

[Home page](#)

## THE ORDINAL OF PAUL VI IS INVALID...

*because it is the servile copy of the Anglican Ordinal*

«The ordination doesn't transmit the ministrations; but only the mission " (said Mgr Vilnet (modernist))

*Study of the priesthood. By M. the abbot Henri Mouraux. †*

*Matter and form of the Catholic ministrations.*

Since still Theologians tried to determine, in the numerous rituals of the sacerdotal ordination, **what were those that constituted matter and the form of the sacrament...** Pie XII, by the Apostolic Constitution of November 30, 1947, **using his supreme and infallible power**, adjusted definitely, and of a **irreformat** manner, conditions of the validity of a sacerdotal ordination... He enacted that **MATTER** of this sacrament was silent imposition of the consecrator bishop with his hand; the **FORM**, words of the Preface, have the Tradition transmitted them to custom.

Here is this preface according to the authentic translation of 1927: "**Want therefore, oh Almighty Father to give to your servants who here is the dignity of the priesthood. Spill all over again in their soul the mind of holiness. They can get you, oh God, the office of the second merit! They can make penetrate the reform of morals by the example of their conduct! They can appear of the cooperators prudent of our Order! That the holiness under all his forms, was resplendent in their life, so that at the moment to give account of the ministry to them confided, they get, in reward, the beatitude.**"

**The essential complements** that represent the collation of powers on the **Christ's Body** are added to this **consecrates words**, that means the Mass, on the one part; of powers on the Christ's Mystical " Body that means on the other part, Faithful, to know, the administration of sacraments.

**Pie XII didn't change anything to the millennial ritual of ordination. He even defended of in to change anything:** «No one, he writes; won't have the right to impair the present Constitution by Us data, nor to oppose itself of it by a daring audacity.»

**Paul VI.** However, Paul VI had this **audacity** and this **foolhardiness** while publishing a New Ordinal. Is he validates? Men done order since his release, does that mean since 1968 are they **priests** or of **simple secular** as affirms it Mgr VILNET? **Question gravissime that I am going to try to solve**, while remembering that J.B. Montini, since the seminary, was attracted by a quick sympathy for the Anglicanism. Become Pope, he displayed him while giving his ring to the Anglican Primate (simple secular) and while inviting him to bless the crowd.

**The ordinal Anglican is invalid.**

However, this "Primate" was not a priest, nor bishop. **The Pope Léon XIII has, indeed, enacted of an infallible manner, in his Encyclical " Apostolicae Curae ", of September 13, 1896, that (specifies the Pope), will always be valid in all his strength, that the ordinal Anglican is completely INVALID.** - However the ordinal of Paul VI and the ordinal Anglican looks alike like brothers - twin. Let's compare them in light of the healthy Catholic theology.

**The holy Council of Trente.** teach us in an *infallible* manner that in all sacraments - in sacraments of the Order in particular - next to *matter* and the *form* , that are *essential* to the transmission of the priesthood *the ritual context that surrounds them, said by Theologians " signs deputies "* , must *proclaim necessarily and must illustrate the sense consecrated of matter and the form* . Certainly, tells us the canon 2 of the XXI session, the Church has the power to modify, according to circumstances the *sacramental sign*; but doesn't *have ANY POWER* on the *SIGNIFICANCE* that must express the transmission of the ministration. While fixing matter and the form of the order definitely, Pie XII recalled this canon.

However, if the *liturgical context* who surrounds matter and does the form contradict, or divert of their sense this matter and this form that they are supposed to *explain and to illustrate*, it is *obvious* that matter and the form are *MODIFY*? Therefore that the sacrament is *invalid*. It is precisely *on the modification of this liturgical context by Anglicans* that the Pope Léon XIII leaned to declare their *ordinations, null*. (Concile de Trente Sess. 7, can 12; Sess. XXI)

*Let's listen to the Pope Léon XIII " Apos. Curae ": The minister of the sacrament* of it is not the owner, but the *servant*, he doesn't have anything *to add* or *to entrench* to the ritual he has merely to want to give to words their *sense obvi*, and to make *that that wants the Church*. That the saint Priest of Ars baptizes or that the unworthy Talleyrand consecrates, if they obey the ritual, the *sacrament is given validly*. From then on, say some if a validly neat minister fully respects matter and the form of the sacrament of the order, while using the Ordinal Anglican of Kramer, the priest is ordained validly. *And well NO!* and it is Léon XIII that proclaims the negative. Because, says the Pope, of the other reasons the adjacent ceremonies that surround matter and the form of this Ordinal make it in addition *invalid*. Why? Because they *don't mean the grant* of the *sacrificial grace* anymore. They keep *the Catholic words of "bishop " priest "* well; but they are *emptied* of their Catholic sense.

Here is the fundamental text of Léon XIII "*In all the Ordinal Anglican he is not made explicit mention of SACRIFICE, of CONSECRATION of the priest, of the power to DEDICATE not only and to OFFER the sacrifice*; but again the least traces of these institutions that subsisted the Catholic ritual have been suppressed carefully".

#### ***Conditions of the validity of the sacrament.***

The topic is too extremely serious so that we didn't take in some sentences all the exposition of the previous page: so that a sacrament is valid (the Order in particular), it is necessary that the minister, *validly ordained* (no matter the holiness), fully use The ordinal that respects *matter* and the *form* specified by the Pope Pie XII scrupulously; and that ceremonies say joined to the form and matter, *don't not only contradict*, but express, without ambiguous, sacrificial ministration that receives the ordinate subject. If all these conditions are not united, the ordination is NULL. (Cf. Dict.de Théol. Cath; XI volume, p. 1175, 1182 ).

#### ***Did a reason extremely serious call the manufacture of a new Ordinal?***

Without hesitating it is necessary to answer *NO*. The Pope Pie XII had had on the question of Ordinations answered to aspirations of the Church for 20 years. Besides such reforms are extremely rare in the Church, always they are the answer to a need, and justified at the head of the new text by the pope reformer. So made the Pope Urbain VIII, June 17, 1644, *no while distorting*, but while *CONFIDING* in only one ritual, the rituals of the Ordination. Paul VI, him,

**factory of all pieces, without worry of the Tradition**, an Ordinal kneaded of innovations, marked by astonishing suppressions, June 16, 1968, and didn't give **any justification** of it... **WHY?** The answer springs the official photograph published by the D.C. n° 1562, dated of May 3, 1970, where one sees Paul VI surrounded of Heretics with which it manufactured a new " Ordo missae "...

The ordinal created two years before was **the heretical basis of the new " Mass " said " Eucharist "**... The suppression in the new Ordinal some **minor Orders** precluded to the entry of **women** in the **sanctuary**; the suppression of under-deaconate was the beginning of the clérogamie that exercises Protestants, and to which inhale the progressive. The suppression of the public wearing of the ecclesiastical costume, imposed **secretly**, completed ecumenical fog in which bathes the ordinal signed Paul VI.

**Let's compare the work of Paul VI to the Ordinal of Kramer, under the look of Léon XIII (Apostolicae Curae)**

Let's hunt this fog and let's descend with Léon XIII in the intimate of the ordinal of Paul VI.

He keeps without change the matter of the Ordinal Catholic. But modifies the form in two places: " in hos famulos " becomes " in his famulis "; the UT conjunction disappears in " ut acceptum.

**UT means " : so that... so that....** While suppressing this conjunction, one destroys all the relation of consequence and cause that binds the two fundamental sentences of consecratory text, that means: Want therefore, Almighty Father to give to your servants who here is the dignity of the priesthood, spread all over again in their soul the mind of holiness... UT... (= so that...) they can get you, oh God, the office of the second merit (= the priesthood).

**UT** that has at a time here the **imperative and causal sense**, impose to the Ordinate " **the mind of holiness** ", that will be the **reason** and the **prelude** to the obtaining **of the priesthood** (second merit). However, the perfect chastity is the surest way to the holiness. She is bound to under-deaconate that precisely Paul VI has SUPPRESSED. This suppression is all Paul VI to the ravaged face, visible expression of his tendencies and his secret life. Mistake «to live as one believes, one believes as one live ".

His second change in the form is grammatical order. He appears insignificant, however he is serious. Let's present the sentence and his change of regime " : Stay up therefore oh Almighty Father... in **HOS... innova** (= to make penetrate in these), accusative of movement that indicates that a **reality of the outside** penetrates an object **internally**; therefore here that **the grace of the ministration** and his character join and penetrate the baptismal character of the subject.

On the contrary, the formula of Paul VI: in HIS is an ablative that situates a thing to his place without he is indicated that there was a transfer beforehand toward the Subject. Therefore the text of Paul VI in HIS indicates merely that the Ordinates are in situation of priests... One recovers there the "mission" of Mgr Vilnet, and as the priest's conception that the bishop Hubert Barbier presents in the " Courrier Savoyard " Mail of June 21, 1991, to know: The priest is a man like another without grants nor consecration individuals that a Chief of community called built-in bishop in a religious group with which he identifies ".

In front of this ruse of change of regime of IN one recovers two dear things to Paul VI, the ambiguous and his love of the Protestant Anglicanism. Anglicans, indeed, as the bishop Barbier, of Annecy, makes of their ministration an office plated on an individual member elect. that directs the liturgy. It is the "President" of conciliar celebration. We are to antipodes of "Sacerdos alter Christus" (= the priest is another Christ).

*Let's conclude with the encyclical "Apostolicae Curae".*

What we exposed is sufficient above to bring the proof that the ordinal of Paul VI is invalid. This certainty affirms himself when, faithful to the teaching of Léon XIII one perceives with stupor that the Catholic texts that surrounded the collation of the Order and gave him his sense, disappeared. Have been hunted between other ": Receive the Holy Spirit, sins will be put back to those to that you will put back them, retained to those to that you will keep " them... **Receive the power to celebrate the Mass for the living and for deaths** <etc... These omissions are not oblivion; but, as in the Ordinal Anglican, the formal will to deprive matter and the form of the sacrament of their Catholic significance, to which one wants to substitute the ecumenism. These suppressions as those that made Kramer, make NULL The ordinal of Paul VI. The word sacrifice kept in the text is only a clause of style, a smokescreen.

*Studies of the episcopate*

*Truth of faith.*

The holy Council of Trent teaches that the **priesthood** is an unique sacrament, that achieves himself in two states, a plenary, that is the episcopate; the other restricts, it is the priesthood... In the first left of this survey he clearly appeared that the Catholic faith clarified by the Pope Léon XIII affirms INVALID the ordination of a priest made with this Ordinal. What he is some of a bishop's consecration?

*Modification of the form.*

The Church, - repeat it - has the power to modify terms in the form of a sacrament, therefore of the Episcopate. But she must not make it that for reasons extremely serious and for the good of the Church that applies for them. When a pope previous to Paul VI touched to the form of a sacrament, he exposed reasons of it. **Paul VI**, to the contrary, **without giving no explanation**, manufactured **a new form** of the episcopate, keeping the ancestral form that the conjunction **AND**.

Here is the form suppressed by the ordinal of Paul VI : " Comple in sacerdote tuo ministerii tui summam, and ornamentis totius glorificationis instructum, cœlestis unguenti rore sanctifica ". What the english returns thus ": Finish in this priest the fullness of his ministry; and decorated of ornaments of the highest honour, sanctify-him by the dew of the celestial unction." No doubt on the validity of this formul that first of all expresses that the candidate to the episcopate is a priest (what is not the case if he has been ordered with the Ordinal of Paul VI); that, affirm then that he is going to receive the fullness of the ministration (" ministerii tui summam "); and, in short, the fullness of the grace (" cœlestis unguenti rore ").

*Alignment on the Ordinal Anglican.*

Instead this text eminently Catholic, Paul VI substituted an Anglican and foreign form for the fullness of the ministration. Here it is: Et nunc effunde in hunc electum eam virtutem qui a te est, spiritum principalem, quem dedisti dilecto Filio tuo, Jésu Christo, quem ipse donavit sanctis apostolis that constituerunt Ecclesiam per singula loca, ut sanctuarium tuum in gloriam and laudem indéficientem nominis tui... " I translate word to word. " And spread now on this elected this strength that is in you, the mind clean to people who order, that you gave to your Son, Christ, and of which himself presented the holy apostles who established the Church in every place like your sanctuary, for the unceasing praise and the glory of your name.

For that knows to read, this text concerns an elected, therefore not explicitly a priest to which the ritual is going to give, no the fullness of the ministration, but chief's mind that is "the peculiar of those that orders".

It is not about therefore in this formul of the Holy Spirit. The proof: Paul VI borrowed this term " spiritu principalem " (= mind of chief) to the vocabulary of the Roman army. This "mind" had to be the one of the chief of the first rank in the line of battle. That comes to make this intruder in a sacrament.

But will say one, to the verse 14 of the psalm 50, one finds this expression "spiritu principali". Certainly, but the sense that one gives to this place of the Writing, invites badly strong to " the mind " that must have a Catholic bishop if one believes holy Paul of it. In the psalm 50 David shouts his pain to have committed a murder to appease his passion adulterine indeed. As commentators of "spiritu principali" translate:" Noble mind of prince that avoids to fall in the crime ". In certain Hebrew texts the expression means "restraint of oneself ", in others "mind of hegemony ". Finally, Paul VI asks for the future "elected " the restraint of his passions. It is very laudable. But this prayer must be the one of all baptized, and mean the grace of the episcopate not at all... On the other hand, in his etymological and historic sense, the expression " spiritu principali " is perfectly adapted to the to the Anglican bishops who are above all civil servants named by the king and revocable by it only. They are not considered like enjoying a power of order superior to the one of the simple priest, NO, they are the living translation of the word "episcopo", etymologically " supervising ", and it under the eye of the political power.

So Paul VI identifies the Catholic bishop to the false Anglican bishop. Modernists understood him so well that one of persons responsible of the Ordinal the P. Boot, wrote a twisting text that tried to give to " spiritu principalem " the sense of " the Holy Spirit" He leaves from an ambiguous text written by the priest Hipolyte that, ambitious disappointed founded under the pontificate of Calixte a schismatic sect of which he made itself the pope. For his disciples he wrote a Pontifical in which the P. Boot came to draw to justify the unjustifiable expression " spiritum principalem " and the équiparer to " Spiritus-Sanctus ". We cannot drag our readers in the confutation of the P. Boot: she has been made authoritatively by an American author (Cf. Burton Easton scott, Tea Apostolic Tradition Hipolytus of.)

Let's satisfy us to say that it is necessary that defenders of the ordinal of Paul VI are well poor in arguments to be going to look for, to XIX centuries of distance a schismatic's text, otherwise very ambiguous, in order to make " spiritum principalem " Holy Spirit " principalem "!! The poor P. Boot delivered itself to a scholarly research that doesn't lack a relationship with a tour of prestidigitation. But perfectly vain research, because the Pope Léon XIII, in the condemnation of the Ordinal Anglican, declares that of the as lucid words, and obviates that " receive the Holy

Spirit " are " far from meaning a manner specifies the ministration as order, and the grace that he confers ", so in the same way this ministration and graces that he confers are not EXPLICITLY meant " A form to which deliberately one withdrew everything that, makes take out again the dignity distinctly in the Catholic ritual and duties of the ministration cannot be a form appropriate and sufficient of the ministration " (Léon XIII).

***The essential words disappeared.***

If now, we consider the problem by another side, do we ask if the essential words that one recovers in all valids forms of Episcopal consecration used during ages in the Church, meet in the ordinal of Paul VI?... Here is most characteristic of these words : "summus sacerdos" (= supreme priest); "dignitas pontificalis" (= pontifical dignity); "épiscopus"(= bishop); "sacerdos plenus" (= ministration perfects)... However, the ordinal of Paul VI doesn't include ANY of it.

Voltaire who was a master in deception formulated his method " thus: Lie! ***Lie! he will always remain something of it...*** " I don't know so Paul VI had read Voltaire. But I note that he takes his joys curiously with the truth when he dares to write in his Constitution Apostolic " Pontificalus Romanus " " That he reviewed the Ordinal to improve and to specify the expression of several points important of doctrine; and that it was necessary to add, to suppress or to change some things... to make expressions more lucid and better to expose effects of the sacrament " .

For whoever compares the Ordinal Catholic and the one of Paul VI, he appears with evidence that words underlined above in the text of the Constitution " Pontificalus Romanus " are lies.

The Cardinal Consalvi in the interminable discussions with Napoléon for the development of the final text of the Concordat had this proud retort one day: "Lord, the sovereign Courses can lie; but the Holy Father, him, would lose all authority in the exercise of his supreme load for the least lie ". However, the conciliar-church takes pleasure in the ambiguous until in sacraments, and in the lie when it is about the ministration.