

NOM - An Ecumenical Rite

How is the NOM Ecumenical?

If we understand what ecumenism is and what is meant by the “rite” of the Mass, we will clearly see that the NOM is an ecumenical rite.

In fact, we will see that the NOM is the incarnation of the new ecumenical theology as was stated in the Ottaviani intervention “the Novus Ordo Mass represents, overall and in its details, a striking departure from the Catholic theology of the Mass as it was elaborated in Session XXII of the Council of Trent, which, by permanently fixing the “canons” of the rite, erected an insurmountable barrier against any heresy which could undermine the integrity of the Mystery...”

We will treat ecumenism in more detail later but can you give a quick summary?

Ecumenism was condemned by Pius XI in his encyclical *Mortalium Animos* 1928 and can be summarized as “unity without truth”. The idea is that we will only discuss the things that unite us and ignore the things that divide us. If the doctrine of Christ or Christ himself divides us, we just leave Him and His doctrine out of the discussion. We must leave behind the sign of contradiction, if He contradicts us.

This reached its peak at Assisi in 1986 when Buddha was put on the tabernacle and crucifix removed from the monastery so as not to offend the false religions.

This Spirit of Ecumenism has an influence on the NOM?

Yes, and this by admission of Msgr. Bugnini, the principal author of the Mass of Paul VI, who stated that it was his intention in changing the liturgy “*The prayer of the Church should not be a cause of spiritual discomfort for anyone...(it is necessary) to push aside any stone that could constitute even a shadow of risk of stumbling or of displeasure for our separated brethren*”¹.

The intention is clearly Ecumenical. Everything which is specifically and unambiguously Catholic and as such offends the Protestant or Orthodox is to be removed from the Catholic Mass. Let just keep the elements which don't offend “our separated brethren” In fact, the NOM prepared the way for Assisi.

¹ *L'Observatore Romano*, March 19, 1965. Fr. Bugnini at the time served as secretary of the Consilium.

How can you remove specifically Catholics elements from the Mass without invalidating the Mass?

To understand this we must make a distinction between the essence of the Mass, which comes from God, and can never change, and the ritual which surrounds this Sacred Act of Christ.

So, there is a Divine and Human Element in the Mass?

The Divine element given by Christ which can never change is the double consecration of valid matter (bread and wine) by means of a valid priest using a valid Form with the intention of doing a Sacred Act. At that moment, we have transubstantiation and the blood of Christ is Sacramentally separated from his body and all the drama of Calvary is made present and applied to the living and the dead.

The human element is the Rite which surround and protects this Sacred Act– We speak of all the prescribed forms of prayer and actions, which (in the Mass) surround the Sacrifice and Sacrament. These human elements must make explicit what God has given in the divine elements. The Rite must also be worthy of the most sacred act of the consecration and it must dispose the priest to properly offer this most august mystery and must dispose the faithful to properly assist at and profit from this great mystery. The law of prayer of correspond to and supports the law of belief.

When did the Traditional Rite develop?

Bl. John-Henry Cardinal Newman remarks, the Traditional Latin Mass is "virtually unchanged since the third century."¹ There were a few minor modifications by Gregory the Great (6th C) Finally codified it was by St. Pius V –

Why did Pope. St. Pius V Codify the Mass?

He codified it since it is a perfect expression of Divine elements, a perfect protection against heresy, especially Protestantism. Pius V recognized that the best way to protect the Catholic Faith of people was through a unified Roman rite which expressed and transmits that Faith to the people who attended it. This Mass had nourished centuries of saints and gave strength to countless martyrs and he knew it was of utmost importance to leave this to the Church.

Seem very rash to change this ancient Rite?

The innovators also knew that if they were to change the Faith in the majority of the faithful they would have to do it through the liturgy. Most people were not reading the documents of Vatican and relatively few Catholics were aware of the prayer meeting at

Assisi, but all good Catholics were attending Mass on a weekly (if not daily basis) so the best way to bring the errors of Vatican II to the people, was through a new Liturgy.

What are the chief doctrines protected by Roman Rite which are undermined by the NOM?

In first place we will define the Mass for what it is: It is the Sacrifice of Christ. From this reality flows three chief Catholic Truths defined by Trent and transmitted by the Roman Rite, which are undermined by the NOM of Paul VI

- 1) That the Mass is a true propitiatory Sacrifice. It satisfies for sin and makes us pleasing to God.
- 2) A sacrificing priesthood. The priest stands in the person of Christ. The priest is truly a mediator who stands between God and man. He is not only a president of the assembly.
- 3) In the Mass, TRANSUBSTANTIATION takes place, and therefore Christ is really present on the altar² – the word “transubstantiation” has been canonized, such that the process by which Christ becomes present cannot be called by any other name.

How are these truths undermined by NOM?

The most obvious attack on these truths is the removal from the new Mass the traditional offertory, replacing it with a Jewish table blessing:

The traditional offertory really expresses the propitiatory nature of the Mass which is offered by a ministerial priest for the glory of God and reparation of sin.

Can we look at these words of the offertory.

OFFERING THE HOST:

“Receive, O Holy father, Almighty and Eternal God, this spotless victim (transubstantiation, true sacrifice – what is offered = Christ), which I (sacrificing priest – one who offers the sacrifice), Your unworthy servant, offer to You, my living and true God (to whom the sacrifice is offered), to atone for my numberless sins (propitiatory sacrifice), offenses, and negligences; on behalf of all here present (mediation of the priest) and likewise for all faithful Christians living and dead (purgatory exist and souls there are helped by our prayers), that it may profit me and them as a means of salvation to life everlasting (to save souls by remitting their sins)...

² “First, the Council teaches, and openly and absolutely confesses, that in the august sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, Our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true man, is present really and substantially under the sensible appearances of bread and wine after their consecration” (Denzinger, 1965 ed., no. 1636; Dumeige, 1969 ed., p. 405).

OFFERING THE WINE:

We offer unto Thee, O Lord, the chalice of salvation, entreating Thy **mercy (propitiation again)** that our offering may ascend with a sweet fragrance (**language of sacrifice consistently in OT**) in the sight of **Thy Divine Majesty**, for our own salvation, and for that of the whole world. Amen.

- We see that the whole Catholic doctrine of the Mass is expressed in the double offertory. This offertory is crucial in determining the intention of the priest to offer a true sacrifice.

How does the New offertory read?

Priest: Blessed are you, Lord, God of all creation. Through your goodness we have this bread to offer, which earth has given and human hands have made. It will become for us the bread of life.

All: Blessed be God for ever.

Priest: Blessed are you, Lord, God of all creation. Through your goodness we have this wine to offer, fruit of the vine and work of human hands. It will become our spiritual drink.

All: Blessed be God for ever.

The Ottaviani intervention clearly points out the deficiency:

“However, the Novus Ordo Mass distorts and degrades the Offertory, making it into a kind of exchange of gifts between man and God; man brings the bread, and God turns it into the bread of life; man brings the wine, and God turns it into a spiritual drink... It is needless to point out the absolute ambiguity of the two formulas “bread of life” (*panis vitae*) and “spiritual drink” (*potus spiritualis*), which could mean anything³.”

This new offertory undermines the faith and the intention of the priest and the Faith of the people.

How else is the “sacrificing priesthood” undermined by the NOM?

In The document of Vatican II on the liturgy and in general instruction and the New Mass, there is a deliberate blurring of priesthood of priest and ‘priesthood’ of the people.

Examples?

- The sacrifice is *always* described as an act of both the priest and the faithful;
- The priest is described in the prayers of the New Mass and the General Instruction as the “president” of the congregation (13 times in the *General Instruction*) and never in terms of the power that he alone possesses to act *in persona Christi*, consecrating and making the sacrificial offering;
- The Confiteor at the beginning of the new Mass is now collective and the absolution recited by the priest has been suppressed;

³ *The Ottaviani Intervention*, Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani, Antonio Cardinal Bacci, A Group of Roman Theologians

- Much of what the priest did exclusively and alone is now delegated to faithful in the name of active participation: reading (a function of the *ecclesia docens*,) distributing Holy Communion, etc.;
- The distinction between the priest's communion and that of the faithful has been suppressed.
 - But the priest's communion is an essential part of the Sacrifice, whereas that of the faithful is completely unnecessary. Moreover, in Traditional Theology, "The intimate union of the priest with the sacrificial victim in a way that is specific to the sacramental order expresses that the Priest and the Victim are the same; this is unique to the Sacrifice of Christ and, manifested sacramentally, it shows that the Sacrifice of the Cross and the Sacrifice of the Mass are substantially the same." (OI p. 31)
- The instrumentality of the priest was made very clear in the Traditional Missal, since the ancient formula of Consecration was a proper *sacramental* formula, which is *declarative* and not *narrative* in tone. It made it clear that the priest was performing a sacred action not recounting a narrative as a memorial of a former event⁴.
 - The punctuation and typeface differentiate the sacramental words of Consecration in the Roman Missal of St. Pius V. The HOC EST ENIM is in effect separated by a period from the preceding line, "take and eat ye all of this (manducate ex hoc omnes)." This period marks the passage from the narrative to the declarative which is proper to the sacramental act.
 - The words of Consecration in the Roman Missal are printed in capital letters in the center of the page and often with a distinct color. All of this shows that these words are unique and independent from the rest, and it is clear that they effect the sacramental change by the agency of the priest alone.
 - In the Novus Ordo Mass, the narrative form (no longer the sacramental form) is explicitly proposed in the description of the "Eucharistic prayer" with the term "institution narrative" (no. 55).
 - The consequence of this is in effect a change of the specific meaning of the Consecration. In the Novus Ordo Mass, the formulas of Consecration will now be pronounced by the priest as an historical narrative, and no longer pronounced as affirming a categorical and declarative Judgment uttered by Him in whose Person he acts

How is belief in transubstantiation undermined?

The following is a sampling of the elements contributing to this denial.

- Elimination of all but three genuflections (fourteen in the Tridentine Mass);
- Elimination of the purification of the priest's fingers over the chalice;
- The preservation of the priest's fingers from all profane contact after the Consecration;
- No purification of any kind required if a host is dropped – The former procedures used if a consecrated Host should fall, "It is reverently picked up" (GIRM 239);
- Communion may be received standing;
- Sacred vessels need no longer be gilded on the inside;
 - The Pall that the Traditional Mass required to protect the chalice is no longer obligatory;
 - The purification of the sacred vessels, which can be done later and not upon the corporal;
 - The three altar cloths, reduced to just one;
- Emphasis is placed on a spiritual presence of Christ within the assembly either through the

⁴ Cf. The Ottaviani Intervention, pp. 26-27.

reading of the word of God or by the gathering of the people itself⁵

- Immediately after Consecration, the people acclaim that they *await* the coming of the Lord
- There remains only one sign of the cross over the Victim (a gesture meant to identify the oblations with Our Lord) – in the Tridentine Mass, there are three in the Offertory, 26 in the Canon, three before Communion and one when receiving;

- Note especially one change which undermines both the real presence and the efficient causality of the mediating priest in confecting the sacrament: namely the **Suppression of the 1st genuflection after each consecration.**
- TLM = priest consecrates, adores, then makes the elevation
- NOM = priest says the ‘words of institution’ (now a narrative in form, to be closer to scripture): does not genuflect, makes the elevation, *then* he genuflects.
- This opens the door to the error that it is the faith of the assembly – rather than the power of the priest – which renders Jesus somehow “present”. This change is very significant. It opens the door to Eucharistic theories besides Transubstantiation.
- It could be thought to imply that it is not the priest alone who confect the sacrament, but priest with people. He says his part, then shows them: they believe and then he genuflects. It implies that their faith is somehow necessary before Christ is sacramentally present.
- It is a sort of subjectivism very dangerous to Catholic doctrine, and very in tune with the subjectivism of the modern world: I believe Him to be present, so He is present *to me*.

Is the word Transubstantiation used in the General instruction of NOM?

- In the entire original *General Instruction*, the word “Transubstantiation” is never used.

You said the original General instruction. Was it edited?

Yes, the absence of the words *Transubstantiation* and *propitiation* caused such an outcry and they were added to the *General Instruction* afterward. But the rite of the Mass itself which was built on the original the *General Instruction* was not changed at all.

In regards to the outcry against the first edition of the General Instruction in 1969, the definition given by the GI was also modified due to the outcry. The definition given In Article 7 of the General Instruction, which precedes the *New Order of Mass*.

“The Lord’s Supper or Mass is the sacred assembly or congregation of the people of God gathering together, with a priest presiding, to celebrate the memorial of the Lord (2). For this reason Christ’s promise applies supremely to a local gathering together of the Church: “Where two or three come together in my name, there am I in their midst.” (Mt. 18:20)

This is very different from the perennial definition that the MASS is the Sacrifice of the Cross.

⁵ For example, the General Instruction (n.280) states, “Then through his greeting the priest declares to the assembled community that the Lord is present. This greeting and response express the mystery of the gathered Church.”

The definition of the Mass is thus reduced to a “supper,” a term which the General Instruction constantly repeats. The Instruction further characterizes this “supper” as an assembly, presided over by a priest and held as a memorial of the Lord to recall what He did on Holy Thursday.

This definition seems very Protestant?

This original definition of the Mass given in the general instruction does not at all imply:

- the Real Presence
- the reality of the Sacrifice
- the sacramental function of the priest who consecrates

After seeing all these we see why the Ottaviani intervention stated that the Denial of the Real Presence is “both tacit and systematic”: The Ottaviani Intervention p. 40

In looking that these grave deficiencies, it is hard to believe that this new rite was written by Catholics?

Monsignor Bugnini, who was its architect was certainly a modernist, and in addition the implementation of the Liturgical Constitution was entrusted to a *Consilium* (Commission) which included six Protestant advisers⁶.

Were they merely observers?

Msgr. William Baum, Executive Director for ecumenical affairs of the American episcopal conference explained:

“They are not simply there as observers, but as consultants as well, and they participate fully in the discussions on Catholic liturgical renewal. It wouldn’t mean much if they just listened, but they contributed⁷.”

Msgr. Boudon gives a similar testimony:

⁶ *La Documentation Catholique*... names the six as Dr. George, Can-on Jasper, Dr. Shepherd, Dr. Kunne, Dr. Smith, and Brother Max Thurian, and affirms that they are there as “representing respectively the World Council of Churches, the Anglican and Lutheran communions, and the Taizé community.” Cf. *Davies, Pope Paul’s New Mass p. 277*

⁷ The Detroit News, June 27, 1967. Cited in TMOAT p. 227

"We had the pleasure of benefitting, as during the previous session in October 1966, from the active presence of observers delegated by the other Christian Churches. Taking part in our work, they were able to contribute the testimony of their own research and to compare this with our own. The liturgical reform was elaborated in a climate of ecumenism eminently profitable for everyone and, in the long run, for the unity of the Church⁸"

Michael Davies writes: "The Protestant observers were able not only to use their influence during preparatory work, but were allowed to attend the Plenary Sessions and, on at least one occasion, were actually permitted to speak during a Plenary Session—a revelation which, had it not been made by Fr. Anthony Boylan⁹, the Secretary of the Liturgical Commission of England and Wales, would almost defy belief¹⁰."

So the new Mass was influenced by Protestants. What are some obvious Protestant elements in NOM?

The observer would have noted the following:

1. *The Catholic Mass*—Latin. *Protestant Communion Service*—vernacular.
2. *Catholic*—much of the liturgy inaudible. *Protestant*—the entire service audible.
3. *Catholic*—no lay readers. *Protestant*—lay readers used.
4. *Catholic*—clearly performing solemn rites upon an altar facing the east. *Protestant*—a meal served upon a table often facing the congregation.
5. *Catholic*—the people receive Holy Communion kneeling and on the tongue. *Protestant*—Communion is taken in the hand while standing.

This Mass must have pleased the Protestants?

Yes, the Protestants rejoiced in this NOM:

"If one takes account of the decisive evolution in the Eucharistic liturgy of the Catholic Church, of the option of substituting other Eucharistic prayers for the Canon of the Mass, of the erasing of the idea that the Mass is a sacrifice, and of the possibility of receiving Communion under both kinds, then there is no further justification for the Reformed Churches' forbidding their members to assist at the Eucharist in a Catholic Church." Roger Mehl (Protestant Theologian)¹¹

Max Thurian of the Protestant Taizé community has stated that one of the fruits of the new Mass will probably be "That Non-Catholic communities will be able to celebrate the Lord's Supper with the same prayers as the Catholic Church: theologically it is possible¹²."

Brother Roger Schutz, The prior of Taizé, said: "The new Eucharistic prayers have a structure

⁸ ("The Eighth Session of the *Consilium* on Liturgy" [French], *Documentation Catholique*, No. 1494, May 21, 1967, col.957). Cited in TMOAT p. 227, footnote 162

⁹ *The Catholic Fireside*, 8 June 1973

¹⁰ *Pope Paul's New Mass*, p. 281

¹¹ *Le Monde*, 10 September 1970 cited in *Pope Paul's New Mass* p. 269

¹² "que des communautés non catholiques pourront célébrer la Sainte Cène avec les mêmes prières que l'Église catholique: théologiquement c'est possible." *Iota Unum* p. 651

corresponding to that of the Lutheran Mass¹³.”

How did this reaction differ from the reaction of Luther to the Catholic Mass?

LUTHER'S ASSESSMENT OF THE MASS

1. Against the Propitiatory Sacrifice?

- On the Offertory, Luther wrote: “Then follows that abomination which is called the Offertory, where everything in it expresses oblation.”
- On the Canon of the Mass: “This abominable Canon is a collection of muddled lacunas; ... it makes the Mass a sacrifice; offertories are added. The mass is not a sacrifice or the action of one who sacrifices. We see it as a sacrament or a testament. Let us call it a blessing, the eucharist, the table of the Lord or the memorial of the Lord.”
- “Christ has been offered only once; what is offered for us each day is less an offering than a memorial of this offering¹⁴.”

2. Against the Sacrificing Priesthood¹⁵?

Luther wrote: “All of us alike are priests, and we all have the same authority in regard to the word and the sacraments, although no one has the right to administer them without the consent of the members of his church, or by the call of the majority (because when something is common to all, no single person is empowered to arrogate it to himself but should await the call of the Church)¹⁶.”

3. Against Transubstantiation¹⁷ ?

Luther wrote: “It is not the doctrine of transubstantiation which is to be believed, but simply that Christ really is present at the Eucharist”¹⁸

¹³ “Les nouvelles prières eucharistiques présentent une structure qui correspond à la Messe luthérienne.” Itinéraires, No.218 December 1977, p.116. [Iota Unum p. 651 footnote 113](#)

¹⁴ *Werke*, LVII, p. 217.

¹⁵ “All the Protestants, Luther included, taught that ordination is no more than the public authorization to undertake the office of minister. There is no difference in essence between a man who is ordained and one who is not; ordination confers no powers not possessed before; there is no question of an indelible priestly character... See *The Order of Melchisedech* Chapter II, for a detailed examination of the Protestant concept of the ministry.) [Pope Paul's New Mass 491-2](#)

¹⁶ *Pagan Servitude of the Church*, cited in LPE, p.22.

¹⁷ “The Protestant Reformers denied that the Eucharistic consecration changes the bread and wine in any way at all beyond giving them a new signification, *i.e.*, they become symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ. Christ is in heaven and nowhere else, they taught, and to offer adoration to the bread and wine (“bread-worship”) constitutes idolatry... An exception to this consensus is found in the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation which teaches that Christ is present together with the bread and wine.” [Pope Paul's New Mass 490](#)

¹⁸ McGrath, A. 1998. *Historical Theology, An Introduction to the History of Christian Thought*. Blackwell Publishers: Oxford. p. 198. 7

“When the Mass will be turned on its head, we will have turned the papacy on its head! Because it is upon the Mass, like a rock, that the papacy is completely supported, with its monasteries, bishoprics, colleges, altars, ministries and doctrine... All this will tumble down when this sacrilegious and abominable Mass tumbles¹⁹.”

We see here how the NOM is perfect in line with Luther’s understanding and has been the vehicle to protestantize and corrupt the minds of countless Catholics

Any final advice or words of hope?

Once ones realized how defective and Protestant the new Mass is one must seek the Mass of all time and attend it with devotion so that the Traditional Mass can transmit to us the Faith with all its fulness

We will refer to the Archbishop from his sermon at Lille where he stated that it was in the pagan missions of Africa that he started to really see the power of the Mass.

“I saw it in those pagan souls transformed by the grace of baptism, transformed by assistance at Holy Mass, and by the Holy Eucharist. These souls understood the mystery of the Sacrifice of the Cross and united themselves to Our Lord Jesus Christ in the sufferings of His Cross, offering their sacrifices and their sufferings with Our Lord Jesus Christ, and living as Christians.

He continues to show how this Tridentine Mass converted the world and made saints and that it will continue to covert soul and make saints the end of time.

And I say to you as well: for the glory of the Most Blessed Trinity, for the love of Our Lord Jesus Christ, for the devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary, for the love of the Church, for the love of the pope, for the love of bishops, of priests, of all the faithful, for the salvation of the world, for the salvation of souls, keep this testament of Our Lord Jesus Christ! Keep the Sacrifice of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Keep the Mass of All Time!

And you will see civilization reflowerish, a civilization which is not of this world, but a civilization which leads to the Catholic City, which is heaven.

¹⁹ Citation needed