

The Dimond Brothers' Heresy regarding the Heretical Council of Constance

By Augustine Stuja

What follows is my response to the apostate Peter Dimond of the "Most Holy Family Monastery," regarding his article *The Incarnation Took Place In The Person, Not In The Natures*.

Apostate Peter Dimond, *The Incarnation Took Place In The Person, Not In The Natures*: "This article deals with properly understanding and communicating an aspect of the Incarnation. This is especially relevant because a few radical schismatics named Ryan and R.I. [Richard Ibranyi], lacking the faith and a correct understanding of this matter, have falsely accused Pope Martin V and the Council of Constance of heresy (as will be explained below)."

I will now show that it is actually Peter and his apostate brother, Michael Dimond, who are radical idolaters, heretics, and schismatics lacking the faith.

Firstly, the title of Peter's article is heretical. He denies the dogma that the Incarnation took place in the two natures of Christ in which the divine nature of Christ took on a human nature; in which the divine person of Christ took on a human nature:

Athanasian Creed: "But it is necessary for eternal salvation that he faithfully believe also the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. Accordingly it is the right faith that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God is God and man... Although he is God and man, yet he is not two, but he is one Christ; one, however, not by the conversion of the Divinity into a human body, but by the assumption of humanity in the Godhead; one absolutely not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person."

Peter denies this dogma. He says, *The Incarnation Took Place In The Person, Not In The Natures*. Hence Peter separates the two natures of the incarnate Christ from the person of Christ.

Peter Dimond attempts to refute RJMI's condemnation of Antipope Martin V and his heretical robbers-council at Constance. This council condemns the following orthodox proposition:

Invalid and heretical *Council of Constance*, Session 15, 1415: "Condemned proposition 4: Two natures, divinity and humanity, are one Christ." (D. 630)

It is a dogma that the Incarnate Jesus Christ has two natures, a divine nature and a human nature. And it is also a dogma that the Incarnate Jesus Christ is one divine person. Hence, the incarnate Jesus Christ's "two natures, divinity and humanity, are one Christ," are in one divine person. Hence Constance condemns this dogma. This dogma is stated in the Athanasian Creed:

Athanasian Creed, 4th century: "For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one Man, so God and Man is one Christ."

In an attempt to defend Constance's heresy, the apostate Peter Dimond gives a meaning to the words that does not exist:

Apostate Peter Dimond, *The Incarnation Took Place In The Person, Not In The Natures*: "Eutyches held that there was a mixing or fusion of the divine and human natures in Christ. But the Church has proclaimed that the divine and human natures were united without mingling or confusion in the one divine person of the Word... This [John Hus' proposition] was correctly condemned by the Church because even though Our Lord Jesus Christ has two natures, the one Christ is not simply a fusion of those natures..."

It seems to me that Peter cannot read a simple text or is a bold liar. Nowhere does the condemned proposition state that Christ is a fusion of two natures. If the robbers-council wanted to condemn the heresy of Eutychianism, it could have worded it this way:

“Divinity and humanity, are the one nature of Christ”; or “Two natures, divinity and humanity, are fused together in the one Christ.”

Christ is one divine person with two natures. Eutychianites and Monophysites both deny that Christ has two natures, rather they held the blasphemous heresy that the incarnate Christ only has only one nature:

Nominal *Catholic Encyclopedia*: “It seems best to use the words indifferently, as no party of the sect looked to Eutychius as a founder or a leader and Eutychian is but a nickname for all those who, like Eutyches, rejected the orthodox expression ‘two natures’ of Christ. The tenet ‘one nature’ was common to all Monophysites and Eutychians...”

So the expression “Two natures are one Christ” is not Eutychianism since they don’t even acknowledge the two natures of Christ. So much for Peter’s canard! But it gets worse since Peter apparently didn’t even research what John Hus allegedly wrote:

John Hus, *De Ecclesia*, translated by David S Schaff: “[Chapter IV] No one of the apostles ever presumed to claim that he was the head or the bridegroom of the Church... And so Christ is the outward head of every particular church and of the universal church by virtue of his divinity, and he is the inward head of the universal church by virtue of his humanity; and these **two natures, divinity and humanity, are one Christ.**”

While Hus was writing some very strange stuff, the robbers-council instead merely condemned an orthodox snippet of his whole chapter. Did authors of this condemnation even peer-review the draft? It should be also noted that John Hus in his writings, acknowledged that Christ had two natures that did not fuse:

John Hus, *De Ecclesia*, translated by David S Schaff: “[Chapter XVII] Hence Christ, who was of a twofold nature, was obedient in a twofold sense...’

Peter didn’t even address the other charges RJMI made against Antipope Martin V! For example, apostate Antipope Martin V held the following heresies:

- The heresies of conciliarism and collegiality, as taught in the heretical Council of Constance.
- The heresy, in his infamous *Ad Evitandi Scandala*, that Catholics are allowed to be in religious communion with major excommunicates (such as formal heretics) as long as the excommunicates have not been sentenced by a judge.
- The idolatry of Hellenizing Christianity.

For information regarding these previous listed heresies, see RJMI book *Non-Catholics Cannot Hold Offices in the Catholic Church: Apostate Antipope Martin V (1417-1431)*.

- The heresy that Christ’s soul is in the Holy Eucharist and the heresy that Christ’s body and blood are in each species, as taught in the heretical Council of Constance. (For these heresies, see RJMI book *Some Dogmas and Heresies regarding Confirmation and the Holy Eucharist: Invalid and heretical Council of Constance (15th century)*).

Hence, here is yet another reason why people should not follow these apostates Dimonds and how the Devil uses them as a deception. And the apostate Dimonds hold many more heresies. Yet Peter has the audacity to say the following, which actually applies to him and his brother:

Apostate Peter Dimond, *The Incarnation Took Place In The Person, Not In The Natures*: “It’s another example of why people should not follow such radical schismatics and how the Devil uses them as a deception.”

Lastly, Peter censoring Richard Ibranyi’s name as “R.I.” is cowardly and unfair. He does not want the readers to know who R.I. is and thus what he actually teaches and his many condemnations of Peter and his apostate brother, Michael Dimond. However, it could actually backfire because that can make the reader more curious to search out who R.I. is by copying-pasting “R.I.’s” quotes in a search engine and find out his true identity.

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: 7/2023; Current version: 7/2023

Mary’s Little Remnant

302 East Joffre St.

Truth or Consequences, New Mexico 87901-2878, USA

Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us