

# The Invalid and Heretical Council of Trent's Heresies and Other Errors

By Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

## Table of Contents

<i>The Council of Trent is invalid and heretical</i> .....	1
<i>The heresy that Jesus' body and blood are in each species of the Holy Eucharist</i> .....	1
<i>The heresy the Catholics only need to receive one species to be saved</i> .....	2
<i>The heresy that Jesus' human soul is in the Holy Eucharist</i> .....	3
<i>The heresy that Catholics must not receive the Holy Eucharist until they attain the use of reason</i> .....	4
<i>Trent's lies regarding the Vulgate</i> .....	5
<i>Trent is willfully ambiguous regarding Baptism of Desire</i> .....	6
<i>Trent is heretical by sins of omission for not condemning prominent heresiarchs</i> .....	6

## The Council of Trent is invalid and heretical

The first reason the Council of Trent is of no consequence is because it was confirmed and promulgated by apostate antipopes and thus is invalid, and hence all of its acts and decrees are null and void. The second reason is that it contains several heresies.

## The heresy that Jesus' body and blood are in each species of the Holy Eucharist

The Council of Trent teaches the heresy that Jesus' body and blood are under the appearance of bread and his body and blood are under the appearance of wine, which I call the two-in-one-species heresy.

Invalid and heretical *Council of Trent*, 1565: "I also profess that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper sacrifice... There takes place a conversion of the whole substance of bread into the body and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood; and this conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation. I also acknowledge that under one species alone the whole and entire Christ and the true sacrament are taken."<sup>1</sup>

Invalid and heretical *Council of Trent*, 1562: "Canon 3. If anyone denies that Christ whole and entire, who is the fountain and author of all graces, is received under the one species of bread, because, as some falsely assert, he is not received according to the institution of Christ himself under both species: let him be anathema."<sup>2</sup>

No pope or Church Father taught this heresy but instead they all condemned it. This heresy denies the dogma that the Holy Eucharist is Jesus' body under the appearance of bread and his blood under the appearance of wine and both are united to his divine nature For example,

"Amen, amen I say unto you: Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you." (Jn. 6:54)

*The Apostolic Constitutions*, 1st to 4th century: "xii. ...Witness of the Lord Jesus' sufferings, that he may show this bread to be the body of thy Christ, and the cup to be the blood of thy Christ'... xiii. ...And let the bishop give the oblation, saying, The body of Christ; and let him that receiveth say, Amen. And let the deacon take

---

<sup>1</sup> The Profession of Faith of the Council of Trent, from the Bull of Pius IV *Iniunctum nobis*; D. 997.

<sup>2</sup> sess. 21, Canons on Communion under Both Species; D. 936.

the cup; and when he gives it, say, The blood of Christ, the cup of life; and let him that drinketh say, Amen...”<sup>3</sup>

St. Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistle to the Romans*, 2nd century: “I desire the bread of God, the heavenly bread, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who became afterwards of the seed of David and Abraham; and I desire the drink of God, namely his blood, which is incorruptible love and everlasting life.”<sup>4</sup>

St. Augustine, *Sermons on the Liturgical Seasons*, Sermon 227: “That Bread which you see on the altar, consecrated by the word of God, is the Body of Christ. That chalice, or rather, what the chalice holds, consecrated by the word of God, is the Blood of Christ.”<sup>5</sup>

*Sixth Roman Council*, Pope St. Gregory VII, 1079: “(Oath taken by Berengarius) I, Berengarius, in my heart believe and with my lips confess that through the mystery of the sacred prayer and the words of our Redeemer the bread and wine which are placed on the altar are substantially changed into the true and proper and living flesh and blood of Jesus Christ, our Lord, and that after consecration it is the true body of Christ... and the true blood of Christ, which was poured out from his side.”<sup>6</sup>

(For an in-depth condemnation of this heresy, see RJMI book *Some Dogmas and Heresies regarding Confirmation and the Holy Eucharist: Jesus’ Body Appears as Bread and His Blood as Wine*.)

### **The heresy the Catholics only need to receive one species to be saved**

The Council of Trent teaches the heresy that men only need to eat the body of Christ under the appearance of bread but not drink his blood under the appearance of wine, which I call the one-species heresy:

Invalid and heretical *Council of Trent*, 1562:

“Canon 1. If anyone says that each and every one of the faithful of Christ ought by a precept of God, or by necessity for salvation to receive both species of the most holy Sacrament: let him be anathema.

“Canon 2. If anyone says that the holy Catholic Church has not been influenced by just causes and reasons to give communion under the form of bread only to laymen and even to clerics when not consecrating, or that she has erred in this: let him be anathema.”<sup>7</sup>

No pope or Church Father taught this heresy but instead they all condemned it. For example,

“Then Jesus said to them: Amen, amen I say unto you: Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you.” (Jn. 6:54)

*Didascalia*, 1st to 3rd century: “The bishop...strengthened you by the Eucharist, and made you meet to receive the holy Body and the precious Blood of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.”<sup>8</sup>

*Apostolic Constitutions*, 1st to 4th century: “[Book 2:33] ...How much more should the word exhort you to honor your spiritual parents [Catholic priests]...who have

---

<sup>3</sup> b. 8.

<sup>4</sup> c. 7.

<sup>5</sup> *Migne*, PL 38, col. 1099.

<sup>6</sup> D. 355.

<sup>7</sup> sess. 21, Canons on Communion under Both Species; D. 934-935.

<sup>8</sup> c. 9 (ii, 33).

imparted to you the saving body and precious blood of Christ, who have loosed you from your sins, who have made you partakers of the holy and sacred Eucharist...”

Decree of Pope St. Fabian, 3rd century: “We decree that on each Lord’s day the oblation of the altar should be made by men and women in bread and wine...”<sup>9</sup>

St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechetical Lectures*, Lecture 22, 4th century: “3. Wherefore with full assurance let us partake as of the Body and Blood of Christ: for in the figure of Bread is given to thee his Body, and in the figure of wine his Blood...”

Pope St. Gelasius I, *On the Consecration*, 5th century: “ii. ... We have learned that some persons after taking only a portion of the sacred body, abstain from the chalice of the sacred blood. I know not for what superstitious motive they do this: therefore let them either receive the entire sacrament, or let them be withheld from the sacrament altogether... because the dividing of one and the same mystery cannot happen without a great sacrilege.”

(For an in-depth condemnation of this heresy, see RJMI book *Some Dogmas and Heresies regarding Confirmation and the Holy Eucharist: The Reception of Both Species Is Necessary for Salvation*.)

### **The heresy that Jesus’ human soul is in the Holy Eucharist**

The Council of Trent teaches the heresy that Jesus’ human soul is in the Holy Eucharist and thus the heresy that the Holy Eucharist is not the dead Christ (the victim) but the living Christ.

Invalid and heretical *Council of Trent*, 1565: “In the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially present the body and blood together with the soul and the divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ.”<sup>10</sup>

Hence Trent denies the dogma that the Holy Eucharist is the incarnate Jesus’ dead human body, dead human blood, and living divine nature under the appearances of bread and wine, which all the popes and Church Fathers teach and thus not one taught that Jesus’ human soul is in the Holy Eucharist. For example,

St. Ambrose, *On the Christian Faith*, 378-380: “124. ...As often as we receive the Sacramental Elements, which by the mysterious efficacy of holy prayer are transformed into the Flesh and the Blood, ‘do show the Lord’s death.’”<sup>11</sup>

St. Augustine, *On the Psalms*, Ps. 39 (40): “12. ...For the men of old time, when as yet the true Sacrifice, which is known to the faithful, was foreshown in figures, used to celebrate rites that were figures of the reality that was to be hereafter... Those sacrifices then, as being but expressions of a promise, have been abrogated. What is that which has been given as its fulfillment? That ‘Body,’ which ye know. ...We are partakers of this ‘Body.’... The sacrifices, however, which used to be performed there, have been put away... They slay the Lamb; they eat the unleavened bread. ‘Christ has been sacrificed for us, as our Passover.’ Lo, in the sacrifice of Christ, I recognize the Lamb that was slain! ...We have the Body of Christ, we have the Blood of Christ.”

The prayers right after the bread and wine are changed into the body and blood of Christ refer to the Holy Eucharist (the body and blood of Christ) as an oblation and victim:

---

<sup>9</sup> Taken from the *Decretals of Gratian*, b. 5, c. 7, 9.

<sup>10</sup> The Profession of Faith of the Council of Trent, from the Bull of Pius IV, *Iniunctum nobis*; D. 997.

<sup>11</sup> b. 4, c. 10.

*Roman Rite of the Mass, Oblation of the Victim of God:* “Wherefore, O Lord, we thy servants and likewise thy holy people, calling to mind the blessed Passion of the same Christ thy Son our Lord...offer unto thy most excellent majesty of thy gifts and presents, a pure ✠ Victim, a holy ✠ Victim, an immaculate ✠ Victim, the holy ✠ Bread of eternal life, and the Chalice ✠ of everlasting salvation.”

(For an in-depth condemnation of this heresy, see RJMI book *Some Dogmas and Heresies regarding Confirmation and the Holy Eucharist: Jesus’ Dead Body, Dead Blood, and Living Divine Nature Are in the Holy Eucharist.*)

### **The heresy that Catholics must not receive the Holy Eucharist until they attain the use of reason**

Because it is a dogma that the Holy Eucharist is necessary for salvation (at least by precept) for all the faithful and hence even infants, it is a dogma that the Holy Eucharist must be given to infants right after or shortly after they are baptized into the Catholic Church. The dogma that Catholic infants must receive the Holy Eucharist was believed and practiced for at least the first 1100 years of the Church. The heresy that infants must not receive the Holy Eucharist unless in danger of death was first taught and practiced in the 12th century. But it was not confirmed by apostate antipopes until the 16th century at the invalid and heretical Council of Trent, which taught the even worse heresy that infants do not have to received the Holy Eucharist at all and thus not even when danger of death:

Invalid and heretical *Council of Trent*, 16th century: “That little children are not bound to sacramental Communion. Finally, this same holy Synod teaches, that little children who have not attained to the use of reason are not by any necessity obliged to the sacramental communion of the Eucharist: forasmuch as, having been regenerated by the laver of baptism, and being incorporated with Christ, they cannot, at that age, lose the grace which they have already acquired of being the sons of God. Not therefore, however, is antiquity to be condemned, if, in some places, it, at one time, observed that custom; for as those most holy Fathers had a probable cause for what they did in respect of their times, so, assuredly, is it to be believed without controversy that they did this without any necessity thereof unto salvation.”<sup>12</sup>

No pope or Church Father taught this heresy but instead they all condemned it. For example,

St. Augustine, *On the Merits and Forgiveness of Sins, and On the Baptism of Infants*, 412: “[Chapter 2] And what else do they say who call the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper life, than that which is written: ‘I am the living bread which came down from heaven’; and ‘The bread that I shall give is my flesh, for the life of the world’; and ‘Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall have no life in you’? If, therefore, as so many and such divine witnesses agree, neither salvation nor everlasting life can be hoped for by any man without baptism and the Lord’s body and blood, it is vain to promise these blessings to infants without them.”<sup>13</sup>

Pope St. Innocent I, *Letter to the Fathers of the Council of Milevis*, 417: “But that which your Fraternity asserts the Pelagians preach, that even without the grace of baptism infants are able to be endowed with the rewards of everlasting life, is quite idiotic. For unless they shall have eaten the flesh of the Son of Man and shall have drunk his blood, they shall not have life in them. But those who defend this for them

---

<sup>12</sup> sess. 21, c. 4.

<sup>13</sup> b. 1.

without rebirth seem to me to want to quash baptism itself when they preach that infants already have what is believed to be conferred on them only through baptism.”<sup>14</sup>

Pope St. Leo the Great, *Sermon 59*, 5th century: “II. ...Even the tongues of infants do not keep silence upon the truth of Christ’s Body and Blood at the rite of Holy Communion...”

(For an in-depth condemnation of this heresy, see RJMI book *Some Dogmas and Heresies regarding Confirmation and the Holy Eucharist: Catholic Infants Must Receive the Holy Eucharist*)

### **Trent’s lies regarding the Vulgate**

While it was commendable that the invalid and heretical Council of Trent attempted to clear up the confusion by producing one Bible as the papally approved and thus only official and primary text, the main text it used as a template for the Old Testament (the Vulgate) was not commendable because it is based upon the corrupted Masoretic text. And, even worse, Trent lied by saying that an authentic Old Latin Vulgate text existed that was used by all or at least by most for many centuries previous to and up until Trent.

Invalid and heretical *Council of Trent*, Session 4, 1546: “Moreover, the same sacred and holy Synod taking into consideration that no small benefit can accrue to the Church of God, if it be made known which one of all the Latin editions of the sacred books which are in circulation is to be considered authentic, has decided and declares that the said old Vulgate edition, which has been approved by the Church itself through long usage for so many centuries in public lectures, disputations, sermons, and expositions, be considered authentic, and that no one under any pretext whatsoever dare or presume to reject it.” (D. 785)

Hence Trent’s decree is the first official so-called papal approval of the Vulgate which from that point forward set out to replace and thus abolish the Septuagint as the primary text for the Old Testament. Now for the errors and lies in Trent’s decree:

1. It admits that the Bible it authorizes has no link with Tradition because it was only in use for several centuries before Trent.
2. It lies because no *one* version of the old Vulgate or any other vulgate existed for many centuries previous to Trent. Instead, there were many differing Latin versions of the Vulgate.

Yet even if an authentic version of the old Vulgate were found (Jerome’s original Vulgate), that would not solve the problem because the main problem is the Vulgate itself. Trent, then, promoted a corrupted version of the Old Testament while rejecting the Septuagint as the main template.

(For in-depth evidence, see RJMI book *On the Clementine Vulgate’s Errors and On Heretical Commentaries*)

---

<sup>14</sup> *Letter 30*, par. 5; contained in *The Faith of the Early Fathers*, by apostate William Jurgens, vol. 3, 2016.

## Trent is willfully ambiguous regarding Baptism of Desire

The invalid and heretical Council of Trent's following degree on baptism is willfully ambiguous, as it can imply baptism of desire but not with certainty:

Invalid and heretical *Council of Trent*, Session 6, Chapter 4, On Justification, 1547 AD: By which words, a description of the justification of the impious is indicated—as being a translation from that state wherein man is born a child of the first Adam to the state of grace and of the adoption of the sons of God through the second Adam, Jesus Christ, our Saviour. And this translation, since the promulgation of the Gospel, cannot be effected without the laver of regeneration or his desire for it, as it is written: “Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” (John 3:5)

Invalid and heretical *Council of Trent*, Session 7, Canons on the Sacraments in General: “Canon 4: If anyone says that the sacraments of the New Law are not necessary for salvation but are superfluous, and that without them or without the desire thereof men obtain from God through faith alone the grace of justification, though all are not necessary for each one, let him be anathema.”

While these degrees can lean toward the opinion of baptism of desire, they do not tip the scale, as they can be explained in a way that upholds the necessity of the reception of the sacrament to be saved. For instance, see my book *The Baptism Controversy Revision*. Yet, none of this is of any consequence because the Council of Trent was invalid and heretical and thus its teachings on baptism, as well as all its teachings, are null and void.

(For in-depth evidence, see my book *The Baptism Controversy Revision*, which needs to be revised as I refer to the Council of Trent as a valid council and to some apostate antipopes as popes and some anti-saints as saints. And it needs other revisions. But I kept it on my site because it contains much useful information regarding this controversy. I hope to revise this book soon.)

## Trent is heretical by sins of omission for not condemning prominent heresiarchs

One of the main jobs of an Ecumenical Council is to condemn the prominent heresiarchs of the day and their heretical sects, and some of the past if their heresies are still a great threat. For example,

*First Council of Nicea*, 325: “First of all the affair of the impiety and lawlessness of Arius and his followers was discussed in the presence of the most pious emperor Constantine. It was unanimously agreed that anathemas should be pronounced against his impious opinion and his blasphemous terms and expressions which he has blasphemously applied to the Son of God... Such indeed was the power of his impiety that Theonas of Marmarica and Secundus of Ptolemais shared in the consequences, for they too suffered the same fate.”

*First Council of Constantinople*, 328: “Canon 1. The profession of faith of the holy fathers who gathered in Nicaea in Bithynia is not to be abrogated, but it is to remain in force. Every heresy is to be anathematized and in particular that of the Eunomians or Anomoeans, that of the Arians or Eudoxians, that of the Semi-Arians or Pneumatomachi, that of the Sabellians that of the Marcellians, that of the Photinians and that of the Apollinarians.”

Fourth Council of Constantinople, ##: “We too, accepting this in the identical meaning, anathematize as of unsound mind and an enemy of the truth, Arius ... And we anathematize that adversary of the Spirit or rather adversary of God, Macedonius... Nor do we confuse, like the lunatic Sabellius, the persons in one and

the same substance... In union with that council we too anathematize Nestorius... We anathematize the insane Eutyches and the mad Dioscorus... We anathematize Severus, Peter and Zoharas the Syrian, as well as Origen with his useless knowledge, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Didymus along with Evagrius, who also, although of the same or different opinions, were ensnared in the same pit of damnation.”

Yet, the invalid and heretical Council of Trent did not condemn one heretic or heretical sect by name. Not one, in spite of the fact that there were as many heresiarchs in its day as at any time in the Church; such as, John Wycliffe (d. 1385), John Hus (d. 1415), Martin Luther (d. 1546), Henry VIII (d. 1547), and John Calvin (1564). And these heretics were so dangerous that they were converting a great multitude out of the Catholic Church and into their heretical sects. Yet, Trent did not condemn one of them by name; and thus, on this point alone, the Council of Trent was a heretical council by sins of omission for not condemning these heresiarchs and their heretical sects by name when the situation demanded that it do so. One can see how the heresy of non-judgmentalism was in full bloom during this council in which heretics are no longer judged and condemned by name. The heresy of non-judgmentalism took root for the sake of a worldly peace and also because many were denying the Salvation Dogma at this time and thus believed men can be saved outside the Catholic Church. The Great Apostasy could never have succeeded without the heresies of non-judgmentalism and non-punishmentalism.

*For the glory of God; in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mary, St. Michael, St. Joseph, Ss. Joachim and Anne, St. John the Baptist, the other angels and saints; and for the salvation of men*

Original version: 7/2022; Current version: 7/2022

**Mary's Little Remnant**

302 East Joffre St.

Truth or Consequences, New Mexico 87901-2878, USA

Website: [www.JohnTheBaptist.us](http://www.JohnTheBaptist.us)