

# **Is the Novus Ordo Mass Valid?**

## **Part II**

This is Part II of Mr. Michael Duddy's argument regarding the validity of the Novus Ordo Mass. We posted Part I on the CAI website a few months ago, and it can be found at <http://www.catholicintl.com/catholicissues/noorvalid.pdf>. Although it is true that, since Part I was written, the Vatican has now informed us that "for many" will be the phrase of choice for use in the Church, the question still remains regarding the validity of "for all" from the time it was employed under Paul VI in 1969 until the recent decision by the Vatican to change it back to "for many." Mr. Duddy argues, quite correctly, that "for all," while perhaps not being the best phrase to use, did not make the Novus Ordo Mass invalid, not only because "for all" does not have sufficient demerit within itself, but mainly because the use of either "for all" or "for many" does not affect the validity of the consecration as a matter of fact. Mr. Duddy argues that the only thing necessary to consecrate the Eucharist into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ is the short form of consecration, that is, "This is my body" or "This is my blood," respectively.

This issue is vitally important for almost all sedevacantists, since one of the main reasons they have separated themselves from the Church and declared that there is no reigning pope is due to their belief that the Novus Ordo Mass is invalid. In their thinking, since it is an indisputable fact that the Novus Ordo Mass is invalid, and since it is also a fact that no pope, protected as he is from leading the universal Church into doctrinal error, could possibly approve an invalid Mass, their conclusion is that there could not have been a validly reigning pope at that time. If their stance can be disproved, as Mr. Duddy will attempt to do, then the major plank of their protest against the Church has been nullified. In his attempt to do so, Mr. Duddy addresses and rebuts the position of Bishop Mark Pivarunas of CMRI, one of the few sedevacantist bishops in the world today.

Robert A. Sungenis, Ph.D.

**An Open Letter to Bishop Mark Pivarunas & the Religious of CMRI**  
**(Answering the Validity Question: Part II)**

Dear Bishop Pivarunas;

I am in receipt of your *Comments on Mr. Duddy's Article on the Eucharistic Form of the Consecration for the Wine*. Let me begin, first by thanking Your Excellency for taking the time and effort to respond to my article in both a professional and forthright manner, resorting neither to barbarous polemic nor sarcasm – commodities all too commonly and universally found these days in traditionalist rhetoric. I would also like to thank you for publishing your *Comments* response in the January 07 issue of the *Reign of Mary* as this will *undoubtedly* (well, *hopefully* anyway) alert many members of your Congregation to the fact that the validity “question” is still far from “airtight” and, as a result, perhaps some of them will take the initiative to further investigate the value of the proofs alleged in your position.

Secondly, I wish to assure you that, unlike Fr. X who, when delivering your article to me, admitted he had not yet read my article, preemptively “knew it is wrong,” and therefore avowed that “any further discussion of this matter would be entirely futile,” I reject such an attitude outright; I declare that I have been, continue to be, and, with God’s grace, will continue to be, open to *any* and *all* information presented either in *defense* of or in *opposition* to the Validity Question. Therefore I invite you to please continue in the future any exchange of criticisms you may have with me.

That being said, I will now proceed to address the contents of your *Comments* article in a spirit of openness and goodwill.

## Point #1

### Mr. Duddy's "Extensive Parsing" of the *Catechism of Trent*

**Bishop:** "In a recent article posted on the web site of Dr. Robert Sungenis, Mr. Mike Duddy has presented a defense for the validity of the Novus Ordo Missae based upon his extensive parsing of the Latin text of the Catechism of the Council of Trent."

**M. Duddy:** Although Bishop Pivarunas begins his article by informing his readers correctly that I have "extensively parsed" the Latin text of the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, he never explains to them *what it was* that I **specifically** parsed, and *what the outcome* of that parsing was. He never tells them that **certain statements** in the Catechism - statements which he had previously used, and, as such, were **absolutely vital** to his proof for the invalidity thesis – are **irrefutably** demonstrated by the parsing of

those texts to be **incorrectly translated** and **falsely utilized**. As a result, those texts are no longer of any value to a defense of his position. Specifically, he never alludes to the **facts** that:

1. the sentence "Certo credendum est eam comprehendi his verbis:" does **not say** that "We must believe with certainty that the (essential) form **consists in all** the following words:" Instead it says "We must believe with certainty that the (essential) form **is joined together with, is found within, is included in, or is dealt with in respect to** or **by means of** these following words.
2. the Catechism, by means of providing proof in the form of two *overt syllogisms*, **categorically declares the short form to be absolutely sufficient**: Regarding the consecration of the bread: After declaring that it is **only** the effect of *transubstantiation* that must be signified by the form, the Catechism concludes: "The form **must be determined in** these very same words (This is My Body)." And for the wine: After directing the reader to allude back to what was just said

about the form for the bread, it then likewise concludes: “Since, therefore, these words openly declare *this* (i.e. *transubstantiation*), it is clear that **no other form needs to be determined.**”

By secluding this evidence from his readers’ awareness, the bishop sidesteps the pointed horns of the following dilemma: if he brings this information to his readers’ attention, he will either:

1. have **to admit to its veracity** (in which case, he will also have **to admit that his former position is based on false information**) or he will
2. have **to refute it**. I believe that, if he had been able to demonstrate that **my parsing of the Catechism was indeed incorrect and that my conclusions emanating from it were patently false**, he would have forcefully and triumphantly done so.

Instead (as we shall see under Point # 3 below), he follows a less formidable path, by simply stating that I was wrong about the *short form* being “ultimately, authoritatively settled” by the Catechism, because “many (sic)” theologians, even after the promulgation of the Catechism, still disagree with me.

#### **Point #2:**

#### **The Authority of the Roman Catechism in the “Long Form” vs. the “Short Form” Controversy**

**Bishop:** “Mr. Duddy concludes that the only necessary words to consecrate the wine at Holy Mass are the words ‘This is My Blood’ and therefore the change of the words ‘for many’ to ‘for all’ would not invalidate the consecration. He claims that ‘the matter was ultimately, authoritatively settled by an authority higher than Thomas.’ Now if this were

true, one should surely find conclusive evidence among the theologians (post publication of Catechism of the Council of Trent) that ‘This is my Blood’ is all that is required to validly consecrate the wine.

**M. Duddy:** What I have claimed is that ‘the matter was ultimately, authoritatively settled by an authority higher than Thomas.’ I will concede, however, that I was **incorrect** in my use of the word “ultimately,” and so I hereby withdraw it from my statement. I will also concede that the word “settled” (although it is used with various shades of meaning in Church documents) was too forceful, too emphatic, and perhaps misleading; therefore I will restate it with the phrase “authoritatively **endorsed.**” But even as this statement stood in its unmodified version, the bishop still goes beyond what I said and concludes that ‘ ... if this were true, one should surely find conclusive evidence among the theologians (post publication of Catechism of the Council of Trent) that ‘This is My Blood’ is all that is required to validly consecrate the wine.’

Well, one does find evidence – plenty of evidence – among the theologians (post publication of the Catechism) who refute and disagree with St. Thomas, namely the theologians who penned this section of the Catechism, St. Pius V who promulgated it, and the vast majority of post-Trent theologians, whereas before the time of the Council of Trent most theologians followed St. Thomas’ opinion.

I don’t think I need to argue the point that no theologian’s opinion – even that of a Doctor of the Church – is more authoritative than a document officially promulgated by a pope. Since the Catechism is a document that was promulgated by Pope St. Pius V in direct compliance with a mandate of the Council of Trent itself – especially a mandate that expressly purported to deal with the “efficacy and use” of the sacraments, I maintain that its position regarding the form of consecration is a matter then that was “authoritatively endorsed” by an authority higher than Thomas.”

**Point #3:**

**The matter “ultimately, authoritatively settled” by the Catechism**

**Bishop:** “Surely one should find in the teachings of theologians that the matter had been settled authoritatively and that none of them would therefore question this matter further. However, herein lies the precise problem with Mr. Duddy’s article. Many theologians who taught well after the publication of the Catechism of the Council of Trent do not teach what Mr. Duddy concludes – that the matter has been ultimately and authoritatively settled.”

**M. Duddy:** Wait just a minute, Your Excellency! In the paragraph immediately above this one, you quoted me correctly when you said: Mr. Duddy claims that “the matter was ultimately, authoritatively settled by an authority higher than Thomas.” Now you are claiming that I said “that the matter has been ultimately and authoritatively settled,” thus implying that I believe the matter to be beyond discussion. I certainly do not claim that the matter has been” ultimately and authoritatively **settled,**” and therefore I do not hold that no theologian is free to **opine** against certain of its statements.

I specifically said that in reference to this issue “the Catechism’s explanations **do not** constitute an infallible definition.” I did state, however, that “they constitute **the most authoritative declaration given to date,**” a “declaration which has stood the test of time for almost 450 years,” and, as a result, “must be considered the Church’s **official** position on the matter.”

Let us recall here, before we go any further, that this entire issue regarding the authority of the Catechism of Trent was **initiated** by Omlor and then **utilized** by the CMRI who re-echoed and defended his reasoning. The only reason we are discussing it here, is because the bishop now wishes to obliquely dismiss the authority of the Catechism on this issue – a Catechism whose authority he so volubly trumpeted previously, when he believed it supported his claim that the long form was necessary for validity. I don’t recall the bishop stating in a postscript to the Frs.’ Radecki book: “Attn: you don’t have to hold that the

long form is truly necessary, because in spite of what *Tumultuous Times* says, many, if not most theologians (post publication of the Catechism) dissent from its position on this matter.”

The Fathers Radecki, presenting the official position of the CMRI in their book *Tumultuous Times*, state on pages 404 – 405 that: “*The Catechism of the Council of Trent specifically defines the form* of the Holy Eucharist ... ‘We are then firmly to believe that it (the form for the consecration of the wine) consists in the following words: **TICMB, ETC.** Of these words the greater part are taken from Scripture; but some have been preserved in the Church from Apostolic Tradition.... It is plain that no other words constitute the form.’ ‘With reason ,therefore, were the words for all not used, as in this place the fruits of the passion are alone spoken of, and to the elect only did His passion bring the fruit of salvation.’

Then, two paragraphs later, the Fathers firmly conclude (based upon what they just cited in the Catechism) that “When Paul VI replaced Christ’s words ‘for many’ with the words ‘for all’ he changed the essential words of the Consecration of the Mass.” Now if these aforementioned statements contained in *Tumultuous Times* don’t constitute evidence of the CMRI believing or claiming that the Catechism “authoritatively settled” the matter by at least “an authority higher than Thomas” then I don’t know what does.

For the sake of argument, I am perfectly willing to let Bishop Pivarunas, John Lane, et al. reduce the authority of the Catechism to a level as **low** as they wish, because, in doing so, they remove from their repository of alleged proofs the only **magisterial** document (albeit a document **merely** of the **ordinary magisterium**) in existence that deals **specifically and directly** with the matter of the form necessary for the consecration. If they thus choose to eliminate this document as a proof, then they have reduced this issue back to the level of **mere theological opinion**. Although some (many??) theologians can be found during the last few centuries to agree with them about the necessity of **some** additional words, even these theologians (as I’ll show later) would not agree with them that the **new** form would invalidate the mass, much less agree with them that the word

“many”, translated literally as “many,” is necessary in order to signify the unity of the mystical body.

This leaves them with only two cards left to play:

- 1) the alleged analogy between *Apostolicae Curae* (the papal bull which declared Anglican Orders to be invalid) and the “for all men” signification evidenced in the new rite,
- 2) the intrinsic falsity of the translation of “for many” as “for all.” While it is well beyond the scope of this present article to deal with the first of these, the second one will be discussed as the subject matter of the bishop’s final point.

Finally, when the bishop states that “the precise problem” with my article is that “many theologians don’t teach what I conclude – that the matter has been ultimately, authoritatively settled,” he introduces the tactic of what I would term “swapping arguments in mid-debate.” In choosing to avoid the problem of dealing with my parsing of the text, he inadvertently introduces another problem; by introducing his new weapon of offence – the sword of undercutting the authority of the Catechism – he introduces an implement that cuts both ways. What he hopes to use against the authority of the Catechism’s support for the sufficiency of the short form, he must now also use retroactively against the authority he alleged the Catechism had, when he believed it supported his case for the necessity of the “long form.” Remember what we just read above in *Tumultuous Times*; the Catechism “*defined*” the long form to be necessary for validity. But therein lies the precise problem with the CMRI’s position. Many, if not most theologians (post publication of the catechism), including the Doctors de Ligouri and Bellarmine, do not teach what the Frs. Radecki conclude.

#### Point #4:

#### The Issues of “mortal sin” and “conditional repetition” of the Long Form

**Bishop:** “There are a number of theologians who teach that the entire form as found in the Canon of the Mass is required for validity. And there are also other theologians who speculatively teach that the short form is sufficient; however, these theologians make it perfectly clear that IN PRACTICE, a priest would sin mortally were he to use only the short form (This is My Blood) and that he would be required to repeat the entire form conditionally.”

**M. Duddy:** First, there were certainly a “number of theologians” **prior to** the time of the Council of Trent who followed St. Thomas in teaching that the “entire form as found in the Canon of the Mass” was necessary for validity. But **after** the Council, while there were certainly **some** who still taught that **some** additional words were necessary, the Salmantecenses and Cardinal Cappisucus were the only noted theologians who continued to defend that “the entire form as found in the Canon of the Mass” was necessary.

Secondly, it is interesting to note that, when speaking about those theologians who teach the mere necessity of the *short form*, the bishop **emphasizes** that they teach speculatively. By this one sided emphasis, does he mean to insinuate that those minority theologians who still teach the necessity of the long form are **not also** teaching speculatively?

Thirdly, yes, it is certainly true that IN PRACTICE **a priest** would sin mortally if **he**, on **his own authority**, decided to use merely the *short form*. But a priest (at least in the previous legislation) would sin mortally if he decided **on his own initiative** to make **any** unauthorized changes in the Ordinary of the Mass. Since, as Pius XII reaffirmed in his encyclical *Mediator Dei*, **only the Holy See has the authority** to regulate the Sacred Liturgy, those who would **presume** to do so on their own would sin mortally.

The bishop goes on to cite several theologians to this effect - Halligan, Davis, Cappello, de Liguori, de la Taille, Amicus, and Wengier – as if this litany of names and repetitive citations of the “mortal sin” issue, and the “repeat the form conditionally” issue, will

definitively, necessarily imply that the *long form* is what **really** is necessary for validity. But these theologians are discussing this subject matter from the standpoint of the principles of **moral theology**, not **dogmatic theology**. No, it is **a precaution** - indeed a precaution mandated by divine law - based on a principle of **moral theology** that it is illicit to follow a less than certain practice when the validity of a sacrament is at stake.

Since the Church has not yet infallibly defined that the *short form* suffices, in practice the *long form* must be used. But the situation is decidedly different when the **Holy See** makes an **authorized change** in a sacramental **form**; it is no longer merely an issue of an individual priest, an individual bishop, or even the entire hierarchy collectively presuming to make a change in virtue of **its own authority**. If a pre-Vatican II pope had made a change in a similar manner, no Traditionalist would have uttered a word of concern. But since the Sedevacantists have already declared these popes to be non-popes, they can arbitrarily decree with impunity the theological rectitude of all their juridical acts.

For example, when Pius XII defined the **matter** for Holy Orders in the Western Church as being **merely the laying on of hands** (the **handing over of the instruments** no longer being deemed a **necessary accompaniment**), he did so without first defining the answer to the prerequisite question of whether or not the Church has the power to add elements to, or subtract elements from, the **substance** of the **rite** (as opposed to the **substance** of the **sacrament**). If the pope were wrong about the ability of the Church to subtract from the essential rite, then the mere laying on of hands would have invalidated the sacrament.

Needless to say, if the Holy See solemnly authorizes a sacramental rite, especially a rite that will be used throughout, not just the diocese of Rome, but throughout the largest and most prominent rite in all Christendom, and that authorization by its very nature would necessarily imply that the *short form* must be sufficient, then that authorization would necessarily settle the matter; it would necessarily be covered under the umbrella of the **indefectibility** of the Church, an umbrella that is certainly wider in its scope of divine protection than infallibility is. And this indefectibility not only pertains to the

fundamental existence of the hierarchy itself, but also to the faith and the essential sacramental welfare of the hundreds of millions of faithful who would potentially be affected by their decisions. (Sr. Lucy and the nation of Portugal immediately come to mind.)

### **Point # 5**

#### **“De Defectibus” in the Roman Missal & Invalidity**

**Bishop:** “It is interesting that this De Defectibus decree had been printed in all Roman Missals for over four centuries and well after the publication of the Catechism of the Council of Trent. Special notice should be made that this De Defectibus decree explicitly stated the form for the consecration of the bread and the wine: (the entire form is cited) If Mr. Duddy’s interpretation of the words of the Catechism (that only the short form, “This is My Blood.” is sufficient), were true, why was this section of the De Defectibus not edited to be reconciled with the Catechism? Is it to be supposed that over this long period of time there has been a discrepancy between the Roman Missal and the Catechism?”

**M. Duddy:** First of all (just for the record), the De Defectibus is not a specific decree, intentionally promulgated with the express intent to settle definitively the issue of the essential form; if it were, then the issue of *short form* vs. *long form* would have been long ago settled, and the *Catechism of Trent* would have been clearly in contradiction to this decree. The Roman Missal was promulgated by the Decree *Quo Primum* on July 14, 1570 and the De Defectibus (DD) was incorporated into that missal together with the sections regarding the Calendar, the General Rubrics, and the Required Ritual when celebrating Mass.

The bishop’s statements that: 1.) “this De Defectibus decree had been printed in all Roman Missals for over four centuries **well after** the publication of the Catechism of Trent” and 2.) “If Mr. Duddy’s interpretation of the words of the Catechism (that only the short form) ... were true, why was this section of the De Defectibus not **edited to be**

**reconciled** with the Catechism?” are, in part, **anachronisms** that place the cart in front of the horse. As for quote #1, of course the Missal was continuously published for centuries after the Catechism, **but the Catechism of Trent was promulgated first**, around November of **1566**, by Pius V, and **the Roman Missal with the De Defectibus was promulgated by the same pope almost three years later** in **1570**. So the real question the bishop needs to ask is: “Why was this section in the *Catechism of Trent* not edited to be reconciled with the DD?”

Unfortunately then, for the DD “decree,” the horse was already out of the papal barn and galloping widely throughout the terrain of the Roman Rite, declaring that only the *short form* suffices. If the bishop is correct about his implication regarding the theological nature of the “DD,” then what an embarrassing dilemma for poor St. Pius V; his left hand didn’t know what his right hand had already done; his left hand – the Catechism – had said (1566) the *short form* suffices for validity and his right hand – the DD - now said (1570) the long form was necessary. (!!!!!!!)

**Bishop:** “In this decree under ‘Defects in the Form’ it is stated: ‘Defects on the part of the form can happen when something is lacking which is required for the integrity of the words in the consecration itself. Thus the words of consecration...are the following: (the entire full form is cited). Thus if any one should shorten anything, or should change anything in the form..., and if, by the change, the words do not signify the same thing, he would not confect the sacrament. If in fact any one should add or subtract anything, which would not change the meaning, he would indeed confect it, but would sin most gravely.”

**M. Duddy:** There are three things that need to be noticed here.

1. Nowhere does the **DD** tell us **which words** in the cited form are **essential** and which are **not**.
2. Nowhere does the **DD** tell us the **meaning** of any word or phrase in the cited form.

3. But the DD does remind us that a **distinction** needs to be made between changes that “change the meaning” and changes that “do not change the meaning.” The words “shorten anything” and “change anything” are first conditioned by the preceding words “when something is lacking which is **required** for the integrity of the **words in the consecration itself**” and secondly by “**and if** by the change the words do not signify **the same thing**.” Thus, the statement “and if, by the change, the words do not signify the same thing, he would not confect the sacrament.” needs to be read – not in isolation – but within the context of the sentence **before** and the sentence **following** which says: “If in fact one should add or subtract anything which would not change the meaning, he would confect it.”

As a result, a judgment has to be made by the priest. In fact two judgments: 1.) Does the verbal error just made involve the essential or the non essential? 2.) If it involves the essential, does it change the meaning? Since the DD doesn't give him the answer to either question, the priest will have to reflect on the theology he learned elsewhere. I would bet that in the era immediately following the Council of Trent, most priests probably reflected on the Catechism and thus based their judgment on its statement that the short form suffices. In the **practical** order then, the Church had already set a **precedent** (the horse out of the barn). Since however (during the last couple of centuries anyway) most theologians have (for whatever reason) shifted their focus away from the Catechism, priests would now base their precautionary practice upon the advice given in the manuals of Moral Theology as cited above by the bishop.

It would seem then that the DD, like the manuals referred to above, is basically a practical and precautionary guide to aid priests in the practical order, a guide based upon accepted principles of moral theology.

## Point # 6

### Frs. de la Taille, Amicus, Wengier et al. & the Necessity of the Long Form

**Bishop:** “Fr. de la Taille addressed the two opinions regarding the essential words for the consecration of the wine. After reading the following excerpt from his work, one will clearly see that Mike Duddy’s conclusion in regard to the short form (This is My Blood.) is **erroneous** and that the matter has not been **authoritatively settled.**” The bishop goes on to quote almost seven pages from theologians who state that **some** additional words are necessary. Because of its great length, I will refrain from giving the full quote here and will refer in my response to any parts that are important.

**M. Duddy:** Just because some theologians have **opined** that some additional words are necessary, does not make the majority opinion “**erroneous.**” Nor does the majority opinion regarding the *short form* make the *long form* opinion “**erroneous.**” That neither opinion has been “**authoritatively settled,**” I readily admit. Again, I here repeat my withdrawal of the terms “ultimately” and “settled” with regard to my former reference to the position taken by the *Catechism of Trent*. The Catechism merely lent whatever degree of authority it has to advancing and supporting the *short form* position.

But there are two points that need to be stated here:

1. The fact is that the Novus Ordo actually uses a long form of consecration and that fact makes the issue of the mere necessity of a *short form* irrelevant for our purposes here.
2. The reasons given by **all** the theologians cited by Bishop Pivarunas for establishing the need for a long form are in fact **verified** in the vernacular form of the Novus Ordo.

The main reason why **some** theologians say that **some** additional words must be added to “This is My Blood” is the fact that the Eucharist is not only a Sacrament but also a **Sacrifice**. They do not believe that the **essential element** of the “outward offering” or the “sacrificial oblation” is sufficiently signified **without** some additional words like “of the new covenant” **or** “shed for the remission of sins.”

There were two opinions held by theologians describing how this “external oblation” is actually manifested: the **majority** view holds that it is sufficiently manifested by the symbolism of **the double consecration itself**, whereby the priest makes Christ present under the appearances of death, thus necessarily **recalling** his sacrificial oblation on the cross. The **minority** view held that it is accomplished by the usage of **the additional words** “shed for the remission of sins,” because only by these words does it become evident that the sacrifice is offered to God, since only God can forgive sins.

Years ago, Mr. Omlor told me that he originally had hoped to use Fr. de la Taille and others to support his case for invalidity, but admitted that their position didn’t help much, since their position would be satisfied with either “of the new testament” or “shed for the purpose of remitting sins.” Thus, it would make no difference to these theologians whether *sufficiency* **or** *efficacy* was referred to, since **either** of these theological concepts would **sufficiently signify** that Christ’s Body and Blood were offered to God in sacrifice; and as we know, the NOM consecration formula uses both “of the new and everlasting covenant” and “shed so that sins may be forgiven,” thus signifying (twice) that the sacrifice is offered to God.

(In my fourth article, I will discuss in greater length the theories of these two schools of theology and show how the encyclical *Mediator Dei* of Pius XII sided with the theological position of the majority school. It was in the wake of that encyclical that de la Taille’s treatise *Mystery of Faith* found its way onto the dusty shelves of used book stores.)

But aside from this opinion of the minority school, there are (unfortunately for their case) no theologians who defend the position that the additional words “for many” are needed in order to adequately signify the grace of the sacrament (*res sacramenti*), i.e. the unity of the mystical body.

### Point # 7

#### The Trent Catechism, St. Alphonsus, Pope Benedict XIV, St. Thomas Aquinas And the Consecration of the Wine

**Bishop:** “In all of this discussion about the words of consecration, it should not be overlooked that regardless of one’s opinion in this matter, the words used in the Novus Ordo Missae, ‘for you and for all’ are theologically erroneous. The Catechism of the Council of Trent clearly taught: ‘With reason, therefore were the words for all not used...’ St. Alphonsus Ligouri in his book *The Holy Eucharist*, reiterated the same thing: ‘The words *‘for you and for many’* are used to distinguish the virtue of the blood of Christ from its fruits; for the blood of our Saviour is of sufficient value to save all men, but its fruits are applicable only to a certain number and not to all, and this is their own fault. Or as the theologians say, this precious blood is (in itself) sufficiently (sufficienter) able to save all men, but (on our part) effectually (efficaciter) it does not save all – it saves only those who cooperate with grace. This is the explanation of St. Thomas, as quoted by Benedict XIV.”

**M. Duddy:** It is indeed providential that Bishop Pivarunas should conclude his article with the above quotation from St. Alphonsus, because this issue will bring us to the final stage - indeed to the very **crux** of this controversy. Yes, “regardless of one’s opinion in this matter,” we can now **transcend** the issue of whether or not the *short form* vs. the *long form* suffices for validity, or even whether or not the mere additional phrase “*of the new testament*” annexed to the *short form*, would suffice for validity, because, as the bishop correctly informs us, the Novus Ordo Missae (NOM) uses more than the mere

*short form*. With the sole exception of omitting the phrase “Mysterium Fidei,” the NOM, then, uses a form which is *conceptually* almost as long as that of the Tridentine Mass.

However, if it can be shown that neither St. Alphonsus, nor Pope Benedict XIV, nor even St. Thomas Aquinas can be co-opted to support the bishop’s allegation against the for “all men” rendition; if it can be shown that, contrary to the bishop’s claim that St. Alphonsus “reiterated the same thing” as the Trent Catechism, these same three persons **do in fact actually contradict** this statement of the Catechism; if it can be shown that the Trent Catechism’s statements regarding the for “all men” controversy are without **any doctrinal authority** whatsoever; and, finally, if it can be shown that there is absolutely **no** reference to, or discussion of, this matter in **any** document of the Magisterium prior to the promulgation of the NOM, then perhaps – just perhaps – Bishop Pivarunas (and other traditionalist groups and individuals as well) will concede that the See of Rome may have been more competent in its approbation of this translation than they were in their condemnation of it. At the very least, these factors should demonstrate the theological poverty, if not to say the **objective** audacity, of those who have relied merely on their own **opinions** in order to condemn **Popes** for promulgating “error,” *lex orandi, lex credendi*, in the very heart of the Mass.

Now, abstracting temporarily from the issue of validity, there are **two other issues** which Bishop Pivarunas alleges that St. Alphonsus, Pope Benedict XIV, and St. Thomas teach by means of the above quoted text. The **first issue** is that the translation of “*for many*” as “*for all*” is, at the very least, theologically inappropriate in the form of the consecration of the wine. The **second issue**, and the far more serious, is that the rendition of “*for many*” as “*for all*” in the form of the consecration constitutes a grave “theological error.” Indeed, if one consults *Tumultuous Times*, (Frs. Radecki), one will discover that this “theological error” is actually something far worse, namely, the heresy of Universalism – that all men are actually saved.

Now, from these words of St. Alphonsus, the bishop draws a conclusion which is not only truly astonishing, but patently illogical: “It is truly amazing” he says “that this

theological error has been universally manifested in vernacular translations of the Novus Ordo Missae for over thirty years.” And again: “The use of the words “for all,” as is the universal practice of the Novus Ordo Missae, is to declare a theological error at the very moment when transubstantiation is supposed to take place.” A strong allegation, indeed, but one which is completely gratuitous; precisely what “this theological error” is, the bishop, unlike the Frs. Radecki, never expressly relates to us, nor, as a result, does he attempt to prove its existence with specific evidence. (If this allegation of “error” or “heresy” were true, one would expect to see in evidence (Exhibit A) that the suspect formula of consecration **actually states** “shed for all men unto the very remission of sins,” not simply “shed for all men so that sins may be forgiven.”)

But since, according to the bishop’s statement, we are **assured** that “this theological error” actually does “manifest(s) itself in vernacular translations” of the NOM, we are therefore left in the precarious position of having to surmise for ourselves: what is “this theological error” that causes the new mass to be akin to the “abomination of desolation” spoken of by Daniel the Prophet?

1. Is it the **fact** that the new form does indeed **objectively express** the solemnly **defined truth** that Christ really did die for all men, i.e. “shed for all so that sins may be forgiven?” Obviously not.
2. Is it the additional **fact** that this same formula also **objectively expresses** the **dogmatic fact** that every single mass is offered for the salvation of every single person alive, i.e. “shed for all so that sins may be forgiven?” Again, obviously not. After all, doesn’t the Church recite the following prayer at every Tridentine Mass during the elevation of the chalice in the Offertory when the priest says: “We offer Thee, O Lord, this chalice of salvation....for our salvation and for the salvation of the whole world.” And does not this offering of the chalice at the Offertory symbolically **look forward to** and **didactically parallel** in its content the same theology signified by the elevation of the Chalice after the consecration of the wine?

3. Or is this theological error just simply the fact that, through a bad translation, we are putting false words on Christ's lips? This last question, then, is the only one which hypothetically possesses any real **possibility**, and that possibility is entirely dependent upon whether or nor the translation in question **really is a false one**; and the answer to that question will be the subject matter of the remainder of this article. (It is also worth considering that falsehood may also be expressed, not only by acts of positive **alteration**, but also by acts of **omission** as well. For example, the Tridentine Rite **omits** certain important words of Christ, words spoken during that most solemn moment in history – the Last Supper - when He said all(?) of the following: “My Body **handed over** for you”, “My Body **given up** for you”, or My Body **broken** for you.” Since these additional words attest to both the historical fact that Christ actually said them, and also signify that the Body of the Lord is indeed **offered up sacrificially**, does not their **omission** suppress and therefore falsely signify the entire truth – the sacrificial nature - of the Eucharistic offering of the consecrated bread?)

What is “truly amazing” then, is how these traditionalists can **conceptually transmute** an expression which objectively expresses two infallible theological truths – “shed for all men so that sins may be forgiven” - into one which somehow becomes **in their minds** an expression of “error” and “heresy,” and is allegedly the equivalent of saying “shed for all men unto the actual remission of sins.”

Such theological alchemy, however, can be understood from a psychological standpoint and thus explained benevolently. There is an axiom in the Epistemology of Thomistic Philosophy which states: “Whatever is perceived is perceived according to the mode of the one perceiving.” In other words, once a person becomes committed to a cause (a scientific hypothesis, a philosophical or a theological position) with a predetermined expectation, mindset or bias, he will have the strongest mental tendency to interpret and even to re-construct subconsciously all data in accordance with that mindset.

And so strong, so determined are Sedevacantists in their impassioned mindset to prove the new mass and other sacraments invalid, and so determined are many other Traditionalists to prove the new mass intrinsically sacrilegious (after all, it makes the case against the new rites so much more intellectually cogent) that they will reflexively read into even the most objectively contrary statements, things which are needed to validate their case. With this idea in mind, let us now examine the above text of St. Alphonsus to see if it supports the bishop's allegation. In doing so, however, I believe that what will be discovered there instead, will be the case of a dyslexic exegesis, i.e. an exegesis that expresses itself **inversely** from what is the objective truth of the matter.

### **St. Alphonsus' Exegesis of "Shed for You and for Many"**

Let us now read again what St. Alphonsus actually says: "The words 'pro vobis et pro multis' are used to distinguish the **virtue** of the blood of Christ **from its **fruits**.**"

First, let us analyze the **parts of speech** which make up this sentence. The **subject** of the sentence is "the words" and is in **opposition to** (=) the phrase "pro vobis et pro multis." The **verb form**, "are used," indicates to us what "the words" ("for you and for many") are conveying, i.e. they are being "used" by their author to signify something. Next, the phrase "to distinguish (something) from (something)" is a **purpose clause** and denotes the orientation of the verb's action, that is we are being instructed "to **distinguish** one use or meaning **from** another use or meaning"; to distinguish between concept **A** and concept **B**. Finally, the **order** in which we are being instructed to make this distinction is important: to **distinguish A from B**, not to distinguish B **from A**; thus the **object of the preposition** "from" is B, not A. It certainly makes a difference if I tell someone that I want them primarily to distinguish the essence of a thing from its mere appearance, as opposed to telling someone to distinguish primarily appearances from essence.

Now let us read that sentence again, this time **slowly** and **attentively**; and in doing so please keep in mind that the word “**virtue**” is synonymous with the word “**power**,” i.e. with the theological concept of “**sufficiency**,” and that the word “**fruits**” is synonymous with the word “**results**,” i.e. with the theological concept of “**efficacy**.” Begin: “The words ‘pro vobis et pro multis’ are used (1) **to distinguish the virtue** of the blood of Christ (2) **from its fruits**.”

Now again, this time with the above referenced **synonymous substitutions**: “The words....are used (1) **to distinguish the power**... (2) **from the results**.” And again: “The words... are used **to distinguish** (1) **sufficiency** from (2) **efficacy**.” That certainly sounds to me like St. Alphonsus is saying that the concept of **sufficiency – not efficacy** – is (1) the **first** and **foremost** idea, that **sufficiency – not efficacy** – is the **immediate subject matter** that the words “pro vobis et pro multis” are **meant to convey**, and that (2) **efficacy**, by implication, is merely of **secondary** relevance. Thus if we now take our synonym-substitution process to its ultimate example, we shall have to say: “The words....are used to **distinguish** the concept that ‘*Christ shed His blood for all men so that sins may be forgiven.*’ **from** the concept that ‘*Christ shed His blood for many unto the actual remission of their sins.*’

In point of fact, notice how St. Alphonsus continues his explanation **by alternating** between (1) the **foremost** idea of **sufficiency** and (2) the **secondary** idea of **efficacy**: “; for the blood of our Saviour is (1) **of sufficient value** to save all men, but (2) **its fruits are applicable only to a certain number and not to all...**” and “Or, as the theologians say, this precious blood (1) is (in itself) **sufficiently (sufficienter)** able to save all men, but (on our part) (2) **effectually (efficaciter)** it does not save all...”

Now because the dynamics of the tendentious mindset (especially one held for so long) tend to paralyze one’s predisposition against objectivity, it therefore takes time, repetition, and multiple examples to deprogram such an inclination. Therefore, at the risk of being considered redundant, I will reinforce the above data concerning St. Alphonsus’ statements by offering one more example.

Let us first substitute the acronym VPS for virtue, power, and sufficiency, and the acronym FRE for fruits, result, and efficacy. Therefore, when St. Alphonsus says that “The words ‘pro vobis et pro multis’ are used to distinguish the VPS of the blood of Christ from its FRE,” we see that the idea of sufficiency – and not efficacy – is first and foremost in his mind. If, on the other hand, St. Alphonsus were to say that “The words ‘pro vobis et pro multis’ are used to distinguish the FRE of the blood of Christ from its VPS,” we would see that the idea of efficacy – and not sufficiency – is first and foremost in his mind. But St. Alphonsus said the former not the latter; therefore, he stressed the idea of sufficiency over efficacy. The quintessence, therefore, of the saint’s statement is: These words distinguish sufficiency from efficacy: These words distinguish the idea that “Christ died for all men so that sins may be forgiven.” from the idea that “Christ died for many men unto the efficacious remission of their sins.” He did **not** say, as the bishop would have us believe, that “These words distinguish efficacy from sufficiency: These words distinguish the idea that “Christ died for many men unto the efficacious remission of their sins.” from the idea that “Christ died for all men so that sins may be forgiven.” To put it as succinctly as possible, let us say that A = sufficiency, and Z = efficacy. These words distinguish A from Z; not Z from A.

Let me add here, however, that I am **not** saying that just because the idea of sufficiency (A) is the first and foremost idea expressed by the words “pro vobis et pro multis,” it is therefore the **exclusive** idea that is being expressed. The idea of efficacy (Z) is **also** expressed, but it is of **secondary consideration**. The same thought would be true even if St. Alphonsus had said “The words...distinguish the efficacy from the sufficiency.” Here, then, efficacy would have been the first and foremost idea and sufficiency would have been the secondary consideration.

Finally, in connection with this last point, there is a concept in Philosophy known as **connex** or **co-relative** ideas. These are ideas that are **inextricably** related to each other. To think of one is to **necessarily** imply the other. (good - evil; teacher - student; creator - creature; potency - act; etc.) Also, just as every **cause** implies its **effect**, so every **effect**

implies its **cause**. Thus, the doctrines of the **sufficiency** of Christ's passion and the **efficacy** of the passion are connex and co-relative theological concepts, and bear to each other the relationship of **cause** and **effect**: As a result, it is not theologically possible to conceptually disassociate the idea that Christ died "for all so that sins may be forgiven (**the cause**)" from the idea that Christ died "for many unto the remission of sins (**the effect**)." This will be discussed further in the section regarding St. Thomas and his teaching regarding the multiplicity of the Literal Sense of Scripture. It also explains why St. Alphonsus, Pope Benedict XIV, and St. Thomas all include **both ideas** in their explanation of the meaning of these words.

And lest there be any doubt that this is what St. Alphonsus is really saying, let us continue on with the examination of the two **sources** he used in order to come to his conclusion, namely, Pope Benedict XIV and St. Thomas Aquinas; for St. Alphonsus tells us: "This is the explanation of St. Thomas, as quoted by Benedict XIV."

**Pope Benedict XIV's "*De Sacrosancto Missae Sacrificio*"  
and the Words "*for many*"  
In the Consecration of the Wine**

Since St. Alphonsus tells us that his own exposition of the phrase "shed for you and for many" is virtually a recapitulation of the exposition of Pope Benedict XIV, and that Benedict also, in actuality, is basically just "quoting" the explanation formulated by St. Thomas in both the *Sentences* and in the *Summa*, it behooves us to look into and see what Benedict actually says about this matter.

In the context of explaining the meaning of the words of the consecration formula for the wine, Pope Benedict XIV, in his monumental theological Tome "*De Sacrosancto Missae Sacrificio*" explains:

Ac eundem Angelicum Doctorem sequuti ita explicamus verba illa *pro multis*, ut vox *multi* juxta modum loquendi Scripturarum sacrarum significet omnes. *Sicut enim per inobedientiam unius hominis peccatores constituti sunt multi; ita et per unius obediendum *justi* constituentur multi*: sunt verba D. Pauli ad Roman.5. ubi sine dubitatione vox *multi omnes* significant, ut luculentissime apparet ex superioribus verbis: *Igitur sicut per unius delictum in omnes homines in condemnationem, sic per unius justitiam in omnes homines in justificationem vitae*. Itaque dicimus Sanguinem Christi fusum esse pro omnibus; Ipse est propitiatio pro peccatis nostris; non pro nostris autem tantum, sed etiam pro totius mundi; sunt verba D. Joannis: fusum autem pro omnibus quoad sufficientiam, et (fusum) pro solis electis quoad efficaciam, ut bene explicat D.Thomas in 4 sentent. dist. 8. quaest. 2. art. 2. quaest. 3. ad septimum: habere porro efficaciam non solum (ait idem D. Thomas 3. par. Quaest. 78. art.3. ad octavum) in Judaeis electis, quibus exhibitus est Sanguis veteris Testamenti, sed etiam in Gentilibus, nec solum in Sacerdotibus, qui hoc conficiunt Sacramentum, vel aliis, qui sumunt, sed etiam in illis, pro quibus offeretur. Et ideo signanter dicit: pro vobis Judaeis, et pro multis, scilicet Gentilibus; vel pro vobis manducantibus, et pro multis, pro quibus offeretur.

And so, following the same Angelic Doctor, we explain those words *for many* as follows, that the word *many* according to the manner of speaking of the Holy Scriptures may signify all. *For as through the disobedience of the one man many were constituted sinners; and so through the obedience of one man many were constituted just*: The words are of St Paul to the Romans 5. where without doubt the word *many* does signify *all men*, as is most clearly evident from the following words written above it: *Therefore as through the sin of one man unto all men the result was condemnation, so through the justice of one man unto all men the result was justification*. Therefore we say that the Blood of Christ has been shed for all men: This same (Blood) is the propitiation for our sins; not, however, for our sins only, but also for the sins of the whole world; The words are of St. John: shed however for all men according to sufficiency, and (shed) for *the elect* only according to efficacy, as Thomas well explains in 4 Sentences: dist. 8. quaest. 2. art. 2. quaest. 3. ad septimum: next (we say) that (the Blood) has efficacy not only

(Thomas affirms the same thing in the Summa part III, Question 78, art.3 to the 8<sup>th</sup> objection.) in the Jewish elect, to whom the Blood of the old Testament was exhibited, but also in the Gentiles, not only in the Priests who confect this Sacrament and also in those who receive it, but also in those for whom it is offered. And thus he significantly says: *for you*, the Jews, and *for many*, namely the Gentiles; or *for you* who partake of it, and *for many* for whom it is offered

The above translation is my own, but it will differ **substantially** in only **one** very critical sentence – the first sentence - from the translation made by Mr. Omlor on page 62 of *The Robber Church*. Omlor translates this critical sentence as follows:

“And so, having agreed with the same Angelic Doctor, we explain those words *for many* accordingly, though it is granted that (sometimes) the word many, after a manner of speaking in Holy Scriptures, may signify all.”

I will repeat my translation here for purpose of comparison:

“And so, following the same Angelic Doctor, we explain those words *for many* as follows, that the word many according to the manner of speaking of the Holy Scriptures may signify all.”

At first sight it might not seem to some that there is any real difference between the two translations; but the difference revolves around the meaning of the phrase “*ita explicamus verba illa pro multis, ut vox multi... significet omnes.*” Omlor attempts to translate the “*ut significet omnes*” clause as a Concessive Clause: “We explain... accordingly, though it is granted that (sometimes) the word many ... may signify all.” and I translate it as a Result Clause: “We explain...as follows, (with the result) that the word many ... may signify all.” So then, who is right?

Here I must digress for a moment and go back to the year 1971. One day, when visiting Mr. Omlor at his house, he gave me a copy of the above Latin text from Benedict’s

writings. He had underlined the “ut significet omnes” clause and then proceeded to explain to me his reason for insisting that it had to be translated as a Concessive, rather than as a Result Clause. (I wrote his explanation on the bottom area of the photocopies he had given me, and which I still possess.) “Unless this passage is translated as a Concessive Clause” he said, “Benedict would then have to be understood as necessarily contradicting Thomas on this point.” Since Omlor had previously already formulated the conclusion that Thomas **actually rejected** the viability of the “for all men” translation, his tendentious eagerness to render this clause as concessive is understandable.

But apart from Omlor’s preconceived **assumption** about Thomas’ position on this matter, his translation is **untenable** for several reasons.

1. A Concessive Clause, by definition, is one which introduces a statement conceded or granted for the sake of argument. But, when an “ut” clause, followed by the use of the subjunctive mood, is to be rendered as a concessive clause, it is accompanied in the **main** clause by the **correlative** word **tamen**. Such a correlative, however, is missing in the case here. Therefore a concessive clause is highly improbable.
2. A Result Clause, on the other hand, is one which expresses the result of the action of the main verb. But when an “ut” clause, also followed by the subjunctive mood, is to be rendered as a result clause, it is accompanied in the main clause by a **correlative** word such as **ita**, tam, sic, tantus, tot, etc. In the case at hand, “ut significet” is introduced by the correlative **ita**: “... **ita** explicamus verba illa..., **ut** vox multi ... significet omnes.” Therefore a result clause is virtually certain.
3. But also, in Omlor’s translation of “ut” as a concessive clause, the idea which the sentence supposedly intends to convey remains **incomplete**; the sentence never goes on to explain the fundamental issue of what “accordingly” means: “We explain those words *for many accordingly*, though it is granted that...” While the pope immediately goes on to give an example from Scripture in order to

demonstrate the truth of the alleged concession, i.e., the use of *many* as sometimes meaning *all*, he doesn't immediately go on to make an explicit point about *many* meaning literally *many*, nor does he give (as one would expect) any corresponding example from Scripture which would demonstrate the literal sense of *many* as *many*. However, immediately after citing this example which proves that *many* can mean *all* (Rom 5:5-15), the pope in the next sentence does complete the idea of "accordingly": "**And so** we say that the blood of Christ was shed **for all**;" Thus (leaving out the example from Scripture) the essential flow of the pope's thought is as follows: "We explain those words accordingly." "And so we say that the blood of Christ was shed for all." Here we clearly see that "accordingly" is equivalent to "**And so we say that** the blood of Christ was shed for all." And to **emphasize** the point again, Benedict immediately goes on to give a second example from Scripture which also verifies that Christ shed his blood for all (1Jn.2:2); but again, no example from Scripture is given for *many*, as literally *many*. To summarize: If the pope had merely wished to acknowledge the occasional possibility (the idea here conceded for the sake of argument) that *many* does sometimes mean *all*, he would not make such a concerted effort to emphasize with **two** examples **the exception to** rather than **the rule itself**, and then not go on to say anything explicitly about the **rule**, namely, the fact that *many* usually and *many* specifically in this particular place means *many*.

4. "Itaque dicimus Sanguinem Christi fusum esse pro omnibus; fusum autem pro omnibus quoad sufficientem, et (fusum) solis pro electis quoad efficaciam, ut bene explicat D.Thomas: porro habere efficaciam non solum in Judicis electis ...sed etiam in Gentilibus..."etc."

"And so we say that the Blood of Christ has been shed for all; shed for all, however, according to sufficiency, and (shed) for the elect only according to efficacy, as the Doctor Thomas explained well: next (it) has efficacy not only in the elect from the Jews...but also in the Gentiles..."

Here Pope Benedict states two things: First, that the word “shed” – **as expressed in the words of consecration** – refers to **two** concepts: the concept of sufficiency **and** the concept of efficacy. He thus indicates that this phrase **in the words of consecration** is **ambiguous**, and therefore refers **simultaneously** to two theologically related ideas: sufficiency and efficacy. And second, that this notion of **dual signification** comes from St. Thomas himself: “Ut bene explicat D. Thomas” “As the Doctor Thomas explains correctly.” What Thomas “explains correctly,” first of all, is the **twofold** distinction between sufficiency and efficacy **in these very words of the consecration**. Remember again the words from St. Alphonsus: “This is the explanation of St. Thomas, as quoted by Benedict XIV.”

### **St. Thomas Aquinas and the Consecration of the Wine**

Now that we have examined the statements of St. Alphonsus and Pope Benedict XIV regarding the words “for you and for many” in the formula for the consecration of the wine, and have demonstrated that both these eminent theologians have asserted that they have expounded **the meaning** of those words in accordance with the interpretation of St. Thomas himself, our final task will now be to examine the statements of St. Thomas for ourselves, and see if these two theologians have done their exposition correctly. But before doing so, I wish to make three preliminary remarks pertinent to the “for many” vs. the “for all” controversy:

#### **Three Preliminary Points**

1. A frequent argument advanced by traditionalists regarding this matter is the rhythmically recited mantra: “*Many* means *many*, and *all* means *all*; if Christ meant *all*, He would have said *all*.” But the problem with this reasoning is that it overlooks the fact that words can and do have more than one meaning. Words have denotative, i.e. literal meanings, and words have connotative, i.e. secondary,

as well as idiomatic meanings. Just pick a word, any word, and consult a dictionary. In addition, the meaning of words can vary from nation to nation (even from area to area within the same nation), not to mention that words periodically change meaning over time. No one denies that in the languages of Scripture, *many* most often means literally many, and *all* most often means literally all; but what traditionalist apologists blithely ignore is the fact that *many* does sometimes – even “often” times (St. Thomas Aquinas) - have the *connotative* and *idiomatic* meaning of *all*. The question then is what does it mean here, in the instance of the consecration formula? Is its meaning strictly denotative, or is it connotative and idiomatic? Or are perhaps both meanings present simultaneously?

2. Another argument advanced is that the word *ravim* in Hebrew/saggi' in Aramaic is translated into the Greek as *polloi*. Therefore, if the word *many* were really intended by the sacred author to have meant *all* in the source manuscript of the Hebrew/Aramaic text, then the sacred author of the final, inspired Greek text would have necessarily rendered it as *panton*, not as *polloi*. In his letter to Fr. Costelloe, S.J. Omlor stated “And it seems to me that if St. Peter had been left with the impression that Our Lord had meant panton when He spoke those words ‘for many’ at the last Supper, then he certainly would have seen to it that panton got written down in his ‘official’ record, and not pollon.” But again, this reasoning is just as inconclusive as the first. Who says that, when an author uses an idiomatic expression in the original language of his manuscript, a translator is **bound** to translate that idiom according to its **meaning**, rather than **transliterate** it in order to retain the literary precision of its original idiomatic form? Certainly, the translator has the option to do either: cf. Mk.10:45; cf. Matt.20:28 ... *and to give his life as a ransom for many (pollon)*. vs. cf.1 Tim.2:6; cf.1 Tim.4:10 ... *who gave Himself as a ransom for all (panton),(soter panton anthropon)*. But there are in fact several places where *many* irrefutably means *all*, and yet the translator still chose to retain the original idiom instead of expressly giving the intended meaning of that idiom. Romans 5:5-15, the verse cited and expounded above by Benedict, is a perfect example. The Holy Scriptures are replete with instances

where idioms are retained, rather than explained. Thus, in order for the above argument to have validity, it would have to be shown that translators, and those sacred authors who quote the idiomatic expressions of others, always render that idiom according to its intended meaning. Again, the question is: Is the Greek word *polloi* a transliteration of the Hebrew idiomatic usage of *ravim*, or is it a translation intending to interpret its meaning? Or again, are both these possibilities signified simultaneously?

3. A third argument, in the case at hand, is that the word *many* is followed by the expression *unto the remission of sins*, thus signifying the result of Christ's action on the cross. Therefore *many* here must mean literally many, since all men do **not** in actuality receive the efficacious remission of their sins. But again, the conclusion doesn't tally with the facts. Just as in Latin, so also in Greek: The preposition *in* followed by the *accusative* case (in remissionem), and the preposition *eis* followed by the *accusative* case (eis aphesein) can signify either purpose and/or result. (*Introduction to Ecc. Latin* by Rev. H.P. Nunn; *Greek-English Lexicon of the N.T.* by Bauer, Arndt, & Gingrich) If purpose, then the translation will be "so that sins may be forgiven" or "for the purpose of forgiving sins." If result, then the translation will be "unto the remission of sins" or "with the result that sins are forgiven." Therefore, the phrases *eis aphesein* 'armartion and *in remissionem peccatorum*, just like their single-word counterparts, *polloi* and *multi*, are intrinsically ambiguous, and therefore the possibility exists that both aspects are signified simultaneously.

Joined together with these three preliminary points, especially the part which addresses the possibility that both aspects – sufficiency and efficacy - might be expressed simultaneously in the words of consecration, there are two additional considerations evidenced in the writings of St. Thomas:

1. He understood and taught that Sacred Scripture often times simultaneously encompasses a multiplicity of meanings within the self same word structure of the divinely intended literal sense.
2. He understood that the word *many* **can** and **often** does have the idiomatic meaning of *all*.

### **The Multiplicity of the Literal Sense**

St. Thomas, following St. Augustine, was one of the first medieval theologians to teach that Scripture contains what he termed “a **multiplicity** of the literal sense.” In other words, if more than one meaning of a text is *grammatically* possible, and if more than one theological aspect can be *related to* the subject matter at hand as a theologically connex and co-relative idea, then it is the divine intention to deliberately include **both meanings simultaneously** as part of the **literal sense**. For a more comprehensive study of St. Thomas and the various senses of Scripture, I recommend *St. Thomas’ Method of Biblical Exegesis* by Thomas P. Kuffel at [www.rtforum.org](http://www.rtforum.org). The following are some of his quotations pertinent to the issue here.

“St. Thomas goes on to affirm:

**It is not unbelievable that it was divinely granted to Moses and other authors of Sacred Scripture that they should know various truths which men could understand, and that they should put them down under one series of words to this effect, that any one of these truths is a meaning intended by the writer.<sup>23</sup>**

Commenting on this passage, Garrigou-Lagrange states: “He would have more to say if it were a question only of the spiritual sense, because this latter is quite evident. Hence, he is speaking of the two-fold literal sense.”<sup>24</sup> Therefore, “we must conclude that the possibility of a word having two literal senses appears to be a certainty, but that there are actually two senses is but a probability.”<sup>25</sup>

In the *Summa Theologiae* St. Thomas contends:

**But since the literal sense is that sense which the author intends, and the author of Sacred Scripture is God, Who comprehends all things at once in his understanding, it is not unbecoming, as Augustine says in his *Confessions*, Chapter Twelve, that even according to the literal sense there be more than one literal sense in a literary expression.<sup>26</sup>**

This reasoning is based on the two authors of Scripture: the Divine Author, namely, the Holy Spirit, Who has inspired the instrumental author, the person who wrote the book. Now, the instrumental, or human, author may or may not have understood all of what he was writing. There is no doubt, however, that the Primary Author, the Holy Spirit, did understand. St. Thomas, then, concludes that every truth which keeps the wording intact and is able to be in harmony with Scripture is its sense.”

### **Thomas’ Awareness that Many May Mean All**

St. Thomas was also well aware that the word *many* was capable of being understood as *all*. In the *Supplementum*, Q.75 Art. #2, he discusses the question “Whether the Resurrection Will Be for All Without Exception.” The second objection raised against this question is as follows: “Further it is written (Dan. xii 2): *Many of those that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake*. But these words imply a restriction. Therefore all will not rise again.” Replying to this objection, Thomas states: “Augustine (De Civ. Dei, xx.22) explains *many* as meaning *all*: in fact, this way of speaking is OFTEN met with in Holy Writ.”

Keeping all these above facts in mind, let us now examine those statements of St. Thomas that both Pope Benedict and St. Alphonsus declare mean “shed for all men as regards sufficiency and shed for many as regards efficacy.”

**St. Thomas' Commentary on the 4<sup>th</sup> Book of Sentences**

**Dist. 8, q.2, art.2, obj.C7**

**Objection 7**

In discussing *the words used in the formula for the consecration of the wine*, St. Thomas formulates the following **objection** to the divinely intended meaning of the scriptural words “for you and for many.” It was in reference to these following statements of St. Thomas that Mr. Omlor assertively claimed: “St. Thomas defended the claim that *many* in the consecration form does not mean all.” Well, let’s see. In order that the reader may more easily comprehend the point I wish to make, I am going to separate Thomas’ objection into its **two essential parts**.

**Part 1**

“In addition, the expression *pro vobis et pro multis effundetur* **IS TAKEN** concerning the shedding **AS regards sufficiency OR AS regards efficacy. IF (TAKEN)** as regards *sufficiency*, thus it was shed for *all*, not merely for *many*;

**Part 2**

**BUT IF (TAKEN)** as regards the *efficacy*, which it has only in *the elect*, **it does not seem that there should be A DISTINCTION BETWEEN the Apostles and the others.**”

The first part of this objection consists of the express allegation that the words *pro vobis et pro multis effundetur* may be taken as regards either sufficiency or as regards efficacy: “... **IS TAKEN... AS regards sufficiency OR (IS TAKEN) AS regards efficacy.**”

The second part raises the actual objection that Thomas sets out to answer: if **efficacy** be meant, then the statement should only say “shed *for many*.” The statement should not continue on to say **both** “*for you and for many*: “... **BUT IF (TAKEN)** as regards **efficacy** ... it does not seem that a distinction should be made between the Apostles and the others.”

Now in his reply to this objection, Thomas makes no effort whatsoever to refute anything concerning the first part – the part which **categorically affirms that sufficiency is a viable meaning** of the formula. In fact, Thomas **positively affirms** the correctness of this assertion by actually **incorporating it** into his response: “To the 7<sup>th</sup> objection **it is to be said that the Blood of Christ was poured out for all** as regards **sufficiency**, but for the elect only as regards efficacy.” Thus he admits to the fact that this expression is both *linguistically* and *theologically* ambiguous, i.e. both sufficiency (for all men) and efficacy (for many only) can be thought of as belonging to the meaning simultaneously. Thus we have a text book example *par excellence* of Thomas’ teaching on the **multiplicity** of the literal sense. Let us again reiterate and summarize what we stated earlier:

1. Thomas acknowledged the fact that in Scripture “many” sometimes can have the meaning of “all.” Thus *many = many*; and *many = all*.
2. He taught furthermore that Scripture contains a multiplicity of meanings with regard to its literal sense. No doubt, the concept that we discussed earlier about the philosophical relationship between connex and co-relative ideas is relevant here. Thus *shed for many*; and *shed for all*.
3. In both Greek and Latin, the prepositions **eis/in** when followed by the **accusative case** can signify either **purpose** and/or **result**. Thus: *shed for all so that sins may be forgiven* (sufficiency/purpose) and/or *shed for many unto the forgiveness of sins* (efficacy/result).

Finally, it must be observed that the only part of the objection Thomas **refutes** is the part which denies that efficacy can also be the meaning here. The second part of the objection was to **deny** that, if the expression *pro vobis et pro multis* may **also** refer to the **efficacy** of the passion, then there should not be a simultaneous twofold reference to persons or groups of persons, i.e. to *pro vobis* & *pro multis* expressed within the efficacy aspect, as such a dichotomy would seem to make no sense. Let me repeat: The aim of this part of the objection was to deny that efficacy is also meant, not to deny that sufficiency is also meant. The objection presumes that sufficiency is meant by these words, and the **proof** given to substantiate this denial that **efficacy** could also be meant, is that it would make no sense to add “for you” and “for many” together.

But Thomas answers this second part by demonstrating with examples how futile such an objection actually is. To the implied question - why can't the theological concept of **efficacy** be broken down into multiple, collective components? - he answers by supplying a list of several theological considerations: “you” = the elect from the Jews, and “many” = the elect from the Gentiles; “you” = the Apostle-Priests, and “many” = other priests who will later follow them; “you” = the Apostles and the other priests who pray for themselves, and “many” = others for whom you (the Apostles & the other priests) actually pray for.

### **Summa Theologia, Bk. III**

**(Quest. 78, art. 3 obj. 8)**

#### **Objection 8**

Again, discussing the same parameters as discussed before in the Book of Sentences, Thomas rephrases the same objection.

“Christ’s Passion *sufficed* for *all*, while in its *efficacy* it was profitable for *many*. Therefore, it ought to be said: Which shall be poured out for *all*, **OR ELSE** for *many*, **without adding for you.**”

St. Thomas again replies to this objection as follows.

“The Blood of Christ’s Passion has its *efficacy*, not merely in the elect among the Jews, to whom the blood of the Old Testament was exhibited, but also in the Gentiles; not only in the priests who consecrate this sacrament and in those who partake of it; but likewise in those for whom it is offered. And, therefore, He says expressly for you, the Jews, and for many, namely, the Gentiles; or for you, who eat of it, and for many, for whom it is offered.”

Although he is more succinct in the *Summa* than he was in the *Sentences*, his response is essentially the same. He only **refutes** the objection which alleges that efficacy can not **also** be an intended meaning of the text due to the fact that the expression says “for you and for many” rather than just simply “for many.”

We can now see that the statements of Pope Benedict XIV and St. Alphonsus exactly concur with those of St. Thomas. Contrary to Mr. Omlor’s claim that “St. Thomas defended the claim that *many* in the consecration form does not mean *all*,” and contrary to the overwhelmingly vast majority of traditionalists who have blindly followed him in this regard during the past 40 years, all three of these eminent theologians held that the formula for the consecration of the wine refers simultaneously to the sufficiency **and** to the efficacy of Christ’s Blood shed in His passion and death.

This now brings us to consider the last document regarding the “for all men” question – the *Catechism of Trent*.

## The Catechism of Trent and the “All Men” Controversy

Now that we can dismiss the **false claim** that Pope Benedict XIV, St. Thomas and St. Alphonsus supported the thesis which denies the veracity of the “*for all men*” translation - the *sufficiency* aspect - in the consecration formula for the wine, Bishop Pivarunas et al. are left with only one other potentially authoritative source to defend their position – *The Catechism of the Council of Trent*.

The pertinent statement they rely upon in the Catechism says: “With reason, therefore, were the words ‘for all’ not used, as in this place the fruits of the Passion are alone spoken of, and to the elect only did His Passion bring the fruit of salvation” Aside from the difficulties contained in the reasoning and in the proofs given by the theologian who authored this passage of the Catechism; and apart from the fact that this theologian also inverted the components of St. Thomas’ statements on this very matter (cf.Obj.7 & Obj.8), the authority of the Catechism in this matter has already been *de facto* negated by Bishop Pivarunas himself and also by his lay theological advisor, Mr. John Lane.

Since the bishop states that several theologians, post publication of the Catechism, still teach the necessity of the long form, the Catechism therefore did not authoritatively settle the matter. Allowing, for the sake of argument, that the bishop’s allegation is absolutely true, then, *a fortiori*, the Catechism also could not have settled a matter that is intrinsically connected with and subordinate to this non-authoritative issue of validity, namely, the issue which addresses the nature of the “additional words of the form” - the “for all men” issue; if the Catechism taught nothing **authoritatively** about either the *short form* vs. *long form*, then, *ipso facto*, it taught nothing **authoritatively** about the “for all men” question either, for this latter issue is part and parcel of the former issue.

Because Mr. Lane repeats and further elucidates the bishop’s thinking on this point, I will address these further insights by switching momentarily to Mr. Lane’s comments. In a missive to Mr. Vince Sheridan, he makes the following attempts to refute my article *Answering the Validity Question*:

**J. Lane:** “Does the Catechism of Trent teach the ‘short form’ position? I profess no expertise in Latin or indeed in grammar, but it seems **apparent** that the English text of Mc Hugh and Callan certainly does **not** teach the ‘short form.’”

**M. Duddy:** If it be true that the Mc Hugh & Callan text doesn’t teach the ‘short form’ position, then Mr. Lane only substantiates my position that in certain expressions the Mc Hugh & Callan English edition was not fully in accord with the official Latin text. But the only text that matters regarding what the Catechism actually taught is the official Latin text, approved and promulgated by Pope St. Pius V in fulfillment of a mandate given by Trent, not a text that was inaccurately translated some 400 years later.

But even here, Mr. Lane is wrong in his premise; although the translation of **McHugh & Callan** is somewhat **inaccurate** on several points, any person with a modicum of expertise in English grammar could see that the ‘short form’ position is expressly taught **even** by the McHugh & Callan edition. One definitely needs no expertise in grammar – only some basic reading and follow-direction skills – to connect the dots between the following four passages of the McHugh & Callan Catechism:

1. “Concerning this form (for the wine) no one can doubt, **if he here also attend to what was already said** about the form used in the consecration of the bread.” And **what** was **already said** about the form for the bread?
2. “That these words (This is My Body.) constitute the form is easily proven from reason ... it therefore follows that these very same words (This is My Body.) constitute the form.” (The Latin text says “must constitute the form.”)
3. Then, after comparing the form for the wine to the form for the bread, it concludes by saying: “Since these words declare what it becomes (i.e. transubstantiation)...”

4. "...it is clear that no other form needs to be determined."

If these four expressions don't indicate that the Catechism taught at least SOMETHING relevant to the question of the ESSENTIAL FORMS for consecration, then I would ask Mr. Lane to tell me WHAT would.

**J. Lane:** "In fact, if it is not affirming the Thomistic doctrine, it is carefully avoiding controversy in accordance with the explicit instructions given by the Council of Trent. Mc Hugh & Callan inform us, in the Introduction to their translation of the Catechism, that 'All those who had part in the work of the Catechism were instructed to avoid in its composition the particular opinions of individuals and schools, and to express the doctrine of the universal Church, keeping especially in mind the decrees of the Council of Trent.' It seems apparent that the English text of Mc Hugh & Callan follows precisely that principle – viz. the entire "long form vs. the short form" controversy is avoided by the judicious choice of subject and words."

**M. Duddy:** First let me say: kudos to Mr. Lane. Without his expressly saying so, it is encouraging to learn that he has undergone a **fundamental change** of mind regarding the **authoritative** dimensions and **evidentiary** value of the Catechism of Trent in reference to the invalidity question. He obviously now parts company with his father-in-law, Pat Omlor, who used the Catechism as a formidable, foundational proof for the necessity of the "long form." We now have good reason to hope that Mr. Lane will continue in his effort to discover the whole truth, and will someday reject Mr. Omlor's other arguments as well.

But unfortunately for the probity of Mr. Lane's argument, the Catechism did not avoid by a "judicious choice of subject and words the entire *long form vs. short form* controversy." As reiterated above, and proven at length in my original article, the Catechism did expressly teach the validity of the mere "short form." The only question then is what theological **value** does this assertive teaching of the Catechism possess? Is it definitive, authoritative but not definitive, simply opinionative, or without value?

Finally, Mr. Lane's statement that "It seems apparent that the English text of Mc Hugh & Callan follows precisely that principle." viz. to avoid controversial opinions, is ludicrous, for this instruction was given to the original authors of the Catechism, not to translators of the officially approved edition some 400 years later.

**J. Lane:** "But we do not need expertise in Latin and grammar to assess the proposition being put by Mr. Duddy. He would have us believe that in this particular case the editors of the Catechism not only chose to present "a particular opinion" of one school in defiance of the instructions of the Council of Trent, but they chose a minority opinion that was opposed to that of St. Thomas Aquinas ..."

**M. Duddy:** I too acknowledge the existence of the **instruction** given by the Council to the Catechism's authors to avoid "opinions of individuals and schools" and "express the doctrine of the universal Church. But here Mr. Lane arbitrarily introduces into this matter the concept of "defiance." Now if Mr. Lane's scenario be true, then only one of two possible conclusions would necessarily follow:

1. the Catechism is a document which contains only material that is classified as "the doctrine of the universal church" and, therefore, the entire Catechism is, at least, authoritative and binding in conscience.
2. the Catechism is a hybrid document which contains both official doctrine and merely opinionative statements, but these merely opinionative statements all exist in the Catechism in defiance of papal authority. To compound the matter, Pope St. Pius V ignored the insolence of these theologians and let them defiantly publish their opinions anyway.

But I deny that either consequence is actually the case. What certainly **is** the case is the fact that the Catechism actually **did** deal with a **subject matter** that **before** the Council was **controversial**. It did **in fact** deal with the matter of what constituted the essential

form of the consecration and spoke assertively about it: “....it therefore follows that these very same words **must constitute the form.**” and “No other form **needs to be determined.**” So then, were these authors defiant of the instruction of the Council or is another explanation possible and far more likely?

Given the supposition that these authors were **not** being **defiant** to this instruction, **three possible conclusions** can be demonstrated from the fact that the Catechism did engage in a controversial matter:

**First**, the instruction of the Council was **not** a morally binding mandate to absolutely avoid all controversial matters, but rather a directive not to get overly involved in offering mere opinions. The fact remains that the Catechism does contain teachings that are merely opinionative. The Catholic Encyclopedia tells us that over two centuries ago the Jesuits downplayed the authority of the Catechism due to it’s strongly anti Molinist bias in explaining issues concerning grace. The Jesuits were never censored by Rome for this.

**Second**, the instruction demonstrates that, to the degree that the Catechism deviates from expressing the “universal doctrine of the Church,” to that same degree its authority diminishes. Thus, documents issued by the Church may admit to various degrees of authority, and that not all statements within a particular document are necessarily of equal authoritative value. Although the Catechism of Trent has always been regarded in general as having a great authority, not every statement it makes is equally authoritative or even authoritative at all. As cited above, its greatest authority lies in its expositions of the “doctrines held by the universal Church” and especially those of the “decrees of the Council of Trent.”

**Third**, it demonstrates the possibility that these express statements and conclusions regarding the form of consecration can **no longer** be regarded as **merely** the “opinion of individuals and schools.” This is due to the fact that the Council wished the Catechism

to give an **official** explanation with regards to the **efficacy** (vis) of the sacraments, due to the widespread ignorance of priests in this matter.

**Council of Trent, Sess. XXIV, ch.7 de ref.**

This is evidenced by the decree of *Sess. XXIV, ch.7 de ref.* which granted a particular authority to the Catechism in that area which concerned the efficacy (vim = power, force, strength) of the sacraments: “The holy synod commands all bishops... to explain their efficacy (vim)... in accordance with the form which will be preordained, one for each of the sacraments, by the holy council in its catechesis.” I will concede to Mr. Lane the truth of his statement that in the phrase “in accordance with **the form to be prescribed** by the council, for each sacrament, in its catechesis,” the words “**form to be prescribed**” do not refer to **the form of the sacrament**. (Again, Mr. Lane provides us with another example of his departure from Mr. Omlor’s theologizing in this matter.) Nevertheless, the **form of the catechesis** ordered by the Council is actually **provided for** and **contained in** the *Catechism of Trent*, and that Catechism does provide express information regarding the efficacy (vis) of the sacraments as that efficacy derives from the sacramental form.

Now the Catechism explains the efficacy (vim) of the sacrament of the Eucharist by referring to the effect of transubstantiation alone, an effect or efficacy which it declares is brought about by those “words which signify that the substances of bread and wine are converted into the Body and the Blood of Christ.” “**Since** the above cited words declare **this** (transubstantiation), it is clear that **no other form** needs to be determined.”

Now in addition to these statements in the Catechism, there is the **further fact** that certain texts of the Council itself also dealt with this aspect of the sacrament of the Eucharist though not directly and explicitly: *Sess.XIII, ch. III and Sess. XXI, ch.III*. As a result, it would therefore **no longer be** simply a matter of what was **in the past** a mere “**opinion** of individuals and schools.” In accordance with that process whereby the Church engages in a true development of doctrine, the Catechism is now officially upgrading this matter; it is now a matter authoritatively encouraged by the Church.

### Council of Trent, Sess.XIII, ch.III

The first relevant text of the Council is that of *Sess. XIII ch.3* which states: “Immediately after the consecration... ex vi verborum (*from the power of the words*) the true body and the true blood of our Lord ... exist ... , the body under the form of bread and the blood under the form of wine.” Since we know from the practice of the Latin Church (which uses only the words “This is My Body.”) that these words of the Council are infallibly **verified immediately after** the recitation of the mere *short form* for the consecration of the bread; and since the words in the above statement of the Council with reference to the wine are exactly synonymous with and conceptually parallel to those words with reference to the bread, it is difficult to avoid the logical conclusion that the *short form* also suffices for the wine. Compare: “Immediately after the consecration... ex vi verborum the true body ... exist(s) ... the body under the form of the bread,” with “Immediately after the consecration... ex vi verborum ... the true blood ... exist(s) ... the blood under the form of the wine.”

### Council of Trent, Sess.XXI, ch. III

The second text is that of *Sess. XXI, ch.III* which says “...it must be acknowledged that Christ... and a true sacrament are received under **either specie alone.**” Now since it is a philosophical axiom that a thing can not exist until it possess all the essential components of its being, it would be ontologically impossible to have a true sacrament without all its essential components being present at the **very first moment** of its existence; and if a true sacrament with all its essential components does exist under the specie of bread alone - which is brought into existence via the *short form alone* - then why do the same criteria not apply equally well for the consecration of the wine?

When the Catechism positively declared that “The form must be constituted in these very same words” and that “No other form needs to be determined,” it did so by drawing these

conclusions from the double set of premises that it set forth by means of two syllogisms. It is very probable then, that the Major Premises used in the Catechism's construction of its two syllogisms were actually derived from these texts of the Council itself. As a result, the conclusions drawn explicitly and directly by the Catechism were in reality those conclusions contained only implicitly and indirectly in the Council texts themselves. Therefore, the Catechism was in some measure authoritatively teaching in an explicit manner what the Council only declared in an implicit manner. That act would certainly qualify as an act that has elevated a mere theological opinion to one that is now of a greater authority.

But implications however – even those contained in an Ecumenical Council or other magisterial document – do not constitute an infallible **definition** in themselves; it is necessary that the Church herself expressly confirm the implication by means of an overt and categorical proposition. But it certainly adds to the **authority** and the **doctrinal status** of such a doctrine's credibility. And this is what I claim in my article – that the mere necessity of the short form for validity is now an authoritative, but non-infallible, position of the Church.

For the sake of argument, however, I will concede to Mr.Lane the totality of his premises in the quote above. If he wishes to conclude that the Catechism in fact “avoided” the issue of the form of consecration, because to do so it would be in “defiance of the Council of Trent,” then Mr.Lane must admit to all of the following:

1. the Catechism taught nothing about the form necessary for the consecration, including the hypothesis that the long form is necessary, because prior to the Council **each** proposition (*short form vs. long form*) was merely the “opinion of individuals and schools.”
2. therefore, the Catechism's statement about for *all men* in the consecration formula is also merely an opinion, and indeed merely the “individual” opinion of the single theologian who penned it.

3. therefore, this opinion doesn't even have the elevated status of being an opinion that is explicated and defended by any "particular school" of theology.
4. this opinion is novel, having no explication in any document of the authentic magisterium, whether papal or ecclesiastical. (No, the phrase "for many etc." included in the various forms used almost universally (today anyway) in the various Rites of the Church will not qualify as an example. That would simply be an effort on your part to "beg the question" and "proof-text." These rites merely "quote" **the objective expression itself**, an **ambiguous idiom**, and therefore make no attempt to **define** the meaning/meanings of that objective expression. Even if one or more of these Rites did **seem** to stress efficacy over sufficiency, it would not prove that sufficiency was thereby positively excluded.)
5. this mere non-authoritative opinion exists here in the Catechism in total defiance to the instruction of an Ecumenical Council.
6. Given the truth of conclusions 1-5, it follows furthermore that Sedevacantists (though they obviously haven't been aware of it) base their most serious attack against the existential Catholic Church on the weight of a mere presumptive opinion – an opinion authored by a theologian whose name has been lost to history, and, if we follow Mr. Lane, was issued in defiance to the instructions of an Ecumenical Council. Martin Luther had more seemingly cogent arguments than that.

Now in my article *Answering the Validity Question*, I maintained that the special authority of the Catechism applied only to its statements upholding the 'short form' as sufficient for validity, because **only** these particular statements fall within **the scope** of the council's above referenced decree pertaining to the essential efficacy (vis) of the Eucharist.

By declaring only the words which constitute the “short form” as essential, the Catechism thereby necessarily declares all other words of the form to be **non-essential**, and therefore **outside** of the parameters of the concept of efficacy. All these other statements, then, which pertain merely to the non-essential or accidental aspects of the form, following the principle referred to above, are clearly non-authoritative. Thus the statement “with reason were the words ‘for all’ not used etc.” is excluded from falling within the scope of the council’s decree concerning efficacy. It falls instead within the scope of its instruction regarding “individual opinions.”

It is no wonder then why Pope Benedict XIV and St. Alphonsus **could** and **did** ignore this statement of the Catechism when they taught the opposite. With St. Alphonsus then, I now conclude: “These words are used to distinguish the virtue of the Passion from its fruits.” vs. “...in this place the fruits of the Passion are alone spoken of.” And together with Pope Benedict XIV I say: “...we explain those words *for many* ... that *many* ... may signify *all*... Therefore we say that the Blood of Christ has been shed *for all men.*” vs. “With reason were the words *for all* not used ...”

## Epilogue

I have no illusion that the above information will convince these Sedevacantists and cause them to suddenly abandon their *cause de l’invalidite*. They will most likely advance to their next line of defense – the issue of the *res sacramenti*. (They may even ultimately declare that the new rites of Holy Orders and Episcopal Consecration are also invalid and so my arguments against the invalidity of the Mass really don’t matter any more.)

They will most likely invoke the Bull *Apostolicae Curae* of Leo XIII and will argue that its decision in declaring Anglican Orders invalid is **exactly analogous to** the change in the new form of consecration. Thus they will continue to claim that “for many,” literally meaning *many* and not *all*, is **explicitly needed** in the form for the Eucharist in order for

the Eucharist, as a sacrament, to signify the special grace of the sacrament (the *res sacramenti*), namely the unity of the mystical body. But what they fail to realize is that, in the vocabulary of sacramental theology, the term “grace” is used for both the reality called the *res et sacramentum* and the reality called the *res sacramenti*. When Leo uses the term “grace” in *Apostolicae Curae*, he uses it in reference to the *res et sacramentum* and not in reference to the *res sacramenti*; thus the analogy they will make will be based upon comparing theological apples to theological oranges.

They will remain oblivious to the fact that, if the Catechism of Trent was able to aver that the *short form* suffices for validity, then it would follow that the *res sacramenti* must somehow **necessarily** be signified **in** and **by** the *short form* **alone**. Since these two aspects will constitute the subject matter of my fourth article, I will end here by confining my comments to the following seven points, and thus tie together the subject matter of the present article with an introduction to the one to come.

Although they will not be able to cite **one** acknowledged theologian – **not a single one** – who has **ever** taught that “many” **must** be translated as literally “many” in order to adequately signify this effect, there are many theologians who **do** declare what the phrase “shed for many unto the remission of sins” does allude to and signify:

1. All Catholic and Eastern Orthodox exegetes, and the majority of even Protestant exegetes, declare that this phrase is **sacrificial in nature** and alludes to Calvary. While Catholics and the Orthodox assert that it refers **simultaneously** to **both** the sacrificial act at Calvary **and** to the sacrificial act at the Mass, Protestant exegetes generally allege that it refers **only** to the sacrificial act at Calvary.
2. In discussing the effect of the Holy Eucharist as a sacrament, Msgrs. Pohle-Preuss state: “It is true that in instituting the Holy Eucharist Christ said of the Chalice: ‘This is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins.’ But in speaking thus, He evidently had in view an effect of the **Sacrifice, not of the Sacrament**; for He did not say that His Blood would be *drunk*

unto the remission of sins, but *shed* for that purpose.” Thus it would seem that these words signify the *res sacrificii*, (**the grace of the sacrifice**) not the *res sacramenti* (*the grace of the sacrament*).

3. In discussing the effect of the Holy Eucharist as a sacrament, Fr. Tanquerey states: “The **general effect** of the Sacrament of the Eucharist is an **increase in habitual grace**. This is *de fide* from the Council of Trent, declaring in opposition to the Lutherans: ‘If anyone says that the principal fruit of the Most Holy Eucharist is the remission of sins, or that other effects do not result from it, AS.’” This being so, does it make sense that the *res sacramenti* would be signified by a phrase that, suggesting the Lutheran Heresy condemned above, emphasizes “many unto the remission of sins?”
  
4. Continuing on, Tanquerey says: “The sacramental grace of the Eucharist is a grace (1) which brings about union with Christ; it is a grace (2) which indeed nourishes...” As to the first effect mentioned by Tanquerey (1), the sacred host itself, evidenced by the words of consecration that it contains the Body of Christ, when received by a member of the mystical body, certainly signifies, all by itself, the “union with Christ.” It should also be stated here that the very Body of Christ is in itself a symbol of the union of the members of the mystical body with Christ, since the person of Christ is Himself a veritable union between divinity and humanity. Does not the Church refer to the doctrine of the mystical body as an extension of the Incarnation? (“Grant that by the mingling of this water and wine, we may become partakers of His divinity, as He condescended to become a partaker of our humanity.”) Next, as to the second effect (2); according to the Council of Florence: ‘Every effect that material food and drink accomplish as they carry on corporeal life, by sustaining, increasing, restoring and delighting, this the sacrament does as it carries on spiritual life’.” The Council of Florence teaches us then, that the immediate grace (res sacramenti) of the Eucharist is the spiritual effects that material food signifies and produces. Therefore the res sacramenti is signified by the very nature of food itself; and food needs no words

to tell us that it possesses the inherent power to increase, sustain, restore and delight. And finally, the simple fact that, in this Sacrament, the **species** of bread **are united** hypostatically to the **Body**, and the **species** of wine united hypostatically to the **Blood** of Christ; and the simple fact that this **composite reality (the species of food united with the substance of Christ's Body and Blood)** is clearly brought into existence by the words "This is My Body" and "This is My Blood," suffices to show how the *res sacramenti* is sufficiently contained in and signified by **either** of the *short form significations*.

5. Thus the **ultimate effect**, the unity of the mystical body, is necessarily **contained in** and **implied by** this **first** and **general** one; so when the Body of Christ touches the tongue of a member of Christ's mystical body at Holy Communion, it is that action which signifies and causes that member to now become more closely and intimately united with Christ, the Head. And since each member who receives becomes more closely united with Christ, each becomes more closely united to each other.(Even in nature, two things that become physically closer to a third reality, become necessarily closer to each other,) Thus, we do not need the words "for you and for many" to signify that.
6. Finally, when the priest recites the words "shed for many unto the remission of sins" during the consecration, those words can not possibly cause at that very moment, *ex vi verborum*, the sacrament of the Eucharist to infuse its grace into the recipient. Therefore, those words cannot possibly be **truly and essentially sacramental** because sacramental words must cause sacramental grace. Since the grace of "union with Christ" is caused at the **moment of reception**, it must also be sacramentally signified at that moment.
7. It is only by properly understanding the 1000 year history, from Augustine to Aquinas, of the development in sacramental theology of the concepts of the *sacramentum tantum*, *res et sacramentum*, and *res sacramenti* that this whole

preposterous argument about invalidity with reference to all the sacraments can finally be laid to rest. Once the relationship among these three concepts is understood, Traditionalists will be able to focus their spiritual energies in a more cohesive, unified and therefore fruitful direction.

Michael Duddy

March 30, 2007

Feast of Our Lady of Sorrows