

042 –B (21-03-1978) – The New Mass

I will continue the study of these few questions which have been submitted to me. We have not finished the answer to the question about assistance at Mass possibly during your vacations and on certain occasions, whether you are with your family or there are ceremonies that you are invited to. What should be done? **What should be our attitude in general towards these New Masses, even if it would be difficult to be able to assist at a Mass of Saint Pius V?**

I believe that we must be more and more severe. Why? Because as I have already told you many times, our attitude also conforms to the evolution which is little by little taking place in people's minds, and I would even say especially in the minds of priests by dint of living in an atmosphere of errors, in an atmosphere contrary to the Faith, intentions can change. The thoughts and judgments that priests can make about their own Masses can end up changing. And I believe that this is not at all illusory, even sometimes for priests who were very close to us, who loved Tradition, but who, by being in this atmosphere created by the liturgical reform, end up slowly but surely somehow losing the Faith, or at least changing their Faith on certain points of the Holy Mass, and this can in the long run influence their intention.

This is why I think that, given this increasingly serious and increasingly dangerous evolution, we must also avoid more and more, and I would almost say, in a radical way, any assistance at this New Mass.

It is obvious that if you are convinced that all these Masses are invalid, you should not go to them. That is clear. One do not go to an invalid Mass; it would be a sacrilege. But I do not personally believe that we can affirm this in an absolute manner. Even Father Guérard des Lauriers arrived at this conclusion after a long journey; but he is not absolutely certain of it. He still has some reservations because it is obvious that what is essential for the validity of the Mass is the required matter, the required form, and the intention.

As for the matter, we still can believe that it is really bread and wine that they are using as the matter of the Eucharist. Still, we have to see The wine, we can sometimes wonder what kind of wine is now taken by priests who no longer pay any attention to whether it is a natural wine, if it is a wine that does not have too much alcohol. For, finally, take your books on morals and see what is required for the matter of the Mass. There are still conditions in order to ensure that it is really natural wine and not fabricated wine.

Next, the form. Here, you know that it is always in the translations that one can hesitate on the form, because the form in Latin, as it was given by the reform, still bears the term *pro multis* for the form which is used for the consecration of the wine. But the translation in most languages is absolutely false since, whether it is in English, Italian, Spanish, or German, it is always *for all: pro omnibus* which is absolutely contrary to what the Church meant, and consequently, what Our Lord Himself meant when He pronounced these words. There is, I think, a page and a half which speaks of this in the Catechism of the Council of Trent in order to explain why, in the form, there is *pro multis* and not *pro omnibus*. The Catechism of the Council of Trent explains this perfectly because in reality, in the application of the Redemption, not everyone is saved. Not in the purpose of the Redemption. The purpose of the

Redemption is to save all men. But the real application of the Redemption, unfortunately, does not benefit all men, through the fault of men who do not want to receive the graces of the Redemption. This is why the term used means the application of the Redemption.

Does this change in the vernacular languages affect the validity of the form? There are books that were written on this, by Americans, by Germans, about this form in particular. A number of them conclude that it is invalid. However, if we study in theology books even what St. Thomas thinks of the form of the sacrament of the Eucharist, it seems that the most general opinion is that the essential words are these words: "*Hoc est Corpus meum, hic est calix Sanguinis mei, novi et aeterni et testament.*" I also think that the phrase, *Mysterium fidei*, which is perhaps a phrase that goes back even to Our Lord Himself ... It seems that these words go back at least to the time of the apostles. It is quite certain that during the forty days that Our Lord spent with the apostles after His resurrection, He must have certainly given them precise instructions – why not? – on the most important thing, on the essential thing of His redemption: His sacrifice, the sacrifice of Calvary. So would it be surprising that Our Lord spoke of it in a precise manner, bequeathing to the apostles the real form they were to use to realize again this sacrifice on our altars? Is this something unbelievable? When we say that it goes back to apostolic times, as the Council of Trent affirms, and as all the Fathers of the Church affirm, we can believe that they also received precise instructions from Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself. But this phrase of *Mysterium fidei* would nevertheless make one think that the Real Presence already exists before the end of the formula. Although, if a priest were to fall sick while pronouncing the words of the Consecration and stop in the middle of the Consecration, obviously the priest must continue the formula in order to ensure the Real Presence, but it is not certain if all the words are absolutely necessary for the Real Presence, because the fact that the priest already says *Mysterium fidei*, it seems that the mystery is then already realized at that moment. The priest exclaims before the mystery which is realized, the great mystery of our Faith. This is perhaps not a definitive argument, but anyway, it is nevertheless a fact that most theologians think that the Real Presence already exists at the first words of the consecration of the Precious Blood.

But the more one examine this liturgical reform, the more one wonder what may have been the intentions of the authors. What idea, what advantage did they think of acquiring by changing these words of the sacramental form which have been said for centuries and centuries by the Church? But what advantage, I ask you? Why remove *Mysterium fidei*, why change something in the form? Why add *quod pro vobis tradetur* in the form of the consecration of the bread? It is unbelievable ... except for ecumenical thoughts, because the Protestants say that, because the Protestants have suppressed *Mysterium fidei* and because the Protestants have added *quod pro vobis tradetur*, and the Protestants wanted to exactly reproduce the Last Supper, the Last Supper which for them was not a sacrifice. So our Last Supper, our Eucharist is not a sacrifice for them, for the Protestants. And that is why they wanted to reproduce the evangelical Last Supper which for us is a sacrifice. Never forget that the Council of Trent explicitly said: *If any one shall say that there was no sacrifice at the Last Supper when Our Lord Jesus Christ instituted the Eucharist, let him be anathema!* So Our Lord made a sacrifice at the Last Supper, a sacrifice which is obviously related to the Sacrifice that He will offer on the Cross, but it is a sacrifice. We, too, our sacrifice is made after, is related to the sacrifice of the Cross. The Last Supper was also a sacrifice made in relation to the sacrifice of the Cross which was accomplished afterwards.

So we don't see any other explanation. No matter how hard we look. Why did they change something? We don't see why. There are no possible explanations, except an ecumenical explanation, which brings us closer to the Protestants. I ask you: how is it possible to go and transform our Mass to make it similar to that of the Protestants who do not believe in the Sacrifice of the Mass, who added this precisely because they do not believe in the Sacrifice of the Mass? It is unheard of!

So of course we can ask these questions. These questions are not in vain. We can ask the question: is the form as it is said, at least in the vernacular languages, really valid? We can ask the question!

And finally, the intention. The intention of doing what the Church does. So there are some who say: - *What the Church does today is the New Mass*. Ah! But no ... what the Church does, and when we say the Church, it is the Church of All Time. The intention of the Church – even if we say what the Church does when we use the indicative, and not what the Church did, but *quod facit Ecclesia* – it is what the Church of All Time does, and therefore, since the Apostles. So we must have this intention of doing what the Church does, what She did, what She will do ... always, always the same thing.

So the intention must be based on what the Church has always wanted to do, so a true sacrifice, and not simply a commemoration and not simply a meal. Now it is quite certain that the young priests at present, in the manner in which they are taught, must not have the intention of doing what the Council of Trent does. Because, precisely, as they broke with the Council of Trent – given that the Council of Trent very clearly defined the Mass as a sacrifice, and defined the priesthood, which is not a priesthood of the faithful, in a very clear way – and so I think these young priests say: - *I want to say the New Mass and not the old!* So they make a rupture in the Church; they do not have the right. They do not have the right to break up the Church. There is not a Church of today and a Church of yesterday: there is the Church of All Time. This Church is only one Church; otherwise there would be a Church every day, at every moment then!

I think precisely that this intention may become that of the priests who constantly say the New Mass. I think that at the end of one or two years, when they have said this New Mass, in the end, they really have the impression of saying a new Mass and not the traditional Mass. They no longer have this conception of saying the traditional Mass. I think there are some, however, a number of them, but few, who belong to these associations, such as that of Canon Quata or others, who resist and who have an intention contrary to what they are doing. It is unbelievable. It is unheard of to do such a thing, but because they believe that they are obliged to take this new rite because of their bishops, they are afraid of being dismissed or any possible reasons they can imagine and which, in my opinion, are worth nothing... but anyway, the facts are there. And certainly a good number of these priests say: *I want to say the Mass of my ordination. I want to continue to have the intention that I always had during my priestly life and I want to, now, even with this rite, say the Mass of All Time*. So in such cases, it is possible that these Masses are valid. But this is not a reason, and it is very serious to put oneself in this danger, to risk little by little the faith in the Sacrifice of the Mass, and in any case, to make their faithful lose it also. It is unacceptable for a priest, when he realizes this. But little by little, it is a question of habit. One forms one's conscience and one no longer sees; one becomes blind.

This is why I think we must avoid going to these Masses. And even if we must be without Masses for a month, we are without Masses for a month. Parents are explaining to their children why they do not go to Mass and if they make a long journey to go to Mass once a month ... You know, in our missions we visited our faithful once every three months. Most of our faithful had Mass once every three months. In South America, I had the opportunity, as Superior General, to found a mission in Paraguay, in a little village called Lima; it is not the big city of Lima in Peru, but it is a little village. Incidentally, I received a letter from them four or five days ago, with all the stamps – the stamps of the president of the village, the president of this, the president of that; they all have magnificent stamps. And then it is signed, re-signed and countersigned to beg me: - *But you gave us priests in the past. We had a very good priest in the person of Father Tchang who is a Trinidadian and who did us a lot of good, who kept good traditions. He was taken away from us. He was sent back to Trinidad and now we have a priest who is demolishing our whole religion. So we learned that you are making priests according to Tradition. Send us a priest like Father Tchang who did us so much good in Paraguay! ...*

So, if there is one that is available! ...

But in those countries, when I arrived in Lima, they were visited once a year. And when I visited the Amazon where our Fathers had missions as well, some of these villages have only one visit every three years. Obviously it is not ideal, that is clear, but at least those people keep the Faith. They pray. On Sundays, they gather together: there is a catechist or a village chief, a president, who gathers them together – not like they do now to eliminate the priests, to remove the priests, to replace the priest by a layperson, but because there are no priests. So they pray; they sanctify Sunday. The priests give them prayers that they must recite, the Gospel that they read and recite. They get together, they pray, they sing, and they make a spiritual communion. They think of the Masses which are celebrated far away from them, but which are celebrated in the world. So this is a different thing than what they are doing now, to practically remove all the priests and replace them with laypeople because they no longer believe in the Mass. That is completely different.

So one can keep the Faith without going to Mass every Sunday, rather than going to a Mass which is more or less poisoned, which makes one risk losing the Faith.

But I think, however, since I do not believe, once again, that all these Masses are invalid, that on certain occasions, for the death of a close relative – in such a case, one does not go for the Mass, but one goes by filial piety, for example for one's parents, one's father, one's mother, one's brother, one's sister ... like one can possibly go to an Orthodox burial, like an Orthodox can come to assist also at our ceremonies, for extraordinary events.

But I think that we must be more and more severe and more and more radical on this subject because the Masses are always deteriorating a little; the Faith diminishes. And consequently, one is more and more likely to find oneself in front of a Mass which is not valid. So, to go to a doubtful Mass ...

I am not telling you, either, when you enter a Church – I suppose you visit the Church; you see the sanctuary lamp; you wonder if the Blessed Sacrament is present. You ask yourself: - *Am I going to make a genuflection, because I do not know who said the Mass. Is it valid or not? ...* I believe that we can

always make a genuflection, while saying: - *My God, if You are present, I adore You*. Rather than manifesting publicly, while saying: - *No, I am making a genuflection because the Blessed Sacrament is certainly not there!* If you are certain that the Blessed Sacrament is not there, you are not obliged to make a genuflection. But I think that if there is a doubt, it would be better, anyway, to make a genuflection, thinking that you are adoring Our Lord there, where He is present, and that if He is present, at least there is someone who adores Him, since they no longer adore Him now. They put Him aside and they no longer make gestures of adoration! So I think it would be better in such cases not to show, even to people who are there, a kind of attitude that may not be understood either!

So you see, I think that the intention of the priest at Mass can be affected by a bad habit.