

Mass Deceptions



R. J. M. I.

By

The Precious Blood of Jesus Christ,
The Grace of the God of the Holy Catholic Church,
The Mediation of the Blessed Virgin Mary,
Our Lady of Good Counsel and Crusher of Heretics,
The Protection of Saint Joseph, Patriarch of the Holy Family,
The Intercession of Saint Michael the Archangel
and the cooperation of

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

To Jesus through Mary

*Júdica me, Deus, et discérne causam meam de gente non sancta:
ab hómine iníquo, et dolóso érue me*

Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam

Original version: 11/2003; Current version: 11/2003

Mary's Little Remnant
302 East Joffre St.
TorC, NM 87901-2878
Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us
(Send for a free catalog)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE MASS IS NOT THE PRIMARY ISSUE	5
THE HOLY MASS CAN AND HAS CHANGED	6
DISCIPLINARY DECREES THAT CAN CHANGE, EVEN IF INFALLIBLY WORDED	6
OTHER INFALLIBLY WORDED DISCIPLINARY DECREES THAT CAN CHANGE	7
<i>The Roman Breviary</i>	7
<i>The Banning of the Jesuit Order</i>	7
WHAT DO THE INFALLIBLE SOUNDING WORDS IN DISCIPLINARY DECREES MEAN?	7
CHANGES TO THE CANON OF THE MASS	8
CHANGES TO WHAT LANGUAGE IS USED IN THE MASS	8
CHANGES TO THE METHOD OF RECEIVING HOLY COMMUNION.....	9
<i>Communion in the hand</i>	9
<i>Kneeling or standing while receiving</i>	11
<i>Reception under the appearance of bread and wine</i>	11
A CONSERVATIVE EXPOSES AND DISCREDITS TRADITIONALISTS	12
CATHOLICS CANNOT ATTEND SACRILEGIOUS OR BLASPHEMOUS MASSES.....	13
HERETICAL CHANGES, EXPLICIT OR IMPLICIT, ARE FORBIDDEN	13
APOSTATE ANTIPOPE PAUL VI'S NEW MASS (NOVUS ORDO MISSAE)	13
BEWARE, MORE SO, OF THE NON-CATHOLICS WHO OFFER PIUS V'S MASS	16
ICEL'S ENGLISH VERSION IS NOT PAUL VI'S NEW MASS. IT IS A NEWER, WORSE MASS.	17
<i>Confession of an ex-member of the ICEL</i>	17
DECEPTIVE TECHNIQUES OF PAUL VI AND HIS MINIONS	19
<i>Good Cop; Bad Cop</i>	19
<i>Pope reduced to a figurehead or equal to bishops</i>	21
<i>Discredits opponents and detracts from the primary issue, the Faith</i>	22
<i>Diverts suspicion away from the heretical Vatican II Documents</i>	23
<i>Alfredo "Cardinal" Ottaviani was a master deceiver</i>	25
<i>New Mass becomes no issue if the faith is put first</i>	26
ICEL'S NEWER MASS INVALIDATES THE CONSECRATION	27
BOTH SPECIES MUST BE VALIDLY CONSECRATED TO CONFECT THE SACRAMENT	29
<i>In the English version, is not the bread properly consecrated?</i>	29
<i>Improper intention, not form, invalids the consecration of the bread</i>	30

The Mass is not the primary Issue

So-called Catholics who believe the New Mass is the primary issue among the many abominations of the Great Apostasy are themselves deservedly deceived, because they put the Mass before the Faith, and as a result, they are not Catholic. The Faith was first denied by most of the bishops at Vatican II, those who signed any one of the documents, and only then did the New Mass come to be. The Roman Rite of the Mass as codified by Pope Pius V (hereafter referred to as Pius V's Mass) was being said in the days of Pope Pius X when most were either bad or fallen-away Catholics.

Pope Pius X, *Acerbo Nimis*, 1905: "2. It is a common complaint, unfortunately too well founded, that there are large numbers of Christians in our own time who are entirely ignorant of those truths necessary for salvation... It is hard to find words to describe how profound is the darkness in which they are engulfed and, what is most deplorable of all, how tranquilly they repose there. They rarely give thought to God, the Supreme Author and Ruler of all things, or to the teachings of the faith of Christ."

The Holy Mass was not saving them, just as it does not save Greek Schismatics, because they did not put the Faith before the Mass. They were either faithless or had a very weak faith. God has confounded Traditional, so-called Catholics who put the Mass before the Faith. Their defending the Pius V's Mass as their primary cause discredits them, because they fail to distinguish between faith issues and disciplinary matters. They are like Pharisees who care more for disciplinary matters than the faith. That is not to say any changes can be made to the Mass whatsoever, as you will learn.

As you will also learn, Satan traps anyone who puts the Mass before the Faith in different ways, and God has allowed it because fallen-away Catholics are worthy of being deceived. How many people do you know are obsessed with the New Mass issue? When we show them evidence of the explicit heresies in the Vatican II documents—such as, Moslems worship the true God, or non-Catholic religions are a means to salvation, or Catholics can knowingly pray in communion with non-Catholics, or Christ denying Jews are not under a curse—they either close their eyes and ears and do not care in the least, or water down the crime. Such as these, I will not converse with, until they first show a primary interest in the faith issues. That is one reason I purposely took so long in writing this article on the New Mass issue, because the faith issues had to be dealt with first, and when that happens, as you will learn, the New Mass issue becomes no issue at all.

Oh, how many have I heard say, "I just want to bring them back to the true Mass first and then we will discuss the faith issues." That only promotes sacrilegious receptions of Holy Communion. Without the Catholic faith one cannot receive Holy Communion, and worse, if they die as such they will go to hell. I also learned they never get around to talking about the faith issues, that is, the faith issues that are being denied, and if they do, they water down the crimes. They become contented with a Holy Mass alone; that is enough for them. They believe all they need to be saved is to attend a Holy Mass on Sunday without doing the primary good works of possessing, professing, and living the full deposit of the Catholic faith. They are Sunday "Catholics," who are not Catholic at all.¹

¹ See: my books, *Faith Before the Mass* and *Where are the Catholic Bishops and Priests?*

The Holy Mass can and has changed

Disciplinary decrees that can change, even if infallibly worded

Disciplinary decrees, and parts of disciplinary decrees, that do not deal with faith or morals are not infallible, even if they are infallibly worded. Only the infallibly worded parts that deal with faith and morals are infallible. Popes teach infallibly only on faith and morals.

Vatican Council, 1870, Definition of Infallibility, Sess. IV, Chap. 4: "...the Roman pontiff speaks... infallibility which the divine Redeemer willed his Church to enjoy in defining doctrine concerning faith or morals."

Popes' disciplinary decrees that do not deal with faith or morals can be infallibly worded, but, nevertheless, they are not infallible, because they do not deal with faith or morals.² For instance, Pope Pius V's encyclical, *Quo Primum Tempore*, July 14, 1570, that codified the Roman Rite of the Mass, is infallibly worded—it sets out by declaring and ends with a perpetual anathema (curse) against all violators—but, nevertheless, it is not infallible.

Pope Pius V, *Quo Primum Tempore*, 1570: "We likewise order and declare that no one whosoever shall be forced or coerced into altering this Missal; and this present constitution can never be revoked or modified, but shall for ever remain valid and have the force of law... Accordingly, no one whosoever is permitted to infringe or rashly contravene this notice of Our permission, statute, ordinance, command, direction, grant, indult, declaration, will, decree and prohibition. Should any person venture to do so, let him understand that he will incur the Wrath of Almighty God and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul."

Quo Primum is not infallible because it does not deal with faith or morals. It deals with a disciplinary matter that can change. Indeed, popes before and after Pope Pius V's *Quo Primum* have changed (modified) the Roman Rite of the Mass. Pope Pius V himself revised the Mass. If it is an infallible dogma that popes could not change the Mass, then the Council of Trent had no right to authorize a revision of the Mass, and Pope Pius V had no right to revise it. Pope Pius V says in *Quo Primum* that the Council of Trent authorizes "Us to revise and re-edit the sacred books: The Catechism, the Missal, and the Breviary." His revising the Mass proves a future pope can revise it also, because it is a disciplinary matter that does not deal with faith or morals. Indeed, popes also modified the Roman Rite of the Mass after Pope Pius V's *Quo Primum*, which is more proof that *Quo Primum* is not infallible.

The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origin and Development, Fr. Joseph A. Jungmann, S.J.: Some real changes since the 16th century in the rubrics and in the text of the Missal of Pius V have resulted in certain instances from papal orders. For instance, in the new edition of the missal under Clement VIII (1604), the biblical chant pieces, which in some printings had been arbitrarily changed in favor of the new Vulgate, were restored to their original state, and new regulations were made regarding the final blessing. In another new edition of the Mass book under Urban VIII (1634), the wording of the rubrics was greatly improved and the revision of the hymns already accomplished in the breviary was carried out also in the few hymns

² See: my book, *A Notorious Heretic cannot be the Pope*, "Papal Errors: Infallibly worded disciplinary decrees that are not infallible."

of the missal. No new edition with any notable changes came out till that of 1920, which contained the revisions based on the reform of Pope Pius X. For the rest, excepting the increase in saints' feasts, every little was done to affect the arrangement of the Mass. Pope Clement XIII prescribed the Preface of the Holy Trinity for Sundays, and Pope Leo XIII ordered the prayers said after low Mass."

Other infallibly worded disciplinary decrees that can change

The Roman Breviary

Like *Quo Primum*, there are other disciplinary decrees that are infallibly worded but are not infallible. Pope Pius V revised the Roman Breviary in his apostolic constitution *Quod a Vobis* in 1568, which ends with the same infallible words found in *Quo Primum*. His revising it proves it cannot be an infallible matter that cannot be revised (changed). Even though he ended *Quod a Vobis* with the words "No one whosoever is permitted to infringe or rashly contravene this notice... Should any person venture to do so, let him understand that he will incur the Wrath of Almighty God and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul," future popes revised (changed) his revision. In 1911, Pope Pius X revised Pius V's version of the Roman Breviary by the authority of his apostolic constitution *Divino Afflatu*. In it, he notes that Popes Clement VIII (1605), Urban VIII (1644), and Leo XIII (1903) made revisions to the Breviary. Clearly, then, *Quod a Vobis* is not infallible, even though it is infallibly worded. The "no one whosoever" does not include the pope, who is the only one who can change such a disciplinary decree.

The Banning of the Jesuit Order

In 1773, Pope Clement XIV suppressed the Jesuits (The Society of Jesus) in a bull that used infallible sounding words, such as banning it "forever" or "perpetual," and that his decree is "perpetually valid." Yet, this was not an infallible decree, as a future pope, Pius VII, in 1814, reestablished the Jesuit Order.

What do the infallible sounding words in disciplinary decrees mean?

Even though they contain infallible words, disciplinary decrees that do not deal with faith or morals are not infallible. History proves that the popes did not understand the infallible sounding words in disciplinary decrees that do not deal with faith or morals as being infallible, because they themselves revised (changed) the same subject matter of past popes decrees that were similarly worded. By saying "this present constitution can never be revoked or modified..." and "no one whosoever is permitted... forever (in perpetuity)" to change or modify these decrees, as stated in *Quo Primum* and *Quod a Vobis*, they mean no person could change these papal decrees until the end of time, except for God speaking through His representative on earth, the pope. Thus, only future popes can change them. If a pope does not change them, they remain in force in perpetuity, till the end of time. This is the only possible interpretation when the historical evidence is considered.

Changes to the Canon of the Mass

There are those who teach, wrongly and illogically, that changes cannot be made to the Canon of the Mass. Changes have been made to the Canon of the Mass, such as the addition of saints' names. Not all the saints in the Canon of the Mass lived when the Mass was first instituted by Christ and said by the apostles; therefore, saints' names were added to the Canon of the Mass, such as Saints Cornelius (253), Cyprian (258), Cosmas (287), and Damian (287). Thus, a pope can add a saint's name, such as St. Joseph, to the Canon of the Mass. The Council of Trent does not teach that the Canon of the Mass can never change or be modified. It teaches that no changes can be made to it under the pretext that it contains errors that need correcting:

Council of Trent, Canons on the Mass: "Canon 6. If any one saith, that the canon of the mass contains errors, and is therefore to be abrogated; let him be anathema."

Changes to what Language is used in the Mass

The Council of Trent does not teach that the Roman Rite of the Mass must only be said in Latin without exception. Even if it did, a future pope could change it, because it is a disciplinary matter that does not deal with faith or morals. The Eastern Rite Catholic Masses are not said in Latin; therefore, it cannot be of the faith that Mass must be said in Latin. The Council of Trent condemns those who teach the Mass should be said in the vernacular only, such as French, Italian, and English.

Council of Trent, Canons on the Mass: "Canon 9. If any one saith, ...that the mass ought to be celebrated in the vulgar [vernacular] tongue only ...let him be anathema."

After the Council of Trent, in 1615, Pope Paul V allowed Chinese priests to say the Roman Rite of the Mass in the Chinese vernacular.

George H. Dunne, S.J., *Generation of Giants*: "The Holy Office, in a meeting held on January 15, 1615, in the presence of Paul V in the Quirinal, granted the concession asked for, namely, permission for priests to wear the headpiece while celebrating Mass, permission to translate the Bible into literary Chinese; permission for Chinese priests to celebrate Mass and recite the canonical hours in literary Chinese. ...To give the highest possible authority to this decree of March 26, 1615, Pope Paul V promulgated it by the Brief *Ecclesiae Antistes*, issued on June 17, 1615."

One can certainly question the motive and prudence of a pope who introduces the vernacular worldwide as the rule, but one could not condemn a pope who allows it, because it is within his right to do so. A pope who allows such a thing must be criticized. There were very specific reasons the Church settled on Latin as the universal language for the Roman Rite of the Mass. Roman Rite Catholics could attend Mass worldwide and hear it in Latin, the same language they are used to hearing it in. They would be just as comfortable in any church they attended Mass at worldwide. Also, Latin is one of the most sublime of all languages and thus is most worthy for use in the official prayers of the Roman Rite. Also, the use of the same language prevents the danger of watering down of the prayers by weak and bad interpretations into the vernacular. Also, once the vernacular is allowed for each race, there is danger of enculturation taking root—the temptation to further add cultural elements, profane and pagan, into the Mass. Allowing

the vernacular as the rule also promotes a spirit of rebellion and individualism where it should not exist. There are certain things Catholics must be uniform on if they are to worship God worthily and in unity. For instance, good folk music has no place in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, after Mass, yes, but during the Mass, no. Even good things have a proper time and place in which they must be used or they become ineffective or even bad.

Changes to the method of receiving Holy Communion

Communion in the hand

At one time, before the New Mass, Catholics were allowed to receive Holy Communion in the hand.

Fr. James L. Meagher, D.D., *How Christ Said the First Mass*: “The Consecration at the Last Supper - ... ‘Jesus took bread, and blessing, broke and gave to them’ ... He breaks off a piece for each and lays the Particle in the left palm of each apostle, for that was the Passover rite. The apostles take It with right thumb and index finger and place It in the mouth. That was the way Communion was given in the early Church, and women covered the left palm with a linen napkin. The Oriental Churches still give Communion this way.”³

St. Cyprian, 3rd century, *The Lapsed*: “Chapter 15 ...Returning from the altars of the devil they approach the holy place of the Lord with hands befouled and reeking with smell; still almost belching forth the death-bearing food of idols, even now with jaws breathing forth their crime and redolent with the fatal contagion they invade the body of the Lord, when the divine Scripture stands in their way, and cries out, saying: ‘Everyone that is clean shall eat of the flesh, and whatever soul shall eat of the flesh of the saving sacrifice which is the Lord, and his uncleanness is upon him, that soul shall perish from his people.’ ...Chapter 16 Spurning and despising all these warnings, before their sins have been expiated, before confession of their crime has been made, before their conscience has been purged by the sacrifice and hand of the priest, before the offense of an angry and threatening Lord has been appeased, violence is done to His body and blood, and they sin more against the Lord with their hands and mouth than when they denied the Lord.”

St. Basil the Great (+379): “It is good and beneficial to communicate every day, and to partake of the holy Body and Blood of Christ. For He distinctly says, ‘He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life.’ And who doubts that to share frequently in life, is the same thing as to have manifold life. I, indeed, communicate four times a week, on the Lord’s day, on Wednesday, on Friday, and on the Sabbath, and on the other days if there is a commemoration of any Saint. It is needless to point out that for anyone in times of persecution to be compelled to take the communion in his own hand without the presence of a priest or minister is not a serious offence, as long custom sanctions this practice from the facts themselves. All the solitaries in the desert, where there is no priest, take the communion themselves, keeping communion at home. And at Alexandria and in Egypt, each one of the laity, for the most part, keeps the communion, at his own house, and participates in it when he likes. For when once the priest has completed the offering, and given it, the recipient, participating in it each time as entire, is bound to believe that he properly takes and receives it from the giver. And even in the church, when

³ *How Christ Said the First Mass*, Fr. James L. Meagher, D.D., Made Doctor of Divinity by Leo XIII’s Congregation of Higher Studies. p. 424; Tan Books and Publishers, Inc., 1984.

the priest gives the portion, the recipient takes it with complete power over it, and so lifts it to his lips with his own hand. It has the same validity whether one portion or several portions are received from the priest at the same time.”(Letter 93, Cæsaria, concerning Communion in its entirety, c. 378)

St. Cyril of Jerusalem (313-386): “Make a throne of your hands in which to receive the King [in Holy Communion].” (“Fifth Mystagogical Catechesis”, 21: PG 33. col. 1125, c. 350 AD, as cited by the Quinsext Synod of Trullo, Canon 101, c. 692 AD)

St. Cyril further counsels great care for any fragments that might remain in one’s hands, since “just as one wouldn’t let gold dust fall to the ground so one should take even greater care when it is a question of the Body of the Lord.”

Quinsext Synod of Trullo (692 AD): “CANON 101 - THE great and divine Apostle Paul with loud voice calls man created in the image of God, the body and temple of Christ. Excelling, therefore, every sensible creature, he who by the saving Passion has attained to the celestial dignity, eating and drinking Christ, is fitted in all respects for eternal life, sanctifying his soul and body by the participation of divine grace. Wherefore, if any one wishes to be a participator of the immaculate Body in the time of the Synaxis, and to offer himself for the communion, let him draw near, arranging his hands in the form of a cross, and so let him receive the communion of grace. But such as, instead of their hands, make vessels of gold or other materials for the reception of the divine gift, and by these receive the immaculate communion, we by no means allow to come, as preferring inanimate and inferior matter to the image of God. But if any one shall be found imparting the immaculate Communion to those who bring vessels of this kind, let him be cut off as well as the one who brings them.

“ANCIENT EPITOME OF CANON 101 - Whoever comes to receive the Eucharist holds his hands in the form of a cross, and takes it with his mouth; whoever shall prepare a receptacle of gold or of any other material instead of his hand, shall be cut off. [Quote from St. Cyril’s Fifth Mystagogical Catechesis]”

St. John Damascus, c. 730: “Wherefore with all fear and a pure conscience and certain faith let us draw near and it will assuredly be to us as we believe, doubting nothing. Let us pay homage to it in all purity both of soul and body: for it is twofold. Let us draw near to it with an ardent desire, and with our hands held in the form of the cross let us receive the body of the Crucified One: and let us apply our eyes and lips and brows and partake of the divine coal, in order that the fire of the longing, that is in us, with the additional heat derived from the coal may utterly consume our sins and illumine our hearts, and that we may be inflamed and deified by the participation in the divine fire.” (*De Fide Orthodoxa*, Book IV, chap. XIV, c. 730 AD)

Therefore, one cannot say that receiving Holy Communion in the hand is, of itself, sacrilegious. Only the abuse of it is sacrilegious. Irreverent Catholics abused this disciplinary law, and so it was abolished and only allowed in emergency situations. One can certainly question the prudence and motive of those who reintroduced this practice in the New Mass, considering the historical proof of the many sacrilegious abuses that led to it being abolished. But, this is not enough proof to condemn a pope if he institutes it, because he can refer to a past law that allowed it and say that he instructs Catholics to receive in the hand reverentially. Therefore, a pope could re-institute the reception of Communion in the hand and only a pope could re-abolish it.

In any case, Catholics are duty bound to rebuke and condemn all sacrilegious abuses the Holy Eucharist, whether received in the hand or the mouth. If the priest does not stop

the abuse, then a Catholic cannot attend his Mass under pain of sharing in the guilt of sacrilegious abuse of the Holy Eucharist.

It is comforting to know, that no pope re-instituted Communion in the hand. Apostate antipopes did, and thus it has no force of law in the Catholic Church. Those who instituted and defend it were and are notorious apostates and heretics on other counts, and thus held and hold no offices in the Catholic Church. Of course, this comfort can only come to those who put the Faith before the Mass.

Kneeling or standing while receiving

To kneel or stand when receiving Holy Communion is a disciplinary matter that can change. The Eastern Rite Catholics stand when receiving Holy Communion. Therefore, it is not an infallible matter that all Catholics must kneel when receiving Holy Communion. Nor can one say it is sacrilegious or irreverent to stand when receiving without condemning all the Eastern Rite Catholics.

Reception under the appearance of bread and wine

It is a dogma that Christ's Body and Blood can be received whole and entire under the appearance of either species, the Bread or the Wine.

The Council of Trent, Sess. xxi, Canon 3, July 16, 1562; D. 936: "If any one denieth, that Christ whole and entire—the fountain and author of all graces—is received under the one species of bread; because that—as some falsely assert—He is not received, according to the institution of Christ himself, under both species; let him be anathema."

Catholics can also receive the Holy Eucharist under appearance of both species, as do Eastern Rite Catholics. In the early days of the Church, Catholics received both species.

Fr. James L. Meagher, D.D., *How Christ Said the First Mass*: "The Consecration at the Last Supper - ... Christ... first partook of the chalice himself as the celebrant of the Mass always does. Then he passed the chalice to each of the apostles. 'And they drank from it.' In the early Church the chalice was thus passed to all who received Communion till abuses forced a change of discipline."⁴

Because of abuses, receiving Communion under the appearance of wine from the chalice was abolished. The Eastern Rite priests prevent this abuse by dipping the bread on a spoon into the wine and then give the Communion to the people in the mouth.

A pope has the authority to decree that Roman Rite Catholics can receive Holy Communion under the appearance of both the bread and wine from the chalice. Although, one must question the motive for allowing a practice that past popes had weighty reasons for disallowing.

The Council of Constance, Session 13, Definition of Communion under One Species, June 15, 1415; D. 626: "...although this sacrament was received by the faithful under both kinds in the early church, nevertheless later it was received under both kinds only by those confecting it, and by the laity only under the form of bread. For it should be very firmly believed, and in no way doubted, that the whole body and blood of Christ are truly contained under both the form of bread and the

⁴ Ibid. p. 425.

form of wine. Therefore, since this custom was introduced for good reasons by the church and holy fathers, and has been observed for a very long time, it should be held as a law which nobody may repudiate or alter at will without the Church's [pope's] permission."

A Conservative exposes and discredits Traditionalists

A member of the Vatican II Church, the apostate and heretic Shawn McElhinney, a so-called Conservative, discredits and exposes so-called Traditionalists, who in some ways are worse than he is.

The Red Herring of Communion in the Hand, by I. Shawn McElhinney: "For some reason, the topic of communion in the hand is a popular red herring among self-styled 'traditionalists'. It is not unusual in fact for a multi-topical discussion to end up with the focus of the 'traditionalist' on this subject as if it somehow defines their resistance to Church policies or provisions. Since this is a topic that comes up again and again, it seems proper to refute once and for all the noxious half-truths that are put forth by not only 'traditionalists' but also liberals.

"...It is not uncommon for 'traditionalists' to pass off earlier Church disciplines as uniform when they were not, and use this mythical 'uniformity' coupled with their profound misunderstanding about what constitutes Tradition and what does not to complain about current practices in the Church that they do not like. This small paper will hopefully let the air out of their so-often insolent little balloons..."

"The controversy on communion in the hand started in Europe in the 1960's and was actually practiced by dissidents before the practice was made licit by the Holy See. From this standpoint the 'traditionalist' has a point as far as objecting to the **way** in which this practice came about in recent times but of course they do not wish to proceed along that track which would indeed be a credible approach for them to take. No, the 'traditionalist' chooses instead to construct a fictitious past with regards to communion in the hand as their means of fighting what they see as a great evil of our time. It stems again from the common ignorance of Church history and the 'traditionalist' feeling that the uniformity of worship, policy, devotions, etc. that prevailed after the Council of Trent was somehow the norm for Church history. In reality, the history of the Church in almost all of the realms where the 'traditionalist' gripes about was not as neat and tidy as they would like it to be. A few examples are the subjects of clerical celibacy, plural prayer forms, vernacular liturgies, active laity participation in the liturgy, sacramental norms of administration, and (of course) different procedures of communion reception. Among many other elements of note these to some extent varied from locale to locale without the strict uniformity that the 'traditionalist' insists is mandatory or 'traditional'.

"Self-styled 'traditionalists' are almost superstitious in their notions about what does and does not constitute reverence and what is and is not sacrilegious. They even go as far as to circulate misleading pamphlets claiming that communion in the hand was not an apostolic custom. This is probably because many groups favouring communion in the hand circulate misleading pamphlets claiming that it was universal in the early church to receive by hand. In short **both** the 'traditionalist' (who argues communion on the tongue) **and** the liberal (who argues for communion by hand) are both wrong in trying to retroject their views as some kind of 'uniform norm' in the first millennium as in neither case was this so..."

"However the 'traditionalist' who tries to make communion by mouth into an Apostolic Tradition is just as guilty of blatant lying as the liberal who revises history to suit their personal agendas. This is the problem that 'traditionalists' put themselves in when they make these kinds of ill-informed arguments."

Therefore, all the good Traditionalists may say or do is discredited, because they put the Mass issues and other disciplinary issues before the Faith issues, and some do not even care at all about the faith issues. (See my Exúrge Michaël Journal, Issue 4, “Society of St. Pius X: Give us the Mass; Forget the Faith!” and Issue 22, “SSPX: Give us the Mass; Forget the Faith, Part Two”)

Actually, the Liberals, Conservatives, and Traditionalists (which includes the sedevacantist sects that are not Catholic) are all liberal, non-Catholic peas of the same pod. God is using one group to punish and expose the other and visa-versa. The enemy successfully sowed schisms and dissensions among them because none of them possess the Catholic faith, and thus they, too, are enemies of the Catholic Church, and the worse type, because they profess to be Catholic.

Catholics cannot attend Sacrilegious or Blasphemous Masses

In any case, Catholics can never attend a Mass in which blasphemy or sacrilege takes place—such as clown or Polka “Masses,” or when women are on the altar, or in churches in which heresy or schism is notoriously taught or practiced—even if told to do so by a superior. If they do, they are partners in the crimes of sacrilege or blasphemy or heresy or schism and thus are guilty of mortal sin.

Heretical changes, explicit or implicit, are forbidden

That is not to say any changes whatsoever could be made to the Mass or other disciplinary matters that do not deal with faith or morals. It is of the faith that no heretical changes, either explicit or implicit, could be made.

Apostate Antipope Paul VI’s New Mass (Novus Ordo Missae)

On December 4, 1963, the first document of the robber’s Second Vatican Council was passed, “Constitution of the Sacred Liturgy,” which called for a revision of the Roman Rite of the Mass. A commission (Consilium) to implement it was formed in 1964, and later, four others. The five commissions consisted mostly of the Council periti (so-called experts). Its reforms had to be approved by the appropriate Roman Congregation. The reforms were being introduced experimentally in many churches before it was promulgated. On April 3, 1969, Paul VI’s Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum* promulgated the New Mass and made it obligatory on November 30, 1969, the First Sunday of Advent. A month after its promulgation, on May 8, 1969, in his Apostolic Constitution *Sacrum Rituum Congregatio*, he ended the Consilium and incorporated it into the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship, with Fr. Annibale Bugnini appointed as secretary, who was one of the main apostate architects of the New Mass and highly suspected of being a Freemason.

The question, then, is, “Does the New Mass contain explicit or implicit heresy, and what are the consequences if it does?” As stated above, no heretical changes could be

made to the Mass prayers, either explicitly or implicitly (by way of omission). For instance, a pope cannot introduce prayers into the Mass that are explicitly heretical. If he did, he would be automatically excommunicated and automatically lose his office for notorious heresy. Or, a pope cannot deliberately leave out or change prayers that clearly profess dogmas so as to appease heretics or schismatics, for this would be an implicit denial of the dogmas deliberately omitted or made deliberately vague. This latter case is harder to prove than explicit heresy; therefore, the pope would not lose his office because it is not notorious (explicit and certain) heresy, and thus, in this case, it would take a future pope to declare him an excommunicated heretic for implicit heresy, and likewise, condemn his implicitly heretical Mass.

Implicit heresy is the reason Paul VI's New Mass (*Novus Ordo*) in Latin is highly suspect, because of heretical intentions in leaving out and changing certain prayers. It speaks less of sacrifice and more of a meal and memorial. It replaces prayers that clearly profess dogmas with ambiguous ones that can be taken either in the orthodox (true) or heterodox (heretical) sense. It left in enough prayers that clearly profess the necessary dogmas so its defenders can point to them proving the orthodoxy of the Paul VI's New Mass—that all the dogmatic truths are professed in it even though not professed as many times as in Pius V's Mass. This ploy prevents those who see Paul VI's and his minions' bad intentions from being able to bring definitive evidence against Paul VI's New Mass. Heretics use this very seductive technique as a first step in corrupting the faith of Catholics, which Pope Pius VI condemns as willful ambiguity:

Pope Pius VI, *Auctorem Fidei*, August 28, 1794: “[The Ancient Doctors] knew the capacity of innovators in the art of deception. In order not to shock the ears of Catholics, they sought to hide the subtleties of their tortuous maneuvers by the use of seemingly innocuous words such as would allow them to insinuate error into souls in the most gentle manner. Once the truth had been compromised, they could, by means of slight changes or additions in phraseology, distort the confession of the faith which is necessary for our salvation, and lead the faithful by subtle errors to their eternal damnation. This manner of dissimulation and lying is vicious, regardless of the circumstance under which it is used. For very good reason it can never be tolerated in a Synod of which the principal glory consists above all in teaching the truth with clarity and excluding all danger of error. Moreover, if all this is sinful, it cannot be excused in the way that one sees it being done, under the erroneous pretext that the seemingly shocking affirmations in one place are further developed along orthodox lines in other places, and even in yet other places corrected; as if allowing for the possibility of either affirming or denying the statement, or of leaving it up to the personal inclinations of the individual--such has always been the fraudulent and daring method used by innovators to establish error. It allows for both the possibility of promoting error and of excusing it. It is as if the innovators pretended that they always intended to present the alternative passages, especially to those of simple faith who eventually come to know only some part of the conclusions of such discussions which are published in the common language for everyone's use. Or again, as if the same faithful had the ability on examining such documents to judge such matters for themselves without getting confused and avoiding all risk of error. It is a most reprehensible technique for the insinuation of doctrinal errors and one condemned long ago by our predecessor Saint Celestine who found it used in the writings of Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, and which he exposed in order to condemn it with the greatest possible severity. Once these texts were examined carefully, the impostor was exposed and confounded, for he expressed himself in a plethora of words, mixing true things with others that were obscure; mixing at times one with the other in such a way that he was also able to

confess those things which were denied while at the same time possessing a basis for denying those very sentences which he confessed. In order to expose such snares, something which becomes necessary with a certain frequency in every century, no other method is required than the following: Whenever it becomes necessary to expose statements which disguise some suspected error or danger under the veil of ambiguity, one must denounce the perverse meaning under which the error opposed to Catholic truth is camouflaged.”

Knowing repetition is the best way to indoctrinate people, Paul VI’s New Mass started the process of minimizing prayers that clearly profess necessary dogmas while adding ambiguous ones, knowing that ambiguity is the best way to confuse people and get them to first doubt and then deny dogmas. The people get less used to hearing prayers that clearly profess dogmas and more used to hearing ambiguous ones that can easily be taken in the heretical sense, especially if explained in the heretical sense by the priest. These false brethren, these enemies of the Catholic faith and Holy Mass, know that the law of prayer establishes the law of belief. How men pray reflects and influences their beliefs.

Pope Pius XI, *Divini Cultus*: “No wonder then, that the Roman Pontiffs have been so solicitous to safeguard and protect the liturgy. They have used the same care in making laws for the regulation of the liturgy, in preserving it from adulteration, as they have in giving accurate expression to the dogmas of the faith... There exists, therefore, a close relationship between dogma and the sacred liturgy, as also between the Christian cult and the sanctification of the people. This is why Pope Celestine I thought that the rule of faith is expressed in the ancient liturgical formulations; he said that the ‘law of prayer establishes the law of belief’ (*legem credendi lex statuit supplicandi*).”

Pope Leo XIII, *Apostolicae Curae*, 1896: “They knew only too well the intimate bond which unites faith with worship, ‘the law of belief with the law of prayer,’ and so, under the pretext of restoring it to its primitive form, corrupted the order of the liturgy in many respects to adapt it to the errors of the Innovators.”

The flock’s faith will be quickly lost once a Mass is promulgated that no longer clearly and firmly professes dogmas. Many fallen-away Catholics who are members of the Vatican II Church no longer believe in the real presence, which was one of the goals of the New Mass, to change the Catholic sacrifice of the Mass into a Protestant memorial and meal service void of the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist. Indeed, the law of prayer as found in the New Mass, especially the ICEL’s Newer version, reflects the law of belief among the flock, most do not believe in the Real Presence of Jesus Christ in the Holy Eucharist: Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity.

Jesuit Theologian Contemplates ‘Wounded Sacrament’, Fr. Richard Foley, S.J., 1997: “...It comes all the more as a shock to learn that tens of millions of our fellow-Catholics no longer believe these sublime mysteries. Their minds and hearts have become estranged from the Eucharist. Their faith in Our Lord’s True Presence and Sacrifice has been eroded if not totally demolished.

“This state of affairs is nothing short of disastrous. We recognize in it a grim symptom of the faith-hemorrhage that over the past few decades has been weakening Christ’s mystical body-the Church. And the chief casualty has been the Eucharist. Newman’s treasure, alas, no longer has its true meaning or value for multitudes of Catholics.

“The following statistics reflect the situation in the United States. But things are no better in Europe; indeed, in certain particulars they are even more disturbing.

“In January 1992, a nationwide Gallup Poll discovered that two out of three

Catholics no longer believed in Christ's Real Presence-that is, His glorified body, soul and divinity- in the Eucharist. Instead, they declared that the consecrated host is merely bread which symbolically represents Christ's spiritual presence.

"These disturbing statistics were confirmed in another national poll conducted by the New York Times/CBS in June 1994. Of Catholics under the age of 45, some two out of three believe that the Blessed Sacrament is merely a 'symbolic reminder of Christ.' Only half the Catholics over 65 years of age still subscribe to the Church's teaching on the Real Presence. And more than half of all those who regularly attend Sunday Mass described the Eucharist's status as 'strictly symbolic.'

"These regular Mass-goers total 15 million: that is, they comprise only one quarter of America's Catholic population. In any case, one wonders how many of the Mass-goers have a clear idea of what is going on at the altar, because people are being led nowadays to believe that Mass is just a commemorative banquet or meal, not the Lord's sacrifice. This in turn, has fed the misconception that Holy Communion's main function is to promote fraternal ties and good fellowship. So everyone present, no matter the state of their conscience or what religion they belong to (if any), is welcome to partake of the symbolic bread from heaven.

"**WHO IS TO BLAME?** - We know exactly where the main blame lies for this appalling breakdown in Eucharistic faith and practice. Liberal theologians, catechists and liturgists have from the Sixties onwards been systematically undermining the Church's traditional teaching in this as well as other areas of theology."⁵

Beware, more so, of the non-Catholics who offer Pius V's Mass

That is not to say Pius V's Mass is a guarantee that one who loves it and attends it is Catholic, just because that Mass clearly and sublimely professes Catholic dogmas. Long before Paul VI's New Mass was promulgated, most who loved and attended Pius V's Mass lost the faith. They did not reap the benefit of the "law of prayer" is the "law of faith," because the faith was not their primary concern, and thus their prayers were empty and devotions false, no matter how pious they seemed.

All the priests that I know of today who exclusively offer Pius V's Mass are non-Catholic, apostates, heretics, or schismatics. They are more deceptive and deadly to souls than those who offer the New Mass and are guilty of the additional sin of hypocrisy. God abominates (abhors) all those who sacrilegiously offer Pius V's Roman Rite of the Mass, because they do not profess the full deposit of the Catholic faith and live by it.

"Well did Isaias prophesy of you hypocrites, as it is written: This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. And in vain do they worship me, teaching doctrines and precepts of men." (Mk. 7:6-7) "The offering of him that sacrificeth of a thing wrongfully gotten, is stained, and the mockeries of the unjust are not acceptable. The Lord is only for them that wait upon him in the way of truth and justice. The most High approveth not the gifts of the wicked: neither hath he respect to the oblations of the unjust, nor will he be pacified for sins by the multitude of their sacrifices." (Eclcus. 34:21-24)

These are the pre-Vatican II type apostates and heretics that led to the Great Apostasy. Again, the Mass is not the primary issue. The Faith is! Anyone who is obsessed with the Mass issue instead of the Faith issues is a non-Catholic apostate, heretic, or schismatic.

⁵ *Queen of Peace Newspaper*, Pittsburgh Center of Peace, Summer 1997.

ICEL's English version is not Paul VI's New Mass. It is a Newer, Worse Mass.

Paul VI's New Mass was just the first step in an attempt to replace the holy sacrifice of the Mass with a Protestant service. The next step was the English translation of Paul VI's New Mass by the "International Commission on English Liturgy" (ICEL). Their version is so corrupted that it is actually another Mass, a newer and worse Mass than Paul VI's New Mass.

English language Mass translation reform: should ICEL be wound up?, Michael Gilchrist: "...A strongly worded letter written on 26 October by Cardinal Jorge Medina Estévez, prefect of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Sacraments, to the Chairman of the Episcopal Board which oversees ICEL, Scotland's Bishop Maurice Taylor.

"In his letter, Cardinal Medina states that ICEL 'in its present form is not in a position to render to the bishops, to the Holy See and to the English-speaking faithful an adequate level of service.' He points out that 'ICEL texts often did not follow the original Latin closely enough; the process for developing, copyrighting and approving translations did not give bishops enough room for making changes and suggestions; and ICEL was writing its own material, not just translating Vatican-approved Latin texts.' He directs that ICEL's governing statutes 'be revised thoroughly and without delay,' adding that his Vatican office had communicated 'for a number of years now ... concerns regarding an undue autonomy that has been observed in the translations prepared by ICEL.'

"ICEL was originally set up in 1963 during Vatican II, under the supervision of representatives of all the world's English-speaking bishops' conferences, with the task of producing uniform English translations of all the liturgical texts.

"...The Cardinal's concerns were endorsed by Dr Eamon Duffy of Cambridge, the noted British historian, and a leading critic of ICEL's translations. He told Britain's *Catholic Herald*: 'My specific criticism was that many of the ICEL collects, offertory and post- communion prayers were drastically over-simplified, inadequate versions of the Latin, which lost a lot of the theology.'"⁶

In the ICEL's Newer Mass, more prayers and parts of prayers from Paul VI's New Mass are deleted and deliberately and notoriously mistranslated to make it even more pleasing to Protestants. See "*Mass*" *Deception* by Louis A. Post for a list of some the mistranslations and their consequences.⁷

Confession of an ex-member of the ICEL

Dear Fellow Catholics in the Roman Rite (ICEL renounced!)
(Rev.) Stephen F. Somerville, S.T.L.
Posted on 08/09/2003 1:27 PM PDT

Dear Fellow Catholics in the Roman Rite,

I am a priest who for over ten years collaborated in a work that became a notable harm to the Catholic Faith. I wish now to apologise before God and the Church and to renounce decisively my personal sharing in that damaging project. I am speaking of the official work of translating the new post-Vatican II Latin liturgy into the English language, when I was a member of the Advisory Board of the International

⁶ AD2000, Vol. 13, No. 2 (March 2000), p. 3.

⁷ Post's article is on my website or can be ordered from my catalog.

Commission on English Liturgy (ICEL).

I am a priest of the Archdiocese of Toronto, Canada, ordained in 1956. Fascinated by the Liturgy from early youth, I was singled out in 1964 to represent Canada on the newly constituted ICEL as a member of the Advisory Board. At 33 its youngest member, and awkwardly aware of my shortcomings in liturgiology and related disciplines, I soon felt perplexity before the bold mistranslations confidently proposed and pressed by the ever-strengthening radical/progressive element in our group. I felt but could not articulate the wrongness of so many of our committee's renderings.

Let me illustrate briefly with a few examples. To the frequent greeting by the priest, "The Lord be with you," the people traditionally answered "and with your (thy) spirit": in Latin, *Et cum spiritu tuo*. But ICEL rewrote the answer: "And also with you" This, besides having an overall trite sound, has added a redundant word, "also." Worse, it has suppressed the word "spirit" which reminds us that we human beings have a spiritual soul. Furthermore, it has stopped the echo of four (inspired) uses of "with your spirit" in St. Paul's letters.

In the "I confess" of the penitential rite, ICEL eliminated the threefold "through my fault, through my fault, through my most grievous fault," and substituted one feeble "through my own fault." This is another nail in the coffin of the sense of sin.

Before Communion, we pray "Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst (you should) enter under my roof." ICEL changed this to "...not worthy to receive you." We lose the roof metaphor, clear echo of the Gospel (Mt. 8:8), and a vivid, concrete image for a child.

ICEL's changes amounted to true devastation especially in the oration prayers of the Mass. The Collect or Opening Prayer for Ordinary Sunday 21 will exemplify the damage. The Latin prayer, strictly translated, runs thus: O God, who make the minds of the faithful to be of one will, grant to your peoples (grace) to love that which you command and to desire that which you promise, so that, amidst worldly variety, our hearts may there be fixed where true joys are found.

Here is the ICEL version, in use since 1973: Father, help us to seek the values that will bring us lasting joy in this changing world. In our desire for what you promise, make us one in mind and heart.

Now a few comments: To call God "Father" is not customary in the Liturgy, except "Our Father" in the Lord's prayer. "Help us to seek" implies that we could do this alone (Pelagian heresy) but would like some aid from God. Jesus teaches, "without me you can do nothing." The Latin prays "grant (to us)," not just "help us." ICEL's "values" suggests that secular buzzword-"values" that are currently popular, or politically correct, or changing from person to person, place to place. "Lasting joy in this changing world," is impossible. "In our desire" presumes we already have the desire, but the Latin humbly prays for this. "What you promise" omits "what you (God) command," thus weakening our sense of duty. "Make us one in mind (and heart)" is a new sentence, and appears as the main petition, yet not in coherence with what went before. The Latin rather teaches that uniting our minds is a constant work of God, to be achieved by our pondering His commandments and promises. Clearly, ICEL has written a new prayer. Does all this criticism matter? Profoundly! The Liturgy is our law of praying (*lex orandi*), and it forms our law of believing (*lex credendi*). If ICEL has changed our liturgy, it will change our faith. We see signs of this change and loss of faith all around us.

The foregoing instances of weakening the Latin Catholic Liturgy prayers must suffice. There are certainly thousands of mistranslations in the accumulated work of ICEL. As the work progressed I became a more and more articulate critic. My term of office on the Advisory Board ended voluntarily about 1973, and I was named Member Emeritus and Consultant. As of this writing I renounce any lingering reality of this status.

... I thank the kindly reader for persevering with me thus far. Let it be clear that it is for the faith that I am renouncing my association with ICEL and the changes in

the Liturgy. It is for the faith that one must recover Catholic liturgical tradition. It is not a matter of mere nostalgia or recoiling before bad taste.

(Rev.) Stephen F. Somerville, STL

Deceptive techniques of Paul VI and his minions

Good Cop; Bad Cop

Paul VI's public disapproval of the ICEL's mistranslation of his New Mass pacified those who were shocked and dismayed. It gave them hope that the "pope" was going to correct it and punish the delinquents. But, Paul VI's disapproval was only a ploy to pacify those who opposed the ICEL's newer Mass and were suspicious of his own New Mass. Paul VI's disapproval was all words and no action. His lack of action, the deficiency of his New Mass, his inviting Protestant ministers to the robber's Second Vatican Council, and most of all his notorious apostasy and heresy before he promulgated the New Mass, confirm his disapproval of the ICEL's version of his New Mass was only a ploy. The ICEL version was the next step that Paul VI himself wanted, but could not do for fear of losing the support of those who were already suspicious of his changes. If change was made too quickly, there would be no time to gradually indoctrinate the flock and his plot would be exposed and defeated.

"Cardinal" Heenan, Pastoral Letter of October 12, 1969: "Why does the Mass keep changing? Here is the answer. It would have been foolhardy to introduce all the changes at once. It was obviously wiser to change gradually and gently. If all the changes had been introduced together you would have been shocked."

This is the same technique used by the Anglican heretic Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury. He gradually changed the Catholic holy sacrifice of the Mass into a Protestant memorial and meal service, void of the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist. Cranmer was of the opinion that the power of "the great harlot, that is to say, the pestiferous see of Rome" lay in "the popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of the real presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the altar (as they call it) and of the sacrifice and oblation of Christ made by the priest for the salvation of the quick and the dead... The eating and drinking of Christ's flesh and blood is not to be taken in the common signification, with mouth and teeth to eat a thing being present, but by a lively faith, in heart and mind to digest a thing being absent." (Cranmer, *Defence*, I, II)

Hilaire Belloc, Historian: "It is the year in which the main issue was joined and the decisive act was done, the suppression of the Mass... to get rid of the Mass was the soul of the whole affair. Archbishop Cranmer would get rid of the Mass, because he hated it, especially... its central doctrine... the Real Presence of God upon the altar... But it would be impossible to effect so complete a revolution at one blow... it had to be done in two stages. The first new service in the place of the Mass must be of a kind that men might mistake for something like the continuance of the Mass in another form. When that pretense had done its work and the measure of popular resistance taken, they could proceed to the second step and produce a final Service Book in which no trace of the old sanctities should remain. The third necessary requisite... was the fixing of a Creed... and with this... new code of Church laws for

repressing rebellion in the matter of doctrine and liturgy.” (Hilaire Belloc, *Cranmer*, Chapter XIII)

One of the main architects of the New Mass, Fr. Annibale Bugnini, admitted his goal to replace the Catholic sacrifice of the Mass with a Service that is pleasing to Protestants.

Archbishop Annibale Bugnini: “We must strip from our Catholic prayers and from the Catholic liturgy everything which can be the shadow of a stumbling block for our separated brethren that is for the Protestants.” (L’Osservatore Romano, March 19, 1965)

Pope Pius XII, on May 28, 1948, appointed Bugnini Secretary of the Commission for Liturgical Reform. Apostate Antipope John XXIII, on July 11, 1960, appointed Bugnini as Secretary of the Preparatory Conciliar Commission on the Liturgy that was to prepare for the Second Vatican Council. In October 1962, John XXIII included Bugnini among the “*periti*” (experts) who advised the Conciliar Commission on the Liturgy during the Second Vatican Council. Cardinal Amleto Cicognani, Secretary of State, on January 3, 1964, informed Bugnini that Paul VI chose him to be Secretary of the Consilium, which was to implement the Council’s teaching on the liturgy. The official announcement was dated January 13, 1964, and made public on January 28, 1964. After Paul VI promulgated his New Mass in April 1969, he created the Congregation for Divine Worship and appointed Bugnini as the Secretary. It should come as no surprise, and even be expected, that Bugnini was denounced as a Freemason by credible sources. Once there was a threat that this information would be revealed to the public unless he was exiled, only then did Paul VI exile Bugnini in order to protect the New Mass from being discredited. Paul VI sacrificed his Masonic collaborator for the greater cause.

Even though apostate Antipope Paul VI was aiming for the New Mass as interpreted by the ICEL, he did not want to alarm the conservative elements in the Church; thus, he did not omit many prayers that professed necessary dogmas in the Latin version he promulgated. Also, in 1965, previous to the promulgation of his New Mass in 1969, in his encyclical *Mysterium Fidei* on the doctrine and worship of the Eucharist, he professed the necessary dogmas regarding the Mass and Holy Eucharist. Paul VI used the ICEL to test the waters with the next, more corrupted version that he and his minions were aiming for. This is a well-known technique of deception among criminal infiltrators. They attempt to corrupt the people step-by-step. One criminal plays the good cop (law enforcer) and the other the bad cop (law enforcer), while both are working for the same corrupt end.

While the bad cop makes radically bad changes, the good cop publicly chastises the bad cop. This pacifies those who are bothered by and suspicious of the changes, while the good cop takes no effective action to stop it. Regarding the New Mass, the ICEL and the bishops who approved its mistranslations played the bad cops by introducing radically bad changes into Paul VI’s New Mass, and Paul VI played the good cop by chastising the ICEL’s mistranslations, thus pacifying those who were aware of the more blatant, evil intentions of the ICEL’s Newer Mass. In the mean time, the good cop, Paul VI, did nothing to stop the more corrupted ICEL version from being said. As time passed, the people got used to it, and it no longer became an issue for most, which was a goal of both the good and bad cops.

Apostate Antipope John Paul II did the same thing with the sacrilegious use of altar girls. At first another, not John Paul II, authorized the use of altar girls. Those who rightly disapproved said that John Paul II would surely condemn it. Well, John Paul II said and did nothing for quite some time, enough time to get the people used to altar girls who were already being used. Once enough people were used to it, then John Paul II allowed altar girls to serve at Masses said by him before he publicly said anything. That was the next step. And then came the next step, he verbally and in writing allowed it. He tested the waters with those under him while not verbally supporting or condemning it; once the people accepted it, he allowed it at Masses said by him and then verbally supported it.

Pope reduced to a figurehead or equal to bishops

The good cop-bad cop ploy serves another purpose. It fosters and rewards disobedience of inferiors to superiors. It reduces the status of the pope to a mere figurehead who only advises with no real power or equal in power with the bishops. It opens the way for the heresy of collegiality that places the pope on equal standing with the bishops when the bishops are either united in Council or agree on any one topic. This is what the apostate antipopes and bishops of the Vatican II Church were both actively working for, while at times pretending to be orthodox in order to appease the conservative elements. The bishops verbally professed obedience to the “pope” when in reality they publicly and boldly disobeyed him, to get the people used to disobeying hierarchic authority. Actions speak louder than words. The apostate antipopes of the Vatican II Church did nothing to stop it, because they, too, want to destroy the supreme office of the papacy and true submission to it. Playing the good cop, the apostate antipopes, at times, publicly complain about the disobedience of the bishops to appease the conservatives, while the bad cops, the bishops, continue to disobey the “pope” and the apostate antipopes continue to do nothing to stop it. In the eyes of the people, it becomes normal (dogma) for bishops to disobey the pope and even meritorious, because the “pope” eventually submits to the bishops’ demands, thus, in reality, the “popes” take their orders from the bishops. Actions speak louder than words.

Apostate Antipope Pius IX,⁸ *Quae in Patriarchatu*, 1876: “What good is it to proclaim the dogma of the supremacy of St. Peter and his successors? What good is it to repeat over and over the declarations of faith in the Catholic Church and of obedience to the Apostolic See when actions give the lie to these fine words? Moreover, is not rebellion rendered all the more inexcusable by the fact that obedience is regarded as a duty? Again, does not the authority of the Holy See extend, as a sanction, to the measures which We have been obliged to take, or is it enough to be in communion of faith with this See without adding the submission of obedience, - a thing which cannot be maintained without damaging the Catholic Faith? In fact, Venerable Brothers and beloved Sons, it is a question of recognizing the power (of this See), even over your churches, not merely in what pertains to faith, but also in what concerns discipline. He who would deny this is a heretic, he who recognize this and obstinately refuses to obey is worthy of anathema.”

By their actions, the apostate antipopes foster disobedience from their bishops, because it is one of their goals, as well as the bishops, to destroy the supreme power of

⁸ Pius IX lost the papal office in 1856. See RJMI article “Pius IX Denied the Salvation Dogma and Lost His Office.” (Added in October 2012)

the papacy. They both work for the same end, while one plays the good cop and the other the bad cop.

Discredits opponents and detracts from the primary issue, the Faith

Although Paul VI was aiming to destroy the Catholic Mass and replace it with a Protestant memorial and meal service void of the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, he cannot be attacked based upon his version of the New Mass without being discredited, because there is no explicit heresy in it and there is not enough evidence to prove an implicit denial of the faith; even if there were enough evidence to prove an implicit denial of the faith, that would not cause him to lose his office. He left in his New Mass enough prayers and parts of prayers that profess the necessary dogmas, which he also proclaimed in encyclicals, and he criticized the ICEL's mistranslation of his Mass.

One must look at the whole Mass, not just parts, to see what was omitted. At first, the infiltrators omit a dogma in one part of the Mass while it is professed in another, thus giving them an excuse against those who were suspicious. The ICEL's Newer Mass replaced even more prayers that clearly professed dogmas with either no prayers or ambiguous ones, but it still contains barely enough prayers that profess the necessary dogmas, and it, too, does not contain explicit heresy.

For instance, the ICEL's Newer Mass has enough references to true sacrifice and the Body and Blood of Christ so that one cannot say it explicitly denies the Real Presence, even though it deliberately left out most of the prayers and terms that sublimely profess the dogma of the Real Presence:

ICEL's Newer Mass, References to true sacrifice and the Real Presence of Christ:
"P: We come to you, Father, with praise and thanksgiving, Through Jesus Christ your Son. Through him we ask you to accept and bless (+) these gifts we offer you in sacrifice... P: Bless and approve our offering; make it acceptable to you, an offering in spirit and in truth. Let it become for us the body and blood of Jesus Christ, your only Son, our Lord.... P: Almighty God, we pray that your angel may take this sacrifice to your altar in heaven. Then, as we receive from this altar the sacred body and blood of your Son, let us be filled with every grace and blessing... [Canon 2: P: Lord, you are holy indeed, the fountain of all holiness. Let your Spirit come upon these gifts to make them holy, so that they may become for us the body (+) and blood of our Lord, Jesus Christ.] ...P: May this mingling of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ bring eternal life to us who receive it. ...P: Lord Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, by the will of the Father and the work of the Holy Spirit your death brought life to the world. By your holy body and blood free me from all my sins and from every evil. Keep me faithful to your teaching, and never let me be parted from you. (or) P: Lord Jesus Christ, with faith in your love and mercy I eat your body and drink your blood.... P: This is the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world. Happy are those who are called to his supper. ...P: May the Body of Christ bring me to everlasting life. P: May the Blood of Christ bring me to everlasting life. P: The Body of Christ...."

What is the end result of those who oppose the New Mass to the point of obsession, treating it as if it is either the only issue or the primary issue? They are discredited, because they cannot definitively prove their case. While all the bickering about Paul VI's New Mass is going on, with no solution at hand, the primary and main issues, the faith issues—the notorious and abominable heresies and crimes in the Vatican II documents and of the apostate antipopes that are now manifest to all—are ignored, forgotten, or

watered down, because the Conservatives and Traditionalists are religiously indifferent regarding the full deposit of the Catholic faith. Those who are obsessed with the New Mass issue are not Catholic; thus, they are worthy of being confused and confounded by the Mass issue, as well as many other issues that they fight over.

Diverts suspicion away from the heretical Vatican II Documents

The discrediting of those who attempt to condemn Paul VI and his minions based on the New Mass serves another purpose of the enemies. And this, perhaps, is the most deceptive ploy of all. Once evidence is brought forward that proves Paul VI New Mass was mistranslated by the ICEL, and that Paul VI did not approve many of the changes, the same argument can be made regarding the Vatican II documents.

For instance, one could say, “Look how the modernists of the ICEL mistranslated Paul VI’s New Mass. These modernists did the same with the Vatican II documents in order to defend and propagate their heresies and crimes. The Vatican II documents are orthodox, they do not contain heresy, but the modernists have deliberately misinterpreted them, just as they have blatantly misinterpreted Paul VI’s New Mass.” The enemies who play the good cop would then only publish the Catholic truths found in the Vatican II documents, lending credence to the presumption that the Vatican II documents do not contain explicit heresy. All this neutralizes effective attacks against the Vatican II documents by diverting suspicion from the documents to the modernists who were believed to be deliberately misinterpreting them. In some cases, this is true, and the enemy will also effectively use these cases in an attempt to prove the orthodoxy of the Vatican II documents by showing how some of them were truly misinterpreted. However, upon a thorough investigation, one will find explicit heresies in the Vatican II documents that the modernists were not misinterpreting. Unlike Paul VI’s New Mass, the Vatican II documents do contain explicit heresies, which one would not know unless one read the documents.

I was fooled by this ploy for quite some time, until a priest gave a sermon that led me to investigate the Vatican II documents myself, and not trust what others said about them. The priest said, “I always thought the Vatican II documents were totally Catholic and contained no heresies. I always thought the modernists were deliberately misinterpreting them. Until one day, I actually read the documents and to my great surprise discovered many explicit heresies in the documents. We have been lied to by our so-called shepherds who are wolves in sheep’s clothing.” Indeed, upon my investigation after this sermon, I found many explicit heresies, not just willfully ambiguous passages, in the Vatican II documents. Below are some.

1) Heresy: Non-Catholic religions are a means to salvation

Vatican II, *Unitatis Redintegratio*: “3...separated Churches and Communities... have by no means been deprived of significance and importance in the mystery of salvation. For the Spirit of Christ has not refrained from using them as means of salvation.”

Condemned by

Pope Leo XIII, *Satis Cognitum*, 1896: “9. The Church alone... supplies those means of salvation.”

2) Apostasy: Moslems worship the true God

Vatican II, *Nostra Aetate*: “3. The Church has also high esteem for the Muslims. They worship God, who is one, living and subsistent, merciful and almighty, the Creator of heaven and earth...”

Condemned by

“Whosoever denieth the Son the same hath not the Father.” (1 Jn. 2:22-23)

Nicene Creed, 325: “I believe in one God, the Father Almighty... and in one Lord Jesus Christ... who was incarnate by the Holy Ghost... And I believe in the Holy Ghost...”

The true God that Catholics profess in the Nicene Creed is not a description of the god of the Moslems who explicitly deny the Most Holy Trinity in their blasphemous religious book, the Koran.

3) Idolatry: Catholics can Pray in Communion with Non-Catholics

Vatican II, *Unitatis Redintegratio*: “8. In certain special circumstances, such as in prayer services ‘for unity’ and during ecumenical gatherings, it is allowable, indeed desirable, that Catholics should join in prayer with their separate brethren...”

Condemned by

III Council of Constantinople, 681: “If any ecclesiastic or layman shall go into the synagogue of the Jews or the meeting-houses of the heretics to join in prayer with them, let them be deposed and deprived of communion.”

Council of Carthage: “One must neither pray nor sing psalms with heretics, and whosoever shall communicate with those who are cut off from the communion of the Church, whether clergy or layman, let him be excommunicated.”

4) Heresy: Unbelieving Jews are not under a curse

Vatican II, *Nostra Aetate*: “4. [Referring to the Jews who do not believe in Jesus Christ and His New Covenant] ...It is true that the Church is the new people of God, yet the Jews should not be spoken of as rejected or accursed as if this followed from holy Scripture...”

Condemned by

“For as many as are of the works of the Law [those who rejected the New Covenant and still claim to be under the Old Covenant and its rituals], are under a curse.”
(Gal. 3: 10)

“He who believeth in the Son of God, hath life everlasting. He who believeth not does not have life. But the wrath of God abideth upon him.” (Jn. 3: 36) [To be under the wrath of God is to be cursed and rejected by God.]

St. Augustine: “The Jews wander over the entire earth, their backs bent and their eyes cast downward, forever calling to our minds the curse they carry with them.”⁹

If a so-called Conservative or Traditionalist tried to misinterpret these above explicit heresies in the Vatican II documents in an attempt to make them seem orthodox, he would be guilty of wilful misinterpretation, because the heresies are inexcusable. He

⁹ “Against the Jews,” *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*: Series Græca, Fr. J. P. Migne, Paris: 1866, 42:51.

would be guilty of the same crime he accuses the Liberals of, who misinterpret the Catholic truths found in the Vatican II documents to suit their heresies. One sees truth (dogma) or merely error where there is notorious heresy; the other sees heresy where there is truth (dogma). And then there is the third option, the ambiguous passages, which can be interpreted either way, in the heretical or the true sense. The Liberal, Conservative, and Traditionalist apologists (defenders) of the Vatican II documents are all liars. They all deceive by willfully misinterpreting the documents one way or another.

Regarding the explicit heresies in the Vatican II documents, the Liberals do not need to misinterpret them. They simply refer to them as they stand and defeat, in debates, the Conservatives and Traditionalists who try to explain them away. Again, we see the Liberals, Conservatives, and Traditionalists are all non-Catholic peas of the same pod, one holding more heresies than the other but all guilty of at least one heresy either explicitly or implicitly. In reality, they are all liberals, one more liberal than the other, but all liberal nevertheless. See my book *The Book of Evidence* for an exhaustive record of the notorious crimes and criminals and the true popes' condemnations of them.

Alfredo “Cardinal” Ottaviani was a master deceiver

A master deceiver who played the good cop was Alfredo “Cardinal” Ottaviani. He opposed Paul VI’s New Mass and rightly exposed its pitfalls and dangers in a paper he approved of, “A Short Critical Study of the New Order of Mass” (*Breve Esame Critico del Novus Ordo Missae*), which came to be known in the English speaking world as the “Ottavianni Intervention.” It was composed by a group of Roman Theologians and presented to Paul VI on 5 June 1969. Yet, Ottavianni signed all the heretical Vatican II documents. Even before Vatican II, he was a notorious heretic. In 1952, he signed the fraudulent and heretical “Holy Office” letter, *Suprema haec sacra*, in which he notoriously taught the heresy that certain men who die worshipping false gods and practicing false religions can be saved, which is a denial of the Salvation Dogma “No Salvation Outside the Catholic Church,” which is the root heresy that led to the Great Apostasy.¹⁰ Evidently, only the potential of people being infected by heresy because of omissions and ambiguities in New Mass mattered to Ottaviani; not the very notorious heresies he himself consented to in the Vatican II documents and his denial of the Salvation Dogma. He did not just deny one dogma, but many when he signed the Vatican II documents, and thus he was a rebellious, non-Catholic heretic.

Pope Leo XIII, *Satis Cognitum*: “The Church has always ‘regarded as rebels and expelled from the ranks of her children all who held beliefs on any point of doctrine different from her own.’ The Arians, the Montanists, the Novatians, the Quatrodecimans, the Eutychians did not certainly reject all Catholic doctrine: they abandoned only a certain portion of it. Still, who does not know that they were declared heretics and banished from the bosom of the Church? There can be nothing more dangerous, and yet by one word, as a drop of poison, infect the real and simple faith taught by our Lord and handed down by Apostolic tradition... The Church has always regarded as rebels and expelled from the ranks of her children all who held beliefs on any point of doctrine different from her own... St. Augustine notes that other heresies may spring up, to a single one of which, should any one give his assent, he is by the very fact cut off from Catholic unity... ‘if any one holds to one

¹⁰ See my book *The Salvation Dogma*, “The Truth About Fr. Feeney: 1) The Fraudulent Holy Office Letter.

single one of these [heresies] he is not a Catholic' (S. Augustinus, De Haeresibus, n. 88).”

Ottaviani infected the Catholic faith with several drops of poison; thus, he was an automatically, excommunicated, non-Catholic, apostate and heretic. Oh, but Ottaviani was so concerned about the Mass issue, while he cared nothing for the full deposit of the Catholic faith that he denied in *Suprema haec sacra* and when he signed the Vatican II documents. This is a perfect example that the Mass alone, even a devout and Holy one as Pius V's Mass, will not save anyone no matter how much he loves it. A man must first possess the Catholic faith and then be in a state of grace to be worthy and in the way of salvation; without these, the Holy Mass will not save him.

Ottaviani was a pre-Vatican II heretic that contributed greatly to the Great Apostasy. He was worse than the flagrant liberals because of his potential to deceive by outward piety. He was a white washed tomb full of dead men's bones and all filthiness.

“Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; because you are like to whited sepulchres, which outwardly appear to men beautiful but within are full of dead men's bones and of all filthiness. So you also outwardly indeed appear to men just: but inwardly you are full of hypocrisy and iniquity.” (Mt. 23:27-28)

“*There is nothing hid, which shall not made manifest.*” (Mk. 4:22) Ottavianni's crimes were not even hid. They are in the public domain, in the heretical and fraudulent “Holy Office” letter and the heretical Vatican II documents both of which he signed. Upon investigation, his heresies can easily be known. Ottavianni's devotion to the Mass was only external and empty, because he did not have the faith. Ottaviani was no Catholic hero. He was a most deceptive, bastard, non-Catholic apostate and heretic. He was a most deceptive wolf who lies at the root, the very origin, of the Great Apostasy. He did not conserve the infallible dogmas of the Church, but, as the liberal that he actually was, he denied them. He was a very deceptive wolf in sheep's clothing, because he was more disguised, looked more like a true shepherd, than the blatant liberals.

All this obsessive fuss about the New Mass serves the enemies' purpose—especially with those like Ottaviani who are considered conservative and good Catholics, but are not truly conservative or Catholic—to divert from the faith issues, the explicit heresies in the Vatican II documents and the notorious crimes of the apostate antipopes of the Vatican II Church. One can say, “Well, if the great conservative and defender of Pius V's Mass, Ottavianni, signed the Vatican II documents and never denounced Paul VI as a heretic, then there can be no heresy in the Vatican II documents and Paul VI could not have been a heretic.” Again, we see a deceptive diversion from the explicitly heretical Vatican II documents and crimes of the apostate antipopes to the Mass issue, which can inhibit one from thoroughly examining the Vatican II documents and crimes of the apostate antipopes. However, in these latter days of the Great Apostasy, one does not even have to investigate the crimes to know of them, because they are manifest to all who have eyes to see and ears to hear.

New Mass becomes no issue if the faith is put first

Now, if you have any good will and common sense, you can see that the primary issue of the Great Apostasy is the faith issues, not the Mass issue. Vatican II came before

the New Mass. The Faith must always come before the Mass, even when there is a holy and reverent Mass, as Pius V's Mass.

Pope Pius X, *Editae Saepe* 1910: "29. ... True reformers understand this very clearly. They do not kill the blossom in saving the root. That is to say, they do not divorce faith from holiness. They rather cultivate both of them, enkindling them with the fire of charity, "which is the bond of perfection". In obedience to the Apostle, they "keep the deposit". They neither obscure nor dim its light before the nations, but spread far and wide the most saving waters of truth and life welling up from that spring. ... When the true son of the church sets out to reform himself and others, he fixes his eyes and heart on matters of faith and morals. ... 41. He yielded no ground on any matter that would endanger faith and morals"

If a Catholic's priorities are in right order, the faith issues would be addressed first, and then the Mass issue would become no issue once the heretical evidence of Vatican II and its apostate antipopes are manifest to him. At this point, the New Mass becomes no issue, because the man he believes is pope already discredited himself by notorious heresy when he signed the Vatican II documents. Thus, Paul VI's so-called good motives in promulgating the New Mass are exposed as bad motives. One would no longer doubt the evil motives of a man he knows is a notorious apostate and heretic. Add to that the knowledge of the Church law that a notorious heretic cannot be pope, and the Mass issue becomes as dead as it can be, because a pope did not promulgate it.

The faith was first denied at Vatican II, which effected the loss of the offices of all the bishops who signed any one of the Vatican II documents—that is, if they had not already lost their offices previous to Vatican II because of notorious heresy.

1917 Code of Canon Law: "Canon 188. 4. There are certain causes which effect the tacit resignation of an office, which resignation is accepted in advance by operation of law, and hence is effective without any declaration. These causes are: ... (4) if he has publicly defected (fallen away) from the Catholic faith."

St. Robert Bellarmine: "... A pope who is a manifest heretic automatically ceases to be pope and head of the Church, just as he ceases automatically to be a Christian and a member of the Church." (*De Romano Pontifice*, II. 30.)

Only after the faith was denied at Vatican II, did the New Mass come to be. The faith, not the Mass, is the primary issue of the Great Apostasy. Pius V's Mass was said before Vatican II, when most Catholics, long before Vatican II, had lost the faith, which paved the road for Vatican II and the Great Apostasy. Pius V's Mass was not saving them then, because they did not have the faith, just as Traditionalist sects today who say Pius V's Mass are not being saved now, because they do not have the faith either—they are the pre-Vatican II type heretics that led to the Great Apostasy.

ICEL's Newer Mass invalidates the Consecration

An essential change to the form (words) of a sacrament invalidates it. If any changes are made to the form (words) of consecration of the bread or the wine that does not signify the same thing, the sacrament is not consecrated. It remains bread and wine.

Pope Pius V, *De defectibus*: "If anyone removes or changes anything in the Form of the Consecration of the Body and Blood, and by this change of words, does not

signify the same thing as these words do he does not consecrate the Sacrament.”
(*Missale Romanum*, Ch. V. par. 1 Desclee.)

The ICEL’s Newer Mass changed the words of the consecration of the wine so that they do not signify the same thing, which invalidates the consecration of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Jesus. In the consecration of wine, the words “for many shall be shed unto the remission of sins” were changed to “for all men so that sins may be forgiven.”

A valid Latin version: “For this is the Chalice of My Blood, of the new and everlasting testament, the mystery of faith, which for you and for many shall be shed unto the remission of sins.”

The invalid ICEL version: “For this is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant. It will be shed for you and for all men so that sins may be forgiven.”

To refer to all men whose sins may be forgiven, as does the ICEL version, does not mean (signify) the same thing as referring to many men whose sins are, in fact, forgiven (remitted), as does the valid version. The invalid form only refers to the potential (sufficiency) of Christ Blood to save all men, not to the reality in which it only saves certain men, Catholics. The valid words of the consecration of the wine refer only to the efficacy of Christ’s Blood, only to those who will benefit from it, only to those who will gain its fruit unto the remission of their sins, only to Catholics. Also, only Catholics in a state of grace can worthily receive the Holy Eucharist that is being consecrated on the Altar, not all men, not non-Catholics. Therefore, the ICEL’s version of the consecration of the wine, although not explicitly heretical, is invalid, because it does not signify (mean) the same thing as the valid version.

Christ most precious Blood is sufficient to save all men, but it will not save all men. “*How narrow is the gate, and strait is the way that leadeth to life: and few there are that find it!*” (Mt. 7:14) To be saved, men must cooperate with God in order to gain the fruit, the benefit of Christ’s Blood unto the remission of their sins. Whether Christ’s Blood will remain only sufficient or also become efficient (fruitful) for men depends on their cooperation with God. Potential is not reality. Christ’s Blood has the potential so remit all men’s sins, but in reality, it will only remit some men’s sins.

The Catechism of Trent, “The Sacrament of the Eucharist: Explanation of the Form used in the Consecration of the Wine”: “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. And this is the purport of the Apostle (Heb. 9:28) when he says: Christ was offered once to exhaust the sins of many; and also of the words of our Lord in John (17:9): I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them whom thou hast given me, because they are thine.” (TAN Edition, pp. 237-228)

The ICEL words of consecration of the wine as compared to the valid words are actually a profanation for including non-Catholics in a prayer that is meant only for Catholics. This relates to those who deny the Salvation dogma by including non-Catholics with Catholics among the elect and the heretical ecumenists who include non-Catholics with Catholics when they pray together. It is the mixing of the sacred with the profane. The same motive exists in all these cases, the justification of Protestants, as well as all non-Catholics, and by implication, their false religions. If men can be saved while practicing false religions, then those religions could not have been harmful to them, and thus, by implication, false religions are given a level of justification, and man no longer needs to cooperate with God's grace and become Catholic in order to be saved.

Both Species must be validly consecrated to confect the sacrament

In the English version, is not the bread properly consecrated?

Because the proper words of consecration are used for the bread in the ICEL's Newer Mass, some may say that the sacrament is confected. Thus, when they receive the species under the appearance of bread, they receive the Body and Blood of Christ even though the wine is not consecrated. However, the Church teaches that both species must be validly consecrated to change the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Jesus.

Pope Pius V, *De defectibus*: Chapter X,3., 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.

1917 Code of Canon Law: "817. It is forbidden, even in extreme cases of necessity, to consecrate one species without the other..."

What is the theological explanation for the invalidity of the consecration of the bread if the proper words (form) of consecration are used when invalid words (form) are used for the consecration of wine? For instance, one may ask, being the bread is consecrated properly into the Body and Blood of Christ in the English version, is not the Body and Blood of Christ present under the appearance of the bread before the consecration of the wine, so that even if the wine was not consecrated, the Body and Blood of Christ is still received under the appearance of the bread? The Church condemned this opinion. One must believe, as the Church teaches above, that both species must be properly consecrated or there is no Body and Blood of Christ under the appearance of the bread or the wine, but what follows is a theological explanation.

The Church teaches that if a priest intends to do as the Church does in confecting the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, he immediately changes the bread into the Body and Blood of Christ upon his pronouncement of the words, "For this is my Body," which means even before he consecrates the wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. This truth is acknowledged, when immediately after the bread is consecrated into the Body and Blood of Christ, Catholics venerate the species before the consecration of the wine.

Improper intention, not form, invalids the consecration of the bread

So, then, being the priest uses the proper words of consecration for the bread in the ICEL's Newer Mass, what invalids the bread from being consecrated into the Body and Blood of Christ? It cannot be because of improper form, because he uses the proper words for the consecration of the Bread. The invalidation is not because of improper form, but because of an improper intention of the priest to do as the Church does.

Pope Pius V, *De Defectibus*, 1570: "For whichever of these is lacking, namely, the right matter, the form with intention, and priestly ordination in the celebrant, the Sacrament is not accomplished."¹¹

Council of Trent, *The Sacraments in General*: "Can. 11. If anyone shall say that in ministers, when they effect and confer the sacrament, the intention at least of doing what the Church does is not required: let him be anathema." (Sess. viii, can. 11; D. 854.)

The priest does not intend to do as the Church does regarding the consecration of the wine. An improper intention in consecrating either the bread or wine invalids either from being consecrated. God knows ahead of time that the priest is going to use the improper form for consecrating the wine, and in so doing, the priest does not intend to do as the Church does. God, knowing this ahead of time, does not allow the bread to be consecrated, even though the proper form is used, because of the improper intention of the priest that will be made manifest when he attempts to consecrate the wine. The people can know this also, as soon as the priest uses the improper form when attempting to consecrate the wine.

¹¹ Pope Pius V, Decree *De Defectibus*, p. xc in the Missal of Pius V, published July 19, 1570.