

## APPENDIX II

# The Doubtful Validity of the *Novus Ordo Missae*

**T**here is the further problem of the doubtful validity of the *Novus Ordo Missae* due to a probable defect of form in the consecration of the wine in most vernacular versions of the *Novus Ordo* ‘Roman’ Missal. Although Pope Paul VI decreed in *Missale Romanum* that the words of consecration must be, “*Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei, novi et æterni testamenti, qui pro vobis et **pro multis** effundetur in remissionem peccatorum*”, nevertheless, nearly all vernacular versions of the New Mass have translated the words “*pro multis*” (for many) as “for all”.

In order that there be a valid consecration of the wine, Tanquerey<sup>219</sup> explains that the words “This is the chalice of My blood” or “This is My blood” are required, and that it is disputed whether those words suffice or whether it is necessary for validity to add the words “new and everlasting covenant, the mystery of faith, etc.”

Many Thomists, Tanquerey explains, hold that the subsequent words are necessary for validity since most of them are set forth in the Gospel and others have been transmitted to us by tradition. This position is based on the opinion of St. Thomas Aquinas (*Summa Theol. III, q. 78, 3c*), who citing the opinion of St. Albert the Great (*In Sent. Lib. IV, dist. VIII, qu. 3, a. 2*) explains that the subsequent words are necessary for validity because they pertain to the substance of the form.

The contrary opinion, held by other Thomists such as Cajetan, John of St. Thomas and Billuart, according to Tanquerey, is the more probable, namely, that the subsequent words are not necessary for

validity but are only required for the integrity of the form.

Similarly Merkelbach explains in the third volume of his *Summa Theologiae Moralis*, that the words *Hic est calix sanguinis mei* are *probably* the only essential words of the form so that the subsequent words in the consecration of the chalice pertain only to the integrity of the form [no. 225].

Aertnys and Damen<sup>220</sup> likewise acknowledge that *both opinions are probable*, as does Frassinetti, who explains: “It is doubtful whether the words *Hic est calix sanguinis mei* would be enough for the valid consecration of the wine, or if the remaining words are also required.”<sup>221</sup>

In practice, Tanquerey explains, the subsequent words “must always be pronounced, and indeed *sub gravi*,\* and if they are omitted, the consecration must be repeated conditionally”; and then he sets forth the doctrine of Pope Innocent XI, “for when one is dealing with validity, ***the safer course is to be followed.***” Even the post-conciliar theologian, Nicholas Halligan, O.P., says on this topic, “In practice it is seriously prescribed to pronounce the entire formula; if any words from “the blood of the new ...” on are omitted, the whole formula is to be repeated conditionally.”<sup>222</sup>

Aertnys and Damen explain, that in practice the priest is obligated *sub gravi* to follow the safer opinion, and therefore, if he has pronounced only the first part of the formula, then he must repeat conditionally the entire formula as is prescribed in the Missal, *de defect., tit. 10. n. 3 (n. 223)*.

In *De Defectibus* in the Roman Missal, in the section *De Defectibus Formae*, it is set forth, following the teaching of the Council of Florence (*DS 1352*) that “the words of consecration, which are the form of this sacrament are these: *For this is My Body. And: This is the Chalice of My Blood, of the new and eternal testament: the mystery of faith: which will be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins.*” The text goes on to explain: “*If someone diminishes or changes something in the form of the consecration of the Body and Blood, and in this changing of the words the same thing*

---

\* “under grave obligation”

*is not signified, the sacrament is not confected.*” According to this teaching, which for centuries has been the official teaching of the *ordinary magisterium* of the Roman Church, if someone changes the words “for many” to “for all”, then the consecration of the chalice would be invalid since the word ‘all’ does not have the same signification as ‘many’.

Contrary to the decree of Paul VI in *Missale Romanum* (and the decree of the Council of Florence as well [DS 1352]), the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship unlawfully approved the translation of the words ‘*pro multis*’ as ‘**for all**’ in most vernacular versions of the new missal thereby, according to the traditional teaching of the Church of Rome, invalidating all vernacular Masses that use the illicit formula “for all”.

It is important to bear in mind that in the vernacular versions of the *Novus Ordo* Mass, we are not dealing with a dubious but probable validity due to the *omission* of the words subsequent to the first part of the formula of consecration, but rather with a highly probable *invalidity* due to an *illicit change of words* in the form of the sacrament which, according to the doctrine set forth in the Roman Missal, effects an invalidating change of verbal signification. It has been falsely argued that rendering the expression ‘*pro multis*’ in the vernacular as ‘for all’ does not effect a change of signification, since (it is argued) Our Lord at the Last Supper used an Aramaic word that means ‘the multitude’, a word which can include the whole or the totality of the human race. This argument is false because the notion of ‘many’ (a large number; a large but indefinite number) or ‘multitude’ (a great number) can — but *does not necessarily* — include the totality or ‘all’, while the notion of ‘all’ (the whole; every member of) is a different concept which *necessarily* denotes the collective whole, the totality. The *Roman Catechism* explains, giving the reason why Our Lord, in using the words “many” did not mean “all”:

The additional words “for you and for many”, are taken, some from Matthew, some from Luke, but were joined together by the Catholic Church under the guidance of the Spirit of God. They serve to declare the fruit and ad-

vantage of His Passion. For if we look to its value, we must confess that the Redeemer shed His blood for the salvation of all; but if we look to the fruit which mankind have received from it, we shall easily find that it pertains not unto all, but to many of the human race. When therefore (Our Lord) said: For you, He meant either those who were present, or those chosen from among the Jewish people, such as were, with the exception of Judas, the disciples with whom He was speaking. When He added, “and for many”, He wished to be understood to mean the remainder of the elect from among the Jews or Gentiles.

Hence, the Apostles and Evangelists under divine inspiration correctly rendered Our Lord’s words in Greek as ‘ὕπὲρ πολλῶν’ [Mk. 14:24], and ‘περὶ πολλῶν’ [Mt. 26:28] (i.e. ‘pro multis’, ‘for many’) and not for “all” (παντων) which has a different signification.

It needs to be emphasised that a Mass which is probably invalid or even probably valid, even if there is a relatively high probability of validity, is ***totally and gravely illicit***, since the Church’s moral doctrine, set forth by Pope Innocent XI (see [Footnote 80](#), p. 97), clearly forbids probably valid sacraments. Thus, it is gravely sinful (in the objective moral order) for anyone to celebrate or attend Mass when the vernacular expression “for all” is used in the consecration of the chalice, since that formula of consecration is not certainly valid.