



The Catholic Voice

A quarterly newsletter of the Society of Traditional Roman Catholics, produced under the patronage of St. Joseph.

P.O. Box 130
Mead, Washington 99021 USA

Volume 23, Issue 2
June, 2007

Terrible Times Await Those Who Will Not Conform To Modernist Spirit

As this issue arrives in the mail for our readers, we have once again had the opportunity to celebrate the feast of Pentecost. This is an important feastday in the Church for on this day we commemorate the birth of the Church through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost. This is why Catholics have such love and confidence in the Church because they know, despite the malice of men, the Church lives on in those faithful to the apostolic traditions made firm on Pentecost day nearly two thousand years ago. Pentecost also begins that season of the Church Year during which we reflect on all that the Apostles had to endure as they fulfilled their mission to preach the Gospel throughout the entire world. Having been enlivened by the Holy Ghost, the Apostles were willing to endure any suffering for the love of Jesus Christ and for the sake of the Gospel. Due to their fidelity and heroism, membership in the Church grew through the doctrine they taught and the example they gave.

The Apostles were the first Christian “non-conformists,” in the sense that they abandoned Judaism and the ways of the world in order to live as God taught them. They were persecuted and put to death precisely because they would not yield to the pressures of the Sanhedrin or of pagan Rome to abandon their “new” religion in favor of those that were more “mainstream”

and publicly acceptable. These men of God chose death rather than conformity, and we honor and admire them for this.

As time passes following the Modernist revolution through Vatican II, faithful Catholics are going to find themselves in the same position as the first champions of our Faith. We hear more and more the accusations that traditional Roman Catholics are too “radical” and even “cultish” because we will not conform to the heresies of our age. Neither will we follow the maxims of the world, because the world is secular and an enemy of Christ and all that He teaches. The world will join forces with the Modernists to persecute those Catholics faithful to the apostolic traditions — a persecution that can lead from ridicule to even imprisonment so that the ancient teachings of the Church will no longer be freely heard among men. Even the modern liturgy is gradually changing to bring it into conformity with the “acceptable and mainstream” notions that are observed by men in our age. Under John XXIII, prayers for the conversion of the Jews were eliminated from Good Friday prayers; now (according to *Nostrae Aetate* of Vatican II) other “anti-semitic” language will be removed from the liturgical prayers, and even the Gospels themselves, all in the name of conformity. The more this happens, the more “non-conformist” we appear, and we will be made to suffer for it. May God help us.

Is The *Novus Ordo Missae* A Catholic Mass? Let's Compare Them: Part 4

By DR. RAMA COOMARASWAMY, M.D.
Used with permission of the author

The Institution Narrative

The Institution Narrative (The words of Christ at the last Supper. *Ed.*) is the same throughout the various Eucharistic Prayers. If one looks at the NOM missalette, no distinction is made between the “Words of Consecration,” now called the “Words of our Lord,” and the rest of the text. In the Missals used with the Tridentine Latin Mass, the critical words are highlighted so there can be no mistake that these are the very words of Christ, given us at the Last Supper when He established the Mass.

In the *Novus Ordo Missae*, as in the Lutheran service, the words of Consecration — the very heart of the Traditional Rite — are now part of what is called the “Institution Narrative,” an expression not found in the traditional Missals of the Church.²⁷ The phrase refers to the Last Supper, at which time Christ established the Mass. It is obvious that it is intended that the priest-president read this as a narrative as if he were merely retelling the story of the Last Supper, some 2000 years ago,

On July 19, 2006, Dr. Coomaraswamy died after a battle with cancer. His writings have helped many to better understand the errors of our times. We continue this sample of his works (with his permission before he died) in memory of the work he had done for the Church in our time. May he rest in peace.

instead of actually consecrating the bread and wine here and now. Retelling the story of the Last Supper alone does not change the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. The priest must act *in persona Christi*, that is, he must say these critical words “in the person of Christ,” for it is Christ who, by His infinite power, through the words of the priest, “confects the Sacrament.” The “revised” version of the General Instruction, seeking to mollify critics of the New Mass, does speak of the priest acting *in persona Christi*, but not with regard to the manner in which he says the words of Consecration. Even if the use of the phrase “Institution Narrative” were the only defect in the New Rite, it would be sufficient to raise grave doubts as to whether or not the elements of bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ in the NOM. To simply read this as a story, as for example when the priest reads the Gospel, transubstantiates nothing.

It is generally assumed that the words of Consecration are taken from Scripture. This is false. The first Scripture of the New Testament was written some eight years after the Crucifixion and

27. The term doesn't appear in the NOM Missalette, but is a part of the General Instruction and hence has the force of a “rubric.” Priests brought up in the NOM are taught this as a matter of course. *(Continued on Page 4)*

STRC News: CD Version of Serving Set; Be Faithful To Donations

The following are some important announcements of interest to those who support the work of the Society of Traditional Roman Catholics.

Serving At The Altar Tape And CD Set

For over ten years, the STRC has provided a special “kit” for those learning how to serve the Roman (Tridentine Latin) Mass. More than 2,800 copies of *Serving At The Altar* have been produced, thus contributing to the work of the Restoration by providing a means for achieving consistency in serving Holy Mass. Up until this time, we have offered a cassette tape with each “kit” so the server-in-training could follow along and perfect his Latin pronunciation. Now, due to many requests, we are offering a CD of this Latin instruction instead of the cassette tape. This is *not* a video presentation for learning how to serve at Mass. It is an *audio* CD for learning to recite the Latin responses. We will continue to offer the cassette tape version *only as long as we can get the material needed to make up these “kits” in cassette form*. So, when ordering your copies of *Serving At The Altar*, *you must specify which media format you prefer*: cassette or CD. *If no preference is given, the cassette tape will be sent* as long as the packaging material for the cassette is available to us.

Your Donations Are Needed

Those who read *The Catholic Voice* in the United States know

Three Important Reprints:

The Mysterious Mysteries of the Rosary:

Reasons for rejecting the “Luminous Mysteries”. By James De Piante

A Catholic Reading of the Declaration *Dominus Jesus*

by Paula Haigh

Considerations On The Upcoming “Universal Indult”

by Fr. Kevin Vaillancourt

Minimum donation: \$5.00 *each, includes postage.*

Order now from: STRC, P.O. Box 130, Mead, WA 99021 USA



Serving at the Altar

Learning to Serve at Low Mass with one Server

Available now for a \$14⁹⁵ donation to STRC.

Please specify if you want a CD or a cassette tape. If you do not specify, a tape will be sent.

that the U.S. Postal Service raised it rates yet again on May 14. It is something that impacts all of us — U.S. residents or not — because each of our lives revolves around the delivery of mail in one way or another. As this pertains to the STRC and the delivery of *The Catholic Voice*, we have experienced an increase in each postal class we use to send our newsletter to our readers. Even a fractional increase in non-profit postage rates impacts an already tight budget. As you know, we are one of the *very few* religious magazines available that neither requires an annual subscription, nor are we subsidized by outside advertising or some charitable trust fund. The continuation of our apostolate depends on the charitable donations of our readers, whom, we acknowledge with deep gratitude, have been faithful and generous in their support over the years. We write now, asking you to keep up this spirit of generosity, even though your expenses (like ours) have continued to increase. May God reward you for efforts in our regard.

Perfect Gift Idea: The Holy Sacrifice Of The Mass

There is no better gift you can give to family and friends than that of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Now, it often happens that Mass intentions given to priests are either delayed in their fulfillment, or else returned because the priest cannot accept anymore for some time to come. A solution to this dilemma is to have your loved ones enrolled in the **Mass Guild of the Missionaries of the Holy Ghost**. For a \$12.00 donation, you can have someone remembered at one Mass each month for an entire year! Each month, those enrolled in the Mass Guild are remembered in the Tridentine Latin Mass offered on the third Sunday of each month. To enroll, send your donation to the Missionaries of the Holy Ghost, P.O. Box 589, Veradale, WA 99037. †

Past Articles Of *The Catholic Voice* Available As Reprints

Are you a new reader of *The Catholic Voice*? Do you want to know where we're “coming from”? Or, would you like more ammunition in the fight to defend the Tridentine Latin Mass? Whatever the case, we have reprinted several articles for those involved in the Traditional Movement. We now have these articles available:

1. Defending The Tridentine Mass

Our case regarding the invalidity of the Novus Ordo fully explained.

2. The Destruction of the Mass and Some Historical Parallels

The attempt to destroy the Mass was tried before.

3. The Ecumenist Heresy

A very important work by Patrick Henry Omlor.

4. The *Special Edition* of The Catholic Voice

A perfect introductory piece, produced specially by STRC for distribution among Catholics not familiar with the Traditional Movement of the Roman Catholic Church.

All of these reprints are available for a donation. Please request the article by name. For quantity discounts, contact us by mail at the address on Page 1. †



The Catholic Voice is a publication of the Society of Traditional Roman Catholics, and is published quarterly, as funds are available. There is no subscription fee, but donations are requested to help us continue our work. Board Officers of the STRC are Larry Martin, *President*, James De Piante, *Secretary*, Jim Callahan, *Treasurer*, Fr. Kevin Vaillancourt, *Newsletter Editor*, and Don Donadio. Unsolicited manuscripts are welcome, but are subject to the editorial policy of the STRC Board of Directors. There is no stipend paid for unsolicited manuscripts, and material submitted cannot be returned. *Pro Multis* pins supporting our work can be obtained from STRC for a minimum donation of \$5.00.

Participation In Holy Mass Is Best Preparation For Communion

By VERY REV. GASPAR LEFEBVRE, OSB
From: *Catholic Liturgy*

Holy Mass is not only a powerful means of sanctification as being the sacrifice of the New Law, but also because in it Jesus, the Bread of Life, becomes in Holy Communion, the food of our souls. It was with this intention that, when instituting the Blessed Sacrament, He chose the species of bread and wine, saying to His Apostles: "Take and eat, this is my Body; . . . take and drink, this is the chalice of my Blood."

In ancient times, participation in the sacrifice was by means of a repast during which the victims immolated on the altar were eaten; as St. Paul says, "Are not they, that eat of the sacrifices, partakers of the altar?" (I Cor. 10:18) And we read in the Canon of the Mass that "to receive the Body and Blood of our Savior is to participate in the altar." (Supplicer.) In the Pontifical, at the time for Holy Communion, there used to be the following rubric for the newly confirmed: "Let them now participate in the Sacrifice."

Sacramental Communion is the supreme degree of participation in the Holy Sacrifice. The faithful are under the obligation of participating in it in this manner at least once a year during Lent or Paschal time, for at that time the day recurs on which the institution of the Holy Eucharist is commemorated. But the Council of Trent desires the faithful to communicate sacramentally everytime they are present at Mass, "in order to receive in greater measure the fruits of the most holy Sacrifice." (Session 22, cap. 6)

The Mass is, in fact, the best preparation for Communion, just as Communion itself is the best way of participating in the Mass. Dom Vandeur remarks that "since Holy Communion is a liturgical act of the first rank, it should not be merely an act of devotion, but above all its liturgical character should be preserved and its liturgical context kept in mind. Preparation, reception and thanksgiving should all be performed according to the liturgy." And the Church thinks She cannot do better than draw near to God with the chalice of the Blood of Christ in Her hands. During the Canon of the Mass, She begins by offering to the Father the Victim on the altar, the same as that on Calvary; and only after this oblation does She give us Holy Communion in His Name, having first begged the Father of Mercies to "give us our daily bread" and the charitable dispositions requisite for receiving it: "Forgive us as we forgive."

Is it not better to receive the Victim of Calvary after having thus offered It in expiation for our sins, as we do at Mass? The Holy Sacrifice satisfies divine justice, and Communion, replaced in its liturgical setting, is a better representation of what Cardinal Mercier calls the kiss of peace bestowed by the Father on His children, with His gifts, as a pledge of reconciliation. Moreover, by being present at Mass, we participate more fully in the effects of the Sacrifice, and thus our reception of the Sacrament is rendered more fruitful. Here is the proof of it:

Acts of contrition occur frequently in the Mass under the most varied forms. These acts made by the priest, with which the faithful unite themselves, if they choose to attend, are sacramentals, which operate in virtue of the prayers and merits of the Church.

Why not make use of these easy means of purifying our hearts?

Acts of Faith are no less numerous. They begin especially by the reading of the Collects, Epistles and Gospel. "Let the *Credo* resound," says the Council of Toledo (589); "for by this chant the true faith is clearly confessed, and the soul of a Catholic people, reviving its faith, is prepared to receive the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ." The Consecration is above all the *mysterium fidei*. Everything in the Mass nourishes faith and makes us realise the greatness of the God we are about to receive.

Acts of hope and love are also to be found in great number in the Mass. All our hope is in Jesus; "through Him and with Him and in Him all honor and glory are given to God." Trusting in Him as her Mediator, the soul immolates herself with Him and her love is enkindled at the memory of "the greatest proof of love" He gave by dying for us, a love which is consummated in Communion, when He gives Himself to our souls.

Thus everything in the Mass relates to our union with Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament. And since the effects produced in our souls by the Holy Sacrifice and Communion vary according to the mysteries and festivals celebrated — for to communicate is to receive Jesus in the mystery which is being commemorated — it is easy to see the advantages of preparation according to the liturgy. For the graces of Christmas are not the same as those of Easter, nor do we ask for and receive the same graces on the feast of a martyr as on that of a virgin. By reading the Communion Antiphons and the Post-communion prayers, we shall understand the manifold graces bestowed upon us by Communion thus placed in its right setting. To receive them with fruit, a fitting preparation is necessary. Therefore, let us not be afraid of giving up the usual acts before Communion, so often monotonous and said by routine by far too many people; and instead, let us attentively and devoutly meditate on the Mass for the day.

How beautiful is the sight of all Christians throughout the world receiving the Holy Eucharist in order to participate in all the mysteries of Our Lord's life commemorated by the Church in Her liturgical cycle.

Let me conclude by remarking that Jesus is substantially present in the Blessed Sacrament, not only to be adored by us, but, above all, to adore our Father in Heaven for us, to satisfy His justice by daily renewing the offering of the Sacrifice of Calvary at Holy Mass, and, by inviting us to receive this Sacred Victim, to make us members evermore intimately incorporated in His Mystical Body.

In this way, the Sacred Liturgy, by organizing our worship of the Holy Eucharist, brings about the extension of the Kingdom of God, not only by an exterior worship of the Blessed Sacrament, continually increasing in splendor, but above all by more perfectly participating in the Holy Sacrifice, and by a growing development of the Mystical Body of Christ through Holy Communion. This is the full realization of the petition of the *Our Father: Adveniat regnum Tuum.* †

**Ø Sacrament Most Holy, Ø Sacrament Divine,
All praise and all thanksgiving be every moment Thine!**

The Church Has Neither The Power Nor Right To Change The Sacraments

(Continued from Page 1)

others much later. As St Thomas Aquinas tells us:

“The Evangelists did not intend to hand down the form of the Sacraments, which in the primitive Church had to be kept concealed, as Dionysius observes at the close of his book on the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy; their object was to write the story of Christ.” (Summa, III, Q78, Art.3)

These words were given us by Christ Himself. According to the Catholic Encyclopedia (1913):

“Christ determined what special graces were to be conferred by means of external rites; for some Sacraments (e.g., Baptism, the Eucharist) He determined minutely (*in specie*) the matter and form: for others He determined only in a general way (*in genere*) that there should be an external ceremony by which special graces were to be conferred, leaving to the Apostles or to the Church the power to determine whatever He had not determined — e.g., to prescribe the matter and form of the Sacraments of Confirmation and of Holy Orders.”

Now in all the 80 plus valid rites of Mass, the form is essentially the same. Some do not include *Mysterium fidei*, which tradition tells us St. Peter added, having received it from Christ Himself. Others do not add “for the forgiveness of sins” to the consecration of the wine. But what does the NOM do . . .

The NOM uses the words of Luther (who totally rejected the sacrificial nature of the Mass), which he in turn took from the Scriptures. Moreover, it persistently uses the word *all* in place of *many* which violates the constant teaching of the Church, and the canons of the Council of Trent. True, *multi* (*many*) may appear in the Latin version of the 1965 to 1967 changes, but, in the practical order, who hears a NOM in Latin? However, this version eliminates the words *Mysterium fidei* from the wine consecration form: a very serious violation of the teachings of the Church as to what constitutes the form of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist that is necessary for validity in the Roman Rite.

Beyond this, Pope Innocent III (1198-1216) notes “that there are three elements in the narrative not commemorated by the Evangelists: ‘with his eyes lifted up to heaven,’ ‘and eternal testament’ (whereas the Gospels give only ‘of the New Testament’) and ‘the mystery of the faith (*mysterium fidei*),” and these he holds to be derived from Christ and the Apostles, “for who would be so presumptuous and daring as to insert [much less remove] these things out of his own devotion? In truth, the Apostles received the form of the words from Christ Himself, and the Church received it from the Apostles themselves.”²⁸

Can the Church — or rather its leaders — do such a thing? Do they have the power or the right to make changes to the very words of Christ as determined by *apostolic tradition* in the Roman Rite? Listen to the words of Leo XIII taken from the irrefragable Encyclical *Apostolicae Curae*:

“The Church is forbidden to change, or even touch, the matter or form of any Sacrament. She may indeed change or

28. *De Sacro Altaris Mysterio*, quoted by Maurice de la Taille, *The Mystery of the Faith*, Theses XXIV and XXXVB, p. 454.

abolish or introduce something in the non-essential rites or ‘ceremonial’ parts to be used in the administration of the Sacraments, such as the processions, prayers or hymns before or after the actual words of the form are recited....”

Consider further the effect of the changes in the last sentences of the modern narrative form. Instead of “do these things,” we find the celebrant instructed to “do this,” that is, “take and eat (drink),” thus strongly suggesting that what is involved is a “supper” and a “memorial” rather than the entire sacrificial action. And all this activity involves a “cup” rather than a “chalice,” thus further reinforcing a merely culinary implication. Next let’s note the additional phrase: “Which will be given up for you,” which is a phrase introduced by Luther because as he said “the word ‘for you’ simply calls for believing hearts.”

The further removal of the *Mysterium fidei* — the mystery of the faith which surely refers to the Transubstantiation — from the wine consecration form, and placing it in a context which implies that this mystery is the Death, Resurrection and Final Coming, not only destroys the apostolic form for the Holy Eucharist, but it introduces a novelty into the Mass that was never allowed before. The placement of “Mystery of Faith” as the “Memorial Acclamation” certainly leads one to believe that no Sacrifice, and no Transubstantiation, has occurred.²⁹

What Follows The Modern “Consecration” Formula

In the traditional Latin Mass, a series of prayers follow the Consecration.

“Wherefore, O Lord, we Thy servants, as also Thy holy people, calling to mind the blessed passion of the same Christ Thy Son, our Lord, His resurrection from the grave, and His glorious ascension into heaven, offer up to Thy most excellent majesty of Thine own gifts bestowed upon us, a victim + which is pure, a victim + which is holy, a victim + which is stainless, the holy bread + of life everlasting, and the chalice + of eternal salvation.”

St. Thomas Aquinas tells us that these five signs of the Cross during this prayer represents the five wounds of Christ present on the altar.

“Vouchsafe to look upon them with a gracious and tranquil countenance, and to accept them, even as Thou wast pleased to accept the offerings of Thy just servant Abel, and the sacrifice of Abraham, our patriarch, and that which Melchisedech, Thy high priest offered up to Thee, a holy sacrifice, a victim without blemish.”³⁰

29. Several “Memorial Acclamations” are provided for the NOM priest-president to choose from. At first they wished to leave this entirely up to the priest, but Paul VI said “no” because he feared (perhaps) that people might continue to recite privately “My Lord and My God.” This is documented in *The Reform of the Liturgy 1948-1975* by Annibale Bugnini, Liturgical Press, Collegeville, MN, 1990.

30. That the sacrifice of Melchisedech was a figure of the Sacrifice of the Mass. St. Paul explains this in his letter to the Hebrews, Chapters VII, VIII, and IX. He expatiates at length on

Most Traditional Prayers Of The Canon Have Been Eliminated

(Continued from Page 4)

This prayer points to the fact that Christ's sacrifice is perpetual, for He is in fact always sacrificing Himself for us. It may have taken different forms throughout history, but it is one and the same Sacrifice — previously seen as it were in "shadow," but now quite obviously before us on the altar.

"We humbly beseech Thee almighty God, to command that these our offerings be borne by the hands of Thy holy angel to Thine altar on high in the presence of Thy divine Majesty; that as many of us as shall receive the most sacred + Body and + Blood of Thy Son by partaking thereof from this altar may be filled with every heavenly blessing and grace. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen."

Next comes the Commemoration of the Dead.

"Be mindful, also O Lord of Thy servants N. and N., who have gone before us with the sign of faith and who sleep the sleep of peace. To these, O Lord, and to all who rest in Christ, grant, we beseech Thee, a place of refreshment, light, and peace. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen"

Protestants, of course, reject the idea of Purgatory. The Orthodox say they do also, but they have simply given it a different name. Protestants also object to priests collecting stipends for saying Masses for the dead. Actually, the destruction of the Chanceries (where such stipends were deposited) was a great source of income to the Reformers. As for stipends, they are offerings made to the priest for saying Mass, and they represent his temporal support. A priest can only accept one stipend a day and he may not spend it before fulfilling his commitment.

Next the priest strikes his breast, thus recognizing that he also is a sinful man, and says:

"To us sinners, also, Thy servants, who put our trust in the multitude of Thy mercies, vouchsafe to grant some part and fellowship with Thy holy apostles and martyrs, with John, Stephen, Matthias, Barnabas, Ignatius, Alexander, Marcellinus, Peter, Felicitas, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucy, Agnes, Cecilia, Anastasia, and with all thy saints. Into their company

30. (cont.) the priesthood of Christ, showing that Christ was a Priest, but not of the order of Aaron, because He was not of the tribe of Levi, whose sons alone were ordained to the priesthood. Being of the generation of Juda, from which kings were chosen, Christ was a King and, therefore a Priest according to the order of the King-priest Melchisedech. The two priesthoods differed in two things. In the first place, Aaron sacrificed the blood of animals, while Melchisedech offered bread and wine. Secondly, the priesthood of Aaron was temporal and was to terminate, but the priesthood of Melchisedech, or Christ, was eternal, and its institution was sealed with an oath of God concerning which the Psalmist writes: "And the Lord hath sworn and he will not repent. Thou are a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech" (Ps. 109:14). St Cyprian tells us "Christ offered that which Melchisedech offered, bread and wine, that is His Body and Blood" (*Lib.2, ca.3*). It is of great significance that all references to Melchisedech have been eliminated both in the NOM and in the new Ordination rites.

do Thou, we beseech Thee, admit us, not weighing our merits, but freely pardoning our offenses: through Christ our Lord."

This is, after all, what our worship through the Mass is all about - to be mercifully led to Eternal Life. In this prayer are listed the Apostles missed in the earlier prayer, as well as various functionaries of the Church, Ignatius, a bishop, Marcellinus a priest, Peter a Deacon, and those glorious martyrs of the early Church.

In the NOM, these above mentioned prayers have all been *eliminated*.

Next the priest makes three Signs of the Cross over the Body and Blood of Our Lord and says:

"By whom, O Lord, Thou dost always create, sanctify +, quicken +, bless+, and bestow upon us all these good things."

Then, uncovering the chalice, and taking the Body of Christ in his consecrated and purified fingers, the priest makes three Signs of the Cross over the Precious Blood saying:

"Through Him +, and with Him +, and in Him + is to Thee, God the Father +, almighty, in the unity of the Holy + Ghost, all honor and glory."

As he says "all honor and glory," the priest raises the Sacred Host over the chalice in what is called the "Minor Elevation." The Sacred Host is placed back on the corporal, after which the priest rubs his fingers over the chalice to be sure no particles of the Sacred Host have stuck to them. He then recovers the chalice.

In the NOM, this prayer *in mitigated form* has been retained. The priest-president lifts the bread and the cup and says what is called a *Doxology* (according to Webster's Dictionary, a *doxology* is a kind of hymn of praise to God):

"Through him, with him; in him; in the unity of the Holy Spirit; all glory and honor is yours; almighty Father for ever and ever."

The *Pater Noster*, Or, "Our Father"

Both the traditional Latin Mass and the NOM say the *Our Father* out loud. It is not surprising that this was retained in the NOM as all the Protestant sects kept the *Our Father* in their ceremonies.

In the NOM, however, after a short hiatus, an additional *Doxology* is appended to it, namely: "For the kingdom, the power, and the glory are yours, now and for ever." This has always been recognized as a Protestant addition to this prayer, something which those who grew up before Vatican II, and who went to public school were well aware of. In those days, when school children were allowed to say the *Our Father* in school at the start of day, Catholics stopped before this Doxology was added. Where does it come from? It is in the King James version. The Latin from which they worked had a note in the margin by a scribe which stated this brief hymn of praise, and they, by mistake, incorporated it into the translation. It is not in the original Scripture they worked from. It is of course quite appropriate, but hardly carries the stamp of exactitude that we are informed is so important to the Innovators. It should also be noted that the *Our Father* has been displaced in the NOM into what is called the "Communion Rite."

(Continued on Page 6)

The *Novus Ordo Missae* Has Eliminated Many Important Prayers

(Continued from Page 5)

The next prayer recited in the traditional Latin Mass is accompanied by some significant actions of the priest. Taking the paten now resting on the altar, he blesses himself with it and then kisses it. Next, he carefully places the Sacred Host on the Paten in preparation for what is soon to come. Here are the words of the prayer he recites at this time:

“Deliver us, we beseech Thee, O Lord, from all evils, past, present and to come; and by the intercession of the blessed and glorious Mary, ever a virgin, Mother of God, and of Thy holy apostles Peter and Paul, of Andrew, and of all the saints, graciously grant peace in our days that through the help of Thy bountiful mercy we may always be free from sin and secure from all disturbances.”

This has been replaced by a variety of very similar options:

“Deliver us, Lord, from every evil, and grant us peace in our day. In your mercy keep us free from sin and protect us from all anxiety as we wait in joyful hope for the coming of our Savior, Jesus Christ.”

One suspects that one has to thank Freud for anxiety being inserted in this “mass” of sorts. Requesting the intercession of Mary and the saints is once again downplayed. And, again, the idea of the Second Coming is stressed, as it was in the Gospel Acclamation — this at a time when Our Lord is supposed to be recognized as present on the Altar.

The traditional Latin Mass continues with a very mystical prayer. The priest, uncovering the chalice, fractures the Sacred Host in two over the Precious Blood, being careful that no particles fall outside the chalice. As he does this he says: *Through the same Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord.* Then he breaks off another small piece and says: *Who liveth and reigneth with Thee in the unity of the Holy Ghost, God. . .* then taking this small piece he says out loud . . . *Per omnia saecula saeculorum — World without end,* to which the server responds: *Amen.*

After this he makes three signs of the Cross with this small piece of the Sacred Host over the Precious Blood saying:

May the peace + of the Lord + be always with + you.

To this the server answers on behalf of all present, *“And with thy spirit.”*

To understand (if one can ever fully comprehend) what happens here, one must again refer to the fact that the traditional Latin Mass recapitulates the entire life of Christ. Of course, this life is capsulated in the various acts and prayers of the priest. We join (hopefully) Christ in His Birth (Gloria), in His Baptism (Asperges), in His Youth and maturity (Epistles and Gospels), and in His triumphal entry of Jerusalem (Sanctus). It is His life we offer up in the Offertory, for what other “spotless host” is there, derived from the Divinity of God and encircled in the flesh of his most pure Mother? We also join Him in His Passion (the “unbloody Sacrifice”) and now in His Resurrection, for as Paul tells us, “we must be crucified with Him if we are to be resurrected with Him.” St. Thomas explains:

“The breaking of the host denotes three things: first the rending of Christ’s body, which took place in the Passion;



In this photo, Paul VI is seen standing with six Protestant “advisors.” He later thanked these men for the manner in which they established formulas “which were completely new” and “imparting greater theological value to the text.” However, Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci publicly stated that the new “Mass” represents as a whole and in detail a “striking departure for the Catholic theology of the Holy Mass as it was formulated at the Council of Trent, Session XXII.”

secondly, the distinction of His mystical body according to its various states; and thirdly, the distribution of the graces which flow from Christ’s Passion as Dionysius observes.”

St. Thomas gives other explanations, such as that of Pope Sergius, that “the Lord’s Body is threefold; the part offered and put into the chalice signifies Christ’s risen Body, namely, Christ Himself, and the Blessed Virgin, and the other saints, if there be any, who are already in glory with their bodies. The part consumed denotes those still walking on earth, because while living upon earth they are united together by this Sacrament; and are bruised by the passions, just as the bread eaten is bruised by the teeth. The part reserved on the altar until the close of the Mass is His Body hidden in the sepulcher, because the bodies of the saints will be in their graves until the end of the world: though their souls are either in Purgatory, or in Heaven. However, this rite of reserving one part on the altar until the close of the Mass is no longer observed, on account of the danger... [It is now reserved in the Tabernacle.] Others however say that the part put into the chalice denotes those still living in this world, while the part kept outside the chalice denotes those fully blessed both in soul and body, while the part consumed means the others.”

The point of all this is that Christ, having divided Himself up for us into innumerable pieces, is reconstituted by the priest. The Body and Blood are united again which speaks to us of the Resurrection. In the NOM, the bread is broken during the mutilated “consecration” which goes to reinforce the culinary aspect that is so heavily stressed in this modern rite. But why is the Sacred Host fractured at this time in the traditional rite? Because, as the great liturgist William Durandas explains, it recapitulates the mysterious breaking of the bread in Emmaus by Jesus Christ after His Resurrection from the dead. †

(Continued next issue)

The New Teaching On Limbo And The “Spirit Of Vatican II”

By REV. KEVIN VAILLANCOURT
Editor, *The Catholic Voice*

The apostolate of the Society of Traditional Roman Catholics through *The Catholic Voice* is twofold: first, to explain and defend the true Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, which was the chief form of Catholic worship prior to Vatican II, while at the same time denouncing the errors in liturgical worship that have afflicted Catholics since the close of that false council; second, to promote true Christian unity, especially unity among Roman Catholics devoted to the traditional teachings of Holy Mother Church, while at the same time denouncing the Modernist errors of false ecumenism. These errors have altered Catholic thinking and believing in most areas. For over twenty-two years we have worked to maintain this twofold apostolate, being careful not to deviate from it and thus to get off course. I explain this because those who are familiar with our publication for a number of years may find it strange to see an article here that is dedicated to the Modernist plan of re-thinking the existence of Limbo. I include it here, not merely to discuss the notion of Limbo itself, but to help Catholics better understand why the subject of something that has been calmly believed by Catholics for centuries should somehow need to be revised and even eliminated. As you will see, the “spirit of Vatican II” (particularly false ecumenism) is at the heart of this new teaching: the same driving force behind all of the errors since this modern day crisis in the Church began.

A Brief Review Of The Event

On April 20, 2007, the International Theological Commission in modern Rome delivered a long-awaited document on the subject of Limbo and the salvation of unborn (and unbaptized) infants entitled: *The Hope of Salvation for Infants Who Die Without Being Baptized*. This commission is a hand-picked, progressive (translate as Modernist) “advisory body” comprised of 30 “theologians” from around the world who have been studying this subject for a number of years. Their conclusion is that Limbo does not exist (never has, never will) — however, some are still allowed to believe in it if they want to — and the fate of those infants who die before Baptism is in the hands of God (they hope), who is “powerful enough to find a way to have them saved,” since it is God’s will that all should reach Heaven. What this does regarding original sin, and the necessity of Baptism *in this life* to remove original sin, is very much a part of this issue. Likewise, a study into the reasons behind the new “findings” reveals that the centuries-old belief in Limbo has been abolished in favor of the new “doctrine” of salvation as taught in the Vatican II documents, and to appease the objections raised by some non-Catholics against “infant Baptism” — an obstacle to the fulfillment of false ecumenism.

Let’s review what the Catholic Church has traditionally taught us about Limbo. First of all, the existence of Limbo as a place of natural happiness is not a part of the Deposit of Faith. For centuries, learned Fathers and Doctors of the Church have expressed their concern of how to balance, on the one hand, God’s mercy and His salvific will (God’s desire to save all of

His creatures) with the other, which is His eternal justice in punishing those who have died in the state of sin, original or actual. As it pertains to this discussion, the early Fathers were quite severe in their teaching on the fate of infants who died before Baptism. It wasn’t until centuries later that St. Thomas Aquinas taught of an intermediate state of natural happiness (a “limbus”) where the souls of those who died unbaptized, and without the guilt of personal sin, would go for eternity. This teaching of the Angelic Doctor, while it does not represent a *de fide doctrinal* teaching on this subject, did find expression in the *sensus Catholicus* of the faithful. It was thus accepted as a teaching not contrary to Faith (and thus safe to be taught), and which helped to explain the critical balance between God’s mercy and justice in what can often become an emotional issue.

Limbo And The Modern Spirit

For almost fifty years now, modern theologians have questioned the Angelic Doctor’s teaching on the existence of Limbo (as they do most of his other teachings), especially following the promulgation of certain decrees at Vatican II. The notion of the salvation of mankind has changed, they say, meaning that an

(Continued on Page 12)

2008 EARLY ORDER CALENDAR SPECIAL

TRADITIONAL ROMAN CATHOLIC
LITURGICAL CALENDAR, ORDO, AND DEVOTIONAL PLANNER



A discounted price of \$6.00* each
or \$5.50* each for 5 or more is being
offered for all calendar orders placed
before July 31st.

After that date, calendars will be \$6.50 each
or \$6.00 for 5 or more.

CALENDARS, ORDOS AND PLANNERS WILL BE AVAILABLE, SEPTEMBER 2007



The Week with the Popes

2008 Devotional Weekly Planner

With quotes from the Popes on

- the love we must have for the authority of the Church,
- the obedience we must pledge to her governing laws
- the important role of Mary and Catholic Action in the Church.

\$12.00 each, 5 or more \$11.00 each.

2008 Traditional Roman Catholic Ordo

For those who offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass according to *Quo Primum*, of Pope St. Pius V, and who recite the Divine Office.

\$5.00 each, 5 or more \$4.50 each.



Please do not use the enclosed STRC envelope for orders to the Catholic Research Institute. Send order, with payment, ONLY to address below. Foreign orders send US funds only.

MISSIONARY SISTERS OF THE HOLY GHOST

CATHOLIC RESEARCH INSTITUTE

P.O. Box 589

VERADALE, WA 99037

WEB SITE: WWW.ASISNA.COM/CR

POSTAGE NOTICE

PLEASE INCLUDE A DONATION
TO COVER THE COST OF
POSTAGE AND HANDLING.

Why The “Short Consecration Form” Cannot Possibly Suffice

By PATRICK HENRY OMLOR
Adapted from longer work of the same title

The Controversy

Defenders of the “short form” position hold that these first few words of the wine-consecration form in the Latin Rite, “*This is the chalice of My Blood,*” suffice for the valid consecration of the Precious Blood. They claim that the remaining words of the sacramental form, namely, “*of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins,*” although being part of the wine-consecration form laid down in the Roman Missal, are nevertheless not necessary for the valid consecration of the wine and hence not necessary for the validity of the Mass.

The defenders of the “entire form” position deny the foregoing supposition. They hold that, except for the word “for,” ALL the words of the sacramental form for the wine-consecration, exactly as laid down in the Roman Missal, are absolutely necessary for bringing about the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist and therefore are essential for the celebration of a valid Mass.

Present-day advocates of the “short form” opinion are wont to point out that from the beginning of the trend in the mid-17th century it has gradually become today the “more common opinion” among theologians. Since the falsely translated words in the English version of the wine-consecration, “for all so that sins may be forgiven”, occur in the latter part of the sacramental form, which (so they claim) is a nonessential part anyway, that deviation from the correct and certainly valid wording, “for many unto the remission of sins”, has no bearing on the validity of the consecration in the English version. So they claim.

Emmanuel Doronzo, O.M.I., professor of Dogmatic Theology at the Catholic University, Washington, DC, and author of *De Eucharista* (1947), points out that the “entire form” position “is taught by the majority of theologians and Thomists up to the Council of Trent, and afterwards by very many Thomists as well as non-Thomists.” Moreover, the Salmanticenses remarked on the UNANIMITY of thought regarding the necessity for validity of the entire form: “All the earlier Thomists up to Cajetan, who rejected it, taught the same unanimously.”

Thus Cajetan (1469-1534), a Dominican cardinal, was the first “Thomist” to oppose the mind of St. Thomas on this matter. In his “Commentaries” on the *Summa Theologica* he emphatically declared that for the wine-consecration nothing more is required than these four words; “This is my blood.” Continuing with excessive self-assurance, he asserted: “Although Scotus and many others doubt this is true, it seems to me that there is no basis for doubting it to be probable: but IT MUST BE CONSIDERED AS BEYOND QUESTION [emphasis added], as I have said.”

This opinion of Cajetan’s appeared during his lifetime in the edition of his “Commentaries” published at Venice in 1533. But the Sovereign Pontiff St. Pius V later proved to be one who

certainly did NOT consider Cajetan’s opinion to be “beyond question”, for when he authorized the “Commentaries” to be republished in a Roman edition in 1570, he also explicitly commanded this particular opinion to be expurgated!

As Cardinal Capisuccus (1677) notes, “They are in error who try to maintain that this was expurgated only because Cajetan downgraded St. Thomas’s opinion too much. For Cajetan here does not merely downgrade the opinion of St. Thomas: he departs from it. Just as he departs from him on other matters, but those other divergences were not ordered to be dropped from the Roman edition. It is evident that Pope Pius V did not agree with this opinion of Cajetan’s [which he ordered to be expurgated].”

Very many great theologians, including saints, popes and doctors of the Church, have held that the mere words “This is the chalice of My Blood” are *insufficient for the validity* of the consecration of the wine and that the entire form (including “for you and for many unto the remission of sins”) is absolutely essential. These exponents include St. Thomas Aquinas; St. Antoninus; Pope St. Pius V; Pope Innocent III; the authors of the Catechism of the Council of Trent; Cardinal Raymond Capisuccus, O.P.; those brilliant Thomists, the renowned Discalced Carmelites of Salamanca known as the Salmanticenses; Hervaeus Natalis and Aegidius Columna (Colonna), who were two of St. Thomas’ disciples; Capreolus (“The Prince of Thomists”); Bartholomeus Spina (a Dominican who was a Master of the Sacred Palace); Sylvester; Tabiena; Armilla Peter de Soto; Viguierius; Arauxo; Marcus Huertos; John Nicolai; Gonet; John Vincent Asturicensis; John Gonzalez; N. Franciscus; Thomas Argentina; Richardus; N. Philippus; N. Cornejo; John Gerson; Andrew Victorellus; Lorca; Thomas Hurtado; Pasqualigo; Petrus de Palude; Henry Henriquez, S.J.; Francis Amicus, S.J.; John of Freiburg; Jacobus de Graffus, O.S.B.; F. Macedo, G.M.; Pere Maurice de la Taille, S.J.

It is worth mentioning that the redoubtable Suarez, who was a prominent “short form” advocate, conceded that the “entire form” position that he opposed “IS VERY PROBABLE AND OF GREAT AUTHORITY [emphasis added] and Scotus himself did not venture to contradict it, but left it as a doubtful matter.”

The Mind of St. Thomas

The view of St. Thomas on which words of the wine-consecration form are essential for validity is given in three different places: *Scriptum Super Lib. IV Sententiarum*; (2) *In 1 Cor. XI*, (lect. 6); (3) *Summa Theologica*.

In *Scriptum Super Lib. IV Sententiarum* (dist. 8. Q. 2. a. 2. q. 1. ad 3) we read: “And therefore those words which follow [that is, which follow ‘This is the chalice of My Blood’] are essential to the blood, inasmuch as it is consecrated in this sacrament; and therefore they must be of the substance of the form.”

In 1 Cor. XI, (lect. 6) has the following: “In regard to these words which the Church uses in the consecration of the Blood, some think that not all of them are NECESSARY [emphasis added] (Continued on Page 9)

The full version of Mr. Omlor’s work is available from:
Catholic Research Institute • P.O. Box 589
Veradale, WA 99037 • www.asisna.com/cri

The Teaching Of St. Thomas On The “Short Form” Is Misunderstood

(Continued from Page 8)

added] for the form, but the words ‘This is the chalice of My Blood’ only, not the remainder which follows, ‘of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins.’ But it would appear that this is not said correctly, because all that which follows is a determination of the predicate: HENCE THOSE SUBSEQUENT WORDS BELONG TO THE MEANING OR SIGNIFICATION OF THE SAME PRONOUNCEMENT, AND BECAUSE, AS HAS OFTEN BEEN SAID, IT IS BY SIGNIFYING THAT THE FORMS OF SACRAMENTS HAVE THEIR EFFECT. HENCE ALL OF THESE WORDS APPERTAIN TO THE EFFECTING POWER OF THE FORM [emphasis added].”

In *Summa Theologica* (III. Q. 78, A. 3): “There is a twofold opinion regarding this form. Some have maintained that the words ‘This is the chalice of My Blood’ alone belong to the substance of this form, but not those words which follow. Now this seems incorrect, because the words which follow them are determinations of the predicate, that is, of Christ’s blood; consequently they belong to the integrity of the recitation of the form.

“And on this account others say more accurately that all the words which follow are of the substance of the form down to the words, ‘As often as ye shall do this,’ which belong to the use of the sacrament, and consequently do not belong to the substance of the form.”

The Salmanticenses Explain Article 1

Those illustrious Discalced Carmelite theologians of Salamanca, Spain (16th-17th centuries), known as the Salmanticenses, were as a group the most learned followers of all time of the mind of St. Thomas. “Consequently they made strict adherence to Thomism their fundamental principle, and carried it out with greater consistency than probably any other commentators of the neo-Scholastic period. . . [S]uch uniformity and consistency were obtained that it could be claimed that there was not a single contradiction in any of these immense works, although nearly a century elapsed between the publication of the first and the appearance of the final instalment. . . - The Salmanticenses have ever been held in the highest esteem, particularly at Rome where they are considered a standard work on Thomistic scholasticism” (*Catholic Encyclopedia*).

Martin Serra, an obscure 17th-century Dominican, claimed that St. Thomas held that the mere words “This is the Chalice of my Blood” are sufficient for the valid consecration of the wine. Serra based his argument on Article 1 of Question 78 in Part III of *Summa Theologica*, which he completely misunderstood. Unfortunately, nowadays there are some who harbor the same ignorance of the meaning of this Article 1. Not being experienced students of St. Thomas, these dilettantes read ONLY HIS WORDS with no understanding whatever of their context and as they relate to the overall purpose of the Angelic Doctor’s explanations.

The following is the refutation against Martin Serra by the Salmanticenses:

“Forasmuch as opposites are more apparent when placed side by side, and in order to avert the possibility of being confronted once again with the question of the Holy Doctor’s meaning, we shall set forth the arguments adduced by various Thomists against our opinion. St. Thomas, they say, remarks in *Summa*. III, Q. 78. Art. 1, Reply to Objection 4, that ‘If a priest were to pronounce only the aforesaid words with the intention of confecting the sacrament. etc.’ Now by the ‘aforesaid words’ we must understand him to mean the words of consecration which he had set forth in the title of the article. But the title reads: ‘Whether this is the form of the sacrament, This is My Body, and This is the Chalice of My Blood.’ Therefore it is the opinion of the Holy Doctor that only the following words are of the essence, or are necessary, for the consecration of the chalice: ‘This is the Chalice of My Blood.’ Serra places so much stock in this argument and line of reasoning that he would have St. Thomas teaching that the changing of wine into blood occurs by the agency of those words alone.”

“To this we might reply as follows. In the passage under consideration the Holy Doctor’s only concern was so to determine the bare minimum of words that are universally received as being essential for the consecration, as to place them beyond questioning. Whether other words besides these are required for the consecration of the chalice he did not care to state in that passage, namely, Art. 1, but he reserved the discussion of that issue for Art. 3, where he fully considered the question. Therefore we must understand him exactly as he explained the Master of Sentences [Peter Lombard] (In IV, d. 8), in his commentary on the letter, where he said, ‘It is not the intention of the Master in this passage to determine definitively the precise words which effect consecration, but only to explain that the consecration *is* effected by the words of the Lord.’

“The reply given in the text itself corroborates this: for when the Holy Doctor says: ‘If a priest were to pronounce only the aforesaid words with the intention of confecting this sacrament, this sacrament would be valid.’ His meaning is not at all such as would be favorable to our opponents, that is to say, that these words alone are required for sacramental validity [of the wine-consecration]: ‘This is the Chalice of My Blood’. His meaning is quite different and in no way similiar to that: viz., that it is the words which precede: ‘*Qui pridie quam pateretur*, etc.’ [i.e., the narrative preambles ‘Who the day before He suffered, etc.’ for the bread; and ‘In like manner, after He had supped, taking also this excellent chalice, etc.’ for the wine] which are not required. This is evident from both the Objection itself as well as from his reply thereto.”

“Such was the difficulty with which St. Thomas was dealing, thus posing a question quite different from that which [our opponents suppose]..., and leading to the demonstration

(Continued on Page 10)

“Long Consecration Form” Argument Has Complete Magisterial Support

(Continued from Page 9)

of an entirely different matter. Furthermore, the ‘Objection’ pertains to both elements of the sacramental form, to both the bread and the wine.

“Thus both in the Objection and in the Reply it is manifest that he is not treating of those words, ‘of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins’ but of others, namely of those that precede, and, as it were, introduce the consecratory form. ‘*Qui pridie quam pateretur*, etc’,... and it is those words only which St. Thomas declares unnecessary... But in no part of this Article 1 does he touch upon the present controversy. Consequently, it is evident that the author of whom we spoke above [Martin Serra] erred in his assertion that St. Thomas’ teaching in this passage is contrary to ours: in fact, neither explicitly nor implicitly did he teach what Serra makes him teach, for on that occasion he was not even discussing the matter of the essential form, since it was not relevant to the question being considered in Article 1.”

The Fatuous “Integrity” Argument

In the first work of St. Thomas that was cited (*Script. Sup. Lib. IV Sent.*) he uses the word “essential” (*essentialia*), and in the very same sentence he uses the phrase “of the substance (*de substantia*) of the form.” In the second source cited (*In 1 Cor. XI*) St. Thomas uses different wording, namely, NECESSARY (*de necessitate*), referring to the entire form. Finally, in *Summa Theologica* he reverts to the words “*de substantia*” (of the substance) of the form.

About four centuries ago, sometime after the Council of Trent, certain “short form” apologists came up with the theory that St. Thomas in the *Summa* did not mean by the expression “*de substantia formae*” what everyone up to that time had always thought he meant by “substance,” namely, a term synonymous with “*essentia*” and with “*necessitas*.” They claimed that by “of the substance of the form” he did not mean necessary for VALIDITY, but necessary only for THE INTEGRITY or completeness of the form. After this bit of sophistry had surfaced, many good Thomists, including Capisuccus and the Salmanticenses, refuted it soundly. And St. Alphonsus does not think much of this particular argument, remarking that how such a theory squares with the mind of St. Thomas is not at all apparent, which is a polite understatement.

“There is no use objecting that the holy Doctor does not teach that all these words are of the essence of the form, but only ‘of the substance of the form’; as though the words ‘This is My blood’ are of the substance as an essential part, and the other words are of the substance as an integral part...”

The first thing that comes to mind that would seem to torpedo this argument is the fact that in the very same *Summa Theologica* where this supposed problematical expression “belonging to the substance” (*de substantia*) is used, St. Thomas ACTUALLY DEFINES what he means by “*de substantia formae sacramentalis*.” In his section on the sacraments in general he

From: *De Defectibus Decree, Chapter V*

“Defects on the part of the form may arise if anything is missing from the complete wording required for the act of consecrating. Now the words of the Consecration, which are the form of this Sacrament, are: *Hoc est enim Corpus meum*, and *Hic est enim Calix Sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni testamenti: mysterium fidei: qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum.* If the priest were to shorten or change the form of the consecration of the Body and the Blood, so that in the change of wording the words did not mean the same thing, he would not be achieving a valid Sacrament. If, on the other hand, he were to add or take away anything which did not change the meaning, the Sacrament would be valid, but he would be committing a grave sin.”

establishes principles that are to apply to all the sacraments individually when he will be discussing them later in the work. In *Summa Theologica* (III, Q. 60, A. 8) he explains:

“Now it is clear that if anything that is OF THE SUBSTANCE OF A SACRAMENTAL FORM be taken away, the essential sense of the words is destroyed: AND CONSEQUENTLY THE SACRAMENT IS NOT ACCOMPLISHED [emphasis added throughout].”

The next thing that would seem to torpedo this argument is that it was not advanced until about THREE HUNDRED YEARS AFTER THE DEATH of St. Thomas. As we saw earlier, the Salmanticenses mentioned that all the earlier Thomists, UNANIMOUSLY, up to Cajetan taught that the entire form is necessary. And Maurice de la Taille, S.J., points out that St. Pius V ordered the expunging of Cajetan’s contrary opinion “as being OPPOSED TO [emphasis added] the teaching of the Angelic Doctor,” which is exactly what Cardinal Raymond Capisuccus said in the passage quoted earlier.

The contemporaries of St. Thomas and those who followed soon thereafter — not only those who agreed with him, but also those who opposed his view — must be considered more reliable interpreters of his mind than those who came upon the scene much later, coming as they did after the fashion of innovators, entertaining such entirely revolutionary and patently unsound theories.

“Furthermore a special probability is given to the ‘entire form’ opinion by the authority of Pope Innocent III, the more obvious interpretation of the words of St. Thomas, and the words of the Catechism of the Council of Trent and of the Roman Missal.”

The Grace of the Sacrament Must be Signified

In his Bull *Apostolicae Curae* (1896), Pope Leo XIII authoritatively re-emphasized the following important principle of sacramental theology:

“All know that the Sacraments of the New Law, as sensible and efficient signs of invisible grace, must both signify THE GRACE which they effect, and effect THE GRACE which they

(Cont. on Page 11)

The “Short Form” Does Not Signify The Grace Communicated At Mass

(Continued from Page 10)

signify. Although the signification ought to be found in the whole essential rite — that is to say, in the matter and in the form — yet it pertains chiefly to the form; since the matter is a part which is not determined by itself, but which is determined by the form.” [In the foregoing the emphasis on the words “THE GRACE” was added.]

The Pontiff added: “That form consequently cannot be apt or sufficient for a Sacrament which omits what it must essentially signify.”

Here Leo XIII teaches that the *forms* of the various Sacraments (“it still pertains chiefly to the form”) must signify THE GRACE which they effect: that is, the “grace proper to the Sacrament (i.e., its sacramental grace). This is also called “the effect” of the sacrament or its *res sacramenti*, translated as “the reality of the sacrament.” All those expressions — grace proper, sacramental grace, the effect, the reality of the sacrament, *res sacramenti* — mean exactly the same thing. It is this GRACE that the words of the sacramental form MUST signify, as the Sovereign Pontiff so clearly teaches.

On page 31 of *A Vindication of the Bull “Apostolicae Curae”* (1898), the chief author of which was Cardinal Vaughan, we find the following reiteration of Leo’s teaching that the form of a Sacrament must signify the GRACE of the Sacrament, which must not be confused with grace in general or other kinds of grace: “Moreover, the signification must not be ambiguous, but so far *definite* [italics in the original text] as to discriminate the grace effected from graces of a different kind; as, for instance, the graces of other Sacraments.”

And on p. 40: “The definite signification, as has already been explained, must be found in the *essential part* [italics in the original text], in the matter and form morally united together.”

Now what is this sacramental grace. This “grace proper”, this effect, this reality, this *res sacramenti* of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist? What is this grace that must be so definitely signified in the sacramental form that it must not be confused with graces of a different kind? As is acknowledged by all theologians, the *res sacramenti* of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist is the union of the Mystical Body of Christ. And this must be signified in the sacramental form, that is, in the Words of Consecration.

Is this signification contained in the mere words, “This is My Body; This is the Chalice of My Blood”? Those words signify the TRUE Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity of Christ, which become present through transubstantiation; not the MYSTICAL Body, as some Protestant theologians (e.g., Dorner and Loofs) have heretically claimed. To hold that BOTH Christ’s True Body AND His Mystical Body are somehow signified by those words is absurd, for that would be saying that a valid sacramental form can signify ambiguously, which is not possible.

The words which in fact provide the vital signification of the *res sacramenti* are found in the final phrase of the form: “for you and for many unto the remission of sins.” The words “you” and “many” are the only words of the form that explicitly designate the members of the Mystical Body of Christ, which is the

Catholic Church. Moreover, the final words, “unto the remission of sins,” signify the union of the members, as will now be explained.

The very principle of existence of the union of members within the Mystical Body is sanctifying grace. Any person living in the state of sanctifying grace is automatically within Christ’s Mystical Body. Since sanctifying grace is the principle of existence of the union of the Mystical Body, it is easily seen that the essential and absolute prerequisite of this union is the remission of sins.

By Baptism we first receive sanctifying grace through THE REMISSION OF SIN(S), original sin and also actual sin in the case of adult baptisms. Thus we first enter the union of the Mystical Body. We retain our status as *living* members of the Mystical Body by remaining in the state of sanctifying grace. One who has become spiritually dead through mortal sin, though not severed altogether from the Mystical Body, becomes a “dead member” and can be reinstated as a living member and again become a VITAL part of the union of the Mystical Body only by THE REMISSION OF HIS SINS through the Sacrament of Penance.

Thus it is seen that THE REMISSION OF SINS — that is, the ACTUAL, EFFICACIOUS remission of sins: or in other words “in remissionem peccatorum” (UNTO the remission of sins) — is the one thing necessary for our initial incorporation in the Mystical Body and the revitalization as living members of those who lose sanctifying grace. Consequently, the remission of sins CAUSES one to be brought within the unity of the Mystical Body.

Hence the final phrase of the form for the wine-consecration in its entirety — to wit: “for you and for many unto the remission of sins” — comprises the essential words signifying the grace of the Sacrament, which is the union of the Mystical Body. For the words “you” and “many” designate the members, and the words “unto the remission of sins” signify the cause of their unity.

The words of the English version, “for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven”, give a false signification. “All” cannot and does not designate the members of the Mystical Body since not all, but only “many”, are members. The words “so that sins may be forgiven” do not express the actual, efficacious remission of sins: they express only the *potential* forgiveness of sins of all men.

A ridiculous argument was raised a few years ago. It was claimed that since the words, “This is My Body; This is the Chalice of My Blood”, signify the Body and Blood of Christ, Who as true God is the Author of all grace, those words suffice to satisfy Pope Leo’s teaching that the form must signify the grace of the Sacrament! That is on par with saying that the final words of the form for Baptism, “in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,” suffice because they signify the Blessed Trinity, God, the Author of all grace. Though God is the Author of all grace, He is not grace, least of all is He sacramental grace: He is not the *res sacramenti* of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist or of any other Sacrament. †

New Teaching On Limbo Came To Satisfy The Pro-Life Movement

(Continued from Page 7)

understanding of Limbo as taught by St. Thomas (and accepted in the Church since then) had to be eliminated. Now, instead of developing a new teaching to contradict a centuries-old belief, they chose to merely say nothing about it at all. These “theologians” succeeded in having the notion of Limbo removed from Catholic discussion altogether, whether in catechism classes or in seminaries, simply by not referring to it anymore. They would have succeeded in burying Limbo completely had not the traditional discussion of Limbo and its existence come to the forefront largely due to the pro-life movement. As more and more secular governments legalize the crime of abortion, those vehemently opposed to it find it necessary to discuss the eternal fate of these unborn infants. It is a necessary corollary of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception that original sin is imparted to men at the first moment of their conception. This means that the fetus in the mother’s womb is in the state of sin from conception, and because of these circumstances, has no hope of obtaining the remission of this sin through Baptism without first being born. Knowing that no one defiled with sin may enter the Kingdom of Heaven, and that original sin and mortal sin exclude a soul from Eternal Life altogether, something needed to be taught to infuse grieving mothers and pro-life advocates with hope regarding the fate of those souls who fell victim to this savage crime. Thus, the traditional teaching on Limbo was revived in conservative circles, and the overall plan of the Modernists was thwarted.

What drove good Catholics in the modern church to have Limbo taught once again was an essential element of the doctrinal teaching on salvation: can someone be justified *after* death? The Vatican Council of 1870 concluded before the topic of the impossibility of justification after death could be reviewed, but that does not mean the Church has never taught this before. On the contrary, from Holy Scripture, Tradition and magisterial teachings, Catholics know that there is *no hope* for the forgiveness of sins after someone dies. One must make his accounting to God before his particular judgment, or else suffer the eternal consequences. Justification (as the Council of Trent teaches) must take place in our wayfaring state or else it will not be accomplished at all. As we know, the unborn infant has no opportunity for Baptism and (by default) original sin cannot be removed. However, the unborn child dies in this state through no fault of his own, and that is why St. Thomas teaches about the “limbus” for souls appearing before God in this condition. But all this teaching on original sin, the necessity of infant Baptism, the possibility of souls never achieving Eternal Life with God in Heaven, yet still being perfectly and naturally happy, and so

much more raised the ire of the Modernists, and something had to be done. On October 7, 2004, John Paul II presented the International Theological Commission with an important topic for review, discussion and a final recommendation for Catholic teaching in this time: Determine a theological understanding on “the fate of children who die without Baptism in the context of the universal salvific will of God, of the one mediation of Jesus Christ, and of the sacramentality of the Church.” In other words, come up with some teaching that can be presented to Catholics that eliminates the notion of Limbo altogether, and will still fill them with “hope” because it finds a way for the effects of Baptism to be accomplished (the removal of original sin) even *after* death. In December, 2005, Benedict XVI praised the work of the Commission for tackling this “important topic,” and in April, 2007, this new teaching was published — with the approval of Benedict XVI.

The New Teaching On The Salvation Of Unbaptized Infants
 What I outlined above is a very basic summary of the traditional teachings regarding justification and the salvation of infants who die without Baptism. The “findings” of the Theological Commission are a major departure from these teachings. In fact, these “findings” employ the classical Modernist pattern for the promotion of heretical doctrine which Pope St. Pius X warned us about in his encyclical letter *Pascendi*, “On Modernism.” It is based on what the Modernists call the “evolution of dogma”: the admission that, while the Church taught and believed a certain way before on this topic, the needs of modern man have changed, and so the teachings of the Church must change with them. U.S. Archbishop William Levada, president of the Theological Commission, justifies the new “findings” mainly because “the number of babies not baptized has increased considerably,” and so modern man can no longer be satisfied with the idea of mere “natural happiness” for all these souls. Rather, we must be able to entertain a “hope” for their salvation, especially in light of the new theology of salvation as taught in *Lumen Gentium* (14 & 16) and *Gaudium et Spes* (22), two of the most revolutionary documents of Vatican II. While these two documents have been used to teach that the salvation of non-Catholics is assured because any “good” person, united to Christ by the fact that he shares the same human flesh that Christ had (even without Baptism), the Commission had to be more creative in using this new theology to explain the “justification of the dead.” Redemptorist Fr. Tony Kelly, an Australian member of the Commission, told the Catholic News Service (December 2, 2005) this turning aside from the traditional teachings about Limbo was part of “the [new] development of the theological virtue of hope,” and reflected “a different sense of God, focusing on His infinite love.” He added: “The fact that God loves His creatures so much that He sent His Son to die in order to save them means that there exists an ‘original grace’ just as there is an ‘original sin.’” The existence of this “original grace,” he concludes, justifies a “hope beyond hope” that those who die without having the opportunity to be baptized will indeed be

(Continued on Page 13)

Would you like the traditional Latin Mass of the Roman Catholic Church offered for your intentions, or those of your loved ones?

Mass requests are being accepted at this time by traditional Roman Catholic priests for any Masses for the living and the dead, including Gregorian Masses.

————— Please contact us at STRC for details. —————

New Teaching On Limbo Makes A Virtue Out Of Presumption

(Continued from Page 12)

saved through the “power of God.”

But just how does this “original grace” work? And, on what is this “hope beyond hope” based? Doesn’t this sound vaguely like the sin of presumption? Not so, we are assured by Commission members, particularly by another party to these discussions, Sr. Sara Butler, MSBT, who also teaches dogmatic theology at St. Joseph’s Seminary in Dunwoodie, New York. In an interview for *Inside the Vatican* online edition (April 28, 2007) Sr. Butler explained that: “The Commission is trying to say that what the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (CCC 1260, 1261, 1283) has already said — that we have a right to hope that God will find a way to offer the grace of Christ to infants who have no opportunity for making a personal choice with regard to their salvation. It’s trying to provide a theological rationale for what has already been proposed in several magisterial [sic] documents since the Council.” After stating that the “faith of the Church” before was that infants who died without Baptism went to Limbo (a natural state of happiness), the “faith of the Church” *now* teaches something different: “. . . given our understanding of God’s mercy and the plan of salvation which includes Christ and the gift of the Holy Spirit in the Church, we dare to hope that these infants will be saved by some *extra-sacramental* gift of Christ.” “God is so powerful,” we are assured, “that He could do this.” She concludes: “God is not bound to the sacraments, and therefore . . . we presume there are other ways, known to God, open to infants who unfortunately die without baptism.”

I would be remiss in not adding a secondary reasoning behind this new found “presumptive hope.” Not only has the “faith of the Church” changed (as if it were possible that the Bride of Christ, infallibly guided by the Holy Ghost, could embrace such a notion) regarding the existence of Limbo for the sake of satisfying the needs of the pro-life movement, it was essential that this belief change for the sake of “union” with the non-Catholics. That original sin is imparted to the soul at conception is a uniquely Catholic position, but is one of the major stumbling blocks for ecumenical “unity” with other faiths. For example:

- The Muslims teach that all souls of the stillborn go straight to Heaven, and many of that religion apply this teaching to those infants who have died from an abortion. There is no original sin in Islam.

- The Baptists and other Protestant denominations resist infant baptism because they believe the souls of babies are innocent, despite the fact that David wrote in Psalm 50,7: *In sin did my mother conceive me*. They teach that it is for adults to choose a life in Christ or to make some other choice. Since infants cannot choose (they say), therefore they can cannot be in a state of sin that requires Baptism for their salvation.

So, to further the cause of ecumenism, the traditional teaching of Limbo had to go, but not entirely. “The report concludes,” says Sr. Butler, “that Limbo remains a ‘possible theological opinion.’ Anyone who wants to defend it is free to do so. This document, however, tries to give a theological rationale for hoping that unbaptized infants will be saved.”

Tackling Some Natural Conclusions

As much as these commission members try to assure us that they are not setting forth dogmatic teaching on this subject, others do — or, at least they come close to expressing this. The conviction that babies who died without Baptism will be in Heaven is not something promoted only by those who teach the “universal salvation of all mankind”; it is the expressed belief and teaching of John Paul II and Benedict XVI, men who both are authors and major promoters of the teachings of Vatican II, particularly its “incarnational theology of salvation.”

Because of these “convictions” other lines of thought have developed over the past few years which place Baptism into a realm of its own regarding a new understanding of its necessity. For instance, not long after the findings of the Theological Commission became known, modern clergy were heard to question the necessity of Baptism altogether, since God will somehow “find a way” for any man’s salvation after death. Without being able to cite a legitimate source for an answer to this question, modern theologians have been heard to teach that our understanding of the necessity of Baptism has changed in the “church” today. They say that Baptism’s *primary* function is to admit someone to the “church-community,” and *secondarily* it is given for the remission of sins. Such an invalidating intention has long been heard since Vatican II. It may just happen that it will be repeated so much that many will believe it. If this happens, then where will we be?

One Last Point

Let no one be mistaken: the “findings” of the International Theological Commission are not intended as mere “opinion” statements — thoughts that seem to abound in the modern church. No, having been approved and signed by Benedict XVI, they are an expression of the *official teaching* of the modern church for the reasons stated above. However, I think it should be obvious to my reader that this new “Limbo document” expresses an entirely new teaching about salvation, while upholding *presumption* as a virtue. The traditional teaching about the Virtue of Hope leads us to believe God will give us Eternal Life by granting us the graces needed for sorrow for sin and personal amendment of life. We base this Hope on the power of God Himself, who can neither deceive nor be deceived. Not so for the “new hope” of the modern church. Since there is no solid basis for these new teachings, save the documents of Vatican II and the “authority” theologians have been given in the modern church, modern Catholics have fallen into the viewpoint that all “good people” go to Heaven, while minimizing the Catholic definition for what it means to be “good.” This new teaching on salvation and “virtuous presumption” is another example of how Modernism rules the church that was spawned after Vatican II, presenting an erroneous system of belief for many poor Catholics — a system that is plainly contradictory to apostolic Tradition and the true magisterial teachings of the Roman Catholic Church. May the Virgin Mother of God, of whom the Church sings that she has “triumphed over all heresies,” help us triumph over Modernism and restore the True Faith to all. †

*Letters To The Editor***Is It Traditional Catholic Practice To Say “Amen” Before Communion?**

Saying “Amen” Before Receiving Holy Communion

Editor, The Catholic Voice:

I am relatively new to the practice of traditional Catholicism. Nearly my whole worship-while life has found me in one of the local churches with the Mass in English. With the help of some of my new friends I am coming to a better awareness of the rich history of the Catholic Church through the Latin observances. I ask them questions, and usually they can answer them for me, or direct me to a book or to the priest for further help. Well, one thing got us all stumped and it was suggested that I write to you for help. One of the most obvious differences between the “old” and the “new” takes place when I come up to receive the Holy Eucharist (I’ve learned not to just call it the “eucharist” anymore). I used to stand before the altar, now there is a Communion Rail and I kneel, and I fully understand why this is proper. Also, before I made a little resting place in my hands for the host, now I receive my Lord on my tongue. Again, I understand the reason why I do this and why the other practice was wrong. A hard habit for me to break has been to not say “Amen” before the Host is placed on my tongue. I was taught before that my “Amen” is an expression of my faith in the Holy Eucharist, and that it is important to make this profession before Communion. If this is so (at least I haven’t found anything to dispute it), then why is it eliminated in the Communion of the traditional Mass? I am not arguing about it, but I would just like to know why. Thank you in advance for your help.

R.S.

via email

Editor’s Note: First of all, the differences between the traditional Latin Mass and the Novus Ordo at Communion time should not be viewed in such a way as to make it appear that the modern version has some claim to antiquity, meaning that if some of its practices are not observed in the traditional Mass that they have somehow been “eliminated” from a more ancient form of worship. In point of truth, it is the Novus Ordo that has added and subtracted from the traditional Latin Mass, in many cases expressing a different form of belief and worship that the Church has brought before us for centuries. The example of the “Amen” works quite nicely here. The central reason why the Catholic Church has never required Her members to say “Amen” before receiving Holy Communion is because it is absolutely unnecessary. You are correct in saying that usually when “Amen” occurs in our prayers, it is a sign of our acceptance of what the prayer or liturgical act has just brought forth. It can be an expression of faith — faith in all that had just been previously recited or even sung. However, no such profession of faith is necessary for us before we receive Holy Communion. Catholics do not need to make a public profession of the faith in the Blessed Sacrament before Holy Communion because that is something the Protestants would do. Many of those churches tell us that Jesus Christ is present under the appearances of bread and wine, not by the words of a priest, but as a result of one’s own profession of faith. But, as Catholics, we know this is not true. It is not our profession of personal faith that causes transubstantiation to occur; no, it is correct words recited by

a validly ordained priest which cause this mystery to take place. It appears that the Modernists introduced this novelty as a concession to the non-Catholics, or maybe it was the non-Catholics themselves who put it there since the Novus Ordo was created with the aid of six Protestant theologians.

† † †

Your Paper Does Not Agree With The Magisterium

Editor, The Catholic Voice:

Please remove my name from your mailing list. While I enjoyed the first newsletter (given by a friend which prompted my subscription), your subsequent newsletters have revealed that you hold certain heresies, and I cannot support heretics under pain of mortal sin. It would be worthwhile for you to review infallible dogma in the Magisterium, and not rely on mere writings of laymen.

C. B.

Surprise, AZ

Editor’s Note: Unfortunately, the author of this letter will not be able to read our reply because we complied with her request to remove her name from our mailing list. But, for the benefit of others who may find themselves in the same position, a reply to it is worthwhile for the purpose of explaining our position.

As our Statement of Purpose (p. 16 of each issue) remarks, it is the stated policy of the STRC that we “. . . pledge our fidelity to the Roman Catholic Church and to her teachings as handed down by the Sacred Magisterium through the centuries.” We are quite aware of what the Magisterium has taught infallibly in matters concerning the Roman (Latin) Mass and true Christian unity over the centuries. Likewise we are aware of the teachings of the modern church — proposed as magisterial — which boldly contradict these past infallible teachings. Since both “magisteria” cannot be correct on such blatantly opposite points, we choose to remain faithful to what was held by the Church prior to Vatican II.

Since the nature of the “heresies” being taught in our newsletter were not outlined, but a reference to the “writings of a layman” was, it can only be assumed that the supposed “heresies” have to deal with the works of Patrick Henry Omlor, which we wholeheartedly support. One who carefully reads the works of Mr. Omlor becomes readily aware that he does not offer his own opinions on the subject of the invalidity of the *Novus Ordo Missae* of Paul VI. Rather, he extensively quotes magisterial works (from the popes, councils, Doctors of the Church, and more) in support of all he writes, AND he gives the reference sources for all to review the context of his findings. For example, in his work *Has The Church The Right?*, he fully explains — from magisterial teachings — that the Church has neither the “power” nor the “right” to change the form of the Sacraments. However, the Modernist innovators chose to make such changes to the form of the Holy Eucharist — based on their own “authority” and “learning” — thus assuming a power and right that the magisterial Church knows She does not possess. What is heretical in such an explanation? There is no heresy here, and a little study will reveal this. †

Grace Notes: The Office And Hymns For Corpus Christi

All good Catholics acknowledge their solemn duty of giving proper honor and reverence to the Blessed Sacrament. We fulfill this duty each time we reverently assist at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, when we receive Holy Communion in a spirit of love and fervor, when we genuflect devoutly on entering and leaving the church, and when taking part in other liturgical eucharistic rites such as Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, Forty Hours Devotions and the solemn procession of the Blessed Sacrament for the feast of Corpus Christi. So many opportunities to prove our love to our Eucharistic Lord abound — all we need to do is make use of them.

In the Sacred Liturgy it was found that it was impossible to give due reverence to the Blessed Sacrament on the anniversary of Its institution: during the liturgical ceremonies for Holy Thursday. So many other rites occupy our minds during that holy time that the appropriate solemn and joyful rites to honor the Holy Eucharist would seem greatly out of place while reflecting on such events as the betrayal of Judas, the denial of Peter, and the agony and arrest of Jesus Christ.

As God has so often worked in His Church, He engaged the aid of a humble nun in Belgium, St. Juliana — the Prioress of Mont Cornillon — to first suggest and then duly advocate a special feast in honor of the Blessed Sacrament to be celebrated on a day other than Holy Thursday. From her sixteenth year, she had often in her prayers beheld a strange sight: it was as if the full moon appeared to her in brilliant light, while part of the orb remained black and lightless. Finally, in a vision, Christ showed her the meaning of this picture. The moon represented the ecclesiastical year; the black spot indicated the lack of a festival in honor of the Blessed Sacrament. She was told to announce to the authorities of the Church that God wished such a feast to be established.

In 1230, St. Juliana told a small group of theologians about her secret communication from Christ Himself. For a number of years she was laughed to scorn the more her request became publicly known. Finally, in 1246, the bishop of Liege expressed a willingness to hear her requests, and at a diocesan synod they approved her petition and prescribed a feast for the churches of Liege. By a special act of Providence, this same bishop became Pope Urban IV (1261 – 1265), and on September 8, 1264, he established the feast of Corpus Christi with all the indulgences for those who receive Holy Communion and take part in the solemn ceremonies to honor the Blessed Sacrament. The Bull that announced this feast did not take immediate effect, because the pope died shortly after his proclamation, and succeeding popes did not find a sense of urgency in the matter. It wasn't until Pope Clement V, in 1314, renewed the decree with one of his own that the feast spread quickly throughout the entire Latin Church. Very early in the fourteenth century the custom developed of carrying the Blessed Sacrament in an outdoor procession. The Council of Trent solemnly approved of this practice, and so the practice of a solemn procession with the Blessed Sacrament after the Corpus Christi Mass began, and is practiced to this day. In the United States, since the feast of Corpus Christi is not a holyday of obligation, the obligation for observing the solemn Mass and Procession is transferred to the following Sunday.

There is a wonderful story that comes to us from the traditions of the Dominicans and the Franciscans to explain the origin of the Office and Mass for Corpus Christi. When Pope Urban IV was preparing to establish the feastday, he requested that one learned and devout author from each of the Dominican and Franciscan Orders be chosen to compose these prayers. The men chosen for this task were learned and holy saints, and, as Providence allowed, were also best of friends. The Dominicans chose St. Thomas Aquinas and the



Franciscans chose St. Bonaventure. Each saint prayerfully and studiously set about his task, and then they both came before the Pope in Rome on the day appointed. Out of humility, St. Bonaventure allowed St. Thomas to present his work first. St. Thomas reviewed all of the prayers he suggested for the Office and the Mass. However, when it came to the recitation of the hymns honoring the Blessed Sacrament, it is said that there was not a dry eye in the place when he finished his presentation. The Pope asked St. Bonaventure to begin his recitation. Instead of reading his material, he tore up all of the pages saying that his work was far inferior to what he had just heard. By default, then, St. Thomas' writings were chosen, and they truly are the work of great inspiration.

The most wonderful part of all this is that the depth, splendor and devotion of St. Thomas' works have not only glorified the Blessed Sacrament each time the feast of Corpus Christi is observed, but many of his hymns and prayers have been used to enrich the Church's liturgical life. For example, the jubilant hymn entitled *Sacris Solemnis*, which is recited during Matins of the feast and is sung during the solemn procession, has yielded an offspring, if you will, through its fifth stanza. As a separate hymn it is known as *Panis Angelicus*, and it is the cherished favorite of Catholics and even some non-Catholic denominations as well. Another hymn written by St. Thomas — the *Pange Lingua Gloriosi*, which is sung for most processions with the Blessed Sacrament, has also yielded two stanzas which are sung all over the Catholic world during Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. They are known as the *Tantum Ergo* and the *Genitori*. Another familiar hymn for Benediction is also taken from part of a hymn St. Thomas wrote for Corpus Christi, this time for the hour of Lauds. The second to the last stanza of the *Verbum Supernum Prodiens* has given us the hymn we all know as *O Salutaris Hostia*. Finally, the Sequence of the Mass, *Lauda Sion Salvatorem*, has been translated into the vernacular and is a popular hymn for expressing one's faith and devotion toward the Holy Eucharist. Truly, we are grateful for all the Angelic Doctor did to honor the Blessed Sacrament through these works. Would that we all could be as faithful to the inspirations of grace as he was, especially when we pray before the Blessed Sacrament.

Statement of Purpose

The CATHOLIC VOICE is the newsletter of the Society of Traditional Roman Catholics, a non-profit corporation, incorporated under the laws of the State of North Carolina.

The Society is a Catholic Apostolate, of both laity and clergy, established to work for the full restoration of traditional Catholic rites, most especially the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass of the Council of Trent, the ancient Latin Mass.

We, the directors and officers of the Society, pledge our fidelity to the Roman Catholic Church and to her teachings as handed down by the Sacred Magisterium through the centuries. We dedicate ourselves and the works of our apostolate to the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Mother of God.

We place our efforts under the patronage of St. Joseph, Patron of the Universal Church, and offer all we do in the name of Jesus Christ for the greater honor and glory of God. We invite all Catholics to join in our work.

From The Traditional Roman Catholic Calendar

These are only some of the special liturgical feasts we will celebrate in the next few weeks. A complete list of all the liturgical feasts is listed in the calendar which is distributed every year by the Society of Traditional Roman Catholics.

- June 3 Trinity Sunday
- June 7 Corpus Christi
- June 13 St. Anthony of Padua
- June 15 Sacred Heart of Jesus
- June 27 Our Mother of Perpetual Help
- June 29 Sts. Peter & Paul
- July 1 Precious Blood of Jesus
- July 2 Visitation BVM
- July 14 St. Bonaventure
- July 16 Our Lady of Mt. Carmel
- July 25 St. James, Apostle
- July 26 St. Anne, Mother BVM
- August 1 St. Peter in Chains
- August 2 St. Alphonsus Liguori
- August 4 St. Dominic
- August 6 Transfiguration of Jesus
- August 9 St. John Vianney
- August 10 St. Lawrence
- August 11 Comm. of St. Philomena
- August 15 Assumption BVM
- August 16 St. Joachim
- August 22 Immaculate Heart of Mary

TO:

Change Service Requested

232607

USA

Mead, Washington 99021-0130

Post Office Box 130

The Society of Traditional Roman Catholics

FROM:

NONPROFIT
U.S. Postage
PAID
MEAD, WA
Permit No. 130