

## WHY THE NEW MASS IS INVALID AND EVEN HERETICAL, AS WELL AS EVIL AND PROTESTANTIZING

The Mass is a Sacramental Sacrifice, or a Sacrificial Sacrament, as Dom Vonier expresses it: *The term 'sacramental sacrifice' is without doubt the best term, although one may prefer, for the sake of exactness, this simple verbal equation: 'sacrament-sacrifice.'* (La Clef de la Doctrine Eucharistique, ed. Les Éditiones de L'Abeille, Lyon, 1943, p. 89).

*The Eucharistic Sacrifice is something essentially sacramental.* (Ibid., p. 56).

*The great Christian Sacrifice is essentially a sacramental mystery.* (Ibid., p. 86).

*The Sacrifice of the Mass is a sacramental reality.* (Ibid., p. 87).

Like every sacrament, it must produce what it signifies.

The sacraments are sensible signs that produce the grace which they signify. Their whole virtue and worth are centered upon the signification that causes, that has the power to cause, to produce grace.

This signification is determined by the form, or formula, of the sacramental words of the consecration of the bread and wine, which are transubstantiated into the Body and Blood of Christ. The substance of bread and wine is converted into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ.

The Mass is more than a sacrament because it is also a Sacrifice. It is more than a sacrament because, beyond grace itself, we have the Author of grace: Christ, who is God.

It is not a question of transubstantiation alone and in its pure form; rather, in addition to it, there is a sacrificial transubstantiation: that is, the Body and Blood of Christ in a state of immolation and sacrifice; the Body immolated, sacrificed, dead, and the Blood shed upon the Cross—the sacrificial effusion of that Blood. As Gonet says: *The nature of sacrifice is expressed only by the effusion of blood, for, as the Apostle teaches in Hebrews 9, sacrifice is fulfilled and consummated by the effusion of blood.* (Clypeus Theologiæ Thomisticæ, ed. Ludovicum Vivés, Paris, 1875, p. 412).

In the Mass, this effusion is sacramental, not bloody – that is, unbloody – as Garrigou-Lagrange says: *In the Mass the immolation is said to be proper and sacramental, since it is not real, that is, with respect to the thing, as though it had to be physical (...) These physical elements cannot really be separated as they were separated on Calvary.* (Ibid., p. 288). For this reason, what is required is not a physical effusion – which could not be produced – but a sacramental effusion which, although real, is not physical. Garrigou-Lagrange expresses it thus: *The notion of external Sacrifice is found in the sacramental immolation, which more vividly represents the real separation that occurred on the Cross and was completed by the physical effusion of the Blood. Now, in the Mass, the Blood is shed only sacramentally and not physically.* (Ibid., p. 288). If there were no effusion sacramentally produced in the Mass, there would be no Sacrifice; but the fact that it is not physical does not mean that it is not real, for the sacraments are a reality, and the Mass is a Sacrifice sacramentally renewed.

A clarification must be made concerning the term unbloody, for bloody comes from the Latin *cruor*, meaning blood shed – that is, physically and visibly, with violence – as may be seen in note 107 of the Roman Catechism, which says: *The immolation of the victim was carried out by means of His bloody death, suffered violently.* (Roman Catechism, ed. BAC, Madrid, 1956, p. 512). For this reason, unbloody is equivalent to the precise theological term sacramental, and it must be understood in this sense. Likewise, the term mystical must also be clarified, for in itself it is imprecise, as is acknowledged in the introduction to the question on the rite of the Eucharist in the *Summa Theologiæ*, which says: *To represent is to present the victim a second time, but with a different victimization (...) It is the repetition of the victim, though with a different victimization: one bloody and the other unbloody. Both victimizations are real and true; the one they call physical, the other mystical. The terminology is not exact, because what is mystical can also be physical. Trent calls the one bloody and the other unbloody. It could also be called natural victimization and sacramental victimization.* (*Summa Theologiæ*, vol. 13, ed. BAC, Madrid, 1957, pp. 829–830).

Indeed, the Roman Catechism goes so far as to say, taking up the words of Leo XIII in note 107: *The sacrifice of the Mass is not a vain and empty commemoration of the death of Christ, but a true and admirable, though mystical and unbloody, renewal of it.* And taking up the words of Pius XII, it likewise says: *We must always remember that the whole virtue of expiation depends upon the one bloody sacrifice of Christ, which is renewed each day upon our altars in an unbloody manner* (*Encyclical Miserentissimus Redemptor*). (Op. cit., p. 511).

Thus we see that the best meaning of unbloody, its exact equivalent, is the term sacramental. The Mass is therefore a sacramental Sacrifice through the sacramental effusion produced upon the altar.

When the Council of Trent defines the Mass as the unbloody renewal of the Sacrifice of Calvary upon the altars, it must be understood in the exact sense of the sacramentality of the Sacrifice. Thus we have that the Mass is the sacramental renewal of the Sacrifice of Calvary upon the altars.

The words of the consecratory formula must signify two things: on the one hand, the exsanguine Body – that is, the dead Body – and the Blood poured out; and on the other, the Sacrifice: *The Eucharist has not only the notion of Sacrament, but also the notion of Sacrifice; therefore, not only are those words of the essence of the form of the chalice which signify the presence of the Blood of Christ under the species of wine, and which belong to the notion of Sacrament, but those words are also required which express the effusion of the Blood, and which signify and declare the nature of the sacrifice.* (Gonet, *Clypeus Theologiae Thomisticae*, ed. Ludovicum Vivés, Paris, 1875, p. 412).

Transubstantiation alone does not signify the Sacrifice, nor the oblation, nor the immolation of Christ upon the Cross as Victim. Nor is the double consecration of the bread and wine separately sufficient – for this is a signification by things; in addition to this signification by things, there is required the signification of the words that signify these things. For as Gonet says: *The Eucharist has not only the character of Sacrament but also of Sacrifice, whose nature includes the immolation of the victim and the effusion of blood. For the essence of the form of the chalice, the words that signify the conversion of wine into Blood are not sufficient; other words are also required which express this effusion.* (Ibid., p. 415).

Sacramental signification requires a twofold signification: one material, by things; and one formal, by words. The latter is the more determining signification, and gives to the matter or thing its true meaning and sense.

The Body and Blood, considered as things, may be separated merely as food and drink, for example, and of themselves they do not signify the Sacrifice. Hence the signification of the words is required, as Gonet explains: *The words which express the conversion of the wine into the Blood of Christ signify it as mystically separated from the Body; but by this alone the nature of the Sacrifice is not sufficiently expressed. For even the*

*mystical action of the separation of the Blood from the Body upon the altar is, of itself, indifferent as to whether it is representative only in the manner of food and drink, or also in the manner of Sacrifice. Therefore, in order that it may be mystically separative as sacrifice, the term 'shall be shed' – effundetur – must be expressed; for in the formula of the chalice there is no other word that mystically separates the Blood from the Body so that it may determinately have the notion of Sacrifice. This, in effect, is what perfectly expresses the action by which the victim is immolated. (Ibid., p. 412).*

Without effusion, there is no shedding of Blood expressing the immolation and death of Christ upon the Cross.

Blood, considered as the seat of life, is such that its shedding constitutes the highest expression and visibility of death, although there can be death without the shedding of blood; for it is evident that a body exsanguine, without blood or with blood shed, is dead. The formula or form of the Mass must gather up this double signification: the sacramental—Body and Blood; and the sacrificial—the Body exsanguine, lifeless, dead, and the Blood shed. And this sacrificial aspect is more fittingly expressed in the formula of the consecration of the wine, as Saint Thomas explains.

For this reason, all the words of the consecration of the wine are a substantial and essential part of the formula, and not only the first words, as is believed by the distorted theology that prevails as classical and most common among theologians, through a misunderstanding of Saint Thomas. Thus Gonet, faithful in this matter to Saint Thomas, says that all the words of the consecration of the wine are required because they express and signify both transubstantiation and the Sacrifice, in order to signify the two things: that is, the twofold transubstantiation carried out separately, and the sacrifice—immolation, victimization, and death.

This signification of the Sacrifice is expressed in the consecration of the wine, as Saint Thomas says: *We have said that the Blood consecrated separately represents the Passion of Christ; therefore, the effect of this Passion is more fittingly mentioned in the consecration of the Blood than in the consecration of the Body, which was the subject that suffered. (S. Th. III, q. 78, a. 3, ad 2).*

It is required that the Sacrifice be signified, as in every sacrament, by words—the formula—and by things. Therefore, the separate double consecration is not

sufficient to signify the Sacrifice, as theologians ignorantly believe; for this is the material part of the signification of the Sacrifice through things, but the formal signification through words is lacking. This is what the most common and current theology of our age fails to understand. The consequence of all this is the theological dispute that seeks to determine wherein the Sacrifice consists, with all that it implies: oblation, victim, victimization, and death. Hence those learned yet foolish disputes: Suarez, Lugo, Lessius, Vazquez, Billot, Maldonado, de la Taille, Dom Lepin, among others, without their having struck the mark even to this day.

In summary, sacrificial signification requires things – the double consecration carried out separately – and words: the effusion of the Blood shed upon the Cross. The double consecration, in its sacramental reality as the Body and Blood of Christ, does not sufficiently signify the Sacrifice nor His death; for both His Body and His Blood may be present as food and drink. Nor must we forget that this food and drink, when we receive Communion, are given because the Sacrifice has been accomplished; but in sacramental Communion we are not performing a Sacrifice.

The problem – or rather, the theological difficulty – arises when one asks how to conceive the Sacrifice, that is, death, in relation to a glorified Body after the Resurrection, under the species of the consecrated bread and wine. If Christ is dead upon the Cross and must be dead in the Mass, how is this reconciled with the glorified and living Christ presently in heaven and in the Eucharist, especially since Christ is not victimized, sacrificed, and made to die anew?

The only explanation and way out is to understand rightly: first, what is brought about in the Mass; and second, how it is brought about.

What is brought about, reproduced, or renewed is the Sacrifice of the Cross – not mystically, for a mystical death is not a physical and natural death, nor spiritually, as has been vaguely and imprecisely repeated in order to escape the problem, but sacramentally: that third dimension of reality which is neither purely natural nor purely supernatural, but requires both joined together in the sacrament, or sacramental reality.

Every sacramental reality is a union of the natural with the supernatural; and this is all the more true of the Mass as a sacrificial-sacramental reality, or sacrificial sacrament, as Vonier says: *The Sacrifice of the Mass is a sacramental Sacrifice.* (La Clef

de la Doctrine Eucharistique, ed. Les Éditiones de L'Abeille, Lyon, 1943, p. 96). Some refute this because they do not understand it, as does Father Álvaro Calderón, the theologian of the Seminary of La Reja. The fox, according to La Fontaine, when it cannot reach the grapes, says they are sour.

It is a matter of the sacramental mode, which in the case of the Mass is also sacrificial. It is a Sacrifice sacramentally accomplished, or a sacrament sacrificially accomplished.

The Christ who is immolated and sacrificed in the Mass is not Christ presently glorified at the right hand of the Father in heaven, but the Christ of Calvary, as Vonier rightly says: *It is not enough, in order to explain the Eucharistic sacrifice in all its fullness, to say that upon the altar we offer the Body and Blood of Christ; we do much more, and there is an immense difference here: Christ who is in heaven is not represented under that title upon the altar; rather, we immolate the Christ of Calvary, since He alone is represented upon the altar.* (Ibid., p. 124).

When this Sacrifice is offered, the death of Christ upon the Cross is sacramentally represented: *When we offer this great sacrifice, we say that we represent the death of Christ sacramentally.* (Ibid., p. 110).

Herein consists the very essence or nature of the Sacrifice of the Mass: namely, that it is the representation of a past event—death—and not a death enacted in the present: *Let us suppose that Christ were in fact to descend from heaven in person, under whatever veil, in order to be sacrificed upon the altar; such an event, impossible in itself, would be something entirely other than the Eucharistic sacrifice. It is the very nature of this sacrifice to be a representation of the past, and not the execution of death in the present.* (Ibid., p. 120).

What is reproduced is the one historical Sacrifice of the Cross on Calvary. We are carried back to the historical time of the Sacrifice of Calvary. There Christ reached His consummation in death through the separation of His Body from His human soul: His Body dead and without blood—exsanguine—and His Blood physically poured out, which is the culminating and supreme expression of death, the most perfect and complete. This, which must be expressed through the signification of the words of consecration, is accomplished in the formula of the

consecration of the wine, wherein the Sacrifice and Death of Christ upon the Cross are signified, as Saint Thomas teaches.

Thus, the formula of the consecration of the wine is pronounced as Christ Himself pronounced it on Holy Thursday at the Last Supper, using the future tense: *shall be shed* – tomorrow. We are carried back in time to that day. But how can this be, if He dies on Friday and the Mass makes present what took place upon the Cross on Friday, not Thursday? Christ anticipates at the Last Supper the Sacrifice of the Cross; He anticipates it sacramentally, just as, after His Resurrection, it is sacramentally renewed. As Gonet says: *By the words of the form of the chalice, the priest intends to convert the present matter into the present Blood of Christ, as though carried back to the time of the Last Supper; for this reason the term 'shall be shed' – effundetur – is fitting there (...) Therefore, the priest is truly made present to the time in which Christ pronounced these words, and he also represents the matter as present to that time when Christ first conferred this Sacrament (...) Therefore, when the priest holds the chalice in his hands, he is made present to that time when Christ first consecrated with His own hand.* (Clypeus Theologiæ Thomisticæ, ed. Ludovicum Vivés, Paris, 1875, pp. 415–416).

This retroaction in time is possible because the Mass is a representation, which, as Alastruey says, *refers equally to what is past and to what is future.* (Tratado de la Santísima Eucaristía, ed. BAC, Madrid, 1951, p. 294). This is in contrast to a memorial, which is always of something already past or accomplished. And this must be kept very much in mind, because at the supper, when Our Lord instituted the Eucharist, He did not make a memorial of something past or already accomplished, but of something that was going to happen and be accomplished in the future – that is, on the following day, Good Friday, upon the Cross.

What is sacramentally anticipated or renewed? Death. How is death sacramentally anticipated or renewed? By the state of death in which the separation of Body and soul takes place: death is produced sacramentally in anticipation on Holy Thursday; it is produced physically on Good Friday on Calvary; and it is produced, by sacramental renewal of the past event, upon the Altar in the Mass. The state of death which Christ had upon the Cross is reproduced, but no longer physically and naturally; rather, sacramentally. It is not another death, but the same death of the Cross, and this is possible only by sacramental means.

How, then, is He glorious, or in a glorified Body, in the Eucharist, and not dead? The Body is present with Blood, soul, and divinity; and the Blood is present with Body, soul, and divinity. The divinity was always present; it was never separated either from the soulless, dead Body, or from the Blood poured out; and the Body is united to the Blood and to the soul in a glorified, and not passible, Body. This is what Saint Thomas says: *Therefore, since the Body is in the sacrament by sacramental power, the soul is there by real concomitance.* (S. Th. III, q. 76, a. 1).

What is produced as anticipation or renewal is the state of death, not a second death, regardless of the physical state of Christ on Holy Thursday or after the Resurrection in His glorified Body, as He is now. For the only state that gives the reason or notion of the Mass is His death on Calvary, and not His present state of glory in heaven since His Resurrection and Ascension, nor the state of His passible but living Body before He died. Thus Saint Thomas says that during the three days in the sepulcher, the soul was not present in the consecration of the bread and wine, for the sacrificial sacrament of the Mass contains the state of Christ corresponding to the actual moment in which it is celebrated. Therefore, now it contains the glorified Body, but what the sacrament as such produces is the state of death, regardless of the state in which He presently is. Thus, we have that sacramentally He is dead; concomitantly, by real natural connection, He is living and glorious. At the Last Supper He was alive but passible; during the three days in the sepulcher, He was dead and without His soul. These, in summary, are the three states of the life of Christ.

*On the other hand, the soul was truly separated from the Body, as we have seen; so that, had the sacrament been celebrated during the triduum of death, the soul of Christ would not have been present either by sacramental power or by real concomitance. But since 'Christ, risen from the dead, dies now no more,' His soul is always united to His Body.* (S. Th. III, q. 76, a. 1, ad 1).

Whereas Christ, whether living or dead, always had the divinity united, by the Incarnation—which was never undone, not even by death—to His human nature: *Since the conversion of the bread and wine does not terminate in the divinity nor in the soul of Christ, these are not in the sacrament by virtue of the sacrament, but by real concomitance. For the divinity never abandoned the assumed Body; wherever this Body is found, the divinity will also be there; and therefore it is necessary that the divinity accompany it in the sacrament.* (S. Th. III, q. 76, a. 1, ad 1).

*The Body of Christ is not under the species of wine by virtue of the sacrament, but by real concomitance. Therefore, by the consecration of the wine, the Body of Christ is not made present there directly, but by concomitance. (S. Th. III, q. 76, a. 2, ad 3).*

For this reason Dom Vonier says: *In the Eucharistic mystery, the Body and the Blood exist separately, by virtue of a sacramental separation perfectly sufficient in the species, although the natural person of Christ remains in all His integrity. (La Clef de la Doctrine Eucharistique, ed. Les Éditiones de L'Abeille, Lyon, 1943, p. 119).*

*Thus, the Body and Blood of the Eucharist represent Christ in the state in which, at the moment of His death, far from possessing physical integrity, He was immolated upon the Cross. Consequently, the Eucharistic Body and Blood were, at the Supper, the representation – or, to use a more exact term, the presentation – of Christ who would be immolated on the morrow, and not of Christ who presided over the supper. The Eucharistic Body and Blood upon our altars are the ‘representation’ – here the word, taken again in its etymological sense, is perfectly exact – not of Christ as He is in heaven, but of Christ as He was immolated upon Calvary. (Ibid., pp. 119–120).*

*The memorial of the death of the Lord can never be the living Lord; rather, it is His Body and His Blood, separated in the truth of the sacrament, which can be the memorial or the representation of this Lord whose Body was placed upon the Cross, and whose Blood flowed upon the hill of Calvary. (Ibid., pp. 120–121).*

*When Christ was Body and Blood, then alone was He the perfect Sacrifice; and the Eucharist is the perfect Sacrifice because it is that which literally ‘makes present’ – this is the true meaning of the word ‘representation’ – what remains of Christ upon this earth after He has pronounced consummatum est and commended His soul into the hands of the Father. (Ibid., p. 121).*

*...the Eucharistic Sacrifice is not directly a mystery of the person of Christ, but it is directly a mystery of the Body and Blood of Christ. (Ibid., p. 110).*

*When we offer this great Sacrifice, we say that we represent the death of Christ sacramentally. Therefore, the death of Christ consists in the separation of His Body and His Blood; we do nothing more and nothing less when we sacrifice upon the altar. We do not enter directly into the mystery of the person of Christ; we enter into the mystery of the Body and Blood of Christ. It is here that we must find the essence of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. (Ibid., pp. 110–111).*

*We insist greatly upon this truth: that, by the consecration of the Mass, we enter into direct contact, by virtue of the sacrament, with the Body and Blood of Christ, not with His entire person. Nevertheless, the representation, which is the very essence of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, terminates in the person of Christ – but in the immolated person of Calvary, not in the integral person of the Supper or of heaven. (Ibid., p. 122).*

*The Eucharistic separation is the memorial of that real separation accomplished at a moment in history. (Ibid., p. 122).*

Within this whole sacrificial-sacramental conception, or sacramentally accomplished sacrifice, of the Mass—and within the imperious necessity of the sacramental signification of the words of consecration, or formula-form, which must produce, as every sacrament does, *ex opere operato*, by the work of the thing wrought or by the action performed, the grace which they signify—those words must, for that very reason, signify both the Sacrifice and the sacrificial Transubstantiation, through words, that is, the formula, and through things, that is, the double consecration: one of the bread and the other of the wine, which contain the Body and Blood of Christ as things.

Transubstantiation is signified by the words: *This is My Body. This is the chalice of My Blood. Hoc est corpus meum. Hic est calix sanguinis mei.* And not *this one*, as it is badly and invalidly translated in the New Mass in the consecration of the bread. Thus, all New Masses that say *this one is my body* instead of *this is my body* are invalid.

The Sacrifice is signified by the remaining words of the formula of the consecration of the wine, which are an integral part of the grammatical utterance—a text without which it remains truncated—and not, as the common run of commentators on Saint Thomas crudely and myopically say, words that are not of the essence or substance of the formula. They do not distinguish, and consequently they confuse, the grammatical integrity of the text with the integrity of the essence of the formula, without which the formula remains truncated; and thus they dissolve the sacramental signification of the Sacrifice, which requires the words of the formula that specifically determine that the double consecration of the Body and Blood of Christ are not present upon the altar as mere food and drink, that is, Communion, but also, principally and in the first place, as a sacrificed Victim.

This sacramental signification of the Sacrifice of the Cross is expressed by the physical effusion of the Blood poured out upon the Cross on Calvary, and not by a mere effusion such as that of the Circumcision, for example. It is a question of the effusion of the Blood of the Victim, by which His death is consummated sacrificially – and not of a merely natural death, but of the death of the Cross.

For this reason, in order for the effusion of the Blood to have its complete and perfect signification, it must be specified in its meaning why and for what purpose it is produced.

For this reason, in the formula of the consecration of the wine, the fruits of the Passion and Death of Christ, their effects, are expressed, specifying that this effusion is sacrificial: *We have said that the Blood consecrated separately represents the Passion of Christ; therefore, the effect of this Passion is more fittingly mentioned in its consecration than in the consecration of the Body, which was the subject that suffered.* (S. Th. III, q. 78, a. 3, ad 2).

Thus, the other words are required: *for you and for many, unto the remission of sins*, and as the sacrifice of the New and Eternal Testament, and not of the blood of calves as in the Old Testament, which were prefigurations; and all this in the Mystery of Faith, of Christ under the species of bread and wine, the faith of the mystery of redemption and salvation. For this reason all the words of the formula of the consecration of the wine are required, and they are of the essence, since they signify the Sacrifice without which there is no valid consecration and no valid Mass.

Thus Gonet speaks, explaining that the mere effusion of blood is, of itself, indifferent to Sacrifice, and therefore requires specification and determination by the other words: *If the end to which the effusion of the Blood is directed is not expressed, the notion of sacrifice is not expressed, for blood can simply be shed, and not in the manner of sacrifice (...)* In order that such a future effusion be signified in the manner of sacrifice, it had to be explained that it was for our good; without this, it is indifferent as to whether it is in the manner of sacrifice or in the manner of simple effusion. (Clypeus Theologiæ Thomisticæ, ed. Ludovicum Vivés, Paris, 1875, p. 415).

*For this reason, in the form of the consecration of the Blood, mention is made of its effusion.* (S. Th. III, q. 76, a. 2, ad 1).

And for this reason the chalice refers to the Passion of Christ: *Therefore, the Lord Himself calls His Passion a chalice: 'Let this chalice pass from Me'; the meaning will be as follows: 'This is the chalice of My Passion.'* (S. Th. III, q. 78, a. 3, ad 1).

It is clear that, for Saint Thomas – as Archbishop Lefebvre himself recognizes in one of his spiritual conferences, although he does not use it categorically at least to say that, according to Saint Thomas, all the words, and not only the first words, in the consecration of the wine are of the essence of the formula; nor does he at least state emphatically that, according to Saint Thomas, the New Mass would be invalid because the signification of these words has been affected – *it must be said that these words are of the substance of the form, and that the first words, 'This is the chalice of My Blood,' signify the fact of the conversion of the wine into the Blood, in the manner indicated in the form of the consecration of the bread. The following words designate the power of the Blood shed in the Passion, which acts in the sacrament and is ordered to three things. The first and principal is the obtaining of the eternal inheritance, according to those words: 'Having therefore confidence to enter into the holies by the Blood of Christ'; and this is expressed by saying 'of the new and eternal testament.' The second is the grace of justification, which is given to us through faith, according to this: 'Whom God hath proposed to be a propitiation through faith in His Blood, to the showing of His justice, and to justify every one that believeth in Jesus Christ'; and this is signified by the words 'mystery of faith.' And the third is the removal of those two things, namely sins, according to this: 'The Blood of Christ shall cleanse our conscience from dead works'; and thus it is added: 'Which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins.'* (S. Th. III, q. 78, a. 3).

We see, then, how according to Saint Thomas these words signify the effects of the effusion of the Blood, without which the formula would not remain duly specified and determined. For it is not a question of the simple transubstantiation of the Blood, but of sacrificial transubstantiation through sacrificial effusion, and not through the mere effusion of blood. This is why many theologians, even those who present themselves as very Thomistic, have neither realized nor perceived what Saint Thomas explains and justifies; and they ignorantly consider that only the first words are sufficient, and not all of them. For this reason those words express the virtue – that is, the effects – of the Blood, which has not been sufficiently grasped.

*The consecrated Blood expressly represents the Passion of Christ; therefore, it is preferable to place the mention of the effect of the Passion in the consecration of the Blood*

*rather than in the consecration of the bread, which is the subject of the Passion. (Clypeus Theologiæ Thomisticæ, ed. Ludovicum Vivés, Paris, 1875, p. 415).*

*In the consecration of the Blood, the mystery of the Passion is represented, for the Blood is not separated from the Body except by the Passion; therefore, the state of the Lord in His Passion is expressed by the words that follow in the consecration of the Blood more than in the consecration of the Body. (Ibid., p. 415).*

*The sacrifice is accomplished and consummated by the effusion of blood, because by the victim which we offer to God in sacrifice, we confess Him to be the author of life and death. The victim is not fit to signify this unless it is by the effusion of blood; when the animal is not immolated by the effusion of blood, this dominion which God has over life and death is not represented. Therefore, by these words, 'which shall be shed for you and for many,' etc., they are necessary in order adequately and perfectly to express the nature of the Eucharist. (Ibid., p. 412).*

*In the other sacraments, it is not sufficient that the sacramental effect be expressed by things alone; it is further required that it be expressed by words. (Ibid., p. 412).*

*For this reason Gonet says once more: Because the forms of the Sacraments signify what they accomplish, everything belongs to the effective virtue of the form; thus it follows that all those words are of the essence of the form of the chalice, and not only of its substance and integrity. (Ibid., p. 411).*

*The form of this Sacrament consists in the words of the Savior by which He confects the Sacrament; the priest, speaking in the person of Christ, performs this sacrament. But the words *Qui pridie* were neither uttered by Christ in order to perform it, nor by the priest insofar as they are said in the person of Christ, but merely historically, as spoken by Christ; therefore, they are not necessary for the consecration of the Body of Christ. (Ibid., p. 408).*

*In the new formula, these words, spoken narratively and historically, are part of the form; and this renders the form narrative, and not affirmative as words that confect or accomplish the sacrament.*

*The new formula incorporates *take this, all of you, and eat of it, which will be given up for you; take this, all of you, and drink from it, and do this in memory of Me.* These are part of the historical narration and not of the sacramental confection, which causes what it signifies. Moreover, according to the Council of Trent, the words *Do**

*this in memory of Me* are the words pronounced by Christ when He ordained the Apostles. Thus says the Roman Catechism: *When Christ said to the Apostles at the Last Supper: Do this in memory of Me, at that very moment He instituted the Twelve as priests – as the holy Council of Trent defined – and commanded them, and in them all who would succeed them in the priestly office, to immolate and sacrifice His Body.* (p. 509).

The Roman Catechism, referring to Holy Orders, says in note 16: *If anyone shall say that by the words: ‘Do this in memory of Me’ (Luke 22:19), Christ did not institute His Apostles as priests, or that He did not ordain that they and other priests should offer His Body and His Blood, let him be anathema.* (p. 622). Thus we see how words that belong to the Ordination of the Apostles, and which in the Tridentine Mass come after the consecration of the wine as a historical or narrative account, become – by some magical art – words of Consecration in the New Mass. Therefore, they would no longer be the words by which Christ ordained the Apostles, as the Council of Trent infallibly states. It is evident that they fall under the anathema, under the denial of a dogma of faith. If they are now words of the consecration of the wine, they could never have been words of the ordination of the Apostles; and this is a heresy according to the anathema of the Council of Trent.

This alone demolishes and pulverizes the New Mass outright, as pure and hard heresy, in relation to the formula of the wine. No one at the time, nor even today, noticed this. And I do not know why the wise words of Scripture come to mind, telling us that infinite is the number of fools.

The mere incorporation of words from the narrative context into the formula of consecration – words that envelop the text of the consecration – invalidates the accomplishment of the sacrament, because it turns the formula into a narration. And we clarify this: even without touching or altering or changing a single word, even if all the words of the sacramental formula are complete.

But there is more, in the formula of the wine, and this should not surprise us; for, as is already known, Article 7 of the General Instruction of the New Mass does not define it as a Sacrifice. And although it was later remodeled, the Mass remained according to this definition, in which it is a supper, an agape, a synopsis – everything except a Sacrifice.

The *Mystery of Faith* means that only by faith is it admitted that the Blood of Christ is really present in the sacrament, as Saint Thomas rightly says. Therefore, to remove it is to remove faith in His Real Presence, which is hidden under the species, or accidents, of wine. But if this is no longer the case, then the *Mystery of Faith* must be removed, because Christ is not present in reality and truth: *The word mystery is placed here to show that it is hidden, not to exclude the truth of what is contained; the Blood of Christ is hidden in the sacrament.* (S. Th. III, q. 78, a. 3, ad 5).

*It is called Mystery of Faith with reference to the object of faith, because only by faith is it admitted that the Blood of Christ is really in the sacrament. The Passion of Christ also justifies through faith.* (S. Th. III, q. 78, a. 3, ad 6).

New and Eternal Testament signifies the effect of the effusion of the Blood in the inheritance of eternal life according to the New Testament: *A testament is the disposition of an inheritance. God disposed to give men the eternal inheritance by virtue of the Blood of Christ, for Hebrews 9:16 says: 'Where there is a testament, the death of the testator must of necessity come in.'* *The Blood of Christ is given, no longer in figure, but in reality.* (S. Th. III, q. 78, a. 3, ad 3).

*The Testament is new by reason of its bestowal; and it is eternal both by the eternal preordination of God and by the eternal inheritance disposed in it.* (S. Th. III, q. 78, a. 3, ad 4).

The words of the New and Eternal Testament and *Mystery of Faith* are Christ's own words, as Saint Thomas affirms: *The added words, 'eternal' and 'Mystery of Faith,' belong to divine tradition.* (S. Th. III, q. 78, a. 3, ad 9).

*Which shall be shed for you and for many unto the remission of sins: We have already said that the Blood consecrated separately represents the Passion of Christ more vividly; therefore, allusion is made to the Passion and to its fruits in its consecration rather than in that of the Body.* (S. Th. III, q. 78, a. 3, ad 7).

*The Blood of the Passion of Christ is efficacious not only for the Jews, to whom the blood of the Old Testament was given, but also for the Gentiles. Nor is it only for the priests who consecrate the sacrament, or for those who receive Communion, but also for those for whom it is offered. Therefore it is expressly said: 'for you,' the Jews, and 'for many,' for whom it is offered.* (S. Th. III, q. 78, a. 3, ad 8).

In the formula, or form, of the consecration of the wine, the Sacrifice is mentioned through the Passion and Death and through their fruits because, in point of fact, the effusion and death of someone do not, of themselves, constitute a sacrifice. For this reason the fruits essentially specify that this death and effusion of Blood are those of a Victim immolated and sacrificed. If the fruits were not mentioned, the Sacrifice would not be signified. That is all.

An equivocal rite in what is essential – as sacramental signification is in every sacrament – is invalid in itself and of itself; for sacramental signification is, and must be, determined and unequivocal. If it is not, it does not sacramentally signify what every sacrament, by definition, must produce. This admits of no reply and no doubt.

No subjective intention of the minister can change, modify, correct, rectify, or invalidate the objective sacramental signification of the rites and sacraments established by the Church.

The minister, like every rational being, must act with and by an intention so that his acts may be specifically human, and he must act in accordance with a rational and free agent; but his intention does not objectively change reality, nor the essence or nature of things. It either conforms to them or it does not; it does not create them.

Therefore, in sacramental matters, the minister must have or adopt the sacramental intention of the Church, which is expressed in the essential rites of the sacramental form or formula. This intention is expressed objectively when the minister takes and applies the rite of the Church, pronouncing the words over the matter of the sacraments, regardless of anything else: whether he has faith or not, whether he is a Freemason or a heretic; it is enough that he be a valid minister. So much so that, for example, in the case of baptism, any person with the use of reason and freedom – a pagan, an infidel, a Jew, a Muslim, or whoever he may be – can baptize if he does what the Church wills to do. All he has to do is apply the formula to the matter according to the intention of the Church, and not according to what he believes, thinks, opines, much less desires or feels.

Thus, when it is said and affirmed that the minister must have the intention of doing what the Church does and wills, this refers to the objective intention which he must have, and which he does have if he applies the sacramental rite exactly as

the Church commands, and not according to his opinions, his own ideas, or his purely subjective views. One must not confuse the objectively realized intention of the subject with the subjective intention of the subject. It is the intention of the subject, and in that sense subjective, but it is according to the objective intention of the Church as signified in the rite.

The minister applies his instrumental action in the sacraments by applying the objective rite. That is the intention required of him, and no other – not ideas, concepts, opinions, doubts, desires, feelings, or particular thoughts of the subject. This must be understood clearly and kept firmly in mind when one speaks, as many do, in the case of the Novus Ordo of the Mass, the New Mass, as is said in the Brief Critical Study of the New Order of Mass by Cardinals Ottaviani and Bacci – though in reality it was only approved by them through their signatures, having been drafted principally by Guérard des Lauriers under the direction and supervision of Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, who led the group of no more than ten members gathered in Rome when it was prepared: *The words of Consecration, by the manner in which they are inserted into the context of the Novus Ordo, can be valid by the subjective efficacy of the minister's intention. But they may not be valid insofar as they are no longer such by the very force of the words themselves, or more exactly, by virtue of the objective mode of signifying which they possessed until now in the Mass; hence, priests in the near future, who will not have been instructed according to traditional doctrine, and who simply trust in the Novus Ordo with the intention of 'doing what the Church does,' will they in fact consecrate validly? It is lawful to doubt it.* (Brief Critical Study of the New Ordo Missæ, note 16).

According to this note, the essential rite of the New Mass is equivocal; it does not possess the determined and specific intention of doing what the Church does, given its equivocity or indetermination. Therefore, the Masses are invalid; yet by the intention of the minister they may be valid.

This also seems to have been the opinion of Father Julio Meinvielle, since, according to witnesses, he affirmed by way of example: if a priest comes in distracted from the street and says Mass without the due preparation, the new rite does not lead him to have the intention of consecrating; if, on the other hand, he takes up the Tridentine rite, that rite causes him to have such an intention. This is a half-truth, for whether distracted, and therefore without the intention, or not distracted, and therefore with the intention, if he takes up the new rite he is limited

to it; and since it is equivocal, he does not have the unequivocal and determined intention. Therefore, he does not consecrate.

Concerning the equivocity, or equivocation, of the *Novus Ordo Missæ*, it is not merely an equivocity of the ceremonial rite, but also, and moreover, an equivocity that touches, concerns, and directly affects the essential rite, that is, the very formula of consecration itself, as the Brief Critical Study says, though without drawing the logical consequence of what it affirms: *Later we shall see how and with what coherence these equivocations are introduced and repeated in the very formula of Consecration and, in general, throughout the whole Novus Ordo.* (p. 6).

Thus, the equivocity of the formula of the New Mass is affirmed in the Brief Critical Study. And an equivocal rite is invalid. They do not draw the consequence, but it is there.

This must not be forgotten, and it must be underscored: according to the Brief Critical Study, the New Mass is equivocal not only in the ceremonial rite, but also, and principally, in the essential rite: the formula of consecration.

Therefore, it is evident that if one acknowledges that the formula itself, in itself, is equivocal, this is because it does not signify univocally and determinately what the words must signify unequivocally and determinately in order to satisfy the definition of the sacraments, which act *ex opere operato*, by the very work wrought, causing the grace which they signify. Hence, an equivocal sacramental signification is, of itself and according to sound and full theology, invalid; and this is the conclusion at which the Brief Critical Study does not arrive, owing to its shortsightedness.

It is not the subjective intention but the objective intention of the minister that is required; and this is possessed or not possessed depending on whether the rite of the Church is applied or not applied.

Therefore, no subjective intention of the minister, whether good or bad, is what matters. What matters is the objective intention of the minister; and this he either has or does not have depending on whether he applies or does not apply what the sacramental ritual of the Church asks and requires.

No minister can modify the intention of the rite. He either takes it or leaves it, and thus he either has the intention or does not have it. He can apply it or not apply it, but he cannot change it, modify it, correct it, or destroy it; he can only have it by applying the rite, or not have it by not applying the rite.

In this sense Gonet says: *It does not depend upon the minister except in its application (...) Nor can he prevent the effect from being produced if it is applied.* (Clypeus Theologiæ Thomisticæ, ed. Ludovicum Vivés, Paris, 1875, p. 413).

It must also be clarified that the words *ex adjunctis* do not determine the sacramental signification of the formula, as Rama Coomaraswamy thinks in his essay *The Anglican Drama*, published in Father Barbara's review *Forts dans la Foi* in 1990.

And just as no Freemason can invalidate a sacramental rite if he applies the rite seriously, and not as mockery, fiction, or theater – for he cannot intend anything other than what he says and does by applying the rite and pronouncing the words of the formula – so too no priest can change, for better or for worse, the equivocal and indeterminate intention of the rite of the New Mass so as to make it valid. If the rite is equivocal in its sacramental signification, no one, if he applies the rite, can change or modify its equivocity. This is what gives force to the fact that even if Cardinal Lienart, who ordained and consecrated Archbishop Lefebvre, was a Freemason, if he applied the rite, he pronounced the words validly. For this same reason, when Saint Pius X discovered the Masonic affiliation of Cardinal Rampola, who had been elected Pope and then vetoed, after which Saint Pius X was elected, he did not order the reordination of the priests or bishops whom Rampola had ordained and consecrated. And for the same reason Father Castellani says: *For example: Freemasonry of itself does not defend Christianity; but nothing prevents a Freemason from defending Christianity, because it suits him to do so in order later to destroy it more effectively.* (Note 1 to the *Summa Theologiæ* translated by Father Castellani, vol. I, ed. Club de Lectores, Buenos Aires, 1944, p. 291).

It is an important but insufficient and naïve note. It is important because it points out that the rite does not have a determined, specific, and therefore unequivocal intention, but rather the very opposite: an equivocal, indeterminate, nonspecific intention, and therefore one not signifying the grace it must produce, or cause; consequently, it is invalid. It is naïve because it presumes, without sufficient

foundation, that this intention can be supplied by the minister, when in reality the minister must always submit himself to the intention of the rite, not the other way around.

To have the intention of doing what the Church does is not merely the subjective intention of the minister; it is the objective intention which the minister, as subject, must have, and the only way to have it is to apply the formula of the rite of the Church, beyond whatever the minister thinks, believes, opines, supposes, or desires. One has the intention of doing what the Church does by applying the rite of the Church, and nothing more. Thus a believer, an unbeliever, a pagan, a Jew, a Muslim, an atheist, a heretic, a schismatic, a Freemason, or whoever he may be, can baptize, for example, if a friend asks him to baptize him and he consents to the request; he performs what the Church asks and confects the rite by applying the words of the Church while pouring the water. Likewise, any validly ordained minister, whether he has faith or not, whatever he may think, even if he be a Freemason, if he takes up the rite of the Catholic Church seriously and applies it, performs the sacrament. Conversely, no traditionalist priest, however traditionalist he may be, if he takes up the rite of the New Mass, consecrates. I hope this is clear.

Although the ritual-sacramental invalidity of the New Mass is due to significant indetermination, this is produced by two paths or ways: first, by the lack of sacramental signification through mere or purely memorial and historical recitation. There is no affirmative and assertive tone of accomplishing something, but rather one of recalling, of narrating a historical event; and this occurs through the inclusion of words from the narrative context within the affirmative text, whereby the latter is diluted into narration, even if nothing in the formula of consecration itself had been changed. Second, by the lack of sacramental signification through failure to produce what is not signified, by altering the sacramental meaning that the words must produce—although in Latin the *pro multis* is preserved, when translated into the vernacular languages, which from the very beginning became the universal and practical way for the faithful to understand the Mass in their own tongue, it is rendered *for all*; and by suppressing the words *Mystery of Faith*, which, like all the words, are essential to the formula of the consecration of the wine, and not only the first words, as some theologians falsely think.

All the words that follow are necessary, since the Sacrifice must be signified by the effusion of the Blood; and this effusion is in turn determined by the fruits, without which the effusion is not signified as a Sacrifice.

To remove the words *Mystery of Faith*, which come from Jesus Christ Himself, as Saint Thomas says — *The added words, 'eternal' and 'Mystery of Faith,' belong to divine tradition, and the Apostles handed them down to the Church* (S. Th. III, q. 78, a. 3, ad 9) — and which are of the essence of the formula for signifying the Sacrifice, just like all the other words, is to deny, by exclusion, that the reality of the Blood shed, present in a hidden manner under the species or accidents of wine and believed by faith, is necessary. They are deemed superfluous, as though there were no Sacrifice sacramentally accomplished by the sacramental effusion of the Blood shed. They are treated as unnecessary; they are superfluous; therefore they are suppressed.

It must also be noted that, although the word *enim* was added by Saint Peter, as Saint Thomas says, and is not of the essence of the formula, it is almost always badly translated; for its exact translation is: *indeed, in truth, or really*, and not *for*, since there is a rupture between the narrative tone and the affirmative tone. There is a continuity with the preceding text; no distinction is marked between what is being narrated and what is being accomplished by consecrating.

Nor should it be said that in other Eastern liturgies of the Church the words *Mystery of Faith* are absent. Not having them is not the mystery of faith, the reality of the Blood shed and hiddenly contained, nor a denial of the sacramental Sacrifice through the sacramental effusion of the Blood, as it is when those words are suppressed in the Roman-Latin rite, where it is explicitly expressed and not merely implicit as in this or that Eastern rite, less formulated or less explicit. To possess a truth implicitly is not to deny an explicit truth. To make explicit what is implicit is to formulate with greater precision; to deny what is explicit is to deny even what is implicit.

In fact, all New Masses are said in the vernacular tongue, and all of them place *all* instead of *many*; and this denies the fruit that specifies the sacramental effusion of the Blood. This fruit is not only universal redemption but also efficacious and real salvation, which does not belong to all but to many, since some are not saved and are condemned; for, sadly, hell exists.

The New Mass in Spanish, moreover, badly translates *hoc* in the consecration of the bread—a neuter demonstrative pronoun—as *este*, which is a masculine demonstrative pronoun and corresponds to the Latin *hic*. Saint Thomas says that to say *hic*, *this one*, instead of *hoc*, *this*, invalidates the consecration: *Therefore, the Lord deliberately did not say: 'This bread is My Body,' as He would have had to say according to the second opinion, nor: 'This Body of Mine is My Body,' according to the third, but rather in general: 'This is My Body,' without adding any noun to the subject, but only a pronoun signifying substance in common, without qualities and without a determined form.* (S. Th. III, q. 78, a. 5).

Therefore, in Spanish, by this change alone, any Mass so said is already invalid. Although now, after forty years, they are changing in Spanish and returning to *for many*, this changes nothing, for the formula remains equivocal, and sacramental rites cannot be equivocal; besides, there are other alterations that have been made and have not been corrected.

*The expression 'this' indicates the substance, but without determination of its nature.* (S. Th. III, q. 78, a. 5, ad 1).

*The pronoun 'this' does not indicate the accidents, but the substance contained under them, which was first bread and afterward the Body of Christ; and although the Body of Christ is not informed by them, it is contained in them.* (S. Th. III, q. 78, a. 5, ad 2).

Thus, to say *this one is My Body* with reference to the bread is, on the one hand, the same as saying *this bread is My Body*; on the other hand, if *this one* refers to the Body and not to the bread, it is the same as saying *this Body of Mine is My Body*. And according to Saint Thomas, both significations are false, for neither is the bread the Body, nor is the Body present before the consecration has been completed, as he explains. Therefore they are erroneous and, consequently, invalid: *For this reason, the point of departure is fittingly expressed by the demonstrative pronoun, referring to the sensible accidents that remain; the term, however, is expressed by the noun that signifies the nature of that into which the conversion is made, namely, the whole Body of Christ and not merely flesh, as we have seen. Therefore, the form 'This is My Body' is most exact.* (S. Th. III, q. 78, a. 2).

This text, incidentally, is badly translated by the BAC – and it is not the only bad translation, for it also badly translates *esse*, confusing it with existence, among

other things—both in the latest five-volume Leonine edition of the *Summa Theologiæ* and in the earlier bilingual edition of sixteen volumes. For although the Latin verb *esse, sum*, can grammatically be translated in Spanish either as *ser* or *estar*, from the theological standpoint it cannot be translated in the formula of consecration by *estar*, for it is a sacrament that produces what it signifies, and the verb *estar* does not signify the fact of the conversion accomplished in *facto esse*, that is, as already made, produced. Thus they are confusing *being present* with *having been made*, and not even the latter should be confused with *becoming* in *fieri*. Theologically, this is a barbarity, because, in order to translate well, it is not enough to be a good Latinist; one must also know sacramental theology, so as not to commit such a blunder, as when they translate *here is My Body* instead of translating *this is My Body*. For this reason Saint Thomas says: *To become is not the final effect of the consecration, but to have become.* (S. Th. III, q. 78, a. 2, ad 1).

For this reason: *The locution must signify its final effect with the substantive verb in the indicative and present tense.* (S. Th. III, q. 78, a. 2, ad 2).

The verb *estar*, to be in the sense of being present or situated, does not signify conversion: *The form of the sacrament must signify what is accomplished in it. It will therefore signify the conversion of the bread into the Body (...)* Therefore, in the form of this sacrament, the conversion already accomplished must be indicated. (S. Th. III, q. 78, a. 2). And this is not signified by *estar*; nor, if taken inadequately, by a mere existential sense of *to be*.

Secondly, because this position contradicts the form of the sacrament, in which it is said: *'This is My Body.'* This would not be true if the substance of the bread remained there, for it is never the Body of Christ. One would then have to say: *'This one is My Body.'* (S. Th. III, q. 75, a. 2).

To say *this one* (*hic*) instead of *this* (*hoc*) is to signify the bread, the substance of the bread; and the bread is evidently not the Body of Christ. Therefore the formula is invalid. By contrast, to say *this* (*hoc*) is to signify the substance without specifying its nature; for this reason it is neuter. Thus, *this*, which is bread before the consecration, is transubstantiated—that is, converted—into *this*, which is the Body of Christ after, at the instant when, the consecration is completed: *The words do not cause the Body to be the Body, nor the bread to be the Body, but rather cause that which is*

*contained under the species, which was formerly bread, to be the Body of Christ. (S. Th. III, q. 78, a. 5).*

If one says *this one* (hic), the bread remains in its substance, which implies impanation in the manner of Luther.

In summary, the fundamental and irrefutable principle for judging the invalidity of the New Mass, both in Latin, its official version, and in the vernacular translations, is this: a rite, in what is essential, cannot be equivocal or ambiguous, but must be univocal and determined in its sacramental signification. An equivocal rite in the formula does not accomplish, and cannot accomplish, the definition proper to every sacrament, namely, to produce, by the very action performed, *ex opere operato*, the grace which it signifies. Applied to the New Mass and to the formula of the consecration of the bread and wine, this permits one to conclude its invalidity. For it is admitted by all that, in what is essential, the New Mass is equivocal, as the Brief Critical Study affirms. Therefore, if the equivocation is found in the formula, the consecration is invalid, even though the Brief Critical Study does not draw this conclusion, refusing to see the theological projection and scope of what it affirms. This intrinsic, internal equivocity of the formula cannot be supplied or corrected by the intention of the minister.

Besides being invalid because of the intrinsic equivocation introduced into the New Mass by the texts added to the formula, making it equivocal and therefore failing to signify what it must produce, it is also invalid by adding, as part of the formula of the wine, *do this in memory of Me* – words that in reality belonged to the ordination of the Apostles and therefore cannot now be said to belong to the consecration, although no one has noticed this. For this reason, it becomes not only invalid but heretical, because one cannot deny, as the Council of Trent says, that with these words Our Lord ordained His Apostles. On the other hand, the suppression of the *Mystery of Faith*, by which the fruit of eternal life and the mystery of the presence of the Blood of Christ hidden under the species or accidents of wine are signified, causes that signification to disappear; and if we add to this the change from *many* (pro multis) to *all* (pro omnibus) in the vernacular languages – though not in the official Latin version – it makes the New Mass invalid and heretical both in the official Latin version and in the vernacular tongue.

It is therefore proven that it is not merely a bad Mass that diminishes the faith, nor merely one that is Protestantizing; but that, moreover, by all this sacrilegious manipulation, it is invalid and heretical. For one cannot manipulate so profoundly a rite as sacrosanct as that of the Mass without altering it, nor can everything remain unpunished and unchanged—any more than wine, once so manipulated that it becomes vinegar, remains the same. Thus, the New Mass is to the Tridentine Mass what vinegar is to wine, even though it derives from it.

Thus, an equivocal rite is not of the Church and can never be so. The New Mass is a rite of the New Conciliar or Postconciliar Church, of the Counter-Church of the Antichrist, the Synagogue of Satan; whether one likes it or not, this is the sorrowful reality, and it could not be more apocalyptic.

Fr. Basilio Méramo

Bogotá, April 22, 2023