

UNIT 7B – THE NEW MASS AND THE NEW THEOLOGY

1. WHAT IS THE NEW THEOLOGY

The New Mass, an expression of Neo-Modernism

A. The New Mass and Ecumenism

This is, in a way, the most obvious connection with Neo-Modernism... but not the most profound. People often describe the New Mass as “Protestant.” But it would be better to say that it is Neo-Modernist and therefore it is ecumenical and therefore it is designed to look Protestant.

UNIT 7B TABLE OF CONTENTS:

1. What is the New Theology?
2. Condemnation of the New Theology in General
3. Classic Theology of Sin, New Theology of Sin
4. Liturgical Consequences of the New Theology of Sin and the Redemption
5. Other Problems: The Paschal Mystery
6. Theological Assessment of the New Mass Under the New Theology

1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND: THE DERAILED LITURGICAL MOVEMENT

In order to understand the New Mass, incarnation and vehicle of Neo-Modernism, we must step back and consider *very briefly* the Liturgical Movement – an intellectual and pastoral movement focused on liturgy. See *The Liturgical Movement*, Fr. Didier Bonnetterre, SSPX.

1. STAGE 1: ORIGIN – ST. PIUS X

DOM PROSPER GUERANGER (1805-1875)

- Secular priest turned Benedictine. He founds the Abbey of Solemses in 1833, the re-introduction of the Benedictine order into France.
- Bull of erection gives Solemses the mission to “restore the traditions of the sacred liturgy.”
- He supports Roman liturgy over multiplicity of Gallican rites practiced in France as a way to unite France closer to Rome.
- His principles for the liturgical movement.
 - The liturgy is the center of spiritual life (summary of doctrine and vehicle of grace).
 - The liturgy is the prayer of the Church – public and sacred by nature (therefore, liturgical texts are sacred whether Scriptural or not).
 - Importance of Tradition – *lex orandi, lex credendi* in the Church. Liturgies are not to be invented but **nor** should we simply go back to its earliest forms. He sees a kind of divine inspiration in the liturgy as the fruit of Tradition which is protected and explained under the influence of the Holy Ghost.

- The Roman liturgy is has special role in preserving doctrinal purity and ecclesiastical unity (although he does not despise other liturgies).
- Educational value of liturgy – real but secondary. Liturgy is firstly about the worship of God, but as a sacred incarnation of doctrine, it has educational value. The faithful should be taught to understand and appreciate liturgy. **It is primarily this principle which will be twisted by the Modernist Liturgical Movement.**

ST. PIUS X (the pope of the Liturgical Movement)

- Taught liturgy as Seminary professor.
- His *Motu Proprio* (his first papal document, 1903) on sacred music gives preference to Gregorian chant and condemns secular/operatic influences in Church music.
- He commands Solemses to publish the Liber.
- Permits daily Communion (1905) and reception by all over age of reason (1910).
- His catechism is the first to contain questions about liturgy.
- He reformed the breviary to make certain that all 150 psalms were being prayed most weeks (by not recited Sunday psalms on every feast day).

STAGE 2: MODERNISM SEIZES THE REINS

From our discussion of Vatican II, it is obvious that modernist influence was entrenched in the Liturgical Movement by 1960. How did this happen? The timing provides some clue... the de-railing of the Liturgical Movement occurs between the two World Wars i.e. immediately after the pontificate of Pius X.

A. Modernists were able to safely “hide” in this field of study.

- For most theologians and bishops, liturgy = rubrics.
- Liturgy was not dogma, philosophy, Church History, or Scripture. Anti-Modernist surveillance was loose in this area.

B. Modernists were attracted to this field of study.

- Liturgy is *symbolic action*. This means it can be easily associated with two fundamental concepts of Modernism.
 - Symbolism. Modernists naturally attracted to a symbol-based field of study because symbolism is their optic for studying everything.
 - Experience. The liturgy is an action performed by people which is meant to make an impression. To some extent, it is experience-based prayer.
- As Modernism assimilates Existentialism, liturgy becomes seen not only a convenient tool for changing Catholicism, but as the intrinsically best-suited tool. If religion (and indeed everything) is based on one's meaningful encounter with existing reality, then the way to reform religion is at its foundations, in daily encounters with religious realities – liturgy.

- Historical liturgical texts (especially ancient texts) provide a new and unwatched playground for using the historical-critical method.¹
- Liturgy, firstly being an activity and not a Creed, could serve as a tool of ecumenism by dodging direct discussion of doctrinal differences e.g. “Let us emphasize the common roots of our liturgy or seek to bring our liturgy in closer harmony.”

Note in passing:

- a) The desire to return to the primitive forms of liturgy mirrors the Neo-Modernist desire to “return to the sources of theology” in order to avoid doctrinal precision.
- b) These theories are actually opposed to each other.
 - To go back to the earliest forms of liturgy should prevent liturgy from adapting to modern needs.
 - But because the two principles are opposites, they can be used to justify anything e.g. celebrating Mass on a table is justified by reference to early forms but allowing women to read in Church (strictly forbidden in the early Church) is justified by adaptation to modern pastoral needs.

The two most important Modernist liturgists during the era just before the Council (the Rahner and de Lubac) of Neo-Modernist Liturgy were:

- **Fr. Josef Jungmann S.J. (1889-1975)**
 - *The Mass of the Roman Rite, Its Origin and Development* (1948), massive scholarly work of 1,000 pages. It provides a scholarly justification for the principles of liturgical reform.
 - Corruption theory.
 - The golden age of liturgy is pre-Constantinian. It was corporate worship with the faithful playing a very active role in the sacrifice.
 - Combat against the Arian heresy caused an exaggerated emphasis on the Real Presence to the exclusion of other applications of “sacrament.”²
 - Essentially pastoral nature of liturgy.
 - Care of the people is the lens through which one must examine the history of liturgy and the only standard by which reform must be judged.
 - “(Pastoral) care was decisive in the shaping of public worship. It accounts for everything... liturgy would lead the faithful to full consciousness of their Christianity.” (*Work of Human Hands*, p.29)
 - In practice, this “pastorality” will degenerate into liturgy as pedagogy (the twisting of the final principle of Dom Gueranger).

¹ This method (already mentioned last semester) is one which does not take writings at face value i.e. expressing the Tradition of the Church or relating an actual historical event but explains them in light of literary forms or some sort of a contemporary cultural or intellectual bias.

² The measure in which the sacramental Presence becomes central, is also the measure in which truly sacramental thinking fades out,” *Pastoral Liturgy*, n.88 (Quoted in *Work of Human Hands*, p.27)

- **Fr. Louis Bouyer S.J. (1913-2003)**

- *Liturgical Piety*, (1954), not as scholarly as Jungmann's book, but continues the development of the theories behind the liturgical reform. Criticism of medieval liturgy, Thomism and of Dom Guéranger much more explicit.

Note that Bouyer was a convert from Protestantism. In his search for the correct notion of liturgy, he turns to the Jewish “Qahal” or assembly. For him, the Christian liturgy evolved from the Jewish brotherly meal assembly. Where does he get such a notion? From Protestant liturgical writers.

Therefore:

- The core of the Christian liturgy is the *synaxis* of assembly. They gather to become the People of God. *“The Mass... was the People of God in the process of making itself.”*
 - They become the People of God by:
 - Hearing the word of God.
 - By sharing a brotherly meal.
 - By jointly remembering (Memorial) and thanking God (Thanksgiving) for all the wonderful works He has done for them.

The emphasis on the Real Presence has obscured these important essential elements.

B. The Theology of the Paschal Mystery: a new Theology of Sin and Redemption

“Paschal Mystery” Theology is from Dom Odo Casel OSB (1886-1948) Maria Laach. New Theory of the Saving actions of Christ (Paschal Mystery) and the Mode of their Presence in the liturgy.

Several liturgists on the *Consilium* credit Casel for freeing us from the notions of sacrifice held in common by Theologians since Trent.

“The first principle (behind the reform of the liturgy) is the 'actualization' of the Paschal mystery of Christ in the Church's liturgy.” – Pope John Paul II³

The Declaration *Inter Oecumenici* states in fact that:

“First of all, however, it is essential that everybody be persuaded that the scope of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy is not limited merely to the changing of liturgical rites and texts. Rather its aim is to foster the formation of the faithful and that pastoral activity of which the liturgy is the summit and the source (see Const. Art. 10). The changes in the liturgy which have already been introduced, or which will be introduced later, have this same end in view. The thrust of pastoral activity which is centered on the liturgy is to give expression to the Paschal Mystery in people's lives”⁴.

“In the 1969 General Instruction on the Missal, an ecumenically-oriented sacramental theology for the celebration of Mass emerged – a theology already self-evident in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (§47) and in [Paul VI's] 1967 instruction on the Eucharist. Despite the new 1970 edition

³ *Vicesimus Quintus Annus*, December 4, 1988

⁴ *Inter Oecumenici*, Sept. 26, 1964, Nos. 5 and 6.

forced by reactionary attacks – but which avoided the worst, thanks to the cleverness of the revisers – it leads us ... out of the dead end of the post Tridentine theories of sacrifice (**in line with the theories of Odo Casel**) and corresponds to the agreement marked out in many of last year's interconfessional documents⁵

The Mass is the continuation of Christ's redemptive work.

- It is completely logical, therefore, that the cause underlying drastic changes in the Mass should be a drastic change in the notion of Redemption.
- Since the traditional notion of Redemption is the “buying back” i.e. paying a debt caused by sin, a new theology of Redemption must involve a new theology of sin.

New Theology of Redemption = the **Paschal Mystery**.

“The Paschal Mystery is Christ at the summit of the revelation of the inscrutable mystery of God” – JP II.

Why a New Theology of the Redemption?

The idea of “redemption” is too negative for modern man:

- Redemption emphasized
 - satisfaction of God's justice
 - man's co-operation in his own salvation
 - pains of Christ's passion
 - Propitiatory Sacrifice (Trent!)

Promoters of the Paschal mystery argue that the traditional way of looking at Redemption raises insoluble problems for modern man.

“Redemption takes the form of a problem to be solved....How can an infinite offense be atoned for? How can one person make up for all? How can somebody who is innocent pay for somebody who is guilty? It is unfortunate that these are the terms in which Redemption is presented to many of our contemporaries.

Some are scandalized in their sense of justice, and think that such a Redemption is an unanswerable objection to the goodness of God. If God were truly Father, would He be so exacting in His accounts, and would He take out His anger on His beloved Son? In the theology of the Paschal mystery, one does not meet with such pitfalls. Our salvation now appears to be wrought by a vital, free, and purely voluntary initiative coming entirely from God's merciful love.” (Aimon-Marie Roguet – a member of the **Consilium** that made the NOM)

Traditional theology solves all of these objections, but these progressive theologians preferred to avoid them altogether by changing the very notion of Redemption itself.

A novelty?

The Proponents of the New Theology claim the Theology of the Paschal Mystery is not an innovation:

⁵ E. J. Lengeling (Member of the Consilium) “Tradition und Fortschritt in der Liturgie” *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 25 (1975), 218-9; cited in *The Work of Human Hands*, Cecaka, Anthony, pp. 156-157.

“What we call Paschal mystery, classic theology called the dogma of the Redemption. It is easy to see how Redemption and Paschal mystery coincide ***broadly speaking.***” Aimon-Marie Roguet – a member of the *Consilium* that made the NOM

2. CONDEMNATION OF THE NEW THEOLOGY IN GENERAL

Pius XII had already warned about “rethinking” dogmas in this way (*Humani Generis*⁶, 1950)

“14. In theology some want to reduce to a minimum the meaning of dogmas; and to free dogma itself from terminology long established in the Church and from philosophical concepts held by Catholic teachers, to bring about a return in the explanation of Catholic doctrine to the way of speaking used in Holy Scripture and by the Fathers of the Church. They cherish the hope that when dogma is stripped of the elements which they hold to be extrinsic to divine revelation, it will compare advantageously with the dogmatic opinions of those who are separated from the unity of the Church and that in this way they will gradually arrive at a mutual assimilation of Catholic dogma with the tenets of the dissidents.

15. Moreover, they assert that when Catholic doctrine has been reduced to this condition, a way will be found to satisfy modern needs, that will permit of dogma being expressed also by the concepts of modern philosophy, whether of immanentism or idealism or existentialism or any other system. Some more audacious affirm that this can and must be done, because they hold that the mysteries of faith are never expressed by truly adequate concepts but only by approximate and ever changeable notions, in which the truth is to some extent expressed, but is necessarily distorted. Wherefore they do not consider it absurd, but altogether necessary, that theology should substitute new concepts in place of the old ones in keeping with the various philosophies which in the course of time it uses as its instruments, so that it should give human expression to divine truths in various ways which are even somewhat opposed, but still equivalent, as they say. They add that the history of dogmas consists in the reporting of the various forms in which revealed truth has been clothed, forms that have succeeded one another in accordance with the different teachings and opinions that have arisen over the course of the centuries.

16. It is evident from what We have already said, that such tentatives not only lead to what they call dogmatic relativism, but that they actually contain it. **The contempt of doctrine commonly taught and of the terms in which it is expressed strongly favor it...** the things that have been composed through common effort by Catholic teachers over the course of the centuries to bring about some understanding of dogma are... based on principles and notions deduced from a true knowledge of created things.... Hence it is not astonishing that some of these notions have not only been used by the Oecumenical Councils, but even sanctioned by them, so that it is wrong to depart from them.

⁶ “Concerning some False Opinions threatening to undermine the foundations of Catholic Doctrine”

17. Hence to neglect, or to reject, or to devalue so many and such great resources which have been conceived, expressed and perfected so often by the age-old work of men endowed with no common talent and holiness, working under the vigilant supervision of the holy magisterium and with the light and leadership of the Holy Ghost in order to state the truths of the faith ever more accurately, to do this so that these things may be replaced by conjectural notions and by some formless and unstable tenets of a new philosophy, tenets which, like the flowers of the field, are in existence today and die tomorrow; this is supreme imprudence and something that would make dogma itself a reed shaken by the wind. – Pius XII, *Humani Generis*.

And he addresses **specifically the nature of the redemption**:

“26. Disregarding the Council of Trent, some pervert the very concept of original sin, along with the concept of sin in general as an offense against God, as well as the idea of satisfaction performed for us by Christ.”

3. CLASSIC THEOLOGY OF SIN, NEW THEOLOGY OF SIN

The Classic Theology of Sin

In classic theology, sin is an offense against the honor of God, and is measured by the scale of the infinite majesty of the person offended rather than by the harm the sinner does to himself. God has in fact created all things for His own glory, and man must direct all of his actions to that end: “Whether you eat or drink, or whatsoever else you do, do all to the glory of God” (I Cor. 10:31). By refusing to give due honor to God, the sinner makes himself God’s enemy and incurs a debt against His justice⁷.

Sin is an **evil human act, a word, deed or desire contrary to the eternal law**.

Every sin involves:

- *Aversio a Deo* = human act must tend towards ultimate end – (mortal sin is essentially retreat from God).
- *Conversio (graviter) deordinata ad creaturas*.

Mortal sin is voluntary aversion from God = the destruction of bond of friendship / charity between God and man, i.e. sanctifying grace.

- As habitual grace is like the life of the soul = “mortal” sin, death of soul.
- From this are incurred:
 - *Reatus culpae* = loss of divine friendship,
 - *Reatus poenae* = divine right to impose a proportionate punishment,
 - Loss of supernatural merits (not definitive).
 - Dead soul cannot enter into eternal life. Therefore, the separation initiated in this life by sin remains in afterlife by violent separation from God = *poena damni*.

⁷ PLR, pg. 41

Sin incurs a debt in justice

“Since sin is an inordinate act, it is evident that whoever sins, commits an offense against an order... man can be punished with a threefold punishment corresponding to the three orders to which the human will is subject.

- In the first place a man's nature is subjected to the order of his own **reason**;
- secondly, it is subjected to the order of another man who governs him either in spiritual or in temporal matters, as a member either of the state or of the household;
- thirdly, it is subjected to the universal order of the Divine government.

Now each of these orders is disturbed by sin, for the sinner acts against his reason, and against human and Divine law. Wherefore he incurs a threefold punishment; one, inflicted by himself, viz. remorse of conscience; another, inflicted by man; and a third, **inflicted by God.**” (Ia IIae Q. 87 a.1)

“Sin incurs a debt of punishment through disturbing an order... so long as the disturbance of the order remains the debt of punishment must needs remain also... Whatever sins turn man away from God, so as to destroy charity, considered in themselves, incur a debt of eternal punishment.”

The “wrath of God”

Scripture does use this language⁸: “You, when you were dead in your offences and sins... and were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest”.

Anger/wrath is the desire to hurt another for the purpose of just vengeance. (ST, 1-2, 47, 1).

We speak of anger being God *metaphorically* because of similarity of effect. “Anger” in God not as of an emotion (passion of the soul) but as of judgment of justice, inasmuch as God wills to punish on sin, and as such He acts in a way similar to the way a ruler who is justly angry acts. (Ibid.) This punishment is not loved in so far as it punishes man *per se*, but in so far as it restores the order of justice.

The truth behind the metaphor of God’s anger is that sin is an injustice, which merits a punishment – a punishment imposed by God⁹. This punishment will break forth especially at the Last Judgment¹⁰.

⁸ “What if God, willing to shew his wrath and to make his power known, endured with much patience vessels of wrath, fitted for destruction” (Rom 9:22); “Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth: fornication, uncleanness, lust, evil concupiscence and covetousness, which is the service of idols. For which things the wrath of God cometh upon the children of unbelief” (Colos :5-6); “In which also we all conversed in time past, in the desires of our flesh, fulfilling the will of the flesh and of our thoughts, and were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest” (Eph. 2:3)

⁹ “Where your fathers tempted me, proved and saw my works, Forty years: for which cause I was offended with this generation, and I said: They always err in heart. And they have not known my ways, As I have sworn in my wrath: If they shall enter into my rest.” (Heb. 3:9-11)

¹⁰ “But according to thy hardness and impenitent heart, thou treasurest up to thyself wrath, against the day of wrath, and revelation of the just judgment of God. Who will render to every man according to his works. To them

Ia IIae, Q. 87, a.3. Whether any sin incurs a debt of eternal punishment?

Objection 3. Further, no one does a thing always unless he delights in it for its own sake. But "God hath not pleasure in the destruction of men." Therefore, He will not inflict eternal punishment on man.

Reply to Objection 3. God does not delight in punishments for their own sake; but He does delight in the order of His justice, which requires them.

Ia IIae Q. 47 a.1: Article 1. Whether the motive of anger is always something done against the one who is angry?

Objection 1. It would seem that the motive of anger is not always something done against the one who is angry. Because man, by sinning, can do nothing against God; since it is written (Job 35:6): "If thy iniquities be multiplied, what shalt thou do against Him?" And yet God is spoken of as being angry with man on account of sin, according to Psalm 105:40: "The Lord was exceedingly angry with His people." Therefore it is not always on account of something done against him, that a man is angry.

Reply to Objection 1. We speak of anger in God, not as of a passion of the soul but as of judgment of justice, inasmuch as He wills to take vengeance on sin. Because the sinner, by sinning, cannot do God any actual harm: but so far as he himself is concerned, he acts against God in two ways. First, in so far as he despises God in His commandments. Secondly, in so far as he harms himself or another; which injury redounds to God, inasmuch as the person injured is an object of God's providence and protection.

"Enemies of God"

We say that Mortal Sin makes us "enemies of God" not in the sense that God no longer wills the salvation of one in Mortal sin: "God our Savior, Who will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth". (1 Tim 2:3-4)

We say it makes us enemies of God in so far as we destroy Charity, the foundation of divine friendship, by Mortal sin.

Need for satisfaction of the sin

Since Sin creates a debt against God, it demands satisfaction: payment of the debt in full to an equality.

Need for restoration of the temporal punishment due for sin

"If any one saith, that, after the grace of Justification has been received, to every penitent sinner the guilt is remitted, and the debt of eternal punishment is blotted out in such wise, that there remains not any debt of temporal punishment to be discharged either in this world, or in the

indeed, who according to patience in good work, seek glory and honor and incorruption, eternal life: But to them that are contentious, and who obey not the truth, but give credit to iniquity, wrath and indignation. Tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that worketh evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Greek. But glory, and honor, and peace to every one that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." (Rom 2:5-10)

next in Purgatory, before the entrance to the kingdom of heaven can be opened (to him); let him be anathema¹¹.”

Christ has blotted out the eternal punishment of Hell. But there remains a debt of temporal punishment due to sin.

That sin merits a temporal punishment finds backing in Scripture and Tradition. From Scripture we have the classic passage from St. Paul : “...if anyone builds upon this foundation... wood, hay, straw – the work of each will be made manifest... if his work burns he will lose his reward, but himself will be saved, yet so as through fire" (I Cor. 3:12-15). Tradition also speaks of a cleansing of the soul "after death by purgatorial or purifying punishments¹².”

Hence the need for penitential practices, indulgences, and the dogma of Purgatory.

The New Theology of Sin

“The notion of sin is equivocal. It seems to be an injury against God, in which case reparation would be eminently fitting. Sin is, however, not prejudicial at all to the nature of God which is inaccessible; the only thing it harms is the nature of man.” – Adalbert Mamman (Member of the *Consilium*)

- true sin cannot “hurt” God: God cannot really be affected or changed by anything.
 - Sin doesn’t damage the Nature or essential Beatitude of God
- But sin **does** damage God's rights to be honored and loved. Adoration and Obedience are strictly owed to God as Creator; sin is a real withholding of a due: creates thereby an objective debt.
 - one can still offend the honor of God (and so owe reparation) even without touching His nature

Sin is an offense against the honor of God, and is measured by the scale of the infinite majesty of the person offended rather than by the harm the sinner does to himself¹³.

¹¹ Trent Session 6 on Justification: CANON XXX

¹² Second Council of Lyons, Denz. 464.

¹³ Vs. this presentation: “Sin is an offense against reason, truth, and right conscience; it is failure in genuine love for God and neighbor caused by a perverse attachment to certain goods. It wounds the nature of man and injures human solidarity. Sin is an offense against God (Ps. 51:6). Sin sets itself against God’s love for us and turns our hearts away from it.” (CCC §§1849, 1850).

Classic Theology

- Sin = refusal to honor God
- Makes man an enemy of God
- Creates a debt of justice
- Hell is a punishment in justice for those who refuse Grace

New Theology

- Sin – “doesn’t harm God”
- Only harms man – lowers his dignity + so harms human society
- creates no debt of justice, and no need for satisfaction
- Hell is not a work of God’s justice – but self-exclusion from God’s love only.

In the New Theology Sin is no longer presented as an injustice against God, only an offense against His love insofar as it constitutes a refusal of this love.

- Throughout all the documents, only **twice** is it stated that **sin offends God**: (in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* §109 and *Lumen Gentium* §11),
- Sin is described 27 times as being harmful to man and to civil and ecclesiastical society.
- Nowhere is it said that sin creates a debt in justice towards God, or that it is an obstacle to God’s love for us.

If the heart of the doctrine concerning the Paschal mystery (the putting aside of the vicarious satisfaction of Christ) was not explicitly declared by the Council, this was later done in a document of the International Theological Commission which resorted to caricature (“merciless God”) to minimize its denial:

“The death of Jesus is not the act of a merciless God glorifying supreme sacrifice; it is not the ‘price of redemption’ paid to some repressive alien power. It is the time and place where a God who is love and who loves us, is made visible. Jesus crucified declares how God loves us and proclaims through this gesture of love that one man has unconditionally consented to the ways of God¹⁴.”

4. CLASSIC THEOLOGY OF THE REDEMPTION, NEW THEOLOGY OF THE REDEMPTION

Classic Theology of The Redemption

Redemption = the act by which Our Lord Jesus Christ, dying on the cross for love of us as an offering to God the Father, makes complete satisfaction for the sins of mankind and delivers it from slavery to sin and the devil.

It is **formally an act of justice**, whose **motive is love**, as follows:

- Its *essence* = a payment for sin, hence the word “Redemption” or “buying back.”
- Its *obstacle* was Original Sin, which demanded infinite payment that no mere man could give.

¹⁴ International Theological Commission, *Questiones selectae de Deo Redemptore*, Dec. 8, 1994,, Part II, No.14.

- Its *accomplishment in eternity* = God's will to satisfy His justice through Our Lord's death and **in time** = Our Lord's fulfillment of the Father's will.
- Its *author* = Our Lord Jesus Christ, as the redemptive work is making satisfaction for sins
- Its *principal act* = the death of Our Lord on the Cross, as by this act Our Lord satisfied for our sins and opened the gates of Heaven
- It is **universal** in that it objectively satisfies for all sin, but it is **particular** in that only some men have the fruits of Redemption applied to them by their faith in Christ.
- Its *effect* = the deliverance of the human race from bondage to sin and the devil and the **eternal salvation of some**.

How is this notion of the Redemption shown forth in Catholic practice?

It is shown forth in the attitude of Catholics toward:

- **Our Lord** – He is the only one who can pay for sin in justice and thus is the sole mediator with God. Without Him, Catholics are nothing.
- **Sin** – it is a terrible evil that takes away from the honor due to God and requires payment. Catholics must confess their sins to a priest, do penance for them, and also make reparation for the sins of mankind.
- **The Cross** – Far be it from Catholics to glory in anything but the Cross, which is their sole hope. Catholics place crucifixes everywhere.
- **Society** – Pope St. Pius X sought to lead society back to submission to God by restoring all things in Christ.

What quotations support this notion of Redemption?¹⁵

There are many Catholic texts that support this notion:

- **Trent** – It refers to the one mediator Jesus Christ “who in His blood has reconciled us with God made unto us justice and sanctification and redemption (I Cor. 1:30)” Dz 790. It also says that Jesus Christ “by His most holy Passion on the Cross offered satisfaction for us to God the Father” Dz 799.
- **Pope Pius XII** – “The notion of original sin, without consideration of the definitions of the Council of Trent, is perverted, and at the same time the notion of sin in general as an offense against God, and likewise the concept of the satisfaction made by Christ for us” *Humani Generis* Dz 2318
- **Pope Pius XII** – “The mystery of the Divine Redemption is firstly and by its nature a mystery of love; the mystery of Christ's love of justice towards His heavenly Father, to whom the sacrifice of the Cross is offered in a spirit of loving obedience, gives the superabundant and infinite satisfaction which the sins of the human race made necessary; “By suffering out of love and obedience, Christ gave more to God than was required to compensate for the offense of the whole human race” (ST, III, Q. 48, A. 2). Moreover, it is the mystery of the merciful love of the august Trinity and of the Divine Redeemer towards men. We were in fact totally incapable of making proper expiation for our sins. Christ, however, through the unfathomable riches of His merits, borne of the shedding of His precious blood, was able to re-establish and conclude the pact of friendship between God and men, that pact which was first violated in Eden by Adam's sin and later on by the innumerable sins of the chosen people. Moved by His ardent charity for us and acting as our rightful and perfect Mediator, the Divine Redeemer has completely harmonized the duty and obligations of humanity with the rights of God. He is thus the true author of that marvellous reconciliation between divine justice and divine mercy where lies the absolute transcendence of our salvation.” Pius XII, *Haurietis Aquas*, May 15, 1956, AAS 48 (1956). Translation from the Daughters of St. Paul edition.

¹⁵cf. Ott, Ludwig, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma* (Tan Books: Rockford, Illinois, 1974), pp. 185-86.

New Theology of The Redemption

Redemption = the revelation of God's unchanging love toward man by Our Lord Jesus Christ, showing man that, in spite of sin, he has an eternal Covenant with God the Father which has never been destroyed.

So Redemption is an act of love?¹

Yes. It is an *act* of love, whose *motive* is love, as follows:

- Its *essence* = a message to men concerning God's unchanging love for them.
- Its *obstacle* was man's lack of understanding of his dignity.
- Its *accomplishment in eternity* = God's undying love for man and in *time* = man's awareness of that love through the revelation made by Our Lord.
- Its *author* = God the Father rather than Our Lord, as the redemptive work is revealing the love of the Father for men.
- Its *principal acts* = Our Lord's Resurrection and Ascension, because they are the fullness of the revelation for which Christ became incarnate, i.e. to show us the unconditional love of the Father for us
- It is *universal* in that God the Father loves all men, which love applies to all men, whether they know it or not, whether they want it or not. It is *particular* in that only some men come to understand their dignity as revealed by Jesus Christ.
- Its *effect* = man's deeper awareness of his dignity and peace and solidarity for mankind through this awareness.

Why is the Resurrection so important in this view?

The *Institutio Generalis Missali Romani*, §2, associates the Mass with the "celebration of the Supper of the Lord" where Christ "instituted the Eucharistic sacrifice of his Body and Blood. He did this in order to perpetuate the sacrifice of the Cross until he should come again; and he wished to entrust to his beloved Spouse, the Church, a memorial of his death and resurrection."

The Passion and the Resurrection are equally the object of this memorial meal (IG §2). These two mysteries are, moreover, united in a single expression; in this memorial, Christ instituted the "Paschal meal" (IG §56). The expression "Paschal sacrifice" (IG §335) is also used.

"Whoever speaks of the Redemption thinks firstly of the Passion and then of the Resurrection as a complement... The Resurrection no longer appears as an epilogue but rather as the end and completion of the mystery which brings us salvation¹⁶."

The primary thing here are the resurrection and ascension. Paschal Mystery is revelation of God's unaltered love and acceptance.

Resurrection = fullest revelation of this.

Resurrection more than cross causes our salvation.

Why does the Resurrection acquire this **primacy**? The reason is that the Resurrection is the fullness of the revelation for which Christ became incarnate:

"The fact that Christ 'was raised the third day' constitutes the final sign of the messianic mission, a

¹⁶ Aimon-Marie Roguet, *La Rédemption et l'Histoire du monde* (Paris: Alsatia, 1947), #9.

sign that perfects the entire revelation of merciful love in a world that is subject to evil....In fact, Christ,...has revealed in His resurrection the fullness of the love that the Father has for Him and, in Him, for all people. 'He is not God of the dead, but of the living'¹⁷."

If there be no debt, the Redemption was a not man giving something to God, but **God giving something to man**. But what was He giving to man if man had not really lost anything in the first place? The modernist answer – a revelation of His love.

The Redemption is the supreme *revelation* of the eternal covenant which God made with humanity and which was *never* destroyed by sin. (**The Mass saves men by revealing that they are unchangeably loved, and that no injustice of sin needs to be repaired**)

*"It is precisely beside the path of man's eternal election to the dignity of being an adopted child of God that there stands in history, **the cross of Christ, the only-begotten Son, who...came to give the final witness to the wonderful covenant of God with humanity, of God with man – every human being.**"* – John Paul II¹⁸

*"Christ...has **revealed in His resurrection** the fullness of the love that the Father has for Him and, in Him, for all people."* – Pope John Paul II¹⁹

"The Paschal Mystery is Christ at the summit of the revelation of the inscrutable mystery of God²⁰."

This mystery remains the mystery of the Cross, but of the Cross "seen in the fullness of its wonderful fruitfulness, i.e., insofar as it includes the Resurrection of Christ, His Ascension into glory, and the showering of all the marvelous gifts upon man through Christ who has himself become pneuma, life-giving Spirit²¹." (Louis Bouyer)

How is this notion of the Redemption shown forth in Catholic practice?

It is shown forth in the attitude of Catholics toward:

- **Our Lord** – He came to deliver the message concerning God's love. But his mediation is not so central that we must despair of the salvation of those who are not Christians.
- **Sin** – no sin can destroy God's unchanging love and so sin is seen more in relation to man. We go to Confession to *reconcile* ourselves with the Church, our fellow men and our own dignity.
- **The Cross** – The Resurrection is the definitive Revelation of the Father's love, so dreary medieval crucifixes give way to joyful more positive "Resurrexifexes".
- **Society** – Pope John Paul II sought to create in society a civilization of love by making men aware of their dignity.²²

What quotations support this notion of Redemption?

- **Vatican II** – "The truth is that only in the mystery of the Incarnate Word does the mystery of man take on light ... Christ the new Adam, in the **very revelation** of the mystery of the Father and of his love, **fully reveals man to himself and brings to light his most high calling.**" *Gaudium et Spes*, 22.

¹⁷ John Paul II, *Dives in Misericordia*, No. 8.

¹⁸ *Dives in Misericordia*, November 30, 1980, n.7

¹⁹ *Dives in Misericordia*, November 30, 1980, n.8

²⁰ John Paul II, *Dives in Misericordia*, No. 8.

²¹ Louis Bouyer, *La vie de la liturgie*, Lex orandi collection (Paris: Cerf, 1956), 117. Cf. Bouyer, "Mysterion" in *Supplément de la Vie spirituelle* 23, November 15, 1952, p.402.

²²cf. de la Rocque, Patrick, *Doubts about a Beatification* (Angelus Press, 2011), pp. 43-55

- **Pope John Paul II** – “Making the Father present as love and mercy is, in Christ’s own consciousness, the fundamental touchstone of His mission as the Messiah“ *Dives in Misericordia*, 20. “In reality, the name for that deep amazement at man's worth and dignity is the Gospel, that is to say: the Good News. It is also called Christianity” *Redemptor Hominis*, 26, and *passim*.
- **Pope Benedict XVI** – “The human being needs unconditional love ... If this absolute love exists, with its absolute certainty, then—only then—is man ‘redeemed’, whatever should happen to him in his particular circumstances. This is what it means to say: Jesus Christ has ‘redeemed’ us.” *Spe Salvi*, 26.
- **International Theological Commission**²³ – “The death of Jesus is not the act of a merciless God glorifying supreme sacrifice; it is not the ‘price of redemption’ paid to some repressive alien power. It is the time and place where a God who is love and who loves us, is made visible. Jesus crucified declares how God loves us.” Dec. 8, 1994

Defending the Classic view: answers to Roguet’s objections

Let’s answer the objections:

- a) How can an infinite offense be atoned for?** By a man who is also God.
- b) How can one person make up for all?** By being the head of the redeemed as Adam was the head of the whole human race.
- c) How can someone who is innocent pay for somebody who is guilty?**

Here a distinction must be made. An innocent person cannot “pay” for someone else (in the sense of removing his debt of punishment) as long as that other person remains guilty, since sin is never forgiven without conversion; but an innocent person can “pay” for someone else if this involves producing that person’s conversion.

Christ does not take away the punishment due to our sins except on condition that we first convert, using the grace that he merited for us.

Step 1: Christ merits graces of conversion (removal of guilt) and satisfaction (removal of punishment).

Step 2: Christ applies the graces he merited to produce a conversion.

Step 3: Christ applies his satisfactions to remove the debt of punishment.

There is no injustice in influencing another to gratuitously produce conversion, or a change of heart, in a sinner who of his own accord could never convert and deserves to be left in his obstinacy. Just as anyone is free to give or not above another’s merits, so anyone is free to influence another to do so.

There is no injustice in influencing another to pardon the debt of punishment for a sin of someone who is repentant. As long as that person repents, his punishment can be lifted.

I think often people think it is unjust for one person to make satisfaction for another because they imagine it happens without that other person’s cooperation, as if Step 2 (above) were not a part of the picture.

- d) If God is truly a Father, how could He take out His anger on His beloved Son?**

²³The International Theological Commission is a group of theologians whose role is to help the Holy See and primarily the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in examining doctrinal questions of major importance.

“Oblatus est quia ipse voluit” (Isaias 53:7) Christ willingly offered himself as the victim of sacrifice: he offered himself, and was rewarded by his Father, knowing that a reward would be given for His personal merit. If Christ had been unwilling to suffer and bear the burden of God’s wrath, and had nevertheless been forced to do so, this would be an entirely different scenario. Also, if he had been made to suffer without being given any reward, such as the glorification of his sacred humanity, it would be different. But he was a willing victim and suffering that is borne willingly is not suffering in the strictest sense, which requires that the thing be endured against one’s will, as St. Thomas writes. Just as God can rightly ask any creature to suffer beyond what in strict justice is due to his sins, because of the promise of a superabundant reward, so he can do with Christ in respect to Christ in his human nature.

- “It is unfortunate that these are the terms in which Redemption is presented to many of our contemporaries.” – So, explain it to them! We cannot change Catholic doctrine, just because it is hard to accept or explain.

Was the Father “angry” with Christ?

Anger, as said above, is said *metaphorically* to be in God because of similarity of effect. “Anger” in God refers to a judgment of justice, whereby God wills to punish on sin, and so to restore the wounded order of Justice, for the very love of justice itself. God willed to take vengeance on the sins of mankind. Christ willingly suffered in man’s place to satisfy divine justice. God willed Christ to suffer so.

Therefore, God the Father was “angry” with Christ, not as his beloved Son, but as a **vicarious victim**. The divine wrath fell, not on the Person of Christ, but on the sins for which that Person chose to suffer.

Put another way, the divine wrath fell directly on the sins of mankind, and only indirectly upon the sacred Humanity of Christ.

Those acts by which Christ chose to submit himself to suffering were not at all a diminution of perfection in him. The only diminution of perfection was in the way of passion or suffering, by the destruction of the physical integrity of Christ’s Body and the corresponding commotions in the inferior part of his human Soul.

5. LITURGICAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE NEW THEOLOGY OF SIN AND THE REDEMPTION

Application of the Paschal Mystery / new theory of Redemption to the Rite of Mass

New Theology of Redemption required all rites to change.

- B/c God does not
 - Regard sin as an injustice against himself
 - Break his side of the agreement with man
- We no longer
 - Ask for remission of the punishment due to sin
 - Speak of the righteous anger of God

- Since the Paschal Mystery is essentially a revelation of God's unrevoked love
 - Liturgy is not application of satisfaction
 - But *thanksgiving* and *petition*

The notion of Christ's vicarious satisfaction is gone here (esp. Eucharistic Prayers 2-4, but even in 1.)

- If the historical death of Christ was not a sacrifice of propitiation, neither is the Mass. Therefore, the suppression of anything that connotes sacrifice or expiation.

| From Propitiation to Thanksgiving | |
|---|---|
| <p><u>Doctrine</u></p> <p>Man has offended God and continues to do so. He deserves punishment for these sins and must make up for them. This unremitted punishment due to man's sins is always in view. The Mass an application of the merits of Redemption to sinful souls. The Cross, and so the Mass, reconcile Man to God and restore the friendship that sin had destroyed.</p> | <p><u>Doctrine</u></p> <p>God has an undying love for man, regardless of man's crimes "God has sent His Son to open again the gates of salvation to all men, it is because His attitude towards them has not changed....The coming of the Only Son of God in the midst of human history reveals God's intention to continue with the implementation of His plan despite the obstacles..." (International Theological Commission, <i>Questiones selectae de Deo Redemptore</i>, Dec. 8, 1994,) Man is seen as reconciled with God, no matter what state his soul is in. The Mass is a liturgy of the saved, a celebration with thanks-giving of a Redemption already released in full, without any propitiatory dimension. This follows from diminution of the Mass as sacrifice and the priest as sacrificing agent & mediator with God.</p> |
| <p><u>Practice</u></p> <p>The Offering and Sorrow for Sin</p> <p>- Prayers of compunction for sin return again and again, e.g. <i>Confiteor</i>, <i>Aufer a nobis</i>²⁴, <i>Oramus te</i>²⁵, <i>Munda cor meum</i>²⁶, <i>Per</i></p> | <p><u>Practice</u></p> <p>The Offering and Sorrow for Sin</p> <p>- Only the "<i>Per evangelica dicta</i>," the "<i>In spiritu humilitatis</i>," and the "<i>Lava me</i>," an abbreviated freestyle version of psalm 25, remain. These prayers, moreover, are often</p> |

²⁴ Take away from us our iniquities, we implore Thee, Lord, that with pure minds we may worthily enter into the holy of holies: through Christ our Lord. Amen.

²⁵ We implore You, Lord, by the merits of all Thy Saints, whose relics are here, and of all the Saints, that thou wouldst deign to forgive me all my sins. Amen.

²⁶ Cleanse my heart and my lips, O Almighty God, Who cleansed the lips of the Prophet Isaias with a burning coal. In Thy gracious mercy deign so to purify me that I may worthily proclaim Thy holy Gospel. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

*evangelica dicta*²⁷, *In spiritu humilitatis*²⁸, *Incensum istud*²⁹, *Lavabo*³⁰.

- The unworthiness of the minister is always in view, because of the unremitted punishment due to his sins. He asks for the approval of his offering in 10 separate prayers in the Offertory and Canon.

Intercession of Our Lord

- Mediators are placed between the minister and God, because of his deficiency, firstly Our Lord Jesus Christ, then the saints.

Intercession of the saints

- There are at least four prayers during the Mass that call upon the merits and intercession of the saints and 200 collects throughout the year.

The Satisfaction Due for Sin

- the traditional missal tries to obtain the remission of punishment due for sin by the merits of Our Lord and the saints.
- Frequent requests in the collects to be "purified from the stains of sin."

Requiem:

- Frequent reference to judgment, punishment due to sins, and the need to be loosed from them.

translated in the vernacular so as to remove all trace of contrition.

- No requests for the approval of the offering.

Intercession of Our Lord

- almost complete suppression of all mention of Our Lord's mediation in the offering of the sacrifice. The one "through Christ our Lord" etc. left in Eucharistic prayers II-IV refers to the heavenly liturgy hereafter.

Intercession of the saints

- Prayers during the Mass are gone and the 200 collects have been reduced to only three obligatory ones.

The Satisfaction Due for Sin

- no thought of the unworthiness of the human ministers
- the consequences of sin are no obstacle to the approval of the sacrifice
- no need for intercession of Our Lord or the saints.
- All references to divine justice in any part of the propers have been considerably reduced. Only a few ferial Masses in Lent have request to be purified from sin.

Requiem:

- No mention of the punishment due to sin or the pains of purgatory; the propers emphasize the happiness of heaven and the resurrection while omitting the traditional Tract³¹, the *Dies Irae*, and Offertory prayer³².

²⁷ By the words of the gospel may our sins be wiped away.

²⁸ In a humble spirit and with a contrite heart, may we be accepted by Thee, O Lord, and may our sacrifice so be offered in Thy sight this day as to please Thee, who art our Lord and our God.

²⁹ May this incense blessed by You, arise before You, O Lord, and may Your mercy come down upon us.

³⁰ "...take not away my soul, O God with the wicked: nor my life with men of blood. On their hands are crimes, and their right hands are full of bribes. But as for me I have walked in my innocence; redeem me, and have mercy on me."

³¹ Absolve, O Lord, the souls of all the faithful departed from every bond of sin. And by the help of Thy grace may they be enabled to escape the avenging judgment. And enjoy the bliss of everlasting light.

³² Lord Jesus Christ, King of glory, deliver the souls of all the faithful departed from the pains of hell and from the bottomless pit: deliver them from the lion's mouth, that hell swallow them not up, that they fall not into darkness, but let the standard-bearer holy Michael lead them into that holy light: Which Thou didst promise of old to Abraham and to his seed. We offer to Thee, O Lord, sacrifices and prayers: do Thou receive them in behalf of those souls of

| <u>The Traditional Mass</u> | <u>The New Mass</u> |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Frequent references to punishment due to sin or need to appease God's anger - Ends of thanksgiving and petition subordinate to those of adoration and propitiation; frequent reference is made to the vicarious satisfaction of Christ and His mediation in prayer - Celebration of first class Feast of the Precious Blood, which was instituted to profess belief in the classic truths regarding Redemption | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No references to punishment due to sin or need to appease God's anger - Ends of Mass are solely thanksgiving and petition; no reference made to the vicarious satisfaction of Christ and His mediation in prayer - Initial removal of the feast of the Precious Blood, then later it was put back as a votive Mass with substantial changes following the theology of the Paschal Mystery |

From what has been said, it should be clear that New Mass was designed with a doctrinal agenda – an agenda which a Catholic in good conscience cannot espouse. The goal of the *Consilium* was precisely to produce a liturgical rite which did *not* clearly express Catholic teaching on doctrines pertaining to Sin, the Redemption, and the propitiatory nature of the Mass.

6. OTHER PROBLEMS: THE PASCHAL MYSTERY

In accord with these altered notions comes a new theory of “sacraments.” This new notion of “sacrament” will be key to the Neo-Modernist understanding because sacraments will be how things are “revealed” to us (and that revelation, in true modernist fashion, gives us the religious experience we need...)

We will look only briefly at this new notion of “sacraments” – more development can be found in *The Problem of the Liturgical Reform*:

whom we make memorial this day. Grant them, O Lord, to pass from death to that life, Which Thou didst promise of old to Abraham and to his seed.

| Classic Theology of Sacraments | New Theology of Sacraments |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The traditional definition of a sacrament: “a sacred sign which effects what it signifies.” · This is a restrictive use of the term, even though the name “sacrament” can be used more broadly. · God is present in the sacraments, but we must distinguish: He is present <i>by His power</i> in six of the sacraments; He is <i>really present substantially</i> only in the Eucharist. These are different modes of presence! | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · First step to the new definition (applicational of the historical-critical method): “The true meaning of sacrament is not the one that theology defined by applying reason to Revelation but rather the one which can be explained by purely historical causes i.e. the one used in pre-existing religious traditions.” · Second step (explain the clear by the obscure): “We have lost the richness of the original meaning of ‘sacrament.’ Every sacred sign that makes something present is a sacrament not just the one that ‘cause’ grace.” · Third step (apply existentialism): “Which signs make something present? Well, they all do by making the knower aware of it. Whatever reveals makes present what is revealed.” |

The result of the change of the theology of the sacraments is that **everything becomes a sacrament without any distinction:**

- Jesus Christ is the first “sacrament” because He makes God present among men by revealing something of God. Christ is the sacrament of God and, of course, He is divine *because He makes God present in Him by revealing God.*
- The Church is the sacrament of Christ since it is through the Church that men meet Christ.
- The assembly is the sacrament of the Church. The congregation symbolizes the Church and makes it present, which in turn makes Christ present, which in turn makes God present.

The liturgy, then, which is also a “sacrament,” is a **revelation experience** (since knowledge is not something firstly intellectual, but experiential). The liturgy uses signs to reveal God and to “make Him present.”

What exactly is made present? The Pascal Mystery, i.e. the saving actions of Christ, which means all of the actions by which the love of the Father is revealed.

If we apply this to the Mass specifically, we can see that certain conclusions follow immediately:

- The Mass is *firstly a memorial*, i.e. a collective remembering, because it is through this memorial that God is “made present.”
- We remember the Pascal Mystery, the saving actions of Christ, so we do recall the Cross, but also (and especially) we recall the resurrection, which is the most “revealing” action.
- Therefore, the Mass is not a visible and propitiatory sacrifice, but rather firstly a commemoration which is a *symbol* of the historical sacrifice of Christ, making it present again for us.

These points are the starting point for a whole series of other changes which we see in the Mass and which reinforce the new notions of sin, sacrament, and redemption.

THE INFLUENCE OF NEO-MODERNISM ON THE NEW MASS, *IN GENERE*

The Definition of the Mass

The influence of Neo-Modernism is clearly seen in the definition of the Mass which is contained in the original version of the General Instruction (1969). This definition drew more controversy and criticism than any other statement and was, therefore, very soon modified. Nevertheless, the insight it provides into the new rite is of permanent value.

Definition from the 1969 GIRM: “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. For this reason, Christ’s promise applies supremely to such a local gathering together of the Church: ‘Where two or three come together in My name, there I am in their midst.’ (Mt 18:20)”

We can note three things immediately from this definition:

1. The Mass is defined as a gathering not as a sacrifice and, furthermore, a gathering which is a supper and a memorial.

This part of the definition corresponds to **a first pattern** which is clearly discernible throughout the new rite and the *General Instruction* (e.g. nn.8, 48, 55d, 56), although it is

foreign to a Catholic understanding of the Mass. There is an unmistakable shift in expression from the Mass as a propitiatory sacrifice to the Mass as a memorial meal.

But the Council of Trent clearly teaches that the Mass is a sacrifice while it never mentions that the Mass is a meal. Furthermore, Pius XII, in his encyclical *Mediator Dei*, explicitly condemns the theory that the Mass is essentially both a sacrifice and a meal. On a practical level, it is obvious that the Mass is not essentially a meal because, while Catholics are obliged to assist at Mass every Sunday, they have never been obliged to receive Communion every Sunday. If the Mass were essentially a supper, the faithful would have to communicate since to attend a meal without eating is to not take part in the meal.

2. The role assigned to the priest is that of president.

The unique role of the priest as instrument of Christ the High Priest, acting in the person of Christ, and vested with powers which flow from the priestly character alone is completely ignored. Here is **the second pattern**: a deliberate obscuring of the difference between the ordained priesthood (which is independent of the congregation and implies active sacramental power) and the priesthood of the faithful (which is only a power in the passive sense of being able to receive benefits from the sacramental actions of the ordained priest).

3. There is a glaring absence of any reference to the Real Presence.

This cannot be a mere oversight, however unpardonable, because an alternative manner of presence is explicitly mentioned, namely, the purely spiritual presence of Christ common to any gathering of the faithful. Here we find **the third pattern** which will be everywhere in the new rite—a denial of the Real Presence which is, in the words of the Ottaviani intervention, “both tacit (not explicit) and systematic.”

We can now step through the New Mass where we will see the three patterns mentioned above assert themselves again and again. It is fair to say that, by means of these three interconnected patterns, the New Mass deliberately hides the very doctrinal points which the Mass of Roman Rite, developed over centuries and codified by St. Pius V, made explicit.

We recall the three patterns here for reference as we go through *in specie*:

Pattern 1: From Propitiatory Sacrifice to Community Memorial Meal

The Mass becomes primarily a gathering of God's people to celebrate God's wonderful works.

Pattern 2: Obscuring of the distinction between the ordained priesthood (active and autonomous) and the priesthood of the faithful (passive and subordinate).

This is connected to the question of “active participation” in the liturgy which we will see later because both the greatest anti-modernist popes and the modernists themselves use this term – but with different meanings.

Pattern 3: Denial of the Real Presence is “both tacit and systematic.”

Nowhere is the Real Presence denied, but there is a systematic obscuring of it which has produced the widespread disbelief in it which is so evident today.

These patterns are obviously connected, and they flow from the shift from sacrifice to memorial: the Mass is not a sacrifice, but only a memorial meal; therefore, the real presence of the victim is not necessary, nor is a real priest (a meal requires neither victim nor priest).

THE INFLUENCE OF NEO-MODERNISM ON THE NEW MASS, *IN SPECIE*

1. Overall Structure

The traditional structure of the Mass of the Faithful has been radically changed. The Last Supper is now taken as the model [PATTERN 1] i.e. the historical context of the institution – completely divorced from theological principles.

| Traditional Structure | New Structure |
|-----------------------|--|
| Oblation (Offertory) | Blessing of food (Jewish meal prayers) |
| Consecration | Thanksgiving |
| Consummation | Breaking and sharing of the bread |

The elimination of the Offertory is extremely important since it is here that the notion of sacrifice is most explicit. The word “sacrifice” appears four times in the traditional Offertory along with frequent references to sin, both direct and indirect.

2. Introductory Rites

The New Mass opens with a greeting of the congregation: “The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all.”

Msgr. Klaus Gamber, a scholar, characterizes this greeting as a “sweeping new change.” The role of the congregation in the Mass is thereby immediately emphasized. This emphasis, if we are to believe the *General Instruction* (n.28), is not accidental for it pertains to the ambiguous spiritual presence of Christ in the assembly [PATTERN 3]. “Through his greeting the priest declares to the assembled community that the Lord is present.” (Gamber, *The Reform of the Roman Liturgy*, p.49)

Moving through the so-called “Introductory Rites,” we note that the *Confiteor* at the beginning of Mass is now collective and the absolution “Indulgentiam, etc.” recited by the priest in his capacity as judge and mediator has been suppressed [PATTERN 2].

3. Liturgy of the Word

Traditionally, the Mass was divided into the Mass of the Catechumens and the Mass of the Faithful. It was recognized that the first part of Mass was primarily to dispose souls for the supernatural mysteries of the second part. But since the readings were not only edifying but also instructive, the first part of Mass could be fittingly attended also by those preparing for Baptism. However, to benefit from the supernatural character of the second part of Mass required faith in the mystery being confessed – hence the term “Mass of the Faithful.” The two “halves” of the Mass were very unequal parts of the whole.

However, in the New Mass, this classic distinction between the Mass of the Catechumens and the Mass of the Faithful has been recast into the “Liturgy of the Word” and the “Liturgy of the Eucharist.” The change aims not only at increasing the importance of Scripture in the liturgy at the expense of Tradition for ecumenical motives, but also and especially at reducing the importance of the Real Presence [PATTERN 3] – which is essential to the very nature of the Mass – by introducing a competing “presence” by which Christ is made present through Scripture.

The terminology used makes this sense of competition very striking. In three places in the *General Instruction*, Scripture and the Eucharist are both described as the “table” of the Lord (IG 8, 34, 56) [PATTERN 1, 3]. The Liturgy of the Word is furthermore described as making God present to the people (e.g. IG 9): “When the Scriptures are read in the Church, God himself is speaking to his people, and Christ, present in His own word, is proclaiming the Gospel.”

Thinking back to the definition of the Mass and the spiritual presence which is emphasized, we can see two things coming together: Christ's spiritual presence is due *not only* to Scripture, *but also* to the assembly gathered together to hear it. In this context, it is interesting to note that churches, traditionally conceived as architectural tabernacles to house the Real Presence and usually cross-shaped as befits temples of the sacrifice of Christ, should henceforth, according to the *General Instruction*, be built so that their shape suggests "the form of the assembly" (IG 257).

4. Offertory

In the traditional Mass, it is in the Offertory that the nature of the Mass as a propitiatory sacrifice is most clearly expressed. This corresponds to the teaching of Trent. The Mass is a sacrifice which truly satisfies for the punishment of sin and which appeases God's justice.⁵ Trent taught this in opposition to the Protestant liturgical heresies of the day. For example, when Martin Luther referred to the Mass as a sacrifice at all – which he preferred not to do – it was merely in the sense of a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving without any redemptive value. Luther especially despised the traditional Offertory as "an abomination" since from the Offertory onward "everything stinks of oblation."⁶

The same pattern of disdain for oblation is observed in the New Mass, which gives every indication that the Mass is at least as much a meal as it is a sacrifice. When mention is made of sacrifice at all, the propitiatory nature of the sacrifice is deliberately hidden.⁷ Member of the *Consilium*, Rev. Emil Joseph Lengeling, says as much explicitly (we quoted this earlier): "In the [original] 1969 General Instruction on the Missal, an ecumenically-oriented sacramental theology for the celebration of Mass emerged... Despite the new 1970 edition forced by reactionary attacks – but which avoided the worst, thanks to the cleverness of the revisers – it leads us... out of the dead end of the post Tridentine theories of sacrifice."

Not surprisingly, therefore, in the New Mass, the Offertory has been radically changed. The two prayers by which the bread and wine are actually offered (the *Suscipe Sancte Pater* and the *Offerimus tibi*) and which clearly expressed the propitiatory nature of the Mass has been replaced by, of all things, a Jewish prayer before meals [PATTERN 1].

⁵ And which, for this reason, calls down graces of contrition for sins not yet forgiven. c.f. Dz. 940

⁶ *Formula Missae et Communionis* (1523), XII, 211

⁷ In addition to the changes to the Ordinary of the Mass mentioned here, the Propers of the Mass have undergone a similar purging of references to sin, penance, and hell.

For this reason, it would be more accurate to say that, at least in any real sense of the word, the Offertory has been not altered but completely eliminated. This was actually admitted by a member of the *Consilium*, Fr. J.M. Martin Patino: “We have gone from an offertory in the strict sense of the word to a simple presentation of gifts which will become ‘the bread of life and the cup of salvation.’” (see *The Problem of the Liturgical Reform*, p.8)

This would be an opportune moment to remind ourselves that, in the original version of the *General Instruction*, the word “propitiatory” is never used. Furthermore, both in the rite of Mass itself and in the *General Instruction*, when the word sacrifice appears, it is always described as an act of both the priest and the faithful. While each individual instance could easily be given an orthodox interpretation in itself, the failure of the new rite ever to mention the sacrifice in relation to the priest alone deliberately obscures the difference between the priesthood of the ordained priest and that of the faithful. In fact, for the *General Instruction*, there almost seems to be only one offerer of the Mass – the assembly – which is mentioned 164 times [PATTERN 2]. The New Missal therefore also introduces the unheard-of distinction between a Mass with a congregation and Mass without a congregation (IG 209-231).

For that matter, in the prayers of the New Mass and in the original *General Instruction*, the priest is always described in his relation to the people of God as their “president” (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.⁸ [PATTERN 2]

The claim is sometimes made that the New Mass merely sought to emphasize other aspects of the faith which Trent had not mentioned. Such a task of further highlighting Catholic doctrine would probably not have required the service of Protestant ministers as consultants, but in any case, one does not make the faith more explicit by rendering ambiguous the explications already made.

5. The “Canon”

Moving ahead from the Offertory to the Canon, we must first point out that there are actually four different “canons” in the original version of the Missal (although others have since been added). These new “canons” are logically enough no longer called “canons” (which means a fixed rule) but instead are known as “Eucharistic Prayers I-IV.” These Eucharistic Prayers vary in terms of their orthodoxy, Eucharistic Prayer I being the best since it is based on the traditional Roman canon. We will examine these separately.

⁸ The phrase “in persona Christi” does appear in the Forward affixed to the 1970 revision of the *Institutio Generalis*.

Eucharistic Prayer I

It is not the Roman Canon:

- It lost its character of canon, that is to say, a fixed, obligatory rule: now it is but one option among others.
- It is now recited in a loud voice (which leads to a desacralization of the Canon).
- The formula of consecration is altered (to resemble the Lutheran rite).
- The formula of consecration is now recited in a narrative tone rather than in the customary low voice.
- The priest's genuflection between the consecration and the elevation is suppressed (which favors the heresy that the faith of the assembly, and not the words of consecration, are the cause of the Real Presence).
- Numerous signs of the cross are omitted.
- An ambiguous acclamation after the consecration is added: "We proclaim your death, O Lord, and profess your resurrection **until you come again.**"

As mentioned, in the TLM, the words of Consecration are clearly set apart from the rest of the text to emphasize that they belong to an **action** taking place in the present and are not merely to a story about the Last Supper. In the NOM, these words of Consecration are seamlessly blended into the "Institution Narrative" (this term is actually found in the *General Instruction*). The emphasis has shifted from a sacramental and sacrificial action performed now, in real time, to a remembrance or memorial of a past event. [PATTERN 1]

Furthermore, by eliminating the phrase "mysterium fidei," the words of Consecration are now taken word-for-word from Scripture, which strengthens the narrative tone. But the elimination of the "mysterium fidei" from the words is even more serious, since the phrase is meant to be an act of faith made by the priest in the Real Presence caused by the words of Consecration while emphasizing the Consecration as the high point of the Mass. In the New Mass, even in this supposedly Roman Canon, the phrase "mystery of faith" is placed *after* the Consecration and refers to all the mysteries of Christ's life. This change "shifts the center of gravity in the Mass" making the Mass seem like a memorial of Christ's resurrection from death to life.

Cardinal Alfons Stickler himself stated that the elimination of the *mysterium fidei* from the Consecration formula can be considered as the symbol of the demystification and thus the humanization of the nucleus of the Mass.⁹ The fact that the Canon is to be recited in a loud voice further desacralizes the Mass while reinforcing the misconception that the assembly's physical participation is of essential importance.

⁹ c.f. *The Second Vatican Council, an Unwritten Story*, Roberto de Mattei, p.548

Still within Eucharistic Prayer I, we should point out the strange ambiguity of the acclamation made by the faithful immediately after the Consecration in which they say that they are looking forward to the coming of Christ—a bizarre sentiment considering that, just a moment before, Christ became present on the altar.

Christ's Real Presence on the altar is further de-emphasized by the reduction in the number of genuflections performed by the celebrant (from 14 down to 3). Particularly troublesome is the elimination of the genuflection immediately after the words of Consecration are said. The priest does genuflect after the elevation, i.e. once the assembly has seen the sacred species. 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.” Along the same lines, there remains only one sign of the cross over the Victim (a gesture meant to identify the offerings with Our Lord).

All of the things just mentioned, taken together, coalesce to achieve a very ambiguous expression of Catholic doctrine. Very relevant to this point is the fact that, in the entire 341 paragraphs of the original *General Instruction*, the word “transubstantiation” does not appear even once. After the storm of protest engendered by the original version, both “transubstantiation” and “propitiatory” were added to the General Instruction – one time each.

Eucharistic Prayers II, III, and IV

After examining some of the problems in Eucharistic Prayer I which is purported to be simply the Roman Canon as it exists in the traditional Mass, let us turn to Eucharistic Prayers II, III, and IV. We may begin by affirming with Msgr. Gamber that: “The three new versions of the Eucharistic Prayer, also known as the Three Canons, constitute a complete break with the traditional rite: they have been newly created using Eastern and Gallican texts as models. They are truly alien to the Roman Rite ...”¹⁰

Beyond their novelty of origin, and the deficiencies already mentioned which they share in common with Eucharistic Prayer I, they suffer from further problems. In none of them is the propitiatory end of the Mass ever explicitly affirmed.¹¹ The impact of this omission is further strengthened by omitting all mention of the souls in Purgatory, i.e. those who are particular beneficiaries of the Mass' propitiatory purpose.

¹⁰ *The Reform of the Roman Liturgy*, Msgr. Klaus Gamber, p.55

¹¹ Even if Eucharistic Prayers III and IV contain the words “sacrifice” and “victim.”

Eucharistic Prayer III contains the following very misleading statement addressed to Our Lord (prayer *Vere sanctus*): “from age to age you gather a people to Thyself in order that from east and west a perfect offering may be made to the glory of Thy name.” Again, the inference is that it is the people, rather than the priest, who are the essential element in the sacrifice.

Eucharistic Prayer II, marketed as the “Canon of St. Hippolytus” from the 3rd century, is at best a shortened form of it (scandalously short in fact). Furthermore, it seems worth mentioning that, although St. Hippolytus was eventually reconciled to the Church and died a martyr, he spent most of his career as an anti-pope. And it was during this less-than-stellar portion of his career that he composed this canon – precisely as a protest against the Roman Rite as it was then practiced by his rival, the true pope. This fact was even admitted by Fr. Roguet a member of the *Consilium*.¹²

However, even with this checkered history, Eucharistic Prayer II was just a little too orthodox for the *Consilium*, which eliminated a passage that asserted that it was the sufferings of Christ which delivered men from the bonds of the devil and of hell. Furthermore, the three new Eucharistic prayers never assert the Eucharistic presence of Christ, except in reference to the gathered assembly, even when this necessitates, once again, a change to the wording of the Canon of St. Hippolytus.¹³

6. Communion

Not surprisingly, the distortion of the notion of sacrifice into a memorial meal comes very much to the fore once the canon has ended and Communion begins.

The *General Instruction* declares that Communion should be given under both species since “the meaning of Communion is signified as clearly as possible when it is given under both kinds. In this form, the meal-aspect of the Eucharist is more fully symbolized.” (IG 240) [PATTERN 1]

Similarly, the priest’s host should be such as to be able to be broken and shared with the faithful. Sacred vessels need no longer be gilded with precious metals on the inside. After all, who eats a meal off of gold plates these days?

As regards the unique role of the priest as compared with the faithful, the rite no longer distinguishes between the priest’s Communion and the Communion of the Faithful. [PATTERN 2]

¹² *Catechism of the Crisis*, Fr. Matthias Gaudron, SSPX, p.140

¹³ *Catechism of the Crisis*, Fr. Matthias Gaudron, SSPX, p.139

But most disturbing are the changes which more directly pertain to the Real Presence:

[PATTERN 3]

- Elimination of the purification of the priest's fingers over the chalice.
- Priest may now touch things with his fingers before they are purified.
- No purification of any kind is required if a host is dropped.
- Communion is no longer received kneeling and the *General Instruction* recommends that the faithful sit for their thanksgiving.

7. Conclusion

From what has been said, it should be clear that New Mass was designed with a doctrinal agenda—an agenda which a Catholic in good conscience cannot espouse. The goal of the *Consilium* was precisely **to produce a liturgical rite which did not clearly express Catholic teaching on doctrines pertaining to the Mass.**

The New Mass presents a vision in which:

- sin incurs no debt of justice / reparation / satisfaction
- The notion of propitiation and references to pain due to sin are removed from the rite;
- Salvation is understood solely as a manifestation of God's unchanged love (which implies universalism).
- The Memorial form of the Mass makes "mysteries" present for our experience (this attacks the essentially sacrificial character of the Mass.)

However:

- Christ's Vicarious Satisfaction is *de fide*
- That the Mass is truly and properly a sacrifice is *de fide*

Since it expresses a theology opposed to Catholic doctrine, The New Rite is a danger to the FAITH.

- It doesn't deny Catholic Doctrine outright,
- It implicitly denies Catholic Doctrine by many alterations, omissions, and ambiguities.
- It no longer expresses the Church's *Lex Credendi*.
- In the last analysis, it is not a Catholic rite of mass, but a neo-Modernist rite

THE "NOVUS ORDO MINDSET"

The changes we listed above in the NOM help to give rise to a new "mindset" among the faithful, which is not a Catholic mindset. This is why Archbishop Lefebvre said the following:

• "And we are convinced that this new rite of Mass expresses a new faith, a faith which
Dogma I

is not ours, a faith which is not the Catholic Faith. This new Mass is a symbol, an expression, an image of a new faith, a Modernist faith.” (Sermon of Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre for the Ordination Mass on the Feast of SS. Peter and Paul, Ecône, Switzerland, 29 June 1976)

- “It is impossible to modify profoundly the *lex orandi* without modifying the *lex credendi*. **To the Novus Ordo Missae correspond a new catechism, a new priesthood, new seminaries, a charismatic Pentecostal Church** — all things opposed to orthodoxy and the perennial teaching of the Church. This Reformation, **born of Liberalism and Modernism**, is poisoned through and through; it derives from heresy and ends in heresy, even if all its acts are not formally heretical. It is therefore impossible for any conscientious and faithful Catholic to espouse this Reformation or to submit to it in any way whatsoever.” (1974 Declaration)

New Doctrinal Mindset

- **Living tradition and evolving dogma:**
Liturgy forms a constantly evolving, experience-based revelation. Truth becomes a thing to be experienced rather than believed. What ceases to be relevant to the faithful apparently ceases to be true.
- **Doctrinal skepticism:**
By tacitly denying the miracle of Transubstantiation and the supernatural power of the ordained priest, the New Mass undermines faith in these dogmas and in related dogmas, e.g. the supernatural nature of the other sacraments and of sanctifying grace in general. One begins to question if there is anything supernatural about the Church – her origin, authority, infallibility, etc. This issue also flows from the evolution of dogma. If someone believes that dogma evolves, they are probably incapable of believing in anything else.
- **Universal salvation:**
If the Redemption is a revelation that God’s covenant with man was never broken, then everyone will be saved. This message is communicated in the New Mass by the practical elimination of references to sin, debt, contrition, and sacrifice. It is also strongly suggested by John Paul II in several of his encyclicals.
- **Religious indifference:**
This flows from the idea of universal salvation and the ecumenical orientation of the New Mass.
- **Loss of a sense of the sacred:**
The New Mass undermines even the natural religious instinct of man by shifting the focus to the

emotional preferences of the worshipers, by exaggerating their importance, by pretending a “mysterious,” i.e. meaningless, presence of God, Whom we thank for not caring anything for His dignity or our insults. Apparently St. Paul was deceived, God is mocked (c.f. Gal. 6:7)

New Moral Mindset

- **Sin does not really exist:**
What is left of the notion of sin if it does not offend God or change my relationship with God or merit a punishment?
- Neglect of confession and penitential practices:
Sin does not need to be forgiven or atoned for if it does not offend God or carry any punishment.
- Peace with the world:
There is no need to fight the attraction of the world towards earthly things and away from spiritual things since sin has no more real meaning, since salvation is assured, and since Catholics do not exclusively possess the truth.
- Liberalism in the strict sense (unbridled use of liberty):
People should be “free.” Such an idea is greatly reinforced by a practical denial of sin, by the leveling down of the priest’s unique power (no authority or power greater than the individual believer) and by doctrinal skepticism (if religious truth is uncertain or changing, constant moral obligations cannot exist anyway).

CONCLUSION: A DANGER TO THE FAITH

In the judgment of Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci, the new rite of Mass promulgated in 1969 “represents, both as a whole and in its details, a striking departure from the Catholic theology of the Mass.”

The New Mass, although it may be valid, is directly based upon a non-Catholic understanding of sin, redemption, priesthood, and liturgy. If one considers the ecumenical dimension of the New Mass, it is even based on non-Catholic notions of dogma, of grace, and of the Church.

The New Mass summarizes and expresses these errors and gradually injects them into the souls of those attending it. The consequence over time is a complete restructuring of thought and practice in accord with these errors. At the doctrinal level, the New Mass is non-Catholic. At the practical

level, i.e. in the day-to-day mindset and practices of people, it creates a new religion. **Its rejection is a matter of fidelity to the virtue of faith.**

7.