

Holy Mass and Christ's Fulfillment of the Law

Christ fulfilled the Law perfectly through the two associated Temple Feasts of "*Passover*" and "*Yom Kippur*", by sacrificing Himself, the unblemished "*Lamb of God*", as "*Scapegoat*" on the Cross, bearing our sins and so giving us the "*Sacrifice of the New Covenant*"

Jack P. Oostveen

September 3rd, 2025

Ecclesia Dei • NL



- DRAFT -

Abstract

The aim of this analysis is to contribute to, or at least inspire the resolution of the current crisis in the Church by deepening our Faith through a better understanding of the root causes and how they can be addressed and corrected. Since the crisis in the Church is largely manifested to around the Holy Mass as a Living Creed, this must be the central theme of this analysis. The question of how the fulfillment of the Law by Christ is connected to the Holy Mass is of particular importance.

In [chapter 2](#), the main source of the current crisis is characterized as:

"A heresy in which the understanding of the correct distinction between the natural and supernatural orders is lost."

Among other things this has led to:

"Replacing 'organic growth' with a search for a reconstruction of early origins".

However, such search for a reconstruction of early origins is by definition based on limited archaeological discoveries and hypothetical interpretations to fill the many gaps in knowledge.

The principles for resolving a crisis is then discussed ([chapter 2.5](#)) using an apostolic example from St. Paul to the Corinthians, in which the deepening of the constant doctrine is central.

Subsequently in [chapter 3](#), for the purpose of such a deepening, the hermeneutical key is defined based on the supernatural way in which Christ arranged his birth:

"Christ, the Lamb of God, was born in the stable of David"

This was not a coincidence. Furthermore, the lambs from the stable in Bethlehem were specifically intended to be sacrificed in the Temple. This key therefore leads to:

"Christ, the Lamb of God, was born in the stable of David and was destined to be offered to fulfill the Law."

In [chapter 3.3](#), by means of the various parallels between Christ as the *"Lamb of God"* and the obligations imposed by the law, it becomes clear that Christ's entire earthly life was directed toward the fulfillment of the Law. A fulfillment that culminated in the *"Sacrifice of Christ"* on the cross.

While the High Priest in the Temple rejected the true *"Lamb of God"* because he considers the unblemished *"Lamb of God"* as blemished. Subsequently, this error of the High Priest had to be corrected by a sin offering in accordance with Yom Kippur. To this end, He arranged that the *"Children of Israel"* had to choose between two goats, namely Barabbas and Christ. They chose Barabbas, with which Christ, as the unblemished *"Lamb of God"* now became the *"Scapegoat"* bearing our sins, who then was led out of Jerusalem, where He, *"Priest after the order of Melchizedek"*, offered the World the New Covenant by offering Himself, the unblemished *"Lamb of God"*, bearing the sins of the world. The sin offering on the Cross to His Father. A Sacrifice which He still offers sacramentally today in our temporal condition as Head of His *"Mystical Body"* in the Holy Mass or Eucharist: the *"Sacrifice of the New Covenant"*! This is what Christ instituted on the night before His Sacrifice.

This was already provided for in the law of the Old Covenant, as the ultimate crowning of its fulfillment.

In [chapter 4](#) an evaluation is presented on the *"organic growth"* in our understanding of Revelation ([chapter 4.1](#)) and the *"refutation"* of the abuses and heresies ([chapter 4.2](#)). Both are discussed with some examples.

As for the current subject of this analysis, the Holy Mass, both aspects go back to the commandment of Christ: *"Do this in remembrance of Me"*, which is in fact a double commandment. On the one hand, the commandment *"Do this..."* refers to the repetition of

His words and actions in the institution of the Eucharist as sacramental "*Sacrifice of Christ*". As such, this is the living core of our Faith and is therefore subject to the "*organic growth*" in an ever deeper understanding of it in union with the Fathers. On the other hand, the commandment "... *in remembrance of Me*" refers to the intention of the acts of Christ, the fullness of the remembrance of Christ in Divine Worship, the "*Sacrifice of Christ*". A indivisible devotional remembrance of Christ leading to a full adoration of Christ in His Blessed Sacrament, in His work of redemption how He redeemed us, as well as in the fruits of His work of redemption, liked how He works still today through His saints. Anything that detracts from and/or distracts from this indivisible fullness of remembrance will lead to abuses which, if not adequately refuted, will degenerate into heresy.

Finally the conclusion in [chapter 5](#)

Heresies can only be effectively refuted by a further deepening of the Doctrine of Faith, that will result in a more effective and unambiguous formulation of the relevant aspects of the Doctrine of Faith, and so **giving those who it concerns the opportunity to return to the Faith of the Church Fathers.**

Content

	page nr.
	pdf file
Chapter	
Abstract	3
Content	5
1. Introduction	6
2. Actual Crisis in Church	6
2.1. Archaeologism versus Organic Growth	6
2.2. Risks related to the Archaeologism	7
2.3. Arguments against the Archaeologism	7
2.4. Crisis related to the Heresy	9
2.5. Resolving a Crisis through "Organic Growth"	13
3. The Fulfillment of the Law	15
3.1. Hermeneutic Key	15
3.2. Christ, Lamb of God	16
3.3. Christ and the Law	16
3.3.1. The Lamb had to be chosen	17
3.3.2. The Houses had to be cleaned	17
3.3.3. The Lamb had to be checked	18
3.3.4. To cast lots for the Scapegoat	18
3.3.5. The First Fruits	19
3.3.6. The Gift of the Law	20
3.4. The Fulfillment of Law and the Holy Mass	21
3.5. The Remembrance of Christ	22
3.6. The Eucharist	22
4. Evaluation	23
4.1. Organic Growth	23
4.2. Refutation	26
4.2.1. General	26
4.2.2. Liturgical Movement in the 20th Century	26
4.2.3. Liturgical Movement and the "<i>ordinary synaxis of the Synagogue</i>"	31
4.2.4. Liturgical Movement and the "<i>memorial Last Supper meal, with the nucleus of the Eucharist proper</i>"	32
4.2.5. Liturgical Movement and the "<i>Sacrifice of the Church</i>"	34
4.2.6. Liturgical Movement and the "<i>Didache</i>"	34
5. Conclusion	36
6. References	38

Holy Mass and Christ's fulfilment of the Law

1. Introduction

*From an increasing recognition of all importance of the documents results that almost crazy activity in search of what has been hitherto unknown; that inquisitiveness as to inedited which characterizes our time, and not infrequently is the cause of amusement or disdain according to disposition of the onlooker [1, note * at p45].*

This 1899 quotation from Edmund Bishop [1846–1917] refers to the discovery of the Didache [2; 3 pp 7-20], a document that had been completely lost but was rediscovered in 1873 as an 11th century copy, subsequently published in 1883 and based on specific phrases in the Didache dated to between AD 50 and AD 150. And as a consequence of this discovery Edmund Bishop continues

*"from the onwards 1890s, the field of liturgical studies experienced a flurry of activity in the gathering, editing, and publication of primary documents" [1, note * at p45].*

2. Actual Crisis in Church

2.1. Archaeologism versus Organic Growth

Apparently, many theologians and liturgists became so enthusiastic by the discovery of the Didache that they lost sight of reality. This has led to them collecting, editing and publishing so-called primary documents. In itself there would be nothing wrong with this but considering these sources as primary documents goes a step too far when the Faith and the Liturgy are concerned. The real truth concerning Faith and the Liturgy is the Revelation, namely the divinely inspired Canonical books and the Tradition. Therefore any conclusions from these so-called primary documents should be tested against them. The lack of this testing then may lead to the most remarkable and dangerous conclusions and more, to archeologism, antiquarism and evolutionism.

Moreover, the fundamental background of this approach is much older and can be found in the humanism of the Renaissance and the Reformation of the 16th century as Erasmus of Rotterdam (1536) already claimed:

"It is at the very sources one extracts pure doctrine"

So, it is the discovery of the Didache that has led to the present archaeological search for the *"pure source"* to reconstruct the original form of the Holy Mass [4, p48]. This completely ignores the essential distinction between divinely inspired sources and archaeological ones which are based on restricted archaeological findings.

Revelation, as the source of our faith and liturgy, is unchangeable—no one can add to it, alter it, or subtract from it. Moreover, our understanding of Revelation can grow through a gradual deepening of our understanding of it, particularly through the refuting of heresies, in union with the Church Fathers and under the divine, protective, and sustaining guidance of the Holy Spirit. This so-called *"organic growth"* can, in turn, influence certain devotions. In their enthusiasm for the discovery of the Didache, however, many modern scholars of the Liturgical Movement have lost sight of the fact that our understanding of Revelation has historically grown organically in unity with the Fathers of the Church and under the divine, protective, and sustaining guidance of the Holy Spirit. Instead of pursuing an *"organic growth"* that deepens our understanding of Revelation, they seek its pure source in the visible remains of history through archaeology and believe they can apply it accordingly today. Consequently, they break with the historical developments that flow from the organic growth of our understanding of Revelation and, under the guise of renewal through reform, attempt to impose their antiquarian ideas.

2.2. Risks related to the Archaeologism

This archaeological search to reconstruct the ancient origin intrinsically entails great risks. On the one hand these risks are the re-implementations of old heresies or aspects thereof, which have been fought and rejected in the past being reintroduced "*in embryo*" as important and fundamental archaeologic discoveries. These re-implemented "*original sources*" potentially contain all the heresies for which they were abolished as well as those also subsequently abolished.

On the other hand, there are also the many gaps in knowledge that are filled by hypothetical interpretations with all kinds of novelties that carry with them the risk of all kinds of new abuses and heresies. An evident source for these gaps can be found in the ancient culture that was built on social memory. It is clear, that:

"... early Christianity was shaped by the apostolic tradition, which was not initially handed down by reference to written texts, but in fidelity to oral teachings, with a special role for social memory" [4, p37].

If everyone within a tradition of social memory is completely harmoniously faithful to the oral teaching, in which the examples of the teachers are of great importance, there will be no trace of the origin. Generally, the first traces will only become visible later, when objections, abuses, and/or heresies arise against the oral teaching. But only when such a difference of opinion about this oral teaching has led to a disagreement between proponents and opponents and has left visible traces, such as a written discussion or historical divisions into different groups. This means that in a society based on oral traditions, traceability does not extend back to the earliest period of the tradition. Therefore, it also applies that:

"the nature of the oral tradition itself frustrates the historian's attempt at reconstruction; our knowledge of the liturgy in the earliest period is very limited and (as a result of that) much research in this area is hypothetical" [4, p48]

2.3. Arguments against the Archaeologism

Regarding these phenomena, among others one should pay attention to the following quotations from Cardinal John Henry Newman [1801-1890] and Pope Pius XII [1947] respectively, which are of great importance here:

- *"It is indeed sometimes said that the stream is clearest near the spring. Whatever use may fairly be made of this image, it does not apply to history of philosophy or belief, which on the contrary is more equable, and purer, and stronger, when its bed become deep, and broad, and full"* [4, p48]
- *"This way of acting bids fair to revive the exaggerated and senseless antiquarianism to which the illegal Council of Pistoia gave rise. It likewise attempts to reinstate a series of errors which were responsible for the calling of that meeting as well as for those resulting from it, with grievous harm to souls, and which the Church, the ever-watchful guardian of the "deposit of faith" committed to her charge by her divine Founder, had every right and reason to condemn. For perverse designs and ventures of this sort tend to paralyze and weaken that process of sanctification by which the sacred liturgy directs the sons of adoption to their Heavenly Father of their souls' salvation."* [Encyclical Mediator Dei 64 (1947)]

It should be noted here that the antiquarist claim based on the comparison that "*the stream is clearest at its source*", is not valid regarding our understanding of Revelation. "*Organic growth*" is based on a totally different comparison, namely that of the "*growth of a mustard tree from a single tiny seed*". Archaeological research to find the seed is pointless once the tree has grown and the seed is no longer present in its original form. Therefore, it is also pointless to look for remains of the seed to re-implement them in the current situation of the mustard tree. It is through this "*organic growth*" how understanding of Faith is growing step by step after Christ has planted the "*seed of Faith*" with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. **And that requires confidence in the preserving and protective guidance by the Holy Spirit regarding the process of "*organic growth*".**

Moreover, **it should be noted** that this essentially applies to all human knowledge. Like the development of our Faith is due to a gradual process of deepening or "*organic growth*" of

understanding of the Revealed Truth, guided by the divine guidance of the Holy Spirit. There is also the development of profane knowledge through a gradual deepening or "*organic growth*" of understanding truth of Creation. This latter occurs partly through simple experiences and partly through systematic scientific research and analysis of anomalous observations.

We cannot conclude that an earlier phase in our understanding of the Creation is more or less clear or correct in the sense of opposed against the understanding in a later phase that has organically been grown through new insights. The knowledge and insights in the later phase will always include the knowledge and insights of the earlier phase through the gradual process of "*organic growth*". Einstein's theory of gravity, for example, is an extension of Newton's original, achieved through a gradual deepening of understanding the truth about Creation, which fully encompasses Newton's theory and absolutely does not negate it. Just as Newton's theory did with respect to earlier theories. We also see a similar organic growth in how from the old idea of the flat world, based on a very restricted overview of the earth, through a gradual process of "*organic growth*" our knowledge developed step by step through geocentric and heliocentric views to the current state of our knowledge about the earth and space has come about. And still taking into account all restrictive observational methods of the ancient generations one should conclude that the antiques could not conclude otherwise. This restricted point of view is just like in mathematics, still nowadays, where a very small element of a curved surface $\Delta x \Delta y \Delta z$ is validly considered as a true flat surface.

Thus all scientific knowledge is based on "*organic growth*" through a gradual acquisition of knowledge by ever-deepening our understanding of Creation, without adding or subtracting a single iota about Creation. Therefore, every deepening of the understanding of creation has its basis in the truth of present knowledge, to which it gradually contributes by a further expansion. Of course, this "*organic growth*" in understanding Creation has influenced the way people are acting throughout history, but always within the given set of unchanging natural laws and in relation to the moral laws. Not as an unrestricted evolution, but as a consequence of the growth of our restricted understanding of Creation. And while the moral Law refers to the free will of man through which man may act by a good or bad will. That is to say, man has the choice to act out of good will, in accordance with the moral law, which brings light, goodness, order and peace, or contrary acting out of evil will, without moral law, which gives rise to confusion, to bitterness in human relations and to the constant danger of fratricidal war.

And as the queen of all sciences, this is fundamentally true for theology as well, because this is simply and fundamentally how human knowledge gradually develops through the growth of understanding. Theology is therefore also based on *organic growth*, a gradual deepening of our understanding of Revelation, without adding, taking away, or otherwise changing even the slightest bit of Revelation itself. And just as above with regard to the secular sciences, the organic growth of the understanding of Revelation ensures that this deepening is always grounded in the Truth of the actual understanding of Revelation. A process in which, within the Church, abuses and heresies in particular are refuted under the guidance of the Magisterium, with the help of the divine, protective, and preserving guidance of the Holy Spirit.

Of course, as in the natural sciences, the "*organic growth*" of the understanding of Revelation will influence the way devotions develop in the Church as a spiritual gift of the Holy Spirit, always with Christ and his work of salvation at the center. In this, the commandment "*Do this in remembrance of me*" in general, and in particular "*..., in remembrance of me*" plays an important role. "*Do this in remembrance of Me*", people are either with Him and His Church, and then enjoy light, goodness, order and peace. or they are without Him, or against Him, and deliberately turn against His Church, and then they cause confusion, bitterness in human relations and the constant danger of fratricidal wars [15].

2.4. Crisis related to the Heresy

It is the Liturgical Movement that is striving to Liturgical Renewal by returning to the sources:

Scripture, the Early Church, the Church Fathers, and the great Saints [26, p19]. It is noteworthy that a member of the Liturgical Movement and an expert who served on the preparatory and conciliar commissions for the liturgy, and from 1964 to 1975 on the post-conciliar commission Consilium (which was responsible, among other things, for the 1969 Roman Missal), came forward with this description still in about 1995. After the Council he supported the hermeneutic of the "*Renewal through reform in continuity*" as well as the "*Reform of the Reform*"-movement. **Here we see that within the Liturgical Movement "*Tradition*" seems to have been replaced by the "*Early Church*", a product of archaeologism.**

It should also be noted that besides the Liturgical Movement, two other renewal movements were/are active: the Theological (New Theology) and the Biblical Movement. These movements all share the same principles and goals:

1. a return to the ancient Christianity or the early Church as the pure source, because it was believed that the Church in the Constantinian era had chosen for a false development;
2. the pursuit of renewal through reform, because, as a consequence of the false development it was believed that the preconciliar Church was built on false premises and must be reformed;
3. a denial of the Tridentine doctrine regarding the two sources of Revelation, namely Tradition and Sacred Scripture.

The true Renewal of the Church is a spiritual gift of the Holy Spirit for a clear manifestation of Faith, as Pope John XXIII already expected from the Council on the basis of the preparatory documents [A & B]. However, in contrast to the intention of Pope John XXIII, these preparatory documents were all replaced by other documents initiated by the renewal movements with the purpose to create a renewal of the Church. But every human attempt for a renewal of the Church through a reform of the Church from within will ultimately lead to a kind of addiction: one reform after another, and none of these reforms will ever bring about the expected renewal. The result is an endless quest for reform. How could it be otherwise, since "*it is the Spirit who gives life*" [Jn 6:63, 2 Cor 3:6]? While it was the origin effort to promote the Liturgical devotion without any intention to reform the Liturgy the Holy Spirit answered with the gift of a spiritual renewal of the Church which was supported by the Popes. Furthermore, these movements did indeed attempt to force their denial of Tradition at Vatican II by a so-called neutral formulation of the two sources of Revelation into the Council documents by which they in fact denies the teachings of Trent. Finally this was prevented by a personal intervention of Pope Paul VI [C].

As aforementioned, the search for the purest source of the liturgy in the early Christian period carried serious risks of abuse, about which both Cardinal John Henry Newman in the 19th century and Pope Pius XII in 1947, among others, had warned. In fact, all these principles and goals of the renewal movements are symptoms of a crisis in the Church [D]. And shortly after 1947, in 1950, Pope Pius XII issued a new warning, this time with a broader perspective, namely, including theological and biblical movements, in his encyclical *Humani Generis* (HG). In it, he first provided a general overview of the most important errors of the time:

1. An **unrestricted evolutionism** (HG 5):

"5. If anyone examines the state of affairs outside the Christian fold, he will easily discover the principle trends that not a few learned men are following. Some imprudently and indiscreetly hold that evolution, which has not been fully proved even in the domain of natural sciences, explains the origin of all things, and audaciously support the monistic and pantheistic opinion that the world is in continual evolution. Communists gladly subscribe to this opinion so that, when the souls of men have been deprived of every idea of a personal God, they may the more efficaciously defend and propagate their dialectical materialism."

- This also applies to, among others, those who reject the historical development as a result of the "*organic growth*" of our understanding of Revelation under the preserving guidance and protection of the Holy Spirit. Those who, like dialectical materialism, strive for a utopian renewal of the Church and the world through reform of the

Church, based on the domain of the natural sciences, such as archaeology, but also placing the natural sciences above Revelation. Hereto the understanding of terms "*Tradition*" and "*organic growth*" has been taken out of its true context and interpreted in an evolutionary way. This has opened the way to introduce historical novelties, like the so-called "*Hermeneutic of the Renewal (of the Church) through a Reform of the Church*". This is a great source "*to confusion, to bitterness in human relations, and to the constant danger of fratricidal wars*".

2. An **existentialism** (HG 6):

"6. Such fictitious tenets of evolution which repudiate all that is absolute, firm and immutable, have paved the way for the new erroneous philosophy which, rivaling idealism, immanentism and pragmatism, has assumed the name of existentialism, since it concerns itself only with existence of individual things and neglects all consideration of their immutable essences."

- This also includes those who do not consider it necessary to strive for clear and unambiguous texts. Here we see those who sought to have the council documents accepted by the largest possible majority by resorting to ambiguous texts that could be interpreted in various ways. Especially in such an ambiguous way that to someone of good will, unprepared for such ambiguities, the text would seem to self-evidently confirm the Doctrine of the Church. Certainly if it is assured as such. And once such a document had been accepted and promulgated, these council fathers and their theologians were already poised to emerge victorious from the struggle for interpretation. To this end, they had already established their own press office and a new theological journal. And they did so, in accordance with their secret intention, promoting the hermeneutics of "*Renewal through a Reform of the Church*", to which they claimed everyone should be committed.

But isn't it true that the Church today, nearly 60 years after the conclusion of the Council, still strives for this, while the Church's very mission is to convert the world? Is the Church thus neglecting her essential duty, and thus missing out on true spiritual renewal as a gift of the Holy Spirit? This is indeed a great source of "*confusion, bitterness in human relationships, and the constant danger of fratricidal war,*" which seems to fit those who are "*without Him or against Him.*" Therefore, we must keep in mind the true "*traditional hermeneutic of the Church*" as described by Pope John XXIII and realize that any deviation from this fundamental hermeneutic of the Church is a true abuse.

3. A **false historicism** (HG 7):

"There is also a certain historicism, which attributing value only to the events of man's life, overthrows the foundation of all truth and absolute law, both on the level of philosophical speculations and especially to Christian dogmas."

- This, among other things, points directly to risks on antiquarianism, that wish to replace the historically development for a so-called reconstruction after its ancient origin, instead of trusting the true understanding of Revelation. This is a serious source of "*confusion, bitterness in human relations, and the constant danger of fratricidal wars.*"

4. An **irenism** (HG 8):

"8. In all this confusion of opinion it is some consolation to Us to see former adherents of rationalism today frequently desiring to return to the fountain of divinely communicated truth, and to acknowledge and profess the word of God as contained in Sacred Scripture as the foundation of religious teaching. But at the same time it is a matter of regret that not a few of these, the more firmly they accept the word of God, so much the more do they diminish the value of human reason, and the more they exalt the authority of God the Revealer, the more severely do they spurn the teaching office of the Church, which has been instituted by Christ, Our Lord, to preserve and interpret divine revelation. This attitude is not only plainly at variance with Holy Scripture, but is shown to be false by experience also. For often those who disagree with the true

Church complain openly of their disagreement in matters of dogma and thus unwillingly bear witness to the necessity of a living Teaching Authority."

- This, among other things, concerns directly to risks of the "*Renewal through a Reform of the Church*" by ancient sources. This is a serious source of "*confusion, bitterness in human relations, and the constant danger of fratricidal wars.*"

Then Pope Pius XII came with the following warning in HG9, that even a false theory may contain a certain amount of truth, but this does not make the false theory a true theory.

"9. Now Catholic theologians and philosophers, whose grave duty it is to defend natural and supernatural truth and instill it in the hearts of men, cannot afford to ignore or neglect these more or less erroneous opinions. Rather they must come to understand these same theories well, both because diseases are not properly treated unless they are rightly diagnosed, and because sometimes even in these false theories a certain amount of truth is contained, and, finally, because these theories provoke more subtle discussion and evaluation of philosophical and theological truths."

Instead of listening to these wise warnings, the Liturgical Movement still continues and sought to replace the "*organic growth*" by introducing their archaeologist ideas into antiquarism:

a quest for the reconstruction of early origins, which by definition is based on limited archaeological discoveries and hypothetical interpretations to fill in the many gaps in the archeological records.

It is clear that by replacing "*organic growth*" with archeologism and antiquarism, the supernatural source of Faith is essentially replaced by a a natural source that in itself is secular and fallible. This is a clear symptom of the current crisis in the Church, based on pride, a lack of trust and resulting in a fundamental heresy, namely:

the correct understanding of the distinction between the natural order and the supernatural order has been lost.

This heretical ideology was certainly present among many theologians of the New Theology and Liturgists of the Liturgical Movement at the Second Vatican Council. Above all, this heresy penetrated the very core of the Church just before the Council, when some cardinals met in secret in the week before the Opening of the Council and decided, against the rules established by Pope John XXIII, to intervene in the first general session of the Council [18, p162]. They did this after Pope John XXIII rejected their advise to delay preparations for the Council. As Pope John XXIII reported in His Opening Address these requests were justified with so-called doomsday scenarios for the Church in case the Council would go on with the preparatory documents. **Note** that Pope John XXIII warned against these prophets of doom in his Opening Address at the Council [17]. **By their rebellious intervention, contrary to the rules of Pope John XXIII, these cardinals demonstrated a lack of confidence in the supernatural character of the Church and the divine inspiration of the Holy Spirit.** Apparently, this intervention is a clear abuse of their power as cardinals. While the Holy Spirit protects, preserves, guides and supports the Church, He will always respect men's free will and so He did in this case of these rebellious intervention. Here the rebellious spirit of these Cardinals did not respect the free will of the Pope anyway.

That this heresy was present in the Council has been made clear by Cardinal Siri too. A similar conclusion about the aforementioned misunderstanding of the distinction between the natural and supernatural orders has also been drawn by Cardinal Siri with regards to three of the most influential theologians of the Second Vatican Council, Fr Karl Rahner, Fr Henry De Lubac and Fr Jacques Maritain [5, pp35-70].

Notice that a heresy which has lost the proper distinction between the natural and supernatural orders operates as a two-edged sword, which

- The natural order can be overvalued in relation to the supernatural order, as in the Reformation.

But also conversely

- The supernatural order can be overvalued in relation to the natural order, as in Ultramontanism.

Both edges are manifestly at work in the actual crisis of the Church in all possible degrees, even including the complete disregard of the supernatural order combined with the opposite, which has disastrous consequences for the Church in all her facets.

Note that, of course, archaeological investigations do give us valuable background insights into historical developments, and cannot or should not be forbidden, but they must certainly be considered with caution (HG 9). They should serve to enhance and deepen our understanding of how the present state of the Doctrine of the Faith has historically come about through "*organic growth*" in unity with the Fathers.

2.5. Resolving a Crisis through "*Organic Growth*"

In order to resolve this crisis, it is of course impossible to respond in isolation to all the abuses and other symptoms that arise from the fundamental underlying heresy. In order to combat these abuses and other symptoms effectively, we must delve into their roots in order to identify the fundamental underlying heresy. Only then we can address them by refuting the heresy through deepening the doctrine of the faith in unity with the Fathers and resolving the crisis in the way that Pope John XXIII had proclaimed unambiguously in his announcement of the Council. This certainly brings about processes of purification of the Church and of maturation of the doctrine of the faith, just as in the example of St. Paul, when he wrote to the Corinthians:

"For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you" [I Cor 11:19]

In general, this expression is very true, because it is a clear consequence of the fact that God created man in his own image and likeness with a free will. Therefore, every man, inherent in his free will, will be put to the test, whereby some will fall into the temptation of this heresy, while others will fall into another heresy.

With these words St. Paul indicates that what happened in Corinth was indeed a concrete case of heresy that had to be refuted as part of a process of purification within the community and by maturing the doctrine of the faith as he did by his teaching. He did this by, on the one hand, condemning the heresy and, on the other hand, refuting it in unity with his previous oral teachings on the doctrine of the faith:

"For I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it, and said, 'This is my body, which is for you. Do this in remembrance of me'. In the same way also he took the cup, after supper, saying, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me'" [I Cor. 11:23-25].

And from a deepening of the doctrine of faith, to proclaim the following maturation of the doctrine:

"For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes. Whoever, therefore, eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty concerning the body and blood of the Lord. Let a person examine himself, then, and so eat of the bread and drink of the cup. For anyone who eats and drinks without discerning the body eats and drinks judgment on himself" [I Cor. 11:26-29].

Apparently, the heresy was a matter of ignoring or disrespecting the "*Breaking of Bread*". St. Paul made here a clear distinction between the "*Breaking of Bread*", including the partaking of Christ's Body and Blood as the sacrificial meal: the Holy Communion and the real meal after that the Eucharist Fast was ended. While the beginning and end of the "*Breaking of Bread*" are

fixed and determined solely by the celebrating priest, only regarding to the real meal there is the possibility of starting too early or too late, but to what reference. The fact that there is now a complaint that some of the faithful begin eating too early and that St. Paul responds to this with explaining the "*Breaking of Bread*" can only mean that by starting to eat too early this refer to the "*Breaking of Bread*". Thus, they did not wait for those who were taking part in the "*Breaking of Bread*".

St. Paul is calling this a heresy and fulminated against those who ignore the sacrificial nature of the "*Breaking of Bread*" by starting the real meal too early. Was it just because they didn't wait for the others or was it against those who did not respect the apostolic use of the Eucharist Fast from midnight until after Holy Communion.

"And if any man hunger, let him eat at home; that ye come not together unto condemnation." [I Cor. 11:34].

This is an apostolic example of "*organic growth*" with a maturation process in the Doctrine of Faith. St. Paul's answer is clear and unambiguous, allowing all those involved to return to correct behaviour. These words of St. Paul should also be sufficient to resolve the current crisis.

In Announcing the Council [15], Pope John XXIII (1959) called for:

The great problem confronting the world after almost two thousand years **remains unchanged**. Christ is ever resplendent as **the centre of history and of life**. Men are either with Him and His Church, and then they **enjoy light, goodness, order, and peace**. Or else they are without Him, or against Him, and deliberately opposed to His Church, and then they **give rise to confusion, to bitterness in human relations, and to the constant danger of fratricidal wars**.

A **doctrinal confirmation** and **wise provision of ecclesiastical discipline** in unity and in accordance with the **doctrines taught by the Fathers** through **clarity of thought**, through the **solidarity of religious unity**, and through **the living flame of Christian passion**

In the Convocation of the Council [16], Pope John XXIII (1962) wrote about the preparatory work:

Three years have passed during which we have seen, day by day, the little seed develop and become, with the blessing of God, a great tree;

We then instituted the different preparatory organizations to which we entrusted the arduous task of drawing up the doctrinal and disciplinary projects, which we intend to submit to the Council. **We finally have the joy of announcing that this intense work of study, to which the cardinals, bishops, prelates, theologians, canonists, and experts from all over the world have given their valuable contribution, is now nearing its end**

In His Opening Address to the Council [17], Pope John XXIII (1962) called for:

Not, certainly, that **there is a lack of fallacious teaching, opinions, and dangerous concepts** to be guarded against and dissipated;

Never depart from the sacred patrimony of truth received from the Fathers

The sacred deposit of Christian doctrine should be guarded and taught more efficaciously.

These words said by Pope John XXIII are truly the only hermeneutic of the Council: the Hermeneutic of the Church!

3. The fulfilment of the Law

3.1. Hermeneutic Key

The following analysis contribute to resolving the crisis in the Church by deepening the essence and meaning of the Holy Mass, the Living Creed, which lies in the fulfillment of the Law through Christ. Christ, who did not come to abolish the Law that regulates the entire Temple Worship of the Old Covenant, but to fulfill this Law. A fulfilment that finally replaced the sacrifices of the Old Covenant Worship in the Temple for a Worship of the New Covenant with the "*Sacrifice of the New Covenant*". This is a point of great importance. This also includes the question, how could the New Covenant replace the Old Covenant through the fulfillment of the Law of the Old Covenant without abolishing the Law given under the Old Covenant.

Therefore, within the general hermeneutic of the Church as pronounced by Pope John XXIII the hermeneutical key to use here must be based on the fulfillment of the Law that regulates the entire Old Covenant's Temple Worship. Hereto the entire event around the birth of Christ cannot be considered as a natural coincidence. It cannot be a coincidence that Joseph and Mary had to travel to Bethlehem and that there was no room in the inn, so that the only place for them was the Stable of Bethlehem. The supernatural character of Christ is of great importance: he is born in the stable of David, while John the Baptist greeted him as the "*Lamb of God*" at the beginning of his public life at the Jordan.

"The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world. ... And looking upon Jesus as he walked, he saith, Behold the Lamb of God." [Jn 1:29,36].

These two events made the hermeneutical key that Christ Himself arranged:

Christ, the Lamb of God, was born in the Stable of David.

Notice that "*Christ, the Lamb of God*" not only refers to the Gospel of St. John, but also to St. Paul in his letter to the Hebrew and to the Book of Revelation. [4, p39-44].

May this analysis be a source of inspiration for further deepening of the Doctrine of the Faith, through which heresies may be refuted and the Church purified as a gift of the Holy Spirit.

3.2. Christ, Lamb of God

- "*Tell all the congregation of Israel that **on the tenth day of this month every man shall take a lamb according to their fathers' houses, a lamb for a household. Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign. Behold, the virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel.***" [Isaiah 7:14]
- "*Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; **I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them.** For truly, I say to you, until heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the Law until all is accomplished.*" [Matthew 5:17-18]
- "*Then he took unto him the twelve, and said unto them, Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and **all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accomplished.***" [Lk 18:31]

Christ fulfilled the Law and the Prophets. He began the fulfillment of the Law according to the prophecy of Isaiah, by taking the flesh of the Immaculate Virgin Mary:

"a virgin shall conceive and bear a son" [Is 7:14].

Given the supernatural nature of this pregnancy, it cannot be a coincidence that Joseph and Mary had to go to Bethlehem and that there was that particular Stable, the Stable of David. While in accordance with the Rabbinic tradition [23, #7:4] all animals suitable for the altar in the

area around Jerusalem with a radius from Jerusalem to **Migdal Eder (= the Tower of Flocks)** nearby Bethlehem were intended to be sacrificed in the Temple. The importance of **Migdal Eder (= the Tower of Flocks)** and **Bethlehem Ephrata** is confirmed by the Prophet Micah [Micah 4:8, 5:2, 5:4]. Thus, with His birth, Christ showed supernaturally how he will fulfill the Law:

"Christ, 'Lamb of God' who was born in the 'Stable of David' was also destined to be 'sacrificed in the Temple' at Passover".

And so it cannot be a coincidence either that the Shepherds nearby in the fields were informed by the Angel about the birth of the "*Lamb of God*".

"And there were shepherds living out in the fields nearby, keeping watch over their flocks at night. An angel of the Lord appeared to them, and the glory of the Lord shone around them, and they were terrified. But the angel said to them, 'Do not be afraid. I bring you good news that will cause great joy for all the people. Today in the town of David a Savior has been born to you; he is the Messiah, the Lord. This will be a sign to you: You will find a baby wrapped in cloths and lying in a manger'. " [Luke 2:8-12].

Apparently, here the addition "*wrapped in swaddling clothes*" is a necessary, more precise addition to the sign to know where to find Christ, otherwise it would have been sufficient only to say "*You will find a baby lying in a manger*".

3.3. Christ and the Law

Certainly, the fulfillment of the Law refers to the Law that regulated the Temple Worship in the Old Covenant. So, a proper understanding of this fulfillment requires a proper understanding of how God's Law regulated Temple Worship in the Old Covenant. With this purpose in mind, the books of the Law must be read from the hermeneutical key as stated above. Without claiming to be exhaustive, a rough outline of this fulfillment is given here in its major aspects as it relates to the final week of Passion and even to the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost:

3.3.1. The Lamb had to be chosen

- *"Tell all the congregation of Israel that **on the tenth day of this month every man shall take a lamb according to their fathers' houses, a lamb for a household.**" [Exodus 12:3]*

Thus, according to the Law the "*Children of Israel*" had to choose an unblemished lamb for the Passover Sacrifice on the 10th day of the 1st month [Nissan] [Ex 12:3], so 4 days before the actual slaughter would take place. Indeed, that day the "*Children of Israel*" shouted:

"Hosanna to the Son of David! Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord! Hosanna in the highest!" [Matt. 21:9]

Hosanna means: "*Please save us!*". In doing so, the messianic prophecy was fulfilled as given by one of the Hallel Psalms recited during Passover meal

"Save us, pray I! Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord! Blessed is the Kingdom to come! Our father David! Save us from the highest. Save us son of David! Blessed is the King who comes in the Name of the Lord, yea, the King of Israel!" [Psalm 118 (Messianic interpretation of the Paashaggada)]

So, by mass acclaim, Jesus is designated the Messiah. Unconsciously, the "*Children of Israel*" choose the "*Lamb of God*" as their Passover Lamb on the day the lambs were to be chosen.

3.3.2. The Houses had to be cleaned

- *"Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread; even **the first day ye shall put away leaven out of your houses: for whosoever eateth leavened bread from the first day until the seventh day, that soul shall be cut off from Israel. ... And ye shall observe the feast of unleavened bread; for in this selfsame day have I brought your armies out of the land of Egypt: therefore shall ye observe this day in your generations by an ordinance for***

ever. In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month at even, ye shall eat unleavened bread, until the one and twentieth day of the month at even" [Ex 12:15,17-18].

- *"Thou shalt eat no leavened bread with it; seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread therewith, even the bread of affliction; for thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt in haste: that thou mayest remember the day when thou camest forth out of the land of Egypt all the days of thy life. And there shall be no leavened bread seen with thee in all thy coast seven days; neither shall there any thing of the flesh, which thou sacrificedst the first day at even, remain all night until the morning" [Deut 16:3-4].*

Thus the Law instructs the Jews to clean their houses from any crumb of leavened bread.

While symbolically the unleavened bread stands for Unblemished [I Cor. 5:7, I John 3:5, Hebr. 7:26], the leavened bread stands on the contrary for sin [Amos 4:5, Hosea 7:4, Lk 12:1, Matt. 16:6-12, Gal. 5:9, I Cor. 5:6-8]. The houses had to be cleaned from the leavened bread, i.e from sin. And whereas, in accordance to His words to His mother, when they found Him after three days in the Temple:

"And he said to them, 'Why were you looking for me? Did you not know that I must be in my Father's house?'" [Lk 2:49].

Apparently, the Temple is the Father's House of Jesus and therefore Christ had to clean the Temple from leaven, which mean from sin [Mt 21:12-15; Mk 11:15-18; Lk 19:45-48; Jn 2:13-16].

3.3.3. The Passover Lamb had to be checked

- *"Your lamb shall be without blemish, a male a year old. You may take it from the sheep or from the goats, and you shall keep it until the fourteenth day of this month, when the whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill their lambs at twilight." [Exodus 12:5-6].*

The Law also instructs that the Lamb must be checked for blemishes. Only a perfect, spotless and unblemished Lamb would suffice for the Passover [Ex 12:5].

1. While Christ was teaching in the Temple, he was approached by Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodian and other teachers of the Torah. Each group poses questions, trying to trap Him in his words. They were looking for any blemish, which might disqualify Him as Messiah, for not being the "*Lamb of God*" [Mt 22:23-46; Mk 12:18-37; Lk 10: 25-28; Lk 20:27-44;]. **They could not find any fault with Him, the Eternal Passover Lamb indeed was without blemish.**
2. And after Last Supper, on the same evening before His Crucifixion, **the Sanhedrin continued this search for blemish by themselves and neither could they find any blemish too** and finally they condemned Him to death for His claim to be the Son of God [Mt 26:57-68, Mk 14:53-65; Lk22:63-71; Jn 18:12-27].
3. Then, Pilate and Herod respectively, **representing the worldly Government, could not find any blemish either** [Mt 1-2,11-26; Mk 15:1-15; Lk 23:1-25; Jn 18:28-19:19].

3.3.4. To cast lots for the Scapegoat

- *"And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses said unto the people, Ye have sinned a great sin: and now I will go up unto the Lord; peradventure I shall make an atonement for your sin" [Ex 32:30].*
- *"And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scapegoat. ... But the goat, on which the lot fell to be the scapegoat, shall be presented alive before the Lord, to make an atonement with him and to let him go for a scapegoat into the wilderness" [Lev 16:8,10].*

According to the law, an error of Passover was to be corrected like at the associated Temple Feast of "*Yom Kippur*", the Day of Atonement. For this, the High Priest cast lots over two goats. While the blood of the chosen one was to be sprinkled on the altar, the other goat was to bear the sins of the "*Children of Israel*" and was taken as a "*Scapegoat*" outside the city of Jerusalem to be sacrificed in the wilderness for the Atonement of sins.

And, after the High Priest had rejected the "*Lamb of God*" [Mt 26:63-66; Mk 14:61-64; Lk 22:70-71] as the spotless and unblemished "*Passover Lamb*", the High Priest sent Christ to Pilate [Mt 27:1-2; Mk 15:1; Lk 23:1] to execute judgement on Christ [Jn 18:28-32]. Then Pilate, representing the Worldly Government of the Emperor, was convinced of Christ's innocence and wanted to release Him [Mt 27:18; Mk 15:10; Lk 23:13-16; Jn 19:38]. As it was already foreseen as a custom, it was Pilate, who, as representative of the Worldly Government, now cast lots for the two goats, Barabbas and Christ, upon which the "*Children of Israel*", as persuaded by the High Priest and his men, chose Barabbas. [Mt 27:13-23; Mk 15:6-14; Lk 23:17-25; Jn 18:39-40]. Then Pilate washed his hands in innocence and delivered Christ to the High Priest [Mt. 27:24-26; Mk 15:15; Jn 19:4-7], after which Christ, the unblemished "*Lamb of God*" and Priest in the order of Melchizedek, sacrificed Himself, the sin offering of "*Scapegoat*" on the Cross bearing our sins.

Apparently the error of the High Priest had to be corrected by a sin offering similar to the sacrifice of the scapegoat on the associated Temple Feast of "*Yom Kippur*" by casting lots between Barabbas and Jesus. And so the "*Children of Israel*", who had already proclaimed Christ as the innocent Passover Lamb without sin, now came forwards with Christ to bear our sins as "*Scapegoat*" for our Atonement with God. [Lev. 16:8-10; Mt. 27:17-26; Mk. 15:6-15; Lk. 23:13-25; John 19:14-16].

As the "*Scapegoat*" was then brought outside the City of Jerusalem to be offered in the Wilderness for the atonement of the sins, Christ too, was brought outside the City of Jerusalem to be offered in the wilderness for the atonement of sin. And because of the representants of the worldly government had recognised Him as the innocent Lamb, He as "*Eternal High Priest, in the order of Melchizedek*" sacrificed Himself as sin offering of atonement for the entire world. The innocent Passover Lamb as Scapegoat sacrificed for our sins on the Cross at Calvary, died at the appointed time for the Passover Lamb to be slaughtered, i.e. the 9th hour of the 14th day of the 1st month [Num. 29:11; Ex 12; Is 53; Mt 27:32-50; Mk 15:21-37; Lk 23:26-46; Jn 19:16-30]. **In this way, Christ perfectly fulfilled the Old Testament law by joining the two temple festivals, "*Passover*" and "*Yom Kippur*", together, as they were already one whole.**

3.3.5. The First Fruits

- "*That thou shalt take of the first of all the fruit of the earth, which thou shalt bring of thy land that the LORD thy God giveth thee, and shalt put it in a basket, and shalt go unto the place which the LORD thy God shall choose to place his name there*" [Exodus 13:1-2];
- "*Thou shalt not delay to offer the first of thy ripe fruits, and of thy liquors: the firstborn of thy sons shalt thou give unto me*" [Exodus 22:29].
- "*And the Lord spoke unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye be come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof, then ye shall bring a sheaf of the first fruits of your harvest unto the priest: And he shall wave the sheaf before the LORD, to be accepted for you: on the morrow after the sabbath the priest shall wave it.*" [Leviticus 23:9-11].

Thus in accordance to the Law, the day after the Feast of Passover was the Feast of the "*First Fruits*". This was also the third day after the crucifixion of Christ and thus that of Christ's Resurrection. This Feast refers on the one hand to the "*Sanctification of the first born*" [Ex 22:29], on the other hand it also refers to the land that the Lord had given to the "*Children of Israel*" [Ex 13:1-2].

With the resurrection of Christ this Feast underwent a paradigm shift by which Jesus Christ as the "*First Born*" [Exodus 13:1-2] is really the "*First Fruit*" [Hebr. 1:6; I Cor 15:23] who first enters the promised land, the heavenly Paradise that is without sin.

"But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept" [I Cor 15:23].

3.3.6. The Gift of the Law

- "*In the third month, when the children of Israel were gone forth out of the land of Egypt, the same day*

came they into the wilderness of Sinai. ... Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people: for all the earth is mine. And ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation. These are the words which thou shalt speak unto the children of Israel. ... And Moses brought forth the people out of the camp to meet with God; and they stood at the nether part of the mount. *And mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire: and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly.* And when the voice of the trumpet sounded long, and waxed louder and louder, Moses spake, and God answered him by a voice" [Ex 19:1, 5-6, 17-19].

- "At that time the Lord said unto me, *hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first, and come up unto me into the mount, and make thee an ark of wood. And I will write on the tables the words that were in the first tables which thou brakest, and thou shalt put them in the ark.* ... And he wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the Ten Commandments, which the Lord spoke unto you in the mount out of the midst of the fire in the day of the assembly and the Lord gave them unto me." [Deut 1:1-2,4].
- "And the Lord spoke unto you out of the midst of the fire: ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only ye heard a voice. And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even Ten Commandments; and he wrote them upon two tables of stone." [Deut 4:12-13].
- "These words the Lord spoke unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice: and he added no more. And he wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me" [Deut 5:22]

It is the Feast of Weeks, Pentecost. On this day Christ poured out the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles and wrote His Law spiritually in our hearts and consciences [II Cor. 1:12; II Cor. 3:7]. Now the Holy Spirit spoke through (non-consuming) tongues of fire and every man heard them speak in his own language.

"And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven. Now when this was noised abroad, the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man heard them speak in his own language." [Acts 2:3-6].

Clearly these non-consuming flame of fire are similar to the other times when God spoke to mankind, such as when God spoke to Moses through the non-consuming flame of fire from the midst of a bush and Moses was given the task of leading the "*Children of Israel*" out of the land of slavery into the promised land [Ex. 3:2:11] and to all the assembled "*Children of Israel*" on the mountain out of the midst of the non-consuming fire [Ex. 19:18; Deut. 1:4; Deut. 4:12; Deut 5:22] where God commanded to carry out the Ten Commandments, which He wrote on two tablets of stone: the Law of the Old Covenant [Deut 4:13; Deut 5:22].

With the description "*In the third month*" [Ex 19:1] the exact day on which God spoke to the "*Children of Israel*" and gave them the Law cannot be deduced further from the Sacred Scriptures. On the other hand, it is certain that the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost took place in this same month. Therefore it should not be a coincidence that both events of receiving the Law from God would specifically have occurred on the same day. On the one hand, this would then confirm that the remembrance of the gift of the Law of God, written on stone in the Old Covenant [Lev. 23:15-16], which has now been transformed in the New Covenant with the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and the gift of God's Law in our hearts and consciences [II Cor. 1:12; II Cor. 3:7] as living stones such as Peter wrote:

"Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. ... But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people" [I Peter 2:5,9].

Therefore these words of Peter in his first letter refers to the Words said by God to the Israelites when He gave them the Law written on stone:

"and you shall be to me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" [Ex 19:6].

On the other hand, this day of the Feasts of Pentecost is also known under several other names, like the Feast of the Weeks, the Feast of Harvest and the Second Feast of the First Fruit. Now on this day the Holy Spirit appeared unto the Apostles by *"cloven tongues like as of fire"* He spoke through the Apostles directly to the Jews in Jerusalem resulting in a large amount of Jews converting to Christ. This harvest confirms the true spiritual meaning of the Feast of Harvest as it does with the Second Feast of the First Fruits, whereas these converts were the First Fruits of Christianity.

Council of Trent, 22nd Session, 1st canon:

If one saith, that in the Mass a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God; or, that to be offered is nothing else but that Christ is given us to eat; let him be anathema.

Council of Trent, 22nd Session, 6th canon:

If any one saith, that the canon of the mass contains errors, and is therefore to be abrogated; let him be anathema.

3.4. The Fulfillment of the Law and the Holy Mass

Obviously, the fulfillment of the Law and the Prophets did not start with Christ hanging on the cross, Christ standing before the Sanhedrin, or Christ instituting the Eucharist at the Last Supper or any other individual event. It seems obvious that Christ's fulfilment of the Law and the Prophets refers to His entire earthly life, from His conception and birth to His death on the cross, His resurrection and ascension as well as the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. It began after Christ took His unblemished Body from the Immaculate Flesh of the Blessed Virgin Mary, who had consecrated her virginity to God, and after she had responded affirmatively to the announcement of the Archangel Gabriel [Mt 1:18-21; Lk 1:26-38].

This means that the Holy Mass as *"Sacrifice of the New Covenant"* is the ultimate crowning of the fulfillment of the entire Law and Prophets of the Old Covenant. By their choice of Barabbas the *"Children of Israel"* refused to accept Christ as the unblemished *"Lamb of God"*. Then Christ Himself as Priest in the order of Melchizedek, instituted the New Covenant in His Blood: the Eucharist, the *"Sacrifice of Christ"* and *"Sacrifice of the New Covenant"*. All this is in accordance with the fulfillment of the Law of the Old Covenant. This New Covenant was already divinely provided for in the Old Covenant as the crowning of the fulfillment of the entire Law. Therefore every Holy Mass is one and the same *"Sacrifice of the New Covenant"* and at the same time a Remembrance of Christ and His Redemptive Work that is still going on in our times how He is working in and through the many saintly lives. And because all these devotions are directed on His Redemptive Work, this is making Him the sole Subject of Divine Worship and Thanksgiving, without any possible distraction.

3.5. The Remembrance of Christ

So a *"Holy Priesthood"* who *"offers spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ"* [I Peter 2:5], is partaking as *"Mystical Body of Christ"* in the unique *"Sacrifice of Christ"*. It is Christ who, in a supernatural and sacramental manner as Head of His *"Mystical Body"*, continues His unique Sacrifice on the Cross of Golgotha. It is Christ, the Priest in the order of Melchizedek, who through the ordained priests *"in Persona Christi"* sacramentally offers on the altar the *"Body and Blood of Christ, the Passover Lamb"* and eats and drinks this Eucharistic Sacrificial Meal. After which

the faithful are invited as the "*People of God, the Holy Priesthood*" to participate in the Sacrifice by partaking in the "*Body and Blood of Christ*", the "*Lamb of God*" from the Altar of Christ. This is the one, true and eternal Sacrifice of Christ, the Eternal unblemished Passover Lamb, who has been appointed "*Scapegoat*". In this way, Christ used the context of the Jewish Passover as a reminder of the "*Exodus from Egypt, the land of slavery*" as a paradigm shift to the Remembrance of Christ, the gateway to Heaven through whom the "*Exodus from the land of slavery to sin*" takes place.

3.6. The Eucharist

It is clear that the institution of the Eucharist by Christ was on Thursday evening. While in the Old and New Testament the day is from sunset to sunset, Thursday evening was the first meal of the 14th day of the first month when the 7-day Feast of Unleavened Bread began [Mt 26:17; Mk 14:12; Lk 22:7]. The Last Supper was thus the first Passover meal, with the symbolic Unleavened Bread on the evening before the Sacrificial Passover meal the next day, after the lambs had been slaughtered on the day of preparation. Because the unleavened Bread stands for unblemished [I Cor 5:7, I John 3:5, Heb 7:26] **it was from this meal that Christ used the symbolic Unleavened Bread as a paradigm shift to His innocent and unblemished Body to sacramentally continue His "*Sacrifice of the New Covenant*" as Head of His Mystical Body in our temporal condition.**

While the Gospels of Matthew and Mark are explicitly reporting that the institution of the consecration of the Bread took place during the Last Supper Meal: "*as they did eat, Jesus took bread and blessed it...*" [Mt 26:26; Mk 14:22], in case of the institution of the consecration of the Wine, any such detailed reference to the Last Supper is lacking: "*he took the cup, and gave thanks...*" [Mt 27:27; Mk 14:23; Lk 22:17]. Moreover, for centuries and without any objection the Sacred Liturgy of the Roman Canon said about the consecration of the Wine: "*Simili modo postquam coenatum est ...*" [Roman Canon], which means "... *when supper was ended, he took the cup*". This addition is more specific, without contradicting the formulations in the Gospels.

Clearly, the institution of the consecration of the Bread must have taken place in connection with the eating of the unleavened bread at the Last Supper [Ex 12:15,17-18; Deut 16:3-4]. However, it appears that despite the thanksgiving of the food/bread at the beginning of the meal, Christ additionally blessed only one loaf of bread used for the institution of the consecration of bread, which separates this act from the meal itself. While, according to the traditional Roman canon, the institution of the consecration of one cup of wine must have taken place after the meal, now, both these events are confirming that the entire institution of the Eucharist is separate from the Last Supper itself. **Note** that Christ only blessed one loaf of bread from which He gave to the Apostles to eat and that He blessed only one Cup from which He gave to drink to the Apostles. This can only mean that the Eucharist as "*Sacrifice of the New Covenant*" did not refer to the Last Supper meal, it was deliberately used as a vehicle for institution of the Eucharist. It is therefore only one aspect of the many aspects concerning the remembrance of Christ.

Pope John Paul II, Encyclical "*Ecclesia de Eucharistia*", 17 April 2003 paragraph 9

How can we not admire the doctrinal expositions of the Decrees on the Most Holy Eucharist and on the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass promulgated by the Council of Trent? For centuries those Decrees guided theology and catechesis, and they are still a dogmatic reference-point for the continual renewal and growth of God's People in faith and in love for the Eucharist.

paragraph 10

At times one encounters an extremely reductive understanding of the Eucharistic mystery. Stripped of its sacrificial meaning, it is celebrated as if it were simply a fraternal banquet. [...] It is my hope that the present Encyclical Letter will effectively help to banish the dark clouds of unacceptable doctrine and practice, so that the Eucharist will continue to shine forth in all its radiant mystery.

4. Evaluation

4.1. Organic Growth

Knowing what was to happen on the following day, Christ, the unblemished "*Lamb of God*", instituted the Holy Mass on the evening before His Passion, in and through which He, as Head of the "*Mystical Body of Christ*" and Priest after the Order of Melchizedek, sacramentally continues this one, unique and eternal "*Sacrifice of the Lamb of God*" in our temporal circumstances, the "*Sacrifice of the New Covenant*" in the Blood of Christ. He is doing this through the ordained Priests, who says the words and are acting "*in Persona Christi*". To this end He commanded His apostles "*Do this, ...*" referring to His words and acts of institution and then "*..., in remembrance of Me*" referring to Himself as the unique centerpoint and intention of the sacramental celebration of the "*Sacrifice of the New Covenant*".

According to the Gospel [John 14:26], it is the Holy Spirit who continually teaches us all things, and brings all things to our remembrance, whatever Christ also said. This ensures an ongoing process of "*organic growth*" of our understanding of Revelation through the refutation of heresies [1 Corinthians 11:19], toward an ever better understanding of the Faith, in which the Holy Mass, as "*Sacrifice of the New Covenant*", is the core and the living confession of Faith. A process that does not change, add to, or take away one iota from Revelation, at which during the first centuries the oral tradition with the social memory plays a protective role.

And so, on the one hand, this learning process by "*organic growth*" towards a better understanding of the commandment "*Do this, ...*" is also the driving force behind the development with regard to the commandment "*..., to remember Me*". At which the "*..., in remembrance of Me*" concerns the fullness of the "*participatio actuosa*" as a spiritual devotional adoration of the "*Lamb of God*" focussed on the remembrance of the "*Sacrifice of Christ*", His Redemptive Work and all the Fruits of it. Especially in this last respect, devotions to the saints are not an adoration of those saints, but through them a glorification of Christ, how the redemptive work of Christ has led to these holy fruits, all according to:

- Save us, God our Savior; gather us and deliver us from the nations, that we may give thanks to your holy name, and glory in your praise [1 Chron 16:35];
- Save us, Lord our God, and gather us from the nations, that we may give thanks to your holy name and glory in your praise [Ps. 106:47];
- Glory to God in the highest heaven, and on earth peace to those on whom his favor rests [Lk 2:14];
- To the only wise God be glory forever through Jesus Christ! Amen [Rom 16:27].

Thus, the commandment "*Do this, ...*" clearly constitutes the essential form of the unchanging core of the Eucharist, while the commandment "*..., in Remembrance of Me*" has contributed to a further devotional shaping with accompanying prayers under the influence of the "*organic growth*" of our understanding and the protective and preserving influence of the divine inspiration of the Holy Spirit. This also determines how, from the same commandment "*Do this, ...*", the various developments in the liturgy have emerged from the hearts and souls of the ancient patriarchates.

And so, while some details can develop with the growth of understanding, after some 20

centuries, the unchangeable words and actions of Christ concerning the commandment "*Do this, ...*" are still present as the fundamental kernel of the Traditional Latin Mass, they are still the same, repeated by the Priests "*in persona Christi*":

The acts of the priest in the **Offertory** refers to the acts of Christ: "*He took the bread and blessed it*" and "*He took the cup and blessed it*". The priest takes bread and wine from the ordinary use, in accordance with the first part of these acts of Christ: "*He took the bread ...*" and "*He took the cup ...*". Then the bread and wine are offered by the priest to the Lord for "*His Blessings of the bread and wine*", whereby the bread and wine become suitable for the "*Sacred Use to become the Body and Blood of Christ*". This refers to the second part of these mentioned acts of Christ for both, the Bread and the Cup: *... and blessed it*".

- **Note**, the Sacred Scripture mentions these blessings over the bread and the cup, but without giving the specific words used by Christ. Since these blessings could not have been the usual prayers of thanksgiving at a meal, since these had already been said over the bread and wine that Christ took in His hands. It cannot be otherwise than that they were here said specifically over the one loaf and the one cup of wine He took in His hands respectively, by which He elevated these above their natural use and thereby make these fit to become His Body and Blood. It is therefore right and logical to request Christ to raise the bread and wine by His blessings from their common use to their destiny for sacred use:

"Veni, sanctificátor omnípotens aetérne Deus: et bénedic hoc sacrificium, tuo sancto nómini præparátum" (Come, O sanctifier, almighty and eternal God, and **bleess this sacrifice prepared for Thy holy name**).

This is an example of how the "*organic growth*" of the understanding of Revelation has influenced the Offertory prayers. However, due to their archaeological bias, the liturgical experts of the Concilium proposed eliminating the Offertory prayers entirely, a proposal rejected by Pope Paul VI. They then replaced the Offertory prayers with a Jewish prayer of thanksgiving for meals. With this, the aforementioned prayer requesting Christ's blessing on bread and wine was completely removed from the Offertory prayers which no longer appears in the reformed Roman Mass of 1969. **Apparently, these so-called experts of the Consilium commission misunderstood the essence of the Offertory prayers by which they removed precisely the essence, the request for the blessing over the bread and wine to make these these suitable to become His Body and Blood!**

Then next, in the **Canon** the "*Blessed Bread and Wine*" are offered to the Lord for the **consecration** into the "*Body and Blood of Christ*" by Christ Himself as the Head of "*His Mystical Body*", with the words of consecration pronounced by the priest "*In Personna Christi*". After this, in the **Anamnesis**, the "*Body and Blood of Christ*" is sacrificed, followed by a "*Remembrance of Christ and His Work of Redemption*". Thereafter, like Christ did, the priest breaks the "*Consecrated Bread*", which is called **Fraction**. After this, again in accordance to Christ's command, the priest, representing the High Priest, Christ, partakes in the "*Sacrifice of Christ*" by eating the "*Body and Blood of Christ*" from the "*Altar of Christ*". Finally, the priest invites the faithful present also to participate in the "*Sacrifice of Christ*" from the "*Altar of Christ*", through the Holy Communion. This is the true Sacrificial Meal.

It must be perfectly clear that the Church, as the "*Mystical Body of Christ*", consequently participates in the sacrifice of her Head, the "*Sacrifice of Christ*".

Both the development of the liturgical calendar and that of the preparatory prayers, hymns, readings and the sermon have developed over time with a focus on the sacred meaning of the commandment "*..., in remembrance of Me*": the "*Sacrifice of Christ*", Christ the gateway to heaven with the "*Exodus from the land of slavery to sin*". On the one hand, the preparatory prayers by the Priest together with the hymns, the lectures and the sermon, have the purpose of preparing the

priest for the Holy Actions that he must perform "*In Persona Christi*" at the Eucharist as well as to prepare the faithful, coming from everyday life in the profane world, each time again for the climax of the "*remembrance of Christ*": the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist. On the other hand, with the historically established liturgical calendar, the Liturgy has an annually recurring series of feasts, with which the Church highlights the multitude of facets surrounding the fulfillment of the Law by Christ, as well as its many fruits as a facet of the commandment "..., *in remembrance of Me*".

4.2. Refutation

4.2.1 General

When considering the commandments of Christ "*Do this, in Remembrance of Me*", it is clear that any innovation, interpretation or use that detracts from it will certainly lead to abuses and heresies and will cause a crisis in the Church. This concerns both, the commandment "*Do this,...*" with regard to His words and acts, with which He instituted the sacramental "*Sacrifice of Christ*". And the intrinsic intention of the commandment "..., *in remembrance of Me*", namely the undivided adoration of Christ, Christ in His work of Redemption and Christ in the fruits of His work of Redemption that includes His resurrection, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, His Blessed Sacrament of the Altar and the Church as His "*Mystical Body*" as well as the many saints, especially His immaculate Mother Mary from whom He took the immaculate Flesh. These are indeed all fruits of His work of Salvation.

Moreover, if anyone claims, as antiquarianism does, that the current state of the Church is the result of historically wrong human decisions or developments that must be reversed by reintroducing ancient uses, he makes a serious accusation against the Holy Spirit. Because, it is the divine guidance of the Holy Spirit that protects and preserves the Church from false historical developments. The divine guidance of the Holy Spirit guarantees the historical development of the Church through an organic growth of the understanding of Revelation along the way of the necessary deepening of the understanding of Revelation to refute abuses and heresies. Therefore, such claim can only end into abuses and heresies very and a clear crisis in the Church that has to be refuted through a deepening of the Revelation too.

It is therefore necessary that the Vicar of Christ addresses the symptomatic abuses concerning the "*Sacrifice of Christ*" by unequivocally refuting the underlying, fundamental heresy through deepening of Faith to give those involved the opportunity to return to the Faith of the Fathers.

4.2.2 Liturgical Movement in the 20th century

It is important to consider the Liturgical Movement of the 20th century in this context, especially because of the questionable role of its experts during the Second Vatican Council, including the preparatory period, as well as during the liturgical reform of 1969 and afterward.

As already mentioned in the introduction, since the early 20th this movement is strongly influenced by an archaeologist approach that has led them to an abusive and senseless antiquarianism [Encyclical *Humanis Generis*, Pius XII (1950)]. With this, they abusively deny and reject the "*organic growth*" as the leading process of growth of understanding Faith with the liturgy as its living centre. On the contrary due to an evolutionist interpretation of "*organic growth*", they sought and still seek a renewal of the Church, not through a deepening of understanding the Revelation that leads to an internal conversion to the Faith of our Fathers and a conversion of the world. No, they seek a renewal of the Church through a reform of the "*Mystical Body of Christ*", of her structure, her doctrine, her liturgy and her pastoral care, all according to an evolutionary antiquarian approach. They do this even though the Church is under the protection and preservation of the divine guidance of the Holy Spirit. In doing so, they implicitly accuse the Holy Spirit of not having preserved and protected the Church through the ages. Hereto,

some suggest a false opposition between the Church before and after Constantine, while others refer to a false opposition between the Church before and after the Council of Trent. An attitude that amounts in fact to a total denial that the Church is under the continuous and everlasting protection of the Holy Spirit and his Divine inspiration. **A clear demonstration of misunderstanding the true distinction between the natural order and the supernatural orders.**

Herewith, the mainstream theologians of the Liturgical Movement, from at least the early twentieth century up to the Second Vatican Council, considered the Holy Mass as being divided into two parts from different origins. They did so, and some still do, because of their archaeological approach, which they gave precedence over the traditional teaching of the Church. In doing so, they sought a practice of the Holy Mass according to what they considered a return to the source, the "*primitive*" ancient Church of the first century. An assumption based on mere hypothetical "*interpretations*" of non-canonical sources from the first centuries:

- Rather than considering the preparatory part of the Holy Mass as a preparation for the Eucharist, they came up with the idea that this would originally have come from the "*ordinary synaxis of the Synagogue*" [7, p392; 11, p6, p70; 12, p43; 13, p44]. It has been hypothetically suggested that the early Christians, after their banishment from the Temple and the synagogues, took the initiative to continue their synagogue worship before the Eucharist. But who were these anonymous early Christians that are mentioned here? Apparently, they don't mean the then-living apostles; otherwise they would have referred to them. Anyway, they could not do so, because none of the Canonical books is mentioning such a change due to the banishment!
- Rather than considering that the Eucharistic part of the Holy Mass specifically concerns the actual celebration of the sacramental "*Sacrifice of Christ*" in accordance with the Trentine dogma that the "*Eucharist is a Sacrifice*", they hypothetically propose that the Holy Mass in its original form was connected with a proper meal that later evolved into a "*memorial meal, containing the nucleus of the Eucharist proper*" after which the memorial meal was transformed into a sacrificial meal [7, p11, p14-15; 11, p54; 13, p18; 14, p21].

Founded on these two hypothetical interpretation of the Holy Mass the post-Conciliar Commission "*Consilium*" initially proposed to Pope Paul VI a Liturgical Reform. Herewith, they did not came forth with a simplification of the Traditional Latin Liturgy, but with a novelty based on their hypothetical ideology!

- The entire preparatory prayers of the priest including the penitential act by the Confiteor were replaced by a Greeting of the People. Then, the H. Mass would directly start with the Kyrie [21] and be followed by the readings and homily as the "*Service of the Word*", based on the idea of the "*ordinary synaxis of the Synagogue*". To achieve this goal, they argued that Catholics do not know enough about Sacred Scripture and need to hear more about it, so they replaced the at least 1,500-year-old traditional lectionary with a new one.
- Then, in the Eucharistic part of the Holy Mass, the Offertory prayers were abolished, by which the Eucharistic Sacrifice would begin without any form of preparation. In place of the offertory prayers, a processional rite was introduced, which is a clear novelty. Hereto, they hypothetically suggest that this is a restoration of an old use, at which the faithful bring their gifts "*in kind*" to the Altar. They see this as a restoration of the active participation of the faithful, which had been lost in the past. In doing so, they completely ignored the fact that the offertory procession, in which the faithful brought their gifts to the altar, still exists in an adapted and more efficient form since about 1000 years by collecting money, necessary to sustain the poor as well as the clergy and church buildings. And this still exists and precisely at the same moment of the origin Offertory procession in the past to which the priest invited the faithful at the beginning of the Offertory!
- Furthermore, this novel proposal not only abolished the Offertory prayers, but also the

centuries-old traditional Roman Canon, which is believed to date from the time of St. Peter and replaced with three completely newly created Eucharistic prayers. The Offertory prayers and the Roman Canon would express too much the idea of a Sacrifice rather than a "*commemorative meal, with the core of the Eucharist proper*". Although this was an initial proposal on the drawing board, it should have immediately led to a fundamental question about the true intention of these experts regarding the dogmatic canons of the Council of Trent concerning the Liturgy. How could they possibly have wanted to abolish such a traditional canonical prayer? Wasn't this a veiled proposal that would lead to a practice in which this canonical prayer would apparently be abolished, because they considered it a historically false development?

Apparently, it was clearly not the intention of Pope Paul VI to break the validity of the liturgy. On the contrary, he sought to ensure the validity of the liturgy through several personal interventions. While preserving the example of Christ and His instruction "*Do this ...*" Pope Paul VI was extremely motivated to maintain the validity of the reform in continuity with Trent and preserving the fundamental "*Eucharist is a Sacrifice*", so he mandated the following:

- Regarding the Opening Prayers these should be reinstated specifically the Confiteor. (20.06.1966) [20, p128].;
- The Offertory should be given more prominence since it "*should be the part of the Mass in which . . .*" (22.01.1968) [20, 134];
- The traditional Roman Canon is to be left untouched in the Roman Rite; two or three other anaphora may be composed or sought in existing texts for only using during certain defined seasons (20.06.1966) [20, p128], and the words of consecration not be recited simply as a narrative but with the special, conscious emphasis given them by the celebrant, who knows, he is speaking and acting "*in the person of Christ*" (22.01.1968) [20, p134] and the expression "*Mysterium Fidei*" should be maintained at the end of the formula of consecration (22.01.1968) [20, p134];
- The triple Agnus Dei invocation should be retained and the last Gospel at the end of Mass (the prologue of the Gospel according to St. John) should be restored (22.01.1968) [20, p134];
- The pope issued several warnings (14.10.1968) [20, p135]: "*Reform of the liturgy must not be taken to be a repudiation of the sacred patrimony of past ages and a reckless welcoming of every conceivable novelty*". He insisted on the "*ecclesial and hierarchic character of the liturgy*" (16.10.1968): "*The rites and prayer formularies must not be regarded as a private matter, left up to individuals, a parish, a diocese, or a nation, but as the property of the whole Church, because they express the living voice of its prayer. No one, then, is permitted to change these formularies, to introduce new ones, or to substitute others in their place*" [20, p136].

Certainly, these interventions confirm the true intention of Pope Paul VI regarding the essential intentions of Christ's example and instruction "*Do this in remembrance of me*". However, the Consilium/Fr. Bugnini clearly did not fully implement these interventions. Certainly Fr. Bugnini manipulated Pope and the Conservative wing of the Consilium-commission [15, p225].

Although Pope Paul VI rejected the initial proposal the Consilium still went on. From the preparatory Prayers only the Confiteor was reinstated, however now **as a novelty** it became an option between other existing prayers that **as a novelty** were set as penitential prayers too. Then they came forth with another **a clear novelty** by introducing old Jewish meal thanksgiving prayers as Offertory prayer, replacing the traditional one as if the Eucharist were a meal instead of a Sacrifice. By this move the bread and wine are not anymore offered to the Lord at the Offertory with the request for His blessings to prepare the Bread and Wine for becoming His Body and Blood. Finally, the Roman Canon is reinstated, but again **as a novelty**, only as an option for all seasons. Herewith they negotiated the intervention by Pope Paul VI to use the novel anaphors only for certain defined seasons. This means that any obligation to use the

Traditional Roman Canon lacks, which is in contrast to the intervention of Pope Paul VI, who wanted to restrict the newly composed anaphoras to use in certain seasons.

Note here that it is absolutely certain that the intention with which the Pope promulgated the 1969 Missal takes precedence over the intention with which some theologians and liturgists within the Consilium, as "experts", thought they could insert their own theories into the text to be promulgated through lies, deceit, and manipulation [25, p225]. The fact is that Pope Paul VI intended to promulgate a simplified version of the traditional Roman Missal, in accordance with the dogmatic definition of Trent: "*The Eucharist is a sacrifice*"> That he did so, is clear from the following:

- By his encyclical *Mysterium Fidei* (September 3, 1965);
- Through the above mentioned interventions to reintroduce the Preparatory Prayers, the Offertory Prayers and Traditional Roman Canon (1966-1968);
- Through his allocutions given during the general audiences on November 19 and 26, 1969, two Wednesdays in a row. Paul VI explained the reasons for the changes in the rite and **reaffirmed that it substantially "*is and will remain the Mass as it always has been: a Sacrifice offered by the priest in a different mode, that is, unbloody and sacramentally, as His perpetual memorial until His final coming*"**. He did so in reaction on the so-called Ottaviani Intervention by the Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci in September 1969.[20, p146];
- Through the corrections made in the "*General Instruction of the Roman Missal*" including the correction of the incorrect description/definition of the Holy Mass, as implemented in reaction on the so-called Ottaviani Intervention by the Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci [20, p146].

Evidently, the Encyclical *Mysterium Fidei* issued in September 1965, only 3 month before the end of the Council in December 1965, made his deepest intention as well as the affirmation of the doctrine of Trente by the Second Vatican Council very clear. Like:

- (ad 3) In order to make the indissoluble bond that exists between faith and devotion perfectly clear, **the Fathers of the Council decided, in the course of reaffirming the doctrine that the Church has always held and taught and that was solemnly defined by the Council of Trent**, to offer the following compendium of truths as an introduction to their treatment of the Most Holy Mystery of the Eucharist:
- (ad 4) "*At the Last Supper, on the night when He was betrayed, our Savior instituted the Eucharistic Sacrifice of His Body and Blood. He did this in order to perpetuate the Sacrifice of the Cross throughout the centuries until He should come again, and so to entrust to His beloved Spouse, the Church, a memorial of His Death and Resurrection: a sacrament of love, a sign of unity, a bond of charity, a paschal banquet in which Christ is eaten, the mind is filled with grace, and a pledge of future glory is given to us*"
- (ad 5) These words highlight both the sacrifice, which pertains to the essence of the Mass that is celebrated daily, and the sacrament in which those who participate in it through holy Communion eat the flesh of Christ and drink the blood of Christ, and thus receive grace, which is the beginning of eternal life, and the "medicine of immortality" according to Our Lord's words: "*The man who eats my flesh and drinks my blood enjoys eternal life, and I will raise him up on the last day.*"

Indeed, the H. Mass can still be celebrated in accordance with the intention set by Pope Paul VI. **However, the hidden private intentions manipulatively introduced into the 1969 reform of the Holy Mass by the "*Consilium*" commission and subsequently proclaimed by them and their broad support, regarding how the Missal should be understood according to their particular intentions, which are in clear contradiction to those of the Church and Pope Paul VI, constitute an obvious abuse.** In particular, the so-called meal setting, supported by new offertory prayers, and a new orientation of the priest, where he faces the faithful instead of the east, from which Christ will return, fall under this. Precisely because of

the many option built in by the Consilium, it is even possible that a priest will never celebrate Holy Mass according to the intention of Pope Paul VI in unity with the Tradition of the Church.

This cannot be considered a healthy situation and can only be refuted by reiterating the Truth unequivocally and removing the sources for these abuses that the reform of 1969 brought with it. This can only be resolved through a deepening of the commandment "*Do this in remembrance of Me*", namely how Christ has redeemed us through the "*Fulfillment of the Law*" and how all the fruits of this fulfillment are one in Christ, nothing more and nothing less. May the analysis in Chapter 3 be helpfull to this, especially, as consequences of the quotation:

"Christ, 'Lamb of God', who was born in the 'Stable of David', was also destined to be 'sacrificed in the Temple' at Passover".

Then, according to the commandment "*Do this, in remembrance to Me*" the unity between the preparation and the Eucharist must be restored by replacing the correct preparatory prayers and restoring the anual reading cycle fitting the liturgical calendar, the traditional offertory prayers should be restored, while the Roman canon should be made obligatory for the most seasons and the priest should again turn to the East. All this is in accordance with the personal interventions of Pope Paul VI.

4.2.3 Liturgical Movement and the "*ordinary synaxis of the Synagogue*"

Firstly, the so-called "*ordinary synaxis of the Synagogue*" does not refer in any manner to the fulfilment of the Law by Christ and so to the "*Sacrifice of the New Covenant*", by which it is contradictory to the commandment "*Do this,...*". Furthermore, it also detracts from the fullness of the commandment "*... in Remembrance of Me*". The Synagogue was a house to study the Law and Prophets and was not a part of the Temple Worship. The emphasis was therefore on the lack of knowledge of the Law and the Prophets among the Jews, and not at all on the Temple Worshipping and its associated sacrifices.

Apparently, contrary to the supposed Synagogue setting, **the Apostles did not go to any of the many Synagogues in Jerusalem** [Acts 2:46], they went instead to the Temple. They prayed the "*Prayers of the Hours*" in the Temple, "*day by day*" as they "*were continually in the Temple blessing God*" and as initiated by the Holy Spirit they proclaimed the Gospel in the Temple to convert the Jews to Christ [Acts 2:42, 3:1,12-25, 5:19-27,42; Lk 24:52-53]. Only when the Apostles were outside Jerusalem, they firstly went to the local Synagogues as the places where the Jews usually were gathered and missioned among them by proclaiming the Gospel. They did this before they went to mission among the pagans [Acts 9:20, 13:15-16,46, 14:1-5, 17:2,10,17, 18:5-6,19].

Precisely, this missioning among the Jews to convert them, had led to the first Martyrs and their banishment from the Temple and the Synagogues [Acts 3:1, 4:1-3,17,21; 5:17-18,40, 7:54-59, 8:1-2; Luke 24:52-53].

- It were the "*Prayers of the Hours*" for which the apostles went to the Temple. Apparently this liturgical practice was separated from the "*Breaking of Bread*" that they did in their homes. This apostolic practice of praying the "*Prayers of the Hours*" has been continued by the Church even after the break with the Temple. It still continues nowadays, and like then, it has remained a separate liturgical practice. So, what has been added to the practice of "*Breaking of Bread*"?
- If their missionary work in the Temple and the Synagogue was ultimately intended to convert Jews and other unbelievers, why would these missionary activities needed to be added to the Eucharist, which was specifically for those who were already converted? As for the Church's missionary activity among unbelievers, there have always been many other opportunities outside the liturgy, then and now.

Note that the readings and the sermon in the Holy Mass serve to prepare for the fullness of the commandment "*..., in remembrance of Me*" and are traditionally linked to the liturgical calendar and considered as a good preparation for the Catechumens.

- The entire Church from East to West has always had an annual cycle of readings parallel to the cycle of their Liturgical Calendar like the Jewish Temple Worship had. This is clearly contrary to the triennial cycle of the Synagogue readings which was focussed on educating the faithful by reading the entire Scripture instead of the commandment "... *in Remembrance of Me*". Such systematic study of Sacred Scripture can be done anywhere and at any time. Why then should it be linked to the sacred event of the "*Breaking of Bread*". The "*Breaking of Bread*" is with its clear intention "*Do this in remembrance of Me*" an act of remembrance and certainly does not serve here as an act of education. That would detract from the commandment "*Do this in remembrance of Me*"

It is clearly evident that the suggestion that the early Christians added the "*ordinary synaxis of the Synagogue*" to the Eucharist is incorrect.

4.2.4 Liturgical Movement and the "*memorial Last Supper meal, with the nucleus of the Eucharist proper*"

Secondly, considering the Eucharist as a "*memorial Last Supper meal, with the nucleus of the Eucharist proper*" is fundamentally opposed to Christ's clear commandments. It divides the commandment "*Do this ..*" into two subjects of which the meal clearly is not a part of the commandment "*Do this ..*". A real meal is fundamentally human-oriented and therefore also contrary to the commandment "... *in Remembrance of Me*", it divides the fullness of the "*Remembrance of Christ and His Sacrifice*" into a reduced "... *in Remembrance of Me*" and something that is human-oriented.

The following quotations show that Fortescue in 1914 and even Fr. Jungmann S.J. in 1948, both important representatives of the liturgical movement of the early and mid-20th century, respectively, could not prove from Sacred Scripture that the Eucharist was originally a meal or was combined with a meal.

- **Fr. Fortescue:** "*The people met together, read their books, heard sermons, sang and prayed; then the bread and wine were brought up and the Eucharist was celebrated. The texts show, as we should in any case have foreseen, that this celebration followed exactly the lines of our Lord's action at the Last Supper. His command was to do this - what he had just done. The repetition of the whole story of the institution, including the words, in I Cor. 11, 23-26 argues that the celebrant repeated those actions and said those words*" [11, p5-6].

Fr. Jungmann S.J.: "*From the words 'breaking of bread' we simply cannot infer anything more. Since the words were not used simply for 'to have a meal', we cannot conclude from them alone that the essential sacramental rite, which our Lord had instituted with the 'breaking of bread' was always bound up with a real meal*" [7, p10-11]

But then Fr. Jungmann S.J. lapses into an argumentation from hypothetical speculations, followed by a "*smokescreen*" of hypothetical references.

- "*But several other arguments [outside the Sacred Scripture] do lead to the conclusion [of a real meal]. When we see the Apostles gathered together after our Saviour's resurrection, it seems to be the common table that brings them together (hypothetical speculation 1). That could have been the case after Pentecost (hypothetical speculation 2). This was then the opportunity at set times to combine with it the memorial meal of the Lord (hypothetical conclusion), just as He Himself had combine it with a meal (hypothetical projection)*" [7, p11].
- "*Every meal was already impressed with a reverential character, since it was always begun and ended with prayer (hypothetical reference 1: what is the meaning of this, while each Jewish and Christian meal begins and ends with a prayer). Especially the Sabbath meal - the meal on Friday night which initiated the Sabbath - possessed a highly religious stamp (hypothetical reference 2: what is the meaning of this, the Sabbath meal on Friday evening has nothing to do with the*

Institution of the Eucharist on Thursday evening). *An expansion of the table company beyond the family circle was a well-loved practice on this day just as at the Easter meal. Like these Sabbath meals in character were the **community banquets which were held on certain occasions for one's circle of friends** (hypothetical reference 3: which repeats in fact reference 2)" [7, p11]*

This conclusion is so clearly based on all sorts of hypotheticals, without any solid evidence. What remains is only an extremely weak suggestion, a biased reality that cannot be confirmed by Scripture, as Fr. Jungmann himself has already confirmed [7, p10-11].

Factually, this should be clear to anybody from St. Paul's letter to the Corinthians:

"Is not the cup of thanksgiving for which we give thanks a participation in the blood of Christ? And is not the bread that we break a participation in the body of Christ? Because there is one loaf, we, who are many, are one body, for we all share the one loaf. Consider the people of Israel: Do not those who eat the sacrifices participate in the altar? You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons too; you cannot have a part in both the Lord's table and the table of demons" [1 Cor 10:16-19,21]

Here St. Paul refers to the Eucharist in terms of a sacrifice, namely by the "*participation in the blood of Christ*" and "*participation in the body of Christ*", which he compares to the Jewish altar: "*Look at the people of Israel: are not those who eat the sacrifices partakers of the altar?*" [1Cor 10:18]. Moreover, St. Paul here also compares two tables: that of the Lord and that of the demons. The latter clearly refers to the pagan altar, from which it follows that the "*table of the Lord*" can only refer to the Christian altar. This is clearly confirmed by the way in which St. Paul describes the Holy Communion as eating the Sacrifice as participation in the altar, which he also compares to the Jewish altar. Moreover, he uses the same terminology here as Malachi did about the Jewish Altar [Mal 1:7,12] [24, p27-32]

Note that St. Paul speaks of one loaf and one cup. This can only mean that St. Paul is here referring to the actions and words of Christ, who took only one loaf in his hands and blessed it, just as he took only one cup in his hands and blessed it, after which he consecrated that one loaf and that one cup of wine as his Body and Blood, respectively. Then he gave the Apostles His Body to eat and His Blood to drink. It is clear that St. Paul here makes no reference to the Last Supper or any other normal meal with which the Eucharist would have been combined. On the contrary, Paul compares it to the Jewish sacrifices on the altar. Therefore, in [1 Cor. 11:23:26] Paul does not refer to the Last Supper itself, but to "*the same night that He was betrayed*".

Moreover, St. Paul here also compares two tables: that of the Lord and that of the demons. The latter clearly refers to the pagan altar, from which it follows that the "*table of the Lord*" can only refer to the Christian altar. This is clearly confirmed by the way in which St. Paul describes the Holy Communion as eating the Sacrifice as participation in the altar, which he also compares to the Jewish altar.

4.2.5 Liturgical Movement and the "*Sacrifice of the Church*"

Thirdly, under the header "*Meaning of the Mass - the Mass and the Church*" [7, p175-195] Fr. Jungmann S.J. went on. With regards to the participation of the Church in the H. Mass he suggestively split up the "*Sacrifice of Christ*" into a "*Sacrifice of Christ*" and a "*Sacrifice of the Church*", which detracts the fullness of "*Remembrance of Christ*":

- "*Thus, the Eucharistic institution does more than commemorate our Saviour* (hypothetical speculation 3). *In it the communion and society of the faithful with their Lord is continually renewed. The meal is a sufficiently striking proof of that* (hypothetical speculation 4). *And we can therefore safely say that, aside from external activity, the meal is still in our time the basic form of Eucharistic celebration* (hypothetical speculation 5). *However even in the biblical sources, this meal is distinguished as sacrificial meal* (hypothetical speculation 6)" after which he stated that the H. Mass refers to both, the "*Sacrifice of Christ*" and the "*Sacrifice of the Church*" (hypothetical speculation 7) [7, p179].

We find here a clear misunderstanding about the distinction between the natural order and

supernatural order of the Church as the "*Mystical Body of Christ*" with Christ as its Head. Fr. Jungmann S.J. is reasoning here from a disordered view, which apparently makes him blind to the fact that the Church, as Mystical Body of Christ" fundamentally participates in the "*Sacrifice of Christ*" through Its Head, Christ. It is Christ as Head of the "*Mystical Body of Christ*", who offers Himself sacramentally through the priest "*in persona Christi*" and it is the Holy Communion by the Priest through which the Church participate in the "*Sacrifice of Christ*".

4.2.6 Liturgical Movement and the "*Didache*"

Fourthly, it is clear that most of the references to the reinterpretation of the Holy Mass, that it essentially originated as a meal, with the priest standing before the faithful during the Holy Mass, can be traced back to interpretations of the Didache, especially the chapters 9 and 10 [2, #9-10]. They are doing this despite the fact that it concerns a non-canonical text of an 11th-century copy of an ancient text discovered in 1873. In doing so, they effectively elevate the Didache above Sacred Scripture and Tradition, which is truly an abuse.

- The Didache itself claims to be the "*Teachings of the twelve Apostles*", but the author(s) is(are) unknown, moreover its entire origine and provenance is unknown. Although considered divinely inspired by some, such as Eusebius of Caesarea (265-340), who put it on His proposed list for Canonical book. However, **it was officially rejected by the Council of Rome (382) as not divinely inspired**. Given the relatively short period between the death of Eusebius of Caesarea and the Council of Rome (340 versus 382), the Council Fathers must certainly have been aware of the contents of the Didache. This rejection is then confirmed by the Synod of Hyppo (393) and the two Councils of Carthage (397 and 429), which were apparently needed to refute a certain resistance to the Canon promulgated by the Council of Rome. Finally, the Council of Florence (1431-1449) declared the Canon as established by the Council of Rome to be a dogma, which was subsequently ratified by the Council of Trent (1545-1563). Thus, any deduction made from the Didache, being an Apocryphal writing, is fallible if it has not been proved by Sacred Scripture and Tradition. It should be noted that the accuracy of the information in one text fragment in such a document does not provide an absolute guarantee for the accuracy of another text fragment. **Therefore, preferring the Didache over Sacred Scripture and Tradition must be considered an abuse.**
- Because a change from a meal-setting to a sacrifice is so essential, it would have led to discussions within the Church and arguments from both, proponents and opponents. Such a process must be traceable through written references, whenever such took place. The fact that there is no historical record of such a change demonstrates that there was no discussion of it until Luther initiated it. The Council of Trent rejected this discussion entirely. However, the Liturgical Movement of the first half of the 20th century rekindled this discussion with hypothetical interpretations of the Didache, albeit in a less controversial way as the 16th century reformation: a "*real meal with a core of the Eucharist proper*".
- The hypothetical interpretations concerning the Didache are based on the prayer of Thanksgiving over the wine and the food in chapter IX [2, #IX; 3, p15] and the concluding prayer of Thanksgiving in chapter X [2, #X; 3, p16] as if they were Eucharistic prayers. However, these two chapters with the Christianized Jewish prayers of Thanksgiving follow directly on to chapter VIII [2, #VIII; 3, p15], on the general attitude of those who fast and the Lord's prayer "*Our Father ...*". Here it is stated that this prayer is to be prayed three times a day. Whereas, on the other hand, the Holy Eucharist is mentioned only three chapters after the Thanksgiving prayers, in Chapter XIV [2, #XIV; 3, p. 18] as "*Breaking of Bread*", moreover, this chapter even refers to the sacrifice three times, instead of any kind of meal.

"But every Lord's day gather yourselves together, and break bread, and give thanksgiving after

having confessed your transgressions, that your sacrifice may pure. But let no one that is at variance with his fellow come together with you, until they be reconciled, that your sacrifice may not be profaned. For this is that which was spoken by the Lord: In every place and time offer to me a pure sacrifice; for I am a great King, says the Lord, and my name is wonderful among the nations" [2, #XIV].

Chapter XIV of the Didache, about the "*Breaking of Bread*", ended with a reference to the Old Covenant prophecy of Malachi as being spoken by the Lord [Mal 1:11]. Since it is a pure sacrifice, it is utterly impossible to consider that the "*Breaking of Bread*" is combined with a real satiating meal. This pure sacrifice can only be considered in accordance to the commandments "*Do this in remembrance of Me*".

It is therefore logical that the prayers of thanksgiving in chapters IX and X do not refer to the Eucharist, but rather to daily meals. Moreover, in the prayers of thanksgiving over wine and bread in chapter IX [2, #IX; 3, p15], the Eucharistic words of Consecration as well as the Anamnesis are missing [19, p75-80], while chapter X [2, #X; 3, p16] itself already indicates that the final thanksgiving is said "*after you are full*", that is after a satiating meal. Logically, the Our Father and the prayers of thanksgiving therefore consciously belong together, as the prayers of the common daily meals, three times a day.

On the contrary, the institution of the sacramental "*Sacrifice of Christ*" on the evening of the Last Supper concerned only the one unleavened loaf that Christ took and blessed to become His unblemished Body and of which He gave to eat to His disciples. The same is true of the one cup of wine that He took and blessed, to become His Blood, which He gave to His disciples to drink. Therefore these blessings cannot be the same prayers of thanksgiving used for a normal meal anyway.

Apparently, many theologians and liturgists were so excited by the discovery of the Didache that they lost sight of reality, blinding themselves to the fact that the Church had rejected the Didache as divinely inspired.

Pope Pius XII, Encyclical "*Mediator Dei*", paragraph 68

The august sacrifice of the altar, then, is no mere empty commemoration of the passion and death of Jesus Christ, but a true and proper act of sacrifice, whereby the High Priest by an unbloody immolation offers Himself a most acceptable victim to the Eternal Father, as He did upon the cross. "It is one and the same victim; the same person now offers it by the ministry of His priests, who then offered Himself on the cross, the manner of offering alone being different"

5. Conclusion

The institution of the Eucharist does not refer to the Last Supper or the Synagogue Service, but to the fulfillment of the Old Testament Temple Worship. The Holy Mass is in its entirety the New Testament Temple Worship, centered on the "*Sacrifice of the unblemished Lamb of God*" who as "*Scapegoat*" was bearing our sins. It is the "*Sacrifice of the New Covenant*" in His Blood. As such, the Eucharist is the same true and eternal "*Sacrifice of Christ*" that is sacramentally offered by Christ Himself as Head of His "*Mystical Body*" through the ordained Priests "*in Persona Christi*" in our temporally conditioned earthly situation.

This means that the reformed Missal of 1969 needs to be corrected, at least by fulfilling the

requirements as stated by Pope Paul VI with the removal of the abusive introduced novelties. Or by simply restoring the Missal of 1962, which is still the answer by Pope John XXIII on both the manipulations by Fr. Bugnini and the falsification of the preparatory document on Liturgy by the putting back the removed manipulations.

Indeed, through the blessings of the unblemished "*Lamb of God*", the Church needs to refute the symptomatic abuses concerning the "*Sacrifice of the New Covenant*" by unambiguously addressing the fundamental underlying abuse and heresy.

It is necessary that the words spoken by Pope John XXIII at the Announcement of the Council [15] be unambiguously acknowledged.

The great problem confronting the world after (almost) two thousand years **remains unchanged**. Christ is ever resplendent as **the centre of history and of life** [15].

Indeed, **the Church has the divine task of converting the world after it has first converted itself**. Only then we can expect a renewal of the Church as a gift of the Holy Spirit: a divine renewal, without a reform of the "*Mystical Body of Christ*". Only then will the crisis in the Church be resolved and "*men will be with Him and His Church enjoying light, goodness, order, and peace*" [15]. Otherwise the crisis will continue, which means that "*men are without Him, or against Him, and deliberately opposed to His Church, and then they give rise to confusion, to bitterness in human relations, and to the constant danger of fratricidal wars*" [15].

Here the Church should also unequivocally affirm: "*the Doctrine of Faith with a wise provision of ecclesiastical discipline in unity and in accordance with the Doctrine taught by the Fathers through clarity of thought, through the solidarity of religious unity, and through the living flame of Christian passion*" [15]. This could be done by accepting the words written by Pope John XXIII in the Convocation of the Council [16] about the preparatory documents as well as his warnings in his Opening Address to the Council [17]. Hereto the hermeneutic of the Council should be founded on the "*great tree that grew with the blessings of God*" which is "*the sacred patrimony of truth and Christian doctrine*".

Three years have passed during which **we have seen, day by day, the little seed developing and becoming, with the blessing of God, a great tree** [16].

Never depart from the sacred patrimony of truth received from the Fathers [17] and **The sacred deposit of Christian doctrine should be guarded and taught more efficaciously**. [17]

This also allows the Church to distance itself from the rebellious actions of the few cardinals who, in the week before the opening of the Council, decided to carry out an unlawful act on the first day of the first General Assembly of the Council, by which they started a chain of unlawfull acts. Pope Paul VI admitted in the published conversation with Jean Guittou [22, p69; 18, p162] that he, as Cardinal Montini, was one of these cardinals and it was indeed here that the unlawful intervention of the Cardinals Liénard and Frings was decided upon. An intervention aimed at postponing the planned vote and thus gaining time to lobby for their own candidates. The real intention behind the scenes, however, was abusively to wipe out what Pope John XXIII called the "*great tree*" which had grown "*with the blessing of God*" [16].

This rebellious intervention that completely changed the outcome of the Council, was a clear abuse of power by these cardinals. Herewith, they responded to Pope John XXIII, who rejected their view that the preparatory documents would be bad for the Church. In fact, by these intervention they clearly showed a lack of confidence in the divine protection and guidance by the Holy Spirit over the Council. **Notice here** that Pope John XXIII in his Opening Address of the Council indeed warned for these "*prophets of doom*" [17]. Because Pope John XXIII went ahead with the Council, these Cardinals took their own measures, against Pope John XXIII's Council, claiming that they were acting spontaneously under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. This clearly is a demonstration of an incorrect understanding of the distinction between the natural order and the supernatural order!

After the Council, the same rebellious spirit came up with the most ridiculous and false proposal abusing the Council, namely, that the documents of this Council had to be interpreted according to a hermeneutic of "*Spirit of the Council*" whatever this spirit would be. Obviously, they do not refer to the Holy Spirit but to their own spirit that is wishing a "*Renewal through a reform of the Church*". A spirit that shortly after the Council was splitted into two groups, one in a reform in discontinuity and rupture while the other is striving for a reform in continuity.

Here, the strive for a "*Renewal through a reform*" in general, is in itself a clear novelty in contrast to Pope John XXIII, who considered the Renewal of the Church as a free gift of the Holy Spirit for a clear act of Faith as he expected from the Council founded on the original preparatory documents. Above all the striving for a "*renewal through a reform in discontinuity and rupture*" is in complete contrast to the fundamental hermeneutic rules of the Church as repeated by Pope John XXIII in his Announcement and the Opening Address of the Council "*Never abandon the sacred heritage of truth received from the Fathers*" where "*the sacred treasure of Christian doctrine must be preserved and taught.*" [17].

Did Christ not create His Mystical Body on earth in the right way, or has the Holy Spirit deceived and improperly preserved the "*Mystical Body of Christ*" on earth? This is why they suggested that the "*Mystical Body of Christ*" on earth must strive for a "*Renewal through Reform*" of its Structure of the Church, its Doctrine, its Liturgy and its Pastoral Care, dit alles v. Apparently, this is in complete contrast to a conversion to Christ by a true act of Faith, as through faithfully accepting the true Structure of the Church, the true Doctrine, the true Liturgy and the true Pastoral Care as Christ created and the Holy Spirit has preserved for nearly 20 centuries. Is this what the evolutionism of the New Theology and the Liturgical Movement has brought: a rebellious uprising!

In 1972 an unambiguous answer on this question came from Pope Paul VI. After having repeatedly warned against misinterpretations of the Council between 1966-1970, Pope Paul VI came forwards in an address to the cardinals of the Curia on June 23, 1972, with a clear description of the "*hermeneutic of reform through discontinuity and rupture*" including a clear condemnation of it:

... an emergency which We cannot and must not keep hidden: in the first place a false and erroneous interpretation of the Council, which would want to break with the tradition, even as regards the doctrine, an interpretation which goes so far that the pre-conciliar Church is rejected and one is allowed to consider a 'new' church, as it were reinvented from the inside, as regards the constitution of the Church, her dogma, custom and law.

While in the same week on June 29th 1972 Pope Paul V stated in his homily:

... from some crack the smoke of Satan has entered the temple of God.

This irrefutably proves the truth of the words spoken by Pope John XXIII in his announcement of the Council in 1960:

Men are either with Him and His Church, and then they enjoy light, goodness, order, and peace. **Or else they are without Him, or against Him, and deliberately opposed to His Church, and then they give rise to confusion, to bitterness in human relations, and to the constant danger of fratricidal wars** [15]

6. References

1. See Edmund Bishop, "*Historical Critics on the Critical Art*," Downside Review 18 (1899): 191. On Edmund Bishop, see Short Biography, no. 38. Footnote from: "*On the Historical Development of the Liturgy*", Anton Baumstark [1921], reprint by Order of Saint Benedict, Collegeville, Minnesota [2011], ISBN 978-0-8146-6096-6, [an internet link to the pdf version

can be found here:

[<https://litpress.org/Products/GetSample/6096/9780814660966>];

2. "The Didache", Unknown author, New Advent [<https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0714.htm>];
3. & "De Apostolische Vaders", Dutch Translation by Franses O.F.M. [1942], Publ. Paul Brand N.V.Nederland;
4. "The Roman Mass, from Early Christian Origins to Tridentine Reform", Uwe M, Lang [2022], Cambridge University, England, ISBN078-1-108-83245-8;
5. "Gethsemane, The Origins of the Intellectual Revolution in the Church" by Guiseppe Cardinal Siri, Sopia Institute Press, ISBN 978-1-64413-682-9; [6a, #66]
6. "The First Apology" by St. Justin Martyr, New Advent [<https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/0126.htm>];
7. "The Mass of the Roman Rite: its origins and development" [Missarum Sollemnia, Volumes 1 and 2], Rev. Joseph A. Jungmann, S.J., 1951, ISBN-13 978-0-87061-274-9 [https://www.ccwatershed.org/2014/01/25/josef-Fr._Jungmannstudy-roman-rite-mass-pdf/];
8. "Monsignor Fr. Klaus Gamber, The Reform of the Roman Liturgy, its Problems and Backgrounds", Contribution to Mgr. Fr. Klaus Gamber from his own work, ISBN1-929291-88-4;
9. "Reclaiming Our Roman Catholic Birth right", Peter Kwasniewski (2020), Angelico Press ISBN 978-1-62138-535-6;
10. "Canon of the New Testament", New Advent: [<https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/03274a.htm>];
11. "The Mass: a study of the Roman Liturgy", Adrian Fortescue, second edition of 1914 and printed 1917 [public domain on the internet - print of 1914: [<https://archive.org/details/massstudyofroman00fort>];
12. "On the Historical Development of the Liturgy", Anton Baumstark [1921], reprint by Order of Saint Benedict, Collegeville, Minesota [2011], ISBN 978-0-8146-6096-6, [an internet link to the pdf version can be found here: [<https://litpress.org/Products/GetSample/6096/9780814660966>];
13. "Het Heilig Misoffer, het middelpunt van onze eredienst", Pio Parsch [Dutch translation from 1937], Wed, J.R. van Rossum, The Neterlands;
14. "Liturgie Übermorgen, Gedanken zur Geschichte und Zukunft des Gottesdienstes", Fr. Klaus Gamber [1966], Herder Verlag, Germany;
15. "Announcement of the Second Vatican Council", Pope John XXIII (1959) [<http://vatican2voice.org/91docs/announcement.htm>];
16. "Convocation of the Second Vatican Council", Pope John XXIII (1961) [<http://vatican2voice.org/91docs/convoke.htm>];
17. "Gaudet Mater Ecclesia, Opening address of the Second Vatican Council" (October 11th), Pope John XXIII (1962)
[because the Vatican website does not provide an English translation of this Opening Address, the translation by <http://www.ourladywarriors.org/teach/v2open.htm> has been used here];
18. "Paul VI, the Divided Pope", Yves Chiron (2011); Angelico Press, ISBN 978-1-62138-840-1;
19. "My Body Given For You", Helmut Hoping (2019); Ignatius Press, ISBN 978-1-62164-189-6;
20. "Annibale Bugnini, Reformer of the Liturgy", Yves Chiron (2018); Angelico Press, ISBN 978-1-62164-189-6;
21. "The Restoration and Organic Development of the Roman Rite, Làszlò Dobszay (2010), T&T Clark International, ISBN 978-0-567-03386-4;

22. "*The Pope speaks: dialogues of Paul VI with Jean Guilton*," (1967); London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, ISBN 978-0-29776-328-4
[<https://archive.org/details/popespeaksdialog0000guit/page/n2/mode/1up>]
23. "*Mishnah Shekalim, Rabbinic oral tradition*" recorded in the third century (English translation by William Davidson Edition)
[https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Shekalim.7.4?lang=bi&lookup=.&with=Lexicon&lang2=en];
24. "*Altar and Church, Princes of Liturgy from Early Christianity*", Stefan Heid (2023), Schnell and Steiner, ISBN 978-3-795-43845-6;
25. "*Memoirs of Louis Bouyer*", John Pepino (translator, 2015), Angelico Press, ISBN 978-1-62138-142-6;
26. "*A Wider View of Vatican II, Memoirs & Analysis of a Council Consultor*", Archimandrite Boniface Luykx (2025); Angelico Press, ISBN 979-8-89280-119-5;
27. "*Draft of a dogmatic constitution on the sources of revelation*", Translation © Joseph A. Komonchak 2012 [<https://jakomonchak.files.wordpress.com/2012/09/de-fontibus-1-5.pdf>];
28. "*Henri de Lubac S.J., Vatican Council Notebooks -volume one*", Henri de Lubac (2015); Ignatius Press, ISBN 978-1-58617-305-0;
29. "*Konzilstagebuch Sebastian Tromp SJ, Band 1/1 (1960-1962)*", Alexandra von Teufenfach (2006); Editrice Pontificia Universita Gregoriana, ISBN 88-7839-057-7;
30. "*Konzilstagebuch Sebastian Tromp SJ, Band 2/1 (1962-1963)*", Alexandra von Teufenfach (2011); Verlag Traugott Bautz GmbH, ISBN 978-3-88309-625-4;
31. "*Konzilstagebuch Sebastian Tromp SJ, Band 3/1 (1963-1964)*", Alexandra von Teufenfach (2014); Verlag Traugott Bautz GmbH, ISBN 978-3-88309-929-3;

© 1997-2025 Stichting Ecclesia Dei Delft