

Is the New Mass Valid?

Cyril B. Andrade, M.D.

Dr. Andrade was one of the first in India to take up the cause of Tradition in the immediate aftermath of Vatican II. Born in about 1915, and still living (2009), he is most likely the senior-most traditional advocate in Asia —& perhaps in the world. He has written several articles on the crisis in the Church, for circulation locally and to the Indian bishops. A retired medical practitioner, he resides in Bangalore. He published this particular paper around the time the New Mass was introduced in 1970 in India.

Preface

October 22, 1967 was the most ominous and frightening day in the two thousand year history of the Catholic Church, for that day saw a legalized contradiction of hitherto inviolate decrees and norms guarding the Canon of the Mass. That day brought a new era of darkness into the world - the extinguishing of the true sacrificial and sacramental Eucharistic Christ from the majority of our churches. It was on that day the mass was struck a fatal blow.

During the early years of agitation for the introduction of the vernacular into the Mass, and even during the climax of the movement when the matter was debated at the First Session of Vatican II (1962), Catholics were always assured that, even if the vernacular should be introduced, the Canon of the Mass would remain untouched in its centuries-old inviolate Latin form. And rightly so, for the Canon is the heart and centre and essence of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. But since the granting, in 1963, by the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, of permission to employ the vernacular in some parts of the Mass, a literal cascade of subsequent changes and increased vernacularization has now culminated in the introduction of the new “English Canon”, yielding what is, in effect, an all-vernacular Mass —notwithstanding Article 36 of that same Constitution and the decrees of the Council of Trent prohibiting an all-vernacular Mass.

Thus, that which has for thirteen centuries has been considered inviolate, has now been disturbingly altered. Something ominously different from the Canon we have always known now occupies the heart and centre of our Catholic worship — something in which the very words of consecration have been savaged, striking horror into the hearts of Catholics everywhere and engendering much protest and intense misgivings. The protest would have been infinitely more thundering were it not for the fact that the clergy and the laity have been gradually “conditioned” by change after change in recent years, to the point of expecting change as the order of the day and the “mind of the Church.”

The main intention of this small booklet is to put before the educated layman some arguments showing that the words of the new English Canon for the consecration of the wine are so different from those of the traditional proper “form” of consecration that the “essential sense” of the original words has been destroyed. The arguments are based largely on the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas Aquinas who, as an authority on Eucharistic theology, deserves profound respect. One day, shortly after he had completed his treatise on the Eucharist and about a year before his death, Thomas was praying before the altar in a church in Naples. Suddenly, from the Crucifix on that altar came the words “*Bene scripsisti de me, Thoma*”

("You have written well of Me, Thomas"). St. Thomas' work has thus received the singular endorsement of Christ Himself.

We are told that Pope Paul VI has "approved" the New Mass. Can we be sure that he has freely chosen to impose the New Mass? And if he has, may we not with all respect recall St. Thomas More's answer to those who excused their acknowledging of King Henry VIII as Head of the Church by pointing to all the bishops who had done so: "For every bishop of yours, I have above one hundred holy bishops of the past, of whom many may now be Saints in Heaven", and remark how irreconcilable with the explicit teaching of Popes St. Pius V, Pius X, Pius XII and even John XXIII the New Mass is?

How can any Catholic priest with a shred of conscience celebrate the Holy sacrifice using the mutilated English Canons? Pope St. Pius V in his Bull, *Quo Primum* (19 July 1570) decreed:

"At no time in the future may any priest, whether secular or regular, ever be forced to use any other rite [than the Tridentine] for celebrating Mass. And in order once and for all to preclude any scruples of conscience and fear of ecclesiastical penalties and censures, we declare herewith that it is by virtue of Our Apostolic Authority that we decree and prescribe that this present order and decree of Ours is to last in perpetuity, and never at a future date can it be revoked or amended legally.... And if, nevertheless, anyone would ever dare attempt any action contrary to this order of Ours, handed down for all times, let him know that he has incurred the wrath of Almighty God and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul."

Let no priest, then, celebrate the New Mass out of a false sense of obedience. Let him celebrate according to the Tridentine rite taking refuge in the above decree of Pope St. Pius V.

It remains but to recall how **Cranmer** — that first Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury and "primate of the King's religion" — proceeded against the "popish doctrine of the Mass" by suppressing the Latin liturgy, substituting a table for the altar, and instituting an altered Canon. Today, Cranmer rides again, for Modernists have selected these same three weapons with which to do the Tridentine Mass to death.

Was October 22, 1967 the beginning of an age of new darkness on the earth, and the harbinger of an unprecedented crisis within the Church? Was the Blessed Virgin's indication that the Rosary and Her Immaculate Heart would be our "last and final weapons" a hint that somehow the Holy Mass would at some point become no longer available to most Catholics?

Is the New Mass Valid?

Pope Paul VI promulgated his Apostolic Constitution on the New Order of the Mass on April 3, 1969. The new rite was introduced in this country on the first Sunday of Lent 1970 and on different days in various other countries. In Italy, the New Mass was made mandatory from the 30th November 1969 but though the Pope told Italians that they should "promptly adhere" to it, he himself continued to celebrate according to the old rite and so, indeed, did hundreds of other Italian priests.

In September last year, Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani, former head of the Holy Office, wrote to the Pope that "the *Novus Ordo* represents both as a whole and in its details, a striking departure from the Catholic theology of the Mass as it was formulated in Session XXII of the Council of Trent". Cardinal Ottaviani together with Cardinal Bacci (the Vatican's renowned Latin expert) also presented the Pope with a copy of a 28-page booklet entitled *A Critical Study of the New*

Order of the Mass and won from him a promise that he would wait a while longer before making the *Novus Ordo* compulsory throughout the Church. Because of this and because the Pope himself continued to use the old rite, traditionalist, orthodox Catholics throughout the world were hopeful that there would be further change in the Mass legislation and that the old (Tridentine) rite would be retained. We are now informed that the Pope has finally approved the new Mass; has assured the faithful of the unchanging nature of the Mass and enjoined on them that they “shall do well to accept it”.

Is it then a case of *Roma locuta est: causa finita est?* (Rome has spoken: the case is closed). Certainly not! And hence this article....

The Murder of the Mass

How It All Began

Those wicked men, who have been permitted by a supine and irresponsible hierarchy to attempt the murder of the Mass, began their criminal campaign by securing the abolition of Latin as the premier liturgical language of the Church. The bewildered and chaotic parliament that was Vatican II did at least — after being long in labor — deliver itself of a document, “The Constitution on the Liturgy”, which insisted (in article 36) that Latin be retained as the principal liturgical language of the West and which required (in its article 54) that “steps be taken to ensure that the faithful are able to say or sing together in Latin those parts of the Ordinary of the Mass which are rightfully theirs.”

From the first, however, these same prescriptions were a dead letter. The ink had scarcely dried on “The Constitution on the Liturgy” before, in some dioceses, it had been contrived to forbid the Latin Mass altogether. Soon, those few churches which continued to allow the celebration of the Tridentine (Latin) Mass, did so almost furtively. One need not look far to find the reason for this obscene haste to get rid of the Latin Mass. **Latin must go that heresy might come.** Nearly all the great heretical movements of history, after all, had agitated for a vernacular liturgy: the Cathari of the thirteenth century were followed in this by the Wycliffites of the fourteenth, the Hussites of the fifteenth and the “Reformers” of the sixteenth centuries. To all of these heretics the advocacy of a vernacular liturgy was entirely natural, because for them the chief purpose of the liturgy was to instruct: none of them had any belief in the Mass as a Sacrifice. The Modernists knew perfectly well that Latin, as Pope Pius XII put it in his *Mediator Dei*, “affords at once an imposing sign of unity and an effective safeguard against the corruption of true doctrine”. That is precisely why they were determined to suppress it.

Did we not know in our hearts what was coming? We watched as the campaign against Latin proceeded knowing full well where it would end. We stood idly by as butchery succeeded butchery and mutilation followed inexorably upon mutilation. We twiddled our thumbs as the Leonine prayers after Mass were suppressed (never were they more appropriate and needed than now!); we suffered from paralyzing inertia when the Last Gospel, which so gloriously proclaimed Our Lord’s Divinity was suppressed; when the signs and postures of reverence and adoration (as, for example, the genuflection at the “*Et incarnatus est*” in the Creed) were one by one suppressed; as the stately Roman rhythms of the Mass were replaced by inept and unlovely parodies so awful as to seem the work of cretins; and worst of all we, who call ourselves orthodox Catholics, behaved like unconcerned spectators when the very words of Consecration were savaged and Our Lord’s own words blasphemously and sacrilegiously

“corrected” to conform with the prevailing heterodoxy. All this wicked work of demolition we watched and we knew in our hearts we were witnessing the murder of the Mass.

Now, with the *Novus Ordo Missae*, the *coup de grace* has been administered. This dreadful travesty, this pseudo-Mass (as a distinguished English priest calls it) has struck horror into the hearts of Catholics everywhere.

“A Critical Study of the New Order of the Mass”

Earlier in this article, reference has been made to the letter of Cardinal Ottaviani to the Pope and to the presentation of a copy of “A Critical Study of the New Order of the Mass” made by Cardinals Bacci and Ottaviani to Paul VI. This 28-page booklet is the work of a group of theologians — of different nationalities and varying tendencies — which is known to include two bishops, four doctors of theology and philosophy who wish to remain anonymous for fear of victimization!...

A “Critical Study” points out that the “General Instruction” which introduces the “New Order” is in repeated instances so equivocal in its languages that it “has every possibility of satisfying the most modernist of Protestants”. Its definition of the Mass, for instance, as “the assembly or gathering together of the people of God, with a priest presiding, to celebrate the memorial of the Lord” could be adopted by a Unitarian to express his belief, or want of it. Throughout this abominable document all mention of the Real Presence of Our Lord in the Holy Eucharist is lacking, as is all clear statement of the true sacrificial character of the Mass. Indeed, the bread and wine are spoken of as “spiritually” changed after the Consecration - not transubstantiated. The prayer, *Quam Oblationem*, which immediately precedes the Consecration prayers should read: “Do Thou, O God, deign to bless what we offer and make it approved, effective, right and wholly pleasing in every way....” The bogus, heretical, new English Canon now reads, instead: “Bless and approve our offering; make it truly spiritual and acceptable”. Obviously this is not just a “pious” use of the word “spiritual”. For at no time did this particular word ever appear in “the holy canon, which is so free from error that it contains nothing that does not in the highest degree savor of a certain holiness and piety” (Council of Trent, Ch. 4, Session 22). The 16th century “Reformers” always used the word “spiritual” to deny the Real Presence of Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament: body, blood, soul and divinity.

Here are some quotations from the writings of the 16th-century heretics-schismatics in support of the above statement:

1) Wycliffe: “The Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper is faith.”

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

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

“... For then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood; then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us.” “He hath left in these holy mysteries as a pledge of His love, and a continual

remembrance of the same, His own blessed body and precious blood, for us spiritually to feed upon to our endless comfort and consolation.”

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

“Thou hast vouchsafed to feed us in these holy mysteries with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of Thy Son.”

Many more examples could be quoted for there is no shortage of them. Indeed, it is difficult to find anyone of the 16th century heretics who failed to use the word “spiritual” when writing of the Sacrifice of the Mass and the Eucharist. And this pious-sounding word did not fool those who were true, orthodox Catholics. Finally, the Fathers of the Council of Trent condemned for all times the heresy contained in this use of the word “spiritual”: “If anyone says that Christ received in the Eucharist is received spiritually only ... let him be anathema”. (Canon 8, Session XIII).

The New English Canon of The Mass

In his Apostolic Constitution, *Missale Romanum* (which is printed as a *Preface* to the official translation of the General Instruction and New Order of the Mass), Paul VI declares that the words “*qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum*” (“which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins”) are to be retained in the form of consecration of the wine. But to our heretical innovators it matters not what the pope says: the official translation of the *Novus Ordo* into English continues to render “*pro multis*” as “for all men”, and this is the translation that is being used in the churches in India.

This is a monstrous perversion of the sacred text. Even a child knows that “many” no more means “all” than “few” means “none”. Any instructed Catholic knows that — as the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, expresses it in its instruction on the form for the Holy Eucharist — “The words ‘for you and for many’ are taken some from *Matthew*, some from *Luke*, but were joined together by Holy Church under the guidance of the Holy Ghost. They serve to declare the fruit and utility of Our Lord’s 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 has received from it we shall easily understand that this pertains to many only and not to all. When therefore, Our Lord said ‘for you’, He meant either those who were present or who had been chosen by Him from among the Jewish people, such as the disciples (excepting Judas) with whom He was speaking. When He added ‘for many’ He wished to be understood to mean the rest of the elect among the Jews or Gentiles. Rightly, therefore, were the words ‘for all’ not used, as in this place the fruits of the Passion alone are spoken of, and it is to the elect alone that His Passion brought the fruit of salvation.” (*Catechismus ex decreto concillii Tridentini* para. 11, Caput IV, Section XXIV)

Does this replacement of the words “for many” by “for all men” in the second consecrating formula render the consecration invalid? There are many who argue that it does.

“Matter” and “form” are the essential components of a rite of a Sacrament. Improper matter or a defective form does indeed invalidate the Sacrament. In the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist the matter is the bread and wine and the form consists in the words of consecration. The new canon obviously does not touch upon the matter but the new form has been criticized as being defective and mutilated. The specification is more necessary and important than the specific

matter for the form is the “determining element” of the matter. Thus a change in the form (i.e., in the words and their intent and meaning) could imply that the “determining” of the matter in a form other than that intended by Christ. “Ideas have consequences”, and as words convey ideas, we must look to the words. St. Thomas Aquinas writes “we must see whether a change of words destroys the essential sense of the words (i.e., the basic meaning of the words) because then the Sacrament is clearly rendered invalid.” (*Summa theologica*, III, Q. 60 Art. 8).

To raise the question again: are there mutilations in the new English form of Consecration, and do they destroy the “essential sense” of the words? There are experts in Eucharistic theology who answer these questions affirmatively in view of the deviations occurring in the “new form” for the consecration of the wine.

The Traditional Form (Words) for Consecration of the Wine

The traditionally proper form for the consecration of the wine is [translated from the Latin]: “For this is the chalice of My blood of the eternal covenant; the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the forgiveness of sins.” all these words are necessary for the valid consecration of the wine and the evidence for this statement is as follows:

According to “*The Catechism by Decree of the Holy Council of Trent*” published by command of Pope St. Pius V: “We are then firmly to believe” that the form for the consecration of the wine “consists in the following words: ‘This is the chalice of my blood, of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many, to the remission of sins.’” (Part II, Chap. 4, para. 21)

And, immediately below, in para. 22, we read: “Concerning this form no one can doubt it is plain that no other words constitute the form.”

There are some theology books which either state or imply that the words “This is My blood” alone constitute the form of consecration of the wine. This would seem to be incorrect for several reasons:

1) Because as just noted above, a *Catechism*, by decree of an ecumenical dogmatic Council (and not a merely “pastoral” Council such as Vatican II), has declared otherwise.

2) Because of the authority of long established usage. In practically all missals, both altar missals and those used by the faithful, we always find italicized or set in bold print the entire form “*Hic est enim Calix*” to “*in remissionem peccatorum.*”

3) We should believe that the entire form of consecration of the wine given above is the necessary and proper form, because the integrity of the expression demands it. St. Thomas Aquinas says “Some have maintained that the words ‘**This is the chalice of My blood**’ alone belong to the substance (i.e. the essence or necessary part) of the form but not those words which follow. Now this seems incorrect, because the words which follow them are determinations of the predicate, that is, of Christ’s blood; consequently, they belong to the integrity of the expression. And on this account others say more accurately that all the words which follow are of the substance of the form down to the words, ‘**As often as ye shall do this...**’ (but not including them). Otherwise why would the priest continue holding the chalice until the completion of all these words? As St. Thomas says: “Hence it is that the priest pronounces all the words, under the same rite and manner, namely, holding the chalice in his hands.” (*Summa Th.* III, Q. 78, Art. 3)

To show why each clause and phrase is necessary St. Thomas explains them one by one. “Consequently it must be said that all the aforesaid words belong to the substance of the form (i.e., the necessary part of the words): but that the first words, **‘This is the chalice of My blood’, the change of wine into blood is denoted....’**. It is important to note that St. Thomas says the transubstantiation is denoted, but he does not say that it actually occurs on the completion of this clause. St. Thomas continues, “but by the words which come after is shown the power of the blood shed in the Passion, which power works in this sacrament, and is ordained for three purposes. First and principally for securing our eternal heritage ... and, in order to denote this, we say, **‘of the New and Eternal Testament’**. Secondly, for justifying by grace which is by faith ... and on this account we add, **‘The Mystery of Faith’**. Thirdly, for removing sins which are the impediments of these things ... and on this account we say, **‘which shall be shed for you and for many unto the forgiveness of sins’**.” (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 78, Art. 3)

To summarize: The proper form for the consecration of the wine — all of which is necessary for its validity — is: “This is the chalice of My blood, of the New and Eternal Testament, the Mystery of Faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the forgiveness of sins.”

The new “Form” for Consecration of the Wine in the all-English Canon

The new text reads: “This is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant - the mystery of faith. This blood is to be shed for you and for all men so that sins may be forgiven.” It is obvious that the new phraseology is not the same as the ancient form. In some places a synonym (more or less) replaces the former word; for example, the dull, common place word cup appears instead of the unique word chalice; but this is not of invalidating consequence. The alteration that requires to be most carefully analyzed is the one that occurs in the final words “For you and for all men so that sins may be forgiven” has been substituted for “for you and for many unto the forgiveness of sins.” If this substitution is not a mere translation but involves an essential change in meaning, then the sacrament has clearly been rendered invalid.

The changes that can invalidate a sacrament are the omission of words, the addition of words or the substitution of words. We can ignore the question of addition or omission of words since the type of change with which we are concerned in the present discussion is one of substitution.

A substitution is permissible if the part inserted is exactly equivalent to the part taken out. For example, the form that is used for the Sacrament of Confirmation contains : “I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation.” But some say: “I confirm thee with the chrism of sanctification.” this is permissible for, as St. Thomas Aquinas explains, “Holiness is the cause of salvation. therefore, it is the same whether we say chrism of salvation or of sanctification.” (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 72, Art. 4) However to substitute the word faith for salvation, would most probably render the Sacrament invalid.

The New “Form” Destroys the Sense of the Proper “Form”

In order to comprehend clearly that the new “form” being used involves a change of essential sense (basic meaning) from the ancient and proper form we must consider two distinct aspects of the Passion and Death of Our Divine Lord. The first aspect is that of sufficiency; that is, for what and for whom did Christ’s Passion suffice? The second aspect is that of efficacy; that is for what and for whom was Christ’s Passion effective?

The Aspect of Sufficiency

It is a truth of our Faith that Christ died for all men without exception. “And He is the propitiation for our sins: not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world.” (*John*, 2,2) Another truth of our Faith is that not all men are saved, but some indeed suffer eternal damnation. Hence we can say that Christ’s Passion is the sufficient cause of the salvation of all men. In the words of St. Thomas Aquinas, “Christ by His Passion delivered us from our sins causally — that is, by setting up the cause of our deliverance, from which all cause of sins whatsoever, past, present and to come — could be forgiven: just as if a doctor were to prepare medicine by which all sickness can be cured even in the future.” (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 49, Art. 2). And this is the meaning of the truth, “Christ died for all men.” His Passion is sufficient for the salvation of all, “from which cause all sins ... could be forgiven.”

The Aspect of Efficacy

Another truth of our Faith is that the efficacy of Christ’s Passion is not communicated to all men but only to those who are actually saved, that is, to the elect. This truth is closely connected to the doctrine of men’s free will, a mystery, and with the doctrine of The Mystical Body of Christ, also a mystery. The two distinct aspects of Christ’s Passion and Death (each conveying its own particular truth) — viz., the standpoints of sufficiency and efficacy — are clearly distinguished in the following passage from a decree of the Council of Trent: “But, though He died for all, yet all do not receive the benefit of His death, but those only unto whom the merit of His passion is communicated.” (Session VI, Ch.3)

The Ancient Established “Form” Conveys the Sense of Efficacy

The ancient and proper form of the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist refers to the shedding of Christ’s Precious Blood from the standpoint of efficacy only. This form terminates with these words: “which shall be shed for you and for many unto the forgiveness of sins.”

Firstly, the word “unto” means to, towards, or leading up to; and thus this word unto in itself conveys the sense of effectiveness or efficacy.

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

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

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

The subtle error in this “objection” is thus exposed and refuted by St. Thomas. “Reply Obj. 8: The blood of Christ’s Passion has its efficacy not only in the elect among the Jews, to whom the blood of the *Old Testament* was exhibited, but also in the Gentiles.... And therefore He says expressly, for you, the Jews, and for many, namely the Gentiles....” Beginning his reply, “The blood of Christ’ Passion has its efficacy.” St. Thomas totally ignores the aspect of sufficiency, and thus he implies that it goes without saying that the proper sense of Christ’s words here is that of efficacy. Moreover his reply speaks only of “the elect”. Thus, for you means not only the Apostles to whom Christ was speaking — and, in fact, Judas, though present, was not included in for you — but it means all the elect among the Jews. Not all the Jews, but only “the elect” among them. And this phraseology, needless to say, denotes only the aspect of efficacy. And the phrase and for many encompasses Gentiles: again it is understood, of course, that St. Thomas is referring on to the elect among the Gentiles.

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

“As Christ’s Passion benefits all” says St. Thomas elsewhere, “...it produces no effect except in those who are united with Christ’s Passion through faith and charity, so likewise this sacrifice, which is the memorial of Our Lord’s Passion, has no effect except in those who are united with this sacrament through faith and charity. ... Hence in the Canon of the Mass no prayer is made for them who are outside the pale of the Church.” (*Summa Th.*, III Q. 79, Art. 7) But if no prayer is made anywhere in the Canon of the Mass for those outside the Church, least of all should the words “for all men” be placed in the very form of the Consecration! For the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist is uniquely the Sacrament of the Mystical Body of Christ, of which Body not all men are members.

The New “Form” Conveys the Sense of Sufficiency

The “form” introduced in the new all-English Canon terminates thus: “is to be shed for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven. Unlike the ancient, established and proper form, the above phraseology fails to convey fails to convey the sense of efficacy, and denotes only the sense of sufficiency. The very words “so that sins may be forgiven.” denote only the notion of possibility, for the verb “may” is the permissive form. To describe sufficiency, St. Thomas uses the words “from which cause all sins ... could be forgiven”. The word “may” is akin to “could”, except that “could” is stronger in that it denotes power, capability or ability and not mere possibility.

Again, as stated earlier, the phrase “for all men” by its universality cannot denote anything but the aspect of sufficiency. Thus it is proved that the new “form” in no way conveys the same meaning as the ancient and proper form.

It is important to note that if the words “all men” had been substituted for the word “many” without changing anything else, the “form” would have read: which shall be shed for you and for all men unto the forgiveness of sins. This “form” is heretical. Since unto denotes efficacy, this “form” says that the benefits of Christ’s Passion are actually communicated to all men unto the forgiveness of sins. And this is contrary to faith.

Necessity of Using Our Lord's Words for the Eucharist

Apart from the invalidation of the Consecration caused by the substitution of the words “for all men” for “for many” there is another important aspect of this matter that requires consideration.

In the Sacraments of Baptism and Confirmation a slight variation in the wording is permissible, provided that the essential sense of the words of the form is not affected. But in the Sacrament of the Most Holy Eucharist a special case presents itself. Here there must be no variation whatsoever.

In all the Sacraments except the Holy Eucharist the minister has an act to perform in addition to pronouncing the required words of the form. For example, pouring water in Baptism, anointing with chrism in Confirmation and, in Holy Orders, the imposition of hands, etc., which constitute the matter of that Sacrament. But in the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist the priest has no act to perform except the pronouncing of the necessary words. (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 78, Art. 1) Moreover the power of the form of this Sacrament is derived solely from the fact that the words spoken by the priest are the exact words of Our Lord. “But the form of this Sacrament is pronounced as if Christ were speaking in person, so that it is given to be understood that the minister does nothing in perfecting this Sacrament except to pronounce the words of Christ.” (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 78, Art. 1)

Our Lord's Words in the Ancient Form

It cannot be doubted that the ancient, established form for the consecration of the wine comprises the words of Our Lord. For this the following proofs are presented.

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

- a) “and eternal” and
- b) “the Mystery of Faith”. But Tradition reveals to us that these words and eternal and the Mystery of Faith were also from Our Lord, for St. Thomas says “The words added, namely, eternal and mystery of faith, were handed down to the Church by the apostles, who received them from Our Lord.” (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 78, Art. 3)

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

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

Putting Words into Our Lord's Mouth

The new “form” for the consecration of the wine alleges that Our Lord said: “to be shed for you and for all men, etc.”. There is no evidence — either in Holy Scripture or in the Traditions handed down — that Our Lord actually said this when instituting the Holy Eucharist. Moreover,

all the evidence is that He did not say “for all men” when instituting the Most Holy Sacrament. St. Matthew (26:28) writes that He said, “for many” and *St. Mark*, also, (14:24) records that Our Lord said, “for many”. But nowhere in Holy Scripture — neither in St. Paul or the Evangelists — do we find that Our Lord said, “for all men.” Now, whom are we to believe? St. Mark and St. Matthew who was actually there at the Last Supper (and both of whom were divinely inspired to write what they wrote)? Or are we to believe an “enlightened” clique of mid-twentieth century Modernists and Innovators?

Even in ordinary writing or oratory, careful scholars are diligent in using the exact words of another person when attributing to him a quotation. How much more diligence is demanded when attributing a direct quotation to Jesus! “It is not lawful to add even words to Holy Scripture as though such words were a part thereof, for this would amount to forgery.” (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 60, Art. 8). Now, the authors of this new Canon boldly claim that Our Lord said something that He clearly and obviously did not say. The text of the new Canon reads precisely: “He ... gave the cup ... and said”. The quotation immediately following includes the bogus phrase: “for all men so that sins may be forgiven.” THIS IS A FORGERY, and those who are responsible for it must be deemed guilty of a deliberate deception, unless they can prove that they are merely completely inept and most culpably negligent.

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

Summary and Conclusion

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

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

This brings us back to St. Thomas: “For since in the Sacraments, the words produce an effect according to the sense which they convey ... We must see whether the change in words destroys the essential sense of the words: because then the Sacrament is clearly rendered invalid.” (*Summa Th.*, III, Q. 60, Art. 8)

Therefore, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass in the form in which it is offered in our churches in India today is invalid!

Originally written in about 1970 — scanned into electronic format in 2009