; and I Cor. xii. 4, *There are diversities of graces, but the same Spirit*. Consequently a compound matter is appropriate to this sacraments."

The one component, olive oil, signifies *strength*; it makes muscles flexible and also helps to heal bruises and wounds received in battle. Oil also "by its nature unctuous and fluid, expresses the plenitude of grace, which, through the Holy Ghost, overflows and is poured into others from Christ the head... Or again, to quote St. Thomas: "Now the grace of the Holy Ghost is signified by oil; hence Christ is said to be *anointed with the oil of gladness* (Ps. xlv.8)..."

The other component, balm, is particularly noted for its soothing and healing power, and for its aroma. Therefore by being anointed with balm we are made conspicuous in our role as soldiers of Christ, and "diffuse around such a sweet odor of all virtues ... Balsam has, also, the efficacy of preserving from putrescence whatever is anointed with it, a property that seems admirably to express the virtue of this sacrament; whereas it is quite evident that the souls of the faithful, prepared by the heavenly grace imparted in Confirmation may be easily protected from the contagion of sins."

The anointing with chrism is on the forehead and in the form of a cross, because the soldier must be signed with the standard of his leader, and in the most conspicuous part of his body. "Now, the forehead," comments St. Thomas, "which is hardly ever covered, is the most conspicuous part of the human body. Wherefore the confirmed is anointed with chrism on the forehead, that: he may show publicly that he is a Christian: thus too the apostles after receiving the Holy Ghost showed themselves in public, whereas before they remained hidden in the upper room."

The matter of chrism, to reiterate the same point, does not necessarily signify the *res sacramenti* of Confirmation, the bestowal of the Holy Ghost for *spiritual strength* in the combat. But the determining principle contained in the words, "I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation," serves to denote the *end of purpose* for which the sacramental chrism is being used.

Summary of This Section

It is very clear why we define a sacrament as an *outward sign* (something that *signifies*) of the invisible grace, *res sacramenti*, which Christ has given it the power to convey to the soul. Likewise clear is the doctrine of faith taught in our catechism: A sacrament is. an outward sign instituted by Christ to produce grace.

The beautifully simple definition of St. Augustine is easily grasped: "The word is added to the element, and this becomes a sacrament." Finally, and this is essential for a grasp of the remainder of our discussion, it should now be evident what the Supreme Pontiff Leo XIII meant when he laid down the basic truth that the whole external rite -- the matter and the form, but chiefly the form -- must signify the special grace of the sacrament, the *res sacramenti*. Baptism and

Confirmation were examined, with this principle in mind, in order to make it easier to see how the same theological rule holds regarding the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist.

III. SIGNIFICATION IN THE HOLY EUCHARIST

The Matter and Form

The matter of the Holy Eucharist is two-fold; namely, bread and wine. The words which are the form of this Sacrament are: FOR THIS IS MY BODY. FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT, THE MYSTERY OF FAITH, WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS. Like the matter this form is twofold, but it pertains to the one integral Sacrament. The first sentence is pronounced over the bread, and the second over the wine. This form, as just stated, was defined by the Council of Florence, and it is given in an identical manner in the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, and in the instruction *De Defectibus* which accompanies the Roman Missal.

An Objection

Some have claimed that the words, "This is the chalice of My Blood," and these words taken alone by themselves, are sufficient for the valid consecration of the wine. And thus they deny the necessity of the entire form stated above, alleging that a mere part of the second sentence suffices for the wine consecration. Many great theologians, including St. Thomas in *all* of his writings where he discusses this subject --not just in the *Summa*-- have, on the contrary, claimed the necessity of the entire second formula up to and including the words: "for many unto the remission of sins." Here, for example, is one clear passage of St. Thomas: "In regard to these words which the Church uses in the consecration of the Blood, some think that not all of them are NECESSARY for the form, but the words *This is the chalice of My Blood* only, not the remainder which follows. ... But this does not seem suitable; for all which follows is a determination of the predicate: HENCE IT ALL PERTAINS TO THE MEANING OR SIGNIFICATION of the same statement. And because, as has often been said, IT IS BY SIGNIFYING THAT THE FORMS OF SACRAMENTS HAVE THEIR EFFECT, THE WHOLE (sentence) BELONGS TO THE EFFECTING POWER OF THE FORM."

All the earlier Thomists, *unanimously*, up to Cajetan's time held this selfsame opinion. Cajetan, however, in his commentaries on the *Summa*, expressed an opinion (contradicting St. Thomas) that the truncated "form", *This is the chalice of My Blood*, is sufficient for the validity of the wine consecration. But the Sovereign Pontiff St. Pius V, when he ordered Cajetan's commentaries to be

published, also explicitly commanded that THIS PARTICULAR OPINION BE EXPURGATED!

The Res Sacramenti of The Holy Eucharist

To attempt to show that the *entire* form is necessary is not our present purpose (the arguments along these lines of the great theologians cannot be improved upon); but we wish to express our opinion why we are convinced that the words of the final clause, namely, "*which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins,*" are necessary for the validity of the Holy Eucharist and, perforce, the validity of the Mass. Particularly are we interested in demonstrating the *vital signification* contained in the words: "for you and for many (*pro multis*)."

The reader, undoubtedly, is anticipating that we will now ask the key question: What is the *res sacramenti* of the Holy Eucharist? The *special grace proper* to this Sacrament, "the *res sacramenti* is the unity of the Mystical Body, outside which there can be no salvation," are the words of the Angelic Doctor. In many laymen's missals is printed the prayer of St. Thomas, which is recommended for recitation before receiving Holy Communion, and which contains the following: "Grant, I beseech Thee, that I may receive not only the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Our Lord, but also the whole grace (*'rem'*) and virtue of the Sacrament." In emphasizing what constitutes the *res sacramenti*, this same prayer of St. Thomas continues, " ... that I may be found worthy to be incorporated with His Mystical Body and numbered among his members."

In a chapter entitled, "The Reason for the Institution of This Most Holy Sacrament," the *Sacred Council of Trent* ratified this teaching of St. Thomas: "He (Christ) wished it (the Eucharist) furthermore to be a pledge of our future glory and everlasting happiness, and **THUS BE A SYMBOL OF THAT ONE BODY OF WHICH HE IS THE HEAD** and to which *He wished us to be united as members* by the closest bond of faith, hope and charity ..."

Just what does this mean: that the *res sacramenti* of the Holy Eucharist is the "unity (or union) of the Mystical Body? Simply this: that the person who receives this Sacrament worthily becomes incorporated, or more strongly incorporated, into the Mystical Body; and thus the *bond of his union* with Christ, the Head, is *solidified and strengthened*, and also the close bond of spiritual union that exists between him and every one of the MANY who are his fellow-members of the Mystical Body.

Res Sacramenti Symbolized in the Matter

In the matter of the bread and wine the unity of the Mystical Body is clearly symbolized (as one must expect), and some of the earliest Fathers, including St. Augustine, pointed this out. Let us, however, quote St. Thomas: "...the effect (of the Eucharist) with regard to the whole Church, which is made up of MANY

believers, just as the bread is composed of MANY grains and the wine flows from MANY grapes, as the gloss observes on I Cor. x,17: *We, being MANY... are one body,etc.*" (In this passage of Aquinas we have capitalized the word MANY, which word appears four times.)

And so, it is easily verified that the *res sacramenti*, the unity of the Mystical Body, is very clearly signified in the *matter* of this Sacrament.

How Can "This Is... My Blood" Suffice?

Adhering to the certain teaching of the Supreme Authority Leo XIII that the special grace of every sacrament must be signified in the external rite of the sacrament--matter and form, but *chiefly in the form--*, we now pose a question for those who claim that the words, *This is My Body. This is the chalice of my Blood*, are all the words required as the *valid* form of the Holy Eucharist. How can they show that these words, alone by themselves, signify the *res sacramenti* which is the unity of Christ's Mystical Body? These words denote transubstantiation, and they refer ONLY to Christ's True CORPOREAL Body, *not* to His MYSTICAL Body. If anyone would claim that these words do signify Christ's Mystical Body, he would thereby in effect be *denying* transubstantiation and Christ's Real Presence! --or rather, and this is worse perhaps, affirming *our own* transubstantiation!

Moreover, it: cannot be argued that these words, *This is My Body. This is...My Blood*, somehow signify *both* Christ's true corporeal Body *and also* His Mystical Body -- an absurd conjecture to begin with, for how then would the *many members* of the Mystical Body enter the picture? --, because a sacramental form *cannot be ambiguous*, i.e., having two meanings. "The essential part must contain within itself all that is essential to the due conveyance of the grace or power attached to the Sacrament....The essential part must 1) *signify* the grace or power to be conveyed; for, as the Bull tells us, 'it is the nature of a Sacrament to signify what it effects, and to effect what it signifies.' Moreover, THE SIGNIFICATION MUST NOT BE AMBIGUOUS, but 2) so far *definite* as to discriminate the grace effected from graces of a different kind; as, for instance, the graces of other Sacraments."

The lengthy quotation just cited is from the "Vindication of the Bull '*Apostolicae Curae*'". Authored by the Catholic Hierarchy of England, in answer to the Anglican Hierarchy's attack on this Bull (wherein Pope Leo XIII declared Anglican Orders invalid and wherein he taught this principle we have been frequently mentioning), this "Vindication" is, needless to say, the most authoritative interpretation of the Bull.

In any case, as for those who claim the abbreviate "form", *This is the chalice of My Blood*, is sufficient for the wine consecration, we would be interested in

seeing how they will attempt to reconcile this opinion with the teaching of Pope Leo XIII that the *res sacramenti* must be signified in the form of the sacrament

Presenting Our Opinion

It would seem that there are four things that are signified in this Sacrament: 1) transubstantiation; 2) sacrifice; 3) propitiation; 4) the *res sacramenti*: the unity of Christ's Mystical Body.

Transubstantiation, the conversion of the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ, is denoted by the words: *This is My Body. This is the chalice of MY Blood.* Although these words *denote* the transubstantiation, the change of the wine into Christ's Blood (and also His Body, soul and divinity) does not actually take place until the entire form is completed.

Had Christ so willed it, He could have left us the Sacrament of His Body and Blood completely apart from Calvary, simply by giving his priests the power of transubstantiation. But He actually willed the Holy Eucharist to be given to us in the context of *Sacrifice*. The Holy Eucharist is Sacrament *and* Sacrifice. The words given above (which denote transubstantiation) do not in themselves denote sacrifice. Therefore these words of the form, "which shall be shed," fulfill the purpose of signifying the *shedding* of Christ's Blood; i.e., sacrifice.

The sacrifices of the Old Law were not true sacrifices of propitiation; they did not actually have the power of *expiating* sins; for the blood of animals is powerless in this regard. Christ's Passion and Death, the Atonement of the Son of God, was truly propitiatory (expiatory) for the remission of sins. This propitiatory aspect of Calvary is denoted by these words of the form, "of the NEW and eternal testament," and also by the final words of the form, "unto the remission of sins."

Of course, this was the effect of Calvary, but it is *not* the principal effect of the Holy Eucharist. "If anyone says that the principal fruit of the most Holy Eucharist is the remission of sins, or that other effects do not result from it, let him be anathema."

And this leads us to the fourth thing that must be signified in this Sacrament: the unity of the Mystical Body. It is our belief that this vital signification is found in the words of the form: "for you and for MANY." For these words denote the *purpose* or *end* of Our Lord's institution *of the Sacrament*. Therefore these words comprise a key part of the *determining principle* in the form. Just as the words, "I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation," denote the *purpose* or *end* for which the sacramental chrism is being used; just as the words "I baptize thee" denote the *purpose* for which the water is being used in Baptism; so also --and this is the crux of it -- the words, "*for you and for many,*" designate the *purpose* or *end* which the matter, the bread and wine become the Body and Blood of Christ, was intended by Christ to be used. And this purpose is to establish the unity of the

many members of the Mystical Body. This sacramental aspect of the Holy Eucharist has nothing to do with the other doctrine of faith that "Christ died for all men."

The Pons Asinorum

Some priests, we are sure, have refused to give our presentation a hearing simply because they have it in their minds that the beginning words, "This is the chalice of My Blood," are sufficient for the validity of the wine consecration. They have heard and read this opinion in textbooks and have adopted it as their own.

What they fail to realize is that all the *truly great* theologians who held this opinion, St. Bonaventure for example, expressed it as their opinion long before the teaching of Pope Leo XIII, that the form must signify the *res sacramenti*. Even after this pronouncement, many writers of theological manuals have simply gone on repeating the same opinion (of the sufficiency of the abbreviated "form"), quoting the same earlier authorities, etc., seemingly without realizing the impact of Pope Leo's principle on this opinion.

The fact that St. Bonaventure, or even St. Alphonsus (who *leaned* towards this opinion and called it "probable"), did not take into consideration the necessity of the *res sacramenti* being expressed in the form, noway detracts from them. In the centuries that have elapsed since the first Pentecost Sunday, all of Catholic theology has developed. What we mean is that the understanding and the codification of theology by men has developed (i.e., the arguments for the truths of faith, their reasonableness, etc.); this, of course, is entirely different from the Modernists' heresy of the "evolution of doctrine." Periodically the Holy Ghost inspires Peter to lay down theological principles with absolute certainty. Often these pronouncements from the Supreme Teaching Authority are to stem a current heresy, and sometimes, through God's infinite wisdom and omniscience, they are to provide a defense against future attacks on Holy Church.

The following example will-add light to this point. Most Catholics are probably not aware that the first person known to have catalogued the Sacraments as seven in number (*circa* 1150) was Peter Lombard. Looking back now, this was at a point farther along than halfway thru the present lifetime of the Church. Though Peter Lombard expressed this *as an opinion*, subsequently the Church declared: "If anyone shall say that there are more or less than seven ... (sacraments), let him be anathema."

IV. THE DENIAL OF THE MYSTICAL BODY

The "Form" in English

Here is the ICEL form: "this is my body which will be given up for you. ...this is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant. It will be shed for you and for all men so that sins may be forgiven."

The mutilation in this form, "for all men," is not the only problem: let us put it in the record. "St. Thomas, you know," writes one of our Dominican collaborators, "argues for the necessity of the *pro multis* clause on the grounds that it belongs to-the integrity of the sentence spoken by Our Lord in consecrating His blood, being a 'determination of the predicate.' But even apart from the substitution of 'for all men' in the form, this integrity is broken up by the period after 'This is the cup of my blood...' (continuing, 'It will be shed...'). I think, then, that even were the form otherwise translated correctly, this might be enough to invalidate it. At least a doubt would remain, for St. Thomas (at least in IV *Sentences*) says that Christ did not consecrate His Blood absolutely but insofar as it was (to be) shed on the cross. And this is brought out by the *pro multis* clause determining the predicate. We must, then, battle for the correction of this point too, arguing for a *completely* literal translation of the form, otherwise the last state may be as bad (though not worse) than the first.

Who authorized the ICEL to break up the wine consecration form into two sentences? No other vernacular version besides the English one has (to our knowledge) this additional bit of tampering with the form. Surely we agree with our Dominican friend that this must be fought also; and we mention this point now, just to put it into the record, though our present occupation is the "all men" battleground.

Change of Meaning

No one is challenging the *truth* of the wording in the ICEL "form": shed-for all men so that sins may be forgiven. These words do express a certain doctrine, namely, that Christ died for all men: the universality of *Redemption*. But no one can deny that there is in this new "form" an inherent change of sense, or meaning. "For since in the sacraments", writes St. Thomas, "the words produce an effect according to the sense which they convey, as stated above, we must see whether the change of words destroys the essential sense of the words: because then the sacrament is clearly rendered invalid." And again: "Now it is clear if any substantial part of the sacramental form be suppressed, that the essential sense of the words is destroyed; and consequently the sacrament is invalid."

Monsieur Paul Poitevin, of Paris, France, writes: "The ICEL translation 'shed for you and for all men so that sins may be forgiven,' were they or not the very words pronounced by our Saviour, expresses happily a major Christian dogma .. "

Not caring that these words are not actually Our Lord's words is bad enough, but M. Poitevin apparently lacks any understanding whatsoever of sacramental

theology. According to his line of reasoning, if one were to recite the Apostles' Creed as the form for Baptism this would baptize a person but good, in view of the fact that the Creed "expresses happily" not merely one, but many "major Christian dogmas."

What Is Wrong With "For All Men"

Since 'all men' do not, never have, and never will belong to Christ's Mystical Body, it is evident that these words, substituted in the form, cannot possibly designate the *res sacramenti*. On the contrary, they contain a *false* signification: they are *in opposition* to the special grace of the Eucharist. "For all men" works against the purpose for which Christ instituted the Holy Eucharist, namely, the unity of His Mystical Body. *As long as these words are present*, mutilating the form, the Sacrament and the Mass must, in our opinion, be considered invalid, or at least *very probably* invalid.

Does the Holy Eucharist strengthen the bond of union (does such a bond exist?) among *all men*? Does the recipient of the Holy Eucharist solidify his spiritual union with *all men*? With the enemies of Christ? With those who hate and attack the Mystical body? The Holy Eucharist *that Christ gave us* strengthens no such bond! It "has no effect," says St. Thomas, "except in those who are united with this sacrament through faith and charity. ... Hence in the Canon of the Mass no prayer is made for them who are outside the pale of the Church." But now *EVERYONE outside the pale of the Church* gets a mention in the very consecration form!

Sacraments effect what they signify and signify what they effect. SO IF THE SIGNIFICATION IS DESTROYED, THE EFFECT IS ALSO DESTROYED. In that the words "for all men" destroy, nullify and oppose the *signification* of the grace of the Sacrament, they also oppose the *very grace itself* of the Sacrament. These words, then, in effect, *attack* the unity of the Mystical Body. They deny *the doctrine* of the Mystical Body. What a mockery they make of the definition of Trent that the Holy Eucharist is "a symbol of that one body of which He is the Head and to which He wished us to be united as members by the closest bond of faith, hope and charity..." In Our Lord's discourse on His Mystical Body, His farewell address to His apostles, which He gave *just after instituting* this Most Holy Sacrament--Judas, Iscariot was absent, by the way, having already gone but to betray Him -- , He said: 'I pray *for them*; I pray *not for the world*, but *for them* whom Thou hast given Me, because they are Thine.'

The solemn teaching of the Magisterium, given through the lips of the Supreme Pontiff Leo XIII: "THAT FORM CONSEQUENTLY CANNOT BE CONSIDERED APT OR SUFFICIENT FOR THE SACRAMENT WHICH OMITTS WHAT IT OUGHT ESSENTIALLY TO SIGNIFY." What then of a "form" which actually *destroys* what it must essentially signify?

THE ECUMENISM HERESY

1. IDENTIFYING A CENTRAL ERROR

What we are up against today is not just an isolated abuse, nor an isolated heresy or errors, nor even simply a whole series of abuses and errors, although no one can deny that never did abuses and errors abound more. Rather, our battle is actually much more difficult and more complex than a mere campaign against abuses and errors; it is in effect a war against a *whole frame of mind*.

It is probably true enough that the numerous abuses, errors and innovations we are witnessing--in short, the present upheaval-- are part of, or at least are the result of, the overall plan for subverting and demolishing the Church -- a plan "*mapped out to the least detail*" (to borrow the phrase Pius XI used to describe the diabolical Communist program against "all that is called God"). Conceived by and nurtured by traitorous ingrates within Her very bosom, the *Modernists'* program of all-out warfare against Mother Church was recognized in its incipency by Pope Saint Pius X, who constantly warned against this satanic plan. Now at length it is in full bloom; and its coming to fruition was and is due largely, but not solely, to the patient labors of *conscious* enemies, both within and outside the Church.

It is most certainly true that the vast majority of Catholics, clergy and laity, are *not* consciously and deliberately -- God forbid! --participating in this assault upon the Church. Many, however, through their tacit cooperation or their apathy are *in fact* collaborating with the enemy's cause. A certain frame of mind has gripped them. Small wonder that those who try to fight the abuses and the errors make no apparent headway, because this ubiquitous *frame of mind*, an insuperable obstacle, cannot even recognize as such the abuses and the errors!

What is this frame of mind? It is impossible to define it rigorously, but some of its characteristics can be studied. In this article we shall confine our attention to only one of its facets, but possibly this one facet is the key to understanding the whole frame of mind. Although as yet subconsciously perhaps, there is rooted deeply in their minds the belief or the "hope" that *all men will be saved*. *Universalism* is the name this heresy has been given.

This error is an old one. In the history of theology it is called *apocatastasis*, the doctrine which teaches that a time will come when all free creatures will attain salvation; that is, a final restoration. Origen (b. 185 A. D.), an early Christian writer, fell into this error, and the Council of Constantinople II condemned him for it and for other errors.

"It (apocatastasis) was destined," says the Catholic Encyclopedia, "to be revived

in the works of ecclesiastical writers...It reappears at the Reformation in the writings of Denk (d. 1527), and Harnack has not hesitated to assert that nearly all the Reformers were apocatastasists at heart, and that it accounts for their aversion to the traditional teaching concerning the sacraments...The doctrine of *apocatastasis* viewed as a belief in a universal salvation is found among the Anabaptists, the Moravian Brethren, the Christadelphians, among rationalistic Protestants, and finally among the professed Universalists." (V. I, p.600, 1907). The *Universalists* sect was founded in the year 1750 in London, having as its distinctive tenet the final salvation of all souls.

Today's Innovators, I am convinced, are also apocatastasists at heart. This central error, that all men are saved, undergirds much of the thinking behind the present upheaval. The entire series of novelties, following a pattern, appears to be designed for spreading this "all men are saved" frame of mind among Catholics.

But, you may ask, where has this error succeeded in gaining a foothold? Who is advancing such an idea that all men are saved? Although perhaps there are at present few Catholics who *openly* advocate it, the seeds of this doctrine are germinating in the minds of many. And this dangerous idea explains many of their actions. One reason this frame of mind is impenetrable is that, believing down deep that all mankind is to be saved anyway, no theological question is really worth discussing. This is why, incidentally, Catholic "social action" nowadays aims no higher than the (alleged) bettering of the *material* side of man.

In analyzing this trend towards Universalism we will see that, *given the assumption that all men are saved*, out of this maze of endless innovations a discernible pattern emerges.

11. A SYNOPSIS OF ISSUE NUMBER 1

To pick up the thread of continuity we must review some of the general principles on heresy explained in *Interdum* #1. A heresy involves *two* truths which, though distinct from one another, are related to one another in some way. The heretic begins by *affirming one* of the two truths, but this affirmation become so vigorous, and emphatic that some aspects of this one truth gradually become exaggerated so that the *other* truth begins to be *deemphasized* and then eventually altogether denied. Thus heresies arise through disturbing the harmonious equilibrium existing between *two related truth*,--affirming and then exaggerating one truth at the expense of the other. Two truths, intimately related to one another, that readily lend themselves to this scheme are: (A) Christ died, for all men; (B) Not all men are saved, but only many.

Truth (A): Christ Died For All Men

"Christ died for all men" means that He *redeemed* mankind by His Death on Calvary. Associated with this first truth (A), then, is the key word, *Redemption*, which means literally a ransom, or buying back, or paying a price for. The sin of Adam was a "sin of the race" in the sense that Original Sin is transmitted to all men; the effects of Adam's sin are felt by the entire *human race*. Similarly, Christ's ransom --i.e., the Redemption--was, like Adam's sin, absolutely *universal* in its scope. Both were "race" acts having their effects--the one damaging, the other repairing--on the *collectivity* of mankind.

Christ's Death was *sufficient* remedy and ransom for all. The Atoning Act of the God-Man sufficed to repair sin's infinite outrage. To our first parents God promised a Redeemer for the human race. This promise and its fulfillment by His only begotten Son were manifestations of His infinite *mercy*. Not owing us anything on this score, God's justice was not involved here, but only His *mercy*. In summary, this first truth, that *Christ died for all men*, has these related sub-concepts associated with it: *Redemption, human race, collectively, universally, infinite mercy, and sufficiency*.

Truth (B): Only Many Are Saved

Exploring the second truth (B), namely, that *only many are saved*, we encounter a different set of key concepts. First of all, *Salvation*. Not all men will attain eternal happiness in heaven, or salvation, but only *many souls* will be saved. Salvation, therefore, in actuality does *not* pertain to the human race on a universal and collective basis, but it pertains to many *individual* souls on a *particular* basis. Even though Our Divine Redeemer paid the price for all men, there are some men who, through their perverse failure to cooperate with God's grace, thereby nullify for themselves the benefits of this Purchase.

That is to say, Christ's Death was sufficient for all, but it is effective, or has *efficacy*, only for those who avail themselves of the necessary graces God gives them for Salvation.

"But, though He died for all," says the Council of Trent, "yet not all receive the benefit of His death, but those only unto whom the merit of His passion is communicated." (Session VI, Chap. 3).

An infinitely *just* God will mete out eternal salvation or eternal punishment to every man. God's attribute which is most closely related to this second truth is His infinite *justice*. In summary, the truth that *only many are saved* has these key related sub-concepts: *Salvation, many souls, individually, particularly, infinite justice, and efficacy*.

The table below summarizes this discussion:

Column A

Column B

CHRIST DIED FOR ALL

ONLY MANY ARE SAVED

REDEMPTION

of

the human race,

collectively,

universally,

showing God's

infinite *mercy*

SALVATION

of

many souls,

individually,

particularly,

showing God's

infinite *justice*

and related to the

sufficiency aspect

of Christ's Death.

and related to the

efficacy aspect

of Christ's Death

Calvinism and Jansenism

In the first issue of *Interdum* we also considered a root heresy shared by the Calvinists and the Jansenists, who denied truth (A) by claiming that *Christ did not die for all men*. We studied how this ultimate denial came about gradually, at first by their *affirming* the related and complementary truth (B) namely, that "only many are saved."

This principle of first affirming and then *overaffirming* one truth, followed by the downgrading and the ultimate denial of its complementary related truth, was indeed illustrated well by the Calvinists and the Jansenists. They overemphasized all the ideas in column B: *only many are saved, salvation, the individual soul, its particular relationship with God, the efficacy of Calvary and of grace*. As each of these was emphasized and blown out of proportion, the counterparts in Column A, the balancing truths, became dwarfed in importance and underplayed. Emphasizing God's *justice* too much made them lose sight of God's *mercy*. Once the toll was taken of something in Column A, the whole equilibrium of the delicate system of truth became disturbed, almost as though a shock wave had gone through it, and every idea in Column A became diminished in importance to the vanishing point until finally the key truth at the very top, that *Christ died for all men*, was shaken to the ground!

To visualize the "frame of mind" of the Calvinists/Jansenists one need only fathom a mentality where the main truth that only many are saved is a dominating idea, and where all the sub-concepts in Column B are elevated to a supreme and exaggerated importance, to the point almost of becoming obsessions, while at the same time the ideas in Column A are correspondingly minimized in importance.

III. THE "UNIVERSALIST" MENTALITY

To get an accurate picture of the "frame of mind" that today is widespread one has only to visualize the exact opposite of the Jansenist "frame of mind." Overemphasized now are the ideas in Column A: the *human race* or *mankind as a whole*, the *collectivity*, *universality* and the *mercy* of God. The central truth related to all these concepts, namely, that "Christ died for all men," is exaggerated and its real meaning is being distorted. It is repeated, almost like a slogan, but few seem to understand the real meaning of this truth. It goes without saying that the natural result of this distortion is that the importance of the main truth of Column B, that *only many are saved*, is being correspondingly diminished. And, true to the pattern, there is the inevitable downplaying of the related sub-concepts in Column B: the *salvation* of the *individual*, God's *justice* and the reality of *hell*, etc.

It would be correct, then, to say that the present-day frame of mind is in a sense "anti-Jansenist," but not in a healthy sense. While Jansenism went to excess in one direction, the present trend is in exactly the opposite direction and also to excess. What must be the ultimate result of the exaggeration of Truth A? Inevitably and inexorably this frame of mind must eventually arrive at *the denial of Truth B*, just as Jansenism inevitably and finally denied Truth A by claiming that Christ did *not* die for all men. And what exactly is this denial in the making, the denial of Truth B? It is that *NOT* only many are saved; or, to put it in the form of an affirmative statement: *All men are saved*. This, of course, is the heresy of Universalism.

The Overemphasis of "Collectively"

Let us start by selecting just one idea in Column A which today is being magnified. While the Jansenists disturbed the harmonious equilibrium between Truth A and Truth B, by *exaggerating* the importance of the individual and the individual soul's personal relationship with God, the present-day mentality *minimizes* the individual's importance and *overemphasizes* its counterpart, *the collectivity*. But little effort is required to perceive that this is indeed the current trend. Let us consider some examples.

The stress is on *participation* in the "liturgy" (so-called). This, of course, makes private *individual* prayer and devotion virtually impossible. The personal individual *Credo* of the Nicene Creed has been changed to a collective "*We believe*." The counterfeit "Confiteor" would have us confess to "the group": "I confess to you, my brothers and sisters." In the famous "Roman theologians' commentary" on the New order of the Mass there is this astute observation: "(T)here is the concelebration mania which will end by destroying Eucharistic Piety in the priest, by overshadowing the central figure of Christ, sole Priest and Victim, in a *collective* presence of concelebrants."

Likewise the very "definition" of the Mass given in no. 7 of the General

Instructions accompanying the New Order reflects the spirit of "togetherness," the collectivist mentality: "The Lord's Supper or Mass is a sacred meeting or assembly of the People of God met together under the presidency of the priest, to celebrate the memorial of the Lord. Thus the promise of Christ, 'where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them,' is eminently true of the local community of the Church." This contains the false implication that the efficacy of the Mass somehow depends upon the presence of "the community" or "the assembly met together." The scriptural quotation cited, which refers to the Presence of God in one sense, misrepresents the nature of the *unique Eucharistic Presence* in the Sacrament of the Altar, because Mass is truly offered and Christ becomes truly present whether "two or three are gathered" or whether nobody at all is present besides the priest. But try to explain this to the collectivist mind!

The phraseology "Lord's Supper," the emphasis on the "meal" or "the banquet of Christian love" (to quote Rev. F. McManus, TCEL bigwig), stresses the necessity of "the community." In their scheme of things there must be a certain fellowship or conviviality, or there can be no Mass.

"Folk Masses," "group dynamics," "sensitivity training," Cursillo-- these "togetherness" vagaries would never have been taken seriously nor have had any degree of success unless the collectivist mentality had already beforehand become implanted far and wide in many minds.

Last December the "consensus on the Eucharist" was announced; i.e., the points of "fundamental agreement" between the Catholic Church and the Orthodox (schismatic) Churches. Point #3 begins thus: "The eucharistic sacrifice involves the active presence of Christ, the High Priest, *acting through the Christian community*, drawing it into His saving worship." Point #5, sounding like a page taken from T. de Chardin, speaks of "the transfiguration of the whole cosmos" being "anticipated" through the Eucharist.

Teilhard de Chardin believed in the evolution of mankind into a "superconsciousness," resulting from the loss of identity of all men's individual consciousnesses as they are united into one single "world consciousness." This "planetization theory" fits in with Teilhard's other doctrine of the *salvation of the individual through the community*. It is by being members at the whole collectivity of mankind that we are saved.

"Salvation through the community." What a catch phrase this has become. "Salvation is something we have together or don't have at all," according to Harvey Cox. This "Professor of Divinity" at Harvard University "sees the role of the Church as de-emphasizing individual salvation and emphasizing group salvation." He deplores "the individualist heresy" in religion which emphasizes "MY individual soul ... " But Harvey says he is greatly encouraged by "corporate" experiments in communal living "where even the children are not looked upon as

belonging to individuals but are a group responsibility, sort of little kidlets." (The remarks quoted in this paragraph are from Cox's talk at a symposium at Wake Forest University during March 1969, as reported in *Review of the News*, Nov. 12, 1969 issue.)

No longer is sex a private family matter but an *affair of the community*. The attempt to take away from parents the responsibility for education in sex matters and to bestow this responsibility upon the schools may be viewed as yet another manifestation of the pervasiveness of the collectivist frame of mind. The youngsters should learn about sex in an atmosphere of "togetherness." Needless to say, the "sex education" push is intended for other more diabolical purposes, but the point is that, like Cursillo and sensitivity training, "sex education" by the schools would have been rejected out of hand were it not for the fact that so many parents had been pre-conditioned in the collectivist "frame of mind."

Auricular confession, being a personal and individual thing, has no place in the present scheme of things. Rather we must have the collectivist "communal penitential rite" or "general absolutions." It was reported in *Catholic Currents* (May 15, 1970) that Fr. Robert L. Faircy, S.J., who was recently fired from Catholic University, claimed that in the present climate of Catholic U. he is unpopular for taking the stand (among other things) "that there is value in individual prayer."

Egalitarianism, or what is commonly known as the "leveling process," is part and parcel of the collectivist mentality. The reduction of all to the same level, complete equality in every respect, is the utopian goal. Thus religious habits must be discarded in favor of more secular attire. Priests and religious who feel compelled to descend to the common level even in the matter of dress show to what extent the collectivist leveling mania has seized them.

"Just call me Sid." "Hello, my name is Pat McCormack." The subconscious desire to reduce themselves in every respect to the level of the laity explains why so many priests no longer wish to be addressed as, "Father." But the leveling mania at its most ludicrous point perhaps may be found in the absurd spectacle of priests shaking hands with altar boys as part of the "peace rite" newly introduced in the "liturgy."

There must be *absolute equality within the Church*. Democratization. "Collegiality" of the bishops, priests' senates, the "assembly" of the "People of God," parish councils. The celibacy issue -- priests are "human beings" after all, *like everybody else!* Yes, like everybody else. Equality! The men do not cover their heads in church, so "women's rights" demand the abandoning of their traditional head covering.

Not only equality within the Church, but *equality among the churches*, and this

follows logically for the frame of mind we are discussing. Hence "interfaith gatherings," the absolute necessity for "intercommunion," "ecumenism," National Council of Churches, WCC, Geneva. One religion is as good as another. "No salvation outside the Church" has become "No *damnation* outside the Church." And no damnation inside the Church either. No damnation *period*.

In the foregoing discussion we have been examining some evidence that the *collectivist* frame of mind of the Innovators who are directing present upheaval in the Church is also infecting the rank and file among the Catholic clergy and laity. In this total frame of mind we are investigating, let us pause to remark, this collectivist mentality is only one facet. It is manifested by the exaggeration of just one of our sub-concepts listed in Column A, namely, "collectively," with the corresponding minimization of its counterpart in Column B, namely, "individually."

No *Interdum* reader needs to be reminded of the extent to which the collectivist mind has been implanted in the general citizenry on the political, social and economic planes, nor of the many propaganda tools that have long been used to popularize this mentality far and wide, nor of the well-laid plans and subversive hands behind this program. Assistance in this total effort is even lent occasionally by the hucksters of horoscopolical bunk. *Aquarius*: "You are the humanitarian concerned and interested in the group rather than the individual." Is our Church being led into the "Age of Aquarius"?

Overemphasis of "Universally" and "Human Race"

As we analyze the total Universalist frame of mind, let us proceed to select two other ideas from Column A which are overstressed today: the *human race* or *mankind as a whole*, and *universally*. Whereas the Jansenists (to continue our comparison) as part of the development of their overall frame of mind overstressed "the elect" and were entirely preoccupied with the idea of the limited number of *particular* souls saved, the Universalists' emphasis, at the opposite extreme, is on *universality* or "all men." This is just a logical extension of the "collectivist mentality with the further notion added that the collectivity must be in no way limited, but must be all-encompassing.

Nowadays the word *universal* is on everybody's lips: "universal peace," "universal fellowship," "universal brotherhood," etc. Everything nowadays must be planned for the benefit of "humanity." And it seems that seldom does anyone show much interest in helping *someone specific*. Least of all, helping someone specific to save his soul.

A "War on Pollution" is being waged, there is much talk about "ecology," and we even had a nationwide "Earth Day" last April 22nd, (the centenary of Lenin's birth, by the way). All these and other such activities, mind you, are for the benefit of "humanity," to alert all men to the perils that are upon us. Supposedly one of the great dangers to "humanity" is "overpopulation," and many stern

measures must be taken for the good of "humanity." Since it is the welfare of the *human race* that is at stake, it is of no consequence that the proposed remedies, such as birth control and legalized abortion, happen to involve grave moral injustices *to the individual*, by encouraging a state of habitual mortal sin, and thus seriously endangering the salvation of these individuals. Yes, many sacrifices must be made for "humanity's" sake. There are occasional cases of ardent humanitarians burning themselves alive in order to protest an "*inhumane*" war, but, tragically, such heroic acts for "mankind as a whole" shipwreck these humanitarians' *individual* souls.

The person obsessed with this "universal" and "human race" outlook of things cannot understand how Our Lord could possibly have been so "limited" in His thinking as to have said the words "for *many*" when consecrating His Precious Blood at the Last Supper. Surely, whatever He may have said He must have *meant* "all men."

The person obsessed with this global outlook soon begins to wonder if the Catholic Church, that is, the "institutional" Church, is really big enough to be the Ark of Salvation. Though the word *catholic*, from the Greek *katholikos* means literally "universal," it seems that the Church really isn't: "catholic," for it surely doesn't embrace *all* men. It is true enough that not so very long ago large numbers of converts were entering the Church on a one-by-one *individual* basis, but such a process is far too slow and tedious. We must think about *corporate* reunion if the Church is really to have *all men* as members, and thus truly fulfill the definition of "catholic." So, to the "Universalist" mind the Roman Catholic plan, as explained by Cardinal Manning, is clearly obsolete:

"Even in the great Greek schism... all the conditions of truth and grace remain It has valid Orders, and the presence of Jesus, and the whole order of divine facts and truths, less only by its schisms and its errors. But it is recoverable, and one day may rise again as from the dead. Not so those bodies which have lost the perpetual presence of Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament, and have mutilated the order of divine facts and the organization of the Mystical Body: for them corporate reunion is impossible. They are in dissolution and must be recreated by the same divine power. Their members may be saved one by one, as men picked off from a raft, or from a reef, but the ship is gone. Its whole structure is dissolved. There remains no body or frame to be recovered from the wreck." (Henry Cardinal Manning, "The Blessed Sacrament: the Centre of Immutable Truth").

No, the Roman Catholic plan of individual salvation and one-by-one conversion just is not geared for the pluralistic society of today:

"There are three plans in action in America today and they all have

different purposes. The first plan is God's plan, a nonsectarian plan; the second is the Roman Catholic plan, and this is a denominational or sectarian plan, and the third is the Communistic plan, an anticapitalist plan."

"God's plan is dedicated to the unification of all races, religions and creeds. This plan, dedicated to the new order of things, is to make all things new-a new nation, a new race, a new civilization and a new religion, a nonsectarian religion that has already been recognized and called the religion of 'The Great Light'."

(C.W. Smith, "God's Plan in America," published in Sept. 1950 issue *The New Age*, official organ of The Supreme Council 33° Scottish Rite Freemasonry.)

Also derived from the Greek and also meaning "universal," like the word *catholic*, is another word. From a literal standpoint this other word, *ecumenical*, is synonymous with the word *catholic*. However, as used among Catholics, this word up until quite recently had only one application, namely, in reference to a general or ecumenical council. Among Protestants and among the Orthodox Churches the word "ecumenical" and the term "ecumenical movement" had already some time ago been given certain other specialized meanings.

With Vatican II the noun "ecumenism" came into vogue. Nowhere in the "Decree on Ecumenism" of Vatican II is the word *ecumenism* actually defined precisely, but a general idea of what is meant is conveyed by the following excerpts from this decree: "spirit of brotherly love and unity," "the restoration of unity among all Christians," "longing for unity," "this movement towards unity is called 'ecumenical'," "fellowship in unity," "to promote Christian unity," "duties for the common good of humanity," "bond of brotherhood between all Christians," "the attainment of union," etc., etc.

"*Ecumenism*," then, is in a sense equated with the idea of "unity," although the decree is too vague throughout to lend itself to any "nailing down" of exactly what is meant. And "ecumenism," as used in this decree, is a misnomer (just as the earlier Protestant "ecumenical movement" was a misnomer), because the etymology of "ecumenism," from *oikoumenikos*=universal, would indicate that this word should mean literally *universalism*, which is an entirely different concept from "unity." Among the four marks of the Church, if I may illustrate this point, are these two marks which all will acknowledge are *distinct* from one another: ONE (having to do with unity) and CATHOLIC (having to do with universality). So *unity* and *ecumenism* (having to do with universality) obviously are not the same idea and cannot be equated.

But, in any case, this misnomer "ecumenism" has become a household word. And judging from the *ecumenism in action* in the various parishes and dioceses, it is amply demonstrated that one rarely finds two pastors or two bishops who

understand exactly the same thing by "*ecumenism*." Which, by the way, is a peculiar sort of "unity." Now inasmuch as this word *ecumenism* means literally and exactly *universalism*, and inasmuch as the heresy that *all men are saved* is known by this same name, *universalism*, we will in the remainder of this article refer to the "Heresy of Ecumenism" instead of "Universalism."

Now some may say that I have here contrived a clever artifice in order to misrepresent "ecumenism," since I am employing this word in a sense completely different from that intended by Vatican II. I answer, in the first place, that certainly I am guilty of *no misrepresentation* because I have just defined clearly and precisely what *I mean by "ecumenism"* and how this word will, be used in this article. This is more honest, by the way, than the behaviour of the Innovators who misrepresent "ecumenism" by actually introducing practices contrary to the tradition of the Church and the Magisterium, claiming that it is in "the spirit of Vatican II." And, in the second place, judging from the "fruits" of Vatican II, or "ecumenism in action" so to speak, it is becoming increasingly evident that the *applied ecumenism* we are witnessing *is actually fulfilling my definition* rather than what Vatican II supposedly intended. So, with no further explanations or apologies, let us continue the investigation of the Heresy of Ecumenism: "all men are saved."

Alongside the true Catholic Church there is a-building a counter-church with its "shadow magisterium." The Catholic Church is the Mystical Body of Christ. The Ecumenical Church is the "People of God." In the Catholic Church the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass is offered. In the Ecumenical Church there is the celebration of the memorial meal known as the "Lord's Supper." In the Catholic Church we have the Sacrament of the Most Holy Eucharist, the Sacrament of the Many, the sign of unity of the Mystical Body of Christ. The Ecumenical Church has introduced the words, "for all men," into its liturgy, as a symbol of "unity" of *all men* -- like a piece in a jigsaw puzzle this change fits into this whole heretical pattern --, and can it be long before *all men* will be invited to participate in the "intercommunion" of the Ecumenical Church?

Latin, one of the three languages of the inscription on Our Saviour's Cross, was designed in God's Providence to be the *language of unity* of His True Catholic Church. And the universal language of the True Church will always be Latin. The leaders of the Ecumenical Church are likewise aware that any *universal* movement must have its universal language of "unity." The vernacularization process is temporary its only real purpose being to do away with the language of unity of the True Church. *Esperanto* is to be the "language of unity" of the Ecumenical Church. In fact, the "liturgy" of the Ecumenical Church *has already been translated into Esperanto* (see p.276 of the Sep.-Oct. 1968 issue of *Notitiae*, the official liturgical organ of the Ecumenical Church). Why an "Esperanto" version of the liturgy? How many today know or speak Esperanto? Is there a country or even a parish where *at this time* a liturgy celebrated in Esperanto would be understood? Then why has the Ecumenical Church put the

liturgy into Esperanto?? The Ecumenical Church does not waste its time; it does not play games.

Anne Catherine Emmerich (1774-1824), the holy German mystic, had visions and mystical experiences in which she saw the birth of what she terms "the dark church" and the "black counterfeit church." The word *counterfeit* connotes more than just the 'idea of *false* (there have always been false churches and false forms of worship); counterfeit implies the intent to *pose for the real*, to ape the true thing. We do not pretend to be gifted with the ability to interpret prophecy with complete accuracy, nor have we ever based our arguments and presentations on prophecy. And scarcely are we now going to "build a case" based on the visions of Anne Catherine Emmerich, for the attempt to interpret prophecy always involves the risk of being completely wrong about its true meaning. But surely we are allowed to speculate whether Sister Emmerich was foreseeing the Ecumenical Church of the present day. The following passages are from volume 2 of "The Life of Anne Catherine Emmerich" by Very Rev. C. E. Schmoeger, C.S.S.R., first printed in 1867.

"I saw a fantastic, odd-looking church being built. ...I saw no angel helping in the construction, but numbers of the most violent planetary spirits dragging all sorts of things into the vault where persons in little ecclesiastical mantles received them and deposited them in various places. Nothing was brought from above; all came from the earth and the dark regions, all was built up by the planetary spirits. ... I saw that many of the instruments of the new church, such as spears and darts, were meant to be used against the living Church. ... In the cave below (the sacristy) some people kneaded bread, but nothing came of it; it would not rise. ... All in this church belonged to the earth, returned to the earth; all was dead, the work of human skill, a church of the latest style, a church of man's invention *like the new heterodox church in Rome.*" (pp. 282-3).

"I fear the Holy Father will suffer many tribulations before his death, for I see the black counterfeit church gaining ground, I see its fatal influence on the public." (p.292). "They built a large singular extravagant church which was to embrace all creeds with equal rights: Evangelicals, Catholics, and all denominations, a true communion of the unholy with one shepherd and one flock. There was to be a Pope, a salaried Pope, without possessions. All was made ready, many things finished; but, in place of an altar, were only abominations and desolation. Such was the new church to be, and it was for it that he had set fire to the old one; but God designed otherwise. He died with confession and satisfaction -- and he lived again." (p. 353).

"When I had witnessed this vision even in the smallest details, I saw again the present Pope and the dark church of his time in Rome." (p.279). "I saw the fatal consequences of this counterfeit church; I saw it increase; I saw heretics of all kinds flocking to the city. I saw the ever-increasing tepidity of the clergy, the circle of darkness ever widening. ...Again I saw in vision St. Peter's undermined

according to a plan devised by the secret sect whilst, at the same time, it was damaged by storms; but it was delivered at the moment of greatest distress. Again I saw the Blessed Virgin extending her mantle over it. In this last scene I saw no longer the reigning Pope, but one of his successors, a mild, but very resolute man who knew how to attach his priests to himself and who drove far from him the bad." (p. 281).

"I saw in Germany among worldly-wise ecclesiastics, and *enlightened* Protestants, plans formed for the blending of religious creeds, the suppression of Papal authority ..." (p.346). "I saw the secret society undermining the great church (St. Peter's) and near them a horrible beast that arose out of the sea." (p.290). I saw during the last few days marvellous things connected with the Church. St. Peter's was almost entirely destroyed by the sect, but their labors were, in turn, rendered fruitless and all that belonged to them, their aprons and tools, burned by the executioners on the public place of infamy. ... In this vision I saw the Mother of God laboring so earnestly for the Church that my devotion to her greatly increased." (p.292).

"They want to install bad bishops. In one place they want to turn a Catholic Church into a Lutheran meeting-house." (p.299). "When I saw St. Peter's in this ruinous state and so many ecclesiastics laboring, though secretly, at its destruction, I was so overcome that I cried earnestly to Jesus for mercy." (p.300).

"I see the little black man in his own country committing many thefts and falsifying things generally. Religion there is so skilfully undermined and stifled that there are scarcely one hundred faithful priests. I cannot say how it is, but I see fog and darkness increasing. ... All must be rebuilt soon for everyone, even ecclesiastics are laboring to destroy--ruin is at hand." (p.298). "...I saw again the great, odd-looking church with nothing holy about it ... All the steps deemed necessary or useful to the construction and maintenance of the church were taken in the most remote countries, and men and things, doctrines and opinions contributed thereto." (pp. 283-4).

"When I have visions of the Church as a whole, I always see to the north-west a deep, black abyss into which no ray of light enters, and I feel that it is hell. ... They were not in a regularly founded, living Church, one with the Church Militant, Suffering, and Triumphant nor did they receive the Body of the Lord, but only bread. They who were in error through no fault of their own and who piously and ardently longed for the Body of Jesus Christ, were spiritually consoled, but not by their communion. They who habitually communicated without this ardent love received nothing; but a child of the Church receives an immense increase of strength." (p.85). "I saw unheard-of abominations spreading over the land, and my guide said to me: '*This is Babel!*' --I saw throughout the whole country a chain of secret societies with influences at work like those of Babel. ...I saw all going to ruin, sacred things destroyed, impiety and heresy flowing in."(p.132).

Distortion of "Christ Died For All Men"

Thus far we have been studying the tendency of the Ecumenists' mentality to emphasize several of the sub-concepts in Column A, for example, "collectively," "human race," "universally." This tendency is part of the make-up of the overall frame of mind which finally is led to the denial of truth B: the Ecumenism Heresy that *all men are saved*. In addition to the exaggeration of the related *sub*-concepts in Column A, it goes without saying that there will also be the exaggeration of the *main* truth atop Column A, "Christ died for all men." This corresponds to and is the exact opposite of the Jansenist/Calvinist tendency to exaggerate the main truth B, "only many are saved."

The true meaning of "Christ died for all men," namely, that He redeemed the human race, that He wills all men to enter his Church, that He wills all men to be saved-- this true meaning is distorted by the Ecumenist into a false and dangerous doctrine of *universal salvation*.

To promote this heresy the Innovators do not hesitate to lay their hands on Holy Scripture. Consider, for example, the epistle for Midnight Mass on Christmas. The passage from Titus 2:11, "For the grace of God our Saviour hath appeared to all men," is rendered in the new Lectionary as: "God's favor has appeared, *bringing salvation to all men*." In the Greek text of this epistle, which is quite short, the expression "God our Saviour" is found no fewer than four times, and there is no linguistic justification for rendering it as "bringing salvation." But in the Ecumenists' scheme of things the heresy of *universal salvation* must be subtly implanted. The mistranslation of this particular passage is undoubtedly explained by the Ecumenist with the affirmation that "Christ died for all men."

"Christ died for all men" is the standard reply given to any inquiry why the words, "for all men" were substituted for "for many" in the Consecration Form.

Misunderstanding "Christ died for all men" as meaning universal salvation is bound to lead to religious indifferentism. If Christ died for *all* men, then why should *we* be so concerned about the salvation of those outside the Church? Perhaps this Ecumenist mentality explains the lessening of true Catholic missionary activity. Earlier eras saw great missionaries, many of them canonized saints, risking everything to go to strange and distant lands for the sole purpose of *baptizing* the pagan, making a Catholic of him. In this ecumenical age most priests wouldn't make a trip across town to *convert* a non-Catholic. But they *will* make great efforts to "dialogue" with him and find out what *he* has got to say.

In an ecumenical age such as ours why worry about *conversions*? After all, Christ died for *all* men! And so we begin to witness a *radical* drop-off of conversions to the true Faith. Why are so many Catholic schools closing? This is *partly* explained, admittedly, by the disgust with them among traditional Catholics. But there are not *that* many informed, traditional Catholics. The truth

is that the "Christ died for *all* men, after all"-mentality just does not see the importance of *Catholic* schools anymore.

If "Christ died for all men" and this means *universal salvation*, then why have devotion to the saints? They are not needed as models to be imitated and patrons to assist us. Assist us for what? We are all saints! We are all equal! And so the Saints go marching out of the Roman Calendar. Hans Kung, true to the Ecumenist cause, has declared that "all canonizations must cease." (*Catholic Currents*, May 15, 1970).

Distortion of "God's Mercy"

The Jansenists' overemphasis on God's infinite *justice* led to an obsession with the doctrine of Hell, a minimal appreciation of God's *mercy*, and heterodox views on predestination. Today's Ecumenist thinks of nothing but God's mercy (or "love"), forgets God's infinite justice, and consequently doesn't even believe in Hell.

In "*Questioning The Validity of the Masses using the New All-English Canon*," I wrote the following sentence. "However, Christ's Passion is not profitable for all men, because we know *de fide* that not all men attain eternal salvation." In writing this book I was aware that I would have to be prepared to defend my position on many of its points, but I never dreamed that *that* particular sentence would be challenged. But it was! "He also says somewhere in the document," argued Fr. Theodore Mackin S.J., "that the Church teaches that some men are damned. Mr. Omlor is the first theologian ever to propose that doctrine that I know of."- (!) Father Mackin, incidentally, is the Head of the Theology Department at Santa Clara University.

An article entitled, "Hell and the Devil: Are They for Real?", by Sidney Callahan, appeared in *National Catholic Reporter*, May 29, 1970. "It's finally gotten through to me," writes Mrs. Callahan, "that a lot of Christians were brought up believing in hell. ... I don't know why it's taken me so long to believe that others really truly believe in hell and the devil. I guess it's part of my Enlightenment heritage which conversion did not really touch. ... But to me, goodness, beauty and joy on earth have always made God and heaven seem an appropriate rumor. ... But hell? ... I just can't imagine that in any reality active love could be refused or that divine love could not heal the most hopeless deformation. ... Some concept of purgatory or purification (compensatory education) I can fathom, but final damnation is incomprehensible. ... In the end I remain an agnostic on the question of evil, hell and the devil. I don't say there can't be any such thing (let Inquisitors take note) and I can give a minimal notional assent when faced with the rack."

The process of denying Hell is gradual. The first question to be raised is concerning the *eternity* aspect of Hell. How could an infinitely merciful God send anyone to Hell *for all eternity*? This is the foot in the door. And it is quite

enough. Taking eternity out of hell literally knocks the hell out of it, for a hell that *isn't* eternal is at worst some sort of purgatory.

In the new "liturgy" of the Ecumenical Church the prayer for the *faithful* departed has been replaced by: "Remember those who have died in the peace of Christ and *all the dead* whose faith is known to you alone." (Eucharistic Prayer IV). What is implied in praying for "*all the dead*"? Does this not at least plant the seed of belief that *all the dead* still have a chance for salvation? And maybe hell *isn't* eternal after all! The opening words, "Remember those who have died in the peace of Christ," we can certainly understand as referring to the souls in *purgatory*, (not the saints, needless to say, because they do not need prayers). This is then followed by the word, *and*, implying that *another* group, *distinct* from those just mentioned, is to be remembered": "*and all the dead ...*".

With the denial of hell the apex of the heresy has been reached. For if there is no Hell then it automatically follows that no one can possibly be damned. "All men are saved."

S u m m a r y

We have investigated the Ecumenist, or Universalist, "frame of mind." It is preoccupied with the notions of the collectivity, universality, human race, God's mercy and the truth (distorted) that "Christ died for all." It downplays individual salvation, the particular soul's relationship with God, God's justice, and the truth that "only many are saved." Hell has no place in this scheme of things. To the Ecumenist the doctrine of Hell is irreconcilable with his twisted idea of God's "mercy," for the *balancing* attribute of God's justice has been overshadowed. To the Ecumenist the culmination that *all men are saved* follows from his frame of mind as night follows day.

To "Ecumenism" with its pomps and its works the reply of the faithful Catholic must be W.C. Fields' classic: "I refuse to be participated."

FIVE FLAWS FOUND

1. A BADLY TRANSLATED SENTENCE

Defect of Form

The principle of sacramental theology upon which rests our case against the validity of the "English Mass" is that of *defect of form*. The falsified wording in the Consecration Form, *viz.*, "shed for ... ALL MEN so that sins may be forgiven," was substituted in place of Christ's own words: "This is ... My Blood ... shed for you and FOR MANY unto the remission of sins." This unwarranted and

unjustifiable innovation constitutes a serious defect of form of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist.

Against our position a frequently advanced objection is the theory that in the form the first seven words only, namely, "This is the chalice of My Blood," are sufficient to consecrate validly the Precious Blood,,and therefore whether or not "for all men, etc." is a mutilation, a faulty translation, or even a falsification, etc., has no bearing on the validity of the Sacrament and the Mass.

A Key Sentence

Lately several *Interdum* readers have inquired about a certain sentence in the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, which sentence appears to them to support the argument that the truncated "form," viz., *This is the chalice or My Blood*, is sufficient. Moreover, Father Cletus Healy, S.J., a staunch advocate of this truncated form theory, in a recent article (*Twin Circle*, Aug.23, 1970) quoted this particular sentence from the Catechism--twice in this a article he quoted it-- to support his arguments. Thus it behooves us to take notice of this key sentence, to investigate it, and to ascertain whether or not the, authors of this Catechism meant what Father Healy believes they meant.

"The Catechism notes," writes Fr. Healy, as he cites this sentence, "that 'THE FORM TO BE USED (IN THE CONSECRATION) OF THIS ELEMENT (THE WINE) EVIDENTLY CONSISTS OF THOSE WORDS WHICH SIGNIFY THAT THE SUBSTANCE OF THE WINE IS CHANGED INTO THE BLOOD OF OUR LORD.' But the words of the consecration, 'This is the chalice of My Blood,' and these words alone, clearly 'signify that the substance of the wine is changed into the blood of our Lord.' Therefore, these words (or their equivalent), and these alone, should be recognized as sufficient for consecration." Thus Father Healy; however, I added emphasis above to this "key sentence" from the *Roman Catechism*, which, by the way, Fr. Healy has quoted from the version translated by John A. McHugh, O.P. and Charles J. Callan, O.P.

This sentence, as rendered above, standing alone out of its context, could appear at first glance to have the meaning attributed to it by Fr. Healy. However (a) first, the above translation is not faithful to the Latin text for this sentence, and (b) the context of this sentence in the Catechism categorically rules out Father Healy's interpretation of it.

Two Clues

If, instead of grasping at straws,they would take a close scholarly look at this particular sentence, our opponents would realize right away that something about it (as quoted above) is surely haywire. Immediately evident, without even consulting the Latin text, are two clues which reveal that the above "translation"

simply cannot be correct.

The first of these clues is given in the five opening words of the sentence: "The form to be used." Setting aside momentarily the question of what is required for *validity*, every priest certainly knows that the form *to be used* is the *entire* form, i.e., the entire sentence which "This is the chalice of My Blood" is only the introductory clause. Every priest knows furthermore, from Ch. V of the Instruction *De Defectibus* in the missal and from what is held unanimously by moral theologians, that actually *to use* only that first clause in consecrating the Precious Blood is forbidden under the pain of *mortal* sin.

"The second clue, the second thing about this key sentence that should have bothered our opponents, is that if their interpretation of it be correct, then the Catechism has contradicted itself outrageously. At the very outset of its discussion of the form (for the wine consecration) the Catechism most emphatically asserted that "we, must FIRMLY BELIEVE" that the form "consists of" the following words: FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD, OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT, THE MYSTERY OF FAITH, WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS. How, then, is it possible that this very same Catechism, just a few lines later in the "key sentence" under discussion, could say or even imply that the form "EVIDENTLY consists of" something less than that entire form which, initially, it vigorously demanded "we must firmly believe" that it "consists of"?

The Latin Text

The Latin text of this disputed sentence is as follows: "Constat enim, iis verbis, quae vini substantiam in sanguinem Domini converti significant, hujus elementi formam contineri."

One need know no Latin whatsoever merely to see with his eyes that the adjective clause, "*quae vini ... significant*," is, separated by commas from the rest of the sentence; and this point is vital. Here is an exact literal rendition of this sentence: "For it is evident (or 'evidently'), in those words, which signify that the substance of the wine is converted into the blood of our Lord, the form of this element consists." Now compare these two versions:

"The form... evidently consists of those words which signify ... blood of our Lord." (McHugh Callan translation quoted by Father Healy).

"For evidently in those words, which signify ... blood of our Lord, the form of this element consists." (Correct and literal translation).

Quite a difference, isn't there, between saying "those words, (pause) which signify" and "those words which signify"?

Essential and Nonessential Clauses

When an adjective clause *restricts* the meaning of a noun or pronoun and is essential to the meaning of the sentence, it is called a restrictive or essential clause. An essential clause is not set apart from the rest of the sentence by any mark of punctuation. Examples:

- (a) The player *who just homered* was Rose.
- (b) The words *which signify transubstantiation* are the required form.

If an adjective clause merely adds to the meaning of the sentence but doesn't restrictively modify a noun or pronoun, it is called a nonrestrictive or nonessential clause. Nonessential clauses are separated from the rest of the sentence by commas. Examples:

- (a) Pete Rose, *who just homered*, is a switch-hitter.
- (b) Those words cited earlier, *which signify transubstantiation*, are the required form.

In our sentence under discussion the clause, "which signify that the substance of the wine is converted into the blood of our Lord," is clearly nonessential.

Interpreting This Sentence Correctly

This sentence should be interpreted in this manner: For it is evident that the form does consist of *those words* ('those', as opposed to 'these', indicates a degree of remoteness), namely, all those words prescribed above, which words signify (among other things) that the substance of the wine is converted into the blood of our Lord.

Why, one may ask, did I take the liberty above to insert the words "among other things"? First, the above purports not to be a *translation*, but rather an *explanation*. Second, I justify the inclusion of this comment, "among other things," because the Catechism itself, two sentences later, does in fact go on to explain these *other things*. It says: "they moreover express certain admirable fruits of the blood shed in our Lord's Passion, fruits which in a most singular manner (*maxime*) are related to this Sacrament." From this last-cited sentence the continuity of the text is apparent, the word, "*they*," obviously is still referring to "those words," *viz.*, the entire form considered as an indivisible entity.

What stands out is that throughout its whole exposition the Catechism at all times treats the form as one integral sentence, and nowhere does it even acknowledge the possibility of chopping it off after "This is the chalice of My Blood." Hence we conclude: from the grammatical structure of this disputed "key sentence" and from the overall text of the Catechism there isn't the slightest justification for Fr.

Healy's claim that its meaning is that the words, *This is the chalice of My Blood*, "and these alone, should be recognized as sufficient for consecration." Quite the contrary! As will be shown next, the Catechism is in open opposition to Father Healy's argument.

Explanation of a Passage

We now reproduce from the Trent Catechism a lengthy excerpt, which includes our disputed sentence translated properly. The parenthetical comments are mine.

"Although in the Evangelist the words. *Take and eat*, precede the words (*This is My Body*), they evidently express the use only, not the consecration, of the matter. Wherefore, while they are not necessary to the consecration of the Sacrament, they are by all means to be pronounced by the priest, as is also the conjunction *for* in the consecration of the body and blood. *But they are not necessary to the validity of the Sacrament ...*" (Emphasis added. The fact that these words, "Take and eat" and "for", are the only words singled out as "not necessary to the validity" is in itself telling. What may be inferred? If the authors of the Catechism believed that the words following "This is the chalice of My Blood" --words, mind you in the actual form itself-- also are not necessary for validity, surely they could not have failed to point this out *somewhere* in the Catechism.)

"With regard of the consecration of the wine,...the priest... ought of necessity to be well acquainted with, and well understand its form. We must firmly believe that it consists of the following words: FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD, OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT, THE MYSTERY OF FAITH, WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS. ..."

(Some theologians, notably Scotus, had contended that *prior to* the form, as just specified, certain other words also are required; e.g., the narrative "Who the day before He suffered" or at least the words "Take ye and eat..." On the other hand, the Greeks claimed that *after* the recitation of the aforesaid form there is required yet *another form*; to wit, the epiclesis (invocation of the Holy Ghost). To refute these opinions the following paragraph was included in the Catechism, under the heading: *That this is the True Form of Consecration is Shown.*)

"Truly of this form no one can doubt, if, in this place also, attention be directed to what was said before about the form of Consecration, the form associated with the element of bread. (I.e., similarly, 'Take ye and drink ...' isn't part of the form for the wine.) For it is evident that in those words, which signify that the substance of the wine is converted into the blood of our Lord, the form of this element consists. Wherefore, since those words openly proclaim this, it is plain that another form (*aliam formam*) need not be set down. (I.e., no epiclesis is

necessary.) They moreover express certain admirable fruits of the blood shed in our Lord's Passion, fruits which in most singular manner are related to this Sacrament. One of these is access to the eternal inheritance, which has come to us by right *of the new and eternal testament*. Another is ... etc. ... by the *mystery of faith*. A third is the *remission of sins*."

II. WHAT IS IMPLIED IN THE CATECHISM?

Even though we may have succeeded in proving that the *Roman Catechism* clearly defined "the form" for the wine to be the *entire* form: FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD ... SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS; nevertheless, our opponents will undoubtedly argue that it did not say explicitly that "the form" in its entirety is necessary for validity.

To this I reply: it need not be said *explicitly*, for it goes without saying. inasmuch as "the form" was defined *as such*, its necessity *as such* is implied; for it is undeniable that the authors of this Catechism, in judging what is essential in a sacramental form, would necessarily be governed by and bound by their own general principles.

For example: in the chapter, 'On the Sacraments in General,' those authors wrote: "In our Sacraments, on the contrary, the form is so definite that any, even a casual deviation from it renders the Sacrament null" (McHugh & Callan's translation). Jeremy Donovan renders this same passage thus: "(Our Sacraments) have so definite a form of words, that if a casual deviation from it be made, the nature of the Sacrament cannot subsist." Both translations are faithful to the sense of the Latin text.

And furthermore, the *failure* of the Catechism to rule out as *nonessential* any part of the form (except for the conjunction, *for*, as noted above) is significant. Because, indeed, throughout the Catechism, in the treatments of the various Sacraments, whenever certain words which might be thought to be necessary are in fact *not* necessary, this is pointed out scrupulously.

Thus, for the Sacrament of Penance the form, *I absolve thee*, is prescribed; next follows an explanation that "Several prayers are moreover added, not indeed as necessary to the form,..." In like manner, in the form for Baptism ("*Ego te baptizo...*" etc." in Latin) the Catechism diligently observes that the word "*ego*" is not absolutely essential, because the force of the word "*I*" is contained in the ending of the verb "*baptizo*." And again, in expounding the form for the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, the esteemed authors *cite precisely* several very minor variations in wording which would be permissible. Permissible only because (they are careful to note) they involve "no change in the meanings."

III. OTHER HOLES IN THE HULL

Although the aforesaid article by Fr. Healy (*T. C.*, 8/23/70) in fact is quite short, still it contains at least five major flaws, which, like five huge holes in the hull, more than suffice to sink the ship of his line of argumentation. The first of these five flaws we have just exposed; that is, his reliance upon a faultily translated sentence in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, taken out of context, and then misinterpreted.

Authority of The Catechism

When he finds, or rather thinks he finds, a sentence in the Catechism to prove his point, Father Healy is not reluctant to quote it. It is possible, however, that he found several *other* things as well, for at one point in his article he endeavors to play down the Catechism. "In the first place," he says, "the authority of the Catechism is somewhat exaggerated. While the Catechism was published 'by decree of the Holy Council of Trent,' it does not enjoy the weighty authority of a conciliar document. Moreover, being a complete catechism, it treats of many things about which the Council of Trent issued no decrees -- this being one such issue."

That constitutes his second flaw. As shall be seen below, the Council of Trent-- yes, the Council itself -- in a decree *did* elucidate the very matter we are discussing. By the way, who has exaggerated the weight of the *Roman Catechism* I do not know. On pp. 109-110 of my monograph, "*Questioning The Validity...*" some of the outstanding credentials of the Catechism were mentioned, but it was also clearly pointed out that it is "still not the Holy See Itself speaking" (p. 110).

However, since that time when I first penned those words there has come to my attention a salient fact, which bestows extraordinary authority upon the Catechism as regards the specific issue at hand. *The sacramental forms, as they appear in the Roman Catechism*, carry the weight of a conciliar decree. When laying down the forms of the Sacraments, the Catechism *is* speaking with the voice of the Holy See Itself.

In that the Catechism was not yet completed when the Council of Trent closed (and consequently was not published until afterwards), it is true that *as a whole* it does not enjoy the full weight of an ecumenical council; it is a "post-conciliar" document. But *certain things* in the Catechism -- to wit, the forms prescribed for the Sacraments -- do indeed enjoy such weight. Let us see that this is true.

The following is from the Decree on Reform, Sess. XXIV, Ch. VII, issued by the Council of Trent itself: "That the faithful may approach the Sacraments with greater reverence and devotion of mind, the Holy Council commands all bishops ... previously to explain their efficacy and use in a manner adapted to the understanding of those who receive them ... ACCORDING, TO THE FORM, ONE

FOR EACH SACRAMENT, TO BE PRESCRIBED BY THE HOLY COUNCIL IN A CATECHISM, which the bishops shall have faithfully translated into the language of the people and explained to the people by all parish priests." (Emphasis added above.)

The above does not say simply that the Catechism will be prescribed; it says far more. It says that *in* the Catechism the forms, one for each Sacrament (*singulis sacramentis*), are to be *those forms prescribed by the Council* itself: "juxta formam a sancta Synodo in catechesi singulis sacramentis praescribendam." Who then actually prescribed these forms? *Obviously* the Council itself did! Now, since the forms were laid down by the Council itself --and the Council itself in this decree assures us that this is indeed the case --, and since the Council moreover instructs us that to find these Council-prescribed forms we are to look in the catechism, what more has to be said?

It is true, of course, that the *full* weight of Trent does not bolster all the explanatory material (about the forms) in this Catechism. But, whatever else in it may or may not have such weight, *the prescribed forms themselves* do have it. Therefore: "We must firmly believe" that the form for consecrating the wine "consists in the following words: FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD ... etc.... SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS."

One final item. Can we be certain that the forms the Council prescribed are the very same forms that ultimately appeared in the Catechism? Yes, we can, because the Council left the responsibility for the Catechism in the *safest* of hands. Just prior to its close, in its final session, since the Catechism was not yet finished, the Council commanded "the Fathers to whom it (the Catechism) was assigned" to give over "whatever has been done by them to the most holy Roman Pontiff, that it may by his judgment and authority be completed and made public." Hence, in most editions of the Catechism the title page bears the words, "ordered published by the Sovereign Pontiff Pius V," or similar words. Expressly ordered by an Ecumenical Council, supervised by the Fathers of the council, published finally by the Holy Father himself : the *Roman Catechism!*

The Third Flaw : "Our Problem"

"Nor was the Catechism of Trent," writes Fr. Healy, "specifically addressing itself to our problem, i.e., precisely which words of Christ, are absolutely necessary for consecration." And again: "While neither Trent nor the Catechism were (*sic*) wrestling with our problem,...". What, I ask, is "our problem," if not the "for all men" mutilation? *In point of fact*, Fr. Healy himself, early in his article, singles out "our problem": "the changing of the English form from 'for you and for many' to 'for you and for all'." Being aware, as he is wherein lies "Our problem," he should likewise be aware that the Catechism did *not* fail to treat of it. In it we read:

"Those words which are added: '*for you and for many*,' were taken partly from Matthew (*for many*) and partly from Luke (*for you*), but the Holy Church, instructed by the Spirit of God, joined them together ... Rightly was this done, in order that '*for all men*' might not be said, since in this instance His utterance concerned only the fruits of His Passion, which brought the fruit of salvation only to the elect."

Four centuries ago the Trent Catechism foresaw "our problem" and repudiated it!

(NOTE-- The final sentence quoted just above begins thus in the Latin: "Recte ergo factum est, ut 'pro universis' non diceretur." McHugh and Callan translate this as follows: "With reason, therefore, were the words *for all* not used," (which is, verbatim, the way it appears also in J. Donovan's earlier translation). But this suppresses the words "factum est": "it was done"; and, moreover, by failing to treat properly the *clause of purpose* "ut... non diceretur," it deprives the statement of its full force and meaning. The passage should read: "Rightly therefore was it done, in order that 'for all men' might not be said." Clearly, what was "rightly done" was the Church's joining together the phrases 'for you' and 'for many', done for the *purpose of preventing* 'all men' from being said; i.e., literally, "in order that 'for all men' *might not be said*." As a consequence, that which the Holy Church *deliberately purposed to prevent* is now being done.)

The Eastern Liturgies

Father Healy: "That it could not consider the entire formula essential is evident from the fact that the Church has long approved many alternative formulae in the Eastern rite liturgies."

Perhaps our position is not clear to Father Healy. Never have we claimed that the precise formula used in the Latin Rite, word for word and syllable by syllable, and not allowing for any possible variation whatever, is absolutely essential. In our earliest treatment of this whole subject, namely, "*Questioning The Validity...*" we did not fail to discuss the Eastern liturgies. Moreover, certain ancient liturgies no longer in use were, also considered. In a section entitled, "Identical Wording Not Required", (p.66), we, following the principles laid down by Pope Leo XIII in his bull *Apostolicae Curae*, pointed out that what is required is that the forms "should always be conformed to the *same definite type*."

In the liturgies recognized by the Holy See, it is easily seen that all the various formulas used for consecrating the Precious Blood conform to the same definite type. In every instance:

(a) The form is a single, somewhat lengthy, integral sentence beginning with the words, *This is the chalice of My Blood*, or *This is My Blood*. These words denote *transubstantiation*, which is one of the things that must be signified in this

Sacrament.

(b) Following these initial words are additional words; to wit, some words which express *sacrifice*, words which denote *propitiation*, and lastly, words which signify the unity of the Mystical Body, which is the *res sacrament* (cf. *Interdum* #3).

(c) It is stated that Christ's blood "shall be shed" or "is shed," and this mention of the *shedding* of blood expresses *sacrifice*.

(d) Immediately following the initial words in (a) above, is the phrase "of the new testament," or else "of the new and eternal testament." These words express the true *propitiatory* nature of this Sacrifice, through the use of the phrase "NEW testament." This distinguishes the True Sacrifice from the sacrifices of the OLD Testament, *viz.*, the blood of animals, etc., which were powerless to atone for sins. Propitiation is also denoted by these words, *unto the remission of sins*, (or other similar words found in every liturgy).

(e) The words: *for you and for many*, or else simply *for many*, -- but never "for all men" are found in every Eastern rite. These words signify the unity of the Mystical Body.

As Fr. Healy correctly acknowledged (in a subsequent *Twin Circle* article, 9/6/70), St. Thomas in his *Summa* (III, Q.78, a.3) insisted that all the words, "This is the chalice of My Blood ... etc. ... unto the remission of sins," belong to "*the substance*" of the form. Father Healy, however, does not believe that he meant by this that all are *necessary*.

But such an opinion does not square with the Angelic Doctor's passage in *In I Cor. XI*, lect. 6: "In regard to these words which the Church uses in the consecration of the Blood, some think that not all of them are NECESSARY for the form, but the words *This is the chalice of, My Blood* only, not the remainder which follows. ... But this does not seem suitable; for all which follows is a determination of the predicate: HENCE IT ALL PERTAINS TO THE MEANING, OR SIGNIFICATION of the same statement. And because, as has often been said, IT IS BY SIGNIFYING THAT THE FORMS OF SACRAMENTS HAVE THEIR EFFECT, THE WHOLE BELONGS TO THE EFFECTING POWER OF THE FORM." (Emphasis added.)

St. Thomas certainly was aware that the form used by the Greek Church did not (and it still does not) contain the words "and eternal" nor the words "the mystery of faith". How, then, are we to understand the above passage of his? I reply that we must interpret it in precisely the same vein as was outlined in the foregoing discussion. That is to say, (a) *This is ... My Blood*, alone by itself, does not suffice; (b) certain other words --i.e., "determinations of the predicate"--, which signify the fruits of the Passion, the graces of the Sacraments, etc., are

also essential; (c) although some minor or nonsubstantial variation in wording, as occurs in other rites, is all right, nevertheless (d) the *essential meaning of nothing* in (a) or in, (b) may be altered, lest the effecting power of the form be destroyed.

Let us not in all of this lose sight of what it is that *Father Healy* is trying to prove. His main plank, namely, that *This is the chalice of My Blood* suffices, is at odds with the very evidence he cites! For we have seen that not a single Eastern liturgy actually uses only those words; but they all use "for many" somewhere in the form. So much for the fourth flaw: the "evidence" has backfired.

A Specious Argument

"For my part," reasons Fr. Healy, "when the ordained priest has said 'This is the chalice of My Blood,' if transubstantiation has not taken place, I have no idea when it does." He continues: "If these words alone, do not contain the consecrating power to effect transubstantiation, I see nothing in the rest of the formula that would give them that power. Anyone who would say that transubstantiation has not taken place by virtue of these words would either have to abandon logic, or put himself in the theologically embarrassing position of admitting that these critical words 'This is the chalice of My Blood' are not only ineffective, but that they are, in this holy function and at this sacred moment, false! For, on this hypothesis, though the assertion has been made that it was blood, the chalice would remain a cup of wine."

This argument, which, presumably, is Father Healy's *pièce de résistance*, actually is a colossal dud. Though it may perhaps seem plausible enough at first glance, upon reflection it will be seen to be unsound. St. Thomas Aquinas and the Salmanticenses, not to mention numerous other renowned theologians, *in fact* did deny that 'This is the chalice of My Blood (and these words alone) suffices for transubstantiating the wine into the Precious Blood. This fact itself -- this fact alone!--indicates how presumptuous is Fr. Healy's verdict that anyone who holds this view "would either have to abandon logic, or put himself in the theologically embarrassing position, etc."

As explained by St. Thomas (*Summa*, III, Q.78, a.3), by these words *This is the chalice My Blood'* the change of the wine into blood is *denoted*," but this does not mean that transubstantiation *actually occurs* just as soon as these words have been recited. In this self- same article, moreover, (cf. Objection 2 and Reply to Obj.2) , the Angelic Doctor explicitly *rejects and rebuts* the following theory: "But as soon as the words are spoken: '*This is My Body*,' there is perfect consecration of the bread. (This much, of course, is true; i.e., at least under *ordinary* circumstances in which both species are being validly consecrated. -- Ed.) Therefore, as soon as these other words are uttered: *This is the chalice of My Blood*, there is perfect consecration of the blood..."

Sacramental forms differ from ordinary words in this vital respect: the forms not only denote but also *accomplish* something. But even in ordinary speech the full and correct meaning of the speaker often is not manifest until the entire sentence is completed, because words in the latter part of the statement may qualify the earlier words. For example, in the declaration "This is my precious pearl, and I now give it to you," if it be truncated after the word "pearl," what is conveyed is that pearl is mine; whereas the true sense of the *whole* statement is that the pearl isn't mine anymore, but yours.

Father Healy believes that the words *This is the chalice of My Blood* must be instantly verified -- that is, the wine must be converted into the Precious Blood -- at the very moment the word "blood" has been said. He reasons that anyone who claims otherwise is, in effect admitting that these words *This is the chalice of My Blood* are at that very instant false.

Consider the form for the Sacrament of Baptism: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." This form, like the form for consecrating the wine, is a single integral sentence. All will agree that this *entire* form is required for a valid baptism. And yet it is evident that the first three words only, namely, *I baptize thee*, are the words which actually *denote* the baptizing. But albeit the words *I baptize thee* denote the act of baptizing, nevertheless the effect of the Sacrament -- to wit: the washing away of sin -- *is not accomplished* until such time as the entire sentence, containing necessary qualifications, is completed.

Therefore the words, "I baptize thee," alone by themselves, *accomplish nothing*; that is, unless the remaining words, "in the name of the Father, etc.," are also recited. Is a person baptized just as soon as the words *I baptize thee* have been pronounced? Of course not. Does this mean that those words are false at that moment? They are not inherently false, because they will be made true, or verified, when the entire sentence has been finished. Needless to say, if the person who is baptizing should stop with these words, *I baptize thee*, and fail to recite the rest of the form then they would indeed turn out to be false. In like manner, if a priest should stop with the words, *This is the chalice of My Blood*, and fail to say the remaining words of the form, then those words would also turn out to be false.

VERNACULARIZATION: A "PREMEDITATED SCHEME"

All the requisites for the celebration of the Eucharistic Sacrifice have been selected with especial care, and nothing has been adopted but what has been found best suited unto this end. This applies also to the language in which the Holy Sacrifice is celebrated; for the liturgical language should correspond to its liturgical object. The Mass considered in itself could assuredly be celebrated in any language, but by the Providence of God the Latin language has become and

still continues to be of all languages the most widely diffused for divine worship. The very ancient practice of the Church of celebrating Mass in the West, not in the living language of the country, but in a dead language, that is, in Latin, for the most part a language unintelligible to the people, has since the twelfth century to the present epoch been frequently made the subject of attack. Such attacks originated principally in an heretical, schismatical, proudly national spirit hostile to the Church, or in a superficial and false enlightenment, in a shallow and arid rationalism entirely destitute of the perception and understanding of the essence and object of the Catholic liturgy, especially of the profoundly mystical sacrifice. In the attempt to suppress the Latin language of the liturgy and to replace it by the vernacular, there was a more or less premeditated scheme to undermine Catholic unity, to loosen the bond of union with Rome, to weaken the Catholic spirit, to destroy the humility and simplicity of faith. Therefore, the Apostolic See at all times most persistently and inflexibly resisted such innovations; for it is an invariable principle of the Church never to alter the ancient liturgical language, but inviolably to adhere to it, even though it be no longer the living language spoken or understood by the people.--The Church likewise, when introducing the Roman Liturgy among newly converted nations, has for many centuries permitted the Latin language only,--She excommunicates all those who presume to declare the vernacular to be necessary or the only permissible language for the liturgy; she stigmatizes as impertinent effrontery for any one to censure or combat the retention of the Latin language for divine worship. This is just; for, as St. Augustine remarks, "to question what the united Church practises as a rule is the most daring madness." In all such general decrees and usages appertaining to divine worship, the Church is directed and preserved from injurious blunders by the Holy Ghost. Instead of censuring the Church on account of her practice, that has endured more than a thousand years, of conducting her liturgical worship in a dead language, we should rather acknowledge and admire her supernatural wisdom; she counts her experiences by centuries: ours we can enumerate only by days.

The use of the Latin language in nowise prevents the faithful from participating in the fruits of the Sacrifice, notwithstanding assertions to the contrary. The demand that the Mass should everywhere be celebrated in the vernacular, is based for the most part on ignorance, or on an entire misconception of the real nature and object of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The liturgy of the Holy Sacrifice contains "much that is instructive" (*magnam eruditionem* - Trident.), but instruction is by no means its principal object. The altar is not a pulpit, the Holy Mass is not primarily a doctrinal lecture or an instruction to the people. The Sacrifice is essentially a liturgical action performed by the priest for propitiating and glorifying God, as well as for the salvation of the faithful.

EASTERN RITE FORMS

Forms used in the Eastern rites for consecration the wine are given below. Quotations and excerpts are from Donald Attwater's "*Eastern Catholic Worship*," Devin-Adair Co., New York, 1945.

From pp. xi-xii: -- "And there are eight of these liturgies, as follows:

The *Byzantine Liturgy*, taking its name from its place of origin, Byzantium (Constantinople), and now in use in many parts of the world. Partly derived from it is--

The *Armenian Liturgy*, used only by the Armenians.

Two *Alexandrian Liturgies*:

- i. The *Coptic* rite, used in Egypt.
- ii. The *Ethiopic* rite, used in Abyssinia.

Two *Antiochene Liturgies*:

- i. The *Syrian* rite, used in Syria, Irak and India.
- ii. The *Maronite* rite, also used in Syria.

Two *East Syrian Liturgies*:

- i. The *Chaldean* rite, used in Irak.
- ii. The *Malabar* rite, used in India."

THE BYZANTINE LITURGY (p. 35):

"THIS IS MY BLOOD OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, WHICH IS SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY FOR THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS."

THE ARMENIAN LITURGY (pp. 58-9):

"THIS IS MY BLOOD OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, WHICH IS SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY FOR THE EXPIATION AND FORGIVENESS OF SINS."

THE COPTIC LITURGY (p. 85):

"FOR THIS IS MY BLOOD OF THE NEW COVENANT, WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS."

THE ETHIOPIC LITURGY (p. 107):

"THIS IS MY BLOOD OF THE NEW COVENANT WHICH IS SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY FOR THE FORGIVENESS OF SIN."

THE SYRIAN LITURGY (p. 127):

"THIS IS MY BLOOD, OF THE NEW COVENANT, WHICH SHALL BE Poured OUT AND OFFERED FOR THE FORGIVENESS OF THE SINS AND ETERNAL LIFE OF YOU AND OF MANY."

THE MARONITE LITURGY (p. 151):

(The form is identical to that which was always used in the Latin Rite.)

THE CHALDEAN LITURGY (pp. 175-6):

"THIS IS MY BLOOD OF THE NEW ETERNAL COVENANT, THE MYSTERY OF FAITH, WHICH IS SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY FOR THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS."

THE LITURGY OF MALABAR (p. 202):

"FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT, THE MYSTERY OF FAITH, WHICH IS SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS."

THE NUMBERS GAME

Though we should expect "rebuttals" of a more theological nature from priests and bishops, especially those with D.D., S.T.D., J.C.D., etc., following their names, yet more often than not we hear from them pearls of wisdom such as:

- (1) "Two thousand bishops can't be wrong!", or
- (2) "Over 99% of the priests in this country are actually using *for all men* in saying Mass."

Of course, of the approximately 2000 bishops in the *world*, how many had anything whatsoever to do with the *English Canon*? Two hundred and fifty, you say? Well, hardly. Quoth Archbishop Robert J. Dwyer, of Portland, Oregon: "The ICEL has performed its task so poorly as to raise serious questions as to its competence. *Never was there the slightest consultation with the bishops of the English-speaking world*; here is a signal instance of bureaucracy inflicting its will by methods which can only be described as high-handed" (*Twin Circle*, June 21, 1970). In a *Clergy Bulletin*, dated Oct. 4, 1967, Archbishop Leo Binz of St. Paul-Minneapolis gave the following testimony: "A new translation of the Canon of the Mass has been made by the International Committee on English in the Liturgy. The Holy See has withheld final approval for good and valid reasons." But this same "English Canon" was railroaded into use *18 days later* (Oct. 22nd)! We don't know if 2000 bishops can be wrong, but...

If 100%, and not just 99%, of the priests in our country were using "for all men," that wouldn't prove its validity. Are such matters decided by the majority's feeling? We don't begin to wonder if the Catholic Church is the One True Church, "outside which there is no salvation," just because some 85% of all the people in the world don't feel that way. But could *85% of all mankind* be

wrong on such a *vital*ly important matter?? I hope so!

At one time, according to Cardinal Newman, *80% of all the bishops* of Christendom had fallen for the Arian Heresy. "The *whole world* groaned and found itself Arian," was the way that St. Jerome put it. The "*whole world*" was in *deadly* error!

At one time *every* Catholic bishop in England except *one*, St. John Fisher, admitted that a mere layman named Henry had more authority over the Church in that country than the Pope of Rome. How many of those bishops were right?

At one time 100% of all mankind -- that is correct, *100% of all* mankind!--was very foolishly mistaken on a certain matter. And this, mind you, was in a *very* enlightened period of history. Their mistake, moreover, has affected all men ever since. They thought that by eating a certain fruit they would become as gods.

What, after all, is a majority? How many does it take to make a majority? Said The Little Flower: "God and I are a majority."

M A R O N - G O - R O U N D ?

Below are some excerpts from an exchange of correspondence I had some months ago with the Most Rev. Francis M. Zayek, D.D., the Maronite, Apostolic Exarch, U.S.A.

#1 (dated April 9, 1970):
Your Excellency:

In the booklet, "THE DIVINE LITURGY ACCORDING TO THE MARONITE ANTIOCHIAN RITE", published with your approval in June, 1969, the English translation of the Form for consecrating the wine contains the words: "*for all men.*"

According to the text, "A GRAMMAR OF BIBLICAL ARAMAIC", which was, published in Wiesbaden, Germany (1961), the Aramaic word which means "all", "everyone", "all men", or "all mankind", etc., is the word "*kol*" or some variation/combination of it, such a "*kolla*". If Our Lord had intended "for all men", then He undoubtedly would have used this clear and unambiguous word, "*kol*".

This word, "*kol*," is opposed in meaning" to the other Aramaic word, "*sagueeia*", which is the word used in this place in your Maronite liturgy. According to the same Aramaic grammar text mentioned above, this word, "*sagueeia*," means strictly and unambiguously "*many*" (or "much", etc.)...

Asking Your Excellency's blessings, etc.

/s/ Patrick Henry Omlor

#2 (dated April 14, 1970; Prot: #234/70)

Dear Mr. Omlor:

I thank you for your letter of April 9 and the copy of "Interdum".

I agree with you that in the actual Aramaic form of consecration, taken from the Latin Rite liturgy, the word is indeed "sagueeia" and not "kol". ...

We have to follow the existing and approved translations of the Latin Rite. -- Both forms are theologically sustainable.-- However, the words of consecration in our Rite are very rarely said in English. Most of the time they are said in Aramaic, which form has the word "sagueeia". ...

With every good wish, I remain ...

/s/ Francis M. Zayek

THE MOST REVEREND FRANCIS M. ZAYEK, D.D.
MARONITE APOSTOLIC EXARCH, U.S.A.

#3 (dated April 21, 1970):

Your Excellency:

...I am very grateful to Your Excellency for replying to me, because you have given me the exact information I want.

Your Excellency, you say in your letter: "I agree with you that in the actual, Aramaic form of consecration, taken from the Latin Rite liturgy, the word is indeed 'sagueeia' and not 'kol'." In other words, if for the moment we set aside all, theological considerations and all other consideration, and treat this solely from the viewpoint of the Aramaic language itself, then the *correct literal translation* should be "many" and *not* "all men". And this, of course, is also in total harmony with the Peshito, which likewise has the word "*sagueeia*" in the words of Institution, as recorded by Sts. Matthew and Mark.

You go on to explain that, "We have to follow the existing and approved translations of the Latin Rite." This, of course, explains why in your Mass Booklet on the pages where the English-language version appears (opposite those pages in Aramaic containing the word, "*sagueeia*" we find the words "all men" instead of

"many".

But let us examine the facts. The International Committee on English in in Liturgy (ICEL), who are the ones responsible for the "all men" version in the first place, made this change from "many" to "all men," giving as *their sole reason* the absurd claim that "all men" is correct *from the linguistic standpoint!* Their pretext is that Aramaic doesn't even have a word for "all", a claim which you yourself, your Excellency, and every Maronite priest in the world knows is absolutely false.

...

Asking Your Excellency's blessings, etc.

/s/ Patrick Henry Omlor

(Ed. Note: The Peshito, or Peshito, is a 5th century Syriac version of the Bible.)

The foregoing farce may be summarized thus:

(1) The Maronites have allowed "for all men" in their new Mass Booklet because (2) the "Latin Rite" --which in the present case amounts to nothing more than the ICEL-- has decided that "for all men" is correct; nevertheless (3) the Maronites *know* that it is *not* correct, at least not as a faithful translation from the Aramaic; and yet (4) the *sole* reason given by the ICEL for the "all men" rendering is an alleged faithfulness to the Aramaic!

THE ROBBER CHURCH

(Part 1)

Pi And Vatican II

Ludicrous as it sounds, the following story is nevertheless true. Once upon a time an attempt was made to set legally the value of π . As every schoolboy knows, π (pi) is a fixed constant--a "constant of nature," so to speak--, being the ratio of the circumference of a circle to its diameter. The approximate value of π , carried out to seven decimal places, is 3.1415927. We say "approximate," for the exact value of π cannot be determined. Consequently for the purpose of calculation some approximation of π must be used, such as $22/7$, or 3.14, or 3.1416, etc. Given any circle at all, therefore, we can compute its approximate circumference by multiplying π times its diameter, using for π the value 3.1416 (for example); the formula is: $c = \pi \times d$.

In the year 1897, Representative T. I. Record of Posey County, Indiana, introduced into the legislature of that great and sovereign State his famous House Bill #246. This bill provided that the value of π would be set legally to 4, or else 3.2, or some other nice number, easier to work with. Although using the value 4 for π might make some arithmetic computations a little easier, the

answers to all mathematical problems involving would be quite wrong, although "legally" correct. Undaunted by such considerations, Mr. Record claimed in his bill that "since the rule in present use fails to work it should be discarded as wholly wanting and misleading in the practical applications(!!).

Although it was initially referred, for some mysterious reason, to the House Committee on Swamp Lands, the bill eventually reached the Committee on Education. That committee, after studying the bill, reported it back to the House with a recommendation that it be passed. And, indeed, House Bill #246 did pass when voted upon by the House of Representatives of Indiana, unanimously to boot, 67-0. Next the bill was sent to the Senate, and although it got by the first reading there with flying colors, on the second reading the Senate threw it out. Thus was finally scuttled this landmark innovation which was designed to give relief to the citizens of Indiana from that older established rule which "fails to work" and is "wholly wanting."

What reminded me of this story was my recent reflection upon the achievements of Vatican II. However, Vatican II succeeded where Rep. Record's bill had failed, for both attempted substantially the same thing. Some subversive delegates at the Council introduced a brand new quantity and the whole Council voted upon this new quantity and approved it. But one and all then pretended that it was the same quantity as before, and they continued to call it by the same old name as before, namely, the "Catholic Church." The fact is that this brand new quantity, their new Ecumenical Church, is in no sense the same as the true Catholic Church any more than is the same as 4.

Is It The Same Church?

The French have a paradoxical saying: "The more it changes, the more it stays the same." This, of course, is not true in most real-life situations. An ashtray full of cigar ashes is not a cigar. And a church that has been demolished to rubble or converted into a dining hall is no longer a church. Let no one delude himself any longer. That ecumenical organisation out there with its lying propagandist organs all over the world, called euphemistically the "diocesan press" or the "Catholic press", or the "Vatican Guidelines" for this and that; that new Church with its cardinals and bishops dedicated to "interfaith," and with its faithless priests who think of themselves as nothing more than "presiders of the assembly" or "ministers of the word," and with its craven and bamboozled "People of God" robbed of their birthright. -- all that is simply not the true Catholic Church. No, that ecumenical nightmare, mired in chaos, is Satan's own Ark of Perdition. Just as Pope St. Leo I rightfully referred to a certain bogus "ecumenical council" as the Robber Council (*Latrocinium*), so likewise what now confronts us is nothing more nor less than a Robber Church.

For just how much "change" could the Catholic Church possibly undergo and still be the Church? Quite apparent for all to see are the frenzied efforts of the new

robbers to destroy all ties and links with the past, to eradicate from memory all vestiges of the ancient, true, traditional Church. To think of the new Robber Church as the very same Catholic Church that it is so deliberately and painstakingly trying to wipe out of memory? Absurdity of absurdities! What are some of the characteristics of the Robber Church? We can enumerate the following: it has abandoned most of the important laws, disciplines and practices of the true Church; it has new "Scriptures" which are re-written falsifications of Holy Scripture; it scorns the true Catholic Tradition; it despises the venerable customs of the Catholic Church; its new "prayers" are alterations of the old Catholic prayers, tailored to harmonize with the heresies of the new Robber Church; it ignores and discourages the many pious practices and devotions which the true Catholic Church had always encouraged; it has a liturgy, sacramental rites and a "New Mass," all devoid of everything that is *true*, good and beautiful in the liturgy, rites and Holy Sacrifice of the Catholic Church; it is not too fond of Saints, and it shows this by disowning some of them, "downgrading" some of them, and seeing to it that many others will soon be forgotten.

Let us continue. The Robber Church has perverse doctrines, innovations which are opposed to true Catholic doctrine; its "People of God" imbibe these doctrines in the sermons they hear and in the "Catholic" literature they read; the children's new "catechisms" are filled with the same insidious doctrines, suggestions and theories, all poisonous and all geared to insure that they will mature into good rebellious "robbers"; the new morality with its "updated" views about "sin" is a denial of the Catholic Church's code of morality; and, lastly, the very structure itself of the new Church is not held to be monarchical like the Catholic Church, but rather "collegial" and democratic.

Now, if the teachings and doctrines, the laws and disciplines, the moral code, the practices, prayers, liturgy, the Mass itself, and, yes, even the structure -- if all these are different, then in what respect, pray tell, is this new church the same as the Catholic Church?

You may claim that no essential has really changed, that the "essence,, of the Church still remains. You may argue that none of the doctrines of belief or teachings on morality are really different from what they were before. But this is only wishful thinking on your part, because the doctrines proposed for belief and the morality encouraged to be practiced are *not* the same. It is agreed that the Church can change laws, disciplines and practices (some of them) without losing Her identity, for the Church has the power and the right to alter merely human institutions. (Of course, never has the Church throughout Her long history altered them wantonly and on a wholesale basis, for this would be madness!) But that is not the issue; the point is that the changes go beyond laws, disciplines, etc.; the "beliefs" and moral standards of the Robber Church are new and different.

In order to prove this last statement it suffices to provide just one example. Because if even one essential teaching -- i.e., on a matter of revealed faith *or* on a matter related to and necessary to safeguard faith -- which the Catholic Church has held is rejected, then the rejectors can in no way be said to represent the true Church. The following sources uphold this assertion:

(1) "To refuse to believe any one of them is equivalent to rejecting them all" (Pope Leo XIII, encyclical *Sapientiae Christianae*).

(2) "Such is the nature of Catholicism that it does not admit of more or less, but must be held as a whole or as a whole rejected: 'This is the Catholic faith, which unless a man believe faithfully and firmly, he cannot be saved' (Athanasian Creed). There is no need of adding any qualifying terms to the profession of Catholicism: it is quite enough for each one to proclaim 'Christian is my name and Catholic my surname,' only let him endeavor to be in reality what he calls himself" (Pope Benedict XV, encyclical *Ad Beatissimi*).

(3) "It was thus the duty of all who heard Jesus Christ, if they wished for eternal salvation, not merely to accept His doctrine as a whole, but to assent with their entire mind to each and every point of it, since it is unlawful to withhold faith from God even in regard to one single point. ... And, therefore, it was no more allowable to repudiate one iota of the apostles' teaching than it was to reject any point of the doctrine of Christ Himself" (Pope Leo XIII, encyclical *Satis Cognitum*).

(4) "Every assertion contrary to the truth of revealed faith is altogether false, for the reason that it contradicts, however slightly, the truth" (Fifth Lateran Council, bull *Apostolici regiminis*).

New Doctrine on "Ecumenism"

Here, then, is an example of a reversal of doctrine. In Vatican II's "Decree on Ecumenism". We read the following: "Most valuable for this purpose are meetings of the two sides --especially for discussion of theological problems where each can treat with the other on an EQUAL FOOTING..."(emphasis added). This teaching of Vatican II refers to so-called "ecumenical dialogue" between Catholics and non-Catholics. The following three points are contained in it: (1) there should be meetings, assemblies, etc., between Catholics and non-Catholics; (2) at the meetings the Catholics not only can, but should, deal with the non-Catholics on an *equal footing*; (3) this "equal footing" is to be observed, and it says this very explicitly, in discussions *on theology*.

First of all, regarding point (1), should there even *be* such meetings? Concerning similar efforts in a past era, Pope Pius XI taught the following: "With this object congresses, meetings, and addresses are arranged, ... where all without distinction ... are invited to join in the discussion. Now, such efforts can meet

with no kind of approval among Catholics. *They presuppose the erroneous view that all religions are more or less good and praiseworthy ...* Those who hold such a view not only are in error; they distort the true idea of religion, and thus reject it, falling gradually into naturalism and atheism. To favour this opinion, therefore, and to encourage such undertakings is tantamount to abandoning the religion revealed by God" (encyclical *Mortalium Animos*; emphasis added). Not only the passage of the "Decree on Ecumenism" we quoted above, but the decree itself, *throughout and in its entirety*, does indeed quite clearly "presuppose the erroneous view that all religions are more or less good and praiseworthy. Numerous passages could be cited to show this. For example: "Moreover, some and even very many of the significant elements and endowments which together go to build up and give life to the Church itself, can exist outside the visible boundaries of the Catholic Church..."; the liturgical actions of non-Catholics "must be regarded as capable of giving access to the community of salvation"; "For the Spirit of Christ has not refrained from using them (separated Churches and Communities) *as a means of salvation ...*" (!); they have "truly Christian endowments"; etc., etc. If the Separated Churches *allegedly* have very many significant elements and endowments, etc.; if they *allegedly* are capable of giving access to the community of salvation; if they are even a "means of salvation" (*allegedly*); then it must be conceded that they are *at least* "more or less good and praiseworthy. " This notion--and it is the whole animus of the Decree on Ecumenism from start to finish--is in the words of Pius XI "erroneous," "distorts the true idea of religion," and it "is tantamount to abandoning the religion revealed by God."

Regarding points (2) and (3), namely, theological discussions on an equal footing, this teaching of Vatican II is *intrinsically wrong*. It is a crime against truth, it is contrary to reason, and it is a betrayal of Christ to allow His Church and His teachings to be placed on any sort of "equal footing" with error, heresy, and infidelity. Pope Leo XIII affirms that "it is contrary to reason that error and truth should have equal rights" (encyclical *Libertas Praestantissimum*). Moreover, the doctrine advanced by the Decree on Ecumenism is Naturalistic and Masonic, for as the same Pope Leo says: "It is held (by the Freemasons and the Naturalists) ... that in the various forms of religion there is no reason why one should have precedence of another; and that they are all to occupy the same place"; and again, "(The Freemasons) thereby teach the great error of this age... that all religions are alike. This manner of reasoning is calculated to bring about the ruin of all forms of religion, and especially of the Catholic religion, which, as it is the only one that is true, cannot, without great injustice, be regarded as merely equal to the other religions" (encyclical *Humanum Genus*). Equal footing??

Needless to say, the non-Catholics have no objection to "equal footing," for "they assert their readiness to treat with the Church of Rome, but on equal terms, as equals with an equal. But even if they could so treat, there seems little doubt that they would do so only on condition that no pact into which they might: enter

should compel them to retract those opinions which still keep them outside the one fold of Christ" (*Mortalium Animos*). Continuing, Pope Pius XI now explains the *essential* nature of this teaching expounded throughout *Mortalium Animos*: "This being so, it is clear that the Apostolic See can by no means take part in these assemblies, nor is it in any way lawful for Catholics to give such enterprises their encouragement or support. If they did so, they would be giving countenance to a false Christianity quite alien to the one Church of Christ. Shall we commit the iniquity of suffering the truth, the truth revealed by God, to be made a subject for compromise? FOR IT IS INDEED A QUESTION OF DEFENDING REVEALED TRUTH" (emphasis added). This new teaching of Vatican 11, therefore, is the exact reversal of an *essential* teaching of the Catholic Church which is related to revealed faith, for the teachings of Leo XIII and Pius XI, following what the Church had always held, are absolutely necessary for the safeguarding of faith. The Robber Church is *not* the Catholic Church.

Not only do they subvert doctrine, but in doing so they even employ the exact phraseology, verbatim, which the Church has condemned. Compare their words "equal footing" with the following teaching of Leo XIII: "The Church, indeed, deems it unlawful to place the various forms of divine worship on the same footing as the true religion" (encyclical *Immortale Dei*).

New Morality of "Ecumenism"

Next let us consider, using the Decree on Ecumenism as an example, how the new Ecumenical Church has reversed the teachings on *morals* of the true Catholic Church. According to Canon Law (c. 1258), worship in common with non-Catholics in any "active" manner is strictly and simply forbidden under pain of mortal sin. Such worship in common is called "*communicatio in sacris*." Every priest was taught, and it was dinned into his ears during his seminary days, that *communicatio in sacris* is absolutely forbidden, no "ifs, ands and buts," under pain of mortal sin; and all Catholics were aware, or certainly should have been aware, of this teaching. To understand fully and clearly the teaching on *communicatio in sacris* it is necessary to grasp the distinction between *active* and *passive* cooperation in non-Catholic worship.

Merely material presence, or *passive* cooperation, is (under Canon Law 1258, par. 2) *only tolerated*, and it is tolerated provided that (1) there is a grave reason for being physically present at a non-Catholic service; (2) in cases of doubt whether such gravity exists the bishop must give his approval; and (3) by being present at a non-Catholic service there is no danger that the Catholic will give scandal or that his own faith will be perverted. Considering these aforesaid stipulations, it is clear that the mind of the Church is to discourage even passive cooperation. As regards passive cooperation, moreover, in order to fulfill the

necessary conditions for it a person may not join in any positive act of worship whatsoever and he must abstain from any positive action. It is evident that even "passive" cooperation very well might be a danger to some Catholics. "*Canon Law*," a text by Bouscaren and Ellis (one of the best commentaries on Canon Law available), says on p. 704: "It is conceivable that even merely passive presence might be accompanied by an internal intention to approve, assent to, or encourage the non-Catholic worship; if that were true it would be *formal cooperation in an evil act, and forbidden by the natural law*" (emphasis added).

If, besides being physically present, a Catholic placed *any positive act of worship whatsoever* in common with the non-Catholics, such an act would be *active cooperation*. This is the meaning of "*communicatio in sacris*." *Communicatio in sacris* is mortally sinful because it is "formal cooperation in an evil act and forbidden by the natural law." Consider the currently widespread so-called "interfaith" activities, visiting Protestant churches and Jewish synagogues, exchanging ministers, etc. To claim that these activities fall under "passive cooperation" would be an outright lie. Least of all is there a "grave reason" for them, least of all is there "no danger of perversion or of scandal." Verily the only one of the three conditions required by canon law that is literally fulfilled is that often the bishop approves of them!

Here is a good example. The 'Parish News Report' of St. Aloysius Church in Palo Alto, California (Jan. 1971) reads: "In honor of the Church Unity Octave the Mass (on Jan. 24th) will have an ecumenical emphasis. Our neighbors across the street from Wesley Methodist Church have been invited to attend and their minister, Rev. Bob Schlager, will participate in the service by saying a few words before the end of the Mass. On the following Sunday, January 31st, our parish community has been invited to *join in* the 11:00 A.M. service at Wesley Methodist. Father McGuinness will address the congregation during the service." Does this sound like "passive" cooperation? "To join in the 11:00 A.M. service at Wesley Methodist"?? When a Catholic priest "addresses" a Protestant congregation "during the service," is it merely "passive"?? This example, which is in my local area, is multiplied every week and everywhere. All such "ecumenical" and "interfaith" activities are *active participation*, they fall under *communicatio in sacris*, and they are mortally sinful, being the formal cooperation in an evil act and forbidden by the natural law.

All of this is not only permitted but encouraged by Vatican 11. In the Decree on Ecumenism we read: "Yet worship in common [*communicatio in sacris* is the exact phraseology used here in the Latin text of this decree] is not to be considered as a means to be used indiscriminately for the restoration of Christian unity. There are two main principles governing the practice of such common worship (*communicatio in sacris*): first, the bearing witness to the unity of the Church, and second, the sharing in the means of grace." Elsewhere in this same decree, referring specifically to the Orthodox schismatic communities, Vatican 11 urges: "Therefore some worship in common (*communicatio in sacris*), given

suitable circumstances and the approval of the Church authority [the Robber Church, that is], is not only possible but to be encouraged."

How does one "bear witness to the unity of the Church" -- that is, the *unity* of the *Catholic* Church -- by worshipping at a non-Catholic service? How does one "share in the means of grace" by participating in an assembly that rejects all the ordinary channels of grace given us by Christ? How does a Catholic "share in the means of grace" by committing an act forbidden by the natural law; i.e., formal cooperation in an evil act? How, in fine, does one "share in the means of grace" by committing a mortal sin? "For we are bound absolutely," says Pope Leo XIII, "to worship God in that way which He has shown to be His will" (*Immortale Dei*).

There it is. Do not try to tell us that nothing essential has changed, that the "essence" of the Catholic Church remains in the Robber Church. Do not say that the precepts of morality, the definitions of what is a sin and what is not a sin, have not been changed. The new doctrines proposed for belief and the new "code of morality" openly conflict with those of the true Catholic Church. The new Ecumenical Church is to the true Catholic Church as 4 is to .

Some Elementary Logic

One fundamental premise we must accept is that the Catholic Church absolutely cannot be guilty, ever, of self-contradiction in regard to any teaching on faith or morals, or any of its teachings so related to faith or morals that it is necessary for the safeguarding of them. One clear fact is that the Decree on Ecumenism -- which is only one of many possible examples that could be cited -- subverts, or overthrows, the teachings of the Catholic Church. Therefore, the conclusion that one *must* draw is that Vatican 11 and the whole new Ecumenical Church it unveiled are in no way part of or identical with the true Catholic Church. Somehow, nevertheless, we are expected to accept it as a matter of fact that the Holy Ghost was there watching over the deliberations and decisions of Vatican 11. The very same Holy Ghost Who has always guided and enlightened and sanctified His Church? The same Holy Ghost Who directed His earlier Sovereign Pontiffs -- e.g., Leo XIII, Pius XI, etc. -- to teach and proclaim precisely the contrary to what Vatican 11 teaches and proclaims?? Tell us, does the Holy Ghost change His mind?

God *permitted* Vatican 11, nothing more! To aver that the Holy Ghost guided its decisions would be as blasphemous as to aver that He guided and inspired the Protestant Revolt. The Author of Truth cannot author nor inspire deceit, confusion, and least of all, He cannot assist in mapping out the actual program for the destruction of His Holy Church! These are the fruits of Vatican 11.

Many loyal and true Catholics find a dilemma in Vatican 11. It is like an ugly duckling, or an incorrigible, disobedient child. In all their sincerity and with all their studious efforts they cannot reconcile its teachings with the true teachings they have always known; but, because they honestly think that "somehow" or "in some way" Vatican II was the work of the Holy Ghost, they try to accept its teachings, or, if worst comes to worst, ignore them, but they do not see how they can reject them outright. Just precisely how Vatican 11 squares with orthodox Catholicism they cannot fathom; it is a "mystery" for them, but they accept the theory that it does square with it.

The Council of Basle (1431-1449) has long been regarded as something of an enigma (see, for example, the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, v. 2, p.334). Whether or not it is to be considered as a general, or ecumenical, council "has been often warmly discussed" (*Cath. Encyc., loc. cit.*). Some reckon the entire council, from beginning to end, as genuine. Some hold that it was a true ecumenical council up until the Bull of Pope Eugene IV appeared, transferring it to Ferrara (Sept. 18, 1437). And some others reject it altogether and claim that in no sense was it, or any part of it, a true ecumenical council. Among these latter we may include St. Robert Bellarmine. He rejected the Council of Basle, whole and entire, because (among other reasons) of the "subsequent rebellious attitude" of the Council Fathers in face of the papal decrees attempting to close the Council. Because of this *subsequent* rebellion (a visible fruit of the attitude of the Council Fathers), St. Robert applied a principle of retroaction and deemed null and void the status of Basle as a true general council. This is not the opinion of an "amateur theologian"; it will be recalled that upon St. Robert Bellarmine the Church has bestowed the rare honor associated with the title "Doctor of the Church."

As mentioned earlier, there are many true and loyal Catholics who are looking for a way out -- an honest and orthodox way out, consonant with the teaching of the Church --, but, try as they may, they are unable to find any so-called "legitimate grounds" for rejecting Vatican II. Hence they try to "live with" the doctrine of Vatican 11, becoming more confused and almost schizophrenic day by day. Really there should be no problem about this. Following the spirit of St. Robert Bellarmine and applying similar principles, one should reject Vatican 11 *for the plain and simple reason that it erred*. This is wholly consonant with the teaching of the Church. Either Vatican 11 erred or the Catholic Church prior to 1962 erred. The rebellion at Vatican 11 was not merely "subsequent," because this rebellion of the instigators and founders of the Robber Church was present from the day the Council opened. However, there has been plenty of *subsequent* rebellion in the entire flock, from the highest to the lowest, which is, as it were, circumstantial evidence. We have Christ's own word for it that a good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, nor an evil tree good fruit. By its fruits is Vatican 11 known.

Studied Defiance

Seemingly the Robber Church has a carefully thought out plan, or a studied effort, to do the following. (1) Introduce just precisely those very practices that have already been explicitly condemned or rejected by the Church in the past. (2) Offer the very same specious arguments and pretexts for innovations that have already in the past been refuted by the Church, and which She has exposed and rejected as rash, false, subversive, etc. (3) Change those very things that have always been held to be absolutely unchangeable (e.g., the Canon of the Mass -- the word 'canon' comes from the Greek word meaning a rigid rod or rule; hence something firm and unchangeable). (4) Teach identically the same erroneous and poisonous doctrines that the Church has repeatedly condemned as actual heresy, or bordering on heresy, or favorable to the heretics, etc.

Adequately illustrating this studied defiance is the use by the Decree on Ecumenism, of the phraseology "equal footing," which flouts *to the letter* the teaching of Pope Leo XIII which declares unlawful the placing of non-Catholic sects "on the same footing" as the true Church. In explaining a practice strictly forbidden under pain of mortal sin Canon Law uses the phrase *communicatio in sacris*. And "*communicatio in sacris*" is the precise wording used by Vatican II in describing the worship in common with non-Catholics that is "to be encouraged." Similarly, the words "for all men" were expressly singled out by the *Roman Catechism* as a forbidden substitute for the words "for many" in the form for the Consecration of the Precious Blood. Yes, the Robber Church makes it a point to violate not only the spirit of the law, but, indeed, whenever and wherever possible its very letter! The following illustration of this penchant is particularly striking.

"*The Southern Cross*" (the official newspaper which is "sponsored by the South African Catholic Hierarchy," to quote the credentials it claims), in its issue of July 9, 1969, carried an article under the full-width banner headline: "*Anglican islanders may share Catholic Eucharist*". Dated Suva, Fiji, the article reads as follows: "In the Fiji and Gilbert Islands, permission has been granted for Anglicans to receive Communion in Catholic churches, in accord with the 1967 Directory on Ecumenism issued by the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity. The conditions for this are that the non-Catholic asks spontaneously for Communion, that he expresses a faith in the Eucharist in accord with the Roman Church, and that his own minister is unavailable for long periods." Note well that of the three conditions prescribed, the only *theological* one (sandwiched in between two "smokescreen" conditions) is "that he *expresses faith in the Eucharist...*" Nothing is said about the Anglicans' accepting whole and entire the Catholic Faith. Nothing is said about requiring that the Anglicans be in the state of grace before receiving "Communion." No, not a word about the necessity of the proper state of the soul of the recipient, sacramental confession, etc. (as if the Robber Church would ask Anglicans to go to confession!).

Now, I say that if someone were on the lookout for an easy and quick way to incur *ipso facto* excommunication from the Catholic Church, he could not do

better than the "Church" in the Fiji and Gilbert Islands has done. All the members of its hierarchy, clergy, and laity who knowingly and willingly even so much as subscribe to or agree with the aforementioned ruling concerning Anglicans are, in very truth, excommunicated. The holy *Council of Trent*, in its session 13, prescribed the following solemn condemnation:

"Canon 11. If anyone says that faith alone is sufficient preparation for receiving the sacrament of the most Holy Eucharist: let him be anathema. And lest so great a sacrament be received unworthily, and therefore unto death and condemnation, this holy Council ordains and declares that sacramental confession, when a confessor can be had, must necessarily be made beforehand by those whose conscience is burdened with mortal sin, however contrite they may consider themselves. Moreover, if anyone shall presume to teach, preach, or obstinately assert the contrary, or in public disputation shall even presume to defend the contrary, by that fact itself he is excommunicated" (emphasis added).

Where can anyone find stronger terms, or more explicit ones, than those embodied in this solemn anathema? It asks no questions; it does not concern itself whether or not someone asks "spontaneously" for the Holy Eucharist; scarcely does it worry whether or not some heretical minister is "unavailable for long periods" for his erring followers. On the contrary, with the full weight of an infallible general council it declares that if anyone *even presumes to defend* the thesis that faith alone is sufficient preparation for receiving the Holy Eucharist. - then such a person is *ipso facto*, on the spot, excommunicated from the Mystical Body of Christ.

Do you wish to dispute the above claim that the "Church" in the Fiji and Gilbert Islands, virtually *in toto*, is at present excommunicated? Very well, then, but -- mark this well! --you will be treading on perilous ground. For if, in your disputation, you somehow, in some way, end up defending the position that "faith alone is sufficient....," you will yourself fall under the selfsame ban of excommunication.

Returning to "Primitive Practices"

In his book, "The Council in Action," Hans Küng argues for the necessity "to go back to the very oldest of the Church's traditions" in reforming the liturgy, and he talks about modeling the new "reformed" liturgy along the lines of the "earliest Roman Rite." These clichés about returning to "primitive rites" and "primitive customs," and restoring the Church to its "pristine purity," etc., are obviously quite useful to the Robber Church, for they parrot and repeat them incessantly. These particular clichés have distinct advantages for the Innovators. In the first place, these "primitive customs" are necessarily cloaked in a degree of obscurity. That is to say, only the "very learned" and those on the "inside" know all about them. The average man has no way to check whether such "primitive customs"

are authentic or prefabricated. Furthermore, this line of argument surely sounds plausible, doesn't it? If nothing else, it surely should satisfy the needs of the traditionalist -- this "pristine, primitive" business -- shouldn't it?

This gimmick serves as a soporific. The simpletons sleepily nod their approval while the gangsters go about deftly mangling and mutilating the liturgy. In truth the only thing "primitive" about the whole business lies in the fact that *the use of this particular pretext* is a very primitive custom among heretics! In the 16th century, Cranmer and his accomplices employed this very same pretext in order to sell the idea of the new "Church of England" to the simple folk. Needless to say, -- and this illustrates our point once again -- the Church has already long ago refuted and exposed this artifice. Referring to the 16th-century Cranmerites, Pope Leo XIII had this to say: "They knew only too well the intimate bond which unites faith with worship, 'the law of belief with the law of prayer', and so, under the pretext of restoring it to its primitive form, they corrupted the order of the liturgy in many ways, to adapt it to the errors of the Innovators" (bull *Apostolicae Curae*).

Likewise the Synod of Pistoia (an 18th-century council of Jansenists and sympathizers, the decrees of which were condemned by Pius VI) made abundant use of such phrases as: "clinging to ancient rules," "in accordance with ancient customs," "it would be against apostolic practice" to do such and such, "happy days of the early Church," etc. It is almost axiomatic: whenever organized subversives plan to lay their vile hands on the Sacred Liturgy, you can count on them to haul out beforehand this old cliché about "primitive rites and customs," and polish it up in all its pristine purity.

Not only did Pope Leo XIII expose this cliché (in *Apostolicae Curae*, as quoted above), but also, more recently, Pope Pius XII in his encyclical *Mediator Dei* condemned liturgical archaism, that is, "the mania for restoring primitive usages in the liturgy." "The desire," he adds, "to restore everything indiscriminately to its ancient condition is neither wise nor praiseworthy."

Frequently the clichés of the Robber Church come in pairs, one member of the pair exactly contradicting the other. Thus the cliché about: "primitive practices" has its counterpart (its contradiction) in the one that jabbars about "updating," "aggiornamento," "adjusting the Church to the modern world," "streamlining," etc. How in the world can one constantly "update" and "adjust the Church to the modern world" at the very same time that he is hellbent upon returning to the primitive? But enough! One should not expect to find consistent speech from liars.

In its 'General Instructions' accompanying its "New Order of the Mass," the Robber Church specifies that it will now use red vestments on Passion Sunday and on Good Friday (see #308b). The now-famous "Commentary on the New order," written by a group of erudite Roman theologians, refers to this as "an

unthinkable innovation, which can only be disastrous psychologically ... (Good Friday) thus becomes as the commemoration of any martyr, instead of the Church's day of mourning for her Founder." Whereas black has always been the customary color associated with mourning, and hence black vestments were always used on Good Friday, red in the customary usage of the Church denotes rejoicing. Red is used on Pentecost Sunday and on the feastdays of martyrs. In that martyrdom is considered among the choicest blessings God bestows, the heavenly birthdays of those who earn the palm of martyrdom are special occasions of joy. Never is red associated with mourning, fasting, and penance. Thus at the commencement of a season of joy, feasting and merrymaking -- that is, on the days immediately following Christmas -- the Church celebrates, the feastdays of the following martyrs: St. Stephen (the 26th), the Holy Innocents (the 28th) , St. Thomas Becket (the 29th) . Considering the connection between the liturgical use of red and the spirit of rejoicing, the Robber Church's decision to use red vestments on Good Friday would indeed seem to hearken back to a certain "primitive practice." Those depraved heretics, the utterly perverse Albigenes, had the custom of holding banquets on Good Friday.

"Simplicity of Rites"

"The rites should be distinguished by a noble *simplicity*: they should be short, clear and unencumbered by useless repetitions; they should be within the people's powers of comprehension, and normally should not require much explanation" (Vatican II's *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*). "For this purpose the rites are to be *simplified*, while due care is taken to preserve their substance. Elements which, with the passage of time, came to be duplicated, or were added with but little advantage, are now to be discarded. Where opportunity allows or necessity demands, other elements which have suffered injury through accidents of history are now to be restored to the *earlier norm* of the holy Fathers" (Vatican II *ibid.*) "In order that the liturgical service may exhibit a noble *simplicity* in harmony with the mentality of our times ... " (*Instruction on the Liturgy*, issued by the Sacred Congregation of Rites, Oct. 16, 1964).

The lack of originality of the Robber Church is remarkable! This plea for "simplicity" is the same identical old ruse used by the Jansenists at Pistoia, when they attempted to get rid of Latin in the liturgy and "vernacularize" everything. One proposition of this Synod of Pistoia demanded "recalling it (the liturgy) to a greater *simplicity of rites*, by expressing it in the vernacular language, by uttering it in a loud voice." In this constitution *Auctorem Fidei* (Aug. 28, 1794), Pope Pius VI *condemned this very proposition* as "rash, offensive to pious ears, insulting to the Church, favorable to the charges of heretics against it" (sec. 6). Regarding this particular Jansenist proposition, the same *Auctorem Fidei* says: "As if the present order of the liturgy, received and approved by the Church, had emanated in some part from the forgetfulness of the principles by which it should be regulated ..." !! (sec. 6). To Vatican 11, in like manner, we should say: "As if the sacred liturgy, received and approved by the Church, is unclear and encumbered

by useless repetitions; as if it is not within the people's power of comprehension; as if it contained elements that had but little advantage -- *Anathema sit!*"

"The proposition (of the Synod of Pistoia)," says the same *Auctorem Fidei* of Pius VI, "asserting that 'it would be against apostolic practice and the plans of God., unless easier ways were prepared for the people to unite their voice with that of the whole Church'; if this be understood to signify the introduction of the use of the vernacular language into the liturgical prayers, it is condemned as false, rash, disturbing to the order prescribed for the celebration of the mysteries, easily productive of many evils" (sec. 24).

Undoubtedly the reader is by now beginning to understand what I meant when I said earlier that the new Robber Church has a penchant, a studied effort, for (1) introducing precisely the same subversive practices already condemned, and (2) offering exactly the same platitudes, arguments and phony pretexts for innovations that the Holy Church has already exposed as mere artifices and devices which heretics are wont to employ.

This clarion call for so-called "simplicity" is contradicted in the very practices of the Robber Church. The priest (that is to say, the "minister" or "presider") now needs half a dozen books, inserts, lectionaries, pamphlets ' etc. to perform his celebration. Whereas there was at one time -- from time immemorial, that is -- one Canon of the Mass, now there are four so-called "Eucharistic prayers." A recent Vatican "Guidelines for Liturgical Renewal" boasts of "34 mass formularies." The Mass used to consist of two parts, in a broad sense, namely, the Mass of the Catechumens and the Mass of the Faithful; the new liturgy is divided into what is termed "four parts." Now there are three *kinds* of masses: (1) with a congregation, (2) concelebrated, and (3) without a congregation. (There are also other kinds: those with guitars and bongos, those with dancing nuns, etc.) In keeping with the Vatican 11 prescription; "and normally should not require much explanation," the "General Instructions" for using the new missal take up a full 58-page book! All very simple.

THE ROBBER CHURCH

(Part 2)

The Law of "Little by Little"

Veteran revolutionaries and conspirators know that the law of life is the law of gradualism. Sudden, unexpected and radical changes are never accepted willingly by "the people." The only reliable technique, psychologically, -- that is, short of physical violence -- is that of "little by little," starting with the foot in the door. Prior to the enforcement of some drastic change there are nearly always

some minor and related changes leading up to it. Often some hints and suggestions, made publicly, concerning the possibility of the intended change serve as a sounding board, and these are known as "trial balloons." The theory is to "send it up" and see whether or not anyone bothers to shoot at it. This determines the pulse of - "the people" or the "trend of public opinion," and if there is no shooting at the trial balloon then it is considered safe to go ahead with the innovation. After all has been accomplished and a respectable waiting period has been observed, candid remarks can be made, such as that of Cardinal Heenan's: "If all the changes had been introduced together you would have been shocked." (*The Tablet*, London, Oct. 11, 1969, p.1010).

A valuable feature of this technique of gradualism is that at each new step a certain precedent is established, one which at a later time can be referred to as a support for the more advanced changes. Thus, after the *serious* and *invalidating* mutilations of the Mass had already been made, it was of no avail to point out to the "new robbers" the decree *Quo Primum* or to insist upon the unchangeable nature of the Canon of the Mass, for they could readily refer to good Pope John who, by personally inserting the name of St. Joseph in the Canon had been the very first person ever to change it. This argument, of course, is supposed to be "unanswerable."

Planned confusion is part of the program of the Robber Church. Nowadays, in truth, no one of the bamboozled "People of God" knows what to expect next. The conditioning for change has been so thorough that "the people" will accept anything. A major success of the Robber Church, one achieved quite early in the game, was to accustom the "People of God" to the idea of "the mystery" of the Church, a Church in flux, a Church always changing to adapt itself to the needs of the "modern world," a Church on the move. Why do you think we hear so often the words "*Pilgrim* Church"? What, after all, is the definition of *pilgrim*? The continual journeying after novelties is the mark of a frivolous mind, but at this point even among the erstwhile more solid and faithful members of the "People of God" the itch for change has spread like a most contagious infection. The Robber Church banked on this happening, so that with the passage of time the potential opposition would be kept to a minimum. The program, viewed as a whole, is geared to condition the entire Church, from the highest ranking prelate to the lowliest layperson, to accept the brand new Church, no questions asked. Call it what you will: the Robber Church, the Ecumenical Church, the WCC, the Universal Church of "Operation '76," etc. Regardless of its name, it is the apostate Church of Antichrist. This is what St. Pius X warned of and foretold: "Their real aims, their plots, the line they are following are well known to all of you, ... What they propose is a UNIVERSAL APOSTASY, worse still than the one which threatened the century of Charles (Borromeo), worse from the fact that it creeps insidious and hidden in the very veins of the Church ... (O)f both revolts the ways are hidden and darksome... Truly a spectacle full of sadness for the present and of menace for the future." (Encyclical *Editae Saepe*, 1910).

Living daily in this chaotic "anything goes" atmosphere, a person's perceptual powers get dimmed, so that eventually the obfuscated mind simply cannot discern legitimate change from illegitimate change. (Of course, there is also most probably a certain failure to cooperate with grace.) Admittedly, many of the robbers' changes were, strictly speaking, legitimate; that is, the true Church would have had the power and the right to make them. However, the true Church, guided and enlightened by the Holy Ghost, would never have actually attempted such suicide. Few today, among the hierarchy and the clergy, can distinguish -- or care to distinguish, for it is "academic" -- between those things which the Catholic Church has the power to change and those things which even the Church and the Pope are forbidden to touch, for example, the substance of the Sacraments (see *Has The Church The Right?* by P.H. Omlor). Later on in the future -- this is coming, for the omens are unmistakable clear--the "Catholic Church" will join the World Council of Churches. The time was, not too long ago, when every Catholic would have understood that such is impossible and is tantamount to apostasy. All those of the "People of God" who, when the time comes, have not yet realized the existence and true nature of the Robber Church will be led, unwittingly or not, on to the path of universal apostasy foretold by St. Pius X. For it will not be and *cannot* be the true Catholic Church which will be joining or "working with" the World Council of Churches.

It is important in the plans of the Robber Church to make it *seem* as though the Catholic Church has contradicted Herself, and then to treat this lightly, as if such contradictions are normal, routine and to be expected. That the true Catholic Church *cannot* contradict Herself can not be repeated too often. In these instances of "contradiction" what is really happening is that the Robber Church is at it again, laying waste to Catholicism; of course, this is what the game is all about. In all of this, what is perhaps the gravest danger to many Catholics is their failure to recognize that it is the Robber Church which is contradicting the true Church, and not at all a case of self-contradiction. But, when it *seems* to them that the Church is reversing Herself continually, this alone tends to shake and seriously undermine their faith.

The Official Policy Is: Insanity

Father John Courtney Murray, S.J. (now deceased) was a notable expert at Vatican II, and, specifically, it was the Decree on Religious Freedom upon which he exercised his talents and influence to their fullest. As *peritus* and insider at Vatican II, especially as regards this decree, Fr. Murray is most capable of giving us some valuable insights. In his commentary on this decree (pp.672-4 of *The Documents of Vatican II*. Gen. Editor W. M. Abbott, S.J.), Father Murray admits, implicitly at least, that this decree conflicts with the existing doctrine of the Catholic Church. He claims, first of all, that this decree's "content is properly doctrinal," and then he apologizes thus. "In all honesty it must be admitted that the Church is late in acknowledging the validity of the principle (of religious freedom)." The Church "is late" on this simply because it wasn't until just fairly

lately that the subversives gained sufficient power to start calling the signals. "In any event," he continues, "the document is a significant event in the history of the Church. It was, of course, the most controversial document of the whole Council, largely because it raised with sharp emphasis the issue that lay continually below the surface of all the conciliar debates -- the issue of the development of doctrine." Does it need pointing out that in the Robbers' argot the "development" of doctrine means the corrupting of it? "The notion of development," states Fr. Murray, "not the notion of religious freedom, was the real sticking-point for many of those who opposed the Declaration even to the end."

Sticking-point indeed! So openly and flagrantly in opposition to the teachings promulgated by His Holiness Pius IX is this decree, that in "Progressive" circles it came to be known as "the de-Stalinization of Pius IX." Though typically irreverent, this label is wholly accurate, because it is impossible to reconcile the doctrine in this document with the *Syllabus of Errors* of Pope Pius IX or with his encyclical *Quanta Cura*. The "development" of doctrine here amounts to a change in course of a full 180°. Father John Courtney Murray, the *peritus*, the insider on this particular decree, now admits (p.673) that: "The course of the development between the *Syllabus of Errors* (1864) and *Dignitatis Humanae Personae* (i. e., Decree on Religious Liberty) STILL REMAINS TO BE EXPLAINED BY THEOLOGIANs (emphasis added)." "Theologians" will succeed in explaining a 180° turn as a "development," and get away with it, only when the whole world will have gone insane.

Let us investigate just one of these "real sticking-points." In *Quanta Cura* (Dec.8, 1864), the Supreme Teacher Pius IX declared: "And, from this wholly false idea of social organization they do not fear to foster that erroneous opinion, especially fatal to the Catholic Church and to the salvation of souls, called by our predecessor of recent memory, Gregory XVI, *insanity*; namely, that 'liberty of conscience and worship is the proper right of every man, and should be proclaimed and asserted by law in every correctly established society...'" "The Synod further declares," --and now we are quoting Vatican II's Decree on Religious Liberty-- "that the right to religious freedom has its foundation in the very dignity of the human person... This right of the human person to religious freedom is to be recognized in the constitutional law whereby society is governed. Thus it is to become a civil right."

And so, the Robber Church through Vatican II formally teaches that the right to religious freedom "is to be *recognized in the constitutional law* whereby society is governed." Diametrically opposed is the Catholic Church, which, through Her Supreme Pontiff Pius IX (who cited his predecessor Gregory XVI), declares that to hold that liberty of worship "should be *proclaimed and asserted by law*" is INSANITY! This opinion, moreover, is "especially fatal to the Catholic Church and to the salvation of souls." As a result, the officially stated policy of the Robber church is clearly insane. "We now submit this text for your consideration," said Bishop Emile De Smedt in introducing this Decree. "It is evident that certain

quotations from the Popes, because of a difference of words, can be put in opposition to our schema. ... The whole world is waiting for this decree... this liberating doctrine on religious liberty!" (Speech Nov.19, 1963).

Newspeak: The Official Language

Speaking and writing with studied ambiguity and with deliberate vagueness is a trademark of Masonic publications and utterances. The "Universal Declaration of Human Rights," drafted by the United Nations and adopted in 1948, had as its prototype and model the "Declaration of the Rights of Man" of 1789, which laid down for France its Masonic, Naturalistic (and ultimately atheistic) philosophy and principles of society. (It is not our present purpose to go into the nightmare of bloody horrors, blasphemies, immorality and utter Godlessness -- all stemming from such principles -- that the French Revolution was.) Referring to this last-mentioned document, Father Denis Fahey remarks: "Of course, there is a certain vagueness about some of the formulae. This is a well-known Masonic trick to deceive the unwary." --(*The Mystical Body of Christ in the Modern World*, p.44). When such ambiguous and vague language is employed systematically, as is the case with the Freemasons and also in the official decrees and pronouncements of the Robber Church the result can be appropriately called *Newspeak* (to borrow a term from novelist George Orwell). Just as Latin is the universal language of the Catholic Church, Newspeak is the universal language of the Robber Church.

A singular advantage of Newspeak is that it is readily spoken in English, French, Spanish or German etc., (i.e., in any of the standard languages), and thus it is fitly called a universal language. Often the hearer of Newspeak is misled into thinking he actually understands what is being said, but nobody really understands Newspeak. Or, perhaps it is more correct to say that *everybody* in a way "understands" it, for Newspeak says all "good things" to all men. So masterfully ambiguous is it, that men of the most varied, even diametrically opposed, opinions can read or hear exactly the same thing in Newspeak, and all be completely pleased. That is why not only Catholics, but also Protestants, Masons, Unitarians, Jews (and probably even the pagan Pygmies of Africa too) *all* are able, immediately, to find the decrees of Vatican II, for example, completely wonderful and meaningful and relevant. Such is the awe-inspiring nature of Newspeak. It is a breakthrough in "ecumenism." Probably everyone who is reading this can think of some friend or acquaintance who, for the most part, is "solid" and orthodox, but who, somewhere along the line, has run afoul of Newspeak and "understood" it, and is therefore now all mixed up on certain things. Such is the dangerous nature of Newspeak.

We define "Newspeak in action" as the *saying* of one thing followed, as soon as possible by the *doing* of its exact opposite. Pope John XXIII in his opening speech at Vatican II spoke about honoring the Council of Trent and changing nothing: "... the renewed, serene, and tranquil adherence to all the teaching of

the Church in its entirety and preciseness, as it still shines forth in the Acts of the Council of Trent and the First Vatican Council." We have all witnessed how the "teaching of the Church in its entirety" was so valorously upheld in the Vatican II decisions, and in what great esteem the Council of Trent was, and is, held by the Robber Church. Their Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy actually had the effrontery to speak about "preserving Latin," while the Robbers knew full well that the decision had already been signed, sealed and delivered to see to it that it would be preserved, at best, only in Mason jars.

If one studies carefully the decrees of Vatican II he will observe the facile manner in which two principal techniques of Newspeak are used. These are the "*suppressio veri*" and the "*suggestio falsi*." (Father George Duggan, S. M., explains these tricks in his book *Hans Kueng and Reunion*.) *Suppressio veri*, the suppression of the truth, involves the stating of something which, if taken exactly literally, is in itself true (and cannot be challenged on this score), but at the same time an important and essential aspect or part of the picture is suppressed. In ordinary everyday parlance this is known as the "half truth."

In *suggestio falsi* something which is *not* true (i.e., an actual falsehood) is suggested or implied, but the falsehood is not actually stated. The Decree on Ecumenism is replete with the *suggestio falsi*. The following passage from this Decree will suffice to illustrate the *suggestio falsi*; "Christ summons the Church, as she goes her pilgrim way, to that continual reformation of which she always has need, insofar as she is an institution of men here on earth. Therefore, if the influence of events or of the times has led to deficiencies in conduct, in Church discipline, or even in the formulation of doctrine (which must be carefully distinguished from the deposit of faith itself), these should be appropriately rectified at the proper moment." This does not claim that there have been such deficiencies, but it suggests, falsely, that there might have been. "If," it says, *if* such deficiencies have existed "these should be appropriately rectified." Even the "Liberal" Father Walter Abbott, commenting on this sentence (*op. cit.*, P-350), rubs his eyes in astonishment: "It is remarkable, indeed, for an Ecumenical Council to admit the possible deficiency of previous doctrinal formulations." Would a genuine Council, aided by the Holy Ghost, ever say anything of the kind, namely, that Holy Mother Church might have been *deficient in the formulation of doctrine*?

"Doing Something" for St. Joseph

On December 8, 1962, through the influence of the then nascent Robber Church, the Canon of the Mass, the ancient Roman Canon, was officially destroyed. With the insertion of the name of St. Joseph into it, a change which went into effect on that day, the "Canon" of the Mass ceased to be a canon. Derived from a Greek word meaning a *rigid rod* or rule, *kanon*, it is a thing, inflexible and unchangeable. By definition, therefore, the Canon of the Mass is unchangeable. Due to the emphasis many of us have recently placed upon the decree *Quo Primum* (1570)

of Pope St. Pius V, which decree forbade *in perpetuity* any additions or changes whatsoever in the Roman Missal, under the penalty of incurring "the wrath of Almighty God, and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul," there are some who now harbor the incorrect notion that the Roman Canon dates only from the year of *Quo Primum*, 1570. In truth this Canon, which St. Pius V took the formidable measures of *Quo Primum* to protect from change, actually is substantially the same as that used by the Roman (or Western) Church *from the very beginning*; that is to say, it quite probably dates from apostolic times. It is believed that St. Gregory the Great (died A.D. 604) perhaps rearranged the order of certain prayers in the Canon; and this much is an absolute certainty: "Since the seventh century our Canon has remained unchanged." (*Cath. Encyc.*, v.III, p.256). In *The Question of Anglican Ordinations Discussed* (London, Burns & Oates, 1873), the esteemed author E. E. Estcourt, then the canon of St. Chad's Cathedral, Birmingham, gives the following account:

"What, then, is the Canon of the Mass? and what claims has it on our respect? Let us hear Sir William Palmer, as a writer whose testimony is beyond suspicion. After stating various facts and arguments on the subject, he says: 'Combining these circumstances together, there seems nothing unreasonable in thinking that the Roman liturgy, as used in the time of Gregory the Great, may have existed from a period of the most remote antiquity; and perhaps there are nearly as good reasons for referring its original composition to the Apostolic age, as there are in the case of the great Oriental liturgy.'

"The care taken to preserve the Canon in its original authentic form we learn from other writers. 'In ancient times,' says Muratori, 'although the liturgy of the Roman Mass was observed generally in the churches of Italy, France, Germany, Britain, and other countries, yet there was no small variety in their Missals; but this did not affect the substance of the mystery, or the chief and essential rites of the Mass. The difference ran in adding collects, sequences, and special feasts, which each Bishop might insert in his own missal. *But to change the sacred words of the Canon was a crime.*' By the laws of Charlemagne it was ordered that only men of full age should be employed to transcribe it; and the Councils of York and Oxford in the twelfth century decreed that the Archdeacon should examine in every church whether there were errors or defects in the Canon, either by the faults of transcribers or the books being old. Always too the Canon was written in different and larger characters than the rest, and sometimes in gold letters throughout, as an offering of reverence." (End of the quotation from Estcourt, pp. 279-280, emphasis added.)

Since the apostolic origin of the Roman Canon is not a *proven* fact, let us consider only that period of history during which we are absolutely certain that it underwent no change whatever, not even a rearrangement of the prayers, namely, from the year 604 until the year 1962. From the time of Pope St. Gregory I up to the time of John XXIII there were one hundred ninety-seven (197) validly chosen sovereign pontiffs. Of these, twenty-three are venerated as saints

and at least another five have been beatified. Neglecting the *possible* exceptions of some *very* few of these 197 popes who might *possibly* have been a little less than devout, we can safely claim that they all had a genuine devotion to St. Joseph, the chaste spouse of the Mother of God. Some of these popes bestowed signal honors upon St. Joseph. For example: Pope Gregory XV extended his feast to the universal Church; Pius IX in 1870 proclaimed him Protector of the universal Church; in 1937 the encyclical *Divini Redemptoris*, explaining and condemning Communism, was issued by Pope Pius XI on March 19th, the feastday of St. Joseph, and in its concluding paragraphs the Pontiff said: "We place the vast campaign of the Church against world Communism under the standard of St. Joseph, her mighty Protector." As a spiritual counter-move against the hallowed May Day of the Communists, a "feastday" they inherited directly from the conspiratorial illuminati (see *Encyc. Britannica*, vol.xiv, p.320, 11th ed.), Pope Pius XII instituted on May 1st the feast of St. Joseph the Workman.

As devoted to St. Joseph as were these 197 popes of this period spanning 1358 years (fully 70% of the total lifetime of the Church thus far!), not one of them ever so much as dreamed of "honoring" him by laying hands on the sacred immutable Canon of the Mass. In point of fact -- and this is history -- in the year 1815 there was indeed a short-lived movement afoot which attempted to get the name of St. Joseph inserted into the Canon. This attempt (the first ancestor of the same identical movement *circa* 1962, which turned out to be successful), needless to say, was doomed to failure under the vigilant eyes of Pope Pius VII. In an 'Urbis et Orbis' decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, dated Sept. 16, 1815, the request was tersely and officially denied: "Negative quoad additionem nominis S. Josephi Sponsi B.M.V. in Canone." (See p.66, V.III, of Gardellini's compilation, 1857, #4520.) On the eve of the Vatican Council (1870) the same campaign was once again renewed, and once again the vigilant Shepherd of Rome (this time it was Pius IX) turned thumbs down on it. Apparently these earlier popes understood not only the meaning of the word *canon*, but also the awful warning of *Quo Primum*. And they also doubtlessly were not ignorant of how the conspiring enemies of the Church will often utilize seemingly "good" causes as opening wedges to attain, ultimately, nefarious ends.

What happened very early during Vatican II is only too well known. In a nutshell: what no one of his 197 immediate predecessors had done, and two very astute ones had outright rejected, John XXIII carried out. An account is given on pp. 44-6 of *The Rhine Flows Into the Tiber*, by Rev. Ralph M. Wiltgen, S.V.D., Hawthorn Books, 1967. In mid-March 1962, Pope John received six volumes of signed petitions, including signatures of cardinals, patriarchs, bishops and archbishops, asking for the name of St. Joseph to be inserted into the Canon of the Mass. "While examining these signatures, Pope John said, 'Something will be done for St. Joseph.'" (p.46). On Oct. 30, Auxiliary Bishop Ildefonso Sansierra of San Juan de Cuyo, Argentina, released the first trial balloon when, from the Council floor, expressed the hope that the inclusion of the name of St. Joseph in the Canon of the Mass "would not be forgotten." (p.45). There was not a bit of

noticeable resistance to this first trial balloon. And so, on Nov. 5, "the same request was made at great length by Bishop Albert Cousineau of Cap Haitien, Haiti, ... who asked that 'the name of Blessed Joseph, Spouse of the Blessed Virgin Mary, be introduced into the mass wherever the name of the Blessed Virgin Mary is mentioned.'" (pp. 44-5). Still no opposition. Eight days later, on Nov. 13, the Cardinal Secretary of State made a special announcement that the Holy Father had decided to insert the name of St. Joseph in the Canon of the Mass, immediately after the name of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and that the change would go into effect almost immediately, that is, on Dec. 8th. "Cardinal Montini later described this unexpected (??!) move as 'a surprise for the Council from the Pope.'" (p.45).

As stated earlier, the Roman Canon was destroyed on December 8, 1962; but only "officially," for there will always be some loyal priests who will adhere to it in its integrity. What the Robber Church has is no 'canon' at all. In fact it eschews the very word *canon*; since 1968 it has had *four* so-called "Eucharistic Prayers," none of which is a true canon. Once the inflexible, unchangeable rigid rule, the Roman Canon, was changed -- in the Robber Church version of it --, it ceased, by definition, to be a canon for them. And the foot was in the door. But little time elapsed before the avalanche of changes came in the "canon," including an "aggiornamentoed" and spurious "consecration formula" in most of the various vernacular versions of it.

One cannot impugn the motives of all of those persons who petitioned for this innovation, for many of them undoubtedly acted from motives of sincere devotion to St. Joseph. Neither can one judge the intentions of Pope John, especially since his aged brain was probably then being fed many an idea pre-programmed by his trusted advisors. But all these devotees of St. Joseph were woefully ignorant of history, and of the true designs of those working behind the scenes. Where, by the way, are these pious devotees of St. Joseph today? Why do we hear no outcries from them? The only purpose of the sinister parties *of influence*, who secretly steered this project to success, was to launch the destruction of the Mass. What they needed was the opening wedge to get to the sacred and immutable Canon, a feat never before accomplished. *They had no interest in St. Joseph then, and they still have none!* Now, how can such an "outlandish" charge be proved? Quite easily; and here is the tell-tale evidence. If their devotion to St. Joseph is so conspicuous then why is it that in *three out of four - 75%-* of their new Eucharistic Prayers the name of St. Joseph is *conspicuously absent???* Have you heard any outcries about this from these "devotees" of St. Joseph?? No indeed; paying honor to St. Joseph wasn't it *at all!* And there are some who, in eternity, will more than likely pay dearly for their mockery of him.

The Sabotage Is Common Knowledge

Thus far in this series on The Robber Church, certain passages from the decrees of Vatican 11 have been cited in order to show that that Council overthrew the

prior traditional teaching of the Catholic Church. No honest observer of the current scene will deny the reality of the existence of the Robber Church; but some perhaps would object to going so far as to reject Vatican 11 and to attribute its achievements to the Robbers rather than to the Holy Ghost. In effect, then, the question reduces to this: Whose property is Vatican 11? the Catholic Church's or the Robber Church's?

In *Interdum* #6, two specific teachings of Vatican 11 were cited, which, we claimed and attempted to demonstrate, are at variance with the true Church's teaching; to wit: allowing non-Catholic sects an "equal footing" with the true Church in theological discussions; and the new doctrine, in violation of Canon Law and the natural law, permitting and encouraging worship in common (*communicatio in sacris*). In this present issue, the "insane" doctrine contained in the Decree on Religious Freedom was examined, and it was seen to be a manifest contradiction of the true Magisterium. These are not merely "isolated" instances, nor are they excerpts "quoted out of context." The *whole animus* of the Decree on Ecumenism (just for example) is pernicious. In *Mortalium Animos*, is Holiness Pius XI, in referring to the very things taught in this Decree, said: "They presuppose the erroneous view that all religions are more or less good and praiseworthy... Those who hold such a view not only are in error; they distort the true idea of religion, and thus reject it, falling gradually into naturalism and atheism. To favor this opinion, therefore, and to encourage such undertakings is tantamount to abandoning the religion revealed by God."

Everything in the Decree on Ecumenism fosters these fatal and erroneous beliefs. The reader is invited to refer to the first full paragraph on p. 3 of *Interdum* #6, for some specific examples, and, of course, consulting the Decree itself will reveal many more similar instances which show how the teachings of that Council regard non-Catholic sects as *at least* "more or less good and praiseworthy." If they are supposedly "capable of giving access to the community of salvation," and are actually, as stated in one place, "*a means of salvation*," then who, can gainsay that they are at least more or less good and praiseworthy? Similarly, we have seen how readily the eminent authority Father John Courtney Murray acknowledged the difficulty of explaining the so-called "development" of doctrine contained in the Decree on Religious Freedom.

Among the "Progressives" (whose leaders planned it that way) the fact that the Decree on Ecumenism contains an overall doctrine that clashes head-on with *Mortalium Animos* is common knowledge. First let us hear from Werner Becker, a European authority who was hand-picked to write the account of "The History of the Decree on Ecumenism" for the comprehensive four-volume study entitled *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, (originally published in German, and now available in English from Burns & Oates, London). In beginning his history, Becker states: "(B)ut setbacks (to ecumenism) followed, both in the form of the encyclical *Mortalium Animos* (1928), and also in 1948 and 1954, when Catholic observers were forbidden to take part in the assemblies of the World

Council of Churches at Amsterdam and Evanston." (Vol. II, pp. 1-2). "This was how the encyclical *Mortalium Animos* had seen the ecumenical situation, and the new title (i.e., of the Decree on Ecumenism) is a clear rejection of this point of view." (Becker, *op. cit.*, p.38). *Mortalium Animos* is thus merely another "point of view."

Johannes Feiner, selected to write the actual commentary on this Decree for the same opus, says similarly: "The content and tone of this evaluation (in the Decree on Ecumenism) are in marked contrast to the encyclical *Mortalium Animos* of Pius XI (6 January 1928)." (*op. Cit.* , p. 60). Father Walter Abbott, an American, in like vein: "The Decree on Ecumenism supersedes various preconciliar directives (e.g., the June 5 , 1948, monitum and the Dec. 20, 1949 instruction of the Holy Office) and some sections of the Code of Canon Law." (*Documents of Vatican II*, p.342).

To round out our discussion and savor it with a bit of "ecumenism," let us now hear from two non-Catholic authorities. Says Dr. Samuel McCrea Cavert: "The significance of the Decree (on Ecumenism) stands out vividly when it is read side by side with the encyclical *Mortalium Animos* of 1928 and the *Monitum* of the Holy Office in 1948. These represented such a isolated aloofness that the door appeared to be closed against any effective dialogue between Roman Catholics and non-Roman Christians. Today the door is wide open." (*Documents*, p.367). Dr. Cavert is a former General Secretary of the National Council of Churches, and he "had a leading part in both the formation of the National Council of Churches and the World Council of Churches." (*Documents*, p.744). Concerned loyal Catholics, incidentally, would benefit immensely from doing the same thing; namely, reading the Decree on Ecumenism "side by side with the encyclical *Mortalium Animos*," and thereby seeing how "vivid" the betrayal is. Lastly, Dr. Oscar Cullmann, a Protestant observer at the Council, praised the Decree on Ecumenism in these words: "This is more than the opening of a door; new ground has been broken. No Catholic document has ever spoken of non-Catholic Christians in this way." (*Documents*, p.338).

By citing specific concrete examples of these reversals and contradictions *Interdum* is doing nothing more than proving that these "Progressive" experts are correct. For good reasons the "Progressives" themselves do not get quite so specific, lest the "People of God" should wake up to what really happened at Vatican II. Imagine Father John Courtney Murray, for example, broadcasting the fact, citing chapter and verse, that the doctrine taught in the Decree on Religious Freedom is the precise doctrine that the Magisterium earlier labeled "*insanity*." Why, then, do these "Progressive" experts even advert at all, to Vatican II's contradictions of the authentic Magisterium? For several reasons:

(1) To create the impression that, despite the "self-contradiction," we needn't worry, because it is perfectly normal for the Church to reverse Herself on doctrinal matters. This, of course, is in fact an impossibility. But the *seeming*

reversal serves to undermine the faith of the average, not-too-well-informed Catholic. (2) To take care of sidetracking most persons from bothering to look too deeply into the previous (true) teaching of the Church. If Father X. Pert has already brilliantly pointed out the fact that discrepancies do exist -- but *not* the actual discrepancies themselves (they are far too telling!) --, and has reassured us that everything is all right and "normal," then who cares what the "old outdated" teaching was, now that we have the "new" one? (3) To be able to claim, in the event that at some future time someone should call attention to these reversals, "Well, we all knew that Vatican 11 was doing it, and, in fact, we even mentioned it at the time. None of the really knowledgeable theologians worried about it, so why are you worrying now?"

A Bit O' Truth Doth Not Sound Doctrine Make

In our brief study of heresy in *Interdum* #1 ("Insights Into Heresy," Jan. 6, 1970), we saw that heresy always comes cloaked in the garb of orthodoxy. Heretical treatises, tracts, dissertations, sermons, etc., are always *mixtures* of sound doctrine and poisonous error, and the reasons behind this *modus operandi* were discussed. Consequently, we are certainly *not* going to find the decrees of Vatican II literally reeking with heresy. Far from it! On the other hand, the danger is that one might get misled by all the "good" things contained in these decrees. In truth, Vatican II taught not a single doctrine that we are bound to believe, which we were not already bound to believe because of previous pronouncements of the *authentic* Magisterium. And, moreover, in every such instance the teaching of the true Magisterium had been set down far more clearly and forcibly.

One should not be able to find a single statement -- nay, a single sentence-- in *any* decree of any *genuine* Council, that cannot stand up on its own two feet and be cited or quoted alone (regardless of any so-called "context") and convey nothing but a true and orthodox meaning. Such is the care and precision with which the *true* Church always words Her pronouncements. As a result, the ambiguous or questionable, or even heretical, doctrines of Vatican II cannot be presumed to be *not* heretical just because somewhere else in the same decree, or in another decree, reasonably orthodox-sounding versions can be found. Consider the following example:

On p. 196 of *Dr. Martin Luther's Small Catechism* (Concordia Publishers, 1943) we find this question: "301. Are bread and wine changed into the body and blood of Christ?". The answer given is: "Bread and wine are *not changed* into the body and blood of Christ; for the Bible expressly declares that *bread and wine are still present in the Sacrament.*" This is heresy; it is Luther's doctrine of "consubstantiation." But, let us examine "the context" of this question in Dr. Luther's *Catechism*. The two questions and their answers surrounding this one, the one just before and the one after, are in perfect accord with orthodox Catholic teaching. Thus, the answer to #302 is: "Christ gives us Christians His body and

His blood to eat and to drink." This *seems*, almost, to contradict what was said in #301, viz., that the bread and the wine are *not changed* into the body and blood of Christ. And the answer to #300 includes this: "D. Because no man has the right to change the meaning of a divine institution and testament." (It is unnecessary to quote the entire, somewhat lengthy, four-part answer to #300.) Now, just because #300 and #302 are all right, does this mean that #301 (which teaches consubstantiation) must be considered as probably orthodox, and must be reviewed in "the context" of the *other* two answers before making a judgment on whether or not it is heresy?

If one knows Luther's ideas on the Eucharist, he realizes that the *whole animus* of his doctrine is perverted, despite parts of it that might sound "good." Similarly, the animus of Vatican II -- so evident from its very fruits! -- is "Copyright Robber Church."

The Will Of "The People"

To try to justify their every subversive machination, the Robbers consult their catalogue of phony pretexts, cliches and specious "reasons": returning to "primitive practices," restoring "simplicity" to the liturgy, implementing their "new insights" into the meanings of certain Scriptural passages, making the pilgrim Church relevant to modern times. Though all laden with duplicity, the one about how "the people wanted the changes" is a naked barefaced lie. Granted that on an average day at Vatican II there was as much deceit, intrigue, subversion and fraud afoot as there is on an average day at the U.N., nevertheless on occasion a "Progressive" would come out with the undisguised truth. Take, for example, the utterly candid remarks of Bishop William Duschak of the Philippines, made at a press conference on Nov. 5, 1962. The following account is quoted from pp. 38-9 of Wiltgen, *op. cit.* (with emphasis added) :

"'My idea,' he (Duschak) said, 'is to introduce an *ecumenical* Mass, stripped wherever possible of historical accretions using language and gestures that are understandable.' ... Bishop Duschak did not accept the conventional reasons for keeping the Canon of the Mass intact. 'If men in centuries gone by,' he said, 'were able to choose and create Mass rites, why should not the greatest of all ecumenical councils be able to do so? Why should it not be possible to ordain that a new mass formula be drawn up with all due reverence, one that is suited to, *desired* and understood by modern man ... ?'... (T)he rite, form, language, and gestures would be accommodated to our modern age. ... The entire Mass, moreover, should be said aloud, in the vernacular, and facing the people. 'I believe it is also likely that if the world receives such an *ecumenical* form of Eucharistic celebration ... etc. ...' Asked whether his proposal *originated* with the people he served, he answered, 'No, *I think they would oppose it*, just as many bishops oppose it. *But if it could be put into practice, I think they would accept it.*' ... Before the Council ended, the Commission for the Implementation of the Constitution on the sacred Liturgy had already approved of three distinct Mass

formulas on a limited experimental basis, in which the entire Mass, including the Canon, was to be said aloud, in the vernacular, with the priest facing the people. A part of Bishop Duschak's proposal was already being put into practice."

All, mind you, because "the people" wanted it!

"IT CAN'T HAPPEN HERE"

There is a certain "argument" (if you can call it that) which some persons occasionally raise against those who believe that the "English Mass" is invalid. For the very reason that this "argument" is not based on reason, nor on theology, nor on logic, etc., but is based solely on emotion, it is perhaps the most difficult one to answer. Advanced chiefly by laypersons, this "argument" is, pure and simple, that so dreadful a thing as the Mass being taken away couldn't conceivably happen. "It is too impossible to be true," they say. Besides, this change in the Consecration Form from "many" to "all men" is really not significant. It is so slight a change, so imperceptible almost. What these persons cannot bring themselves to accept is that most of the "services" in the erstwhile Catholic churches are just that, namely, "services," and not the offering of the True Sacrifice.

On so ominous a day, when an invalid "Mass" would be introduced, surely there would be convulsions of nature, and most likely the sun would fail to shine. But the sun has continued to shine every day, the church bells continue to ring, and the People of God continue to attend their services. In many cases, moreover, definite appearances of outward devotion and piety continue to be manifest : some persons continue to recite the Rosary, some still pray the *Magnificat*, some priests even continue to give good "solid" sermons. So many Catholics continue to act, look, and comport themselves as devout Catholics, -- could so many persons be deceived? Take, for example, the pastor. Despite his faults and his many recent compromises, surely such a venerable man, so long a priest, could not fall so low as to be saying invalid Masses! No, it just cannot be true!

Of course, the Mass *was* once deliberately destroyed by some Satan-directed Innovators in England. But that was long ago and far away. It can't happen here. And besides, that time in England it was done by trickery; the people wouldn't have stood for it, had they known what was happening. No, it can't happen here.

Let us hear the Words of Cardinal Henry Edward Manning, second Archbishop of Westminster, who died in 1892. From *The Blessed Sacrament, the Centre of Immutable Truth* :

"For where the Blessed Sacrament is not, all dies. As when the sun departs all things sicken and decay, and when life is gone the body

returns to dust; so with any province or member of the Church. There was a time when the truth and grace which went out from Canterbury and York spread throughout the whole of England, and bound it together in a perfect unity of faith and communion... There was but one jurisdiction reigning over all the people of England, guiding them by a divine voice of changeless faith, and sanctifying them by the Seven Sacraments of grace."

"But then the grand old churches were the majestic tabernacles of the Word made Flesh. Jesus dwelt there in the Divine Mystery of the Holy Eucharist. His presence radiated on every side, quickening, sustaining, upholding the perpetual unity of His Mystical Body."

"Then came a change, slight indeed, to sense, but, in the sight of God, fraught with inexhaustible consequences of supernatural loss. 'Does any one know the name of the man who removed the Blessed Sacrament from the cathedral of Canterbury, or from York Minster? Is it written in history? or is it blotted out from the knowledge of men, and known only to God and His holy angels? Who did it, and when it was done I cannot say. Was it in the morning, or in the evening? Can we hope that some holy priest, in sorrow, yielding to the violence of the storm then falling upon the Church, out of love to his Divine Master, removed His Eucharistical Presence to save it from profanation; or was it some sacrilegious hand that dragged Him from His throne, as of old He was dragged from Gethsemane to Calvary?'"

"We cannot know. It was a terrible deed; and that name, if it be recorded, has a terrible brand upon it. But a change which held both on earth and in heaven had been accomplished. Canterbury and York went on the day after as the day before. But the Light of Life had gone out of them. Men were busy as not knowing or not believing what was done, and what would follow from the deed. There was no Holy Sacrifice offered morning by morning. The Scriptures were read there, but there was no Divine Teacher to interpret them. The *Magnificat* was chanted still, but it rolled along the empty roofs, for Jesus was no longer on the altar. So it is to this day. There is no light, no tabernacle, no altar, nor can be till Jesus shall return thither. They stand like the open sepulchre, and we may believe that angels are there, ever saying, 'He is not here. Come and see the place where the Lord was laid.'"

"But this is not all. The change, so imperceptible to sense, in the supernatural order is potent and irresistible. The centre of the order of grace had been taken away, and the whole had lost its unity and coherence. ... Straightway all began to dissolve and go to pieces. The sinews relaxed and lost their tenacity, the joints and bands of what had been the Mystical Body parted asunder."

THE ROBBER CHURCH

(Part 3)

"Extra Ecclesiam Nulla Salus"

A well-known doctrine continually taught and repeatedly proclaimed by the Magisterium of the Church is that "Outside the Church there is no salvation" This is a *dogma* of our Faith, and, as such it is infallibly true and it admits of *absolutely no exceptions*. In holding to this dogma we are bound absolutely to understand it and to profess it as the Church Herself understands it, following this prescription laid down by Pope Pius XII in his encyclical *Humani Generis*: "Hence Our Predecessor of immortal memory, Pius IX, teaching that the most noble office of theology is to show how a doctrine defined by the Church is contained in the sources of revelation, added these words, and with very good reason: '*in that sense in which it has been defined by the Church*'."

Our discussion of this subject by using the most authentic sources will explain this dogma "in that sense in which it has been defined by the Church." In doing so, we will follow the scholarly theological explanations of it so brilliantly expounded by the late Monsignor Joseph Clifford Fenton in his book entitled, "*The Catholic Church and Salvation*," the Newman Press, 1958; and we will be quoting from and citing this book often in this article.

In the course of gaining a clear understanding of this dogma, we will encounter certain key words and phrases, which must be mastered and understood in their precise and exact meanings in which the Church uses them. For example: in the statement itself "Outside the Church there is no salvation" we must have clearly in mind the exact meanings of: (1) "outside" as opposed to "within"; (2) "the Church"; and (3) "salvation." Lest anyone might think that this is to belabor the obvious or the elementary, let it be said here that these very words have often been the source of misunderstandings and false notions about this doctrine. Also, we must know the precise and rigorous meanings of: (1) "the faithful"; (2) "Mystical Body"; (3) "member" of the Mystical Body, as opposed to "non-member"; (4) "explicit desire" for membership; (5) "implicit desire" for membership; (6) "invincible ignorance." All these terms will be explained in the course of this article, according to the meanings given them by official papal documents of the Church.

To understand this dogma and to profess it as the Church teaches it, we need to consider *all* the teachings concerning it that the Church has laid down. To consider only a part of this body of teaching, while overlooking, disregarding, or neglecting other parts of it, is bound to lead one astray. For such selecting or "picking and choosing" is the very soul, and the definition, of heresy.

As stated earlier, the absolute necessity of the Roman Catholic Church for the attainment of eternal salvation is a dogma, having no exceptions whatsoever, which we must believe and profess under the penalty of severing ourselves from the Mystical Body, which *is* the Church. "A dogma is a truth which the Church finds in Scripture or in divine apostolic tradition and which, either in solemn judgment or in its ordinary and universal teaching activity, it presents to its people as a doctrine revealed by God and as something which all are obligated to accept with the assent of divine and Catholic faith" (Fenton, *op. cit.*, P. 3).

Though it may seem at first to be a contradiction, or at least a paradox, the Church also teaches - and this is actually a part of or an aspect of the same dogma "Outside the Church . . ." - that a person who dies without ever becoming an *actual member* of the Roman Catholic Church *can* attain eternal salvation. The word "*can*" has attached to it *very specific* and rigorously defined conditions, which will be explained a little later. Consequently, we have these two teachings, or rather two aspects of the same dogma, namely: (1) Outside the Roman Catholic Church there is absolutely no salvation; and (2) It is possible for a *non-member* of the Catholic Church to attain eternal salvation.

In *Interdum* #1 ("Insights Into Heresy"), we saw that the nature of heresy is to exaggerate or overemphasize one aspect of a truth, so that another different, but related, aspect is *underemphasized* and eventually altogether denied. Some twenty or twenty-five years ago, a group of Catholics centered in the Archdiocese of Boston began to overemphasize, and then to distort, the first truth: "Outside the Church there is no salvation." As could have been predicted, this exaggeration took its toll of the second, closely related, truth that it is possible for a non-member of the Catholic Church to be saved. The principal figure in this so-called "Boston Heresy Case" was eventually excommunicated on Feb. 4, 1953.

Today the pendulum has swung back in the other direction, and we can now perceive the "rebound" from the "Boston Heresy." Today the second of our pair of truths - that a person *can* be saved even though he dies without ever becoming an *actual member* of the Catholic Church - is so exaggerated and overstressed that the necessity of the Roman Catholic Church for salvation is being emphatically denied in some quarters. The conditions attached to this word "*can*," which are *very specific*, are being entirely overlooked and scorned by the Robber Church, so that nowadays non-membership in the visible Roman Catholic Church is actually regarded as, practically some sort of sacrament! "Some reduce to a meaningless formula," said Pope Pius XII, "the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to gain eternal salvation" (*Humani Generis*). Though occasionally giving lip service to this dogma, the Robber Church, and particularly the Vatican 11 decrees, have truly reduced to a "meaningless formula" the doctrine that there is no salvation outside the Church.

Some Early Pronouncements

The Creed "Quicumque," which is also known as the Athanasian Creed, begins thus: "Whoever, wishes to be saved, needs above all to hold to the Catholic faith; unless each one preserves this whole and inviolate, he will without a doubt perish in eternity." "Christ teaching from the ship," remarks the Doctor St. Hilary, "signifies that those who are outside the Church can never grasp the divine teaching; for the ship typifies the Church where the word of life is deposited and preached. Those who are outside are like sterile and worthless sand; they cannot comprehend" (*Comment, in Matt. xiii, n.1*).

Some of the earliest actual doctrinal pronouncements by the Church's magisterium on the matter of "no salvation outside the Church" are those of the early part of the 13th century. In the profession of faith that he laid down for the Waldensians who wished to return to the Church, Pope Innocent III (1208) included the following: "We believe in our hearts and we profess orally that there is one Church, not that of the heretics, but the Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic [Church], outside of which we believe that no one will be saved." Seven years later (1215) the Fourth Lateran Council (which was the twelfth Ecumenical Council in the history of the Church) defined: "There is, then, one universal Church of the faithful (*una ... fidelium universalis ecclesia*), outside of which no one at all is saved (*extra quam nullus omnino salvatur*)."

From the above we may draw the following conclusions and observations (cf. Fenton, *op. cit.*, p.6) : (1) There is *only one* true Church of God. (2) This one true Church is the *Roman Catholic Church*, which is a social unit properly called "the universal Church of the faithful" (3) *No one at all (nullus omnino)* can be saved if, at the time of his death, he is "outside" of this society. (4) The above statements, 1-3, are *divinely revealed truths* clearly contained in a dogma solemnly defined by an Ecumenical Council.

At this point it should be noted that even many heretics and non-Catholics can and do accept statements (1) and (3) above. They will admit that there is only one true Church outside which there is no salvation. *However*, what do they mean by "the Church?" What is their "Church" which is necessary for salvation? To them this "Church" is an invisible society, the sum total of all the "good" men and women on earth (whoever and wherever they are), or those who are leading good and upright "Christian" lives, or, simply, their "one true Church" consists of the elect or the predestined.

On the contrary, the Catholic Church teaches that this one true Church outside which no one at all is saved is the Roman Catholic Church, a *visible* society, the Mystical Body of Christ, governed by a visible head, the Vicar of Christ on earth, the Bishop of Rome. The Church teaches, moreover, that the membership of this visible society does *not* consist solely of "good" people or those who "lead good Christian lives." At any given time there are some actual members of this universal Church of the faithful who are *not* good, who are *not* in the state of

sanctifying grace, and who are *not* going to be counted among the predestined.

The expression of Lateran Council IV, "universal Church of the faithful," deserves a brief comment. Who are "the faithful?" "The faithful" are not, as Vatican 11 would seem to indicate (cf. the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, especially its chapter on "The People of God," and also the *Decree on Ecumenism* in its entirety), are *not* all good Christians who have been baptized. In the traditional technical language of the Church the word *fideles* (the faithful) has a very specialized meaning. It means those who (a) have been baptized *and* who (b) profess the Roman Catholic faith; in short, simply the Catholic. (Cf. Fenton, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9). Thus, for example, a catechumen (i.e., a person who, taking instructions to become a Catholic, has the *explicit desire* to enter the Church as a member) is *not* one of the *fideles*. One may here recall the divisions of the Holy Mass into the "Mass of the Catechumens" and the "Mass of the faithful."

Therefore, it should be unmistakably clear just precisely what is meant by "the Church" in the axiom, "No salvation outside the Church." Let us now proceed to study the meaning of the word "salvation."

What Is Salvation?

A person who, in the course of a long airplane trip, is routinely transferred from one plane to another in order to make a connecting flight is not said to be "saved." To be saved means to be transferred to a situation or state of security or safety from a situation which, if remained in, would mean certain mortal danger. Hence, a person who gets transferred from an airplane containing a bomb about to explode to another airplane which contains no bomb or other hazard, would be said to be "saved."

In the spiritual order, the *process* of salvation has an essential requisite the *remission of sins*. No one is saved *ultimately* - that is, no one eventually attains the enjoyment of the Beatific Vision, seeing God "as He is" - unless that person dies in the state of sanctifying grace. To be in the state of sanctifying grace means, stated negatively, to be in a state in which the soul is not stained by original or mortal sin. Stated positively, it means to be in a state of friendship with Almighty God, living a life of *supernatural charity*. Why do we say "supernatural" charity? Because the attainment of the Beatific Vision is absolutely beyond the *natural* powers or abilities of man, and this supernatural end demands supernatural means of attaining it. The possession of God is above (*super*) the natural activities or potencies of human beings. As a consequence, we say that a person in the state of sanctifying grace is living the *supernatural life*. He is living a life in which there is a true love of God, or charity, which *must* be built upon *supernatural* (i.e., beyond man's natural powers) *faith*, as defined by the Vatican Council in 1870:

"Since man is wholly dependent on God as his Creator and Lord, and since

created reason is completely subject to uncreated truth, we are bound by faith to give full obedience of intellect and will to God who reveals. But the Catholic Church professes that this faith, which 'is the beginning of human salvation', is a supernatural virtue by which we, with the aid and inspiration of the grace of God, believe that the things revealed by Him are true, not because the intrinsic truth of the revealed things has been perceived by the natural light of reason, but because of the authority of God Himself who reveals them, who can neither deceive nor be deceived."

"But," continues this decree, "since 'without faith it is impossible to please God' (Heb. 11:6) and to attain to the fellowship of His sons, hence it follows that *no one is justified without it; nor will anyone attain eternal life except 'he shall persevere unto the end in it'* (Matt. 10:22, 24:13). Moreover, in order that we may satisfactorily perform the duty of embracing the true faith and of constantly persevering in it, God, through His only-begotten Son, has instituted the Church, and has equipped it with manifest signs of the fact that He has instituted it, so that it may be acknowledged by all as the guardian and teacher of the revealed word." (Emphasis added).

Now, there is no alternative to being saved, other than being lost. Every man will either possess the Beatific Vision for all eternity, or else he will not possess it. In this life, at any given time, a person either has supernatural charity or he does not have it; he is either in the state of sanctifying grace, friendship with God, or else he is in a state of aversion or enmity towards God by being in the state of original and /or mortal sin. There is absolutely no middle ground or "neutrality" possible here.

The *remission of sins* is, as we have said, an essential requisite for the attainment of eternal salvation. And, furthermore, it is a divinely revealed truth that *there is absolutely no remission of sins outside the Catholic Church*. This is clearly and unequivocally declared by Pope Boniface VIII in his famous Bull *Unam Sanctam* (Nov. 18, 1302): "We are bound by the obligation of faith to believe and to hold the one, holy, Catholic, and apostolic Church, and we sincerely profess this [Church] outside of which there is neither salvation nor the remission of sins (*extra quam nec salus est, nec remissio peccatorum*)." This Bull, which repeats and amplifies the teachings already cited (i.e., those of Pope Innocent III and Lateran IV), concludes thus: "Furthermore, we declare, state, define and proclaim that for every human creature submission to the Roman Pontiff is absolutely necessary for salvation (*omnino de necessitate salutis*)."

Since there is no possibility of the remission of sins outside the Catholic Church, it follows that one cannot possibly be living the supernatural life outside this divinely established society. And the *only* alternative to living this supernatural life within the Catholic Church is clearly spelled out by yet another magisterial pronouncement: "It [the sacrosanct Roman Church, established by the voice of Our Lord and Saviour] firmly believes, professes and teaches that none of those

who do not exist within the Catholic Church, not only pagans, but Jews, heretics, and schismatics, can become partakers of eternal life; but that they are going into the everlasting fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels, unless they become associated with it before they die ... ; and that, however great his almsgiving may be, and even though he might shed his blood for the name of Christ, no one can be saved unless he remains within the embrace and the unity of the Catholic Church" (The Decree for the Jacobites, the Bull *Cantate Domino*, published by Pope Eugene IV on Feb. 4, 1442, and included in the "Acts" of the Council of Florence, the seventeenth in the series of Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church) .

"Outside" And "Within"

We have thus far studied the meanings of "the Church" and "salvation" in the divinely revealed dogma: "Outside the Church there is no salvation." It now remains to examine carefully the precise meaning, as the Church understands it, of the word "*outside*," The opposite of "outside" is "within." In those doctrinal pronouncements of the Church that we have quoted thus far, it can be seen that either the word "outside" or the word "within" is used in speaking of this dogma.

As a start, let it be said (without explanation at this time) that being "within" the Church *cannot* be equated with being *a member* of the Church. In order to understand this it is imperative that we study and define precisely what constitutes *actual membership* in the Catholic Church. Also let us see that the Roman Catholic Church *is* the Mystical Body of Christ; that is these two expressions *can* be equated.

"If We would define and describe this true Church of Jesus Christ - which is the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church - we shall find no expression more noble, more sublime or more divine than the phrase which calls it 'the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ'." (Pius XII, encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi*, June 29, 1943).

"Some say they are not bound by the doctrine, explained in Our Encyclical Letter of a few years ago, and based on the sources of revelation, which teaches that the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church *are one and the same thing*" (Pius XII, encyclical *Humani Generis*, Aug. 12, 1950, emphasis added).

Who are the "members" of the Church, Christ's Mystical Body? "To be really (*reapse*) included as members of the Church," continues the same Pius, "are *only* those who have been baptized *AND* profess the true faith *AND* who have not unhappily withdrawn from Body-unity or for grave faults have been excluded by legitimate authority. . . . And so, if a man refuse to hear the Church, let him be considered - so the Lord commands - as a heathen and a publican. It follows that those who are divided in faith or government *cannot* be living in one body

such as this; and *cannot* be living the life of its one divine Spirit" For not every sin," continues Pius XII in *Mystici Corporis Christi*, "however grave and enormous it be, is such as to *sever a man automatically* from the Body of the Church, as *does schism*, or heresy, or apostasy" (emphasis added throughout).

From the above it should be amply clear at this point what is required to be an actual *member* of the Church, a member of Christ's Mystical Body. Contrast this with the teaching of Vatican II in its "Decree on Ecumenism": "For men who believe in Christ and have been truly baptized are in communion with the Catholic Church even though this communion is imperfect. . . . But in spite of them [i.e., certain 'obstacles' to 'unity'] it remains true that *all who have been justified by faith in Baptism are members of Christ's body*, and have a right to be called Christian, and so are correctly accepted as brothers by the children of the Catholic Church" (*The Sixteen Documents of Vatican 11*, official N.C.W.C. translation, published by the Daughters of St. Paul, P-197). A little later we will be dissecting this manifest contradiction of the abovestated teaching of Pope Pius XII's *Mystici Corporis*.

Now, is it possible for a *non-member* of the Church to be "within" the Church? The answer is in the affirmative. A catechumen, for example, is a person who *explicitly desires* to become an actual member of the Church. Therefore, while still a catechumen he obviously is not yet an actual member, or else his "explicit desire" to *become* a member would be a contradiction in terms. But, even though he is a non-member, a catechumen *may* possibly already be "within" the Church (this does not mean that all catechumen *are* already within the Church, of course). *If* a catechumen is already within the Church, such a one may attain eternal salvation if he dies before becoming an actual member. The Church has accepted as true Catholic doctrine the teaching of St. Ambrose in his sermon *De obitu Valentiniani*:

"But I hear that you are sorrowing because he [the Emperor Valentinian II] did not receive the rites of baptism. Tell me, what else is there in us but will, but petition? Now, quite recently it was his intention to be baptized before coming into Italy. He let it be known that he wanted to be baptized by me very shortly, and it was for that reason, above all others, that he decided to have me sent for. Does he not, then, have the grace he desired? Does he not have what he prayed for? Surely, because he prayed for it, he has received it. Hence it is that 'the soul of the just man will be at rest, whatever kind of death may overtake him'."

"St. Ambrose was speaking of an instance in which a man who had been a catechumen had died before he had an opportunity to receive the sacrament of baptism. He had passed from this life, then, as a non-member of the *ecclesia fidelium*. At the moment of his death he was not one of the *fideles*. Yet, according to St. Ambrose, this man had died a good death. He had prayed for the grace of baptism, and God had given

him this answer to his prayer. He had passed from this life 'within' rather than 'outside' the Church of the faithful. He had been able to attain eternal salvation." (Fenton, *op. cit.*, P. 11).

Also the Church teaches that a non-member can be saved as being "within" the Church, if he sheds his blood for Christ *before* he is able to be actually baptized; and this presupposes that he has at least the implicit desire to enter the Church. Let us quote Monsignor Fenton again:

"Thus the Fathers of the Fourth Lateran Council and all the other churchmen who have drawn up authoritative statements of the Church's teaching on the necessity of the Church for the attainment of eternal salvation were well aware of what St. Augustine had taught about men who suffered martyrdom for the sake of Christ before having had the opportunity to receive the sacrament of baptism. In his *De civitate Dei*, St. Augustine taught that 'whosoever dies for Christ, not having received the laver of regeneration, has this avail him for the forgiveness of sins as much as if these sins had been forgiven in the sacred font of baptism.' Since the forgiveness of mortal or original sin is accomplished only in the infusion of the life of sanctifying grace, the person whose sins are forgiven is in the state of grace. If such a person dies in the state of grace, he will inevitably attain to the Beatific Vision. He will be saved, as having died 'within' and not 'outside' the true Church." (*op. cit.*, p.10).

Let us summarize this discussion on what is meant by "outside" and "within" the Church. There are two classes of persons, *and two classes only*, who are "within" the true Church: (1) *all actual members* of the visible Roman Catholic Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, who possess *membership* as defined by the Sovereign Pontiff Pius XII in his encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi*; and (2) *certain nonmembers* of the Catholic Church - and this is a limited and restricted category - who desire to enter the Church as members. *All other persons* are outside the true Church, and these persons cannot be saved if they die in this condition.

Needless to say, just because a person is within the Church is no guarantee that he will indeed be saved finally. It should be observed that those who are within the Church by virtue of being *actual members* possess immeasurable advantages over these who are within the Church only by virtue of their *desire* to enter. An actual member of the Church can sin, even mortally, and still remain within the Church. "For not every sin," says Pius XII in *Mystici Corporis*, "however grave and enormous it be, is such as to sever a man automatically from the Body of the Church, as does schism or heresy or apostasy. Men may lose charity and divine grace through sin and so become incapable of supernatural merit, and yet not be deprived of all life, if they hold on to faith and Christian hope, and ... are moved to prayer and penance for their sins. . . . No reason to despair of the health of whatever is still part of the body; once it has

been cut off, it can be neither cured nor healed" (emphasis added).

On the other hand, a *non-member* who happens to be within the Church (by virtue of his *desire* to enter, and this will be explained shortly) *must be and remain in the state of sanctifying grace* in order to remain within the Church. In qualifying the nature of this *desire* of which we are speaking, the Holy Office Letter *Suprema Haec Sacra* (Aug. 8, 1949) states: "But it must not be thought that any kind of desire of entering the Church suffices that one may be saved. It is *necessary* that the desire by which one is related to the Church be animated by *perfect* charity. Nor can an implicit desire produce its effect, unless a person has *supernatural faith*" (emphasis added).

Desire

This key word must be understood very clearly, lest many grave errors might arise. By *no means* do all "Christians" who belong to the various non Catholic sects, even though they may be validly baptized, possess that desire which is required of a non-member of the Church in order for him to qualify as being "within" the Church. By no means, Vatican II notwithstanding!

The desire of which we speak may be either *explicit* or *implicit*. Explicit desire is such, for example, as that of a catechumen, namely, a clearly expressed desire to enter the Church. But one may be within the Church, and thus able to attain eternal salvation, even though he may not even know of the Church, or know that the Church is necessary for salvation. Desire such as this is called *implicit*. However, a person cannot possibly have this implicit desire unless he fulfills *two necessary conditions*: (1) He must be in *invincible ignorance* of the Catholic Church and of its necessity for salvation. Invincible means unable to be conquered. Such ignorance, it goes without saying, is not culpable. And, in addition to being invincibly ignorant, (2) he *must* be constantly and "carefully observing the natural law and its precepts which God has inscribed in the hearts of all, and . . . live an honest and upright life" (encyclical *Quanto Conficiamur Moerore*, Pius IX, Aug. 10, 1863). That is to say, he must possess *perfect charity* and *supernatural faith*, or, stated simply, he must be living, through God's infinite goodness and mercy, the supernatural life of sanctifying grace.

The following teachings of Pope Pius IX, namely, *Singulari Quadam* (Dec. 9, 1854) and *Quanto Conficiamur Moerore* (Aug. 10, 1863), will shed much light on what the Church Herself understands by "implicit desire." First, let us quote a lengthy excerpt from the allocution *Singulari Quadam*:

"Not without sorrow have we seen that another error, and one not less ruinous [than the error of crass rationalism dealt with in the previous section of the allocution], has taken possession of certain portions of the

Catholic world, and has entered into the souls of many Catholics who think that they can well hope for the eternal salvation of all those who have in no way entered into the true Church of Christ. For that reason they are accustomed to inquire time and time again as to what is going to be the fate and the condition after death of those who have never yielded themselves to the Catholic faith and, convinced by completely inadequate arguments (*vanissimisque adductis rationibus*), they await a response that will favor this evil teaching. Far be it from Us, Venerable Brethren, to presume to establish limits to the divine mercy, which is infinite. Far be it from Us to wish to scrutinize the hidden counsels and judgments of God, which are 'a great deep,' and which human thought can never penetrate. In accordance with Our apostolic duty, We wish to stir up your episcopal solicitude and vigilance to drive out of men's minds, to the extent to which you are able to use all your energies, that opinion, equally impious and deadly, that the way of eternal salvation can be found in any religion (*quavis in religione reperiri posse aeternae salutis viam*). With all the skill and learning at your command, you should prove to the people entrusted to your care that this dogma of the Catholic faith is in no way opposed to the divine mercy and justice.

"Certainly we must hold it as of faith that no one can be saved outside the apostolic Roman Church, that this is the only Ark of salvation, and that the one who does not enter it is going to perish in the deluge. But, nevertheless, we must likewise hold it as certain that those who labor in ignorance of the true religion, if that [ignorance] be invincible, will never be charged with any guilt on this account before the eyes of the Lord. Now, who is there who would arrogate to himself the power to indicate the extent of such [invincible] ignorance according to the nature and the variety of peoples, regions, talents, and so many other things? For really when, loosed from these bodily bonds, we see God as He is, we shall certainly understand with what intimate and beautiful a connection the divine mercy and justice are joined together. But, while we live on earth, weighed down by this mortal body that darkens the mind, let us hold most firmly, from Catholic doctrine, that there is one God, one faith, one baptism. It is wrong to push our inquiries further than this.

"For the rest, as the cause of charity demands, let us pour forth continual prayers to God that all nations everywhere may be converted to Christ. And let us do all in our power to bring about the common salvation of men, for the hand of the Lord is not shortened and the gifts of heavenly grace will never be lacking to those who sincerely wish and pray to be comforted in this light. Truths of this kind must be deeply implanted in the minds of the faithful so that they may not be corrupted by the false doctrines that tend to encourage the religious indifference (*doctrinis eo spectantibus, ut religionis foveant indifferentiam*) which we see being spread abroad and strengthened to the ruination of souls."

In this passage Pope Pius IX certainly does not say, nor does he imply, that *everyone* who is invincible ignorance will automatically be saved, or is automatically "within" the church. What he says is that those who are invincibly ignorant will not be punished "*on this account*" (*hujusce rei*). That is to say, invincible ignorance of the true Church (or of anything else, for that matter) is not sinful in the eyes of God; and the all-merciful and all-just God never punishes anyone who is invincibly, and therefore inculpably, ignorant of any matter whatsoever. However, such persons (who are invincibly ignorant of certain particular things) may very well be punished eternally for *other* sins.

Quanto Conficiamur Moerore

On August 10, 1863, slightly less than a decade after the issuance of his allocution *Singulari Quadam* (which was cited just above) the same Pontiff Pius IX released his encyclical *Quanto Conficiamur Moerore*. In a key passage of this encyclical, quoted below, he explains and elucidates the Church's teaching on "invincible ignorance."

"And here, Our Beloved Sons and Venerable Brethren, We must mention and reprove a most serious error into which some Catholics have fallen, imagining that men living in errors and apart (*alienos*) from the true faith and from the Catholic unity can attain to eternal life. This, of course, is completely opposed to Catholic doctrine. It is known to Us and to you that those who labor in invincible ignorance of our most holy religion, and who, carefully observing the natural law and its precepts which God has inscribed in the hearts of all, and who, being ready to obey God, live an honest and upright life, can, through the working of the divine light and grace, attain eternal life, since God, who clearly sees, inspects; and knows the minds, the intentions, the thoughts, and the habits of all, will, by reason of His goodness and kindness, never allow anyone who has not the guilt of wilful sin to be punished by eternal sufferings. But it is a perfectly well known Catholic dogma that no one can be saved outside the Catholic Church, and that those who are contumacious against the authority of that same Church, and who are pertinaciously separated from the unity of that Church and from Peter's successor, the Roman Pontiff, to whom the custody of the vineyard has been entrusted by the Saviour, cannot obtain eternal salvation.

"God forbid, however, that the children of the Catholic Church should in any way ever be the enemies of those who are in no way joined to us in the same bonds of faith and of charity. But let them [the Catholics] rather strive always to take care of these people when they [those outside the Church] are poor or sick or afflicted by any other ills. Primarily, let them strive to take these people out of the darkness of error in which they unfortunately live, and bring them back to the Catholic truth and to the

loving Mother Church that never ceases to hold out its maternal hands affectionately to them, and to call them back to its embrace so that, established and strengthened in faith, hope, and charity, and bringing forth fruit in every good work, they may attain eternal salvation."

Suprema Haec Sacra

On August 8, 1949, the Holy Office issued a letter, addressed to the Arch-bishop of Boston, which letter was occasioned by the controversy that had been stirred up by the St. Benedict Center in Cambridge, which was at that time the headquarters of the "Boston Heresy." This letter, known as the *Suprema Haec Sacra*, begins by making explicit mention of this Center and of the "unfortunate controversy" that was there given birth. In that this letter is the most comprehensive, as well as the most recent, summary of the true Catholic teaching on the dogma "Outside the Church there is no salvation," we will quote the entire doctrinal portion of it.

"Accordingly the Most Eminent and Most Reverend Cardinals of this Supreme Congregation, in a plenary session, held on Wednesday, July 27, 1949, decreed, and the August Pontiff in an audience on the following Thursday, July 28, 1949, deigned to give his approval, that the following explanations pertinent to the doctrine, and also that invitations and exhortations relevant to discipline, be given.

"We are bound by divine and Catholic faith to believe all those things which are contained in the word of God, whether it be Scripture or Tradition, and are proposed by the Church to be believed as divinely revealed, not only through solemn judgment but also through the ordinary and universal teaching office (*magisterium*).

"Now, among these things which the Church has always preached and will never cease to preach there is also contained that infallible statement by which we are taught that there is no salvation outside the Church.

"However, this dogma must be understood in the sense in which the Church itself understands it. For Our Saviour gave the things that are contained in the deposit of faith to be explained by the ecclesiastical *magisterium* and not by private judgments.

"Now, in the first place, the Church teaches us that in this matter we are dealing with a most strict precept of Jesus Christ. For He explicitly ordered His apostles to teach all nations to observe all things whatsoever He Himself had commanded.

"Now, not the least important among the commandments of Christ is that one by which we are command to be incorporated by baptism into the

Mystical Body of Christ, which is the Church, and to remain united to Christ and to His Vicar, through whom He Himself governs the Church on earth in a visible manner.

"Therefore, no one will be saved who, knowing the Church to have been divinely established by Christ, nevertheless refuses to submit to the Church or withholds obedience from the Roman Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ on earth.

"The Saviour not only gave the precept that all nations should enter the Church, but He also established the Church as a means of salvation without which no one may be able to enter the kingdom of eternal glory.

"In His infinite mercy God has willed that the effects, necessary for one to be saved, of those helps to salvation which are directed towards man's final end, not by intrinsic necessity, but only by divine institution, can also be obtained in certain circumstances when these helps are used only in intention or desire (*ubi voto solummodo vel desiderio adhibeantur*). This we see clearly stated in the Sacred Council of Trent, both with reference to the sacrament of regeneration and with reference to the sacrament of penance.

"In its own way, the same thing must be said about the Church, insofar as the Church itself is a general help to salvation. Therefore, in order that one may obtain eternal salvation, it is not always required that he be incorporated into the Church *actually* as a member, but it is required that at least he be united to it by intention and desire.

"However, this desire need not always be explicit, as it is in catechumens; but, when a person is involved in invincible ignorance, God accepts also an implicit intention (*votum*) which is so called because it is included in that good disposition of the soul whereby a person wishes his will to be conformed to the will of God.

"These things are clearly taught in that dogmatic letter which was issued by the Sovereign Pontiff, Pope Pius XII, on June 29, 1943, 'On the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ.' For in this letter the Sovereign Pontiff clearly distinguishes between those who are really (*in re*) incorporated into the Church as members and those who are joined to it only in intention (*in voto*).

"Discussing the members of whom the Mystical Body is composed here on earth, the same August Pontiff says: 'Only those who have received the laver of regeneration, who profess the true faith, who have not miserably separated themselves from the fabric of the Body or been expelled by legitimate authority by reason of very serious offences, are

actually to be counted as members of the Church.'

"Towards the end of the same encyclical letter, when most affectionately inviting to unity those who do not belong to the body of the Catholic Church (*qui ad Ecclesiae Catholicae compagem non pertinent*), he mentions those who are 'ordered to the Redeemer's Mystical Body by a sort of unconscious desire and intention,' and these he by no means excludes from eternal salvation, but, on the contrary, asserts that they are in a condition in which 'they cannot be secure about their own eternal salvation,' since they still lack so many and such great heavenly helps to salvation that can be enjoyed only in the Catholic Church.'

"With these wise words he reproves both those who exclude from eternal salvation all those united to the Church only by implicit desire and those who falsely assert that men can be saved equally (*aequaliter*) in every religion.

"Nor must we think that any kind of intention of entering the Church is sufficient in order that one may be saved. It is requisite that the intention by which one is ordered to the Church should be informed by perfect charity; and no explicit intention can produce its effect unless the man have supernatural faith: 'For he who comes to God must believe that God exists and is a rewarder of those who seek Him.' The Council of Trent declares: 'Faith is the beginning of man's salvation, the foundation and root of all justification, without which it is impossible to please God and attain the fellowship of His children'."

Summary and Conclusions

There is *only one* true Church of Jesus Christ, the universal Church of the faithful, which is the Holy Roman Catholic Church, presided over by the Supreme Pontiff, the Bishop of Rome, who is the Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth. Outside this Church there is absolutely no salvation; no one at all can possibly be saved unless he is within this Church at the time of his death. This is an infallible *dogma*, and it does not admit of any exceptions whatsoever. To say that it does have exceptions is, in effect, to *deny* the dogma. Cardinal Newman in his *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*, erred seriously when he claimed that this dogma has "exceptions." This was an unfortunate manner of expression. Monsignor Fenton has a good discussion on this error of Newman's (*op. cit.*, pp. 124-6), and the key passage from this discussion is given below:

"Newman taught that the principle 'out of the Church, and out of the faith, is no salvation' admits of exceptions. He believed that what Pope Pius IX had taught in his encyclical *Quanto conficiamur moerore* indicated the existence of such exceptions. In support of his contention, he quotes the following lines from the encyclical:

'*We and you know*, that those who lie under invincible ignorance as regards our most holy religion, and who, diligently observing the natural law and its precepts, which are engraven by God on the hearts of all, and prepared to obey God, lead a good and upright life, are able, by the operation of the power of divine light and grace, to obtain eternal life.'

"According to the *Letter to the Duke of Norfolk*, these words of Pope Pius IX conveyed what Newman called 'the doctrine of invincible ignorance - or, that it is possible to belong to the soul of the Church without belonging to the body.' He concluded his treatment of the dogma with this question: 'Who would at first sight gather from the wording of so forcible a universal ['Out of the Church, and out of the faith, is no salvation'], that an exception to its operation, such as this, so distinct, and, for all we know, so very wide, was consistent with holding it?'

"If Newman's words mean anything, they assert that the Church holds and proposes as a dogma, which no Catholic can ever think of disputing, a statement which it contradicts at the very same time." (Fenton, *op. cit.*, p.125).

If we wish to adhere to this dogma, as the Church Herself teaches it and understands it, *we must reject* all notions of an "invisible" true Church. *We must reject* the departure from the above doctrine of the Magisterium of the Church where Vatican II speaks of such things as "full" (*plene*) unity with the Church or "full" membership in the Church, as opposed to a so-called "incomplete" or "less full" (*no plene*) unity or membership. Supposedly, many "good Christians" of the various sects possess such "*non plane*" unity. All of mankind is divided into these two mutually exclusive and distinct categories: *members* of the true Church and *non-members* of it. There is no such thing as "full" membership and "partial" membership. Such blurring of distinctions is a convenient tool for the heretics. (We still bear in mind, of course, that *some* non-members may be "within" the Church, as has been explained already.)

The following passage from Msgr. Fenton's book is apropos at this juncture:

"In this section of the *Singulari quadam* Pope Pius IX goes on to urge the Bishops of the Catholic Church to use all of their energies to drive from the minds of men the deadly error that the way of salvation can be found in any religion. To a certain extent this is a mere restatement of the erroneous opinion according to which we may well hope for the salvation of men who have never entered in any way into the Catholic Church, the first misinterpretation of Catholic teaching reprovred in this section of the allocution. Yet, in another way, the error that the way of salvation can be found in any religion has its own peculiar and individual malignity. It is

based on the false implication that the false religions, those other than the Catholic, are in some measure a partial approach to the fullness of truth which is to be found in Catholicism. According to this doctrinal aberration, the Catholic religion would be distinct from others, not as the true is distinguished from the false, but only as the plenitude is distinct from incomplete participations of itself. It is this notion, the idea that all other religions contain enough of the essence of that completeness of truth which is to be found in Catholicism, to make them vehicles of eternal salvation, which is thus reproved in the *Singulari quadam*." (Fenton, *op. cit.*, P. 47).

We must reject the erroneous idea that the Catholic Church is only the "ordinary" means of salvation, and that God also uses other "churches" (so-called) as a means of salvation, such as is clearly taught by Vatican II.

We must reject the erroneous idea that the Catholic Church is a "perfect" realization of the true Church of Jesus Christ, while the other sects and "churches" (so-called) are somehow "less perfect" realizations of the one true Church. In his momentous encyclical *Pascendi* (against the Modernists), Pope St. Pius X exposed the fallacy of such distinctions: "In fact, Modernists . . . some rather obscurely, others very openly, contend that all religions are true. . . . In the conflict of different religions the Modernists might be able to contend for one thing at most, that the Catholic religion, inasmuch as it is the more vivid, has more truth; and likewise that it is more worthy of the name of Christian, inasmuch as it corresponds more fully with the origins of Christianity."

We must reject the erroneous idea that *all* those who have ever been baptized, whether they be Catholics or non-Catholics, still remain somehow "incorporated into Christ," regardless of what their present state of soul is and regardless of what their present relationship to the true visible Catholic Church may or may not be.

We must reject the erroneous idea that the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are not quite exactly one and the same thing. And therefore *we must reject* the totally erroneous and dangerous idea that the true Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ merely "subsists in" the Catholic Church, as is taught by Vatican II.

The Doctrines of the Robber Church

Viewed alongside the true Catholic teaching which has been set forth in this article, the following doctrines of the Robber Church can be readily seen for what they are. Emphasis is added throughout.

"This is the unique Church of Christ which in the creed we avow as one, holy, catholic, and apostolic. . . . This Church, constituted and organized in the world

as a society, *subsists in* the Catholic Church . . ." (Vatican 11's *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*). What Church do they mean by "this Church?" What Church is "*this Church*" which "subsists in" the Catholic Church? Commenting on this passage of Vatican 11, Rev. Gregory Baum explains what it means and he quotes the *official explanation of Vatican II's Theological Commission*. Says Baum: "The final text of the Constitution says that the Church of Christ 'subsists in' the Catholic Church. The Church of Christ, then, is realized and embodied in the Catholic Church; conversely, the Catholic Church is the realization of the Church of Christ on earth, according to Catholic faith the only institutionally *perfect realization* of this Church, *but there is no simple and unqualified identity*. The explanation for the change of words given to the Council by the Theological Commission says: 'Instead of *is* we now say *subsists in*, so that the expression corresponds better with what is affirmed about the ecclesial elements which are present elsewhere.'" (Gregory Baum, "The Ecclesial Reality of the Other Churches," in *The Church and Ecumenism, Concilium* 4, p.70).

"This same understanding," continues Baum, "is carried through the entire Constitution on the Church. When the chapter on the People of God (Chapter 2) comes to the question of who is incorporated in the Church of Christ, it *modifies* [!] the teaching of *Mystici Corporis Christi*. This encyclical had insisted that *reapse* (really) members of the Church are only men joined by the bonds of faith, sacraments and hierarchical communion, *i.e.*, only Roman Catholics. . . However, in the final text of the Constitution (*i.e.*, Vatican 11's *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*) we read that the Catholic faithful are *plene* (fully) incorporated in the Church. This implies that apart from the full participation in the mystery of the Church there are other, less perfect, ways. This *remarkable* change [!] from *reapse to plene*, introduced because of the demands of the Council Fathers, makes the doctrine consistent with what is taught in other parts of the Constitution. In fact, the report given by the Theological Commission to the Council reminds us that *all the baptized are in some way incorporated in the Church*. . . . We conclude that on these three points the Constitution on the Church has gone *far beyond* the teaching of *Mystici Corporis Christi*. According to the Constitution the Catholic Church is the institutionally perfect realization of the Church of Christ on earth."

"Though the ecclesial Communities which are separated from us lack the *fullness* of unity with us flowing from Baptism, and though we believe they have not retained the proper reality of the eucharistic mystery *in its fullness* . . ." (Vatican 11's *Decree on Ecumenism*),

"The brethren divided from us also use many liturgical actions of the Christian religion. They most certainly *can truly engender the life of grace* ... These liturgical actions must be regarded as capable of *giving access to the community of salvation*." (*Ibid.*)

"It follows that the separated Churches and Communities, though we believe

them to be deficient in *some* respects [!], have been by no means deprived of *significance and importance in the mystery of salvation*. For the Spirit of Christ has not refrained from using them as a *means of salvation*.. (*Decree on Ecumenism*).

"The attainment of union is the concern of the whole Church...This concern itself reveals already to some extent the *bond of brotherhood between all Christians* and it helps toward that *full and perfect* unity . . ." (*ibid.*).

"The daily Christian life of these brethren is nourished by their *faith in Christ* [do all these "brethren" have the gift of *supernatural faith*?] ... Their *faith in Christ* bears fruit . . ." (*Decree on Ecumenism*). Their "faith in Christ" (so-called) bears *no* fruit unless it brings them closer to being *within* the Catholic Church. "On this account those who would strive for salvation apart from the Church, wander from the way and are struggling in vain" (Pope Leo XIII, encyclical *Tametsi*, Nov. 1, 1900).

"For it is only through Christ's Catholic Church, which is 'the all-embracing means of salvation,' that they can benefit *fully* from the means of salvation" (*Decree a Ecumenism*).

"For men who *believe in Christ* and have been truly baptized are *in communion* with the Catholic Church, even though this communion is *imperfect*" (*Decree on Ecumenism*).

"Moreover, some and *even very many* of the significant elements and endowments which together go to *build up and give life to the Church itself* can exist *outside the visible boundaries* of the Catholic Church: the written word of God [which needs the Church as the infallible interpreter, they fail to mention], the *life of grace* [non-Catholics receive actual graces, but they *cannot* be living the *life of grace* unless they are within the Catholic Church], faith, hope and charity [certainly not *supernatural* faith, hope and charity, as is implied] . . ." (*Decree on Ecumenism*).

"Cooperation among Christians vividly expresses *that bond which in fact already unites* them . . ." (*ibid.*).

"Nevertheless, the divisions among Christians prevent the Church from attaining the *fullness at catholicity* proper to her [Catholicity is one of the four marks of the Catholic Church, which, from the beginning, she has possessed in all fullness], in those of *her sons* who, though attached to her by Baptism, are yet separated from *full* communion with her [Her *sons*? just anybody who happens to have once been baptized is now dignified with the title of "son" of the true Church? Incredible!]" (*Decree on Ecumenism*).

"Whenever the Sacrament of Baptism is duly administered as Our Lord instituted

it, and is received with the right disposition, a person is *truly incorporated* into the crucified and glorified Christ. . ." (*ibid.*). But he does not necessarily *remain* incorporated.

Walter J. Burghardt, S.J., an expert of the "Robber Church," writes: ... "The grace of Christ is at work, richly and incessantly, not only within Protestants but within Protestantism, not only within the Orthodox but within Orthodoxy, not only within Anglicans but within Anglicanism": (*Theology Digest*, Winter 1970, P. 359). "How can the Catholic theologian," asks Burghardt, "reconcile with his traditional understanding of 'one true Church' the recognition by Vatican 11 of other Christian churches, not simply as sociological phenomena but as *ecclesial realities*... as structures splendidly fruitful for the grace that saves? As yet there is no 'Catholic answer.' Understandably so, for the Council has confronted the theologian with development, with evolution, in the Catholic understanding of the mystery that is the Church" (*op. cit.*, p.360). "First, all of us who are baptized (Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox) have been incorporated through baptism into Christ; and because we have been incorporated into Christ, *all of us belong in a very real way to the Church of Christ*.... This is not fiction; this is 'for real.' Despite our unchristian division, we are more one than ever we used to dream; for the same Christ is our one life, and *in some mysterious fashion we all belong to the one Church of Christ*... The reality which is the *Church of Christ transcends the institutional Catholic Church*, is realized to some extent in other Christian communities; *they too are communities of grace and salvation*, alive with the presence and grace of the one same Christ" (Burghardt, *op. cit.* pp. 360-1, emphasis added).

In his "*History of the Decree on Ecumenism*," the Progressive Werner Becker makes many interesting observations on the debates that took place at the Council (over this Decree) . "Some of the Fathers," says Becker, "wanted to see an explicit mention of the necessity of the Catholic Church for salvation and of the infallibility of the Pope. Was it sufficient to speak of the Church of Rome in patristic terminology as a communion of love, without taking into account the warnings of the encyclical *Mystici Corporis* against separating the 'juridical Church' and 'the Church of love?' Was it right to see the Church as something dynamic, as a communion (*communio*), in which there were different ways and levels of participation? The objection was also raised that the Holy Spirit could only be described as the soul of the Catholic Church in its concrete form, and could only be effective *per accidens* outside the frontiers of the Church... Was not the discussion of separated Christians 'more than polite' (Cardinal Ruffini)? Are they all without exception of good faith? What is the purpose of this *laudatio protestantium*? ...But these objections could not prevent the overwhelming impression that in the debate, to the surprise of many, *a genuine breakthrough towards ecumenical thought became evident*. Almost everyone saw the schema as constituting *a great step forward* ... As Cardinal Leger declared, the acceptance and approbation of so many bishops represented a 'true conversion.' (*Commentary on the Documents of Vatican 11*, Vol. 2, pp. 33-4, emphasis

added).

"A true conversion," yes, to the kingdom of Satan. O miserable bishops! In betraying His Mystical Body they betray the Master Himself. Infinitely better off is the poor pagan who is afflicted only by invincible ignorance! "Never to have known Jesus Christ in any way is the greatest of misfortunes, but it involves no perversity or ingratitude. But, after having known, to reject or forget Him, is such a horrible and mad crime as to be scarcely credible" (Pope Leo XIII, encyclical *Tametsi*).

Let us conclude this section by quoting once again from Rev. Gregory Baum. "The encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi* taught a strict identity between the Body of the Lord and the Church of Rome. . . . At the Council, several bishops expressed their disapproval of asserting this doctrine without qualifications. Among the many Fathers who criticized the draft proposal *De Ecclesia* for teaching this simple identity, *Cardinal Lercaro*, Archbishop of Bologna, said:,,,,, ' . . . The Church as society and the Mystical Body of Christ express two distinct aspects ... But these two aspects can never be the same in the existential and historical order. In that order, these two aspects do not always enjoy the same fullness of extension; *in fact, conflicts arise between them*, and will continue to arise until the very end of human history. *Then and only then will the identity and equality of the Church and the Mystical Body be consummated and made manifest*." Thus Lercaro.

"How does the Constitution on the Church solve this problem?" asks Baum. "It asserts and defends the fundamental article of Catholic faith that the earthly body of the Lord and the Catholic Church refer *basically* to the same reality, yet the wording of this declaration indicates ... that *the Body of Christ and the Catholic Church are not simply identical* but diverse aspects of the same complex reality" (Baum, *op. cit.*, pp. 68-9).

Again Baum: "The teaching of the Constitution on the Church, therefore, leaves theological space for other Churches. *The Church of Christ* that constitutes one single complex reality with the Catholic Church *is present in other Christian Churches*, even though according to Catholic faith these are only institutionally imperfect or inadequate realizations of Christ's Church. . . . It is, of course, obvious that on her pilgrimage the *Catholic Church is not and never will be*, simply speaking, *the perfect realization of Christ's Church*" (p. 72).

And finally, on P. 82 of the same article, Rev. Baum reaches the logical conclusions that necessarily flow from the teachings laid down by the Robber Council Vatican 11: "It will be remembered that toward the beginning of this essay, I stated that the Catholic Church is the *institutionally* perfect realization of the Church of Christ, while other Churches, not in communion with Rome, are *institutionally* imperfect realizations of the same Church. Expressing myself in this careful way, I left room for the complementary aspect that permits me to say

that *concretely and actually the Church Of Christ may be realized less, equally, or even more in a Church separated from Rome than in a Church in communion with Rome. This conclusion is inescapable on the basis of the understanding of Church that emerges from the teaching of Vatican Council II.*" (Emphasis added).

Ambiguities? Or Worse?

The principals of the Robber Church are accomplished masters of ambiguity. *Newspeak* is their "native language." One fatal result of allowing these Robbers free rein in their glib use of Newspeak is pointed out in the following astute remarks that appeared in the Parish Bulletin of St. Peter's Church, Cambridge, Mass., Apr. 25, 1971: "In the transmission of the faith from generation to generation there can be a distortion, a series of masked heresies, which gradually empty the faith of its divinely communicated content. . . . Ambiguities of language which today seem quite irrelevant may be susceptible in later years to misunderstanding, and then to new points of view which find justification for what is objectively false. The Church has always recognized the danger of falsification in poorly worded professions of faith and in loosely phrased formulas of prayer. The language of the ancient creeds was through much screening and re-formulation presented. So too the language of the liturgy. We are now beginning to understand the hidden implications of some of the hastily composed translations of the liturgical texts. Generations as yet unborn may find in the scholarly language of the present day a lack of doctrinal accuracy which will create theological problems later on."

If we focused our attention only on those teachings of Vatican 11 that are ambiguous, and *merely* ambiguous, we would still be kept busy for quite a long time. In this series on "The Robber Church," we have been concerned mainly with pointing out passages in these decrees of Vatican II that are, considered in themselves, *irreconcilable* (in our opinion) with true Catholic doctrine. To conclude this series we will next study a passage from the Decree on Ecumenism, a passage which contains the *central* attack on the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ.

"Saul, Saul, Why Persecutest Thou Me?"

"And Saul, as yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went to the high priest and asked of him letters to Damascus, to the synagogues, that if he found any men and women of this way, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem. And as he went on his journey, it came to pass that he drew nigh to Damascus; and suddenly a light from heaven shined round about him. And falling on the ground, he heard a voice saying to him: 'Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?' Who said: 'Who art thou, Lord?' And he: 'I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. It is hard for thee to kick against the goad.' And he trembling and astonished, said: 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?'"

Thus the account of the conversion of St. Paul, as found in the Acts of the Apostles, chapter 9. Our Lord did not say to Saul: "Why persecutest thou My followers?"; but rather: "Why persecutest thou Me". Christ, in speaking thus, taught and illustrated that beautiful facet of the doctrine of the *Mystical Body*, that there is an intimate bond of union existing between Him, the Head of the Mystical Body, and each individual member of this Body; and also a most intimate bond of union, a supreme spiritual solidarity, between all the individual members themselves. Consequently, any attack whatsoever upon any individual member or members of this Mystical Body is simultaneously an attack upon Christ Himself. "Why persecutest thou *Me*?"

Saul's persecution was directed against the physical bodies of those Christians, those early members of Christ's Mystical Body. Today the assault is directed against minds and souls. Today the Mystical Body is attacked *from the very standpoint of its existence as a doctrine* of the Roman Catholic Church; the Robber Church effectively denies the existence of the Mystical Body! This denial, of course, is not open, but, on the contrary, it is extremely subtle and therefore all the more dangerous. Reiterating and re-emphasizing his teaching set forth in *Mystici Corporis Christi* (June 29, 1943), that the Mystical Body of Christ is *identical with* and categorically to *be equated* to the Roman Catholic Church, His Holiness Pius XII wrote in his later encyclical *Humani Generis*: "Some say they are not bound by the doctrine, explained in Our Encyclical Letter of a few years ago, and based on the sources of revelation, which teaches that the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same thing. Some reduce to a meaningless formula the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to gain eternal salvation."

The Robber Church, through its many "spokesmen," agents and lackeys, and primarily through the decrees it was able to get "approved" by Vatican II, "reduces to a meaningless formula" the doctrine of the Mystical Body. To reduce this doctrine (or any doctrine) to a meaningless formula, to "water it down" and therefore effectively deny it, *while at the same time paying it lip service*, is the customary *modus operandi* of Modernists, Masons, and, of course, the "Robbers" with whom we are dealing. The "Decree on Ecumenism" is a vehicle of persecution against the Mystical Body that makes Saul's persecution appear as but childish sport. Saul persecuted only the mere physical bodies of his victims, and, moreover, he acted as an outsider. The present-day persecutors attack the *very doctrine itself*, and, moreover, they operate "insidious and hidden in the very veins of the Church" (St. Pius X, encyclical *Editae Saepe*). On Nov. 21, 1964, the "Decree on Ecumenism" was approved. At this present time, within the short space of seven years, it has taken its toll on a universal basis. Today the widespread utter faithlessness in this revealed doctrine is visible for all to behold. This faithlessness in the doctrine of the Mystical Body stems, as from its fountainhead, from the devastating religious indifferentism that is fostered and encouraged by some of the decrees of Vatican 11. Those who might ever have wondered how eventually will be fulfilled these words of Christ, "But yet the Son

of Man, when he cometh, shall he find, think you, faith on earth?" (Luke 18:8), need look no farther than the satanic tide of apostasy and universal faithlessness unleashed upon Christendom by the Robber Church's Vatican II.

A Key Passage

"Nihilominus, justificati ex fide in baptisate, Christo incorporantur, ideoque christiano nomine jure decorantur et a filiis Ecclesiae catholicae ut fratres in Domino merito agnoscuntur." (From Vatican II's "Decree on Ecumenism".)

The Decree on Ecumenism, corrupt in spirit throughout, contains many open and central attacks upon true Roman Catholic doctrine, and these open attacks are often contained concisely in passages consisting of but a few words. The passage cited above illustrates this well. In explaining this passage, what it actually says, how it is today interpreted, and its overall poisonous effect upon the Catholic Faith, our approach will be as follows:

- (1) First, the true Catholic doctrine on the point that is at stake will be expounded, by quoting the decree *Exultate Deo* of the General Council of Florence, and Pope Pius XII's encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi*.
- (2) We will examine an *earlier version* of the above-cited text, namely, the "draft version" or so-called "Schema of 1963," which bore the title *Schema Decreti de Oecumenismo*. This earlier version of this passage, as it stood when it was proposed to the Council Fathers in April 1963, did indeed leave much to be desired, but at least, *as it then stood*, it could be reconciled with Catholic doctrine.
- (3) Next, we will quote, giving the official N.C.W.C. English translation as well as several other variant but acceptable translations, the *final and approved* version of this passage in question. And the remarkable change of wording from the "Draft Schema of 1963" - a change that is doctrinally absolutely untenable - will be immediately manifest.
- (4) Then we will again refer to the Latin text of this passage (given above), in order to show that the *English* versions cited in (3) are accurate *as translations*.
- (5) In passing, we will call attention to the footnote which the Council itself appended to this passage, which footnote cites a certain reference source in order to support its false teaching. We will see, needless to say, that this theological reference source does *not* support the "teaching" of this passage.
- (6) Finally, in order to refute in advance any possible charges that we are "quoting out of context" or giving a false interpretation or slant to this passage, we will quote several well-known "Progressive" commentators (those on the "inside," who helped, directly or indirectly, to draft this decree or later to tout it), thereby proving that the way we are interpreting this passage, *based on what it actually says*, is the way it is generally interpreted.

What The Church Teaches

Pope Eugene IV's Bull *Exultate Deo*, which was later incorporated into the Acts of the Council of Florence as the "Decree for the Armenians," teaches: "Holy baptism, which is the gateway to the spiritual life, holds the first place among all the sacraments; through it we are made members of Christ and of the body of the Church" (*Denz.* 696). From the use of the words *janua* (gateway) and *efficimur* (we are made), it is entirely obvious that the meaning and sole purport of this passage is simply this: through holy baptism we *enter* (via the *janua*: gateway) the Mystical Body of Christ. That is to say, we *become* for the first time members of the Mystical Body through the reception of this sacrament; or, to quote the exact words of this passage, "*we are made*" (*efficimur*) members of the Mystical Body by means of baptism.

Consequently it is true to say that a person who receives baptism, even as a member of a Protestant community, *provided that the Roman Catholic Church recognizes it as a valid baptism*, becomes *at that time* a member of the Mystical Body, because with the reception of this Sacrament original sin is remitted and also all personal or actual mortal sins.. Thus the baptized person *at the time* is living in the state of sanctifying grace, and he has just entered the "*janua*" of the Body of the Church. This is *one* aspect of the teaching under discussion.

And here is another aspect. The Church also clearly teaches that not all persons, once having *become* members, necessarily *remain* members of the Church throughout their entire lifetimes. *Mystici Corporis Christi* teaches: "If we would define and describe this true Church of Jesus Christ - which is the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church - we shall find no expression more noble, more sublime or more divine than the phrase which calls it 'the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ'." The fact that a baptized person can *lose* membership and be *severed* from the Mystical Body is very clearly taught in this same encyclical: "To be really (*reapse*) included as members of the Church are *only* those who have been baptized *and* profess the true faith *and* who have not unhappily withdrawn from Body-unity or for grave faults been excluded by legitimate authority. . . . And so if a man refuse to hear the Church, let him be considered - so the Lord commands - as a heathen and a publican. It follows that *those who are divided in faith or government cannot be living in the one body such as this*, and cannot be living the life of its one divine spirit" (emphasis added). The Pontiff specifically names "schism or heresy or apostasy" as crimes which "sever a man automatically from the Body of the Church."

What, then, is required to *become and remain* a member of the Mystical Body? Valid baptism, first of all, and then "profession of the same faith, and their sharing of the same sacred rites, through participation in the same sacrifice and practical observance of the same laws" (*Mystici Corporis Christi*). Lastly, "They, therefore, walk the path of dangerous error, who believe that they can accept Christ as Head of the Church, while they reject genuine loyalty to His Vicar on earth" (*ibid.*).

The Draft Version of 1963

Paragraph 22 of the "draft version" of what later became the "Decree on Ecumenism," as that early version stood in the spring of 1963, stated that through the Sacrament of Baptism "a man *becomes* truly incorporated into the crucified and glorified Christ and is reborn to a sharing of the divine life-" This statement stresses the first aspect of the teaching we are discussing, namely, that by Baptism a person *becomes* a member of the Mystical Body. In point of fact, by actually using this word "*becomes*," the above statement is in harmony with the teaching of *Exultate Deo* (cited earlier), which employs the word "*efficimur*": *we are made* (members). Therefore, this passage of the "Draft Version of 1963," as it stands, is orthodox. It is deficient, however, in its failure even to mention (*suppressio veri*) the other complementary aspect of this teaching; namely, that of *Mystici Corporis Christi* which points out that this membership is *not necessarily permanent*. In this early draft version it was only an *omission*, but, as shall be seen, the final version contains a *denial* of it.

The Final and "Approved" Text

We began this discussion by quoting the Latin text of this wholly subversive passage from the Decree on Ecumenism, which begins: "Nihilominus, . ." Here is my own translation of this passage: "Nevertheless, those who have been justified through faith, in Baptism *are united with* the Body of Christ, and therefore by right they are honoured by the name of Christian, and by the sons of the Catholic Church they are deservedly acknowledged as brothers in the Lord." It should be carefully noted - and we will refer to this again shortly - that all the verbs in this sentence are in the *present tense*: "they *are* united with the body" (*incorporantur*); "they *are* honoured" (*decorantur*); "they *are* acknowledged" (*agnoscuntur*).

The Latin verb *incorporo* merits attention. This word is made up of "*in*" and "*corporo*," the latter part being derived from the noun *corpus*, which means "body." Hence the definition, and the *sole* definition, of "*incorporo*" that is given by the very authoritative *Latin-English Lexicon of F. P. Leverett* is as follows: "INCORPORO, *to unite with the body*" (p. 419, editions of 1884 and 1931). Since *incorporantur*, (the word used by the Decree on Ecumenism in this passage) is in the present tense, passive voice, the most accurate and literal translation is the one I have given, namely, "*they are united with the Body* (of Christ)."

The Universal Latin Lexicon of Facciolatus and Forcellinus, 1828 edition, gives as the first definition of "*incorporo*": "to embody." Thus it could also be translated as "they are embodied (in Christ)." The official N.C.W.C. translation renders it as: "they are members of Christ's Body" and this is certainly an acceptable translation. The N.C.W.C. translation of the whole passage is: "But even in spite of them it remains true that all who have been justified by faith in Baptism *are*

members of Christ's body, and have a right to be called Christian, and so are correctly accepted as brothers by the children of the Catholic Church."

The most widely read English version of the Decrees of Vatican 11, edited by Walter M. Abbott, S.J., translates it as follows: "Nevertheless, all those justified by faith through baptism *are* incorporated into Christ . . ."

The subversion is there for all to see, both in Latin and in English! The point is clearly implied that *all* those who were at any time baptized *are now* united with the Body of Christ, *are now* members of Christ's Mystical Body *are now* incorporated into Christ. The use of the present tense, *incorporantur*, admits of no other interpretation. If the Council Fathers had meant to say that Baptism is the gateway through which we *become* members, and thus to take into consideration the clear teaching of *Mystici Corporis Christi* that membership in the Church is not necessarily permanent, then the text should have read: "Nevertheless all those who have been justified by faith in baptism *have been* (not 'are') united with the Body of Christ... " That is, *incorporati sunt*," not *incorporantur*."

As this decree went from version to version, a clever and devastating change, was introduced into the text. Whereas it stated at first that we "become" members of the Mystical Body through Baptism, the final version claims that all who have been baptized "are" members,

The Footnote

Footnote 17 immediately follows the word "*incorporantur*" in the Latin text of this passage. The source cited in this footnote is the very sentence of the Bull *Exultate Deo* that we quoted, earlier! The Authors of this Decree not only subvert the Faith, but they have the colossal effrontery to attempt to have the Magisterium of the Church support their heresy! As stressed, earlier, *Exultate Deo*, using the words "*janua*" and "*efficimur*," teaches simply that Baptism is the *gateway* to the spiritual life and by it we, are made at that time members of the Church. To claim that it says more than this is to err and to contradict the clear teaching of the Church.

The Common Interpretation

Now, how do the "Progressive" authorities of the Robber Church interpret this key passage we are discussing: "Nihilominus, - Werner Becker, in his "*History of the Decree on Ecumenism*" (*op. cit.*, pp, 26- 7), brazenly asks this rhetorical question: "Has, not the Church repeatedly declared that all the baptized are 'members of Christ, belonging to the body of the Church' (cf. Denzinger, 696)?" Never has the *Catholic* Church taught this! Only the Robber Church. Becker, however, is being entirely consistent with what the Decree on Ecumenism

actually teaches. Notice that he cites Denzinger, 696, which is the selfsame sentence from *Exultate Deo* that Vatican 11 distorts and misquotes in its footnote 17, which was just discussed. Notice also that in quoting this phrase from *Exultate Deo*, Becker is careful not to include the word "are" within his opening quotation mark; the correct word, given in *Exultate Deo*, is not "are," but "efficimur": "are made."

Says Walter Burghardt (*op. cit.*, p.360): "Basic to any Catholic theology of the Church is incorporation into Christ. Basic to all future theologizing within Catholicism on 'who belongs to the Church of Christ?' is the affirmation of Vatican II: 'all those justified by faith through baptism are incorporated into Christ. They therefore have a right to be honored by the title of Christian ...'" A basic passage, yes, basic to the denial and overthrow of the Church's doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ. By now it should be evident to the reader that this "Church of Christ" (so-called) that the Robbers so often refer to, is *not* the same thing as the Catholic Church. The expert Johannes Feiner is quite clear about this.

"The text of the decree (on Ecumenism)," says Feiner, "later makes it clear that one can only think of a union of the Church if *the Catholic Church, also changes*. It is particularly stressed in the last sentence of this paragraph that the obstacles which hinder *full communion do not prevent incorporation into the body of Christ*; even outside the Catholic Church one is not merely justified by faith in baptism ... but also incorporated into the body of Christ.

The Latin text does not in fact use the expression *corpus Christi*, but says (in equally Pauline terms) *Christo incorporantur*, the concept of the body being retained in the verb. The translation 'they are incorporated into the body of Christ' is as much in accord with the meaning as the rendering 'they are incorporated into Christ.' *Special mention is made of this here, because it raises the question of the identity of the (mystical) body of Christ.* The encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi* of Pius XII (1943) opposed views which did not sufficiently maintain the unity of the mystical body of Christ as an invisible reality and the Catholic Church as a visible and social reality; it used the very strongly worded formula: 'The Mystical Body of Christ *is* the Catholic Church.' If this formula is not regarded in its historical context [here we go again!], and the identity of the body of Christ as the Catholic Church *is pressed* [!], *justice cannot be done to the reality of the Church outside the Catholic Church.*" ("Commentary on the Decree on Ecumenism," *Documents of Vatican 11*, vol. 2, pp. 72-3, emphasis added.)

"Catholic teaching," says an instruction of the Holy Office, "is to be set forth and explained whole and entire, and none of its truths must be passed over in silence or cloaked in ambiguity, for example, the truths concerning the nature and means of salvation, the Roman Pontiff's primacy of jurisdiction, and *the certainty that true reunion can only come from the return* of the dissidents to the one, true Church of Christ... All this must be stated clearly and openly, since they are

seeking the truth, and real union will never be found outside the truth"
(translation as given in *The Tablet*, March 4, 1950).

On the contrary Johannes Feiner -- most accurately conveying the mind of the Robber Church and Vatican 11 -- has said: "In this context the goal of the ecumenical movement is seen *not as the return* of other Christians to the Catholic Church, but rather restoration of full communion with the Catholic Church by the overcoming of the obstacles mentioned" In a word, the "ecumenical movement" does not mean the return to the fold of those who are miserably outside the true Church, but simply the *declaring* that -lo and behold! -- they were all *already* all along "united with the Body of the Church."

Choosing Up Sides

There, is no middle ground. Every man must ultimately ally himself either with the true Catholic Church or with the Robber Church. We conclude this series by quoting the following inspiring words of John Donoso Cortes:

"There is no man, let him be aware of it or not, who is not a combatant in this hot contest; no one who does not take an active part in the responsibility of the defeat or victory. The Prisoner in his chains and the king on his throne, the poor and the rich, the healthy and the infirm, the wise and the ignorant, the captive and the free, the old man and the child, the civilized and the savage, share equally in the combat. Every word that is pronounced, is either inspired by God or by the world, and necessarily proclaims, implicitly or explicitly, but always clearly, the glory of the one or the triumph of the other. In this singular warfare we all fight through forced enlistment; here the system of substitutes or volunteers finds no place. In it is unknown the exception of sex or age; here no attention is paid to him who says, I am the son of a poor widow; nor to the mother of the paralytic, nor to the wife of the cripple. In this warfare all men born of woman are soldiers.

"And don't tell me you don't wish to fight; for the moment you tell me that, you are already fighting: nor that you don't know which side to join; for while you are saying that, you have already joined a side: nor that you wish to remain neutral; for while you are thinking to be so, you are so no longer: nor that you want to be indifferent; for I will laugh at you, because on pronouncing that word you have chosen your party. Don't tire yourself in seeking a place of security against the chances of the war, for you tire yourself in vain; that war is extended as far as space, and prolonged through all time. In eternity alone, the country of the just, can you find rest, because there alone there is no combat: but do not imagine, however, that the gates of eternity shall be opened for you, unless you first show the wounds you bear; those gates are only opened for those who gloriously fought here the battles of the Lord, and were, like the Lord, crucified." (*Essays on Catholicism, Liberalism, and Socialism*, M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin, 1879, PP. 117-18.)

"THE SKY GROWS DARKER YET"

by PATRICK HENRY OMLOR

Text of speech of Patrick H. Omlor delivered to the LATIN MASS SOCIETY OF AUSTRALIA at its General Annual Meeting at Sydney, Australia, on Sunday, October 21, 1973.

In his encyclical *Acerbo Nimis*, dated April 15, 1905, Pope St. Pius X singled out one principal cause of the remissness from which all the grave evils of that day arose. He claimed that the main source of all the troubles was *ignorance* - the ignorance of divine things on the part of Catholics. And in stating his case he cited these words of his predecessor, Benedict XIV: "We declare that the greater part of those who are damned have brought the calamity on themselves by ignorance of the mysteries of the faith, which they should have known and believed, in order to be united with the elect."

As an immediate and drastic remedy for this dangerous and widespread ignorance, St. Pius ordered, by virtue of his apostolic authority, that every bishop in the world should immediately put into effect a program for the Catholic education, not only of children, but also of adult Catholics. He directed that all pastors should on Sundays and Holy Days, in addition to the usual sermon at Mass, give a separate full period of instruction to all the faithful. Moreover he specified that the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* be followed in all these instructions. Very shortly, by the way, we will be examining several compelling teachings found in this Trent Catechism.

Now by the time 1962 rolled around, the widespread ignorance of divine things, not only among the laity, but also and especially among the hierarchy and clergy, had reached colossal proportions. *Had even a significant minority at that time known what is taught in the Trent Catechism*, it is doubtful that even a fraction of the subversion of our Faith that has occurred could indeed have occurred. It is certain that all of us, sadder and wiser now, have learned or relearned much about our precious Catholic Faith since 1962.

This warfare in which we are all presently engaged is a very vast and all-encompassing one. It is no less than a war to preserve the very Catholic Faith itself. *Many are the different battlefronts* where we must dig in and take our stand. We must oppose the forces of religious indifferentism which today masquerades under the euphemistic banner of "ecumenism." We all know of the dangerous "catechisms" (so-called) which are designed to rob our children of their precious Catholic Faith and heritage. On every side we witness the almost

total abandonment of all standards of Christian morality.

THE MASS - OUR CHIEF RAMPART

Although we must fight all these battles, and many others, the chief rampart we must defend is the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. The enemies of the Church have always had this key axiom: "*Tolle missam; tolle ecclesiam.*" "Take away the Mass, and thereby take away the Church." Contrariwise we may affirm with the greatest confidence: Preserve the Mass, and thereby preserve the Church.

But what exactly can we hope actually to accomplish? At this point - and it is very late in the game - perhaps our chief job is salvaging, preventing shipwreck. That is to say, through our prayers and our work we must hinder as many as possible of our fellow-Catholics-members of Christ's Mystical Body - from being sucked down into the quicksands of this universal apostasy we are witnessing. We must awaken them to what has happened, and what is even now happening, in this complete sell-out of our Faith and our Church by our supposed spiritual leaders, who are abetted and encouraged by a largely craven and faithless laity.

Our *prayer* should be especially the Rosary. Our *work* lies principally in informing others. We must continue to write our letters, to talk to confused and uninformed priests and lay persons, and to pass out appropriate literature to be read. In a word: we must continue to proselytize, to make converts even as did the early Christians. With this difference, that here the missionary field is not among the pagan and the infidel, but among the nominal Catholics!

DARK FOREBODINGS - A GRACE!

The mental anguish we often feel in seeing the situation worsen from day to day is, paradoxically, our comfort. It was Chesterton who wrote these lines:

Out of the mouth of the Mother of God
Like a little word come I;
For I go gathering Christian men
From sunken paving and ford and fen
To die in a battle, God knows when,
By God, but I know why.

And this is the word of Mary,
The word of the world's desire;
No more of comfort shall ye get,
Save that the sky grows darker yet
And the sea rises higher.

No more comfort, save that the sky grows darker yet? Are we actually to find comfort in witnessing the situation growing bleaker? Yes! It is because from the

standpoint of eternity bad news is often good news. It forces us down upon our knees, it reminds us that we have not here a lasting city, and that our dependence upon Almighty God must be *total*. And so, paradoxically, we may rejoice in the fact that very likely there are even far worse things in store for us, lurking beyond the horizon.

THE MUCH-FEARED "VALIDITY ISSUE"

The issue feared most by the "progressive" or "new-breed" hierarchy and clergy is the question whether the "English Mass" is valid. Often they will tolerate our complaints about this and that, the forsaking of traditions, the abolition of the Latin liturgy, the deplorable catechisms, and so forth. On occasion they may even partially agree with us, or else simply nod their heads and go their way. *However, when the "validity issue" is raised to them their reaction is usually quite intense.* There have been instances when bishops and priests, upon having the question of validity put to them, have become livid with rage. This is doubtless a defense mechanism on their part, for down deep they fear that we are right, they know that we have a sound case, and since they cannot explain away our arguments even to themselves, they wish to hear nothing of them.

Many cannot face up to this dreadful possibility - or, rather, in my opinion, *probability* - that the "English Masses" are invalid. But for our part we must never fear the truth, nor must we fear to be "controversial," always bearing in mind, of course, how essential it is in theological matters to be absolutely sure of our facts. We must be careful to state our case calmly but emphatically, without fear, and also without flaw in our facts or in our logic.

We should be determined never to fear or flee from the truth. however agonizing it may be. For we cannot afford to be like those who, having eyes see not and having ears hear not. Quite to the contrary, we must seek to know the truth, the very worst, and to provide for it. It is my belief that in the English, and in certain other vernacular versions, the Mass has most probably been rendered invalid, and that what is performed in most Catholic churches today is, at best, on a par with the Protestants' "Lord's Supper" or "Communion service."

Our case is based on the principle of sacramental theology known as "invalidity through defect of form." We do not claim that the "English Mass" is invalid because it is no longer celebrated in Latin, nor because an entire "New Order" has replaced the Tridentine mass, nor because we feel that many priests simply no longer have the proper intention, or have largely lost their faith. No, *the sole basis for our position is not a subjective one, but a very concrete and objective one .*

OUR CASE IN THE BRIEFEST TERMS

In as few words as possible, this is our case. Always we were taught that the form, the necessary words, for a sacrament must not be altered, or else the sacrament is not produced. "In our sacraments," teaches the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, "the form is so definite that any, even a casual deviation from it, renders the sacrament *NULL*." Concerning the sacramental form for the Holy Eucharist (the wine consecration at Mass) this same Catechism clearly states: "We are firmly to believe that it consists of the following words: 'THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD, OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT, THE MYSTERY OF FAITH, WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS.'"

The "English Mass" alters this form substantially, in several ways, but principally by using the words "*FOR ALL MEN*" instead of "*FOR MANY*." In explaining that these words "for many" refer to the elect only, and not to all men, the Trent Catechism explicitly affirms: "*With reason, therefore were the words 'for ALL(men)' NOT used, as in this place the fruit of the Passion are alone spoken of, and to the elect only did His Passion bring the fruit of salvation.*" And so we see that these very words "for all men" which, according to the resolute and clear teaching of the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, must *not* be used, are in very fact being used in the "English Mass."

There are many other details and aspects of our position, and other important principles of sacramental theology enter in. Many additional and very forceful pronouncements of the *Magisterium*, and of learned and holy theologians, such as St. Thomas Aquinas, can be cited to support our arguments, but the foregoing is the case condensed as briefly as possible.

During the past five and a half years we have encountered only *five main counter-arguments* that have been brought forth against our thesis. (1) That the words spoken in the Aramaic language by Our Lord at the Last Supper really meant "for all men" and not "for many." (2) That in Holy Scripture the word "many" is often to be taken as meaning "all." (3) That Christ indeed died for all, and not just for many. (4) That in the consecration of the wine the mere words "This is My Blood" are sufficient for a valid consecration, just as the words "This is My Body" suffice for the consecration of the bread.

CHURCH TRULY COULDN'T HAVE APPROVED

Once these four counter-arguments have been decisively answered, and they are easily rebutted; and once logic, reason and sound theology have backed our opponents into a corner, invariably they will resort to the fifth and final argument, which is supposedly the very last word. All discussion must come to an end, so they suppose, when they solemnly proclaim: (5) "*It has been approved!*" And,

needless to say, by inference we are being disobedient to lawful authority by daring to question what has "been approved."

How do we answer that one? Once again we have sound papal authority on our side. In the ensuing discussion we shall see *proof* that the altered form containing "for all men" cannot have been lawfully approved. It is important to bear in mind that we are referring only to the change in the Words of Consecration, and that the following evidence does not constitute a case for the Tridentine Mass as a whole, against the "New Order."

Now, on at least four separate occasions Holy Mother Church, speaking through Her authentic, *Magisterium*, or teaching authority, has positively declared that *no one* has the right or the power to innovate anything whatsoever touching upon the substance of the sacraments. By "substance of a sacrament" is meant the matter and the form. Of these four clear-cut pronouncements let us, to serve the purpose, consider only the two most recent ones.

First: in the letter *Ex Quo, Nono*, of December 26, 1910, Pope St. Pius X declared: "It is well known that to the Church there belongs no right whatsoever to innovate anything touching on the substance of the sacraments." Thus *even the Church Herself* has no power or authority to alter the words in the form of a sacrament.

The second ruling we will cite is that of Pope Pius XII in his apostolic constitution *Sacramentum Ordinis*, of November 30, 1947. Said Pius XII: "As the Council of Trent teaches, the seven sacraments of the New Law have all been instituted by Jesus Christ, our Lord, and *the Church has no power* over the 'substance of the sacraments'." The Church has no power! No bishop, no council, no Pope, no one at all can change or even tamper with the essential matter or form of a sacrament.

By the very fact that these pronouncements were made one thing is quite evident. It is evident that the Church, always guided by the Holy Ghost, envisaged and foresaw the possibility at least, that at some future time someone (or ones) calling themselves "the legitimate authority of the Church" - but in fact abusing authority - just might actually presume to attempt to change the form of a sacrament. Now it might be thought by some that certainly our very shepherds, the ones whose chief business should be defending the Faith, would not and could not ever do such a thing. But if such a possibility were entirely out of the question, then St. Pius X and Pope Pius XII (both of whom we have just quoted) - and before them the Council of Trent and also Clement VI - would not have bothered to issue their solemn admonitions. "*De rebus parvulis non curat lex*": the law does not concern itself with trifles, nor we might add does it concern itself with impossible situations.

Therefore this change "for all men" - a change in the sacramental form of the

Holy Eucharist, the substance of that Sacrament- simply cannot have been made validly or legitimately. If you should tell me that all the bishops have approved this change; if you tell me that a general council has approved it; or if you should tell me that the Pope himself has approved it, or even, yes, that an angel sent from Heaven made this change, my reply will be ever the same. It will be in the words of St. Pius X; "It is well known that to the Church there belongs no right whatsoever to innovate anything touching on the substance of the sacraments." Or in these words of Pope Pius XII: "As the Council of Trent teaches,... the Church has no power over the substance of the sacraments."

Consequently any so-called "approval", regardless of the alleged source, must have been necessarily null and void *at the very outset*. And, moreover, null and void in a manner totally beyond the control or powers of any would-be innovators. And that is the firm and resounding stand we must take against those who would claim that it is *we* who are being disobedient! Name for me those who have made and "approved" this change, and I'll name for you the disobedient ones.

A BISHOP DID SPEAK OUT

At one point during this *"for all men"* controversy in the United States, Bishop Sylvester Treinen of Boise, Idaho, had a letter published in the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, a magazine widely read by the clergy. Bishop Treinen pointed out that there is no Scriptural basis whatever for this change. In the accounts of the Institution of the Holy Eucharist, both St. Matthew and St. Mark record in their Gospels that Our Lord said "for many," and not "for all men."

Moreover the Bishop enumerated many Bible editions - Catholic and Protestant, very old, editions as well as the newest versions - and he claimed that there isn't now nor has there ever been a single edition of the New Testament that has those words "for all men" in this place. He might have added that this holds true not only in English, but in all the Greek texts, ancient and modern, in the Peshito Bible translated into the Syriac language in the fifth century, in the Latin Vulgate, and without doubt in all the Bibles ever printed in any language.

Clearly, then, there is a discrepancy between the "English Mass" and Holy Writ itself. No one seems to deny that. Now perhaps the "Modernist" or "progressive" would claim that all those Bibles are deficient, and that now the I.C.E.L. has finally got it right! But the point is that no one will deny that there is indeed a discrepancy. Please bear that in mind while we ponder these words of St. Teresa: *"The Holy Ghost never inspires anything that is not conformable to Holy Writ.* If there were the slightest divergence, that alone by itself would prove so evidently the work of the Evil One, that were the whole world to assure me it was the Holy Ghost, I would never believe it."

FACING UP TO UNPLEASANT REALITIES

As you know, there are those who do not agree that the "English Mass" is most probably invalid. Some do not even concede that it might *possibly* be invalid. Consider, for example, the pamphlet entitled, "*Why The Tridentine Mass?*" The author is at pains to assert most confidently that the "English Mass" is certainly valid. This he does in at least three different places. Yet on page 25 he cites a decree from the Roman Missal which states: "If anyone removes or changes anything in the Form of Consecration of the Body and Blood, and by this change of words does not signify the same thing as these words do, he does not confect the Sacrament." In short, this decree avers that if any words in the form are changed, and this involves a change of meaning, the Holy Eucharist is not produced and hence there is no Mass. Now, immediately after quoting this decree, the author of this said pamphlet goes on to say (and I certainly agree, with him here) that the "for all men" change is "a most serious mutilation of the meaning of the words of the Consecration of the wine, at the very least." And in the very next breath he proclaims: "We must firmly reaffirm our belief that it does not, *per se*, make the new Mass in English invalid"(SIC!). No further comment!

Tampering with the form of a sacrament - and the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist at that - is by far the most serious and the most audacious move the Innovators have undertaken thus far. *Everything is at stake on this point.* My friends, if we are willing to let them get away with *this* unchallenged, our other lesser battles are certainly fought in vain.

In all this strife and confusion, in all our efforts and our frustrations, we must at all costs avoid bitterness. When events don't shape up to our liking, when we seem to be getting nowhere, when all appears futile and hopeless, let us recall these lines:

"No more of comfort shall ye get,
Save that the sky grows darker yet
And the sea rises higher."

The Remnant

'THE SALMANTICENSES' RESPONSE TO DE LUGO ON THE FORM OF CONSECRATION OF THE WINE

(A documentary translation
by Fr. Lawrence S. Brey,
with Introduction by Patrick Henry Omlor)

INTRODUCTION

Off and on during the seven centuries that have elapsed since the death of St. Thomas, a quite legitimate theological controversy has been waged, with many

and various theologians and scholars (both the famous and the not-so-famous) from time to time espousing one side or the other. The mooted question has been and is: *for a valid consecration of the wine during mass do the mere words, "THIS IS MY BLOOD", suffice as the sacramental form?* Or are the additional words of the form, which are used by the Western Church (equivalent words being used, by the way, in the Eastern rites), namely, "OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT...(ETC.)...FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS," *also required for validity?* (Those who are able to read Latin may wish to consult *De Eucharistia*, by Immanuel Doronzo, for an interesting account of this controversy. Doronzo airs both sides, giving the principal arguments and counter-arguments of each, and he lists the main theologians of note who, over the centuries, have allied themselves with one side or the other. His own *personal* conclusion expressed at the end of his article is that it comes out a "dead-heat"; that is, that both opinions are "equally probable".)

Until somewhat recently this controversy held interest from an academic point of view only. But with the first appearance in 1967 of the vernacular liturgies, many of which have the well-known "for all men" mutilation in the wine-consecration in place of the words "*pro multis*" ("for many"), this particular controversy became revived, and it is no longer of "academic" interest only. For the "for all men" mutilation occurs in the latter words of the aforesaid sacramental form, that is, in the part which is disputed regarding its necessity for validity.

This present article hardly purports to resolve this centuries-old controversy. Its aim is merely to explode one, and only one, specific erroneous theory. John De Lugo (1583-1660), a Spanish Jesuit and Cardinal, and a brilliant theologian particularly in moral theology, at one time claimed to have discovered certain ancient oriental liturgies that actually used only the few words, "This is My Blood", (or a similar short form), as the complete sacramental form for the wine-consecration. De Lugo argued that the very existence of such liturgies proved that those few words are enough, for validity, and that *ipso facto* the additional words of the form, although used universally in the Church, are not essential.

Such weighty and wholly conclusive evidence ended the great controversy once and for all; *or rather*, (to state it correctly), it *should* have done so, that is, unless De Lugo's evidence turned out to be in some manner faulty. Of course, everyone knows that the controversy has not in fact been settled even yet; otherwise scholars of our times, including Doronzo, would not continue to write about it as an open question. Occasionally, even nowadays, a rare amateur theologian or dilettante will chance to discover De Lugo, exclaim to himself "Eureka!", and then proceed to proclaim that "the ball game is over", the losers being St. Thomas and his adherents who deny that the short form, "This is My Blood", is sufficient.

In De Lugo's own time, his evidence was weighed, analyzed, and finally rejected by contemporary theologians on the "other side"; and what is perhaps the best and most thorough rebuttal was made by the Salmanticenses. These were the

Discalced Carmelites of Salamanca, Spain, whose strict policy was an unwavering adherence to Thomism. A most remarkable aspect of the Salmanticenses' writings is the fact that they were from the pens of many different theologians over a period of time spanning nearly a century. According to the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, "the Salmanticenses have ever been held in the highest esteem, particularly at Rome where they are considered a standard work on Thomistic scholasticism" (Vol. XIII, p. 402, N.Y., 1912-1913).

Their "*Cursus Theologicus*" (written between 1631 and 1672) contains their reply against De Lugo; and this reply comprises paragraphs 30-32 of disp. IX, dub. 3, of the volume *De Eucharistia*, i.e. Vol. XVIII of the *Cursus*. An English language version of this particular text (paragr.30-32) has most probably never been published. One reason for this would be that even the Latin text is not all that easy to find; and, secondly, the "Lugo argument" had already been laid to rest long ago, before theological tracts in English became common. Consequently the following translation by Fr. Lawrence Brey is in this sense an historical first. Overriding that important consideration, however, is the vital nature of the subject matter that is discussed and its current opportuneness. Also, readers of *The Remnant* will, no doubt, enjoy and appreciate the Salmanticenses' brilliant polemics. I trust, therefore, that I speak for the majority of *Remnant* readers in commending and thanking Fr. Brey for his very able and valuable effort in preparing the following excellent translation.

Patrick Henry Omlor
June 17, 1976
Feast of Corpus Christi

The Crucial Salmanticenses Paragraphs
(30-32, Disp. IX, dub. 3)

(NOTE: Having just refuted a certain argument by Cajetan, the Salmanticenses now discuss De Lugo's thesis. Sectional headings and line numberings added by translator).

Alleged "Precedence" of "Short Form" Usage
Paragr. 30

Of no better standing (than Cajetan's argument) is another argument derived from Lugo (disp. 11, sect. 4), namely, that although in the liturgies we have adduced one finds those subsequent words which we have just discussed (i.e., '*novi et aeterni... pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum*'), nevertheless in other liturgies one finds only the five prior words (i.e., '*Hic est calix sanguinis mei*'); consequently from the aforesaid liturgies of this type it is evident that those words suffice. But in our considered opinion it is apparent that certainly if such five words should suffice, then God would have provided that the Church

somehow would consummate the consecration form of the chalice by means of those same words, and no additional words. For indeed according to this argument (Lugo's) we arrive at that conclusion. That author (Lugo) claims that this is indeed the case. Here are his words: "Certainly in some liturgies" (such as used by the Maronites) "namely, of St. John the Evangelist, of the holy Apostles, of St. Eustasius, St. John the Patriarch, the words are: '*Hoc est corpus meum: Hic est sanguis meus*'. In the liturgy of St. Mark the Evangelist: '*Corpus meum est hoc: Sanguis meus est hoc*'. In the liturgy of St. Matthew the Pastor: '*Hoc caro mea est: Hoc sanguis meus est*'. These forms from the manuscript Missal of the Maronites, which was sent from Mt. Libanus to Rome, were given to me by an erudite man, Victorius Scialach, Abbot of St. Gregory, a Maronite from birth, and for many years a public interpreter of languages in the city of Rome." (End of quotation from Lugo.)

Based on Questionable Sources

This argument, we say, does not in the least demolish the fundamental position laid down by us; because our position assuredly relies only upon Scriptures, liturgies, or Masses of some certain (certae) authority and approbation. Those sources which do not have this certain authority and approbation ought to be spurned and reputed as nought. And of that ilk are those which Lugo adduces in the quotation just cited. For indeed, in the first place, Peter de Soto, Arauxo, Labat, and other men no less learned than he, testify that at first the Greeks and the Maronites used the same words in consecrating the chalice as those used by the Roman Church, or at least their equivalent. However, after the Greeks and their adherents became schismatics, just as they corrupted many canons of the Councils, as all Catholics recognize, so also they perverted not a few liturgies. Besides the malice of the schismatics and the heretics, there was at one time added towards the growth of this erroneous position the ignorance and carelessness of the transcribers; at another time the great catastrophe of the era, bringing the Greeks and the Maronites under the power of the Turks; at another time the distance and a diminishing commerce with the Romans; at another time, finally, the self-love and the excessive attachment to one's own opinions of those who did not neglect this means of overlooking the ancient form, in order to show that the prior words suffice. And from all these factors it came about that in the manuscript Missals of the Maronites prior to the year 1592 one may find some forms for consecrating the chalice that do not have the final words which we Latins use, and which it is certain that the Church of the Greeks once used.

Vitiated Missals - Pope Intervened!

Consequently whatever is culled from such Missals, thus vitiated to that extent, has no firmness and authority. Secondly, because as N. Franciscus relates (*loc. cit.*, no. 42), the most learned consultants among the Maronites at Rome replied that generally in almost all their liturgies (namely, of St. Peter, of the Twelve Apostles, St. John Chrysostom, St. Cyril, St. Eustasius, St. John the Patriarch,

Pope Julius, and others) they have the same consecration form as the Latins, albeit with one word or another transposed, or if not explicitly expressed nevertheless implicitly contained in other words. Wherefore the Supreme Pontiff ordered the manuscript Missals of the Maronites that were in any manner corrupted to be corrected. And in accord with this mandate a Maronite Missal was printed at Rome in the year 1592 in the Medici printery. That Missal has in practically all the liturgies one and the same form for the consecration of the chalice. This form faithfully translated into Latin from the Syriac text reads: '*Hic autem est calix sanguinis mei, testamenti novi, et aeterni, mysterium fidei, qui quo vobis, et multis effunditur in remissionem peccatorum.*' ('This is the Chalice of My Blood, of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which is poured out for you and for many unto the remission of sins.') And it is to such liturgies, of clearly certain authority, that one must direct one's attention, not indeed to those corrupted ones and apocrypha, not a few of which were cited by Lugo. For truly those must be estimated of no more value than the Scriptures perverted by the English, and others, in times of heresy and schism. For just as among those there were many Catholics who took pains to preserve the authentic Scriptures, there were also many heretics who strove diligently to corrupt them, distorting them into false meanings. So also among the Maronite inhabitants of Mt. Libanus there were many Catholics; nevertheless there were at the same time many schismatics and those addicted to the errors of the Greeks. For which reason along with the legitimate liturgies and forms found in those manuscript codices there are not a few spurious ones of no authority, namely, those foisted by the schismatics. And of that ilk are those forms which lack the latter words (*namely, 'novi et aeterni... pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum'*), and in this respect they differ from other forms of universal and approved faith, which we reviewed in no. 28 *supra*. And for this reason the strength of our fundamental position cannot be nullified through this avenue of argument, just as the Catholic position neither can nor must be undermined by the Scripture versions corrupted by the English and other heretics.

If Some Maronites Used the "Short Form", Then What?

Paragr. 31

Perhaps one might contend that the Maronites at one time consecrated the chalice with only those words, '*Hic calix est sanguinis Dei,*' (This is the chalice of the Blood of God'), or '*Hic est sanguis meus,*' ('This is My Blood'), and that it is contrary to reason that they would not actually have consecrated, i.e. , by changing the wine into Christ's Blood; because from that it would follow that they adored and exposed for adoration something which was not worthy of adoration; and likewise they would not have completed the Sacrifice, along with "a thousand and one" other absurdities. If anyone should contend all the foregoing, we shall reply first of all that the Maronites do not in fact consecrate in that way, but rather in accord with the mandate and the correction of the form ordered by the Supreme Pontiff, as stated earlier. Just as in times past the

Armenians were consecrating with other words and other formulas, but subsequently in the Council of Florence Pope Eugene ordered them to use the common form, i.e., the one used by the Latins, so also *de facto* the same case prevails with the Maronites as with the Armenians.

*No "Ecclesia Supplet"
For Defective Consecration Form*

However, granting the contrary supposition that at some time they in consecrating used only the five prior words, one could respond that they confected a valid sacrament, not because such a form would be sufficient according to the Institution of Christ, but by reason of some extraordinary dispensation. For just as the Church gives jurisdiction to those who act with a probable opinion, or in "common error", so also can it be piously believed that God supplies whatever is lacking for the validity of the sacraments in the case of those who act with a probable opinion, which sort of matter is generally adjudicated in the Church; and similarly not a few believe that God supplies for a defect of intention on the part of a minister, as is evident from what we stated in an earlier tract (disp. 7, no. 37). But setting aside these predicated theories (which we do not approve of, for the reasons already stated), we do admit that the Maronites, or at least some of them, at one time (reportedly) used that form, '*Hic sanguis est meus*'; but consequently we say that *by no means did they confect the Consecration and the Sacrament* (emphasis added). That such a thing befell them we do not deem absurd, One may say that this would not seem fitting according to the disposition of Divine Providence, on account of a certain remarkable Divine Government that is universal in all respects. However, it would be by no means unfitting for Providence to permit the aforesaid error and its effects in some small part of the world peopled by the Maronites of Mt. Libanus, and among some of its inhabitants, especially the ignorant and the schismatics, as some of them were. And that can be demonstrated by an example: for the Ethiopians sometimes used this form in consecrating: '*Hic panis est corpus meum*' ('This bread is my body'), as Verricelli observes in *de Missionibus*, tit.15, q.265, and nevertheless that form is plainly invalid, as all theologians concede. Therefore, just as it is not improper to admit that the Ethiopians (even though Catholics) did not validly consecrate in their extremely vast regions; so neither is it absurd to say that some few Maronites (especially schismatics or the ignorant, or those associated with schismatics), living in their small territory by sufferance of the Turks, had or endured a similar error, in consecrating the chalice with only those words, '*Hic est sanguis meus*'; and that other absurdities ensued from this error.

*De Lugo Argument Proves Nothing,
Is Untenable in Practice*

Paragr. 32

From which it follows, firstly, that our adversaries (who are wont to prize so highly this argument from the Maronite liturgies and other similar evidence) actually demonstrate nothing; but they are even weighed down by difficulty. Because, even granting that their opinion might be probable, they nevertheless cannot deny that our opinion is *most probable* and of great authority, as Suarez said (quoted by us *supra* in no. 22). According to this our opinion, a consecration of the chalice expressed in these few words, *Hic est sanguis meus*, is invalid. And consequently whoever would attempt to consecrate using only those words would place himself in manifest danger of not consecrating, and therefore of adoring and exposing for adoration that which is not worthy of adoration. And the Maronites were guilty of all those things, if it be true (as Lugo and certain others think) that they were employing those few words in consecrating the chalice. And consequently this conduct of theirs is incapable of establishing any authority; but, what is far more important, as it is so fraught with danger it should not even be spoken of approvingly. Particularly so, since our Most Holy Father Innocent XI, on March 2, 1679, *condemned* the following proposition: "In conferring the sacraments it is not illicit to follow a probable opinion concerning what pertains to the validity of the sacrament, while forsaking a safer opinion; unless law, convention, or the grave danger of incurring harm would prohibit it. Hence it is only in the conferring of Baptism and sacerdotal or episcopal orders that a probable opinion must not be used." Wherefore the Maronites cannot use that form, nor were they formerly able to use it licitly, unless ignorance might have excused them: for in using that form one places oneself in manifest danger of not consecrating, and of suffering the other consequences arising therefrom.

Secondly, it so happens that our opinion and that of the Doctor St. Thomas is, on the one hand, most probable, from a speculative point of view; and on the other hand it is the safer opinion and the one that must be wholly followed in practice. Whereas in reality our adversaries' opinion is solely speculative, and "probable" from, as it were, a metaphysical point of view only, but it is totally devoid of any practical value, since it cannot be reduced to practice because of the danger of not consecrating.

Thirdly, it so happens that what we have said about the Maronites' liturgies and similar rites of uncertain authority must be applied *a fortiori* to a certain liturgy by the name of "St. Peter", in which precisely these words, '*Hic est sanguis meus*', are set down as the consecration form for the chalice. For this liturgy is appraised as being wholly apocryphal, and it was first brought out (made public) by Lindanus, Bishop of Ghent, there being no evidence of it in the preceding centuries.

Fourthly, it so happens that they err, those who say (as we insinuated in no. 23) that the Doctor St. Thomas taught our opinion by virtue of the fact that he had not been aware of those other liturgies, and that if he had seen them he would not have opposed himself to them, but would have been prepared to teach

otherwise. They are deceived, we say, and they are lacking in the reverence due to St. Thomas. First, because in the liturgies of any authority there is nothing that does not favor the opinion of the holy Doctor (as we considered in no. 28). And he himself encompassed all these in the liturgy of the most excellent Mass of all, namely that of the Roman Church, which to his credit he expounded in his dissertation, "*Sed Contra*". Also because in the other liturgies he sees nothing of importance that he would have found necessary to exclude. And, finally, because they are believed not to have existed at his time, but later were fabricated either by schismatics or by certain partisans, and those who were most diligent in promoting their own opinions. Just as there were those who, in the recent editions of the "Fathers" took the trouble to excise and remove certain passages from the fathers, which were least favorable to their cause, and especially certain homilies of St. John Chrysostom, so also, conversely, there were those who somehow concerned themselves with adding to the liturgies whatever might more favorably further their purposes.

(End of Salmanticenses Text)

Translator's Comments

Special thanks are due to Patrick H. Omlor for locating the authoritative Salmanticenses treatise and calling attention to the extremely significant above passages and the desirability of their being rendered into English, as an added contribution to the study and clarification of the "for all men"/ invalidity controversy of the "New mass" problem. Similar thanks are due to Walter L. Matt and The Remnant Press for their instrumentality in the publication of this important document.

I have endeavored to make this translation, from the original Latin, as faithful as possible, and in cases of difficult idiomatic rendering, giving priority to the sense of the text in a manner strictly compatible with or equivalent to the original. I am also indebted to Mr. Omlor for his further suggestions and modifications that were incorporated into the finalized translation. While we feel that the translation is accurate and more than adequate, especially as regards the substance of the Salmanticenses argument, the rendering, needless to say, remains open to any responsible and warranted correction or modification. There were, admittedly, some difficult passages, but apparently not in critical areas.

The gist of the Salmanticenses' refutation of De Lugo is this: (1) De Lugo cites certain Maronite missals as "proof" for the acceptability and sufficiency of the mere words, "This is My Blood", simply because these or similar abbreviated forms were found in those missals. (2) But those particular missals were actually corrupt and vitiated, products of a heretical and schismatic situation, hence have no value whatsoever as evidence on behalf of the "short form" argument. On the other hand, the missals of the non-schismatic Maronites and all other bonafide Eastern traditions, incorporated the entire proper form, including the words

equivalent to "pro multis". (3) Moreover, the Roman Pontiff himself ordered the correction of the corrupted missals, and the Insertion of the proper complete Form. (4) If some of the Maronites used the corrupted forms, those particular Masses are considered invalid, despite theoretical pious beliefs that perhaps God's Providence would "supply" for the defect (which hardly can be presumed and seems not in accord with the Will of Christ in instituting the Eucharist and its absolute requirements); while "*ecclesia supplet*" would not apply at all, as it regards jurisdictional, not sacramental defects. (5) The De Lugo short-form-sufficiency concept (whose probability was already outweighed by the teaching of St. Thomas and arguments of the Salmanticenses later) is forbidden in actual practice, as it exposes such consecrations to the danger of invalidity, and counters the Church's directive that *safer* opinions must be followed in confecting the Sacraments.

Thus, in but a few pointed and well-measured passages, these Spanish theologians, highly esteemed in Rome as authoritative Thomists, as Mr. Omlor pointed out, have pulled the props from under a specious and seemingly "clinching" argument in defense of the validity of the "abbreviated form" (and implicitly of the "for all men" mutilation or any similar corruption of the latter words of the form): i.e., the alleged evidence that certain Catholic missals once incorporated the abbreviated form, omitting the latter words which include "which shall be shed for you and for many..."

Even very recent papal documents, by the way, testify to the use of "for many" in the Divine Eucharistic Words. One not too well known is Pope John XXIII's Apostolic Letter on the Precious Blood, in which he speaks of "the religious worship of the Most Precious Blood of the Word Incarnate, which is shed *for many unto the remission of sins*" (June 30, 1960, AAS 52-545). As is well known, these papally-affirmed Divine Words were soon to be swapped for the "for all men" distortion; just as the same Pontiff's *Veterum Sapientia* (on the importance of Latin) was replaced by runaway vernacularism!

The idea of God or the Church "supplying" for the defect is worthy of special comment, in view of widespread misconceptions about the role of Divine Intervention, "good intention", and "*ecclesia supplet*". While these considerations are comforting and do fill some well-defined roles, it is wishful thinking, without theological basis, to hold that any possible sacramental irregularity or defect is "covered" or "saved" by one or the other of these. In regard to a defective sacramental form, for example, while Divine power could provide for a valid effect in such a case, this could not be gratuitously presumed as a matter of course, and in fact would not seem to be in accord with the ordinary disposition of Divine Providence nor with Christ's Will and requirements governing the Sacraments He instituted. (On the other hand, regarding the overall universal situation, including the subversion of the Mass, there is no doubt that Divine Intervention, direct or indirect, will rectify things in God's due time; perhaps after the apostasy reaches its apogee and the "Son of Perdition" has had his day, if these are indeed the

apocalyptic times). As for "good intention", no amount of a priest's "good intention" can rectify or validate an objectively defective sacramental form - unless the priest carry that good intention into action, by himself correcting the form to its proper wording! But a thousand "good intentions" by themselves will never make up for or validate an uncorrected form.

As for "*ecclesia supplet*" ("the Church supplies"), this canonical provision (Canon 209, C.J.C.) regards the Church's supplying, "automatically", ecclesiastical *jurisdiction* in certain cases where it is lacking and needed (in cases of "common error" and "doubt of law or fact"), mainly in connection with the Sacrament of Penance and certain other priestly functions requiring jurisdiction. It does *not* (and cannot) supply for any defect of sacramental matter or form, nor does it supply any power of Orders (as distinct from power of Jurisdiction); nor does it give one a "blank check" covering "everything", even in an "emergency situation". In cases of danger of death there is a similar canonical provision. "*Ecclesia supplet*", somewhat like the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, is often wrongly understood, or misapplied, or overextended; whereas in reality each of these is limited to well defined functions. The Salmanticenses, in the above document, cite the role of "*ecclesia supplet*" and conclude that no such supplying validates a defective or incomplete Consecration form.

The Catechism of the Council of Trent states: "In our sacraments. . . the form is so definite that any, even a casual deviation from it renders the Sacrament null." Consequently if the wine-consecration-form, with the "for all men" mutilation, is intrinsically defective to the extent of rendering the Sacrament and the Mass invalid, then neither "*ecclesia supplet*", nor the "good and proper" intention of the priest, nor any other force or argument can come to the rescue and make it valid. Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ instituted the seven Sacraments. Several of these, including the Holy Eucharist, were instituted "*in specie*"; that is, Christ determined in detail and minutely their matter and form. Would it not seem incongruous for the same Divine Lord to so prescribe, and nevertheless "supply" for flagrant deviations from His sacred prescription? We can see the wisdom of the above teaching of the Trent Catechism!

Finally, the Salmanticenses concede that there were at times cases of invalid Consecration forms being used (and hence, invalid Masses!), in both a limited area (the Maronites of Mt. Libanus), and also in extensive regions (among the Ethiopians). In the former case, the invalid forms for consecrating the wine resulted, at least partly, from the atmosphere of heresy and schism prevailing at the time, and were used not only by the schismatics, but even by "the ignorant" and those "associated with schismatics". Now, remembering the prophetic words of Pope St. Pius X, written in 1910, concerning the "*universal apostasy*" that even then crept "insidious and hidden in the very veins of the Church", one can easily concede the distinct possibility of invalid Masses in our present day, on a far more extensive, indeed universal, scale. In accord with the dispositions of an all-wise and all-just Divine Providence, such an ominous situation would not

at all be "unthinkable", but rather might be a logical result of the present climate of heresy, schism, and apostasy that is infinitely more far-reaching and widespread than that which affected the Maronites of Mt. Libanus! In our present circumstances, which clearly are those of a "universal apostasy" or the closest thing to it imaginable, *could we not* apply and extend the conclusion expressed by the Salmanticenses: "*However, it would be by no means unfitting for Providence to permit the aforesaid error and its effects*" in virtually the entire world?

Fr. Lawrence S. Brey
July 1, 1976
Feast of the Most Precious Blood.

QUESTIONING THE VALIDITY OF McCARTHY'S CASE

1. Synopsis of the Monograph:
Questioning The Validity
of the Masses using the New,
All-English Canon

Issue No. 24 of the journal *Living Tradition* (July 1989) is devoted to a commentary on my monograph, *Questioning The Validity of the Masses using the New, All-English Canon*, first published in March of 1968. For the sake of brevity it will hereinafter be referred to as simply "QTV". The Editor of *Living Tradition* is Monsignor John F. McCarthy, J.C.D., S.T.D.; and he is also the author of its featured critique of QTV.

Because some readers of this present booklet may not be familiar with QTV, it is expedient to give here a concise synopsis of its central points. Always we were taught that the *form*, the necessary words, for a sacrament must not be altered, or else the sacrament is not produced. "In our sacraments," teaches the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "the form is so definite that any, even a casual deviation from it, renders the sacrament null." Concerning the sacramental form for the Holy Eucharist (the wine consecration at Mass) this same Catechism clearly states: "We are firmly to believe that it consists of the following words: 'THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD, OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT, THE MYSTERY OF FAITH, WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS.'"

In the English "Mass" (that is, the vernacularized [English] version of the so-called *Novus Ordo Missae*) this sacramental form is altered substantially, in

several ways, but principally by the substitution of the words "for all" in place of "for many." In his *Catena Aurea in Quatuor Evangelia* (in *Matth. Evan.*, Chap. XXVI, par. 8) St. Thomas Aquinas quotes Remigius of Auxerre as follows: "And it must be noted that He [Our Lord] did not say *pro paucis* [for a FEW], nor *pro omnibus* [for ALL], but *pro multis* [for MANY]; for He had not come to redeem only one nation (race), but MANY from among all the nations."

In explaining why Christ said "for many" instead of "for all" the Catechism of the Council of Trent continues: "Rightly therefore was it done, that it was not said 'for all,' seeing that in this place *the design of the discourse extends only to the fruits of the Passion*, which brought the fruit of salvation only to the elect." And so we see that those words "for all," which according to vital principles of sacramental theology are NOT to be used in the form for the consecration of the wine, are in very fact the precise words the ICEL (International Committee on English in the Liturgy) chose to be used in this place!

2. Sufficiency (All Men)
vs.
Efficacy (Mystical Body)

In his *Living Tradition* article Monsignor McCarthy summarizes my position thus:

"Let us examine his [Omlor's] argument, which is as follows on page 48 [of QTV]:

'The ancient and *proper* form for the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist uses Christ's own words and conveys the latter truth; namely, that of *efficacy*. The new 'form' uses men's words and conveys the former truth; namely, that of *sufficiency*. And thus the Innovators, the authors of this change, have destroyed the essential sense of the proper form.'

There are, of course, other theological principles and salient facts that enter into my treatise. Monsignor McCarthy does acknowledge many of these throughout his article; hence the foregoing brief summary of my case will serve as an adequate starting point for this present discussion.

Having quoted the above passage from p. 48 of QTV, Msgr. McCarthy remarks: "For Omlor, sufficiency regards all men, while efficacy regards only the members of the Mystical Body of Christ". I will get back to this puzzling remark a little later.

The distinction between the efficacy aspect and the sufficiency aspect of Christ's Passion and Death is indeed one of the fundamentals in my argumentation

against the validity of the ICEL version of the wine consecration, which is presently used in the *Novus Ordo* "Masses" throughout the English-speaking world.

In the final words of the ancient and proper form ("for you and for many unto the remission of sins") the words "you" and "many" refer to *the elect only*, those who attain eternal salvation. St. Thomas Aquinas teaches this very clearly in Summa Th., III, Q.78, a.3, ad 8; and also in *Book IV of Sentences*, Dist.8, Q.2, a.2, ad 7. Holding fast to these explanations of the Angelic Doctor, the Catechism of the Council of Trent, also known as the Roman Catechism, expounds the same idea in the following words:

'For if we look at the *vertue* of it, it must be confess'd, that our Savior shed his *Blood* for the salvation of *all men*. But if we look at the *fruit* which *men gather from thence*, we may easily understand that it comes *not to all* to advantage, but only to *some*. When therefore he said, 'For you,' he signifi'd either them that were then *present*, or those whom he had *chosen* out of the *Jewish people*, such as were his *Disciples*, except *Judas*, with whom he spake. But when he added, "*For many*," he would have the *rest* that were elected, either *Jews* or *Gentiles*, to be understood. Rightly therefore was it done, that it was not said "*for all*," seeing that in this place the design of the discourse extends only to the *fruits* of the *Passion*, which brought the Fruit of Salvation *only to the Elect*.'

The foregoing is a faithful transcription from page 207 of the first translation of the Trent Catechism into the English language, published at London in 1687, under the Catholic King James 11. The emphasized words and phrases shown above are as they appear in the original text. In this excerpt just cited the wording "for all" is explicitly singled out as being contrary to the "design of the discourse," that is, contrary to the Mind of Christ when He said, "for many," meaning not all men, but only the elect who are the only ones who actually benefit from the fruits of the Passion, namely, "the Fruit of Salvation."

As will be demonstrated later, the final prepositional phrase, "unto the remission of sins" (*in remissionem peccatorum*), denotes *result* or efficacy, inasmuch as with the elect the remission of their sins *actually takes place*. This concept is quite different from that of *purpose* or sufficiency, which is what is conveyed by these final words of the despoiled ICEL version: "for you and for *all* so that sins *may* be forgiven." Coupled with the condemned substitution of "all" for "many" is the additional corruption of meaning in the ICEL's final (mistranslated) words, "so that sins may be forgiven." Such a clause is known grammatically as a clause of *purpose* (beginning with 'so that'); it fails to convey the theologically demanded sense of *result* or efficacy, as explained by the Roman Catechism, St. Thomas, and other theologians (including saints, popes and doctors of the Church).

In QTV and in subsequent writings I have presented abundant documentation from many learned authorities to elucidate the distinction between efficacy (result) and sufficiency (purpose). The following passage (as only one example) illustrates this important idea very well. It is from *Treatise on THE HOLY EUCHARIST*, by St. Alphonsus Mary de Liguori, a Doctor of the Church whose writings display the most profound learning and piety. The passage is from p. 44 of the translation by Rev. Eugene Grimm, C.Ss.R.

The words *pro vobis et pro multis* ('For you and for many') are used to distinguish the virtue of the blood of Christ from its fruits; for the blood of our Saviour is of sufficient value to save all men, but its fruits are applicable only to a certain number and not to all, and this is their own fault. Or, as the theologians say, this precious blood is (in itself) sufficiently (*sufficenter*) able to save all men, but (on our part) effectually (*efficaciter*) it does not save all - it saves only those who cooperate with grace. This is the explanation of St. Thomas, as quoted by Benedict XIV.

Moreover, I have in one place or another also quoted passages in the same vein from the Roman Catechism, St. Thomas Aquinas, Popes Innocent III and Benedict XIV. Consequently it is puzzling that Monsignor McCarthy would remark that it is "for Omlor" that the distinction between sufficiency and efficacy is a tenet.

Another very important theological principle in my case against the validity of the English "Mass" is that the *res sacramenti* (a term that theologians use for the principal fruit, "*the effect*") of the Holy Eucharist -- namely, the union of the Mystical Body of Christ -- must necessarily be signified in the words of the form for this Sacrament. This point is verified by many weighty theological authorities I have frequently quoted, including Pope Leo XIII who laid down specific criteria for valid sacramental signification (in the Bull *Apostolicae Curae*, 1896). "For you and for many unto the remission of sins" are the words of the sacramental form for the Holy Eucharist that provide this vital signification of the *res sacramenti*, for the words "you" and "many" are the only words of the form that explicitly designate the members of the Mystical Body of Christ, which is the Catholic Church. Moreover, the final phrase, "unto the remission of sins," signifies the *union* of the members, as shall be demonstrated later in Section 5.

The words "you" and "many" (not "you" by itself nor "many" by itself, but the two words in conjunction with each other) are said to designate the elect, and they are also said to designate the Mystical Body. There is no ambiguity in this, because in *termino* they are one and the same thing.

For the sake of clarity, however, it should be remarked that at any given moment on earth the elect and the Mystical Body do not exactly coincide, and this is readily understood by Catholics. For there are always some persons who at one

time are not yet in the Church, but who will eventually become incorporated among the *fideles* through Baptism. Similarly, there are some who once were members of the Mystical Body, the Church, but who will not be counted among the elect. That is, those who become "dead members" through mortal sin and then, tragically, die in that state. Also those who surrender membership in the Mystical Body through heresy, apostasy, schism or excommunication will not be among the elect, though at one time in their lives they were members of the Mystical Body. They will not be counted among the elect, that is, unless they repent and become restored to grace in the bosom of their Holy Mother the Church.

We therefore speak of the elect and the Mystical Body interchangeably in the context of the consecration form, because they come to the same thing *in termino*: at the end of time they will exactly coincide. The elect are those, and only those, who profit from the efficacy aspect of Our Lord's Passion and Death through the remission of their sins, and who die as *living* members of the Mystical Body. After the Last Judgment the "finalized" Mystical Body (namely, the Church Triumphant) and "The Elect" will be one and the same thing.

3. A Mosaic of Sacramental Theology

Msgr. McCarthy writes: "First of all, Omlor's case for the invalidity of the ICEL form of the consecration of the wine does not appear convincing to me. The quotations which he produces to support his case are impressive in their own right, but they do not prove the invalidity of the 'for all men' translation." And in another place he states, "and Omlor quotes an array of authorities who have raised doubts about the use of 'for all.' But none of these authorities says explicitly that the addition of 'for all' would invalidate the sacrament. This is Omlor's own conclusion."

After the first edition of QTV appeared twenty-two years ago, Father William G. Most, (the first person to oppose QTV in public print), posed a similar objection. Appendix 3 of the third edition of QTV was devoted to presenting Fr. Most's arguments and my replies to them. The following appears on page 116 of QTV (3rd edition, March 1969):

Father Most: "His [Omlor's] appeal to St. Thomas and the Catechism of the Council of Trent is insufficient by far to prove his case...Neither one explicitly states the invalidity of the English form of consecration."

My lengthy reply (pp. 116-117) begins thus: "No one could be expected to enumerate *explicitly* all *invalid* forms, since there is an infinitude of *invalid* forms. There is, however, only one *valid* form for any given sacrament."

May one reasonably conjecture that nitroglycerine is possibly valid matter for Baptism merely because not a single dogmatic theologian has ever *explicitly* ruled it out?

This argument advanced by both Monsignor McCarthy and Father Most does, however, serve admirably as a model; it is the paragon of fuzzy logic. Consider this: if "for all" had already been *explicitly* declared invalid, then the issue would have been settled in advance -- case closed ("*causa finita est!*")! Under such circumstances I would have had neither the occasion nor the reason to write *Questioning The Validity..* in the first place; consequently, in the second place, Father Most and Monsignor McCarthy would not have entered the picture to oppose QTV (since it would not have even existed); and, finally, I would not be writing this now! Therefore it is entirely illogical to argue against me on the grounds that "all men" had not been explicitly ruled invalid.

Up until 1967 no one had ever attempted *any* innovation in the form for the Holy Eucharist, least of all such a brazen innovation as "for all men so that sins may be forgiven." Consequently none of my "array of authorities" would have had the occasion to single out explicitly as invalid this particular phraseology. For no one would have imagined (and I dare say this would have included Monsignor John F. McCarthy prior to 1967) that anyone would ever presume even to suggest such a villainous violation of the form of a sacrament as the one of which we are speaking. The ICEL subversives were living and breathing testimonials to the truth of the sardonic Italian aphorism "Traduttori: Traditori" (Translators : Traitors)!

When the authors of the Roman Catechism taught, "Rightly therefore was it done, that it was not said 'for all' ... etc.," they were expounding the theology underlying the distinction between sufficiency and efficacy. Now, it would be supreme lunacy to suppose the theologians who wrote this profound disquisition *would have actually deemed to be valid* a form that contains the very words, "for all," *which they had singled out as being contrary to Christ's design* in the words He spoke when instituting the Holy Eucharist at the Last Supper!

Least of all would those renowned exegetes have considered to be valid a form that so evidently violates the fundamental principle of sacramental theology they so emphatically taught elsewhere in the same Catechism: "In our sacraments ... the form is so definite that any, *even a casual deviation from it*, renders the sacrament null."

Though none of my cited authorities explicitly declared "for all" to be an invalidating substitution, all of them implicitly did so. Each of these respected authorities has furnished valuable jewels of evidence, theological principles that are certain beyond question, all of which if taken as a whole form one harmonious mosaic of sacramental theology. I am only the mosaicist. If all these

brilliant facets are considered in their magnificent totality, the one supporting and enhancing the other, and the overall panorama is beheld, then my conclusion that the vernacular "Mass" is no Mass at all is the only conclusion that can reasonably be reached. Such a scientific approach to philosophy and theology is of the essence of Scholasticism.

"But none of those authorities [cited by Omlor] says explicitly that the addition of 'for all' would invalidate the sacrament. This is Omlor's own conclusion." Here we detect two polemical subterfuges: the *suppressio veri* and the *suggestio falsi*. *Suppressio veri* (suppression of the truth) is the stating of something that is true in itself, while suppressing something that has an essential bearing on the overall truth. Thus Monsignor McCarthy correctly says that no authority of mine explicitly avers "for all" is invalid, but he suppresses the impact, the dynamic force, of the mosaic of their teachings, the formidable ensemble of those truths, which implicitly but *relentlessly* drives towards that conclusion.

Suggestio falsi is the stating of something that in itself is not false, while suggesting to the reader's mind an idea that is false. After referring to the "array of authorities" who do not explicitly say "for all" is invalid, Omlor (the amateur) is contrasted with them in these words, "This is Omlor's own conclusion." Although he does not expressly say so, he falsely suggests my judgment must be wrong *solely because* it is mine.

4. Some Latin, Greek and English Grammar

Monsignor McCarthy writes: "Omlor contends that the Latin preposition *in* followed by the accusative case means 'unto the remission of sins,' and 'thus this word *unto* in itself conveys the sense of effectiveness or efficacy.' But Omlor's explanation is not exact. The Latin preposition *in* plus the accusative sets up a direction leading to efficacy and can include both the beginning situation of redemption for all and the final situation of salvation for some. Therefore, Omlor's reasoning is not conclusive."

Here, in its entirety, is my par. 71 from QTV:

"A first observation is that the word *unto* --(which in Latin is the preposition '*in*' followed by a noun in the accusative case) -- means to, *towards*, or *leading up to*; and thus this word *unto* in itself conveys the sense of effectiveness or efficacy."

The charge that my "explanation is not exact" is meaningless, for I gave no explanation at all. My paragraph begins, "A first observation is... etc.," and I concluded this short, one-sentence paragraph with the bare assertion, "this word *unto* in itself conveys ... etc." It was an *ipse dixit* on my part, a bold "take it from me" declaration. I gave no reasoning at all to support my assertion, and therefore

the remark that my "reasoning is not conclusive" is likewise meaningless. When I wrote that sentence I did not elaborate, for I frankly didn't expect so rudimentary a point to be challenged. As it has now been challenged, I will present some of the grammatical rules and "reasoning" underpinning my assertion. In this section, then, what is to be defended is my *ipse dixit* that not only do the words "for many" convey the correct restrictive sense of efficacy, but the final phrase, "*in remissionem peccatorum*," which in English is "unto the remission of sins," *in itself* also conveys the sense of efficacy or result.

The Latin preposition *in* with the accusative case is used to denote physical motion, and it is also used in an abstract or conceptual sense. Certain parallels can be drawn between these two usages. Firstly, as regards *physical motion* the effective reaching of a destination is nearly always indicated. Thus "Caesar in Galliam venit" means that Caesar came into Gaul; he effectively arrived in Gaul.

I said "nearly always" because one finds occasional examples in classical Latin where *in* with the accusative fails to denote efficacy, as, for instance, in the phrase, "*in meridiem fugit*" (he fled *towards* the south), which does not imply an effective arrival at a destination. However it must be noted that to use *in* with the accusative case in such a manner is to do so "idiomatically or less exactly," according to Allen & Greenough (*New Latin Grammar*, 1903 edition, p.133, par. 221.12c).

Secondly, and more to our point, are instances in which *in* with the accusative is used in the *conceptual* sense, such as in the phrase we are discussing, "*in remissionem peccatorum*." The analogy between the physical motion usage and the conceptual usage will become apparent, in that the notion of efficacy or result is common to both. Consulting the text *An Introduction to Ecclesiastical Latin* (by Rev. H.P.V. Nunn, Cambridge University Press, 1927), we find on page 111 the paragraph 234, under the heading "In With the Accusative," where the author illustrates the "pregnant sense" giving the *result* of the action of the verb, and also the use "in a predicate" *to express result*, i.e., efficacy.

It was St. Jerome who gave us the Latin phrase in the Vulgate, "*in remissionem peccatorum*," the words of Jesus in instituting the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist at the Last Supper, as recorded in St. Matthew's Gospel (26,28). The Greek text for this phrase is "*eis aphesin hamartiòn*," using the preposition "*eis*," which St. Jerome translated into Latin as "*in*." This in turn was rendered into English as "unto" by Father Gregory Martin, the scholarly linguistics master appointed by the saintly Cardinal William Allen to translate the New Testament at Rheims (1578-82). It is therefore important to discover the meaning contained in the first link of the chain, namely, this Greek preposition "*eis*."

We may consult *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* by C.F.D. Moule, Cambridge University Press, 1960. On p.70 the author discusses "*eis*" and its connotation *resulting in*, and he furnishes several passages from the New

Testament to illustrate this point of grammar. One of these examples is from Romans (5,18), which contains two "eis" prepositional phrases: "*eis katakrima*" and "*eis dikaiōsin*." Investigating these two phrases proves to be most enlightening.

Romans (5,18) reads thus in St. Jerome's Vulgate: "*Igitur sicut per unius delictum in omnes homines in condemnationem, sic et per unius justitiam in omnes homines in justificationem vitae.*" Thus we find the two "eis" prepositional phrases ("*eis katakrima*" and "*eis dikaiōsin*" translated by St. Jerome into two corresponding Latin prepositional phrases; to wit: "*in condemnationem*" and "*in justificationem*." These would be rendered literally into English simply by "unto condemnation" and "unto justification."

Nevertheless the translators of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine New Testament (1941) did not limit themselves to the mere phrases "unto condemnation" and "unto justification." Rather, for the sake of even greater clarity, they explicitly spelled out "*the result was* unto condemnation" and "*the result is* unto justification." Here is the complete passage:

'Therefore as from the offense of the one man the result was unto condemnation to all men, so from the justice of the one the result is unto justification of life to all men.'

When Father Gregory Martin at Rheims translated Matthew (26,28) into English, he rendered "*eis aphasin hamartiōn*" or "*in remissionem peccatorum*" into a corresponding simple prepositional phrase. Of the possible choices of an English preposition (from among to, for, towards, etc.) he selected "unto" -- the one that best denotes the required sense of result. The word "unto" (which is now classified by some dictionaries as archaic) is of Middle English origin (circa 1150-1500), and its etymology derives from "up to + to"; hence "sick unto death" means so sick that death results.

The word "unto" can have other entirely different meanings, as in "do unto others." Also "faithful unto death" would not necessarily mean that fidelity results in death (though it could be argued that such was certainly the case with the martyrs).

Exactly the same phrase, *in remissionem peccatorum (eis aphasin hamartiōn)*, is found in the *Credo* of the Mass: I confess one baptism *unto* the *remission of sins*. "*For* the remission of sins" (as is often found) would seem to indicate purpose only and would thus fail to impart the idea of result or efficacy. "*For* the remission of sins" is not faithful to the true sense of "*eis aphasin hamartiōn*" intended by the Fathers at Constantinople, who incorporated this article in the Creed (A.D. 381). I confess one baptism *unto* the remission of sins, a baptism that *results in* the remission of sins, a baptism that *has efficacy*, that *does* something! Not just a baptism "so that sins may be forgiven," as the ICEL would

undoubtedly put it.

What I have been attempting to prove in this section is that in addition to the aspect of efficacy or result being necessarily denoted by the restrictive wording "for many," this same sense of efficacy is also contained in the very words of the final prepositional phrase "unto the remission of sins." This was the *ipse dixit* in par. 71 of QTV, which was challenged by Msgr. McCarthy.

In my foregoing demonstration I trust I have shown that, purely from the standpoint of Latin, Greek and English grammar, the true meaning of the words of Jesus in the consecration of the wine is contained in these words: This is My Blood which shall be shed for you and for many *resulting in* (unto) the remission of their sins. This conveys the notion of efficacy, or result, that is insisted upon by the Roman Catechism, St. Thomas, St. Alphonsus, Innocent III and Benedict XIV. The ICEL's "shed for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven" is so immeasurably different from this correct notion that even a certified clod would be able to detect the discrepancy.

When the Innovators replaced Christ's word 'many' by their own words 'all men', they necessarily had to change also the final phrase, *unto the forgiveness* of sins. For to say that Christ died for *ALL* men *UNTO* the forgiveness of sins is, in effect, to say that His Passion *actually brought about the* forgiveness of the sins of all men. And this, of course, clearly is undiluted heresy.

And therefore the entire meaning, or 'essential sense' of Christ's own words was changed when the Innovators made their 'form' read: "for you and for *ALL* men *so that sins MAY be forgiven.*" What is conveyed by these words is the idea of the *potential* forgiveness of the sins of all men, which idea is opposed to the original meaning Christ clearly intended to convey which is that of the *actual* forgiveness of the sins of 'many'. (From QTV, pp. 149-150).

5. *Raison d'être* of The Union of the Mystical Body

As has been stated above, the principal fruit or effect of the Holy Eucharist -- that is, its *res sacramenti* -- is the union of the Mystical Body of Christ. Now, it is through reception of the Holy Eucharist that we, the members of the Mystical Body in the branch known as the "Church Militant," become more closely and firmly united to Jesus Christ -- the Head of the Mystical Body -- and also to one another, and also to our fellow members in the other two branches; *viz.*, the Church Suffering and the Church Triumphant.

"This truth is closely related to the Church's teaching on the Communion of Saints (which we profess in the Ninth Article of the Apostles' Creed), whereby the different members of the Mystical Body participate in one another's spiritual goods.

The very *principle of existence* and origin of this aforesaid union is sanctifying grace. Any person living in the state of sanctifying grace is *automatically* within Christ's Mystical Body.

But if sanctifying grace is the *raison d'être* of the union of the Mystical Body, which is the *res sacramenti* of the Holy Eucharist, it must then be acknowledged that the essential and absolute prerequisite -- the *sine qua non* -- of this union is the *remission of sins*.

It is by means of the Sacrament of Baptism that we first receive sanctifying grace, and through the remission of original sin and actual sin (in the case of adult baptisms) we first become members of the Mystical Body. The Bull *Exultate Deo* of Pope Eugene IV teaches: "Holy Baptism, which is the gateway (*janua*) to the spiritual life, holds the first place among all the sacraments; through it we are made members of Christ and of the body of the Church."

We retain our status as *living* members of the Mystical Body by remaining in the state of sanctifying grace. And a member who has become spiritually dead through mortal sin can be reinstated as a living member only by the *remission of sin(s)*, through what St. Jerome calls "the second plank after shipwreck," namely, the Sacrament of Penance. Concerning the Sacrament of Penance, the Council of Trent teaches:

'Besides, it is clear that this sacrament is in many respects different from Baptism. For apart from the fact that in matter and form, which constitute the essence of a sacrament, It differs very widely, ... the fruit of Baptism is one thing, that of Penance another. For by Baptism *we put on Christ* (Gal. 3:27) and are made in Him an entirely new creature, receiving a full and complete remission of all sins; to which newness and integrity, however, we are by no means able to arrive by the sacrament of Penance without many tears and labors on our part, divine justice demanding this, so that Penance has rightly been called by the holy Fathers a laborious kind of Baptism. This sacrament of Penance is for those who have fallen after Baptism necessary for salvation, as Baptism is for those who have not yet been regenerated.'

'If anyone, confounding the sacraments, says that Baptism is itself the sacrament of Penance, as though these two sacraments were not distinct, and that Penance therefore is not rightly called the second plank after shipwreck, let him be anathema.'

From all the foregoing it is evident that the *remission of sins* -- that is, the *actual and efficacious* remission of sins; or in other words "*in remissionem peccatorum*" (UNTO the remission of sins) -- is the necessary prerequisite for: (a) our initial incorporation in the Mystical Body; and (b) the reinstatement as living members, through the Second Plank After Shipwreck, of those who have lost sanctifying grace. Consequently, the REMISSION OF SINS CAN BE SAID TO CAUSE THE UNION of the members of the Mystical Body.

THEREFORE, inasmuch as this union is the very *res sacramenti* of the Holy Eucharist, which *must be signified in the words of the sacramental form*, it is likewise evident that the final phrase of the form for the Consecration of the Wine *in its entirety* -- to wit: "for you and for many unto the remission of sins" -- comprises these essential words. The words "you" and "many" designate the members; the words, "unto the remission of sins", signify the principle of their unity. *O vinculum caritatis!*

6. Ambiguity in Sacramental Forms

The dictionary definition of "*ambiguous*" is: "Capable of being understood in two or more possible senses; equivocal." The seven examples below are all excerpts taken verbatim from Monsignor McCarthy's article. They were selected for presentation because they all contain the inherent assumption or the forthright admission that the ICEL form is ambiguous.

1) The Latin preposition *in* plus the accusative sets up a direction leading to efficacy and can include both the beginning situation of redemption for all and the final situation of salvation for some.

2) What I do want to point out is that "for all men" does not invalidate the form, if the aspect of efficacy recedes from "for many" to "for you" and the following words "for all" become an expression of the salvific will of Christ towards all men.

3) Was the ICEL translation made and presented in awareness of this contrary theological and doctrinal position? Was due attention paid to the need to keep the form of the sacrament clear and unambiguous ... ?

4) And so Omlor is constrained to argue that the addition of the words "and for all men" changes the essential sense of the form from that of efficacy to that of sufficiency. Now, this might be true if the words, "for you" did not precede the words "for all," but, when the words "for you" are retained, the sense of efficacy is already conveyed, so that the succeeding words "and for all" simply express the background of the salvific will of Christ on the Cross. Thus, the sense of efficacy

of the form may be weakened and obscured, but it is not destroyed.

5) While this translation does not clearly invalidate the sacrament, as Omlor maintains, it does seem to confuse and obscure its integral form.

6) Note also that the form of the Holy Eucharist both looks to the future and looks to the past ... Similarly, the words of the form for the Holy Eucharist, even as they refer primarily to the efficacious graces that will flow from the Mass, refer also in a secondary sense to all the graces that were to come from the sacrifice on Calvary. To make this secondary sense explicit in a secondary way would not necessarily invalidate the form, but it does effect a partial change of emphasis which does not seem very consistent with the original meaning of the words.

7) Martin Luther contended that, since Christ died once and for all and thereby redeemed all men, there was no need for the Mass. The emphasis upon the salvific will in the words "for all" could suggest a Lutheran misunderstanding of the Mass, and its reduction in the minds of some to a mere communion service.

The foregoing excerpts all reveal that Monsignor McCarthy believes the ICEL form, "for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven," can be understood in two or more possible senses. **NOW, A SACRAMENTAL FORM THAT IS AMBIGUOUS IS *IPSO FACTO INVALID*.** "in our sacraments," teaches the Catechism of the Council of Trent, "the form is so definite that any, even a casual deviation from it, renders the sacrament null. Hence the form is expressed in the clearest terms, such as exclude the possibility of doubt." "Moreover, the signification must not be ambiguous, but so far definite as to discriminate the grace effected from graces of a different kind...," noted Cardinal Vaughan on the same subject.

Here I should make an important clarification. From the above it must not be thought that the form of a sacrament cannot signify more than one thing. The "*Respondeo*" of St. Thomas in *Summa Th.*, 111, Q.78, a.3, explains the various things that are designated or signified in the consecration of the wine by the various parts of the form: "This is the chalice of My Blood," "of the new and eternal testament," "the mystery of faith," "for you and for many unto the remission of sins," etc. (Also, in "*Res Sacramenti*", an article published in May 1970, as Issue No. 3 of *Interdum*, I discussed four things that are signified in the form for the Holy Eucharist, namely, transubstantiation, sacrifice, propitiation, and the *res sacramenti*, which is the union of the Mystical Body of Christ).

When we say an ambiguous sacramental form is *ipso facto* invalid, we mean that *a single word or group of words* cannot be understood in more than one way. Thus, for example, were one to claim "This is My Body" refers both to Christ's true body and also to His Mystical Body, he would be asserting that those words

are ambiguous. Therefore it is evident that Monsignor McCarthy's opinions that were cited above all presume the ICEL form is ambiguous in the "*ipso facto* invalid" sense, because they all claim the same phrase, "for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven," is to be understood as meaning more than one thing.

7. Monsignor McCarthy's Case

Msgr. McCarthy observes, "First of all, Omlor's case for the invalidity of the ICEL form for the consecration of the wine does not appear convincing to me," but he does acknowledge elsewhere in his article that I have written a "highly documented treatise," that my quoted sources are "impressive in their own right," and that "Omlor quotes an array of authorities," etc.

What do appear convincing to him are his own jerry-built theological theories. In propounding them he appeals to no higher authority. He offers no quotations from any Father or Doctor of the Church, nor does he cite any recognized theologian, or catechism, or dogmatic theology text. Neither does he invoke the Magisterium of the Church through *dicta* or *acta* of the Sovereign Pontiffs, ecumenical councils, etc. Throughout the entire presentation of his case (which begins at the bottom of page 4 of the journal and takes up most of page 5) he quotes one, and only one, supposed authority to support his theories. This authority is, of all people, Omlor! The amateur!

He commences his case thus; "But Our Lord, in the ICEL translation of the form, is referring only to members (present or future) of the Mystical Body where He says 'for you.' Therefore, from this aspect, the essential sense of the proper form is preserved. Omlor himself admits this (on page 65 of his treatise), where he says that 'even simply the words *for you* would suffice to signify the members of the Mystical Body.' And therefore, this part of his argument falls."

Great balls o' fire! *Never*, on page 65 or in any other place have I admitted that the ICEL version preserves the essential sense of the proper form. For that is the very antithesis of my position! Monsignor McCarthy has failed utterly to perceive the context in which I made the remark he cites, the purpose of which was *simply to show that all the Scriptural accounts* of the Institution of the Holy Eucharist contain words that refer to the Mystical Body. Below is the mere half-sentence he has quoted (the part in bold print), followed by the remainder of my explanation on page 65 of QTV, which clearly shows the overall context:

...even simply the words "for you" would suffice to signify the members of the Mystical Body. And it is important to note well that *all Scriptural accounts* [Note: these italics are in the original text of QTV] of the institution of the Holy Eucharist contain this signification of the members of the Mystical Body.

Thus Sts. Matthew and Mark record "for many." St. Luke records: "This is my body, which is given for you," and also "This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you."...

St. Thomas has explained that not all the essential elements of this sacramental form can be found in any single account from the Scriptures: "The Evangelists did not intend to hand down the forms for the sacraments, which in the primitive Church had to be kept concealed, as Dionysius observes at the close of his book on the ecclesiastical hierarchy: their object was to write the story of Christ." (*Summa Th.*, III, Q.78, a.3, ad 9).

From my comments on p. 65 of QTV it cannot be inferred that the words, "for you," *and these words alone* (which appear in St. Luke's Gospel), would suffice to signify the Mystical Body *in the sacramental form* for the Holy Eucharist.

The crux of Msgr. McCarthy's case, upon which his whole argument depends, is that the mere words, "for you," suffice to denote the *entire* Mystical Body in the ICEL form. And therefore the presence of these two words, "for you," preserves validity, despite the addition of "and for all," and despite the further addition of the clause of purpose, "so that sins may be forgiven." The cornerstone of his case hinges on the great authority Omlor, whom he quotes as saying, "even simply the words 'for you' would suffice to signify the members of the Mystical Body."

There is a subtle, yet chasmal, difference between the "for you" in St. Luke's Gospel I cited, standing alone by itself, and these same words "for you" taken from St. Luke and made part of the sacramental form, "for you and for many unto the remission of sins." When incorporated into the sacramental form, these words "for you" do not signify the entire Mystical Body, *but only a part thereof*. This mysterious signification now contained in the sacramental form is wrought through the incomprehensible design and operation of the Holy Ghost, as is explained by the Roman Catechism in these words:

'But those words which are added, "For you and for many," are taken severally from S. Matthew and S. Luke, which notwithstanding Holy Church, taught by the Spirit of God, has join'd together. ...

When therefore He said, "For you", He signifi'd either them that were then present, or those whom He had chosen out of the Jewish people, such as were His Disciples, except Judas, with whom He spake. But when He added, "For many," He would have the rest that were elected [i.e., the *REMAINDER* of the Elect] either Jews or Gentiles, to be understood.'

Ergo, Monsignor McCarthy's key assumption, the cornerstone on which his entire case rests, namely, that the mere words "for you" allegedly denote the Mystical Body *in toto* (thus supposedly preserving the essential sense of the form) is absolutely unsound, as I have just shown, quoting the original 1687 English version of the Roman Catechism.

Furthermore, contrary to Monsignor McCarthy's theory, the simple fact that the words "for you" were retained in the ICEL's form does not and cannot take care of the invalidity problem. These words "for you" in no way nullify or counteract the *false signification* of the ICEL's additional spurious words, "and for all men." This is an important point, and it seems appropriate to reproduce what I wrote some twenty years ago in the article, "*Res Sacramenti*".

Since 'all men' do not, never have, and never will belong to Christ's Mystical Body, it is evident that these words substituted in the form cannot possibly designate the *res sacramenti* (the union of the Mystical Body). On the contrary, they contain a *false signification*; they are *in opposition* to the special grace of the Eucharist. "For all men" works against the purpose for which Christ instituted the Holy Eucharist, namely, the unity of His Mystical Body. *As long as these words are present*, mutilating the form, the Sacrament and the Mass must, in our opinion, be considered invalid ...

In another place Msgr. McCarthy states, "And so Omlor is constrained to argue that the addition of the words 'and for all men' changes the essential sense of the form from that of efficacy to that of sufficiency." Not in the derogatory sense that is implied am I constrained to argue thus; but I am constrained in the sense that principles of sacramental theology and simple English rhetoric *force* me to this conclusion. Examine the ICEL's bogus form. Look at the words themselves, "shed for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven." Do they denote even a whit of efficacy?

Monsignor McCarthy seemingly does not pay sufficient attention to the overall contexts in which words appear. He claims, "... but, when the words 'for you' are retained, the sense of efficacy is already conveyed." Now, to assert, albeit erroneously, that "for you" denotes the entire Mystical Body is one thing. But to claim these words "for you" *in themselves denote efficacy* is absurd. Even moreso when they are followed by the clause of *purpose*: "so that sins may be forgiven." His other theory that "the aspect of efficacy recedes from 'for many' to 'for you'" smacks of semantic sleight of hand.

When reading his many arguments (cited earlier) that presume ambiguity in the ICEL form, I was struck particularly by this one:

"The Latin preposition *in* plus the accusative case sets up a direction leading to efficacy and can include both the beginning

situation of redemption for all and the final situation of salvation for some."

It was déjà-vu!

Back in 1968, Father Most claimed, "One can with equal ease think of the fact that the redemption was *sufficient* to forgive *all* sins, or the fact that it actually or *efficaciously* leads to forgiveness only in *some* men, in those who accept its fruits."

My reply to this was as follows:

Though it is not the case, let us assume (for argument's sake) that the new "form" actually does convey *both* sufficiency and efficacy. The "form" would then be automatically wrong, for the *proper* form should denote *efficacy only*. In explaining why "all men" should not be used, the Trent Catechism gives this reason: "in this place the fruits of the Passion *are alone spoken of, and to the elect only* did His Passion bring the fruit of salvation." (Emphasis added).

Secondly, if the new "form" does convey these two entirely different concepts, it is, by definition, *ambiguous*. Hence it cannot be a valid form, which *must be definite* as stated above in *Reply to Objection C*.

But, finally, the new "form" actually denotes *sufficiency only* (as explained in par. 72 and in pars. 80-82 earlier in this monograph), because the phrase "all men," by its universality, cannot possibly denote "the elect only." (QTV, 3rd edition, pp. 118-119).

The good news is that the ICEL form is not *ipso facto* invalid owing to some ambiguity, simply because the actual words don't signify more than one thing; they clearly signify sufficiency only. It is solely in the imaginings of Father Most and Monsignor McCarthy that both sufficiency and efficacy are signified. The bad news is that my case for invalidity remains unrefuted.

Another plank in Msgr. McCarthy's case is that "The validity of the ICEL translation is bolstered in the new Sacramentary by the addition of the words in the consecration of the bread, 'which will be given up for you.' It is the same 'you,' the members of the Mystical Body, that appears again in the consecration of the wine." (He has an *idée fixe* about those words "for you".)

One dictionary definition of "*bolster*" is "To support, hold up, or maintain; esp. to support with difficulty or effort." Another dictionary gives: "Support so as to keep from falling." What is unshakeable needs no bolstering. During the long period before the new Sacramentary became finally "approved", with the updated bread

consecration form, what was the status of the English "Mass"? Invalid, or doubtfully valid, or merely unbolstered? This plank in the Monsignor's case is so mournfully weak it is beyond bolstering.

First, the words that were added to the bread consecration, "which will be given up for you," do not denote efficacy any more than do the words "for you" in the ICEL wine consecration. The formulae in the various Eastern rite liturgies contain additional words in the consecration of the bread (which, it must be noted, are not necessary for validity), but these additional words denote efficacy. For example, in the Byzantine Rite we find: "This is My Body which is broken for you unto the remission of sins." The ICEL's form does not have "unto the remission of sins," or any other equivalent words which would denote efficacy.

In comparing our Latin Rite with the Eastern rites, however, some caution must be observed. Some elements that are fittingly contained in the Oriental liturgies are not to be found in our Latin Rite. Vice versa, the words, "the Mystery of Faith," (for example), that are part of the Latin Rite formula, do not fittingly appear in any of the Eastern rite liturgies, except those of the Maronites, the Chaldeans, and the Malabarites.

Second, therefore, words to commemorate Our Lord's Passion, such as the ICEL's "which will be given up for you," are not appropriate in the Latin Rite form for the consecration of the bread. The Roman Catechism explains this inaptness in the passage quoted below, which is excerpted from the same 1687 edition, all italics being in the original text. Concerning the wine consecration:

'Wherefore fitly in this place, rather than in the Consecration of the *Body*, is the Passion of the Lord commemorated in these words 'which shall be shed for the remission of sins.' For the *Blood* being *separately consecrated* by it self, with relation to the *Passion* of the Lord, has greater *force* and *power* to lay *before the eyes of all*, both the *Death* and *kind of suffering*.'

Third, the words, "This is My Body", and these words alone, suffice for the valid consecration of the bread. *After nearly two thousand years* the Innovators decide to append "which will be given up for you." This meddling, this pointless innovation, would seem to accomplish nothing. However, whenever *seemingly* harmless, though also *seemingly* pointless, things are done by conspirators, there is *always* purpose behind them. They are called machinations.

8. If At First You Don't Succeed

To date the Innovators have violated the sacred consecration form by means of at least six distinct changes, on three separate occasions. This "trial and error" tinkering would be farcical if it regarded any ordinary matter, instead of the most

holy of things, the words of Jesus Christ.

(1) The original despoiled version of 1967 introduced the "for all men so that sins may be forgiven" change, which is the invalidating mutilation of the form we have been discussing in depth.

(2) In the same 1967 version the consecration form for the wine was broken up into two separate sentences; the first sentence ending with the words, "the mystery of faith," and the second beginning with the words, "This blood is to be shed for you and for all men ... etc." As was pointed out as far back as May 1970 in the article *Res Sacramenti*, this unprecedented innovation in itself is yet another probable source of invalidity. St. Thomas Aquinas teaches that all the words following "This is the chalice of My Blood" are determinations of the predicate; that is, they determine the essential signifying elements of the Sacrament by means of the uninterrupted recitation by the priest of the words of Christ. Consequently the discontinuity of the ICEL form, caused by stopping the recitation after several determinations have been expressed (that is, up through the words "the mystery of faith"), and then resuming with *a new sentence*, interferes with the integrity of the entire expression. In all other sacraments the essential form is expressed in a single statement, wherein all the necessary signifying elements of the sacrament are contained in the one uninterrupted utterance.

(3) In the "New Order" of the Mass (*Novus Ordo Missae*) that was first promulgated several years later in 1969, the vitiated form comprising the two separate sentences was retained. However, the sentences themselves were changed in wording once again! The first now completely omits the words "the mystery of faith," and ends with the words "new and everlasting covenant." The second sentence was changed from "This blood is to be shed for you and for all men... etc." to "It will be shed for you and for all men... etc.". Observe the trivial alterations: "It" instead of "This blood"; "will be shed" instead of "is to be shed." Such seemingly foolish fiddling, apparently just for the sake of fiddling, was really not foolish at all. These changes and the ones mentioned just below in Nos. (4) and (5) all served the very useful purpose of diverting attention away from the real issue, namely the serious and invalidating change, "for all men so that sins may be forgiven."

(4) In the same *Novus Ordo* of 1969, the words "the Mystery of Faith" were deleted from the actual consecration form, as was mentioned above, only to reappear *afterwards* outside the consecration itself, in the form of an acclamation by the priest, to which the congregation replies, "Christ has died, Christ is risen, Christ will come again." These three truths have nothing whatsoever to do with the mystery of faith *of the Holy Eucharist*, to wit, what was formerly wine and still has all the physical and chemical properties of wine is not wine, but It is now the Precious Blood and the Body, Soul and Divinity of Jesus Christ. *O res mirabilis!* The acclamation, "the mystery of faith," followed by the wholly inappropriate reply

by the congregation, suppresses the dogma of the Real Presence and thereby implicitly but in fact denies it. For the true meaning of those words, "Mystery of Faith," in this place, is explained lucidly and succinctly by the Roman Catechism:

"for it is call'd the mystery of Faith, because by *Faith* we perceive *Christ's Blood* hid under the *Species of Wine*."

(5) The appending to the form for the consecration of the bread of the words, "which will be given up for you," (which was already discussed in the previous section) was also a feature of the *Novus Ordo*.

(6) The reader has perhaps noticed that I have sometimes referred to the "for all men" change, and sometimes simply to "for all." Only a few years ago (1985) the ICEL changed their original "for all men" to "for all." The change was an official and mandatory one. The reason? Because political pressure was exerted by vociferous, left wing, so-called "feminist" creatures! Lest we forget, we are talking about the supposed sacred words of Jesus Christ in the supposed Catholic Mass.

But the sacred words of Christ and the safeguarding of a valid Mass mean absolutely nothing to those vile wreckers. They are like automobile mechanics adjusting a carburetor until the mixture seems right. They treat those sacred words as toys, to be played with, taken apart and experimented upon again and again until they finally come up with something "acceptable," at least for the time being.

9. Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James

In one edition of Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary the first definitions given for "*conspiracy*" are "Combination of persons for an evil purpose; a plot." In this section I shall show that the invalidating "for all men" vitiation of the Catholic Mass was prearranged and carried out by the perpetrators of what I hereby designate as the 'For All Men' International Conspiracy.

As Monsignor McCarthy so capably demonstrated, never was there the slightest explicit approval or "go ahead" officially given, not even by the Vatican 11 Council of the Robber Church, for anyone to render the Canon of the Mass into the vernacular tongues. Archbishop Robert J. Dwyer of Portland, Oregon, stated at the time: "The ICEL has performed its task so poorly as to raise serious questions as to its competence. *Never was there the slightest consultation with the bishops of the English-speaking world*; here is a signal instance of bureaucracy inflicting its will by methods which can only be described as high-handed." (Quoted in *Twin Circle*, June 21, 1970, with my italics added). The Archbishop's first statement is quite incorrect, for the ICEL performed its assigned task magnificently with consummate competence, all according to plan.

The conspirators knew exactly what they were doing, their execution of the scheme was deft, and everything went as smoothly as clockwork, at least at first.

These words of Danton come to mind: "In order to overcome them, Messieurs, we need audacity, more audacity, always audacity, and France is saved." Mrs. Nesta Webster described the *modus operandi* of the conspiratorial French Revolutionists as "effrontery, an insolent contempt for public opinion, the mutual resolution to bring off a coup and brazen out the consequences" (*The French Revolution*, p. 305).

During 1967-68 vernacularized liturgies started popping up "spontaneously" in a multitude of languages all over the globe, all at about the same time and all, as we have seen, without official approbation. Now, if the phony "translation" of "*pro multis*" into "for all men" had slipped by only in the English version, then one might possibly have attributed such a blatant blunder to the deplorable ignorance of Latin and sacramental theology that was then prevalent among most bishops of the English-speaking world, whose proficiency in those areas of learning, as is now quite clear, was (and is) somewhat less remarkable than that of, say, the Negrillo pygmies of Central Africa.

However, the bogus words, *for all men*, did not appear only in the English version. With very few exceptions (e.g., in the Polish, Japanese and Vietnamese translations) the very same falsified words, *for all*, or *for all men* also occurred in all those vernacular renditions that popped up so spontaneously. As examples: in Italian, *per tutti*; in German, *für Alle*; in Spanish, *por todos*; in Portuguese, *por todos os homens*, etc. Departing from the various versions of the French New Testament (Matthew 26,28), which have either *pour un grand nombre* or *pour une multitude* (both of which mean literally "for many"), the vernacularized French liturgy has *pour la multitude*. There is a difference between the correct "*une multitude*" and "*la multitude*," for the latter does not mean many, but rather "the masses." It is equivalent literally to the Greek *hoi polloi*, which has become part of the English language. "*La multitude*" certainly does not satisfactorily signify the Mystical Body, the "many" that Christ intended.

To anyone who has no inkling that a preconcerted plan of conspirators was afoot this spontaneous incorrect rendering of "*pro multis*" on a virtually universal basis must seem most astounding, for two reasons. (1) In all those countries and in all those languages the New Testament sources of these words (Matt. 26,28) all have the word which is the equivalent of "many" in English. Moreover, presumably these same equivalents of "many" appeared in the vernacular versions of the wine consecration form in all the laymen's missals that were in use in all those countries. (2) Every schoolboy knows that "*pro multis*" means "for many"; and "for all" would be "*pro omnibus*".

Those vernacularized liturgies that started popping up "spontaneously" in 1967-68, in a multitude of languages all over the globe, all at about the same time and

all without official approbation, were all produced by various national or international "Committees on the Liturgy," which were the counterparts of the English-speaking ICEL. This orchestrated global operation was directed and controlled by the Vatican's now defunct "Sacred Congregation for the Divine Cult," that nefarious creation of Montini which supplanted the Sacred Congregation of Rites. At the time of the '*For All Men*' *International Conspiracy* the Secretary of this "Sacred" Congregation was Msgr. Annibale Bugnini who was later (1972) made an archbishop. He died in 1982 at the age of seventy.

The reader will recall that Bugnini, the ringleader of the conspiracy, was publicly exposed in 1976 as having been secretly a Freemason since April 23, 1963, Code Number 1365-75, and Code Name "BUAN". Pope Leo XIII (encyclical *Humanum Genus*, 1884) declared Freemasonry to be of "the kingdom of Satan"; and eighteen years later in "*A Review of His Pontificate*" (March 19, 1902), the same Pontiff spoke again of Freemasonry as "Full of the spirit of Satan." Now I ask, can any person of sound mind conceivably suppose that Annibale Bugnini, that most talented operative of Freemasonry, which is of the "mystical body of *Satan*" would be taking pains to preserve the validity of the Catholic Mass and would be making sure that the Mystical Body of *Christ* was being properly signified in the words of the consecration form?

Catholics all over the world -- the victims of "audacity, more audacity, always audacity" -- were supposed to believe that this ubiquitous occurrence of "all men" resulted from the universally acknowledged fact that "for all men" is indeed correct. As there was supposedly no complicity or connivance between the various national liturgical groups, all those linguistic scholars in different parts of the world worked on their translations all by themselves, totally without any outside influences, and all those experts came up with the very correct translation "for all." Least of all (we must supposedly conclude) would there have been any secret Masonic clique masterminding the whole concerted operation of those various national groups, all acting so absolutely independently and individually, for that would smack of conspiracy!

There are two, and only two, possible explanations of what happened. Either there was a brilliantly executed conspiracy, "the mutual resolution to bring off a coup and brazen out the consequences," or else there was in the years 1967-68 a world-wide, mysterious dearth of schoolboys able to give advice on the correct translation of "pro multis".

We cannot absolutely know that all these exact adaptations are the result of preconcert. But when we see a lot of framed timbers, different portions of which we know have been gotten out at different times and places, and by different workmen - Stephen, Franklin, Roger, and James, for instance - and when we see these timbers joined together, and see they exactly make the frame of a house or a mill, all the tenons and mortices exactly fitting, and all

the lengths and proportions of the different pieces exactly adapted to their respective places, and not a piece too many or too few, -not omitting even scaffolding- or, if a single piece be lacking, we see the place in the frame exactly fitted and prepared yet to bring such a piece in - in such a case, we find it impossible not to believe that Stephen and Franklin and Roger and James all understood one another from the beginning, and all worked upon a common plan or draft drawn up before the first blow was struck. (*From the speech, "The House Divided Against Itself," delivered at Springfield, Illinois, June 17, 1858, by Abraham Lincoln*).

At this point the reader is possibly wondering why the international gangsters were so hellbent on getting "for all" firmly implanted in virtually all the liturgies throughout the world. A little later on I shall elucidate this point.

10. Perversity of Intention

In declaring Anglican Orders to be categorically invalid, Pope Leo XIII (Bull *Apostolicae Curae*, 1896) averred that the invalidity arises from two sources, namely, defect of form and defect of intention. *Defect of form* because the form of words for the Sacrament of Holy Orders that the Protestant Revolutionaries concocted fails to provide the necessary sacramental signification; thus on this count the Anglicans' "sacrament" is utterly null. They have no priests at all.

By *defect of intention* the Sovereign Pontiff Leo XIII meant that the Anglicans' "sacrament" is, moreover, likewise null because of the depraved intentions of the framers of the bogus rite. Pope Leo furthermore made it clear that either one of these defects, of form or of intention, alone by itself, would have been sufficient to render the sacrament invalid; both defects were not required.

The intention in another's mind is at times difficult to know, but it is not always impossible to discover it. Leo determined that the intentions of those Protestant Revolutionaries, *clearly and unmistakably ascertainable from their own words and writings*, were to invent a new rite for a *new type of ministry* that is totally different from the Catholic Church's, and perforce from Christ's, concept of the priesthood.

We have thus far focused attention on the defect of form of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist and the Mass resulting from the "for all men ... etc." falsification. In the preceding section we also adverted to the Masonic animus that inspired this falsification. Therefore it would seem unnecessary to press the invalidity issue any further. However, it seems appropriate to touch upon, though only very briefly, the defect of intention of the framers of the new liturgy. Their perverse intentions have already been most skillfully exposed by a group of eminent Roman theologians.

The "New Order of the Mass" (*Novus Ordo Missae*) was originally promulgated in April of 1969; and it is important to note that its authors were the very same Masonic subversives, still directed and controlled by Annibale Bugnini, who had earlier brazened out the "for all men" conspiracy. Shortly after the *Novus Ordo* was released a theological tract appeared that bore the title, *Roman Theologians Take a Look at the New Order of the Mass*.

This brilliant treatise is replete throughout with the most damning evidence, quoted from the very lips of the criminals themselves through their published words, showing conclusively their perverse intentions to invent a new liturgy that is totally different from the Catholic Mass. Bearing in mind the proverb, "*Qui nimis probat nihil probat*," (he who proves too much proves nothing), I shall cite but one passage from this tract in which the Roman Theologians reproduce, verbatim, the *very definition* of "Mass" furnished by the criminals, followed by the analysis of this definition. The passage is from pages 5-6, and all the italics shown are in the original text:

Let us begin with the definition of the Mass given in para. 7, that is at the beginning of the second chapter of the *Novus Ordo*, "De structura missae": "*Cena dominica sive Missa est sacra synaxis seu congregatio populi Dei in unum convenientis, sacerdote praeside, ad memoriale Domini celebrandum. Quare de sanctae ecclesiae locali congregatione eminenter valet promissio Christi 'Ubi sunt duo vel tres congregati in nomine meo, ibi sum in medio eorum.'* (Mt. 18,20)."

[Author's note: an English translation of the foregoing definition of Mass is, "The Lord's Supper or Mass is the gathering together as one of the holy assembly or the congregation of the People of God, with a priest as President, to celebrate the memorial of the Lord." The Roman Theologians' analysis of this definition continues below.]

The definition of Mass is thus limited to that of "supper," which is constantly repeated (Nos. 8, 48, 55d, 56); this "supper" is, moreover, characterised by the congregation presided over by the priest, and by the act of remembrance of our Lord, recalling what He did on Holy Thursday. None of this implies either the *Real Presence or the reality of the Sacrifice* or the *sacral character* of the officiating priest or the *intrinsic* worth of the eucharistic Sacrifice independently of the presence of the congregation. In a word, it does not imply a *single* one of the dogmatic values essential to the Mass, and constituting its true definition. Their deliberate omission here suggests that they are "out of date" and amounts, at least in practice, to their denial.

Roman Theologians Take a Look at the New Order of the Mass continues with page after page of similar self-incriminating evidence provided by the inventors of the new "Mass." The Roman Theologians' concluding comments include the following: "We have limited ourselves to a summary examination of the *Novus Ordo* at those points where it departs from the theology of the Catholic Mass" (p. 18); "It is clear that the *Novus Ordo* no longer intends to present the faith as taught by the Council of Trent" (p. 19). Note well the words, "no longer intends." Defect of intention *of the FRAMERS of the rite as well as* defect of form. No Mass at all on two counts.

G.B. Montini promulgated the *Novus Ordo* on April 3, 1969, whereas Pope Leo XIII, a true Vicar of Christ, would have anathematized it in a flash! The Council of Trent, in fact, did anathematize it *in advance*, as shall be seen. My purpose now is not to continue demonstrating the invalidity of the Bogus Ordo, but merely to cite one example of the incredible impudence of the conspirators.

The Conspirators: "Since the Eucharistic celebration is a Paschal banquet, according to the command of the Lord, his body and blood are taken as SPIRITUAL FOOD." (Quoted from par. 56 of "General Instruction on the Roman Missal"). Commenting on *yet another place* where this same heretical view is expressed (namely, in par. 28 of the same "General Instruction"), the Roman Theologians remarked on p. 14 of their devastating treatise: "So Christ is indeed present, but ONLY SPIRITUALLY."

"His body and blood are taken as SPIRITUAL FOOD":even Danton would have blushed at such audacity! For the Conspirators poached this condemned phraseology from Thomas Cranmer's Book of Common Prayer (1549): "Thou has vouchsafed to feed us in these holy mysteries with the SPIRITUAL FOOD of the most precious body and blood of thy Son." The Holy Council of Trent (Canon 8, Session XIII) condemned this heresy of Cranmer and of all those who would ever dare to follow in his footsteps: "If anyone says that Christ received in the Eucharist is received ONLY SPIRITUALLY and not also sacramentally and really, *let him be anathema.*"

(All emphases in the preceding two paragraphs were added by the author.).

11. A Travelogue of Apostasy

Some fundamental Catholic principles must be recalled before we come to the gist of this present section. It is essential that these few selected vital teachings of Catholicism, set side by side (mosaicked), become crystallized in the reader's mind, so that the realization of what has happened and is still happening today may become emblazoned upon his intellect. What for some has thus far been mere suspicion must now be confirmed as being reality. The reality is not

gladsome. But instead of becoming timorous we should perhaps reflect upon these words of the immortal patriot Patrick Henry: "For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth; to know the worst, and to provide for it." (From the speech, "Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death," *delivered at Richmond, Virginia, March 23, 1775*).

(1) The Catholic Church is not "first among equals." It is the UNIQUE, True, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church, founded by Our Lord Jesus Christ. This Catholic Church, known also as the Mystical Body of Christ, is the one and only ARK OF SALVATION, outside which there is naught but spiritual shipwreck.

(2) Apostasy, which is defined as the "abandonment of the Catholic faith," automatically severs a person -- totally -- from the Church, Christ's Mystical Body, the Ark of Salvation. St. Thomas Aquinas (*Summa Th.*, 11-11, Q. 12, a. 3) gives this example of apostasy: "Moreover if anyone were ... to worship at the tomb of Mahomet, he would be deemed an apostate." Concerning an apostate the Angelic Doctor remarks, "The result is that *he sows discord*, endeavoring to sever others from the faith even as he severed himself."

(3) Pope Pius XI deemed ecumenism to be "tantamount to abandoning the religion revealed by God." In his encyclical *Mortalium Animos* (1928), he taught authoritatively: "With this object congresses, meetings and addresses are arranged... where all without distinction ... are invited to join in the discussion. Now, such efforts can meet with no kind of approval among Catholics. *They presume the erroneous view that all religions are more or less good and praiseworthy.* Those who hold such a view are not only in error; they distort the true idea of religion, and thus they reject it, falling gradually into naturalism and atheism. To favor this opinion, therefore, and to encourage such undertakings is *tantamount to abandoning the religion revealed by God.*" The last six words that were quoted constitute the precise definition of apostasy. (Italics added in the above).

In the magisterial words just cited the Sovereign Pontiff Pius XI spoke only of *mere meetings* with those outside the Faith for the purpose of theological discussions, since that *in itself* presupposes the erroneous view that false sects are "more or less good and praiseworthy"; and such ecumenism furthermore dares to presume also that the words of Christ, "An evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit," are false. Man's only real and ultimate good is the possession of the Beatific Vision; no false church, or sect, or religious movement, or pagan cult can possibly lead thereto. On the contrary, such as these are but harmful *impedimenta*.

(4) Even more serious a crime than the ecumenism described above -- which involves mere meetings, but is nevertheless tantamount to apostasy -- is the *worshipping together* with those outside the Catholic Faith. This crime is known as "*communicatio in sacris*," and it is expressly condemned by *CANON LAW*

(Canon 1258, CJC). As every Catholic surely knows, *communicatio in sacris* is mortally sinful; it is a flagrant act of apostasy.

The interpretation of CANON 1258 is expounded by the noted Jesuit authors, Bouscaren and Ellis, in *Canon Law, A Text and Commentary*, (Bruce, Milwaukee, 1951). In the following comment (from p. 704) the authors are referring to merely *passive* presence, that is, the mere physical presence at a non-Catholic service; let alone *active participation*, which is what constitutes *communicatio in sacris*. "It is conceivable that even merely passive presence might be accompanied by an internal intention to approve, assent to, or encourage the non-Catholic worship; if that were true it would be *formal co-operation in an evil act, and forbidden by the natural law.*" (Emphasis added).

(5) A well know axiom, "*Lex Credendi : Lex Orandi*" should also be called to mind:

"What people already believe is automatically and necessarily mirrored in the very words of the prayers they recite. This truism is one part of the principle: *Lex Credendi : Lex Orandi* --the law of belief is the law of prayer. This principle works reversely also: that is to say, people can be *led* towards certain beliefs by means of the very prayers they are accustomed to saying (and hearing). And that is why parents teach their small children The Hail Mary, for example, and The Apostles' Creed, even though these little ones do not yet fully understand everything they are praying. Now, whether or not these parents are familiar with the phrase, *lex credendi : lex orandi*, they are nevertheless putting this principle into practice, for they are teaching their children to pray those things that they will ultimately come to *believe.*" (From pp. 97-98 QTV).

Having defined apostasy and having given some theoretical examples, such as ecumenism and *communicatio in sacris*, I shall now provide a few specific examples. From several dozen that readily come to mind I have selected the following as being good hypothetical illustrations.

EXAMPLE 1. If any Catholic (for example, one known as 'Pope') were to enter a Lutheran place of worship in Rome (let us say, just for example, on Dec. 11, 1983) in order to participate in the Lutherans' celebration of the 500th anniversary of Martin Luther's birth;
-- *and if* this hypothetical Catholic were to join in the Lutherans' worship, and, moreover, were even to preach a sermon eulogizing Martin Luther; then this hypothetical Catholic (or, rather, ex-Catholic) would thereby in effect be publicly proclaiming that Martin Luther was not the very incarnate personification of

consummate hatred and enmity towards Catholicism which, of course, he was. In a hypothetical situation such as the one we are describing, this ex-Catholic (for example, a pope) would have clearly and publicly demonstrated his betrayal of Jesus Christ and His Church, thus becoming an apostate, for such behaviour would be "tantamount to abandoning the religion revealed by God," as the Catholic Church so forcibly teaches through the words of the Sovereign Pontiff Pius XI, cited above.

EXAMPLE 2. If any Catholic (for example, one known as 'Pope') were to go into a "sacred forest" of tribal animists at Lake Togo in Africa (I realize this must sound like a wholly preposterous hypothetical example, but please bear with me) on, say, August 11, 1985 (which will serve as a reasonable hypothetical date); -- *and if* this hypothetical Catholic were to pray at a place in this sacred forest consecrated to the worship of false gods and then actually perform pagan rites, such as the sprinkling on the ground of a mixture of flour and water, which is a ritual of ancestor worship; -- *and if* the entirely hypothetical French periodical *La Croix* on, say, Aug. 13, 1985, were to quote our hypothetical Catholic (for example, a pope) as saying, "The prayer meeting in the sanctuary at Lake Togo was particularly striking. There I prayed for the first time with animists."; -- *and if* the Vatican newspaper *L'Osservatore Romano* in its Italian edition of, say, August 11th, (page 5, for example), were to report: "On John-Paul II's arrival at the place, a sorcerer began to invoke the spirits: 'Power of water, I invoke you; Ancestors, I invoke you.'"; then in such a hypothetical case as the one we're studying the hypothetical ex-Catholic, namely the entirely fictitious "John-Paul II", would be the most hideous apostate. For such odious, atavistic behaviour would be the ultimate violation of CANON 1258; *unnatural* worshipping with heathens is certainly "formal cooperation in an evil act, and forbidden by the natural law," as stated by the canon lawyers Bouscaren and Ellis.

EXAMPLE 3. If any Catholic (for example, one known as 'Pope') were to travel across the Tiber River from the Vatican (on, say, April 13, 1986, hypothetically) in order to visit the Jewish synagogue in Rome, -- *and if* (as would perhaps be reported via Reuters news service the same day -- this is all hypothetical) "he offered prayers in the synagogue with Rabbi Elio Toaff during a religious service in the afternoon," then such a traitorous ex-Catholic (for example, a pope) would thereby perform an act of supreme apostasy, namely, *communicatio in sacris* with an anti-Christian Jewish rabbi. Such a betrayal of Jesus Christ and His Mystical Body, the Church, would be not merely "tantamount to," but *brazenly* abandoning the religion revealed by God.

EXAMPLE 4. If any Catholic (for example, one known as 'Pope') were personally to organize an assembly in a certain city (the Italian city famous as that of St.

Francis will serve as a hypothetical location) of sundry and motley non-Catholic, anti-Catholic and pagan personages, including (hypothetically) Anglican Runcie, Greek Orthodox Methodios, Buddhist Dalai Lama, Methodist Emilio Castro, Hindus, Sikhs, Shintoists, Jainists, tribal animists from Africa, Moslems, Zoroastrians, Jewish rabbis, and the Crow Indian medicine man from Montana, Mr. John Pretty-on-Top;

-- *and if* this hypothetical menagerie were to be assembled on, say, Oct. 27, 1986, so that it could be hypothetically reported in the Nov. 10th edition of *Time* magazine that our hypothetical ex-Catholic, a most humble and unpretentious traitor, travelled to the venue in "a bus with thirty other representatives, and quietly took a place at the rear of the procession through the town's cobble-stone streets"; then the hypothetical ex-Catholic (for example, a hypothetical apostate pope) would thereby be proving -- audaciously proving -- that he is apostate *par excellence!* World-wide statistics on renegade priests, fallen away Catholics, apostate nuns, decreasing numbers of priestly and religious vocations, decreasing numbers of converts to the Faith, increasing unbelief in even the most essential Catholic dogmas such as the divinity of Christ and the existence of hell, etc., --all these statistics would verify that our hypothetical apostate pope has been and is being most successful, because he would effectively confirm these words of St. Thomas, "The result is that he sows discord, endeavoring to sever others from the faith even as he severed himself."

We must move along to consider other matters, so our little travelogue must now come to an end. In a way that is disappointing, for I have a plethora of wonderful hypothetical examples, all very interesting and instructive. These hypothetical examples could be set in many exotic geographical locations, such as Fiji, New Delhi, Cameroon, Taizé (France), Tokyo, Seoul, Mainz (Germany), World Council of Churches Headquarters (Geneva), Canterbury Cathedral, Kinshasa (formerly Leopoldville, Belgian Congo), Bangkok, Bombay, Westminster Cathedral, Masonic Lodge of B'nai B'rith, Port Moresby, Morocco, Istanbul, Manila, Madras, etc.

I do hope the four hypothetical examples I selected for presentation have served adequately as illustrations of apostasy; and I also hope that certain things are crystallizing in the reader's mind.

12 Ecumenical Movement
Equals
Universal Apostasy

It is not coincidental that the words "for all men" are part of the bogus consecration form as well as being one of Freemasonry's shibboleths. For the "universal brotherhood of all men" philosophy is one of the animating principles of Freemasonry, which underpins its anticipated one-world, universal religion.

At one place in his article Monsignor McCarthy made the following very perspicacious observation: "What seems to have prompted the 'for all men' translation was not the exigencies of the words themselves [i.e., *pro multis*], but rather a theological framework in the minds of the translators, to which these words were made to conform."

Here the Monsignor is apparently questioning the motives of the "translators," and therein lies his perspicacity. However, he probably assumes the "theological framework" to which the words "for all men" were made to conform is somehow related to the Catholic teaching on the sufficiency aspect of Christ's Passion. While the words "for all men" do in fact conform to the sufficiency aspect, that is NOT the theology to which these words *were made to conform*.

On the contrary, the "theology" to which the Masonic operatives *made* "for all men" conform is the theology of apostate ecumenism and Freemasonry's envisaged universal religion. It must constantly be kept in mind that Freemason Annibale ("BUAN") Bugnini was the leader of the 'For All Men' International Conspiracy. Another influential "Special Consultant on the Commission for the Liturgy" at the time was Msgr. Virgilio Noé, who subsequently became the Secretary of the "Sacred" Congregation for the Divine Cult, which was the same position that Bugnini had held previously.

According to published documentation (*Bulletin de L'Occident Chrétien*, No. 12, July 1976), Virgilio Noé was initiated into Freemasonry on April 3, 1961, Code Name "VINO", and Code No. 43652-21.

In Issue No. 53 (April 1970) of *Notitiae*, the official organ of *Mafia Liturgica*, under the Godfather Bugnini, there appeared an article written by Professor Max Zerwick, S.J. Its subject matter was the "for all men" controversy which by then was receiving considerable international attention. Zerwick concluded that "for many" must yield to "for all men" for the following reason: "because of the accidental but real unsuitableness of the words, 'for many.'" (Page 140, *Notitiae*, No. 53).

No doubt the reader will recall that in 1961 Max Zerwick was removed from his professorship at the Biblical Institute on the grounds of "suspicion of teaching heresy." But that fact has no bearing on the value of his opinion I just quoted, which from the viewpoint of the conspirators is quite correct, because the words "for many" are utterly unsuitable for their purposes, as will now be shown.

The "President" of the Congregation (which in the Robber Church's argot means "priest-celebrant") stands behind the table, facing the congregation. At one very propitious moment during his performance, when all are paying close attention, the President says clearly and audibly so that everyone can hear, these words: "for you and for all" (or if the President and the congregation should happen to be Italians, for example, the words would be "per voi e per tutti", etc.).

St. Paul writes (Rom. 10,17): "Faith then cometh by hearing." Destruction of faith can likewise come by hearing. Hearing these same words every Sunday (or Saturday evening), repeatedly, time and time again, the congregation will eventually, but inevitably, come to understand what "for all" is all about. Things will begin to click for them; the pieces of the jigsaw puzzle will start fitting neatly into place; they will develop "theological insights"; a clear picture will finally emerge. In a word: they will be hit with the full force of "*Lex Credendi : Lex Orandi*" They hear and they will be led to believe. Now they will see the full significance of the "Ecumenical Movement." Now they will understand what deep meanings underlie this new form of worship, this new liturgy and the new communion rite, in fact the whole new streamlined and "aggiornamento'd" Robber Church. They will realize that the old teaching about the Mystical Body was too narrow and parochial, because our new church and our new "eucharist" aren't just for Catholics. As the "President" has been saying, while holding up the cup:"for you and for ALL!"

"*Lex Credendi : Lex Orandi*" will also enable them to understand why the See of Peter is *vacant*, at least a good part of the time. That is, why K. Wojtyla is nearly always on the go, travelling hither, thither and yon, earnestly endeavoring to worship together with *all men*, that is to say, with specimens of every conceivable class of heretics, schismatics and pagans: Anglican Runcie, Greek Orthodox Methodios, Buddhist Dalai Lama, Methodist Emilio Castro, Hindus, Sikhs, Shintoists, Jainists, tribal animists from Africa, Moslems, Zoroastrians, Jewish rabbis, and Mr. John Pretty on-Top, the Crow Indian medicine man from Montana (and my apologies if I have overlooked any other notable Assisi freak).

Now, if the President of the Congregation were saying "for many," rather than "for all," some of those nice people just mentioned might get left out. (In fact, they would *all* be left out. The "many," Christ's Mystical Body, was not represented at the Assisi "pantheon," nor could it have been.). Saying "for many" would surely mess up the whole plan, wouldn't it? Yes, Professor Max Zerwick wrote with wisdom, because those words "for many" are absolutely "unsuitable" and they definitely must yield to "for all." Another thing: if the priest were facing towards God in the tabernacle and praying a silent Canon of the Mass, that would *REALLY* mess things up! "BUAN", "VINO", Zerwick, and the ICEL with its many international counterparts did all the necessary paper work; the ubiquitous Wojtyla now does the necessary leg work. As St. Thomas observed, apostates always endeavor to sever others from the faith even as they have severed themselves. The apostasy is rapidly becoming universal, which is Satan's and Freemasonry's plan for all men.

Pope St. Pius X long ago foretold what is now happening. "Their real aims, their plots, the line they are following are well known to all of you. ... What they propose is universal apostasy... it creeps insidious and hidden in the very veins of the Church ... the ways are hidden and darksome ... Truly a spectacle full of

sadness for the present and of menace for the future." (Encyclical *Editae Saepe*, May 26, 1910).

13. Epitaph

"The real issue is not so much the validity or invalidity of the translation as it is its correctness and opportuneness." This remark of Monsignor McCarthy's exhibits two characteristics. First of all, it is euphemistic; it is not the validity of the translation that is at stake, but the validity of the Mass itself. Secondly, it illustrates the familiar debating flaw known as "*Ignoratio Elenchi*," that is, arguing for something other than the issue actually proposed for discussion. Opportuneness? Ridiculous! Knowledgeable Catholics who avoid the bogus vernacular "Mass" do not do so just because it isn't nice and its inopportune wording is offensive. On the contrary, they seek out the True Mass, the ancient Latin Mass, because they want to be sure it IS Mass. Our enemy, The Robber Church, doubtless knows well that the real issue is validity, which is why its so-called "Indult Mass" is available only for the purblind and the pusillanimous who are willing to concede that the invalid "New Order Mass" is "valid." The real issue is validity, not some airy-fairy "correctness and opportuneness." If Monsignor McCarthy truly believes otherwise, then why did he attempt to refute "Questioning the *Validity*...?"

The autopsy is finished. It is now time to write the epitaph for Msgr. McCarthy's article. I propose that it should read simply: *100-to-1*. Although the "New Order" is presumably neither "correct" nor "opportune," the Monsignor nevertheless insists it is valid. To put it in the proverbial nutshell: he would have it that Freemason No. 1365-75 and Freemason No. 43652-21 and the whole gang of ICEL outlaws (none of whom cared a feather or a fig about validity anyway) inadvertently and despite their very best efforts and contrary to their stated intentions came up with a winner," with something that somehow turned out to be a valid Catholic Mass, at bookmakers' odds of 100 to 1.

POSTSCRIPT 1

The Freemasons' penetration of the Vatican, by having secret members placed in influential positions, has been cited or documented or at least commented upon by several writers, groups and publications, including International Committee of Defense of Catholic Tradition, David Yallop, *Bulletin de L'Occident Chrétien*, Tito Casini, the Italian Government, Stephen Knight, Martin Short, *Faithful and True* (Plympton, South Australia), Michael Davies and, of course, the perennially entertaining Father Brian Harrison (letter printed in *AD 2000*, Aug. 1989).

A list giving the names of 117 Catholic clerics, all allegedly secret Masons, first appeared in 1976; and it is still being circulated, with new names being added from time to time. Father Brian Harrison, who deplors "crackpot conspiracy theorists," for some reason thinks the list is "absurdly long." I fail to see his point. One-hundred-some-odd masterminding inside operatives represent an infinitesimal percentage of the total number of "Catholic" churchmen who presently are laboring like Hercules to destroy the faith of Catholics. Perhaps the "absurdly long" list, even with its subsequent additions, is still missing quite a few.

After the list had become fairly widely disseminated, stories and theories about it abounded (and today some of them still survive). The speculations and the tales concerned the original sources of the information, its accuracy or lack thereof, and the motives behind its disclosure. Perhaps we shall never know the exact original source of the data or the reasons for making it public, but we do have some substantiating proof of its probable accuracy.

Later, In 1981, the raid on Gelli's premises by the Italian "*gendarmeria*" turned up many names --of *undeniably* actual Masons (but not all clerics, of course) -- of the members of the Lodge *Propaganda Massonica Due*, known familiarly as simply "P2". Vindicating the putative reliability of the original list, Martin Short observes that "it is remarkable how it [the 1976 list] named several men deeply implicated in the P2 scandal *nearly five years later*" (*Inside The Brotherhood*, Grafton Books, 1989, p. 117, emphasis added).

Never dreaming that four cardinals named on the "controversial" 1976 list -- namely, Casaroli, Villot, Macchi and Poletti -- would five years later be *irrefutably* identified as Masons through the corroborating evidence found by the Italian authorities, *L'Osservatore Romano* in its issue of October 10, 1976 (quoted by Fr. Harrison) matter-of-factly proffered this barefaced lie: "Not one, we say, not one of the accused Vatican prelates has ever had anything to do with Freemasonry." Not only a lie, it was a *clearly unprovable*, grossly audacious asseveration. It merely confirms the wisdom in the advice that no one should believe even the page numbers of *L'Osservatore Romano* without verifying by actually counting.

Even if Bugnini and Noé had never been exposed publicly, the *telltale Masonic stamp* on "for all men" and on the *Novus Ordo's* various "anaphoras" is in itself ample proof of the workings of Satan's Masonic "hidden hand." The subsequent unmasking as actual Masons of the key figures in the "liturgical revolution" has such a high probability of being valid testimony that it would be foolhardy to decry it. The most rational comment would be, "Well, it figures!"

POSTSCRIPT 2

I hope no critic of mine will be tempted to resurrect the hackneyed "Aramaic language" argument. That fraud was first advanced by Dr. Joachim Jeremias. It then got parroted, with occasional embellishments (predictably), by ICEL, *Notitiae* In several issues, Max Zerwick, Bishop Thomas Muldoon, and many other linguistic wizards of even lesser ability.

The "argument" is basically that the Aramaic language spoken by Our Lord had no word at all meaning "all" and that He was forced to use a "Semitic idiom" like those found in the Book of Isaias, in order to convey the idea that He really meant "all men," and not just many. Jesus, then, supposedly used some ambiguous term that unfortunately might appear to mean "many" when translated into other languages. But fortunately we now have all these linguistic wizards who solemnly assure us that Our Lord really *meant* "all men" when He said "many" at the Last Supper.

The whole business is 100% polyunsaturated horse feathers.

I have in my files a letter, dated 18 July 1970, that I received from Dr. Revilo P. Oliver, the distinguished scholar, author and lecturer of international repute, who at that time was in his 25th year as Professor of the Classics at the University of Illinois. His letter reads in part:

Dear Mr. Omlor:

Thank you for the copy of your excellent booklet, 'The Ventriloquists.' I was particularly interested in the subject because several months ago an acquaintance of mine asked me to check the critical editions of the Greek text of the New Testament to make certain that there was no variant reading that would authorize the words 'for all men.' The inquirer evidently did not know of the impudent claim that you refute.

The sheer impudence of the claim is almost breathtaking, because everyone who has even the slightest knowledge of linguistics knows very well that no language used by a people that has attained even the rudiments of a culture could fail to distinguish between 'many' and 'all'. Aramaic was for several centuries the language in which the business and diplomacy of the Near East (including Indo-European nations) was conducted.

You were dealing, of course, with a specimen of what I regard as the ultimate dishonesty, calculated lying by persons who have been trained as scholars and who use their expert knowledge not only to swindle the uneducated but to destroy the very civilization that made scholarship possible.

Your booklet is addressed, of course, to members of the Church that is now committing suicide, but you have also exposed the cancer that is destroying the civilization of the West.

Sincerely,
/s/ Revilo P. Oliver.

Whoever would sincerely attempt to discover the actual Aramaic words that Jesus spoke and investigate their grammar sense, would do well to start by consulting the ancient Syriac (Aramaic) texts of the New Testament. For example, the Peshito (Peschitto), which is the earliest dated Syriac Biblical manuscript. St. Ephrem, the great Eastern Doctor of the Church, who died in A.D. 373, wrote exegetical treatises in Syriac and he used the Peshito for his Scriptural references.

Matt. (26,28) and Mark (14,24) are the two Scriptural sources of the word under discussion. In both places the Peshito has the word, "*saggi'a*," which means strictly "many," as opposed to the other Aramaic word, "*kolla*," which unequivocally means "all men." One can verify these facts by inspecting the Peshito and then checking an Aramaic-English dictionary. But I suspect that any given one of our linguistic wizards, selected randomly, would be totally incapable of recognizing or identifying even a single word of Aramaic, not even if one should happen to jump up out of his beer stein and land right smack on his proboscis.

This same ancient Aramaic word, "*saggi'a*," (which is pronounced "saa-gee-yeh," with hard "g" and accent on the second syllable), meaning "many" and not "all men," is still often heard today. For it is in the Consecration of the Wine in Masses of the Maronite Rite, which employs for its Words of Consecration the ancient Aramaic tongue that Our Saviour spoke.

As a final point of interest, in three small Syrian villages -- Bakha, Jabaadin and Malula (which is only 35 miles from Damascus) -- the Aramaic language, exactly as spoken by Our Lord, is still preserved and used as the local tongue, unchanged through the centuries except for the inclusion of some Arabic words from time to time, in order to keep abreast of technological change. (See *The Milwaukee Journal*, Jan. 13, 1987, p. 1G).

Notes

1 Subtitled "Organ of the Roman Theological Forum," Living Tradition is published at Via Concordia, 1; 00183 Rome, Italy.

2 Editor's Note. The "for all" substitution made its debut in the United States on October 22, 1967, more than a year prior to the promulgation of the *Novus Ordo Missae* in 1969. Needless to say, the latter incorporated this same mutilation in its English vernacular Canons (or "Eucharistic Prayers").-- L.S.B.

[All footnotes herein that are designated as "Editor's Note" are by Father Lawrence S. Brey (L.S.B.)].

3 Italics added.

4 In *Summa Th.*, III, Q.60, a.3, St. Thomas teaches: "In the Sacrament of the Altar, two things are signified, viz. Christ's true body, and Christ's mystical body; as Augustine says (*Liber Sent. Prosper.*)" And again in his *Respondeo* of III, Q.83, a.5, the Angelic Doctor states: "Now, in the celebration of this sacrament [the Holy Eucharist] WORDS ARE USED TO SIGNIFY things pertaining to Christ's Passion, which is represented in this sacrament; or again PERTAINING TO CHRIST'S MYSTICAL BODY, WHICH IS SIGNIFIED THEREIN." (Emphasis added).

5 In this Bull, Leo taught: "All know that the Sacraments of the New Law, as sensible and efficient signs of invisible grace, ought both to signify the grace which they effect, and effect the grace which they signify. Although the signification ought to be found in the whole essential rite -- that is to say, in the matter and the form -- it still pertains chiefly to the form." And also: "That form consequently cannot be considered apt or sufficient which omits what it ought essentially to signify."

6 "If we would define and describe this true Church of Jesus Christ -- which is the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church -- we shall find no expression more noble, more sublime or more divine than the phrase which calls it 'the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ.'" (*Encyclical Mystici Corporis Christi*, Pope Pius XII, June 29, 1943).

7 Editor's Note. "In termino" refers to the state of eternity, after the completion of our "wayfaring" status on earth ("in via"). -- L.S.B.

8 Father Most was then with the Dept. of Latin and Greek at Loras College, Dubuque, Iowa. His first attempt to refute QTV appeared in *The Wanderer* (April 25, 1968) as the feature article on the Editorial Page. My reply thereto was printed as a "Letter to the Editor" on May 16th, followed immediately below by Fr. Most's criticisms of it (his second attempt to refute my thesis). In a brief letter (dated May 22nd) I replied to these latter objections by Fr. Most, but *The Wanderer* declined to print it.

9 Editor's Note. The Catechism of the Council of Trent is alternatively known

as the Roman Catechism, and sometimes as simply the Trent Catechism. It is the Church's official catechism a papally designated norm for other catechisms and for pastoral instruction. Its authority is unique; some consider it an organ of the Church's Ordinary Magisterium. -- L.S.B.

10 Editor's Note. What theologian, priest, or even seminarian is not aware of that indispensable procedure in scholastic theology known as "theological reasoning," whereby implicit truths and conclusions are made explicit by applying the principles of logic to major principles and doctrines, also as regards minor premises and specific cases? --L.S.B.

11 Throughout this section the Greek letter omega is transliterated thus: ò.

12 The Catholic Encyclopedia (Vol. IX, pp. 727-28, 1913 edition) has an interesting and edifying article on Martin. It notes that he was "assisted by several of the other great scholars..., but Gregory Martin made the whole translation in the first instance and bore the brunt of the work throughout." He died at Rheims on Oct. 28, 1582, six months after the first printing of his magnificent translation, which he had begun on Oct. 16, 1578.

13 The prepositions "for" and "to" are (barely) acceptable substitutions for "unto" in this place, but only provided that the idea of result (efficacy) is understood. For example, one of the definitions of "to" is: "resulting in" (Funk and Wagnall's Standard Desk Dictionary, 1974). Likewise in The Concise Oxford Dictionary (1976) we find the following as one of the definitions of "for": "with the result of". However, in today's common parlance "for" is generally understood to mean "for the purpose of," rather than "with the result of." For this reason it is a misleading and jeopardizing alternative. At the time of the Protestant Revolt the then existing English version of the Sarum Missal had "unto" in the wine consecration, which was changed to "for" in the Book of Common Prayer. When Gregory Martin selected "unto" he, as always, captured the mot juste.

14 Pope Innocent III in De Sacro Altaris Mysterio, Book IV, Chap. XLI; Pope Benedict XIV in De Sacrosancto Missae Sacrificio, Book II, Chap. XV, par. II.

15 In several places St. Thomas has comments which if not read in their contexts would seem to say that Christ's blood was shed "in remissionem peccatorum" not only for many, but also for all. In I Cor. (lect. 6, cap. XI) furnishes a good example. Here, however, the Angelic Doctor is clearly using remissionem not in its literal meaning of remission (or forgiveness), but rather in the less precise sense of propitiation (or expiation). This is evident from the Scriptural quotation he cites (from I John, 2:2). A discussion on the important distinction between remission and propitiation can be found in QTV, pp. 145-146 and 148-149.

16 St. Thomas brings this out clearly in these words, which we find in a prayer

before Holy Communion he composed: "Grant, I beseech Thee, that I may receive not only the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord, but also the fruit and effect ["rem et virtutem"; i.e., the res sacramenti] of this Sacrament. O most indulgent God, grant me so to receive the Body of Thine only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, which He took of the Virgin Mary, that I may be found worthy to be incorporated with His Mystical Body and numbered among His members.

17 "To be sure, personal piety is given particular consideration in the usual devotions for Holy Communion, this being, of course, of great value. But the first and greatest significance of Holy Communion is this: the sublime union with Christ establishes the most sublime union of the members with one another... "To regard Holy Communion as a matter of personal private devotion is not sufficient for the member of the mystical body of Christ who is striving to attain perfection, for even the greatest spiritual benefit gained therefrom is not the ultimate goal of his endeavour. The most sublime significance of the Holy Eucharist lies in the fact that it establishes and fosters the great, incomparable fellowship of the mystical body, bringing us closer to Christ and to one another. If books of devotion and even religious instruction indicate that the Holy Eucharist is almost exclusively a matter of personal piety, overlooking its most admirable characteristic, they herewith disregard an integral part of Catholic doctrine.(Friedrich Jürgensmeier, D.D., Rector of the Archiepiscopal Seminary, Paderborn, THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST as the Basic Principle of Religious Life, Bruce, Milwaukee, pp. 246-247.).

18 For an exposition of the Church's authoritative interpretation of the teaching, "No salvation outside the Church," see Interdum #8. (The Robber Church: Part 3).

19 This Bull was incorporated in the Acts of the Council of Florence (1438-1445) as the "Decree for the Armenians" (see Denz. 696).

20 Sess. XIV, Chap. II.

21 Sess. XIV, Canon 2.

22 In the "Vindication of the Bull Apostolicae Curae". After the Bull had been issued by Pope Leo XIII, the Anglican Archbishops of Canterbury and York published an attempted rebuttal of it. The brilliant "Vindication" was then written by Cardinal Vaughan and the Catholic hierarchy of the Province of Westminster; it further clarified Apostolicae Curae and it annihilated the Anglicans' counter-arguments.

23 Editor's Note. The res sacramenti, which is the effect or the "grace proper" of any given sacrament, must be signified in the words of the sacramental form.

This pertains to all sacraments. St. Alphonsus Liguori writes: "Hic praenotandum quod in omnibus sacramentis tria distinguuntur, nempe sacramentum tantum, res tantum, et sacramentum ac res." (Theologia Moralis, V. II, Lib. 6, Tract. 3, Cap. 1, dub. 1, par. 189, italics added). --L.S.B.

24 Editor's Note. In the Church's parlance, "Innovators" (Novatores) is a proper designation for heretics or those who otherwise depart from Catholic teaching and tradition; this concept is clearly distinguished from legitimate developments in conformity with Catholic doctrine and authority. - -L.S.B.

25 This point was first raised in 1970 by Father Robert McKenna, O.P., who was then at St. Mary's Priory, New Haven, Conn. Here is his explanation: "St. Thomas, you know, argues for the necessity of the pro multis clause on the grounds that it belongs to the integrity of the sentence spoken by Our Lord in consecrating His Blood, being a 'determination of the predicate.' But even apart from the substitution of 'for all men' in the form, this integrity is broken up by the period after 'This is the cup of my blood...' (continuing 'It will be shed...'). I think, then, that even were the form otherwise translated correctly, this might be enough to invalidate it. At least a doubt would remain, for St. Thomas (at least in IV Sentences) says that Christ did not consecrate His Blood absolutely, but insofar as it was (to be) shed on the cross. And this is brought out by the pro multis clause determining the predicate."

26 In his famous speech to the Assembly of Paris, September 2, 1792.

27 Hannibal (i.e., Annibale) Bugnini was, I think, christened most aptly (and perhaps even prophetically!), inasmuch as one of the historically famous dedicated enemies of Rome was the Carthaginian general Hannibal.

28 Recently Michael Davies (The Remnant, Oct. 15, 1989) made this daft observation: "I very much regret that the question of Mgr. Bugnini's possible [?!] Masonic affiliation was ever raised as it tends to distract attention from the liturgical revolution which he masterminded. The important question is not whether Mgr. Bugnini was a Mason..." On the contrary, Bugnini's Masonic membership largely explains the "liturgical revolution," and it would distract the attention of only the simple-minded.

In a letter to the Editor of The Remnant (dated June 24, 1986), Mr. E.A. Wilson of Miami, Florida, puts it plainly: "It is a great mystery to many of us why you have been so fascinated by the writings of Mr. Michael Davies. If we were asked to characterize his articles in a brief manner, we would be compelled to say that essentially (aside from his tedious wordiness), he has an uncanny ability for gathering correct facts and after thoroughly examining these facts, reaching erroneous conclusions."

29 The defect of intention of which Pope Leo speaks was the failure of the FRAMERS of the Anglican rite to intend to produce a valid Catholic Sacrament of

Holy Orders. Hence the rite itself as a whole was (and is) devoid of sacramental power, regardless of the personal intention of any individual minister using that rite. Defect of intention of the framers must not be confused with defect of intention on the part of an individual minister of a Sacrament; that is, a failure to have the personal intention to do what the Church does. The Dominican authors McHugh and Callan confuse these two types of defect of intention [cf. MORAL THEOLOGY, A Complete Course, Vol. II, p. 634, #2666, par. (a)]. Moreover, they also go astray by saying, "The intention not to do what the Church does was the chief cause of the nullity of Anglican Orders." (Loc. cit.). In *Apostolicae Curae*, Leo XIII taught that the nullity derives from defect of form AND defect of intention (of the framers), not singling out either as being the more important cause.

30 Translated into English by Mary Ambrose, and published by Ogilvie Foundation (Lumen Gentium); c/o 3 Magdala Crescent, Edinburgh, Scotland, second edition, August 1970. Pages 17-18 have a letter to Paul VI by Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci, which includes the observation that the *Novus Ordo* "represents, as a whole and in detail, a striking departure from the Catholic theology of the Holy Mass as it was formulated in Session XXII of the Council of Trent..."

31 By means of the Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum*.

32 Audacity is a vital tool for all subversive revolutionaries. Referring to one of his early (1948) schemes, Bugnini himself boasts, "It was an audacious act. And on that occasion was verified the proverb, 'Fortune helps the audacious.'" (From *La riforma liturgica (1948-1975)*, A. Bugnini, p.23: "Fu un'audacia. E quella volta si verifico il proverbio AUDACES FORTUNA IU VAT."). And then in the very next line he doth protest that it involved "no underhanded manoeuvre" ("nessuna manovra nascosta"). He forgot to add, "Just kidding!"

33 Editor's Note. The 1917 Code of Canon Law, authorized by St. Pius X and promulgated by Benedict XV. --L.S.B.

34 See throughout its 205 pages the recently (1989) published book, *Peter, Lovest Thou Me?*, by Abbé Daniel Le Roux. English translation by Instauratio Press, P.O. Box 36, Yarra Junction, Victoria 3797, Australia.

35 From *L'Osservatore Romano* (May 28, p.11, English edition): "The Cardinal [Benno Gut], who was accompanied [at a papal private audience] by Fr. Annibale Bugnini, Secretary [of the "Sacred" Cong. for the Div. Cult], and Mons. Virgilio Noé, Under-secretary for the same Congregation, briefly explained ... some outstanding points of this highly important publication." The publication referred to was the text of Bugnini's and Noé's newly revised Masonic-style "Catholic" liturgy, which the Innovators chose to call "*Missale Romanum*". It is "highly important" for Lucifer's cause.

36 As reported in Time (Nov. 10, 1986), Mother Teresa of Calcutta called the Assisi debacle the "most beautiful gift of God."

37 Editor's Note. In all cases those who attend such Indult Masses must concede that the "New Mass" is theologically irreproachable, which is implicitly tantamount to acknowledging its validity. In some instances explicit affirmation of its validity is required. -- L.S.B.

38 See "The Ventriloquists," which first appeared as Issue No. 2 of Interdum (Feb. 24, 1970), for a thorough exposure of this fraud.

THE NECESSARY SIGNIFICATION IN THE SACRAMENTAL FORM OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST"

By Patrick Henry Omlor

"PRO VOBIS ET PRO MULTIS IN REMISSIONEM PECCATORUM" ARE ESSENTIAL WORDS IN THIS SACRAMENTAL FORM. ESTABLISHED THEOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES INDICATE THAT THE FALSIFIED WORDING IN ENGLISH OF THE WINE-CONSECRATION FORM, "FOR YOU AND FOR ALL SO THAT SINS MAY BE FORGIVEN," CANNOT YIELD A TRUE AND VALID CATHOLIC MASS.

PART I : THE BACKGROUND

1. The Long-standing Dispute

A dispute going back at least as far as the 13th century regarding exactly which of the words in the Consecration of the Wine printed in the Roman Missal are absolutely required for the validity of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist and, perforce, for the validity of the Mass itself, has never been settled definitively by the Church. This unresolved issue we call "the short form versus the entire form" controversy.

The defenders of the "short form" position hold that these words alone by themselves, "This is the chalice of My blood," or else "This is My blood" (which are the first few words of the sacramental form in many of the Oriental liturgies) suffice for the valid consecration of the Precious Blood. They claim that the remaining words of the sacramental form, namely, "of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins," although being a part of the form handed down in the Latin Rite, are nevertheless not necessary for validity. The defenders of the "entire form" position deny the foregoing supposition, asserting that (with the exception of the word "enim"), all the words of the sacramental form for the wine-consecration, exactly as laid down in bold print in Missale Romanum, are absolutely necessary for bringing about the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist and

therefore essential for the celebration of a valid Mass.

A most weighty authority supporting the "entire form" adherents is a preceptive passage contained in Part V of *De Defectibus in Celebratione Missarum Occurrentibus*, which is incorporated in the official rubrics accompanying the Roman Missal. In his Bull *Quo Primum* (1570) Pope St. Pius V ordered that this Missal be used in the Latin Rite "in perpetuity," and the aforementioned "*De Defectibus*" always appears in the introductory pages of legitimate altar missals. This salient passage from Part V of *De Defectibus* reads thus:

'The words of Consecration, which are the form of this Sacrament, are these: *Hoc est enim corpus meum. And: Hic est enim Calix Sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti: mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.* Now if one were to omit, or to change anything in the form of the consecration of the Body and Blood, and in that very change of the words the [new] wording would fail to mean the same thing, he would not consecrate the Sacrament. If in fact he were to add something that did not change the meaning, it is true he would consecrate, but he would sin gravely.'¹ This precept² begins by setting forth the consecration form in its entirety. It then warns that if anything (*aliquid*) in this form just defined should be altered in any way whatsoever involving a change in meaning of the originally specified words, then the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist containing the true Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity of Jesus Christ would not be produced, and hence the priest-celebrant would celebrate no Mass at all. *De Defectibus* does not single out the introductory words of the form, "This is the chalice of my blood," and state that if only those words are changed in meaning the consecration is invalid. It therefore is evident that this official injunction in *Missale Romanum* supports the "entire form" position and implicitly denies the claim of the "short form" apologists.

As it would appear that *De Defectibus* is part of the Ordinary Magisterium of the Church, its authority is on a level well above that of the speculative opinions advanced by various theologians. Although one cannot claim the passage cited from *De Defectibus* is a definition by the Church on this matter, nevertheless it is certain from it that the "Mind of the Church" is that the entire form must be treated as though it is all essential, inasmuch as the penalty of mortal sin attaches to anyone who would dare to add something to the form, even though the addition would not nullify or interfere with the meaning of anything contained in the given proper form.

A thorough and unbiased discussion of the "short form versus entire form" controversy is presented by Emmanuel Doronzo, O.M.I., Professor of Dogmatic Theology at Catholic University, Washington, D.C., in his work *Tractatus Dogmaticus DE EUCHARISTIA*, Tom. I *De Sacramento*, Bruce, Milwaukee, 1947. His airing of the controversy is on pp. 150-161, being Article 10 entitled "Whether Among the Words of Our Lord in the Latin Form of Consecration Only These Pertain to the Essence of the Sacramental Form: 'This Is My Body, This Is My Blood'." The author begins with a section entitled *Status Quaestionis*,

which includes this sound admonition: "By no means must this controversy be deemed to be an idle one, but rather it must be diligently attended to by the theologian 'lest most shameful sins be committed by consecrating priests through ignorance of the form,' as the Catechism of the Council of Trent warns (Part 11, Chap. 4, Q. 19)."³

Doronzo next discusses Pars Negativa (the negative position which denies the short form is sufficient for validity) and the Pars Affirmativa, (which affirms that the short form, "This is My Blood," suffices for validity). Many theologians are cited on both sides, and the various arguments of each are presented along with the counter-arguments by the opposing side. On page 161 Doronzo summarizes his exposition as follows:

"Having considered all these foregoing arguments, WE COME TO THIS CONCLUSION: The authority of the Catechism of the Council of Trent and of St. Thomas strongly moves us to judge that the Negative Opinion [which denies that the short form suffices] is the more probable. However, since in the opinion of so many theologians, especially 'Thomists,' the mind of St. Thomas, which the authors of the Catechism [of the Council of Trent] evidently intend to follow, is not clearly evident, we do not venture to deem one of the opinions more probable than the other, but we judge both to be equally probable."⁴

When a theological opinion is said to be probable, it must not be thought that this means "probable" in the ordinary sense of the word; that is, more than likely to be true. A theologically probable opinion is simply one that has sound reasons behind it and is espoused by theologians of high repute, but which lacks theological certainty and cannot be claimed to be certain.⁵ This explains why commentators (e.g., St. Alphonsus,⁶ Doronzo, etc.) are able to state that two diametrically opposed opinions are "equally probable," meaning not that both are equally likely to be true, but only that both have sound theological foundations and numerous reputable theologians as adherents.

2. No Longer A Purely Theoretical Controversy

Until the late 1960's the controversy we have been discussing, although extremely important and demanding diligent attention (as Doronzo wisely observed in the passage cited earlier), was nevertheless of academic or theoretical interest only, because in practice all Latin Rite priests knew -- and should still know -- that the entire wine-consecration form exactly as laid down in the Roman Missal of Pope St. Pius V must be used without any alterations.⁷ To fail to do so would be mortally sinful. Moreover such a failure to use the prescribed form in its entirety would probably result (if we realistically acknowledge the considered probability of a very sound theological opinion) in failing to consecrate the Holy Eucharist and consequently invalidating the "Mass" supposedly being celebrated.

But around 1967-68 this controversy became overnight a most serious one and

no longer a matter of academic interest only, due to the introduction of the vernacularized liturgies in almost every country in the world. Practically all of these new "Masses" in those various and multitudinous vernacular tongues suffered a change of wording in the sacramental form for the wine-consecration - a change involving a mutilation of meaning. In most of the vernacularized versions the concluding words of the form, "pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum," were not translated correctly from the canonized Latin text. The correct and literal translation into English is: "shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins." Instead it was rendered as "shed for you and for all men so that sins may be forgiven."⁸

This innovation is more than just a mistranslation. It is a forgery,⁹ a falsification of the words spoken by Our Lord, as recorded in Holy Scripture,¹⁰ when He instituted the Sacrament of the Altar at the Last Supper.¹¹ Much higher stakes now came into play surrounding the controversy about whether or not these words, correctly translated,¹² are part of the form essential for validity. The matter ceased to be of "academic interest" only. Because there and then we became confronted with a deliberate and premeditated¹³ change in meaning of the established and proper form of the Sacrament -- a change occurring in those words which many esteemed and reputable theologians over the centuries capably argued are necessary for the validity of the Mass. Yes, infinitely greater stakes! The continued widespread existence of the Holy Mass in the western Latin Rite became jeopardized.¹⁴

However, after the question was publicly raised¹⁵ concerning the possible invalidity of "Masses" using the all-English Canon (which was introduced in the United States on October 22, 1967) -- the case being based on its aforesaid vitiated wine-consecration form containing the falsified "for you and for all men, etc." and the implications thereof--, many writers, chiefly "conservatives" and "traditionalists," chose straightaway to defend vehemently the validity of the English "Masses" using this despoiled "consecration form." Most of these Adversarii¹⁶ resorted to the argument that it is the common opinion among present-day theologians that the mere words, "This is the chalice of My blood," are the only words of the form that are absolutely essential for the validity of the Sacrament.

In other words the "short form" position, a mere theological opinion, which Doronzo had termed the "Pars Affirmativa" on the centuries-old controversy, was assumed to be automatically correct, veritably an infallible dogma. Since the falsified words, "for all men so that sins may be forgiven," occur in the concluding part of the form, which (so they allege) is a nonessential part anyway, such a change from the proper and certainly valid "for many unto the remission of sins" could not possibly affect the validity. So goes the argument of the Adversarii.

An important point I would stress now is that the controversy concerning exactly which words of the wine-consecration are absolutely essential for validity clearly

cannot be settled definitively simply by appealing to the authority of this or that theologian. If it is ever to be settled at all, nothing short of a definition by the infallible Magisterium of the Catholic Church (not The Robber Church) will suffice.

3. A Digression : The Robber Catechism

There are many other introductory "background" points that need to be covered. We must furnish some concrete examples that reveal the calibre of scholarship of the Adversarii. However, this present section comprises a brief digression from our main theme, in order to examine yet one more desperate effort by The Robber Church (whose miscreants are not to be confused with our sincere but lamentably ignorant and, therefore, reckless Adversarii). That it would happen was almost predictable with certainty and, yes, eventually The Robber Church did make its belated attempt to torpedo one of the most authoritative and devastating bulwarks of our invalidity thesis, namely, the Catechism of the Council of Trent, also known as the Roman Catechism.

A new English "translation" of the Roman Catechism appeared in 1984, which date is quite appropriate inasmuch as parts of this opus are written in Orwellian "Newspeak". In the first place, there was no genuine need at all for a new translation, because those many earlier editions translated by Dr. Jeremy Donovan and the later version by the Dominican scholars John McHugh and Charles Callan (not to mention the first English translation printed at London in 1687) all are first-rate, very clearly expressed in elegant English prose and, with a very few notable exceptions in several places, entirely faithful to the Latin text.

Nevertheless The Robber Church, for unmistakable reasons my present readers will easily discern, did find it necessary to retranslate -- rather rewrite -- certain parts. The new work is entitled simply (and erroneously) The Roman Catechism; and it is subtitled, "Translated and Annotated in Accord with Vatican 11 and Post-Conciliar Documents and the New Code of Canon Law". Published by St. Paul Editions, Boston, the "translators" are Robert I. Bradley, S.J., and Msgr. Eugene Kevane. A laudatory "Presentation" written by Cardinal Oddi graces its introductory pages.

Let us examine a few excerpts from this 1984 "Orwellian" edition of the Roman Catechism.

The earlier translators McHugh & Callan render quite correctly and fluently the following passage from Part II, Chap. I, Q. XVII: "In this the Sacraments of the New Law excel those of the Old that, as far as we know, there was no definite form of administering the latter, and hence they were very uncertain and obscure. In our Sacraments, on the contrary, the form is so definite that any, even a casual deviation from it, renders the Sacrament null,..."¹⁷ (Emphasis added).

Here is the Robbers' Newspeak version of this text: "In this regard the

sacraments of the New Law far excell [sic] those of the Old. There was, as far as we know, no definite form for administering the sacraments of the Old Testament; and because of this they remained very uncertain and obscure. Under the New Law, however, the verbal form is so important ["praescriptam" means prescribed, or "definite" as McHugh & Callan render it; not "important!"] that its omission -- even if accidental -- renders the sacrament null."¹⁸ (Emphasis added).

The Roman Catechism was not written for kindergartners. Imagine its erudite 16th-century authors supposedly informing parish priests (for whom the Catechism was primarily written) that in effectuating a sacrament the sacramental form is not to be omitted! (The Latin 'ab ea discedatur' means 'departed from' or 'deviated from,' as McHugh & Callan correctly so translate). The phrase, "even if accidental," makes it sound even more ridiculous, as though any sane priest would accidentally omit the entire form. What comes through here is that all those Robber Church priests -- correction: "Presidents of the Assembly of the People of God" -- had better not forget to say something! Now there is a certain passage in the Roman Catechism that most convincingly damns the purported authenticity of the phony "for all men" mutilation and annihilates all claims for its validity. It is that well known passage that explicitly condemns the wording "for all men," as being destructive of the correct theological meaning in this place in the sacramental form, and therefore categorically unacceptable. The slightly different renderings of this passage by Donovan and by McHugh & Callan are both quite competently penned and, of course, representative of the correct meaning of the original Latin text. However, what is reproduced below is the equally excellent version that appears on page 207 of the very first English translation of the Catechism, published at London in 1687, under the Catholic King James II.

'When therefore He said, 'For you,' He signifi'd either them that were then present, or those whom He had chosen out of the Jewish people, such as were His Disciples, except Judas, with whom He spake. But when He added, "For many," He would have the rest that were elected, either Jews or Gentiles to be understood. Rightly therefore was it done, that it was not said 'for all,' seeing that in this place the design of the discourse extends only to the fruits of the Passion,, which brought the Fruit of Salvation only to the Elect.'¹⁹

The Robber Catechism's version of the above-cited passage reads thus: "When, therefore, he said, 'for you,' he meant those only who were present at the Supper except Judas; or he may also have meant all the disciples whom he had chosen along with the Twelve. And when he added, 'for many,' he was including all the other elect from among the Jews and the Gentiles until the end of time. The alternative expression, 'for all,' was properly omitted, because here it is only the fruit of the Passion which is spoken of; and for the elect only does the Passion bear the fruit of salvation."²⁰

Observe how they euphemistically term the wording for all an "alternative

expression," one that was simply "properly omitted," rather than one expressly rejected by Our Lord. Rightly therefore did Jesus not say 'for all!' is what the Catechism states. Do Catholics speak about possible alternatives for Divinely spoken words? Furthermore "for all" was not, in point of fact, "omitted" at all, because it was never there in the first place.

And lo! We even find a footnote subjoined to this carnage wreaked upon the Roman Catechism. Verily the pièce de résistance:

"This disjunction in meaning between 'many' and 'all,' although valid on the terms of the theological distinction made in the text, is unnecessary on purely philological and historical terms."

[Unnecessary? It is absolutely necessary to make the clear distinction between 'many' and 'all.' 'Disjunction' is their slippery word that avoids saying that these two words 'many' and 'all' are directly related correspondingly to the two different ideas in the 'theological distinction' to which they refer. 'All' is wrong not only on 'philological and historical terms,' but also, more importantly, theologically; and finally, most importantly, because it is not what Our Lord said].

Continuing, then, with the footnote:

"The 'polloi' of the original New Testament text means both 'many' and 'all' interchangeably. Taken as an exact equivalent of that Greek word, the Latin 'multi' can - and should -- convey both senses. And therefore both equivalents in English, 'many' and 'all,' are justified."²¹

Apparently these new Robbers have now abandoned the original ploy, which was to try to justify the bogus 'for all' on the basis of an ambiguity or peculiarity allegedly inherent in the Aramaic language. With good reason do they abandon it, for when that deceitful manoeuvre by the International Committee on English in the Liturgy (ICEL) came to light, it was exposed as the colossal fraud that it most plainly and assuredly is.²² This new generation of Robbers now tries to justify the bogus words "for all" by alleging a supposed peculiarity in the Greek language, which is a complete turnabout, as we shall now see.

In the course of their prevaricating "explanation" of the phony Aramaic language business, the ICEL Robbers did manage to admit (and in this they were correct) that in the Greek as well as in the Latin the word in question does in fact mean "many" rather than "all".²³ Moreover, to substantiate this they even quoted their guru, the late Dr. Joachim Jeremias, who stated quite clearly and correctly: "While 'many' in Greek (as in English) stands in opposition to 'all', and therefore has the exclusive sense ('many, but not all') ... etc."²⁴

But now we find these erudite translators of the 1984 "Roman Catechism" (so-called) forswearing the true doctrine of their ICEL forebears (on one of the few occasions those chronic crooks were actually truthful), by now turning around 180 degrees and claiming that the Greek word 'polloi' means "both [their

emphasis] 'many' and 'all' interchangeably" and therefore "the Latin 'multi' can -- and should -- convey both senses." "And," in conclusion, "therefore both equivalents in English, 'many' and 'all,' [which are not equivalents at all, but contrary concepts] are justified"! Those pesky Robbers -- foiled earlier and proved to be liars on the "Aramaic hoax," and now again foiled on the "Greek hoax," this time in advance by the 1968 testimony of the ICEL itself. We eagerly await the next installment.

4. Cajetan and De Lugo

Said Doronzo: "The Negative Position [i.e., the 'entire form' position] is taught by the majority of theologians and Thomists up to the Council of Trent, and afterwards by very many ('a pluribus'), Thomists as well as non-Thomists."²⁵ The Salmanticenses, moreover, remarked, "All the earlier Thomists up to Cajetan, who rejected it, taught the same [i.e., the 'entire form' position] unanimously."²⁶

Apparently therefore it was Cajetan, Tommaso De Vio Gaetani, baptized Giacomo (1469-1534), a Dominican cardinal, who was the first "Thomist" to oppose the mind of St. Thomas on this matter. Cajetan had been called a "lamp of the Church" by Pope Clement VII,²⁷ and it was said that he could quote almost the entire Summa of St. Thomas from memory. Now, in his commentaries on the Summa, Cajetan contradicted the teaching of the Angelic Doctor by emphatically declaring that for the consecration of the Precious Blood nothing more is required than these four words: "This is my blood." ("Invenimus non esse necessaria ad consecrationem sanguinis nisi quatuor verba haec, 'Hic est sanguis meus'.") Continuing with excessive self-assurance, he asserted: "Although Scotus and many others doubt this is true, it seems to me that there is no basis for doubting it to be probable; but it must be considered as beyond question, as I have said."²⁸ (Emphasis added).

This opinion of Cajetan's appeared in the edition of his "Commentaries" published at Venice in 1533.²⁹ But subsequently the Sovereign Pontiff St. Pius V, also a Dominican, proved to be one of those who certainly did not consider Cajetan's opinion to be "beyond question," for when he authorized Cajetan's commentaries to be published in a Roman edition in 1570 he also explicitly commanded this particular opinion to be expurgated! As Cardinal Capisuccus notes, "They are in error who try to maintain that this was expurgated only because Cajetan downgraded St. Thomas's opinion too much. For Cajetan here does not merely downgrade the opinion of St. Thomas; he departs from it. Just as he departs from him on other matters, but those other divergences were not ordered to be dropped from the Roman edition. It is evident that Pope Pius V did not agree with this opinion of Cajetan [the one which he expunged]."³⁰

John De Lugo (1583-1660), the noted Spanish Jesuit and Cardinal, and an adamant "short form" promoter, once claimed to have come across some previously used Maronite Catholic liturgies that employed only the words "This is My Blood" as the complete form for the wine-consecration. He argued that the

very existence of such liturgies proves beyond doubt that the "short form" opinion is not just probable, but certain. In a word, he claimed in effect that by his discovery of those "short form" liturgies the controversy now had been settled once and for all.

Even today some persons still cite the De Lugo "findings" as "proof" that the short form, 'This is My blood,' is sufficient for validity. Such persons are apparently unaware that De Lugo's evidence is now of historical interest only as a noble but futile effort, for even in his own day it was weighed and analyzed and thoroughly rejected by many of his contemporaries. Perhaps the best and most thoroughly devastating rebuttal was made by the renowned 17th-century Thomists of Salamanca, Spain, that group of learned Discalced Carmelites known as the Salmanticenses,³¹ who showed that the De Lugo findings consisted of either spurious liturgies or liturgies used by schismatics and/or heretics, which fact automatically disqualifies them as credible evidence.

Every person who thinks he knows something about the "pro multis" invalidity issue and the "short form versus entire form" controversy should at least realize that De Lugo surely did not settle and could not possibly have settled the matter once and for all; for if he had, then recent experts, such as Doronzo in 1947, would not have still been writing on this issue as an open question. Now a quite remarkable aspect of the Salmanticenses' writings is that although they poured forth from the pens of many different Carmelite Thomists over a period of nearly a century, they do not contain a single self-contradiction.

Back in 1976, Father Lawrence S. Brey translated the Salmanticenses' entire disputation against De Lugo, which comprises sections 30-32 of Disp. IX, dub.3 of *Cursus Theologicus*, Vol. XVIII, 'De Eucharistiae Sacramento,' from the edition published at Paris, 1882. This translation, the first (and only) ever made into English, was published in *The Remnant*, issue of July 31, 1976, pages 8-12, under the title, "The Salmanticenses' Response To De Lugo On The Form Of Consecration Of The Wine". No scholar or even casual student of the "pro multis" invalidity issue should fail to read and thoroughly digest this most comprehensive and brilliant polemical treatise, so capably and faithfully translated by our intrepid and illustrious Father Lawrence S. Brey.³²

5. Our Temerarious Adversarii

Very many great theologians, including Saints, Popes and Doctors of the Church, have claimed that the words "This is (the chalice of) My blood," alone by themselves, are not sufficient for the validity of the wine-consecration, but that the entire form including "for you and for many unto the remission of sins" is absolutely essential.

Among these "Pars Negativa" exponents we may include St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Antoninus, Pope St. Pius V, Pope Innocent 111, the authors of the Catechism

of the Council of Trent, Cardinal Raymond Capisuccus, O.P., those brilliant Thomists, the renowned Discalced Carmelites of Salamanca known as the Salmanticenses, Herveus, Capreolus, Sylvester, Tabiena, Armilla, Peter de Soto, Viguierius, Bartholomeus Spina, Arauxo, Marcus Huertos, John Nicolai, Gonet, John Vincent Asturicensis, John Gonzalez, N. Franciscus, Thomas Argentina, Richardus, N. Philippus, N. Cornejo, John Gerson, Aegidius Columna, Andrew Victorellus, Lorca, Thomas Hurtado, Pasqualigo, Petrus de Palude, Henry Henriquez, S.J., Francis Amicus, S.J., John of Freiburg, Jacobus de Graffiis, O.S.B., F. Macedo, O.M., and Père Maurice de la Taille, S.J.

THEREFORE, the entire form is absolutely necessary for validity, and the words "This is My blood" alone do not suffice. This is proved conclusively by the authority of the theologians just named.

The claim in the last sentence of the above paragraph is absurd! It does not in the least represent my view, nor that of anyone I know. Although the comprehensive list of authorities I presented is quite accurate, everyone must realize by now that even if I had cited 10,000 theologians, that would still not settle the issue definitively. Because the one and only ultimate verdict, namely, "Roma locuta est, Causa finita est," remains lacking. This matter can be conclusively resolved only by our Holy Mother the Church. The Adversarii (many of whom have "settled" the matter for their readers so self-confidently and so facilely) would do well to keep this fact in mind.

One of the early Adversarii, Father Daniel Lyons, S.J., was able to settle the matter conclusively for the readers of *Twin Circle* (Jan. 4, 1970). He wrote: "The translation of the consecration of the Precious Blood as 'all men' is perfectly valid. The matter has been checked out theologically.... One good source is an old but very scholarly manual of Dogmatic Theology, more rigorous than many modern treatises. ... Fr. Tanquerey says that for validity ... these words are sufficient: 'Hoc est corpus meum. Hic est calix sanguinis mei'." So! We can all rest easily now; there is no problem; Tanquerey has spoken. And Father Lyons has ratified!

To attempt thus to settle that centuries-old controversy by appealing to a single theologian bespeaks a deplorable and culpable ignorance and an incredible temerity. Moreover Fr. Lyons's alleged "facts" are even in error. Here is what Tanquerey actually says in his *Brevior Synopsis Theologiae Dogmaticae*: "It is certain (Certum est) that for the valid consecration of the bread the words of Christ are required: 'This is my body'; and for the consecration of the wine the words: 'This is the chalice of my blood'; or 'This is my blood'."³³

What Tanquerey is saying here is that it is certain that at least those words are essential, not that they alone suffice. Which is evident from what he says next: "There is a dispute as to whether the words: 'of the new and eternal testament ... etc.' are required for a valid consecration. Many of the Thomists say that they

are required because ... etc. Other theologians say that they are not required because ... etc."³⁴

And again Tanqueray: "For the valid consecration of the blood of Christ; the words 'this is the chalice of my blood' or 'this is my blood' are required; rather, with much probability they are sufficient. In practice, however, the form, as it is in the Missal, must always be pronounced; for when validity is at stake, the safer opinion must be followed."³⁵

Writing in *The Remnant* (15 Feb. 1971), the late Dr. Dietrich von Hildebrand gave his readers this simplistic soporific: "since a great many theologians (among them the Franciscan Duns Scotus) had stated that the strictly essential words for the validity of the Consecration are, 'This is My Body' and 'This is My Blood,' we need not worry about the validity." So! Now we have Scotus and von Hildebrand finally deciding the matter. All our worries are over. For the Adversarii it is all such a simple matter!

Scotus? John Duns Scotus, the Franciscans' eminent "Subtle Doctor"?? Quite to the contrary, Scotus³⁶ did not advance the "short form" theory.³⁷ In fact, one of the noted "short form" exponents, the redoubtable Suarez (disp. 60, sect. 1, n. 3),³⁸ in referring to the contrary doctrine of St. Thomas that the entire form is necessary, admitted: "This teaching [ie., that the short form does not suffice] is very probable and of great authority [ie., St. Thomas and the Roman Catechism, et al.] and Scotus himself did not venture to contradict it, but left it as a doubtful matter." The reason Suarez remarks that "Scotus himself" did not dare to contradict St. Thomas on this matter is that Scotus was notorious for so very frequently impugning the Angelic Doctor, choosing exactly the opposite opinion.³⁹

Most of the reputable theologians of the past who advanced the "short form" opinion were honest enough and careful enough to point out that their opinion is only "probable," and that the opposite view has great weight. Thus, for example, Suarez, who held the "short form" position, conceded that the "entire form" opinion contrary to his is very probable and of great authority ("Haec opinio est valde probabilis, et magnae auctoritatis").⁴⁰

But some of our present-day Adversarii adopt a completely different attitude, as is indicated in the examples just given. Now that the matter has become one of clear and present danger -- that is, now that we are faced with a "consecration form" (so-called) that actually contains a mutilation in the mooted final words--, they vehemently insist on its validity, superficially and temerarily citing as "conclusive proof" speculative opinions of a few theologians of far lesser authority than St. Thomas, who moreover (as we have seen) do not even hold those opinions our pitiable Adversarii so ignorantly ascribe to them!

I have in my files a four-page document entitled, "Two Letters of Father Forrest

Concerning The English Mass". It contains excerpts from some personal correspondence of the late Father Michael D. Forrest, M.S.C., to a Mr. Chester D. Mann of Tustin, California.⁴¹ Here are several of Fr. Forrest's statements:

- (1) "As to the All-English Canon now used in this country ... However, defective and bad as the translation of the Canon is, I emphatically defend that it does not invalidate the Mass."
- (2) "The entire valid form of consecration is simply: 'This is My Body; this is My Blood,' or 'this is the chalice (cup) of My Blood'." (Underscoring in Fr. Forrest's original letter).
- (3) "No, Chester, you can be sure that Mass celebrated according to the new badly worded Canon is VALID." (Emphasis is Fr. Forrest's).
- (4) "However, this is my definite view: It is morally certain [my emphasis] that the only essential [Fr. Forrest's underscoring] form of consecration are the words: Hoc est corpus meum; hic est sanguis meus."
- (5) "When I was teaching theology (long ago in Australia), I had at my disposal a magnificent library. I treasured two large, pig-skin covered volumes of Cardinal John de Lugo ... (who) stoutly defended that the only essential form of consecration of the wine is HIC EST SANGUIS MEUS, and he appealed prolifically in abundant quotations to numerous Liturgies [many of which were proved conclusively by the Salmanticenses to be either spurious or those of schismatics, as we have noted], showing that these were the only consecrating words COMMON TO ALL LITURGIES."

Father Forrest claimed the view that the short form "This is My Blood" suffices for validity to be a morally certain view. Father Felix Cappello, S.J., earlier made the same rash asseveration. Now "morally certain" certainly sounds terribly definite. To many readers those words "morally certain" must surely convey a sense of finality. If they can be "morally certain" there is no invalidity problem with the English "Mass," then the matter is no doubt more or less settled in their minds. This is certainly morally dangerous. If trusted advisors (who are so positive in asserting their opinions) are in fact fatally wrong on the "invalidity issue," -- as we believe they are -- then they are leading many Catholics to accept a "Mass" that is very possibly an idolatrous performance, and therefore imperilling to their eternal salvation.

What exactly does the phrase "morally certain" mean? Well, it is defined in Webster's Twentieth Century Dictionary (Unabridged). The first part of the definition is: "Supported by the evidence of reason or probability." If we consider only that part of the definition, then it can with equal justification be said that the view that the entire consecration form is essential is also morally certain.

The second part of the definition of "morally certain" is: "founded on experience of the ordinary course of things." Here the claim that the short form opinion is "morally certain" disintegrates, while the moral certainty of the entire form

position would be thoroughly vindicated. For if we base the verdict on experience, all experience shows that there is not a single example of an unquestionably valid liturgy that uses or has ever used only the mere words "This is My Blood." (From the foregoing demonstration it must not be inferred that I am now being so bold as to claim our opinion to be morally certain, I hasten to add.)

Cappello had written, "Whatever may be the opinion of the Holy Doctor [St. Thomas] and of other theologians, the opposite opinion is common and morally certain."⁴² To conclude this discussion on "morally certain," I would point out that the fair-minded Doronzo, a man of apparent equanimity, quotes those words of Cappello with displeasure and upbraids him for writing far too frivolously ("nimis leviter scribit") on so important a matter.⁴³

6. The Mind of St. Thomas

Albeit the matter concerning which words of the wine-consecration form are essential cannot be settled conclusively by any theologian, nevertheless one cannot minimize the importance of the opinion of St. Thomas. He is and always has been the one central figure, not only in this dispute, but in all theological questions. To begin to appreciate the unique role of the Angelic Doctor in the affairs of the Church one should read Pope Leo XIII's encyclical *Aeterni Patris*. In that document we find, among others, the following exceptional tributes to the Angelic Doctor:

'The ecumenical councils have always been careful to hold Thomas Aquinas in singular honor. In the councils of Lyons, Vienne, Florence, and the Vatican one might almost say that Thomas took part and presided over the deliberations and decrees of the Fathers.'

'But the chief and special glory of Thomas, one which he has shared with none of the Catholic doctors, is that the Fathers of Trent made it part of the order of the conclave to lay upon the altar, together with the code of sacred Scripture and the decrees of the Supreme Pontiffs, the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas, whence to seek counsel, reason, and inspiration.'

The view of St. Thomas on the essential words of the wine-consecration form is stated in three different places: (1) *Scriptum Super Lib. IV Sententiarum*; (2) *In I Cor. XI*, (lect. 6); (3) *The Summa Theologica*.

- (1) In *Scriptum Super Lib. IV Sententiarum* (dist. 8, Q. 2, a. 2, q. 1, ad 3) we read: "And therefore those words which follow [that is, which follow 'This is the chalice of My Blood'] are essential to the blood, inasmuch as it is consecrated in this sacrament; and therefore they must be of the substance of the form."⁴⁴
- (2) *In I Cor. XI*, (lect. 6) has the following: "In regard to these words which the Church uses in the consecration of the Blood, some think that not

all of them are necessary for the form, but the words 'This is the chalice of My Blood' only, not the remainder which follows, 'of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins.' But it would appear that this is not said correctly, because all that which follows is a determination of the predicate [the predicate being 'This is the chalice of my blood'] : hence those subsequent words belong to the meaning or signification of the same pronouncement. And because, as has often been said, it is by signifying that the forms of sacraments have their effect, hence all of these words appertain to the effecting power of the form."⁴⁵ (Emphasis added).

(3) In Summa Theologica (111, Q. 78, A. 3) St. Thomas again lucidly expounds his view:

"I answer that, There is a twofold opinion regarding this form. Some have maintained that the words This is the chalice of My blood alone belong to the substance of this form, but not those words which follow. Now this seems incorrect, because the words which follow them are determinations of the predicate, that is, of Christ's blood; consequently they belong to the integrity of its [i.e, the forms] recitation.

"And on this account others say more accurately that all the words which follow are of the substance of the form down to the words, As often as ye shall do this, which belong to the use of the sacrament, and consequently do not belong to the substance of the form. Hence it is that the priest pronounces all these words under the same rite and manner, namely, holding the chalice in his hands."⁴⁶

7. Our Wishful Thinking Adversarii

There are three types of Adversarii. First, we have those who are able to read and who honestly concede that they have the Angelic Doctor against them. All of the earlier theologians who espoused the "short form" theory up through the time of Cajetan, and including Cajetan himself, fell into this category. Earlier we quoted the words of Suarez, who affirmed that the opinion of St. Thomas, though opposed to his own, "is very probable and of great authority, and Scotus himself did not venture to contradict it, but left it as a doubtful matter." Most of our present-day Adversarii are of this first type.

The second class of Adversarii includes those who claim it is not clear what the Angelic Doctor really taught, or that he wrote ambiguously, or that he contradicted himself, or that he was unsure of himself. Or that he changed his mind from one of his writings to the next! That ludicrous claim was actually made by Billuart, who for so doing was derisively accused by Doronzo of "flying to the extreme."⁴⁷ To all those confused Adversarii of this class we reply in the words of Capisuccus to De Lugo: "The opinion of St. Thomas is not difficult if it is properly understood."⁴⁸

These first two categories do not at present capture our attention. With the first

group we have no quarrel: we see eye to eye with them, at least regarding what it was that St. Thomas actually held. To the second group I say merely that what confuses me is that anyone could be so confused as to think the Angelic Doctor was confused.

About four centuries ago there was a certain argument of the "short form" apologists making the rounds, and occasionally (but fortunately not very often) some of the present-day Adversarii haul it out and attempt to expound it, at least to the degree they are able to understand it. St. Alphonsus does not think much of this particular argument, remarking that how such a theory squares with the mind of St. Thomas is not at all apparent.⁴⁹ That remark is a polite understatement. For the argument to which we are here referring is that St. Thomas indeed supports the "short form" position! Which is surely a quaint theory, and one which therefore brings us to the third class, namely, the Adversarii Cogitationis Cupidae.

Before examining this painfully tortuous argument of those wishful thinkers, let us in anticipation of it recall a few facts that have already been presented. In the first work of St. Thomas that we considered (Script. Sup. Lib. IV Sent.) he says that the entire sacramental form is essential (essentialia) and also in the very same sentence he uses the equivalent phraseology 'of the substance' (de substantia) of the form. In the second source cited (In I Cor. XI) St. Thomas uses different phraseology, namely, necessary (de necessitate), referring of course to the form in its entirety. Finally, in the Summa he reverts to the word substantia (the substance of the form).

Now sometime after the Council of Trent, certain "short form" exponents devised the theory that St. Thomas in the Summa did not mean by the word 'substantia' what everyone up to that time had always thought he meant, namely, a term synonymous with 'essentia' or with 'necessitas'. They claimed that by substance he did not mean necessary for validity, but only necessary for the integrity or completeness of the form.⁵⁰ From the Angelic Doctor's statement that the words following 'This is the chalice of my blood' are "determinations of the predicate," they erroneously inferred that he meant those additional words of the form are necessary only to express the properties of the blood; that is to say, to make the form one single complete utterance that neatly links together all these (supposedly unnecessary) determinations of the predicate. That is the argument in a nutshell.

After this bit of seeming sophistry had surfaced, many sound theologians, including Capisuccus and the Salmanticenses, painstakingly and methodically refuted it point by point, as does Doronzo (all of these commentators exhibiting a laudable patience in the face of foolishness, it would seem).

The first thing that comes to mind that would seem to torpedo this argument is that it was not advanced until about three hundred years after the death of St. Thomas. As we saw earlier, Salmanticenses mentioned that all the earlier

Thomists, unanimously, up to Cajetan taught that the entire form is necessary. And as we read in de la Taille, St. Pius V ordered the expunging of Cajetan's contrary opinion "as being opposed to the teaching of the Angelic Doctor,"⁵¹ which is exactly what Cardinal Raymond Capisuccus said in the passage quoted earlier (see text associated with footnote 30). It would seem that the contemporaries of St. Thomas and those who followed soon thereafter -- not only those who agreed with him, but also those who opposed his view -- must be considered more reliable interpreters of the mind of St. Thomas than those who came upon the scene much later, coming as they did after the fashion of innovators, entertaining such entirely revolutionary (and patently unsound) theories.

The second thing that comes to mind is that those wishful thinking bearers of novelties were evidently employing what Mgr. Pierre Batiffol has called la *méthode régressive*:

"This is a cumbrous and uncomfortable method. The theory comes first, and then the evidence. Sometimes it refuses to go in; and there is nothing for it but to show that the author says the opposite elsewhere, and is therefore inconsistent, or else to prove that the passage or the whole work is not genuine."⁵²

Finally what comes to mind is the fact that in the very same *Summa Theologica* where this supposed difficult or problematical word "substance" (*substantia*) is used, St. Thomas actually defines what he means by substance. In his section on the sacraments in general he establishes principles that are to apply to all the sacraments individually when he will be discussing them later in the work. Ergo, in his *Summa Th.*, (111, Q. 60, A. 8) he avers:

"Now it is clear that if anything that is of the substance of the sacramental form would be suppressed, then that would destroy the essential sense of the words; and consequently the sacrament would not be accomplished." ("*Manifestum est quod si diminuatür aliquid eorum, quae sunt de substantia formae sacramentalis, tollitur debitus sensus verborum: et ideo non perficitur sacramentum.*"). -- [Emphasis added].

On p. 151 of his classic work Doronzo adverts to this claim of certain *Pars Affirmativa* ("short form") advocates that St. Thomas allegedly supports their position, and comments dryly, "so they say" (*ut dicunt*). Later (on p. 153) he writes: "Furthermore a special probability is given to the negative [entire form] opinion by the authority of Pope Innocent III, the more obvious interpretation [emphasis added] of the words of St. Thomas, and the words of the Catechism of the Council of Trent and of the Roman Missal"⁵³

Here is Emmanuel Doronzo's full elucidation of the "substance as opposed to essence" theory:

"There is no use objecting that the holy Doctor does not teach that all these words are of the essence of the form, but only 'of the substance of the form'; as

though the words 'This is My blood' are of the substance as an essential part, and the other words are of the substance as an integral part ...

[To support and to bring out even more clearly what Doronzo is saying here, we interrupt his exposition and interpolate this cogent clarification by Cardinal Capisuccus from p. 214 of his work that was cited earlier (footnote 29). "And then the reasoning of St. Thomas holds," says Capisuccus, "because inasmuch as all those words are determinations of the predicate, the predicate being the Blood of Christ itself, they all belong to the same identical theme and the utterance of it ... Therefore some of the words of the entire form may not be dropped in such a way as to imply that some of these words concur to confect the Blood of Christ while certain others would not concur in confecting the Blood of Christ. For this would be the same as saying that the very same cause applied to bring about a given effect partly concurs to bring about that effect and partly does not do so, which involves a contradiction."]

We proceed with Doronzo's exposition:

"For although the expression 'to be of the substance of the form' may be interpreted [by some] in the alleged double sense, nevertheless they are not thus meant here by St. Thomas. For in Q. 60, Art. 8, in handing down the general doctrine on the sacraments (which he intends to apply in this place), he says: 'Now it is clear that if anything that is of the substance of the sacramental form would be suppressed, then that would destroy the essential sense of the words; and consequently the sacrament would not be accomplished.' ...

"From all this we gather that for St. Thomas these four expressions have the same meaning (a) to have reference not to the use of the sacrament, but to the sacrament itself, (b) to be of the substance of the form; (c) to be of the necessity of the form; (d) to be that by which the sacrament is performed or accomplished.

...

"Besides, St. Thomas does not say that these words pertain 'to the integrity of the form,' but rather 'to the integrity of the recitation of the form,' which is itself the very substance or essence of the form." 54

Although I have the greatest admiration for the Reverend Doctor Emmanuel Doronzo, I do have one criticism of him: he is far too benevolent. Let us recall his "concluding remarks" that were quoted much earlier. After affirming that he is strongly moved to judge the "entire form" position as being the more probable (because of the authority of St. Thomas and the Roman Catechism), he then awards "equal probability" to the opposite opinion solely because it is the view of some benighted persons that the mind of St. Thomas is not clearly evident! This, mind you, after his own devastating rebuttal of those confused individuals (which we have seen just above), in which he himself brilliantly demonstrates what is clearly the mind of St. Thomas!

8. What Is Meant By "The Entire Form"

Up till now we have been frequently using the expression, "the entire form." It is essential to understand exactly what we mean when we say the entire form is necessary for the validity of the Sacrament, and, perforce, for the validity of the Mass. We do not mean necessary in an absolutely universal sense (relating to all rites), but in the limited sense, that is, with respect to our own Latin Rite. For what is essential in one of the rites of the Church is not necessarily essential in another rite. This important idea will be developed.

First, let us examine the entire form, as translated literally from the Latin of the Roman Missal:

"FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD, OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT: THE MYSTERY OF FAITH, WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS."

To begin with, the word 'for' ('enim') is considered by no one to be an essential part of the form. However, St. Thomas does mention that this word "is set in the form according to the custom of the Roman Church, which derived it from Peter the Apostle". Nevertheless it is "not part of the form." (Summa Th., III, Q. 78, A. 2, ad 5). Elsewhere (in Q.60, A. 8) he states that one who would omit this word, 'for,' would perhaps in so doing sin from negligence or contempt.

It is erroneously believed by some that transubstantiation is the only thing that is necessary to be signified in the sacramental form for the Holy Eucharist. This mistaken belief leads to the false theory that "This is My blood" is sufficient for the sacramental form. On the contrary, there are in fact four things that must be signified, namely: (1) transubstantiation; (2) propitiation; (3) sacrifice; (4) the effect of the Sacrament (called its "Res Sacramenti"), which is the union of the Mystical Body of Christ.

(1) Transubstantiation. As is evident, transubstantiation is clearly denoted by the first words of the form, "This is the chalice of My blood." It is denoted, but it does not yet occur once these words have been uttered, for the essential additional determinations of this statement have not yet been expressed. Just as the washing away of sin and the imprinting of the indelible sacramental character of Baptism do not occur just as soon as the words, "I baptize thee," have been uttered (as all will admit), but these effects await the completion of the sacramental form with those necessary additional words, "in the Name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." So the words "I baptize thee," as is easily seen, are not true as soon as they are pronounced, because the recipient in very fact at that moment is not baptized. Similarly the words, "This is My Blood," are not true until the recitation of the entire form has been completed.

(2) Propitiation. With Christ's propitiatory sacrifice on Calvary the Old Law was permanently abrogated, as is so beautifully expressed by the words of St. Thomas in the "Tantum Ergo" : "Et antiquum documentum novo cedat ritui." The sacrifices of the Old Law, though pleasing to God, were not true sacrifices of propitiation -- that is, truly expiatory or atoning in nature -- for, it goes without

saying, the blood of animals has no power to expiate sins. The Passion and Death of the Man-God, the True Unique Atonement for the sins of man by the Son of God made man, was required.

Hence we see this necessary concept of propitiation is denoted in the sacramental form by the words, "of the new and eternal testament," meaning that the Blood of Christ is that of God's new testament with man, in contradistinction to the impotent blood of animals as shed under the the Old Law.⁵⁵ As we read in the Catholic Encyclopedia: "As may be gathered from the words of consecration of the Chalice, Christ established the New Testament in His Blood, just as the Old Testament had been established in the typical blood of animals (cf. Ex., xxiv, 8; Heb., ix, 11 sq.)."⁵⁶

(3) Sacrifice. The Holy Eucharist is both Sacrament and Sacrifice. As Maurice de la Taille points out,⁵⁷ had Christ so willed it, He could have left us the Sacrament of His Body and Blood completely apart from His Sacrifice on Calvary, simply by giving his priests the power of transubstantiating. However, He in fact did will to leave us this Holy Sacrament in the context of His Sacrifice on the Cross. None of the words of the sacramental form considered thus far bring out the idea of sacrifice. Because the words, "This is the Chalice of My Blood," denote only transubstantiation; and the words, "of the new and eternal testament" denote only propitiation. Therefore we see that the words "which shall be shed" are the necessary words that fulfill the role of signifying the shedding of Christ's blood; ie., sacrifice.

(4) The Union of the Mystical Body. This is "the effect" of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, which was defined as such by the Council of Florence in these words: "The effect of this sacrament, which is brought about in the soul of him who receives it worthily, is to unite him to Christ. And since through this grace [the grace proper of the sacrament] a man becomes incorporated into Christ and is united with His members ...".⁵⁸

As is so well known, a sacrament must signify what it effects, especially its chief effect (the effect). Consequently it is evident that this principal effect, the Res Sacramenti or the "grace proper" of the Sacrament, which is the union of the Mystical Body of Christ, must necessarily be signified in the sacramental form. The words, "for you and for many unto the remission of sins," provide this essential signification in the sacramental form.⁵⁹

These four things must be expressed, and they are in fact expressed, in the sacramental wine consecration forms of the various liturgies presently used in all those diverse Eastern rites of the Catholic Church, although the precise wordings in all these various forms are not all identically the same. The forms used in these eight Oriental rites can be found in Eastern Catholic Worship, by Donald Attwater, The Devin-Adair Co., New York, 1945, on pages 35, 58-59, 85, 107, 126-127, 151, 175-176 and 202.⁶⁰

Moreover, we always find these same four things signified in all the ancient rites that we know for certain were valid (which excludes, of course, those used by known heretical or schismatic sects, and also excluding those patently invalid forms once used by the Ethiopians, and also excluding those of doubtful authenticity, such as that form found in the "Canons of Hippolytus," of which there is no evidence whatever that it was ever actually used, except perhaps in Ethiopia).⁶¹ On pages 730-750 of *Dictionnaire d'Archeologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie* one can find the texts (in Latin) of some eighty-five of these ancient forms, many of which, as we have said, are categorically invalid or of very doubtful validity. Nevertheless, even most of those forms used by the various schismatical Syrian sects do in fact contain these four essential signifying elements.

As alluded to earlier, when we speak of the entire form being necessary for validity, we do not mean that the form of words, exactly as laid down in the Roman Missal, must be used verbatim. This point is so obvious from an examination of the various Oriental liturgies that it hardly needs mentioning. An historical example, however, will be useful to illustrate how this fundamental fact can be misunderstood. After Pope Leo XIII had declared Anglican Orders to be categorically invalid because of a defective form of words (via his Bull *Apostolicae Curae*, 1896), the Anglican Hierarchy argued that there are Oriental liturgies which Rome has always acknowledged to be valid, but which do not employ the exact sacramental form of words for Holy Orders as is used in the Latin Rite.

This objection was answered by the Catholic Bishops of England in the famous *Vindication of the Bull 'Apostolicae Curae'*:

"But you are also mistaken in thinking that matters have been left by Our Lord in such uncertainty, and that there is no one definite form which has prevailed in the Catholic Church, both in the East and in the West. If, indeed, you mean merely that no identical form of words has always and everywhere been in use... you say what all will admit, and the Bull nowhere denies. ... The Bull, however ... is requiring, not that the form should always consist of the same words, but that it should always be conformed to the same definite type." (Emphasis in the original text).

Now according to de la Taille some of those who opposed the opinion of St. Thomas labored under a similar misunderstanding, thinking that the Angelic Doctor was insisting that the exact entire form of words used in the Latin Rite is required for validity in an absolute sense, that is to say, universally in all rites. "Suarez, however," writes de la Taille, "interpreted the mind of the holy Doctor too narrowly, as though St. Thomas meant that the actual words used by the Roman Church are necessary in their actual grammatical tenor, and not merely in this or some other form equivalent in sense. Scotus, however, noted well that

equivalence of sense would suffice (4, D. 8, 2; cf. Reportata 4, D.8, 2)."62

Other opponents, in order to "exculpate" the Angelic Doctor for having "erred," alleged that he was ignorant of the Greek liturgies (the expression "Greek liturgies" is a generic term that includes the various Oriental liturgies), and that if he had been familiar with them he would not have held his view that the entire form is required. To that theory the Salmanticenses replied that it deserves not to be attacked but to be laughed at (non impugnationem sed risum meretur), going on to point out that the Holy Doctor was not ignorant of those Greek liturgies and rites, for he wrote a most brilliant minor work against their errors. (Tum quia S. Doctor non ignoravit Graecorum Liturgias, et ritus, qui luculentissimum opusculum scripsit contra illorum errores).63

The following is taken from a letter I received, dated April 23 1990. It is from one of the seasoned Adversarii of about twenty years' standing, who also happens to be an American priest of the Society of St. Pius X.

"It seems to me that your basic error is that you treat the opinions of St. Thomas as if they were dogmas. We know that St. Thomas was wrong in some of his opinions, notably about the Immaculate Conception. So why could he not be wrong in other areas? Did St. Thomas have the same detailed knowledge of Scripture - and of the Hebrew and Greek languages used in it -that scholars have today? There has been no progress at all in the past seven centuries? ... And, since it is known that St. Thomas was not at all familiar with Greek or Hebrew, we can hardly expect him to have the depth of reference on this point that modern scholars have."64

The widely circulated claim (which I regard as nothing more than a canard) of the Angelic Doctor's supposed ignorance of Greek is based primarily, if not solely, on the fact that he at one time persuaded a Belgian Dominican, William of Moerbeke, who was one of the foremost Greek scholars of his time, to undertake a complete translation of the works of Aristotle into Latin. Which, of course, in itself proves nothing. What should most logically be inferred is simply that St. Thomas committed this laborious task to a specialist who would be able to do the job more speedily and efficiently. The episode furnishes no real evidence whatever that St. Thomas was "not at all familiar with Greek."65

Now I, appearing on the scene seven centuries later, am no more able to prove that St. Thomas knew Greek than others (for example, my correspondent) removed equally far away in time, can prove that he did not. No biographies of the Holy Doctor comment with certainty or give any conclusive proof on this particular issue one way or the other. Our Adversarius, this priest of the Society of St. Pius X, who apparently prefers the "depth of reference" of the "modern scholars" to that of St. Thomas, asks: "Did St. Thomas have the same detailed knowledge of Scripture ... that scholars have today?" We shall let his own St. Pius X reply:

"To hear them [the Modernists] talk about their works on the Sacred Books ... one would imagine that before them nobody ever even glanced through the pages of Scripture; whereas the truth is that a whole multitude of doctors, infinitely superior to them in genius, in erudition, and in sanctity, have sifted them; and the deeper they have gone into them, the more and more have they thanked God for His Divine Bounty in having vouchsafed to speak thus to men." (From the encyclical *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*).

9. The Words "The Mystery of Faith"

By way of prologue, let us now revert to our earlier remarks on the important idea that what is absolutely essential for the validity of a sacramental form in one rite or liturgy of the Church may not necessarily be essential in a universally absolute sense; that is, may not be essential for all, or even for any, of the other rites.

This notion, which at first might seem to be revolutionary or astonishing, is in fact quite valid and true, as we shall see later from the lucid exposition thereof by Raymond Capisuccus. First of all, however, let us, by way of ground work, consider a certain significant parallelism. For two of the other requisites for the validity of a sacrament besides the form -- namely, the matter and the proper minister -- it is easily seen by examples that what is necessary for validity in the Latin Rite is in some cases quite clearly not necessary in the Eastern Rites.

Minister. We need only consider the Sacrament of Confirmation, as a start. In the Latin Rite the ordinary minister of Confirmation, and the only valid minister (with the exceptions noted immediately below) is a bishop. The extraordinary minister of Confirmation is a priest to whom the faculty to confirm has been given either by common law or by a general or special indult of the Holy See, (according to Canon 782). However, such extraordinary ministers of the Latin Rite (under the same Canon 782), can validly confirm only Catholics of the Latin Rite. Ergo, it is certain that ordinary Latin Rite priests cannot validly administer this Sacrament. Whereas it is a well known fact that in the Oriental rites any priest at all confirms validly and licitly, even Catholics of the Latin Rite.

Matter. In the Eastern rites the ordinary valid matter for the Consecration of the Body of Christ is leavened bread. But in contrariety to this we know that: "In the Latin Church hosts must be unleavened and circular in form."⁶⁶ A Latin Rite priest cannot consecrate using leavened bread, except under one extraordinary condition: "Leavened bread may be used in the Latin Rite only to complete the Sacrifice already begun."⁶⁷

Matter. Now let us consider the Sacrament of Holy Orders. In the Oriental rites the matter of this Sacrament (for the order of presbyterate) is and always has been simply the bishop's imposition of hands. Up until Nov. 30, 1947, the matter of this Sacrament (for ordination to the priesthood) in the Latin Rite was twofold; namely, the aforesaid imposition of hands and the "bestowal of the instruments,"

that is, the touching by the candidate of a chalice containing wine and a few drops of water, and a paten with host. Both elements of this twofold matter were considered to be essential for validity. On the aforementioned date Pope Pius XII issued the Apostolic Constitution "Sacramentum Ordinis," in which the Pontiff determined that thereafter the valid matter for the Latin Rite would consist of only the first imposition of hands by the bishop, and not the bestowal of the instruments also.

Pius XII distinctly implied, nevertheless, that not only was the bestowal of the instruments considered necessary for validity previously, but that it was in fact necessary: "(B)y Our Apostolic Authority We do ... decide that the bestowal of the instruments at least for the future ("saltem in posterum") is not necessary for the validity..." noting that "this Our Constitution does not have retroactive force." He also granted the possibility that the Church might even in the future revert to maintaining that the bestowal of the instruments is necessary for validity: "But if, according to the will and prescription of the Church, the same should some day be held necessary for validity also, all would know the Church is able even to change and to abrogate what She has established."⁶⁸

[Note: The Sovereign Pontiff Pius XII had both the power and the right to determine further the matter of Holy Orders, since that Sacrament was instituted by Christ "in genere." Contrariwise, no agency on earth, neither pope nor council nor all the bishops of the world collectively, can alter the substance -- i.e., the matter and the form -- of the Holy Eucharist, which Christ instituted "in specie." For a fuller development of these ideas see the pamphlet, Has The Church The Right?].

Having thus seen that certain things or qualifications necessary for validity as regards matter and minister in the Latin Rite are sometimes not necessary in the Oriental Churches, by parallelism it should not be repugnant to the intellect to entertain the probability that similar disparities may exist regarding what is essential for validity with respect to the sacramental forms in the different rites.

For example, we find the words, "the mystery of faith," in the Latin Rite form for the wine consecration; but we find those same words in none of the Oriental rites, save those of the Maronites, the Chaldeans and the Malabarites. From this only one thing can be deduced with certainty, namely, that those words are not essential for those rites that do not use them. It cannot be deduced that they are not essential for the consecrations in the Latin, Maronite, Chaldean and Malabarite rites, which do use them.

All the words in the Latin Rite wine consecration form are taken from Holy Scripture, with the exceptions of (a) "and eternal" and (b) "the mystery of faith". In a letter to a certain John, Archbishop of Lyons, who had asked who it was that added the words, "the mystery of faith," to the consecration form, since they are found nowhere in Holy Scripture, Pope Innocent III replied that no one had added them, but that they had been there from the beginning. Said Innocent, "Surely we find many such things omitted by the Evangelists from the words as well as

from the deeds of the Lord, which things the Apostles supplied by word or expressed by deed. ... Therefore we believe that the form of words, as is found in the Canon, the Apostles received from Christ, and their successors from them."⁶⁹

"Now while the Latin Church uses the entire form as laid down in the Roman Missal," observes Capisuccus, "and whereas the other rites, of the Greek and of other Churches, do not have all those words in the form, it may be reasonably said that all those other forms were likewise instituted by Christ for the consecration of the wine, and that the Apostles and their successors had them from Christ. Hence James Goar, in the Greek Ritual which he annotated, says: 'As to the question whence there arose a certain diversity between the Greeks and the Latins regarding the words of the Gospel requisite for the consecration, it is abundantly clear that this diversity arose from the traditions handed down by the different Apostles'."⁷⁰

"And this does not change the fact that all those words which the Latin Church uses in the consecration of the wine are of the essence of that form. For it is one thing to say that all those words are not of the essence of the form as such, and it is another thing to say that they are not of the essence of the form that the Latin Church uses. Therefore we say that although all those words are not of the essence of the form as such, they are of the essence of the form in which they are found, such as that form which the Latin Church uses."⁷¹ (Emphasis added).

"Hence from the fact that the Latin Church does use all those words, we may gather that Christ the Lord, although He did not require that all [rites] use the same identical words in the Consecration of the Blood, nevertheless He wished that they who do use all those words use them as being essential. Moreover He gave to those words the power to consecrate His Blood, provided that those words are in fact used. And consequently those words, seeing that they are in fact all pronounced, are of the essence of this form in which they are used."⁷² (Emphasis added).

"In confirmation of the foregoing," continues Capisuccus, "we can adduce an example very suited to our statements. For the Apostles in the early Church baptized in the name of Christ (Acts, ch. 8), and St. Thomas teaches (111, Q. 66, A. 6, ad 1), and others with him, that the form of Baptism consisted only in these words, "I baptize thee in the Name of Christ." But there was also another form, "I baptize thee in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." Now who, unless he has lost his reason, will say that these words of this second form, "in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," are not essential for that form, simply because of the fact that the Apostles used for Baptism that other form in which these words are not found?

"Certainly each form sufficed and was licit at that time for Baptism. And although the Apostles were able to baptize and sometimes did baptize with only these

words, "I baptize thee in the name of Christ," nevertheless they were also able to baptize with those other words, "I baptize thee in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." And in those cases where they did use this latter form, all those words efficiently contributed to the Baptism, and all of them were therefore of the essence of that form.

"Thus in our case -- that is, the form for the Eucharist -- the Greeks validly consecrate the blood of Christ through the form they use, in which the following words are not found: 'and eternal' and 'the mystery of faith.'... Now those of the Latin Rite consecrate validly through the form in which those words are in fact found; and in this case wherein the Latins use all those words, all those words are of the essence of the form which they use."⁷³

Earlier we quoted Father Michael Forrest, who said that De Lugo "appealed prolifically in abundant quotations to numerous liturgies, showing that these words [viz., 'This is My Blood'] were the only consecrating words common to all liturgies." Provided that De Lugo did in fact go through such an exercise, and if he had been careful to consider only those liturgies that are valid beyond doubt (which the Salmanticenses proved was not the case), nevertheless to glean only those words "common to all liturgies" would prove nothing, as we have just demonstrated by quoting at length from the brilliant and unanswerable exposition given by Cardinal Raymond Capisuccus, O.P.

As was discussed back in Section 8, there are four things that must be signified in the sacramental form for the Holy Eucharist, viz., transubstantiation, propitiation, sacrifice and the union of the Mystical Body. We then went through the words of the wine-consecration form showing how each one of the various phrases and clauses signifies one of these four things. In so doing, we passed over these words, "the mystery of faith." Having just expounded the foregoing important ideas concerning the differences that occur in the phraseologies of the divers rites of the Church, we are now ready to discuss those words, "mysterium fidei."

"The mystery of faith." In their context in the form of consecration what is the precise meaning or signification of these words? The Roman Catechism teaches:

"for it is call'd the mystery of Faith, because by Faith we perceive Christ's Blood hid under the Species of Wine."

And Pope Innocent III teaches likewise that the significance of these words in the sacramental form lies in the fact that they express the doctrine of the Real Presence:

"Yet 'mysterium fidei' is mentioned, since something is believed there other than what is perceived; and something is perceived other than what is believed. For the species of the bread and wine is perceived there, but what is believed is the

truth of the Body and Blood of Christ and the power of unity and love."⁷⁴
In that the doctrine of the Real Presence is already implicitly signified in those words that denote transubstantiation -- to wit: "This is My Body; This is the Chalice of My Blood" -- and therefore the words, "The Mystery of Faith," would appear to be superfluous here; and inasmuch as we find the words, "The Mystery of Faith," in no other consecration form other than that of the Latin Rite and only three of the Oriental rites, it would appear that those words, "The Mystery of Faith," are not essential and could be omitted without endangering the validity of the Mass.

To this I reply simply: I deny! St. Thomas clearly teaches that all the words following "This is the Chalice of My Blood" are necessary. We admit that those words, "mysterium fidei!," are not necessary in an absolute sense (which is self-evident by virtue of their absence from many of the liturgies), but we affirm that they are necessary for those rites in which God has willed that they be included. For according to the Divine Dispensation, the inscrutable wisdom of which no man can comprehend, and according to what was so evidently willed by Our Lord when He handed these words down to the Apostles to be used among certain peoples of certain traditions and cultures, we must insist with the Angelic Doctor, whose teaching has been so lucidly expounded by Cardinal Capisuccus, that even the words, "The Mystery of Faith," are of the essence of those consecration forms in which they occur.

"Hence from the fact that the Latin Church does use all those words, we may gather that Christ the Lord, although He did not require that all [rites] use the same identical words in the Consecration of the Blood, nevertheless He wished that they who do use all those words use them as being essential. Moreover He gave to those words the power to consecrate His Blood, provided that those words are in fact used. And consequently those words, seeing that they are in fact all pronounced, are of the essence of this form in which they are used."
(The words of Capisuccus quoted earlier).

And therefore our Ancient Enemy Satan, who being our "adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, goeth about seeking whom he may devour" (1 Pet., 5, 8) inspired his terrestrial agents, those Masonic members of his own 'Mystical Body' who devised the "Novus Ordo Missae," to delete these words, "The Mystery of Faith," from the consecration form, thus doubly jeopardizing the validity of those "Masses" they had already vitiated earlier in 1967 by means of their "for all men, etc." corruption.

"In adhering rigidly to the rite handed down to us we can always feel secure; whereas if we omit or change anything, we may perhaps be abandoning just that element which is essential."⁷⁵

Not only did they delete those words, but they made a mockery of them. For they were retained, not in the form of consecration, but in a subsequent

acclamation, to which the people respond: "Christ has died, Christ is risen, Christ will come again." Inasmuch as these three truths that are expressed -- orthodox as they are -- have nothing whatever to do with the true meaning of "the mystery of faith" in this place, this response to the acclamation suppresses this true meaning, which, as we have seen, is to affirm our belief in the Real Presence, and substitutes a false construction on the words "the Mystery of Faith." And therefore this response, by its suppression of the Real Presence doctrine, implicitly but effectively and in very truth denies it. What is here manifest is the mark of the Father of Lies, the supreme expert in the art of denying truth by affirming what is true.

Here is my own theory why in the Divine Dispensation the words, "The Mystery of Faith," were handed down in the Latin Rite and not in the majority of the Eastern rites. Through God's Infinite Wisdom, Providence, design and foreknowledge of all things, it has turned out that only in the Western Church has the doctrine of the Real Presence been assailed. We know this to be true from the striking testimony of history. Berengarius, Tanchelmus of Antwerp, who in the 12th century was resisted and vanquished by St. Norbert, Wyclif, the "Sacramentarians,"⁷⁶ Calvin, Zwingli, the whole host of 16th-century Protestant Revolutionaries, etc. --all these deniers of the Real Presence arose in the West.

With one notable known exception, the doctrine of the Real Presence has never been attacked by heretics in the Eastern churches; on the contrary, it has always been believed and upheld, even by the schismatics since the 11th century and by the early Oriental heretics. "In fact," we read in the Catholic Encyclopedia, "even the Nestorians and Monophysites, who broke away from Rome in the fifth century, have, as is evident from their literature and liturgical books, preserved their faith in the Eucharist as unwaveringly as the Greeks, and this in spite of the dogmatic difficulties which, on account of their denial of the hypostatic union, stood in the way of a clear and correct notion of the Real Presence."⁷⁷

Staining this glorious banner of constant faithfulness in the Orient is the sole ignominious blot of Cyrillos Lucaris (1572-1637). In his younger days having come under the influence of Calvinistic errors while studying in Geneva, he published in 1629 his famous *Confessio* espousing Calvinistic doctrines, including, of course, the denial of the Real Presence. At that time Lucaris was Patriarch of Constantinople. The publication of his *Confessio* set off in the Orthodox churches a fierce and fiery controversy --à la byzantine. The "schism within a schism" lasted over sixty years, ending in 1691 when the Synod of Jerusalem affirmed all the Orthodox doctrines, including the Real Presence, thus condemning the Calvinistic errors of Cyril Lucaris. The errors, but not Lucaris. As Fortescue observes, "The Fathers, however, are anxious to save Lukaris's reputation." In the byzantine style that is so typical of the Orthodox schismatics even today, the Fathers of the Synod attacked the "wicked attempts of the Calvinists to poison the Orthodox Church with heresy," and staunchly defended Lucaris, denying that he ever wrote the *Confessio* (which, of

course, was the very thing for which he was singularly known), and moreover anathematizing "anyone who shall ever say that he was its author."⁷⁸

The Maronites, one of those few groups of Eastern rite Catholics that have "The Mystery of Faith" in their consecration form, were literally forced to have these words included in the form. When many Maronites became reunited with the Church of Rome after having been for a long time in schism, the Sovereign Pontiff Clement VIII for the sake of uniformity ordered to be discarded their various manuscript Missals, many of which in any case had corrupted and invalid consecration forms. (Schismatics in general, especially those of the Arab world, have always tended to tamper with established liturgical forms, as have the Ethiopian Catholics.)⁷⁹

By Clement's mandate a new Maronite Missal, a printed version, was issued in Rome in 1592; and all priests of the Maronite Rite were required thereafter to use this Missal. Its wine-consecration form, which is still in use today, is identical to that of the Latin Rite, with the words 'mysterium fidei' included.⁸⁰

There is no evidence (at least none known by this author) that any of the Maronite groups while in schism denied or attacked the doctrine of the Real Presence. This, however, cannot be affirmed with absolute certitude, for the conflicting accounts of early Maronite history (one of which strongly avers that they fell into heresy) accomplish nothing for the reader but the strengthening of his own uncertainty.⁸¹ Nevertheless it is interesting to note that the "Profession of Faith" which Benedict XIV subsequently prescribed to be accepted by all returning Maronites does in fact include an affirmation of belief in the Real Presence.⁸²

While it is true that the words, "This is My Body, This is My Blood," to the faithful Catholic imply the doctrine of the Real Presence, and consequently the stressing of this doctrine by the more explicit words, "The Mystery of Faith," would not appear to be absolutely necessary for such orthodox Catholics, nevertheless heretics have construed (as is well known) "This is My Body, This is My Blood" to mean only a "spiritual" or "symbolic" presence. Such a supposed symbolic presence of Christ in the Eucharist involves no "mystery of faith" at all; no great mystery requiring no great faith. Hence to these heretics the words, "The Mystery of Faith," in the consecration form defy rational explanation.

We know from the teaching of Pope Innocent III, which we cited earlier (the letter *Cum Marthae Circa*), that the words, "The Mystery of Faith," were included in our wine-consecration from the beginning, having been handed down by the Apostles who received them from Our Lord. My aforesaid theory therefore concludes that these words are an essential part of the Latin Rite consecration form, having in God's Providence been placed there as a bulwark in defense of the doctrine of the Real Presence, and as a stumbling block and most potent rebuke against those many deniers of this teaching who have sprung up from time to time to attack it, such onslaughts deriving virtually exclusively from the

rationalism of the West that has for so long a time infested and infected our Latin Church.

10. Coup de Grâce

The Adversarii who imagine they have destroyed our arguments against the validity of the vernacularized "Masses" simply by dogmatically asserting that the mere words, "This is the Chalice of My Blood," are sufficient for validity know nothing. What these deluded individuals seem to be overlooking is the fact that the consecration form (so-called) in the English "Mass" is not simply: "This is the Chalice of My Blood."

In point of fact, the ICEL's despoiled wine consecration form contains a great deal more than "This is the chalice of my blood." The latest version I know of (the meddlers having already tampered with it on three separate occasions since 1967, involving a total of six distinct changes) reads as follows:

'This is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant. It will be shed for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven.'

Let us assume, purely for the sake of illustrating our point, that the argument of some of our Adversarii is correct, namely, that the first seven words, "This is the cup of my blood," alone by themselves, would be sufficient for a valid consecration.

Of all those reputable theologians of the past who held the view that "This is My blood" suffices, there is not a single one of them who would have denied that such a consecration formula could still be rendered invalid by substantial changes of meaning introduced in the remaining words of the form, even though they did not consider those remaining words essential. That any sacramental form can possibly be rendered invalid by an addition to the essential words is a fact held to be certain by all theologians.

St. Thomas⁸³ furnishes two examples of such an invalidating addition, one an actual case and the other a hypothetical one. The Arians baptized with the words: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father Who is greater, and of the Son Who is less, etc.". The hypothetical example is: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and of the Blessed Virgin Mary." This would invalidate the Baptism if the intention were to baptize in the name of the Blessed Virgin as though she is on a par with the Trinity, for such a sense is heretical.

One final example, this one regarding the Holy Eucharist, will be more than enough to drive home this point. Suppose a priest were to substitute the word "old" for "new" in the wine-consecration:

"For this is the Chalice of My Blood, of the old and eternal testament ... ".
Now even supposing (purely hypothetically) that the words, "This is the Chalice

of My Blood," do suffice for a valid consecration, "who unless he has lost his reason" (to borrow the words of Capisuccus) would assert that such a substitution, even though occurring in words (hypothetically) considered to be nonessential for validity, would not invalidate the consecration? For clearly that single substituted word, "old," now being part of the same utterance that begins with "For this is the Chalice of My Blood," blasphemously denies the true propitiatory nature of Christ's Sacrifice on Calvary, by implying that His Precious Blood was no more efficacious for atonement than was the blood of animals under the Old Law.

Therefore it should be equally clear that the substitution of the falsifying words "for all" in place of "for many," likewise invalidates the consecration, even though those words in the final phrase of the form might possibly be nonessential for validity (as is claimed). For those words "for all" signify falsely, inasmuch as not all men are members of Christ's Mystical Body. Hence the purpose of the words, "for many," which is to signify the effect of this Sacrament, namely, the union of the members of the Mystical Body, which consists of MANY members only, is frustrated, nay, annihilated by the counterfeit words: "for all." Just as the word "old" in the example given above destroys the signification of propitiation and in fact denies that truth, similarly the word "all" denies the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ, whose members are the sole heirs of the Holy Eucharist.

PART II : THE THESIS

1. Preface

Now we arrive at our ultimate purpose, which is to explain and clarify even further (I have already written on it frequently) a particular thesis that conclusively proves (at least to me) the necessity for validity of the final words of the wine-consecration form: "for you and for many unto the remission of sins". The development of my case is not dependent solely or even primarily on the authority of theologians (although I do cite some esteemed ones for supporting evidence). Rather is it based on reasoning and on conclusions that I believe logically flow necessarily from and must necessarily be inferred from various theological truths established with certitude and handed down authoritatively by the Church, and which therefore cannot be questioned.

In this thesis I shall attempt to show three things: [i] the words, "This is My Body. This is the Chalice of My Blood," and these words alone, cannot possibly suffice as the complete Consecration Form; because: [ii] the words, "for you and for many unto the remission of sins," fulfill an essential and indispensable signifying role in the wine-consecration form; and consequently: [iii] the false words, "for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven," not only render invalid the "English Masses" by losing the aforesaid indispensable signification; but they moreover express a different and false signification, which by its nature makes the celebrants of such "Masses," as well as those who are in attendance, implicitly deny the Catholic Church's doctrine of the Mystical Body; and more-over

simultaneously makes them espouse that false ecumenism condemned by the Sovereign Pontiff Pius XI as being tantamount to apostasy.⁸⁴

Many of the ideas underlying -- or perhaps even proving -- these points have already been brought out in the foregoing Part I. What we shall be covering in this present Part II are some fundamental teachings on the sacraments, many of which are doubtless already known quite well by the reader; hence, a part of my presentation is simply a necessary preliminary review, necessary in order to lay the ground work for the unfolding of some additional extremely important aspects of the theology of the sacraments.

These particular aspects are probably not so well known; except, of course, by those of our present readership who happen to be priests. In earlier and less destructive times the laity did not need to explore these finer points of sacramental theology. Nor indeed was your author familiar with them in that saner and happier era. These were said above to be "extremely important aspects," and so they now are; for no true Catholic today -- in this age of ignorance, apostasy, infidelity, treason and indifference -- can plead that he is unable to fight the fight against The Destroyers because he is "not a theologian." Gaining knowledge and understanding of all Catholic truth is, and always has been, a most critical obligation for the one who values his soul.⁸⁵

2. Signs and Wonders

A sign is by definition something that signifies or denotes something else. The recognizable thing that is signified by a sign is called a reality. These two things, the sign and the reality, are intimately related to one another, but, of course, they are two separate and distinct things. Several examples will illustrate this. A black arm band is a sign that signifies a reality, namely, mourning. That is, it signifies that the person wearing it is mourning the death of one who was loved and respected. The arm band does not cause the mourning; it merely, being only a sign, signifies the mourning. Conversely, the mourning does not per se bring the arm band into existence; it merely prompts the mourner to wear it.

In a written musical score there are to be found many symbols that denote certain musical sounds; these are called notes. The notes not only signify the musical tones themselves, but also the intended duration of these tones, and perhaps also the manner and style in which they are by the composer meant to be heard. These written notes are only signs; they signify something audible, but they are not themselves these sounds. The notes are signs and the sounds are their realities. The written notes do not cause the sounds; the musician playing his instrument and reading the notes is the cause. If no one ever read the score or played what is indicated, then there would be no sounds. And conversely, the realities, namely, the tones, in no way bring about their signs, the written notes.

Finally, consider a motorist travelling along a highway who suddenly is

confronted by a sign that reads, for example, "St. Cloud City Limits". This sign indicates or signifies to the motorist that he is crossing an invisible boundary defining one of the limits of that geographical entity known as the city of St. Cloud, Minnesota. The sign does not cause the reality it is signifying, which is St. Cloud, to suddenly be there; it was probably there long before the sign was erected. And conversely, of course, the city did not cause the existence of the sign (although some city officials undoubtedly did at one time).

Now in our study of the Sacraments we encounter these same two concepts: sign and reality. And in sacramental theology a sign (which in Latin is designated by the word *sacramentum*) and the reality it signifies (the Latin word *res*) mean exactly the same things as we have just demonstrated in our foregoing examples. When "Sacramentum" is spelled with the capital letter "S" it means a Sacrament in the ordinary sense to which we are accustomed; but when spelled with a lower case "s" as in "sacramentum" it means simply "sign." At least that is the convention we shall adopt.

A Sacrament is defined as "an outward sign instituted by Christ to give (or produce) grace." Below we shall investigate briefly the three parts of this definition, but for now let us ponder the "wonder" aspect of the Sacraments. Unlike any other kind of sign of which we know, our wonderful Sacraments that Our Lord so lovingly gave to His Church for the salvation of men are signs that actually cause or bring about the very realities that they signify. That is what is meant by the familiar axiom: "Sacraments effect what they signify and signify what they effect." Only God can give to a sign this remarkable, inscrutable and wondrous power.

3. The Definition Of A Sacrament

Of the three parts of the definition of a Sacrament, it is the first and the last that are chiefly pertinent to our discussion; namely, "an outward sign" and "to produce grace." The central part, "instituted by Christ," needs but little commentary. It is an Article of Faith that all seven Sacraments were instituted by Our Lord. Of these it is certain that at least two of them, namely, Baptism and the Holy Eucharist, were instituted in specie, that is to say, Our Lord specifically determined the exact matter (water for Baptism; bread and wine for the Eucharist) and the precise words of the sacramental forms. Other Sacraments, however, Christ instituted in genere, that is, in a general manner by instructing the Apostles as to the nature and purpose of these Sacraments and then allowing the Church to determine the matter and the form.⁸⁶

The first person known to have catalogued the Sacraments as exactly seven in number was Peter Lombard (circa 1150). Looking back now, this was at a point farther along than halfway thru the present lifetime of the Church. This does not mean, needless to say, that there were not always seven Sacraments: "In the centuries that have elapsed since the first Pentecost Sunday, all of

Catholic theology has developed. What we mean is that the understanding and the codification of theology by men has developed (i.e., the arguments for the truths of faith, their reasonableness, etc.); this, of course, is entirely different from the Modernists' heresy of the "evolution of doctrine." Periodically the Holy Ghost inspires Peter to lay down theological principles with absolute certainty. Often these pronouncements from the Supreme Teaching Authority are to stem a current heresy, and sometimes, through God's infinite wisdom and omniscience, they are to provide a defense against future attacks on Holy Church." (From p. 7 of *Interdum* No. 3, May 2, 1970, entitled "Res Sacramenti").

It must be noted carefully that any pronouncement from an alleged "Magisterium" that contradicts, waters down, or introduces an ambiguity into an earlier teaching of the Catholic Church must be rejected. Such activity is one of the marks of The Robber Church, which contradicts not only the Catholic Church but often even controverts itself. The one, true, holy, apostolic, Roman Catholic Church cannot ever contradict Herself, whereas the kingdom of Satan is one of disunion.

In Canon I of the section, "On the Sacraments in General," the Council of Trent issued this solemn declaration: "If anyone says that the Sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by Our Lord Jesus Christ, or that there are more or fewer than seven, namely, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order and Matrimony, or that any one of these seven is not truly and intrinsically a Sacrament, let him be anathema."⁸⁷

"A Sacrament is an outward sign," are the beginning words of the definition. Already we have gone into detail about the nature of a sign ("sacramentum") and the reality ("res") it signifies. To complete our analysis of this part of the definition of a Sacrament, it remains only to investigate the word "outward." As used here, this word means simply this: perceptible by one or more of the five senses.

The outward sign that is uniquely and especially associated with each of the Sacraments -- that is the "sacramentum" of the particular Sacrament -- always is composed of two separate and distinct elements, its matter and its form. Since the form consists of words that are spoken, it is clear that it fulfills the requirement of being perceptible by one of the senses, namely, hearing. The other element, the matter, is in some of the Sacraments a physical substance; for example, bread and wine, water, chrism and blessed oil. These, of course, are perceptible by the senses of sight, smell, taste and touch. In some other Sacraments, however, the matter is not a tangible substance. As we have observed earlier, the matter of the Sacrament of Holy Orders is the imposition of hands. This, as is easily seen, is an action that is perceptible by the senses of sight and touch. For the Sacrament of Penance the matter consists in the acts of the penitent, one of which is the actual confession of sins.⁸⁸ This confession must be auricular; it must be heard by the confessor, and thus perceptible by one of the senses.

Finally, the third part of the definition of a Sacrament is "to produce grace." This grace is a supernatural effect brought about in the soul of the recipient. If there were no infusion of the sacramental grace, which is called the Sacrament's "grace proper" or its "Res Sacramenti", the whole nature and purpose of the Sacrament would be frustrated. We have the reserved Blessed Sacrament, the True Body of Christ, sometimes exposed for veneration during Benediction or Corpus Christi processions, etc. But that solemn adoration is not the principal purpose for which Christ instituted this Sacrament. He gave It to us to be received.

Hence with the Holy Eucharist, as with all the Sacraments, there must be the recipients. For otherwise a Sacrament would have no subject in whom it would be able to produce grace. The worthy reception of the Holy Eucharist infuses in the soul the effect of the Sacrament, which is grace. Specifically this "grace proper" of the Holy Eucharist is the incorporation into Christ's Mystical Body of the Catholic who worthily, as a living member, receives It. That is, the solidifying and strengthening of his union with Jesus Christ and with all the other members. This mysterious and very vital truth we will now but touch upon.

4. The Mystical Body Of Christ

"Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou Me?" And Saul, who shortly before had been "breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord," as we read in the Acts of the Apostles, now finding himself suddenly hurled to the ground and mysteriously blinded hears this question asked. "Who said: Who art thou, Lord? And He: I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. It is hard for thee to kick against the goad."⁸⁹ Our Lord thus gave to the Apostle to the Gentiles the first faint glimmerings of that mysterious reality. It was not "Why persecutest thou my followers?" that he was asked; but "Why persecutest thou Me?" So powerful is the bond of union of the Mystical Body, that an attack upon any of its members is an attack upon all its members and, more significant still, an attack upon the Head of the Mystical Body, Jesus Christ Our Lord.

Within a few days to this "vessel of election," Saul of Tarsus, was revealed to the maximum extent that any finite mind still imprisoned in a mortal coil can comprehend it, at a house in the ancient city of Damascus on the street called Strait, the sublime mystery of the doctrine of the Mystical Body. "Let it be observed also that one is treating here of a hidden mystery, which in this earthly exile can never be fully disclosed and grasped, and expressed in human language," wrote Pius XII in his encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi*. Whoever wishes to gain a clearer insight into this revealed doctrine should study this document, issued by the Pontiff on June 29, 1943, as well as the book entitled, *The Doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ, According to the Principles of the Theology of St. Thomas*, by the learned Abbé Anger.⁹⁰

Though it is quite outside the scope of this essay to attempt to sound the depths of this great mystery (a feat of which we are incapable in any case), nevertheless

for our present purposes several important teachings related to it must be set forth.

A person first gains entry into the Mystical Body through the Sacrament of Baptism, as is taught by Pope Eugene IV in these words: "Holy Baptism, which is the gateway to the spiritual life, holds the first place among all the Sacraments; through it we are made members of Christ and of the body of the Church."⁹¹ The Mystical Body of Christ and the Catholic Church are one and the same thing, as is taught by the Sovereign Pontiff Pius XII in the aforementioned *Mystici Corporis Christi*: "If we would define and describe this true Church of Jesus Christ -- which is the One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church -- we shall find no expression more noble, more sublime or more divine than the phrase which calls it 'the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ'."

A baptized Catholic, who by the grace given in that very Sacrament has automatically become a member of the Mystical Body, remains a member unless or until he forfeits membership by one or more of the following: excommunication, heresy, apostasy, schism. "Really to be included as members of the Church," writes Pius XII, "are only those who have been baptized and profess the true faith and who have not unhappily withdrawn from Body-unity or for grave faults have been excluded by legitimate authority." And again Pius: "For not every sin, however grave and enormous it be, is such as to sever a man automatically from the Body of the Church, as does schism or heresy or apostasy."

By committing mortal sin a Catholic becomes a "dead member" of the Mystical Body, but he still nonetheless remains a member; for he can -- and he must, else he is an ungrateful fool -- be revived and resuscitated to the status of a living member, by his sincere repentance and his restoration to the state of sanctifying grace through the Sacrament of Penance. On the other hand, Jews, Freemasons, Moslems, Hindus, tribal animists in Africa, members of non-Catholic sects, pagans, apostates, infidels, atheists, etc. -- for example -- are not members of Christ's Mystical Body.

Not all men have been given this gratuitous gift from Almighty God, the incorporation into the very Mystical Body of His only-begotten Son. "On this account", wrote Pope Leo XIII, "those who would strive for salvation apart from the Church, wander from the way and are struggling in vain."⁹² In the same encyclical Leo also had words for our present-day Robbers: "Never to have known Jesus Christ in any way is the greatest of misfortunes, but it involves no perversity or ingratitude. But, after having known, to reject or forget Him, is such a horrible and mad crime as to be scarcely credible."

5. The Three Cornerstones Of A Sacrament

The foregoing discussion on the Mystical Body is not a digression from our theme on the Sacraments; rather is it an integral part of it, establishing an important plank in our overall thesis. Next to be explained is a teaching

regarding the Sacraments which is probably not too well known by many of our readers. It is one of those vital "finer points" of theology which nowadays it is incumbent upon us to understand.

There are three "things" which are involved in the very make-up of all the Sacraments. These are certain features or aspects or "things," which we prefer to designate as "cornerstones." The three cornerstones are defined and explained as follows.

(1) The "sacramentum tantum"- which is translated as "the sign only." The sacramentum tantum has a role that is solely an active one. It is that cornerstone which has only one function (which is why it is called the sign only), namely, to signify. But it signifies two different realities; that is, two distinct and separate "res's" -- as will be explained.

Furthermore this sacramentum tantum consists of two components, both of which are already familiar to us, namely, the matter of the Sacrament, and the form of words that determine the purpose of the sacramental matter. St. Thomas calls the form the "determining principle." These two components -- the matter and the form -- always act together in the process of signifying; they must be "morally united." In the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, for example, the sacramentum tantum is the bread and wine joined with the Words of Consecration, which are the form of the Sacrament.

(2) The "res et sacramentum", that is, "a reality and a sign." This cornerstone fulfills two roles, an active one and a passive one. First of all, it is a reality, a res, because it is one of the two separate and distinct realities that are signified by the sacramentum tantum; that is its passive role. But although it is a reality that is itself (by definition) something that is signified, it in turn signifies something else again, thus fulfilling its active role, namely, as a sign. Hence it is readily understood why this cornerstone is said to be both "a reality and a sign" -- it is signified and it also signifies. Unlike the sacramentum tantum which consists of both matter and words (the form), the res et sacramentum is a silent sign, for it signifies by its very presence, without any words being necessary. In the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist the True Body of Christ is the res et sacramentum.

(3) Finally, the res tantum, which means "the reality only," is the third cornerstone. It does no signifying; its nature is solely that of a res; hence, res tantum. It is, so to speak, hit from two different directions. It is signified twice; first by the matter and the form of the sacramentum tantum; and also without words by the res et sacramentum.

Instead of res tantum it is often called by that other term with which we are already familiar, namely, the "Res Sacramenti," which is translated as "the Reality of the Sacrament." Notice the definite article, "the"; it is the reality of the Sacrament, not just a reality. Other ways of expressing this are "the effect" or the "grace proper" of the Sacrament. This third cornerstone, the effect of the

Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, is the union of the Mystical Body. Or perhaps it is better said that the effect on the recipient is his more intense and firmer incorporation in the Mystical Body. This effect is sacramental grace.

These two sentences, taken from a prayer before Holy Communion composed by St. Thomas, beautifully and cogently bring out this idea:

"Grant, I beseech Thee, that I may receive not only the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Our Lord [that is, not just the transubstantiated species, which is the *res et sacramentum*], but also the reality [*res sacramenti*] and effect of this Sacrament. O most indulgent God, grant me so to receive the Body of Thine only-begotten Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, which He took of the Virgin Mary, that I may be found worthy to be incorporated with His Mystical Body and numbered among its members."

Inasmuch as this concept bears such momentous significance for the Catholic, it behooves us to include the following salient comments from the pen of Dr. Friedrich Jürgensmeier:

"Analogically, the real meaning of Holy Communion first becomes clear when seen in its relationship to the supernatural organism of the mystical body of Christ. Holy Communion is the sacrament reserved for the members who are really united to Christ, the Head. The individual's fellowship with Him is already established through Baptism, the sacrament of incorporation and implantation in Christ. The substantial union of the member with the true and complete body of the Saviour in Holy Communion is the highest and most perfect realization of vital fellowship with Him. The mystical union with Christ which already exists is raised to sublime heights through Holy Communion; it is the principle or primal cause substantiating the highest vital fellowship with Him."⁹³

"A deep and intimate fellowship with Christ and with one another, surpassing all natural ties and relationships, is conferred upon the members of the mystical body in the Eucharistic fellowship of the Holy Sacrifice and Communion. ... To regard Holy Communion as a matter of personal, private devotion is not sufficient for the member of the mystical body who is striving to attain perfection, for even the greatest spiritual benefit gained therefrom is not the ultimate goal of his endeavour. The most sublime significance of the Holy Eucharist lies in the fact that it establishes and fosters the great, incomparable fellowship of the mystical body, bringing us closer to Christ and to one another. If books of devotion and even religious instruction indicate that the Holy Eucharist is almost exclusively a matter of personal piety, overlooking its most admirable characteristic, they herewith disregard an integral part of Catholic doctrine."⁹⁴

Of these three cornerstones only one of them, the last one considered, the *Res Sacramenti*, is grace, which is invisible. The "sign only" is not grace; it is bread and wine morally united with the Words of Consecration, and hence perceptible

by the senses. It is that which satisfies the first part of the definition of a Sacrament, viz., "an outward sign." The "reality and sign" is not grace; it is the transubstantiated species, namely, the true Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity of Christ. Now, since the only one of these cornerstones that is grace is the Res Sacramenti, it is easily seen that it alone is the ultimate result that fulfills that essential third part of the definition of a Sacrament, "to produce grace."

Summary. The first cornerstone is the "sign only," which is twofold in that it signifies (but not in an ambiguous manner) two different realities. It is, moreover, twofold in another way; for it comprises two elements, namely, the matter and the form of the Sacrament. Secondly, the "reality and sign," being partly res is one of the two realities signified by the "sign only." It in turn signifies another different reality, namely, "the reality of the Sacrament," the Res Sacramenti. This signifying is done without words. The third cornerstone is "the reality only," the effect of the Sacrament, which is grace infused in the soul of the recipient. The Reality Only (Res Sacramenti) is signified twice, by the "sign only" and by the "reality and sign." Thus in the overall structure there are two signs involved and two realities, but there are three different signifying actions.

The diagram below illustrates the "three-cornerstone" structure.

Res Et Sacramentum
(A reality and a sign)
It is signified and It also signifies
The True Body of Christ

Signifies

Sacramentum Tantum
(The Sign Only)
Signifies two realities
The Matter and the Form
of the Sacrament

Signifies

Res Sacramenti
(The Reality Only)
Signified by two signs
The Effect:
The Union of the Mystical Body

6. Documentation Of The Preceding Section

What have been set forth and explained above are not just theories, or some

concepts devised by the theologians in order to expound better the nature of the Sacraments. Everything we have said has been defined by and is supported by the teaching authority of the Church, the Magisterium.

First, as regards the "cornerstone" structure, we read the following in St. Alphonsus Liguori: "Here it must be observed that in all the Sacraments there are three things to be distinguished, namely the 'sign only' (*sacramentum tantum*), the 'reality only' (*res tantum*) and the 'sign and reality' (*sacramentum ac res*). The 'sign only' is that which signifies; the 'reality only' is that which is signified, namely, the effect of the Sacrament; the 'sign and reality' is at the same time that which is signified by one thing and signifies another thing."⁹⁵ As the Doctor St. Alphonsus notes, this threefold structure is found in all the Sacraments ("in omnibus sacramentis"), not just in the Holy Eucharist.⁹⁶ Throughout his discussion on the Sacraments in general in the *Summa* as well as in his explanations on the individual Sacraments, St. Thomas Aquinas also frequently alludes to these three elements. And Scotus gives us the following beautiful disquisition:

"Let us now see what is the Sacrament and what the reality. 'A Sacrament is the visible sign of invisible grace,' as we read in Augustine (*De Civ. Dei*, lib. 10, ch. 5). Therefore the species of bread and wine is the sign, that is, 'the sign of a sacred thing, which besides the appearances which the senses perceive, brings yet another thing to our cognition [i.e., the Real Presence].' The sign therefore consists in those things that existed before [transubstantiation], namely, the bread and wine.

"Now in this Sacrament the reality is twofold; the first is that which signifies and is signified (*contenta et significata*) the other is that which is signified but does not signify (*significata et non contenta*). The reality that signifies and is signified is the flesh of Christ, the same which was born of the Virgin; and His blood which He shed for us. The reality that is only signified and which does not itself signify anything is the union in the Church of those who are predestined, called, justified and glorified. ...

"There are then three things which must be distinguished here. The first is that which is sign only; the second, that which is sign and reality; and the third, that which is reality only. That which is sign only is the visible species of the bread and wine [the significance of which is determined specifically by the form of words]. That which is sign and reality is Christ's own flesh and blood. And that which is reality only is His Mystical Body.

"Moreover, the visible sign of the Sacrament has two realities, inasmuch as it signifies both of them and conveys the distinct symbolism of both. For just as bread above all other food restores and sustains the body, and wine gladdens and satisfies man, so also does the flesh of Christ refresh and feed the inner man above all other spiritual gifts. ... And in like manner do bread and wine signify the

mystical reality, which is the union of the faithful. For just as the one bread is composed of many grains of wheat and the wine is the product of many grapes, so does the unity of the Church [the Mystical Body] consist in many persons, namely, the faithful. (Thus John Duns Scotus).⁹⁷

The pseudo-Eucharist of The Robber Church (which we believe to be a meal of bread and wine, nothing else) is not for the "many persons, namely, the faithful," as Scotus so eloquently explained, but for all men, as John Paul II (also so eloquently) reveals:

"The pope briefly discussed the ecumenical dimension of the Eucharist: 'The eucharistic celebration joins together all Christians, whatever their differences, in a unanimous offering and in a meal in which all participate. It gathers them all together in equal dignity as brothers of Christ and sons of the Father; it calls them to respect, to reciprocal esteem, to mutual service. Communion also gives each one the moral strength necessary to overcome reasons for division and opposition, to forgive wrongs, to make a new effort in the direction of reconciliation and fraternal understanding,'the pope said."⁹⁸

All we have presented so far are the commentaries and documentation from Doctors and theologians; whereas we asserted we would document everything with the teachings of the Magisterium. It goes without saying that Scotus, St. Thomas, St. Alphonsus (and many others) do not fabricate this "three-cornerstone" structure on their own authority. It was laid down authoritatively by Pope Innocent III in Cum Marthae Circa, which letter has already been cited several times:

"We must, however, distinguish precisely these three things which in this Sacrament are distinct and separate, namely, the visible sign, the true corporeal presence, and the spiritual effect, or grace. The sign is in the bread and wine; the verity is in the Body and the Blood; the effect is that of unity and charity. The first of these we call the 'sign but not a reality' [i.e., the sign only]. The second is 'a sign and a reality.' The third is 'the reality but not a sign' [i.e., the reality only]. But the first of these is the sign of two different realities. The second, however, has a role as the sign of one reality, and also the role of itself being a reality. And the third element in fact is the reality that arises from this double signification." ⁹⁹

As we proceed through the further development of our thesis, we shall furnish the appropriate documentation, both from recognized esteemed authorities and from magisterial pronouncements. Before continuing, however, there is one truth we have stated already that it is expedient to document here and now. We have averred that "the effect" of the Holy Eucharist is the union of the Mystical Body; that is, the strengthening of the recipient's bond of union with Christ, the Head of the Mystical Body, as well as with the other members. This is, as we have seen, the teaching of St. Thomas, St. Alphonsus and Scotus. It is also defined as such by the Church.

While it is true that there are many effects of this Sacrament -- to wit: the nutriment and preservation of the soul, the remission of venial sins, as a heavenly medicine to preserve us from future evils, the extinguishing of concupiscence, spiritual refreshment, an increase of charity, etc. -- nevertheless when we speak of "the" effect, one thing only is meant, namely, the Res Sacramenti, the aforesaid union of the Mystical Body. This teaching was handed down by Pope Eugene IV at the Council of Florence by means of his Bull Exultate Deo, and it was also defined by the Council of Trent.

Said Eugene, "The effect which this Sacrament has in the soul of a person who receives it worthily, is to unite him with Christ. Since it is by grace that a man is incorporated into Christ and united with Christ's members, it follows that those who receive this sacrament worthily, receive an increase of grace."¹⁰⁰

Furthermore, the same Sovereign Pontiff Eugene IV, after citing his predecessor "Blessed Alexander, the fifth pope after St. Peter" as follows: "Not wine only nor water only should be offered in the chalice of the Lord, but a mixture of both. For we read that both, that is, blood and water, flowed from the side of Christ," goes on to say, "Finally, this is a fitting way to signify the effect of this Sacrament, that is, the union of the Christian people with Christ."¹⁰¹

"It was Christ's will, moreover," teaches the Council of Trent, "that this Sacrament be a pledge of our future glory and our everlasting happiness and, likewise, a symbol of that one body of which He is the head (see I Cor. 11:3; Eph. 5:23). He willed that we, as members of this body, should be united to it by firm bonds of faith, hope and charity, so that we might all say the same thing, and that there might be no dissensions among us (see I Cor. 1:10)."¹⁰²

And again the same Council: "And finally this holy Synod with paternal affection admonishes, exhorts, entreats and beseeches, 'through the bowels of the mercy of our God' (Luke, 1:78), that each and all, who are classed under the name of Christian, will now finally agree and be of the same opinion in this 'sign of unity,' in this 'bond of charity,' in this symbol of concord..."¹⁰³ Finally, "...our Saviour left the Eucharist in His Church as a symbol of that unity and charity by which He willed all Christians to be mutually bound and united."¹⁰⁴

Keeping all this in mind, we shall fully understand that Pope Leo XIII is referring to the Res Sacramenti (the effect, which is grace) when he teaches: "All know that the Sacraments of the New Law, as sensible and efficient signs of invisible grace, must both signify the grace which they effect, and effect the grace which they signify. Although the signification ought to be found in the whole essential rite -- that is to say, in the matter and in the form -- it still pertains chiefly to the form; since the matter is a part which is not determined by itself, but which is determined by the form."¹⁰⁵ "That form consequently cannot be considered apt or sufficient for a Sacrament," Leo further remarks, "which omits what it must essentially signify."¹⁰⁶

7. The First Signification:

Sacramentum Tantum Signifies Res Et Sacramentum

How the sacramentum tantum, the "sign only" cornerstone, denotes the res et sacramentum is easily seen. It will be recalled that the sacramentum tantum signifies by means of both of its components, the matter and the form. Now as regards the matter, the bread and the wine, Scotus has already explained how these in themselves signify the True Body of Christ, the res et sacramentum: "For just as bread above all other food restores and sustains the body, and wine gladdens and satisfies man, so also does the flesh of Christ refresh and feed the inner man above all other spiritual gifts." In the Old Testament we find many fore-shadowings of this signification, of which the following are examples:

"But Melchisedech the king of Salem, bringing forth bread and wine, for he was the priest of the most high God." (Gen. 14:18).

"And when the children of Israel saw it, they said one to another: Manhu! which signifieth: What is this! for they knew not what it was. And Moses said to them: This is the bread, which the Lord hath given you to eat". (Exod. 16:15).

"Instead of which things thou didst feed thy people with the food of angels, and gavest them bread from heaven prepared without labour; having in it all that is delicious, and the sweetness of every taste." (Wis. 16:20).

"Come, eat my bread, and drink the wine which I have mingled for you." (Prov. 9:5).

"I will take the chalice of salvation; and I will call upon the name of the Lord." (Psalm 115:13).

"And my chalice which inebriateth me, how goodly is it!" (Psalm 22:5).

"For what is the good thing of him, and what is his beautiful thing, but the corn of the elect, and wine springing forth virgins?" (Zach. 9:17).

Our Lord likened His Body and Blood to "food and drink" and called Himself "bread" in revealing the mystery of the Holy Eucharist.

"Then Jesus said to them: Amen, amen I say to you; Moses gave you not bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven." (Jn. 6:32).

"And Jesus said to them: I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger: and he that believeth in me shall never thirst." (Jn. 6:35).

'I am the bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the desert, and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven; that if any man eat of it, he may not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world. ... Amen, amen I say unto you: Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth

my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life: and I will raise him up in the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed: and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me, and I in him." (Jn. 6: 48-52, 54-57).

Having thus shown the signification of the True Body of Christ to be contained in the matter of the bread and wine, to complete the demonstration it now remains only to prove the more important fact that It is signified in the sacramental form. Which is self-evident, at least to Catholics, for this signification is contained in the words that denote transubstantiation: "This is My Body. This is the Chalice of My Blood."

8. The Second Signification:
Res Et Sacramentum Signifies Res Sacramenti

One role of the cornerstone that is "a reality and a sign" has just been explained, namely, its passive role as a reality ("res"). Next we shall investigate its role as a sign, a sign which denotes the Res Sacramenti. This signification is effected by the very True Body of Christ Itself, without the use of words, since the res et sacramentum has no words with which it signifies, as does the sacramentum tantum.

The True Body of Christ, composed of head, torso, limbs, organs, sinews, blood, etc., is figurative of the Mystical Body. For the Mystical Body, like Christ's human Body which was conceived in the womb of His Virgin Mother, is composed of the Head, Who is Jesus Christ, and all Catholics -- the technical term is simply "fideles," the faithful -- who are the members of the Mystical Body. "I am the true vine; and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he will take away; and every one that beareth fruit, he will purge it that it may bring forth more fruit. ... Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, unless it abide in the vine, so neither can you, unless you abide in me. I am the vine; you the branches." (Jn. 15: 1-2, 4-5).

The effect of this Sacrament, which is the union of the Mystical Body, is also very lucidly demonstrated to be symbolized by the Body of Christ in these words of St. Paul, who understood best this great mystery:

'For as the body is one, and hath many members; and all the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body, so also is Christ. ... For the body also is not one member, but many. If the foot should say, because I am not the hand I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear should say, because I am not the eye I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were the eye, where would be the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where would be the smelling?

'But now God hath set the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleased him. And if they all were one member, where would be the body? But

now there are many members indeed, yet one body. ... And if one member suffer any thing, all the members suffer with it; or if one member glory, all the members rejoice with it. Now you are the body of Christ, and members of member." (I Cor. 12: 12, 14-20, 26-27).

9. Some Preliminary Notes On The Third Signification

Adhering to our plan to illustrate the "three-cornerstone" structure in a systematic manner, it now remains for us only to demonstrate the third and final action of signification: the signifying by the sacramentum tantum of the res tantum. That is to say, the signifying of the union of the Mystical Body by the sacramental matter and form of the Holy Eucharist.

Before going ahead in earnest with this undertaking it is useful to observe the symbolism of the Mystical Body that is so abundant in the Mass, through the prayers and rubrics, even outside the Consecration itself.

In the Canon of the Mass references are made to each of the three branches of the Mystical Body. In the prayer "In Primis" the Mass is offered up for "Thy holy Catholic Church" and for "all true believers and professors of the Catholic and Apostolic Faith." The members of the Mystical Body on earth, the Church Militant, are especially remembered in the Commemoration of the Living, the prayer "Memento, Domine". In the prayer "Communicantes" mention is made of "the glorious ever Virgin Mary, Mother of our God and Lord Jesus Christ" and also of the Apostles and martyrs of the early Church, and thus the Church Triumphant is honored. After the Consecration we have the prayer "Memento Etiam, Domine" in which we beseech God on behalf of the members of the Church Suffering.

Finally in the prayer "Nobis Quoque Peccatoribus" the Church Triumphant and we, the Church Militant, are linked together by means of the intercession: "And to us sinners also, Thy servants, hoping in the multitude of Thy mercies, vouchsafe to grant some part and fellowship with Thy holy apostles and martyrs: with John, Stephen, Matthias, Barnabas, Ignatius, Alexander, Marcellinus, Peter, Felicitas, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucy, Agnes, Cecilia, Anastasia, and with all Thy saints, into whose company admit us, we beseech Thee, not considering our merits but pardoning our offenses. Through Christ our Lord."

"(W)hereas it [Christ's Passion] produces no effect except in those who are united with Christ's Passion through faith and charity," remarks St. Thomas, "so likewise this sacrifice, which is the memorial of our Lord's Passion, has no effect except in those who are united with this Sacrament through faith and charity. Hence Augustine says to Renatus (De Anima et ejus origine, i): 'Who may offer Christ's Body except for those who are Christ's members?' Hence in the Canon of the Mass no prayer is made for those who are outside the pale of the Church."107

"Strangely enough," says a writer (who does not perceive the vital symbolism herein contained and who, moreover, ignores the very essence of the Holy Eucharist as the Sacrament of the Mystical Body), "nearly all the Oriental liturgies mention the mingling of water with the wine in the form of consecration."¹⁰⁸ Only to those of his mentality would this appear "strange," for the mingling of the water with the wine in the chalice is symbolic of the union of the members of the Mystical Body with Christ, a signification attested to at least as far back as the fourth century, and which is so well known as to require no documentation. Nevertheless to maintain a thorough and integrated exposition the following evidence of this is cited.

In his Bull *Exultate Deo*, Pope Eugene IV teaches: "... 'Not wine only nor water only should be offered in the chalice of the Lord but a mixture of both. For we read that both, that is, blood and water, flowed from the side of Christ.' [Here he was citing the words of Pope Alexander]. Water represents the people as the Apocalypse says: 'The waters are many peoples' (see Apoc. 17:15). And Julius, the second pope after Blessed Sylvester, says: 'According to the command of the canons, the Lord's chalice should be offered with wine mixed with water. For we see that the water stands for the people, the wine for the blood of Christ. Thus when wine and water are mixed in the chalice, the people are united with Christ, and the faithful are closely joined to Him in whom they believe'." In his own explanation of this signification of the mingling of water with the wine, St. Thomas Aquinas¹⁰⁹ also quotes the same authority of Pope St. Julius 1 (337-352).

The Council of Trent reinforced this teaching: "The Holy Synod then admonishes priests that it has been prescribed by the Church to mix water with the wine to be offered in the chalice [Canon 9], not only because the belief is that Christ the Lord did so, but also because there came from His side water together with blood [John 19:34], since by this mixture the Sacrament is recalled. And since in the Apocalypse of the blessed John the peoples are called waters [Apoc. 17 : 1,15], the union of the faithful with Christ, their Head, is represented."¹¹⁰

Lastly, as St. Thomas mentions, the priest's breaking of the Host into the three parts symbolizes the Mystical Body in its three branches.¹¹¹ " (W)hich some persons have expressed in verse thus:

The host being rent --

What is dipped means the blest;

What is dry means the living;

What is kept, those at rest.

Others, however, say that the part put into the chalice denotes those still living in this world; while the part kept outside the chalice denotes those fully blessed both in soul and body; while the part consumed means the others."¹¹²

10. The Third Signification:

Sacramentum Tantum Signifies Res Sacramenti

Part 1: Via The Matter

Briefly reviewing some of the points covered thus far, let us examine several teachings gleaned from various places in the Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas:

"I answer that, We can consider three things in this Sacrament: namely, that which is sign only, and this is the bread and wine; that which is both reality and sign, to wit, Christ's true body; and lastly that which is reality only, namely the effect of this Sacrament."113

"I answer that, Two things have to be considered in this Sacrament, namely the sign itself, and what is contained in it. Now it was stated above (A. 1, Obj. 2) that the reality of the Sacrament is the unity of the Mystical Body, outside which there can be no salvation; for there is no entering into salvation outside the Church, just as in the time of the deluge there was none outside the Ark, which denotes the Church, according to I Pet., 3: 20-21."114

"On the contrary, The Apostle says (I Cor. 10:17): For we, being many, are one bread. one body, all that partake of one bread: from which it is clear that the Eucharist is the Sacrament of the Church's unity."115

"For just as the natural body is one, though made up of diverse members, so the whole Church, Christ's Mystical Body, is reckoned as one person with its head, Who is Christ."116

"On the contrary, In the Sacrament of the Altar, two things are signified, viz., Christ's true body, and Christ's Mystical Body, as Augustine says (Liber Sent. Prosper.). "117

In this short Section 10 the first phase of the signification of the Res Sacramenti by the "sign only" cornerstone is to be discussed; namely, the signification contained in the very matter of the Sacrament, the bread and wine. Already in Section 6 of this Part 11, we have read the elucidation by Scotus: "And in like manner do bread and wine signify the mystical reality, which is the union of the faithful. For just as the one bread is composed of many grains of wheat and the wine is the product of many grapes, so does the unity of the Church [the Mystical Body] consist in many persons, namely, the faithful." But this symbolism was pointed out long before the time of Scotus by some of the earliest Fathers, including St. Augustine.

However, to round out our demonstration we shall stay with the Angelic Doctor:

"Fourthly, the effect of this Sacrament is considered from the species under which it is given. Hence Augustine says (Tract. xxvi, in Joan.): 'Our Lord

betokened His body and blood in things which out of many units are made into some one whole: for out of many grains is one thing made, viz. bread; and many grapes flow into one thing, viz. wine. And therefore he observes elsewhere (ibid.): O Sacrament of piety, O sign of unity, O bond of charity!" 118

"Fourthly, as to the effect with regard to the whole Church, which is made up of many believers, just as bread is composed of many grains, and wine flows from many grapes, as the gloss observes on 1 Cor. X. 17: We being many are ... one body, etc."119

11. The Third Signification: Sacramentum Tantum Signifies Res Sacrament!

Part 2: Via The Form

"A sacrament may be considered from the aspect of the sacramental signification itself," says St. Thomas, "for Augustine says (De Doctr. Christ. ii) that 'among men words have come to have pride of place as a means of signifying' because words can be formed in different ways in order to convey various mental concepts; and on account of this we are able through words to express our thoughts more distinctly. And therefore for the perfection of sacramental signification it is necessary that the meaning of sensible things [ie., the matter] be determined by means of certain words [ie., the form]."120

The form is called the "determining principle," because it is the words that are recited that determine the purpose for which the sacramental matter is being used. Water in itself, for example, signifies nothing in particular (it can be used for drinking, bathing, putting out a fire, washing clothes, etc). But when a person says the words, "I baptize thee, etc. ..." while simultaneously pouring water over the head of another person, the purpose for which that particular water is being used is clearly denoted. Hence the sacramental form, "I baptize thee...", constitutes the principle which determines unambiguously that this water here and now is being used to signify and to effect the cleansing from sin and the bringing to the state of justification. Consequently we should clearly understand why St. Thomas explains (Summa, III, Q. 60, A. 7) that in the Sacraments specific determinate forms of words are more essential even than specific determinate matter.

Now we have just shown in the preceding Section 10 that the matter of the bread and wine, even without the vivifying force of the form, signifies in this Sacrament (albeit not yet in a sufficiently determined manner) the union of the Mystical Body. Hence it now is incumbent upon us to ascertain what words of the sacramental form are those words that explicitly determine this specific meaning. Reviewing the texts quoted earlier -- those of Scotus, of St. Augustine as cited by St. Thomas, and the words of the Angelic Doctor himself -- a most striking consistency is apparent, common to all three texts, which lies in the repetition of the word "many." That word,121 which may be regarded as a truly sacrosanct word in the context of the Holy Eucharist, is most singularly and uniquely

associated with the members of the Mystical Body.

All that remains to bring our explanation of the "three-cornerstone" structure to completion is to show how the union of the members of the Mystical Body is signified in the sacramental form. This is a most vital signification, for here we are dealing with the Res Sacramenti, the very effect of the Sacrament, which (as in all the Sacraments) must be signified in the form. The teaching of Pope Leo XIII, which was cited earlier, needs to be repeated here:

"All know that the Sacraments of the New Law, as sensible and efficient signs of invisible grace, must both signify the grace which they effect, and effect the grace which they signify. Although the signification ought to be found in the whole essential rite - that is to say, in the matter and in the form - it still pertains chiefly to the form; since the matter is a part which is not determined by itself, but which is determined by the form." "That form consequently cannot be considered apt or sufficient for a Sacrament which omits what it must essentially signify."¹²²

Let us then study the sacramental form for the Holy Eucharist, phrase by phrase, in order to discover precisely wherein this signification of the Res Sacramenti is contained.

"FOR THIS IS MY BODY. FOR THIS IS THE CHALICE OF MY BLOOD, OF THE NEW AND ETERNAL TESTAMENT: THE MYSTERY OF FAITH, WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR YOU AND FOR MANY UNTO THE REMISSION OF SINS."

Do the words, "For this is My Body. For this is the Chalice of My Blood," signify the Mystical Body or the union of the Mystical Body? Indeed they do according to certain Protestant commentators: "For Dorner and Loofs and others the Eucharistic Body and Blood are not the real Body and Blood of Christ, but His Mystical Body, the Church only. Hence, according to them, 'This is my Body,' and all the Eucharistic passages signify only the Church. If this were so, they would make St. Augustine say that the Flesh born of Mary, which we adore in the Eucharist, the Body He carried in His hands at the Last Supper, is the Church. Such an interpretation is refuted in its very statement."¹²³

These words either signify the Mystical Body, as those Protestants claim, or else they signify the True Body and Blood of Christ, as Catholics believe; but they cannot signify both, otherwise they would be ambiguous. But sacramental forms cannot signify ambiguously, as we read in the Roman Catechism: "In our Sacraments the form is so definite that any, even a casual deviation from it, renders the Sacrament null. Hence the form is expressed in the clearest terms, such as exclude the possibility of doubt."¹²⁴ This teaching is corroborated by the Vindication of the Bull 'Apostolicae Curae': "Moreover, the signification must not be ambiguous, but so far definite as to discriminate the grace effected from graces of a different kind."

Ergo, since the words, "This is My Body. This is the Chalice of My Blood," do not and cannot provide this essential signification of the Mystical Body, the first point we set out to demonstrate in this our thesis would seem to be proved, namely:

[i] The words, "This is My Body. This is the Chalice of My Blood," and these words alone, cannot possibly suffice as the complete Consecration Form. Next let us proceed with our examination of the remaining words of the Consecration Form. Do the words, "of the new and eternal testament," bring out the signification of the Mystical Body? Of course they do not because, as demonstrated earlier, these words, by their contrasting the sacrifices of the Old Law with Christ's unique atoning Sacrifice of the New Law on Calvary, the mystery of mankind's Redemption by the Son of God made man, denote true propitiation.

Moving along then to the next phrase in the Consecration form, "the mystery of faith," we recall that those words were shown to signify the doctrine of the Real Presence.

Next in order, we consider the words, "which shall be shed." Once again we are thwarted in our search for words that denote the union of the Mystical Body, for these are the words of the sacramental form that denote sacrifice.¹²⁵ By the process of elimination, if for no other reason, it is evident that the signification of the union of the Mystical Body must be contained in these final words of the form: "for you and for many unto the remission of sins." However, the manner in which these words most refulgently bring out this signification of the Res Sacramenti has been explained already by your author.¹²⁶ It will suffice here to reproduce two paragraphs from p. 23 of Questioning The Validity of McCarthy's Case:

"From all the foregoing it is evident that the remission of sins -- that is, the actual and efficacious remission of sins; or in other words "in remissionem peccatorum" (unto the remission of sins) -- is the necessary prerequisite for (a) our initial incorporation in the Mystical Body; and (b) the reinstatement as living members, through the Second Plank After Shipwreck [the Sacrament of Penance], of those who have lost sanctifying grace. Consequently, the remission of sins can be said to cause the union of the members of the Mystical Body.

"Therefore, inasmuch as this union is the very Res Sacramenti of the Holy Eucharist, which must be signified in the words of the sacramental form, it is likewise evident that the final phrase of the form for the Consecration of the Wine in its entirety--to wit: 'for you and for many unto the remission of sins' -- comprises these essential words. The words 'you' and 'many' designate the members; the words, 'unto the remission of sins,' signify the principle of their unity. O vinculum caritatis!"

Thus would seem to be proved the second point we set out to demonstrate: [ii]

the words, "for you and for many unto the remission of sins," fulfill an essential and indispensable signifying role in the wine-consecration form.

Finally we come to the third plank of our thesis, namely, [iii] the false words, "for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven," not only render invalid the "English Masses" by losing the aforesaid indispensable signification; but they moreover express a different and false signification, which by its nature makes the celebrants of such "Masses," as well as those who are in attendance, implicitly deny the Catholic Church's doctrine of the Mystical Body; and moreover simultaneously makes them espouse that false ecumenism condemned by the Sovereign Pontiff Pius XI as being tantamount to apostasy.

It would be laboring the point to comment further on this, for I believe the truth of these assertions to have been sufficiently established throughout the development of our case.

One last topic needs some brief discussion. Some may argue that the designation of the *res et sacramentum*, the True Body of Christ, by means of the words, "This is My Body. This is the Chalice of My Blood," is sufficient to signify the *Res Sacramenti* also. The argument would rest on the assumption that since God is the Author of all grace, this would automatically fulfill the requirement that the grace of the Sacrament be signified.

But such a theory cannot hold. For firstly, even though it is true that the Author of all grace is signified by the words, "This is My Body. This is the Chalice of My Blood"; and, moreover, once the entire consecration form has been pronounced He is there present on the altar; nevertheless to suppose this would suffice to signify the sacramental grace effected by the Holy Eucharist would be grasping at straws. For such a supposed signification would be too vague. What is essential is that the *Res Sacramenti* be explicitly denoted, as was explained by Cardinal Vaughan and the Catholic hierarchy of the Province of Westminster in the Vindication of the Bull 'Apostolicae Curae': "Moreover, the signification must not be ambiguous, but so far definite as to discriminate the grace effected from graces of a different kind."

Secondly, God is the Author of grace, but He is not grace. When the Catechism of the Council of Trent speaks of "Christ the Lord, who is true grace,"¹²⁷ this is only a certain figure of speech and is not to be taken literally, for the sense of this statement is brought out later in the same sentence, "and the fountain of all heavenly gifts." "Sacramental grace consists in divine help towards the fulfillment of the duties imposed by the particular sacrament."¹²⁸ God is the giver and the principal cause of grace (the sacrament itself is an "Instrumental cause"); and sacramental grace is the effect. Now an effect cannot be the same as the cause, or be contained in the cause as an integral part of it; for in such a case the cause would cause itself, which is impossible. Hence one must not confuse the Author of all grace with the sacramental grace itself.

END OF PART II : THE THESIS

Some Society of St. Pius X priests (not all of them by any means) are at present the most injurious Adversarii, who sometimes exert their influence by private "priestly advice." Occasionally we read reports of the "official" Society position that the vernacularized "Mass" is not per se invalid, but no sound theological basis for this assertion is ever provided. Their claim that "more and more Masses are becoming invalid because of defect of intention of the priests" is mere speculation and absolutely unprovable in any specific, concrete case. If the vernacularized Novus Ordo Missae is intrinsically invalid by virtue of its corrupted Consecration Form (as we have attempted to show), then the priest's intention, whether good, or absent, or evil has no additional bearing on the invalidity issue.

Until now (after more than twenty years) the Society has produced in public print no sound theological case against our position. We cannot refute silent adversaries. All "traditionalists" know, as surely the Society must know, the stakes here are enormous. The Novus Ordo (which they oppose for far less serious reasons than ours) is either the valid Catholic Mass and therefore the most sublime action performable by man on earth, or it is an idolatrous mockery of the Mass. Is not the validity issue, then, of prime importance? Those neutralizing bishops and priests within the Society are invited to come out openly and let everyone read their arguments, know their exact position and its basis. The Holy Ghost bestows the "Catholic instinct" on all devout Catholics. The faithful who seek the truth will be able to weigh their sound counter-arguments, if they have any, against ours.

Patrick Henry Omlor
May 9, 1991
Ascension Thursday

APPENDIX I

Following his excellent translation entitled, "The Salmanticenses' Response to De Lugo on the Form of Consecration of the Wine," Father Lawrence S. Brey included some very cogent "Translator's Comments". Paragraphs excerpted from this commentary by Father Brey are now reproduced below.

The idea of God or the Church "supplying" for the defect is worthy of special comment, in view of widespread misconceptions about the role of Divine Intervention, "good intention," and "ecclesia supplet." While these considerations are comforting and do fill some well-defined roles, it is wishful thinking, without theological basis, to hold that any possible sacramental irregularity or defect is "covered" or "saved" by one or the other of these. In regard to a defective sacramental form, for example, while Divine power could provide for a valid effect in such a case, this could not be gratuitously presumed as a matter of course, and in fact would not seem to be in accord with the ordinary disposition of Divine Providence, nor with Christ's Will and requirements governing the Sacraments

He instituted. ...

As for "good intention," no amount of a priest's "good intention" can rectify or validate an objectively defective sacramental form -- unless the priest carry out that good intention into action, by himself correcting the form to its proper wording! But a thousand "good intentions" by themselves will never make up for or validate an uncorrected form.

As for "ecclesia supplet" ("the Church supplies") this canonical provision (Canon 209, C.J.C.) regards the Church's supplying, "automatically," ecclesiastical jurisdiction in certain cases where it is lacking and needed (in cases of "common error" and "doubt of law or fact"), mainly in connection with the Sacrament of Penance and certain other priestly functions requiring jurisdiction. It does not (and cannot) supply for any defect of sacramental matter or form, nor does it supply any power of Orders (as distinct from power of Jurisdiction); nor does it give one a "blank check" covering "everything," even in an "emergency situation." In cases of danger of death there is a similar canonical provision.

"Ecclesia supplet," somewhat like the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, is often wrongly understood, or misapplied, or overextended; whereas in reality each of these is limited to well defined functions. The Salmanticenses, in the above document, cite the role of "ecclesia supplet" and conclude that no such supplying validates a defective or incomplete Consecration form. ...

Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ instituted the seven Sacraments. Several of these, including the Holy Eucharist, were instituted "in specie"; that is, Christ determined in detail and minutely their matter and form. Would it not seem incongruous for the same Divine Lord to so prescribe, and nevertheless "supply" for flagrant deviations from His sacred prescription? ...

Finally, the Salmanticenses concede that there were at times Cases of invalid Consecration forms being used (and hence, invalid Masses!), in both a limited area (the Maronites of Mt. Libanus), and also in extensive regions (among the Ethiopians). In the former case, the invalid forms for consecrating the wine resulted, at least partly, from the atmosphere of heresy and schism prevailing at the time, and were used not only by the schismatics, but even by "the ignorant" and those "associated with the schismatics."

Now, remembering the prophetic words of Pope St. Pius X, written in 1910, concerning the 'universal apostasy' that even then crept "insidious and hidden in the very veins of the Church," one can easily concede the distinct possibility of invalid Masses in our present day, on a far more extensive, indeed universal, scale. In accord with the dispositions of an all-wise and all-just Divine Providence, such an ominous situation would not at all be "unthinkable," but rather might be a logical result of the present climate of heresy, schism, and apostasy that is infinitely more far-reaching and widespread than that which affected the Maronites of Mt. Libanus!

In our present circumstances, which clearly are those of a "universal apostasy" or the closest thing to it imaginable, could we not apply and extend the conclusion expressed by the Salmanticenses: "However, it would be by no means unfitting for Providence to permit the aforesaid error and its effects" in virtually the entire world?

1 "Verba autem Consecrationis, quae sunt forma hujus Sacramenti, sunt haec: Hoc est enim Corpus meum. Et: Hic est enim Calix Sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti: mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Si quis autem aliquid diminueret, vel immutaret de forma consecrationis Corporis et Sanguinis, et in ipsa verborum immutatione verba idem non significarent, non conficeret Sacramentum. Si vero aliquid adderet, quod significationem non mutaret, conficeret quidem, sed gravissime peccaret."

2 Some "short form" defenders cite Suarez who held that *De Defectibus* comprises "doctrinal instructions which are no more binding than the teachings on which they are based" (*instructiones doctrinales quae non magis obligant quam doctrina in qua fundantur*). This strange remark seems erroneously to imply that these rubrics are based on mere theological opinions held by the Magisterium which might subsequently be modified, leading to a corresponding change in the rubrics. On the contrary, while some of the introductory paragraphs of *De Defectibus* are instructive in nature, the rubrics themselves, by definition, are injunctions. The emphatic phraseology of the passage I cited from Part V clearly shows it is perceptive in nature, not merely instructive.

3 "Quae disputatio nequaquam otiosa censenda est sed potius diligenter a theologo attendenda 'ne formae ignorance in sacramento conficiendo a sacerdotibus turpissime peccetur,' ut monet Catechismus Conc. Trid., p. 2, c. 4, q. 19." (Page 150).

4 "His rationibus hinc inde consideratis, CONCLUDIMUS: Auctoritas Catechismi Conc. Trid et S. Thomae nos vehementer impelleret ad sententiam negativam probabiliorem judicandam; cum tamen de iudicio tot ac tantorum theologorum, praesertim thomistarum, non clare constet de mente S. Thomae, quam auctores Catechismi evidenter sequi intendunt, non audemus uni sententiae potius quam alteri adhaerere sed utrique aequalem probabilitatem adjudicamus."

5 "PROBABLE. As used in theology, this word means 'possible' rather than 'probable' in the ordinary sense. That is to say, an opinion is 'probable' if it has some solid reasons in its favour and is taught by some respectable theologians" (*A Catholic Dictionary*, edited by Donald Attwater, Macmillan, N.Y., 1949, p. 404). "A probable opinion is one which rests on reasons which are good and solid, but not so strong as to exclude all doubt" (*A Catholic*

Dictionary, William E. Addis and Thomas Arnold, The Catholic Publication Society Co., New York, 1884, p. 602).

6 St. Alphonsus held that the "short form" and the "entire form" opinions are both speculatively probable, adding that in practice it is certain ("certum est") that a priest would sin mortally if he failed to recite the entire form. "Caeterum utraque sententia est speculative probabilis, sed in praxi certum est quod sacerdos graviter peccaret, si non proferret omnia verba quae in consecratione calicis habentur" (Theologia Moralis, Lib. VI, Tract. III, Cap. I, Dub. VI, par. 223). In the following paragraph (224), St. Alphonsus quotes the passage from Part V of De Defectibus which we have already cited (see foot note 1), and stresses its importance: "Hic autem notandum quoad mutationem verborum formae id quod habetur in Rubrica Missalis (tit. 5, n.1): 'Si quis autem aliquid diminueret vel immutaret...etc.'."

7 In his Bull Quo Primum (July, 1570) St. Pius V forbade "in perpetuity" any additions or changes whatsoever in the Roman Missal, under the penalty of incurring "the wrath of Almighty God, and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul." By this he did not mean that new "propers" or new prefaces, etc., for feasts that might subsequently be introduced could not be added. He meant that the Ordinary of the Mass, and especially the Canon, was never to be changed.

It must not be thought that the Roman Canon (or the Latin Rite Mass as a whole) dates only from the year of Quo Primum. The Canon of the Mass that St. Pius V took such formidable measures to safeguard is substantially the same as that used by the Western Church from the very beginning; that is to say, there is evidence that it dates from apostolic times. It is believed that Pope St. Gregory the Great (died A.D. 604) merely rearranged the order of certain prayers in the Canon. This much is certain: "Since the seventh century our Canon has remained unchanged" (Catholic Encyclopedia, V. III, p. 256). Designating the True Valid Mass as the "Tridentine Mass" is therefore misleading, in that it might be inferred by some that it dates only from the time of the Council of Trent.

8 The mutilated Italian version is "sparso per voi e per tutti [for all] in remissione dei peccati." In German: "Für euch und für Alle [for all] vergossen wird zur Vergebung der Sünden." These are only two examples of the same falsified translation in other languages.

9 According to St. Thomas (Summa Th., III, Q. 60, A. 8, ad 1): "It is not lawful to add anything to the words of Holy Scripture as regards the sense; ... Nevertheless, it is not lawful to add even words to Holy Scripture as though such words were a part thereof, for this would amount to forgery."

10 St. Matthew (26,28) records: "which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins." And in St. Mark (14,24): "which shall be shed for many."

11 Consider these words of St. Teresa: "The Holy Ghost never inspires anything that is not conformable to Holy Writ. If there were the slightest divergence, that, alone by itself, would suffice to prove so evidently the work of the Evil One that were the whole world to assure me it was the Holy Ghost I would never believe it." (Quoted in Christendom, Lexington, Ky., issue of Feb. 1968, page 19).

12 The liturgy should never have been vernacularized at all. As Rev. Dr. Nicholas Gehr states (The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, Herder's, St. Louis, 1929): "The very ancient practice of the Church of celebrating Mass in the West, not in the living language of the country, but in a dead language, that is, in Latin...has since the twelfth century to the present epoch been frequently made the subject of attack. (Footnote: Opponents of the Latin language of worship were, as a rule, heretics, schismatics and rationalistic Catholics...). Such attacks originated principally in an heretical, schismatical, proudly national spirit hostile to the Church, or in a superficial and false enlightenment, in a shallow and arid rationalism entirely destitute of the perception and understanding of the essence and object of the Catholic liturgy, especially the profoundly mystical sacrifice. In the attempt to suppress the Latin language of the liturgy and to replace it by the vernacular, there was a more or less premeditated scheme to undermine Catholic unity, to loosen the bond of union with Rome, to weaken the Catholic Spirit, to destroy the humility and simplicity of faith." (Pages 319-320).

"The Latin language is consecrated by the mystic inscription attached to the Cross, as well as sanctified by the usage of nearly two thousand years, and hence it is most closely interwoven with the primitive Roman Catholic liturgy of the holy Sacrifice. The inscription on the Cross: 'Jesus of Nazareth, king of the Jews,' was written in Hebrew, Greek and Latin (John 19, 19, 20). These were the three principal languages of that epoch, and by divine dispensation they were, so to say, destined and consecrated on the Cross for the liturgical use of the Church." (Page 322). "The demand that the Mass should everywhere be celebrated in the vernacular, is based for the most part on ignorance, or on an entire misconception of the real nature and object of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. ... The altar is not a pulpit, the Holy Mass is not primarily a doctrinal lecture or an instruction to the people. The Sacrifice is essentially a liturgical action performed by the priest for propitiating and glorifying God, as well as for the salvation of the faithful." (Page 325).

13 For an unmasking of the conspiratorial aspect of the "for all men" innovation and the Masonic animus behind it, see pages 39-50 of my recent booklet (published in December, 1990), Questioning The Validity of McCarthy's Case.

14 Though the invalidating "for all" is embodied in most of the vernacular

versions, the so-called "consecration form" in the English "Mass" is even more corrupt than those in the other vernacular versions. Besides the "for all men so that sins may be forgiven" mutilation in the English language rendition, there are yet other unwarranted deviations in meaning and also in the grammatical structure of the form. These are additional probable sources of invalidity. (For a commentary on this see the above-mentioned Questioning The Validity of McCarthy's Case, pp. 36-39).

15 In my monograph, Questioning the Validity of the Masses using The New, All-English Canon, which first appeared in March of 1968, with Foreword by Father Lawrence S. Brey. For the Subsequent editions, starting with the 3rd in March of 1969, Father Brey also wrote the learned and almost indispensable (from the standpoint of understanding correctly the theology involved) Appendix 4, entitled, "Invalid Consecration Of The Wine Invalidates Or At Least Casts Doubt Upon The Consecration Of The Bread" and an Epilogue. For the subsequent reprinting of Questioning The Validity... in 1975 he painstakingly compiled an invaluable Alphabetic Index with an accompanying commentary.

16 These critical opponents of ours, who have been and are so very zealous in their attempts to discredit our arguments, will, for the sake of brevity, hereinafter be referred to as simply the "Adversarii".

17 "In hoc autem nostra sacramenta antiquae legis sacramentis plurimum praestant, quod in illis administrandis nulla, quod quidem acceperimus, definita forma servaretur; quo etiam fiebat, ut incerta admodum et obscura essent; nostra vero formam verborum ita praescriptam habent, ut, si forte ab ea discedatur, sacramenti ratio constare non possit,...". (Emphasis added).

18 Bradley & Kevane, op. cit., p. 154.

19 "Quum igitur 'pro vobis' dixit, vel eos, qui aderant, vel delectos ex Iudaeorum populo, quales erant discipuli, excepto Iuda, quibuscum loquebatur, significavit. Quum autem addidit: 'pro multis,' reliquos electos ex Iudaeis aut gentibus intelligi voluit. Recte ergo factum est, ut 'pro universis' non diceretur, quum hoc loco tantummodo de fructibus passionis sermo esset, quae salutis fructum delectis solum attulit." (Part II, Chap. IV, Q. XX1V).

20 Bradley & Kevan, op. cit., p. 224.

21 Ibid., footnote 18.

22 For my initial exposure of this attempted ruse by the ICEL refer to Interdum Issue No. 2, (of Feb. 24, 1970), entitled, "The Ventriloquists." In a 'Postscript' included in Questioning The Validity of McCarthy's Case (pp. 66-69), the ICEL's "Aramaic language" hoax is again discussed with a few new side lights.

23 See pages 34-35 of the ICEL's explanatory booklet, *The Roman Canon in English Translation*, published by Geoffrey Chapman, London, Dublin, Melbourne, 1968.

24 Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, p. 179. This is the very source quoted by the ICEL in the booklet mentioned in the preceding footnote.

25 Doronzo, *op. cit.*, p. 150.

26 "Et idem unanimiter docuerunt omnes antiqui Thomistae usque ad Cajetanum, qui recalcitravit" (*De Euch. Sac.*, Dis. 9, Db.3, 2, 22).

27 There were others, however, who regarded him somewhat differently. For example, the learned Dominican Bartholomew Spina, who in his later years was appointed Master of the Sacred Palace, suspected him of having heretical leanings. Spina "relentlessly pursued Cajetan living and dead." (*Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. III, p. 147). Cajetan at one point was selected to meet Luther in order to obtain his submission. John R. Volz, the author of the *Catholic Encyclopedia* article on Cajetan, remarks (p. 146) that some have blamed Cajetan for his failure to avert Luther's defection.

28 "Et licet Scotus, cum multis aliis, dubitet, mihi tamen nulla apparet dubitandi ratio probabilis, sed indubie sentiendum est ut diximus." Quoted by Doronzo, *op. cit.*, p. 152. (Emphasis added).

29 The edition of this date is documented by Cardinal Raymond Capisuccus, O.P., *Controversiae theologicae selectae, contr. 3, de forma consecrationis vini eucharistici*, 1677, p. 208. Although de la Taille cites this obscure work in *The Mystery of Faith*, it is difficult to find its original Latin text. Nevertheless it was located, and the late and beloved Father George Kathrein, C.Ss.R., scholar, theologian and Latinist par excellence, translated into English the entire Controversy 3, from pages 204-222 of the original text. (Incidentally, the *Catholic Encyclopedia* does not mention this Venetian edition of 1533, but it does list a later edition of Cajetan's commentaries, published at Lyons in 1540).

30 Capisuccus, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

31 "The Salmanticenses have ever been held in the highest esteem, particularly at Rome where they are considered a standard work on Thomistic scholasticism." (*Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. XIII, p. 402).

32 Reprints are available. Father Brey's elegantly presented finished product is a potent weapon for inclusion in the armories of all present-day orthodox English-speaking theologians; they, and posterity also, will be indebted to Fr. Brey, not only for this particular jewel, but also for his many other spiritual,

devotional, theological and always soundly instructive doctrinal writings. Like Father Kathrein: scholar, theologian and Latinist.

33 Page 652 of the edition published by Benziger Bros., copyright 1931.

34 Tanquerey, op. cit., pp. 652-653.

35 Tanquerey, *Brevior Synopsis Theologiae Moralis et Pastoralis*, Typis Societatis S. Joannis Evangel., Desclée & Co., Paris, 1933, p. 430.

36 Died Nov. 8, 1308.

37 In *Theologia Moralis* of St. Alphonsus (Lib. VI, Tract. III, Cap. I, Dub. VI, par. 223) we read: "The second more common opinion [namely, that the words 'This is My blood' alone suffice], which Scotus holds in his passage from In 4, distinction 8, question 2 ...". That documentation is not correct. Not only does Scotus not advance this opinion here, but many commentators even cite this selfsame passage of Scotus to demonstrate the contrary. For example, Cajetan, who himself vigorously defends the "short form" position, writes, "Although Scotus and many others doubt it...". And Suarez concedes that the "entire form" position "is very probable and Scotus himself did not venture to contradict it, but left it as a doubtful matter (disp. 60, sect. 1, n. 3)." Also the *Salmanticenses* (op. cit., Sec. 22, on pp. 570-571) quote this passage of Scotus at length to show that he, who so frequently opposed St. Thomas, did not dare to impugn him on this matter. ("Et Scotus, qui tam frequenter impugnat Angelicum Doctorem eligendo sententias ipsi contrarias..."). St. Alphonsus's slip is just that, a mere *lapsus calami*.

38 As quoted by Maurice de la Taille, S.J., op. cit., Book II, p. 440 n. 1.

39 Scotus was an ardent defender of the Immaculate Conception, following his master William of Ware. In this case his penchant for opposing St. Thomas was vindicated nearly six centuries later when the dogma was defined. The *Adversarii* are fond of pointing out that the Angelic Doctor advanced an erroneous opinion on the Immaculate Conception (*Summa Th.*, III Q. 14, A. 3, ad 1), as if that automatically proves that he must also have been wrong in advancing the "entire form" position! There is a valuable Editorial Note entitled, "St. Thomas and the Immaculate Conception," appearing on pages 2161-2162 of Vol. Two of the *Summa* English translation by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Benziger, 1947. It concludes as follows: "And it must not be forgotten that among those who upheld the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, not a few ascribed the privilege as being absolute and not one of preservation and Redemption. Hence it is that St. Thomas insists on two things-- (1) that the Mother of God was redeemed, and (2) that the grace of her sanctification was a grace of preservation. And, be it remarked in conclusion, these two points, so much insisted upon by St. Thomas, are at the very basis of

the Catholic doctrine of the Immaculate Conception."

40 From Disp. 60, Sect. 1, quoted by Doronzo, op. cit., p. 153.

41 Mr. Mann reproduced this commentary, under the date of 12 December 1971, and offered it for sale at 10 cents per copy..

42 "Quidquid sit de opinione S. Doctoris aliorumque theologorum, sententia opposita est communis et moraliter certa" (De sacram., v.1, n. 311), as quoted by Doronzo, op. cit., p. 153.

43 Ibid.

44 "Et ideo illa quae sequuntur sunt essentialia sanguini, prout in hoc sacramento consecratur; et ideo oportet quod sint de substantia formae."

45 "Sed Circa ista verba quibus Ecclesia utitur in consecratione sanguinis, quidam opinantur, quod non omnia sint de necessitate formae, sed solum quod dicitur, 'Hic est calix sanguinis mei,' non autem residuum quod sequitur, 'Novi et aeterni testamenti, mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.' Sed hoc non videtur convenienter dici: nam totum illud quod sequitur est quaedam determinatio praedicati: unde et ad ejusdem locutionis sententiam seu significationem pertinet. Et quia, ut saepe dictum est, formae sacramentorum significando efficiunt, totum pertinet ad vim effectivam formae." (Emphasis added).

46 "Respondeo, Circa hanc formam est duplex opinio: quidam enim dixerunt quod de substantia formae hujus est hoc solum quod dicitur: 'Hic est calix sanguinis mei,' non autem ea quae sequuntur. Sed hoc videtur inconveniens, quia ea quae sequuntur sunt quaedam determinationes praedicati, id est, sanguinis Christi; unde pertinent ad integritatem ejusdem locutionis. Et propter hoc sunt alii qui melius dicunt quod omnia sequentia sunt de substantia formae usque ad hoc quod postea sequitur: 'Haec quotiescumque feceritis,' quod pertinet ad usum hujus sacramenti; unde non est de substantia formae. Et inde est quod sacerdos eodem ritu et modo, scilicet tenendo calicem in manibus, omnia haec verba profert."

47 Billuart inanely claimed that St. Thomas had "changed his mind," because he switched from the word "necessary" in In 1 Cor. XI to the synonymous phrase "of the substance" in the Summa which was written later. Doronzo's comment is: "Quae tam evidentialia sunt ut Billuart ad extremam hanc responsionem confugiat...", (op. cit., p. 158), which could be loosely and idiomatically translated as: Billuart is here grasping at straws.

48 Capisuccus, op. cit., p. 212.

49 "Haec autem explicatio an vera sit juxta mentem D. Thomae non satis percipitur," (Theologia Moralis, in the same par. 223 that was cited earlier).

50 Here they misinterpreted the words of St. Thomas, "ad integritatem ejusdem locutionis," which does not mean "to the integrity of the form," but rather "to the integrity of the recitation (of the form)," which is an important distinction that Doronzo points out, and to which we shall advert later.

51 de la Taille, op, cit., p. 447 (Emphasis added).

52 From "The Holy Eucharist in the Pre-Nicene Church," by Dom John Chapman, O.S.B., an essay included in the collection of papers published under the title, Catholic Faith In The Holy Eucharist, edited by Rev. C. Lattey, S.J., Herder, St. Louis, 1923. The paragraph quoted is from p. 16 of this volume.

53 "Praeterea peculiariter sententiam negativam saltem probabilem faciunt auctoritas Innocentii III infra citandi, magis obvia, ut videtur, interpretatio verborum S. Thomae, et verba Catechismi Conc. Trid. et Missalis Romani infra citanda."

54 "Nec juvat respondere S. Doctorem non docere omnia verba esse de essentia formae sed tantum de substantia formae, ita ut verba 'Hic est sanguis meus' sint de substantia ut pars essentialis, cetera vero de substantia ut pars integralis... Nam, quamvis expressio 'esse de substantia formae' praedicto duplici sensu posset accipi, sic tamen non accipitur hic a S. Thoma. Etenim in q. 60, a. 8, tradens generalem doctrinam de sacramento (quam hic intendit applicare), ait: 'Manifestum est quod si diminuatur aliquid eorum, quae sunt de substantia formae sacramentalis, tollitur debitus sensus verborum: et ideo non perficitur sacramentum.'... Ex quibus omnibus colligitur pro S. Thoma quatuor haec: 'referri non ad usum sed ad ipsum sacramentum -- esse de substantia formae -- esse de necessitate formae -- esse id quo perficitur seu conficitur sacramentum' esse aequivalentia. ... Ceterum S. Thomas non dicit ea verba pertinere ad integritatem formae sed 'ad integritatem ejusdem locutionis,' quae est ipsa substantia seu essentia formae." (Doronzo, op. cit., p. 156, with emphasis added).

55 "For here the blood of the testament or covenant, both in itself (in view of customs of the ancient peoples), and especially as opposed to the sacrifice of Exodus, an opposition which the word 'new' suggests, is necessarily understood as sacrificial, the blood of sacrifice by which God, so propitiated, is bound and pledged to man." (de la Taille, op, cit., p. 443, n. 1).

56 Vol. V, p. 575, 1909 ed.

57 de la Taille, op. cit., p. 442.

58 Decree for the Armenians, from the Bull "Exultate Deo," Nov. 22, 1439, (Denz., no. 698): "Huius sacramenti effectus, quem in anima operatur digne sumentis, est adunatio hominis ad Christum. Et quia per gratiam homo Christo incorporatur et membris eius unitur, consequens est, quod per hoc sacramentum in sumentibus digne gratia augeatur."

59 See Questioning the Validity of McCarthy's Case. On pp. 7-8: "For you and for many unto the remission of sins are the words of the sacramental form for the Holy Eucharist that provide this vital signification of the Res Sacramenti, for the words 'you' and 'many' are the only words of the form that explicitly designate the members of the Mystical Body of Christ, which is the Catholic Church. Moreover, the final phrase, 'unto the remission of sins,' signifies the union of the members, as shall be demonstrated later in Section 5 [on pp. 20-23]."

60 I presented these eight forms currently in use, as found in Attwater's book on page 7 of *Interdum* No. 5, (Oct. 7, 1970).

61 In its pretext of piously going back to "ancient" or "primitive" liturgical forms, The Robber Church has made much of these so-called "Canons of Hippolytus," a Sahidic fragment discovered last century. In fact, according to these Robbers their "Anaphora II" is allegedly "based on the most ancient eucharistic prayer that we possess, namely that of Hippolytus." R.H. Richens, writing in a leaflet published by the Latin Mass Society of England and Wales, states: "There is no direct evidence that his anaphora was ever in liturgical use in the West. Its only certain liturgical use is in Ethiopia ... the Hippolytan anaphora in the Verona fragments, which was never used, as far as is known, as a liturgical text." This tallies with the earlier assessment given in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (Vol. V, pp. 359-360, 1909 ed.): "So far as this present writer (H. Hyvernat) knows, these canons have not yet been the object of a critical study; nor does it seem they were ever published." (Emphasis added).

62 de la Taille, op, cit., p. 400, n. 1.

63 Salmanticenses, op. cit., p. 571.

64 A young friend advised me (and the reader will observe that I have ignored his advise) to omit this letter and my ensuing comments on it, for the following sensible reason. Being a good Latin scholar who is fond of quoting St. Jerome, he suggested that I ponder these words of that most forthright "no nonsense" Doctor, which he had ventured to translate for me: "Recently I was asked by the brethren to make a reply against a book by a certain Helvidius. I hesitated to do this, not because it would be a difficult task to refute in the assertion of truth a boorish bumpkin [his somewhat colorful translation à la Cicero of 'hominem rusticanum'] who had scarcely been taught his first letters, but for fear that by replying I should be admitting that he posed a danger

demanding confutation." (From Lib I, "De Perpet. Virg. B. Mariae").

65 A Brief commentary on this, pointing out the fatuity in claiming St. Thomas knew no Greek, is given (on p.3069 of Volume Three of the English-language Summa cited earlier) in the biographical sketch on St. Thomas by Rev. Reginald M. Coffey, O.P.

66 Heribert Jone & Urban Adelman, Moral Theology, Newman Press, Westminster, Md., 1955, No. 493, p. 346.

67 Ibid.

68 Pope Pius XII, Sacramentum Ordinis, (Denz. no. 2301), with emphasis added throughout.

69 Pope Innocent III, the letter Cum Marthae Circa, Nov. 29, 1202 (see Denz., nos. 414-415). Commenting on the ICEL Robbers' despoliation of the consecration form by expunging therefrom these words of Christ, which Tradition tells us He handed down to the Apostles, the "translators" of the "Robber Catechism" (in a footnote on p. 221) remark (with a typically Protestant or "Born Again Christian" slant): "The phrase in the consecration of the wine which was not strictly Scriptural, viz., 'the mystery of faith,' was deleted."

70 Capisuccus, op. cit., pp. 213-214.

71 Ibid.

72 Ibid.

73 Capisuccus, op. cit., pp. 214-215.

74 Innocent III, op. cit., (Denz., no. 414).

75 From the "Vindication of the Bull 'Apostolicae Curae'."

76 The name given by Luther to those who opposed the doctrine of the Real Presence.

77 Vol V, p. 578, 1909 ed.

78 See especially Adrian Fortescue, The Orthodox Eastern Church, Catholic Truth Society, London, 1929, pp. 264-268. Also cf. *ibid.* and Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. 14, p. 456, 1946.

79 There are three classes of liturgies we always automatically suspect a

priori as being of doubtful validity: those of heretics, of schismatics, and of Ethiopians.

80 The Maronites were of course not required to use Latin for their liturgy, but were allowed to continue celebrating in their accustomed language. Though the Mass as a whole is in Arabic, the consecration formulas for the Body and Blood were translated into Aramaic, the ancient language spoken by Our Lord. The earlier dishonest claim by ICEL that the supposedly impoverished Aramaic language makes no distinction between "many" and "all" was clearly disproved as far back as 1592, when the Maronite linguists correctly translated "many" into the Aramaic word "saggi'a," which is the same word found in the Syriac Peshito Bible (Matt. 26, 28).

81 See the section, "History of the Maronites," on pp 685-687 of the Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. IX.

82 From the Constitution, "Nuper ad nos," March 16, 1743, Denz., no. 1469.

83 See Summa Th., III, Q. 60, A. 8.

84 In his encyclical *Mortalium Animos* (1928). For documentation of the Pontiff's condemnation, followed by a discussion of its applicability to the "for all men" mutilation of the consecration form see *Questioning The Validity of McCarthy's Case*, pp. 50-62.

85 "(W)e must agree with the judgment of those who attribute the intellectual debility of our times -- a condition from which such grave evils arise -- chiefly to ignorance of divine things. Fittingly has it been said by our predecessor, Benedict XIV: 'We declare that the greater part of those who are damned have brought the calamity on themselves by ignorance of the mysteries of the faith, which they should have known and believed, in order to be united with the elect'." -- From the encyclical *Acerbo Nimis*, Pope St. Pius X, April 15, 1905.

86 "Christ determined what special graces were to be conferred by means of external rites: for some sacraments (e.g., Baptism, the Eucharist) He determined minutely (in specie) the matter and form: for others He determined only in a general way (in genere) that there should be an external ceremony, by which special graces were to be conferred, leaving to the Apostles or to the Church the power to determine whatever He had not determined, e.g., to prescribe the matter and form of the Sacraments of Confirmation and Holy Orders." (Catholic Encyclopedia, V. XIII, p. 299, 1913 ed.) From this it is evident that Pius XII, as Vicar of Christ, had the power and the right to determine more precisely the matter of Holy Orders, as was observed earlier. Cf. also the pamphlet, *Has The Church The Right?*, for the explanation of how this distinction has a bearing upon the supposed ecclesiastical "approval" of the vernacular pseudo-Masses which contain tamperings with the substance of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist.

87 Canon 1 of the Seventh Session (March 3, 1547), see Denz., no. 844. This teaching had been defined earlier at the Council of Lyons II in 1274 (See Denz., no. 465) and by the Council of Florence in 1439 (Denz., no. 695). Subsequent to the Council of Trent, Pope Pius IV in his Bull *Injunctum nobis* (Nov. 13, 1565) included in the "Profession of Faith in the Council of Trent" the solemn avowal of belief in the "seven Sacraments of the New Law instituted by Jesus Christ Our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind..." (Denz., no. 996).

88 The Council of Trent defined the acts of the penitent to be the matter of this Sacrament. See Chap. 3 "The Parts and Fruits of This Sacrament" (Penance) and also Canon 4 of Session XIV (Nov. 25, 1551). The Catechism of the Council of Trent comments thus: "With regard to what has been said by some, that the sins themselves are the matter of this Sacrament, if we attend carefully it will be seen that it differs not at all [from what the Council itself has laid down]; for as we say that wood which is consumed by the force of fire is the matter of fire; so sins which are destroyed by penance may also be properly called the matter of this Sacrament." (Part II, Chap. V, Q. XIII).

89 Acts, Chap. 9.

90 Translated from the French by Rev. John J. Burke, C.S.P., S.T.D., Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1932.

91 Bull *Exultate Deo*, which was later incorporated into the Acts of the Council of Florence as the "Decree for the Armenians," (see Denz., no. 696).

92 Encyclical *Tametsi*, Nov. 1, 1900.

93 Friedrich Jürgensmeier, D.D., Rector of the Archiepiscopal Seminary, Paderborn, *The Mystical Body of Christ As The Basic Principle of Religious Life*, Bruce, Milwaukee, p. 205.

94 Jürgensmeier, *op. cit.*, p. 247.

95 *Theologia Moralis*, Lib. 6, Tract. 3, Cap. 1, dub. 1, par. 189.

96 The article entitled, *Res Sacramenti* (which comprised issue no. 3 of *Interdum*) was devoted primarily to the study of the *Res Sacramenti* of the Holy Eucharist. Baptism and Confirmation were investigated as well, in order to gain some insights into the *Res Sacramenti* of other Sacraments besides the Holy Eucharist. However, the threefold "cornerstone" structure was not considered then, because your author did not at that time have a sufficient understanding of it.

- 97 Lib. IV Sententiarum, Dist. 8, Q. 1.
- 98 Words spoken at a weekly general audience, as cited in *The Dialog*, June 17, 1983.
- 99 See Denz., no. 415.
- 100 See Denz., no. 698.
- 101 Ibid. Emphasis added.
- 102 See Denz no. 875.
- 103 See Denz., no. 882.
- 104 See Denz., no. 873a.
- 105 Bull Apostolicae Curae, 1896.
- 106 Ibid.
- 107 Summa Th., III, Q. 79, A. 7, ad 2.
- 108 John O'Brien, A.M., *A History of the Mass and Its Ceremonies in the Eastern and Western Church*, 1881, p. 333. O'Brien further displays brilliantly his total ignorance on p. 331, where he writes: "According to the best authorities, and Pope Benedict XIV [who teaches exactly the opposite of what O'Brien claims] among others, the word 'many' is here [in the wine-consecration] to be taken as meaning all, a mode of expression by no means uncommon in the Holy Scripture. St. Thomas Aquinas also interprets it in this way." This last obtuse remark only proves that O'Brien did not actually read St. Thomas, who clearly teaches the opposite, just as he apparently never laid eyes on Benedict XIV's *De Sacrosancto Missae Sacrificio*.
- 109 Summa Th., III, Q. 74, A. 6.
- 110 Session XXII, Sept. 17, 1562, Chap. 7. See Denz., no. 945.
- 111 Summa Th., III, Q. 83, A. 5, ad 7: "(T)he distinction of His Mystical Body according to its various states."
- 112 Summa Th., III, Q. 83, A. 5, ad 8.
- 113 Part III, Q. 73, A. 6. (Emphasis added).

- 114 Part III, Q. 73, A. 3. (Emphasis added).
- 115 Part III, Q. 73, A. 2.
- 116 Part III, Q. 49, A. 1.
- 117 Part III, Q. 60, A. 3.
- 118 Summa Th., III, Q. 79, A. 1. (Emphasis added).
- 119 Summa Th., III, Q. 74, A. 1. (Emphasis added).
- 120 Summa Th., III, Q. 60, A. 6.
- 121 In Latin: "multi"; in Greek: "polloi", in Aramaic: "saggi'a".
- 122 Bull Apostolicae Curae, 1896.
- 123 From "The Holy Eucharist in the Latin Fathers: St. Augustine," by the Rev. J.B. Jaggar, S.J., an essay included in the collection of papers published under the title, Catholic Faith In The Holy Eucharist, edited by Rev. C. Lattey, S.J., Herder, St. Louis, 1923. The paragraph is quoted from p. 65 of this volume.
- 124 Part II, Chap. I, Q. XVII.
- 125 Père Maurice de la Taille, S.J., develops this theme in Thesis XXXV of The Mystery of Faith (which we have cited frequently in this present book). For example, we read on pp. 442-443: "But Christ did in fact will that the conversion of the bread and wine into His Body and Blood should be a sacrifice, by transubstantiation He willed to offer sacrifice, He willed to offer the transubstantiation sacrificially... This being His will, the mere indication of His Body and Blood would not suffice for His purpose in the line of sacramental form: for it would not express this purpose, as we have said above; it was necessary that a further determination should be added to this demonstration of the Body and Blood, by which it would be plain that what was done was sacrificial, immolative."
- 126 In Questioning The Validity of the Masses using The New, All-English Canon; Issue No. 3 of Interdum, entitled "Res Sacramenti"; and more recently in Questioning The Validity of McCarthy's Case.
- 127 "Christum Dominum, qui vera gratia... est." (Part II, Chap. IV, Q. 3).
- 128 Quoted from p. 251 of My Catholic Faith, published by My Mission House, Kenosha, Wis., 1955, and authored by Most Rev. Louis La Ravoire Morrow,

S.T.D. (consecrated Bishop of Krishnagar, India in 1939). It should be noted that sacramental grace is generally held by theologians to be habitual grace, which is a created and finite habit.

EXCERPTS FROM MONSIGNOR McCARTHY AGAIN! ANOTHER FIASCO!

By
Patrick Henry Omlor

The following four items appeared in the above-named book, which was first published in September of 1992. Some of the text reproduced below has been slightly revised and updated.

Item 1: Some Historical Background

The subversive Innovators of the ICEL (International Committee on English in the Liturgy) were the original protagonists, namely, the chief performers who started it all thirty years ago, when on October 22, 1967 they introduced in the United States their "All-English Canon," which was purportedly a mere translation from the Latin of the Canon of the ancient Roman Mass.

From the very outset there were very many Catholics, clergy and laity alike, who opposed this new and revolutionary "All-English Canon," not only on the grounds that it was a deviation from the traditional Mass, nor merely on the grounds that its English is quite pedestrian, nor on the grounds that the Latin must be preserved, nor because through sheer unbending resistance to change they simply wanted to keep intact that which they had always been accustomed to have.

On the contrary, they opposed the subversive Innovators and their many apologists because the English "translation" (which is what it was brazenly called) from the Latin is no translation at all, but rather a mutilation and a falsification of the true words of the Mass, most seriously those in the Words of Consecration.

Archbishop Robert J. Dwyer of Portland, Oregon, was quoted as follows in *Twin Circle*, June 21, 1970: "The ICEL has performed its task so poorly as to raise serious questions as to its competence. Never was there the slightest consultation with the bishops of the English-speaking world; here is a signal instance of bureaucracy inflicting its will by methods which can only be described as highhanded."

The falsification of the Words of Consecration renders these so-called "Masses" in the vernacular invalid as Masses and hence not true Catholic Masses at all. And this matter of the invalidity of the vernacular liturgies is the issue on which our battle with the protagonists has been waged for more than a quarter of a century.

Within a very short period of time after QTV (Questioning The Validity of the Masses using The New, All-English Canon) was first released (March 1968), quite a few critical reviews and articles appeared. What was surprising at the time was that without exception they were "conservative" publications that carried those reviews, all of which were authored by "traditionalist" priests and laymen. While many of the "conservative" critics agreed with the major portions of our argumentation and did not contest our documentation, they nevertheless balked at accepting the awesome final line; namely, that the ICEL's product is thoroughly ersatz, no Mass at all. On the other hand, the Modernist "Robber Church" clergy and laity were giving QTV the silent treatment, hoping the problem would go away, and it wasn't until early 1970 that they went on the defense in public print.

Father Lawrence Brey and many other sound theologians (for example, those priests who had letters printed in Homiletic and Pastoral Review and other publications), and also your present writer were kept busy refuting these counter-arguments. So unconvincing were those attempts by our opponents that, by default, our own case was strengthened considerably, at least in the minds of those who were intelligently following the issue. For some of those specious counter-arguments led us to undertake additional research and thus enabled us to bring to light more and more valuable theological, liturgical, and philological evidence in support of our thesis.

The extent of the interest in this invalidity issue at that time and some indication of the considerable number of Catholics who had understood our arguments are revealed by the following. The Wanderer, one of the oldest and most widely read "conservative" journals, was then conducting a virtual crusade against us, parading one author after the other in a series of adverse articles and editorials. The editorial in the issue of March 12, 1970, complained thus about the amount of correspondence The Wanderer was receiving in support of the invalidity thesis: "This assertion of invalidity unfortunately has gained acceptance among not a few Catholics. (The Wanderer has received several hundred letters in support of this thesis during the past two years.)"

The editorial continued, "It is our hope that Fr. James McNerney's scholarly and precise refutation of the invalidity arguments (see p. 8) will reassure and set at rest the troubled consciences of those who have been disturbed by the unfortunate controversy." The only troubled consciences over the "unfortunate controversy" at that time belonged to the bishops and priests who were using the bogus rite. The final upshot was that Fr. McNerney's scholarly and precise refutation successfully refuted precisely nothing; and it probably triggered off the

descent of yet another avalanche of mail onto the desk of the beleaguered Editor.

By late 1969 the "invalidity issue" had aroused a lot of attention, not only in the English-speaking world but also internationally, because the same falsely translated Consecration form, "for you and for all men," occurred in the Spanish, German, Portuguese, Italian, and in fact most of the other vernacularized liturgies which were popping up all over the place.

Finally, The Enemy entered the picture. In the January 1970 issue of *Notitiae*, the official organ of the ICEL and its international counterparts, the argument was advanced that in the Aramaic language there was no way of expressing the idea, "for all men," and so Our Lord was forced to say "for many," while He really meant "all men"! This philological fraud was exposed and exploded in "The Ventriloquists," which first appeared as Issue No. 2 of *Interdum* (Feb. 24, 1970). It is again discussed with some additional useful information in *POSTSCRIPT 2 of Questioning the Validity of McCarthy's Case* (1990); and finally *The Charlatans* (1993) is an essay in which this topic is again investigated, but more exhaustively than before.

The next issue of *Notitiae* (Feb. 1970) carried an article by Max Zerwick, S.J. It was written in Latin, which was a fortunate thing in that most of the English-speaking bishops and priests (whose great proficiency in Latin enabled them to deem the ICEL "translation" just fine and dandy) were thus unable to read it and get brainwashed. Distancing himself from the phony argument that had appeared in the January issue, Zerwick apologized that it should have been advanced "with some reservation" (*paulo cautius*), meaning in ordinary parlance, as we all knew, that it was absolutely groundless in the first place.

Item 2: The ICEL's "Form" Contains Four Flagrant Deviations

In the "All-English Canon" of October 22, 1967, the ICEL subversives gave the following "form" for the wine-consecration:

"this is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant -- the mystery of faith. This blood is to be shed for you and for all men so that sins may be forgiven."

Since this original "translation" of 1967, the ICEL has meddled with it two more times, so that it now reads:

"This is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant. It will be shed for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven."
The foregoing "form" consists of two sentences, with exactly fifteen words in each sentence. In those thirty words the ICEL deviated four times from the established form set down in the Roman Missal and in Part V of *De Defectibus* in

Celebratione Missarum Occurrentibus, which is a section of the official rubrics accompanying the Missal.

The four flagrant deviations in the ICEL's "sacramental form" are as follows:

- (1) The breaking up of the form into two sentences. This has serious theological implications. Section 8 of Questioning the Validity of McCarthy's Case treats of this matter.
- (2) The omission of the words, "the mystery of faith." The consequences of that omission are discussed at length in No "Mystery of Faith" : No Mass (1994).
- (3) The changing of "for you and for many unto the remission of sins" to "for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven."
- (4) After the first words, "This is the cup of my blood," the words "the blood" are inserted: "the blood of the new and everlasting covenant... etc." At first glance this insertion would seem to be only a strange one, but the ICEL's Innovators do nothing without a purpose in mind. This innovation has serious implications.

In the true Latin Rite form for the consecration of the wine: "For this is the Chalice of my Blood, of the new and eternal testament: the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins," ALL the words following the word "which" in the final words of the form refer to the word "chalice" in the introductory words of the form, NOT to the word "blood." Hence, in the ICEL's "form": "This is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant. It will be shed for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven" the insertion of the words "the blood" makes the words following "It" refer to "blood" rather than to "cup," thus deviating from the meaning of the true consecration form.

The translation into English of the Douay-Rheims Bible was the work of that most excellent theologian and linguistics scholar Father Gregory Martin (some scant details about him and also a reproduction of his portrait appear in Questioning the Validity of McCarthy's Case). The original edition was filled throughout with valuable annotations, but they were for the most part subsequently omitted by Bishop Richard Challoner in his revised editions (1749 and 1750). It is among those original annotations for Chapter XXII of the Gospel of St. Luke that we find the following important demonstration that the word "chalice" and not the word "blood" governs the pronoun "which" and is the antecedent of the words that follow "which."

"Which shall be shed. It is much to be observed that the relative, 'which, ' in these words is not governed or ruled (as some would perhaps think) by the noun 'blood,' but by the word 'chalice.' Which is most plain by the Greek. Which taketh away all cavillations and shifts from the Protestants, both against the real presence and the true Sacrificing. For it sheweth evidently, that the blood as the contents of the chalice, or as in the chalice [emphasis added], is shed for us (for

so the Greek readeth in the present tense) [i.e., 'which is being shed'] and not only as upon the cross [emphasis added]. And therefore as it followeth thereof invincibly, that it is no bare figure, but his blood indeed, so it ensueth necessarily, that it is a Sacrifice, and propitiatory, because the chalice (that is, the Blood contained in the same) is shed for our sins."...

"And this text proveth all this so plainly that Beza [16th-century Calvinist] turneth himself roundly upon the Holy Evangelist, charging him with solecism or false Greek, or else that the words (which yet he confesseth to be in all copies Greek and Latin) are thrust into the text out of some other place : which he rather standeth upon than that St. Luke should speak incongruously in so plain a matter. And therefore he saith plainly that it cannot be truly said neither of the chalice itself nor of the contents thereof : which is indeed to give the lie to the blessed Evangelist, or to deny this to be Scripture. So clear is the Scripture for us, so miserable flights and shifts is falsehood put unto, God be thanked." This clear analysis proves that the ICEL's words deviate from the sense of the correct form by inserting the words "the blood," thus making "blood" instead of "chalice" (or "cup," as they put it) the antecedent governing that which is being shed. By thus introducing this false construction the Innovators subtly succeeded in destroying a powerful affirmation of these Catholic truths: transubstantiation, the Real Presence, the true sacrificial action of the Mass and its propitiatory nature.

In the passage cited above the annotators of the Rheims New Testament ably explain how all these truths are emphasized by means of the word "chalice" instead of the word "blood" governing "which" in the words that follow. By their false construction, which suppresses those truths, the destroyers of the ICEL with their bogus "consecration form" thereby deny them. For whenever there is the deliberate suppression of a concept that previously prevailed, the intention to deny it is automatically and necessarily implied.

Other vernacularized liturgies have the same serious destruction of meaning. For example, the Italian text begins, "Poiché questo è il calice del mio sangue....," and then resumes by repeating "the blood" : "è il sangue sparso ... etc." In the German version we read, "This is the chalice of the new and eternal testament, my blood, which shall be shed... etc." ("Das ist der Kelch des neuen und ewigen Bundes, mein Blut, das für euch und für Alle ... u.s.w.").

Item 3: Summa Theologica, Part 111, Q. 78, Article 1

Those illustrious Discalced Carmelite theologians of Salamanca, Spain (16th-17th centuries), known as the Salmanticenses, were as a group the most learned followers of all time of the mind of St. Thomas. "Consequently they made strict adherence to Thomism their fundamental principle, and carried it out with greater consistency than probably any other commentators of the neo-Scholastic period. ... [S]uch uniformity and consistency were obtained that it could be claimed that

there was not a single contradiction in any of these immense works, although nearly a century elapsed between the publication of the first and the appearance of the final instalment. ... The Salmanticenses have ever been held in the highest esteem, particularly at Rome where they are considered a standard work on Thomistic scholasticism." (The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. XIII, p. 402, 1912.)

An obscure 17th-century Dominican named Martin Serra claimed that St. Thomas held that the mere words "This is the Chalice of my Blood" are sufficient for the valid consecration of the wine, and the remainder of the sacramental form, namely, "of the new and eternal testament: the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins" is not required for validity. Serra based his argument on Article 1 of Question 78 in Part III of the Summa Theologica, which he (Serra) completely misunderstood. Unfortunately there are others nowadays who harbor the same unfounded notion. Therefore it is necessary to reproduce the Salmanticenses' brilliant refutation of Martin Serra. The following is from De Eucharistiae Sacramento, Q. LXXVIII, Disp. IX, Dub. III, Sec. 2, par. 26, which appears on pp. 573-574 of Vol. XVIII of the Paris edition (1882) of the Salmanticenses' Cursus Theologicus.

"Forasmuch as opposites are more apparent when placed side by side, and in order to avert the possibility of being confronted once again with the question of the Holy Doctor's meaning, we shall set forth the arguments adduced by various Thomists against our opinion. St. Thomas, they say, remarks in Summa, III, Q. 78, Art. 1, Reply to Objection 4, that 'If a priest were to pronounce only the aforesaid words with the intention of confecting the sacrament, etc.' Now by the 'aforesaid words' we must understand him to mean the words of consecration which he had set forth in the title of the article. But the title reads: 'Whether this is the form of the sacrament, This is My Body, and This is the Chalice of My Blood.' Therefore it is the opinion of the Holy Doctor that only the following words are of the essence, or are necessary, for the consecration of the chalice: 'This is the Chalice of My Blood.' Serra places so much stock in this argument and line of reasoning that he would have St. Thomas teaching that the changing of wine into blood occurs by the agency of those words alone." ...

"To this we might reply as follows. In the passage under consideration the Holy Doctor's only concern was so to determine the bare minimum of words that are universally received as being essential for the consecration, as to place them beyond questioning. Whether other words besides these are required for the consecration of the chalice he did not care to state in that passage, namely, Art. 1, but he reserved the discussion of that issue for Art. 3, where he fully considered the question. Therefore we must understand him exactly as he explained the Master of Sentences [Peter Lombard] (In IV, d. 8), in his commentary on the letter, where he said 'It is not the intention of the Master in this passage to determine definitively the precise words which effect consecration, but only to explain that the consecration is effected by the words of

the Lord.'

"The reply given in the text itself corroborates this: for when the Holy Doctor says: 'If a priest were to pronounce only the aforesaid words with the intention of confecting this sacrament, this sacrament would be valid,' his meaning is not at all such as would be favorable to our opponents, that is to say, that these words alone are required for sacramental validity [of the wine-consecration]: 'This is the Chalice of My Blood'. His meaning is quite different and in no way similar to that: viz., that it is the words which precede [emphasis added] : 'Qui pridie quam pateretur, etc.' [i.e., the narrative preambles 'Who the day before He suffered, etc.' for the bread; and 'In like manner, after He had supped, taking also this excellent chalice, etc.' for the wine] which are not required. This is evident from both the Objection itself as well as from his reply thereto." ...

"Such was the difficulty with which St. Thomas was dealing, thus posing a question quite different from that which [our opponents suppose].... and leading to the demonstration of an entirely different matter. Furthermore, the Objection pertains to both elements of the sacramental form, to both the bread and the wine.

"Thus both in the Objection and in the Reply it is manifest that he is not treating of those words, 'of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins' but of others, namely of those that precede, and, as it were, introduce the consecratory form. 'Qui pridie quam pateretur, etc.' ... and it is those words only which St. Thomas declares unnecessary... But in no part of this Article 1 does he touch upon the present controversy. Consequently, it is evident that the author of whom we spoke above [Martin Serra] erred in his assertion that St. Thomas' teaching in this passage is contrary to ours: in fact, neither explicitly nor implicitly did he teach what Serra makes him teach, for on that occasion he was not even discussing the matter of the essential form, since it was not relevant to the question being considered in Article I."

Occasionally in their homilies on transubstantiation or on the truth of the Real Presence the Fathers (e.g., St. Justin, St. John Damascene) say that the words of consecration are "This is My Body, This is the Chalice of My Blood." Now no one would seriously cite these passages to show that they considered these words alone to be essential for validity. One would easily see that the purpose of the homily was to teach transubstantiation, etc., not to teach the precise form of words required for validity. In his classic work, *The Mystery of Faith*, the distinguished scholar Fr. Maurice de la Taille, S.J. discusses this point:

"I pass over an objection from patristic authority in which it is presumed that: when the Fathers say, as they often do, that the consecration is effected at the words This is my body, this is my blood, they must be taken thereby to determine the precise series of formal words which is required. But what these Fathers

actually mean to convey is: that at the enunciation of the work which is done, that work which is enunciated is done (as the Salmanticenses justly remark ...). Much in the same way St. Thomas, having said briefly in art. 1, ad. 4m of the same question 78, that were the priest to make use of these words alone, This is my body, This is the chalice of my blood, without any narrative preamble, he would consecrate, goes on to say, nevertheless, in article 3, that the words This is the chalice of my blood would not suffice without the words which follow them." (The Mystery of Faith, Sheed and Ward, London and New York, 1950, Thesis XXXV, Book II, p. 441, footnote 2).

Item 4: What Is Common To All Liturgies Is Irrelevant

That most excellent theologian Cardinal John de Lugo, S.J. (1583-1660), once asserted that in our own Latin Rite and in all the Eastern rites, even the ancient ones no longer in use, the only words of the wine-consecration that are common to all those liturgies are the words: "This is my Blood." From this he claimed that those are the only words that are absolutely essential for the validity of the consecration of the Precious Blood. But that claim, based only on what happens to be common to the various liturgies, is clearly untenable, as was demonstrated by the Salmanticenses in the tract *De Eucharistiae Sacramento*, Q. LXXVIII, Disp. IX, Dub. III, Sec. 2, pars. 30-32, which is included in their comprehensive work *Cursus Theologicus*.

Although the following is not part of the Salmanticenses' argument, it would seem to demonstrate the same ultimate conclusion. In our Latin Rite the sacramental form for the Sacrament of Confirmation consists of the following words: "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." In the Byzantine Rite the form for Confirmation consists of simply these nine words: "The seal of the gift of the Holy Ghost." Since the words, "the Holy Ghost," are the only words common to those two forms, it is evident that considering that which is common to the sacramental forms of the various rites is not any criterion at all for determining what is essential for validity. Otherwise one would have to conclude absurdly that the mere words, "The Holy Ghost" suffice for validly conferring the Sacrament of Confirmation.

THE CHARLATANS

By Patrick Henry Omlor

A little inquisition into the words and the works of the International Committee on English in the Liturgy.

"One of the most controversial ICEL translations from the very beginning has been the rendering of the Latin *pro multis* in the words of (the wine) consecration

as 'for all', instead of the literal 'for many'." -- The Catholic World Report, August 1992, p. 40.

"But those words which are added: [For you and for many] are taken severally from S. Matthew and S. Luke, which notwithstanding Holy Church, taught by the Spirit of God, has join'd together: but they belong to the fruit of the Passion, and shew the profitableness thereof: For if we look at the vertue of it, it must be confess'd, that our Savior shed his Blood for the salvation of all men. But if we look at the fruit which men gather from thence, we may easily understand that it comes not to all to advantage, but only to some. ...

"Rightly therefore was it done, that it was not said 'for all', seeing that in this place the design of the discourse extends only to the fruits of the Passion, which brought the Fruit of Salvation only to the Elect." -- Catechism of the Council of Trent, original English translation, London, 1687, pp. 206-207.

APPENDIX

Note of Clarification on the Translation of "pro multis" in the Eucharistic Prayers

With its original submission in 1968 of a translation of the several eucharistic prayers, ICEL provided extensive notes and explanations. Among these explanations was a brief note on the translation of the words *pro multis* in the words of institution, namely, "for all men". The translation was offered as a faithful, accurate rendering of the sense of the original biblical text, even though it does not appear to be a "literal" translation.

Although this translation was approved by the various English-speaking conferences of bishops and confirmed by the Holy See, criticisms of the rendering of *pro multis* have been raised from time to time. These criticisms sometimes indicate a misunderstanding not only of the original biblical text but also of the doctrine of redemption that it conveys.

Before proceeding with a note of clarification on this translation, it should be mentioned that in 1980 ICEL issued a draft translation of the eucharistic prayers that contained a limited number of revisions. These few revisions were proposed by ICEL primarily in order to eliminate anything in these liturgical texts that had been judged to be exclusive or exclusionary, in particular, anything that could be considered discriminatory to women. The proposed translation of *pro multis* in the 1980 text was "for all." This was accompanied by a note explaining the revision in terms of the need for inclusive language. This change was subsequently approved by the conferences of bishops of the United States, of Canada, and of New Zealand and has been confirmed by the Holy See.

The occasional criticisms raised over the years of "for all men" would also apply to "for all," since it is the "all" that seems to be at issue. Thus, the following biblical reflections are offered in view of both forms of translation, although only

the most recent version. "for all," will be referred to.

The expression "for all" in the words of institution is an accurate translation of the Greek phrase ὑπὲρ πολλῶν, literally "for many." Mark 14:24.1 This may be shown by the following biblical considerations.

1. St. Paul used the phrase "for many" to mean "for all" in the precise context of the significance of our Lord's sacrifice on the cross. Romans 5:18 states that the sin of one person (Adam) led to condemnation for all (εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπων) and that the "act of righteousness" of one person (Jesus) led to acquittal and life for all (εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπων), yet the very next sentence, 5:19, repeats the same thought in different words, this time using "many" (πολλοί) in place of "all": "For as by one man's disobedience 'many' (οἱ πολλοί) were made sinners, so by one man's obedience 'many' (οἱ πολλοί) will be made righteous." Certainly it would be untrue to think that only "many," and not all, were made sinners through the disobedience of Adam, yet Romans 5:19 reads "many" and 5:18 reads "all." Again, Romans 5:15 declares, "For if 'many' died through one man's trespass, much more have the grace of God and the free gift in the grace of that one man Jesus Christ abounded for 'many.'" Indeed, not "many" but rather all died "through one man's trespass," and the grace of Christ abounded not only for "many" but for all, as is shown in Romans 11:32, "For God has consigned all (τοὺς πάντας) to disobedience, that he may have mercy upon all (τοὺς πάντας)," and 1 Corinthians 15:22, "For as in Adam all (πάντες) die, so also in Christ shall all (πάντες) be made alive." See also 1 Corinthians 10:33.

2. "Many" stands for "all" elsewhere in the New Testament. Compare Mark 10:45, "For the Son of man also came...to give his life as a ransom for 'many' (ἀντι πολλῶν)," with 1 Timothy 2:5-6, "...Christ Jesus, who gave himself as a ransom for all (ὑπὲρ πάντων)" and Romans 8:32, "He who did not spare his own Son but gave him up for us all (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων)."

3. At this point one may ask why the expression "many" often stands for "all" in the New Testament. The answer is twofold.

a. First, Greek πολλοί translates Hebrew rabbim (Aramaic saggī'in). The Hebrew or Aramaic word means "many," but it can be used in both an EXCLUSIVE sense, "many, but not all" and in an INCLUSIVE sense, "the many, namely all." The inclusive use is found, for example, in Daniel 12:2, "And 'many' (Hebrew rabbim: Greek πολλοί) of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." The context shows that all will rise, some to everlasting life and the rest to everlasting contempt.

The Hebrew and Aramaic words for "many" have an inclusive sense because their word for "all" (Hebrew kōl: Aramaic kollā) is limited in this regard. It really means "totality," and considers things in terms of their wholeness but not as a

sum of many parts.² The latter sense is supplied by *rabbim*, and its Greek translation *polloi*, used inclusively, as in the above cases where this was shown either from the context (Daniel 12:2; 1 Corinthians 10:33) or by comparison with parallel statements (Romans 5:15,19 parallel to Romans 5:18; Romans 11:32; and 1 Corinthians 15:22; or Mark 10:45 parallel to 1 Timothy 2:5-6 and Romans 8:32).

b. A second reason for the use of the expression *ὡς πρὸς πολλῶν* ("for many") rather than *ὡς πρὸς πάντων* ("for all") in the New Testament words of institution is the probable allusion to Isaiah 53: 12. "...yet he bore the sin of 'many' (Hebrew *rabbim*, Greek *pollvn*). That 'many' here means "all" is indicated by Isaiah 53:6, "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way, and the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all (Hebrew *kullānû*; Greek *ὡς ὅσων*)."

New Testament texts such as Romans 5:15,19; Mark 10:45, as well as the words of institution of the eucharist, Mark 12:24 and parallels, most probably allude to Isaiah 53:12.³

In conclusion, it should be noted that matters of translation are always in dispute. Often, whether in biblical texts or liturgical texts, a preferable version must be chosen among several possibilities. Neither "for all" nor "for many" should be considered to be incorrect translations of *pro multis*. In view of the considerations presented above, however, "for all" must be considered preferable in preserving the genuine significance of the original and for allowing the least possibility of misunderstanding. The English word "many" is not used in the same way as its counterpart in Hebrew, Aramaic, or biblical Greek, with the inclusive meaning "the many, namely all." The "for all" translation is furthermore supported by Romans 5:18 and 8:32; 1 Corinthians 15:22 and 1 Timothy 2:6. It is worth mentioning that because the same sort of reasoning is followed in the official translation of *pro multis* into German, Spanish, and Italian, the journal published by the Congregation for Sacraments and Divine Worship, *Notitiae*, has twice explained the legitimacy of these versions.⁴

THE CHARLATANS

The experts of the International Committee on English in the Liturgy (ICEL) have published an apologia of their translation of these Latin words of the wine-consecration: "*pro multis*," as "for all" in English. It is entitled, "Note of Clarification on the Translation of 'pro multis' in the Eucharistic Prayers," and it is reproduced in its entirety (see appendix 1). For the sake of brevity it will hereinafter be denoted by the abbreviation: "NoC"; i.e., "Note of Clarification." The ICEL's English version of the Canon of the Mass, first introduced in the United States on October 22, 1967, rendered the phrase, "*pro multis in remissionem peccatorum*," as "for all men so that sins may be forgiven" instead of the correct literal translation, namely, "for many unto the remission of sins." In its subsequent English version of the "*Novus Ordo Missae*," which appeared

several years later, the ICEL retained the same "for all men, etc." in the words of the wine-consecration. Much later, circa 1980, they changed "for all men" to "for all," thus dropping the word "men," a move that served to placate the noisy (and noisome) "Feminist Movement," which perforce frowns upon such "sexist" language as "for all MEN."

A little less than five months after the debut (October 22, 1967) of the ICEL's original "All-English Canon" -- that is, on St. Patrick's Day of 1968 -- the first edition of my monograph entitled, *Questioning The Validity of the Masses using the New, All English Canon*, was released. As its title indicates, this monograph sets forth a case showing that the ICEL's "Mass," by virtue of its corrupted wine-consecration form, violates certain fundamental principles of sacramental theology, so that it must be deemed invalid as a Catholic Mass; it is no Mass at all. From the recent article entitled, "For All"?, on page 40 of the August 1992 issue of *The Catholic World Report*, it is evident that the pro multis "invalidity thesis" is far from a dead issue in the minds of many of the Catholic clergy and laity.

For more than twenty-five years now I have unwaveringly stood by my case with all its evidence; and from the beginning in 1968 I have defended it against all my adversaries, first via the eight issues of my journal *Interdum* and thereafter in five articles and books. However, my purpose now is not to discuss further the "pro multis" invalidity thesis. Here we shall simply be examining the ICEL's arguments, as proffered in the NoC, that either "for all men" or "for all" is a valid and therefore acceptable rendering of "pro multis."

In the first paragraph of the NoC (see appendix 1) mention is made of "extensive notes and explanations" offered originally by the ICEL in defense of its all-English Canon. This refers to the document entitled, *The Roman Canon in English Translation*, by The International Committee on English in the Liturgy, published by Geoffrey Chapman Ltd., of London, Dublin and Melbourne, copyright 1967. Therein the brief commentary on Pro Multis appears on pp. 34-35, and it reads as follows:

"Neither Hebrew nor Aramaic possess [sic] a word for 'all'. The word rabbim or 'multitude' thus served also in the inclusive sense for 'the whole', even though the corresponding Greek and the Latin appear to have an exclusive sense, i.e., 'the many' rather than 'the all'." Cf. J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (New York, 1966), pp. 179-182, 229.

The gist of this argument is that in the Aramaic language that Our Lord spoke at the Last Supper there was no word meaning "all" or "all men"; and therefore He used a word that literally means "many" -- "For this is My Blood ... shed for many unto the remission of sins" (Matt. 26,28) -- but He really meant to say "shed for all men." The same "Aramaic argument" was in substance repeated in the Jan.1970 issue of *Notitiae*, a journal of the International Liturgy Gang, whose Secretary at that time was a priest, later made an archbishop, (who since 1963

had been a Freemason), Annibale Bugnini.

The following month in Issue #2 of *Interdum* (Feb. 24, 1970), entitled "The Ventriloquists," I exposed this "Hebrew and Aramaic" business, showing that it was a colossal deception. In doing so it became necessary to bring out some facts about Dr. Joachim Jeremias, the heterodox, non-Catholic "expert" upon whom the ICEL relies so heavily. It is therefore surprising that the NoC ventures even to allude to that thoroughly discredited argument. One would think they would prefer to keep that skeleton hidden in the closet. Two months after "The Ventriloquists" had appeared, the April 1970 issue of *Notitiae* carried an article by Father Maximilian Zerwick, S.J. That article, by the way, is the one cited in footnote 4 of the NoC.

Zerwick, tellingly, made it a point to distance himself from the earlier absurd claim regarding the supposed peculiarities of Aramaic, by blandly disclaiming what had appeared on p. 39 of the January issue, remarking that "It seems this assertion should be made with some reservation (*paulo cautius*)," which in ordinary parlance meant that it was absolutely groundless in the first place, as had already been demonstrated two months previously in "The Ventriloquists". I have in my files a letter, dated 18 July 1970, that I received from Dr. Revilo P. Oliver, the distinguished scholar, author and lecturer of international repute, who at that time was in his 25th year as Professor of the Classics at the University of Illinois. His remarks are singularly applicable to the ICEL, Dr. Jeremias, et alii:

"Thank you for the copy of your excellent booklet, 'The Ventriloquists.' I was particularly interested in the subject because several months ago an acquaintance of mine asked me to check the critical editions of the Greek text of the New Testament to make certain that there was no variant reading that would authorize the words 'for all men.' The inquirer evidently did not know of the impudent claim that you refute.

"The sheer impudence of the claim is almost breathtaking, because everyone who has even the slightest knowledge of linguistics knows very well that no language used by a people that has attained even the rudiments of a culture could fail to distinguish between 'many' and 'all'. Aramaic was for several centuries the language in which the business and diplomacy of the Near East (including Indo-European nations) was conducted.

"You were dealing, of course, with a specimen of what I regard as the ultimate dishonesty, calculated lying by persons who have been trained as scholars and who use their expert knowledge not only to swindle the uneducated but to destroy the very civilization that made scholarship possible."

There is also in my files a personal letter written to me and signed by Himself, Father Annibale Bugnini, dated June 5, 1969. He said the following:

"With regard to your question of the 'Pro multis' I refer you to the original Greek.

[Greek?] The other aspects of the translation as well as this one have been carefully studied. There is no need to worry or become astonished."

These marvelous experts cannot agree even among themselves. The ICEL's wizards tell us that in order to understand their arcane doings we must examine the Hebrew and Aramaic languages (which, of course, few persons are able to do). Moreover their linguistics idol, Joachim Jeremias, advises us (and in this case correctly) that there is no justification for "for all" based on the Greek text, because, says Jeremias: "'many' in Greek (as in English) stands in opposition to 'all', and therefore has the exclusive sense ('many, but not all')." (The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, p. 179). But, lo, the Grand Pooh-Bah Bugnini refers me to the Greek for the solution! Everything, of course, has been "carefully studied" by these amateurs. And he tells me not to worry?

In concluding this discussion of the very first paragraph of the NoC, I call attention to the glaringly incorrect English in the sentence quoted earlier from the ICEL's 1967 document, namely, "Neither Hebrew nor Aramaic possess a word for 'all'." The grammatical genius responsible for this faux pas apparently does not know that the indefinite "neither" is singular and hence requires the singular verb "possesses," not "possess." Such ignorance of a very rudimentary point of correct English hardly inspires confidence in these experts' pontifications on the alleged subtleties of Hebrew and Aramaic. It is improbable that the "neither" mistake was simply a typographical error, because years later in the final paragraph of the wonderful NoC we find the very same blunder yet again (perhaps the work of the same illiterate): "Neither [singular] 'for all' nor 'for many' should be considered to be incorrect translations [plural] of pro multis."

We now move along to the second paragraph of the NoC. The only points raised in this short paragraph that require discussion are contained in the assertion that the criticisms of the ICEL's rendering of pro multis "sometimes indicate a misunderstanding not only of the original biblical text but also of the doctrine of redemption that it conveys." There are two points to be considered.

First point: It would appear that these boys are really "in the know." Back in the first paragraph of the NoC they used the phrase "original biblical text" and here they repeat it. It must be packed with meaning. What is this mysterious "original biblical text" that we critics of the ICEL misunderstand? It cannot be St. Mark's Gospel. That Evangelist wrote his original text in Greek, and the word he used in the place in question is pollōn, meaning "many"; it will be recalled that the ICEL's own guru Joachim Jeremias informed us that there is no case justifying "for all" based on the Greek. So, St. Mark's Gospel must be ruled out as the "original biblical text" that we misunderstand.

The only other biblical source of this particular "for many" is the Gospel of St. Matthew, who wrote in Aramaic. His original text is not extant, but it was translated at the time of the Apostles into Greek, where we again find the word pollōn. Since St. Matthew's original text has been lost, then (unless the ICEL has recently found it) it likewise cannot possibly be the elusive "original biblical text"

we ignoramuses so blissfully misunderstand. Thus the count of misunderstood "original" biblical texts stands at zero, the ICEL's pedantic and completely vacuous statement notwithstanding.

The ICEL's experts assure us that that crucial word used by Our Lord in the Words of Institution at the Last Supper meant "all men" or "all" and not just "many," but they never identify for us just exactly what was that elusive word He used. Using the Peshito as evidence, one could surmise that the word Jesus probably used at that time was ʿsaggīʾā. For in the Peshito, the earliest-dated authentic Sacred Scripture text in the Syriac language (a dialect of Aramaic), we find the word in question in St. Matthew's Gospel (26,28) and also in St. Mark's Gospel (14,24) to be the word ʿsaggīʾā. Any standard Aramaic-English dictionary or Aramaic grammar text can be consulted to find out that the Aramaic word ʿsaggīʾā. means strictly "many," as opposed to another Aramaic word kóllā, which means "all men" or "everyone." But in truth neither I nor you, my patient reader, can know with certainty the Aramaic word Our Lord did utter. It is, moreover, inconceivable that the ICEL experts, who know nothing, might know.

Second point: Now, the other claim in this paragraph of the NoC is that the words of Our Lord, as handed down in the wine-consecration form, convey "the doctrine of redemption." Furthermore, these experts claim that the critics of their "translation" also misunderstand this "doctrine of redemption that is conveyed."

It would seem that they do not understand the distinction between redemption and salvation. In order to comprehend clearly that the ICEL's "wine-consecration form" involves a basic change in the theological meaning of Our Divine Lord's words, it is necessary to consider two distinct aspects of His Passion and Death. The first aspect is that of sufficiency; that is, for what and for whom did Christ's Passion suffice? The second aspect is that of efficacy; that is, for what and for whom is Christ's Passion effective or efficacious?

Redemption is not the same as salvation. Redemption is absolutely universal in its scope. All -- namely, those who had already died, those who were then alive, and all who would ever live in the future -- were redeemed by Our Lord on that first Good Friday. His Passion and Death sufficed to expiate, or ransom, or pay the price for all sins of all men, past, present and future. That is what is meant by the sufficiency aspect. The efficacy aspect, on the contrary, relates to salvation; not all men, but only many are saved. Salvation is not universal in its scope; it is a particular and individual affair. The distinction between these two aspects was stated in one brief sentence of the Council of Trent: "But, though He died for all, yet not all receive the benefit of His death, but those only unto whom the merit of His Passion is communicated." (Session VI, "Decree concerning Justification," Chap. 3).

Many theologians have expounded this distinction between the sufficiency and the efficacy aspects of Our Lord's Passion and Death. I cite the following examples:

*St. Thomas Aquinas: Summa Th., III, Q. 78, art. 3, ad 8 and Scriptum Super Lib. IV Sententiarum, Dist. 8, Q. 2, Art. 2, q. 3, ad 7;

*Authors of the Catechism of the Council of Trent: Part II, Chap. IV, § XXIV;

*St. Alphonsus: Treatise on the Holy Eucharist, translated from the Italian, and edited by Rev. Eugene Grimm, C.Ss.R., published by Redemptorist Fathers, U.S.A., 1934, p. 44;

*Pope Innocent III: De Sacro Altaris Mysterio, Book IV, Chap. XLI;

*Pope Benedict XIV: De Sacrosancto Missæ Sacrificio, Book II, Chap. XV, §11;

*Remigius of Auxerre: Quoted by St. Thomas in his Catena Aurea in Quatuor Evangelia, Expositio In Matthæum, XXVI, 28.

It is significant that the "sufficiency vs. efficacy" explanations of all the above mentioned esteemed authorities are found within the contexts of their discourses on the correct theological meaning of the words for the wine-consecration. It is even more significant that they all teach that Our Lord said and meant "for many," as opposed to "for all," for at that time He was instituting the Sacrament for His Mystical Body and was therefore necessarily speaking of the salvation of many, the elect, and not of the redemption of all.

It will suffice here to examine just two of these explanations.

First, St. Alphonsus: "The words *pro vobis et pro multis* ('For you and for many') are used to distinguish the virtue of the blood of Christ from its fruits; for the blood of our Saviour is of sufficient value to save all men, but its fruits are applicable only to a certain number and not to all, and this is their own fault. Or, as the theologians say, this precious blood is (in itself) sufficiently (sufficienter) able to save all men, but (on our part) effectually (efficaciter) it does not save all - it saves only those who co-operate with grace. This is the explanation of St. Thomas, as quoted by Benedict XIV."

Second, the Catechism of the Council of Trent: "For if we look at the vertue of it, it must be confess'd, that our Savior shed his Blood for the salvation of all men. But if we look at the fruit which men gather from thence, we may easily understand that it comes not to all to advantage, but only to some. When therefore he said, 'For you,' he signifi'd either them that were then present, or those whom he had chosen out of the Jewish people, such as were his Disciples, except Judas, with whom he spake. But when he added, 'For many,' he would have the rest that were elected, either Jews or Gentiles, to be understood." (Original English-language translation, London, 1687, p. 207).

Continuing, the Catechism explicitly singles out the ICEL's false substitution, "for all," in the wine-consecration as being contrary to "the design of the discourse"; that is, contrary to the Mind of Christ, when in instituting the Holy Sacrament He expressly said "for many," meaning not all men, but only the members of His

Church, the Mystical Body, the elect, who are the only ones who actually benefit ultimately from the "fruits of the Passion," namely, the "Fruit of Salvation":

"Rightly therefore was it done, that it was not said 'for all,' seeing that in this place the design of the discourse extends only to the fruits of the Passion, which brought the Fruit of Salvation only to the Elect." And hither do belong those words of the Apostle, 'Christ was once offer'd to take away the sins of many' (Heb. 9,28): and that which Our Lord himself said in S. John, 'I pray for them, I pray not for the world; but for those whom thou hast given me, because they are thine' (John 17,9)."

"The Fruit of Salvation only to the elect": it is the doctrine of the salvation of many, or of efficacy, that the words "pro multis" convey, not the "doctrine of redemption" of all men, as our ICEL experts so erroneously maintain. However, it must be admitted that their falsified words, "for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven," do refer only to redemption, thus failing to convey the correct sense: "for you and for many unto the remission of sins."

Since the teaching of the Catechism: "Rightly therefore was it done that it was not said 'for all', ..." is in direct conflict with what the ICEL has not rightly done, the villains eventually decided to try to come up with an answer. After a delay of about two years, they finally took up the matter in the January 1970 issue of *Notitiae* (p. 39), where they posed the following question: "Must the teaching [on 'pro multis'] handed down in the Roman Catechism decreed by the Council of Trent, and ordered to be published by St. Pius V, be regarded as having been superseded?" The question itself is pompous and impudent. As if anything those arrogant little know-nothings might do could possibly supersede the authority of the official Catechism of the Catholic Church!

Here is their slippery reply: "In no way must the teaching of the Roman Catechism be regarded as having been superseded: the distinction between Christ's sufficient death for all, and his efficacious death for only many retains its validity." So! They "ratify" this distinction, an essential Catholic doctrine proclaimed by the Council of Trent! They say "in no way," which would seem to be all-encompassing, is the Catechism's teaching on "pro multis" now supplanted. Then what about the real issue that is *ad rem*, the issue that has always been so embarrassing to them, namely, the Catechism's express condemnation of their wording: 'for all'? These slippery specimens breathe not a word about that!

Having now discussed the first two paragraphs of the NoC, we proceed through the third and fourth paragraphs without comment. This brings us to the fifth paragraph, a very short one that begins with the words: "The expression 'for all' in the words of institution is an accurate translation ... etc." There is one puzzling thing in this paragraph: why is the passage in St. Mark (14,24) given as the source of the Words of Institution? It is true that both St. Mark (14,24) and St. Matthew (26,28) have the phrase "for many," but St. Mark's account does not

contain the final phrase, "unto the remission of sins," as does that of St. Matthew. Hence the Gospels of Saints Matthew and Luke are usually cited as the Scriptural sources of the wine-consecration. For example, in the Catechism of the Council of Trent we read: "But those words ... [for you and for many] are taken severally from St. Matthew [i.e., 'for many'] and St. Luke [i.e., 'for you'] ..." The ICEL's citing of St. Mark, rather than St. Matthew, may not be a critical point, but it is nevertheless puzzling.

The next paragraph of the NoC begins as follows: "1. St. Paul used the phrase 'for many' to mean 'for all' ... etc." The object of this lengthy paragraph is to prove that in verses 15 and 19 of Chapter 5 of the Epistle to the Romans, the Greek expressions employed by St. Paul (namely, *hoi polloi* and *tous pollous*) -- which are translated literally as "the many" -- are to be taken as meaning "all" (just as the same phrase "*hoi polloi*," which is now a part of the English language, is defined as "the masses"). Everyone (except, perhaps, the Jansenists) acknowledges that "many" in Romans 5 means "all." It is, however, incorrect and a mark of sloppy scholarship to say that in this place "St. Paul used the phrase 'for many' to mean 'for all'"; because the text does not have "for many," but rather "the many," without the word "for" even appearing.

Point 1: In those instances where the Greek "many" does in fact mean "all" one generally finds that the word "many" does not stand alone but is preceded by the definite article "the"; for example, *hoi* and *tous* in Romans (5,15) and (5,19). It must furthermore be noted that this is not the case in the Words of Institution, either in St. Matthew (26,28) or in St. Mark (14,24), where the definite article "the" is absent, and the expression reads simply "for many," and not "for the many."

Point 2: It is absurd to imply that this example from St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans proves that in the Words of Institution, found in the Gospels of Saints Matthew and Mark, the phrase "for many" must be construed as meaning "for all." No intelligent person is to be gulled by such sophistry (see Point 3 below). As the Dominican Fr. Bede Jarrett once remarked, "To be the dupe of every charlatan is not Christian, but criminal" (*Meditations for Layfolk*, Catholic Truth Society, 1955, p. 418).

Point 3: "Proving" anything at all by comparing Romans (5,15) and (5,19) with Matthew (26,28) or Mark (14,24) betokens amateurish biblical exegesis: "The so-called real or verbal parallelisms will aid the commentator in determining the precise sense in which the inspired writer employed his words. In case of verbal parallelism, or in the recurrence of the same literary expressions in different parts of the inspired books, it is better to explain the language of Paul by that of Paul, the expressions of John by those of John, than to explain Paul by Matthew, and John by Luke. Again, it is more natural to explain an expression occurring in the Fourth Gospel by another found in the same book than by a parallel passage taken from the Apocalypse." (From the article on Biblical

Exegesis, Catholic Encyclopedia, 1909, Vol. V, pp. 697-698).

Point 4: Following the sound exegetical principles just cited, let us explore the Gospel of St. Matthew, alone by itself. In it there are exactly fifty occurrences of the word 'multus' or one of its derivative forms. If we exclude the "pro multis" in (26,28), then of the remaining forty-nine occurrences there is not a single case where the meaning must be construed as "all." It defies common sense and mathematical probability to think that in only one case out of fifty -- namely the "pro multis" of (26,28) -- the correct meaning is "all" rather than the literal translation "many."

Of the above-mentioned fifty occurrences there are only four in which one might possibly think at first that the correct sense is "all" and not "many." But for each of these four passages there is the sound teaching from reliable exegetes that the correct meaning is what is literally written, namely, "many."

These are the four passages:

(1) (19,30): "And many that are first, shall be last: and the last shall be first." For interpretations of this passage see Origen: (as quoted in St. Thomas' *Catena Aurea* in *Quatuor Evangelia*); Blessed Maurus Rabanus: (also quoted in *Catena Aurea*); and St. Thomas: *Lectura Super Evangelium S. Matthæi*, § 1619.

(2) (20,16): "So shall the last be first, and the first last. For many are called, but few chosen." For interpretations of this passage see St. John Chrysostom: (as quoted in *Catena Aurea*); and St. Thomas: *Lectura Super Evangelium S. Matthæi*, § 1649.

(3) (20,28): "Even as the Son of man is not come to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a redemption for many." This parallels Mark (10,45): "For the Son of man also is not come to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a redemption for many." Origen: "And He would give His life a redemption for many, namely, those who would believe in Him." (*Catena Aurea*); St. Bede: "But He did not say He would give His life a redemption for all, but 'for many,' that is, for those who shall be willing to believe." (*Catena Aurea*); St. Thomas: "He does not say 'for all,' because that would regard sufficiency; but regarding efficacy He in fact says 'for many,' namely, for the elect." (*Lectura Super Ev. S. Matth.*, § 1670).

(4) (22,14): "For many are called, but few are chosen." See [2] above.

The next paragraph of the NoC: "2. 'Many' stands for 'all' elsewhere in the New Testament. Compare Mark 10:45, 'For the Son of man also came ... to give his life as a ransom for many.'" The example is not a valid one, as we have seen just above, where St. Bede, St. Thomas and Origen teach the contrary regarding Mark (10,45); namely, that "many" here means "many" and is not to be construed as meaning "all."

The next paragraph: "At this point one may ask why the expression 'many' often stands for 'all' in the New Testament." This phenomenon is not all that common. St. Augustine remarks that the word many "is sometimes (aliquando) used in Scripture for 'all'" (The City of God, Book XX, Ch. 23). Sometimes, not "often."

Skipping over to the second column of the NoC, we come to the paragraph which begins thus: "The Hebrew and Aramaic words for 'many' have an inclusive sense because their word for 'all' [Whoa! It will be recalled that at first they assured us that Hebrew and Aramaic do not even possess a word for 'all'] ... is limited in this regard. It really means 'totality,' and considers things in terms of their wholeness but not as a sum of many parts."

Well, if anyone can understand what they are talking about, or, failing that, believes the story anyway, he has forgotten what Father Bede Jarrett said about being the dupe of every charlatan that comes along. Now, the Aramaic word *kól* preceding a determined noun in the plural or a collective singular, for example, "all mankind," does in fact mean "totality." But that is only one facet of the complex grammatical rules governing *kól*. Preceding a singular noun without the article *kól* means "every," as in "every person," which is the same as "all men" considered as "a sum of many parts," to use the ICEL's phraseology. Furthermore, the word *kóllā* means "everyone" or "all persons," the Aramaic word found in Daniel (4,9) and (4,18): "food for all (*kóllā*)." These verses from the Book of Daniel are among the few Aramaic passages occurring in the Old Testament.

In the second column of the NoC there is a section labelled "b.", which consists of two paragraphs. In the first of these paragraphs we encounter a sample of grammatically grotesque Greek: *ῥup`er p`antez*. I mention this only in passing to point out the remarkable ability in languages of these philological frauds.

The case they build here is based on pure speculation, and the perceptive reader will recognize how shaky it is. Notice their cautious words, "the probable allusion to Isaiah 53:12" and "most probably allude to Isaiah 53:12." In the Notitiae article mentioned earlier, the one written by Max Zerwick (who in 1961 was expelled by the Holy Office from the faculty of the Biblical Institute on the grounds of teaching heresy: just the right credentials for admission to the ICEL team), we find the same argument based on the Book of Isaias, and Zerwick is equally cautious: "'Pro multis' seems to have been [emphasis added] used by Jesus because calling to mind chapter 53 of Isaias ... etc." In his critique of the Zerwick article the late Fr. George Kathrein, C.Ss.R. remarked: "Here Max becomes the mind reader of Our Lord at the Last Supper."

At the moment Our Lord spoke these words at the Last Supper, "This is My blood of the new testament ... shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins," there is one thing we are sure He had in mind, which was the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist He was instituting. The Sacrament that is not "for all men," but

rather for the many who are the members of His Mystical Body. And immediately after the Last Supper He gave a lengthy discourse to His Apostles which is recorded in St. John's Gospel, wherein He spoke again of His Mystical Body in the analogy of the Vine and its branches, etc. And He said: "I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them whom thou hast given me: because they are thine." (John 17,9).

In the final paragraph of the NoC it is claimed that "matters of translation are always in dispute." That is not true. The beautiful English translations of the Mass found in missals for the laity, e.g., The St. Andrew Daily Missal, were never questioned. The fact that the ICEL's "translations" have from the beginning been criticized far and wide does indeed lead them to make this claim, but such an unfounded "blanket" assertion is but a weak pretext. They say that neither "for all" nor "for many" should be considered incorrect. That is nonsense. Our Lord could not have spoken in ambiguous terms at that solemn moment. Moreover the Catechism of the Council of Trent teaches that one of them is not correct; to wit: "for all." These pseudo-experts then say that "the legitimacy" of their so-called "translation" had already been "twice explained," thus making the NoC the third attempt! These repeated futile efforts to clear up "misunderstandings" about "pro multis" no doubt explain why their version "must be considered preferable" because it allows "the least possibility of misunderstanding."(!)

If the ICEL were to do an "about face" and change "for all" to "for many" in the sacramental form for the wine-consecration, would that suffice to guarantee the validity of the English "Mass"? We must deny such a supposition. Besides the "for all" mutilation there are four other invalidating causes in the wine-consecration: (1) the use of the words, "so that sins may be forgiven," instead of "unto the remission of sins"; (2) the breaking up of the form into two sentences, which destroys the integrity of the form as one single uninterrupted utterance; (3) the strange repetition of the words, "the blood," which makes "the blood" rather than "the chalice" govern the remaining words of the form; (4) the removal from the actual consecration form itself of the words, "the mystery of faith" (it was not the ICEL alone that was responsible for this).

Even if the ICEL were to restore the wine-consecration to its correct, literal wording; for example, that found in the English versions of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, the Novus Ordo Missae would still not pass as a true Catholic Mass, because of its overall heterodox animus, the result of the perversity of intention of the framers of the rite. I discussed this at length on pp. 45-50 of *Questioning The Validity of McCarthy's Case* (1990), and so here I will leave it at that.

"Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est." Long endorsed and sanctioned by the Church, this famous maxim was first articulated by St. Vincent of Lerins in the fifth century. It concisely sets forth three criteria for identifying orthodox Catholic teaching. Whatever doctrine has been taught always, everywhere, and by everyone must be regarded as true Catholic doctrine, as

opposed to the false doctrine of innovators.

The words "for many" in the wine-consecration convincingly satisfy this threefold test of orthodoxy. The exegesis of Doctors of the Church and of the Church's time-honored and official Catechism; the inerrant authority of every Catholic edition of the Bible: the Latin Vulgate, the ancient Greek texts, the Peshito in Syriac, the Rheims version in English, nay, all the vernacular versions, both ancient and modern; the testimony furnished by the various sacred liturgies of the Church from the beginning, and in many different tongues, *several of which ancient liturgies by their more explicit wording: "for the many faithful," verify the true meaning of "pro multis"- -- all this evidence most clearly shows that "for many" is true and "for all" false.

What madness it is to swallow that doctrine which until lately was taught never, nowhere, and by no one!

*Even to this day the Words of Consecration in the Masses of the Maronite rite are said (or sung) in the ancient Aramaic language of Our Lord. The important word in the place in question that is used is "saggīā".

1 See Matthew 26:28, Luke 22:19 and 1 Corinthians 11:24 have ἵνα ὑμῖν "for you"; note that 1 Corinthians 11:24 refers to the words over the bread; the words over the cup, 11:25, omit the ἵνα-expression entirely.

2 Kittel, TDNT VI, 536; J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1966), 179-182; P. Joüon, *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique* (Rome: PBI, 1947), nos. 139e-i.

3 Jeremias, 229-231.

4 See "Documentorum Explicatio," *Notitiae* 6 (1970) 39-40; M. Zerwick. "... Pro Vobis et pro Multis Effundetur...", *ibid.*, 138-140.

Biblical quotations from the Revised Standard Version Bible, Catholic Edition, copyrighted 1965 and 1966 by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. and used by permission.

EXPOSING SOME ERRONEOUS IDEAS ABOUT "DEFECT OF INTENTION" By Patrick Henry Omlor

The Society Plays Down Invalidity By "Defect Of Form"

"Archbishop Lefebvre did not want his priests in the English-speaking world to teach that the New English Masses are definitely always invalid." Those words were written by a priest of the Society of St. Pius X to a friend of mine back in 1991. There is no reason to doubt the truth of the statement, because it is often said by priests and supporters of the Society that Archbishop Lefebvre held that

the Novus Ordo Missae is not per se invalid. What exactly does this mean? Father François Laisney, another Society priest, clarified for me what the Archbishop meant by "not per se invalid." "This [that is, being not per se invalid], "wrote Fr. Laisney, "of course applied to the New Mass with the Latin Consecration."

However, many lay followers of the Society (and perhaps even some of its priests), thinking they are adhering to the "mind of Archbishop Lefebvre," have assumed that by "not per se invalid" he meant "not invalid by defect of form." That is to say, that even in the vernacularized versions, especially the "English Mass," there is not a problem of invalidity by virtue of "defect of form," namely, the theologically corrupted sacramental form for the wine-consecration foisted upon Catholics by the International Committee on English in the Liturgy (ICEL).

My own views on the invalidity of the English "Mass" with the ICEL's bogus "consecration form" are fairly well known; and it is not my purpose in this present paper to discuss the invalidity of the Novus Ordo Missae in either its Latin version or its vernacularized versions. But I wish now to reaffirm that even in its Latin version the Novus Ordo Missae is almost certainly invalid; I have given evidence for this in several of my recent books. For example, in *The Necessary Signification In The Sacramental Form Of The Holy Eucharist* (on pp. 50-64) I demonstrated the necessity for validity in our Latin Rite of the words, "the Mystery of Faith," which have been expunged from the form for the wine-consecration in the Latin version as well as in the vernacular versions. Also on pp. 45-50 of *Questioning The Validity of McCarthy's Case I* demonstrated the invalidity universally in all languages (including the original Latin version) of the Novus Ordo rite as a whole, and not just its invalidity by virtue of its corrupted and mutilated sacramental wine-consecration form in the many vernacularized versions. This invalidity of the Novus Ordo rite, in toto and intrinsically, derives from the perverse intentions of the FRAMERS of the Novus Ordo Missae. "We have limited ourselves to a summary examination of the Novus Ordo at those points where it departs from the theology of the Catholic Mass," wrote the authors of the scholarly treatise entitled, *Roman Theologians Take a Look at the New Order of the Mass* (p. 18). "It is clear," continued these authors, "that the Novus Ordo no longer intends [emphasis added] to present the faith as taught by the Council of Trent" (p. 19).

My case claiming invalidity of the Novus Ordo Missae through defect of intention of the framers of that rite is based on principles set down by Pope Leo XIII in his Bull *Apostolicae Curae*. In that Bull Leo declared Anglican Orders to be invalid because of defect of form and also defect of intention. The primary defect of intention was that of the FRAMERS of the Anglican Rite, whose purpose was to invent a new rite for a new type of ministry that is totally different from that of the Catholic Church. "...[T]he Anglican rite for Holy Orders ... was, on the contrary, set up in opposition to the Catholic rite, with the express object of rejecting that kind of priesthood for the conveyance of which the Catholic rite was instituted"

(Vindication of the Bull 'Apostolicae Curae' p. 35).

Secondarily, this primary defect of intention of the framers of the Anglican rite carries over as a consequence to those who use that rite: "The intention, therefore, of the Anglican clergy, coinciding with that of their own Church, is opposed to the intention of the Catholic Church, and so 'is adverse to and destructive of the Sacrament'" (ibidem).

The official position of the Society of St. Pius X is that its priests (and with a little luck its lay followers) do not question publicly the validity of the "New Mass" on the grounds of the defect of form, not even in the vernacularized versions. Nor does the Society ascribe the invalidity of the "New Mass" to the defect of intention of the framers of the Novus Ordo. Upon what, then, is the invalidity theory of the Society based?

The Invalidity Theory of The Society

The solid case showing invalidity by defect of form, based on sound sacramental theology and the teachings of great Catholic authorities, is not only easy to demonstrate and even more easily understood; but because of its clear-cut nature it is the most potent weapon against the "New Mass" and the one most feared by the Innovators who produced it. Having disarmed itself of this most potent weapon against the "New Mass," the Society then, as an afterthought, promotes the idea that Novus Ordo "Masses" are "becoming increasingly invalid," not because of the patently invalid sacramental form nor because of the demonstrable perverse intentions of the composers of the Novus Ordo rite, but because of an airy-fairy theory about the alleged personal "defect of intention of the priests." That is, the theory that "more and more masses are becoming invalid" because of this supposed personal "defect of intention" on the part of more and more priests in performing the Novus Ordo "Mass." This is the "More and More Theory."

This frequently repeated line is what led to my criticism on p. 112 of *The Necessary Signification...*. There I wrote that this claim "is mere speculation and absolutely unprovable in any specific, concrete case." I went on to say: "If the vernacularized Novus Ordo Missae is intrinsically invalid by virtue of its corrupted Consecration Form (as we have attempted to show), then the priest's intention, whether good, or absent, or evil has no additional bearing on the invalidity issue."

From the final paragraph on p. 112 one can deduce the reason for my efforts since 1968 in exposing the intrinsic invalidity by defect of form. The issue is of prime importance, because if my position is indeed correct, then those who attend such invalid "Masses" adore bread and wine, which objectively is an idolatrous act; and objectively it is just as sinful as the worship of snakes, or the sun, or phalli, or ancestors, or sacred cows, or graven images, etc. There are those who, for no apparent reasons of a grave nature or perhaps even

from ulterior motives, obstruct the efforts of those who try to instruct and warn others, through arguments based on sound sacramental theology, of the invalidity problem. If the "pro multis" invalidity case just happens to be true (and who can be absolutely certain it is not true?), then these neutralizers and obstructors are in fact guilty of abetting on a widespread basis the performance of acts that are objectively idolatrous.

Included among those who reject out of hand the "pro multis" invalidity thesis because of ulterior motives are those priests who habitually use the Novus Ordo rite, as well as certain priests who no longer use it but did so at one time. Pride and fear would lead them to think along these lines: The Novus Ordo cannot possibly be an invalid non-mass, because 1, Father Hannibal Blimpsnort, the humble and devoted servant of the Lord, use (or have used) it. Besides, wow! What a problem would be posed by all the stipends I have received for saying masses that were in fact non-masses!

Verbal Manifestation Of A Contrary Intention Is Required

Father François Laisney wrote me a 4-page letter, dated July 18, 1991, wherein he defended the Society's position that there are more and more invalid masses because of defect of intention of the priests. This was a response to a letter that I had written earlier to Mr. S. Donald McLean, the Editor of the Australian journal Catholic. Reproduced just below is the first paragraph of Father Laisney's letter.

"As St. Thomas says, there may very well be such cases [of invalidity through defect of intention] when the wrong intention is EXTERNALLY manifested. It is not necessary that it be manifested at the very moment of the Sacrament, by distorting the words of the Sacrament: nowhere does St. Thomas say so. If an intention contrary to that of the Church is manifested outside the moment of the Sacrament, then **EVEN A VALID FORM IS NOT SUFFICIENT.**"

These remarks by Father Laisney are based on St. Thomas' teaching on intention found in Summa Th., III, Q. 64, A. 8, ad 2:

"Consequently, others with better reason hold that the minister of a sacrament acts in the person of the whole Church, whose minister he is; while in the words uttered by him [i.e., the recitation of the correct sacramental form] the intention of the Church is expressed; and that this suffices for the validity of the sacrament, unless the contrary be externally expressed on the part either of the minister or of the recipient of the sacrament."

It is true that St. Thomas does not say in this article that an invalidating contrary intention must be expressed at the very moment the sacrament is being confected or administered. I do not wish to challenge Fr. Laisney on this point, even though it is a key point in his argumentation (as shall be seen). There is a more important idea in the passage from St. Thomas quoted above that I wish to bring out. He teaches that the recitation of the sacramental form by the minister

expresses the intention of the Church and that this suffices for validity, "unless the contrary be externally expressed" ("nisi contrarium exterius exprimatur"). Father Laisney seems to interpret "exterius exprimatur" as simply "externally manifested" without any qualifications. But it is clear that St. Thomas means that an invalidating contrary intention must be expressed (or manifested) by the minister not only externally, but also verbally.

The verb St. Thomas uses is "exprimatur." Various dictionaries, including Collins, Cassell's and Roy Deferrari's A Latin-English Dictionary of St. Thomas Aquinas, Based on The Summa Theologica, show that the verb "exprimo" does not necessarily mean to express verbally. That is only one of its meanings. Cassell's has as its definition II-B-1: "to express in words." But other possible meanings are "to articulate distinctly," "to express, model, portray, represent, describe, translate," etc. Hence per se, without being in a given context, the meaning of "exprimo" is not determined precisely. This is always the case with words that have various meanings that are not synonymous. How, then, am I able to claim that St. Thomas in this place means "expressed verbally"? By examining various neighboring, or proximate, contexts wherein he uses this word "exprimo" one can discover his meaning in the place in question. In this article 8 of Question 64 St. Thomas uses the verb "exprimo" three times. In the Respondeo he says "exprimitur per verba" : "expressed through words." In the final sentence of Ad Secundum he says "in verbis ... exprimitur": again "expressed in words." Then almost immediately in the final part of this same sentence of Ad Secundum he again uses the same verb "exprimo": "nisi contrarium exterius exprimatur," without, however, again specifying "in words." From his express determination in two of the three places that by the verb "exprimo" he means expressed in words, it would seem impossible that he would use the same verb in the same article 8 a third time, and in this third instance in a different sense.

A parallel passage of St. Thomas in his Commentary on Book IV of Sentences proves the point beyond doubt. He writes: "et ideo si forma servatur nec aliquid exterius dicitur [my emphasis], quod intentionem contrariam exprimat, baptizatus est." (Dist. 6, Q. 1, A. 2). "And therefore if the form is preserved and not anything outwardly is said that expresses a contrary intention, the baptism is valid."

It is evident from his principal arguments (which will be examined presently) that Fr. Laisney either does not acknowledge or does not understand this important fact that the teaching of St. Thomas is that an invalidating contrary intention on the part of the minister of a sacrament must be expressed in words, and not (for example) by facial expressions, actions, etc. Hence his appeal to the Angelic Doctor's teaching will not prove useful to him; it will work against him.

I must point out, however, that in one place in his letter Fr. Laisney remarked, "Yet in the case of the Marranos, if they stated that they explicitly rejected the proper intention, any manifestation of this rejection (even if they would have kept

the proper form) would be sufficient to render the sacrament invalid." By his wording, "if they stated that they explicitly rejected the proper intention," it would appear that in this place at least he acknowledges that an invalidating contrary intention must be expressed verbally.

What The Church Intends? Or What The Church Does?

In the third paragraph on p. 1 of his letter, Father Laisney, in speaking about certain baptisms by Baptists and other fundamentalists, says: "It is based on the fact that they often DO manifest an intention contrary to what the Church intends, **THOUGH THEY USE THE PROPER FORM.**" The only thing to which I now wish to call attention is his phrase, "an intention contrary to what the Church intends." In the preceding paragraph he uses the same expression, "opposed to do what the Church intends." That wording, which is not theologically correct from the standpoint of the Church's doctrine on intention, can and does lead one to make serious errors in discussing that doctrine. It is not necessary for the minister "to intend what the Church intends" but rather to have the intention of doing what the Church does" : "intentionem, saltem faciendi quod facit Ecclesia," Council of Trent, Sess. VII, Can. 11 (Denz. 854). This is an important distinction.

...[A]n error about what baptism does cannot destroy the heretic's intention of doing what the Church does, even though it may mean that he does not intend what the Church intends by conferring baptism. It is this distinction which in modern times has enabled the Church to accept as valid the baptisms conferred by Methodists and other non-conformists who practice baptism as an initiation-rite of the Church but who deny that it has a regenerative effect." (Nelson's Dictionary of Theological Terms, p. 135).

Dr. Ludwig Ott says this on p. 344 of *The Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*: "Objectively considered, the intention of doing what the Church does suffices. The minister, therefore, does not need to intend what the Church intends, namely, to produce the effects of the Sacraments, for example, the forgiveness of sins: neither does he need to intend to execute a specific Catholic rite. It suffices if he have the intention of performing the religious action as it is current among Christians."

"The Necessary Intention. (a) objectively, there must be an intention of doing what the Church does (i.e., of performing a sacred rite instituted by Christ, for the minister acts in the name and authority of Christ)." (McHugh & Callan's *Moral Theology*, #2666).

"The intention must be to perform the respective sacramental action." (Jone-Adelman, *Moral Theology*, 1955 edition, par. 451 b).

I have dwelt on this matter and provided ample documentation, because Father Laisney's flawed argumentation (which shall be presented next) on behalf of the

Society's theory that "increasingly more and more masses are becoming invalid because of defect of intention" results from his failure either to recognize or to understand this important distinction between "what the Church intends" and "what the Church does."

A Complete Explanation Of The "More And More Theory"

Under the heading: "Invalidity of the New Mass by lack of intention," Father Laisney presents his complete case in three paragraphs:

"Any honest observer cannot deny that there are many more and more exterior manifestations of intentions contrary to the performance of a Sacrifice. Now if a priest has a prevalent intention not to perform a Sacrifice, and MANIFESTS IT EXTERNALLY, he does not confect the Sacrament validly. In other words if a priest has the intention to perform ONLY a commemorative meal, and manifests it externally, the Mass is invalid."

"The fact that this is becoming more and more common comes from two causes: (1) the new priests coming from Novus Ordo seminaries, where they have received a training which hardly gives them another intention; (2) the growing influence of the modern errors, even on the minds of priests who were once orthodox, but who have been (become?) weaker and weaker. This fact is manifested by the scandals that continue to grow. (I was just shown today a clipping from a newspaper about a nun claiming to be both a Buddhist and a Catholic nun!!! Though that has not much relation with the Mass directly, the article contained a passage about women priests, as if this could be valid.)" "These reasons are explicitly stated in the two documents of Archbishop Lefebvre referenced earlier [i.e., those dated February 24, 1977 and January 20, 1978]. They are in perfect conformity with St. Thomas."

He begins thus: "Any honest observer cannot deny that there are many more and more exterior manifestations of intentions contrary to the performance of a Sacrifice." His words "any honest observer cannot deny" illustrate the familiar debating flaw known as "False Appeal To Common Knowledge." "As everybody knows" and "Only a fool would deny that..." are two examples of this flaw that the Jesuit authors Kammer and Mulligan give on p. 532 of their text entitled simply Writing Handbook (Loyola University Press, Chicago, 1953). Moreover, his first sentence states as a fact (a fact that every honest observer presumably accepts) the very thing he is supposed to be demonstrating.

Twice he uses the phrase, "and manifests it externally," but he does not say how this supposed invalidating contrary intention is "manifested externally." In both cases he uses this phrase, "and manifests it externally," in a hypothetical "if" sentence, and he furnishes no concrete example to prove the external manifestation, in words either spoken or written, of a priest's intention contrary to the intention of doing what the Church does. In any case, an intention contrary to the "performance of a Sacrifice" does not

ipso facto violate the requirement of having the intention to do what the Church does. Now, it is true that the Church intends that the Mass be a Sacrifice and indeed a true Sacrifice takes place. She also intends that the Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity of Christ become truly present on the altar and indeed transubstantiation takes place. She intends that the effect of the Sacrament (the *res sacramenti*), which is the grace of the Sacrament, be infused in the souls of the recipients of the Holy Eucharist, and in worthy recipients this sacramental grace is infused, whether or not they know exactly the nature of this special grace. But (as was pointed out earlier at length) for the validity of a sacrament the minister does not have to intend what the Church intends to bring about; it suffices for him to intend at least to do what the Church does : "intentionem, saltem faciendi quod facit Ecclesia" (Council of Trent).

Monsignor Joseph Pohle writes: "To understand the full significance of this declaration it should be noted that the Council [of Trent] does not say, 'what the Church intends,' but merely, 'what the Church does.' Consequently, all that is necessary for the valid administration of the Sacraments is the direct intention, i.e. the purpose of performing the rite as is usual among Catholics. To demand in addition a reflex intention, either for the administration of the Sacrament as such, or for the production of the sacramental character and the infusion of grace, would be to make the validity of the Sacrament depend upon the orthodoxy of the minister, -- an assumption which we have shown to be false. [V. supra, Art. 2, Thesis II]." (From *The Sacraments, A Dogmatic Treatise*, Herder, 1945, Vol. 1, p. 178).

In what does the "intention of doing what the Church does" consist? It is, in a word, the intention to perform an action. What kind of action? It is "the intention of performing the religious action as it is current among Christians" (Ott). The intention "of performing a sacred rite instituted by Christ" is the way it is put by McHugh & Callan.

"The intention to perform the respective sacramental action" (Jone-Adelman).
"The purpose of performing the rite as is usual among Catholics" (Pohle). The various heterodox notions that are now widespread among the non-traditionalist clergy concerning what this "religious action" or "sacred rite" or "sacramental action" might or might not happen to achieve have no bearing on the issue.

Father Laisney speaks of "a prevalent intention not to perform a Sacrifice, and MANIFESTS IT EXTERNALLY" and also of "the intention to perform ONLY a commemorative meal, and manifests it externally." Does he know or know of any priest who has ever manifested externally in words -- i.e., has said or put it in writing -- that in celebrating Mass he does not intend to do what the Church does? Or has said that he does not intend to perform the religious action, the sacred rite, the sacramental action that the Church performs? I have never come across such a priest.

If he cannot prove definitely that even one particular priest on even one occasion has failed to have the intention of doing what the Church does when celebrating Mass, then how can he claim -- without using the method of "proof by gut-feeling" -- that on a generalized basis an invalidating lack of intention is becoming more and more common? Perhaps he can provide us with some specific examples of such priests. How many then? One? Five? Ten? How many world-wide can be shown to exist? Enough to prove that such invalidating lack of intention is becoming more and more common?

He says: "The fact [now we have an established fact!] that this is becoming more and more common comes from two causes ..." The first alleged cause is that priests trained in the present-day seminaries "have received a training which hardly gives them another intention." Training does not in itself have anything to do with having the intention to do what the Church does. A Jew, for example, who has no Catholic training at all, can have the intention of doing what the Church does and consequently can administer valid Baptism. And so can Anglicans, Methodists, Baptists, etc., who are persons who (in some cases at least) have a distinct animosity towards Catholicism. If he had argued that those coming out of modern seminaries are probably not validly ordained, I would agree that this would probably lead to "more and more" nonmasses being performed; that is, by virtue of lack of proper minister.

The second cause he alleges is that older priests, who were once orthodox, have become infected with modern errors. Holding erroneous theological notions, nay, even unbelief and heresy, are not impediments to a priest's celebration of a valid Mass. Orthodoxy is not required for the valid confecting of sacraments. We know this from the teaching of St. Thomas. He speaks of a minister of a sacrament whose "faith is defective even in regard to very sacrament he confers" or who believes that the external performance of the Catholic rite accomplishes nothing. "Wherefore, his unbelief notwithstanding, he can intend to do what the Church does, albeit he esteems it to be nothing. And such an intention suffices for the Sacrament..." (Summa Th., 111, Q. 64, A. 9, ad 1).

Finally, in support of his theory Father Laisney adduces circumstantial evidence, namely, the widespread scandals we witness. He says: "This fact is manifested by the scandals that continue to grow," and he then mentions a newspaper clipping about a nun claiming to be both a Buddhist and a Catholic. This is too deep for me. I am unable to see how the scandals which have become so rife in the Robber Church have any bearing whatsoever on a proof that "more and more masses are invalid through defect of intention." I was not aware that the argument, "Look! Things out there are bad, really bad," constitutes theological evidence of widespread defect of intention.

If Father François Laisney's defense of the "more and more" theory represents the cream of the Society's thinking on the matter, then I would humbly suggest that the theory be abandoned with all possible haste.

"For Fools Rush In Where Angels Fear To Tread" -- Alexander Pope
In the Bull *Apostolicae Curae*, Pope Leo XIII taught that the invalidity of Anglican

Orders arises from two causes: defect of form and defect of intention. In explaining the latter cause the Pontiff distinguished between the intention of an individual minister to do what the Church does in confecting or administering a sacrament and the perverse intentions of heretical innovators in framing a new rite. He said the following:

"With this inherent defect of form is joined the defect of intention, which is equally essential to the Sacrament. THE CHURCH DOES NOT JUDGE ABOUT THE MIND OR INTENTION IN SO FAR AS IT IS SOMETHING BY ITS NATURE INTERNAL [emphasis added]; but in so far as it is manifested externally she is bound to judge concerning it. When any one has rightly and seriously made use of the due form and the matter requisite for effecting or conferring the Sacrament, he is considered by the very fact to do what the Church does. On this principle rests the doctrine that a Sacrament is truly conferred by the ministry of one who is a heretic or unbaptized, provided the Catholic rite be employed. On the other hand if the rite be changed, with the manifest intention of introducing another rite not approved by the Church and of rejecting what the Church does, and what by the institution of Christ belongs to the nature of the Sacrament, then it is clear that not only is the necessary intention wanting to the Sacrament, but that the intention is adverse to and destructive of the Sacrament."

Now, regarding the minister's intention to do what the Church does: if the Church herself does not presume to "judge about the mind or intention in so far as it is something by its nature internal," but considers that the use of correct matter and form indicates the required intention of doing what the Church does, then by whose authority does the Society of St. Pius X presume to judge that even one Novus Ordo "Mass" performed by even one Novus Ordo priest is invalid because of something that no one, not even the Church, is allowed to judge upon, namely, the "mind or intention ... something by its nature internal" of the celebrant?

The Society's judgment, moreover, is not with respect to isolated cases of supposed defect of intention of Novus Ordo priests (upon which to judge is wrong and contrary to the mind and practice of the Church, as Pope Leo teaches); but, absurdly, with respect to alleged defect of intention on a widespread basis -- i.e., "more and more" invalid masses and "increasing invalidity" of masses. Thus the Society dares to pronounce its judgment on matters that the Church declares, through the Sovereign Pontiff Leo XIII, that She herself does not presume to have the prerogative of judging upon.

Perth, Western Australia
Feast of St. Anthony of Padua 1994

NO "MYSTERY OF FAITH" : NO MASS
By Patrick Henry Omlor

PREFACE

Those of my present readers who are familiar with my previous writings will know that I have dwelt principally upon the "pro multis" ("for many") issue, demonstrating the invalidity of the Novus Ordo Missae in its various vernacularized versions, in particular in the ICEL's version in English. The invalidity results from the corrupted form for the wine consecration, the form of a sacrament being defined as the necessary words spoken by the minister in conferring or confecting a sacrament.

In *The Necessary Signification In The Sacramental Form Of The Holy Eucharist*, published in 1991, I went beyond the "pro multis" issue and devoted fifteen pages (Part I, Sec. 9, pp. 50-64) to a detailed discussion which further demonstrated the necessity for validity of the words "the mystery of faith" in the form for the wine consecration. Therefore the mass of evidence that the Novus Ordo Missae (NOM) is invalid is greater than, but of course includes, the "pro multis" issue. For those essential words "the mystery of faith" were in fact expunged from the wine consecration by Paul VI in his prototypal Latin edition of the Novus Ordo Missae .

The consequences of this are more far-reaching than those of the "pro multis" issue alone, because if the Novus Ordo Missae even in its Latin version is invalid by virtue of the deletion of the words "the mystery of faith" -- No "Mystery of Faith" : No Mass --then the New Mass is invalid universally; it is per se invalid. Even those few vernacularized versions of the NOM that have faithful translations of pro multis are affected; faithful copies of a counterfeit original yield only more counterfeits. No "Mystery of Faith" : No Mass!

Yet another serious fact automatically follows: namely, that Paul VI was not a bona fide pope and the true Vicar of Christ on earth, at least not at the time he promulgated his Novus Ordo Missae. That this is necessarily a consequence of the invalidity of his prototypal edition of the Novus Ordo Missae, though immediately apparent to most readers, will nevertheless be discussed in this essay.

Now, some of my Adversarii may reject out of hand these notions, by pointing out that the words *mysterium fidei* are not found in the consecration forms in the majority of the Eastern rites and hence cannot possibly be essential for validity. I have already discussed and refuted this argument in *The Necessary Signification In The Sacramental Form Of The Holy Eucharist* (denoted hereinafter by the abbreviation "TNS"), and I shall do so again in this essay. Therefore my adversaries and other skeptics should not too hastily dismiss my case peremptorily.

The following is an excerpt from my Preface to *Questioning The Validity Of The Masses Using The New, All-English Canon* (1968): "Each paragraph of this monograph is numbered uniquely, so that all who wish to question or rebut any

particular point, or many points, may with ease refer to what I have written. Not only will this aid my sincere opponents in citing chapter and verse against me, but it will also point up the insincerity of all blanket criticisms that avoid citing specifics." Similarly and for the same reasons each paragraph of this present essay is numbered.

Perth, Western Australia

October 1994

NO "MYSTERY OF FAITH" : NO MASS

I. The Entire Form Is Necessary For Validity

1. The sacramental form for the wine consecration printed in altar missals prior to the introduction of the Novus Ordo Missae is as follows: Hic est enim Calix Sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti: mysterium fidei: qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.
2. The correct, literal English-language translation of this form is given thus in ante-NOM editions of The Saint Andrew Daily Missal: For this is the Chalice of my Blood, of the new and eternal testament: the mystery of faith: which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins.
3. For the validity of the Consecration of the Wine, and hence for the validity of the mass, the entire form laid down in Missale Romanum (and reproduced in pars. 1-2 above) is required, and the mere words "This is the Chalice of my Blood," do not suffice.
4. That the entire form is necessary for validity and the introductory words, "This is the Chalice of my blood," alone by themselves, do not suffice for a valid consecration is maintained by St. Thomas Aquinas, the authors of the Roman Catechism (Catechism of The Council of Trent), Pope St. Pius V, St. Antoninus, Pope Innocent III, the Salmanticenses, and many other theologians of great authority. A list of the names of thirty-nine such theologians (which is not exhaustive, but cited only as examples) is given on pp. 22-23 of TNS.
5. The school of opinion that the "short form" of words "This is the Chalice of my Blood" suffices for validity also includes theologians of repute. The matter has not been decided definitively by the Church. A thorough discussion of the pros and cons of this "entire form versus short form" controversy is given by Emmanuel Doronzo, O.M.I., Professor of Dogmatic Theology at Catholic University, Washington, D.C., in Article 10 on pp. 150-161 of his work entitled, Tractatus Dogmaticus De Eucharistia, Tom. I De Sacramento, published by Bruce, Milwaukee, 1947.
6. Father Doronzo himself, the preëminent scholar of recent times to have studied this matter, leans heavily towards the opinion that the entire form is necessary. I devoted the whole of Part I of TNS (pp. 1-67) to a discussion of "the entire form" versus "the short form" controversy. It is left to the interested reader to consult those pages, for there is not the space here to review all the evidence, based both on authority and on sacramental theology, that the entire form is necessary for validity.

7. Those of my Adversarii who follow the opinion that the words "This is the Chalice of my Blood" are the only words required for validity cannot base a refutation of my case on that hypothesis. For it is only a theological opinion, one that is greatly outweighed by the stature of the many eminent theological authorities opposed to it, whose cogent evidence and theological reasons are veritably invulnerable to refutation.

II. The Teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas

8. Although space limitations prevent us from presenting the learned commentaries of all the renowned authorities defending the entire form, it will be useful now at least to examine the doctrine of the "Prince of Theologians" regarding the necessity of the entire form for the Consecration of the Wine.

9. In Summa Theologica (III, Q. 78, A. 3) he writes: "Respondeo dicendum quod circa hanc formam est duplex opinio. Quidam enim dixerunt quod de substantia formae huius est hoc solum quod dicitur, Hic est calix sanguinis mei, non autem ea quae sequuntur.--Sed hoc videtur inconueniens: quia ea quae sequuntur, sunt quaedam determinationes praedicati, idest sanguinis Christi; unde pertinent ad integritatem locutionis.

"Et propter hoc sunt alii qui melius dicunt quod omnia sequentia sunt [emphasis added] de substantia formae, usque ad hoc quod postea sequitur, Hoc quotiescumque feceritis, quae pertinet ad usum huius sacramenti, unde non sunt de substantia formae."

10. Which is translated as follows: "I answer that There is a twofold opinion regarding this form. Some have maintained that the words This is the chalice of My blood alone belong to the substance of this form, but not those words which follow. Now this seems incorrect, because the words which follow them are determinations of the predicate, that is, of Christ's blood; consequently they belong to the integrity of the recitation of the form.

"And on this account others say more accurately that all the words which follow [emphasis added; and these words which follow include the words 'the mystery of faith'] are of the substance of the form down to the words, As often as ye shall do this, which belong to the use of this sacrament, and consequently do not belong to the substance of the form."

11. In the same Summa Theologica (111, Q. 60, A. 8) St. Thomas explains what he means when he speaks of "the substance of the form": "Manifestum est quod si diminuatur aliquid eorum, quae sunt de substantia formae sacramentalis, tollitur debitus sensus verborum: et ideo non perficitur sacramentum." "Now it is clear that if anything that is of the substance of the sacramental form [emphasis added] would be suppressed, then that would destroy the essential sense of the words; and consequently the sacrament would be rendered invalid" [emphasis added].

12. Again in his treatise In I Cor. XI, (lect. 6), the Angelic Doctor teaches the same thing: "Sed circa ista verba quibus Ecclesia utitur in consecratione sanguinis, quidam opinantur, quod non omnia sint de necessitate formae, sed solum quod dicitur, 'Hic est calix sanguinis mei,' non autem residuum quod

sequitur, 'Novi et aeterni testamenti, mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.' Sed hoc non videtur convenienter dici: nam totum illud quod sequitur est quaedam determinatio praedicati: unde et ad ejusdem locutionis sententiam seu significationem pertinet. Et quia, ut saepe dictum est, formae sacramentorum significando efficiunt, totum pertinet ad vim effectivam formae."

13. Which in English reads as follows: "In regard to these words which the Church uses in the consecration of the Blood, some think that not all of them are necessary for the form, but the words 'This is the chalice of My Blood' only, not the remainder which follows, 'of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins.' But it would appear that this is not said correctly, because all that which follows is a determination of the predicate [namely, 'This is the chalice of my blood']: hence those subsequent words belong to the meaning or signification of the same pronouncement.

And because, as has often been said, it is by signifying that the forms of sacraments have their effect, hence all of these words appertain to the effecting power of the form." [Bold print emphasis throughout was added.]

14. It needs to be mentioned that, when speaking of the "entire form," the first word of the form in English--namely, "For" ("enim")--is not required for validity. All theologians agree on this point. The Roman Catechism (Part II, Chap. 4, Q. 20) teaches that, although all other words of the form are essential, this word, namely, the conjunction "enim," is not required for validity, but "by all means is to be pronounced by the priest." St. Thomas remarks that the word enim "is set in the form according to the custom of the Roman Church, which derived it from Peter the Apostle" (Summa Th., III, Q. 78, A. 2, ad 5); and that although it is not part of the substance of the form, nevertheless if a priest would omit this word, "for," he would thereby perhaps sin through his negligence or contempt (Summa Th., III, Q. 60, A. 8).

III. Pope St. Pius V Rebuffs Cajetan

15. Tommaso Cajetan (1469 1534), a Dominican cardinal, was the first "Thomist" to oppose publicly the mind of St. Thomas regarding the necessity for validity of the entire wine consecration form. In his 'Commentaries' on the Summa, Cajetan, contradicting St. Thomas, boldly asserted that for the consecration of the Precious Blood nothing more is required than these four words: "This is my blood."

16. The "Commentaries" of Cajetan were published at Venice (1533) and later at Lyons (1540). In 1570, some thirty-six years after Cajetan's death, the reigning Sovereign Pontiff St. Pius V authorized the publication of a Roman edition. But at the same time St. Pius V explicitly ordered Cajetan's claim (viz., that the short form suffices for validity) to be expurgated.

17. Raymond Capisuccus, a Dominican cardinal and a true Thomist, wrote a learned treatise, published in 1677, entitled *Controversiae theologicae selectae*. 'In Controversy 3, under the heading "De forma consecrationis vini eucharistici,"

on p. 209 Capisuccus wrote the following: "They are in error who try to maintain that this was expurgated only because Cajetan downgraded St. Thomas' opinion too much. For Cajetan here does not merely downgrade the opinion of St. Thomas; he departs from it. Just as he departs from him on other matters, but those other divergences were not ordered to be dropped from the Roman edition. It is evident that Pope Pius V did not agree with this opinion [the expurgated one] of Cajetan's."

IV. The Powerful Backing Of De Defectibus

18. There is yet another most weighty authority supporting our position that the entire form for the wine consecration is required for validity. De Defectibus in Celebrations Missarum Occurrentibus (abbr. as "De Defectibus") is a section of the official rubrics for the celebration of Holy Mass, and it is to be found printed among the introductory pages of all legitimate (ante NOM) altar missals.

19. In Part V of De Defectibus we read: "Verba autem Consecrationis, quae sunt forma hujus Sacramenti, sunt haec: Hoc est enim Corpus meum. Et: Hic est enim Calix Sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti: mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Si quis autem aliquid diminueret, vel immutaret de forma consecrationis Corporis et Sanguinis, et in ipsa verborum immutatione verba idem non significarent, non conficeret Sacramentum. Si vero aliquid adderet, quod significationem non mutaret, conficeret quidem, sed gravissime peccaret."

20. The English version of this reads: "The words of Consecration, which are the form of this Sacrament, are these: For this is my Body. And: For this is the Chalice of my Blood, of the new and eternal testament: the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins. Now if one were to omit, or to change anything in the form of the consecration of the Body and Blood, and in that very change of the words the [new] wording would fail to mean the same thing, he would not consecrate the Sacrament. If in fact he were to add something that did not change the meaning, it is true he would consecrate, but he would sin most gravely."

21. Could anything be clearer? Anything more incapable of being misunderstood? It begins by saying "The words of Consecration, which are the form of this Sacrament, are these:" Then the entire form, both for the Consecration of the Body and of the Blood -- including, of course, the words "the mystery of faith" -- is set down precisely.

22. Having specified the sacramental form in its entirety, the prescription then warns that if the priest-celebrant should omit anything at all (aliquid) of this form -- for example, omit the words "the mystery of faith" -- or use different wording that would change the meaning of the prescribed words, then "he would not consecrate the Sacrament"; he would celebrate no Mass at all.

23. What is the binding force of rubrics? In the article under the heading Rubrics by F. Cabrol in The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. XIII, p. 217, 1913 edition, we read:

"Obligatory Character.--...Writers distinguish between Divine and human rubrics, but as soon as rubrics are approved by the sovereign pontiff and promulgated in his name it seems to us that they emanate from a Divine-human authority, and none save the Church has the right to establish such rules. ...

"It may be said that the rubrics of the liturgical books are real laws; this follows from the definition: they are prescriptions for the good order of external worship in the Catholic Church, they emanate from the highest authority -- the sovereign pontiff -- and considering the terms in which they are promulgated it does not appear that the supreme head of the Church merely desires to give a counsel. ...[T]he minds of the sovereign pontiffs as expressed in their Bulls, which in establishing and promulgating rubrics, intend to make them real laws."

24. Some may argue that De Defectibus, being thus classified as a law, may be legitimately and validly changed by another Sovereign Pontiff; for example, Paul VI. I reply that the text of De Defectibus I cited above (in pars. 19-20) is not merely a law pertaining to a purely disciplinary matter -- that is, "prescriptions for the good order of external worship in the Catholic Church," as Cabrol puts it. Much more than the preservation of "good order of external worship" is intended here. These particular dicta are definitive teachings of sacramental theology regarding the sacramental form of the Holy Eucharist. They fall within the domain of dogmatic theology, rather than as ecclesiastical law.

25. This is true because rubrics relating to the matter or the form of sacraments take on a new dimension. "The Rubrics, if we except the few which regard the matter and form of sacraments [emphasis added] , are ecclesiastical laws..."

(Notes on the Rubrics of the Roman Ritual, by Rev. James O'Kane, Jas. Duffy & Co., Dublin, 1922, p. 14).

26. Simply examining Part V of De Defectibus drives this point home. It is a plain statement of theological fact on a most vital matter. In effect it says to the priest: "Here are the words you must recite. They are all essential. If you leave anything out or change anything you will not celebrate valid Mass." What the informed priest will also know is that the full authority of the Sovereign Pontiff is behind this teaching.

27. An aside: An important point to note is that the aforementioned Part V of De Defectibus does not speak of two forms. The singular noun "forma" --"The words of Consecration, which are the form of this Sacrament, are these:"--means that the form of this Sacrament, although two-fold in nature, is but a single form. Hence any of the proscribed violations of the form -- either of the part for the consecration of the bread or of that for the consecration of the wine -- invalidates the whole Sacrament. "Now if one were to omit, or to change anything in the form [N.B. "the form" : singular] of the consecration of the Body and Blood, and in that very change of the words the [new] wording would fail to mean the same thing, he would not consecrate the Sacrament."

28. Some persons who accept our arguments that the wine consecration is invalid and therefore the Mass itself is invalid, nevertheless believe that the hosts

may he truly consecrated. If the interpretation in the preceding paragraph is correct, then such a belief is unfounded.

V. Synopsis Of The Preceding Points

29. To prove the necessity for validity of the words "the mystery of faith," in the consecration form for the wine we have specifically named these authorities: St. Thomas Aquinas, the Roman Catechism, St. Pius V, St. Antoninus, Innocent III, the Salmanticenses, Raymond Capisuccus, O.P., Emmanuel Doronzo, O.M.I., and, lastly, Part V of *De Defectibus*.

30. We have cited the incident of the expunging by Pope St. Pius V of the contrary opinion held by Cajetan (*supra*, Part III, pars. 15-17).

31. The detailed and cogent evidence from the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas was presented in paragraphs 9-13 of Part II.

32. The whole of Part IV (pars. 18-28) was devoted to a treatment of the doctrine of the Ordinary Magisterium of the Church found in Part V of *De Defectibus in Celebratione Missarum Occurrentibus*, which comprises part of the official rubrics of *Missale Romanum*.

33. The evidence thus far presented is based solely on arguments from authority. It is outside the scope of this present essay to give the arguments based on sacramental theology. This theological evidence that the entire form is necessary is found in several of my writings; for example, in *Interdum* #3, entitled "Res Sacramenti," and in Part II of TNS (pages 68-111), where a thorough treatment of the matter is presented.

34. An *Adversarius*, who wishes to destroy my thesis must do the following things: either [1] show that I have not quoted correctly the authorities I have cited; or [2] show that, although I have cited them correctly, I have misunderstood their meanings and thereby unwittingly placed a false construction on what they teach; [3] present a solid, virtually irrefutable case, based on sacramental theology, that the mere words "This is the Chalice of my Blood" suffice for validity, and such a case must at the same time successfully refute my own case that is presented on pp. 68-111 on TNS; [4] produce authorities of greater weight who teach the opposite of my cited authorities.

35. To accomplish what is required in point [4] above would seem impossible. In his encyclical *Aeterni Patris* Pope Leo XIII stresses the unique role of St. Thomas in the affairs of the Church:

"The ecumenical councils have always been careful to hold Thomas Aquinas in singular honor. In the councils of Lyons, Vienne, Florence, and the Vatican one might almost say that Thomas took part and presided over the deliberations and decrees of the Fathers."

"But the chief and special glory of Thomas, one which he has shared with none of the Catholic doctors, is that the Fathers of Trent made it part of the order of the conclave to lay upon the altar, together with the code of sacred Scripture and the decrees of the Supreme Pontiffs, the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas, whence to

seek counsel, reason, and inspiration."

VI. Origin Of The Words "The Mystery Of Faith"

36. All of the words of the wine consecration form are found in Holy Scripture, with the exception of "and eternal" and "the mystery of faith." What, therefore, is the origin of these words? "[N]early all these words [of the wine consecration] can be culled from various passages of the Scriptures. Because the words, This is the chalice, are found in Luke xxii 20, and in 1 Cor. xi 25, while Matthew says in chapter xxvi 28: This is My blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins. The words added, namely, eternal and mystery of faith, were handed down to the Church by the apostles, who received them from our Lord..." (Summa Th., III, 78, A. 3, ad 9).

37. St. Thomas therefore teaches here that the words "the mystery of faith" are derived from Tradition (Tradition with capital "T", which is one of the two sources of Divine Revelation), since they "were handed down to the Church by the apostles, who received them from our Lord."

38. It is not merely an "opinion" that the Angelic Doctor is here expressing; rather it is a fact of ecclesiastical history -- nay, a truth of Divine Revelation -- fully substantiated by the Papal authority of Innocent III in his doctrinal letter *Cum Marthae Circa*, Nov. 29, 1202. (Cf. Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, nos. 414 - 415).

39. An Archbishop of Lyons had inquired of Pope Innocent who it was that inserted "the mystery of faith" in the consecration form for the wine. In *Cum Marthae Circa* the Sovereign Pontiff replied as follows:

"You have asked (indeed) who has added to the form of words which Christ himself expressed when He changed the bread and wine into the Body and Blood, which are in the Canon of the Mass that the general Church uses, but which we find expressed by none of the Evangelists. ... In the Canon of the Mass that expression, "the mystery of faith," is found interspersed among His words. ... Surely we find many such things omitted by the Evangelists from the words as well as from the deeds of the Lord ... Therefore We believe that the form of words as is found in the Canon, the Apostles received from Christ, and, their successors from them" [emphasis added].

40. What is the force and status of *Cum Marthae Circa*? It is not just the theological opinion of a pope writing as a private theologian. Leeming calls it a "doctrinal letter" (*Principles of Sacramental Theology*, 1960, p. 255). Its very inclusion in Denzinger shows that it is part of the Ordinary Magisterium of the Church. Since those words "the mystery of faith" were received from Our Lord by the Apostles and handed down by them, they come down to us via Apostolic Tradition, one of the two sources of Divine Revelation. And that is why I claimed in par. 38 above that the words "the mystery of faith" are in the wine consecration of the Latin Rite through Divine Revelation.

41. Anyone who would be so bold as to gainsay the teaching of Pope Innocent III that the words "the mystery of faith" were in the Latin Rite consecration form from the very beginning would be obliged to show when,

where and by whom these words were inserted at some later date. Such evidence cannot be found, and in quest of it one would in vain search the Apostolic Constitutions, the Decretals, the writings of the Apostolic Fathers and the Doctors, all extant official ecclesiastical records, or even Apocrypha.

VII. Some Amusing Theories

42. From p. 67 of *A Short History of the Mass*, by J. D. Crichton, published by The Incorporated Catholic Truth Society, London, 1983:

"Sufficient has been said about the Roman Canon above. All we need to comment on here is the expression 'mysterium fidei' which is found inserted in the words of the consecration of the wine in the seventh century edition of the Canon. It is thought, with some probability, to be the Pious exclamation of a copyist who put it in the margin, from which it got into the text. Or it may have been uttered by the deacon."

43. These explanations will appeal to those of Crichton's gullible readers who believe in Santa Claus. And also perhaps to members of the Flat Earth Society. First of all he says these words are "found inserted in the words of the consecration of the wine in the seventh century edition of the Canon." That is undoubtedly true, but the incautious reader would be led to believe from that statement that the origin of the words "the mystery of faith" dates only from the seventh century.

44. Commencing by citing as unimpeachable evidence the "thought" of some anonymous authorities of unassailable sagacity; to wit: "It is thought, with some probability" -- he then advances the laughable theory that these words were "the pious exclamation of a copyist who put it in the margin, from which it got into the text." Some obscure, unnamed "pious" copyist, presumably one commissioned in make manuscript copies of the Canon of the Mass, commits the crime of tampering with the text, and lo! the change eventually gets incorporated in all copies of the missal used throughout the western Church! Great halls o' fire!

45. Canon E. E. Estcourt in *The Question of Anglican Ordinations Discussed*, (London, Burns & Oates, 1873), writes thus: "The care taken to preserve the Canon in its original authentic form we learn from other writers. 'In ancient times...,' says Muratori, 'to change the sacred words of the Canon was a crime.' [Emphasis added]. By the laws of Charlemagne it was ordered that only men of full age should be employed to transcribe it; and the Councils of York and Oxford in the twelfth century decreed that the Archdeacon should examine every church whether there were errors or defects in the Canon, either by the faults of transcribers or the books being old" (pp. 279 - 280).

46. "Or it may have been uttered by the deacon" is Crichton's other illustrious theory. As a priest is reciting the solemn words of the wine consecration, and right after he has said "novi et aeterni testamenti," picture in your mind some feather-brained, garrulous deacon, who has no business "uttering" anything at all at that sacred moment, chiming in: "mysterium fidei"!!

VIII. Meaning Of "The Mystery Of Faith"

47. What is the meaning, the theological significance, of these words, the mystery of faith, in the consecration form? "In this place, however," teaches the Roman Catechism, "these words bear an import different from that which they have when applied to baptism; for here 'the mystery of faith' consists in seeing by faith the blood of Christ, veiled under the species of wine --- " (Part II, Chap. IV, Q. 23).

48. Pope Innocent III teaches likewise that the theological significance of these words in the sacramental form is their expression of the doctrine of the Real Presence of the true Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar:

"Yet 'mysterium fidei' is mentioned, since something is believed there other than what is perceived; and something is perceived other than what is believed. For the species of the bread and wine is perceived there, but what is believed is the truth of the Body and Blood of Christ and the power of unity and love." (From the doctrinal letter *Cum Marthae Circa* cited earlier, Denz. # 414).

49. Catholics believe that hidden under the consecrated species of Bread and Wine is the Real Presence of the Sacred Humanity and Divinity of Our Lord. Present sacramentally is the same true body of Jesus that was conceived in the womb of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the same body that came forth in the stable at Bethlehem, the same Jesus Christ Who as the Divine Infant was held in the loving arms of St. Joseph. The same Divine Infant Who was borne on the shoulders of St. Christopher and Who appeared to St. Anthony and lay upon his breast. Yes, what we receive in Holy Communion is the true Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity of the same Jesus Christ Who suffered His dolorous Passion and Death on Calvary for us, who rose from the dead on the first Easter and Who ascended into heaven forty days later. It is the same Jesus Christ Whom we will meet at the terrifying moment of our particular judgment, and Who at the end of time will come again to judge the living and the dead.

50. This is what is meant precisely and exclusively by the phrase "the mystery of faith" in the wine consecration of the Mass: our belief in the Real Presence of Jesus Christ -- right now -- in the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist. Among those things that are NOT meant here are the truths of our faith that Christ has died, that He is risen, and that He will come again.

51. Although this may be getting ahead of what will be discussed later, it is expedient to mention at this point that Paul VI not only removed the words "the mystery of faith" from the sacramental form itself, but inappropriately brought them in later. He wrote: "The words *Mysterium Fidei*, taken from the context of the words of Christ the Lord, and said by the priest:, serve as an introduction to the acclamation of the faithful" (Apostolic Constitution promulgating the NOM). The "acclamation of the faithful" is "Christ has died, Christ is risen, Christ will come again."

52. From the treatise entitled *Roman Theologians take a look at the New Order of the Mass* (known also as the "Ottaviani Intervention"): "Then the acclamation assigned to the people after the Consecration ... brings us to the crowning ambiguity with regard to the Real Presence, under pretext of concern

about the Last Day. Without a break the expectation of Christ's second coming at the end of time is proclaimed at precisely the moment when He is actually present on the altar -- as if the second coming, and not this, were the true coming" (p. 13 of the edition published by Ogilvie Foundation, Edinburgh, 1970; translated by Mary Ambrose).

From the hymn *Lauda Sion*, the sequence of the Mass for the feast of Corpus Christi, composed by St. Thomas:

"Dogma datur Christianis,
Quod in carnem transit panis,
Et vinum in sanguinem.

'Quod non capis, quod non vides,
Animosa format fides,
Praeter rerum ordinem."

"Hear what holy Church maintaineth,
That the bread its substance changeth
Into flesh, the wine to blood.

"Doth it pass thy comprehending?
Faith, the law of sight transcending,
Leaps to things not understood."

IX. Absence Of These Words In The Eastern Rites

53. It is essential to understand exactly what we mean when we say the entire wine consecration form is necessary for the validity of the Sacrament, and, perforce, for the validity of the Mass. We do not mean necessary in an absolutely universal sense (relating to all rites), but in the limited sense, that is, with respect to our own Latin Rite. For what is essential in one of the rites of the Church is not necessarily essential in another rite.

54. Thus we do not mean that the form of words, exactly as laid down in the Roman Missal, must be used verbatim in all rites. This point is so obvious from an examination of the various Oriental liturgies that it hardly needs mentioning. An historical example, however, will be useful to illustrate how this fundamental fact can be misunderstood. After Pope Leo XIII had declared Anglican Orders to be, categorically invalid because of a defective form of words (via his Bull *Apostolicae Curae*, 1896), the Anglican Hierarchy argued that there are Oriental liturgies which Rome has always acknowledged to be valid, but which do not employ the exact sacramental form of words for Holy Orders as is used in the Latin Rite.

55. This objection was answered by the Catholic Bishops of England in the famous *Vindication of the Bull 'Apostolicae Curae'*:

"But you are also mistaken in thinking that matters have been left by Our Lord in

such uncertainty, and that there is no one definite form which has prevailed in the Catholic Church, both in the East and in the West. If, indeed, you mean merely that no identical form of words has always and everywhere been in use ... you say what all will admit, and the Bull nowhere denies. ... The Bull, however ... is requiring, not that the form should always consist of the same words, but that it should always be conformed to the same definite type." (Both emphases in this paragraph appear in the original text.)

56. Let us now revert to the important idea that what is absolutely essential for the validity of a sacramental form in one rite or liturgy of the Church may not necessarily be essential in a universally absolute sense; that is, may not be essential for all, or even for any, of the other rites.

57. John De Lugo (1583 - 1660), the noted Spanish Jesuit and cardinal, reportedly examined numerous liturgies, showing that these words, 'This is My Body' 'This is My Blood', are the only consecrating words common to all liturgies. This does not prove that those words, and those words only, suffice as the valid sacramental form in any of the liturgies.

58. Consider the Sacrament of Confirmation. In our Latin Rite the form for the Sacrament of Confirmation is: "I sign thee with the sign of the cross, and I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation, in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." In the Byzantine Rite the form for Confirmation consists of simply these nine words: "The seal of the gift of the Holy Ghost." The words, "the Holy Ghost," are the only words common to these two forms. Who in his right mind would infer from this that a sufficient form for validly conferring the Sacrament of Confirmation consists of the mere words "The Holy Ghost"?

59. We find the words, "the mystery of faith," in the Latin Rite form for the wine consecration; but we find those same words in none of the Oriental rites, save those of the Maronites, the Chaldeans and the Malabarites. From this only one thing can be deduced with certainty, namely, that those words are not essential for those rites that do not use them. It cannot be deduced that they are not essential for the consecrations in the Latin, Maronite, Chaldean and Malabarite rites, which do use them.

60. "Now while the Latin Church uses the entire form as laid down in the Roman Missal," observes Capisuccus (on pp. 213 - 214 of the work cited, above in Part III, par. 17), "and whereas the other rites, of the Greek and of other Churches, do not have all those words in the form, it may be reasonably said that all those other forms were likewise instituted by Christ for the consecration of the wine, and that the Apostles and their successors had them, from Christ. Hence Jacques Goar [see the article on Goar in The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. VI, pp. 606 - 607, 1909 ed.], in the Greek Ritual which he annotated, says; 'As to the question whence there, arose a certain diversity between the Greeks and the Latins regarding the words of the Gospel requisite for the consecration, it is abundantly clear that this diversity arose from the traditions handed down by the different Apostles.'"

61. Continuing with Capisuccus: "And this does not change the fact that all those words which the Latin Church uses in the consecration of the wine are of

the essence of that form. For it is one thing to say that all those words are not of the essence of the form as such, and it is another thing to say that they are not of the essence of the form that the Latin Church uses. Therefore we say that although all those words are not of the essence of the form as such, they are of the essence of the form in which they are found, such as that form which the Latin Church uses.,, Ibid. (Emphasis added).

62. "Hence from the fact that the Latin Church does use all those words, we may gather that Christ the Lord, although He did not require that all [rites] use the same identical words in the Consecration of the Blood, nevertheless He wished that they who do use all those words use them as being essential. [Emphasis added]. Moreover He gave to those words the power to consecrate His Blood, provided that those words are in fact used. And consequently those words, seeing that they are in fact all pronounced, are of the essence of this form in which they are used." Ibid.

63. "Thus in our case -- that is, the form for the Eucharist -- the Greeks validly consecrate the blood of Christ through the form they use, in which the following words are not found: 'and eternal' and 'the mystery of faith.'... Now those of the Latin Rite consecrate validly through the form in which those words are in fact found; and in this case wherein the Latins use all those words, all those words are of the essence of the form which they use." Capisuccus, op. cit., pp. 214 - 215.

64. Hence we state that those words, "mysterium fidei," are not necessary in an absolute sense (which is self-evident by virtue of their absence from many of the liturgies), but, we affirm that they are necessary for those rites in which God has willed that they be included.

65. For according to the Divine Dispensation, the inscrutable wisdom of which no man can comprehend, and according to what was so evidently willed by Our Lord when He handed these words down to certain apostles to be used among certain peoples of certain traditions and cultures -- that is, in the Western Church -- we must insist with the Angelic Doctor, whose teaching has been so lucidly defended by Cardinal Raymond Capisuccus, O.P., that the words "the mystery of faith" are necessary for the validity of the wine consecration in the Latin Rite. "In adhering rigidly to the rite handed down to us we can always feel secure; whereas if we omit or change anything, we may perhaps be abandoning just that element which is essential." (From Vindication of the Bull 'Apostolicae Curae') .

66. Through God's Infinite Wisdom, Providence, design and foreknowledge of all things, it has turned out that only in the Western Church has the doctrine of the Real Presence been assailed. We know this to be true from the striking testimony of history. Berengarius, Tanchelmus of Antwerp, whose heresies in the 12th century were resisted and vanquished by St. Norbert, Wyclif, the Sacramentarians, Calvin, Zwingli, the whole host of 16th-century Protestant Revolutionaries, etc -- all these deniers of the Real Presence arose in the West.

67. With the one notable exception of Cyrillos Lukaris (1572 - 1637) (cf. TNS, pp. 61 - 62) , the doctrine of the Real Presence has never been attacked by heretics in the Eastern churches; on the contrary, it has always been believed and upheld, even by the schismatics since the 11th century and by the early

Oriental heretics. "In fact," we read in *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (Vol. V, p. 578, 1909 ed.), "even the Nestorians and Monophysites, who broke away from Rome in the fifth century, have, as is evident from their literature and liturgical books, preserved their faith in the Eucharist as unwaveringly as the Greeks, and this in spite of the dogmatic difficulties which, on account of their denial of the hypostatic union, stood in the way of a clear and correct notion of the Real Presence."

68. We know from the teaching Pope Innocent III, which we cited earlier (the letter *Cum Marthae Circa*), that the words, "the mystery or faith," were included in our wine consecration from the beginning, having been handed down by the apostles who received them from Our Lord. Therefore one must conclude that these words are an essential part of the Latin Rite consecration form. Moreover, one may theorize that in God's Providence those words, "the mystery of faith," are in the Latin Rite -- though absent in the Eastern rites -- as a necessary bulwark in defense of the doctrine of the Real Presence, and as a stumbling block and most potent rebuke against those many deniers of this teaching who have sprung up from time to time - and especially nowadays -- to attack it, such onslaughts deriving virtually exclusively from the rationalism of the West that has for so long a time infested and infected our Latin Church.

X. D (for "Destruction")-Day ; April 3, 1969

69. The English-language edition of *L'Osservatore Romano* dated May 8, 1969, carried a translation of the complete text of Paul VI's Apostolic Constitution, dated April 3, 1969, promulgating the *Novus Ordo Missae*.

However, Paul VI's new words of "consecration" were not rendered into English.

70. "Thus, in each Eucharistic Prayer," wrote Paul, "we wish that the words be pronounced thus: over the bread: *Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes: hoc est enim Corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur*; over the chalice: *accipite et bibite ex eo omnes: hic est enim calix sanguinis mei novi et aeterni testamenti, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*.

"The words *Mysterium Fidei*, taken from the context of the words of Christ the Lord, and said by the priest, serve as an introduction to the acclamation of the faithful."

71. By having the introductory words, *Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes* and *accipite et bibite ex eo omnes* and the final sentence *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem* in italics and in Latin -- that is, in the same type and style as the purported consecration form -- Paul erroneously implies that these words are (and presumably always have been) part of the consecratory formula necessary for validity. Such blurring of essential distinctions, a thing avoided at all costs by the Catholic Church, is, *cela va sans dire*, quite normal procedure in the Robber Church.

72. We have already discussed the false and deliberately misleading nature of the "acclamation." In effect the *Novus Ordo Missae* contains a denial of the Real

Presence doctrine. For if a given expression has always had a particular meaning in its original context, and the very same expression is used in the very same setting but with an altogether different meaning attached, which different meaning is explicitly acclaimed, then one may reasonably infer that the original meaning was not only suppressed, but that the innovator has intended its denial.

73. Nevertheless one must admire the cleverness, or craftiness, behind this "acclamation" innovation. Even the most somnolent members of the clergy were bound to notice -- maybe not immediately, but at least eventually -- that in the "wine consecration" of Paul's "New Order" they were no longer saying the words "the mystery of faith." Forgetful of, or in some cases totally ignorant of, all (or perhaps only 99%) of the principles of sacramental theology and the historical facts we have been documenting herein, the Sacerdotes Somniculosi became quite relieved and everything appeared to be "all O.K." when they suddenly realized they were, after all, saying those words "the mystery of faith" --and "after" all is to be taken literally -- due to that well planned, remarkably clever "acclamation" business.

74. A little over ten years before Paul promulgated his *Novus Ordo Missae* there was already a precedent for the omission from the wine consecration of the words "mysterium fidei". The Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office issued a *Monitum* (warning) dated July 24, 1958.

75. It reads as follows: "It has been made known to this Supreme Sacred Congregation that in a certain translation into the vernacular of the New Order of Holy Week the words 'the Mystery of Faith' have been omitted in the form for the consecration of the Chalice. Furthermore it has been reported that certain priests omit these same words in the actual celebration of Mass.

"Wherefore on this account this Supreme Congregation warns that it is nefarious [emphasis added] to introduce changes into so holy a thing and to mutilate or to falsify editions of liturgical books (cfr. can. 1399, 10°).

"Let the bishops, therefore, see to it, according to the intention of the *Communio* [reminder] of the Holy Office of February 14, 1958, that the prescripts of the sacred canons on divine worship be strictly observed and let them be diligently vigilant lest anyone dare to introduce even the minutest change into the matter and form of the Sacraments [emphasis added].

"Given at Rome, from the Palace of the Holy Office, on the 24th day of the month of July in the year 1958."

(The original Latin text of this *Monitum* may be found in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, Volume 50, page 536.)

XI. Pius XII's *Sacramentum Ordinis*

76. By way of prologue to the matter under discussion in this Part XI, it is necessary to present an explanation of the distinction between sacraments that Our Lord instituted in *genere* and those He instituted in *specie*.

77. From *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (Vol. XIII, p. 299, 1913 ed.): "Christ determined what special graces were to be conferred by means of external rites:

for some sacraments (e.g. baptism, the Eucharist) He determined minutely (in specie) the matter and form: for others He determined only in a general way (in genere) that there should be an external ceremony, by which special graces were to be conferred, leaving to the Apostles or to the Church the power to determine whatever He had not determined, e.g. to prescribe the matter and form of the Sacraments of Confirmation and Holy Orders."

78. In the Eastern rites the sacramental matter for Holy Orders (for the order of presbyterate) is and always has been simply the bishop's imposition of hands. Up until Nov. 30, 1947, the matter of this sacrament (for ordination to the priesthood) in the Latin Rite was twofold; viz, the aforesaid imposition of hands and the "bestowal of the instruments," that is, the touching by the candidate of a chalice containing wine and a few drops of water, and a paten with host. Both elements of this twofold matter were considered to be essential for validity. On the aforementioned date Pope Pius XII issued the Apostolic Constitution *Sacramentum Ordinis*, wherein he determined that thereafter the valid matter for the Latin Rite would consist of only the first imposition of hands by the bishop, and not the bestowal of the instruments also.

79. Two things must here be noted. First of all, Pius, while stating: "by Our Apostolic Authority We do... decide that the bestowal of the instruments at least for the future ('saltem in posterum') is not necessary for the validity..." (Denz no. 2301), he nevertheless did not change the rites and ceremonies of the sacrament. The "bestowal of the instruments" remained, the only difference being that it was now not to be considered part of the essential sacramental matter.

80. The Pontiff also mentioned the possibility that the Church might even in the future revert to maintaining that the bestowal of the instruments is necessary for validity: "But if, according to the will and prescription of the Church, the same should some day be held necessary for validity also, all would know the Church is able even to change and to abrogate what She has established." (That is a possible reason he left intact this ceremony of the bestowal of the instruments.)

81. The second thing to note is that Pius XII did not touch upon a matter of such gravity -- the "substance" of a sacrament; i.e., its matter and form -- without giving a thorough and clear explanation. In fact he made it a point to recall the doctrine of the Church's Magisterium that the Church has no power over the substance of the sacraments. "[A]s the Council of Trent teaches," wrote Pius, "the seven sacraments of the New Law have all been instituted by Jesus Christ, and the Church has no power [emphasis added] over the 'substance of the sacraments,' that is, over those things which, with the sources of Divine Revelation as witnesses, Christ the Lord Himself decreed to be preserved in a sacramental sign."

82. The Catholic Encyclopedia (loc. cit.): "The Council of Trent declared that the Church had not the power to change the 'substance' of the sacraments. She would not be claiming power to alter the substance of the sacraments if she used her Divinely given authority to determine more precisely the matter and form in so far as they had not been determined by Christ" [emphasis added]. And that is all that Pope Pius XII did. But the Church has no power whatsoever to alter the

sacramental form of the Holy Eucharist instituted in specie, wherein, by definition, Our Lord "determined minutely" the matter and the form.

83. The Sovereign Pontiff Pius XII had both the power and the right to determine further the matter of Holy Orders, since that sacrament was instituted by Christ in genere, "leaving to the Apostles or to the Church the power to determine whatever He had not determined, e.g. to prescribe the matter and form of the Sacraments of Confirmation and Holy Orders" (as quoted in par. 77 above).

XII. Paul VI Lacked Both The Power And The Right

84. The promulgating by Paul VI of "New Mass" containing a changed sacramental form for the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, instituted in specie by Our Lord, was ab initio, ultra vires null and void. For it was an action that was from the very outset (ab initio) null and void, inasmuch as soon meddling with the substance of a sacrament transcended the powers (ultra vires) of Paul VI (or any other would-be innovator).

85. Here are four pronouncements of the Magisterium of the Church that prove this claim:

- (1) "[T]he Roman Pontiff regarding the administration of the sacraments of the Church, can tolerate and even permit different rites of the Church of Christ, ... always without violating those things which pertain to the integrity and necessary parts [emphasis added] of the sacraments" (from the letter Super quibusdam of Pope Clement VI, Sept. 29, 1351).
- (2) "It [the Council] declares furthermore that this power has always been in the Church, that in the administration of the sacraments, without violating their substance [emphasis added], she may determine or change whatever she may judge to be more expedient for those who receive them or for the veneration of the sacraments, according to the variety of circumstances, times and places" (Council of Trent, Session XXI, Ch. 2).
- (3) "[I]t is well known that to the Church there belongs no right whatsoever [emphasis added] to innovate anything touching on the substance of the sacraments (Pope St. Pius X, in the letter Ex quo, nono, Dec. 26, 1910).
- (4) [A]s the Council of Trent teaches, the seven sacraments of the New Law have all been instituted by Jesus Christ, and the Church has no power [emphasis added] over the 'substance of the sacraments,' that is, over those things which, with the sources of Divine Revelation as witnesses, Christ the Lord Himself decreed to be preserved in a sacramental sign" (Pius XII, Apostolic Constitution Sacramentum Ordinis, Nov. 30, 1947).

86. "The Church has no power," said Pius XII; "No right whatsoever," said St. Pius X. No bishop, nor all the bishops together unanimously, no council, no

pope, no one at all has the right or the power to tamper with the substance of a sacrament, its essential matter or form, least of all Christ's own words in the form of the Holy Eucharist.

87. The very fact that the Holy Ghost, always guiding and protecting the Church, saw to it that these four aforementioned teachings came forth from the Magisterium on four different occasions would seem to indicate that Almighty God in His Providence and foreknowledge of all things was thereby giving faithful Catholics of our times the weapons to resist and rebuff anyone who, posing as legitimate authority, but in fact abusing his ostensible authority, would ever dare to attempt to change the essential form of the Holy Eucharist.

88. Pope Pius XII, defining the untouchable "substance" of a sacrament as "those things which, with the sources of Divine Revelation [emphasis added] as witnesses, Christ the Lord Himself decreed to be preserved in a sacramental sign," could not have more aptly described the words "the mystery of faith" in the wine consecration. For as was shown earlier (Part VI, par. 40) Pope Innocent III taught that those words "the mystery of faith" were received from Our Lord by the Apostles and handed down by them. Therefore we have those words via apostolic Tradition, which the Church holds to be one of the two sources of Divine Revelation.

XIII. The Indefectibility Of The Church

89. The Jan.-Feb. 1994 issue of the Australian journal Catholic carried a letter from Michael Davies. "What is known as the Latin Typical edition [of the Novus Ordo Missae]," wrote Mr. Davies, "is protected by the Church's indefectibility and cannot be invalid and cannot contain anything heretical or harmful to the faith. The indefectibility of the Church protects only what is mandated or authorised for the universal Church (legislation for the Roman Rite alone is considered as coming into this category)."

90. Mr. Davies reasons that the doctrine of the indefectibility of the Church is totally incompatible with the promulgation by a Sovereign Pontiff of a Mass that is per se invalid. This reasoning is absolutely sound. For if the true Church of Jesus Christ were to foist upon the faithful of the Roman Rite a Mass that is invalid, She would thus deprive them of the primary source of grace for their sanctification. In such a case we would be bound to admit that the Church had indeed failed in its mission on earth; it would be defectible, which is impossible.

91. Let us consider from a different viewpoint Mr. Davies' argument based on the indefectibility of the Church. Let us deny his premise that Paul VI was truly Christ's Vicar and that he represented the true and indefectible Roman Catholic Church.

92. A true Vicar of Christ does not invalidate the Mass, or even place its validity in jeopardy, by expunging from the most sacred of settings the words handed down by Christ Himself; namely, "mysterium fidei" in the Consecration of the Mass. He is aware of and heeds the warning: "In adhering rigidly to the rite handed down to us we can always feel secure; whereas if we omit or change anything, we may perhaps be abandoning just that element which is essential."

(From Vindication of the Bull 'Apostolicae Curae').

93. Paul VI expunged these words without explaining (as did Pius XII in *Sacramentum Ordinis*) the background for such a momentous and unprecedented decision; nor did he give any compelling and salutary reasons for his action -- for indeed there are none. Relying solely upon his supposed power and right and supreme authority as the supposed genuine sovereign pontiff, he simply presented his *fait accompli* to the Catholic Church, that Catholic Church of which he was ostensibly the head, but whose teachings and warnings he had abandoned and which he now clearly in no way represented.

94. The true Church does not and cannot contradict Herself. Therefore a true Vicar of Christ does not by his mere *fait accompli* act in contradiction to and disobey the infallible teaching of the Council of Trent and the teachings of three earlier Vicars of Christ, all four of which *dicta* (which we reproduced above in Part XII, par. 85) specifically deny him -- or indeed anyone -- the power and the right to touch the substance of a sacrament instituted in *specie*.

95. A true Vicar of Christ does not lightly disregard the teaching of St. Thomas and many other esteemed theologians regarding which words of the sacramental form for the Holy Eucharist are essential for validity. He does not guess that perhaps the Angelic Doctor and these other authorities all erred on this matter and maybe those words "the Mystery at faith" are not essential after all.

96. A true Vicar of Christ does not ignore a *Monitum* issued by the Holy Office a mere ten years earlier, which specifically warned against the omission of these very words "the mystery of faith," remarking that "it is nefarious to introduce changes into so holy a thing," and, moreover, instructing the bishops to "be diligently vigilant lest anyone dare to introduce even the minutest change into the matter and form of the Sacraments."

97. A true Vicar of Christ does not have the temerity to risk, by *fait accompli* and the mere "stroke of a pen," the terrible consequence of invalidity which *De Defectibus* warns would ensue *ipso facto* from the deletion of anything from the Consecration Form laid down in the Roman Missal.

98. Finally, no Catholic, let alone a true Vicar of Christ, defies and contemns Divine Revelation, as did Paul VI in subtracting from that which Christ gave to the Apostles to be handed down: "Therefore We believe that the form of words as is found in the Canon, the Apostles received from Christ, and their successors from them." (Pope Innocent III, as cited earlier.)

99. Paul VI himself could not have denied that these words he expunged from the consecration form, "the mystery of faith," are words said by Our Lord without at the same time tacitly admitting that for years he daily uttered a lie. Because when he did at one time celebrate the true Mass he would say: "In like manner ... taking also this excellent chalice... He blessed and gave it to His disciples saying: ... 'For this is the Chalice of My blood ... the mystery of faith...'"

100. Since Paul VI in fact did all those things that a true Vicar of Christ would never do, the conclusion at which one must logically and necessarily arrive is clear: at least at the time he promulgated his *Novus Ordo Missae* Paul VI was not the *bona fide* pope and the true Vicar of Christ on earth. As Michael Davies implied (and correctly so) the indefectibility of the Church is incompatible with the

promulgation of an invalid Mass by its true Sovereign Pontiff.

101. For had he been the legitimate and infallible voice of the true Church of Jesus Christ while foisting upon Catholics his Novus Ordo Missae, which we have shown is certainly invalid, then this so-called "true Church" would be proved to be a sham, a defectible imposture.

102. Indefectibility does not guarantee that many Catholics, particularly those who are sometimes designated as "nominal Catholics," could not be deceived and be deprived of the graces of the true Holy Sacrifice and the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, the primary sources of grace for their sanctification. Such a deprivation and such spiritual blindness could well be the result of God's punishment for the sinfulness and negligence of many, nay most, of us.

103. Indefectibility allows that terrestrial enemies of Christ and his Church, engulfed in the "smoke of Satan," to use the very words of Paul VI, would some day bring about the fulfillment of that which is foretold in the Holy Scriptures: "And they shall defile the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the continual sacrifice, and they shall place there the abomination unto desolation" (Dan. 11:31); and also: "And from the time when the continual sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination unto desolation shall be set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred ninety days" (Dan. 12:11).

104. In this essay I have advanced two theses, the latter flowing necessarily from the former: [1] Paul VI's Novus Ordo Missae is per se invalid; and [2] its corollary that he was not a bona fide pope -- the true Bishop of Rome and the Patriarch of the West, the Vicar of Christ on earth. In refuting me an Adversarius must first disprove (or attempt to do so) my case that Paul VI's Novus Ordo Missae is invalid. But he cannot argue circularly by building his case on the premise that Paul VI was a true pope, incapable of promulgating an invalid Mass.

"DENOTES" DOES NOT IMPLY "ACCOMPLISHES"

By Patrick Henry Omlor

Some persons erroneously believe that transubstantiation is the only thing that must necessarily be signified, or denoted, in the sacramental form for the wine-consecration. This mistaken belief plants in their minds the false notion that the first few words of the form, namely, "This is the Chalice of My Blood," which denote the transubstantiation of the wine into the Precious Blood, would suffice as a valid (though not licit) form for consecrating the wine. They assume that these few introductory words of the form, since they denote the conversion of the wine into Christ's Blood, automatically accomplish this conversion just as soon as they have been pronounced by the priest.

No one (at least, no Catholic) will deny that the words, "This is the Chalice of My Blood," do in fact denote transubstantiation. Although St. Thomas holds that the entire form is necessary for validity, he does acknowledge that "by the first words, This is the Chalice of My Blood, the change of the wine into blood is denoted" (Summa Theologica, III, Q. 78, Art. 3). In the same Summa (III, Q. 60,

Art. 3) he also teaches: "In the Sacrament of the Altar two things [emphasis added] are signified, viz., Christ's true body and Christ's Mystical Body, as Augustine says (Liber Sent. Prosper.)."

The final words of the form, "for you and for many unto the remission of sins," are the words that denote, or signify, the union of the Mystical Body of Christ. This union of the Mystical Body is the effect or grace proper (the *res sacramenti*) of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist; and these signifying words, namely, "for you and for many unto the remission of sins," are therefore essential for the validity of the Sacrament, and, perforce, for the validity of the Mass.

Although transubstantiation is clearly denoted by the first words of the form, "This is the Chalice of My Blood," it is not brought about, or accomplished, just as soon as these words have been uttered. The remaining words of the form, namely, "of the new and eternal testament ... for you and for many unto the remission of sins," which have not yet been pronounced by the priest, contain essential determinations of the statement "This is the Chalice of My Blood."

Analyzing the sacramental form for baptism brings home the distinction between "denotes" and "accomplishes." The words "I baptize thee" denote the washing away of sin. But the cleansing from sin, the infusion of sanctifying grace, as well as the imprinting of the indelible sacramental character of baptism are not brought about, or accomplished, just as soon as the words "I baptize thee" have been uttered, as all will admit. On the contrary, these effects await the completion of the sacramental form with those necessary additional words, "in the Name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost." The statement "I baptize thee" is not true at the moment those three words are pronounced, because the recipient of the sacrament in very fact at that precise moment has not yet been validly baptized.

Similarly, upon the utterance of the mere statement, "This is the Chalice of My Blood," nothing as yet happens. The additional words of the form, which are essential "determinations of the predicate" (as St. Thomas puts it), have not yet been expressed. Hence the statement "This is the Chalice of My Blood" does not become true until the recitation of the entire form has been completed.

Patrick Henry Omlor
March 10, 1995

THE MEANING OF "AD INTEGRITATEM EJUSDEM LOCUTIONIS"
By Patrick Henry Omlor

From a single isolated phrase in St. Thomas's *Summa Theologica*, III, Q. 78, Art.

3, some commentators have claimed that the Angelic Doctor's opinion is that the entire form for the wine-consecration is not essential for the validity of the Sacrament, but essential only for the integrity of the form. The phrase in question is "unde pertinent ad integritatem ejusdem locutionis."

These commentators argue that St. Thomas teaches that the words following "This is the Chalice of My Blood" -- namely, "of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins" -- pertain to "integrity" and not to "validity." They give the analogy that the integrity, meaning wholeness, of a human body is destroyed by, say, the loss of an arm or a leg, but that does not destroy the essential being of the person. Hence (so they argue) if one were to omit the words following "This is the Chalice of My Blood" that would destroy the integrity, or wholeness, of the sacramental form, but not its very essence. They claim this is what St. Thomas means.

On the contrary, I will show that by the word integritatem St. Thomas does not mean "integrity" in the limited sense of wholeness, which is its common meaning in English, but he uses this word as a synonym for "meaning or signification." Hence "pertinent ad integritatem ejusdem locutionis" can be correctly rendered as "they [i.e., the words following 'This is the Chalice of My Blood'] pertain to the meaning or signification of the very recitation [of the form]."

Consider two parallel passages from the pen of St. Thomas.

In I Cor. XI, (lect. 6)	Summa Theologica
Sed hoc non videtur convenienter dici: nam totum illud quod sequitur est quaedam determinatio praedicati: unde et ad ejusdem locutionis sententiam seu significationem pertinet.	Sed hoc videtur inconveniens, quia ea quae sequuntur sunt quaedam determinationes praedicati, id est, sanguinis Christi; unde pertinent ad integritatem ejusdem locutionis.

Although the actual words used differ slightly in these two parallel passages, the idea that St. Thomas is conveying is identical in both. Often I (and many others, I am sure) do the same thing; that is, in several different writings I will be making the same point, but my actual wording differs in these several writings.

In these two treatises St. Thomas is saying that the opinion that the words "This is the Chalice of My Blood" suffice for validity does not seem to be correct ("Sed hoc non videtur convenienter dici" and "Sed hoc videtur inconveniens"). He then explains that the words which follow are "determinations of the predicate" ("quaedam determinatio praedicati" and "quaedam determinationes praedicati").

He concludes by saying "therefore they [the words 'of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto

the remission of sins'] pertain to the meaning or signification ['sententiam seu significationem' are his words in In I Cor. XI, (lect. 6)] of the very recitation [ad ejusdem locutionis] of the form."

But in Summa Theologica instead of "sententiam seu significationem" he uses the word "integritatem." Since the meaning he intends must be the same in the two treatises, it is evident that by integritatem in the Summa St. Thomas does not mean simply "wholeness"; but by this word he intends to convey the idea of "meaning or signification."

-1-

In the very next sentence of In I Cor. XI (following the last one quoted in the table above) St. Thomas explains the vital role of signification in sacramental forms, which in turn explains his use of the words "pertain to the meaning or signification" : ("sententiam seu significationem pertinet"). He continues: "And because, as has often been said, it is by signifying [emphasis added] that the forms of sacraments produce their effect; hence all of these words belong to the effecting power of the form."

The position of St. Thomas that the entire form is essential for validity is clearly expressed in three separate writings: Summa Theologica, In I Cor. XI, (lect. 6), and in Scriptum Super Lib. IV Sententiarum. It is important to note that all of the early commentators on St. Thomas agreed that he held that the entire wine-consecration form is essential for the validity of the Sacrament.

Among these commentators were not only those who espoused this view, but also those who held the opposite opinion and those who, like John Duns Scotus, did not state a definite opinion. The Salmanticenses remark: "All the earlier Thomists up to Cajetan, who rejected it, unanimously [emphasis added] taught the same [i.e., the necessity for validity of the entire form]." "Et idem unanimiter docuerunt omnes antiqui Thomistae usque ad Cajetanum, qui recalcitravit" (De Eucharistiae Sacramento, Disp. IX, Dub. III, Sec. 2, par. 22).

Hervaeus Natalis and Aegidius Columna (Colonna) were disciples of St. Thomas, who learned from the very lips of the Angelic Doctor. Both of these renowned Thomists strongly upheld the position that the entire form is essential for validity. Another staunch defender of this position was the Dominican theologian John Capreolus (d. Apr. 6, 1444). Capreolus is known as "Prince of Thomists" and, moreover, "a scrupulous fidelity to the Angelical Doctor earned for him the extraordinary appellation 'Soul of St. Thomas'." (The Catholic Encyclopedia, 1908 edition, Vol. III, p. 314c).

Surely all of the early Thomists, who unanimously taught the necessity of the entire form for validity, are more reliable interpreters of the mind of St. Thomas than those innovators who came upon the scene much later. For it was not until

three centuries after the death of St. Thomas that the hollow "integrity" argument surfaced, a fact that in it-self would seem to destroy all credence in it. St. Alphonsus remarks that how such a theory squares with the mind of St. Thomas is not at all apparent (cf. Theologia Moralis, Lib. 6, Tract. III, Cap. I, Dub. VI, par. 223).

The analogy comparing the integrity of the human body to that of the integrity of the sacramental form is a fanciful invention, and nowhere does St. Thomas say or even imply that such is his meaning. Seizing upon just one word (integritatem) out of all of the Angelic Doctor's writings (the significance of this word in this place they misinter-pret!), certain bearers of a novel theory groundlessly and belatedly, after a lapse of three hundred years, build a bizarre case upon this single word, thus contradicting all the preceding Thomists. Such behavior strikes me as being fatuous to the extreme.

Patrick Henry Omlor
February 27, 1995
Feast of St. Gabriel of Our Lady of Sorrows

A SENTENCE BADLY TRANSLATED BY McHUGH AND CALLAN
By Patrick Henry Omlor

A SENTENCE BADLY TRANSLATED BY McHUGH AND CALLAN
By Patrick Henry Omlor

The following excerpts are taken from McHugh & Callan's translation of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, () pages 224-226. These texts are reproduced below exactly as they appear in the book, with the following three exceptions: (1) I have put boxes around two parts, which I have labeled (A) and (B); (2) I have underscored and put in boldface type seven words or phrases which I have labeled with the Roman numerals from I to VII enclosed in parentheses (the reason for this will be made clear later); (3) I have supplied my own translation of one sentence, thus rejecting McHugh & Callan's translation of it. This sentence will later be identified and compared with the original Latin and also with McHugh & Callan's faulty version.

Excerpts from the McHugh & Callan Translation of the Roman Catechism

[The Authors of the Roman Catechism begin by giving the form for the bread-consecration.]

"We are then taught by the holy Evangelists, Matthew and Luke, and also by the Apostle, that the form consists of these words: 'This is my body' ..."

(A) By Reason

"That these words constitute the form is easily proved from reason also. The form is that which signifies what is accomplished in this Sacrament; but as the preceding words signify and declare what takes place in the Eucharist, that is, the conversion of the bread into the true body of our Lord, it therefore follows that these very words constitute the form. In this sense may be understood the words of the Evangelist: He blessed ..."

"Although in the Evangelist the words, Take and eat, precede the words (This is my body), they evidently express the use only, not the consecration of the matter. Wherefore, while they are not necessary to the consecration of the Sacrament, they are by all means to be pronounced by the priest, as is also the conjunction for in the consecration of the body and blood. But they are not necessary to the validity of the Sacrament ..."

"With regard to the consecration of the wine, which is the other element of this Sacrament, the priest, for the reason we have already assigned, ought of necessity to be well acquainted with, and well understand its form (I). We are then firmly to believe that it consists in the following words (II): This is the chalice of my blood, of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many, to the remission of sins. Of these words (III) the greater part are taken from scripture; but some have been preserved in the Church from Apostolic tradition. ..."

(B) And Reason

"Concerning this form (IV) no one can doubt, if he here also attend to what has been already said about the form used in the consecration of the bread. For it is evident: of those words (V), which signify that the substance of the wine is changed into the Blood of our Lord, the form of this element consists. Since, therefore, the words already cited (VI) clearly declare this, it is plain that no other words constitute the form."

"They (VII) moreover express certain fruits of the blood shed in the Passion of our Lord, ... Of these, one is access to the eternal inheritance, which has come to us by right of the new and everlasting testament. Another is access to righteousness by the mystery of faith; ... A third effect is the remission of sins."

Explanation of the Foregoing Excerpts

At the time the Authors wrote the Catechism, as well as in St. Thomas's day, some held that besides the Words of Consecration other words are required for validity. For example: (1) the entire Canon; (2) the narrative preambles Who the day before He suffered, etc. and In like manner, etc.; (3) the words: He blessed,

etc.; (4) the words Take ye and eat and Take ye and drink; (5) the word "for" in For this is My body; For this is the Chalice etc.; (6) the epiclesis.()

The purpose of St. Thomas's Art. 1 of the Summa Theologica, III, Q. 78 is to refute the aforementioned opinions (1), (2), (3) and (4). He refuted (5) in Art. 2. Studiously following St. Thomas, the Authors of the Catechism also consider and reject several of these opinions.

Examination of the boxed part on the preceding page labeled "A" shows that here the purpose of the Catechism's Authors is to refute the opinions that the following are required for validity, namely, those views denoted just above as: (3) The words: He blessed; (4) The words Take ye and eat; and (5) The word "for" in For this is My body. Moreover, they are here discussing only the bread-consecration.

Now it is to be observed that the paragraph above which I have labeled "B" is the counterpart of "A", as the translators of the original London edition of 1687 point out by means of the marginal note "By Reason" alongside "A" and the complementary note "And Reason" alongside "B". In "B" the purpose of the Authors of the Catechism is to explain that what they taught in "A" regarding the bread-consecration likewise applies to the wine-consecration; to wit, these three things only: that (1) "He blessed, etc.," (2) "Take ye and drink, etc." and (3) the word "for" are not necessary for the validity of the wine-consecration.

But, to avoid detailed repetition of the same points, they cover it by saying, "Concerning this form no one can doubt, if he here also attend to what has been already said about the form used in the consecration of the bread," referring to what they had explained in "A". This statement does not, needless to say, refer to what was said in the sentence just above "A", where they teach that the words This is My Body comprise the only essential words for the bread-consecration. For such an erroneous conjecture would lead to the unfounded notion that, by comparison, they mean that This is the Chalice of My Blood suffices for the wine, which would blatantly contradict what they had stated so emphatically in the immediately preceding paragraph: "We are then firmly to believe ... etc."

The reader is next asked to examine the seven words or phrases that I underscored and labeled with Roman numerals. Clearly all seven refer to exactly the same thing, namely, the entire form that is prefaced by "We are then firmly to believe that it consists in the following words." Consider (V) for example: "For it is evident: of those words (V), which signify that the substance of the wine is changed into the Blood of our Lord, the form of this element consists."

Now the words which actually signify the transubstantiation of the wine are in fact the mere words "This is the Chalice of My Blood." But in the sacramental form for the consecration of the wine more must be signified than simply transubstantiation; for example, the res sacramenti, which is the unity of the

Mystical Body, must also be signified in the form as St. Thomas and others clearly teach.

The Catechism therefore does not teach that "those words...of which the form of this element consists" are only the first words of the form: "This is the Chalice of My Blood." For immediately following this sentence we read: "Since, therefore, the words already cited (VI) clearly declare this." Now, the only words "already cited" are the entire form. Finally, in They (VII): "They" -- still referring to those words (V) -- cannot possibly mean "This is the Chalice of My Blood"; because "They" are said to include the following: "of the new and everlasting testament" and "the mystery of faith" and "the remission of sins".

Let us now consider the sentence for which I provided my own translation. Compare the following versions:

(_) Latin: "Constat enim, iis verbis, quae vini substantiam in sanguinem Domini converti significant, hujus elementi formam contineri."

(_) Omlor: "For it is evident: of those words, which signify that the substance of the wine is changed into the Blood our Lord, the form of this element consists."

(_) London (1687): "For it is manifest that by these words, which signifie the substance of the wine to be converted into the Blood of our Lord, the Form of this element is contained."(_)

(_) Donovan:(_): "...evidently consists of those words, which signify that the substance of the wine is changed into the blood of the Lord."

(_) McHugh & Callan: "The form to be used (in the consecration) of this element, evidently consists of those words which signify that the substance of the wine is changed into the blood of our Lord."

McHugh and Callan's Faulty Translation, Which Has Led to Some Confusion

The McHugh & Callan sentence cited above is badly put down, nay, glaringly mistranslated. Unlike the Latin text, and unlike the other three English translations provided, the McHugh & Callan version fails to set off by commas (or a comma) the clause which reads: "which signify ... the Blood of our Lord." The superficial reader, encountering this very poor rendition by McHugh & Callan and also not realizing the purpose of the Catechism's Authors in this place, and reading only this sentence, might take it to mean that the mere words, "This is the Chalice of My Blood," are the words of which the form "evidently consists."

The opening words of McHugh & Callan's translation, namely, "The form to be

used," are absurd. The original Latin text says nothing at all about "being used." As every priest knows, the form that must be used is that entire form laid down in the Roman Missal and insisted upon by De Defectibus in Celebratione Missarum Occurrentibus, which is a section of the official rubrics for the celebration of Holy Mass. It is to be found printed among the introductory pages of all legitimate altar missals.

In Part V of De Defectibus we read: "The words of Consecration, which are the form of this Sacrament, are these: For this is my Body. And: For this is the Chalice of my Blood, of the new and eternal testament: the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins. Now if one were to omit, or to change anything in the form of the consecration of the Body and Blood, and in that very change of the words the [new] wording would fail to mean the same thing, he would not consecrate the Sacrament. If in fact he were to add something that did not change the meaning, it is true he would consecrate, but he would sin most gravely."

Inasmuch as the Catechism was written primarily for the salutary instruction of parish priests, the Authors in their explanations of the various sacraments never failed to make clear exactly what is the sacramental form for each of the sacraments. If some part of a given prescribed form that might be thought by some to be necessary for validity is in fact not necessary, these Authors are diligent in explicitly pointing this out.

As examples: In the Latin form for Baptism, "Ego te baptizo, etc." the emphatic word "ego" is not absolutely necessary because the verb ending of "baptizo" conveys the concept: "I baptize."() The entire form for Penance is "I absolve thee from thy sins in the Name of the Father, etc." The Catechism states that the form is simply "I absolve thee."() Regarding the form for Extreme Unction,() the Catechism cites several minor variations in wording used by the Eastern Rites, which they are careful to note involve "no change of the sense."

Having said so emphatically, "It must certainly be believed that it [viz. the sacramental form for the wine-consecration] consists of the following words: 'For this is the chalice of my blood, of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many, unto the remission of sins'," the Catechism specifically singles out as not being necessary for validity one and only one word, namely, the word "for". If in the opinion of the Authors of the Catechism only the opening words, "This is the Chalice of My Blood," are required for validity, they would certainly have spelled this out explicitly, just as they explicitly single out unnecessary words in the forms of the other sacraments, as was demonstrated in the preceding paragraph.

In their translation of the wine-consecration form, I think McHugh & Callan, instead of writing "to the remission of sins," would have done better had they adhered to the time-honored words "unto the remission of sins," as set down in

the Rheims New Testament (Matt. 26,28) by that most eminent theologian and linguistics scholar Father Gregory Martin.

Consider also their translation: "Since, therefore, the words already cited clearly declare this, it is plain that no other words constitute the form." The final words, adhering literally to the Latin text, should read: "it is plain that another form must not be set down" : (perspicuum est, aliam formam constituendam non esse); and not "it is plain that no other words constitute the form." For the correct translation clearly brings out the purpose of these words, which is to teach that the epiclesis of the Eastern schismatics -- that is, "another form" or an additional form -- must not be set down as being necessary for validity (as is still claimed to this day by those Eastern schismatics).

Hence "aliam formam constituendam non esse" was set down here as a forewarning for those Eastern schismatics who were at that time (the latter part of the 16th century) indicating their desire to return to Catholic unity within the bosom of Holy Mother Church. Many of them did in fact return. "Aliam formam constituendam non esse" emphasized that their belief in the necessity of the epiclesis must now be abandoned.

Patrick Henry Omlor
Perth, Western Australia
September 29, 1996

(_) Published by Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York, Fifteenth Printing, 1958.

(_) A prayer after the two consecrations, which from ancient times and up to the present is part of the Eastern liturgies, which invokes the Holy Ghost to "Make this bread the precious Body of Thy Christ. And that which is in this chalice, the precious Blood of Thy Christ." The schismatic Eastern Churches always held, and to this day hold, that the epiclesis is essential for the validity of the consecrations. In the Eastern rites of the Catholic Church, while the epiclesis is still a part of the Mass, the belief that it is essential for validity is not held, nor in fact may it be held.

(_) I have substituted the word "contained." The text actually reads: "chang'd"; and since that makes no sense, it is clearly an unfortunate printing error. The translators obviously had "contained" in this place.

(_) Catechism of the Council of Trent, translated into English by Very Rev. J. Donovan, D.D., James Duffy and Co., Dublin, 1908, p. 197.

(_) Part II, Chap. II, _ XIV.

(_) Part II, Chap. V, _ XIV.

(_) Part II, Chap. VI, _ VI.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Patrick Henry Omlor was born of Catholic parents, Joseph Peter Omlor and Helen Anastasia Omlor (née Kochan), on June 13, 1931 in Amarillo, Texas. After finishing primary school at St. Mary's Academy, Amarillo, he entered Price Memorial College, a high school in Amarillo conducted by the Brothers of the Christian Schools (F.S.C.). At the age of thirteen, in the middle of his freshman year, he was accepted at the F.S.C. Preparatory Novitiate in Glencoe, Missouri. Five years later he commenced his studies in the F.S.C. Scholasticate at St. Mary's College in Winona, Minnesota, where he received a Bachelor of Science degree in mathematics, graduating summa cum laude. While at St. Mary's he was introduced to the Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas and learned how to study it and appreciate its incomparable importance and value.

For more than eight years Omlor benefited from the sound spiritual direction and the excellent religious and secular education provided by the Christian Brothers, blessings for which he will always be grateful. But he came to realize that the religious state was not his true vocation and he left the F.S.C. Congregation in 1953. Over the next eleven years he taught mathematics at several Catholic institutions in Louisiana and California and at the Franciscan Sisters' College of St. Joseph on the Rio Grande in Albuquerque, New Mexico, (which unfortunately was later renamed the University of Albuquerque). In 1956, while at the College of St. Joseph, he married Mary Victoria Adelo.

Following upon his career as a teacher, Mr. Omlor next became a staff mathematician at Stanford Research Institute in Menlo Park, California, where he remained until late 1972. In early 1973 he arrived in Perth, Western Australia, accompanied by his wife and their three sons and seven daughters. Until his retirement in 1993 he held the position of Operations Research Practitioner at the Western Australian Division of the Pittsburgh-based Aluminium Company of America.