

Some of Apostate Thomas Aquinas' Heresies

By Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	2
HE WAS RIGHTFULLY CONDEMNED BY MANY IN HIS DAYS	2
HIS APOSTASY FOR GLORIFYING PHILOSOPHY.....	3
<i>His heresy of scholastic babble</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>His heresy for putting the intellect over the will</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>His willful ambiguity and willful contradictions.....</i>	<i>6</i>
Contradictions regarding his limbo of children	6
HIS HERESY FOR GLORIFYING THE APOSTATE ORIGEN	7
HIS HERESY THAT ORIGINAL SIN IS NOT A REAL SIN THAT CAUSES GUILT.....	8
HIS HERESY THAT GOD COULD HAVE CREATED THE WORLD ETERNAL.....	8
HIS HERESY THAT INFANTS WHO DIE WITH ORIGINAL SIN ARE HAPPY AND UNITED TO GOD	9
HIS HERESY THAT MEN CAN DESIRE TO DO GOOD WITHOUT GOD'S GRACE.....	10
HIS TWO HERESIES REGARDING USURY.....	11
HIS HERESY OF PROMOTING SIMONY	12
HIS HERESY THAT JESUS' HUMAN SOUL IS IN THE HOLY EUCHARIST.....	13
HIS HERESY THAT JESUS' BODY AND BLOOD ARE IN EACH SPECIES OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST	14
HIS HERESY THAT THE RECEPTION OF ONLY ONE SPECIES IS NECESSARY FOR SALVATION.....	16
HIS HERESY THAT POOR PEOPLE AND THOSE WHO HELP THEM CAN STEAL	18
HIS HERESY THAT THE DIVINE ESSENCE DOES NOT BEGAT, IS NOT BEGOTTEN, AND DOES NOT PROCEED	19

Introduction



Triumph of Thomas Aquinas, by Benozzo Gozzoli, 1471

The fat bastard and dumb ox who acquired knowledge and lost wisdom.

“Be not over just; and be not more wise than is necessary,
lest thou become stupid.”
(Ecclesiastes 7:17)

The apostate Thomas Aquinas’ heresies contained in this book are taken from my other works. I gathered them together in this one book. For more thorough evidence of his heresies and their condemnations, I will list the appropriate works to refer to.

He Was Rightfully Condemned by Many in His Days

I titled this article *Some of Apostate Thomas Aquinas’ Heresies* because he held many others. And others, in his days, rightly condemned him. For example,

“The Literary Reception of Thomas Aquinas’ View on the Provability of the Eternity of the World in De La Mare’s *Correctorium* (1278-9) and the *Correctoria Corruptorii* (1279-Ca 1286),” by M. J. F. M. Hoenen, 1986: “In 1278 or 1279, some years after the death of Thomas Aquinas, the Franciscan theologian William de la Mare composed a work that was to elicit a vehement reaction from Dominican theology. And not without reason, as Mare sharply opposed the views of Thomas, itemizing no less than 118 points of criticism... Most often he speaks of his opinions being ‘false,’ for example with regard to the view that beatitude is essentially an act of intellect, not of will... But apart from the theses dubbed ‘false,’ many are described as being ‘erroneous,’ or as ‘giving rise to errors.’ What is meant by ‘errors’? What is meant by ‘erroneous’? According to Mare, errors are theses or positions that are not just false, but that are more specifically opposed to Faith, to Holy Scripture, or to Tradition (i.e., to the opinions of the Saints). Thomas’s work is said to contain not only views that are merely false, but also views that are contrary to Faith.”

(For in depth evidence, see RJMI book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics*: Scholastics: Thomas Aquinas: “He was condemned by some of his peers”; and see “The Dominicans and idolizers and non-idolizers of Aquinas.”)

His Apostasy for Glorifying Philosophy

The apostate Thomas Aquinas glorified philosophy in all of the three ways; that is, 1) by using philosophy or mythology to edify or enlighten oneself or others on faith or morals; 2) by using methods unique to philosophy; 3) by using terminologies unique to philosophy (scholastic babble).¹

Thomas Aquinas used Aristotle's and other philosophers' teachings on faith and morals to be enlightened and edified and to enlighten and edify others and hence was an apostate on this count alone. Aquinas got many of his heresies from Aristotle because he looked not only to God and the Catholic faith for revelations on faith or morals but also to Aristotle. And in some cases he favored Aristotle's revelations over those of the Catholic faith and thus fell into heresy.

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, 13th century: "Reply to Objection 2. This science [sacred doctrine/theology] can in a sense depend upon the philosophical sciences, not as though it stood in need of them, but only in order to make its teaching clearer."²

(For in depth evidence, see RJMI book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics: Against Philosophy and Mythology*.)

His heresy of scholastic babble

Another philosophical method of the scholastics is the use of terminologies unique to philosophy when teaching on faith or morals, which I call scholastic babble or TP Talk (theophilosophy talk). The apostate Thomas Aquinas used scholastic babble:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*: "Reply to Objection 1. Before the world existed it was possible for the world to be, not, indeed, according to a passive power which is matter, but according to the active power of God; and also, according as a thing is called absolutely possible, not in relation to any power, but from the sole habitude of the terms which are not repugnant to each other; in which sense possible is opposed to impossible, as appears from the Philosopher [Aristotle] (Metaph. v, text 17)..."

"Reply to Objection 6. The first agent is a voluntary agent. And although he had the eternal will to produce some effect, yet he did not produce an eternal effect. Nor is it necessary for some change to be presupposed, not even on account of imaginary time. For we must take into consideration the difference between a particular agent, that presupposes something and produces something else, and the universal agent, who produces the whole. The particular agent produces the form, and presupposes the matter; and hence it is necessary that it introduce the form in due proportion into a suitable matter. Hence it is correct to say that it introduces the form into such matter, and not into another, on account of the different kinds of matter. But it is not correct to say so of God who produces form and matter together: whereas it is correct to say of him that he produces matter fitting to the form and to the end. Now, a particular agent presupposes time just as it presupposes matter. Hence it is correctly described as acting in time 'after' and not in time 'before,' according to an imaginary succession of time after time. But the universal agent who produces the thing and time also is not correctly described as acting now, and not before, according to an imaginary succession of time succeeding time, as if time were presupposed to his action; but he must be considered as giving time to his effect as much as and when he willed, and according to what was fitting to demonstrate his power. For the world leads more evidently to the knowledge of the divine creating power, if it was not always, than if it had always been; since

¹ For more on this topic, RJMI book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics: The Methods and Effects of Hellenizing Christianity*.

² I, q. 1, Art. 5 (Whether sacred doctrine is nobler than other sciences?).

everything which was not always manifestly has a cause; whereas this is not so manifest of what always was.

“Reply to Objection 9. As the effect follows from the cause that acts by nature, according to the mode of its form, so likewise it follows from the voluntary agent, according to the form preconceived and determined by the agent... Therefore, although God was from eternity the sufficient cause of the world, we should not say that the world was produced by him, except as preordained by his will...”³

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*: “I answer that, ...Parts can be assigned to a virtue in three ways. First, in likeness to integral parts, so that the things which need to concur for the perfect act of a virtue are called the parts of that virtue. On this way, out of all the things mentioned above, eight may be taken as parts of prudence, namely, the six assigned by Macrobius; with the addition of a seventh, viz. ‘memory’ mentioned by Tully; and *eustochia* or ‘shrewdness’ mentioned by Aristotle. For the ‘sense’ of prudence is also called ‘understanding’: wherefore the Philosopher says (Ethic. vi, 11): ‘Of such things one needs to have the sense, and this is understanding.’”⁴

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*: “I answer that, ...Wherefore it seems that in such things at least, everything happens of necessity; according to the reasoning of some of the ancients who supposing that everything that is has a cause; and that, given the cause, the effect follows of necessity; concluded that all things happen of necessity. This opinion is refuted by Aristotle (Metaph. vi, Did. v, 3) as to this double supposition. For in the first place it is not true that, given any cause whatever, the effect must follow of necessity. For some causes are so ordered to their effects as to produce them, not of necessity, but in the majority of cases, and in the minority, to fail in producing them. But that such cases do fail in the minority of cases is due to some hindering cause; consequently the above-mentioned difficulty seems not to be avoided, since the cause in question is hindered of necessity. Therefore we must say, in the second place, that everything that is a being ‘per se’ has a cause; but what is accidentally has not a cause because it is not truly a being since it is not truly one. For (that a thing is) ‘white’ has a cause, likewise (that a man is) ‘musical’ has not a cause, but (that a being is) ‘white-musical’ has not a cause because it is not truly a being, nor truly one. Now it is manifest that a cause which hinders the action of a cause so ordered to its effect as to produce it in the majority of cases clashes sometimes with this cause by accident; and the clashing of these two causes, inasmuch as it is accidental, has no cause. Consequently what results from this clashing of causes is not to be reduced to a further pre-existing cause, from which it follows of necessity...”⁵

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*: “I answer that,... Thirdly, ...That God is not in a genus, as reducible to it as its principle, is clear from this, that a principle reducible to any genus does not extend beyond that genus; as, a point is the principle of continuous quantity alone; and unity, of discontinuous quantity. But God is the principle of all being. Therefore He is not contained in any genus as its principle.”⁶

(For in depth evidence, see RJMI book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics: The Ways That Philosophy or Mythology Are Glorified: 3) By using terminologies unique to philosophy (scholastics babble) when teaching on faith or morals)*

³ I, q. 46, art. 1.

⁴ II-II, q. 48, art. 1.

⁵ I, q. 115, art. 6.

⁶ I, q. 3, art. 5.

His heresy for putting the intellect over the will

Jesus Christ teaches that good faith or bad faith, virtue or vice, good or evil, righteousness or sin comes forth from the heart, the will, and thus not from the brain, the mind, the intellect:

“But the things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart, and those things defile a man. For from the heart come forth evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false testimonies, blasphemies.” (Mt. 15:18-19)

“A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth that which is good: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth that which is evil. For out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.” (Lk. 6:45)

“O generation of vipers, how can you speak good things, whereas you are evil? For out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh.” (Mt. 12:34)

St. Peter teaches that Ananias’ and Simon Magus’ sins were conceived in their hearts, not in their brains:

“But Peter said: Ananias, why hath Satan tempted thy heart, that thou shouldst lie to the Holy Spirit and by fraud keep part of the price of the land? Whilst it remained, did it not remain to thee? And after it was sold, was it not in thy power? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thy heart? Thou hast not lied to men, but to God.” (Acts 5:3-4)

Beware, then, of the heresy, as taught by the apostate Thomas Aquinas and other scholastics, that the intellect is over the will and thus the brain is over the heart and reason over faith:

The Contested Theological Authority of Thomas Aquinas, by Elizabeth Lowe, 2003: “The Thomists ranked the intellect over the will in both humanity and God, the opposite was true of the neo-Augustinians. Therefore, in the eyes of the neo-Augustinians, the Thomistic concept of the soul reversed the ‘traditional order from right willing to right knowing’ and thereby raised the specter of determinism.⁷ Likewise, Thomas’ contention that a sinful act originated in a defect of the intellect provoked charges of Pelagianism.^{8,9}

Reason, Religion, and Natural Law: From Plato to Spinoza, edited by Jonathan A. Jacobs, 2012: “Ockham never doubts that the will is prominent. He rejects Aquinas’s position because he considers that Aquinas limits the will and subjects the act of willing to the requirements of the intellect. Aquinas, of course, adopts this position. In the *Summa Theologiae*, Aquinas writes the following about the superiority of the intellect over the will: ‘Reason precedes the will, and reason ordains the will; in other words, the will tends to its object only according to the order of reason since the intellect (*Recta ratio*) presents the object to the will’ (*Summa Theologiae*, I-II, A. 18, art. 1)... Aquinas’s ethical naturalism falls apart conceptually. The will is a rational appetite that undertakes actions under the guise of what is good; this cognitive content depends on both speculative and practical reason. Ockham denies that limits can be placed upon the will.⁵² Aquinas does put cognitive limits on the will—both the human will and the divine will. Therefore, the human agent functions differently for Ockham than for Aquinas. These are two radically different theories of human action.”¹⁰

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I-II:

Q. 13, a. 1: “I answer that, ...Reason precedes the will and ordains its act...”

Q. 17, a. 1: “I answer that, ...Command is an act of reason.”

⁷ Footnote 127: “Leff, *Paris and Oxford*, 239.”

⁸ Footnote 128: “William de la Mare, *Corr. Thom.* 82 (Bibl. Thom., 9): 331-332.”

⁹ c. 2, p. 53.

¹⁰ Oxford University Press, 2012. Pt. 3, c. 6, p. 171.

Q. 74, a. 5, Reply to Objection 2: "...Accordingly sin is found in the reason, either through being a voluntary defect of the reason, or through the reason being the principle of the will's act."

(See RJMI book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics: Philosophical Hellenizers Put Reason over Faith and the Brain over the Heart.*)

His willful ambiguity and willful contradictions

The beliefs of the apostate Thomas Aquinas are disputed probably more than the beliefs of any other so-called theologian because his works contain many willful ambiguities and willful contradictions. Men on both sides of a topic (both those who hold a heresy and those who hold the dogma that opposes that heresy) find themselves using the works of Aquinas to equally and credibly defend their opinions and thus with no possible resolution and hence endless books could be written trying to defend this or that opinion of Aquinas.

"But God is faithful, for our preaching which was to you, was not, It is, and It is not. For the Son of God, Jesus Christ who was preached among you by us, by me, and Sylvanus, and Timothy, was not, It is and It is not, but, It is, was in him." (2 Cor. 1:18-19)

Aquinas' works are filled with "it is" and "it is not." In these cases, Aquinas is guilty of either willful ambiguity or willful contradictions and thus is either guilty of the heretical opinion that can be derived from an ambiguous passage or guilty of the heretical opinion he teaches in spite of the fact that he teaches the dogma elsewhere.

In many places it is impossible to know for sure what Aquinas teaches because his words are willfully ambiguous and thus a heretical or orthodox meaning can be applied.

And in many places his works contain willful contradictions regarding dogmas, heresies, and non-heretical errors. In one place he teaches a dogma, and in another place he teaches the heresy that opposes that dogma. And in one place he teaches heresy, and in another place he teaches the dogma that opposes that heresy.

(See RJMI book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics: The Ways That Philosophy or Mythology Are Glorified: 2) By using methods unique to philosophy when teaching on faith or morals: 2d) By willful ambiguity or willful contradictions.*)

Contradictions regarding his limbo of children

For example, in one place he teaches the heresy that infants who die with the sole guilt of original sin are not in hell but are in another place which he calls the limbo of children:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*: "I answer that, The abodes of souls are distinguished according to the souls' various states... so that after death it is either in the state of receiving its final reward, or in the state of being hindered from receiving it. If it is in the state of receiving its final retribution, this happens in two ways: either in the respect of good, and then it is paradise; or in respect of evil, and thus as regards actual sin it is hell, and as regards original sin it is the limbo of children."¹¹

Hence according to this teaching of Aquinas, only souls guilty of actual sins are in hell and thus souls guilty only of original sin are in the limbo of children, which in this case is some place other than hell.

But in another place he teaches that these infants are in the highest level of hell, one level lower than was Abrahams' Bosom (aka, Limbo of the Fathers). But you need to combine two of

¹¹ Supp., q. 69, a. 7.

his teachings to know this. In one place, he correctly teaches that Abraham's Bosom was in the highest level of hell, which he calls the limbo of hell:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*: "I answer that, ...Consequently the state of the saints before Christ's coming may be considered both as regards the rest it afforded, and thus it is called Abraham's bosom, and as regards its lack of rest, and thus it is called the limbo of hell."¹²

In another place he teaches that his limbo of children is one level lower than Abraham's Bosom:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*: "I answer that, ...the limbo of the Fathers is placed higher than the limbo of children..."¹³

With the two teachings combined, you get this:

"Abraham's bosom...is called the limbo of hell. The limbo of the Fathers is placed higher than the limbo of children."

Hence, according to these two teachings, Aquinas' limbo of children is in hell. Yet in another place he teaches that these children are happy and united to God and thus describes a place that cannot be hell:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*: "Reply to Objection 5. Although unbaptized children are separated from God as regards the union of glory, they are not utterly separated from him: in fact they are united to him by their share of natural goods, and so will also be able to rejoice in him by their natural knowledge and love."¹⁴

There you have it. In one place the lying apostate Aquinas says that his limbo of children is not in hell. In another place he says that it is in hell. And yet in another place he implies that it is not in hell because he says that the children are happy and united to God. For in-depth evidence regarding this contradiction and others, see RJMI book *Damned Infants*.

His Heresy for Glorifying the Apostate Origen

The apostate Thomas Aquinas, in his infamous *Summa*, quotes Origen 75 times and never once says that Origen was a heretic—let alone a *sentenced* heretic—even though he points out a few of Origen's heresies. Most of his quotes on Origen are in a positive light, and thus he presents Origen as an authoritative source equal to the Church Fathers.

Therefore Aquinas was an anathematized heretic, disobedient schismatic, and denier of sacred tradition on this point alone because he did not anathematize Origen, as infallibly decreed by the Second Council of Constantinople, as well as by the three following ecumenical councils:

Second Council of Constantinople, 553, confirmed by Pope Pelagius, 556, Anathema against Origen: "Anathema 11: If anyone does not anathematize...Origen, together with [his] impious writings..., let him be anathema."¹⁵

(See RJMI book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics: The Anti-Church Fathers: Origen*.)

¹² Ibid., a. 4.

¹³ Ibid., a. 6.

¹⁴ Supp., App. I, q. 1, a. 2.

¹⁵ Taken from *A History of the Councils of the Church*, by apostate Bishop Hefele, v. 4, c. 2, s. 274, pp. 336-337.

His Heresy that Original Sin Is Not a Real Sin that Causes Guilt

The apostate Aquinas taught the Pelagian heresy that original sin has only the character of sin and thus is not a real sin that causes real guilt:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*: “I answer that, ...The defect transmitted to us through our origin, and having the character of a sin does not result from the withdrawal or corruption of a good consequent upon human nature by virtue of its principles, but from the withdrawal or corruption of something that had been superadded to nature.”¹⁶

He sees original sin as only a deprivation of grace that deprives one of some good things and of heaven, but not as a real sin:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*: “Reply to Objection 2. Nor does it matter that original sin is incompatible with grace; because privation of grace has the character, not of sin, but of punishment...”¹⁷

This heresy was infallibly condemned in 418 by Pope St. Zosimus, in 529 by Pope St. Felix IV, and in 1140 by the invalid Council of Sens:

Council of Carthage XVI, Pope St. Zosimus, Original Sin and Grace, 418: “Canon 2. Likewise it has been decided that whoever says that infants fresh from their mothers’ wombs ought not to be baptized, or says that they are indeed baptized unto the remission of sins, but that they draw nothing of the original sin from Adam, which is expiated in the bath of regeneration, whence it follows that in regard to them the form of baptism ‘unto the remission of sins’ is understood as not true, but as false, let him be anathema. Since what the Apostle says: ‘*Through one man sin entered into the world (and through sin death), and so passed into all men, in whom all have sinned*’ [cf. Rom. 5:12], must not to be understood otherwise than as the Catholic Church spread everywhere has always understood it. For on account of this rule of faith even infants, who in themselves thus far have not been able to commit any sin, are therefore truly baptized unto the remission of sins, so that that which they have contracted from generation may be cleansed in them by regeneration.” (D. 102)

Second Council of Orange, Pope St. Felix IV, 529: “Can. 2. If anyone asserts that Adam’s transgression injured him alone and not his descendants, or declares that certainly death of the body only, which is the punishment of sin, but not sin also, which is the death of the soul, passed through one man into the whole human race, he will do an injustice to God, contradicting the Apostle who says: ‘*Through one man sin entered in the world, and through sin death, and thus death passed into all men, in whom all have sinned*’ [Rom. 5:12; cf. St. Augustine].” (D. 175)

Invalid *Council of Sens*, 1140, The Errors of Peter Abelard: “Condemned Proposition 9. That we have not contracted sin from Adam, but only punishment.” (D. 376)

(For in-depth evidence on this topic, see RJMI book *Damned Infants: Aquinas’ Pelagian Heresy That Original Sin Is Not a Real Sin That Causes Real Guilt*.)

His Heresy that God Could Have Created the World Eternal

It is a dogma that only God had no beginning, that only God existed with himself in eternity before anything else was created or existed, and that God created the world and hence the world could not have always existed with God in eternity:

¹⁶ Supp., App. I, q. 1, a. 1.

¹⁷ Ibid., a. 1.

Pope Hadrian II, *Fourth Council of Constantinople*, 869: “[Infallible] We confess, indeed, God to be one...and we declare...that he is alone, ever existing without beginning, and eternal...”

Invalid and heretical *Fourth Lateran Council*, 1215: “Chap. 2: We, however, with the approval of the sacred Council, believe and confess...in God there is Trinity...which alone is the beginning of all things, beyond which nothing else can be found.” (D. 432)

St. Augustine, *Super Genesis ad Litteram*, 415: “Since the nature of the Trinity is wholly unchangeable, it is eternal in such a way that nothing can be coeternal with it.”¹⁸ (PL 34, 389)

Hence it is not only a dogma that God is eternal but also that only God can be eternal. Hence it is heresy to teach that God created the world eternal or could have created the world eternal and thus the world always existed even though it was created. This heresy was not only condemned by the solemn magisterium and ordinary magisterium but also by the natural law, by common sense.

While the apostate Thomas Aquinas believed the dogma that the world had a beginning and thus did not always exist in eternity with God, he heretically believed that it cannot be demonstrated by the natural law and reason that God could not, if he so desired, create a world that always existed eternally with God. Hence he held the heresy that God could have created the world eternal if he wanted to:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*: “I answer that, By faith alone do we hold, and by no demonstration can it be proved, that the world did not always exist, as was said above of the mystery of the Trinity (32, 1). The reason of this is that the newness of the world cannot be demonstrated on the part of the world itself... Hence that the world began to exist is an object of faith, but not of demonstration or science.”¹⁹

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *De Aeternitate Mundi*, 1271: “Let us assume, in accordance with the Catholic faith, that the world had a beginning in time. The question still arises whether the world could have always existed... It will not be heretical to say that God can make something created by him to have always existed... In this, therefore, the entire question consists: whether to be wholly created by God and not to have a beginning in time are contradictory terms. They are not contradictory... Thus it is clear that there is no contradiction in saying that something made by God has always existed... Therefore, much more can God, who produces the whole substance of things, make something caused by him exist whenever he himself exists... Therefore, at any instant at which God exists, so too can his effects...”

(For in depth evidence, see RJMI book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics*: Scholastics: Thomas Aquinas: His eternal-world heresy.)

His Heresy that Infants Who Die with Original Sin Are Happy and United to God

Because the apostate Aquinas denies the dogma that original sin is a real sin that causes real guilt, he denied dogmas regarding the punishments due to original sin. He heretically believed that the only punishment due to original sin is deprivation of something good but not pain or suffering. As a result of these Pelagian heresies, he held another Pelagian heresy that men, such as infants, who die with the sole guilt of original sin are happy and united to God even though they are deprived of heaven and the Beatific Vision:

¹⁸ bk. 8, c. 23.

¹⁹ I-I, q. 46, art. 2.

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*: “I answer that, ...Their [damned infants’] being deprived of eternal life and the reason for this privation...will not cause any sorrow in them. ...Hence they will nowise grieve for being deprived of the divine vision.”²⁰

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*: “Reply to Objection 5. Although unbaptized children are separated from God as regards the union of glory, they are not utterly separated from him: in fact they are united to him by their share of natural goods, and so will also be able to rejoice in him by their natural knowledge and love.”²¹

The heresy that those who die with the sole guilt of original sin are happy and united to God was infallibly condemned in AD 33 by the ordinary magisterium from Pentecost Day by the unanimous consensus of the twelve Apostles and following Church Fathers. And in AD 418 it was infallibly condemned by the solemn magisterium by Pope St. Zosimus, who confirmed the *Sixteenth Council of Carthage*. He infallibly condemned the belief that infants who die with original sin “live in bliss,” and infallibly decreed that infants who die with original sin are “partner[s] of the devil” and thus are not united to God:

Pope St. Zosimus, *Sixteenth Council of Carthage*, 418: “Canon 3.1. If any man says that in the kingdom of heaven or elsewhere there is a certain middle place, where children who die unbaptized live in bliss (*beate vivant*), whereas without baptism they cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven, that is, into eternal life, let him be anathema. For when the Lord says: ‘Unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of God,’ what Catholic will doubt that he will be a partner of the devil who has not deserved to be a coheir of Christ? For he who lacks the right part will without doubt run to the left.”²²

For in-depth evidence on this topic, see RJMI book *Damned Infants: Aquinas’ Heretical Beliefs That Damned Infants Are Happy and United to God*. As a result of this heresy, the apostate Aquinas denied other dogmas regarding grace, the hell of the damned, and God’s omnipotence and omniscience.

(For in-depth evidence on this topic, see RJMI book *Damned Infants*: “4. He [Aquinas] heretically believes that happiness exists in the hell of the damned” and “10. His belief brings down a piece of heaven into the hell of the damned” and “Thomas’ eternal place for unbaptized infants is the same as the Pelagians’ third everlasting place but with a different name.”)

His Heresy that Men Can Desire to Do Good without God’s Grace

The apostate Thomas Aquinas held the Pelagian Good-without-Grace heresy. It is a deeper dogma of the solemn magisterium and probably a deeper dogma of the ordinary magisterium that without God’s actual or sanctifying grace (any grace from God) men cannot think or do any good with a good motive and hence can only think evil and do things with an evil motive:

Popes St. Zosimus and St. Celestine I, 418 & 431: “For no one is good of himself, unless he gives [him] a participation of himself, who alone is good... That all the zeal and all the works and merits of the saints ought to be referred to the glory and praise of God; because no one pleases him with anything except with that which he himself has given... That God thus operates in the hearts of men and in the free will itself, so that a holy thought, a pious plan, and every motion of good will is from God, because we can do anything good through him, without whom we can do nothing (Jn. 15:5)... Whoever says...that what we are ordered to do through free will, we may be able to accomplish more easily through grace, just as if, even if

²⁰ Supp., App. I, q. 1, a. 2.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Translated by the apostate Bishop Charles Joseph Hefele, D.D.; & Henry Nutcombe Oxenham, M.A. Edited by Rev. Daniel R. Jennings, M.A.

grace were not given, we could nevertheless fulfill the divine commands without it, though not indeed easily, let him be anathema.”²³

Pope Boniface II, 531: “Canon 22. Concerning those things that belong to man. No man has anything of his own but untruth and sin. But if a man has any truth or righteousness, it is from that fountain [grace] for which we must thirst in this desert, so that we may be refreshed from it as by drops of water and not faint on the way.”²⁴

The apostate Aquinas denied this dogma. He believed that men can do a natural good with a good motive by the natural law alone and thus without the need of God’s grace:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*: “I answer that: Man by his natural endowments could wish and do the good proportionate to his nature... Yet because human nature is not altogether corrupted by sin, so as to be shorn of every natural good, even in the state of corrupted nature it can, by virtue of its natural endowments, work some particular good, as to build dwellings, plant vineyards, and the like; yet it cannot do all the good natural to it, so as to fall short in nothing...”²⁵

(For in-depth evidence on this topic, see RJMI article *Good-without-Grace Heresy Taught by Aquinas and Apostate Antipopes.*)

His Two Heresies regarding Usury

Usury is not intrinsically evil. It is a dogma that usury oppresses the borrower and thus is a weapon of war that can be legally used against enemies, unbelievers:

“Thou shalt not lend to thy brother money to usury nor corn nor any other thing: But to the stranger. To thy brother thou shalt lend that which he wanteth without usury, that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all thy works in the land which thou shalt go in to possess.” (Deut. 23:19-20)

Commenting on this verse, St. Ambrose says,

St. Ambrose, *On Tobias*, 4th century: “[Chap. 14] Usury is allowable where an appeal to arms is lawful; you may take usury from the man whose life you may justly take. The usurer’s extortion subdues his opponent without fighting, without the sword. The Law ordains that usury be not taken from a brother. [Chap. 15] Who was the stranger but Amelech, the enemy. Take usury from him whose life you may take without sin. The right of waging war implies the right of taking usury.”²⁶

However, is a sin and intrinsically evil for the faithful to give usurious loans to one another. The apostate Aquinas was guilty of denying two dogmas on usury. Below he teaches that usury is always unjust and thus intrinsically evil and thus denied the dogma that usury is *not* intrinsically evil:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*: “I answer that, To take usury for money lent is unjust in itself, because this is to sell what does not exist, and this evidently leads to inequality which is contrary to justice... He commits an injustice who lends wine or wheat, and asks for double payment, viz., one, the return of the thing in equal measure, the other, the price of the use, which is called usury.”²⁷

And Aquinas was guilty of giving usury another name and thus teaching that it was not sinful for the faithful to give one another usurious loans by pretending that these loans were not

²³ *Sixteenth Council of Carthage*, Can. 5, 418 AD (D. 105); *Council of Ephesus*, 431 AD, Catalog of Authoritative Statements, Chap. 2 (D. 131), Chap. 5 (D. 134), Chap. 6 (D. 135), Chap. 7 (D. 138).

²⁴ *Second Council of Orange*, 529 AD (D. 195); confirmed by Boniface II, *Per Filium Nostrum*, 531 AD (D. 200).
²⁵ I-II, q. 109, art. 2.

²⁶ Quoted in *The Church and Usury*, by apostate Rev. Patrick Cleary. *Nihil Obstat*: Joannes Waters, Censor Theol. Deput. *Imprimi Potest*: + Gulielmus, Archiep. Dublinen. Hiberniae Primas, Dublinii, die 17 Junii, 1914. Chap. 4, p. 51.

²⁷ II-II, q. 78, art. 1.

usurious. While Aquinas correctly condemned the loss-of-profit excuse, he taught and promoted the loss-by-damage and the emergent-loss excuses.

What follows is his correct condemnation of the loss-of-profit excuse:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*: “Reply to Objection 1. ...The lender cannot enter an agreement for compensation, through the fact that he makes no profit out of his money: because he must not sell that which he has not yet and may be prevented in many ways from having.”²⁸

What follows is his heretical teaching in which he gives usury another name by calling it compensation for loss by damage or for an emergent loss:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*: “Objection 1. It would seem that one may ask for some other kind of consideration for money lent. For everyone may lawfully seek to indemnify himself. Now sometimes a man suffers loss through lending money. Therefore he may lawfully ask for or even exact something else besides the money lent...

“Reply to Objection 1. A lender may without sin enter an agreement with the borrower for compensation for the loss he incurs of something he ought to have, for this is not to sell the use of money but to avoid a loss.”²⁹

The emergent-loss excuse (*damnum emergens*), aka loss-by-damage excuse, which Aquinas also justifies, teaches that a loaner is entitled to compensation if he incurs some loss during the period of the loan and thus is entitled to get back more than he loaned to compensate for his loss. For example, a man loans \$1000 for three years. But after one year he loses his barn by fire and must pay to have it rebuilt. The \$1000 he loaned could have helped him rebuild the barn and thus he is entitled to get more money back than he loaned. But the loaner nevertheless makes a profit on the money loaned and this is usury, no matter what name one gives it—in this case, compensation!

In almost all cases, one can make a case for a loss they will incur by loaning something. For example, a man who loans a horse to his neighbor could ask for compensation for not only the loss of the work the horse would have produced but also for the damage caused by the loss of crops due to the loss of the horse manure to fertilize the field.

(For in depth evidence, see RJMI book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics*: Scholastics: Thomas Aquinas: ...His heresy that a certain kind of usury is not usury; and see *RJMI Topic Index*: Usury.)

His Heresy of Promoting Simony

God has given His Catholic Church sufficient means to support Herself by mandatory tithes and freewill offerings and donations. However, God forbids the selling of grace, the channels of grace, and other spiritual things, such as the sacraments, Orders, Masses, funerals, marriages, offices, and relics. Hence God condemns Mass stipends, stole fees, the selling of offices, etc.³⁰ Jesus said to the Apostles, “And going, preach, saying: The kingdom of heaven is at hand. Heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils: freely have you received, freely give.” (Mt. 10:7-8) And St. Peter, speaking to the priests, says, “Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking care of it, not by constraint, but willingly, according to God: not for filthy lucre’s sake, but voluntarily.” (1 Pt. 5:2) The selling of grace and other spiritual things is the mortal sin of heresy known as simony. The apostate Thomas Aquinas taught this heresy:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, Second Part of the Second Part, Question 110, Article 2:

²⁸ Ibid., art. 2.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ See RJMI book *Against Simony*: Mass Stipends and Stole Fees. As of 8/2014, this book is not available.

“Objection 2. Further, the greatest of the sacraments is the Eucharist, which is consecrated in the Mass. But some priests receive a prebend or money for singing Masses. Much more therefore is it lawful to buy or sell the other sacraments.

“Reply to Objection 2. The priest receives money, not as the price for consecrating the Eucharist, or for singing the Mass (for this would be simoniacal), but as payment for his livelihood, as stated above.

“Objection 3. Further, the sacrament of Penance is a necessary sacrament consisting chiefly in the absolution. But some persons demand money when absolving from excommunication. Therefore it is not always unlawful to buy or sell a sacrament.

“Reply to Objection 3. The money exacted of the person absolved is not the price of his absolution (for this would be simoniacal), but a punishment of a past crime for which he was excommunicated.”

(See RJMI book *The Great Apostasy*: Simony; and see *RJMI Topic Index*: Simony.)

His Heresy that Jesus’ Human Soul Is in the Holy Eucharist

The Holy Eucharist is the incarnate Jesus’ dead human body, dead human blood, and living divine nature under the appearances of bread and wine. When you eat Jesus’ body and drink his blood in the Holy Eucharist you also take in his divine nature because his divine nature is united to his dead human body and dead human blood:

St. Ambrose, *The Sacraments*, 390: “4. ...Jesus Christ is a sharer of both divinity and body, and you who receive the flesh participate in that nourishment of his divine substance.”³¹

The Holy Eucharist is the dead body and dead blood of Christ, not his living body and living blood. The definition of death is the separation of the human soul from the human body. “The body without the spirit is dead.” (Ja. 2:26) Jesus, then, died in his human nature when he died on the holy Cross, when his soul left his body and went to the Limbo of the Fathers while his dead blood was poured out, and his dead body was taken down from the Cross and placed in the tomb. However, his divine nature, which is united to his human nature, was united to his soul in Limbo, to his poured-out dead blood, and to his dead body on the Cross and then in the tomb. However, Jesus’ divine nature could never die. That is one of the reasons why Jesus had to take on a human nature so that he could offer himself up as a sacrifice to the Father for the remission of sins and the punishment due to sins, which requires not only the death of the victim but also that it be consumed. Animal sacrifices during the Old Testament era, such as the Paschal Lamb, prefigured the ultimate sacrifice made by Jesus for the remission of sins. The animal was killed, and consumed, and covered sins but did not remit them.³² The sacrificial victim was eaten when it was dead, not alive, for unless it died there could be no forgiveness or remission of sins:

³¹ b. 6, c. 1.

³² Faith in the true God and obedience to the Old Testament laws, sacrifices, and rituals that God instituted for that time forgave sins but did not *remit* sins. “For the [old] law brought nothing to perfection.” (Heb. 7:19) The old laws forgave and covered sins but did not remit them. King David speaks of how his forgiven sins were covered and hence not imputed to him: “To David himself, understanding. Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord hath not imputed sin, and in whose spirit there is no guile.” (Ps. 31:1-2) Because the sins of the Old Testament elect were forgiven and covered but not remitted, they could not enter heaven when they died but had to wait in the Limbo of the Fathers, also known as Abraham’s Bosom, which was a prison that was located in the highest level of hell. Not until Christ died were the Old Testament elect redeemed and completely justified. Only then were their forgiven and covered sins remitted. “And therefore he is the mediator of the new testament: that by means of his death, for the redemption of those transgressions, which were under the former testament, they that are called may receive the promise of everlasting inheritance.” (Heb. 9:15) St. Paul teaches that sins are remitted only by the most precious blood of the Divine Lamb, Jesus Christ, not by the blood of oxen or goats or circumcision. Even though the animal sacrifices did not remit sins (take away sins), they did forgive and cover them. During the time of the Levitical priesthood, God prescribed very specific sacrifices that had to be offered up by the Levitical priests for their sins and the sins of the faithful, accompanied by a confession from the penitents. Upon confession and the offering of the prescribed sacrifices, penitents’ sins were forgiven: “If any one shall sin...he shall offer for his offence a ram without blemish...delivering it to the priest, who shall pray for him, offering the ram, and it shall be forgiven him.” (Lev. 5:15-16) Clearly, then, we see the difference between forgiveness of sin during the Old Testament era and the remission of sins during the New Testament era. The animal sacrifices forgave sin—“it shall be forgiven him”—but did not

“Without shedding of blood, there is no remission.” (Heb. 9:22)

The Holy Eucharist, then, is the sacrificed and dead Jesus, the victim, who died in his human nature for our sins.

Beware, then, of the heresy which teaches that Jesus’ soul is in the Holy Eucharist and thus the Holy Eucharist contains Jesus’ living human nature which comes down from heaven. Not one pope or Church Father ever taught this heresy. From the information I have, this heresy was first taught in the 12th century by the apostate Peter Lombard and in the 15th century onward by apostate antipopes.

(For in depth evidence, 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.*)

In the following quotes, the apostate Thomas Aquinas correctly teaches that Jesus’ divine nature is in the Holy Eucharist by concomitance, because his divine nature is united to Jesus’ body and blood. But he heretically teaches that Jesus’ soul is also in the Holy Eucharist by concomitance, by his soul being united with his body and blood. Hence he teaches the heresy that the Holy Eucharist is the resurrected body and blood of Christ and thus contains his soul. However, he does acknowledge that if the Holy Eucharist were Jesus’ dead human body and blood, then his soul would not be in the Holy Eucharist:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, Whether the whole Christ is contained under this sacrament?: “Reply to Objection 1. Because the change of the bread and wine is not terminated at the Godhead or the soul of Christ, it follows as a consequence that the Godhead or the soul of Christ is in this sacrament not by the power of the sacrament, but from real concomitance. For since the Godhead never set aside the assumed body, wherever the body of Christ is, there, of necessity, must the Godhead be; and therefore it is necessary for the Godhead to be in this sacrament concomitantly with his body. Hence we read in the profession of faith at Ephesus (P. I., chap. xxvi): ‘We are made partakers of the body and blood of Christ, not as taking common flesh, nor as of a holy man united to the Word in dignity, but the truly life-giving flesh of the Word himself.’

“On the other hand, his soul was truly separated from his body, as stated above (50, 5). And therefore had this sacrament been celebrated during those three days when he was dead, the soul of Christ would not have been there, neither by the power of the sacrament, nor from real concomitance. But since ‘Christ rising from the dead dieth now no more’ (Rom. 6:9), his soul is always really united with his body. And therefore in this sacrament the body indeed of Christ is present by the power of the sacrament, but his soul from real concomitance.”³³

His Heresy that Jesus’ Body and Blood Are in Each Species of the Holy Eucharist

It is a 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. Hence the apparent bread is Jesus’ body but not his blood, and the apparent wine is Jesus’ blood but not his body.

Jesus said,

“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)

remit sin because ‘it is impossible that with the blood of oxen and goats, sin should be taken away.’ (Heb. 10:4) (See *RJMI Topic Index: Justification during the Old and New Testament Eras.*)

³³ pt. 3, q. 75, art. 1.

He did not say,

“Amen, amen I say unto you: Except you eat the flesh and blood of the Son of man, and drink his blood and body, you shall not have life in you.”

The changing of bread into Jesus’ body and wine into Jesus’ blood during Holy Mass is called Transubstantiation. This occurs right after the Hanc Igitur (This Oblation) part of the Mass. Note that it says that the bread is turned into his body, not into his blood, and the wine is turned into his blood, not into his body.

The Apostolic Constitutions, 1st to 4th century: “xii. ...In like manner also ‘He took the cup,’ and mixed it of wine and water and sanctified it and delivered it to them, saying: ‘Drink ye all of this; for this is my blood, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins, do this in remembrance of me... Thou accept them to the honour of thy Christ, and send down upon this sacrifice thine Holy Spirit, the 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’”

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.”³⁴

St. Hippolytus, *The Apostolic Traditions*, c. 215: “23. And then the deacons immediately bring the oblation to the bishop; and he Eucharists the bread into the antitype of the Body of Christ; and the cup of mixed wine, for an antitype of the Blood, which was shed for all who believe in him.”³⁵

St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechetical Lectures*, Lecture 19. 4th century: “7. ...For as the bread and wine of the Eucharist before the invocation of the Holy and Adorable Trinity were simple bread and wine, while after the invocation the Bread becomes the Body of Christ, and the Wine the Blood of Christ...”

St. Augustine, *Sermons on the Liturgical Seasons*, Sermon 272: “What your faith obliges you to accept is that the bread is the Body of Christ and the chalice the Blood of Christ.”

Therefore beware of 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. Not one pope or Church Father taught this heresy but instead condemned it, as you have read in the previous section. From the information I have, this heresy was first taught in the 12th century by the apostate Peter Lombard. The most influential apostate who taught it was Thomas Aquinas in the 13th century. And it was then taught in the 15th century onward by apostate antipopes.

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

The apostate Thomas Aquinas taught that when the bread is turned into Jesus’ body, his blood comes along with it because it is the living Christ you receive in which his body and blood are united and thus not separated, which is another heresy. Hence he said that when the wine is turned into Jesus’ blood, his body comes along with it and thus by concomitance, which would be true if the Holy Eucharist were the living body and blood of Christ:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, 13th century: “Whether the whole Christ is contained under each species of this sacrament?: **I answer that**, After what we have said above, it must be held most certainly that the whole Christ is under each sacramental species yet not alike in each. For the body of Christ is indeed present under the species of bread by the power of the sacrament, while the blood is there

³⁴ c. 7.

³⁵ Contained in *The Faith of the Early Fathers*, by apostate William Jurgens, vol. 1, 394i.

from real concomitance, as stated above in regard to the soul and Godhead of Christ; and under the species of wine the blood is present by the power of the sacrament and his body by real concomitance, as is also his soul and Godhead: because now Christ's blood is not separated from his body, as it was at the time of his Passion and death."

Hence Aquinas teaches two heresies: 1) the Holy Eucharist is the living human nature of Christ and thus contains his soul, and hence 2) Christ's body and blood are under each species (the two-in-one-species heresy).

Aquinas, in the continuation of his above statement, acknowledges that if the Holy Eucharist is the dead body and blood of Christ, then the whole Christ would not be in each species and thus the bread is turned only into the body of Christ without being united to his blood, and the wine is turned into the blood of Christ without being united to his body:

Ibid.: "Now Christ's blood is not separated from his body, as it was at the time of his Passion and death. Hence if this sacrament had been celebrated then, the body of Christ would have been under the species of the bread, but without the blood; and, under the species of the wine, the blood would have been present without the body, as it was then, in fact."³⁶

Hence, Aquinas also admits that if the Holy Eucharist is the dead body and blood of Christ, it does not contain his soul:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, 13th century: "Whether the whole Christ is contained under this sacrament?: **Reply to Objection 1.** Because the change of the bread and wine is not terminated at the Godhead or the soul of Christ, it follows as a consequence that the Godhead or the soul of Christ is in this sacrament not by the power of the sacrament, but from real concomitance. For since the Godhead never set aside the assumed body, wherever the body of Christ is, there, of necessity, must the Godhead be; and therefore it is necessary for the Godhead to be in this sacrament concomitantly with his body. Hence we read in the profession of faith at Ephesus (P. I., chap. xxvi): 'We are made partakers of the body and blood of Christ, not as taking common flesh, nor as of a holy man united to the Word in dignity, but the truly life-giving flesh of the Word himself.'

"On the other hand, his soul was truly separated from his body, as stated above (50, 5). And therefore had this sacrament been celebrated during those three days when he was dead, the soul of Christ would not have been there, neither by the power of the sacrament, nor from real concomitance. But since 'Christ rising from the dead dieth now no more' (Rom. 6:9), his soul is always really united with his body. And therefore in this sacrament the body indeed of Christ is present by the power of the sacrament, but his soul from real concomitance."³⁷

Hence the crux of the two-in-one-species heresy is the heresy that the Holy Eucharist is the living body and blood of Christ; that is, the risen Christ who now reigns in heaven and sits at the right hand of the Father in which his human body, blood, and soul are united to his divine nature.³⁸ And this also denies the dogma that the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass is just that—a sacrifice! It goes back in time and relives the Passion and death of Christ. Hence the Mass does not bring down the resurrected Christ from heaven.

His Heresy that the Reception of Only One Species Is Necessary for Salvation

Jesus said that the reception of both species of the Holy Eucharist is necessary for salvation:

³⁶ pt. 3, q. 76, art. 2.

³⁷ pt. 3, q. 75, art. 1.

³⁸ See in this book "Jesus' Dead Body, Dead Blood, and Living Divine Nature Are in the Holy Eucharist," p. 30.

“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)

Hence it is a dogma that the reception of the Holy Eucharist is necessary, at least by precept, for the faithful to have life in them and thus for salvation. Necessity of precept means that the faithful must receive the Holy Eucharist within their lifetime if possible.

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.”³⁹

St. Cyprian, *Treatise 4* (On the Lord’s Prayer), 3rd century: “18. ... ‘Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall have no life in you.’ And therefore we ask that our bread—that is, Christ—may be given to us daily, that we who abide and live in Christ may not depart from his sanctification and body.”

St. Augustine, *On the Merits and Forgiveness of Sins, and On the Baptism of Infants*, 412: “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.”⁴⁰

Pope St. Innocent I, *Letter to the Fathers of the Council of Milevis*, 417: “For unless they [baptized Catholic infants] shall have eaten the Flesh of the Son of Man and shall have drunk his Blood, they shall not have life in them.”⁴¹

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.”

Once the heresy that Jesus’ body and blood are in each species was established, the logical conclusion to this heresy eventually followed, which was yet another and even worse heresy, that the faithful only need to receive one species, and thus not both, to be saved. It is worse because Jesus said that the faithful need to receive both species, not only his flesh but also his blood, to have life in them: “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)⁴²

Beware, then, of 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, or only need to drink his blood under the appearance of wine but not eat his body under the appearance of bread, which I call the one-species heresy. No pope or Church Father ever taught this, as shown in the last section. From the information I have, this heresy was first taught in the 13th century by apostate Thomas Aquinas and was first taught by apostate antipopes from the 15th century onward:

(See RJMI book *Some Dogmas and Heresies regarding Confirmation and the Holy Eucharist: ... The Dogma That the Reception of the Holy Eucharist Is Necessary for Salvation by Necessity of Precept*)

From the information I have, the one-species heresy was first taught in the 13th century by the apostate Thomas Aquinas; and he teaches that some put this heresy into practice:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, 13th century: “Whether it is lawful to receive the body of Christ without the blood?”

³⁹ c. 7.

⁴⁰ b. 1, c. 2.

⁴¹ *Letter 30*, par. 5; contained in *The Faith of the Early Fathers*, by apostate William Jurgens, vol. 3, 2016.

⁴² See in this book “**Error! Reference source not found.**,” p. [87](#).

“I answer that, Two points should be observed regarding the use of this sacrament, one on the part of the sacrament, the other on the part of the recipients; on the part of the sacrament it is proper for both the body and the blood to be received, since the perfection of the sacrament lies in both, and consequently, since it is the priest’s duty both to consecrate and finish the sacrament, he ought on no account to receive Christ’s body without the blood. But on the part of the recipient, the greatest reverence and caution are called for, lest anything happen which is unworthy of so great a mystery. Now this could especially happen in receiving the blood, for, if incautiously handled, it might easily be spilt. And because the multitude of the Christian people increased, in which there are old, young, and children, some of whom have not enough discretion to observe due caution in using this sacrament, on that account it is a prudent custom in some churches for the blood not to be offered to the reception of the people, but to be received by the priest alone.”

“Reply to Objection 2. The perfection of this sacrament does not lie in the use of the faithful, but in the consecration of the matter. And hence there is nothing derogatory to the perfection of this sacrament if the people receive the body without the blood, provided that the priest who consecrates receives both.

“Reply to Objection 3. Our Lord’s Passion is represented in the very consecration of this sacrament, in which the body ought not to be consecrated without the blood. But the body can be received by the people without the blood: nor is this detrimental to the sacrament. Because the priest both offers and consumes the blood on behalf of all; and Christ is fully contained under either species, as was shown above (76, 2).”⁴³

If the priest receives the blood under the appearance of wine for all the faithful and thus without them having to drink the blood of Christ, then, logically, the same should apply to Christ’s body under the appearance of bread and thus the faithful do not even have to eat Christ’s body because the priest also does that for them. Again, these scholastic bastards do not even have common sense.

His Heresy that Poor People and Those Who Help Them Can Steal

It is a dogma that God forbids men to commit any sin for any reason. Hence men must be willing to die rather than commit any sin, be it mortal or venial. Jesus says, “Sin no more.” (Jn. 8:12) St. Peter says, “You shall not sin at any time.” (2 Pt. 1:10) St. John says, “Whosoever abideth in him, sinneth not.” (1 Jn. 3:6) And St. Paul says, “Sin not.” (1 Cor. 15:34) Hence God forbids men to commit a lesser sin in order not to commit a greater sin. If they commit the lesser sin, then they are guilty of the lesser sin. For example, the Seventh Commandment is, “Thou shalt not steal.” (Deut. 5:19) And the Eighth Commandment is, Thou shalt not lie: “Neither shalt thou bear false witness against thy neighbour.” (Deut. 5:20) And the word of God teaches the following:

“A thief is better than a man that is always lying, but both of them shall inherit destruction.” (Eccus. 20:27)

Hence, even though a thief is not as guilty as a man that always lies, both are guilty of mortal sin and will inherit destruction. Likewise, even though a thief who steals for greed is guiltier than a thief who steals to sustain himself, both are guilty of sin and shall inherit destruction. And the thief in need who steals must still restore what he stole even to the whole of his house:

“The sin is not so great when a man hath stolen, for he stealeth to fill his hungry soul; and if he be taken, he shall restore sevenfold and shall give up all the substance of his house.” (Prv. 6:30-31)

⁴³ pt. 3, q. 80, art. 12.

The word of God teaches that a beggar who is of God's chosen people who steals to survive is nevertheless guilty and forswears the name of God, gives the true God a bad name:

“Give me neither beggary, nor riches: give me only the necessities of life: Lest perhaps being filled, I should be tempted to deny, and say: Who is the Lord? or being compelled by poverty, I should steal, and forswear the name of my God.”
(Prv. 30:8-9)

Hence the word of God says,

“Every thief shall be judged. (Zach. 5:3) Through poverty many have sinned.
(Eccus. 27:1)”

Even though Gregory IX was an apostate antipope, his following law, as contained in his decretals, teaches the dogma that even a man in need who steals, sins:

Apostate Antipope Gregory IX, *Decretals*, Bk. 5, Title 18, Chap. 3: “In committing a theft because of the urgency of necessity, not many times, he sins, but not gravely; and as such, a light penance should be imposed.”

Hence poverty does not excuse stealing. Therefore, the poor man who steals to sustain himself is guilty of sin.⁴⁴ The apostate Thomas Aquinas says, “No, this is not true.” He teaches that a man who is in need can steal and it is not a sin. He also teaches that even a man who is not in need can steal and give to the poor who are in need and he does not sin. This is heresy for denying the dogma that God forbids men to commit any sin for any reason. This heresy can be called the “Robin Hood heresy”:

Apostate Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, 2-2, q. 66, art. 7: “(Whether it is lawful to steal through stress of need?):

“I answer that, ...If the need be so manifest and urgent, that it is evident that the present need must be remedied by whatever means be at hand (for instance, when a person is in some imminent danger and there is no other possible remedy), then it is lawful for a man to succor his own need by means of another's property, by taking it either openly or secretly: nor is this properly speaking theft or robbery.

“Reply to Objection 2. It is not theft, properly speaking, to take secretly and use another's property in a case of extreme need: because that which he takes for the support of his life becomes his own property by reason of that need.

“Reply to Objection 3. In a case of a like need, a man may also take secretly another's property in order to succor his neighbor in need.”

No doubt, the apostate thief Thomas Aquinas would have told the poor Lazarus to steal from the greedy rich man because the rich man gave him nothing. If Lazarus had followed Aquinas' sinful counsel, then Lazarus would have ended up in hell, side by side with the greedy rich man.

His Heresy that the Divine Essence Does Not Begat, Is Not Begotten, and Does Not Proceed

It is a solemn magisterium dogma and an ordinary magisterium dogma that the God's divine essence is unbegotten in the Father, begotten in the Son by the Father, and proceeds in the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son. Hence it is a dogma that the divine essence is unbegotten, begot, is begotten, and proceeds:

Nicene Creed, 325: “We believe in...the Son of God, the only begotten, born of the Father, that is [born] of the substance [divine essence] of the Father, God of God,

⁴⁴ If God's chosen people are being starved to death by an unbelieving nation, then war can be declared against that nation by a competent authority. God's chosen people would then be able to fight for their food and take it from the unbelievers, and this would not be stealing but booty.

light of light, true God of true God, born, not made, of one substance with the Father.”⁴⁵

Pope Damasus I, *Council of Rome*, 382: “11. If anyone does not say that the Son was begotten of the Father, that is, of the divine substance of him himself, he is a heretic.”⁴⁶

The Athanasian Creed, 4th century: “Accordingly, it is the right faith that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man. He is God eternally begotten of the substance [divine essence] of the Father, and he is man born of the substance of his mother in time...”

From the information I have, the apostate Peter Lombard was the first modern theologian to teach the heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten in his *Sentences*, 1150. From that time forward, most of the following scholastics held the heresy that the divine essence does not beget, is not begotten, and does not proceed. The apostate Thomas Aquinas was one of the most prominent to hold this heresy.

Church Fathers	Scholastic Theologians
<p>St. Hilary of Poitiers, <i>On the Trinity</i>, 4th century: “He [God the Father] begat the only-begotten from his own unbegotten substance [divine essence], bestowing through love and power his whole Divinity upon that birth.”</p> <p>St. Athanasius, <i>Defence of the Nicene Definition</i>, 350/351: “The Word is an offspring from the substance of the Father... The Son is ‘from the essence of the Father’... And on this account did the Holy Council [of Nicea] declare expressly that he was of the essence of the Father.”</p> <p>St. Ambrose, <i>On the Christian Faith</i>, 4th century: “The Son [is] begotten of the substance of the Father.”</p> <p>St. Augustine and Alypius, <i>Letter 170</i>, to Maximus, c. 428: “He [God the Father] begot the Son of his own substance [divine essence].”</p> <p>St. Augustine, <i>The Trinity</i>, 5th century: “He [God the Father] has begotten his own essence [in his Son].”</p> <p>St. Fulgentius of Ruspe, <i>To Peter on the Faith</i>, 6th century: “Therefore, believe that Christ, the Son of God, i.e., one of the persons of the Trinity, is true God, so that you do not doubt that his divinity has been born of the nature [divine essence] of the Father.”</p>	<p>Apostate Peter Lombard, <i>Sentences</i>, 1150: “Neither did the Father beget a divine essence, nor did a divine essence beget a son, nor did a divine essence beget a divine essence... Thus there also must not be said that the divine essence begot the Son.”</p> <p>Apostate Thomas Aquinas, <i>Expositio, super secundum decretalem</i>, 13th century: “If therefore the divine essence begets or proceeds, it follows that just as the Father is one Person, the Son another and the Holy Spirit yet another, so too would their own essence or substance be still yet another [divine essence].”</p> <p>Apostate Thomas Aquinas, <i>Summa</i>, 13th century: “I answer that, Concerning this, the abbot Joachim erred in asserting that as we can say ‘God begot God,’ so we can say ‘Essence begot Essence.’ ” (I, q. 39, art. 5.)</p> <p>Apostate Thomas Aquinas, <i>Summa</i>, 13th century: “So the divine nature in the Son is not begotten either directly or accidentally.” (I, q. 39, art. 5, Reply to Objection 2.)</p>

(For in depth evidence, see RJMI book *The Heresy That the Divine Essence Does Not Beget, Is Not Begotten, and Does Not Proceed*: The apostate Thomas Aquinas held this heresy.)

⁴⁵ Denzinger 13, Epiphanius’ version; Denzinger 54, Hilary of Poitiers’ version.

⁴⁶ D. 69.

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: 5/2024

Mary's Little Remnant

302 East Joffre St.

Truth or Consequences, New Mexico 87901-2878, USA

Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us