

“Novus Ordo Missae” : an anti-Mass

B. F. Dryden

The *Novus Ordo Missae* [NOM] is not a Mass, but an anti-Mass, a weapon used by the Conciliar anti-Church against the Church. It will be shown in this paper that the *NOM* is invalid, illicit and sacrilegious and that it is substituted for the Mass – which is the central mystery & core of Catholicism.

Why the NOM is not valid

Pope St. Pius V makes the requirements for a valid Mass clearly known by citing a Church rubric:

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. (a rubric, *De Defectibus*, p.xc, as cited in the *Missal* of St. Pius V – missal published 19 July 1570) NOTE: This rubric was not authored by Pope St. Pius V but preceded both him and the *Council of Trent* by several decades. He deemed the rubric so important that he gave it a binding prominence as *Preface* to his Missal. A separate paper is available on the exact origin of *De Defectibus*.

Right Matter

For it is required that the bread be of wheat and the wine from the vine; and that such matter for consecration be before the priest in the act of consecration. (*Ibid.*, p.xc)

Right Form

The words of consecration which are the form of this Sacrament are these: *Hoc est enim Corpus meum*. [For this is My Body] And: *Hic est enim Caliz Sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti; mysterium fidei, qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum*. [For this is the Chalice of My Blood, of the new and eternal Testament, the Mystery of Faith, which for you and for many shall be shed unto the remission of sins.] If anyone should take away or change anything in the form of consecration of the Body and Blood, and in this change of wording the words should not mean the same, he would not accomplish the Sacrament. If he should add anything that does not change the meaning, he would accomplish the Sacrament indeed, but would sin most gravely.” (*Ibid.*, pp.xci-xcii)

For all men, in the *NOM*, does not mean the same as *for many* [*pro multis*]. As per *De Defectibus*, therefore, whoever makes this change does not “accomplish the Sacrament” – that is, he does not say a valid Mass. Indeed, all participating in this new rite approve it and so share in the priest's grave sin of sacrilege, unless per chance they be excused by an ignorance that is not itself sinful.

For all men furthermore makes of the words of consecration a heresy, stating, namely, that Christ not only willed all men to be saved and made reparation sufficient for the whole world's sins, but also actually applied it unto remission of the sins, repented and unrepented, even of men who do not wish their sins forgiven or do not wish it on the terms required by Christ. To state for all men is to profess the heresy that all men will be saved and that Hell is abolished.

Warning against this very heresy is given by the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, which expounds the words “for you and for many” as follows:

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 has given me, because they are thine." (Translation by McHugh and Callan, *Marian Publication*, 1976, p.227-228)

But why is more required for valid consecration than the words, "This is the Chalice of My Blood"? For the same reason that valid baptism requires more than the words "I baptize thee." It requires the rest of the form, "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," by which Catholic Baptism is distinguished from Jewish ablutions, from St. John the Baptist's baptisms of penance, and from the heretical Arian baptism "in the name of the Father who is greater and of the Son who is lesser." The truncated form signifies the Sacrament of Baptism but does not accomplish it until the meaning is completed.

So also, in all rites approved by the Catholic Church, Transubstantiation of the wine is, indeed, signified by words equivalent to "This is the Chalice of My Blood" or "This is My Blood." But it is not accomplished until the meaning is completed by three additions: (1) words signifying sacrifice ("which shall be shed"); (2) words signifying true propitiation for sin, obtainable only through the Blood of Christ, not the blood of animals; and (3) words signifying the unity of the Church, outside which there is no salvation ("for many", "for you and for many", but never "for all men").

The words "The Mystery of Faith", which are lacking in several Oriental rites, are placed by St. Thomas Aquinas (*ST III, Q 78, a 3c*) under propitiation, which is applied through faith in Christ's redeeming Sacrifice on Calvary. Thus St. Paul wrote to the (*Romans 3:25-26*):

Whom God hath proposed to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to the showing of his justice, for the remission of former sins, through the forbearance of God, for the shewing of his justice in this time; that he himself may be just and the justified of him who is of the faith of Jesus Christ.

The Latin *NOM*

But is not the Latin original of Paul VI's formula of Consecration valid, since it reads *pro multis* (for many)? And do not the words "For this is My Body", whether in Latin or in English, change the bread into Christ's Body in the new rite, as in the old? An answer to these questions is based on the third requisite for validity cited in *De Defectibus*, namely, intention, which has not yet been explained.

We may say here, however, firstly that this Latin original, promulgated on 3 April 1969, serves no practical purpose but to provide an official record containing the words *pro multis*, to which defenders of the *NOM* may point. A vernacular mistranslation containing the words "for all men" had already for some years been enforced nearly, if not quite, everywhere; and the vernacular mistranslation is still enforced by John Paul II.

Secondly, in promulgating the new rite, Paul VI referred to the *Institutio Generalis*, a general introduction to his new missal. Paragraph 7 of this *Institutio* defines "The Lord's supper or Mass" simply as a memorial meal, without reference to Transubstantiation, sacramental effect, or anything else to which the terms form, consecration, and validity could be related. Paul VI speaks, not as Catholics speak, of form

or consecration, but as a Protestant, simply of “the Lord's words”. Quite indiscriminately he quotes some words used in the Catholic form of Consecration, omits or displaces some, and adds other words that are not part of the form. Here is Paul VI's directive:

However, whether out of regard for reasons called pastoral or in order that concelebration might proceed more smoothly, We have commanded that the Lord's words in any form of the Canon be precisely the same. Hence in any Eucharistic Prayer We wish them to be pronounced thus: Over the bread: “Take ye all and eat of this: For this is My Body, which shall be delivered for you”; and over the chalice: “Take ye all and drink of this; for this is the chalice of My Blood of the new and eternal Testament, which for you and for many shall be shed unto the remission of sins. This do in commemoration of Me.” But the words “the Mystery of Faith”, taken out of the context of the Lord Christ's words and pronounced by the priest, open the door, as it were, to the acclamation of the faithful.

What are the alleged *pastoral* reasons behind this capricious unfaithfulness to Catholic Tradition, this replacement of a form of Consecration with a plain narrative of “the Lord's Supper”? How does it help concelebration (forbidden, in any case, by Canon 803 except at ordinations)? No other real motive appears than that of Luther in making very nearly the same changes: sacrilegious contempt for the Tradition of the Holy Catholic church and for the Catholic concept of the Holy Mass and Eucharist, which alone gives a meaning to the terms form, consecration, and validity.

Intention in the Sacraments

The Mass, like any other Sacrament, is principally the work of Christ, Who, however, uses in it a human instrument, the minister of the Sacrament. This minister is not a mere tool, like the carpenter's hammer or saw, but has free will. Unless he intends to do what Christ and the Church do, the Sacrament is invalid through defect of intention. Thus Pope Leo XIII in 1896, in the Bull *Apostolicae Curae*, found the Sacrament of Holy Orders in the Anglican Church invalid, not only through a defect in the form of words used by the Anglican bishops, but also through their defective intention. His principles are quite general and can therefore be applied to any Sacrament, including the Mass. Pope Leo states:

Then with this intrinsic defect of form has been combined a defect of intention – of that intention which is equally necessary for the existence of a Sacrament. Concerning the mind of intention, inasmuch as it is primarily something interior, the Church does not pass judgment; but in so far as it is externally manifested, she is bound to judge of it.

Now if, in order to effect and confer a sacrament, a person has seriously and correctly used the due matter and form, he is for that very reason presumed to have intended to do what the Church does. This principle is the basis of the doctrine that a sacrament is truly a sacrament even if it is conferred through the ministry of a heretic or unbaptized person, provided the Catholic rite is used.

But if, on the contrary, the rite is changed with the manifest purpose of introducing another rite which is not accepted by the Church, and of repudiating what in fact the Church does and by Christ's institution belongs to the nature of Sacrament, then it is evident, not only that the intention necessary for a sacrament is lacking, but even that an intention is present which is adverse to and incompatible with the sacrament. (*Acta Sanctae Sedis*, Vol. XIX, 1896-1897, pp.198-201. Translation from Francis Clark, S.J., *Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention*, Longmans, Green, and Co., 1956)

What does this mean in practical terms, as applied to the Mass? When we do not have other external ways of knowing a priest's intention, we are to presume that it is correct and that his Mass is valid if he uses a Catholic rite. If, however, he uses a rite invented to do away with the Catholic rite, then it is

evident that his intention is insufficient, even opposed to Christ's purpose – and his Mass is invalid for that reason, if for no other.

Leaving aside licitness, for the moment, the Tridentine Mass, correctly celebrated by a validly ordained priest, is always to be presumed valid, whether the priest is a good or a bad man, sound or heretical in his preaching. Presumably valid, also, is the Mass celebrated by priests of the Eastern Churches, schismatic or uniate, according to their own rites, which are recognized as valid by the Catholic Church. The Protestant “Communion Service” and the *NOM*, on the other hand, are invalid because they were invented, intended to replace the Catholic Mass.

Intention in the *NOM*

Here is the description of his new rite published by Paul VI in Article 7 of the *Institutio Generalis* or General Introduction to his new *Roman Missal*:

The Lord's Supper or Mass is a sacred assembly or gathering of the people of God coming together, with a priest presiding, to celebrate the memorial of the Lord. Hence the promise of Christ is particularly true of the local gathering of the Holy Church: “Where there are two or three gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them.”

Calling this a Mass is a heresy because: it contains no reference to Christ's Sacrifice on Calvary or to any repetition thereof; it contains no reference to Transubstantiation and none to the real and physical presence of Christ, as distinguished from His spiritual presence in a gathering held as a memorial to Him; and no reference to the requisites so carefully enunciated in *De Defectibus*.

This is not just error, but heresy, for the heretic, Paul VI, though quickly admonished by a worldwide outcry of protest, caused or permitted Msgr. Annibale Bugnini, Secretary of Paul VI's Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship, to publish in the Congregation's organ, *Notitiae* (May 1970) that after examination of the “Introduction” of the new rite, “the fathers and experts of the Consilium found in it no doctrinal error, and no reason to make any changes”; but that, nevertheless, without adding “anything new”, a “a new version was made in order to make clearer certain expressions.”

In reading the new version, it is well to remember two points: (1) Any seeming rectification of error in the original text is disclaimed in advance; the new version is said to mean the same as the original definition of the *NOM*; (2) the Latin word *seu*, translated or, is used between two names for one and the same thing; its use between an unsatisfactory or ambiguous term and the strictly correct one is a pretense that the two terms are synonymous. Says Bugnini:

In the Mass or Lord's Supper, the people of God are called together into one place, with a priest presiding and acting in the person of Christ, to celebrate the memorial of the Lord or Eucharistic Sacrifice. Hence the promise of Christ is particularly true of such a local meeting of the Holy Church: “Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them. (Matt. xviii. 20) For in the celebration of the Mass, in which the Sacrifice of the Cross is perpetuated, Christ is really present in the assembly itself, which has gathered in His name; in the person of the minister; in His word; and, indeed, substantially and continually under the Eucharistic Species.”

The original version expresses clearly, in Protestant terms, a Protestant intention to celebrate merely a memorial meal. As promised by Bugnini, this new version expresses the same intention in the same terms; but Catholic terms, of quite different meaning, have been added as synonymous with the Protestant ones: Mass equals Lord's Supper, and memorial of the Lord equals Eucharistic Sacrifice. The Sacrifice of Christ is, indeed, mentioned; not, however, as mystically and really repeated, but as celebrated and perpetuated through the assembly, i.e., merely commemorated.

The Real Presence of Christ is not clearly physical, in Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity, but spiritual in the assembly, the minister, the sermon. In view of Bugnini's assurance that nothing new is added, nothing of the original text corrected, the substantial and continual presence of Christ "Under the Eucharistic Species": must be understood in a Protestant sense, as resulting from the assembly and lasting "continually" only while the assembly is in session. The priest "acts in the person of Christ"; but we have no hint as to what his action is, whether or how it differs from that of laymen in the assembly.

In either version, then, of Paul VI's official definition – the original, which has never been repudiated, or the new, which is equivalent to it, though less clear – the NOM is not a Mass. Its declared purpose is to celebrate a memorial meal. Paul VI, though well admonished, remained obstinate in his heresy, that this is a Mass. By Pope Leo's rule, the intention of anyone celebrating this rite is evidently that of Paul VI, who promulgated it as a substitute for the Mass of the Catholic Church.. All such celebrations are invalid, not only through a defect in the form, but also through a defect in the intention.

Priestly Ordination in the Celebrant

The fourth requisite for the validity of a Mass, "priestly ordination: in the celebrant", is, in St. Pius V's Latin, *ordo sacerdotalis* – literally, priestly class or rank, conferred in the Sacrament of Holy Orders. Says Canon 948: "*Ordo* [i.e., the Sacrament of Holy Orders], by institution of Christ, sets clerics apart from lay folk in the Church for government of the Faithful and the ministry of divine worship." The *Pontificale Romanum* of 1873, in its ordination rite for priests, beautifully expresses their duties; their rank, second to the bishop whom they are to assist; and their powers of blessing and consecrating, offering Mass for the living and the dead, and giving absolution for sins.

Since, however some Oriental rites, approved by the Catholic Church as valid, are less explicit, doubt arose as to the validity of Oriental ordinations. Pope Pius XII decreed, therefore, in his *Sacramentum Ordinis* (30 Nov 1947) that the following words are the form sufficient for a valid ordination:

Give, we pray, Almighty Father, to this Thy servant the dignity of the priesthood [*Presbyterii dignitatem*]; renew within him the Spirit of holiness, that he may receive from Thee and hold rank of the second degree [*secundi meriti munus*] and instill sound morals through the example of his own conduct.

The Roman ordination rite makes it quite clear what the dignity of the priesthood is, by expressly conferring power to bless, offer Mass, and absolve:

Deign, O Lord to consecrate and sanctify these hands, through this anointing and our blessing.
Amen.

That whatever they bless may be blessed, and whatever they consecrate may be consecrated and sanctified, in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ.

... Receive the power to offer Sacrifice to God, to celebrate Masses both for the living and the dead, in the Lord's name.

... Receive the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven; and whose thou shalt retain, they are retained.

Conciliar Ordination as to Form

On 18 June 1968 in a document called *Pontificalis Roman Recognitio* (Revision of the Roman Pontifical), Paul VI approved a new and designedly dubious ordination rite, which his Sacred Congregation of Rites, on 15 Aug 1968 decreed permissible immediately and obligatory as of 6 April 1969. Just three days before this latter date, namely on 3 April 1969, Paul VI published his Apostolic Constitution, *Missale Romanum*, describing the *NOM* and mentioning the priest, as we have seen, merely as presiding over a

memorial meal. These dates suffice, of themselves, to suggest some connection between the two new rites, one to replace the Catholic priesthood and the other to replace the Catholic Mass, which can be validly celebrated only by a validly ordained priest.

Why do we say that this new ordination rite is designedly dubious? Because on the one hand it is shorn of the authentic Roman rite's express conferrals of power to bless, offer Mass, and absolve, which, like the beams of three powerful searchlights, illumine the meaning of the key phrase, dignity of the priesthood; and this shearing away, this snuffing out of the sources of light gives the lie to Paul VI's sole professed purpose "to restore the entire rite, which has been divided into several parts, to great unity and to express in sharper light the central part of the ordination, that is, the imposition of the hands and consecratory prayer." The new rite confers nothing at all save *presbyterii dignitas*, the dignity of the priesthood in whatever sense it may please the Conciliar Church to understand that dignity -- presumably as nothing more than the paltry dignity of presiding over the assembly at a memorial meal.

On the other hand, Paul VI expressly refers to Pius XII's *Sacramentum Ordinis* and keeps the form which is therein declared sufficient for validity. He conveniently neglects to tell us that Pius XII was speaking, not of a new rite invented to replace the Catholic rite, but of "Ordinations conferred by the Greek rite," approved by the Church many centuries ago, and used among Eastern Catholics in Rome itself or among schismatics who share the Catholic concept of the priesthood.

Paul VI also omits -- hardly through ignorance -- all mention of the Constitution *Apostolicae Curae* (1896), in which Pope Leo XIII, among reasons for considering Anglican ordinations invalid, notes that the same form of words which may be valid among Catholics becomes invalid under circumstances that change the meaning of those words:

... Nor have the words for the office and work of a priest or bishop, etc. any longer their validity, being now mere names, voided of the reality which Christ instituted. (Pope Leo XIII)

The form of Paul VI's new ordination rite, then, is meant to appear valid on the authority of Pope Pius XII, while being really invalid through a change in the meaning of the term *priesthood*. It is designedly dubious, meant to be accepted by Protestants and, with some misgivings, by Catholics.

Conciliar Ordination as to Intention

If, however, we consider the intention implicit in it, the new ordination rite is clearly invalid on the same grounds as Anglican orders. First of all, the pretense of restoring a primitive rite corrupted by the Roman Church is not only a studied irreverence and insult to that Church, but also a hollow sham. For the various expressions used to convey one and the same meaning in the various Catholic rites resulted from the peculiar circumstance of Catholics in the first four or five centuries. The Canon of the Mass and the forms of other Sacraments, in those ages of persecution, were secret, not written, but handed down orally; and perfect uniformity was impossible also because communication were difficult and infrequent among the various Catholic communities. Nevertheless, all have preserved substantially the same meaning, without which the Catholic Church would have rejected them. (See Addis and Arnold's *Catholic Dictionary*, Herder, 1950, s.v. Liturgy.)

The Anglican and Conciliar rites, on the contrary, resulted from other causes in an age when the printer's art and ease of communications made uniformity easy to maintain. These rites were concocted expressly, not to preserve, but to replace a Catholic rite; and this very act, by Pope Leo XIII's rule, is clear evidence of an intention "which is adverse to and incompatible with the sacrament."

Further, the intention to destroy the true Mass, for which genuine priests are ordained, had long been notorious in Paul VI and his Conciliar Church; and such an intention precludes any intention validly to ordain priests for that Mass.

26 Sept 1964: The Sacred Congregation of Rites, in *Inter Oecumenici*, art. R, warns that wrecking operation must be done cautiously: “The general reform of the liturgy will be better received by the faithful if it is accomplished gradually, and if it is proposed and explained to them properly by their pastors.”

July 1965: Yves Dupont writes, in his *Word Trends*, No. 6, pp.4-5: “The new Mass in the vernacular (which is being repeatedly modified) has aroused opposition in England, France, America and other countries ... The liturgical changes have not been, and cannot be, justified ... The sad fact is that the Church is now drawing nearer to Protestantism...”

October 1967: The Episcopal Synod called in Rome rejects a “normative Mass” identical in substance with the *NOM* which was imposed two years later. (*Ottaviani Intervention*, Art. 1)

Fall 1967: The American bishops impose a vernacular mistranslation of the Roman Canon including, among other heresies, “for all men”, which makes the Mass invalid. (Louis A. Post, *Mass Deception*, 16 June 1969; published by *Americans for Public Morality*, Box 145, Norwood, MA 02062.

18 June 1968: The mutilated ordination rite of which we have spoken is announced, evidently with the knowledge that the rejected “normative Mass”, soon to be promulgated as *NOM*, changes the meaning of priesthood, on which depends the ordination rite's validity.

15 Aug 1968: Three new Canons are introduced. “Canon II can be recited, with a clear conscience, by a priest who believes neither in transubstantiation nor in the sacrificial nature of the Mass.” (R. H. Richens in *The Tablet*, reprinted in *Word Trends*, May 1970, pp.5-8)

15 Aug 1968: On this same day, the mutilated ordination rite becomes permissible immediately, obligatory as of 6 April 1969.

3 April 1969: The *NOM* is described and touted in Paul VI's *Apostolic Constitution Missale Romanum*. He speaks of “having commanded” (*iussimus*) but commands nothing, for fear of the consequences. Nevertheless, a date is set, 30 Nov 1969, when “what we have commanded will become effective.” A false impression of legal force is also given in the conclusion: “We will that these our statutes and commands be now and henceforth firm and effective...”

6 April 1969: The mutilated ordination rite becomes obligatory: henceforth, no priests may be ordained for the true Mass. Implicit is the hope that the last validly ordained priest will one day die; and that all Masses will thereafter be invalid through lack of “priestly ordination in the celebrant.”

25 Sept 1969: In *The Ottaviani Intervention*, a group of Roman theologians examine, not the vernacular mistranslations being imposed on the faithful, but Paul VI's own Latin NOM. “It is evident,” they say in Art. 6, “that the *NOM* has no intention of presenting the Faith, as taught by the *Council of Trent*, to which, nonetheless, the Catholic conscience is bound forever. With the promulgation of the *NOM*, the loyal Catholic is thus faced with a most tragic alternative.”

Oct 1969: Msgr. Marcel Lefebvre founds a seminary in Fribourg, Switzerland, because no other seminary can be found to give a priestly formation rather than deformation. (Rev. Peter J. Morgan, “The Seminary of the True Faith”, in *World Trends*, No. 23, August 1971; Msgr. Lefebvre, “Priests for Tomorrow”, 29 March 1973)

27 Nov 1971: Bishop A. de Castro Mayer of Campos, Brazil, in a radio address, notes that the effective date, 28 Nov 1969, for forbidding the traditional Mass of St. Pius V was first postponed two years until 28 Nov 1971; that this new date was then never again mentioned in official documents; and that there is a good reason: “Canon 30 provides that a custom of more than one hundred years ... cannot be abrogated unless in an explicit manner.” But celebration of the Mass of St. Pius V is a custom dating back at least to the 6th century. “Therefore ... no one can censure a priest for celebrating it.”

Oct. 28, 1974: Paul VI's Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship permits and incites the new bishops' conferences to ban the Mass of St. Pius V in defiance of the decree *Quo Primum* and of Canon 30: "When an episcopal conference has determined that a vernacular version of the *Roman Missal* – or a part of it such as the Order of the Mass – must be used in its territory, from then on Mass must not be celebrated, whether in Latin or the vernacular, save according to the rite of the *Roman Missal* promulgated by the authority of Paul VI on 3 April 1969... What has been said does not apply to officially recognized non-Roman rites; but it does apply against any pretext of even an immemorial custom."

24 May 1976: The imminent valid ordination of priests for the true Mass, to be performed by Msgr. Lefebvre at Ecône, stings Paul VI into forbidding the true Mass personally, in a form still not canonically correct and binding, but scandalously clear and available to the laity throughout the world: "Today's authority is rejected in the name of yesterday's... Is it for this group, not the Pope, not the College of Bishops, not the ecumenical Council, to decide which among the innumerable traditions must be considered as the norm of faith?... The adoption of the *NOM* is certainly not left to the free choice of priests or faithful... With the same supreme authority that came from Christ Jesus, we call for the same obedience to all the other liturgical, disciplinary, and pastoral reforms which have matured in these years in the implementation of the Council decrees." (Paul VI, *Custos Quid de Nocte?* – an address to the Consistory; *The Wanderer*, June 10, 1976, p.6, col.5)

22 July 1976: An anonymous document informs Msgr. Lefebvre that Paul VI has suspended him *a divinis* for having ordained priests the preceding June 29. (Text in *Itinéraires*, No. 206, Sept. 1976, pp.271-272; pertinent correspondence, *ibid.*, pp.239-246)

11 Oct 1976: Paul VI rejects Msgr. Lefebvre's request that the Tridentine Mass be tolerated in some churches and traditional training of priests in some seminaries. The suspension *a divinis* will not be lifted until Msgr. Lefebvre accepts all decrees of Vatican II and the *NOM* and turns over to Paul VI all his seminaries and other works. (*Itinéraires*, No. 208, Dec. 1976, pp.181, 190-194)

Such is the record of an intention well manifested and realized in deed, and declared in words that were, at first, equivocal but finally quite clear: to ban the true Mass and replace it with "mere names voided of the reality which Christ instituted." Among the names so voided are those of Mass, priest, priesthood, seminary, and ordination. The Catholic realities they express will not be tolerated in the Conciliar Church. Invalid, therefore, by defect of intention, if not also through its designedly dubious form, is the Conciliar ordination rite. And anyone claiming to have been ordained a priest since April 6, 1969 – unless, indeed, in defiance of Paul VI, the Catholic rite was used – must be considered a mere layman, without power to bless and consecrate, to say valid Masses, or absolve from sin.

The *NOM* is illicit

Independently of its validity, Paul VI's *NOM* is illicit – i.e., forbidden by the Church's law. Participants in it commit a sin of disobedience to the authority which Christ vested in St. Peter and his successors, and in particular to that of St. Pius V in his decree *Quo Primum* (July 19, 1570). Adrian Fortescue wrote in 1908, in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* (vol. III, pp. 260-261, s.v. Canon of the Mass) as follows:

From the time of St. Gregory I (590-604) – certainly from the time when St. Gregory became pope – our Canon was already fixed in its present order. There are scarcely any changes to note in its history since then. "No pope has added to or changed the Canon since St. Gregory," says Benedict XIV (*De SS. Missae Sacr.*, 162)...

From the tenth century people took all manner of liberties with the text of the Missal. It was the time of farced *Kyries* and *Glorias*, of dramatic and even theatrical ritual, of endlessly varying and lengthy prefaces, into which interminable accounts of stories from Bible history and lives of saints were introduced. This tendency did not even spare the Canon... The Council of Trent

(1545-1563) restrained this tendency and ordered that ‘the holy Canon composed many centuries ago’ should be kept pure and unchanged; it also condemned those who say that the “Canon of the Mass contains errors and should be abolished.” (Sess. XXII., cap. iv, can. vi; *Denzinger* 819, 830). Pope Pius V (1566-1572) published an authentic edition of the *Roman Missal* in 1570, and accompanied it with a Bull forbidding anyone to either add, or in any way change any part of it. This Missal is to be the only one used in the West, and everyone is to conform to it, except that local uses which can be proved to have existed for more than 200 years are to be kept... Since Pius V our Canon, then, has been brought back to its original simplicity...

...So that of all liturgical prayers in the Christian world no one is more ancient nor more venerable than the Canon of the Roman Mass.

Paul VI, therefore, lied brazenly when he said, *in Custos Quid de Nocte?*, 24 May 1976:

The new Ordo was promulgated to take the place of the old, after mature deliberation, following upon the requests of the Second Vatican Council. In no different way did our holy predecessor Pius V make obligatory the Missal reformed under his authority, following the Council of Trent.

With the same authority that comes from Christ Jesus, we call for the same obedience ...

There are notable differences in “the way” of the *De Defectibus* rubric, as applied by St. Pius V, and that of Paul VI:

1) The authority cited by Pius V was genuine, and never abused. That of Paul VI rested on an election whose validity is suspect, having been managed quite possibly by Masonic conspirators. If genuine at first, it was quickly forfeited through public profession of heresy, under Canon 188, n.4, when he publicly approved heretical decrees of Vatican II (On Ecumenism, teaching, in par.3, salvation through non-Catholic religions and, in par.8, common worship with non-Catholics; Declaration on Religious Liberty, teaching a natural right to profess a false religion). Or again in the *NOM* itself, teaching that all men will be saved and that the Mass is merely a memorial meal.

2) St. Pius V’s purpose in applying the *De Defectibus* rubric was to honor the Church’s most venerable tradition and to preserve through the ages and throughout the world her unity of worship. Paul’s purpose was just the opposite, to propagate an invalid Protestant rite, in a newly concocted form, as a replacement for what Pius V and *De Defectibus* strove to preserve.

3) St. Pius V, in clear and proper form, commanded use of his traditional Missal and forbade use of any other that had not been in use at least 200 years. Paul VI never, in proper form, commanded use of his new rite, but imposed it in practice through a pretense of having commanded it, and by persecuting those who remained faithful to the Catholic Mass.

This last difference [in the actions of the genuine pontiff and those of the usurper] has an immediate bearing on licitness, which is being considered here. St. Pius V canonized the ancient Roman Missal, making it “unlawful henceforth and forever” to use any other, in virtue of his own genuine authority as Pope, and under pain of the displeasure of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul. Paul VI could not officially and in proper form abrogate the Pius V Missal and rubric without drawing attention to his own lack of genuine authority.

Had any influential person called the world’s attention to Canon 188, n.4, according to which no heretic such as Paul VI and his underlings can possess authority in the Catholic Church, a general clamor would have arisen for the election of a true pope. And usurpation of the Church’s offices by her enemies would have come to an end. Paul VI’s fear of being revealed as an anti-Pope (which indeed he was) left (and still leaves) the decree *Quo Primum* free of any possible legal challenge, even within the Conciliar Church itself; and the *NOM* is illicit in that Church, as it is in the Catholic Church.

Whoever participates in the new rite, then, commits a sin of disobedience to the authority conferred by Christ on St. Pius V, successor to St. Peter. And sin is an impediment which turns away grace, even the grace of a valid sacrament, from its recipient. The *NOM* confers no grace, not only because it is invalid through defects of form and intention, but also because it is illicit.

The Novus Ordo is Sacrilegious

Disobedience is not the only sin involved with *NOM*. Other sins are common worship with non-Catholics and sacrilege against the Holy Mass and Eucharist instituted by Christ, as we may infer from St. Thomas Aquinas' explanation of unworthy Communions:

In this Sacrament, as in others, the Sacrament is, in essence, a sign of the *res sacramenti* (value of the sacrament). But this Sacrament has a two-fold value (*res*) as stated above (Q 60, a 3, *Sed contra*; Q 73, a 6): one which is signified and contained in it, namely, Christ Himself; and another which is signified but not contained, namely, Christ's Mystical Body, which is the fellowship of the saints. Whoever, therefore, receives this Sacrament signifies, by that very fact, that he is united to Christ and incorporated with His members. But this is accomplished through faith informed with charity (*per fidem formatam*), which no one can have together with mortal sin. Hence it is clear that whoever receives this Sacrament with mortal sin, commits a falsehood in this Sacrament. And he therefore incurs sacrilege, as a violator of the Sacrament. For that reason, he sins mortally. (*ST III, Q 80, a 4c*)

St. Thomas' words, though meant to refer to any unworthy reception of the Holy Eucharist, are applicable with particular force to two practices that are widespread in our own time:

1) The right Mass in the wrong Church; that is, the valid Tridentine Mass and reception of Christ's true Body from a priest or in a group belonging to the Conciliar anti-Church, which is neither the Catholic Church nor any part thereof. Thus it is falsely signified that the members of a conspiracy organized to destroy Christ's Mystical Body are themselves united to Christ and incorporated in that Mystical Body – not only a falsehood, but a sacrilegious falsehood, violating the Real Presence of Christ, physical and sacramental.

2) The wrong "Mass", the *NOM*, anywhere and at any time, signifies these same untruths – not indeed in Christ's Real and Sacramental Presence, but in a more deliberate and systematic denial and mockery of it, twisting Christ's own words, "for many", into an assertion that all men ((His mockers included)) will be united with Him forever. The rite itself is sacrilegious, and all who participate in it or condone it vilely affront the true Sacrifice and Sacrament of the Mass. That is, they commit a sacrilege against it. Inevitable ignorance may be an excuse.

This is the **1st** of **3** papers central to the Church crisis that became transparent in the wake of Vatican II.
The other papers are: **(2) *Quo Primum*** **(3) *De Defectibus***

A possible source for these papers [in WordDoc format] is origins10@verizon.net

Photocopying encouraged.