



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 25, Issue 3
November, 2009

The Rumors Are Not True: STRC And *The Catholic Voice* Live On

By REV. KEVIN VAILLANCOURT
For *The Catholic Voice*

When some of our readers did not receive the September issue of *The Catholic Voice* as they were accustomed to do, a series of rumors started about the demise of the Society of Traditional Roman Catholics. At times it was hard to tell if people were disappointed or glad that our organization and this newsletter seemed to disappear, but they were a series of rumors that were not necessary, and even downright erroneous. The truth is, we did not publish a September issue simply because we did not have the money to do so. For the time being, we are going back to our original plan of publication (established more than twenty-five years ago) that we will publish each issue when we have the money to do so, no matter how long it takes for us to get to the level of donations we need.

As you know, ours is a unique publication. We do not require a subscription fee *per se*, save for those who receive our newsletter outside the United States. With a down-turn in the economy has come a down-turn in donations, and our organization does not run like some government entities where the money needed to meet a budget can just be legislated and then printed. We have a large number of people on our mailing list, and perhaps the time has come to eliminate those who have not donated in a long while. We have often discussed this policy over the years, but have decided not to implement it because we wanted our message to continue to get out to as many as possible. However,

the updating of our mailing list is back “on the table,” and we will soon determine if we will put it into practice. If you are reading this and have not contributed for a long time (or never have done so), and should a long period of time pass without receiving this newsletter, it may be because your name was eliminated due to a failure to support our work.

“But,” some have remarked, “could you not have quieted these rumors about STRC and *The Catholic Voice* by notifying everyone about your decision?” If by “notify” is meant to send a mailing to everyone about our lack of funds, such a thing would be self-defeating and extremely costly. In August, we did publish a notice about this on our web site, telling our readers not to expect another issue in November. This was (and still is) the best way we have to reach as many people as possible for the least amount of money. In fact, it will be our *only* medium for the immediate future of announcing when to expect the next issue. For those who do not have Internet access, we are sorry that you may not directly receive this notification. However, by this time in modern society, nearly everyone knows someone with online access (even through a library) in order to obtain this information.

Thank you to everyone for your past support of our work through your financial donations. If you find our work worthy of continuing, please remember us again so that our apostolate to educate Catholics about the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and true Christian unity will not go away. †

The New, New, *Novus Ordo Missae* Is Almost Ready For Publication

By REV. KEVIN VAILLANCOURT
For *The Catholic Voice*

In July of this year, the USCCB (United States Conference of Catholic Bishops) released draft copies of the new, new, *new* and improved Ordinary prayers of the *Novus Ordo Missae*. It will be made available for public use sometime after modern Rome gives the final approval for its promulgation. This *Order of Mass* was “approved” in 2008, but not “approved” for implementation in the churches. The reason for the indefinite delay is so that pastors, catechists, choir directors and others can get their people ready for the changes made to the text — changes, we are told, that will get things right. Perhaps another reason for the delay is because nearly all of the other sections of the modern missal are under discussion and revision, and have not yet been submitted to modern Rome for approval.

This *third* edition of the modern rite is reported to be a “more accurate” translation of the Latin version of the *Novus Ordo* than has been used in American churches up until now. For all the “revisions” the traditional Roman Missal underwent in times gone by — “revisions,” not to get the translation of the Latin correct, but to bring the Missal into more common use



Opening ceremony at the June, 2009, USCCB Meeting throughout the Latin Rite due to many independent liturgists — these changes should not be compared with what is now the *third* attempt to get the vernacular language “just right.” This is a clear demonstration that many Catholics, bamboozled by the modern church, have lost continuity in what is considered their prayers

(Continued on Page 4)

STRC News: Annual Fundraiser; 2010 Calendar Now Available

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

Annual Request For Donations

Subscribers to *The Catholic Voice* know that it has been the policy of the Society of Traditional Roman Catholics to offer our newsletter without a set subscription fee. We have always depended on the Providence of God, and the good will of those who read our publication, to supply us with enough money to print and distribute our newsletter, and then accomplish some other works of our apostolate, if possible. This policy only applies to domestic mail. All foreign subscription require a US\$20.00 fee to offset costs.

It goes without saying that we have all experienced increases in our expenses. There are many factors that lead to this problem, and for us it is the postage and printing costs that have gone up in many ways. Increases like this seriously impact the budget we set aside for each issue. It is not the intent of the STRC Board of Directors to begin requiring a subscription fee to our newsletter, even though our funds have obviously tightened this past year. However, we find it necessary to come to you, our readers, once again, asking for your financial assistance. If you receive some benefit from our publication, could you please take

the time *today* to send us a donation to help us defray these essential costs? Any size donation will most certainly help. May God reward your charity and generosity. We pray that as our level of donations improves, we can resume our regular schedule of publication four times a year.

2010 Calendar To Arrive Before End Of Year

One of the works of our apostolate is to make available a traditional liturgical Roman Catholic calendar for those who give us a minimum annual financial support. The 2010 calendar is being sent out with this issue of *The Catholic Voice* to all who have helped us during 2009 with a minimum donation of \$25.00. Because our newsletter, for the time being (we pray), will only be available on an irregular basis, it was thought that mailing the calendars now would be the best course of action. We pray you find this beautiful calendar to be a source of great spiritual benefit, and that you will give it an honored place in your homes. Additional calendars are available for a donation.

Church Unity Prayers: January 18 to 25

Besides promoting the traditional Latin Mass, the STRC seeks to educate Catholics about the principles of true Christian unity as opposed to the false ecumenism of Vatican II. It is the duty of all to work and pray for the true reunion of all under the one fold of Jesus Christ, our Good Shepherd. One means of doing this is to observe the Church Unity Octave — a special time of public prayers for the return of all to the True Catholic Faith. A specific prayer was requested to be recited each day of this octave by Pope Leo XIII (on next page). †

Several 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

Summorum Pontificum: Is It Traditional Teaching? and NEW -- Exploding The Myth: Traditional Mass vs. Novus Ordo -- both by Fr. Kevin Vaillancourt

Critical reviews of the motu proprio on the Latin Mass

Minimum donation: \$5.00 each, includes postage.



Serving at the Altar

Learning to Serve at Low Mass with one Server

Available now for a \$14⁹⁵ donation to STRC.

The serving instructions come to you on an audio CD. There are no video instructions. Cassette tapes are no longer available.

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 Sky Grows Darker Yet

The text of a speech by Patrick Henry Omlor. A great summary.

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.

The *Orate Fratres* Prayer Unites Priest And Faithful In Offering Mass

By REV. DR. NICHOLAS GIHR
From *The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass*

The purer and the more perfect the disposition, recollection and, fervor of the priest and of the faithful present, so much the more acceptably does the Sacrifice rise from their hands to the throne of God. In order to support and inflame each other mutually, the celebrant and the people uniting with him in the Sacrifice keep up reciprocally an active and lively intercourse with each other; hence the priest frequently salutes the people and invites them to pray with him, and the people chime in through their representative, the acolyte or choir, in the priest's prayer.

After the *Suscipe sancta Trinitas* has been concluded, the priest again summons all the faithful to unite with him in common prayer, in order that their common Sacrifice may be so much the more favorably received by God. For the priest kisses the altar, rises, and turning toward the people with downcast eyes, extending his hands and again joining them, he says the words: *Orate fratres* - "Brethren pray", in a somewhat audible voice (*voce aliquantulum elate*), so as to be heard by the acolyte and those standing nearby; then while again turning to the altar, he continues in silence: *ut meum ac vestrum sacrificium acceptabile fiat apud Deum Patrem omnipotentem* - "that my sacrifice and yours may be acceptable to God the Father Almighty."

The priest here addresses all the faithful as "brethren", without distinction of state or sex. By their regeneration in Baptism, all Christians are children of God and of the Church; they form one great, grand and holy family of God, and they are all brethren among each other, unto whom it is granted to say: "Our Father, who art in heaven." "All you are brethren," and one alone is your Father who is in heaven" (Matt. 28: 8-9), says our Savior. As brethren, all Christians should, above all at the



Eucharistic Sacrifice and Communion, have but one heart and one soul, and pray for and with one another.

In addressing the faithful, the priest says: "my Sacrifice and yours." The Eucharist is the Sacrifice of the whole Church; it is not exclusively the priest's Sacrifice, but the property of the faithful also. They partake in a variety of ways, and in different degrees in the offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, while the priest in their name, and for their benefit alone, completes the sacrificial action itself. Thus priest and people are at the altar bound together in a communion of sacrifice; and they offer not only the Host and Chalice, but themselves also.

In compliance with the invitation of the priest, the acolyte answers in the name of the faithful: *May the Lord receive the Sacrifice from thy hands, to the praise and glory of His name, to our benefit, and to that of all His holy Church.*

The priest answers in a low voice: *Amen* - "So be it," whereby he expresses his assent to the devout desires of the faithful.

Although the faithful unite in offering the Holy Sacrifice, still they make mention here only of the act of the celebrant, inasmuch as they pray that the Lord would favorably receive this Sacrifice "from his hands." This is proper, for it indicates that the priest, as the servant and organ of Christ, alone performs the sacrificial act itself; for only his hands are anointed and consecrated to offer sacrifice. Only from priestly hands, which exhale the mystical perfume of the chalice and Host, does the Sacrifice ascend agreeably before the face of God.

This prayer expresses the object and purpose of the Sacrifice of the Mass. On the one hand, the Sacrifice is offered for the honor and praise of God, to adore and glorify His infinite majesty; on the other, it is offered to be for us and the whole Church an inexhaustible source of all goods and gifts. †

Prayers For Unity Octave Are An Essential Part Of Our Work

The STRC has two essential goals: to work and pray for the restoration of the Tridentine Latin Mass and the ancient traditions of the Roman Catholic Church, and that all members of the Traditional Movement will set aside their personal differences and begin to work together toward the first goal mentioned above. We cannot fully hope to achieve the first without the accomplishment of the second.

Unity is one of the four essential marks of the Roman Catholic Church. This means that we want all men united to the Church and Her teachings as their only means to salvation, and that all Catholics must be united under the same apostolic teachings and traditions of the Church, rejecting the current errors of modernism and ecumenism.

Join with us in prayer from January 18 - 25 for the *Church Unity Octave*. Prayer and sacrifice, more than anything else, will help us fulfill Our Lord's wish that "all may be one." †

Official Prayer For Church Unity

(To be recited each day of the Octave, January 18 to 25)

ANTIPHON: That they all may be one, as Thou, Father, in Me and I in Thee; that they also may be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me. (John 17:21)
V. I say unto thee that thou art Peter,
R. And upon this rock I will build My Church.

Let us pray: O Lord Jesus Christ, Who saidst unto Thine Apostles peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you, regard not our sins, but the faith of Thy Church, and vouchsafe to grant unto her that peace and unity which are agreeable to Thy will, who livest and reignest, God, forever and ever. Amen.

300 days indulgence, each day of Octave.

Changes Are Made To The Vernacular *Novus Ordo*, But They Are Not In Use

(Continued from Page 1)

of worship, despite the fact that these prayers are not the same as those used for centuries by Catholics of the Roman Rite in their worship of God and their attendance at the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Poor modern-day Catholics have had to endure change after change, and novelty after novelty, all in the “spirit of Vatican II.” This is but one more example of the lack of spiritual stability in the modern church.

The Process Of Change

Copies of the draft forms of this changed rite can be found on the USCCB web site (usccb.org). Every page has the words *Study Text Only* screened into the background to make it quite clear that the text everyone can view is provisional at best, and capable of further changes at worst. By their own admission, the USCCB received its copy of the new translation from the ICEL (International Commission on English in the Liturgy), the organization that is responsible for preparing English translations of the modern liturgy and sending them out to eleven conferences of bishops throughout the world where the vernacular form of the liturgy is English is used. The bishops in each of these conferences “have the opportunity to offer comments and suggestions to ICEL,” developing a second (or third, or fourth, or . . .) draft which the bishops of the various conferences submit to modern Rome for approval. In the end, the plan is that each of the eleven conferences will have a somewhat common English version of the *Novus Ordo Missae*, with some adaptations for each of the various countries where the new rites will be observed.

As for the USCCB, they have been at work discussing and offering revisions to the updated ICEL version at nearly everyone of their meetings since 2004. It was at that time they undertook a review of only the *Order of Mass*, finally completing it in 2006. Modern Rome gave its approval (with provisions) in June, 2008. This doesn't say anything as to the completion of a draft for the rest of the modern missal (which should be completed at the November, 2009, meeting of USCCB). This draft will then be submitted to modern Rome for final approval. It is believed that full approval for these final sections will take place sometime in 2010. But, you may ask, when will the third edition of the modern missal be published with all these changes? No one knows, not even the staff of the Secretariat of Divine Worship of USCCB. In fact, USCCB makes this clear:

It is hoped that when the time comes to use the texts in the celebration of (m)ass, priests will be properly trained, the faithful will have an understanding and appreciation of what is being prayed, and musical settings of the liturgical texts will be readily available. The revised translation of the Order of Mass will be permitted only when the complete text of the Roman Missal is promulgated. . . . Training for priests, music ministers and other liturgical leaders (liturgy committees and liturgical commissions) as well as formation for all Catholics will help to ensure the successful implementation of the new text.

There seems to be a deep concern to train everyone in the nuances of this “new” liturgy before it appears on the scene. This

is a stark reminder of what happened in parishes in the 60's when the *Novus Ordo* first appeared on the scene. The proposed ceremonies were so radically different at that time, that training and indoctrination into the new meanings of “liturgy” and “worship” et al. had to be securely in place before the new mass was forced on Catholics. And now everyone needs “retraining” before the third try at the *Novus Ordo* is pushed into the parishes? Let us pray for those Catholics in all these parishes who are once again swept away from the stability the True Mass offers through the implementation of liturgical novelties.

Just What Is Being Changed?

Most published news reports make it sound like the “revisions” in the third attempt at the English version of the *Novus Ordo* are not so different that people cannot make the change in their parts without too much difficulty. All they have to do is unlearn what they learned were the reasons for the *first* ICEL form in use during the heady days of liturgical revolution. I suppose the modernists are making this easy by telling the “People of God” that their parts have been adjusted to offer a “more correct” translation of the Latin *Novus Ordo* than what has been available all these years. There are no apologies for the errors of the past, even the doctrinal ones. All people need to know now is that they are finally praying the “correct” way, as far as the translation goes.

On August 26, 2009, the online Vatican news service Zenit published an overview of some of the changes made to the *Order of Mass* text:

To prepare U.S. Catholics for the word shifts, the nation's bishops have offered a side-by-side comparison chart of the liturgical changes. And though the new translation is bound to cause some tongue tripping — and probably make Mass-goers more alert — the bishops' site is aiming to minimize discomfort by already publishing some of the changes.

So, for example, catechists, parents and ordinary faithful can begin to prepare “And with your spirit” as the response to the priest's “The Lord be with you.” (The answer will no longer be “And also with you.”)

Form B for the Penitential Act is also getting a makeover. It will now go: Priest: “Have mercy on us, O Lord.” People: “For we have sinned against you.” Priest: “Show us, O Lord, your mercy.” People: “And grant us your salvation.”

Different Look

Changes that promise to take longest to become familiar are those that affect prayers said by the congregation at Mass: the *Confiteor*, *Gloria* and *Nicene Creed* will have a more faithful translation.

“I confess to almighty God and to you, my brothers and sisters, that I have greatly sinned in my thoughts and in my words, in what I have done and in what I have failed to do, through my fault, through my fault, through my most grievous fault [...]” the faithful will now pray at the beginning of Mass.

(Continued on Page 5)

Despite Changes, English Novus Ordo Still Unacceptable

(Continued from Page 4)

And in reciting our common faith, Mass attendees will say the *Nicene Creed* this way: “I believe in one God, the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Only Begotten Son of God, born of the Father before all ages.”

The changes are a “marked improvement over the translations with which we have become familiar,” Bishop Serratelli wrote in another of his weekly columns. “They are densely theological. They respect the rich vocabulary of the Roman Rite. They carefully avoid the overuse of certain phrases and words.

“Liturgical language should border on the poetic. Prose bumps along the ground. Poetry soars to the heavens. And our liturgy is already a sharing of the liturgy in heaven.”

Even though an attempt is made to translate the Latin into “better” English, the truth of the matter is that, regardless of how “faithful” the new *Order of Mass* is to the Latin *Novus Ordo*, it is still the *Novus Ordo* with all its non-traditional quirks and dogmatic problems:

- While this modern liturgy may be “poetic,” it is far from fulfilling the sense of the sacred that is necessary when sinful man worships his Creator. For example, it has always been a point of contention that the *Novus Ordo* uses grammatical constructions in English that are disrespectful to Almighty God. Besides the use of the familiar “you, your,” in place of the devout “Thee, Thou,” the lack of capitalization of those words addressed to God places Him on the level of man, and increases our concerns about the man-centeredness of the modern liturgy. There is no better means of emphasizing this than the practice of merely bowing during the Creed at the words *and by the Holy Spirit was incarnate of the Virgin Mary and became man*, while the traditional practice has been to bend the knee at the recitation of *et Homo factus est* as any creature should do before his Creator, especially in acknowledgment of this most sublime and mysterious of acts.

- In general, the *Novus Ordo Missae* introduced instability into Catholic worship through the use of many “options” during the liturgy, from beginning to end, all performed at the whim of the minister. For example, the Introductory Rites of the *Order of Mass* allows the minister to greet the people in one of three ways, followed by the Penitential Act that also can be recited in one of three ways. This says nothing of two versions of the Creed that could be recited, and even the four Eucharistic Prayers, any one of which is questionably valid, without even mentioning the corrupted form of the Words of Consecration over the wine.

- The *Novus Ordo* and man-centered Offertory (or Liturgy of the Eucharist) is a terrible corruption of the Offertory Prayers of the Latin Mass (I will not call it the *extraordinary form* as is the practice in the modern church). The “works of man’s hands” are so greatly honored, that one appears to be congratulating Christ to come “share in our humanity,” as if prayers to emphasize humanity and human actions are fit means of expressing the preparation of the elements of bread and wine to become the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, offered in unbloody sacrifice to

His Father for our sins. In the *Novus Ordo*, the people prepare for the “gifts” to merely become our “bread of life” and “spiritual drink.” The proper intent necessary for a valid sacramental offering for the traditional understanding of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist is not present here. Traditional teachings on the things necessary for a valid Mass include the proper prayers of Offertory, Consecration and Communion. If one of these is defective, then the whole rite is not valid or pleasing to God. The man-centered liturgy found in the *Order of Mass* is gravely defective in the nature of sacrificial intent, expressing, rather, an excessive preoccupation with the things of man. There is only one Catholic conclusion when we acknowledge this.

The Words Of Consecration

Perhaps the most significant change in the *Order of Mass* of the third revision is the replacement of the word *for many* in the wine consecration form, eliminating the word *for all* that has been a novelty of the vernacular *Novus Ordo* since its foundation. This change appears in all four Eucharistic Canons.

By means of background, this change of *all* to *many* was mandated on November 20, 2006, by a letter sent to prelates of the modern church worldwide by Cardinal Francis Arinze, the Vatican’s Prefect of the Congregation for the Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments. This letter did not require that the change of these words were to take place throughout the world on that day. No, the change in public liturgies will not take place until such time as the new missals are approved and published, whatever date in the future that may be.

Please take note: this change in words that have such *radically different meanings* is not mandated because the use of *all* somehow invalidates the consecration of the wine. No, this would be giving in to the “schismatics” who teach such things. “Indeed,” the cardinal writes, “the formula *for all* would undoubtedly correspond to a correct interpretation of the Lord’s intention expressed in the text. It is a dogma of faith that Christ died for all men and women . . . *for all* is an explanation that belongs properly to catechesis, [and] *for many* is a faithful translation of *pro multis*” as found in the Latin version of the *Novus Ordo Missae*. So, this change is made within the third version of the *Order of Mass* merely for grammatical correctness, not a proper expression of doctrinal teaching of the fruit bestowed by the redemptive act of Christ, His death on the Cross. You see, Arinze is in grave error when he tells us that the words of consecration “correspond to a correct interpretation of the Lord’s *intention*.” The Church has been careful over the centuries to explain to those guilty of heretical teachings regarding the Redemption that the salvific effect of Christ’s death upon the Cross has nothing to do with His *intention*, nor our interpretation of it. *It is the act itself*— the death of Jesus on the Cross — that is the true work of our Redemption. This is why we call the Mass the unbloody renewal of the Sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, not a mere Paschal celebration, or a reenactment of the “Lord’s Supper” (as the *General Instruction* in the front of the *Novus Ordo*

(Continued on Page 6)

The Words *For Many* Are Essential For Sacramental Validity

(Continued from Page 5)

missals teaches), nor even an action based on our *interpretation* of the intent of Jesus as He died on the Cross. The dogma of the effects of the Redemption, as it applies to the wine consecration form at Mass, is clearly taught at the Council of Trent and faithfully explained by the Catechism of that holy and dogmatic Council. To summarize the traditional teaching:

- Christ's death upon the Cross fulfilled the requirement of His Father that fitting reparation needed to be made for the sins of all men. Thus, when we say the Jesus Christ died for all men, we mean that His death was *sufficient* to make up for the outrages suffered by our Heavenly Father by all the sins of all men until the end of time. This does not mean, as by some manner of an erroneous interpretation of the intent of Jesus Christ, that all men are automatically saved because Jesus died for all men, or if all men accept this death for themselves, or some other heretical idea. The sufficiency teachings explains that the death of Jesus Christ satisfied for the debt of sin as to the collective guilt of all mankind for their sins in a manner that mankind could never do on their own, whether individually or collectively. The redemptive act of Christ did *not* take away the sins of all man; it made sufficient *reparation* for these sins to God the Father as insults made by His creatures.

- Apart from this universal reparation for the outrages caused by the sins of men, the death of Jesus Christ is productive of grace for all those who, through membership in the Church, and live holy lives, are worthy of the "remission of sins." Thus the death of Jesus on the Cross, and the shedding of His Precious Blood, have an *efficacious*, fruitful effect on the souls of the *many* — those who are in the state of grace and who are numbered among the Elect. The shedding of His Blood produces the fruit of grace for these *many*, and not for all, because all men are not worthy of such graces because of their sinful lives and rejection of Christ. In the words of the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*:

With great propriety, therefore, were the words *for all* omitted because here the fruit of the Passion is alone spoken of, and to the Elect only did His Passion bring the fruit of salvation. This the words of the Apostle declare when he says that Christ was offered once to take away the sins of many (Hebrews 9:26); and the same truth is conveyed in these words of Our Lord recorded by St. John: "I pray for them, I pray not for the world, but for them whom Thou hast given Me because they are Thine" (John 17:9). [Fr. Donovan edition, 1829, p. 220]

So, while Cardinal Arinze makes reference to the "intention" of Jesus Christ as somehow being the same as what the Modernists hold (*i.e.* that all men are saved), these two quotes from Scriptures make it obvious that the effects of the *deeds* of Jesus Christ by dying on the Cross and shedding His Blood were the efficacious works of Jesus, and these apply only to the *many*.

But We Have *For Many* Now; Isn't Everything OK Now?

As an aside, I am aware that there are some who have no standing in the Church yet who are presenting their own "new" English versions of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, and/or who

give their own interpretations of the teachings of this catechism in order to somehow "authoritatively" justify the erroneous opinion that the use of *for all* in the wine consecration form is valid. They assert this, either because (they say) that the *new* interpretation of the catechism (which they present without ecclesiastical approval) makes room for this interpretation, or else the wording of the catechism is ambiguous, and one is left "free" to interpret the catechism according to one's liking. Frankly, I have never read anything in good, traditional theological teaching that gives the lay person freedom to make his own judgment about so important a matter as *sacramental validity* based on the opinions of men who themselves are ambiguous and quite infatuated with their own opinions, and who have no standing as teachers of men in the Catholic Church. They justify their actions by telling us that the Church has never defined this subject (*i.e.*, that the use of *for all* is valid in the wine consecration form at Mass), giving them liberty to form their own opinions one way or another, and to make these opinions known to Catholics in some authoritative manner. I remind these men that not every dogmatic truth to which we adhere has been dogmatically defined by the Church as *de fide*, yet that fact alone does not stop us from holding the existence of these truths as certain, and without the threat of revision by someone else later on. For example, the fact that everyone of us has an immortal soul immediately created out of nothing by God is not a *de fide* proposition. As Dr. Ludwig Ott explains in his book *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma* (p. 100) that this belief is classified as *sententia certa*, not *de fide*. Yet, even though this teaching has not yet been defined by the Church as *de fide*, it does not give a Catholic the right to form his own opinions on the matter, and then teach those ill formed opinions to others. On the contrary, in this case, a *sententia certa* proposition is held to be true as a teaching pertaining to the Faith which, even though not yet solemnly defined by the Church, nevertheless it is guaranteed as true due to its intrinsic connection with the doctrine of Revelation.

As this pertains to the words of Consecration for the wine at Mass, it is not true to say that the Church has not made dogmatic pronouncements of some nature on the matter, thus allowing a public debate about which words are to be used to fulfill sacramental validity during the wine consecration until She defines this matter, if and when She sees fit. Our protagonists look only to the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* and *De Defectibus* as their sources for dogmatic definition on this matter. They are both excellent sources, forming as they do part of the magisterial teachings of the Church on this subject. However, it is wrong to end one's research here, implying through this that an exhaustive study on this matter has been accomplished.

We have seen above what the Catechism teaches on this subject. This is not a mere book, but a catechism requested by the Fathers of the Council of Trent in order to give priests a handy reference for teaching the truths of the Faith so the hoped for reform would take place. It was published with the approval of Pope St. Pius V. A catechism of the Roman Catholic Church approved at this level, it is magisterial in its authority, and it is

(Continued on Page 7)

St. Thomas Teaches The Necessity Of The Entire Form

(Continued from Page 6)

a sign of rash thinking for any Catholic to diminish its doctrinal value in the Church.

As for *De Defectibus*, this is a handy reference guide placed in the front of every altar Missal prior to the Vatican II debacle. I am not attempting to be irreverent by referring to *De Defectibus* in this manner, for it is a magisterial teaching having been promulgated by the Church for publication and public distribution. Thus we are required to respect its doctrinal value (where taught) and follow its teachings *exactly* without forming opinions otherwise. After all, as the full title implies, this is a guide for the celebrant at Mass that aids him to make the correct decision should certain defects arise in the celebration of Mass. One of the aforementioned protagonists makes light of this decree in an article he authored in a recent traditional publication. While explaining some value to be found in *De Defectibus* in helping to solve the *for all vs. for many* problem (Which he himself created, by the way. The Church has never had a problem with this.), he proclaims he has found it to be ambiguous in nature, and that one could use it to support the “short form” erroneous theory that has been floating around for awhile. He declares that *De Defectibus* is not clear in determining which words are necessary for a valid consecration of the wine at Mass. He concludes, then, that the “short form” theory is thereby vindicated. Not true. He was careful to parse some Latin words earlier in his piece, and he seems to have forgotten this talent while reading *De Defectibus*, Chapter V, *On Defects in the Form*. The English translation of this pertinent section is:

The words of Consecration, which are the form of this Sacrament, are these: *For this is my Body. And: For this is the Chalice of my Blood, of the new and eternal testament: the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins.* Now if one were to omit, or to change anything in the form of the consecration of the Body and Blood, and in that very change of the words the [new] wording would fail to mean the same thing, he would not consecrate the Sacrament. If in fact he were to add something that did not change the meaning, it is true he would consecrate, but he would sin most gravely.

Had he used the altar missal priests use each day when they offer the true Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, he would have found two very important points:

- The entire sentence leading up to identification of the words of Consecration is in the present tense. In Logic we understand the use of the present tense to be a direct identifier of the relationship between the subject and that which occurs after the form of the verb *I am*. Thus, when we read *Verba autem consecrationis, quae sunt forma hujus Sacramenti, sunt haec: Hic est enim*, etc., we have certainty that the entire *verba consecrationis* which are (*sunt*), not “may be,” the form of the Sacrament are (*sunt*) these. There is no mistaking what the priest is being taught here regarding a possible invalid consecration through his own fault while reciting all of these words “which are the form of the Sacrament”: he must use the entire form with no alterations.

- In order to best solidify this teaching in the mind of the priest, that is, that the *entire* form must be used and recited correctly, the words of the form are printed in *red* to distinguish them from the rest of the type that is printed in *black*. Now I use a missal published by the former Benziger Brothers, and they make this distinction quite clear. They were “Printers to the Apostolic See,” so you know they got it right. They made sure the sense and teaching of *De Defectibus* was well understood through the use of red ink for the words of Consecration, and this is that all of the words necessary for a valid consecration of the bread and the wine are printed on the page in *red ink*. How could our protagonist have missed such an obvious point? Perhaps it is his desire to preserve his predilection for the “short form” that caused this error in good research.

Other Magisterial References: The *Summa* And More

I have spent much time answering the recent objections of some opinionated Catholic authors because it seems that many Catholics, desiring to read traditional works, might have been detoured by these opinions. I still have not said anything regarding their abuse of the teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas in this matter. His works form a part of the magisterial teachings of the Church, both because he is a Doctor of the Church (our protagonists are not), and his works were the *only* source of reference used at the Council of Trent, save also the Holy Scriptures. Thus it is safe to assume that the sense of the teachings found in the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* are based on the doctrinal teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas, not merely a group of theological opinions. Our protagonists cannot say the same of their writings. The Angelic Doctor made his “mind” quite clear when he wrote in the *Summa Theologica*, III, Q. 78, A. 3:

I answer that 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* [emphasis added] are of the substance of the form down to the words, *As often as ye shall do this*, which belong to the use of this sacrament, and consequently do not belong to substance of the form.

In the same *Summa Theologica* (III, Q. 60, A. 8) St. Thomas explains what he means when he speaks of “the substance of the form”: “Now it is clear that if anything that is *of the substance of the sacramental form* [emphasis added] would be suppressed, then that would destroy the essential sense of the words; *and consequently the sacrament would be rendered invalid*” [emphasis added].

Lastly, he also writes in his treatise *In 1 Cor. XI*, (lect. 6):

In regard to these words which the Church uses in the

(Continued on Page 8)

Removing *Mysterium Fidei* From Form Makes Consecration Invalid

(Continued from Page 7)

consecration of the Blood, some think that not all of them are **necessary** 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 [*namely, This is the chalice of my blood*]: **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**. [Bold print emphasis throughout was added.]

Patrick Henry Omlor wrote a wonderful treatise on this subject, greatly explaining, not only what St. Thomas wrote on this subject, but also defending his teachings against those who malign this great Doctor. Among other things, Mr. Omlor uses the writings of the Salmantecenses, a 16th and 17th century group of Discalced Carmelites from Salamanca, Spain, who are recognized as the faithful interpreters of St. Thomas. We reproduced this work in the December, 2001, issue of *The Catholic Voice*, and it has been reprinted (as are all of Patrick Omlor's works) by the Catholic Research Institute (see their ad on the next page). Why not add these works to your library? Our protagonists have no such authoritative reference sources to back up their opinions.

Another "Defect" In The Modern Canons

The correct understanding of the necessity of using the "long form" of the words of Consecration for the wine at Mass is essential in another area. Few have addressed the point (save in this publication and the works of Patrick Omlor) of the removal of the words *mysterium fidei* from the wine consecration form, placing it a few lines later as one of three more options that can be recited by all at the Novus Ordo. The "short form" theorists dismiss this point with little argument except to stand behind their opinions on the "short form." However, those who better understand the teachings regarding the necessity of using *all* the words in the form of Consecration know that the removal of this term affects the validity of the consecration of the wine in several ways. Why? Because by removing these words, then the words that are traditionally considered to be the words of Christ in the Roman Rite are eliminated, changing in a severe manner the meaning of what is conveyed. If one changes the meaning of the consecration form purposefully, then one endangers the effect known as *transubstantiation*. We have already reviewed what St. Thomas and *De Defectibus* have to teach on the necessity of the use of the entire form at the wine consecration at Mass. There are other magisterial teachings that support this understanding as well — more teachings our protagonists failed to find in their opinionated "research." For example:

- The teaching of *Cum Marthae Circa* of Pope Innocent III in 1202. I wrote about this in the March, 2004, issue of *The Catholic Voice*. Here is how Patrick Omlor explains it in his book *No Mystery of Faith, No Mass*:

St. Thomas therefore teaches here that the words "*the mystery of faith*" are derived from **Tradition** (Tradition with capital "T", which is one of the two sources of Divine Revelation), since they "were handed down to the Church by the apostles, who received them from our Lord."

It is not merely an "opinion" that the Angelic Doctor is here expressing; rather it is a fact of ecclesiastical history — nay, a truth of Divine Revelation — fully substantiated by the Papal authority of Innocent III in his doctrinal letter *Cum Marthae Circa*, Nov. 29, 1202. (Cf. Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, nos. 414-415).

An Archbishop of Lyons had inquired of Pope Innocent who it was that inserted "*the mystery of faith*" in the consecration form for the wine. In *Cum Marthae Circa* the Sovereign Pontiff replied as follows:

"You have asked (indeed) who has added to the form of words which Christ Himself expressed when He changed the bread and wine into the Body and Blood, which are in the Canon of the Mass that the general Church uses, but which we find expressed by none of the Evangelists. ... In the Canon of the Mass that expression, "*the mystery of faith*," is found interspersed among His words. ... Surely we find many such things omitted by the Evangelists from the words as well as from the deeds of the Lord ... Therefore We believe that the form of words as is found in the Canon, ***the Apostles received from Christ***, and their successors from them" [*emphasis added*].

What is the force and status of *Cum Marthae Circa*? It is not just the theological opinion of a pope writing as a private theologian. Leeming calls it a "doctrinal letter" (*Principles of Sacramental Theology*, 1960, p. 255). Its very inclusion in Denzinger shows that it is part of the *Ordinary Magisterium* of the Church. Since those words "*the mystery of faith*" were received from Our Lord by the Apostles and handed down by them, they come down to us via Apostolic Tradition, one of the two sources of Divine Revelation. And that is why I claimed above that the words "*the mystery of faith*" are in the wine consecration of the Latin Rite through Divine Revelation.

Anyone who would be so bold as to gainsay the teaching of Pope Innocent III that the words "*the mystery of faith*" were in the Latin Rite consecration form ***from the very beginning*** would be obliged to show when, where and by whom these words were inserted at some later date. Such evidence cannot be found, and in quest of it one would in vain search the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the *Decretals*, the writings of the Apostolic Fathers and the Doctors, all extant official ecclesiastical records, or even Apocrypha.

- The Decree of the Council of Florence (1438 - 1439). This truly ecumenical and binding Council wrote to inform the schismatic Armenians about the true words of consecration if they would seek union with Rome:

"But since in the above written decree of the Armenians there was not set forth the form of words, which in the

(Continued on Page 9)

Liturgical Abuse Is One Thing; False Ecumenism Is Another

(Continued from Page 8)

consecration of the Body and Blood of the Lord, the holy Roman Church, confirmed by the teaching and authority of the Apostles Peter and Paul, has always been accustomed to use, we have deemed that it should be inserted here. In the consecration of the Body, the Church uses this form of words: *For this is my body*; and for the consecration of the Blood: *For this is the chalice of my blood, of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins.* (From "Decree for the Greeks and Armenians").

• The Holy Office (the department in the Vatican assigned to safeguard the Faith, not merely make sure the Sacred Liturgy is performed correctly) wrote a *Monitum* (warning) on July 24, 1958 (AAS 50-536) when it became known that some liturgists were already eliminating the words *mysterium fidei* from the wine consecration form at Mass *because it was considered by this Congregation as part of the form of the Holy Eucharist.* Here it is, and it is another example of a magisterial decree, having been written just prior to Vatican II:

This Supreme Sacred Congregation has learned that in a certain translation of the New Order of Holy Week into the vernacular the words *mysterium fidei* in the form of the consecration of the chalice are omitted. It is also reported that some priests omit these words in the very celebration of Mass.

Therefore this Supreme Congregation gives warning that it is impious (*nefas*) to introduce a change in so sacred a matter and to mutilate or alter editions of liturgical books (cf. Canon 1399, 10).

Bishops, therefore, in accordance with the warning of the Holy Office on February 14, 1958 (AAS 50-114), should see to it that the prescription of the sacred canons on divine worship be strictly observed, and they should be closely watchful that no one dare to introduce even the slightest change in the matter and form of the Sacraments.

Do our protagonists need more examples of magisterial teachings of the Church on this subject? How well do their opinions stand now in light of what the Church has had to say on this matter?

Still Not Convinced To Stay Away?

I hope there are no people who, while reading this work, have the audacity to dismiss the writings of Patrick Omlor in these matters as unimportant. I cite his works, and recommend them to others, not merely because Mr. Omlor is a recognized source of scholarly thought in the Church today, but because, regardless of one's opinion of him, one cannot argue with his research and the sources whom he cites. Our protagonists are no shining examples in this area. What they offer are their *opinions*, based on their retranslations and unreferenced quotations. Such a shoddy presentation does not dignify any further comment here because it is a work that is grossly failing in Catholic orthopraxy, and it is sad that the editors of the traditional publication in which it ran did not see this before it was printed.

So, if up until now my reader is still not convinced to stay away from the Novus Ordo — *any* edition of it — because it is not Catholic worship, allow me one more consideration on the nature of that church which presents this liturgy to you.

The Heresy Of Ecumenism

Catholics know that the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, while the central act of worship for all members of our Church, and the heart of our Holy Faith, does not represent the entire set of teachings of all those truths we must believe in order to be saved. We do not read in the Creed "I believe in the Mass," but that "I believe" in the carefully defined set of doctrines of the Church coming down to us through Divine Revelation and the authority of the Roman Catholic Church. Thus, even if a Catholic could attend a valid Liturgy in a schismatic rite, this does not of itself give him permission to be present at those schismatic services because of the danger to faith that occurs by taking part in worship services in a non-Catholic church. What is said here applies in a greater way to taking part in services where the church is not merely schismatic, but a firm teacher of non-Catholic doctrine. For years, I have written numerous articles in

(Continued on Page 15)


2010 Early Order Special

Traditional Roman Catholic Liturgical Calendar, Ordo and Planner

A discounted price of \$7.00 each or \$6.50 for 5 or more is being offered for all calendar orders placed before July 31st.


After that date, calendars will be \$7.50 each or \$6.50 each for 5 or more.

Calendars, Ordos and Planners will be available September, 2009



• **The Week with the Most Holy Rosary 2010 Devotional Weekly Planner \$12.50 each; 5 or more \$12.00 each**

THIS IS THE ONLY PRE-VATICAN II TRADITIONAL ORDO WE KNOW OF IN PRINT.



• **2010 Traditional Roman Catholic Ordo \$6.50 each; 5 or more \$6.00 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.

A Look Into The Rise (And Errors) Of “Catholic” Pentecostalism

By BETTY R. HAMMER

Editor’s Note: Although this article was written by Betty Hammer over 25 years ago, its message is still very important in the Church today. Pentecostalism is one of the major forces that is changing the very nature of modern Catholicism, so that, even with the approval of bishops and priests, the conciliar church is looking more and more Protestant as the years go on.

Catholics who wish to defend the traditional Church doctrine against the Pentecostals must first understand that people get involved in this movement largely from the emotionally-charged atmosphere it brings to their lives. Mistaking the excitation of human sensibilities for the “movement of the spirit,” Pentecostals will lay on hands, speak in unknown tongues, interpret these unknown tongues “according to the spirit,” and engage in sensible and even sensual activity, all in the name of religion. On one level, they have turned Faith into something that is guided by the senses, while on the other hand they make such a requirement of sensible feelings that it causes many Pentecostals to lose the supernatural aspect of religion altogether. Therefore, perhaps one of the first apologetical defenses against Pentecostalism is to demonstrate how this belief system brings a destruction of supernatural faith.

In addition to this, when speaking to Catholics who are wrapped up in Pentecostalism, an appeal must be made to the role of the Church in the life of each Catholic. Since to the Church alone was given the promise of guidance by the Holy Ghost, and since St. Peter and his successors alone of the promise of personal, individual guidance by the Holy Ghost, all other manifestations of spiritual guidance apart from these doctrinal understanding are erroneous. St. Paul warned the Corinthians (I Cor. 14: 6-19, 22-23) that the gift of tongues is for the profit of unbelievers, not believers, and that, if misused, it is a source of great schisms in the Church. It is for this reason that the Catholic Church, the sole guardian of the Deposit of Faith, has forbidden her children to either lend support to the spiritists and/or to attend such meetings, even if only out of curiosity. Those who, knowing this, still participate in the gatherings of the Pentecostals sin both through disobedience and against faith.

Made up of who knows what

Thousands of Catholics are now involved in what is commonly called “The Pentecostal Movement” or the Charismatic Renewal in the United States. This movement has practically absorbed the Cursillo movement in this country, and is growing daily in leaps and bounds, and enjoying, apparently, the approval of some local modern bishops.

But what is the Pentecostal Movement? Where did it begin? What has the Church said about Pentecostal Meetings? Should Catholics attend these prayer meetings? Can Pentecostals truthfully claim inspiration and reception of the Holy Ghost? These are hard questions Catholics should ask themselves before becoming involved in Pentecostalism.

Pentecostal meetings are emotion-charged prayer sessions, which feature holding hands, locking arms around each other,



self-criticism (a form of sensitivity training), Bible reading, the laying on of hands, baptism by the spirit, physical healing, faith healing, prophesying, speaking in strange and unknown tongues while in a hysterical state, interpretation of unknown tongues, clapping hands and swaying to guitar music. Quite frequently “mass” is said sitting on a sofa, using a modern coffee table as an “altar,” while the participants sit on chairs or recline on the floor. In this informal atmosphere many Pentecostals pour out their anxieties, inner doubts, fears, desires and feelings (sexual, sometimes), guilt, and requests for prayers, while sobbing hysterically.

Interestingly enough, the above takes place in a semi-dark room or church, reminiscent of spiritistic seances.

“Catholic” Universities: The Seed Bed

To the best of our knowledge, Pentecostalism was introduced into Catholic circles by Protestant Pentecostals at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, PA. In the spring of 1967 these meetings were spread from Duquesne to Notre Dame University, South Bend, IN. From Notre Dame University to Loyola University of the South, New Orleans, LA, under the direction of Harold Cohen, S.J., and to practically every diocese in the United States — and virtually all “Catholic” Colleges, some State Colleges, and many Catholic homes.

In the Spring of 1967, Dan Murray, then a Senior at L.S.U., Baton Rouge, writing on a Pentecostal meeting in the *Scholastic* (campus publication) said in part: “The first part of the healing was slow - probably because there were a lot of skeptics. There were present one-fourth skeptics, three-fourths with faith. What changed it was the *laying on of hands* by Kevin.” (Kevin was Kevin Ranaghan, a Notre Dame graduate student who was teaching at St. Mary of the Pines near Baton Rouge.) “After Kevin laid on the hands, the spirit came in very strong. Fifteen or twenty received the gift of tongues that night. Forty or fifty had the laying on of hands.”

Dan Murray’s article quoted the strong reservations on such prayer meetings by Father James Burtchael, a Holy Cross Order priest who teaches scripture at Notre Dame University:

“The Pentecostal experience some-how provokes a startling

(Continued on Page 11)

The Church Condemned Pentecostalism Many Years Ago

(Continued from Page 10)

release of emotion which is, I fear, of *ambiguous value*. On the one hand, if a person's life has been clogged and frustrated by a mess of psychological debris, the emotional explosion from laying on of hands may well blast him free in a way that any less vigorous religious experience could not. But on the other hand, this *violent shakeup* tends to overwhelm a person and throw him off balance for a while and leave him open to all sorts of manipulation by personal suggestion or group frenzy."

Modern Yokels

The Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, presided over by Archbishop Spalding in 1866, declared that some of the manifestations of Spiritism are to be ascribed to Satanic intervention, and *warned the faithful against lending any support* or even, out of curiosity, *attending seances or Pentecostal meetings*. (Decreta, nn. 33-41)

The Congregation of the Holy Office issued a decree in June, 1840, condemning Spiritism as "nothing else than unlawful and heretical deception." This decision was reiterated by the Holy Office in 1847, and a further decree was promulgated in 1856, which, after mentioning discourses about religion, evocation of spirits and other superstitious practices, including "*speaking in unknown tongues*," expressly exhorts the "*Bishops to put forth every effort for the suppression of these abuses in order that the flock of the Lord may be protected against the enemy, the deposit of faith safeguarded, and the faithful preserved from moral corruption*."

Vatican Council I emphatically declared:

"For the Holy Spirit *was not* promised to the successors of Peter, that by His revelation they might make known a *new doctrine*, but that by His assistance they might inviolably keep and faithfully expound the revelation or deposit of faith delivered through the apostles." (Sess. IV-1870) In other words, the Holy

Ghost was promised to St. Peter and his successors to teach and feed the universal Church, *not to every prelate, priest and Pentecostal* who are today claiming Spirit baptism, Spirit healing, Spirit inspiration, Spirit glossolalia, and other unusual phenomena through the laying on of hands at Pentecostal meetings. Such claims amount to *new doctrine* over and above the deposit of Faith.

This misfortune, claiming of the Holy Ghost, was realized, too late, by the apostate Martin Luther, when he sadly wrote, "No Yokel is so rude but when he has dreams and fancies he thinks himself inspired by the Holy Ghost" (*Martin Luther* by Hartman Grisar, S.J., 1930)

Gift or Gibberish?

Glossolalia, or speaking in tongues (which is frequently heard at Pentecostal prayer meetings while the individual is in an hysterical state), is presently creating a great deal of confusion among many Catholics.

What happened on the first Pentecost, when the Apostles were understood by listeners of many different languages, is clearly a miracle. The explanation given by *authentic* Biblical scholars seems to be that the Apostle would speak in his own language (Aramaic), but miraculously he would seem to be speaking, say, Greek to a listener who understood only that language. It is certainly improbable that the Apostles learned miraculously any foreign or strange language. While speaking in their own native tongue to unbelievers, the Holy Ghost was operable on their hearers. The Holy Ghost translated the Apostles' Aramaic into their listeners' own tongue for their conversion to Christianity.

I Corinthians XIV is often quoted today by our modern "Catholic" Pentecostals in justification of their use or "gift of tongues." Pentecostals refuse to admit that St. Paul was admonishing the Corinthians for indulging in unknown and

(Continued on Page 12)



Laying Of Hands By Pentecostals Does Not Bring Down Holy Ghost



(Continued from Page 11)

uninterpreted tongues. Let us read I Corinthians 14:6-9,22:

6. "But now, brethren, if I come to you speaking in tongues what shall I profit you, unless I speak to you either in revelation, or in knowledge, or in prophesy, or in teaching?

7. Even inanimate instruments, like the flute or the harp, may produce sound, but if there is no difference in the notes, how shall it be known what is piped or harped?

8. If the trumpet gives forth an uncertain sound, who will prepare for battle?

9. So likewise you - unless with the tongue you utter intelligible speech — how shall it be known what is said? For you will be speaking to the empty air.

10. There are, for example, so many kinds of languages in this world and none without a meaning.

11. If, then, I do not know the meaning of the language, I shall be to the one to whom I speak, a foreigner; and he who speaks is a foreigner to me,

12. So also you, since you strive after spiritual gifts, seek to have them abundantly for the edification of the Church.

13. Therefore, let him who speaks in a tongue pray that he may interpret.

14. For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays, but my understanding is unfruitful.

15. What then is to be done? I will pray with the spirit, but I will pray with the understanding also; I will sing with the spirit, but I will sing with the understanding also.

16. Else if thou givest praise with the spirit alone, how shall he who fills the place of the uninstructed say "Amen" to thy thanksgiving? For he does not

know what thou sayest.

17. For thou, indeed givest thanks well, but the other is not edified.

18. I thank God that I speak with all your tongues;

19. Yet in the Church, I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I may also instruct others, than ten thousand words in a tongue."

In verse 22, St. Paul says: "Wherefore tongues are intended as a sign, not to believers, but to unbelievers."

A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture edited by Dom Bernard Orchard, M.A.; Rev. Edmond F. Sutcliffe, S.J., M.A., L.S.S.; Rev. Reginald C. Fuller, D.D., L.S.S.; Dom Ralph Russell, D.D., M.A., makes the following comments on Chapter XIV the Corinthians:

"As regards the charisma of tongues (i.e. languages- one word for both in Greek) by far the best view is that it was the same gift as the apostles received at Pentecost; the miraculous power of speaking languages not previously learned. Its purpose, as St. Paul says in Verse 22, was the conversion of unbelievers, and to make it a frequent part of Christian worship, as had been done at Corinth, *was an abuse*. That is, in brief, the complaint that St. Paul makes. There are two other views of the gift:

(1) That it was the sort of unintelligible utterance which we hear in *Certain Sects*, Christian and otherwise, caused by *unwholesome religious excitement* — in fact, *gibberish*. In that case St. Paul would not merely have restricted it, but would *very certainly have banned it*.

(Continued on Page 13)

Any “Spirit” Called Down At These Meetings Is An Unholy Spirit

(Continued from Page 12)

(2) That it was the use of *unusual* words (obsolete, poetical, dialectical, etc.) to give an impression of a lofty style. Objections:

(a) We cannot believe God would inspire eccentricity and affectation;

(b) It would not be unintelligible: its *drift* at least would be understood;

(c) It would be entirely different from the gift of Pentecost, yet St. Paul uses precisely the same term as used in Acts.

7-13 Sounds are useless unless their meaning is understood. St. Paul argues from music and ordinary speech — or perhaps “a definite arrangement of notes.” How can the tune be known or recognized?

9. *Tongue* here probably means the organ itself. ‘Speaking’— i.e. *wasting your breath*.

13. *Pray interpret*. From this and verse 5 it seems that sometimes the speaker in a language could not translate what he said.

Verses 14-20 Among Christians themselves (whether in praying or preaching). *All incomprehensible speech is out of place*. St. Paul’s argument is that as the human intellect is not exercised, the benefit cannot be communicated.

14. *My spirit*; either ‘the inspiration within me’ or ‘the innermost part of my soul.’ Without fruit: unfruitful, i.e., unprofitable to others. A truth may be grasped by some intuition, but cannot be communicated without intellectual activity.

15. What is the conclusion? or ‘What is to be done then?’ ‘I will pray...’ i.e., he will welcome every divine inspiration in his (public) prayer, but by the exercise of his intellect he will put his prayer into ordinary Greek words. ‘I will sing’: compose songs or hymns (probably).

16. Otherwise, if you pronounce a blessing in the spirit only (i.e., in an unknown language) how are those who fill the place of ordinary members to say Amen to your thanksgiving? The ‘ordinary member’ is the Christian who has no Charisma or who does not understand the ‘language’ used.

19. ‘In the Church,’ i.e., in a gathering of Christians.

20. ‘In sense’: ‘in mind.’ The gross misuse of ‘tongues’ argued a *silliness* worthy of children. ‘Perfect’: grown up.

Verse 22 St. Paul says: ‘Wherefore tongues are intended as a sign to unbelievers.’

The Catholic Encyclopedia (1912 Edition) dealing with the subject *The Gift of Tongues* says in part:

“St. Luke relates (Acts II, 1-15) that on the feast of Pentecost following the Ascension of Christ into heaven, one hundred and twenty disciples of Gallilean origin were heard speaking ‘with diverse tongues, according as the Holy Ghost gave them to speak.’ Devout Jews then dwelling at Jerusalem, the scene of the incident, were quickly drawn together to the number of approximately three thousand. The multitude embraced two religious classes, Jews and proselytes, from fifteen distinct lands so distributed geographically as to represent ‘every nation under heaven.’ All were ‘confounded in mind’ because every man heard the disciples speaking

“The essential working of the Spirit of testimony is within the hearts of the Apostles, and its outward showing is to be seen, not in the working of miracles or the speaking with tongues, but in the new courage with which they now proclaim their message, and which presents so marvellous a contrast with their former timidity.”

Canon George Smith

The Teaching of the Catholic Church

‘wonderful things of God’ in his *own tongue*, namely, *that in which he was born*.

The glossolaly (tongues) thus described was historic, articulate, and intelligible. Jerusalem was then as now a poly-glottal region and could easily have produced one hundred and twenty persons who, in the presence of a cosmopolitan assemblage, might express themselves in fifteen different tongues.

Since the variety of tongues is attributed to the group and not to individuals, particular disciples may not have used more than their native Aramaic, though it is difficult to picture any of them historically and socially without at least a smattering of other tongues. The linguistic conditions of the country were far more diverse than those of Switzerland today. The number of languages spoken equalled the number of those in which the *listeners were born*.”

The article from *The Catholic Encyclopedia* continues:

“**St. Paul’s Concept.** (Cor. XII-XIV) For the Biblical data thus far examined we are indebted to the bosom friend and companion of St. Paul — St. Luke. That being true, the views of St. Paul on supernatural glossolaly must have coincided with those of St. Luke. Now St. Paul had seen the gift conferred at Ephesus and St. Luke does not distinguish Ephesian glossolaly from that of Jerusalem. They must therefore have been alike and St. Paul seems to have had both in mind when he commanded the Corinthians (I, 14:37) to employ none but articulate and ‘plain speech’ in their use of the gift (9), and to refrain from such use in Church unless even the unlearned could grasp what was said (16). No tongue could be genuine ‘without the voice’

(Continued on Page 15)

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. —

*Letters To The Editor***Is There A New Liturgical Reform On The Way; SSPX Meeting In Rome**

“For The Time Being”

Editor, *The Catholic Voice*:

Over the summer, rumors seemed to abound regarding a possible “reform of the reform” was in the works by Benedict XVI. It is said that a report was sent from the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Sacraments outlining ways to promote a greater sense of the sacred in the liturgy, recover the use of the Latin language in celebrations, and reformulate parts of the missal to end abuses and experimentation. Do you know anything about this?

H.H.

Grand Rapids, MI

Editor's Note: We have heard these rumors as well. However, the last “official” words on this came from Fr. Ciro Benedettini on August 24, 2009. As deputy director of the Vatican press office he said that “for the time being there are no institutional proposals for a modification of the liturgical books used at present.” While not directly denying the truth of the rumors, he merely stated that “for the time being” it isn't true. Even if a reform of the Vatican II reforms do take place in regards to the liturgical rites, a total elimination of the doctrinal errors of the Modernists in favor of the traditional faith are here to stay.

**Rome Is Abuzz: Latin Mass And Anglican Overture**Editor, *The Catholic Voice*:

There certainly has been a lot of news coming from Rome these days! Witness the spur of the moment announcement of the celebration of a Latin Mass in St. Peter's Basilica itself. Then, an overture has been made by Benedict XVI toward the traditional Anglicans to find refuge in the Catholic Church as a means of uniting with the Church and also preserving their traditional rites. It sure seems that Rome is sending “traditional” signals these days.

J.D.

via Internet

Editor's Note: One would think that one event has nothing to do with another, save the use of the word “traditional” while reporting the stories. Yet, on further reflection, it seems they may not. The one common denominator in these events, and



The “extraordinary form” celebrated in Rome on October 18, 2009.

the timing of their announcements, seem to coincide with the meeting between members of the modern Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF) and representatives of the Society of St. Pius X (SSPX). On the one hand, the celebration of the Latin Mass in St. Peter's seems to indicate a growing sense of toleration for the Latin Mass (or, as the moderns say, the “extraordinary form”) while on the other, the acceptance of “traditional Anglicans” to come under the umbrella of the modern church and receive their own “ordinariate”: their own separate “rite” in which the Anglican liturgy and way of life could still be maintained while being “under Rome.” As to the former, we have long considered modern Rome's move to the Latin Mass as a smokescreen to keep people loyal to the modern church, the *Novus Ordo Missae* and the errors of Vatican II. The latter is more interesting. There are many issues at hand that need to be revealed before full judgment is made on the notion of providing a separate entity for more than 400,000 Anglicans worldwide who are seeking safe shelter from the liberalism of their own church. Despite the fact that Anglican Orders (since Pope Leo XIII) have been declared invalid (and nothing is being said in this announcement about rectifying this situation), a specific point has been addressed regarding married clergy. According to the announcement, married Anglican clergy can still exist within this new “rite,” giving rise to more complaints about a celibate clergy among the “Romans.” Indeed, a watchful eye is necessary on both of these fronts.

**SSPX And Negotiations In Rome**Editor, *The Catholic Voice*:

Do you have any thoughts about the proposed meeting between Bishop de Galarreta and members of SSPX with some counterparts of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith? Since these talks have to deal with the doctrinal acceptance of teachings resulting from Vatican II and the status of SSPX with Rome, can they hope to come to some agreements in a matter of two weeks?

R.T., *via Internet*

Editor's Note: It is hard to believe that the severe doctrinal questions concerning the errors of Vatican II, the modern liturgy, false ecumenism and the like can be solved in a short time unless some compromise is made. In an interview with *The Catholic World Report* (October, 2009), Bishop de Galarreta remarked about the upcoming meeting: “In the best case, humanly speaking, we have several years of discussion ahead of us,” adding that the SSPX has no intention of “converting Rome,” but leaving a matter of “reconversion to Tradition” to God and His grace. The bishop also stated that there would be “no negotiations about a canonical status for (SSPX) until doctrinal differences with Rome have been resolved.” This may be a long time, for it is obvious that modern Rome will not walk away from the “New Evangelization.” ✠

Want To Contact Us? Here's How:

By Letter:	P.O. Box 130, Mead WA 99021-0130 USA
By Fax:	(509) 489-4060
By email:	tradition@strc.org
	Web site: www.strc.org

The Pentecostal Movement Appeals To Those Who Desire Novelties

(Continued from Page 13)

and to use such a tongue would be the *act of a barbarian* (10, 11). For him the impulse to praise God in one or more strange tongues should proceed from the Holy Ghost. It was even then an inferior gift which he ranked next to last in a list of eight Charismata. It was a mere 'sign' and as such was intended not for believers but for unbelievers (22).

There is enough in St. Paul to show us that the Corinthian peculiarities were ignoble accretions and abuses. *They made of 'tongues' a source of schism in the Church and of scandal without* (14:23). The Charism had deteriorated into a mixture of *meaningless inarticulate gabble*, (9, 10) with an element of *uncertain sounds* (7, 8), which sometimes might be construed as *little short of blasphemous* (12:3). The Divine praises were recognized now and then, but the general effect was one of confusion and disedification for *the very unbelievers* for whom the normal gift was intended (14:22, 23, 26). The Corinthians, misled not by insincerity but by *simplicity and ignorance* (20), were actuated by an undisciplined religious spirit, or rather by frenzied emotions and not by the understanding or the Spirit of God (15). What today purports to be the 'gift of tongues' at certain Protestant revivals is a fair reproduction of Corinthian glossolaly, and shows the need there was in the primitive Church of the Apostles'



Counsel to do all things 'decently, and according to order' (40).

Faithful adherence to the text of Sacred Scripture makes it obligatory to *reject those opinions* which turn the Charism of tongues into little more than *infantile babbling, incoherent exclamations, pythonic utterance or prophetic demonstrations* of the archaic kind (see 1 Kings, XIX, 20, 24)."

(Continued in our next issue.)

Ecumenical Errors, Previously Condemned, Abound In The Modern Church

(Continued from Page 9)

past issues of *The Catholic Voice* on the grave errors of false ecumenism, demonstrating quite clearly that the ecumenical teachings of the post-Vatican II religion do not represent traditional Catholic teachings. In fact, they are a direct violation of them, most especially *Mortaliū Animōs* of Pope Pius XI. Please understand: the modern ecumenical movement was declared *anathema* — and a violation of Divine Faith — before Vatican II, while after that council this dogmatic teaching somehow radically changed so that what was directly forbidden as against faith is now allowed and encouraged as part of the "New Evangelization." Which teaching represents that of the True Church of Jesus Christ and the other that of an imposter? A recent case in point:

When Benedict XVI visited the Czech Republic in September of this year, he took part at an ecumenical meeting where he and Pavel Cerny, the chairman of the Czech Ecumenical Council of Churches, jointly recalled the person of John Huss as a 15th Century "church reformer." On the contrary, Catholic history regards John Huss as a public heretic whose teachings on *impanation* regarding the Holy Eucharist he defended to his death — a death that came with his burning at the stake at the Council of Constance on July 6, 1415. At what point can a Catholic refer to a public heretic as somehow "rehabilitated as a reformer" even though he never recanted his heresies?

Just what is the heresy of *impanation*? According to the Catholic Encyclopedia (1913), Impanation is "an heretical doctrine according to which Christ is in the Eucharist through His human body substantially united with the substances of bread

and wine, and that is really present as God made bread." This doctrine agrees in the main with that of *consubstantiation*, as was taught by Martin Luther in that it denies *transubstantiation* of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, and yet professes the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist. This is also the heresy of Berengarius, condemned as such in the eleventh century. Modern day Lutherans reject *impanation*.

As small as such an event may seem to be, the consequences of it are enormous. In one brief meeting, and with a few words of public praise, a man whose heresy struck at the very nature of the eucharistic Presence of Jesus Christ has now been swept away as an act of a "reformer." Such a radical compromise of Catholic doctrine cannot be defended, nor should we continue to look upon that church in which this compromise is promoted and applauded and the religion which safeguards the teachings of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church. Anyone who attends the ceremonies of this church runs the risk of imbibing its grave errors, all the while saying that "at least" the Mass is valid

But is it? The attempts of the USCCB to upgrade the Novus Ordo to make the vernacular liturgy a more accurate translation of the Latin version fail to address the very nature of the *Novus Ordo Missae* itself. The wholesale dismissal by the Modernist theologians and innovators of traditional sacramental doctrine in favor of their grievous errors cannot be viewed as magisterial teachings, at least those that a good Catholic should follow. Likewise, conservative authors attempting to present a traditional slant to their works must be careful not to minimize such traditions in favor of their acceptance of the modern church. When we worship, it is important to do so in spirit and in truth. ✚

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 and teachings, 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.

- St. Francis Xavier December 3
- Immaculate Conception December 8
- Our Lady of Loretto December 10
- Our Lady of Guadalupe December 12
- Ember Days of Advent December 17, 19 & 20
- Nativity of Our Lord Jesus Christ December 25
- St. John the Evangelist December 27
- Holy Innocents December 28
- Circumcision January 1
- Holy Name of Jesus January 3
- Epiphany of Jesus January 6
- Chair of Unity Octave January 18 - 25
- St. Agnes January 21
- Septuagesima Sunday January 31
- Purification BVM February 2
- Our Lady of Lourdes February 11
- Ash Wednesday February 17
- St. Matthias February 24
- St. Gabriel of Our Lady of Sorrows February 27
- Ember Days of Lent February 24, 26 & 27

TO:

FROM:
 The Society of Traditional Roman Catholics
 Post Office Box 130
 Mead, Washington 99021-0130
 USA
 25031109
Change Service Requested

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