

This version originally published by  
ATHANASIUS PRESS  
780 California Avenue  
Reno, Nevada 89502  
Printing History  
Aladextra Press editions:  
1st Printing - March 1968  
2nd Printing - April 1968  
ATHANASIUS Press  
3rd Printing - (Enlarged) March 1969  
COPYRIGHT © Patrick Henry Omlor 1969  
Printed Form-to-HTML Conversion  
by  
jmcnally@fred.net  
<http://www.fred.net/jmcnally>  
*Internet release with permission of the author*

---

*Frontispiece*

St. Pius X  
*"To restore all things in Christ."*

---

**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**

*Frontispiece* ST. PIUS X  
*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

## 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 Canon, they are not nearly so frightening and catastrophic as are the implication 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."

L. S. B.

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 I 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 areas 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 you 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 LORD'S 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 quote 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 on 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 thou hast given me, because they are thine*."

123. *Always this was 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 (*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." (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 Body. 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 Blood*; 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 sunstantiali tum accidental*," (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 confect 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 in 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 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. . . . *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 before 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 infinite 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 canonized 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 *canonized 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 canonized formula* is employed (*and since it signifies falsely, the form: 'for all men so that, etc.' cannot become canonized 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 percent 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 *fortold* 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 oversown 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*.

(Emphasis added throughout)

# 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	NEW ALL-ENGLISH CANON - 1967	BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER - 1549
Qui pridie quam pateretur,	Who, the day before He suffered,	The day before he suffered	who, in the same night that he was betrayed,
accepit panem	took bread	he took bread	took bread,
in sanctas ac vener- abiles manus suas,	into His holy and venerable hands,	(*)	(*)
et eleva- tis oculis in coelum	and having raised His eyes to heaven,	and looking up to heaven,	(*)
ad te Deum Patrem suum omni- potentem	unto Thee, O God, His Al- mighty Father,	to you, (*) his almighty Father,	(*)
tibi gratias agens	giving thanks to Thee,	he gave you thanks and praise [1]	and when he had blessed,
benedixit,	He blessed it,	(*) [2]	and given thanks,
fregit,	broke it,	He broke the bread,	he brake it,
deditque discipu- lis suis,	and gave it to His disciples,	gave it to his disciples	and gave it to his disciples
dicens:	saying:	and said:	saying,
Accipite et mandu- cate ex hoc omnes	Take ye all and eat of this:	Take this and eat it, all of you;	Take, eat,
HOC EST	FOR THIS IS	(*) [3] THIS IS	(*) [3] this

ENIM CORPUS MEUM.	MY BODY.	MY BODY.	is my body. which is given for you: do this in remem- brance of me.
Simili modo	In like manner,	(*)	Likewise
postquam coenatum est,	when the supper was done,	When supper was ended,	after supper,
accipiens et hunc praecla- rum [4] Calicem	taking also this goodly chalice	he took the cup [4]	he took the cup [4]
in sanctas ac venera- biles manus suas,	into His holy and venerable hands,	(*)	(*)
item tibi gratias agens	again giving thanks to Thee,	Again, he gave you thanks and praise, [5]	and when he had given thanks,
benedixit, deditque, discipulis suis, dicens: Accipite, et bibite ex eo Omnes:	He blessed it, and gave it to His disciples, saying: Take ye all, and drink of this:	(*) gave the cup to his disciples and said: Take this and drink from it, all of you;	(*) he gave it to them, saying, (*)
HIC EST ENIM CALIX SANGUINIS MEI, NOVI ET AETERNI TESTAMEN- TI, MYS- TERIUM FIDEI, QUI PRO VOBIS ET PRO MULTIS EFFUNDETUR IN REMIS- SIONEM PECCATORUM.	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.	(*) 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.	for this is (*) My Blood of the new Testament, (*) which is shed for you, and for many, for remission of sins:
Haec quoties- cumque feceritis, in mei memoriam facietis.	As often as you shall do these things, in memory of Me shall you do them.	Whenever you do this, you will do it in memory of me.	Do this as oft as you shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

#### FOOTNOTES

[1] *This curious addition of the words "and praise" is discussed in Appendix 2.*

[2] *St. Matthew (26,26) writes "and blessed," and St. Mark (14,22) gives: "and blessing." Ignoring these divinely inspired sources, the new Canon not only omits the word "blessed," at both consecrations, but also the actual blessings of the host and chalice have been removed from the rubrics. In the form for the bread the Anglican Schismatics retained the word "blessed," but they omitted it for the wine. From their rubrics they also removed the actual blessing of both species. The heretic-schismatic, ex-Dominican friar Martin Bucer explained that Christ's presence "is merely in the receiving, and not in the bread and wine, which in no way are changed in their nature, but being symbols . . ." Therefore, Bucer suggested that "the little black crosses" be omitted. (Quoted from E. D. Estcourt, "The Question of Anglican Ordinations Discussed," p. 325.)*

[3] *The Schismatics, understandably, and the authors of the new all-English Canon both omit the word, **for**, which was "derived from Peter the apostle."*

[4] *Not just any cup, but "This" (hunc) particular chalice. The "Catholic Encyclopedia" comments thus on the words: "this goodly chalice." "Hunc praeclarum calicem, a dramatic identification of the Mass with the Last Supper," (v. 3, p. 263, 1908 ed.) The new all-English Canon and the Schismatics' version - with identical phraseology - say simply, "He took the cup." How dramatic! Incidentally, as Father Jungmann points out in "The Mass of the Roman Rite" (v. 2, p. 199 and again on p. 203), the expression, "goodly chalice," is taken from Psalm 22:5. Thus the claim of the "new-breed liturgists" that their changes reflect an attempt towards becoming "more scriptural" is quite preposterous.*

[5] *See Appendix 2.*

## 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 give 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 Hieresiarchs 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 hieresiarch 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 on 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. 4, 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 of 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 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."*

#### *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 canonize 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.

Amply clear, then, should be the reason why no pope could possibly canonize 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 UPON 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 or 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 or 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 canonized 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 6

### A 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 the 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 163 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*' (I 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.' (I 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 on 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." 2(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. 11: 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 Savior 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 Savior, 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 then 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*

---

**Back Cover of *Questioning the Validity*  
From the decree *Quo Primum* issued by  
Pope St. Pius V, July 19,1570:**

"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.*"