

[Back](#)

[Home](#)

Revisited: Why the SSPX Cannot Possibly Defend the Catholic Faith or Catholic Tradition Bakery and Wine Cellar Consecrations and other SSPX Non-Sense

Archbishop Carlo Maria Vigano, in an interview with Aldo Maria Valli on July 14, 2023 made this comment:

The progressive restrictions on the celebration of the ancient Liturgy serve to confine conservatives to hunting grounds, only to channel them to the St. Pius X Fraternity, as soon as the Synod brings to their tragic consequences the doctrinal, moral and disciplinary changes that are in the pipeline and cause an exodus of Catholics to what, after the suppression or normalization of the Ecclesia Dei Institutes, will become the "monopolist" of Tradition. But at that point-when, that is, traditional Catholics have migrated into the Fraternity and its leaders believe they have achieved a victory over the competition of the suppressed Summorum Pontificum-a new intolerable provocation will force at least a parade of the St. Pius X Fraternity to distance itself from Bergoglian Rome, sanctioning the "excommunication" of traditionalism, no longer represented within the official Church, assuming it ever was. That is why in my opinion it is important to preserve a certain parcelization, so as to make the malicious maneuver of ousting traditional Catholics from the ecclesial body more complex.

Archbishop Vigano is correct in recognizing the fact that Rome is implementing a long established policy to move conservative and traditional minded Catholics under the control of the SSPX. He is also correct in his recommendation that to "preserve a certain parcelization" of opposition to modernist Rome is not just good, but the only possible structure of an effective defense of the faith against the abuse of a corrupted authority. We differ from Archbishop Vigano as to the motive of Rome in following this policy. The Archbishop believes it is to corral faithful Catholics into an identifiable organization that can be stigmatized and excommunicated. We believe that it is because the SSPX, while traditional in its sentiments, is hopelessly afflicted with Neo-modernists fundamental errors that make the defense of tradition and the faith impossible.

A paper was written thirteen years ago entitled: [Why the SSPX Cannot Defend Catholic Tradition](#). Nothing in that article needs to be changed, qualified or retracted. Still the SSPX has not made any effort at self-reflection to determine if any of these accusations are true and, if so, what should be done about it. This article's purpose is to revisit these problems primarily from a liturgical perspective.

Recently the SSPX posted on their District USA web page an article June 12, 2023 entitled, "United States: Illicit Wine Used for Masses" that discusses the recent problem in the Archdiocese of Kansas City for using invalid wine as matter for Novus Ordo Masses over several years. In this article the author says:

"It should be noted that the faithful still received Communion, since the consecration of the Holy Host was accomplished normally. On the other hand, the Mass did not take place in the case considered, because, to accomplish it, there must be the consecration of the two species."

[United States: Illicit Wine Used for Masses | FSSPX News](#)

The SSPX is affirming their theological belief that bread alone can be consecrated independently of the wine, and that transubstantiation occurs independently of the context of the sacrifice of the Mass. This opinion regarding the case in Kansas City diocese is a variation of the teaching of Bishop Bernard Fellay regarding Bakery-Wine Cellar Consecrations. In Pittsburgh, PA at Our Lady of Fatima Church on Sunday, June 21, 2009 Bishop Fellay related this anecdote:

"The priest was mad at the bishop. He went into a bakery and consecrates the whole bakery. Another went into the cellar of the bishop and he consecrates all the wine. It's sacrilegious but its valid. The bishop had to buy the bread, that was no longer bread, of this bakery. It's stupid, it's crazy but it is valid."

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AshtjLRr6Y8>

This is the standard theological teaching of the SSPX in their seminaries and is the common opinion held by their priests who are willing to publically discuss the question.ⁱ

The sacramental and liturgical theology of Bishop Fellay was justifiably criticized on a CathInfo discussion entitled: **[Fr. Caldern Refutes Bishop Fellay](#)** that began June 3, 2015. This public discussion in turn eventually resulted in an article in SSPX USA District publication entitled: "Is the Consecration of Bread and Wine Outside of Mass Valid?" published August 23, 2019 which features a picture of an impressive wine cellar with massive casks.

[SSPX Is the Consecration of Bread and Wine Outside of Mass Valid District of the USA.htm](#)

The title of this article is misleading. The question proposed in the title is never addressed in the article; it is just taken for granted by the author as an affirmative truthful presupposition and he assumes his like-minded readers do as well. The article shifts gears and actually addresses the question of the volume of bread and/or the volume of wine that may be consecrated in any particular Mass. The SSPX would have been better to have just let the matter drop than offer a defense that looks like a shell game - just one big begging of the question. Bakery and wine cellar consecrations have nothing to do with the question of volume of sacramental matter but with much deeper and important truths.

The SSPX believes, contrary to Catholic dogma, that the sacramental consecration can be effected by a priest either with bread alone or with wine alone and they hold that the sacrament is only accidentally, that is, not necessarily related to the Sacrifice of the Mass. The SSPX believes and teaches that the pope is the "master of the liturgy." They hold that the liturgy is merely a matter of Church discipline and the pope as lawmaker can do with it whatever he pleases with one exception. Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre held that the pope could not change anything in the liturgy that lessened his personal faith. Therefore, the SSPX says the pope cannot do anything to the liturgy that damages the faith *per se*. How was this question to be judged? Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, according to Bishop Richard Williamson Eleison Comments, examined the Bugnini reforms in light of this principle.

When Archbishop Lefebvre, who was initially using the 1967 Bugnini transitional Missal at Ecône, examined changes according to their subjective effect on his personal faith and found them detrimental, he rejected them. If they were not seen as damaging to his personal faith, he accepted them. This is the principle employed which resulted in the SSPX using the 1962 Bugnini transitional Missal with a few modifications. In brief, Archbishop Lefebvre made himself the "master of the liturgy" for the SSPX based upon his subjective impression of their effects on his personal faith. But if the liturgy is merely accidental to the theology of sacrifice and with no necessary relationship to the sacramental True Presence, what possible difference can it really make to anyone's "personal" faith? What is worse, how can there be an intelligent defense of the immemorial Roman rite of Mass by anyone who says, 'The pope can do whatever he wants to the liturgy as long as he does not damage my faith'. In all fairness to Archbishop Lefebvre, there has been considerable academic research and publication of important material on the liturgical question since the early 1990 from which he would have benefitted and may very well have reconsidered his understanding on the nature of the "received and approved" immemorial Roman rite of Mass and the limitations on the authority of the pope regarding liturgical innovations.

The first problem with this theology is that it is not true. It is a theology unmoored from the certainty of Catholic dogma. What follows from this error leads to a corrupted sense of the Sacrament and its necessary dependence upon the Mass, a corrupted sense of the Mass and its sacrificial character, a corrupted sense of the priestly intention necessary at the Mass, and a corrupted sense of the priesthood itself.

Where did this theological mess come from? It starts with a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature of Dogma; what Dogma is *essentially*. And from this misunderstanding, what follows is a rejection of the fundamental Catholic truth that Dogma is the proximate rule of faith for all Catholics. Dogma is divine revelation that is formally defined by the Church and proposed to all the faithful as a formal object of divine and Catholic faith. Faith is believing *what* God has revealed on the *authority* of God the revealer. Dogma is the *what* of what God has revealed with the additional attribute of perfect clarity of expression. The pope is the material and instrumental cause of Dogma; God is the formal and final cause. Dogma is irreformable in both its form, that is, the truth defined, and in its matter, that is, the words used under divine inspiration in the definition. No theological competency is required to understand dogma for it is formulated for all the faithful. What is required is good-will, proper grammar, and correct definition. Dogma is the end of theological speculation. It is the clear voice of God articulating a divinely revealed truth as explicitly and clearly as possible for the mind of men. It is as St. Pius X said, "A truth fallen from heaven."

The first question proposed by St. Thomas in the Summa is with philosophy why do we need theological studies? There are certain doctrines of divine revelation that can be known with certainty by philosophy but still form part of God's revelation. Why? The reason is that most people do not have the time, inclination, or competency to study philosophy and even if they do may still end in error, so God in His mercy has provided certainty of these philosophical truths through divine revelation.

The precious gift of Dogma is exactly analogous to this very point made by St. Thomas. We know by divine revelation from the remote rule of faith in Scripture and Tradition certain truths but often through lack of time, inclination or competency these remain poorly known. But what is worse, heretics corrupt this divine revelation leading many into error. God in His mercy again provides Dogma as a sure guide to His faithful, typically structured as a categorical proposition, that must be believed by all the faithful on pain of heresy if

rejected. Dogma possesses such additional clarity that it is within the competency of every Catholic. There is plenty of evidence for this truth that Dogma is the proximate rule of faith but it can clearly be demonstrated by examining the definition of heresy. Heresy is the denial of dogma. Therefore the faithful are those who keep dogma as their rule of faith. This is an *essential definition* that provides the proximate genus and the specific difference. It is the best of all definitions because it is the most intelligible of all definitions.

Applying the proximate rule of faith to the SSPX's sacramental theology exposes an immediate problem. An adolescent with basic understanding of Catholic catechesis and faithful to Dogma knows that it is a Dogma of Catholic faith that there are seven sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ. He knows that it is a Dogma that each sacrament has a necessary form and matter. He knows that the form and the matter is the sacrament by definition; it is the outward sign instituted by Jesus Christ. He knows that it is a Dogma of Catholic faith that the matter of the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist is bread AND wine. The matter is NOT bread OR wine, but bread AND wine. Any defect in the matter of the bread OR any defect in the matter of the wine invalidates the sacrament. Why does not the SSPX know this? Because dogma is not their proximate rule of faith.

Regarding the sacramental form, an early and effective defender of Catholic tradition was Patrick Henry Omlor. His first publication was the 1968 tract entitled: *Questioning the Validity of the Masses using the New All English Canon*. The primary focus of Mr. Omlor's published writings over the next 45 years until his death in 2013 was the question of sacramental theology. Since Mr. Omlor did not hold dogma as his proximate rule of faith, he consequently held in my opinion erroneous views regarding the nature of indefectibility, the necessity of the Church for salvation, and the problems with sedevacantism, but regarding sacramental theology no one has articulated the subject any better. And yet the SSPX seems to be entirely ignorant of what he had to say about the necessity of the sacramental form to signify both the reality of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ AND signify the union with the Mystical Body of Christ. The SSPX believes in bakery and wine cellar consecrations even when there is evident and undoubted defects of both the form and the matter of the sacrament. But Omlor was concerned about corruption of the sacramental form and matter in the context of the Mass and not in the context of a bakery or wine cellar. The bigger question regards the possibility of a sacramental consecration without the Mass. Is it possible divide what God has united?

The Catholic teaching that the 'law of prayer determines the law of belief' is not a simple axiom but as Pius XI said in *Divini cultus*, it is a "canon of faith" that is, a dogma of Catholic faith handed down from the time of Celestine I (d 432):

“Since the Church has received from her founder, Christ, the duty of guarding the holiness of divine worship, surely it is part of the same, of course after preserving the substance of the sacrifice and the sacraments, to prescribe the following: ceremonies, rites, formulas, prayers, chant - by which that august and public ministry is best controlled, whose special name is Liturgy, as if an exceedingly sacred action. And the liturgy is an undoubtedly sacred thing; for, through it we are brought to God and are joined with Him; we bear witness to our faith, and we are obligated to it by a most serious duty because of the benefits and helps received, of which we are always in need. Hence a kind of intimate relationship between dogma and sacred liturgy, and likewise between Christian worship and the sanctification of the people. Therefore, Celestine I proposed and expressed a canon of faith in the venerated formulas of the Liturgy: ‘Let the law of supplication establish the law of believing. For when the leaders of holy peoples administer legislation enjoined upon themselves they plead the course of the human race before divine Clemency, and they beg and pray while the entire Church sighs with them’”.

The consecration of bread and wine can only occur in the context of the holy sacrifice of the Mass. In the *Quam oblationem*, said directly before the consecration, the priest praysⁱⁱ:

Which oblation do Thou, O God, we beseech Thee, vouchsafe to make in all things blessed, approved, ratified, reasonable, and acceptable: that it may become for us the Body and Blood of Thy dearly beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. (Fr. McHugh and Callan Missal)

Which oblation do Thou, O God, vouchsafe in all things to bless, approve, ratify, make worthy and acceptable: that it may become for us the Body and Blood of Thy most beloved Son our Lord Jesus Christ. (St. Andrew Missal)

And do Thou, O God, vouchsafe in all respects to bless, consecrate, and approve this our oblation, to perfect it and to render it well-pleasing to Thyself, so that it may become for us the body and blood of Thy most beloved Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. (Fr. Lasance Missal)

The belief determined by this immemorial prayer is that the priest is the *efficient* and *instrumental* material cause of the consecration of bread and wine. It is God who is the *formal* and *final* cause of the consecration. The priest is an *alter Christus* and at the consecration he is acting *in persona Christi*. He is not a sorcerer's apprentice. It is not possible that the four causes of any material object can be working toward different ends. All causes must work to the same end or the end is not accomplished. The intention of the priest must conform to the intention of Jesus Christ. The "worthy and acceptable" "oblation", i.e.: the sacrifice, of the bread and wine, is necessary for it to be "well-pleasing" to God the Father so that He will "approve this oblation," He will "consecrate" it, and it will then "become for us" the "body and blood of Thy most beloved Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord." This is possible only when the priest has the intention to do what the Church does. And what the Church DOES is what Jesus Christ DID at the Last Supper when He offered the first sacrificial Mass, and every Mass offered since then. Furthermore, at the very moment that Jesus Christ instituted the sacrament of His Body and Blood, we know as a Dogma of Catholic faith that He made the Apostles priests when He said, "Do this in commemoration of Me." It is Jesus Christ who bound the sacrament, the sacrifice and the priesthood. Those whose theology drives a wedge between what Christ has bound together are committing a grave error. To believe that a priest can enter a bakery and turn all the bread into the Blessed Sacrament and believe that this can be done while intending to do what Jesus Christ did, displays a profound ignorance of sacramental theology.

Canon law is instructive on this question. Canon 927 (1983 code) [or 817 (1917 code)] states that under no circumstances whatsoever may any priest attempt consecration outside of the sacrifice of the Mass, or consecration of bread alone, or wine alone in a Mass. Canon law is clear that this is not permitted under any circumstances whatsoever, none whatsoever, not even in extreme necessity including danger of death. Why is this so since all laws, precepts, commands, injunctions, etc. do not bind in cases of necessity or impossibility? The exception to this rule is invalidating laws. An invalidating law is a law that concerns a prohibited act that is invalid always and everywhere because of the nature of the act or the nature of the actor and thus, invalidating laws admit no exceptions whatsoever.

It is a Dogma of faith that the matter of the sacrament is bread AND wine, not bread OR wine. Without the necessary matter, the sacrament cannot be confected. Can. 927 (1983) [or Can. 817 (1917)] forbids two different acts. It prohibits the attempt to consecrate only one species of the sacrament. This prohibition by the canon is an invalidating law known as a matter of revealed truth, of divine and Catholic faith. The second prohibition of

attempting a consecration outside of Mass is of the same nature, and that can be deduced from these two facts: It is cited in a single canon with a prohibition that is known to be invalidating by Catholic dogma, and secondly, if it were not an invalidating law, it would necessarily admit exceptions in the case of necessity or impossibility.

Let me suggest why this is so. The essence of the sacrifice is the consecration of the bread AND wine but it alone cannot be sufficient to form the proper intention. The reason the faithful do not have to question a priest after he administers a sacrament to determine if he, in fact, had the right intention is because his intention is demonstrated by using the proper form and matter in the context of the proper rite. In all the sacraments except the Holy Eucharist, the priest performs the form and matter in his own person, and in these cases, for a sufficiently grave reason, the Church permits the sacrament without the rite. This is not so in regard to the Holy Eucharist in which no exception is permitted whatsoever to attempt to consecrate the sacrament without the rite. This may be because when the priest consecrates in the Mass he consecrates *in persona Christi*. The form and matter alone do not demonstrate the intention of the priest but the intention of Christ. The priest's intention in the Holy Eucharist is demonstrated by both the proper form and matter and by the proper rite but it is only in the rite that the priest speaks in his own person and expresses his own intention.

Furthermore, the rite itself can invalidate a sacrament even if the correct form and matter are used. There were two reasons given, each one sufficient in itself, for the invalidity of Anglican orders. One concerned the form and matter of the sacrament, and the other concerned deficiencies in the Anglican rite itself. The rite did not demonstrate a proper intention in itself and in its historical setting. The valid form and matter are used in many Protestant communion services where the theology of sacrifice is denied. The SSPX would believe that a validly ordained Catholic priest would validly consecrate in an Protestant communion service because the form and matter is all that is necessary with the intent to consecrate. This is not true. The rite itself can invalidate a proper sacramental form and matter by defect of intent.

The Novus Ordo was initially officially defined as a memorial mealⁱⁱⁱ. Fr. James Wathen said many years ago that were the mistranslated form of consecration of the wine in the Novus Ordo ever corrected, as explained by Patrick Henry Omlor, the fact that the Novus Ordo rite itself offers only the “fruit of the earth and the work of human hands” remains a serious argument against validity. It is the rite itself for the Holy Eucharist that determines intent of the minister and that is at least one reason why the rite is necessary for a valid sacrament.

The SSPX sacramental theology is what makes the Novus Ordo possible. If a priest can walk into a bakery and simply say, ‘this is my body’, or into a wine cellar and say, ‘this is my blood’, and thereby validly consecrate all the bread in the bakery or all the wine in a wine cellar, then the necessary matter of the sacrament becomes bread OR wine and the dogmatic canon is wrong. If the same thing can be done without the liturgical rite, then the Mass is reduced to an accidental disciplinary matter that is open to the free and independent will of the legislator to do with as he pleases. The theology expressed in the Mass becomes a matter of indifference unrelated to the sacrament. The dogmatic canons on the ‘received and approved’ immemorial rite of Mass are meaningless and the reason given for the invalidity of Anglican orders is doubtful. This is the Bugnini formula for liturgical and sacramental destruction. It is an utterly false theology that ultimately in a practical sense holds the dogmatic canons of our faith in contempt. When dogma is treated merely as a human axiom that provides guidelines for launching theological daydreams you end up with this nonsense of bakery and wine cellar consecrations.

Remember, it is Jesus Christ who does the consecration through the intermediation of the priest. The intention that the priest must have is to do what the Church does. The Church's intention is the same intention of Christ and since Christ is the person doing the consecration through the ministration of the priest, he must have the same intention of Christ to offer the Body and Blood separate from each other as a victim of propitiation offered to the eternal Father. It is the sacrifice that makes the sacrament possible. The sacrifice is the meritorious cause of the consecration. Dom Gueranger wrote:

The Evangelist, says St. Augustine, "made use of a word which has a special import, when he said: the soldier 'opened Jesus' Side' with a spear. He did not say struck the Side, or wounded the Side, or anything else like that; but he said he opened Jesus' Side. He opened it; for that Side was like the door of life; and when it was opened, the Sacraments (the Mysteries) of the Church came through it.... This was predicted by that door which Noe was commanded to make in the side of the Ark, through which were to go those living creatures which were not to be destroyed by the deluge; and all these things were a figure of the Church."
Dom Gueranger, *The Liturgical Year on the Sacred Heart of Jesus*

Such intention is clearly impossible with the bakery and wine cellar nonsense that divides the sacrament and the sacrifice. For those who would have the presence of Jesus Christ sacramentally without the sacrifice are like St. Peter after Jesus foretold His coming passion, death and resurrection, said: "Lord, be it far from thee, this shall not be unto thee." And Jesus replied: "Go behind me, Satan, thou art a scandal unto me: because thou savourest not the things that are of God, but the things that are of men" (Matt. 16: 21-23). The division is deeper than just the division between the sacrament and the sacrifice. Those who would have the Blessed Sacrament without the Mass divide the necessary elements of the entire redemption. In the offertory prayer, *Suscipe, sancta Trinitas*, recited after the *Lavabo* and before the *Orate fratres*, the priest prays, "Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation, which we offer unto Thee, in memory of the passion, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ..." In the canon directly after the consecration of the bread and wine the priest says the *Unde et memores Domine* in which he prays, "We thy servants, and likewise thy holy people, calling to mind the blessed passion of the same Christ thy Son, our Lord, together with his resurrection from the grave and also his glorious ascension into heaven, offer unto thine excellent majesty...." The Mass is not just a memorial of the passion and death of Jesus Christ but also of His resurrection and ascension because the Mass is a memorial of the entire redemptive act of Jesus Christ for the end of uniting the faithful with Himself and through Himself to the Holy Trinity. St. Paul says that Jesus "was delivered up for our sins, and rose again for our justification" (Rom. 4:25) and in the Preface for the Ascension the Church prays that Jesus "in their sight was raised up to heaven, in order to give to us to be partakers of His Godhead." The resurrection is necessary "for our justification" and the ascension is necessary for us to be "partakers of His Godhead" for Jesus Christ in the Sacred Host is fully present: not only by His Body, Blood, Soul, Divinity, but also in His Mystical Body, the Church, the Communion of Saints, symbolized by the commingling of the water with the wine.^{iv} In the *Haec commixtion* before the *Agnus Dei* the priest reunites the "Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ" signifying the resurrection which is also signified by the altar linen cloth reaching to the floor. The ascension is commemorated repeatedly throughout the Mass with the ending doxology, "Through Jesus Christ, thy Son, our Lord, who lives and reigns with thee in the unity of the Holy Ghost, God forever and ever." Bakery and wine cellar theology fractures first the sacrament and the sacrifice and then drives the wedge deeper to fracture the sacrament from the entire redemptive act and its end, that is, the union with the Blessed Trinity as adopted sons of God.^v

It is impossible to believe in bakery and wine cellar consecrations and at the same time defend Catholic doctrine or Catholic worship according to the "received and approved" immemorial Roman rite of Mass dogmatized at the Council of Trent and added to the Tridentine Profession of Faith. This theology drives a wedge between the priest and his *essence*, which is to offer sacrifice, for the sacrifice has been *essentially* divorced from the sacrament. This is an important question because Rome has already regularized the leadership of the SSPX and implemented a policy to move all conservative and traditional minded Catholics under their jurisdiction. The SSPX is acceptable to Neo-Modernist Rome because the SSPX, while conservative in practice, is Neo-Modernist in principle for the *essence* of Neo-modernism is the rejection of Dogma as the proximate rule of faith. Rome knows that in the end the principle always drives the practice. That is why the 'slippery slope' metaphor is universally true. Bad ideas in time will always result in bad morals. Rome knows the SSPX cannot defend Catholic truth and therefore can be used as an authoritative vehicle to implement unacceptable compromises in both doctrine and worship.

The first and principle problem with the SSPX is that it does not hold Dogma as the proximate Rule of Faith. The truth that Dogma is the proximate Rule of Faith was demonstrated in detail in the CathInfo thread: [Is Father Ringrose dumping the R & R crowd?](#) That discussion was closed and cleaned up by the moderator just over three years ago. Since that time the thread has been read over 120,000 times and is currently over 167,000 viewings.

The simple reason that the Church fathers at Vatican II failed to defend the Catholic faith is because before the council they had accepted the neo-modernist proposition that dogma is open to continual development and reformulation, and thus the pope is necessarily the proximate rule of faith and not dogmatic truth. Fr. Karl Rahner, an important *peritus* at Vatican II who provided influential input on the four of the Vatican II Constitutions: *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, *Lumen Gentium*, *Dei Verbum*, and *Gaudium et Spes*, said:

“It was declared at the Second Vatican Council that atheists too are not excluded from this possibility of salvation... The only necessary condition which is recognized here is the necessity of faithfulness and obedience to the individual’s own personal conscience. This optimism concerning salvation appears to me one of the most noteworthy results of the Second Vatican Council. For when we consider the officially received theology concerning these questions, which was more or less traditional right down to the Second Vatican Council, we can only wonder how few controversies arose during the Council with regard to these assertions of optimism concerning salvation, and wonder too at how little opposition the conservative wing of the Council brought to bear on this point, how all this took place without any setting of the stage or any great stir even though this doctrine marked a far more decisive phase in the development of the Church’s conscious awareness of her Faith than, for instance, the doctrine of collegiality in the Church, the relationship between scripture and tradition, the acceptance of the new exegesis, etc.”

Fr. Karl Rahner, *The Anonymous Christian*

Fr. Rahner's claim that this is "one of the most noteworthy results of the Second Vatican Council" is modest. It is in fact the most noteworthy presupposition of the Council Fathers. It is this corruption of the Catholic faith regarding what is necessary for salvation upon which all the other errors of Vatican II, such as liturgical worship, religious liberty, and ecumenism, are predicated. Rahner is not straightforward on why the dogma that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church was so easily discarded without protest by the Council Fathers.

Fr. Rahner edited the 1962 edition of Denzinger's and in that edition he included the private 1949 Holy Office Letter to Cardinal Richard Cushing of Boston censoring Fr. Leonard Feeney for believing and preaching the dogma that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church. Fr. Feeney took all the dogmas regarding what is necessary for salvation literally. The Holy Office Letter threw all these Catholic dogmas aside and taught the novelty of salvation by an implicit desire to belong to the Church inferred by an explicit desire to do the will of a god who rewards and punishes. This letter from the Holy Office to Cardinal Cushing was published by Cushing and was never entered into the Acts of the Apostolic See. It has no greater authority than a private letter from one bishop to another. It was Rahner who gave the letter an authority that it did not deserve by entering into Denzinger's 1962 edition and the Denzinger citation was then footnoted as the authority in Vatican II's *Lumen Gentium* for the new ecclesiology. The Fathers of Vatican II believed that dogma need not be taken literally and therefore any 'good willed' Hindu, Moslem, Jew, Protestant, etc., etc. could be saved as a Hindu, Moslem, Jew, Protestant, etc., etc. by implicit desire alone without believing a single article of divine revelation, without receiving any sacrament whatsoever, and without being subject to the Roman pontiff.

If the dogmas regarding salvation need not be taken literally then why should the dogmas regarding sacraments or the dogmas regarding the "received and approved" rite of Mass? It is not possible to object to the doctrines of religious liberty and modern ecumenism if you believe that any 'good willed' Hindu, Moslem, Jew, Protestant, etc., etc. can be in the state of grace and a temple of the Holy Ghost while remaining Hindu, Moslem, Jew, Protestant, etc., etc.

It is now evident as Archbishop Carlo Maria Vigano observes that the policy of Rome is to herd all traditional and conservative Catholic into the SSPX corral and make the SSPX by default the designated spokesman for Catholic tradition. Whether the reason for this is that Rome knows that the SSPX cannot possibly defend Catholic faith and tradition or, as Archbishop Vigano believes, to drive all faithful Catholics into an identifiable group that can be smeared as a "schismatic" and "heretical" sect, waits to be seen. It may very well be for both reasons. Truth is the only weapon possessed by faithful Catholic against an abusive authority. That truth is Catholic Dogma, the proximate rule of faith. Catholic opposition to the heresies of Rome must be grounded in Dogma and carried out in every individual diocese as Archbishop Vigano recommends when he says, it is "important to preserve a certain parcelization, so as to make the malicious maneuver of ousting traditional Catholics from the ecclesial body more complex." If Rome is to condemn the Catholic faithful, it must be forced to condemn specific doctrinal, moral and liturgical truths that the Catholic faithful will not compromise at any cost, even the cost of their lives. The defense of the true faith and purity of worship cannot be done by anyone who rejects Dogma as the proximate rule of faith and believes in fairy tales like bakery and wine cellar consecrations.

**D. M. Drew
Ss. Peter & Paul Roman Catholic Mission
July 22, 2023**

ADDENDUM 1:

Bakery and Wine Cellar consecration theology drives a wedge between the Passion of Jesus Christ and the Holy Eucharist. This theology believes that wine can be consecrated alone without bread, it believes that bread can be consecrated alone without wine, and it believes that either species can be consecrated alone or together without the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. As said before, this is the theology of the Novus Ordo. Evidence for this is provided by the Novus Ordites themselves.

Pope Paul VI introducing the Novus Ordo Missal in 1969 said:

"This renewal has also shown clearly that the formulas of the Roman Missal ought to be revised and enriched. The beginning of this renewal was the work of Our predecessor, this same Pius XII, in the restoration of the Paschal Vigil and of the Holy Week Rite, which formed the first stage of updating the Roman Missal for the present-day mentality."

Ordo Hebdomadae Sanctae (OHS), published November 16, 1955 and became effective during Holy Week of 1956, eliminated many immemorial liturgical customs. One novelty adopted was the uniting of the readings of Passion and the Gospel that heretofore were distinct readings. In 1956 they were not only combined together but the Passion reading eliminated the institution narrative of Holy Eucharist!

Fr. Stefano Carusi wrote a treatise entitled, "The Reform of Holy Week in the Years 1951-1956 from Liturgy to Theology by Way of the Statements of Certain Leading Thinkers (Annibale Bugnini, Carlo Braga, Ferdinando Antonelli)" that was published in *Disputationes Theologicae*, translated to English by Fr. Charles W. Johnson, and made available through Rorate Caeli.

OHS 1956, page 11: Elimination of the Gospel passage which connects the institution of the Eucharist with the Passion of Christ (Matthew 26: 1-36).
Fr. Stefano Carusi Commentary: We now come to a pass that to us seems the most disconcerting, above all because it seems, as far as the archives reveal, that the Commission had decided not to change anything in regard to the Passion, since it was of the most ancient origin (Msgr. Nicola Giampietro, op. cit., pp. 304, 305*). Nevertheless, we know neither how nor why the narrative of the Last Supper was expunged. It is hard to believe that for simple motives of saving time thirty verses of the Gospel would be struck out, especially considering the relevance of the passage concerned. Up till then, tradition desired that the narration of the Passion in the Synoptics always include the institution of the Eucharist, which, by virtue of the sacramental separation of the Body and Blood of Christ, is the herald of the Passion. The reform, with a single stroke aimed at a fundamental passage of Sacred Scripture, obscured the vital relation of the Last Supper, the sacrifice of Good Friday, and the Eucharist. The passage on the institution of the Eucharist was eliminated as well from Holy Tuesday and Holy Wednesday, with the astounding result that it is nowhere to be found in the entire liturgical cycle! This was the result of a climate of hasty change, which disrupted centuries-old traditions yet was incapable of considering the entirety of Scripture read during the year.
(*Msgr. Nicola Giampietro, liturgical historian, kept the notes and minutes of the discussions of the preparatory commission preserved in the archives of the Congregation of Rites.)

There you have it! It was Bugnini and his liturgical commission who drove a deep wedge between the Passion of Jesus Christ and the Holy Eucharist destroying their necessary relationship for benefit of "present-day mentality." Does anyone suppose that Bugnini had the presence of mind to envision Bakery and Wine Cellar consecrations as the end result of

his theological-liturgical novelty?

D. M. Drew

ADDENDUM 2:

Further proof that Bugnini and his liturgical committee wanted to destroy the necessary relationship between the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and the Passion was their collective hatred for the Mass of the Presanctified offered on Good Friday. They replaced the Mass of the Presanctified with a general distribution of Holy Communion to all the faithful in the first Bugnini transitional missal of 1956 (and continued in the 1962 Bugnini transitional Missal used by the SSPX and other Indult communities):

GOOD FRIDAY Sepulchre 1. (Ordo Hebdomadae Sanctae (OHS), 1956): The name "Solemn Liturgical Action" is devised, thus eliminating the very ancient names "Mass of the Presanctified" and "Feria Sexta in Parasceve."

Commentary: The terminology of "Presanctified" underlined the fact that the sacred Species had been consecrated at an earlier ceremony and showed the connection with the return of the Eucharist, an important and ancient part of the rite. But the Commission despised this concept and decided to reform the name along with the rite itself: "[We need] to trim back the medieval extravagances, so little noted, of the so-called Mass of the Presanctified to the severe and original lines of a great, general communion service." The usage "in Parasceve" [i.e., Friday "in Preparation"] was no longer in favor, even though its Hebraic overtones indicate its great antiquity.

Fr. Stefano Carusi, "The Reform of Holy Week in the Years 1951-1956 from Liturgy to Theology by Way of the Statements of Certain Leading Thinkers (Annibale Bugnini, Carlo Braga, Ferdinando Antonelli)", published in *Disputationes Theologicae*, translated to English by Fr. Charles W. Johnson

Why did innovators hate this tradition that they called a "medieval extravagance"? The answer is not entirely addressed directly in Fr. Carusi's comments. It is because the Mass of the Presanctified is a continuation of the Mass offered on Holy Thursday. They are united in one consecration, one sacrifice, and two separate communions. This unity was destroyed by Bugnini in both its terminology and its act. That is why the Eucharist procession from the Sepulcher (Altar of Repose) is reduced to nearly a private affair:

OHS, 1956: The importance of the Eucharistic procession is downplayed.

Commentary: The procession with the cross is a new creation, but the reform decides to downgrade the return procession with the Body of Christ to an almost private form in an inexplicable inversion of perspective. The Most Holy Sacrament was carried out the day before in a solemn manner to the altar of the Sepulcher. (We deliberately use the name "Sepulcher" because all of Christian tradition calls it thus, including the *Memoriale Rituum* and the Congregation of Rites, even if the Commission members barely tolerated this term; it appears to us profoundly theological and suffused with that *sensus fidei* [sense of the Faith] that is lacking in certain theologians.) It seems logical and "liturgical" that there should be for a solemn procession like that of Holy Thursday an equally dignified return on Good Friday. After all, here there is a particle of the same Blessed Sacrament from the previous day, the Body of Christ. With this innovation the honors to be paid to the

Blessed Sacrament are reduced, and, in the case of Solemn Mass [of the Presanctified], it is the deacon who is instructed to go to the altar of the Sepulcher to bring back the Sacrament, while the priest sits tranquilly resting on the sedilia. The celebrant graciously arises when Our Lord, in the form of the sacred Species, is brought in by a subaltern, and then goes to the high altar. Perhaps it was for this reason that John XXIII did not want to follow this rubric at the Mass celebrated at Santa Croce in Gerusalemme and desired to go himself, as Pope and as celebrant, to bring back the Most Holy Sacrament. (MR 1952): The Most Blessed Sacrament returns in a procession equal in solemnity to that of the preceding day. It is the celebrant who goes to bring It back, as is natural. Since one is dealing with Our Lord Himself, present in the Host, one does not send a subordinate to bring Him to the altar.

And it is also the reason that any reference of sacrifice that was present in the Mass of the Presanctified was suppressed to destroy the direct relationship between the Mass of Holy Thursday and the Passion of Jesus Christ.

OHS, 1956: Elimination of the prayers that make reference to sacrifice while the Host is consumed.

Commentary: It is true that on this day, in the strict sense, there is no Eucharistic sacrifice with the separation of the sacred Species, but it is also true that the consuming the Victim, immolated the preceding day, is a part, though not an essential one, of the sacrifice. This is, in a certain sense, the sacramental continuation of the sacrifice, because the Body, when consumed, is nevertheless always the Body as immolated and sacrificed. Accordingly, tradition always speaks of the sacrifice in the prayers connected with the consuming of the Host. Some members of the Commission held that after so many years of tradition the time had come to correct errors and to declare that words such as "meum ac vestrum sacrificium" ["my sacrifice and yours"] were "completely out of place in this instance, since one is not dealing with a sacrifice but only with communion." The decision was then taken to abolish these age-old prayers. (MR 1952): The prayer, "Orate, fratres, ut meum ac vestrum sacrificium, etc." is recited, but, given the unique context, it is not followed by the usual response.

Bugnini also denied that the individual communion of the priest was a necessary element of the sacrifice. The majority of theologians in the past may have agreed with Bugnini but the grounds for this opinion remain very, very weak. The intention of the priest must be to do what the Church does. The Church does what it has always done and that is what Jesus Christ did. The first Mass at the Last Supper was done in the context of the Paschal sacrifice established by God through His servant, Moses. This Paschal sacrifice is a type of both the Mass and the sacrifice of Jesus Christ on Calvary. Even the Old Testament terminology is retained in the New. The Paschal sacrifice of Moses required the necessary consumption of the victim to be delivered from the destroying angel. The reality cannot be less than the type. Jesus Christ said directly before the consecration, "Take and eat... Take and drink". After the consecration He said, "Do this in commemoration..." where he made the apostles priests, a necessary element for the sacrifice. Why should we be blind to the necessary element of the communion of the sacrificing priest to the sacrifice? The Church requires the priest to consume the Host consecrated at the Mass. He cannot substitute another. If a priest dies after the consecration, another priest is required to complete the Mass and consume the consecrated Host. This is what the Old Testament type required, what Jesus Christ did and what the Church has always done. Any theology that would conclude that the communion is not a necessary element of the sacrifice is grounded on purely human interpolations. Remember, although the *essence* of the sacrifice are the

words of consecration there is a real distinction between *essence* and *existence*. Even the SSPX recognizes that the essence of the sacrifice is insufficient in itself. They recognize the necessity of a validly ordained priest with the intent to do what the Church does. They are just ignorant as to what it is that the "Church does". The theology that teaches that the sacramental existence of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ can be done to all the bread in a bakery or all the wine in a cellar cannot be sufficiently execrated.

D. M. Drew

ADDENDUM 3:

A final reflection on the importance of the Mass of the Pre-sanctified offered on Good Friday. Dr. Brant Pitre, born in 1975, is a research professor of scripture at The Augustine Institute who received his Ph.D. in New Testament and ancient Judaism from the University of Notre Dame. He was raised and educated in the Novus Ordo, and is thoroughly devoted Novus Ordo apologist. In his book, *Jesus and the Jewish Roots of the Eucharist*, he says that the Jewish tradition for the Passover meal requires four libations of wine each for a specific end. I was able to confirm this from another authoritative source.

At the Last Supper Jesus says as narrated in all three synoptic gospels:

"For I say to you, that I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, till the kingdom of God come" (Luke 22:18).

"And I say to you, i will not drink from henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I shall drink it with you new in the kingdom of my Father" (Matthew 26:29).

"Amen I say to you, that I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I shall drink it new in the kingdom of God" (Mark 14:25).

Pitre opines that during the Last Supper Jesus followed the Jewish traditions explicitly except He did not drink the fourth libation before leaving the Cenacle which ends the Jewish Passover celebration. Jesus drank this fourth libation the moment before He expired on the Cross.

St. John does not narrate the Last Supper in his Gospel but, as an eye witness, he reports:

"Afterwards, Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the scripture might be fulfilled, said: I thirst. Now there was a vessel set the full of vinegar. And they, puffing a sponge full of vinegar about hyssop, put it to his mouth. Jesus therefore, when he had taken the vinegar, said: It is consummated. And bowing his head, he gave up the ghost" (John 19:28-30).

Vinegar is soured wine. That is what the word "vinegar" literally means. Pitre believes that this drinking of soured wine is in fact the fourth libation. Pitre after making this observation from his knowledge of the Jewish Passover does not see its obvious implications. Bugnini and the liturgical commission's goal was to destroy the relationship between the sacrament of the Eucharist and the Passion of Jesus Christ. This fact explains why the institution narratives were removed from the three Passion readings during Holy Week, and its explains why he and his fellow iconoclasts hated the Mass of the Pre-sanctified on Good Friday with its triumphant procession singing the *Vexilla Regis* from the Altar of Repose to the church sanctuary high altar. The Last Supper and the Passion

are one and the same sacrifice. Jesus is the Passover Lamb, the "Lamb of God." The Passover meal did not end until the drinking of the fourth libation on the cross directly before Jesus "gave up the ghost." Likewise the anti-type, the Mass of the Pre-sanctified is a continuation of the Mass of Holy Thursday. It constitutes one sacrificial offering. There is one consecration and two communions. The first communion at the Mass of Maundy Thursday and the second on Good Friday. Lastly, the ends for each libation during the Passover meal roughly correspond with the four ends of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass: Adoration, Reparation, Petition and, the fourth libation, Thanksgiving because, 'It was consummated', 'the kingdom of God had come', He 'drank it new in the kingdom of God'.

On Maundy Thursday in the traditional "received and approved" Roman rite the epistle is taken from St. Paul's first letter to the Corinthians 11:20-32. Not in the 1962 Bugnini transitional missal but in the Novus Ordo missal of 1969, the service reads I Cor. 11:23-26 eliminating the beginning two verses and the last six. This probably would have been a step too far in 1956. Alas, Bugnini was very patient destroyer.

D. M. Drew

i Bishop Fellay's belief in bakery and wine cellar consecrations is not a private opinion but rather the common belief held and taught by SSPX priests. Fr. Paul-Isaac Franks, a professor of theology at St. Mary's College, expressed the same conviction when he said :

"In a sense if an apostate Catholic priest passed a bakery and had a glass of wine in his hand and then said, "Hoc est enim corpus meum" with the bakery and consecrated the wine then you have a valid Mass and it is infinitely pleasing to almighty God from that one point of validity but, does that make the whole act a good act? A Catholic would still be horrified. Now that is a very strong comparison for the New Mass and I do not mean to say that there is any malice on the part of the priests who celebrate it and so on. These are often good pious men doing their best but they do not see clearly with the same, at least with that judgment, I would argue that we have, in the traditionalist movement, through the providential benefits of a very clear sighted soul like Archbishop Lefebvre, a man of the Church." and is signified.

Fr. Paul-Isaac Franks, interview, Crisis in the Church, episode 26

[Crisis in the Church #26 SSPX at the 34:35 time](#)

ii **The immemorial "received and approved" Roman rite of Mass is one of many Catholic rites. These other rites also include canonical prayers invoking God to consecrate the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. These prayers necessarily teach that the priest is only the necessary material and instrumental cause of the consecration. God is the formal and final cause of the consecration at every Mass. Is it possible for a marble stone (the material cause) and chisel (the instrumental cause) to create of itself Michelangelo's statue of Moses? No it is not. But it is sooner to happen than a priest entering a bakery and consecrating all the bread in the bakery.**

The epiclesis is the invocation of the Holy Ghost to change the bread and wine in to the body and blood of Jesus Christ. It occurs in the immemorial Roman rite during the offertory prayers said over the chalice when the priest prays: "Come, O Sanctifier, almighty, eternal

God, and bless this sacrifice, prepared for Thy Holy Name." In the Ambrosian liturgy the priest prays before the consecration:

"Send down, Lord, the invisible majesty of Thy Holy Spirit, as He descended of old upon the holocausts of the patriarchs."

In the Byzantine rite it occurs directly after the consecration when the priest says:

"Further, we offer to You this rational and unbloody worship; and we ask, we pray and we entreat You: Sent down Your Holy Spirit upon us and upon these Gifts here present, and make this bread the precious Body of Your Christ and that which is in this chalice the precious Blood of Your Christ, changing them by Your Holy Spirit. So that they may be for the communicants sobriety of soul, forgiveness of sins, fellowship of Your Holy Spirit, fulfillment of the kingdom of heaven, confidence before You and not for judgment or condemnation."

Fr. Martin Cochem in his book *Explanation of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass*, published 1896, cites this Apostolic tradition:

"That the Holy Ghost is the agent in this mystery we know from the liturgy of the apostle James. Immediately before the consecration we find this prayer: ' Send down, O Lord, we beseech Thee, upon these proposed gifts. Thy Holy Spirit, that, coming upon them with His Holy and glorious presence, He may hallow them, and make this bread the Holy body, and this cup the Holy blood, of Thy Son Jesus Christ.' Almost identical are the words employed in the liturgy of St. Clement, pope and martyr: 'We beseech Thee, O Lord, to send down Thy Holy Spirit upon this oblation, that He may make this bread the body, this chalice the blood, of Thy Christ.' Both these eminent saints, who were contemporaries, attribute the transubstantiation of the bread and wine, not to Christ, but to the Holy Ghost, and Him they invoke to complete the word. For as the Holy Ghost operated the incarnation of the Son of God, according to the testimony of the archangel Gabriel: 'They Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee' (St. Luke 1:35), so in every Mass He accomplished the renewal of this mystery."

That God is the formal and final cause of the miracle of Transubstantiation is evident in this citation from Apostolic tradition which always has the theological note of infallibility. The intent of the priest to do what the Church DOES is to unite himself as the material and instrumental cause to the end which God intends. Again, ALL causes must intend to the same end or the end is not accomplished.

iii "Cena dominica, sive Missa, est sacra synaxis, seu congregatio populi Dei in unum convenientis, sacerdotale praeside, ad memoriale Domini celebrationem..."

["The Sunday Supper, or Mass, is the sacred meeting or congregation of the people of God assembled, the priest presiding, to celebrate the memorial of the Lord."]

Istitutio Generalis Missalis Romani, Article 7

iv So too, grace makes us one with God, not in the same perfect manner, but in a similar way. And yet it is not a question of a mere relationship or similarity, but of an intimate union which makes us, as it were, one being with God. Concerning this union, St. Cyril of Alexandria teaches that, imitating the unity of the Blessed Trinity, we may enjoy a twofold

real union with God, namely, union of the soul with the Son of God in His Divine Nature and union of the body with Him in His human nature (In Joan, 1. 11, c. 11, 12). The latter union represents and brings with it the former. Considering the Son of God in His human nature, we know that He unites us, not only in imagination or affection, but in truth and reality, in one Mystical Body, of which He is the Head. Moreover, He unites our soul to His divinity to form with it one spirit.

Rev. Matthias J. Scheeben, *The Glories of Divine Grace*, pp.154

v The word "adopted" does not in fact express adequately what takes place when we are "born again of water and the Holy Ghost" (John 3:5). Rev. Matthias J. Scheeben in *The Glories of Divine Grace* explains the implications of the baptismal character: "When a earthly father, out of love, takes someone as his child, he can give to such a one only his name and the rights of his natural son. But through the love that the Heavenly Father gives to us, it is brought about that we are not merely called children of God, but that we are such. 'Behold,' says St. John, 'what manner of charity the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called, and should be the sons of God' (1 John 3:1).... We must say that God loves us not only as His children, in His Son and through His Son, but that He impresses on us the image of His Son and makes us like Him, that we may be truly His children. 'For whom,' says the Apostle, 'he foreknew, he also predestinated to be made conformable to the image of his Son; that he might be the firstborn amongst many brethren' (Rom. 8:29)."

St. Thomas identifies three elements of a sacrament: the *sacrament* which signifies, i.e.: the form and matter; the *reality of the sacrament* which is signified, i.e.: the particular grace conferred by the sacrament; and the *reality plus the sacrament*, which both signifies and is signified, i.e.: with regard the Holy Eucharist it is the True Presence. This is why the *sacrament*, i.e.: form and the matter for the Holy Eucharist, as Patrick Henry Omlor explained drawing from St. Thomas, must necessarily signify both the *reality of the sacrament* (i.e.: the unity with the Mystical Body of Christ) and the *reality plus the sacrament* (i.e.: the true presence). Those in the state of grace are united with the True Sacramental Presence signified by the words, "for you and for many" in the sacramental form. The Mystical Body of Christ necessarily must be united to the sacrifice of Christ because it is His body. Those who believe in Bakery and Wine cellar consecrations are dead to the most sublime of spiritual realities. They are like the bandits in the *Treasure of Sierra Madre* who murder to steal animal hides while throwing away the gold.