

Epikeia Debate

RJMI, Fr. Egregyi, and Patrick Henry's Debate
On
Epikeia and Preaching, Teaching, Confessions, Episcopal Ordinations and
Abjurations



R. J. M. I.

by
The Precious Blood of Jesus Christ,
The Grace of the God of the Holy Catholic Church,
The Mediation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Our Lady of Good Counsel & Crusher of
Heretics,
The Protection of Saint Joseph, Patriarch of the Holy Family,
The Intercession of Saint Michael the Archangel,
and
Cooperation
of

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi
To Jesus Through Mary

*Judica me Deus, et discerne causam meam de gente non sancta: ab homine iniquo et
doloso erue me.*

Soli Deo Gloria

Original version: 8/2000; Current version: 10/2009

Mary's Little Remnant

302 East Joffre St.

TorC, NM 87901-2878

Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us

(Send for a free catalog)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction and Crimes of Patrick Henry	5
Part One – Initial Letters (Questions And Answers).....	10
RJMI's original letter to Fr. Egregyi, a copy was sent to Patrick Henry 1/31/2000.....	10
<i>Teaching:</i>	10
<i>Preaching:</i>	10
<i>Confessions:</i>	11
<i>Episcopal Consecrations & Ordinations:</i>	12
<i>Conversions:</i>	12
<i>The Abjuration, Lifting of Censures, and Absolution from Sins:</i>	13
Patrick Henry's Response Received on 2/8/2000	16
RJMI's Response to Patrick Henry 2/8/2000	16
Patrick Henry's Response to RJMI 2/11/2000	17
RJMI Response to Patrick Henry 2/17/2000	19
<i>Definition of Epikeia</i>	23
Response from Patrick Henry to RJMI 3/4/2000.....	25
Response by Richard Ibranyi 3/8/2000.....	26
<i>Episcopal Consecrations and Public Preaching and Teaching</i>	27
Part Two – Main Discourse.....	29
Epikeia for Private and Public Abjurations without a Bishop or Priest	29
Patrick's Contradiction: He is inside and outside the Catholic Church.	30
Epikeia and the laws on public teaching.....	31
Patrick's Schismatic Interpretation of Holy Scripture that disobeys Church Law	32
Epikeia and jurisdiction for a Catholic priest in prison to hear confessions.	35
Patrick denies the need/use of epikeia	36
The two witnesses of the Book of the Apocalypse	39
Laymen and supplied jurisdiction.....	40
Patrick uses a singular dissenting theologian, out of context, as authoritative source.....	41
Aequitas and Epikeia, and External/Internal Forum Discourse:	44
<i>First Case of Aequitas: Does not Involve Epikeia.</i>	45
<i>Second Case of Aequitas: Does Involve Epikeia</i>	46
<i>External and Internal Forum of Law vs. Conscience (the soul)</i>	47
<i>Practical Application:</i>	49
Supplied Jurisdiction from the Church	52
<i>Parallel Laws Defending Necessity of Abjuration before Lay Witnesses</i>	55
Does there always have to be a Catholic pope or bishop alive at all times?.....	56
<i>Patrick heretically teaches the primary apostolic mark, the Papacy, has defected</i>	60
Patrick condemns Fr. Egregyi for functioning as a priest without jurisdiction	67
<i>Patrick took abjurations contrary to Church law and denies the use of epikeia</i>	69
Patrick, quoting out of context, denies use of epikeia for ordinations	69
Patrick denies the necessity of a specific abjuration from the Great Apostasy.....	71
Epikeia does not change or in the strict senses correct a law	75
<i>Episcopal Consecrations and Ordinations</i>	76
Disunity is not due to Epikeia.....	77
Patrick denies the most basic definition of Epikeia	79
<i>Definitions of Epikeia</i>	79
Epikeia does not invalidate a law, but only exempts from the law	82
Patrick denies a basic principle of Epikeia	83
Epikeia also applies to human invalidating laws	83
<i>Definitions of Epikeia (Human invalidating laws)</i>	84
<i>On Marriage and the Tametsi Decree of Trent</i>	87
Abjurations for those who know they must; a perfect act of contrition suffices until	88
<i>Responsibility and Culpability</i>	88
Abjurations can, and have changed	94

Private Abjurations that are not in writing cannot be proved	96
<i>The case of Fr. Egregyi</i>	96
Epikēia applies to specific abjurations from the Great Apostasy	99
<i>Specific Abjurations demanded for fallen away Catholics; non-specific form for others.</i>	99
<i>The Japanese Catholics and other Common Sense examples</i>	100
The validity of the SSPX priesthood and a draft copy versus the final copy	103
Does Fr. Egregyi and Richard J. M. Ibranyi agree?.....	105
Epikēia cannot give a bishop an office (ordinary jurisdiction)	106
Popes have not always chose and appointed Bishops.....	107
<i>Bishops cannot be appointed if it is contrary to the will of the pope</i>	108
Fr. Egregyi, confession, and proof of his abjuration.....	109
<i>Fr. Egregyi and culpability</i>	110
RJ MI's amended position. Epikēia allows for the public teaching of the faith	111
<i>Patrick cannot be justified to publically teach because he denies epikēia</i>	111
Patrick takes RJMI out of context: Epikēia and non-Catholics	112
A Perfect Act of Contrition must be accompanied with a promise to do as the Church demands	113
Patrick denies the Dogma "No Salvation Outside the Catholic Church"	115
<i>Misinterprets the events of Noe's Ark as it relates to Bull Unam Sanctum</i>	115
Patrick's contradictions; inside/outside the Church; bishops/laymen teaching	122
<i>On true and false prophets (teachers)</i>	122
Patrick abuses God's mercy	125
<i>Patrick is akin to an impotent general; promotes inaction and quietism.</i>	125
Conclusion and the verdict awaits Fr. Egregyi's answers	127

Introduction and Crimes of Patrick Henry

Abbreviations of Books:

HNUE - Fr. Lawrence Joseph Riley, A.B. S.T.L., “*The History, Nature, & Use of Epikeia in Moral Theology*,” Imprimatur +Ricardus Jacobus Cushing D.D., May 7, 1948, The Catholic University of America Press.

TRC – Rev. Joseph G. Goodwine, A.B., S.T.B., J.C.L., *The Reception of Converts*, A Dissertation, Imprimatur +Franciscus J. Spellman, D.D., May 31, 1944, The Catholic University of America Press.

Introduction

Introduction: 7-2025

As of January 2014, I have discovered conclusive evidence that all the so-called popes and cardinals from Innocent II (1130-1143) onward have been idolaters or formal heretics and thus were apostate antipopes and apostate anticardinals. Also all of the theologians and canon lawyers from 1250 onward have been apostates. (See RJMI article and audio “No Popes or Cardinals since 1130.”) Hence all their teachings, laws, judgments, and other acts are null and void. Therefore, all of the ecumenical councils, canon laws, and other acts from Apostate Antipope Innocent II onward are null and void.

In my works before January 2014, I may have referred to these apostate antipopes as popes and to their councils, canon laws, and other acts as valid. Until I correct these works, keep in mind that these so-called popes are actually apostate antipopes and all their acts are null and void. However, the teachings, laws, and judgments of the apostate antipopes, invalid ecumenical councils, and invalid canon laws can nevertheless be useful to quote if they reflect dogmas, good laws, or good judgments or show how corrupt some of their teachings, laws, or judgments were. (See my article [On RJMI Works](#).)

Introduction: 1-2004

This debate took place four years ago. The information in it may be helpful to those who have been confused by Jurisdictional Pharisees, as I was at one time. However, you can learn all you need to know about *Epikeia* (exemptions from the letter of laws that do not deal with faith or morals) in emergency situations in my books [Exemptions to the Law](#) and [Epikeia Controversy](#) without undue confusion. The teachings in that book are laid out simply and clearly without the confusing twists of Jurisdictional Pharisees that you will see if you choose to read this debate.

All you need to know about exemptions from the letter of laws that do not deal with faith or morals is summed up in the following statement: If a bishop or priest is truly Catholic in word and deed, then he can function as such even though he does not have access to legitimate Church authorities to receive jurisdiction from them. Instead, the Church supplies him with the jurisdiction. A future pope would never condemn any truly Catholic bishop or Catholic priest for doing what he can to spread the faith and help save souls. The future pope will judge all these bishops and priests in light of the faith, whether they were or are Catholic or not. That means Catholic bishops can legally consecrate Catholic bishops, legally ordain Catholic priests, legally confirm Catholics, etc. That means Catholic priests can legally hear confessions of Catholics, legally offer Mass to Catholics, legally give them Holy Communion, and legally preach sermons and teach the faith, etc.

Soli Deo Gloria
Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi
“To Jesus through Mary”

Introduction: 8/2000:

This debate is not necessary for your average laymen to read, unless false teachers have led them astray. A layman, if he is of good will, using common sense alone, will not question the truth when it is presented to them. He will instinctually know the truth that is confirmed in the teachings and practice of the Catholic Church, and not need to delve deeply into theology. Such is our faith, that even a simple child can understand it. All those who have been confused and led astray by Patrick's teachings, or any other false teachings, deserve to be led astray because they have lost common sense. Patrick Henry is an operation of error sent to those who have lost common sense. Most laymen have lost the faith because they do not put forward any real persevering effort to learn the Catholic faith, and therefore they have been confounded because of their own sloth and other vices. Culpable ignorance is a sin, in and of itself, whereas, invincible ignorance of the things one must know to save his soul, is not a sin in and of itself, but is a curse that God allows due to other sins that a person is guilty of, and invincible ignorance cannot give a man what he needs in order to be saved—the faith.

This debate is primarily presented to all those in these days of the great apostasy who put themselves forward as teachers of the Catholic faith, and for those who have been confused and led astray by Patrick Henry and his like. Yes, it is a must for these people to read! A great responsibility rests upon a man who puts himself forward as a teacher of the Catholic faith. Those who have been confused by Patrick's false teachings are culpable. Their confusion is a punishment for their own sins and lack of common sense.

Another reason for presenting this debate is to assist those men whom God will choose to set things right among Catholics. It is my hope that this work will be of great assistance to the future pope and Catholic bishops whose immense task it will be to set things right, to judge rightly in these most complicated matters. It has never been easy for the pope and Catholic bishops to rule the Church, especially in the times of great crisis, as were the days when antipopes ruled in Rome, such as Anacletus II who ruled in Rome for eight years and the true Pope, Innocent II, had to set things right after this Anacletus died, as also in the days of the Western Schism, when Pope Martin V had to set things right among three opposing parties. None of these crises in the past compares to the great apostasy. The great apostasy is unique in its monstrous nature and is the ultimate affliction that God has allowed, as prophesied would happen, as a punishment for the crimes of bad Catholics who have been lazy, slothful in learning the faith, and disobedient to popes, bishops, and priests, and steeped in sins of immorality well before the robber's Second Vatican Council. Even more so demanding will the task be for the future pope and prelates who must set things right in the midst and aftermath of the great apostasy.

Patrick Henry:

Patrick Henry holds the sedevacante position (the Holy See is vacant) and was a member, a "priest," of the CMRI sect under Bishop Francis Schuckardt. He no longer functions as a CMRI "priest" and has abjured from this entity. He rightly doubts the validity of this sect's Holy Orders and that is one of the reasons he no longer functions as a "priest." The other reason is that since his departure from the CMRI he no longer believes that anyone can function as a priest by the principle of epikeia. Therefore, Patrick teaches that the only Catholic priest that can function as a priest is one that is under a Catholic bishop who was consecrated and given ordinary jurisdiction (a territory) from the time of Pope Pius XII or before, and must also have never adhered to the Conciliar Church, and that the priests that are under this bishop can only function in the diocese (territory) in which he has delegated jurisdiction from the bishop. Patrick Henry schismatically denies that the principle of epikeia is needed in the days of the great apostasy and he denies its use altogether, which is contrary to the constant teaching and practice of the Church. Therefore, Patrick Henry denies that epikeia can justify the election of a pope, Episcopal consecrations and priestly ordinations, the preaching of sermons, the hearing of confessions, and if he is to be consistent that should also include the public teaching of the Catholic faith, which is one of the areas in which he proves to be hypocritical, because he is publicly teaching the Catholic faith without being approved by a Catholic authority. Patrick Henry condemns the Thuc, Kelly, and the CMRI sects as non-Catholic entities, along with all the entities in communion with the Conciliar Church, which includes the Society of Saint Pius X which he also publicly teaches has an invalid priesthood (they are not priests), which is a mortal sin of presumption that is not based upon a positive objective doubt.

Fr. Egregyi:

Fr. Egregyi is a Hungarian priest who resides in Belgium that holds the sedevacante position. He received his orders from the Society of Saint Pius X, which he abjured from along with the Conciliar Church. It seems that Fr. Egregyi never personally adhered to the heresies of the Conciliar Church, but nevertheless he did abjure from the Society of Saint Pius X. He functions as a priest by offering the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, hearing confessions, and teaching, but he does not believe he can preach a sermon during Mass, and he does not believe that Episcopal consecrations and priestly ordinations can take place until the See of Peter is occupied (under the next pope). Fr. Egregyi requires abjurations from all those who have been culpably associated with the Conciliar Church and other non-Catholic sects such as the Thucytes, Kellyites, and CMRI, along with every group in communion with the Conciliar Church, which includes the Society of Saint Pius X, whose priesthood, he teaches, is valid but not legal. Fr. Egregyi does not deny the principle or need of epikeia but he does not seem to apply to anything, especially in areas that apply to him. If Fr. Egregyi does not emend his position by admitting that the principle of epikeia is what justifies his hearing of the confessions of those who are not in danger of death, which means he would have to emend his position and allow for the preaching of sermons, and Episcopal Consecrations and priestly ordinations by a Catholic bishop, then he too, would fall under the same condemnation of Patrick Henry.

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi (RJMI):

RJMI are the initials of my name, Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi. I hold the sedevacante position and support the principle of epikeia in these emergency days of the great apostasy and teach that it is absolutely necessary in order for Catholics to save their souls in these days. I, according to the teachings of the Catholic Church, condemn the Thucytes, Kellyites, and the CMRI as non-Catholic entities, along with all the groups in direct communion with the Conciliar Church, which includes the Society of Saint Pius X, whose priesthood is illegal but is valid—to publicly teach that it is invalid is a mortal sin. I also teach that the Church demands specific abjurations for falling away Catholics. I also teach that the Church allows, by the principle of epikeia, a Catholic priest to hear the confessions of penitents who are not in danger of death; it allows a Catholic priest or layman to publically teach the faith; it allows a Catholic priest to preach a sermon, and it allows a Catholic bishop to consecrate other bishops and ordain priests.

During the course of this debate I have made a correction, regarding jurisdiction being supplied to laymen (See: Part Two: RJMI Response 11.1). And I have amended my justification for publically teaching the Catholic faith, which is by the principle of epikeia, and not, as I have previously taught, by Pope Leo XIII's *Sapientiae Christianae*, or Canon 1325.1's obligation to profess the faith that applies to the private teaching of the faith and not to the public teaching of the faith without being authorized by a Catholic authority. (See: Part Two: RJMI Response 66.1).

The Crimes of Patrick Henry—A True Pharisee

1) He denies the use of epikeia and this is a sin of schism because Jesus Christ and His Church has always taught, and Her children have put into practice, the use of epikeia. The denial of the use of epikeia can also cause a man to sin by not using epikeia when it must be used. You will learn that Patrick is guilty on both of these counts. (See: Patrick Comment: 9)

2) Because he denies the use of epikeia he teaches the Papacy itself has defected by saying that it is not possible for the Catholic Church to have another pope. Patrick teaches that the Church has defected in Her primary apostolic mark in that it is no longer possible to have a pope, the chief and head of all the apostles (the bishops). This is a sin against the faith that labels Patrick a heretic for violating the First Vatican Council's decree that the Holy See of Peter will have perpetual successors until of the end of time. (See: RJMI Response: 20.1)

3) Because he denies the use of epikeia his censure cannot be lifted that he incurred when he was associated with the CMRI. The letter of the law (canon 2314.2) teaches that abjurations to lift censures must be taken before the local Ordinary or his delegate and in both cases before two witnesses. Patrick admits he abjured privately, and then another time, because he must of not been sure that his private abjurations was acceptable, abjured before lay witnesses, and in both cases this is a violation of canon 2314.2, because he did not do so before the local Ordinary or his delegate and at least two witnesses. (See: RJMI Response: 32.1)

4) Because he denies the use of epikeia he teaches that a Catholic must violate and disobey the Church's laws in order to publically teach the Catholic faith. He teaches that a Catholic cannot legally baptize his infant or a convert who is not in danger of death because they do not have access to a Catholic priest who is under a Catholic bishop with ordinary jurisdiction from the time of Pope Pius XII, which means the bishop and priest must still be in the territory (diocese) in which they were assigned in order to function as a bishop and priest (See: RJMI Response: 48.1).

5) Because he denies the use of epikeia he has misinterpreted Holy Scripture by using the Bible alone (sola-scriptura) as do Protestants, to go contrary to the Catholic Church's teachings regarding the public teaching of the Catholic faith. He uses 1Peter 3:15—"*Being ready always to satisfy everyone that asketh you a reason of that hope which is in you*"—to justify his public teaching of the Catholic faith without approval from a Catholic bishop. (See: Patrick Comment: 6)

6) He contradicts himself in that he is publicly teaching the Catholic faith without the approval of a Catholic bishop, and he is writing books and making tapes without imprimaturs that Church law teaches he must have (c. 1385). Therefore by him denying the use of epikeia he cannot be exempted from these Church laws and is guilty of violating them and this is an act of schism, of disobedience and total disregard for the Church's laws. (See: Comments and Responses 4 to 9)

7) Because he denies the use of epikeia he teaches that a non-Catholic bishop or priest who repents and converts cannot function as a Catholic bishop and priest in order to help save souls. This is a merciless teaching that deprives the flock of a spiritual good that will help save their souls—the salvation of souls being the highest good. Worse even, he teaches that if there was a Catholic priest who never lost the faith he could still not function as a priest unless he was under a Catholic bishop with ordinary jurisdiction from the time of Pope Pius XII. Which means the bishop and priest must still be in the territory (diocese) in which they were assigned in order to function as a bishop and priest. (See: Patrick Henry Comments 40, 41, 73))

8) Because he denies the use of epikeia there is no way for a baptized non-Catholic to re-enter the Catholic Church by abjuration, be it private or public. He contradicts himself on all these points in that he will say on one hand a Catholic can re-enter the Catholic Church by an abjuration, but because he denies the use of epikeia that would make such an abjuration illegal and invalid, because the Church law specifically states abjuration must be taken before a Catholic bishop or his delegate, and two witnesses. Unless epikeia is

evoked there is no other way to re-enter the Catholic Church. He also denies the Church teaching that demands a specific abjuration for fallen away Catholics, which common sense dictates is a must. (See: Patrick Comment: 1)

9) He teaches the heresy that one can belong to the Catholic Church in the internal forum, while being outside the Catholic Church in the external forum. He teaches in one place that he is inside the Church and in another that he is outside the Church—that he does not belong to Her in the external forum. (See: 3, 14 # in out of Church. (See: Patrick Henry Comments 3, 14, 72)

10) He also holds heresy of salvation by an implicit faith that teaches a man can be saved without explicit faith in the Incarnation and the Most Holy Trinity, and that Protestants and schismatics can be saved, by belonging to the soul of the Church without belonging to Her body. (See: Patrick Comment: 70)

11) He commits a mortal sin by publically teaching that the non-Catholic Society of St. Pius X priesthood is invalid, because he does not have positive evidence that proves that Leinhart at the time he ordained Lefebvre as a priest and consecrated him as a bishop, did not intend to do so. The proof that is needed to make such an accusation requires a verbal or written statement on the part of Lienhart that he does not intend to ordain or consecrate, either previous to, or during the ceremony. Whether or not Lienhart was a secret member of the Masons has no bearing on legality or validity of Lefebvre's ordination and consecration. (See: Patrick Comment: 54)

12) His denial of the need for a specific public abjuration for falling away Catholics in these days of the Great Apostasy is highly offensive to God who demands a specific abjuration of the not just each and every apostate, heretical, and idolatrous teaching, but also a condemnation of the apostates, heretics, and idolaters. God's glory and justice demands this!!! His denial also promotes schism and makes unity among all Catholics impossible, and is contrary to the Church teachings that demand specific public abjurations for falling away Catholics. He deceptively tries to use the non-specific *Form of Receiving a Convert* for abjurations that, as you will learn, is only intended to be used for non-Catholic converts, such as Protestants and schismatics, who were never Catholic any time in their life previous to their conversion. (See: Patrick Henry Comments 37, 72)

Part One – Initial Letters (Questions And Answers)

RJMI's original letter to Fr. Egregyi, a copy was sent to Patrick Henry 1/31/2000

R. J. M. I.

✘ ✘ ✘

J.M.J.

January 31, 2000
St. John Bosco – Ora pro nobis!

Dear Fr. Egregyi,

The Achille Lienart Affair:

I believe the SSPX priesthood is valid. You are right, in that some have presented corrupted evidence to try and support their case against the invalidity of the SSPX priesthood. Most of these wish with a vengeance that the SSPX priests are invalid. They have gone too far. I believe that the SSPX priesthood is valid, and even if some have doubts, they are not positive objective doubts and they have no right to say the SSPX priests are invalid or they sin. It is clear from Church teaching, that unless some defect manifested itself in the external rite of ordination, or the bishop had made a public statement to the effect that he did not intend to consecrate or ordain, then no one can question the validity of the ordinations.

Preaching Sermons, Teaching, Confessions, and Episcopal Consecrations:

Father, the reason it is important to resolve this issue. When other priests convert, and believe they can preach sermons, that would represent a problem for you. This would cause a division, a schism. I am not saying you are wrong to avoid priests whom you believe are in heresy or schism, and that is why the issue has to be resolved according to the truth, the facts.

Teaching:

The article you sent me about preaching sermons is excellent. It surely tells us why Protestants have no authority to preach. This mission, being sent by proper Church authorities, also extends to written or oral teachings, such as catechisms, catechism classes, or any book or oral teaching that attempts to put forward the Catholic position.

Protestants have no right to preach, teach, or write books regarding the faith. Catholics must be authorized not just to preach but also to teach, and write books or tracts. All articles or books that are written by a Catholic, in normal times, must have the approval of an Ordinary, and if a religious he also needs the approval of his superior.

1917 Code of Canon Law: “c. 1385 1. Without previous ecclesiastical approval, even laymen are not allowed to publish: (1) the books of Sacred Scripture, or annotations and commentaries on the same: (2) books treating of Sacred Scripture, theology, church history, canon law, natural theology, ethics, or other religious or moral sciences... c. 1385 2. The permission to publish books... in this Canon may be given either by proper local Ordinary of the author, or by the local Ordinary of the place where the books... are published, or the local Ordinary of the place where they are printed... Religious authors must also obtain the permission of their major superior before publication.”

Preaching:

This is the law that bans preaching without being sent by proper Church authorities:

1917 Code of Canon Law: “c. 1328. Nobody is allowed to exercise the ministry of preaching, unless he has received a commission from the legitimate superior, either by special faculty or by appointment to an office to which the duty of preaching is attached by the Sacred Canons.”

You can see there is no difference between the ban from preaching and teaching without approval of proper Church authorities. Both cases deal with the divine law because it deals with the teaching of the Catholic faith and morals; this is what is conveyed to the listener, whether by preaching or teaching, the principle is the same. To appeal for an exemption by the use of *epikeia* for one, would automatically include the other. Pope Gregory XVI makes this clear.

Pope Gregory XVI, *Mirrari Vos*: “8. ...Nor may the priests ever forget that they are forbidden by ancient canons to undertake ministry and to assume the tasks of teaching and preaching ‘without the permission of their bishop to whom the people have been entrusted; an accounting for the souls of the people will be demanded from the bishop’. Finally let them understand that all those who struggle against this established order disturb the position of the Church.”

Confessions:

This is the law that bans the hearing of confession unless one is sent by proper Church authorities:

1917 Code of Canon Law: “c. 872. For the valid absolution of sins, the minister requires, besides the power of Orders, either ordinary or delegated power of jurisdiction over the penitent.”

“c. 2366. Giving Absolution Beyond Jurisdiction “A priest who presumes to hear sacramental confessions without the required jurisdiction is ipso facto suspended a divinis...”

We will now compare the preaching of sermons to the hearing of confessions. The article you sent, “*Unless They Be Sent*,” proves that confessions and preaching sermons come under the same category. I quote from the book:

“The disciples, therefore, on the commission and by the example of the Master preach only as sent... by the mission the preacher is united to Christ. Confession heard without the necessary jurisdiction cannot lead to valid absolution. So, too, preaching without the necessary jurisdiction, which is conferred by the mission, is invalid. “Preaching and hearing confession are dependant upon both jurisdiction and orders.”¹

““Monks” who presuming on their sanctity, by their own volition usurp the office of ministers of the Church, namely by absolving sinners and by preaching without the authority of the bishop, which is in no wise permissible to them”²

If *epikeia* exempts a Catholic from the need of faculties and delegated jurisdiction from a bishop for hearing confessions in this emergency situation, then surely the same applies to the preaching sermons. The use of *epikeia* draws supplied jurisdiction directly from the Church and the Church delegates this jurisdiction to the bishop or priest.

Clearly, we see the hearing of confessions falls into the same category as preaching sermons. No canonical law directly allows for the hearing of confessions in this emergency situation. Canon 882 does not apply.

¹ Augustine Rock, O.P., S.T.D., M.A., “*Unless They Be Sent*,” Blackriars Publications, London, 1955, p 113.

² *Ibid.*, p. 121-122

1917 Code of Canon Law: “c. 882 In danger of death all priests, though not approved for confessions, can validly and licitly absolve any penitent from any sins and censures, although reserved and notorious...”

The letter-of-the-law of canon 882 says that priests can hear confession without faculties or delegated jurisdiction from an ordinary only if the penitent is “in danger of death.” If you disregard the phrase “in danger of death” you would be appealing to epikeia to be exempted from this necessary condition as specified by the letter of this law, and therefore canon 882 cannot be used. However, this canon does prove that legal and valid confessions can be heard without supplied jurisdiction from an Ordinary, and that this jurisdiction, which is necessary, is supplied directly by the Church and delegated to the priest who has no faculties for the confession, for one who is in danger of death.

As a matter of fact no canon law can be used to support the hearing of confessions or the preaching of sermons in these days of emergency and this is why we have a clear case of the use of epikeia (an exemption from the law) for a Catholic priest to hear confessions and preach sermons.

Canon law had not foreseen the extent of the great apostasy we are now living through. A Catholic priest, in these days of emergency, must appeal to epikeia in order to justify his legal and valid hearing of confessions, from his flock that are not in danger of death.

The exact same principle applies to the preaching of sermons, which you must admit comes under the same conditions as hearing confessions. One cannot say the hearing of confessions is less important than the preaching of sermons, and if one can be exempted from the law to hear confessions, one can be exempted from the law for preaching sermons, writing books without imprimaturs, or simply teaching the Catholic faith.

Episcopal Consecrations & Ordinations:

Code of Canon Law 1917: “c. 953. Episcopal consecration is reserved to the Roman Pontiff; hence, no Bishop is allowed to consecrate another Bishop unless he is certain that he has a papal mandate.... This requirement is for the licitness of the consecration, not for its validity.” “c. 2370. The bishop who, contrary to canon 953, confers Episcopal consecration and the assistant bishops or the priest taking their place, as well as the one who receives Episcopal consecration without having obtained an Apostolic Mandate are suspended ipso jure until the Holy See has granted a dispensation.”

Pope Pius XII, *Ad Apostolorum Principis*, June 29, 1958: “47. ...No person or group, whether of priests or of laymen, can claim the right of nominating bishops; that no one can lawfully confer Episcopal consecration unless he has received the mandate of the Apostolic See. 48. Consequently, if consecration of this kind is being done contrary to all right and law, and by this crime the unity of the Church is being seriously attacked, and excommunication reserved *specialissimo modo* to the Apostolic See has been established which is automatically incurred by the consecrator and by anyone who has received consecration irresponsibly conferred.”

Epikeia also applies to Episcopal consecrations and priestly ordinations as I have written about in “*Book Two*.” In order for a Catholic bishop to consecrate and ordain in these days of emergency he is appealing to epikeia to be exempted from the letter of the law as stated in Pope Pius XII’s “*Ad Apostolorum Principis*.” I know what the letter of the law says regarding this document, just as what the letter of the law teaches regarding hearing confessions, teaching, and preaching sermons and epikeia applies in all cases, provided the one who uses it is Catholic. A non-Catholic cannot apply to any of the Church laws, let alone epikeia. Simply put, the next pope will never condemn a Catholic bishop or priest for doing whatever he can to preserve the apostolic marks or the Church (the Episcopacy), the sacraments (the priesthood, and the faith by preaching and teaching. Of course this is all based upon the fact that the bishop or priest is Catholic, not just in word, but also in deed. The next pope would bless and confirm all Catholic bishops and priests who did whatever they could to maintain all the Marks of the Church. How could he do anything else?

Conversions:

We must be prepared to accept converts from the Conciliar Church and from those who hold the *sede-vacante* position, but are not Catholic due to either their illegal consecrations and ordinations, or their not holding or practicing the full deposit of the Catholic faith. God is merciful; He does forgive.

Father, God has forgiven you for your association with the Society of St. Pius X, and He approves of you carrying out your priestly duties as a form of penance. I know we cannot be easy on converts, and I believe that the hard penance for such converts is precisely to function as Catholic bishops and priests in these days of the great apostasy. This is truly a hard and monumental task that would require a great effort and sacrifice of their time, patience, and all the virtues. They would then be able to go about making right what they have made wrong for so many years.

If the Church was living through normal times, it would be no excessive burden from them to function as Catholic bishops and priests and would even be a relief due to the more comfortable position of the Church in more normal times when all Her structures are intact, and therefore a penance that deprives them of functioning as bishops or priests for some specified time would be just. But not in these days, it must be demanded of them, as their penance, to function as Catholic bishops and priests and gird themselves for the great sacrifices and persecutions that will follow, and to be prepared to shed their blood for the Catholic faith in expiation for their sins.

The Abjuration, Lifting of Censures, and Absolution from Sins:

Father, what I have said above applies to the taking of an abjuration, and the lifting of a penitents censures in the external forum, before he can go to confession and have his sins forgiven in the internal forum. This can be accomplished without a pope, bishop or priest, if a pope, bishop or priest is not available, in these days of emergency, provided the penitent has a firm purpose to go before a the pope if necessary, or a Catholic bishop or priest the first opportunity. Father, you were lifted of your censures, without following the letter of the law. What priest did you take an abjuration and profession of faith before, and have your censures lifted by his absolution? The letter of the law requires the following:

The Holy Office, 1859: "...Henceforth, then, the abjuration of heresy and the profession of faith would have to be made in the presence of the bishop, or his delegate, and of two witnesses besides."³

The simple rule is that a man must keep as much of the law that he is exempted from, as possible. According to the above law from the Holy Office regarding excommunications reserved to the local ordinary, the abjuration and lifting of censures must be done before a bishop, or his delegate and two witnesses. If it is impossible to approach a Catholic bishop or his delegate and two witnesses, then *epikeia* would apply and a Catholic priest must then be sought. If a Catholic priest cannot be foreseeably approached within a six-month period of time, which is known as a "long duration," then the penitent would then take the abjuration before two witnesses. An article from the Catholic Encyclopedia explains this duration.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, "Excommunications," 1907: "They distinguished between obstacles that were more or less prolonged: perpetual obstacles were such as exceed five years; obstacles of long duration were those lasting over six months; and obstacles of short duration, those continuing for less than six months. When the obstacle was perpetual the bishop or, if he could not be reached, any priest might absolve without appealing to the superior; this could also be done, but not without obligation of recourse to the superior on the cessation of the obstacle, when the latter was of long duration, provided there were urgency."

The situation a penitent finds himself in these times of emergency regarding the access to a pope, or a Catholic bishop, and in most cases a Catholic priest, is an obstacle of "perpetual duration." The article goes on to explain what qualifies for an urgent case.

Ibid: "As to what constitutes a state of urgency, the reply of 16 June, 1897, is very reassuring, since it permits absolution from censures 'as soon as it becomes too distressing to the penitent to

³ Rescript of the *Holy Office*, July 20, 1859, to the Bishop of Philadelphia

remain in the state of sin during the time necessary for soliciting and receiving from Rome the power to absolve’.”

Ibid: “The (2) Urgent Cases - In the chapter "Nuper" (xxix, de sent. excomm., lib. V, tit. xxxix), Innocent III sets forth the principle that governs such cases: "When it is difficult for the excommunicated person to go to him who excommunicated him, he may be absolved by his bishop or even by his own priest, on promising to obey the orders of him by whom excommunication was pronounced." This is the principle that moralists and canonists formulated as an axiom: *Impedito casus papalis fit episcopalis*: in case of one who is prevented from presenting himself to the pope, the excommunication reserved to the pope may be removed by the bishop. But most authors carried the analogy still further: for him who is prevented from presenting himself to the bishop, the excommunication may be removed by any confessor...”

Now there is no doubt this principle could even be carried further if a Catholic priest was not available in that lay witnesses may be approached and if that’s impossible, it can be done privately. The principle is the same in that God would never allow a repentant man to languish in damnation due to lack of a Catholic bishop or priest, or lay witnesses. If only one witness can be found, then he takes the abjuration and profession of faith before one witness, and in the extreme case, if the penitent should find himself all alone on an island, then he would take the abjuration privately, between him and God.

A baptized man cannot have his sins forgiven unless he is inside the Catholic Church. Therefore, he would be able to make the abjuration and profession of faith in front of lay witnesses, or privately if he is alone and have his censures lifted, if he cannot get to a Catholic bishop or priest, provided he promises to go before a Catholic bishop or priest the first available opportunity.

The cases in which the penitent is in danger of death teach that the necessary jurisdiction that a priest needs in normal times can be supplied to a priest by the Church, even though he is not sent, does not have faculties from the proper Church authorities.

Ibid: “(3) In Danger of Death - It is a principle repeatedly set forth in canon law that at the point of death all reservations cease and all necessary jurisdiction is supplied by the Church. "At the point of death", says the Council of Trent (Sess. XIV, c. vii), "in danger of death", says the Ritual (tit. III, cap. i, n. 23), any priest can absolve from all sins and censures, even if he be without the ordinary faculties of confessors, or if he himself be excommunicated; he may do so even in presence of another priest properly authorized (Holy Office, 29 July, 1891).”

In the cases of an abjuration that is done privately or only before lay witnesses, the censure would be lifted immediately after taking the abjuration and profession of faith, provided the penitent promises to go before a Catholic bishop or priest the first opportunity to do so. It is the same principle taught in Trent, that a Catholic can be forgiven of their sins, if they cannot get to a Catholic priest, if they have true contrition, confessing their sins to God, with the desire and promise to go before a Catholic priest the first opportunity to do so.

The Council of Trent, On penance: “The Synod teaches moreover, that, although it sometimes happen that this contrition is perfect through charity, and reconciles man with God before this sacrament be actually received, the said reconciliation, nevertheless, is not to be ascribed to that contrition, independently of the desire of the sacrament which is included therein.” 4

The penitent, after he took the abjuration and the profession of faith, would then confess his sins privately before God with the desire and firm purpose to go confession to a priest the first opportunity to do so, and if he did not the sins would fall back on his head. The Council of Trent, as stated above, teaches this. The same principle would apply to the lifting of censures. If the penitent does not go before a Catholic bishop or priest the first opportunity he has, then the abjuration would be null and void and the censure would fall back on his head (reincidence), along with his other sins. The Catholic Encyclopedia article on Excommunication speaks of reincidence, the re-incurring of the censures and sins of the penitent.

4 *The Council of Trent*, On penance, sess. xiv, chap. 4; D 898.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, "Excommunication," 1907: "Finally, the authors drew up a long list of those who were supposed to be unable to present themselves in person to the pope; and this list included almost every one (Gury, *Theol. Moralis*, II, nn. 952 and 375). This practice, far more lenient than was intended by Innocent III, has been recently profoundly modified by a decree of the Congregation of the Inquisition (Holy Office) dated 23 June, 1886. Henceforth "in urgent cases when absolution cannot be deferred without danger of grave scandal or infamy, which is left to the conscientious appreciation of the confessor, the latter, after having imposed the necessary satisfaction, can absolve, without other faculties, from all censure; even those specially reserved to the Holy See, but under pain or recurrence under the same censure if, within a month, the penitent thus absolved does not recur to the Holy See by letters and through the medium of the confessor." This new method has been more precisely explained and even rendered easier by subsequent papal decisions. The absolution thus given is direct (Holy Office, 19 Aug., 1891), and although recourse to the Penitentiaria is obligatory, its object is not to ask a new absolution, but only to solicit the order of the Church, the penitent, as stated above, having had to make a serious promise to conform to them (*standi mandatis Ecclesi*). The power thus granted in urgent cases is valid for all cases, without exception, reserved by law to the pope or the ordinary, even for the absolution of an accomplice (Holy Office, 7 June, 1899)... If the interested party, though able to appeal to the Holy See, fails to do so... he or she incurs the former censures, which remain effective until there is a new absolution followed by recourse to Rome..."

It is obvious that if Rome, the pope, or any proper Church authority, cannot be approached for a long duration, then the penitent can be absolved of his censure until the first opportunity comes along to go before the proper Church authorities. The penitent in all cases must ultimately apply to the local ordinary if his censure was reserved to the local ordinary, and to the Holy See, if it was reserved to the Holy See.

The penitent incurs the former censures if he does not keep as much of the law as possible by presenting himself to the pope if necessary, or a Catholic bishop if he can, or Catholic priest if he can, or lay witnesses if he can, the first available opportunity. The simple rule is to fulfill as much of the law as can be fulfilled as it becomes possible to fulfill it.

A final comment must be made. A penitent cannot be forgiven of his sins in the internal forum until he makes the abjuration, profession of faith and then has his censures lifted. It is the abjuration and profession of the Catholic faith that places him back in the Church and the absolution in the external forum lifts the censure so that the penitent would now be inside the Catholic Church. Only then can he go to confession or receive the other sacraments. All the sacraments, except baptism, are forbidden to non-Catholics.

It is impossible, even heretical, to say that a Catholic can have his sins forgiven in the internal forum, without belonging to the Catholic Church in the external forum - without being inside the Church. The bull *Unam Sanctum* teaches, "*Outside the Church there is no salvation, nor remission of sins.*" This is equivalent to the *formaliter/materialiter* heresy held by Bishop McKenna, that states a pope can belong to the body of the Church, but not the soul, a pope that is materially (physically) the pope, but not spiritually the pope (no jurisdiction). This is the same heresy that teaches a man can be saved by belonging to the soul of the Church without belonging to Her body. Father, I know you do not hold this view, but Patrick Henry does. He believes that a private abjuration is all a penitent can take and he cannot have his censures lifted, because he does not believe epikeia applies to going before a Catholic priest, who does not have faculties from an ordinary, or to go before lay witnesses. His thinking is not logical on this point, because the letter of the law does not allow for private abjurations. If one did take a private abjuration he is appealing to the law of epikeia to justify his action. So why does Patrick not apply the law of epikeia by approaching a Catholic priest, or lay witnesses if a Catholic priest is not accessible, which the law of epikeia would demand of a penitent? Patrick does not even believe the censures can be lifted in these days, and if that's the case then penitents would still be outside the Catholic Church and cannot have their sins forgiven in the internal forum by confession.

Patrick has some very excellent writings on many of the key topics of our day, in which you would totally agree, and he is a thorough researcher. I can send you a copy of his "*True Church*" booklet. You will find it very informative. He has sacrificed practicing as a priest, precisely because he doubts the validity of his ordination from "Bishop" Schuckardt." Much is to be said of such a sacrifice in these days when many bandits are making themselves priests and bishops. Although, I believe the day will come soon in which a

bishop will convert, and then Patrick will surely be ordained and function as the priest God has called him to be. He has the heart, mind, and soul of a priest.

“Soli Deo Gloria”

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi
“To Jesus through Mary”

Patrick Henry’s Response Received on 2/8/2000

-----Original Message-----

From: Patrick Henry
To: rjmi@email.com
Sent: February 6, 2000 12:46:49 AM GMT
Subject: received your message

Dear Richard,

Thank you for the email message. I am just now changing over to another computer. It takes time to backup and transfer files. I plan to use Word 2000 as my Word Processor. Your attachment seems to have come here correctly.

Have you read the book: History, Nature and use of Epikeia in Moral Theology?

What priest did Fr. Egregyi take an abjuration and profession of faith before?

Did you know that all the statements in your letter to Fr. Egregyi are not true?

In Jesus, Mary and Joseph,

Patrick Henry

RJMI's Response to Patrick Henry 2/8/2000

Dear Patrick,

Who did you take an abjuration before?

What canon law teaches you can take a private abjuration?

Who lifted your censures?

Are you inside or outside the Catholic Church?

What authority do you have to teach the Catholic faith?

What bishop has authorized you to teach the Catholic faith?

Teaching and preaching come under the same category and under normal circumstances one must be sent by the bishop to do both. The following quote from *Mirrari Vos*, by Pope Gregory XVI proves this fact.

"8. ...Nor may the priests ever forget that they are forbidden by ancient canons to undertake ministry and to assume the tasks of teaching or preaching 'without the permission of their bishop to whom the people have been entrusted; and accounting for the souls of the people will be demanded from the bishop."

Again Patrick, I ask you, what bishop has given you authority to teach?

Patrick, this is a serious issue, if you do not want to be considered a true Pharisee you must amend your position. It is incorrect and blatantly false. Your position leaves no hope or mercy for those who truly repent and want to get right with God and go about trying to save souls.

One last note, the tape you sent me on y2k that was a speech of some third party contained outright heresy. He referred to the apostate Jews as our brothers. You must know that you are responsible before God if you put out tapes or books with heresy in it.

Patrick, you have a right to be righteously angry about the abuses of Bishop Schuckart, but it seems you have become overly bitter. In that you condemn even some of the good things that he had done. I am not making excuses for him. But, you have gone too far. You had mentioned that he did not let his priests study canon law unless he had approved of it. This seemed to be one your points in which you disagreed with him. But, the fact is this is the teaching of the Church. If at that time you placed yourself under his authority then he had the right to prevent you, or any other priest under his authority from reading and commenting upon canon law. This prohibition of the Church is necessary to stop rogue canonists from presenting novel interpretation and causing a great loss of faith among his listeners.

Fr. Egregyi's email address is: egregyi@usa.net

Soli Deo Gloria

Richard J. M. Ibranyi
"To Jesus through Mary"

—

Patrick Henry's Response to RJMI 2/11/2000

Subject: Dear Richard Ibranyi = 2-8-00 Show brief headers | Show all headers
From: "Patrick Henry"
Date: February 8, 2000 8:55:06 PM EST
To: rjmi@email.com Add to Address Book
CC:

Dear Richard Ibranyi,

Will you please tell me:

Who did you take an abjuration before?

When was it taken?

If it was before a priest or bishop? Was he Catholic? Did he have ordinary or delegated jurisdiction?

What canon law teaches you can take a private abjuration?

Who lifted your censures?

Are you inside or outside the Catholic Church?

Can you prove before the world, you are inside the Catholic Church in the external forum?

What authority do you have to teach the Catholic faith?

What bishop has authorized you to teach the Catholic faith?

Teaching and preaching come under the same category and under normal circumstances one must be sent by the bishop to do both.

The following quote from Mirari Vos, by Pope Gregory XVI proves this fact.

"8. ...Nor may the priests ever forget that they are forbidden by ancient canons to undertake ministry and to assume the tasks of teaching or preaching 'without the permission of their bishop to whom the people have been entrusted; and accounting for the souls of the people will be demanded from the bishop.'"

Again Richard, I ask you, what bishop has given you authority to teach?

Richard, this is a serious issue, if you do not want to be considered a true Pharisee you must amend your position. Have you done what you think others should do? Are things alright for Richard Ibranyi to do; but the same actions condemned by Richard Ibranyi when done by others?

Have you read the book: History, Nature and use of Epikeia in Moral Theology?

What priest or bishop did Fr. Egregyi take an abjuration and profession of faith before? What CATHOLIC bishop ever gave Fr. Egregyi jurisdiction? Does Fr. Egregyi totally agree with you on the issue of the necessity of water Baptism for salvation? If Fr. Egregyi was close to where you are at next week, would you attend his Mass? Would you go to confession and receive Communion from Fr. Egregyi if there was an opportunity to do so? If you confessed to Fr. Egregyi, how will he absolve you without jurisdiction? Do you have any doubts whatever about the validity of his orders? May you attend his Mass if you have any doubt about the validity of his orders? May you receive Sacraments from Fr. Egregyi if you have any doubt about the validity of his orders?

Thank you.

In Jesus, Mary and Joseph,

Patrick Henry

—

RJMI Response to Patrick Henry 2/17/2000

R. J. M. I.

✘ ✘ ✘

J.M.J

February 17, 2000
Ferial Day

Dear Patrick Henry,

This is a response to your response of February 11, 2000. Thank you for not answering my questions. I will now answer my own questions you have rephrased to me, to prove my good will. When I am done I demand you do the same, answer the questions.

I have already answered them in detail in the 9-page letter I sent you that was addressed to Fr. Egregyi dealing with the topic of Epikeia and its legitimate use regarding abjuration and profession of faith, the lifting of censures, confession, teaching, preaching, and Episcopal consecrations and priestly ordinations. First I will answer the questions.

1) Who did I take an abjuration and profession of faith before?

I took an abjuration and profession of faith before two lay witnesses. I hope to have it confirmed and signed by a Catholic priest. Hopefully Fr. Egregyi if it be God's will. And ultimately I promise to go before a Catholic bishop when one is accessible. If I do not then the censures will fall back upon my head.

2) Who lifted my censures?

The Church lifted my censures by supplied jurisdiction. The next pope will confirm this. A parallel case can be used to prove this. The sins of a Catholic can be forgiven without going to confession to a priest, if a priest cannot be found, provided they make an act of contrition and promise to go to a priest to confession the first available opportunity.

3) Am I inside or outside the Catholic Church?

I am inside the Catholic Church, because my censures have been lifted.

Comment on Questions 2 and 3:

You asked me if I do not at least have a doubt that epikeia would apply in my taking of the abjuration and profession of faith that would effect the lifting of my censures as long as I promise to ultimately go before a Catholic bishop, and if a Catholic priest is available go before him, until a Catholic bishop is accessible. I do not doubt in the least that my censures are lifted. Why? Because to deny this is to say that no penitent, in these days of crisis, can enter the Catholic Church, and that they are doomed to remain outside the Catholic Church and in the way of damnation, until a Catholic bishop is available. This is not even common sense.

Questions:

a) Is there a way for a penitent to have his censures lifted in today's crisis, without any known Catholic bishops?

b) Is there a way for a penitent to enter into the Catholic Church? If you say no then you sin against the mercy of God.

c) How can a man's sins be forgiven if his censures have not been lifted, and therefore he is not inside the Catholic Church? The Bull *Unam Sanctum* by Pope Boniface VIII teaches, "*Outside the Church there is no salvation, nor remission of sins.*"

Patrick, your book the "*True Church*" teaches that a man's sins can be forgiven without the lifting of his censure of excommunication.

Patrick Henry, *True Church*, p. 36. "The true fact of the matter is clerics in the Traditionalist Movement do NOT have an Office, Authority and Jurisdiction. Without Jurisdiction they cannot provide the necessary help to anyone who needs to make an Abjuration of Errors and Profession of Faith. An act of perfect contrition puts one back into the State of Sanctifying Grace. Only an Abjuration of Errors and Profession of Faith made to one who has Jurisdiction can put anyone back into the True Church in the EXTERNAL Forum."

Patrick, it is clear, you are teaching a man's sins can be forgiven while he does not belong to the Church in the external forum. This teaching is insanity! Is this fictitious sanctified man you speak of a Catholic, or is he a non-Catholic, or is there a third category?

It is heresy to say a man can belong to the soul (interior) of the Church without belonging to Her Body (the exterior). Where did you get this heretical teaching? What would be the status of such a man? Is he considered a Catholic? Is he a member of the Church? Is he inside or outside the Church? It is obvious that you deny the law of *epikeia* and cannot see where the Church supplies jurisdiction for those who have a legitimate claim to it. Your book makes it clear that an abjuration and profession of faith is necessary and condemn other Traditionalists for not requiring it, and then you say that no one is authorized to accept an abjuration or profession of faith. Can't you see the contradiction in your teaching and the dilemma (the great confusion) you present to the reader? This is absolutely cruel to torment God's sheep in such a manner.

I will now present a clear contradiction from your own book. In it, on page 33, you say that a man's sins cannot be forgiven unless he is first absolved of his censures in the external forum.

Patrick Henry, *True Church*, p. 33. "The excommunication of non-Catholics who convert to the Catholic Faith is first ABSOLVED in the EXTERNAL forum. Only after that are their sins absolved in the internal forum."

Of course, this is true, so then why on page 36 do you say your sins can be forgiven in the internal forum while not being absolved of your censures in the external forum—while not belonging to the Church in the external forum? Talk about confusing the poor sheep. I will now present another contradiction. You make it clear in your book that an abjuration and profession of faith is necessary for all non-Catholics who convert on page 33.

Patrick Henry, *True Church*, p. 33. "The Abjuration of Error and Profession of Faith is part of the LITURGY of the Catholic Church, and also part of the Laws of God's infallible Church. The Church teaches [this] in the Encyclical *Mediator Dei*. [Pope Pius XII]... In the mind of Pope Pius XII the question of the need for the ABJURATION OF ERRORS is no longer OPEN TO DISCUSSION."

Of course this is true also. So then why, on page 36, do you teach there is no way for a penitent to make an abjuration and profession of faith and have his censures lifted? Talk about confusing the sheep and offering them no way out of their horrible sins, which a true penitent abhors. You tell a penitent of the absolute necessity to abjure. But guess what? There is no way possible for him to do so until he locates a Catholic bishop with ordinary jurisdiction and abjures before him.

4) Am I certain that my censures have been lifted, without the least doubt?

Yes! Why am I certain? Why to I have not the least doubt that my censures are lifted? Because I have no doubt that God wills that all men should come to the knowledge of the truth and be saved (1Tim. 2:2-3). Because God does not will that any man should be damned but that he should have life everlasting. There is no doubt that God forgives all who are truly penitent. There is no doubt that God would never make it impossible for a penitent soul to enter the Catholic Church. "Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy." (Mt. 5:7) "Forgive: and you shall be forgiven." (Luke 6:37) This last passage refers to forgiving those who are true penitents, those who are truly sorry for the sins and want to repent and amend their lives. It does not refer to the unrepentant.

There is no doubt that God will never close the gate to Heaven on earth so that none can enter. The gates to Heaven are closed only after the General Judgment that takes place after the second coming of Christ. God's mercy endures till the end of time. "*For the Lord is sweet, his mercy endureth forever, and his truth to generation and generation.*" (Psalm 99:5)

Patrick, what kind of god do you teach of? Certainly this is not the God of the Holy Catholic Church! Certainly this is not the God who suffered and died so that all men might have a chance to enter His Church and thus have a hope of salvation. You teach of a god who is merciless. A god who points out men's sins, and then leaves them no way to be reconciled through His Catholic Church. Your teaching leaves the readers in despair and hopelessness. Your position does more damage to the true *sede-vacante* position than one who still believes JP2 is the pope. There are two courses one can take when they are done reading your "*True Church*" booklet.

The First Course:

They admit the *sede-vacante* position is true, of which you do prove beyond a shadow of a doubt, but they are then destine for despair because you do not offer any solution. You tell them there is no way for them to get back into the Catholic Church and that there is no possibility for a repentant Catholic priest or bishop to function again as a preist or bishop. This first position leads to true Phariseism if one believes in all of your teachings. They would have to believe in a merciless god who offers no hope for the penitent to enter the Catholic Church.

One of your readers, a (***), is a prime example of this. He had told me that there could never be any more bishops or priests again. I told him his belief is heresy! It is heresy because he is teaching that a key mark of the Church, the apostolic mark, has defected. I told him that we do not always have to have a pope, and we do not always even have to have one bishop, but there must always be the possibility of having a pope and Catholic bishops. That means there must always at least one valid bishop who converts and thereby becomes a Catholic bishop. He asked me how the next pope could ever be elected and I said, by repentant bishops and priests. He laughed with a devilish laugh. I told him he is mean and nasty. I asked him if God forgave him for being associated with the Conciliar Church, and he said, yes. I than said, why then will God not forgive a repentant priest or bishop. You can see the great hypocrisy and bitterness in such a man. He says God will forgive him, but not others. Blessed are those who forgive for they shall be forgiven. Blessed are those who are merciful for they shall obtain mercy. In reality Willie is not in the Church and he is not forgiven but is in damnation. His belief that the apostolic mark had defected is proof that sooner or latter the true Pharisee falls into obvious heresy.

The Second Course:

The second course one can take who reads your book, *True Church*, as I had witnesses with two of my ex-friends that were tormented by your writings, is to abandon all hope in the *sede-vacante* position. They either go back to the Conciliar Church, because they recognized the dead end that your position puts forth and they reject the *sede-vacante* position all together, or they do not even consider going to a Catholic priest who holds the *sede-vacante* position, because they cannot have delegated jurisdiction from a local ordinary. I experienced the same problem when reading your book, and immediately saw that you made no room whatsoever for *epikeia*. I used plain old common sense to see your error. I saw your grievous error and my ex-friends did not. They are a prime example of two souls that are now in the way of damnation because they are attending a Fraternity of St. Peter Chapel. They were reading your book as if it was *defide*, as many people do when anything is in writing, and could not reconcile the dilemma. These same ex-friends of mine, refused to help me, precisely because of your book. They said that I had no right to teach

the Catholic faith because I was not sent by a bishop who has ordinary jurisdiction. When I asked them who then has the right to teach the Catholic faith? They could not answer. If we admit that even if there was a Catholic bishop in these days, he could not have ordinary jurisdiction, therefore, no one would have the right to teach the Catholic faith, according to your teachings Patrick, and the Word of God has been silenced world-wide and has died. Our dear Lord said, *"Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away."* (Mt. 13:31)

Patrick, it would seem that your intentions are not right. You seem to be more of a Jansenist/Puritan than a Catholic. If a man's intentions are not right it is bound to exhibit itself in his writings. He will become actually stupid, foolish, and eccentric. Our faith is reasonable, meaning it is not contrary to right reason and prudence. Patrick, it is pride that prevents a man from admitting he is wrong, and the only answer is true humility. Many of the greatest heretics that fell out of the Church were very ascetical. Their mortifications and sacrifices were all done for a selfish motive, pride and vainglory. Remember the true Pharisee who said, *"The Pharisee standing, prayed thus with himself: O God, I give thee thanks that I am not as the rest of men, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, as also is this publican. I fast twice in a week: I give tithes of all that I possess."* (Luke 18:11-12) And the most dangerous fact of being a true Pharisee is that he does not perceived himself to be wrong. *"The congregation of the proud shall not be healed: for the plant of wickedness shall take root in them, and it shall not be perceived."* (Ecclus. 3:30) All his ways seem right to him, but the end thereof is death. *"(Proverbs 16:25) There is a way that seemeth to a man right: and the ends thereof lead to death."*

Now, you may also have become bitter because you discovered that you are most probably not a priest, and therefore, you cannot function as a priest. This can lead to an all out attack on all priests. This also seems to be your problem. I suspect you are guilty on both counts. God will have mercy, not just on repentant laymen, but also repentant priests and bishops. *"For God is compassionate and merciful, and will forgive sins in the day of tribulation: and he is a protector to all that seek him in truth."* (Ecclus. 2:13)

5) What authority do I have to teach the Catholic faith?

The Church authorizes me with supplied jurisdiction that She delegates to me by the law of epikeia. As long as I am Catholic, that is to say, as long as I teach and practice the full deposit of the Catholic faith, then the next pope will confirm me.

6) What bishop has authorized me to teach the Catholic faith?

No bishop has authorized me to teach the Catholic faith, because there is no Catholic bishop available that I know of. Therefore, this is a clear-cut case of the legitimate use of epikeia, that is used when it becomes either an undue burden, or impossible to keep the law. I will pose myself a question.

7) Am I in a state of grace?

I hope so, but I do not know for sure. No man can no if he is in a state of grace with all certainty unless by special revelation from God. The *Council of Trent* is clear on this. That is why we must always examine our conscience. We must never, no not ever think we are prefect and cannot fall from grace. This takes humility the key virtue that conquers pride. Pride is the root of all evil. I will now answer the questions you posed regarding Fr. Egregyi.

A) Do I not at least doubt that Fr. Egregyi is a priest?

No I do not doubt that he is a priest. Fr. Egregyi is a priest. I do not have a positive objective doubt to the validity of Lefebvre's consecrations and ordinations. Therefore I do not doubt the validity of the bishops consecrated or the priests ordained by Lefebvre. The Church demands that I accept the validity of these bishops and priests under pain of mortal sin.

Patrick, do you know what constitutes a positive objective doubt? Unlike assuming malice when a man's heresy is public and persistent, a sign that can easily be detected by any man, an intention of a man, in this case a bishop, cannot be known unless he explicitly states that he does not intent to consecrate or ordain, or if there is an essential defect in the form or matter. If no explicit statement was made by the bishop, before a credible witness, that he did not intent to consecrate or ordain, then we cannot assume he did not intent to

consecrate or ordain, or we sin mortally and create scandal. This is the teaching of the Church regarding the intentions of the ministers of the sacraments. If the Church allowed men to start questioning the intention of priest, without explicit proof, then this is surely a prescription for chaos.

B) Would I attend Fr. Egregyi's Mass?

Yes, I would, as long as he remained Catholic in word and deed.

C) Would you go to confession to Fr. Egregyi?

Yes I would.

D) Where does Fr. Egregyi get his jurisdiction to hear confession and say Mass?

The Church supplies him with jurisdiction and delegates it to him, by the law of *epikeia*. Question: If a priest was taken prisoner in a communist country, and obviously has no access to a bishop and is outside his diocese, could he hear the confessions of the Catholic prisoners?

E) Does Fr. Egregyi agree with my opinion that one must absolutely be baptized by water in order to be justified?

No he does not. But, it is my hope that he will see that we need a future pope to settle this dispute. I believe I presented an un-prejudiced defense of my opinion that poses the great difficulty regarding this topic. It is my hope that both opinions can be put forth without the exclusion of one or the other, and without demanding anyone hold to either side under pain of heresy. It is my hope Fr. Egregyi and I can get down to the business of teaching and preaching the absolute necessity of conversion into the Catholic Church and the need to come to baptismal water. After all, is this not the primary purpose of the Church (Mt. 28:20) (Mk 16:16)? Did not our Lord promise that many apostate Jews will convert in these final days? Not just apostate Jews but Moslems, Protestants, and pagans. How can a servant of the Lord be about any other business, unless he is first concerned with the primary business of the Church, the conversion of souls? Even if one is not given the gifts of teaching, preaching, or writing they can still actively pray for conversions, and assist in bringing them into the Church once converted. It is not my intention to open another door, even the slightest one that offers salvation for those who explicitly lived and died in false religions.

F) Did I read the History, Nature, Use of Epikeia in Moral Theology?

Yes I read,

History, Nature, Use of Epikeia in Moral Theology, by Rev. Lawrence Joseph Riley, A. B., S. T. L., The Catholic University of America Studies in Sacred Theology (Second series) no. 17, 1948.

Definition of Epikeia

It does not support your position. I will elaborate. On pages 19-20 we read a good definition of *epikeia*.

“The reasons for the existence of such a concept [*epikeia*] is to be found in the fact that laws are, of their very nature, universal. Lawmakers legislate for the general run of cases, and not for any particular concrete instance. But particular details and circumstance are almost limitless in number and nature; it is clear that no legislator in the act of framing of a law can foresee all the variable circumstances which may arise. Taking into account what usually and ordinarily happens, he enacts his law. He is not, however, ignorant of the possibility that his law, though just and good in general, may be deficient in particular cases. On the other hand, an individual may find himself confronted with a case which, although it is included in the law insofar as the words are concerned, nevertheless is not comprehended in the general law, if the intention of the legislator, and not merely the verbal formula, be scrutinized. And so, he *emends* or *corrects* the law; he prudently judges that if the lawmaker had foreseen this particular case, he would not have wished to bind

his subject; and so the subject does not observe the law as it is written. In other words, *epikeia* is used.”

“[pp. 28-29]...No man has wisdom so great that he can take into consideration all individual cases; and therefore he cannot adequately express in words all those things that are fitting from the end which he has in mind. And if the legislator were able to consider all cases, it would not be fitting that he mention all, in order to avoid confusion; but he should formulate the law according to what is the most usual occurrence.⁵”

“[p. 52] In cases where it is certain that the lawmaker would be unwilling to urge obligation, *epikeia* may always be used without recourse to authority; in cases of doubt, an authority with power to dispense must be consulted if time allows, otherwise the words of the law are to be observed; in cases of probability, an authority must be resorted to; but if this is impossible, *epikeia* may be used.”

St. Antoninus teaches on page 55,

“In Holy Scripture too he (St. Antoninus, +1459) finds an instance of the use of *epikeia*. For it is there related that many of the army of the Machabees had submitted to the sword of the enemy rather than battle on the Sabbath. But after consultation with the more prudent, Mathathias realized that an act of self-defense was not a violation of the Sabbath; and consequently, by the use of *epikeia* it was decided: ‘Whoever shall come up against us to fight on the Sabbath day, we will fight against him.’⁶”

RJMI Comment: Laws are made for the general good of all the people, places, and time. In other words they are universal. But, they are not particular. They do not deal with each individual unique case that may arise for an individual person, place, or time. It is impossible for a law to include all the foreseeable exceptions without making the law burdensome, and in many cases the lawmaker cannot see exceptional cases that may arise in the future, either because it has not entered his thoughts, or it did and was dismissed as never having the possibility to occur.

And lastly, John Gerson teaches on page 54 of the sinful nature of a true Pharisee,

“Hence, two extremes are to be avoided: first, a literal adherence to the law so rigid that *epikeia* is never admitted - this results in the situation envisaged by the adage *summum jus summa injuria fit* – and secondly, a frequent and constant resorting to *epikeia* which will break down the stability of the law...

A beautiful description of the results of the use of *epikeia* – understood apparently as benignity – is found in another passage of his works (John Gerson, +1429).

“It is the function [of *epikeia*] to take into consideration not the bare precept, but all the particular circumstances clothing it from such a consideration arises a means of harmonizing the rigor of justice and the severity of discipline with the leniency of mercy and propitious pardon. Nay, such is necessary, so that in our every act toward another, we may sing to the Lord mercy and judgment; otherwise justice becomes iniquity, and severity is turned into cruelty.⁷”

RJMI Comment: If the spirit of the letter of the law (the intention) is not discerned, then only superficial obedience to the law is rendered, with the wrong intention. The wrong intention is always self-centered (pride, self-glory, greed, human respect) and is a key mark of a true Pharisee. These types are equally

⁵ Thomas, *Sum. Theol.*, I-II, q. 96, a. 6, ad 3.

⁶ 1Mach.2:41

⁷ John Gerson, *Liber de Vita Spirituali Animae (Opera Omnia, III)*, Lect. V.

guilty as the liberals who break the law in letter and spirit. Yea, they are more dangerous because of their exterior piety can deceive the good-willed for a season.

A Final Question:

Patrick, in what do you envision the use of *epikeia*? Please give some examples. Or, do you deny its use altogether?

Patrick, I await your response, your answer to my questions. I hope you correct your grievous errors so we can work together in doing the work of the Catholic Church, converting souls, and edifying those that are sanctified. I still believe you were meant to be a priest, but not a priest without mercy.

Soli Deo Gloria

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi
"To Jesus through Mary"

Response from Patrick Henry to RJMI 3/4/2000

Subject: short or long answers Show brief headers | Show all headers
From: "Patrick Henry" <jmjhfr@zekes.com> Add to Address Book
Date: March 4, 2000 5:52:43 PM EST
To: rjmi@email.com Add to Address Book
CC:

St. Casimir, ora pro nobis!

March 4, 2000

Dear Richard,

Praised be Jesus, Mary and St. Joseph; now and forever!

You were kind enough to point out to me that some things I have written are, in your opinion, insanity and heretical. In your letter you also demand that I answer your questions.

Before I answer the questions, I think it will be good to review again what I have written. It seems better to take time to read again the material I used to first compose my letters. That is a lot of material to review. I should try to see why I came to the conclusions you say are insanity and heretical.

I started reviewing the book: History, Nature, and Use of Epikeia in Moral Theology. You wrote that you read this book. Why is it that it contains so much information that is contrary to your statements about the use of Epikeia?

Richard, why is it that you condemn me for writing letters to answer the questions of others, then you go on to DEMAND that I write a letter to answer your questions?

You may not agree with the answers I give to your letters, but will you go on to condemn me for writing to you? If you answer no, then why do you condemn me for trying to help others and giving an answer to their questions?

Doing research work and writing letters is very slow going for me. It cost me thousands of hours and enough money to build a new house to send out the letter: The True Church is One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic.

It seems there are two major ways I could answer your questions. FIRST: In a few words. SECOND: With more quotations and reference sources cited that those who read what I write could better understand why I believe as I believe. To answer your questions the second way will cost me hundreds, if not thousands of hours of time as well as much money.

If you want me to answer your questions this second way, you will have to give your word under pain of sin, that you will send a complete copy of whatever I send you to everyone you now have an address for. That includes both Email and U S Mail addresses. This mailing is to also include everyone else you receive an address for during the next five years from the time you receive my letter that gives an answer to those first set of questions you asked me.

I will await your reply to know if you want brief answers or a more complete explanation.

May Jesus, Mary and St. Joseph grant you every grace you need.

Ora Pro Nobis!

In Jesus, Mary and Joseph,

Patrick Henry

Response by Richard Ibranyi 3/8/2000

Ash Wednesday
St. John of God, ora pro nobis!

Dear Patrick,

Praised be Jesus and Mary, now and forever!

Patrick, I did not condemn you for writing letters to answer questions of others. I said, why did you not answer the questions I posed to you. Of which you now indicate you will.

Although the answers you have given others confuses them and leads many of them, as has happened to two of my ex-friends in New Jersey, who read your True Church, back into the Conciliar Church. They now attend the FSSP. I personally witnessed their dilemma, the despair and hopelessness they experienced after reading your True Church and realizing there was: 1) no way to get back into the Church in the external forum, and 2) no possibility for a Catholic priest to function as a priest until a Catholic bishop is found who was ordained by Pope Pius XII and is still Catholic, meaning he never adhered to the Conciliar Church and he must also have ordinary jurisdiction. This is the delimmia you present to the reader. You make no room for epikeia for Catholic priests to function unless this improbable Catholic bishop who was consecrated by Pope Pius XII is found. Until he is found, all must languish outside the Church and without any possibility of being administered to by a Catholic priest, or even without the preaching or teaching, meaning the word of God has ceased upon earth.

The other problem, and I don't know if you spoke with him, is Felix Martinez. I believe you have or at least he has used your information to continue to go to Fr. Blanco's Masses. Felix had taken the abjuration I wrote and now rejects it. He took it of his own free will. I did not force him. When he rejected it I asked him if he could find any heresy in it. And he could not. He tried very hard to find heresy in it, but could not. I told him this public abjuration is a solemn vow between him and God and if he cannot find any heresy in it he has no excuse before God for rejecting it after he had taken it. He then tried to attack the fact of the necessity of an abjuration altogether, or at least of the one I wrote up.

The true reason he rejected it is due to pride. His wife was present and was supposed to also take the abjuration and she refused and that is when he took his wife's side, and proceeded reject the abjuration he

had taken. I told his wife she did not have to take it until she understood it, and that she should not take it until she does. I then told Felix it was partially his fault that his wife was ignorant of the faith, because he never taught her the faith nor demanded she learn it. The six months I lived with Felix, his wife never once asked me a question about the faith, nor showed any interest in learning it. When the abjuration was presented to her she was stunned, and of course, because she never studied her faith and never thought it a necessary thing to do. Therefore, she now could take two courses. One, she admits her ignorance and confess before God her sloth in learning the Catholic faith, and proceed to learn in preparation for taking the abjuration. Or two, deny the necessity of abjuration altogether and this would relieve her of her duty of having to learn the Catholic faith.

Felix could not point out any heresy in the abjuration, although he tried real hard, even coming up with stupid points that were quickly disproved. He then proceeded to formulate excuses as to why it is not valid before God. He attacked me personally because I had admonished him. He tried to say I had no right to say he must take an abjuration, because I wrote up the abjuration, and as a result he spoke to Fr. Blanco and they had agreed to the need of an abjuration but an old form of abjuration would be used either from Pope Pius's day regarding modernism or some other form. That would obviously be meaningless because an abjuration must be specific for the heresies of the day.

When this attempt failed and Felix realized this would not work, and Fr. Blanco backed out from the need of abjuration altogether, then Felix, in order to continue to attend Fr. Blanco's Masses formulated the next excuse that he got from you. He now said that no one is required to take abjurations because there are no Catholic bishops to take it before.

The end result is that Felix is still attending Fr. Blanco Masses because he believes that abjurations cannot be required of anybody until a Catholic bishop is found. And you may have added fuel to his fire by telling him this. In spite of all the crimes the Fr. Blanco commits as you are well aware of, Felix is still attending his chapel and has used your teaching, that public abjurations cannot be taken in these days, to justify his position. He had mentioned your name in defense of him justifying Fr. Blanco's non-demand for an abjuration as a result of this he continues to attend Fr. Blanco's Masses. Do you see again how your teaching has confused and sent a man and his family back into the clutches of the enemy? Felix, due to pride, now avidly attacks me and has even become friendly with Br. Michael in order to join forces against me.

Felix has some major problems that led to his obstinacy in heresy and this is pride. He can never be told he is wrong, even in every day simple affairs. Patrick, if you did teach this to Felix directly, or he may of found out about your teaching from someone else, because he did mention your name to defend himself when condemning my position, you are bound to write him or call him and set him on the straight and narrow road to Heaven. You must, at the very least, tell him he cannot attend Fr. Blanco's Masses and you must also tell him he is bound to the abjuration he took. Patrick, don't let people think they don't have to publicly abjure in writing. Don't let them off the hook by easing their consciences; this would be highly offensive to God. Your sister was about to publicly abjure before God and it is you who are preventing her. Do you think this is pleasing to God? She has now separated from my friends in New Jersey because of your teachings.

Episcopal Consecrations and Public Preaching and Teaching

Patrick, a brief answer will do fine, regarding the question I put to you, as I had already briefly answered the questions. If any extrapolation from the answers is required then a deeper study can be made regarding that topic. The main thing I am trying to get across is that it serves no purpose the quote the letter of the law regarding Episcopal Consecrations from Pope Pius XII.

Pope Pius XII, *Ad Apostolorum Principis*, June 29, 1958: "47. ...No person or group, whether of priests or of laymen, can claim the right of nominating bishops; that no one can lawfully confer Episcopal consecration unless he has received the mandate of the Apostolic See. 48. Consequently, if consecration of this kind is being done contrary to all right and law, and by this crime the unity of the Church his being seriously attacked, and excommunication reserved specialissimo modo to the Apostolic See has been established which is automatically incurred by

The letter of this law that states one must have a direct papal mandate from the pope in order to be consecrated a bishop. The legitimate use of *epikeia* grants an exemption from laws that do not deal with faith or

morals. That means if one has a legitimate claim to epikeia they are exempted from this law promulgated by Pope Pius XII, and if they have a legitimate claim for epikeia they can consecrate bishops without a direct papal mandate. This has been done before in the history of the Church, St. Eusebius did so during the Arian crises. Now, for one of my main points to be made, I will quote from another pope, who condemns anyone who teaches the Catholic faith without being sent by a Catholic bishop.

Pope Gregory XVI, *Mirrari Vos*: "8. ...Nor may the priests ever forget that they are forbidden by ancient canons to undertake ministry and to assume the tasks of teaching and preaching 'without the permission of their bishop to whom the people have been entrusted; an accounting for the souls of the people will be demanded from the bishop'. Finally let them understand that all those who struggle against this established order disturb the position of the Church."

Patrick, by the letter of this law you and I are disobeying a papal decree by teaching without being sent by a Catholic bishop. You and I teach the Catholic faith without being sent. The letter of the law of Pope Gregory XVI condemns teaching the Catholic faith without being sent by a Catholic bishop, just as Pope Pius XII has condemned Episcopal consecration without a direct papal mandate. If we are exempted from the letter of the law of Pope Gregory, by the use of epikeia to teach the Catholic faith, then why is not a Catholic bishop exempted from the letter of the law of Pope Pius XII in order to consecrate other bishops or ordain priests? If you say that anyone who teaches that epikeia can apply to Episcopal consecrations is condemned because of Pope Pius XII *Ad Apostolorum Principis*, then epikeia could not apply to teaching the Catholic faith based upon Pope Gregory XVI *Mirrari Vos*.

Patrick, you and I are using epikeia to teach the Catholic faith and are exempted from the law as stated by Pope Gregory. Why do you not apply the same reasoning to Episcopal consecrations? There is a hypocrisy that would be evident if after this was pointed out to you, you did not amend your position, either one way or the other. If you continue to believe epikeia does not apply to Episcopal consecrations then you must no longer teach the Catholic faith. Or if you continue to teach the Catholic faith without being sent by a Catholic bishop you must also admit the epikeia can also apply to Episcopal consecrations without being sent (having a direct papal mandate).

The other main question was whether you took an abjuration or not. If you did what type of abjuration did you take and what law supports your action? And are you inside or outside the Church? Are you a member or non-member of the Church? Are you in the Church in the external forum or not? A simple brief yes or no will suffice. A brief explanation would be appreciated if you say you are not in the Church in the external forum, as to how you can have your sins forgiven in the internal forum if you are not in the Church in the external forum. Remember the teaching of Bull *Unam Sanctum*. "*Outside the Church there is no salvation, nor remission of sins.*"

Regarding you telling me I must send your response to my whole mailing list under pain of sin, I don't understand the point you are getting at. What is the point? Where is it taught I must send every response I get from whoever it may be to everyone on my mailing list? Where does the Church teach this under pain of sin? Maybe I did not understand the point you were getting at. Rephrase the question so that I can understand why you have requested this.

Soli Deo Gloria

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi
"To Jesus through Mary"

Part Two – Main Discourse

Subject: My answers to RJMI questions S

From: Patrick Henry

Date: April 12, 2000 7:49:18 PM EDT

To: Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

CC:

Patrick Henry comments of April 12, 2000 and RJMI's responses that were completed on August 29, 2000.

Epikeia for Private and Public Abjurations without a Bishop or Priest

Patrick Comment: 1

Dear Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi,

The following are my answers to your questions, as you **demand**ed.

Who did you take an abjuration before? In about 1972 I took it before the man known as Bishop Francis Konard Maria Schuckardt. Shortly after I left his community in August of 1983 I took it privately before God, just much the way you wrote about on page seven of your letter to Rev. Francois Egregyi. (The first thing you sent me that started this series of email correspondence.) Not long after that I again took it in the presence of several lay witnesses. (Again, much the way you wrote about on page seven of your letter to Rev. Francois Egregyi.)

What canon law teaches you can take a private abjuration? If Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi had answered this question when asked, we would both know. Why did you ask? Is there something wrong with a private abjuration? If it is wrong, why did you recommend it in your letter to Rev. Francois Egregyi?

RJMI Response: 1.1

I did not recommend a private abjuration in my letter to Fr. Egregyi. There are those who have taken private abjurations because they did not know they must take a public one in writing and they are justified in the taking of a private abjuration, but are bound to confirm their private abjuration, once the fact is made known to them that they must take a public abjuration in writing (See: RJMI Response: 49.1).

Patrick, in your above response you have just proved one of the main points of this discourse, by not answering the question you admit that no canon law teaches you can take a private abjuration, or take it before lay witnesses. Nevertheless, you did take a private abjuration and another one before lay witnesses, in spite of the fact that the Church law states you must take an abjuration either before the local bishop, or his delegate and two witnesses. Therefore, because you deny the use of epikeia to be exempted from this Church law, you are guilty of violating the letter and the spirit of the law, either by ignoring the law altogether, which is a taking away from the words of the law, or by an act of pure disobedience.

I did answer the question regarding private abjurations if you read carefully. I stated that Canon law teaches that there is only one way to make an abjuration if your censure was reserved to the local ordinary. Canon law says these abjurations must be taken before the local bishop, or his delegate and two witnesses. Anything else is obviously not taught in the Canon law. Even a child can make that conclusion from my writings. I was trying to get you to admit, as you just have, that no canon law teaches you can take a pri-

vate abjuration or take it before lay witnesses, and that is precisely my point. You are violating the letter and spirit of the canon law because you deny the use of epikeia.

Therefore as I had stated, I have applied the legitimate use of epikeia, an exemption from that Canon law, in order to take, and demand others to do the same, the abjuration before two lay witnesses, just as you had taken your abjuration privately and one before lay witnesses. The difference between your position and mine is that I have justified it by the use of epikeia, and your position is outward disobedience to a canon law because of your denial of the use of epikeia. (See: RJMI Response: 48.1: RJMI Response: 53.1)

Patrick Comment: 2

Who lifted your censures? If Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi believes what he writes is the truth, than the truth should apply to all men equally. If I believed that what Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi wrote was the truth, then I could answer this question with Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi's own words: "The Church lifted my censures by supplied jurisdiction."

RJMI Response: 2.1

Patrick, your sarcasm in writing is a key mark of a man infected with vanity and pride that makes him eccentric. To just answer the question would be sufficient. So, I take it your answer is that the Church lifted your censures by supplied jurisdiction. And again you have proved my point! The letter of the canon law states that only the absolution from the bishop, or his delegate can lift the censure. Therefore, your censure can only be lifted (absolved) by the principle of epikeia, an exemption from the letter of the law that states you need absolution from the bishop or his delegate. Patrick, you have denied the use of epikeia and I have not, therefore your censures are not lifted and mine are.

Patrick's Contradiction: He is inside and outside the Catholic Church.

Patrick Comment: 3

Are you inside or outside the Catholic Church? If Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi believes what he writes is the truth, than the truth should apply to all men equally. Therefore, according to the teachings of Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi I am in the Catholic Church.

RJMI Response: 3.1

Your answer contradicts what you have written in True Church.

Patrick Henry, *True Church*, p. 36. "The true fact of the matter is clerics in the Traditionalist Movement do NOT have an Office, Authority and Jurisdiction. Without Jurisdiction they cannot provide the necessary help to anyone who needs to make an Abjuration of Errors and Profession of Faith. And act of perfect contrition puts on back into the State of Sanctifying Grace. Only and Abjuration of Errors and Profession of Faith made to one who has Jurisdiction can put anyone back into the True Church in the EXTERNAL Forum."

Here you are clearly teaching that your private abjuration and the one you took before lay witness, could put you in a state of grace, but that you are still not "back into the Church in the External Forum." Talk about contradictions! How do you rectify your contradiction? You teach in one place that you are inside

the Church, while in another you teach you are not in the Church in the external forum, and this is heresy. (See: RJMI Response: 14.1)

I will expose the root of your problem that has led you into this heresy. You are teaching here the heresy that one can be inside the Catholic Church in one sense, while being outside the Church in another sense. It is the same as the formaliter/materialiter heresy that the non-Catholic Bishop Guerand des Lauriers formulated that the non-Catholic Bishop McKenna holds. As you know that heresy teaches that John Paul II is materially the pope but not formally the pope, that he is the pope in one sense, but not the pope in another sense. By your reasoning John Paul is not the pope in the internal forum, but because no one has officially declared him to be a non-Catholic antipope in the external forum, he would still be the pope in the external forum. It is the same as the salvation by an implicit faith heresy that teaches a pagan can be saved by belonging to the soul of the Church while not belonging to the body of the Church. And that Patrick, is the root of your whole problem, you hold the implicit faith heresy, as does most all other traditional “Catholics,” and God has confounded and confused you and them, and it shows in the your writings and theirs.

Patrick Comment: 4

What authority do you have to teach the Catholic faith? On the videotape, “STRANGE VOICES”, produced by Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi, I heard you explain that you have authority to teach the Catholic faith because you are a Confirmed Catholic. I believe my chances of being a Confirmed Catholic are better than yours. Why, then, does not the same apply in my case. Later when I talked to you over the phone, you admitted that you may not be a Confirmed Catholic because you were “Confirmed” by a “Bishop” of the Novus Ordo sect. At that time you said you had authority to teach the Catholic faith because you were a Baptized Catholic. Again, my chances of being Baptized are probably as good, and maybe even better than your chance of being Baptized. If Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi teaches the truth, then he should agree that I have authority to teach the Catholic faith.

RJMI Response: 4.1

First of all Patrick, I was baptized in 1955. Are you questioning the validity of the sacrament of baptism under the Pontificate of Pius XII, before the invention of the Conciliar Church? I was confirmed in 1966 before they changed the rite of confirmation, and even though the bishop was a non-Catholic bishop canon 209 applies to a legal confirmation, because I thought he was a Catholic bishop and the sins of the Conciliar Church were not yet manifest to me in these early days.

Epikēia and the laws on public teaching

Patrick, either you are not getting the intent of my line of questioning, or you are deliberately pretending you don’t understand. I am not saying Catholics cannot publically teach. I am saying you are not defending your position the right way. You are not justifying your position to publically teach and take abjurations. My justification to publically teach the Catholic faith, as put forward in this debate, is precisely the same one you should be appealing too. I have since corrected my justification for teaching the Catholic faith as put forward in my Strange Voice Video tape and Exurge Michael Issue #1 (See: RJMI Response: 66.1). But, my point is, that your position is not justified and mine is, because I do not deny the legitimate use of epikēia and you do. I am trying to help you escape the contradictions in your writings, that is, your lack of justifying your actions by the proper use and exemptions from the law.

The law that I am appealing to for an exemption is decreed in the 1917 Code of Canon law:

1917 Code of Canon Law: “c. 1385 1. Without previous ecclesiastical approval, even laymen are not allowed to publish: (1) the books of Sacred Scripture, or annotations and commentaries on the same: (2) books treating of Sacred Scripture, theology, church history, canon law, natural theology, ethics, or other religious or moral sciences... c. 1385 2. The permission to publish books... in

this Canon may be given either by proper local Ordinary of the author, or by the local Ordinary of the place where the books... are published, or the local Ordinary of the place where they are printed... Religious authors must also obtain the permission of their major superior before publication."

Two of the laws that a Catholic preist would appeal to for an exemption in order to teach and preach the Catholic faith, are *Mirrari Vos*, and Canon 1328.

Pope Gregory XVI, *Mirrari Vos*: "8. ...Nor may the priests ever forget that they are forbidden by ancient canons to undertake ministry and to assume the tasks of teaching and preaching 'without the permission of their bishop to whom the people have been entrusted; an accounting for the souls of the people will be demanded from the bishop'. Finally let them understand that all those who struggle against this established order disturb the position of the Church."

1917 Code of Canon Law: "c. 1328. Nobody is allowed to exercise the ministry of preaching, unless he has received a commission from the legitimate superior, ether by special faculty or by appointment to an office to which the duty of preaching is attached by the Sacred Canons."

Those who violate these laws in letter and spirit, regarding the public teaching of the Catholic faith, are *ipso facto* excommunicated.

Canon 2318.2: Authors and publishers who without the proper permission procure the printing of books of the Sacred Scriptures of annotations or commentaries on the same incur ipso fact non-reserved excommunication."

Being that a preist cannot publicly teach the Catholic faith without the permission of his bishop, then it is certain that a layman cannot publicly teach the Catholic faith without the permission of either his local bishop or preist. Both the Catholic preist and Catholic layman who publicaly teaches the Catholic faith in these emergency (extraordinary) days of the great apostasy, cannot deny that it is epikeia that justifies their public teaching. And the priest cannot deny that epikeia justifies his preaching and allows him to be supplied with jurisdiction directly from the Church Herself, in order for the preist to preach, because preaching requires jurisdiction.

Patrick Comment: 5

What bishop has authorized you to teach the Catholic faith? In your email letter you imply that Bishop Schuckardt has authority. If that was true than he authorized me to teach the Catholic faith. Although Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi may believe Bishop Schuckardt has authority, I do not believe he ever had an Office, Authority or Jurisdiction in the Catholic Church. Therefore I do not claim that Bishop Schuckardt authorized me to teach the Catholic Faith. To answer the question

RJMI Response: 5.1

You have craftily evaded answering the question. I will repeat the question more emphatically: "What bishop, as of this current day of May 25, 2000, has authorized you to teach the Catholic faith?" Whether Bishop Schuckardt had authority or not, you are not under him now.

Patrick's Schismatic Interpretation of Holy Scripture that disobeys Church Law

Patrick Comment: 6

What bishop has authorized you to teach the Catholic faith? I reply: St. Peter, the Apostle, first Pope and Bishop of Rome. “Be ready always to satisfy everyone that asketh you a reason of that hope which is in you.” (2Peter 3/15). By the grace of God, I have a book titled Our Greatest Treasure. In Chapter VI, Father John Kearney gives a beautiful explanation of this command of the Holy Ghost. St. Peter expected the early Christians, as well as ourselves, to be able to reply satisfactorily to the basic questions, such as:

“Why are you a Catholic?” One of the main reasons I made the *Five Hour Tape* and the other tapes explaining the Religious Vows; *Which Bishop Should I Follow?*; *Another Evident Contradiction*; *What Is It All About?*; *Who Is Right and Who Is Wrong?* As well as some other tapes, was to fulfill this command of the Holy Ghost, given through St. Peter. People asked me questions pertaining to the Catholic faith and that was the means I used to answer them. This is also the basic reason I put together the letter: The True Church is One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic. When people ask me about the Church, I am now better able to fulfill the command of the Holy Ghost: “Be ready always to satisfy everyone that asketh you a reason of that hope which is in you.” (2 Peter 3/15). This command of the Holy Ghost, given through the first Bishop of Rome, is a reason why I am writing this letter.

*Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi demands that I answer your letter, yet you seem to want to condemn me for giving information to others, or to try and instruct them in the Faith.

RJMI Response: 6.1

The verse you are using is 1Peter 2:15, not 2Peter 2:15. Again, I am not saying, the Catholic faith cannot be taught by laymen in these days of the great apostasy, or I obviously would be condemning myself for teaching the Catholic faith. That should be obvious to you! It is clear you are trying to twist the meaning of my words to confuse the reader and evade a clear answer.

I am condemning the reasons you put forth to try and justify your public teaching of the Catholic faith. You are not justified in the public teaching the Catholic faith and I am, because I do not deny the use of epikeia and you do. That is the main issue at hand, the use of epikeia, in this whole discourse we are having. Therefore you have not justified yourself for being exempted from the Church laws regarding the public teaching of the Catholic faith, because you deny the use of epikeia that would exempt you from these laws. By what principle, as taught by the Catholic Church, and not by Scripture alone, gives you the right to be exempted from the Church laws regarding the public teaching of the Catholic faith?

You have answered that question above, and your answer is woefully inadequate and is heretical and schismatic! You are not trying to justify yourself with a Catholic spirit (mind). Instead you are appealing to a purely rebellious Protestant spirit (mind) in order to try and justify your position. Do you realize that every Protestant says he is teaching the “Christian” faith by the authority Peter gives them in the Bible? You are trying to use the Bible Alone (*Sola Scriptura*), the 1Peter 3:15 verse, without any regard to the Church’s interpretation of that verse as proven in Her laws regarding the public teaching of the Catholic faith. You are using a Bible verse out of context to do away with a Church law!

Your novel interpretation of this verse does not agree with the mind of the Church, with the Church’s teachings regarding this verse and how it applies to the public teaching of the Catholic faith. I will remind you Patrick, that it is the Church who interprets the Holy Scriptures, and it is the Church and the unanimous consent of the Fathers, who must be followed when they tell us what Holy Scripture means. I quote:

First Vatican Council, 1870, sess. III, chap. 2, On Revelation (D. 1788): “[The interpretation of Sacred Scripture]. But, since the rules which the holy Synod of Trent salutarily decreed concerning the interpretation of Divine Scripture in order to restrain impetuous minds, are wrongly explained by certain men, We, renewing the same decree, declare this to be its intention: that, in matters of faith and morals pertaining to the instruction of Christian Doctrine, that must be considered as the true sense of Sacred Scripture which Holy Mother Church has held and holds, whose office it is to judge concerning the true understanding and interpretation of Sacred Scriptures; and, for

that reason, no one is permitted to interpret Sacred Scripture itself contrary to this sense, or even contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

I will now put forward the proper meaning of this verse, as the Church interprets it.

1Peter 3:15

Does 1Peter 3:15 allow Catholics (clerics and laymen alike) to violate this following canon law?

1917 Code of Canon Law: “c. 1385 1. Without previous ecclesiastical approval, even laymen are not allowed to publish: (1) the books of Sacred Scripture, or annotations and commentaries on the same: (2) books treating of Sacred Scripture, theology, church history, canon law, natural theology, ethics, or other religious or moral sciences... c. 1385 2. The permission to publish books... in this Canon may be given either by proper local Ordinary of the author, or by the local Ordinary of the place where the books... are published, or the local Ordinary of the place where they are printed... Religious authors must also obtain the permission of their major superior before publication.”

Does 1Peter 3:15 allow a Catholic priest⁸ to violate this following teaching from Pope Gregory XVI?

Pope Gregory XVI, *Mirrari Vos*: “8. ...Nor may the priests ever forget that they are forbidden by ancient canons to undertake ministry and to assume the tasks of teaching and preaching ‘without the permission of their bishop to whom the people have been entrusted; an accounting for the souls of the people will be demanded from the bishop’. Finally let them understand that all those who struggle against this established order disturb the position of the Church.”

It is obvious, after reading these above Church laws of the Catholic Church, that 1Peter 3:15 is referring to the private teaching of the Catholic faith and not the public teaching of the faith, nor does it allow for a layman to write his own books, or make his own tapes teaching the faith, without the approval (imprimatur) of the local bishop.

Private teaching: This entails a layman’s duty to witness to, and teach the Catholic faith, to his everyday acquaintances. Such as, a parent’s duty to teach the faith to their children; a layman’s duty to teach the faith to his neighbor or those whom he comes into contact with during his every day life; a layman’s duty to defend the Catholic faith when he is confronted with someone who is denying it. A layman who teaches in his private capacity must use, and refer only to books and tapes that have been approved by the competent authority (with imprimaturs). He cannot write his own books, make his own tapes in an attempt to teach the Catholic faith, unless he has the approval (imprimatur) from the local ordinary (c. 1385), therefore it is clear 1Peter 3:15 does not allow for this.

Public teaching: If a layman starts his own apostolate and begins to propagate to the general public, material teaching the Catholic faith, either by means of mail order, newspaper advertising, door to door evangelizing, then this falls under the category of public teaching. If a layman writes his own books and puts out his own tapes then this falls under the category of public teaching, and requires an imprimatur from the local bishop.

Therefore, your interpretation of 1Peter 3:15 is not the Church’s interpretation. As a result of this you are not justified in your public teaching the Catholic faith by appealing to 1Peter 3:15. The Church law (c. 1385) condemns you for publishing books and tapes without an imprimatur, because you have denied the use of epikeia and as a result cannot be exempted from this law. Why am I not condemned by these same Church laws for publicly teaching the Catholic faith? Because I do not deny the use of epikeia to receive an exemption from those Church laws, due to the fact that it is impossible in these days to locate and have

⁸ If a priest must be sent (authorized) to teach the Catholic faith by his local bishop, then so must a layman be sent (authorized) by his local bishop or priest.

access to a Catholic bishop for approval to publicly teach the Catholic faith, or to receive an imprimatur. Even if I did not know it was the principle of epikeia that gave me the right to teach the Catholic faith, I would still be justified, as long as I don't deny its use once I realize it applies. I do not blatantly disregard these laws, as you do Patrick, because I do not deny the use of epikeia to be exempted from them in this emergency situation (the great apostasy).

Patrick Comment: 7

Another reason I have done the research and put it into writing and onto tapes is to practice Charity to myself and others. The work done helps us avoid getting caught in the traps put forth by people such as Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi. When I, AND OTHERS, read what has been written and put onto the tapes, we know *epikeia cannot supply jurisdiction for sacramental confession.

RJMI Response: 7.1

Epikeia and jurisdiction for a Catholic priest in prison to hear confessions.

First of all, it is not epikeia that supplies the jurisdiction. Epikeia cannot supply jurisdiction. Epikeia justifies the Church in Her supplying of jurisdiction, in emergency situations. It is the Church that supplies the jurisdiction because of the proper use of epikeia. Patrick, I will restate a question that you have not answered in this entire discourse of yours. This question, if you have an ounce of good will and common sense, will make it clear that epikeia does apply to the hearing of confessions in extraordinary situations.

Question: If a priest was taken prisoner in a communist country, and has no access to a bishop and is outside his diocese, could he hear the confessions of the Catholic prisoners, who are not in danger of death, without faculties or approval from the local bishop?

If you would have attempted to answer this question, and you were of good will, you would have immediately realized that epikeia does apply in this situation. Under normal circumstances a Catholic priest must have faculties to hear confession unless the penitent is in danger of death. These are the laws that teach this:

1917 Code of Canon Law: "c. 872. For the valid absolution of sins, the minister requires, besides the power of Orders, either ordinary or delegated power of jurisdiction over the penitent."

1917 Code of Canon Law: "c. 882 In danger of death all priests, though not approved for confessions, can validly and licitly absolve any penitent from any sins and censures, although reserved and notorious..."

In the above example of the priest in prison, it is impossible for him to get faculties from his local bishop. Therefore, it is the principle of epikeia that justifies the priest in hearing the prisoners' confessions, who are not in danger of death, by exempting him from the necessary faculties (approval) from his local bishop that he would need under normal circumstances, and the Church would directly supply the priest with necessary jurisdiction.

If you were of bad will, you would have either said, the priest cannot hear the confessions of the Catholic prisoners, thus in the spirit of a true Pharisee, you would deprive the Catholic prisoners of a spiritual good that can be administered to them by a Catholic priest, that would benefit the salvation of their souls—the salvation of souls being the highest good. Or, you would have tried to use another scripture verse out of context to try and justify the priest's hearing of confessions, without appealing to an exemption

from the Church law that states a priest must have faculties (approval) to hear confessions, unless the penitent is in danger of death, thus you would use a scripture verse out of context to override Church law.

Patrick Comment: 8

We are reminded that laymen do not have jurisdiction in the Catholic Church. Another bishop that **has authorized me to teach the Catholic faith** is St. John the Evangelist. God's Infallible Church Teaches: Blessed John the Evangelist remained at Ephesus to the very last of an extreme age. In the end, when he could scarcely endure the journey to the church in the arms of his disciples, when he was unable to speak at any length, at each single gathering he said nothing else than: "Little children, love one another." Finally the disciples and the brethren who were present, wearied with the tedium of constant repetition, asked, "Master, why do you say the same thing always?" He replied to them in a sentence worthy of John, "Because it is the precept of the Lord; if this only is done, it is enough." (Lesson VI from the Divine Office for December 27th.) "God is Love and he who abides in Love abides in God and God in him." "And by this we can be sure that we know Him, if we keep His commandments. He who says that he knows him, and does not keep His commandments, is a liar and the truth is not in him. But he who keeps his word, in him the love of God is truly perfected." = St. John. What is the second greatest commandment? "*Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thy self for the love of God.*"

RJMI Response: 8.1

Patrick, what is your point? So St. John says the brothers (Catholics) must love one another. What true Catholic would deny that? How does that justify your public teaching of the Catholic faith and allow you to be disobedient to the Church laws regarding the public teaching of the Catholic faith? The point you are trying to make is totally lost and has nothing to do whatsoever with the public teaching of the Catholic faith. Here you show a lack of common sense. It is like comparing apples to oranges. A Catholic's duty to love his brothers is one thing, whereas the publicly teaching of the Catholic faith is a totally separate issue.

Patrick denies the need/use of epikeia

Patrick Comment: 9

Richard, you may not agree with me, but I do not think *I need to evoke epikeia to keep God's Commandments.

RJMI Response: 9.1

Here is where you prove yourself to be a true Pharisee. Your above statement is the most damning evidence against you regarding epikeia. Oh yes you do need to evoke epikeia, or you sin mortally and are not justified in the public teaching of the Catholic faith and your censures from your association with the CMRI are not lifted. You admit that you have no use for epikeia. You deny its proper use, which is necessary, especially in these days of emergency. Not only that but you deny the teachings of canon law that teach the use of epikeia (See: Part One: Definition of Epikeia, p. 37).

Canon Law a Text and Commentary: "Canon 18. Epikeia is an interpretation exempting one from the law contrary to the clear words of the law and in accordance with the mind of the legislator. It is evidently a very exceptional thing. It may be used with prudent discretion, and is justified, only in a partic-

ular case where: a) the strict interpretation of the law would work a great hardship; and b) in view of the usual interpretation it may be prudently conjectured that, in this particular case, the legislator would not wish the law to be strictly applied.”⁹

Patrick, do you believe this above teachings as codified in this canon law? You have already answered, no, by denying the use of epikeia! So, you are denying this canon law. Remember, Patrick, Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, Himself, teaches the use of epikeia when rebuking the true Pharisees of His day. I quote from my Book Two:

Richard J.M. Ibranyi, Book Two, *Epikeia vs. Schism*, pp. 6-7: King David and his men ate the loaves of proposition that were unlawful for them to eat, as decreed in by God in the Book of Exodus. “*And Aaron and his sons shall eat it. The loaves also, that are in the basket, they shall eat in the entry of the tabernacle of the testimony... A stranger shall not eat of them.*” (Exodus 29:32) In the gospel of Saint Luke we read; “*And some of the Pharisees said to them: Why do you that which is not lawful on the Sabbath days? And Jesus answering them, said: Have you not read so much as this, what David did, when himself was hungry and they that were with him: How he went into the house of God and took and ate the bread of proposition and gave to them that were with him, which is not lawful to eat but only for the priests? And he said to them: The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath.*” (Luke 6:2-5) King David and his men were exempted from this law in this extraordinary situation by the principle of epikeia. Common sense is all one needs to know this, but the Pharisees, due to pride and the lack of charity had lost common sense. The law was never meant to include these extraordinary situations.

You have just read our Lord Jesus Christ teach the law of *epikeia*. You would commit a mortal sin for denying its valid use, and be considered a schismatic for trying to separate the law of epikeia from the a constant practice of the Catholic Church, as taught by God and practiced in the Old Covenant and God the Son in the New Covenant and down through the apostles and popes; *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus* (What always, what everywhere, what by everyone was done).

Patrick, you are acting in the same spirit of these Pharisees. You would say to Our Lord Jesus Christ, “I have no use for epikeia. I do not need to evoke it, and moreover I condemn all those that do evoke it. Jesus, I condemn King David for eating the loaves of proposition, in spite of what You teach. No exemption, no epikeia for King David,” thus says Patrick Henry.

If you don’t evoke it you are disobedient to the Church laws regarding the public teaching of the Catholic faith, just as King David would have been guilty of eating the loaves of proposition if it were not for the principle of epikeia. King David had common sense; he instinctually knew that God would make an exception in this case, as proven by the very words of Jesus Christ regarding this incident. If King David had thought as you did Patrick, he would say to Our Lord that no law can be exempted from by epikeia and he would reject Our Lord’s defense of his actions. He would then have to try and prove that he was not really going against the letter of the law by eating the loaves of proposition, or try to re-interpret the law out of context.

The fact is, Patrick, that you must evoke epikeia—you cannot deny its use—in order to justify your public teaching of the Catholic faith, or you are breaking a commandment of God, that His Church had imposed regarding the public teaching of the Catholic faith and the need for imprimaturs. It is not a matter of choice for you Patrick, because you are publicly claiming to teach the Catholic faith. So you do need to evoke epikeia if you want to keep God’s commandment, as taught by His Church, regarding the public teaching of the Catholic faith. (See: public teaching faith ###)

I will give some examples—there are many that the saints, theologians, and canonist put forward—that proves in certain cases that if epikeia is denied then mortal sin is incurred. This happens when the faithful are faced with two conflicting laws in that if one were kept the other would be violated. The use of epikeia is a must in these cases or guilt would be incurred regarding the law that was objectively violated. In other words, if epikeia does not apply in these specific cases then one cannot keep God’s commandments.

⁹ Bouscaren and Ellis, *Canon Law a Text and Commentary*, p.33, on can. 18

First example:

The law of circumcision teaches that an infant must be circumcised on the eighth day. The law of the Sabbath says there must be no work on the Sabbath Day. Now, if an infant's eighth day falls on the Sabbath Day then there are two conflicting laws, both cannot be kept. If the Sabbath Day law of no work is kept then no circumcision can be done on the Sabbath Day and the circumcision law is violated. On the other hand, if the circumcision were done on the Sabbath Day then the law that teaches that no work is to be done on the Sabbath Day would be broken. Our Lord clearly mentions this to the true Pharisees of His day.

Matthew 12:2,5: "And the Pharisees seeing them, said to him: Behold thy disciples do that which is not lawful to do on the Sabbath days... Or have ye not read in the law, that on the Sabbath days the priests in the temple break the Sabbath, and are without blame?"

Here, our Lord clearly teaches the priests had broken the letter of the law but were without blame and this is due to the principle of epikeia. The priest was exempted from the letter of the law that states no work on the Sabbath, in order to do the work of circumcision on the eighth day. If the use of epikeia were denied then the priests would be guilty of not keeping God's commandments by working on the Sabbath Day.

Do you now see, Patrick, how mortally wrong you are when you said, "*Richard, you may not agree with me, but I do not think *I need to evoke epikeia to keep God's Commandments.*" You would condemn these priests for doing the work of circumcision and say the Lord had no right to tell them they incurred no guilt/blame for violating the letter of the law regarding no work on the Sabbath. You condemn yourself because your public teaching of the Catholic faith and printing books without imprimaturs is in direct conflict with canon 1385, and since you do not believe you need epikeia, then you are not exempted from canon 1385 and stand condemned for violating the letter and spirit of that law.

Second example:

A priest must pray the divine office (the seven daily prayers in the Roman Breviary) before 12:00 am, or he commits a mortal sin. We have a situation in which a priest is hearing confessions all day and waits until 11:00 pm to recite the last prayers of the day from the Breviary. He gets a phone call from a parishioner who is on his deathbed and asks for the sacrament of extreme unction. If the priest goes to administer the sacrament he will not complete his daily Breviary before 12:00 am and would violate the letter of that law. What is the priest to do? He is faced with two conflicting laws, his obligation to administer the sacraments to his parishioners, and the finishing of his daily office. Would the priest commit a mortal sin if he administered the sacrament and in so doing not finish his daily office?

Third example:

I quote:

HNUE, p. 224-5: "This conclusion seems clear from a study of the two following examples. In the first case: to return a sword to an insane person is obviously contrary to the intention of the legislator, in spite of the law demanding that deposit's be restored. Consequently and individual who delays such a return performs an act of legal justice, in that he conforms to the will of the lawmaker. Indeed not only does he act in a more excellent way than if he returned the sword (for he obeys a higher law), but actually to do otherwise—that is observe the words of the law would be sinful."

Patrick, being that you have no use for epikeia, you would have given the sword back to the insane man, and in so doing gone against the intent and will of the lawgiver, harmed the common good, and would have sinned in doing so.

Mortal guilt is also incurred if a Catholic is presented with a situation in which he can help to save souls, that could not get help from anyone else, and he does not help them because he denies the principle of epikeia. The salvation of souls is the highest good, and the goal of all the Church laws.

Just because there are those who abuse (misuse) epikeia—and therefore have no claim to it and cannot be justified by appealing to it—does not mean that epikeia is wrong. Just because prelates in the days of Martin Luther were abusing indulgences and misusing them, does not mean indulgences are wrong.

The two witnesses of the Book of the Apocalypse

Patrick Comment: 10

I am not trying to make others think I am teaching with some kind of **special** AUTHORITY as if I was a Priest, or one of the two Witnesses St. John wrote about in the book of the Apocalypse. I do not think as you do.

RJMI Response: 10.1

Patrick, so you do admit that the two witnesses would have a special power and authority from God, that would be needed in these days of the great apostasy in order to unite Catholics and teach the truth, authoritatively.

Haydock Commentary: “Apocalypse 11:1. Two prophets are promised, to teach mankind.”

Patrick, I am one of the two witnesses mentioned in the Book of the Apocalypse chapter 11, and I do invoke that power and authority that God will confirm in me. A prophecy from a brother of St. Francis of Assisi confirms that the Church will be saved in an unprecedented way that indicates teachers who have no spiritual directors or prelates to authorize them, not because they don’t seek them, but because there are none to be found. I quote.

The Little Flowers of St. Francis of Assisi: “76. ...*The Holy Spirit will choose uneducated young men, and unsophisticated ordinary persons who are looked down upon. Without precedent, without teacher, in fact contrary to the training and personal character of those who teach, the Spirit of Christ will choose them and will fill them with a holy reverence and a very pure love of Christ. And when the Spirit has increased the number of such persons in various places, then it will send forth a wholly pure and saintly shepherd and leader, conforming to Christ. To the praise and glory, etc.*” (Translated by E.M. Blaiklock & A.C. Keys, cap. 76, p.169.)

This prophecy is being fulfilled before our very eyes. Without the principle of epikeia this prophecy would be schismatic and the Church cannot exist in these days of the great apostasy. The special authority that the two witnesses have does not mean they can ignore the Catholic Church’s laws and commandments. That is precisely why I have always defended myself by proper use of Church law and dogma, and appeal to epikeia which is also a teaching and practice of the Church that is absolutely needed in these days.

My public mission of directly opposing the Antichrist has not yet begun. This is all a preparation. When it does come then starts the 3 ½ years. God will confirm me when my teachings are pleasing to Him, when I have corrected my errors and completed my learning. This is the test of fire the prophet Daniel speaks of, “*Many shall be chosen, and made white, and shall be tried as fire: and the wicked shall deal wickedly, and none of the wicked shall understand, but the learned shall understand.*” (Daniel 12:10) Patrick, if you wish not to be wicked you must humble yourself and admit you are wrong. No prophet and no saint is God, and they can be wrong. During their approach to perfection God tests them and trains them, educates them and prepares them for battle. One of the key elements of this test is to be able to admit when one is wrong and that takes humility. In these days of the great apostasy not one of us can claim to have been right in everything we have taught as we travel to the road of perfection, but one thing is certain, when God shows us the truth we must accept it and admit we were wrong or not only can we not be perfected, but we will go backward and fall into all sort of evil and be among the wicked spoken of by the prophet Daniel in which they shall not understand. The most seductive aspect of these wicked is that they think they do understand while their mouths are full of contradictions, stupidities, eccentricities, and vain babble.

In God's good time, if I stay faithful, He will confirm me as one of the witnesses of the Book of the Apocalypse, and you will realize that this is true. Whether you accept the truth or not depends if you have true humility. If you are not humble, and full of pride, as you are now, then you will rebel against this truth, as you already are. God will choose between you and I, and between any others that oppose the mission God has given me. "*Judica me Deus, et discerne causum meum, de gente non sancta, ab homine et iniquo et doloso erue me.*" This is not a game Patrick, to see who is right and wrong, but a matter of crying out for the Glory of God, and for the salvation of souls. There is no room in this battle for either liberals on the left, or Pharisees on the right who scrupulously paralyze their victims.

Laymen and supplied jurisdiction

Patrick Comment: 11

You claim you have authority to preach by stating that: **"The Church authorizes me with supplied jurisdiction that She delegates to me by the law of epikeia. As long as I am Catholic, that is to say, as long as I teach and practice the full deposit of the Catholic faith, then the next pope will confirm me."**

RJMI Response: 11.1

Patrick, you are wrong when you say laymen cannot receive jurisdiction. I quote:

The Catholic Encyclopedia, Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction: "For acts of jurisdiction he must be an ecclesiastic, though the pope could delegate a layman."

But, I was wrong in saying that a layman gets jurisdiction to teach. A layman needs to be approved (authorized) by one in authority to teach the Catholic faith, but he does not receive jurisdiction to teach, as does a priest when he preaches. When a layman receives the necessary imprimatur to publish works dealing with the Catholic faith, the layman has not been granted any jurisdiction to write his book (teach), but was approved (authorized) by a Catholic bishop to do so. If a layman was to give a public talk, in which he teaches the Catholic faith, or teach catechism class he does not receive jurisdiction to do so, but needs the approval (authorization) of a Catholic bishop or priest. (See: RJMI Response 16.1, 37.1, 66.1)

Patrick Comment: 12

Review some teachings of the Church about Jurisdiction beginning with: *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. VIII, June 1, 1910, page 751: "The principle is that the laity as such have no share in the spiritual jurisdiction and government of the Church; but they may be commissioned or delegated by ecclesiastical authority to exercise certain rights, especially when there is NO question of strictly spiritual jurisdiction, for instance, in the administration of property. **The laity are incapable, if not by Divine law at least by canon law, of real jurisdiction in the Church.**"

Richard, have you been ordained a priest or consecrated a bishop? If you answer no, it should be obvious you no longer **"teach and practice the full deposit of the Catholic faith."** You are claiming the Church supplied you with jurisdiction. Since the Catholic Church NEVER gives jurisdiction to laymen, maybe you want people to think you are a pope that has not yet received ordination. Do you need to be reminded for true Catholic Popes ***The Church does NOT supply jurisdiction by the law of epikeia.** Catholic popes receive universal jurisdiction directly from God. If you claim to be a pope, when you are not the pope, you are in schism. Your statements are confusing. If you claim to be a pope why do you state: **"then the next pope will confirm me."** I have not really heard that you claim to be a priest,

bishop or pope. However, it seems you hold a doctrine **contrary** to God's Infallible Church. It is explained in more books than one that **NO** layman has jurisdiction in the Catholic Church. Can you provide proof, from the Fathers of the Church, or provide a direct quote from a Pope, that **The Church supplies jurisdiction to laymen by the law of epikeia**? Let us again review the question and your answer: **What bishop has authorized you to teach the Catholic faith? "The Church authorizes me with supplied jurisdiction that She delegates to me by the law of epikeia. As long as I am Catholic, that is to say, as long as I teach and practice the full deposit of the Catholic faith, then the next pope will confirm me."**

RJMI Response: 12.1

(See: RJMI Response: 11.1) Here we have another outlandish lie. Where do I say, or even infer, that I am a pope or a priest. This is just more proof that you are wrong, because you cannot honestly defend yourself so you resort to lies and character assassination, a key mark of a heretic and/or schismatic. If someone who did not know me, read your comments alone, they would think that this is what I have said about myself.

Patrick uses a singular dissenting theologian, out of context, as authoritative source

Patrick Comment: 13

Next review some things Father Riley quoted with regard to epikeia: Page 232. "Intimately connected with this problem is the question of whether or not epikeia has any standing in the **external** forum. It would appear to be the rather general consensus of authorities today that it has NOT." Page 233. "Van Hove... contends that, since **EPIKEIA IS NOT AN ACT OF JURISDICTION**, it has value only in the **internal** forum. Hilling seems almost unwilling to give any standing to epikeia at all. Believing that it practically amounts to self-dispensation, which is in contradiction to law as a binding norm, he concedes at the most that it may be recognized in the **internal** forum, where one's conscience is the highest subjective obligating force." Page 235. "But the point here is that, in spite of the existence and necessity of this objective element, the effects of epikeia are confined to the **internal** forum. The lack of immutability and lack of guilt for transgressing the letter of the law have standing only in that forum."

RJMI Response: 13.1

The theologian, Hilling, that you use to support your position is the only one in the whole book, *"The History, Nature, & Use of Epikeia in Moral Theology,"* that rejects the use of epikeia in most cases, although he admits to its use in a more confined manner. But, you have even taking his teachings out of context because he teaches one can be exempted from the law in an extraordinary circumstance but he does not attribute this to epikeia, rather he teaches the law ceases or is suspended. I will list the saints and theologians from that book that teach the legitimate use of epikeia for an individual that has no recourse to a Catholic bishop or a superior.

St. Albert the Great (+1280), Thomas Aquinas (+1274), Gerson (+1429), St. Antoninus (+1459), Catetan (+1534), Soto (+1560), Covarruvias (+1577), Medina (+1581), Navarrus (+1586), Vasquez (+1604), Suarez (+1617), Lessius (+1623), Bonacina (+1631), Malderus (+1633), Laymann (+1635), Tamburini (+1675), Salmanticenses (1665-c. 1725), Viva (+1726), Roncaglia (+1737), Mazzotta (+1746), Billuart (+1757), Pope Benedict XIV (+1758), Patuzzi (+1769), Alphonsus (+1787), Kenrick (+1863), Gury (+1866), Ballerini (+1881), Konings (+1884), Marc (+1887), Muller (+1888), D'Annibale (+1892), Bouquillon (+1902), Bucerioni (+1918), Lehmkuhl (+1918), Waffelaert (+1932), Vermeersch (+1936), Merkelbach (+1943), Prummer (+1931), Loiano, (1933), McHugh-Callan, Wouters (+1933). Rodrigo. .

All of these men agree that in cases where it is certain that if the legislator were present, he would not demand obedience to the law as it stands, and if there is no access to a superior, *epikeia* may be used, and therefore the law does not bind in that particular case.

Hilling concedes, “that it [epikeia] may be recognized in the internal forum.” I am quite sure if Hilling were alive today, witnessing the effects of the great apostasy, he would immediately amend his erroneous teaching that has no use for epikeia, except in the most confined manner. He would have no choice, if he would want to remain Catholic, he would have to support the use of epikeia or he would fall into heresy and schism.

The next point to make is that a doctor, saint, canonist, or theologian’s opinion does not constitute a teaching of the Catholic Church that Catholics are bound to.

Errors of the Jansenists: 30. When anyone finds a doctrine clearly established in Augustine, he can absolutely hold and teach it, disregarding any bull of the pope - CONDEMNED!¹⁰

However, we are bound to the unanimous teachings of the fathers, doctors, and saints regarding an undefined doctrine, under pain of schism, but not heresy. We are bound to solemn declarations from the popes in and out of Council, under pain of heresy, and we are bound to the unanimous consent of the fathers and doctors, under pain of schism.

I quote from a canonist, Fr. Augustine, O.S.B., in his book *A Commentary on Canon Law*, and will ask you a question after I quote his opinion regarding the *ipso facto* deposition of a prelate, pope or bishop, from his office. Fr. Augustine, O.S.B., in his book *A Commentary on Canon Law*, does not believe a prelate can be deposed *ipso facto*. His prejudice shows, when he deals with canons that clearly indicate an *ipso facto* deposition from office, in that he dishonestly leaves out a commentary on key sentences that clearly indicate loss of office without declaration and takes them out of context. He is one of the few canonists who teach that a prelate cannot be deposed without declaration. We begin by looking at his commentary on Canon 2303.3, vol. VIII, p. 261:

A Commentary on Canon Law, vol. VIII, p. 261: Canon 2303.3 “The mode of inflicting the penalty of deposition is indicated in can. 2303.3: “*It cannot be inflicted except for crimes expressly stated in the Code.*” However, the Code knows no penalty which would be incurred *ipso facto* or *latae sententiae*...”

Patrick, do you believe that teaching? I know you don’t, or you could not condemn John Paul II as a non-Catholic antipope, or any of the conciliar bishops of being non-Catholics who hold no office. What would you think if I kept repeating this opinion of Fr. Augustine to you, and tried to bind you to it, as if it was an infallible teaching of the Catholic Church? Fr. Augustine is the only canonist I know of that teaches a prelate cannot be *ipso facto* deposed. To use this one canonist’s opinion, that a pope cannot be deposed, in the face of today’s crisis, would be an act of total bad will and insanity. This is what you have done by referring to Hilling’s opinion to support your position that denies the use of epikeia. Hilling is the only theologian in the whole book that states that he does not believe in the use of epikeia in most cases, but even he concedes to its possible use when he admits that it has standing in the internal forum.

Those who were not of the opinion that a prelate can be *ipso facto* deposed, as was Fr. Augustine, and those that denied the use of epikeia in most cases, as did Hilling, had never even dreamed that the great apostasy would be this bad, to the point that the enemy so thoroughly corrupted almost every, if not every bishop and priest, and have placed impostor non-Catholic antipopes in Rome.

I will give an example that will make it clear why Fr. Augustine and Hilling’s opinions cannot be sustained in the face of overwhelming evidence. A General of an army may not believe that the enemy could ever have the proper power (ability, weapons, technology, manpower, etc.) to conquer the highest hill of his army (the command post). Therefore, he makes no provision to fortify it, and writes that this high hill cannot be taken. The day comes when the enemy takes the high hill. Would that General persist in his now disproved theory, when the evidence is before his eyes and the enemy from that very high hill is attacking him? Would he pretend it did not happen just to suit his pride (via, how could he have been wrong)?

¹⁰ *Errors of the Jansenists*, Decree of the Holy Office, Dec. 7, 1690; D. 1320.

The same applies to those, in these days of the great apostasy, who try to use the opinions of past theologians who did not believe a pope could fall into heresy and be deposed, and of past theologians who denied the use of *epikeia*. These now proven false opinions, in the face of overwhelming facts, are useless, and it would be mortally sinful if anyone tried to sustain them. Anyone who tried to use them would commit mortal sins, either by omission or commission, or would be insane. As a consequence of sustaining these false opinions, in these latter days of the great apostasy, such a man would inevitably place himself in communion with public heretics and/or schismatics and would not take the proper action to be Catholic; therefore, he would be outside the Catholic Church. He would be equivalent to a man who is being bombed from the high hill and denying that it is happening to him because General X said it could never happen. The reality that is before his face is denied because of an erroneous speculation (belief) of General X previous to the reality of the enemy taking the high hill. Such a man would be worse than a pagan General who would never persist in his old opinion in the face of the enemy occupation of the high hill. In this we see that a fallen away “Catholic” is worse than a pagan, and has lost all supernatural faith, and not only that, they also lost the common sense that even a pagan has.

Hilling’s opinion is even more dangerous because *epikeia* has already been used many times in the Church and was taught directly by Jesus Christ—with no need for a great apostasy to prove the need of its use. If Hilling did not concede to the possible use of *epikeia* he would absolutely be a schismatic and outside the Catholic Church.

If Fr. Augustine were living through the effects of the great apostasy he no doubt would immediately change his erroneous opinion that a prelate cannot be *ipso facto* deposed. If Hilling was faced with today’s crisis (the great apostasy), if he had an ounce of good will and common sense, he would definitely change his erroneous position, seeing that if *epikeia* is not evoked then the Church would have defected because no one could be authorized, according to the letter of the law, to teach or preach the Catholic faith. Nor would there be anyway for falling away Catholics who repent to re-enter the Catholic Church. Nor would there be any way to baptize those who are not in danger of death. Nor would there be any possibility for a Catholic bishop or priest to function as a bishop or priest, and go about their duty of helping to save souls, unless the bishop has ordinary jurisdiction given him from Pope Pius XII and he is still in the diocese in which he was given it, and the priest would also only be able to function under such a bishop. Nor would there be any way to elect a pope according to the current law in force dealing with papal elections that requires Cardinals to elect a pope. How does one elect the next pope without using *epikeia* to be exempted from the current law, and invoke the use of an older law dealing with papal election?

Fr. Riley’s timely book presents all the different opinions of the saints, doctors, and canonists as to what constitutes *epikeia* as opposed to *aequitas*, and what constitutes the proper use of *epikeia*. Fr. Riley points out inconsistencies that are found among many of their teachings on this most difficult topic. One such inconsistency is found in the canonist Van Hove’s teachings. I quote

HNUE, pp. 50-51: “Van Hove expresses the belief that in these passages there is no question of *epikeia* at all, because the “reasonable cause” mentioned in the first, is ‘very different from the causes which he requires in *epikeia*.’ The author considers it to be the opinion of the Angelic Doctor that there are several causes which excuse a subject from obeying a law, that *epikeia* is one of these causes, and that in the passage in question the cause exempting the subject from the obligation of the precept of fasting is not *epikeia*.... It would seem to be a rather unsound argument to state that Thomas does not here refer to *epikeia*—because the discussion of *epikeia* and of the reasons justifying its use is restricted to other passages. Indeed as has been seen above, Van Hove does not hesitate to maintain that in II-II, q. 60, a. 5 of the *Summa Theologica* *epikeia* is involved... In the light of this opinion of Van Hove, it seems inconsistent to maintain that in II-II, p. 147, a. 3, ad 2 and a. 4 *epikeia* is not involved, merely because the reason warranting deviation from the words of the law is different from those discussed by the Angelic Doctor in previous passages.”

As stated above, every saint, doctor, theologian, and canonist, except for Hilling’s wavering opinion, in Fr. Riley’s book teach that *epikeia* can be legitimately used in cases of emergency in which it is impossible to have access to one in authority, be he a bishop or superior. They are unanimous that *epikeia* applies in these cases and that a Catholic would not be bound to the law, and would be granted an exemption from the

law. Most also teach that epikeia can even be used if it is inconvenient to access one in authority in cases where it is certain that epikeia would apply.

Even before the saints and doctors dealt with this teaching, the Church always practiced epikeia, and these saints and doctors are formulating a theology that must justify the members of the Church who have used it, even if its principles have not yet been theologically laid out. Fr. Riley gives many such examples in his book. Theology must justify the use of epikeia, precisely because from the birth of the Church and at all times there have been some of Her children who have gone against the letter of the law, in emergency situations, and were justified in so doing. Any theology that denies the use of epikeia would therefore be condemning all the Catholics who have legitimately used it in the past, and most of all he would be condemning our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ who evoked epikeia when he healed on the Sabbath Day and when His apostles picked corn from a field to eat on the Sabbath Day.

Patrick Comment: 14

Richard, when **you teach the Catholic faith**, are you doing it in the external forum or the internal forum? Remember what we were just taught about epikeia. “Intimately connected with this problem is the question of whether or not epikeia has any standing in the external forum. It would appear to be the rather general consensus of authorities today that it has NOT.” “At the most epikeia may be recognized in the internal forum, where one's conscience is the highest subjective obligating force.” Because epikeia does NOT have ANY standing in the **EXTERNAL** forum, Richard must be claiming the Church delegated him jurisdiction by the law of epikeia for the INTERNAL forum.

RJMI Response: 14.1

Patrick, you have now confused topics again. The proper terms for teaching the Catholic faith are “private” or “public,” not “external” and “internal”. The terms external and internal forum are used to refer to the law itself and to the disposition of the soul of an individual.

The second to the last sentence above, “At the most epikeia may be recognized in the internal forum...” is a quote from Hilling and is not the common consensus of the canonists. As stated above (See: RJMI Response: 13.1) Hilling is the only canonist who is against the use of epikeia in almost all cases. The use of the word “at the most” is Hilling’s statement not that of all the other saints, fathers, doctors, theologians and canonists (the general consensus) who comment on epikeia. The general consensus does not say, “at most epikeia may be recognized” but teach, “epikeia may definitely be recognized in the internal forum.” You have spoke falsely regarding the teachings of the general consensus to try and support you schismatic teaching and this only confuses and misleads the reader by making him think that the general consensus teaches that epikeia is a precarious principle when the opposite is the truth.

What follows explains aequitas and epikeia, and the external and internal forum of the law, and the external (objective) and internal (subjective) forum of conscience (soul) of the individual who has legitimately used epikeia in order to be exempted from the law. Patrick, your confusion and false teachings on these points are heretical and schismatic and have confused many. All the canonists that discuss epikeia in relation to the external and internal forum of the law, and how it relates to the external (objective) and internal (subjective) disposition of the soul, teach that epikeia can absolutely be used by individual Catholics and that in some cases if it would be sinful if the principle of epikeia was not used.

Aequitas and Epikeia, and External/Internal Forum Discourse:

- Aequitas is an act of equity from a lawgiver. Aequitas is an act of the lawgiver in the external forum regarding the law, because the lawgiver deals officially (juridically) with a judgment regarding the law. If a lawgiver allows an exception to a law then this is known as an act of aequitas in which a new law

is created, or is an emendation to an existing law. An act of *aequitas* is also when a lawgiver or a creditor exempts one from a penalty that is justly owed out of a pure act of charity. Such a lawgiver or creditor would be known as a man who is not a stickler for his rights in certain cases. The use of *Aequitas* in this case does not create a new law, nor exempt from the law, but is just an alleviation of the penalty of the law or of a debt.

- Epikeia is an act of equity used by an individual without recourse to a one in authority. *Epikeia* is an act of a private individual that relates to the internal forum regarding the law, only because a lawgiver in the external forum has not yet judged if the individual was justified in his use of *epikeia* regarding the law.

HNUE, p. 231: “A very clear explanation of the relationship existing between *epikeia* and *aequitas* is outlined by Cicognani Staffa. According to these authors, *aequitas* is applied by public authority, *epikeia* by private individuals. *Aequitas* has reference to the external forum, *epikeia* to the internal. *Aequitas* is an objective judgment, which directly touches the norm itself; *epikeia* is a subjective judgment of a private person.

A lawgiver can use *aequitas* in two ways. It is the second case that concerns us in regard to *epikeia*.

First Case of *Aequitas*: Does not Involve *Epikeia*.

The first case does not involve the use of *epikeia* by a subject in which a lawgiver must decide if the subject was justified in his use of *epikeia*. The first case is concerned with a subject who absolutely violated a law in letter and in spirit (objectively and subjectively) or incurred a true debt, and the lawgiver or creditor has the option of forgiving the subject from the penalty, or debt he incurred, by a pure act of charity. The lawgiver in using *aequitas* in this manner, in the first case, is acting solely on the virtue of charity and not according to justice. Justice would require the penalty or debt to be paid; an act of charity can forgive this penalty or debt.

I will give an example of a man who owes a debt to a creditor, the creditor being the lawgiver in this case. The creditor can justly exact full payment from the debtor. Or, if the creditor sees that the debtor is in dire straits, he can relieve (forgive) the debtor of either a portion of the debt, or of the entire debt. This would be an act of pure charity on the part of the creditor that does not involve justice. There is no question here as to the fact that the debtor had incurred the debt. Therefore the debtor is not exempted from the debt by *epikeia*. The debtor justly owes the debt. But the creditor can release the debtor from his obligation to pay the debt as a pure act of charity.

The creditor (lawgiver), in this case, is not bound to forgive the debt. He can justly exact full payment of the debt. This act of *aequitas* by the creditor is not granting an exemption from the debt, but is forgiving the true debt incurred. An exemption would state that a man, who appeared to be in debt, was not actually ever in debt in the first place, because he was exempted from the law (debt) by the principle of *epikeia*. This would involve the second case of *aequitas* on the part of the lawgiver which I will speak of below.

I will give another example of a man who was found to be guilty of the crime of stealing. This was the man's first offence, and the facts show that he stole only because he was hungry and at the point of starvation. Now, there is no question that the man had violated the law, and is absolutely guilty of stealing, but the lawgiver could lessen the severity of the penalty or eliminate it altogether. If the penalty was a jail sentence of two years, the lawgiver can reduce it to a lesser period of time, or eliminate jail time altogether, and warn the man that if he is caught again he will serve jail time. The record would still show the man is guilty of the crime, but that the penalty was lessened or eliminated in his particular case.

We read of this principle in the Gospel of St. Matthew:

Matthew 18:23: Therefore is the kingdom of heaven likened to a king, who would take an account of his servants. And when he had begun to take the account, one as brought to him, that owed him ten thousand talents. And as he had not wherewith to pay it, his lord commanded that he should be sold, and his wife and children, and all that he had, and payment to be made. But that servant falling down, besought him, saying: Have patience with me, and I will pay thee all. And the lord of that servant being moved with pity, let him go and forgave him the debt.

Second Case of Aequitas: Does Involve Epikeia

When a lawmaker makes an official judgment regarding a subject's legitimate use of epikeia, he is using the virtue of aequitas. The subject in this case is not truly guilty of violating the law, even though he appears to have violated it. He is not guilty due to his legitimate exception and therefore the subject cannot incur any penalty for a law he did not truly violate. When the lawgiver officially judges the subject's case in the external forum regarding the law, if he is to be just, he has no choice but to allow the exception if it was legitimate. The lawgiver is not at liberty to choose one way or the other as in the first case use of aequitas spoken of above, where the subject truly violated the law in letter and spirit and had incurred a penalty.

A law consists of two parts, the letter and the spirit. Guilt is only incurred when one violates the spirit of the law—this is what a true violation of the law consists of. One who appears to have violated the letter of the law, but keeps the spirit of the law incurs no guilt and cannot be said to have even violated the law, even though he appears to have violated it in the external forum. A proper term to use for a subject who legitimately uses epikeia is that he overlooks the letter of the law in the external forum, but he does not ignore it, or change it. He looks beyond the letter law by looking to an exception of the law that exempts him from the letter of the law. When he looks beyond the letter of the law he is looking at the spirit of the law, the intention of the lawgiver. The subject is exempted from the parts of letter of the law that he cannot keep; they do not bind him due to a legitimate exception.

HNUE, p. 44: "If, however, one does not observe [a precept] in some case in which it can be believed with probability that, if the legislator were present, he would not be willing to bind him, such a one is not to be deemed a transgressor of the precept.¹¹

The law is not truly transgressed by the subject, meaning that the legitimate exception to the law, which the subject appeals to, is actually an invisible part of the law, because it is in keeping with the spirit of the law and the intention of the lawgiver. No violation is incurred if there is an exception to the law, be it invisible (waiting for a future lawgiver to confirm the exception in the external forum) or an exception already written into the law.

Exception found in a Separate Law

An example in the 1917 Code of Canon Law shows that an exception to a law can be found in another law (that is to say, another law was created that teaches an exception).

Canon 879: For the valid hearing of confessions, it is necessary that jurisdiction shall have been explicitly granted either in writing or orally.

But there is an exception to this law in canon 882:

Canon 882: In danger of death all priests, though not approved for confessions, can validly and licitly absolve any penitent from any sins and censures, although reserved and notorious..."

In this case, one would not know of this exception unless they read all the canons regarding confession.

Exception within the Same Law

The following teaching in the 1917 Code of Canon Law shows that an exception to a law can be found within the same law (that is to say, an emendation was added to that law).

Canon 755: Baptism shall be given solemnly, except in the cases spoken of in Canon 759.

¹¹ Sent. IV, dist. 15, q. 3, a. 1, sol. 4, ad 3. Cf. note 62 supra.

You would know by reading this law alone that there is an exception found in Canon 759. That canon states that anyone can baptize a candidate who is in danger of death.

The fact that exceptions exist in the laws of the Church prove there can be other exceptions that were either not foreseen or not included so as not to make the law burdensome.¹² The legitimate use of *epikeia* evokes this same principle of exceptions, even though the exception has not yet been included in the letter of the law. The letter of the law has no force over the subject who evokes *epikeia* because of a legitimate exception. The exception can be looked at as invisible in regards to the law (the external forum), but present nevertheless, and is only awaiting a future lawgiver to officially include the exception into the law itself or create a new law that teaches the exception, just as has already been done in the above canon laws. It is the appearance of violating (transgressing) the letter of the law in external forum that needs a lawgiver, acting in the external forum regarding the law, to officially confirm the subject's legitimate use of *epikeia*, and in so doing either create a new law, or an emendation (an exception) to the existing law.

Once a lawgiver has judged that a subject's use of *epikeia* was justified then the exception to the law that the subject evoked would now be confirmed in the external forum regarding the law. This needs to be done by the lawgiver who is said to be acting with *aequitas*, instead of *epikeia*—although the principle is the same. The individual uses *epikeia* to be exempted from the law, whereas the lawgiver use *aequitas* to officially allow an exemption from a law and in essence creates a new law, or an emendation of the existing law by his official act.

HNUE, p. 231-232 “A very clear explanation of the relationship existing between *epikeia* and *aequitas* is outlined by Cicognani Scaffa. According to these authors, *aequitas* is applied by public authority, *epikeia* by private individuals. *Aequitas* has reference to the external forum, *epikeia* to the internal. *Aequitas* is an objective judgment which directly touches the norm itself; *epikeia* is a subjective judgment of a private person. *Aequitas* is a criterion which creates a new law in a particular case... *epikeia* is not an act of jurisdiction. *Aequitas* in the external forum tempers the rights and obligations of subjects, and rules on the proper application of *epikeia*; *epikeia* is directly concerned only with the imputability of the violation of a law, and indirectly with the consequences in the internal forum, which flow from this absence of imputability. *Epikēia* does not change the objective obligation of the law, but only the imputability of its violation In the internal forum—although even in the external forum, *epikeia* may be invoked to prove good faith, and to plead immunity from ecclesiastical punishment. Finally, *aequitas* is a juridic element; *epikeia* is a ethical and moral element.”

External and Internal Forum of Law vs. Conscience (the soul)

The external and internal forum can refer to either, 1) The law itself, or, 2) The disposition of a soul in relation to the lifting of censures, the forgiveness of sins, or the non-incurring of guilt when it appears that a law has been violated. It can refer to the external (objective) and internal (subjective) forum regarding the law, or the external (objective) and internal (subjective) forum regarding the conscience (the soul) of the subject. A soul that is subjectively innocent is also objectively innocent. The two cannot be separated. A soul cannot be innocent of a crime in one sense while guilty in another, to say so would be heresy. If the innocent soul appears to be guilty in the external forum regarding the law, it is only by appearance and not by fact, because even though a lawgiver has not yet confirmed his legitimate use of *epikeia* in the external forum regarding the law, that facts are that he is innocent of violating the law in the external and internal forum of his conscience/soul (his disposition to the God and the Church) and even in regard to the law, but because a lawgiver has not yet official confirmed his use of *epikeia* in the external forum, he is said to only be justified in the internal forum regarding the law, while awaiting future confirmation in the external forum regarding the law by a lawgiver.¹³

¹² See: ### on how the *Ne Temere* decree by Pope Pius X added and exception to the *Tametsi* decree from the Council of Trent.

¹³ From this point forward, once a lawgiver has judged in the external forum, in regard to this specific exception there would now be a law to refer to in order to be justified with no need to appeal to *epikeia* in the future regarding that specific exception.

HNUE, p. 235: It cannot be denied that the whole history of the concept of epikeia in Moral Theology points to the fact that it has always been considered an institute which has reference to the internal forum only. In point of fact, no aspect of epikeia is more characteristic than its subjectivity. The subject of the law, finding himself involved in a most difficult situation, confronted by a written law which sees to demand immediate observance, realizing, that recourse to a Superior is impossible, yet believing that the legislator benignly excluded from the law the case at hand, invokes epikeia on his own authority, in order to deviate from the clear words of the law. Thus to insist upon the importance of the subjective element in epikeia, however, is not to deny that there is, indeed and must be, an objective justification for it. But the point here is that, in spite of the existence and necessity of this objective element [ed. objective justification of the man in regard to his soul and actions], the effects of the lack of guilt for transgressing the letter of the law have standing only in that forum [ed. internal forum regarding the law]. Yet, in the external forum epikeia may well have an indirect effect, at least insofar as ecclesiastical authority is concerned. For the plea that epikeia was used by the subject of the law in good faith will often be taken into consideration by an equitable Superior in evaluating the subjective guilt or innocence of him who has transgressed the words of the law.”

This future act of the lawgiver does not make the subject innocent, he is already innocent, it is only a retroactive confirmation of the subject’s innocence at the time he used epikeia. In regard to the lifting of censures of a subject who had legitimately used epikeia, the future act of the lawgiver does not lift the censures, they are already lifted from the moment the subject used epikeia. The lawgiver is only retroactively confirming that the subject’s censures were lifted at the time he used epikeia. A penitent cannot be said to have his censures lifted in one sense (internally) while not being lifted in another sense (externally), for to say so would be heresy. If that could be true, were would such a penitent stand? Neither here nor there and he would be paralyzed in the teaching, practicing and living of his Catholic faith.

A penitent who evokes the principle of epikeia by either privately abjuring, or only before lay witnesses has his censures lifted and is free from guilt, both objectively and subjectively and is free to publicly act as a Catholic as long as no scandal is involved, meaning other Catholics must be made aware of the fact that he abjured.

TRC, p. 149: It is to be remembered that one who has been absolved in the internal forum can conduct himself in the manner of one who has been absolved in the external forum.

Canon 2251: If absolution from a censure is given in the external forum it holds good for both the external and internal forum; if it is given in the internal forum, the person who obtained absolution may if no scandal is caused thereby conduct himself as if absolved even in his actions of the external forum.

A cause of scandal would be if the penitent was in public heresy and being that there can be no public record of the confession before a priest the people may think he is still in public heresy while acting as a Catholic. Thus the advice that the priest present something in writing, attesting to the fact of the penitent’s private abjuration.

TRC, p. 149 Footnote 159: The faithful can suffer scandal because they know of the censures but do not know of the absolution. Hence the one absolved is bound to remove the scandal and must, therefore, avoid all public acts which in the eyes of the faithful would make him appear to be rebellious, until he has given sufficient proof of his absolution. Such proof can be had by means of the confessor’s written or declared assurance, or through the testimony of witness who saw him go to confession.

Here lies the justification of a specific public abjuration, either before a Catholic priest or lay witnesses in these extraordinary days of the great apostasy. This justifies and demands in these days of the great apostasy a specific public abjuration that would remove any scandal due to lack of evidence that the penitent indeed abjured and converted. We read that when a priest lifts a censure or a convert in the internal forum that it is prudent for him to also receive the convert in the external forum as would have been done

before the bishop in order to remove the presumption of guilty in the external forum (so that other Catholics would know such a penitent indeed converted).

TRC, P. 154: While there is not prohibition against granting absolution in the internal forum, and although the absolution will restore the convert to the state of grace, the absolution will generally be powerless to remove the presumptions of the external forum. It is therefore more practicable, especially in view of the delegation of powers generally conceded by bishop to their parish priests, to receive the convert in the external forum with the full observance of the prescriptions of the Instruction.

The same principle would apply if the abjuration were only taken before lay witnesses.

Those who did not act according to the principle of epikeia, when it would be sinful not too, would be confirmed as have being condemned by the lawgiver for not acting upon the principle of epikeia. The lawgiver would also judge against a subject who did not have a legitimate claim to epikeia and retroactively condemn him and all those that followed him if his crimes were public. The lawgiver would also condemn all those who have acted against the letter of the law while explicitly denying the use of epikeia, as you have Patrick.

Practical Application:

Patrick, you say your censures have been lifted. I quote from your own words from the above question: Who lifted your censures? Your reply was, “The Church lifted my censures by supplied jurisdiction.” I hope you will not say that in one sense your censures have been lifted (subjectively), but in another sense they have not been lifted (objectively). You have taught the heresy that a man can be inside the Church in the internal forum while being but outside the Church in the external forum. I quote from your comment #3. Patrick Henry, comment 3: “Only and Abjuration of Errors and Profession of Faith made to one who has Jurisdiction can put anyone back into the True Church in the EXTERNAL Forum.” Again as stated above this is pure heresy and shows a lack of common sense. This heretical teaching would apply to you in that you have not taken an abjuration before a bishop with ordinary jurisdiction. The future act of the lawgiver, acting in the external forum regarding the law, only confirms that you were inside the Catholic Church at the time the subject evoked epikeia, it does not place him in the Church in the external forum. The same is true of penitents, who do not have access to a priest, can have their sins forgiven (remitted) by confessing their sins privately before God along with perfect contrition, along with the promise to go to confession to a Catholic priest the first available opportunity. Their sins are truly forgiven and it would be heretical and plain stupid to say their sins are forgiven in the internal forum but not in the external forum.

The same reasoning applies to those who have been *latae sententiae* excommunicated. They are outside the Church, external (objectively) and internally (subjectively). In no way can they be considered inside the Catholic Church. These penalties are real and take effect in both forums.

Errors of the Synod of Pistoia: Condemned proposition: “47. Likewise, the proposition which teaches that it is necessary, according to the natural and divine laws, for either excommunication or for suspension, that a personal examination should precede, and that, therefore, sentences called “*ipso facto*” have no other force than that of a serious threat without any actual effect, - false, rash, pernicious, injurious to the power of the Church, erroneous.”¹⁴

Errors of the Synod of Pistoia: Condemned proposition: “46. The proposition asserting that “the effect of excommunication is merely exterior, because by its nature it merely excludes from exterior communion with the Church”; as if excommunication were not a spiritual punishment, binding in heaven, obligating souls, - false, dangerous, condemned in art. 23 of Luther, at least erroneous.”¹⁵

¹⁴ Pope Pius VI, *Errors of the Synod of Pistoia*, on Censures, secs. 21 and 23, D. 1447.

¹⁵ Pope Pius VI, *Errors of the Synod of Pistoia*, on Censures, secs. 20 and 22, D. 1546

Fifth Lateran Council: “23. Excommunications are only external penalties and they do not deprive man of the common spiritual prayers of the Church - Condemned!”¹⁶

When a lawgiver confirms that a subject had been *latae sententiae* excommunication the subject is then said to be *ferendae sententiae* excommunicated (by name).¹⁷ It does not mean the subject was not excommunicated until a lawgiver hands down a sentence. The lawgiver is only confirming that the subject was already excommunicated when he violated the law. The subject was already outside the Catholic Church both externally and internally and the future act of the lawgiver only confirms this fact.

Patrick, you also say your sins are forgiven, and if it is true that your censures have been lifted, then surely your sins can be forgiven without a priest as taught by the law itself in the Council of Trent. That would mean you hope you are in a state of grace. I will now ask you the following questions about being in a “state of grace” and how it relates to the external and internal forum regarding the law, and the subjective and objective justification of your soul. 1) If you believe you are in a “state of grace,” do you think it is possible for you to be in a “state of grace” in the internal forum, while not being in a “state of grace” in the external forum? 2) If you believe you are in a “state of grace,” do you think it is possible to be subjectively in a “state of grace” while not being objectively in a “state of grace”?

Patrick, the reality of the matter is that you cannot be in a state of grace, because your censures could not have been lifted. Therefore, if your censures have not been lifted you are still outside the Catholic Church, and there is no remission of sins outside of the Catholic Church. Why are your censures not lifted? Because you explicitly deny the use of epikeia, which is the very principle that would allow you to be exempted from the appropriate laws and have your censures lifted without access to a bishop, or the bishop’s delegate and two witnesses. You are also outside the Catholic Church due to your other heretical and schismatic teachings.

I am not saying every man has to know about epikeia to legitimately use it. A man who uses common sense automatically evokes epikeia, even if he does not know anything at all about the Church’s teachings regarding epikeia. This man, even though he does not know of epikeia, has not explicitly denied the use of epikeia as you have. Therefore it is true to say that a penitent who uses common sense alone, and either took a private abjuration before God, because he did not know he is supposed to take abjurations publically before witnesses, and the penitent who took a public abjuration before lay witnesses, would both have their censures lifted.

Once a man who took a private abjuration realizes he was supposed to take a public abjuration before witnesses, he would then be required to confirm his private abjuration, publicly, not to have his censures re-lifted, but to have it confirmed that his censures were lifted the date he took the private abjuration. If the man does not take the public abjuration either before the bishop, priest, or witnesses after he has been told he must, then his censures would fall back upon his head.

This is what canonists teach in regard to a priest’s lifting of censures of a penitent in an urgent case, who is not in danger of death, but does not have access to the pope or bishop for a long duration (six-months). Regarding the priest (confessors) use of epikeia in urgent cases to lift censures we read:

The Catholic Encyclopedia, “Excommunications,” 1907: “The (2) Urgent Cases - In the chapter “Nuper” (xxix, de sent. excomm., lib. V, tit. xxxix), Innocent III sets forth the principle that governs such cases: “When it is difficult for the excommunicated person to go to him who excommunicated him, he may be absolved by his bishop or even by his own priest, on promising to obey the orders of him by whom excommunication was pronounced.” This is the principle that moralists and canonists formulated as an axiom: *Impedito casus papalis fit episcopalis*: in case of one who is prevented from presenting himself to the pope, the excommunication reserved to the pope may be removed by the bishop. But most authors carried the analogy still further: for him who is prevented from presenting himself to the bishop, the excommunication may be removed by any confessor...”

Regarding the long duration:

¹⁶ Fifth Lateran Council, Bull “*Exsurge Domine*,” errors of Luther, June 15, 1520, D. 763.

¹⁷ 4/20/04 Correction: The subject is not *ferendae* excommunicated but only declared to have been *latae* excommunicated.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, “Excommunications,” 1907: “They distinguished between obstacles that were more or less prolonged: perpetual obstacles were such as exceed five years; obstacles of long duration were those lasting over six months; and obstacles of short duration, those continuing for less than six months. When the obstacle was perpetual the bishop or, if he could not be reached, any priest might absolve without appealing to the superior; this could also be done, but not without obligation of recourse to the superior on the cessation of the obstacle, when the latter was of long duration, provided there were urgency.”

This last sentence makes it clear that after the priest has lifted the penitent’s censure by the law of epikeia, the penitent must then promise to go before the proper authorities (pope or bishop) to have his lifting of the censures confirmed, and if he does not at the first available opportunity (upon the cessation of the obstacle) the censures fall back on his head.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, “Excommunication,” 1907: “Henceforth “in urgent cases when absolution cannot be deferred without danger of grave scandal or infamy, which is left to the conscientious appreciation of the confessor, the latter, after having imposed the necessary satisfaction, can absolve, without other faculties, from all censure; even those specially reserved to the Holy See, but under pain or recurrence under the same censure if, within a month, the penitent thus absolved does not recur to the Holy See by letters and through the medium of the confessor.” This new method has been more precisely explained and even rendered easier by subsequent papal decisions. The absolution thus given is direct (Holy Office, 19 Aug., 1891), and although recourse to the Penitentiaria is obligatory, its object is not to ask a new absolution, but only to solicit the order of the Church, the penitent, as stated above, having had to make a serious promise to conform to them (standi mandatis Ecclesi). The power thus granted in urgent cases is valid for all cases, without exception, reserved by law to the pope or the ordinary, even for the absolution of an accomplice (Holy Office, 7 June, 1899)... If the interested party, though able to appeal to the Holy See, fails to do so... he incurs the former censures, which remain effective until there is a new absolution followed by recourse to Rome...”

Note carefully, the future act of the bishop or pope does not absolve from the censure, because they are already absolved (their censures had already been lifted). Patrick, this is contrary to your heretical teaching that says this future act of the pope or bishop would absolve (lift censures) in the external forum. The future act of the pope or bishop confirms the absolution (lifting of censures) that took place when the penitent went before the priest when acting upon epikeia.

A Catholic who took a private abjuration, because he did not know he was supposed to take a public abjuration, truly has his censures lifted, but once the fact is made known to him that he must take a public abjuration in writing and he does not, then the censures fall back on his head, he re-incurs his censures. Once he knows of the law of abjuration as the Church teaches it, he must fulfill as much of it as he can. As the obstacles of non-accessibility of the pope, bishop, priest, or lay witnesses are removed that were preventing him from fulfilling the letter of the law, then he must fulfill that part of the law that he can now fulfill. (See: RJMI Response: 49.1; RJMI, Abjuration Booklet)

Patrick Comment: 15

Note: “**EPIKEIA IS NOT AN ACT OF JURISDICTION.**” Richard, are you a Catholic Priest who has been hearing Confessions? Are you wanting us to believe **The Church authorizes Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi, with supplied jurisdiction, to teach the Catholic Faith, while hearing Confessions, that She delegates to him by the law of epikeia?**

RJMI Response: 15.1

Where did I say that I, a layman, can hear confession? That statement is an outright lie, that you must make reparation for in writing. If people read your above statement, without reading my original letters, they would think I said that I could hear confessions. The whole sentence you wrote does not make sense.

Do you realize that in this discourse we are having I am not just speaking of myself, a layman, but also of Fr. Egregyi, a priest.

Patrick Comment: 16

What Pope, Father of the Church or Catholic Theologian can you quote that will *PROVE* to Catholics that the Catholic Church supplies you, as a layman, with jurisdiction for the external forum **by the law of epikeia**?

RJMI Response: 16.1

Again, laymen are not supplied with jurisdiction to teach, but must be authorized (be sent) to publicly teach the Catholic faith by proper Church authorities, and they must have imprimaturs for books or tapes they make defending the Catholic faith. Regarding a priest, as is Fr. Egregyi, your question of supplied jurisdiction would be appropriate. (See: RJMI Response: 11.1)

It is the principle of epikeia as taught and practiced by the Church that authorizes me, as well a priest, to teach the Catholic faith, and for a Catholic priest to hear confessions and preach sermons. The principle of epikeia grants Catholic laymen and priests an exemption from the Church laws that are impossible to keep in these days, regarding the duty of all Catholics to help save their own soul and the souls of others. The highest goal of all the Church laws is the salvation of souls.

It is an obvious fact that a priest who legitimately uses epikeia is directly supplied with jurisdiction by the Church in order for his acts to be legal, and in the case of confession for his absolution to be legal and valid. In other words, if one was to agree that a priest who is in prison, and outside his diocese and with no access to the local bishop, can hear the confessions of Catholic prisoners who are not in danger of death, by the use of epikeia, then it is also certain that the Church must directly supply the priest with the jurisdiction to hear the individual confessions, because it is of the Divine Law that a priest cannot act legally without jurisdiction, nor can he validly absolve from sins without jurisdiction.

Supplied Jurisdiction from the Church

I will present two official teachings of the Church that proves the Church can supply jurisdiction directly to priest who does not have delegated jurisdiction from either his local ordinary or his religious superior.

Canon 882:

The following is an example, as taught in canon law, that proves a priest who has no faculties can hear the confession of a penitent who is in danger of death, and the Church directly supplies him with jurisdiction with no need for him to be authorized by the local bishop, or his religious superior.

Canon law teaches that the Church supplies jurisdiction in extraordinary circumstances when normally a priest must have faculties, either from the local bishop or a superior of a religious order, to hear valid confessions (c. 879).

Canon 879: For the valid hearing of confessions, it is necessary that jurisdiction shall have been explicitly granted either in writing or orally.

The Church teaches this in canon law 882:

1917 Code of Canon Law: “c. 882 In danger of death all priests, though not approved for confessions, can validly and licitly absolve any penitent from any sins and censures, although reserved and notorious...”

It is clear, that in these extraordinary (particular) cases, when the penitent is in danger of death, a priest who had not been approved for confession by legitimate Church authority—meaning without faculties, without delegated jurisdiction from legitimate Church authorities—can forgive sins in confession and even lift censures. In order for these acts to be legal and valid the priest must have jurisdiction. If it does not come from legitimate Church authorities, then where does it come from? It is clear the jurisdiction does not come from a prelate, a local ordinary, or a superior of a religious order, therefore the jurisdiction must come directly from the Church and supplied to the priest for the hearing of confessions, or the lifting of censures of a penitent in danger of death. The priest would receive supplied jurisdiction from the Church. There you have it Patrick, an official teaching from the Church that proves the Church can supply jurisdiction, in certain cases, when a bishop or superior cannot be accessed.

Canon 209:

Another example: Canon 209 is another law that teaches the Church can directly supply jurisdiction when priest, even a non-Catholic one, who obviously does not have delegated jurisdiction from a local ordinary or religious superior, hears the confession of a penitent who thinks he is a Catholic priest.¹⁸

Canon 209: “The Church supplies jurisdiction both for the external and the internal forum: (1) in common error; (2) in a positive and probable doubt whether of fact or law.”

Such a priest can validly hear the confessions of a penitent, who is not in danger of death, provided the penitent believes he is a Catholic priest with faculties. This is a clear case in which the Church directly supplies the jurisdiction, which normally must come from a Catholic bishop, or religious superior. The Catholic bishop or religious superior is bypassed in this case and the Church steps in and directly supplies jurisdiction. This proves that the Church can directly supply jurisdiction in want of a Pope, a Catholic bishop or religious superior. That principle being established let no one say the Church can never directly supply jurisdiction by bypassing a Catholic bishop or religious superior.

PCC, Vol. I, on Canon 209, p. 94: Common error consists in the erroneous belief of all or nearly all the people, parish, community, that a man has jurisdiction. The fact that the person knows¹⁹ that he has not jurisdiction, does not interfere with the validity of his acts if by common error he is believed to have jurisdiction... in the case of common error, not matter how created, the Church supplies the jurisdiction for the benefit of the people. The Church likewise supplies jurisdiction in a positive and probable doubt.

This teaching of the Church is restated in an article in the Catholic encyclopedia. First we learn that a priest can absolve from censures (accept abjurations and professions of faith) reserved to the Holy See, or the local ordinary when the pope or the bishop cannot be reached.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, “Excommunications,” 1907: “When the obstacle was perpetual the bishop or, if he could not be reached, any priest might absolve without appealing to the superior;

¹⁸ Example: An Eastern Rite Catholic may go into a Greek Schismatic church, thinking it is an Eastern Rite Catholic church, and go to confession to the schismatic priest. The Catholic penitent believes the priest is Catholic and as a result would be forgiven of his sins due to canon 209 and the Church will supply the necessary jurisdiction for this one confession to be legal and valid.

¹⁹ This is not the case with the priests in the Conciliar Church, whether they are Catholic or non-Catholic—depending on how they respond to the crimes when manifested to them—they both think they have jurisdiction from a legitimate Roman Pontiff and bishops, even though in fact they do not, because John Paul II is a non-Catholic antipope and all the bishops are non-Catholic. Therefore both classes of priests are not aware of the fact that they have no jurisdiction. This is how the saintly priest Padre Pio was supplied with jurisdiction from the time he was under a non-Catholic Conciliar bishop so that his confessions were valid. His jurisdiction did not come from the non-Catholic bishop but was supplied by the Church in virtue of Canon 209.

this could also be done, but not without obligation of recourse to the superior on the cessation of the obstacle, when the latter was of long duration, provided there were urgency.”

Second we learn what constitutes and case of urgency.

Ibid: “As to what constitutes a state of urgency, the reply of 16 June, 1897, is very reassuring, since it permits absolution from censures ‘as soon as it becomes too distressing to the penitent to remain in the state of sin during the time necessary for soliciting and receiving from Rome the power to absolve’.”

Third we learn that the Church supplies such jurisdiction in these extraordinary cases.

Ibid: “(3) In Danger of Death - It is a principle repeatedly set forth in canon law that at the point of death all reservations cease and all necessary **jurisdiction is supplied by the Church**. “At the point of death”, says the Council of Trent (Sess. XIV, c. vii), “in danger of death”, says the Ritual (tit. III, cap. i, n. 23), **any priest can absolve from all sins and censures, even if he be without the ordinary faculties of confessors...** (Holy Office, 29 July, 1891).”

Fourth, as also stated above regarding urgent cases, we learn that a priest may even lift a censure reserved to the Holy See, or ordinary, even when the penitent is not in danger of death, in urgent cases, by the law of epikeia.

Ibid: “The (2) Urgent Cases - In the chapter “Nuper” (xxix, de sent. excomm., lib. V, tit. xxxix), Innocent III sets forth the principle that governs such cases: “When it is difficult for the excommunicated person to go to him who excommunicated him, he may be absolved by his bishop or even by his own priest, on promising to obey the orders of him by whom excommunication was pronounced.” This is the principle that moralists and canonists formulated as an axiom: *Impedito casus papalis fit episcopalis*: in case of one who is prevented from presenting himself to the pope, the excommunication reserved to the pope may be removed by the bishop. **But most authors carried the analogy still further: for him who is prevented from presenting himself to the bishop, the excommunication may be removed by any confessor...**”

This action of the priest, of lifting of censures in urgent cases was not taught in the letter of the law before 1917, but canonists agreed that epikeia applies in urgent cases and that indeed a priest could lift the censures of a penitent in urgent cases. The lawgiver had codified this use of epikeia in 1917 by creating a new law that teaches an ordinary priest may lift the censures of a penitent in urgent cases.

Canon 2254.3: [Absolution from Censures in Urgent Cases] If in some extraordinary case the recourse is morally impossible, the confessor himself can grant absolution without the obligation of recourse...”

This same principle would apply to abjurations taken before lay witnesses due to lack of a priest. A future pope (the lawgiver) will confirm this use of epikeia for abjurations before lay witnesses, by creating a new law just as has been done for priests in canon 2254.3

Remember, as much of the law that one is appealing to for an exemption must be kept, if it can be kept. The letter of the law regarding abjurations states:

Canon 2314.2: The abjuration is made in juridical form, when it takes place in the presence of the local Ordinary or his delegate and at least two witnesses.

Therefore, if a bishop cannot be accessed, nor obviously a priest delegated by the bishop, then one must at least make an effort to take the abjuration before another Catholic priest, and if no priest is available then before two lay witnesses. The 1917 Code of Canon Law, Canon 2314.2, requires two lay witnesses in all cases, even when the abjuration is taken before the bishop or a priest, whereas the Instruction of 1859 only required two lay witness if the abjuration was taken before the bishop’s delegate.

Regarding the law of confessions the only condition for a legal and valid confession is that one goes to a priest authorized to hear confessions. There is no mention of confessing sins before lay witnesses, and therefore, as Trent teaches, a penitent can be forgiven (absolved) of their sins by making a private confession before God, if they have perfect contrition, along with the promise to go to a Catholic priest the first opportunity.

Confession differs from abjuration in that confession is an act of the internal forum of conscience (a private act), whereas an abjuration is an act of the external forum of conscience (a public act), that is taken not just for the good of the penitent, but for the common good and order of the Church. Therefore the abjuration must be a public act, even if it is a private abjuration because no witnesses were available, it must still be in writing and publicly available to anyone who asks to see it as proof that the said person, indeed took an abjuration. A man who had publicly fallen away from the Catholic faith, either by explicitly believing in heresy, or is a heretic by omission by being in communion with public heretics, or by being in communion with those who are in communion with public heretics, must make a public abjuration so that other Catholics may know that he now holds the Catholic faith and that they may now allow him into religious communion with them.

Parallel Laws Defending Necessity of Abjuration before Lay Witnesses

As you have read above, canon 2314.2 requires two lay witnesses to be present during a penitent's abjuration in all cases, even before the local Ordinary. The Holy Office has taught that at least two lay witnesses must be present during the abjuration in order for it to have juridic value in the external forum.

TRC, p. 123: The Holy Office determined the juridical form of abjuration, as it is now prescribed in the Code, in two responses, the former dated March 28, 1900,²⁰ the latter under date of February 19, 1916.²¹ These responses **demand the presence of two witnesses at the abjuration** in order that the act would have juridical value in the external forum.

This proves that one of the main aspects of an abjuration, for a penitent whose sins are public, is that his abjuration must also be public and provable by the presence of at least two witnesses that can attest to the fact that the penitent indeed abjured.

The use of lay witnesses is also demanded for private baptisms (those without a priest in which a layman is the minister) and for marriages without a priest.

Canon 742: Private Baptism, as spoken of in Canon 759, may be given by any one who uses the proper matter and form and has the right intention. In so far as possible, **two witnesses, or a least one, should be present** by whom the conferring of Baptism can be proved.

Canon 1098: (1) In danger of death, marriage may be validly and licitly contracted **in the presence only of two witnesses**; even apart from the danger of death marriage may be thus contracted, if it can be prudently foreseen that this state of affairs (namely, the great difficulty of getting an authorized priest to witness the marriage) will continue for a month.

The exact same principle applies to abjurations that take place without a Catholic bishop or priest. These abjurations must take place, if possible, before two lay witnesses, in order to fulfill as much of the law regarding abjuration as is possible, and so the penitent can prove to other Catholics that he did take the abjuration by the presence of witnesses. Secular courts and the signing of contracts operate in the same manner. They require that a contract be signed in the presence of a credible witness to prove that, one, the person who signs it is who he says he is, and that he indeed signed it and did not have someone else sign it. The same applies to verbal court testimonies. You see, Patrick, pagan courts have more common sense than fallen away Catholics.

And now for a last piece of evidence from the Holy Office that allows a penitent to take an abjuration before lay witnesses if a Catholic bishop or priest is not available. They addressed this to missionary countries that did not have easy access to priests.

²⁰ *Fontes*, n. 1237.

²¹ *Fontes*, n. 1299.

TRC. p. 121-122: During the period between the Council of Trent (1545-1563) and the present Code (1918) the Sacred Congregation developed many aspects of the abjuration of heresy and the profession of faith through instructions and responses. Thus, on April 7, 1629, the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith declared that apostates in missionary countries were under no obligation of making a public abjuration before infidels, but it was sufficient for them to make it before the faithful, provided that they discontinued wearing any garb indicative of apostasy, and that they took care that the infidels learned of their abjuration in due time either from themselves or from others, even if this entailed danger to their lives.²² Ordinarily the abjuration was to be made before the bishop; but the Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith permitted a private abjuration²³ with only a few of the faithful present as witnesses under certain conditions.²⁴

If there was question of scandal, the abjuration necessarily had to be public. The Congregation insisted on this, even at the risk of the loss of temporal goods necessary for the sustenance of the convert and his family, when the retention of these goods connoted an implicit profession of heresy. At the same time, the Congregation declared that no one could be received into the Church, if he wished to keep his Catholicity secret by publically posing as a heretic.

Now, you may ask, if a layman cannot be supplied with jurisdiction to lift censures, then how can the censures be lifted of a penitent who takes an abjuration before lay witnesses? Precisely in the same way a penitent's mortal sins are forgiven, if he cannot get to a priest to confession. For this penitent's mortal sins to be forgiven jurisdiction must be supplied to him to absolve him. Where does this jurisdiction come from? The Church supplies the jurisdiction directly to absolve the penitent of the mortal sins he privately confesses. The same principle applies to a penitent who takes an abjuration, either privately or only before lay witnesses due to the lack of a priest. The Church supplies the jurisdiction directly to absolve the penitent. The taking of the abjuration before lay witnesses, if lay witnesses are available, would be a necessary condition to effect the lifting of censures of the penitent, the supplied jurisdiction does not come through the penitent or the lay witnesses but is supplied by the Church directly to absolve the penitent and in so doing lift his censures, in the exact same way the mortal sins of a Catholic can be forgiven (absolved) without going to confession to a priest.

Does there always have to be a Catholic pope or bishop alive at all times?

Patrick Comment: 17

You stated in your letter: **“We do not always have to have a pope, and we do not always even have to have one bishop, but there must always be the possibility of having a pope and Catholic bishops.”** This seems to be another NEW DOCTRINE of Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi. How can the Church Jesus Christ founded remain the SAME as it was when Jesus founded it as a perfect, HIERARCHICAL society, if there are no Catholic bishops living?

RJMI Response: 17.1

How do you account for this following quote by St. Athanasius? “If there were only one Catholic left in the world, there goes the Church.” For the sake of argument let's say there are Catholic bishops alive that we don't know about. How does the help you and me, and others who do not know of them, in our every day duty of living, practicing and teaching the Catholic faith? I will address the possibility that there may

²² Contained in the response of 28 dec. 1770—*Fontes*, n. 4551. Cf. S.C.S. Off., 5 sept. 1736, and ad 2—*Fontes* n. 790.

²³ RJMI Comment: Private abjuration in this context means that it is still done in public and before witnesses by that it is not done according to the letter of the law that requires abjurations to be taken before the local Ordinary or his delegate (who must be a priest) therefore such an abjuration would need to be confirmed in the future by the local Ordinary or his delegate.

²⁴ S.C. de Prop. Fide, litt. (ad Ep. Limericenses), 8 apr. 1786. This response was confirmed by the Holy Office on March 28, 1900, could take place before the bishop or anyone delegated by him as notary.—*Fontes*, n. 1237.

be no Catholic bishops as we go along. One thing will be clear to the reader, you do not produce one infallible papal decree or Council that taught that there must always be Catholic bishops and a Catholic pope reigning in the Church at all times. If that were so then the papacy would have defected the first time the Holy See fell vacant, with no pope to rule and govern the Church.

Theologians put forth opinions that they believe there must always be Catholic bishops, and a ruling hierarchy, but this is only their opinions, and not dogma. Just as it was Fr. Augustine's opinion that a prelate cannot be *ipso facto* deposed? If the theologians, who believed there must always be a ruling hierarchy, were alive today, they would think differently. Do you think they could have ever imagined the extent of the apostasy, to the point, that even as you admit, we know of no Catholic bishop who is now visibly ruling and governing the Church and the faithful? What good is an invisible hierarchy that the faithful (Catholics) do not know about, so as to be ruled and governed? What good for the faithful is there in a Catholic bishop they do not even know of, so as to be ruled and governed by him? If there was such a bishop would he not be a coward and have effectively denied the faith by omission? Isn't he obliged to profess the Catholic faith openly, as are laymen, especially when it is being denied? (See my book "Chasing Ghosts: The Siri Thesis)

Even if there were Catholic bishops alive, that does us no good in our every day living of the Catholic life, and it does you no good in order to justify your teaching of the Catholic faith, because we do not know who or where these Catholic bishops are to get their approval to teach the Catholic faith, or to get an imprimatur from them to publish books and tapes. So this argument, as to whether there needs to be Catholic bishops alive at all times until the second coming of Christ has nothing to do with what was the main topic of this debate. I will only briefly deal with this topic, so as not to distract from the main points of this debate between us, which is the use of epikeia when it is impossible to have access to a Catholic bishop.

Patrick Comment: 18

Let us review what is taught about God's infallible Church and see if this statement: "**we do not always even have to have one bishop**" is true or false. To understand better the EXTERNAL and INTERNAL FORUM we open: *Dictionary of Dogmatic Theology* by Pietro Parente, Antonio Piolanti and Salvatore Garofalo. Imprimatur, May 1, 1951, pages 124 & 125:

"**HIERARCHY** (from a Greek word meaning sacred authority). The body of persons participating in ecclesiastical power, which is divided into power of orders and powers of jurisdiction. The power of orders is immediately directed to the sanctification of souls through the offering of the sacrifice of the Mass and the administration of the sacraments. The power of jurisdiction, on the other hand, is immediately directed to ruling the faithful... The power of jurisdiction is divided into: (1) power of forum **externum**, when directed principally to the common good, in so far as it regulates the social relations of the members and produces public juridical effects; and the power of forum **internum**, when directed principally to private good, in so far as it regulates the relations of consciences with God and is exercised per se SECRETLY and with prevalently moral effects; (2) ordinary power, when ipso jure (by Law) it is connected with an office, and delegated power, when it is granted to a person by commission or delegation... Since sacred power is TWOFOLD, **hierarchy** is likewise TWOFOLD, and therefore we have in the Church the hierarchy of orders, constituted by the body of persons having the power of orders in its different grades, and the hierarchy of jurisdiction, consisting in the series of those persons who have the power of **teaching** and **governing**... The two hierarchies, although very closely related, are really distinct. Orders are conferred by the appropriate sacrament, while **jurisdiction** ORIGINATES through **canonical mission**."

Question. If "**jurisdiction** ORIGINATES through **canonical mission**" how does the Church supply jurisdiction to Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi by the law of epikeia, who is a layman, who has never had a **canonical** mission?

RJMI Response: 18.1

Patrick, here you go again confusing the people, by confusing topics. There is a difference between preaching and teaching. Sometimes the preaching of a priest is referred to as teaching, just as sometimes a dogma is referred to as a doctrine. The teaching the above quote is speaking of is the preaching of a Catholic priest that requires a canonical mission and jurisdiction. When a layman teaches the Catholic faith, he does not need a canonical mission or jurisdiction, but he does need to be authorized (approved) by a superior, and he needs an imprimatur if he is to publish works defending and teaching the Catholic faith. A layman who receives an imprimatur is not receiving jurisdiction from his local bishop, but is simply receiving the bishop's necessary approval (authorization). The only way a layman can publically teach the Catholic faith without the approval of Church authorities is by the principle of epikeia that exempts him from the letter of the law due to an extraordinary circumstance.

The above quote is referring to a priest's preaching that is referred to as teaching. Quoting the letter of the law regarding the preaching of a priest that states he needs a canonical mission from a prelate will do you no good. It is an exemption from this law that epikeia appeals to when it is impossible to receive a canonical mission from one in authority.

I have stated these facts above regarding a priest's hearing of confession, or a priest right to preach. It has already been proven above by canon 882 that a priest does not always need to have a canonical mission (be sent by proper Church authority) in order to hear confessions of penitents in danger of death. Canon 209 teaches that a non-Catholic priest, who obviously does not have a canonical mission, can legally and validly hear the confession of a Catholic penitent, provided the Catholic penitent believes he is a Catholic priest who has been approved to hear confession. In both cases the Church directly supplies jurisdiction to the priest in order for the individual confessions to be valid, without a canonical mission. (See: RJMI Response: 16.1)

Patrick Comment: 19

Pope Pius XII wrote, August 2, 1958, concerning: *The Apostolate of the Church*? "The Church has received in its totality the deposit of faith and of grace, all revealed truth and all the means of salvation LEFT as a heritage by the Redeemer: ... the government of the faithful by the POWER OF JURISDICTION ... Do you believe the above teaching of Pope Pius XII is true? If you answer no, please explain why. As part of the means of salvation, there absolutely MUST be Bishops and priests ALWAYS LIVING who ACTUALLY POSSESS real, lawful, spiritual JURISDICTION! It is necessary for the government of the faithful.

Do you believe without at least some **bishops**, priests and deacons having JURISDICTION, there is no Catholic Church? If you answer no, please explain why. Pope Pius XII taught in his address to the 2nd World Congress of the Lay Apostolate, October 5, 1957: "The HIERARCHY ALONE is responsible before God for the government of the Church." Do you believe this teaching of Pope Pius XII is the truth? If you answer no, please explain why. Do you believe God's Catholic Church teaches Her children that:

RJMI Response: 19.1

Where, in the above statement, does Pope Pius XII say there must always be bishops in the Church? How are these unknown bishops fulfilling the above quotes by Pope Pius XII? How does an unknown bishop govern the faithful? How can an unknown bishop be a means to salvation, which is your own comment? How can an unknown bishop preach and teach the Catholic faith, authorize others to do so, and administer the sacraments? What good are these unknown bishops doing for the faithful, if the faithful do not even know where, or who they are? Where are the faithful that these bishops are governing? Are they

governing you at this moment? What Catholic bishop governs you, Patrick? Pope Pius says the Redeemer has left us a government to rule the faithful? How is this fulfilled if Catholics do not know of these bishops, and therefore are not governed by them? Pope Pius said the Redeemer left us a government that does not mean that the Church will always, at all times, and in all places have men governing the Church. Even when the Holy See, or a local sees are vacant the Church's power to govern still exists.

Patrick Comment: 20

1) NO laymen have Jurisdiction in the Church!

2) No laymen are chosen by God to make the government body of the HIERARCHICAL society founded by Jesus Christ! If you answer no, please explain why. Review *The Acts and Decrees of the Vatican Council* (1870). "The Church is a perfect and HIERARCHICAL society. In this respect, She is NOT a society of EQUALS in which ALL the faithful enjoy the SAME rights. Not only because, among the faithful, some

are clergy and others laity, but above all, because there **IS** IN THE CHURCH A POWER INSTITUTED BY GOD in order to SANCTIFY, to TEACH and to GOVERN, which certain ones have received and **OTHERS** HAVE NOT." It will be well to believe what God's Infallible Church teaches in the above paragraph.

The Acts and Decrees of the Vatican Council, very plainly, teach us: "there **IS** IN THE CHURCH A POWER INSTITUTED BY GOD." This is speaking in the PRESENT tense. God's Catholic Church does NOT change Her teachings. Therefore there will ALWAYS be CATHOLIC bishops IN THE CHURCH INSTITUTED BY GOD in order to SANCTIFY, to TEACH and to GOVERN.

RJMI Response: 20.1

You would make a lie of the *First Vatican Council* if you would have us believe there must always be a bishop to sanctify, teach, and govern, because we do not have a Catholic bishop who is at this very moment sanctifying, teaching, or governing the faithful. If you know of one, Patrick, please let me know.

You may ask, how is this power of the Church, that is given the Catholic pope and bishops to sanctify, teach and governing the faithful today? It is doing so by the past teachings and decrees of the popes that teach and govern eternally, and by the teachings that allow for a Catholic to be sanctified by baptism, marriage, and confession without a priest when one is not available.

Patrick, do you believe that when the Holy See is vacant that the power of the papacy is still intact? The power of the office is not lost due to a vacancy! Just because the Holy See is vacant, does not mean the papacy has defected and the power of the papacy is extinguished. The power of the papacy is perpetual and will exist till the end of time. Must the Church always have a pope to rule and govern the Church at all times? If so, the first time the Holy See fell vacant the Church would have defected and lost Her primary apostolic mark—the pope, and the papacy—from which all the other apostles (bishops) derive their power and jurisdiction. When the Church supplies jurisdiction directly, because there is no pope, or bishop to derive it from, She supplies it through the papacy, from the Chair of Peter (the papacy), even when it is Holy See is vacant.

HNUE, p. 330, Footnote 133: "It is to be noted that we do not here enter into the controversy as to whether the jurisdiction of the Bishops is derived immediately from God, or immediately from the Roman Pontiff. Billot, though himself subscribing to the latter opinion asserts that in practice it is a matter of indifference which opinions is held for even those theologians who maintain that Episcopal jurisdiction is derived immediately from God, still say that it is undoubtedly conferred with real and complete dependences of the Sovereign Pontiff.

If the papacy defected, then there can be no bishops; and there can be no Church. If the papacy and Church does not defect when She does not have a pope (the ruler of all the bishops), then how can one say the Church would defect if the Church did not have any Catholic bishops in the world, bishops being lesser in power than the pope? The office of the papacy still exists when the Holy See is vacant, just as the offices of the local sees still exist when they are vacant, with no Catholic bishops to rule them. The power of their offices still exists and is only waiting to be filled, just as the Holy See is now waiting for the next pope.

Jesus Christ (Mt. 16:18-19) put a pope as the head of the Church on earth, to rule, sanctify, and govern Her and the faithful at all times. The succession of popes cannot be broken and is perpetual, even during papal interregnums, as infallibly defined by the First Vatican Council.

First Vatican Council: “1. That which our Lord Jesus Christ, the prince of shepherds and great shepherd of the sheep, established in the blessed apostle Peter, for the continual salvation and permanent benefit of the Church, must of necessity remain for ever, by Christ's authority, in the Church which, founded as it is upon a rock, will stand firm until the end of time... 5. Therefore, if anyone says that it is not by the institution of Christ the Lord himself (that is to say, by divine law) that blessed Peter should have perpetual successors in the primacy over the whole Church; or that the Roman pontiff is not the successor of blessed Peter in this primacy: let him be anathema.” 25

Do you believe this Patrick? Does this mean we must always have a pope to sanctify, teach, and govern the Church? This means that the Chair of Peter and its power will be preserved until the end of time. The Power of the Chair and the Keys is always present, even during vacancies, waiting for a legally and validly elected pope to assume command.

First Vatican Council: “3. Therefore whoever succeeds to the chair of Peter obtains by the institution of Christ himself, the primacy of Peter over the whole Church. So what the truth has ordained stands firm, and blessed Peter perseveres in the rock-like strength he was granted, and does not abandon that guidance of the Church which he once received.”26

Patrick heretically teaches the primary apostolic mark, the Papacy, has defected

Patrick, you have denied these above infallible decrees from the First Vatican Council. How you may ask? You have written in a side note on page 329 in the book HNUE that you sent me, the following. I will first print the part of the book you were commenting on and then follow it by your written comment.

HNUE, p. 329. “(4) The primacy of St. Peter, by divine disposition, was to be perpetual, that is, until the end of time it was to be transmitted to this successors.”

Patrick Henry's comment: “and it was, but because she now has no successors (or any lawful way to get one) we must be close to the end of time!”

Now that is outright heresy by teaching that the primary apostolic mark of the Church, the papacy, has defected in that there is no way to have another pope, so that the perpetual succession of popes has ended, before the end of time. The reason, Patrick, that you teach this heresy is because, as you have said, you deny the use of epikeia. In order to have a next pope epikeia must apply to grant an exemption from current law in force as to how a pope must be elected. This law was promulgated by the last pope, Pius XII, on how a pope is to be elected and is found in *Vacantis apostolicae sedis* (Dec. 8, 1955).²⁷ It states that Cardinals must elect a pope, and he must have a 2/3 majority of the votes of the Cardinals to be elected pope. Therefore, Patrick, because you deny the use of epikeia, this law cannot be exempted from, and being there are no more Cardinals there is no way to elect a next pope, and therefore the perpetual successors of Peter has ended, before the end of time, according to you. You see how your denial of the use of epikeia has led you into the mortal sin of heresy by denying the above First Vatican Council decree that Peter will have perpetual successors until the end of time, and this has led you to teach that the gates of hell have pre-

²⁵ *First Vatican Council*, Sess. IV, Chapter 2. On the permanence of the primacy of blessed Peter in the Roman pontiffs

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ ActAps 38 (1946) 65-99)

vailed over the Church by destroying the papacy, and this is a direct contradiction of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ's direct promise to St. Peter, "*And I say to thee: That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.*" (Matthew 16:18)

Epikeia allows one to go back to an older practice in the Church in order to elect or choose a pope. By the use of epikeia and following past practices of the Church, there are several ways in which we can get a next pope. I will not take up time to deal with that topic here, but will do so in a separate article.

To summarize, just as the office of the papacy does not always depend on a pope to rule, sanctify, and govern the Church, so the office of the bishops does not always depend on the need to have bishops to rule, sanctify, and govern the Church at the local levels. The papacy and bishoprics are perpetual, even if there is no pope or one bishop at the moment to rule the Church. The offices are waiting to be filled. Even if Christ was to come and end the world when the Holy See is vacant (*sede-vacante*) the papacy is still intact in that if Christ did not come there would always be a way to elect or choose a pope, and fill the vacant local sees with bishops. I firmly believe there will be a pope to greet Jesus Christ upon His second coming, just as there was a pope, St. Peter, to see Christ leave the earth when He ascended to Heaven. It would also prove that even though it seemed almost hopeless, as to how and when we will get another pope, we nevertheless will, when God says and commands it to be so, and that after Satan has unleashed his most furious attack against the Church there will still be a pope that will rule over the Church and greet Jesus Christ upon His second coming.

Patrick Comment: 21

However, Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi teaches: "**We do not always even have to have one bishop.**" Two fundamental principles are sanctioned in Canon 108: "All the clergy are NOT of the SAME grade, but there is a SACRED HIERARCHY among them, some being subordinated to others. By Divine institution, the sacred **hierarchy**, as regards Order, consists of bishop**S**, priest**S**, and minister**S**." NOTE the PLURAL us used. There will ALWAYS be, by Divine institution, the sacred **hierarchy**, which consists of bishop**S**, priest**S**, and minister**S** in God's Catholic Church.

RJMI Response: 21.1

Patrick, where does Canon 108 say that the sacred hierarchy must always have bishops, priests, ministers to rule it? The plural used here to refer to bishops is not meant to teach that there must always be more than one bishop in the world at all times, but that all the bishops that do exist are part of the sacred hierarchy. You have totally taken this canon out of context. Canon 108 does not take up the topic as to whether there must always be Catholic bishops present in the world, but that all the Catholic bishops that are in the world at any given time make up a part of the sacred hierarchy.

Canon 108 "By Divine institution, the sacred hierarchy, as regards Order, consists of bishops, priests, and ministers; the hierarchy of jurisdiction consists of the Supreme Pontificate and the subordinate episcopate."

You conveniently left out this last underlined sentence, because it proves your twisted interpretation of this canon to be wrong. The Supreme Pontificate is included in the Divine institution and sacred hierarchy of the Church. Does this mean we must always have a pope ruling the Church? If we don't always need a pope for the Church to remain a Divine institution, then it is certain, we do not always need to have even one bishop in order for the Church to remain a Divine institution, but it is certain that the offices always exist along with the possibility of filling them when they fall vacant.

Patrick Comment: 22

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi teaches the exact opposite of what God's infallible Church teaches. Read what Pope Pius XII wrote, January 14, 1958: "The fidelity of this submission to the authority of the Church sprang from his [Thomas Aquinas] firm persuasion that the LIVING and INFALLIBLE MAGISTERIUM of the Church is the immediate and universal rule of CATHOLIC FAITH." How can there be a LIVING and INFALLIBLE MAGISTERIUM if there are NO bishops with JURISDICTION and AUTHORITY in the world? Therefore, there MUST be at least two Bishops WITH JURISDICTION LIVING in the world.

RJMI Response: 22.1

The living and infallible magisterium is comprised of all the Church's infallible decrees. Past infallible decrees of popes, in and out of Council, live and bind forever, even if there is no pope currently ruling the Church, or a bishop ruling a local see. If there were no pope or bishops at all ruling the Church, the past infallible decrees are living and all are bound to them. Jesus Christ said, "He is the truth and the Word made Flesh." Therefore the infallible truths taught by the Church are part of Christ's very Body and live forever. When the Holy See is vacant (when there is no pope currently ruling the Church) the Solemn Magisterium does not die, it still lives and is still infallible, and is found in the vacant Chair (the office) and the past decrees of the popes. The same principle applies to the bishoprics.

Our Lord said that the final days would be so bad that he questioned if there would be any faith left at all (Lk 18:8). We know there must be at least one faithful Catholic alive at all times, and I have no doubt that there are now, only a very few Catholics left in the world. Our Lord said it would be so bad that "*Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my word shall not pass away.*" (Mark 13:31) That is one thing we are assured of that God's Word is eternal and it is always present and all men are bound to it at all times, even if the Holy See and local sees are vacant.

Our Lord, referred to the Levitical priesthood as eternal. The Catholic priesthood is now the Levitical priesthood. But there were times during the Old Covenant when the function of the priest was suspended, to the point that there was not even one faithful priest left. Under the Old Covenant, when the Temple was destroyed and the Jews went into the Babylonian exile, they lost the sacrifice and the power of the priesthood. That did not mean the Levitical priesthood was totally extinguished, it just meant that because of the unfaithful priests, the sacrifice was taken away and the unfaithful priest were deprived of their office and power to function as priests, until the day came, 70 years later, when God rose up faithful priests to resume the sacrifices, once the Temple was rebuilt.

Patrick Comment: 23

The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Ecumenical Council of Trent, session XXIII teaches: "Canon I. --If anyone saith that there is NOT in the New Testament a VISIBLE and EXTERNAL priesthood; or that there is NOT any power of CONSECRATING and offering the TRUE Body and Blood of the Lord, and of FORGIVING and RETAINING SINS; but ONLY an OFFICE and bare ministry of preaching the Gospel; or that those who do not preach are not priests at all; let him be ANATHEMA. Canon VI. --If anyone saith that in the Catholic Church there is NOT a HIERARCHY by DIVINE ordination instituted, consisting of bishopS, priestS and ministerS; let him be ANATHEMA."

RJMI Response: 23.1

Patrick, Canon 1 was written to condemn the Protestant heresy that teaches that Christ did not institute a sacrificial priesthood that was given the power to consecrate bread and wine into the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ and to forgive sins. This canon is directed to the Protestants as the last part of it makes this clear when it refers to those who say the priesthood is *“only an office and bare ministry of preaching the Gospel; or that those who do not preach are not priests at all.”* The purpose of this canon was not to define that we must always have bishops and priests. The word in that canon says a “visible” priesthood, this means that Catholic priests are real and visible priests that offer sacrifice and forgive sins, as opposed to the Protestant heresy of an invisible priesthood that all people share in. Chapter 4 in session XXIII clearly directs itself to the Protestant heretics.

Council of Trent, sess. XXIII, Chap. 4: “But if anyone should affirm that all Christians without distinction are priests of the New Testament, or that they are all endowed among themselves with an equal spiritual power, he seems to do nothing else than disarrange the ecclesiastical hierarchy,”

Canon 1 does not teach that the Church must always have visible priests, but that when She does have priests that they are visible with real power to consecrate the Holy Eucharist and forgive sins. Patrick, if the purpose of this canon was to teach that there must always be visible bishops and priests then what bishops or priests are visible to you? Please, give me their names and let me know where they are and whom they are ruling, teaching and sanctifying?

The same applies to canon VI that condemns the Protestant heresy, which denies the hierarchic structure of the Catholic Church, and taught the Catholic Church is not a Divine institution, but man-made, and that man alone, without a Church can be saved. The purpose of this canon was not to teach that there must always be a pope and bishops, but that their offices can never change or be eliminated until the end of time. The hierarchy of the Church is still intact, even when She does not have a leader, a pope to rule Her, nor even if She had one bishop, both the offices of the papacy and bishoprics are still alive, they are only waiting to be filled. We read from HNUE:

HNUE, p. 330-31: “...it was the manifest and unmistakable intention of Jesus Christ, the Divine Founder of the Church, to establish it forever as a hierarchic-monarchical society. Nowhere in revelation is there any evidence of any intention to permit exceptions to, or changes in this constitution in future history, by the use of *epikeia* or on any other basis. Men are physically free, of course, to found other churches, differing in constitution and nature from that established by Christ. But such churches are not Christ’s, and their very existence is opposed to the will of the Son of God. For by reason of the positively expressed will of its Divine Founder, the Church in its essence is to remain unchanged until the end of time.

The point is made that the hierarchic structure (the constitution) of the Catholic Church can never be changed as the Protestants had tried to do, and were cast out from the body of the Church. Just because there is no pope ruling the Church does not mean the hierarchic structure of the papacy has been changed, nor just because there are no bishops ruling local sees does it mean that the hierarchic structure of the bishoprics are changed in any way. Vacant sees do not equal a denial of the hierarchic structure (the constitution) of the Catholic Church. If anyone were to teach that the Church could no longer have a pope then they would be denying the hierarchic structure of the Church by saying it has change by eliminating the office of the papacy, which would mean the Church defected in Her primary apostolic mark. The same applies to bishops. There must always be the possibility of filling the vacant sees with a Catholic pope and Catholic bishops. (See: Patrick Comment: 34)

Patrick Comment: 24

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi teaches the exact opposite of what God's infallible Church teaches when he teaches: **"We do not always even have to have one bishop."** The INFALLIBLE Bride of Jesus Christ said let you be anathema, let you be damned, let you burn forever in Hell if you believe the following errors: 1 - There is no VISIBLE and EXTERNAL priesthood on earth today, that has power, that is JURISDICTION! 2 - There is NO HIERARCHY consisting of bishopS, priestS and ministerS. (NOTE the PLURAL is used! There MUST be at LEAST TWO bishops, priests, and ministers living on earth till the end of time. They MUST also have an OFFICE, AUTHORITY and JURISDICTION, for without this they simply cannot fulfill the NECESSARY REQUIREMENTS to make up the Divinely instituted HIERARCHY of the Catholic Church!) Do you believe the statements in the above paragraph are true? If you answer no, please explain why. From: *The Liturgical Year*, by Dom Gueranger, Imprimatur Feb., 1924, Vol. VIII, Page 102: "Three things are needed by the Church in order that She may carry on Her mission: a constitution framed by the very hand of the Son of God, whereby She will become a visible and permanent society; the possession of all the truths which Her Divine Lord came upon this earth to reveal or confirm - and in this is included the right to teach, and teach infallibly; thirdly, the means whereby She may efficaciously apply to the faithful the fruit of Jesus' sacrifice on the Cross, that is to say, the graces of salvation and sanctification. Hierarchy, Doctrine, Sacraments - these are the all - important subjects upon which our Lord instructs His disciples during the forty days between His Resurrection and Ascension." Do you believe the statements in the above paragraph are true?

RJMI Response: 24.1

In your above statement (1) you introduce it as if the source is from the infallible Bride, and in statement 1 you added your own words "priesthood on earth today." These words are not in the original quote. So you have craftily added these words seducing the reader who is not diligent to think these words were in the original source from Trent. Now, in all other times in which the Church existed it would be true to say there were priests on the earth now, but that does not have to apply in the days of the great apostasy. To say there are no Catholic priests alive today is not the same as someone who denies the Catholic priesthood.

In your above statement (2) you rightly quoted the canon from Trent. Again, that canon teaches that bishops, priests, and ministers make up the hierarchy. I do not deny that? Where does it say there must always be a pope and bishops ruling in the Church or the hierarchic structure defects? I have dealt these two topics in more detail in RJMI Response: 23.1.

Patrick Dom Gueranger is not saying we must always have a pope or bishops. He teaches that the Church has a hierarchy. I do not deny that. He mentions that the Church teaches infallibly and that means the pope—the pope being the head of hierarchy. I do not deny that. He does not say the Church must always have a pope, bishops, or priests.

Patrick, do you know of a visible bishop or priest? He also teaches that She (the Church) teaches infallibly. Do you know of any pope alive today that can teach infallibly? He teaches that these priests efficaciously apply to the faithful the fruit of Jesus' sacrifice on the cross. Does that apply to you or to anybody you know of? Where can you go to benefit from attending a Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, or at least join your intentions to a Mass that you know is being said elsewhere? Not only do you not know of any priests, your denial of epikieia makes it impossible for repentant bishops and priests to function as Catholic bishops and priests, which is a merciless and unforgiving teaching. Our Lord said, blessed are they who forgive, for they shall be forgiven. Of course this implies the subjects whom we forgive are truly repentant. And if they are who are you to say they cannot function as a Catholic and go about assisting in saving souls?

Patrick Comment: 25

If you answer no, please explain why. Pages 228-229: "Moreover, the sacraments, being visible signs, are an additional bond of union between the members of the Church: we say additional, because these members have the two other strong links of union - submission to Peter and to the pastors sent by him and

profession of the same faith. The Holy Ghost tells us, in the sacred Volume, that a threefold cord is not easily broken. Now we have such a one; and it keeps us in the glorious **UNITY** of the Church: **hierarchy, dogma, and sacraments**. ALL contribute to make us **ONE** Body.” Do you believe the statements in the above paragraph are true?

RJMI Response: 25.1

Yes, and again, that does not mean we must always have a pope and bishops (See: RJMI Response: 23.1). In this above comment we read that there are “*two other strong links of union - submission to Peter and to the pastors sent by him...*” What Peter, pope, are you currently in submission to? Does he mean that when there is no current pope ruling that Catholics are in submission to, that one of the two links of union is broken, the primary one of the papacy. Why would the same not apply to bishops? Do Catholics always have to be in submission to a current ruling bishop? If so, then what Catholic bishop are you in submission to? Because there has been no pope (the first link) to rule the Church going on 42 years does not mean the hierarchy has changed in anyway or defected in its first link. And if there may be no Catholic bishops (the second link) the same applies, in that the hierarchy has not been changed in anyway or defected in its secondary link.

Patrick Comment: 26

If you answer no, please explain why. Page 261: “Hierarchy means Sacred Government. It comprises three degrees: the **EPISCOPATE**, priesthood, and diaconate, in which last are included the Orders below it. This is called the hierarchy of Order, to distinguish it from the hierarchy of Jurisdiction.” I, Patrick Henry, comment: The above paragraph teaches clearly, unmistakably and unquestionably that the Sacred Government of the Hierarchy comprises the **EPISCOPATE**. That teaches faithful Catholics there must be Catholic bishops living that **NOW** have an Office, Authority and Jurisdiction. Do you believe the statements in the above paragraph are true?

RJMI Response: 26.1

There are two questions in the above paragraph, the one posed by Dom Gueranger and the other which is your opinion. Regarding the first question my answer is yes, I believe that the hierarchy is made up of the episcopate, priesthood, and diaconate. The answer to the second question in which you state we **must** now have Catholic bishops with office, authority, and jurisdiction, I do not agree.

Patrick, you state that there must always be an Episcopate that teaches faithful Catholics. Would you please tell me what Catholic bishop do you know of that is teaching any Catholic in the whole world? If you, or anyone else, cannot point out any bishop, then there is no Episcopate at this time that is sanctifying, teaching, or ruling faithful Catholics? If there were, why would the bishop be silent for 42 years, he is supposed to be visible and show himself, even if it means martyrdom.. And if he is silent then he is not ruling, teaching, nor sanctifying. And if he were silent for 42 years then he would have lost his office be sins of omission, by neglect in defending the faith and coming to the aid of his lost sheep. (See: RJMI Response: 17.1)

Patrick Comment: 27

If you answer no, please explain why. Page 195: “Our Risen Jesus is not satisfied with establishing His Church and constituting the hierarchy which **is to govern it** in His name **to the end** of time....” Pages 130-131: “This Church is a society, unto which all mankind is invited. It is composed of two classes of members; the governing and the governed; the teaching and the taught; the sanctifying and the sanctified.” Who can doubt there will be **Catholic** bishops until the end of time? ONLY Catholic bishops with OFFICE, AUTHORITY AND JURISDICTION make up the HIERARCHY in the Catholic Church. ONLY Catholic bishops with OFFICE, AUTHORITY AND JURISDICTION make up the governing, teaching and sanctifying class of the Catholic Church. Do you believe the statements in the above paragraph are true? If you answer no, please explain why.

RJMI Response: 27.1

The statements by Dom Gueranger are true and your interpretation of that he meant is false. We do not have to have Catholic bishops all times anymore than we have to have a pope at all times. But it is certain the offices still exist when they are vacant and the possibility to fill them must always exist until the end of time.

I will make a point that will show how you have deceptively taken out of context the meaning of the quotes you use in this debate. I will quote from a book with and imprimatur and ask you a question when I am done. I can produce many other similar statements from other books but this will suffice.

The Catechism Explained, Spriago-Clarke, imprimatur October 21, 1921, p. 223: “The mainstay of the Church is the Pope. He is the rock on which the Church rests; and his office secures the maintenance of unity. St. John Chrysostom says that the Church would fail if it were not for its Head, who is the center of its unity, as a ship would be wrecked if deprived of its pilot; and St. Cyprian adds that the enemies of the Church direct their attacks against its Head, in the hope that deprived of his guidance it may be shipwrecked.”

Do you believe the above statement? If you say yes, then tell me how we can have no pope (no Head of the Church), going on 42 years without the Church being shipwrecked, losing Her unity, and defecting. This relates to the First Vatican Council’s decree about perpetual successor of Peter until the end of time. Do you now see how a text can be twisted and taken out of context if one does not consider other related teachings of the Church and examine Her history? If we examine the history of the Church we will realize that there were extended periods of time when the Holy See was vacant, when there was no Head. If you only refer to the above quote without considering other teachings and events in the Church one can easily deceive a reader into thinking there must always be a pope (a Head) ruling the Church. You use this exact same deception when commenting on your opinion that we must always have Catholic bishops.

See RJMI Response: 20.1 and my books *A Notorious Heretic cannot be the Pope* or *Quick Reference Manual* for the true interpretation of what the Church means when She infallible teaches that there will be perpetual successors to Peter until the end of time, and the same principle applies to bishops.

Patrick Comment: 28

Now let us continue with the *Liturgical Year*, page 150: “Peter will ever institute the bishops; the bishops will ever delegate a portion of their own authority to the priests who have the charge of souls. No human power shall ever be able to intercept this transmission, or have power to set up as pastors them that have not partaken of it.”

RJMI Response: 28.1

Yes, this is true. Even though we have no pope for 42 years, no human or demonic power can ever destroy the papacy, and the same goes for bishoprics. If any group attempts to set up a hierarchy in direct opposition to the visible hierarchy of the Catholic Church they are schismatic. And if any group attempts to set up a hierarchy contrary to the will of the Roman Pontiffs he is a schismatic. What does this have to do with whether there are any Catholic bishops in the world at this time?

Patrick condemns Fr. Egregyi for functioning as a priest without jurisdiction

Patrick Comment: 29

Rev. Francois Egregyi and Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi are among the many who **have not partaken of it**. The Traditional Movement “bishops” and “priests” do NOT make up the least part of the Sacred Hierarchy of the Perfect Society founded by Jesus Christ. They are included among those the Council of Trent wrote about: “Those who of their rashness assume them [Ordination and Consecration] to themselves, are NOT ministers of the Church, but are to be looked upon as *thieves and robbers, who have not entered by the door.*” Do you believe the statements in the above paragraph are true?

RJMI Response: 29.1

The meaning this decree from Trent is that it is certain that no Catholic bishop can consecrate or ordain contrary to the will of the pope. Now we know it is contrary to the will of all popes that non-Catholics can legally consecrate and ordain, but the same does not apply to Catholic bishops and priest who do the same in these days of emergency, only because there is absolutely no access to any Catholic pope or bishops.

Who are you to say a Catholic bishop cannot consecrate Catholic bishops and ordain Catholic priests? Who are you to say the next pope will not retroactively approve them for heroically setting out to save the Church and souls? Certainly non-Catholics cannot legally consecrate and ordain, the non-Catholic bishops such as Thuc and Kelly, and they are easily distinguished. But who are you to judge a Catholic bishop’s consecrations and ordinations? Who are you to assume that he is rash and acting contrary to the will of the next pope? If he is Catholic in word in practice, meaning he holds no heresy or schismatic teaching, then who are to say the next pope will not retroactively confirm him? I would not want to be in yours shoes on judgment day for denying a Catholic bishop the right to consecrate, ordain, and confirm. (See: RJMI Response: 16.1)

Patrick Comment: 30

If you answer no, please explain why. From *A Manual of Pastoral Theology* by Rev. Fr. Frederick Schulze, Imprimatur +Joannes J. Glennon, 1923, Page 295:

“Jurisdiction rests with the hierarchy, - the Pope, as the head of the Church, and the bishops in their respective dioceses. This Jurisdiction the bishop does not obtain through Episcopal consecration; it is conveyed to him by the authority of the Holy See in the Apostolic brief appointing him and setting him as a ruler over a portion of Christ’s vineyard. No temporal sovereign or State can give this jurisdiction. It is not earthly, but of heavenly creation. It is emphatically a power from God. The channel of its derivation is through the apostolate.”

Note: “The channel of its derivation is through the apostolate.”

RJMI Response: 30.1

Of course no temporal sovereign or State can give jurisdiction. That is not where the power of jurisdiction comes from when a Catholic cleric has a legitimate claim to epikeia. The jurisdiction comes from the power of God and is directly supplied to the cleric through the vacant Chair of Peter (the papacy).

However, it is true that a Catholic bishop who evokes epikeia in these days of emergency cannot have an office (ordinary jurisdiction) for that would be an act of schism and only be a cause for chaos among other Catholic bishops, because a pope is the only one that can give a Catholic bishop a territory (“a portion of the vineyard”) with ordinary jurisdiction. That is one of the reasons Bishop Vezilis is not Catholic, because of his schismatic claiming of ordinary jurisdiction, of claiming all the territory east of the Mississippi, along with the fact that he is from the non-Catholic Thuc line.

The Catholic bishops would receive supplied jurisdiction that comes directly from the Church, in order to legally consecrate, ordain, confirm, preach, and teach, that comes directly from the Church, from the **power of God** and not from a temporal sovereign or State.

Patrick Comment: 31

How then does the Church supply it to laymen, for the **EXTERNAL** forum, by the law of epikeia? Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi teaches the opposite of what we learn *A Manual of Pastoral Theology*. Who is right and who is wrong? Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi teaches **he**, as a LAYMAN, has jurisdiction by the law of epikeia. Again I ask: “Who is right and who is wrong?” Is not Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi’s teaching a NEW DOCTRINE contrary to what God’s Church teaches? If you answer no, please explain why. The Church teaches in the *Summa Contra Gentiles*, of Thomas, Lib. IV, cap. 76: “To conserve the UNITY of the Church, the power of the keys must be passed on, through Peter, to the other pastors of the Church.” “The power of the keys” pertains to JURISDICTION which Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi does not have.

RJMI Response: 31.1

(See: RJMI Response: 11.1)

Patrick Comment: 32

Neither does Rev. Francois Egregyi have any Jurisdiction. Neither do bishops or priests receive ordinary or delegated jurisdiction by taking the abjuration, before several laymen as witnesses, written up by Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi. Do you believe the statements in the above paragraph are true? If you answer no, please explain why.

RJMI Response: 32.1

Patrick took abjurations contrary to Church law and denies the use of epikeia

Patrick, you mentioned in your comment #1 that you took a private abjuration, and then latter, because you must have had doubts about your private abjuration, you took one before several lay witnesses. Now, do you believe your censures have been lifted? You have already said they have been lifted in your comment #2, and you have said you are inside the Catholic Church in your comment #3. If that is true, then how could taking an abjuration before layman without jurisdiction lift your censures—absolve you from your censures? The act of lifting censures by abjuration and absolving from sins requires jurisdiction for these acts to be valid and legal. What was the purpose of you taking an abjuration if jurisdiction was not involved, it would have been a waste of time, and of no effect? If you do not believe the Church directly supplied jurisdiction in order to absolve you from (lift) your censures then your censures remain, and as I said above, because you have no use for epikeia that activates this supplied jurisdiction from the Church, therefore your censures remain and you are outside the Catholic Church. Are you aware of the fact that the Church must supply jurisdiction to absolve the sins of a Catholic who privately confesses their sins, without a priest, if a priest cannot be accessed within a reasonable amount of time? Where does this jurisdiction come from?

Patrick Comment: 33

Let us review from the book: *History, Nature, and Use of Epikeia, in Moral Theology* by Father Riley. Page 329.

“Insofar as the constitution of the Church is concerned, we may assume as having been proved in Ecclesiology the following facts: 1 - Christ established His Church as a true and JURIDICALLY PERFECT SOCIETY, a hierarchical society, promising and conferring upon the Apostles power to be exercised for the salvation of souls; 2 - the hierarchical authority was to be perpetual - it was to be passed on to the successors of the Apostles; 3 - St. Peter directly and immediately received from Christ the primacy of universal jurisdiction over the whole Church; 4 - The primacy of St. Peter, by divine disposition, was to be perpetual, that is, until the end of time it was to be transmitted to his successors. In view of these facts, we may conclude that by force of its very institution the Church is a society divinely hierarchical and at the same time monarchical, to be ruled perpetually by the Apostles and their successors, but under Peter, the prince of the Apostles and his successors, and dependently on them... Moreover, this true Church immediately and for all time received from Christ alone its form of government and its entire power, and it can and must exercise it entirely independently of any other authority which is not of Christ..

RJMI Response: 33.1

Is the papacy (the office of the pope), which is the head of the hierarchy, through which all jurisdiction flows, intact without a reigning pope, when the Holy See is vacant? Is perpetual papal succession lost when the Holy See is vacant? We know that when the Holy See is vacant, the papacy (the office) the hierarchic head of the Church, is still intact and only waiting to be filled by the next pope. We know that when the Holy See is vacant that jurisdiction is not suspended and it flows through the papacy itself, through the office, which is perpetual, even when there is no pope ruling the Church. The same then applies to the bishops who hold office, the lesser members of the hierarchy. Just because there may be no Catholic bishops in the world today, their local sees being vacant, does not mean their offices are lost. The offices and hierarchic structure is still intact and waiting to be filled by Catholic bishops. (See: RJMI Response: 20.1)

Patrick, quoting out of context, denies use of epikeia for ordinations

Patrick Comment: 34

[Fr. Riley quote continued]

A consideration of the foregoing truths will lead to the conclusion that it was the manifest and unmistakable intention of Jesus Christ, the Divine Founder of the Church, to establish it forever as a **hierarchico**-monarchical society. **Nowhere in revelation is there any evidence of any intention to permit exceptions to, or changes in, this constitution in future history, by the use of EPIKEIA or on any other basis.**

RJMI Response: 34.1

Again, just because the Holy See is vacant, and most probably all the bishoprics, does not mean the constitution of the Church has changed (See: Patrick Comment: 23). The proper use of epikeia does not exempt, nor change the hierarchic structure of the Church in any way. Only if a bishop tried to claim a territory (ordinary jurisdiction) without receiving it directly from a pope would he then be guilty of attempting to be exempt from, and change the constitution of the Church, in the way that She gives territory to bishops.

How is a Catholic bishop, that operates wherever he might be with supplied jurisdiction in these days of emergency by the use of epikeia, usurping the authority of the local bishop, if there is no local Catholic bishop—if the local see is currently vacant? If a bishop who attempts to use epikeia in these days of emergency, was to find himself in a local see that was occupied by a Catholic bishop that has territory and ordinary jurisdiction from Pope Pius XII, then he would have no claim to epikeia and he would be guilty of changing the constitution of the Church by attempting to usurp the power and authority of the local Catholic bishop that was given that territory (ordinary jurisdiction) by Pope Pius XII. (See: RJMI Response: 30.1)

Patrick Comment: 35

[Fr. Riley quote continued]

Men are physically free, of course, to found other churches, differing in constitution and nature from that established by Christ. But such churches are not Christ's, and their very existence is opposed to the Will of the Son of God. For by reason of the positively expressed will of its Divine Founder, the Church in its essence is to remain **unchanged** until the end of time. To maintain that Christ had some intention for the future, contrary to that made manifest in the actual establishment of His Church, is to utter a purely gratuitous assertion. More than that--it is a refusal to believe in the efficacy of the divine promise to be with the Church until the consummation of the world; it is a denial of the Stability, the Unity, the Apostolicity and the Indefectibility of this divinely established institution." Page 333. "No human authority has the power to **change** what Christ Himself has established for the attaining of salvation."

Jesus Christ established His Church as a **hierarchic** society with Catholic bishops and priests that receive ordinary or delegated jurisdiction from others who already have jurisdiction in the Church. No human authority has power to **change** this way Jesus Christ established for priests and bishops to receive jurisdiction. Therefore human legislators cannot WILL that the Church supply laymen jurisdiction by the law of epikeia. Do you agree that the above statement is true? If you answer NO, please explain why. Jesus Christ established His Church as a **hierarchic** society. How is there a **hierarchic** society without **Catholic** Bishops that **NOW** have an Office, Authority and Jurisdiction?

RJMI Response: 35.1

(See: RJMI Response: 16.1, RJMI Response: 33.1)

Patrick Comment: 36

Do you believe it is a NEW doctrine that an Office, Authority and Jurisdiction are given to bishops, or anyone else, just by the use of epikeia? If you answer no, please explain why. Canon 436 teaches the TRUTH when it says succinctly: “While the See is vacant **nothing** may be changed.”

RJMI Response: 36.1

First of all, as I have already said, epikeia cannot give a Catholic bishop an office (ordinary jurisdiction), but it certainly can give them supplied jurisdiction (RJMI Response: 16.1).

Epikeia changes nothing that cannot be changed; it is only an exemption from the law due to a valid exception. It is admitted that just use of epikeia can amend a law, in that it can be added to the law as an exception by the lawgiver, and thus in essence create a new law, and this would be done when the lawgiver judges if the individual had properly used epikeia. But epikeia can never change any of the laws that deal with the faith (which includes the Constitution of the Church) and morals. Not all the Church laws and decrees are unchangeable, those dealing with purely man-made, ecclesiastical laws, can and have changed, many times in the Church—those dealing with how a pope is to be elected, how a bishop is to be chosen, or elected, and how bishops are to be consecrated, what constitutes a valid marriage contract, or the changing of the forms of abjuration to suit the purpose to reject the heretics and heresies of day, all these things can change, and allow the use of epikeia. That is precisely why I have the right by the virtue of epikeia to write up a specific abjuration for the Great Apostasy, because there is no one in authority who can do so, and the Church demands specific abjurations for Catholics who have fallen away from the faith, and common sense dictates that this is the only way there can be unity among Catholics.

Patrick denies the necessity of a specific abjuration from the Great Apostasy

Patrick Comment: 37

Can you give positive examples, from Church History, that the Church actually supplied jurisdiction to laymen by the law of epikeia? Does Canon 436 teach us that laymen are **NOT** to be changing The Form of Receiving a Convert, as given in the sacred Catholic Liturgy? If you answer no, please explain why. If you answered YES to the last question, please explain how Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi is authorized to change The Form of Receiving a Convert into his NEW version titled: *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration*.

RJMI Response: 37.1

Again, layman are not supplied with jurisdiction to publicly teach the Catholic faith, but must be authorized by proper Church authorities (See: RJMI Response: 11.1)

Canon 436 teaches that no one can make innovations to laws when the See is vacant. And that is true in regards to the external forum. Only a lawgiver can change, emend, or make new laws in the external forum. Epikeia does not claim to do any or this in the external forum, but only claims an individual's exemption from the law, due to an extraordinary situation in a particular case, and appeals to a future lawgiver to confirm his use of epikeia. Just as the public teaching of the Catholic faith by a layman requires approval from Church authorities, but due to a true emergency, the principle of epikeia applies that would allow a Catholic layman to publically teach the Catholic faith without approval from Church authorities. Patrick, would you consider this an innovation to Canon 1385 or merely an exemption from it? If you deny the use of epikeia in relation to publically teaching the Catholic faith as taught in Canon 1385 then you are condemned by Canon 436 by making an innovation to Canon 1385.

A specific abjuration for heresies of the day is not an innovation or a changing, but is what the Church demands. The Church has written up many different forms of abjurations that applied to the specific heresies and heretics and have accordingly changed them many times. Therefore, common sense dictates that as long as heretics keep showing their heads from within the ranks of Catholics, spouting new heresies, or a multiple of past condemned heresies, they too, must be condemned in a specific abjuration, especially in these days of the great apostasy!

Just because there is no lawgiver in these days to write up a specific abjuration, does not mean this Church law can be ignored. If God inspires a competent Catholic to write one then it is his duty to do so, be he a Catholic bishop, priest, or layman. If the abjuration is pleasing to God then the next pope will retroactively confirm it, and condemn all who opposed it. There does not have to be only one form. A Catholic layman in Europe may write his own form and if it is pleasing to God, the Church will also approve it.

The lawgiver who wrote the "*Form of Receiving a Convert*" only intended that form to be used for Protestant and Schismatic converts. It was not intended to be used for apostates and heretics who sprung from the Catholic ranks and thus forming a new sect while still putting themselves forward as Catholics. The lawgiver did not intend this form to be used for apostates and heretics that rise up from within Catholic ranks who form a new sect. They did not foresee the great apostasy we are now living through, with its very specific apostasy and many heresies and heretics, of the Conciliar Church. It is clear that the spirit of the law of abjuration, as practiced in the past, is to have specific abjurations for the heresies and heretics of the day if the situation and common sense dictates. Yes, Patrick, good old common sense, something a true Pharisee as yourself does not have, dictates that there must be a specific abjuration that condemns the heresies of the Conciliar Church, point by point, and the heresiarchs, the antipopes, by name. How can a general abjuration that makes no mention of these things be a source of unity among Catholics? I will extrapolate.

Are you aware of the fact that Conciliar apostates and heretics like Michael Davis would consent to *The Form of Receiving a Convert* as found in the Catholic Liturgy, as would all your Conciliar Church heretics? So, how would that form serve to distinguish a true Catholic, who has condemned all the heresies of the Conciliar Church and her non-Catholic antipopes from the Conciliar heretics? You see, Patrick, it only takes common sense to know, that unity can only be achieved by a specific abjuration that condemns the specific heresies and heresiarchs of the Conciliar Church and various the other Traditionalists that are masquerading as Catholics. The heresies and heretics you already condemn in your books, I have listed as condemned in the abjuration, so what is your objection? These questions posed to you will prove my point.

Would you consider a man to be Catholic if he tells you he took an abjuration according to the general "*Form of Receiving a Convert*" but,

- 1) believes the Thuc line is legal?
- 2) believes the Kelly line is legal?
- 3) holds the religious liberty heresy?
- 4) believes you can pray with non-Catholics?
- 5) believes the Protestants and Schismatics are joined to the Church in a certain though imperfect manner?

- 6) believes the Jews and Moslems worship the same God as Catholics, because they claim to worship the God of Abraham?
- 7) believes the John XIII, Paul VI, John Paul I, and John Paul II, are still Roman Pontiffs, because no one can judge the pope?
- 8) but believed John Paul II is materially the pope, but not formally the pope?
- 9) but believed John Paul II is a doubtful pope?

You see Patrick; you would not consider any of the above to be Catholics, even if they did take an abjuration according to the non-specific *Form of Receiving a Convert*. So what purpose would this abjuration serve in promoting unity? Many questions are left unanswered as to the position of the individual who takes it in regards to the Conciliar Church, her antipopes, the SSPX, Thuc and Kelly lines, etc., and all their very specific apostasies, heresies, teachings and/or schismatic actions.

That is not to say that if a penitent had used this *Form of Receiving a Convert*, because he had no other, is not justified and absolved of his censures, provided he holds the full deposit of the Catholic faith, meaning he rejects the Conciliar Church, her antipopes, the SSPX, the Thuc line, as the crimes became manifest to him, etc.

Now all the points listed in the abjuration that I composed are backed up by the Catholic faith, and if you do not agree then you better study your faith, because in what you do not agree is where you are in schism and/or heresy. The same heresies of the Conciliar Church and Antipope John Paul II, which it is a Catholic's duty to condemn, are the exact same heresies found in the abjuration I had written. In one case a Catholic verbally condemns them in the other they are condemned in writing. And if you say you can only verbally condemn the heresies, but you are not willing to put them in writing with your signature on it, then you are a hypocrite, or a coward, or tainted with human respect, or full of pride, and you would become guilty of the heresies and/or schisms that you refuse to reject in writing, even if you say you don't personally hold them.

Don't act surprised because of my strictness in demanding you consent to the Catholic position. Do you not pretend to do the same in your writings? Isn't that a job of a Catholic, to demand the full deposit of the Catholic faith be held, taught, and practiced? You do it verbally, and in your writing too, I have put it into a form of abjuration, that I have signed to back up my teachings by this abjuration. You must not be too sure of your position, not to have attempted to write up a specific abjuration of your own.

Patrick Comment: 38

Is Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi a pope who has filled the vacant See? Richard, do you believe Pope Pius XII wrote the TRUTH in his Constitution Vacantis Apostolicae Sedis dated 8th December, 1945, in his words: "During the vacancy of the Holy See, laws passed by the Roman Pontiff cannot be in **ANY WAY** corrected or changed by the cardinals of the Roman Church, nor can anything be subtracted from them or **added** to them in whole or in part?"

RJMI Response: 38.1

I agree with this. Epikeia is not a changing, adding or taking away (subtracting) from the Church laws. Whereas you Patrick, by ignoring the law altogether have taken away (subtracted) not just some of the words of the law, but you have taken away (subtracted) all the words of the law—the whole law.

I am appealing to an exemption from the appropriate laws by epikeia, and am following the constant practice of the Church Herself, by telling fallen away Catholics that they must take abjurations. An exemption from the law—in this case taking an abjuration before lay witnesses because no Catholic bishop is available—is not a taking away from, nor an adding to the law, it is simply an exemption from the law, just as is a dispensation from a law that one in authority can give an individual. A dispensation is not the denial of the law or a changing, taking away, or adding to the law. One in authority can grant a dispensa-

tion from the law, whereas an individual who has no recourse to one in authority, in an emergency situation, is exempted from a law by the legitimate use of epikeia. Both a dispensation from one in authority and exemption for an individual by the principle of epikeia, are based on the same principle in that neither is a changing, taking away, or an adding to the existing law.

Patrick, I will now prove that it is you who have taken away (subtracted from) the law by ignoring it completely. If you deny the use of epikeia to justify your publically teaching the Catholic faith then you have taking away all the words of the canon law (c. 1385) that teaches you must have an imprimatur to print, make tapes, or publish any work defending the Catholic faith

1917 Code of Canon Law: "c. 1385 1. Without previous ecclesiastical approval, even laymen are not allowed to publish: (1) the books of Sacred Scripture, or annotations and commentaries on the same: (2) books treating of Sacred Scripture, theology, church history, canon law, natural theology, ethics, or other religious or moral sciences... c. 1385 2. The permission to publish books... in this Canon may be given either by proper local Ordinary of the author, or by the local Ordinary of the place where the books... are published, or the local Ordinary of the place where they are printed... Religious authors must also obtain the permission of their major superior before publication."

Patrick, do you believe this above Church law? If you have no use for epikeia, then you must admit that you cannot be exempted from this above canon law of the Church, and therefore you have taken away (subtracted) this whole Church law. You have also taken away all the words of Pope Gregory in *Mirrari Vos* that states you must be authorized to teach the Catholic faith.

*Pope Gregory XVI, *Mirrari Vos*: "8. ...Nor may the priests ever forget that they are forbidden by ancient canons to undertake ministry and to assume the tasks of teaching and preaching 'without the permission of their bishop to whom the people have been entrusted; an accounting for the souls of the people will be demanded from the bishop'. Finally let them understand that all those who struggle against this established order disturb the position of the Church."*

You would agree, that what applies to a priest regarding the public teaching of the faith, most certainly applies to a layman, in that a layman must have the permission of either a Catholic bishop or preist in order to publicly teach the Catholic faith.

Therefore, Patrick, you are either ignoring these above laws altogether or rejecting them outright, which in both cases is a taking away of the words of the whole law. I do not believe you would be foolish enough to say you reject the law outright, so therefore it is clear you are disobedient to these Church laws by totally ignoring them, and is so doing you have taken away all the words of these laws. You stand condemned by the very quote you tried to use against me by Pope Pius XII, who wrote, "*During the vacancy of the Holy See, laws passed by the Roman Pontiff cannot be in ANY WAY corrected or changed by the cardinals of the Roman Church, nor can anything be subtracted from them or added to them in whole or in part?*" Why are you condemned and I am justified, because I do not reject, nor ignore these laws. I don't take away these words, I appeal to an exemption from them by epikeia while acknowledging the full force of these laws under universal and ordinary circumstances. Whereas you, Patrick Henry, by denying the use of epikeia cannot be exempted from them, and therefore you are disobedient to these laws by ignoring them, and it is you who have taken away all the words of these above laws. As the saying goes, give a true Pharisee or a liberal, enough rope and they will hang themselves. If you say that these above laws, regarding the public teaching of the Catholic faith, are still in force, and that you are not ignoring, or rejecting them, then how do these laws apply to your public teaching of the Catholic faith? Please don't stupidly use the 1Peter 3:15 quote again to override and ignore these Church laws. I asked you a question in direct reference to these Church laws. How do you legitimately get around these Church laws if not by epikeia?

Patrick Comment: 39

If you answer NO, please explain why. Pope Pius XII gave the following law when he wrote in: *Ad sinarum gentem*: “The power of **JURISDICTION** which is conferred directly by divine right on the Supreme Pontiff comes to bishops by that same right, but **ONLY** through the successor of Peter, to whom not only the faithful but also all bishops are bound to be constantly subject and to adhere both the reverence of obedience and by the bond of unity.” Remember, “During the vacancy of the Holy See, laws passed by the Roman Pontiff cannot be in **ANY WAY** corrected or changed.” Therefore it follows, “The power of **JURISDICTION** comes to bishops **ONLY** through the successor of Peter.” Do you agree the above statement is true? If you answer NO, please explain why. If jurisdiction comes only through a valid Pope, why does Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi teach it comes by the law of epikeia? Pope Pius XII gave the following law when he wrote in: *Ad Apostolorum Principis*: “41. Acts requiring the **power of Holy Orders** which are performed by ecclesiastics of this kind, though they are valid as long as the consecration conferred on them was valid, are yet gravely **ILLICIT**, that is, criminal and **SACRILEGIOUS**.” To absolve sins in the confessional requires the **power of Holy Orders** and also the power of jurisdiction. Does the bishop or priest you use for confession have jurisdiction coming from a ROMAN PONTIFF?

RJMI Response: 39.1

When there is no successor of Peter ruling the Church, when the Holy See is vacant, jurisdiction still flows through the Chair of Peter, through the office of the papacy. The same is true when a local see falls vacant and there is no current bishop ruling it. Now, canon law 882 teaches:

1917 Code of Canon Law: “c. 882 In danger of death all priests, though not approved for confessions, can validly and licitly absolve any penitent from any sins and censures, although reserved and notorious...”

Even in the case of an excommunicated non-Catholic priest who is not approved by any Church authority, having no faculties or jurisdiction from one in authority, can hear a legal and valid confession from a penitent who is in danger of death. Therefore we have a case of jurisdiction being supplied directly by the Church, through the papacy, to this priest for this one confession, bypassing the approval and jurisdiction that comes from a pope, Catholic bishop, or religious superior. If you agree with this canon law, then you cannot say that in all cases one must absolutely have the approval of a pope or bishops to receive jurisdiction from them, but can receive jurisdiction directly from the Church that flows through the papacy (the vacant Chair of Peter). (See: RJMI Response: 16.1)

Epikeia does not change or in the strict senses correct a law

Patrick Comment: 40

To consecrate bishops requires the **power of Holy Orders**. Pope Pius XII teaches us that even if the consecrations coming from Lefebvre and Thuc are valid they are yet gravely **ILLICIT**, that is, criminal and **SACRILEGIOUS**. This was the law passed before the Holy See became vacant. Remember, “During the vacancy of the Holy See, laws passed by the Roman Pontiff cannot be in **ANY WAY** corrected or changed.”

RJMI Response: 40.1

Again, Patrick, epikeia is not the changing or in the strict sense a correcting of the law in any manner, it is an exemption from the law that admits to an exception of the law, not a correction in the strict sense (See: RJMI Response: 38.1). This exception of the law, when approved in the external forum by a lawgiver, will then amend the law, not actually correct it, and in essence create a new law, which would then be an official exception to the existing law. Many canon laws already incorporate exceptions within the wording of the law. This act of the lawgiver, that confirms the proper use of epikeia is not a changing or correcting of the existing law, by is the emendation of the law by adding an exception. This teaching on the use of epikeia is proof that a Catholic bishop can appeal to the principle of epikeia to be exempted from letter of the law of Pope Pius XII's *Ad Principis*. (See: RJMI Response: 44.1)

Episcopal Consecrations and Ordinations

Patrick Comment: 41

Remembering the teaching of the true Church, just stated above, why does Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi teach that bishops should consecrate other bishops? Does Richard care about God's side? What date did consecrations of bishops without a Papal Mandate cease to be gravely ILLICIT, that is, criminal and SACRILEGIOUS? Pope Pius XII gave the following law when he wrote in: *Ad Apostolorum Principis*: "48. Consequently, if consecration of this kind is being done **contrary to** all right and **law**, and by this crime the **UNITY** of the Church is being seriously attacked, an excommunication reserved specialissimo modo to the Apostolic See has been established which is automatically incurred by the consecrator and by anyone who has received consecration irresponsibly conferred." Remember, "During the vacancy of the Holy See, laws passed by the Roman Pontiff cannot be in ANY WAY corrected or changed."

Let us review what Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi wrote:

"Epikeia also applies to Episcopal consecrations and priestly ordinations as I have written about in "Book Two." In order for a Catholic bishop to consecrate and ordain in these days of emergency he is appealing to epikeia to be exempted from the letter of the law as stated in Pope Pius XII's "Ad Apostolorum Principis." I know what the letter of the law says regarding this document, just as what the letter of the law teaches regarding hearing confessions, teaching, and preaching sermons and epikeia applies in all cases, provided the one who uses it is Catholic. A non-Catholic cannot apply to any of the Church laws, let alone epikeia."

Does Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi teach the OPPOSITE of God's true popes? In his video movies, books and letters Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi condemns others as heretics because they teach the OPPOSITE of God's true popes. What will Catholics think of Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi when he also teaches the OPPOSITE of God's true popes? Pope Pius XII in at least one degree and at least three encyclicals, including *Ad Apostolorum Principis*, told the world repeatedly, again and again that: the **UNITY** of the Church is being seriously attacked when consecrations take place without a Papal Mandate. Does Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi teach that consecrations without a Papal Mandate are **contrary to** all right and **law**, and by this crime the **UNITY** of the Church is being seriously attacked? If you answer NO, please explain what Richard meant when he wrote: "Epikeia also applies to Episcopal consecrations and priestly ordinations as I have written about in "Book Two." In order for a Catholic bishop to consecrate and ordain in these days of emergency he is appealing to epikeia to be exempted from the letter of the law as stated in Pope Pius XII's "Ad Apostolorum Principis."

RJMI Response: 41.1

I agree totally with this encyclical, *Ad Principis*, by Pope Pius XII. A Catholic bishop who appeals to epikeia to consecrate or ordain is not denying this law, but is appealing to and exemption from it. Just as I must agree with the law under the Old Covenant that states only priests (Levites—the sons of Aaron) can

eat the loaves of proposition. But that does not mean there cannot be exceptions. King David and his men who ate the loaves of proposition, not being priests (Levites), broke the letter of that law, but were defended by our Lord Jesus Christ by the principle of epikeia. Our Lord did not deny that law, nor did he change or correct that law, but said David and his men were exempted from it in this extraordinary situation due to common sense. Our Lord was saying that the law did not bind King David and his men in that particular case due to an extraordinary circumstance.

Can't you see this truth, Patrick? Of, course you can't because you are a true Pharisee. In the spirit of the true Pharisee, you would say that this law admits to no exceptions, because you do not believe in epikeia. Therefore you would keep repeating the letter of that law to our Lord Jesus Christ, saying,

“Jesus, only priests can eat the loaves of proposition. Jesus, do you believe that? Therefore Jesus, you are violating that law. Jesus, show me where it is written in the law that King David and his men could eat the loaves of proposition? Jesus, that law clearly states they cannot eat the loaves of proposition because they are not priests, therefore you are breaking the law.”

Patrick, you would continually accuse Jesus of violating that law, while not admitting to the exemption of the law that our Lord confirmed in King David's case. You are absolutely doing the same thing when you keep quoting the letter of the law as found in Pope Pius XII's *Ad Principis*. I tell you that epikeia can apply in an extraordinary circumstance, so that a Catholic bishop can be consecrated without the direct approval of a pope, and without having ordinary jurisdiction, you keep repeating the letter of the law that says they can't. I repeat, as our Lord would repeat, we are not denying the letter of the law as taught in *Ad Principis*, we are saying that in an extraordinary circumstance that epikeia would apply and that an exemption from this law is just. We are not denying the Divine aspects of this law by saying one can consecrate and ordain contrary to the will of the Roman Pontiff, and we admit that the certainty of a papal mandate exists when the next pope will definitely retroactively approve any Catholic bishop's consecrations and ordinations, who had legitimately used epikeia. We are not denying the Divine law that states such a bishop must have jurisdiction to consecrate and ordain, we are saying the Church directly supplies such jurisdiction in these extraordinary cases.

The manner of how bishops are chosen, or elected, is a matter of man-made Church law that has changed many times in the Church, and can change in the future and therefore is subject to the use of epikeia. Many times the popes have changed the manner and procedure in which popes and bishops are chosen. The pope did not always have to have knowledge, or give his approval of the bishops that were chosen and consecrated before the fact (See: RJMI Response: 58.1).

So, stop repeating the letter of the law of *Ad Principis*, I don't deny that law, any more than our Lord was denying the law that only the sons of Aaron can eat the loaves of proposition. What I am doing is appealing to an exemption from the law of *Ad Principis*, just as King David was exempted from the law regarding the loaves of proposition.

Disunity is not due to Epikeia

Patrick Comment: 42

Has the UNITY of the Church been better or worse since Thuc and Lefebvre joined the non-Catholic Novus Ordo church, and then consecrated bishops? Is there now UNITY among the Traditionalists? Is the UNITY of the Church being seriously attacked because of the MANY gravely ILLICIT, that is, criminal and SACRILEGIOUS consecrations of bishops that have taken place since the death of Pope Pius XII?

RJMI Response: 42.1

That is like asking the question, “Has the unity of the Church been better or worse since the Greek Schismatics continue to consecrate bishops and ordain priests?” Or, “Has the unity of the Church been better or worse since the Protestant rebellion in the 16th century?” The fact is Patrick, as I am sure you would

admit, that Thuc and Lefebvre were not Catholic. Both of them were non-Catholic heretics, schismatics, so you cannot use them in our debate over the use of epikeia, because an un-penitent non-Catholic has no right to use epikeia, nor can they be a source of unity, because they are not Catholic.

There is no true unity among these groups because they are not Catholic, and because they went to non-Catholic bishops to be consecrated and ordained. Our debate involves the proper use of epikeia by a Catholic bishop. So please, Patrick, don't craftily change the topic so as to distract the reader.

Patrick, the unity of the Church can never be rent asunder. Just because many non-Catholic bishops are consecrating bishops and ordaining priest does not mean the unity of the Church is affected in any way, anymore than all the illegal consecrations and ordinations that have taken place from the time of the Greek Schism in 1054 until the present day, along with all the other Old Catholic heretics and schismatics.

Patrick, is there unity among "Catholic" laymen who propose to teach the Catholic faith? By your line of reasoning even laymen cannot teach the Catholic faith, because there is not unity among them. And I admit there is no unity among many of them, precisely because they are not Catholic either. (See: RJMI Response: 72.1) This is why it is so important for laymen to learn their faith in these days. They have no choice if they want to save their souls. They must read and take sides. In the past laymen have been very, very slothful in learning the faith, and so now God has made it very difficult for them as a punishment for their sins.

"Behold the days come, saith the Lord, and I will send forth a famine into the land: not a famine of bread, nor a thirst of water, but of hearing the word of the Lord. And they shall move from sea to sea, and from the north to the east: they shall go about seeking the word of the Lord, and shall not find it." (Amos 8:11-12)

This verse surely tell us that it will be very difficult to find a man who is teaching the Catholic faith, be he a bishop, priest, or layman. So the burden is on the laymen, as a punishment for their own sins to seek the truth with all their will and might. They must study and decipher between many discordant voices, which means they cannot make a half-hearted effort in learning their faith, but a total and complete effort or they will be damned. Many false teachers of our day have turned this above curse into a blessing by saying that if a man has not heard the truth, and is therefore ignorant of truths he needs to know, that this man can be saved. Therefore this great famine of the word would send all the souls that don't hear it to Heaven by invincible ignorance, instead of damning them to hell. They have called the damned blessed and they have called the blessed damned, and they are an abomination to God (Isa. 5:20) (Prv. 17:15).

Patrick, there is no unity between us laymen! Just because I know you are a non-Catholic who pretends to teach the Catholic faith does not mean a Catholic, such as myself, cannot teach the Catholic faith. More so, Catholics should speak up in these days to refute men like you.

Patrick Comment: 43

Will the UNITY of the Church be seriously attacked if MORE gravely ILLICIT, that is, criminal and SACRILEGIOUS consecrations of bishops take place because men follow the advice of Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi?

RJMI Response: 43.1

Here we have a first class piece of calumny and an outright lie. Where do I condone, or teach that illicit consecrations are allowable? What I have taught is that consecrations and ordinations by CATHOLIC BISHOPS, in days of the great apostasy, can licitly (legally) take place by the legitimate use of epikeia. Listen carefully Patrick; I said Catholic bishops and licit consecrations and ordinations, not non-Catholic heretics and schismatics, such as the Thucites, Kellyites, and SSPX, and their illicit consecrations and ordinations.

Patrick denies the most basic definition of Epikeia

Patrick Comment: 44

Remember Richard teaches:

“Epikeia also applies to Episcopal consecrations and priestly ordinations as I have written about in *“Book Two.”* In order for a Catholic bishop to consecrate and ordain in these days of emergency he is appealing to epikeia to be exempted from the letter of the law as stated in Pope Pius XII’s *“Ad Apostolorum Principis.”*”

Remember the important principle. Epikeia **ONLY** applies in particular and individual cases! In other words, the person who invokes epikeia in not permitted to say: “The legislator obviously never foresaw today’s horrendous and completely unexpected situation, and, bearing in mind that the Church exists for the good of souls, he would certainly not have intended certain laws to bind if he had foreseen it.”

RJMI Response: 44.1

Your above statement is a pure fabrication, and totally contrary to the teachings regarding epikeia as is also taught in the book HNUE. Are you saying that the human legislators foresaw the great apostasy we are now living through, when the great saints themselves could not even imagine how bad it would be? Were do you get this above teaching that a person is not permitted to say the legislator could not foresee all exceptions, as if a human legislator is God. Even God allows exceptions to His own divine positive laws, for different reasons, as you will learn below.

Your above statement denies a principle of epikeia that the unanimous consent of the fathers, doctors, theologians, and canonists admits to. Not one of them would dare say that a human legislator could foresee all things. The following quote summarizes their teachings regarding epikeia:

Definitions of Epikeia

HNUE, p. 19-20: “The reasons for the existence of such a concept [*epikeia*] is to be found in the fact that laws are, of their very nature, universal. Lawmakers legislate for the general run of cases, and not for any particular concrete instance. But particular details and circumstance are almost limitless in number and nature; it is clear that no legislator in the act of framing of a law can foresee all the variable circumstances which may arise. Taking into account what usually and ordinarily happens, he enacts his law. He is not, however, ignorant of the possibility that his law, though just and good in general, may be deficient in particular cases. On the other hand, an individual may find himself confronted with a case which, although it is included in the law insofar as the words are concerned, nevertheless is not comprehended in the general law, if the intention of the legislator, and not merely the verbal formula, be scrutinized. And so, he *emends* or *corrects* the law; he prudently judges that if the lawmaker had foreseen this particular case, he would not have wished to bind his subject; and so the subject does not observe the law as it is written. In other words, *epikeia* is used.”

This clearly refutes your own unique schismatic teaching that epikeia cannot be evoked by reason of the lawgiver not foreseeing a particular event. Even the one canonist you use, Hilling, who is reluctant in admitting to the use of epikeia, would not deny this definition of it, and even he admitted to its possible use, under more limited circumstances (See: **Error! Unknown switch argument.**).

The canonists and theologians admit that epikeia can be used with laws not dealing with faith or morals, because these laws are general, universal, and ordinary, and that they can be deficient in a particular and extraordinary situation. This, they say, is because of two reasons:

Reason 1) The lawgiver, being human, when enacting human laws that can change, cannot foresee all the exceptions that might arise in the future. No human lawgiver can foresee all the exceptions that might arise, because he is not God.

Reason 2) The lawgiver is aware of many exceptions that can take place, but it would be burdensome to include them in the law, because they would literally take up a huge volume of space for each law, with almost endless possibilities arising.

God, who foresees all things, makes His divine positive laws that do not deal with faith or morals, with this in mind by deliberately not including all the exceptions to His laws that can be changed, abrogated, or amended, so as to avoid being burdensome and a cause for confusion.

For both of these above reasons the use of *epikeia* is admitted when a legitimate exception arises.

Thomas Aquinas (+1274) teaches both of these reasons as to why a universal law is deficient. (HNUE, pp. 28-29).

Here is reason 1:

Thomas: "...No man has wisdom so great that he can take into consideration all individual cases; and therefore he cannot adequately express in words all those things that are fitting for the end which he has in mind."

Here is reason 2:

{Cont.} "And if the legislator were able to consider all cases, it would not be fitting that he mention all, in order to avoid confusion; but he should formulate the law according to what is the most usual occurrence.²⁸"

On page 52 we read:

"Thomas teaches that in cases where it is certain that the lawmaker would be unwilling to urge obligation, *epikeia* may always be used without recourse to authority; in cases of doubt, an authority with power to dispense must be consulted if time allows, otherwise the words of the law are to be observed; in cases of probability, an authority must be resorted to; but if this is impossible, *epikeia* may be used."

However, it cannot be said that God did not foresee exceptions that He had allowed for, such as King David and his men eating the loaves of proposition. Therefore, the second reason above—that God did not want His laws to be burdensome—is why God did not include exceptions that He allows for regarding His divine positive laws. We will now show where *epikeia* applies to some of God's divine positive laws. The laws that God directly makes are known as the divine positive laws.

HNUE, p. 292: "The divine positive law may be defined as 'that law imposed by God upon men through revelation to direct them fittingly toward their supernatural end.'... The divine positive law is three-fold: the Primitive, the Old or Mosaic Law, and the New or Christian Evangelical Law..."

The divine positive laws deal with two basic types of laws:

- a) Those dealing with faith and morals that can never admit to the use of *epikeia*, because they can never be changed or abrogated, and individuals can never be exempted from them. These laws admit to no exceptions.

²⁸ Thomas, *Sum. Theol.*, I-II, q. 96, a. 6, ad 3.

b) Those dealing that do not deal with faith or morals in which epikeia can be used. These admit to exceptions, and can be change, or abrogated.

In case (b), the divine positive laws that do not deal with faith and morals can be exempted from in extraordinary situations. God has allowed exceptions to His own laws, such as the case of King David and his men eating the loaves of proposition. God teaches the use of epikeia, even in the divine positive laws He had instituted that don't deal with faith or morals. It is obvious that God has allowed exceptions (exemptions) from His own laws, by examples God has given us regarding King David and the loaves of proposition, circumcision on the Sabbath Day, and the Machabees when they fought to defend their lives on the Sabbath Day, the feeding of animals and taking an Ox out of a pit on the Sabbath Day. Theologians attest to this truth, the epikeia applies not just to human laws, but also divine positive laws not dealing with faith and morals.

HNUE, p. 298-9: *Cajetan*. Although Cajetan does not explicitly state that the use of epikeia in a matter concerning divine positive law is licit, nevertheless, one may easily derive this conclusion from his statement that epikeia is the direction of law—any law, natural or positive—when such law becomes deficient by reason of its universality... *Henno*. The theologian asserts unhesitatingly that the use of epikeia in reference to divine law is lawful... First, he points to the fact that the Machabees believed themselves excused from the observance of the Sabbath when their lives were in danger (1Mach. 2:41)... Finally, he declares that God, Whose 'yoke is sweet and burden light' is not to be deemed desirous of binding us to the fulfillment of any precept which is morally impossible. Hence, when there arises a grave difficulty in observing a law we can assume that it is not God's intention to urge obligation in such a case.

St. Antoninus teaches on page 55,

"In Holy Scripture too he (St. Antoninus, +1459) finds an instance of the use of *epikeia*. For it is there related that many of the army of the Machabees had submitted to the sword of the enemy rather than battle on the Sabbath. But after consultation with the more prudent, Mathathias realized that an act of self-defense was not a violation of the Sabbath; and consequently, by the use of *epikeia* it was decided: 'Whoever shall come up against us to fight on the Sabbath day, we will fight against him.' 29"

It is not that God did not foresee the exceptions of His own laws, for God knows all things. That is why the law is deficient as stated in reason 2 above—a more accurate term to use when the lawgiver had foreseen exceptions but did not wish to include them in the law, is that the law is curtailed instead of deficient. It is that God did not want the law to be burdensome and confusing to His people, when the common sense God has given all men would suffice to know when a true exception arises.

HNUE, p. 301: *Viva*. It is the contention of Viva that epikeia... may be used in reference to the divine law, not insofar as the mind of God is concerned, but only in relation to the words of the law. As a clarification of this final clause, Viva explains that a universal divine positive law may be deficient in a particular case, not because God cannot foresee such a case (as might be verified if there were question of a merely human legislator), but rather owing to the fact that it would be incongruous to express in His law the countless particular cases liable to arise. Consequently, the divine law may be corrected, not in relation to the divine mind, but rather in relation to the words of the law. As examples of divine positive laws in reference to which epikeia is permissible, Viva mentions the precept of requiring material integrity of confession, and the law demanding the confession of mortal sins before receiving Holy Communion.

HNUE, p. 300: *Salmanticenses*. According to the opinion of the Salmanticenses, epikeia may be used, with regard not only to human law, but also to divine positive law. The basic reason for their view arises from the fact that they believe that divine positive law, like human law, may be deficient owing to the universality of its expression, and hence require correction by epikeia. Fur-

29 1Mach.2:41

thermore, it is not necessary to suppose, as a basis for epikeia, the lawgiver's limitation of knowledge which prevented his foreseeing all possible cases.³⁰ This condition obviously can apply only to human legislators. But, it is quite possible—and for this statement the Salmanticenses cite the Angelic Doctor—that in order to avoid prolixity and confusion in his law, the legislator was unwilling to express in particular all the cases he wished to exempt, even though actually he foresaw them. That this is the situation which is verified in the case of divine positive laws the Salmanticenses strongly maintain. For God well understood that making use of the virtue of epikeia, men could correct a universal or general law when the occasion presented itself, and could interpret His Will in accordance with circumstances as they arose. In support of this position, the Salmanticenses allege the instances of David's partaking of the loaves of proposition, and the Machabees' interpretation that they were not obliged to observe the Sabbath by abstaining in all circumstances from the shedding of blood.

Patrick, if God, Himself allows and uses epikeia in relation to His own divine positive laws, that do not deal with faith or morals, who do you think you are to say you have no use for epikeia? How dare you! Do you know better than God? Of course you do! Because you are of the same blood of the true Pharisees that opposed our Lord Jesus Christ when he walked the earth. Not only did these Pharisees not admit to Christ's use of epikeia, they actually condemned Him for using it. Imagine that, the Pharisees condemning the ultimate lawgiver, God Himself, from which all just laws flow.

Epikeia does not invalidate a law, but only exempts from the law

Patrick Comment: 45

On the contrary, epikeia assumes that the law being corrected in the particular instance in which it is invoked still binds the Faithful just as much as ever it did, but that a given individual has good reason to believe it solidly probable that the legislator would have wished to excuse him, in his particular circumstance, from obedience to it.

RJMI Response: 45.1

Now here, in this last sentence, you admit that individuals can use epikeia and be excused from obedience to the law, but you have said elsewhere that you have no use for it. So now, you have confused your readers even more. Oh, and what a Satanic confusion, which by God's grace and this great effort on my part, I will dispel your nonsense, so as to try and help those who have become confused by your teachings and led astray by you.

You infer that I have taught epikeia invalidates the law, and make it no longer binding on the faithful. Where to I teach this? That inference is a seductive lie. No where do I teach that epikeia eliminates the law, or due obedience to the law. I quote from my Book Two:

Richard J.M. Ibranyi, *Epikeia vs Schism*, Book Two, p.7-8: "Epikeia is not a license to ignore Church law or the divine positive laws that can change, far from it. These laws are always to be obeyed without question, until it becomes impossible to do so, in certain extraordinary cases that will definitely be harmful and wrong if it were followed. Epikeia can only be invoked in reference to the law that it is appealing to for an exemption. In the use of epikeia, the spirit of the law is always considered in reference to the letter of the law. Never can a Catholic take action without reference to the letter of the law, if it can be obeyed it must be obeyed. If there is no emergency then it must be obeyed.... Epikeia is not a liberal interpretation (use) of the law; it is an exemption from the law, the law that is always strictly interpreted. It is not a diminishment (watering down) of the

³⁰ HNUE, Footnote 42: "This view of the nature of epikeia must obviously be taken by all who admit the applicability of epikeia to divine positive law. Cf., e.g., Wouters, loc. cit.: Van den Bergh, art. cit., Coll. Brug., Vii, 363; Leroux, 'De Epikeia,'..."

law, that would redefine the law, but an exemption from the law. Those who would diminish (dissolve the law) are antichrists. *“And every spirit that dissolveth Jesus is not of God. And this is Antichrist.” (1John 4:3)”*

Now, Patrick, have you not misrepresented my position to the reader. O, the dishonest techniques of a true Pharisee are present in your teachings: lies, half-truths, distraction from the main issue, and a relying on the hope that other readers will not study your sources so as to be able to expose your gross misuse of them.

What I have taught is in complete accord with the Catholic position on epikeia. I quote:

HNUE, p. 51-51: “To summarize this discussion of the teaching of Thomas... that epikeia is founded on the fact that law sometimes is deficient by reason of the universality of its expression. He clearly explains that epikeia is a judgment of a subject about the case at hand, and not about the law itself.” p. 324: “On the other hand, when epikeia strictly understood is applied to a law, there is no question of the law’s having ceased previously. It is still in force objectively, but it is presumed not to bind the individual in the particular case because, according to his prudent judgment, he believes that the legislator intended to exclude from his law the case at hand.”

Patrick denies a basic principle of Epikeia

Patrick Comment: 46

Another most important restriction is that the power of epikeia cannot extend beyond making licit what the law pronounces to be illicit. Epikeia cannot make valid what the law pronounces to be invalid, nor can it give JURISDICTION where the law does not give, or expressly denies, jurisdiction.

RJMI Response: 46.1

Where did you get this above teaching from. This is another of your own fabrications. The whole basis of epikeia, when it applies, is to be exempted from any man made Church law, and even the divine positive laws that do not deal with faith in morals, in an extraordinary circumstance. I have already proved the Church can supply jurisdiction directly when one in authority is lacking (See: RJMI Response: 16.1).

Epikeia also applies to human invalidating laws

Patrick Comment: 47

Nor does the principle that epikeia cannot make valid what the law pronounces to be invalid apply only to invalidating laws in the Code which are simply there to reflect and reinforce Divine positive laws, such as the law which says that only fermented wine will provide matter for valid consecration at Mass and that unfermented grape juice will not.

RJMI Response: 47.1

Patrick, this is another of your own schismatic fabrications when you teach that epikeia cannot make valid what the law makes invalid. That is the whole purpose of epikeia, to make valid what the letter of the Church law would make invalid, due to a legitimate exception. The Church fathers, doctors, theologians,

and canonists are unanimous on this point. The differences between them are in what laws can epikeia apply. But they all agree that when it applies it makes valid and legal what the letter of the law would make invalid and/or illegal.

You make the reader think that human invalidating laws are not subject to epikeia when this is the minority opinion only, of which if this minority were alive today in the midst of the great apostasy they would immediately change their opinion. Epikeia applies to all man-made laws, even human invaliding laws that are found in the code. I will deal with that topic below (See: RJMI Response: 48.1). Epikeia cannot be invoked regarding the divine positive laws that deal with faith, morals, and the essentials of the form and matter of the sacraments; these can never change, be abrogated, or exempted from.³¹ Do not change the topic so as to confuse the reader. In this debate we are only dealing with the laws that can change, be emended, dispensed or exempted from, or abrogated, and those are the laws that do not deal with faith, morals, and the essentials of the form and matter of the sacraments.

Patrick Comment: 48

It applies also to invalidation laws included in the Code by the Church on her own authority, known as human invalidating laws. Thus for instance, no possible application of epikeia could make valid an invalid absolution (say, because of lack of jurisdiction) in the sacrament of penance. If “the power of epikeia cannot extend beyond making licit what the law pronounces to be illicit,” how can epikeia make licit what God’s true popes told us are illicit consecrations of bishops? Pope Pius XII teaches us that even if the consecrations coming from Lefebvre and Thuc are valid they are yet gravely ILLICIT, that is, criminal and SACRILEGIOUS. How can epikeia change this fact?

RJMI Response: 48.1

Human Invalidating Laws

I have already addressed the fact that the Thuc and Lefebvre consecrations are illegal, because they are non-Catholics. If they were Catholic epikeia would apply so that they could have legally consecrated.

Again Patrick, your teaching regarding human invalidation laws, confessions, and consecrations and ordinations by Catholic bishops, is deceptive and is not what the common consensus of fathers, doctors, theologians, and canonists teach, that epikeia applies to all man-made laws, provided there is a legitimate emergency. The few canonists that taught that epikeia does not apply to human invalidating laws would immediately change their erroneous opinion if they were alive today in the midst of the great apostasy. The following is a sample of the common consensus regarding human invalidations laws and how epikeia applies to them.

Definitions of Epikeia (Human invalidating laws)

HNUE, p. 382: “*Ballerini*: ...Suffice it here to call attention to his insistence that the fact that a law is invalidating does not exclude the possibility of the subject’s resorting to the use of epikeia in regard to it. For, precisely the same reason explained by Thomas as the underlying basis of epikeia, as such—namely, that laws, being sometimes deficient by reason of the universality of their expression, cannot include each and every possible case—applies to invalidating laws no less than to other laws. And consequently, whenever the observance of an invalidating law would become ‘injurious or intolerable’ the use of epikeia in regard to it becomes lawful.” p. 383: “*Leroux*: Leroux... admits however, that it is generally taught that an invalidating law can cease by the lawful use of epikeia on account of common necessity—when, for example, it was impossible for

³¹ The Church has changed the matter of the sacrament of matrimony in the Tametsi decree in the Council of Trent, that then required a Catholic minister to preside ###.

people in general living in some region to have access to a pastor for the celebration of marriage [ed. under the “*Tametsi*” Decree in Trent]. Continuing, he observes that some authors maintain that even in a case of particular necessity which is most urgent, epikeia may be applied to an invalidating law.” p.383-4: “*Wouters*: It is the opinion of *Wouters* that any human law will admit to epikeia in its regard. Extreme rigor on the part of the legislator is not to be presumed. The law must not be deemed to extend to each and every case which, if the matter be considered strictly, the lawmaker could justly include in his law. To these general principles invalidating laws form no exception”

I will now present a quote from the author of the book, *History, Nature, and Use of Epikeia*, Fr. Riley. He confirms the teaching that epikeia must also apply to human invalidating laws. This, he teaches, is the only possible teaching, after all views are considered.

HNUE, pp. 409-410, 412-414: “(Fr. Riley) It would seem to be indisputable that any human law ceases to bind when it would be beyond the power of the legislator to urge its obligation. Now, in point of fact, there are times when it is beyond the power of a human legislator to urge the obligation of human invalidating law. It follows, then, that there are times when a human invalidating law ceases to bind...

It cannot be denied that no lawmaker may impose an obligation, compliance with which would be either impossible or disproportionately difficult. This conclusion extends to invalidating as well as other laws. Secondly, no legislator may demand that his law be obeyed if such an observance would transgress, or necessitate the transgression of, a higher law. This is obviously true even when there is a question of invalidating laws...

It is clear that a law ceases to bind once it commences to defeat the very purpose for which all law exists... It can sometimes happen that circumstances give rise to an encumbrance extrinsically connected with the observance of an invalidating law, which encumbrance is entirely out of proportion with the good intended, and with the gravity of the precept. This is possible cannot be denied. Nor is it any less incontrovertible that in such an instance the legislator would in justice be unable to demand observance of his law. As a result, the invalidating law would cease...”³² It is indisputable that it would exceed the power of a human legislator to demand the observance of his invalidating law if to exact obedience would necessarily infringe upon a higher law, or right. There is not sound reason why what has been said above in regard to this principle, insofar as it concerns human laws in general, should not be true where human invalidating laws are concerned.”

Those who held the minority opinion, that denied the use of epikeia for human invalidating laws, did not deny that a subject can be freed from the obligation of obeying the letter of the law in extraordinary situations, but justified their opinions in a different ways. They taught that the subject was not bound to human invalidating laws in extraordinary circumstances, not because of an exemption due to epikeia, but because the law **ceased** to bind in a particular case, or is **suspended**, or is the law is **interdicted**. But, the author and other canonists make the point that if the law ceases to bind in a particular case then this can only happen by the principle of epikeia. We will read the opinion of *De Smet* regarding this topic.

HNUE, pp. 402-403: “*De Smet* believes that authors agree as, to the solution proposed in this last case, but differ as to the juridical explanation of it. Some maintain that the ecclesiastical law ceases by reason of *epikeia* insofar as it is prohibiting, but not insofar as it is invalidating. Such an opinion *De Smet* deems to be startling, incomplete and defective. He himself follows the view which that in such extreme necessity the law of the Church ceases by reason of *epikeia* not merely insofar as it is prohibiting, but even as invalidating.”

So, Patrick, have you not deceived the reader by making him think your erroneous opinion that human invalidating laws also bind and can never cease, be suspended, or exempted from, is an infallible (*de fide*)

³² RJMI Comment: You can see how this applies to Pope Pius XII’s, *Ad Principes*, dealing with Episcopal Consecrations, which is a human invalidating law. It can be exempted from in an extraordinary situation that would make it harmful if one obeyed the letter of that law when there is no hierarchy to approve bishops. It is the mind of the Church to have Catholic bishops who can assist in saving souls.

teaching when it is only the minority opinion, that has since been proved wrong. You use this deceptive technique throughout all your writings. A Catholic does not need to be a theologian to know what you teach is contradictory and confusing, all they need is good old common sense.

Example 1: Canon 209

A good example of epikeia is the valid hearing of confessions by an unauthorized priest who has no faculties, and can even be a non-Catholic priest under certain specific conditions. Such a priest can validly hear the confession of a penitent who is not in danger of death, provided the penitent thinks he is a Catholic priest with faculties to hear confession. This is taught in canon 209 on common error and probable doubt.

Canon 209: "The Church supplies jurisdiction both for the external and the internal forum: (1) in common error; (2) in a positive and probable doubt whether of fact or law."

Normally, such a priest without faculties or approval from either the local ordinary or his religious superior is under the ban of an invalidating law that states he cannot validly hear confessions, but canon 209 allows him to be exempted from this invalidating law.

Example 2: Confessions in prison.

A good example of epikeia regarding a human invalidating law would be a Catholic priest who was not in his diocese and was in prison in a communist country. Such a priest would have no access to the local bishop and therefore would not be able to get faculties to hear valid confessions of the Catholic prisoners that are not in danger of death, according to the letter of the following laws. The following is a human invalidating laws that would prevent such a priest from hearing the prisoners confessions.

Canon 879: For the valid hearing of confessions, it is necessary that jurisdiction shall have been explicitly granted either in writing or orally.

Now this is a clear cut case in which epikeia would apply, in that the priest would be exempted from this above law by the principle of epikeia, so that he could validly and legally hear the confessions of the Catholic prisoners who are not in danger of death. It is of the divine law that for a confession to be valid there must be jurisdiction, so that in this case the jurisdiction is supplied directly by the Church, while the priest is exempted from the explicit authorization (faculties) from a Catholic bishop that he would need in ordinary circumstances (See: RJMI Response: 16.1)

Patrick, according to you such a Catholic priest could not hear the confessions of the Catholic prisoners who are not in danger of death because you deny the use of epikeia for human invalidating laws. And there is where you are showing a total lack of common sense, which is what epikeia relies upon, simple common sense. If this priest heard the prisoners confessions, according to you Patrick, they would be invalid because epikeia does not apply to human invalidating laws. You see how a true Pharisee ends up sinning mortally because he has no use for epikeia, and thus deprive Catholics of a great spiritual good from a Catholic priest that would assist them in saving their souls.

It is important to note, such a Catholic priest is not being disobedient to Church authority, or Church law. He finds himself in a dilemma because the highest law of the Church, of which all others are based, is the salvation of souls, and therefore because it is impossible for him to access the local Catholic bishop, he evokes the principle of epikeia by using common sense, even if he did not know of the principle, and rightly hears the confessions of the Catholic prisoners who are not in danger of death. It cannot be said such a Catholic priest is acting contrary to the local bishop, for surely if he had access to the local bishop, the Catholic bishop would grant him the faculty.

Example 3: Baptism before a non-Catholic minister, when not in danger of death.

What you are saying, Patrick, is that if there are not Catholic priests in a country then parents cannot baptize their children, nor adult converts, unless they are in danger, because canon law teaches that a infant or adult catechumen must approach an authorized Catholic minister to receive baptism, unless they are in danger of death, and if they do not then the baptism is illicit, illegal and they are excommunicated. Would

you then have us believe epikeia does not apply to Catholics who have no access to an authorized Catholic minister, who baptize their children or converts, who are not in danger of death, so that these baptisms are illicit, because epikeia cannot make licit what the man made Church law declares illicit? That is what you are saying Patrick that all these Catholics must wait for their children or converts to be in danger of death, before they can baptize them. Again, a true Pharisee lacks common sense, and true mercy.

On Marriage and the Tametsi Decree of Trent

Example 4: Marriages not before an authorized Catholic minister from the time of the Council of Trent in 1545 until the *Ne Temere* decree of 1907.

The marriage law, for those of the Roman Rite, from the time of the Council of Trent until the promulgation of the “*Ne Temere*” decree of Pope Pius X in 1907, teaches that a Catholic must get married before a authorized Catholic minister and two witnesses or their marriage is null and void. This human invalidating law is known as the “*Tametsi*” decree as found in the Council of Trent and admits to no exceptions.

Council of Trent, “*Tametsi*” on the reformation of matrimony, sess. XXIX, Chap. 1: Those who shall attempt to contract marriage otherwise than in the presence of the parish priest, or of some other priest by permission of the said parish priest, or of the Ordinary, and in the presence of two or three witnesses; the holy Synod renders such wholly incapable of thus contracting and declares such contracts invalid and null, as by the present decree It invalidates and annuls them.

This is a human invalidating law; no Catholic minister and two witnesses then no marriage is possible. Epikeia must apply in the cases where Catholic priests cannot be accessed or else Catholics could not get married in those areas. The saints, theologians and canonists discussed how the *Tametsi* decree relates to lands where the *Tametsi* decree was in force in which there was a common obstacle in that it is impossible to have access to a Catholic priest. Almost every one agrees that epikeia must apply. Fr. Riley summarizes the majority opinion and teaches:

HNUE, pp. 416-417: “Now, it cannot be denied that in some instances invalidating laws, if they should continue to be possessed of obligating force, would despot certain subjects of basic human rights. Suppose, for example, that, in a region where the regulations of the Council of Trent regarding clandestine marriages had been promulgated, all the priests had been slain because of a persecution of the Church. If there was no possibility of any priests’ re-entering the territory for an indefinitely long period, then to insist upon the bidding force of the decree *Tametsi* would be equivalent to the confiscation of the natural right to marry.”

Those, the very few, who were reluctant to admit to exemptions for human invalidating laws, had to admit to that epikeia does apply to human invaliding laws when they studied this dilemma. When this question was put before the Holy Office in 1625, the Holy Office confirmed that private marriages without a Catholic priest could take place in the presence of two witnesses when a priest is not available within a period of one month.

Common Law Marriage: “If it should eventuate that two Catholics desirous of marriage should not be able to find a parish priest or bishop within their reach, and such a condition were to last for a month, in such cases consent expressed before two witnesses would suffice for a valid marriage (S.C. de Prop. Fide, 13 iun., 1625—*Ius Pontificium*, I, pars 2 n. 15.).”

In 1907 Pope Pius X emended the law (the *Tametsi* decree) by allowing for private marriages when no access to a authorized Catholic priest was possible within a one-month period of time.

Pope Pius X, *Ne Temere*, 1907, D. 2069: “VIII. If it happens that in some region the pastor or ordinary of the place or priest delegated by them, in the presence of whom marriage can be celebrated, cannot be had, and this conditions of things has lasted now for a month, the marriage can be validly and licit entered upon after a formal consent has been given by the betrothed in the presence of two witnesses.

The Sacred Congregation of Faith in 1625 confirmed those who used Epikeia to get married without a Catholic priest when none was available from the time of Trent's *Tametsi* decree (1563) until 1625. And no pope had officially changed (emended) the law (*Tametsi* decree) in the external forum until Pope Pius X in 1907. Now, Patrick, being that you have no use for epikeia, "How would a Catholics get married, from the time of the *Tametsi* decree until 1625, when it was impossible to have access to a Catholic priest?" If, as you falsely teach, the human invalidating law of the *Tametsi* decree cannot be exempted from by epikeia then you would be going against the decision of the Sacred Congregation of Faith of 1625 that allowed this exception, and Pope Pius X who officially emended the law (with the exception) in the external forum in 1907. If according to you, human invalidating laws cannot be exempted from by epikeia then you would have to tell these Catholics that have no access to a priest—such as the Catholics in Japan who had no priest for 200 years—that they couldn't get married. Can you now see clearly how you sin by denying the use of epikeia?

A study of the *Tametsi* decree, and how it relates to an exemption from a human invaliding law by the principle of epikeia before the *Ne Temere* decree, will prove to a man of a good will, that human invalidating laws can be exempted from in extraordinary situations. Refer to HNUE p. 399-400.

Abjurations for those who know they must; a perfect act of contrition suffices until

Patrick Comment: 49

Richard, do you believe that those who belonged to the Novus Ordo sect and/or the Traditional Movement sects can pray an act of perfect contrition before they have taken *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration*, which you wrote? If you answer YES, are they then in the state of Sanctifying Grace? Do they belong to the Church in the external forum? If you answer NO, then explain how you belonged to the Church in the external forum before you wrote and professed *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration*. And if you answer NO, also please explain how the MAJORITY of them have any chance to save their souls. Far less than one percent of the world's population know you wrote *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration*, people are REQUIRED to take before they could save their souls, according to the statements of Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi. Probably less than 10 percent of those who have heard you wrote *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration* have seen a printed copy of it. Has your Abjuration already been translated into every language of the world? If people do not read English, how long will it be before they could take the Abjuration you require?

RJMI Response: 49.1

Responsibility and Culpability

No, Patrick, not everybody who embraced the heresies of the Conciliar Church is currently bound to take an abjuration if they have not leaned that they must take an abjuration. A confession of their sins against the faith followed by a perfect act of contrition would place them back inside the Church. That does not alleviate a subject who embraced the heresies of the Conciliar Church from his responsibility to take an abjuration once he learns the Church teaches he must. What follows will explain these facts.

[Edited and place following section in QRM ###]

1) STEP ONE: Those who were still attending the Conciliar churches.

The subject would be Catholic if he condemned the heresies, idolatries, blasphemes, sacrileges, or schismatic positions, once that have been presented to him, along with his condemning the heretics and/or schismatics who teach and practice them, even though he did not yet separate from them—the Conciliar Church—due to his lack of knowledge of the papal deposition teachings. If the subject did not condemn

the heresy and heretics when the evidence was presented to him he would also be a heretic and fall outside the Catholic Church. There are two classes in which a Catholic can find himself who condemns the heresies and heretics, and/or schisms and schismatics.

1a) A subject who never fell outside the Catholic Church, because he never accepted the heresies and/or schisms, either by commission or omission. When the heresies were made known to him for the first time he immediately condemned them and the men that taught them, even though he had not yet separated from the Conciliar Church due to his lack of knowledge of the papal deposition teachings. Such a man would remain Catholic. Once this Catholic learns of the papal deposition teachings and separates from, and condemns the Conciliar Church, he must then take other actions as applies (See: Step Four) The saintly Padre Pio falls into this category, and incurred no guilt whatsoever in the earliest days of the apostasy, even though he was objectively in a non-Catholic Church, precisely because the crimes were not even manifest at the local levels. Padre Pio died as a Catholic—inside the Catholic Church—and I firmly believe the next pope will make him a saint. God in his great mercy, and due to Padre Pio’s great holiness, had not allowed him to live through the worse days of the apostasy.

1b) A subject of the Conciliar Church who was himself a heretic, either by sins of commission or omission, and therefore was outside the Catholic Church. Upon his repentance and confession, by his condemning of the heresies and heretics and/or the schisms and schismatics he would automatically have his censures lifted and he would be Catholic (in the Catholic Church), even though he had not yet separated from the Conciliar Church due to his lack of knowledge of the papal deposition teachings. He would not yet know he needs to abjure if he did not have the papal deposition teachings and the teachings of abjuration. His attempt to confess his sins against the faith to a Conciliar priest would be impossible because the priest will not accept his confession of the heresies of the Conciliar Church, but God will accept the penitent’s desire to confess these sins and absolve him of his censures upon the penitent’s act of contrition. Once this penitent learns of the papal deposition teachings and separates from, and condemns the Conciliar Church, he must then take other actions as applies (See: Step Four)

Culpable Ignorance

Canon Law a Text and Commentary: “Ignorance is want of due knowledge... it is vincible if it could be so cured, but adequate means are not taken. Vincible ignorance is further divided: it is simply vincible if some means of curing it have been used, short of due diligence; it is crass or supine, if no diligence whatever is used; it is affected, if it is directly desired and preserved.”³³

Simple, Crass or Supine Ignorance

A Catholic of good will would logically seek for evidence of heresy and idolatry among the Conciliar hierarchy and her official teachings, once the heresies and idolatries became manifest to him at the local level (his diocese, parish church, or country). If a subject could have easy access to the heresies and idolatries of the hierarchy and official teachings of the Conciliar Church, and did not seek them, then he too would be fully culpable and outside the Catholic Church. If the subject truly sought evidence of heresies and idolatries then God will see to it that they find the evidence along with the teachings of the Catholic Church that condemn them—seek and you shall find (Mt. 7:7). To not seek the truth when it is warranted is a fully culpable sin.

Affected Ignorance

Affected ignorance is the result of a person who avoids the truth because he does not want to amend his life and change his ways, which is an effective denial of the cross, the persecution and suffering he will undergo by accepting the truth. A clear case of affected ignorance is if a subject is handed the evi-

³³ Bouscaren, *Canon Law a Text and Commentary*, p. 29

dence of heresy and idolatry among the Conciliar hierarchy and in her official teachings, and rejects it without reading it. Such a person would be automatically and fully culpable, as if he read the evidence and rejected it as false. If he tried to say he never knew of the heresies and idolatries among the Conciliar hierarchy and those in her official teachings because he never read the evidence when presented to him, then, whose fault is it if he did not read the information? God's grace was certainly inspiring him to read it, and he rejected it.

2) STEP TWO: Those, who without having been presented with the papal deposition teachings, that have separated from the Conciliar Church while still believing it is the Catholic Church

There are two classes a subject can find himself in if he separated from the Conciliar Church, before he had the papal deposition teachings—thinking the Conciliar Church is the Catholic Church—those who are not justified in doing so, and those who are.

2a) Those who are not justified: Until the deposition teachings are presented to a subject, he cannot break off all contact and communion with the Conciliar Church, as the schismatic Society of Saint Pius X has done, because that would be a sin of schism. It is an act of schism, at all times and with no excuse, to set up your own hierarchy, consecrate bishops, operate seminaries, and ordain priests, and offer public Masses without the approval from those whom you believe to be the pope and Catholic bishops, as is the case with Society of Saint Pius X (SSPX). The SSPX is also guilty of heresy because they do not condemn the manifest heresies of the Conciliar Church, nor accuse those who manifestly teach the heresy of being heretics.

Culpability of Laymen who Attend these churches

A simple rule to follow is that if a layman had attended these churches for more than six months he would be presumed to be culpable and must abjure. Some who attended longer than six months may not be culpable, but they must be assumed so. Six months is plenty of time to detect any heresies or schismatic positions that the sect teaches or practices, either by sins of commission or omission. Once suspicion is aroused a basic inquiry of the priest would reveal his crimes along with the sect he is a member of. Truly this inquiring should have been done before any layman attends such churches.

A brief example is if a layman, who attends such a church, hears the bishop or priest only refer to John Paul II's and the Conciliar Church's apostasies, heresies and idolatries as errors and scandals, while deliberately leaving out any accusation of apostasy, heresy or idolatry, or any reference to the perpetrators as apostates, heretics or idolaters. This immediately makes such a bishop or priest suspect by a good-willed layman. The layman would then be bound, by his obligation to profess the faith, to immediately approach the bishop or priest and inquire further by demanding that he confess and teach that John Paul II is an apostate, heretic, and idolater, and that he and the Conciliar Church teach apostasy, heresy, and practice idolatry and sacrilege. If the priest either is not willing to clarify his statement or directly says that heresy is not heresy but only error, or if he said it is heresy but he does not condemn the man who manifestly teaches it as a heretic, then layman's must reject and condemn the priest and his sect, avoid them, and warn others as the situation presents itself. The laymen that attend these churches cannot claim ignorance of the heresies and idolatries of the Conciliar Church. The very fact that they separated from the Conciliar Church bishops and parishes proves that they can have only done this because of manifest apostasy, heresy, idolatry that was being taught in these churches.

2b) Those who are justified: Not all disobedience is schism. The case of Fr. Feeney S.J. presents itself here. Fr. Feeney was not guilty as is the SSPX, precisely because he actively sought to be in communion with the Conciliar Church, which he thought was the Catholic Church, because he did not know of the papal deposition teachings and the crimes of the Conciliar Church were not yet manifest at all levels as they are today in the latter days of the great apostasy. Fr. Feeney's reconciliation with the Conciliar Church—that he thought was the Catholic Church—is what actually

justifies him and condemns the SSPX who have made no effort whatsoever to communicate or reconcile with the Conciliar Church, which they too believe is the Catholic Church. Fr. Feeney never sought to set up his own hierarchy (consecrate bishops), nor did he seek to operate seminaries to train and ordain priests, or offer public Masses in opposition to what he believed was the Catholic Church hierarchy.

At this point in time, in the latter days of the great apostasy, there is no excuse for anybody remaining in the Conciliar Church. If Fr. Feeney were alive today, when the crimes are now manifest at all levels and the papal deposition teachings are readily available for those who seek, he would be bound to separate from, and condemn the Conciliar Church and her antipopes as non-Catholic entities, that is why the current day St. Benedict Centers are in heresy and schism and are on the road to damnation. Any attempt at reconciling with manifest heretics would make the person guilty of the sins against the faith of the manifest heretic.

3) STEP THREE: Those who have been presented with the Papal Deposition teachings

Note: For the sake of brevity I refer to “papal deposition” teachings, but also include in this the teaching that if a manifest heretic was elected to be pope, his election would be null and void and he would not be the pope. Both teachings make the same point, “A manifest heretic cannot be a pope.”

After the crimes of the Conciliar Church and her apostate hierarchy have been manifest to the subject and he was presented with the papal deposition teachings, he would then be bound to separate from, and condemn the Conciliar Church and her antipopes as non-Catholic entities within six months of him being presented with the papal deposition teachings. If he does not, it is certain that he fell outside the Catholic Church (is a non-Catholic), and this may even happen sooner depending on the circumstances.

Culpable Ignorance

If the papal deposition teachings are made known to a subject, or easily can be known by him if he sought them, then he is also bound to reject any bishop, even a man who claims to be the pope as legitimate Catholic prelates. One who knows of the papal deposition teachings, or even heard of the *sedevacante* position (the papal deposition teachings even if in a negative way, is bound to pursue it and study it. If he does not he is culpable. Once a man recognizes a bishop or a man he believes to be the pope is a manifest heretic then by common sense alone, if he is of good-will, leads him to ask, “How can such a man be a Catholic bishop or be the pope?” You don’t even have to know of the papal deposition teachings yet. If you recognize this dilemma by common sense then God will get the truth to you—the papal depositions teachings. A Protestant or a pagan, using their common sense would ask any Catholic, “How can a man be a Catholic pope if he publicly teaches heresies that were infallibly condemned by past popes?” “How can he be considered infallible?” “Would it not defeat the purpose of the past popes infallible definitions?” Even though the Protestants and pagans do not believe in the infallibility of the pope, they know we do, and will immediately see the delimmia. These non-Catholics have already made these observations, and they do not have supernatural faith. They are only acting upon common sense, which apostate Catholics do not even have. How long can a good willed subject, after he knows John Paul II does not profess the Catholic and Orthodox Faith because he publicly teaches heresy and apostasy, continue to pray with him in the *Te Igitur* prayer of the Mass—[*Te Igitur ###*] —without feeling more guilty each time? And if the subject is of good will his guilt will become almost unbearable, and then God would set him free with the truth, the papal deposition teachings and the invalidity of a papal election of a candidate was a heretic before his election, proving, what common sense should know in the face of the evidence, that a manifest heretic cannot be pope.

Simple, Crass or Supine Ignorance

If a subject could of easily had access to the papal deposition teachings with an effort on his part, and did not seek them, then he too would be fully culpable and outside the Catholic Church. A Catholic of good will would logically seek such teachings, once he is aware of the heresies at the highest levels of the

hierarchy, to resolve the crisis of obedience to men who are manifest heretics. And if he truly sought a solution to the dilemma God will see to it that he finds the papal deposition teachings.

Affected Ignorance

A clear case of affected ignorance is if a person is handed an article that contains the papal deposition teachings and rejects it without reading it. Such a person would be automatically and fully culpable, as if he read them and rejected them. If he tried to say he never knew of the papal deposition teachings because he never read the article, then, whose fault is it if he did not read the article? God's grace was certainly inspiring him to read it, and he rejected it. The same would apply if a subject read an article condemning the *sedevacante* position but did not seek further, the opposing position, to learn the truth of the matter. His not reading of the opposing position, in such an important matter, makes him guilty of affected ignorance.

4) STEP FOUR: Those who have been presented with the teachings on Abjuration

The Three Forms of Condemnation of the Great Apostasy

There are three specific forms, each representing a condemnation of the Great Apostasy, her apostate and heretical hierarchy, her specific apostasies, heresies, and idolatries, and the other various non-Catholic groups that claim to be Roman Catholic. One must be taken, as it applies, when the subject learns that the Church teaches that he must reject, in writing, these entities. The three forms are:

A Condemnation of the Great Apostasy: For those who remained Catholic, that is, those Catholics who never adhered to the heresies and idolatries of the Conciliar Church or various other non-Catholic sects who claim to be Roman Catholic. They do not need to abjure but must make a specific condemnation of the Great Apostasy so that others may know they are Catholic.

A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration from the Great Apostasy: For non-Catholic penitents, who believed they were Roman Catholic, who have not yet abjured in any way, either privately or by a non-specific public form of abjuration. These must make a specific abjuration from the Great Apostasy

A Confirmation of Abjuration from the Great Apostasy: For Catholics who have already abjured, either privately or by a non-specific public abjuration. These would have to take the specific confirmation of abjuration from the Great Apostasy so that others would know they abjured and are now Catholic.

Abjuration and Confirmation of Abjuration

Not everybody who embraced the heresies of the Conciliar Church is currently bound to take an abjuration if they have not learned that they must take an abjuration. A confession of their sins against the faith followed by an act of perfect contrition (which is far from the impossible thing some make it out to be) would place them back inside the Church. That does not alleviate a subject who embraced the heresies of the Conciliar Church from his responsibility to take an abjuration once he learns the Church teaches he must. Once the Church's law on abjuration has been presented to a subject, who already holds the *sedevacante* position (has condemned the Conciliar Church and her antipopes as non-Catholic entities and separated from them), he would then be bound to take it. Even if at first he only believes he can take a private abjuration, he would be bound to do that. Once it is made known to him that the Church demands a public abjuration in writing, specific for the crimes of the Conciliar Church, he is then bound to take it. There are four types of Catholics who hold the *sedevacante* position.³⁴

³⁴ Sects such as the Thucytes, Kellyites, and CMRI, although they hold the *sedevacante* position are not Catholic and therefore, they too, must be abjured from. Holding the *sedevacante* position is not enough to know if a man is Catholic. He must also hold the full deposit of the Catholic faith in word and deed.

- a) Those who have privately confessed their sins and made a perfect act of contrition, not knowing they must take an abjuration, and are not in communion with non-Catholic bishops or priests.
- b) Those who have taken a private abjuration, not knowing they must take a public abjuration, and are not in communion with non-Catholic bishops or priests.
- c) Those who have taken a non-specific public abjuration—as is the *Form of Receiving a Convert*—not knowing they must take a specific public abjuration, and are not in communion with non-Catholic bishops or priests.
- d) Those who have taken a specific public abjuration, and are not in communion with non-Catholic bishops or priests

All are bound to fulfill the above conditions as the information becomes available to them. Being that they are already Catholic they would be fulfilling these demands, as they become known to them, not to have their censures lifted, because their censures are already lifted, but to confirm their earlier actions, as an act of obedience to the Church, and as a necessity to foster unity among other Catholics. If they do not fulfill the Church's demands, as they become known then they re-incur the censures (recidivism).

The ultimate non-specific form of abjuration that these Catholics would take, once they learn they must, is titled "*A Confirmation of Abjuration from the Great Apostasy*." Because, their original abjuration, whether it was a private confession followed by a act of perfect contrition, or a private abjuration, or a non-specific public abjuration, would have been acceptable to God and would have lifted their censures, because they acted in good faith according to the information available to them at the time. Their future compliance by ultimately taking a specific public abjuration would only be a confirmation of their earlier abjuration, and not another abjuration to lift censures.

A Condemnation of the Great Apostasy for those who remained Catholic

Abjuration from the Great Apostasy is not necessary for those who remained Catholic. There are three classes of Catholics who only need to sign the specific position paper, *A Condemnation of the Great Apostasy*.

1. Those who were always Catholic. These fall into two classes.

- a) Those who were never a part of the Conciliar Church and other non-Catholic sect that claimed to be Roman Catholic, not even objectively.
- b) Those who were objectively in the Conciliar Church or other non-Catholic sects that claimed to be Roman Catholic, but remained Catholic (See: Step One and Two).

2. A penitent who wants to convert from a Protestant sect, or Schismatic sect that does not claim to be Roman Catholic (Greek or Russian, or Old Catholic Schismatics), provided they truly convert into the Roman Catholic Church. That means they did not convert into the Conciliar Church or any other non-Catholic sect that calls itself Roman Catholic. These would need to take the abjuration *Form of Receiving a Convert* followed by the profession of the Catholic faith, and then they would be required to sign the specific position paper *A Condemnation of the Great Apostasy*, to prove they reject these entities.

3. A man baptized into the Roman Catholic Church who was never a part of the sects of the Great Apostasy. Before his baptism, he would be required to sign the specific position paper *A Condemnation of the Great Apostasy*, to prove he rejects these entities.

Why must a man, who always remained Catholic, have to sign the position paper *A Condemnation of the Great Apostasy*? Prudence and common sense dictates that the only way for these Catholics to be united and protected from heretics and schismatics, and be considered Catholic themselves by other Catholics, is

by signing a position paper titled “*A Condemnation of the Great Apostasy*” that condemns the Conciliar Church, her apostate bishops and antipopes, and specific heresies, and all the various non-Catholic traditionalists. This is the only way there can be unity among Catholics in these days of the great apostasy. There would be no other way to know for sure if a man holds the full deposit of the Catholic faith. To be merely separated from the Conciliar Church is not enough, a man must also be examined to see if he holds the full deposit of the Catholic faith and is not in communion with schismatics, and this must be done in writing to assist other Catholics in knowing that they are not in communion with non-Catholics.

The Non-Catholic Sedevacante Sects

There are many sedevacantists (those who believe the Holy See is Vacant) who are separated from the Conciliar Church, who call themselves Roman Catholic, but are not Catholic, such as, the Thucites, the Kellyites, the current day CMRI, etc., and even individuals who do not belong to any of these groups but hold to any one heresy must be exposed and avoided. These non-Catholic sects, who claim to be Roman Catholic, are also a part of the great apostasy, and are the most dangerous of all, because of the many truths they profess, and outward piety in Liturgical practices (just like the Greek Schismatics) while tainted by deadly heresies and/or a schismatic clergy. This is a partial list of some of these sects and individuals; those consecrated or ordained by Bishop Thuc, those consecrated or ordained by Bishop Kelly (the Society of Pius V), Bishop Pivarunas (the CMRI), Bishop McKenna, etc. (See: The Abjuration Form for a more complete list).

A simple rule to follow is that if a layman had attended these churches more than six months he would be presumed to be culpable and must abjure from them, he may even be culpable sooner. Some who attended longer than six months may not be culpable, but they must assumed so. Six months is plenty of time to detect any heresies and/or schismatic teachings and practices of the sect, either by sins of commission or omission. Once suspicion is aroused a basic inquiry of the priest would reveal his crimes along with the sect he is a member of. Truly this inquiring should have been done before any layman attends such churches. Some examples are the questioning of the bishop or priest as to who consecrated or ordained him, so that the layman can learn if the bishop who consecrated or ordained him was Catholic. Or, does the priest or bishop allow the members of his church to attend other churches that are in heresy or schism. Or, does the bishop or priest require that his members hold the full deposit of the Catholic faith before the approach his altar rail, and does he require those who have been in heresy or schism, or in communion with those who are in heresy and schism to abjure before they are allowed to receive Holy Communion and be treated as members of the Catholic Church. Or, does such a group only put forth their position as opinions and not as dogmas, thus denying infallibility by putting forth dogmas as only opinions that need a future pope to confirm—such as these incur the anathema of *Exsecrabilis*, by referring to a future pope or council for what has already been infallible defined by a past pope. Or, the questioning of any other heresy or schismatic position they make manifest to laymen.

Interesting to note Patrick, you agree with me that a perfect act of contrition can place one back in the Church if they do not know the Church teaches they must take an abjuration. And that certainly being true, then epikeia would have to apply to these penitents, because the letter of the Church law demands abjurations. You admitted that you have taken a private abjuration, but later took another abjuration before lay witnesses, and this could only have been because you did not feel comfortable with taking a private abjuration. Either your instincts had told you, or you read about it, that a public abjuration before witnesses is necessary, and that is why you had taken one before lay witnesses, and none of these actions of yours is allowed by the letter of the Church’s law. So, being that you deny the use of epikeia, you cannot be exempted from the Church law that teaches abjurations must be taken before a Catholic bishop (the local Ordinary) or his delegate and two witnesses. As a result, Patrick, your censures remain, and you are still outside the Catholic Church.

Abjurations can, and have changed

Patrick Comment: 50

Is the FIRST copy of your Abjuration sufficient, adequate and satisfactory? If you answer YES, then why did you keep revising it and changing it? If you answer NO, then which version is sufficient, adequate and satisfactory? You will probably add my name into your next version, if you have not done so already. If you do that, will that mean that the Abjuration you and your followers already took will be null and void? Will you, and the others, now have to do it over another time using the latest version of *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration*?

RJMI Response: 50.1

By no means is the form of Abjuration I composed have to be the only one (See: RJMI Response: 49.1). If a form of Abjuration was revised, meaning embellished by additions, that does not make invalid the former abjuration when it was in force. The Church has changed abjuration forms many times to accommodate the unique heresies of the day. That does not mean past abjurations that used the old form become invalid (null and void) when the Church uses a new one. Just as is the case with the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass that has been embellished over the years and eventually codified by Pope Pius V. These additions (embellishments) to the Holy Mass did not invalidate or make illegal the earlier Masses of the Roman Rite.

No essential change can be made to an abjuration that would admit to a heresy, or schismatic teaching in the abjuration itself. If an abjuration contained heresy or a schismatic teaching then obviously it would be invalid and have no force at any time. Therefore, being that you oppose the form of abjuration I wrote, your time would be better spent trying to find a heresy or schismatic teaching within the form, instead of denying the necessity of a specific abjuration as the Church demands.

The Form of Receiving a Convert of 1859 is Abrogated for the USA

The last abjuration form for the United States was promulgated in 1942 and had abrogated *The Form of Receiving a Convert* of 1859 for that Country. It differs from the 1859 form, in that it is more detailed. Does that mean the previous form was invalid at the time it was in force in the United States?

TRC, pp. 10-11, 101: “Another difficulty arises by reason of the new formula of profession of faith which was approved by the Holy Office and sent to the Ordinaries of the United States by His Excellency, the Most Reverend Amleto G. Cicognani, Apostolic Delegate, under date of March 26, 1942. Does the more recent formula abrogate the use of the profession of faith which is contained in the Instruction? It seems that the approval given the new formula by the Holy Office acting in the name of the Holy See is sufficient to warrant the abrogation of the formula of the Instruction, just as the Holy Office in the Instruction abrogated the use of the formula of Pius IV... While the two formulas are essentially the same, the more recent formula is more detailed concerning certain truths and does not follow the same order...” Since the profession of faith³⁵ prescribed by the II and III Plenary Councils of Baltimore has given place to the more recent formula approved by the Holy Office, this latter formula is to be used. In other countries, unless special regulations exist, the convert may recite the formula prescribed by the Instruction of July 20, 1859.

The Form of Receiving a Convert

Instruction Formula of 1859

(Instruction of the Holy Office, July 20, 1859, *Forma Receptionis Neo-Converti*
(The one Patrick Henry promotes for all Countries))

³⁵ The profession of faith when used in this context also includes the Abjuration. I quote from *The Reception of Converts*, p. 101. “Neither the Instruction of 1859, nor the Code, nor the Ritual prescribes any special faculty for receiving the converts profession of faith. By reason of the fact that the profession and the abjuration are combined to form one formality, however, and also in view of the norm set forth in canon 2314.2, governing the juridic efficacy of the abjuration, the delegation of the Ordinary should be obtained before the priest proceeds to act as an official witness to the convert’s profession of faith.”

“I, N,N., having before my eyes the holy Gospels, which I touch with my hand, and knowing that no one can be saved without that faith which the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church holds, believes, and teaches... I firmly believe all the articles that she proposes to my belief; I reject and condemn all that she rejects and condemns, and I am ready to observe all she commands me.” 36

1942 Formula

(The Holy Office, March 26, 1942)

”1. I..... years of age, born outside the Catholic Church, have held and believed errors contrary to her teaching. Now, enlightened by divine grace, I kneel before you, Reverend Father.... having before my eyes and touching with my hands the Holy Gospels;”37

The book gives the full text of the abjuration and profession of faith for both forms.

Two points are made.

One: Abjuration forms can and have changed. Changes to a new abjuration form that is currently in force, does not nullify and invalidate the effect of older forms when they were in force, or if someone used the older form, not knowing there was a newer form, they would still be absolved.

Two: That means, Patrick, the form you promote in your book, “*The True Church*” is no longer in force in the United States and has been abrogated by the 1942 formula—which is the current form that is part of the Sacred Liturgy for the United States—not the 1859 that you use. Does that mean all those in the United States who followed your advice and took the 1859 Instruction form is null and void and therefore did not have their censures lifted? If you say they did have their censures lifted, in spite of your error, then it would have to be by the principle of epikeia, because it is not the one approved by the Holy See in 1942. If you deny the use of epikeia then the abrogated form of 1859, that you tell penitents in the United States to use, is null and void and has left these penitents outside the Church because their censures cannot be lifted.

Private Abjurations that are not in writing cannot be proved

The case of Fr. Egregyi

Patrick Comment: 51

Which version of your Abjuration did Rev. Francois Egregyi use? Do you have REAL PROOF that Rev. Francois Egregyi has ever taken an Abjuration since receiving Holy Orders outside the Catholic Church? Was it before a Catholic Bishop? Who was it that absolved him during that Abjuration? When did it take place? Where did it take place? Are the Witnesses still living? How can I contact them? Are there any other people still living who knew the bishop or priest who absolved Rev. Francois Egregyi during that Abjuration? If it was a Catholic bishop who absolved him, did that bishop then grant Rev. Francois Egregyi delegated Jurisdiction? If you answer NO, why not?

RJMI Response: 51.1

You have just proved my case and have condemned yourself by the above questions. You substantiate the absolute need of public abjurations that are recorded in a manner that can be proved later on. An abjuration in writing offers other Catholics such proof. What proof can you present to me that you privately abjured, as you said you did? What proof can you present to me that you abjured before lay witnesses?

36 Ibid.

37 Ibid.

Please give me the date and place of the abjuration, the name and address of the witnesses so I can contact them, and the content of the abjuration you took? And if you took the non-specific *Form of Receiving a Convert* then how does that prove to me that you abjured from the Schuckardt sect (CMRI) that you belonged to. Do you realize that Schuckardt would have used the same form of receiving converts into his sect? You see how specific proof is necessary as the only way to know for sure that a man who calls himself Catholic has indeed abjured? How would you propose this be done without a public written record? Just as Fr. Egregyi says below that he privately abjured before a Catholic Belgian priest, so you say you privately abjured and then later on publically abjured before lay witnesses. If I did not take both of your words for it, or believe those who witnessed your abjuration, I would have no written proof that both of you abjured.

I will present a letter Fr. Egregyi had sent me, to correct me. I had thought he left the SSPX with the Oyster Bay Nine, but that was not true. He had left earlier then they did. The following letter I had sent to those whom I had misinformed to correct this error. This is the letter he sent me explaining his situation.

-----Original Message-----

From: Francois Egregyi To: Richard Ibranyi Sent: March 19, 2036
12:09:03 PM GMT Subject: Answer from Fr. Egregyi

Dear Richard, I am glad you got back onto the Internet and that you now have an email address. This will facilitate further communication. Thanks for the P. Henry letter. I am afraid that this gentleman (whom I met for several hours in Phoenix, Arizona, in March 1996) ignores quite an amount of doctrine and canon law. This is due to his having lived with the Schuckardt sect in the 70's and 80's. He does bring up, though, an interesting point in his letter. If I did incur censures (suspension a divinis) for the space of a year because I was ordained by Archbishop Lefebvre on June 29, 1977, without having been incardinated in a diocese and without having received dimissorial letters from a legitimate bishop, and because Lefebvre was in reality a public heretic and schismatic (which I was not aware of at the time), those censures were taken away when I confessed to a (now dead) Catholic Belgian priest after having left the Society of St. Pius X in October 1981. The problem is I have never made an abjuration before a priest because, for the moment, I know of no CATHOLIC priest before whom I can make an abjuration and receive absolution in the confessional. I suppose I could make an abjuration in front of two lay witnesses, but that still does not solve the problem of the absolution of any censures I may have incurred for having given the sacraments to just about anybody who came to me for them from June 30, 1977 until I met Martin Gwynne and John Daly during 1989 who explained to me that I could not do such a thing.

---End Of Message---

It seems that Fr. Egregyi never accepted the heresies of the Conciliar Church, and even if he attended it for a period of time, due to a lack of deposition teachings, he did condemn the heresies and heretics. Therefore, it cannot be said that he ever adhered to the Conciliar Church, previous to his entering the SSPX and during his time spent in the SSPX. Once the papal deposition teachings were manifest to him he left the SSPX and held the sedevacante position (See: RJMI Response: 49.1). He can correct if I am wrong.

Fr. Egregyi was associated with the SSPX before their excommunication, and he cannot be accused of the type of schism that the SSPX is now in since their excommunication from the Conciliar Church. So his association with the SSPX is the same as a man who would still be Catholic, such as Padre Pio, even

though objectively in the Conciliar Church.³⁸ Even the sin he thought he committed—giving Holy Communion to non-Catholics—while still associated with the Conciliar Church and the SSPX, was not a sin, because until he knew of the depositions teachings he thought they were Catholic. Fr. Egregyi can correct me if I am wrong about any of these statements. However, he did incur the guilt of that sin once he held the sedevacante position and continued to give Holy Communion to non-Catholics until 1989.

Fr. Egregyi did privately abjure before a Catholic priest from the Conciliar Church and the SSPX, even he may not have had to. If he did have to abjure then this was acceptable to God because he did not know he must take a public abjuration at the time, so he took one privately before a Catholic priest. If the penitent's crimes against the faith are occult (secret) then he can have his censures lifted before a Catholic priest in the confessional, but if the sins are public, then he must take a public abjuration before the Catholic priest. Abjurations can be taken before Catholic priests when a Catholic bishop is not available.

The Catholic Encyclopedia, "Excommunications," 1907: The (2) Urgent Cases - In the chapter "Nuper" (xxix, de sent. excomm., lib. V, tit. xxxix), Innocent III sets forth the principle that governs such cases: "When it is difficult for the excommunicated person to go to him who excommunicated him, he may be absolved by his bishop or even by his own priest, on promising to obey the orders of him by whom excommunication was pronounced." This is the principle that moralists and canonists formulated as an axiom: *Impedito casus papalis fit episcopalis*: in case of one who is prevented from presenting himself to the pope, the excommunication reserved to the pope may be removed by the bishop. But most authors carried the analogy still further: for him who is prevented from presenting himself to the bishop, the excommunication may be removed by any confessor...

Fr. Egregyi indicated that he would consent to a written form for the public record, in keeping with what the Church demands and as commonsense dictates, so that other Catholics will know where he stands in relation to the Catholic faith. The form that Fr. Egregyi would have to sign would be either "*A Condemnation of the Conciliar Church*" if he was always Catholic. Or, "*A Confirmation of Abjuration from the Great Apostasy*," if he was not Catholic when he was associated with SSPX, because he already had abjured before a Catholic priest from the Conciliar Church, and the SSPX which is a part of the Great Apostasy (the Conciliar Church). He had already abjured from this entity—privately and before a Catholic priest, and so his censures were already lifted regarding this matter.

The other matter of his sins incurred since leaving the SSPX, by giving Holy Communion to non-Catholics, would also needed to be abjured from, which he already did by a private confession before God and a perfect act of contrition. But, he is still bound to make this public and put it in writing once he knows the Church demands this, but not to lift his censures, because they were already lifted upon his private confession and perfect act of contrition. The only reason he did not take a public abjuration for that sin is because he believed he must take it at least before a Catholic priest, and was not aware of the fact that he could take it before lay witnesses. He can do all this by signing "*A Confirmation of Abjuration from the Great Apostasy*" that covers all these points. His giving Holy Communion to non-Catholics from the time he held the sedevacante position until 1989 had put him in communion with the Conciliar Church because he was giving communion to those who he knew were associated with the Conciliar Church or SSPX and he was publicly praying in communion with them during his Masses.

The signing of a form is what commonsense dictates, as you, Patrick, so amply prove in you line of questioning me for evidence that proves if Fr. Egregyi did indeed abjure from these entities and holds the Catholic faith. Your very questions prove my point and condemn you! What evidence can I provide for you? Other than a specific form of abjuration or condemnation as it applies, be it "*A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration from the Great Apostasy*," or, "*A Confirmation of Abjuration from the Great Apostasy*," or for those who were always Catholic, "*A Condemnation of the Great Apostasy*." If Fr. Egregyi had taken the non-specific "*Form of Receiving a Convert*," although it would be valid because he did not know

³⁸ When Padre Pio was objectively in the non-Catholic Conciliar Church, were the confessions he heard invalid because he had no jurisdiction from a local ordinary? The truth of the matter is that Padre Pio was always Catholic because he did not know at that time, in the earliest days of the great apostasy, that the Conciliar Church is a non-Catholic Church. The confessions he heard were supplied with jurisdiction directly by the Church, by the authority of Canon Law 209, regarding common error and probable doubt. Padre Pio believed that his bishop was a Catholic bishop with ordinary jurisdiction, because the crimes were not yet manifest. Even though he was not a Catholic bishop the Church still supplied Padre Pio with jurisdiction for hearing confessions. And if this canon did not exist epikeia would have applied and supplied him with jurisdiction.

he must take a specific one, how would that prove to others that he condemns the Conciliar Church, her non-Catholic antipopes, the SSPX, the Thucites, or the Kellyites? It is only by a specific abjuration, or confirmation of abjuration, or form of condemnation, that will prove to other Catholics that a bishop, priest or layman is Catholic in word and deed. Common sense, Patrick, good old common sense, that a true Pharisee does not have.

And a last point, if Fr. Egregyi's censure have not been lifted by his confession to a Catholic priest, then how can you even hope to have yours lifted by the private abjuration you took and then, because you must of doubted your first abjuration, the second one you took before lay witnesses? Is this not a hypocritical line of reasoning on your part?

Patrick Comment: 52

Does Rev. Francois Egregyi require ALL those who come to him to take an Abjuration before he allows them to receive any sacraments from him? Does Rev. Francois Egregyi use *The Form of Receiving a Convert* as found in the Catholic Liturgy? Has he ever used *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration* written by Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi? If Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi permits Rev. Francois Egregyi to use *The Form of Receiving a Convert* as found in the Catholic Liturgy, why does Richard not allow EVERYONE to use *The Form of Receiving a Convert* as found in the Catholic Liturgy?

RJMI Response: 52.1

Yes, Fr. Egregyi requires an abjuration. I do not know what form of abjuration Fr. Egregyi uses, or if it is verbal or in writing. If he is using *The Form of Receiving a Convert* as found in the Catholic Liturgy, it would certainly be valid and legal, but only because he did not know that an abjuration must be specific for the crimes committed, and that this would certainly apply to the Conciliar Church because of the many heretical teaching that are unique to her. (See: RJMI Response: 37.1)

Epikeia applies to specific abjurations from the Great Apostasy

Patrick Comment: 53

Richard, have you reviewed Canon 1257 recently? "It belongs **exclusively** to the **Apostolic See** to **regulate** the **sacred liturgy** and to approve liturgical books." (1917 Code of Canon Law, Canon 1257) Catholics believe: 1-*The Form of Receiving a Convert* is part of the **sacred Catholic Liturgy**. 2-It belongs **exclusively** to the **Apostolic See** to **regulate** the **sacred liturgy**. Does it seem to you Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi is claiming to be a pope doing the work of the **Apostolic See**, since he is trying to force people to accept his attempt to **regulate** the **sacred liturgy**?

RJMI Response: 53.1

Specific Abjurations demanded for fallen away Catholics; non-specific form for others.

First of all, Patrick, you have not used the proper form of receiving converts for the United States. The 1859, *Form of Receiving a Convert*, has been abrogated in the United States by a new form in 1942 (See: RJMI Response: 50.1).

Second the Form of Receiving Converts of 1859 as well as the Form of 1942 are intended to be used only by those converts who were baptized outside the Catholic Church, such as Protestants and Schismatics who were never Catholic at any time previous to their conversion.

TRC, p. 133, Footnote 88: [RJMI: Speaking of Catholics who incurred excommunication according to canon 2314.1 and what type of abjuration they must take.] “In both cases heresy is presupposed. Hence before full restoration of status in the Church there is necessary: ... (2) A juridic abjuration of the **specific errors**, and a profession of faith. The formula used by converts [RJMI: The 1942 Form of Receiving a Convert] could not be employed, as is evident from the words “born outside the Church” in the first paragraph of the new formula.”

The same applies to the 1859 Form in that it is to only be used by those who were never Catholic; those born outside the Catholic Church. The following is the confessor’s duty, when the bishop is not available, in bringing a falling away Catholic back into the Church, and it demands a specific abjuration of heresies and the heretics.

TRC, pp. 152-3: [RJMI: Speaking of a confessor receiving a falling away Catholic back into the Church] The penitent is bound to observe the mandates of the confessor ... The mandates in either case will enjoin a promise for a fuller instruction and practice of the faith, a complete severance with every and all non-Catholic sects, an abjuration of heretical beliefs, a penance and satisfaction for the censure and the sins, the reparation of any scandal, and the denunciation of any Catholic teachers of heresy or accomplices... Hence, a promise must be exacted from the penitent to denounce any ecclesiastics or other teachers of heresy; he must abjure all heretical beliefs and sever any and all connections with non-Catholic sects; he must make at least a short profession of faith; he is to be enjoined to frequent the sacraments, to retract his errors in the presence of those before whom he manifested his heresy, and to repair any scandal he may have caused.

The rites and rules of Baptism are also part of the Sacred Liturgy. If epikeia cannot apply to baptism, in that no one can change or be exempted from these rules, unless by direct command from a pope, then no one in these days can be baptized unless they are in danger of death, because solemn baptism is demanded for all those who are not in danger of death and to use any other form is to go against the form of solemn baptism as found in the sacred liturgy. So, my question to you Patrick: Can an infant or adult convert, who is not in danger of death, get non-solemnly baptized in these days? Or, do they have to wait until they are at the point of death to be privately baptized? If you admit they can be baptized then you have changed the rules of the Sacred Liturgy that states that solemn baptism by a authorized Catholic minister is a must for all those not in danger of death. The same goes for the rules regulating marriages from the time of the *Tametsi* decree in the Council of Trent to the time of the *Ne Temere* decree of Pope Pius X and how it relates to private marriages without a authorized Catholic minister (See: RJMI Response: 48.1, Example 4).

The Japanese Catholics and other Common Sense examples

The Japanese did not have a Catholic priest for 200 years. They kept the faith and laymen had to baptize, marry themselves, receive converts, teach the faith, and they had to privately confess their sins with a promise to go to a Catholic priest the first opportunity. The question is, “How did they accept converts into the Catholic Church, if they did not have the official form of abjuration and profession of faith that was in force at the time as found in the Sacred Liturgy? Now, knowing the Church demands abjurations and professions of faith from baptized converts, they would have to write up their own abjuration that condemned the heresies of the sect to which the penitent had belonged, and write a profession of faith in keeping with the Catholic faith. When they used this form, as basic as it may be, are you to say that God would not accept it by the principle of epikeia, in that all those converts who took their unique abjuration would not have their censures lifted?

Now, even though we do have the current form of abjuration from the Catholic Church, as promulgated in 1942, it is not sufficient as a vehicle of unity. Nor is it sufficient to really know if the penitent actually abjured from all the specific heresies and heretics of the Conciliar Church and other sects calling themselves Catholic, so, Church law and commonsense dictate a specific form of abjuration. Just because there is no hierarchy to compose one, does not mean one should not be composed. As in Japan, just because they had no access to a priest or hierarchy, would not invalidate an abjuration form that a layman wrote.

As you are aware of, Patrick, we have no pope ruling the Apostolic See at this moment, nor do we have bishops we are aware of. There is no hierarchic structure to look to for guidance and leadership. That is not license to ignore Church Law or commonsense that looks to the common good and the salvation of souls! To those with simple commonsense, with childlike faith, the following example will suffice to prove my point.

Example: Doctors are the only ones that are allowed to legally dispense and administer prescription medications. All the doctors of a Country are killed by an enemy in hope that this will further facilitate the demise of the rest of the citizens. Now, we have a Country that finds itself with no doctors to cure the people when they are ill. If a person who is not a doctor (a layman) knows how to mix the proper ingredients to make medicines and properly administer them, that would obviously effect the cure of the people that are sick, would this man be allowed to legally do so, being that he is not a doctor, or would he have to wait until a doctor shows up to mix and administer the medicine?

All the more in these days must competent laymen rise up and teach the faith and demand others hold and practice it, according to Church teachings, in order to heal the sick souls of Catholics and fallen away Catholics, and effect the conversion of those who were never Catholic. This is what I have done by writing up a specific form of abjuration. The proper ingredients are the specific heresies and heretics, schisms and schismatics, etc. The proper administering of it is the demanding that falling away Catholic take an abjuration that lists the heresies and heretics, schisms and schismatics, etc. The Church demands abjurations be taken and she demands they be specific for any group that has recently fallen away from the Catholic faith. This is the perfect cure that Holy Mother Church demands, and just because we have no cleric in authority to write one up does not mean a Catholic layman, whom God inspires, should not do so. Yea, if the layman God inspires to do so, and gives him the gifts to do it, disobeys and does not write up a specific form of abjuration then he will fall out of God's favor and be damned on his judgment day for spurning these gifts God has given him to help save souls. Just as God rose up many men who did not have official position of authority to take action and condemn when those in authority became deficient, such as the prophets and other men God.

For any new heretical group that arises that considers itself part of the Roman Catholic Church, it would be imperative that they take a specific abjuration. It would be imperative for these elements to be condemned publically and specifically. Protestants who never claimed to be part of the Roman Catholic Church, are a different matter. When there original heresiarchs were condemned by the Catholic Church, specific abjurations were required for all who followed them, but since their specific condemnations by Councils and their utter expulsion from the Roman Catholic Church, so that their followers of today do not even consider themselves part of the Roman Catholic Church, then a non-specific form will suffice for them. There are over 27,000 protestant sects. It would not be practical to have 27,000 specific forms of abjuration.

When Luther first broke away from the Catholic Church he still considered himself and his adherents to be part of the Catholic Church, and he believe that those whom he condemned were not Catholic. Since his public condemnation by the Catholic Church his original adherents, most of them being Roman Catholic at one time, or at least claimed to be Roman Catholic, if they wanted to repent had to take a specific abjuration. There is a difference from these original Lutheran heretics than from the current day Lutheran heretics. The current day Lutherans are far removed from the Roman Catholic Church—they have already been thoroughly condemned and dealt with by the Roman Catholic Church—and for these current day Lutherans, all that would be necessary would be the non-specific form or abjuration.

The Conciliar Church presents a situation in which her adherents are claiming to be Roman Catholic, many being Roman Catholic at one time in their life, and all still claiming to be Roman Catholic. They even have the churches and structures that were once Catholic to try and prove this. In this we see a precise case of the need of specific abjuration, because they are of a new sect that has arisen from within claiming to be Roman Catholic. The fact that there is no Church hierarchy to publicly (*ferendae sententiae*) excommunicate them makes it all the more imperative that someone, even if it be a layman, arises to publically condemn them and demand others to do so, and to demand they do it according to the past teachings and practices of the Catholic Church (Psalm 93:16). Common sense, which is what *epikeia* is based upon, demands that this action be taken.

We do not need to have a pope at all times, nor even have access to a Catholic bishop to condemn heresies that have already been condemned by the Church, or make judgments regarding manifest heretics as not being Catholic, or to tell Catholics or non-Catholic penitents, what they must do, and demand they do it. You have made such judgments and demands yourself regarding the heresies and antipopes of the Conciliar Church, so why do you shy away from them when they are in writing? Why do you shy away and deny my right as a Catholic to tell you and others, that once they know the Church demands they take a specific abjuration, then at that point they must do so?

I would suggest, Patrick, your time would be better spent trying to see if I have any heretical or schismatic teachings in the abjuration, and if you cannot find one, then you have no excuse for not taking it, or writing a similar one up and taking it. I put this challenge to Felix Martinez who took the abjuration and now rejects it. He could not find one heresy in it, so he stands condemned before God. A man is condemned before God, even if he makes a private vow, let alone a public one, that can be kept or abided by, and then rejects it later on.

Patrick, a few simple questions should make it clear to you as to why The Form of Receiving a Convert into the Church is not prudent to use, and will not effect unity among Catholics.

1) By what authority do you have to condemn the Thuc line as non-Catholic and write about it in books and speak about it on tapes, if you do not have an imprimatur, that is to say the approval of a Catholic bishop, nor are you a part of the Magisterium of the Church?

So then why do you condemn me for putting in writing, in the abjuration I composed, that the Thuc line is illegal, is non-Catholic? I am willing to put it in writing and sign what the Church teaches and you are not. That is an act of a coward or a hypocrite! The abjuration we wrote would prevent any conciliar heretic, or any other heretic or schismatic, from sneaking into Catholic circles, whereas a non-specific abjuration will accomplish absolutely nothing in that regard.

If a penitent took the non-specific abjuration according to “The Form of Receiving a Convert”:

2) But believed the Thuc line was legal, would this abjuration bring them into the Catholic Church. Would you consider him Catholic?

3) But still believed John Paul II is the pope, because no one can judge the pope, would that penitent be Catholic. Would you consider him Catholic?

4) But believes that man has the right to religious liberty. Would you consider him Catholic?

5) But believes that apostate Jews and Moslems worship the same God as Catholics. Would you consider him Catholic?

6) But believed in the heresy that John Paul II is materially the pope, but not formally the pope. Would you consider him Catholic?

(See: also RJMI Response: 37.1) Would you place yourself in communion with the above? And if not, then what purpose did the non-specific abjuration serve in the case of the above heretics? You see, Patrick, a non-specific form of abjuration will serve no purpose for real unity and will not tell us anything about the

penitents disposition, or stance regarding the Conciliar Church, her apostate antipopes, and all other heretics and schematics that claim to be Catholic. Common sense is all you would need to know this.

God will not sustain a non-specific abjuration that does not cry out against each and every specific heresy and apostasy of the Conciliar Church, while condemning her leaders as non-Catholic apostates and heretics. Thus, Patrick, you are robbing God of the glory that is due Him and His Holy Church, by not DEMANDING a specific abjuration that condemns the heresies and the heretics, the schisms and the schismatics, the apostasies and apostates, the idolatries and the idolaters, to the glory of God. The bastards that put themselves forward as teachers and rulers of the Catholic Church are blaspheming God and His Church and you would have an abjuration that makes no mention whatsoever of them or their crimes, that cry out to Heaven for vengeance. You have muted this cry, and reduced it to a whimper of a mere opinion, by not willing to see the Catholic position put into a specific form of abjuration or condemnation as it applies. All talk and no action is how the saying goes. Ah, Patrick, I dare say you too, are in the service of the False Prophet and the Antichrist, due to your true Pharisaical pride.

The validity of the SSPX priesthood and a draft copy versus the final copy

Patrick Comment: 54

If you answer no, please explain why. Richard, in the copy of *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration* you sent me, I find on page 4, under paragraph 22: "I acknowledge these entities as non-Catholic sects that are outside the Catholic Church. Therefore, I reject the non-Catholic heretical and schismatic Society of Saint Pius X and the **illegal**, and **possibly invalid**, consecrations and ordinations of the non-Catholic Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre. I also reject as non-Catholic and illegal, the heretical and schismatic Bishop De Castro Mayer." Am I correct to believe that those who officially take this *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration* believe ALL the consecrations and ordinations of the non-Catholic Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre are **illegal**, and **possibly invalid**? If you answer no, please explain why.

(Note: I thought the name was spelled Lefebvre, but I think we are both writing about the same man who was the head of the Society of St. Pius X) Richard, it presents a different side when I read in your letter dated February 17, 2000 the following: (Most of the emphasis, of **bold** and underline and so on here and throughout this letter are mine, of course, as I think most people who read this will understand.)

RJMI: A) Do I not at least doubt that Fr. Egregyi is a priest?

RJMI: No I do **not** doubt that he is a priest. Fr. Egregyi is a priest. I do not have a positive objective doubt to the validity of Lefebvre's consecrations and ordinations. Therefore I do not doubt the validity of the bishops consecrated or the priests ordained by Lefebvre. The Church demands that I accept the validity of these bishops and priests under pain of mortal sin. Patrick, do you know what constitutes a positive objective doubt? Unlike assuming malice when a man's heresy is public and persistent, a sign that can easily be detected by any man, an intention of a man, in this case a bishop, cannot be known unless he explicitly states that he does not intent to consecrate or ordain, or if there is an essential defect in the form or matter. **If no explicit statement was made by the bishop, before a credible witness, that he did not intent to consecrate or ordain, then we cannot assume he did not intent to consecrate or ordain, or we sin mortally and create scandal.** This is the teaching of the Church regarding the intentions of the ministers of the sacraments. If the Church allowed men to start questioning the intention of priest, without explicit proof, then this is surely a prescription for chaos.

Richard, when did you teach the truth? Was it when you wrote the above two paragraphs in your letter to me? Or was it when you said the consecrations and ordinations by Lefebvre are **illegal**, and **possibly invalid**? In your OFFICIAL Abjuration to Almighty God, you make the SOLEMN, FORMAL and GRAVE profession that the consecrations and ordinations by Lefebvre are **illegal**, and **possibly invalid**.

In your private letter, just a very short time later, you write: **The Church demands that I accept the validity of these bishops and priests under pain of mortal sin.** Richard, are you trying to FORCE your followers **under pain of mortal sin** to OFFICIALLY Abjure that the consecrations and ordinations by Lefebvre are **illegal**, and **possibly invalid**?

RJMI Response: 54.1

That form of abjuration you have is a draft copy. It is not the final copy I mailed out, nor the one that I or anyone else took. I have studied more regarding the intentions of ministers of the sacraments and have not included that statement "possibly invalid" in the form that went out to the public. I knew this was a serious accusation and before I put it in the final form I thoroughly studied the topic. The following encyclical by Pope Leo XIII infallibly teaches that unless an explicit (manifest) sign, either verbally or in writing by the minister, stating that he does not intend to do as the Church intends or to confect the sacrament, then validity must be presumed and cannot even be questioned.

Pope Leo XIII, *Apostolicae Curae*: 33. With this inherent defect of "form" is joined the defect of "intention" which is equally essential to the Sacrament. The Church does not judge about the mind and intention, in so far as it is something by its nature internal; but in so far as it is manifested externally she is bound to judge concerning it. A person who has correctly and seriously used the requisite matter and form to effect and confer a sacrament is presumed for that very reason to have intended to do (intendisse) what the Church does. On this principle rests the doctrine that a Sacrament is truly conferred by the ministry of one who is a heretic or unbaptized, provided the Catholic rite be employed. On the other hand, if the rite be changed, with the manifest intention of introducing another rite not approved by the Church and of rejecting what the Church does, and what, by the institution of Christ, belongs to the nature of the Sacrament, then it is clear that not only is the necessary intention wanting to the Sacrament, but that the intention is adverse to and destructive of the Sacrament.³⁹

Therefore, Patrick, you must presume that Lefebvre's ordination as a priest and consecration as bishop by Lienart was valid, even if Lienart was the Masonic heretic that some accuse him of being. Because Lienart showed no outward manifestation, either verbally or in writing, that he did not intend to ordain and consecrate and he used the proper Catholic Rite. Anyone who says the SSPX consecrations and ordinations are invalid is condemned by Pope Leo XIII, just as would anyone who states that the Edwardian Rite of the Anglican Church can make valid priests. The same principle exists for both. If there is an explicit lack of intention within the rite itself then the minister, by his own words that are known to all when he uses the deficient rite, manifests this deficient intention and therefore the sacrament is invalid because of an improper intention that is manifest. By the same reasoning, if the Catholic Rite is used by a valid bishop, and that bishop does not explicitly state that he does not intend to consecrate or ordain, then he does so validly and we cannot even assume he has a deficient intention because he used the Catholic Rite that explicitly mentions the proper intention.

I was in error, when in that draft form of the abjuration I said the SSPX bishops and priests are possible invalid. Upon study, I learnt one must base such an accusation upon a manifest sign of the ordaining bishop that he did not intend to ordain. If there were no evidence of an external manifestation of non-intention to ordain, then it would be mortally sinful to make such an accusation. If I did not remove this error from the draft form that you have, then I would have presented an erroneous and mortally sinful conclusion regarding the status of the SSPX bishops and priests. The final form, the one I mailed out, does not contain that statement, because I humbly submitted to the truth when I learned I was wrong on this point. The Holy Ghost had a strong Hand in my coming to the knowledge of this truth before I mailed out the final form. I did not even engage you in this debate when I had already come to the knowledge of this truth. Patrick, you know the Holy Ghost works the same way in Catholic Ecumenical Councils, in that many drafts are

³⁹ It was this very principle that invalidates the Edwardian Ordinal of the Anglican rite and the Novus Ordo Consecrations and Ordinations, because the rite itself, by its own words, expressly (explicitly) denies the proper intention.

composed and reviewed by the bishops, and revised before the final copy is incorporated into the official teaching of the Council.

The form of abjuration that Felix Martinez and I signed did not contain the words “possibly invalid.” I will quote the appropriate point.

“10. ...Therefore, I reject the non-Catholic heretical and schismatic Society of Saint Pius X and the illegal consecrations and ordinations of the non-Catholic Archbishop Marcel Levebvre and Bishop De Castro Mayer.”

As a side note, Felix Martinez has taken this abjuration by his own free will and was not forced in any way. When he later on rejected this oath between him and God, I told him that he can only reject it if it contained a heretical or schismatic teachings, which he could not produce after he had tried his best to find one. As you know, Patrick, even a private oath before God is binding, as long as it is an oath the can be keep and does not contain something sinful. A man who takes an oath of any kind, and then immediately rejects it is either, insane or totally untrustworthy and a liar of the worse sort who has no shame or honor. If the oath was bad, then he never should have taken it, and if there is noting sinful in the oath then he is a man devoid of all character and a reprobate of the worse sort who cannot be trusted in any matter whatsoever. Felix cannot even be admonished in the simplest every day affairs and that is the root of his problem pride and rebellion.

Does Fr. Egregyi and Richard J. M. Ibranyi agree?

Patrick Comment: 55

Richard, your letter of 2-17-00 continues: B) Would I attend Fr. Egregyi’s Mass?

Yes, I would, as long as he **remained** Catholic in word and deed. Does this mean you believe Rev. Francois Egregyi is **NOW** a Catholic in word and deed? Does Rev. Francois Egregyi want as many people as possible to spread the information around the world that he thinks, believes and teaches the **EXACT SAME** way Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi believes and teaches? Do both of you believe the same way about using *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration* written by Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi? Do both of you believe the same way about EVERY matter pertaining to the teachings of the Catholic Church? Does Rev. Francois Egregyi believe and teach: “**we do not always even have to have one bishop?**”

RJMI Response: 55.1

First of all, Patrick, disagreements can be allowed among Catholics when the topic deals with an undefined doctrine, such as was the case the Immaculate Conception before it was infallibly defined as a dogma in 1854. That is the case with the baptism dispute regarding the necessity of receiving the sacrament of baptism in which water must be used, or can an explicit vow, or blood martyrdom substitute for the sacrament. The same goes with the opinions on both sides as to if there always has to be a Catholic bishop alive at all times. These topics need to be settled by a future pope and should not be a cause of division among Catholics. However, if someone denies a dogma or is schismatic then he is not Catholic and must be condemned and avoided.

As of this date, Fr. Egregyi and I have not even met one another in person, and it is precisely because of the differences we have. If Fr. Egregyi does not admit to the use of epikeia, once he knows it must be applied to a law, then he would be guilty of schism for disobeying the letter of the law, with no excuse for an exception.

I will not accept any priest or bishop as Catholic unless he consents to all that the Catholic Church teaches, and each of these key teachings are found in the Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration from the Great Apostasy that I had composed based upon what the Church teaches. I would not put myself in com-

munion with any bishop, priest, or layman until they consent to all that the Church teaches. I have committed many mortal sins in the past by going to priests to pray the Holy Mass, and receive the Holy Eucharist without first thoroughly inquiring as to what they believe in and demand it in writing. I don't intend to commit that mortal sin against the faith again!!!

Patrick Comment: 56

Does Rev. Francois Egregyi believe and teach the same as Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi when he writes:

“D) Where does Fr. Egregyi get his jurisdiction to hear confession and say Mass?”

RJMI: “The Church supplies him with jurisdiction and delegates it to him, by the law of *epikeia*.”

RJMI Response: 56.1

No, Fr. Egregyi does not agree with me on this point, and that is one of our major point's of disagreement, as you know from the first letter I wrote that was addressed to Fr. Egregyi. Your line of questioning proves a point I was trying to make with Fr. Egregyi that if he does not defend himself properly by the use of *epikeia*, then men, such as yourself, would discredit him.

Epikeia cannot give a bishop an office (ordinary jurisdiction)

Patrick Comment: 57

Once any cleric falls out of his ecclesiastical office, there is no way he just falls back into it, **for instance by confessing his heresy and publicly retracting it**. There is, in other words, no converse of Canon 188/4 saying something like: “A cleric who publicly reverses his defection from the Catholic Faith automatically, and without declaration or delegation from ecclesiastical authority, regains whatever ecclesiastical office and jurisdiction he lost by his defection.” For a cleric to hold, or regain, an ecclesiastical office, he must be given it by COMPETENT authority.

RJMI Response: 57.1

First of all Patrick, a simple priest does not hold an office in the Catholic Church. You have completely changed the topic again. It is like one starts out by talking about apples and then switches in the middle of the conversation to talking about baseball.

Patrick, a simple priest holds no office in the Catholic Church, but receives delegated jurisdiction, either from his local ordinary, or religious superior, or directly from the Church. The priest receives jurisdiction directly from the Church in cases where *epikeia* applies.

So then what is your point in your above comment? I agree prelates cannot regain their office when they repent unless a pope gives it back to them. A non-Catholic bishop, who truly repents and converts, cannot claim ordinary jurisdiction or an office, but that does not mean he cannot function as a Catholic bishop by jurisdiction that is supplied by the Church directly to him in order to rule, teach, and sanctify the souls he comes in contact with. Surely you would agree he is still a bishop (once a bishop always a bishop). And if he becomes Catholic by a true conversion then I have no doubt that the Church can supply him with jurisdiction to function as a bishop by the rule of *epikeia*, and go about assisting in the saving of souls, which is the highest good (See: RJMI Response: 30.1).

Even if there were a Catholic bishop alive today, as you believe, he would only have an office (ordinary jurisdiction) in the diocese in which the last legitimate pope had assigned to him. So that if he was no longer in his diocese he could not function with ordinary jurisdiction. But, this is a moot point regarding you and I, because we have no access or knowledge of a Catholic bishop with ordinary jurisdiction. This bishop, if he exists, will do us no good in attempting to justify our actions.

Popes have not always chose and appointed Bishops

Patrick Comment: 58

Priests must be appointed by a bishop and bishops appointed by a pope. Does Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi believe the statements in the above paragraph are true?

RJMI Response: 58.1

No, this is not true in all cases. You are wrong again; popes do not always have to appoint bishops. Many times in the history of the Church, neighboring bishops have elected and consecrated bishops, without the direct approval of the pope. They have done so without the pope's knowledge, until after the elections and consecrations took place.

Council of Nicaea, 325 AD: Canon 2. It is by all means desirable that a bishop should be appointed by all the bishops of the province. But if this is difficult because of some pressing necessity or the length of the journey involved, let at least three come together and perform the ordination, but only after the absent bishops have taken part in the vote and given their written consent. But in each province the right of confirming the proceedings belongs to the metropolitan bishop.

The reason for this rule was because it took a very long time, sometimes several years, before communication could take place between the pope and Catholics at the local levels. Therefore, to prevent lengthy vacancies at the local levels, that would negatively affect the salvation of souls, it was necessary for the neighboring bishops to elect and consecrate a new bishop when a see fell vacant without the knowledge of the pope and thus without being appointed by the pope,

Read clearly the above statement, Patrick, from the infallible Council of Nicaea, "*a bishop should be appointed by all the bishops of the province*," not appointed by the pope, as you have said above. You use the tactics of the Conciliar heretic Michael Davis, in that you make statements that have no truth as if they are fact and hope no one is diligent enough to study and catch in your seductive lies. You have spoken falsely when you say a pope must always appoint bishops. But it is certain that a bishop can never be appointed contrary to the will of the pope. If when the pope did not approve of such a bishop, who was chosen and elected by neighboring bishops, then he could nullify the election.

During the days of the Arian crisis there were Catholic and Arian bishops vying for the same territory and it took a long time before these disputes would reach the pope so that he could settle them in the external forum by retroactively condemning the Arian bishops and confirming the Catholic ones. The Catholic bishops did not have to wait before this judgment of the pope in the external forum in order to function as Catholic bishops, nor did Catholics have to wait for a judgment from the pope in the external forum to condemn and avoid the manifest Arian heretics.

We also have the example of bishops that have been consecrated when the Holy See was vacant, when there was no pope to appoint them. During the two year and nine month papal interregnum (vacancy), between the Pontificate of Clement IV and Gregory X, bishops were consecrated when local Sees fell vacant. We read from an excerpt from *Il Nuovo Osservatore Cattolico*, by Dr. Stephano Filiberto, Doctor of Ecclesiastical History:

“On November 29, 1268, Pope Clement IV died, and there began one of the longest periods of interregnum or vacancy of the papal office in the history of the Catholic Church. The cardinals at that time would have assembled in conclave in the city of Viterbo, but through the intrigues of Carlo d'Anglio, King of Naples, discord was sown among the members of the Sacred College and the prospect of any election grew more and more remote. After almost three years, the mayor of Viterbo enclosed the cardinals in a palace, allowing them only strict living rations, until a decision would be made which would give to the Church its visible Head. At last, on September 1, 1271, Pope Gregory X was elected to the Chair of Peter. During this long period of vacancy of the Apostolic See, vacancies also occurred in many dioceses through the world. In order that the priests and faithful be not left without a spiritual shepherd, bishops were elected and consecrated to fill the vacant sees. There were accomplished during this time twenty-one known elections and consecrations in various countries. The most important aspect of this historical precedent is that all of these consecrations of bishops were ratified by Pope Gregory X, who consequently affirmed the lawfulness of such consecrations.”

The following is a list of some the bishops consecrated at the time of the vacancy between the Pontificates of Clement IV and Gregory X:

- 1) In Avranches, France, Radulfus de Thieville, consecrated November, 1269;
- 2) In Aleria, Corsica, Nicolaus Forteguerra, consecrated 1270;
- 3) In Antivari, Epiro (Northwestern Greece), Caspar Adam, O.P., consecrated 1270;
- 4) In Auxerre, France, Erardus de Lesinnes, consecrated January, 1271;
- 5) In Cagli, Italy, Jacobus, consecrated September 8, 1270;
- 6) In Le Mans, France, Geoffridus d'Asse, consecrated 1270;
- 7) In Cefalu, Sicily, Petrus Taurus, consecrated 1269;
- 8) In Cervia, Italy, Theodoricus Borgognoni, O.P., consecrated 1270.

So there you have it, Patrick, another example of bishops not appointed by the pope, because there was no pope at the time they were chosen in consecrated. Therefore, it cannot be an infallible law that a pope must always appoint bishops, or have knowledge of consecrations before the fact.

Bishops cannot be appointed if it is contrary to the will of the pope

But it is an infallible law that no bishop can be appointed contrary to the will of the pope, and that a non-Catholic bishop can never hold an office in the Catholic Church, nor can he legally consecrate or ordain.

Patrick Comment: 59

Does Rev. Francois Egregyi believe they are true? Does Rev. Francois Egregyi believe and teach the same as Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi when he writes: “**The Church demands that I accept the validity of these bishops and priests** (Consecrated or Ordained by Archbishop Lefebvre) **under pain of mortal sin?**” Does Rev. Francois Egregyi believe and teach the same as Richard when Richard has his followers OFFICIALLY Abjure that the consecrations and ordinations by Lefebvre are **illegal**, and **possibly invalid?** Does Rev. Francois Egregyi believe and teach that the Church supplies JURISDICTION to **LAYMAN** by the law of epikeia?

RJMI Response: 59.1

Obviously Fr. Egregyi believes the SSPX priesthood is valid or he would not be functioning as a priest (See: RJMI Response: 54.1). I already acknowledged that layman is not supplied with jurisdiction to publically teach the Catholic faith, but only needs to be authorized by a Catholic bishop, and if he is to write books or make tapes he needs an imprimatur from the local bishop. Epikeia authorizes a layman to publically teach the Catholic faith and write books without the approval of a Catholic bishop. I believe Fr. Egregyi would agree with this. (See: RJMI Response: 11.1)

Fr. Egregyi, confession, and proof of his abjuration

Patrick Comment: 60

Richard, your letter of 2-17-00 continues to tell us you would go to confession to Rev. Francois Egregyi.

C) Would you go to confession to Fr. Egregyi?

Yes I would.

I assume this answer means more than just at the hour of death. If you would go to confession to Rev. Francois Egregyi, you should know without any doubt that he Abjured his errors before a priest or bishop that himself had the use of Ordinary or Delegated JURISDICTION. Will you please provide ALL the PROOF related to Rev. Francois Egregyi's Abjuration? Please provide PROOF of when, where and by who Rev. Francois Egregyi received Ordinary or Delegated Jurisdiction. Before confessing to Rev. Francois Egregyi it is good to recall some TRUTHS.

- 1) Rev. Francois Egregyi received Holy Orders from Archbishop Lefebvre, whom Richard teaches was a non-Catholic at the time of Rev. Francois Egregyi's ordination.
- 2) Rev. Francois Egregyi's ordination took place outside the Catholic Church. Rev. Francois Egregyi has never had Ordinary or Delegated Jurisdiction.
- 3) Rev. Francois Egregyi belonged to a non-Catholic sect while he belonged to the Society of St. Pius X.

RJMI Response: 60.1

(See: RJMI Response: 49.1 and RJMI Response: 51.1)

Patrick Comment: 61

4) Canon 1258 states: "It is unlawful for the faithful to assist in any active manner, or to take part in the sacred services of non-Catholics..."

RJMI Response: 61.1

If an Eastern rite Catholic was visiting a foreign country and entered a Greek Schismatic Church and attended their Sunday Mass, actually thinking it was a Byzantine Rite Church, does such a Catholic commit

sin? Objectively he is in a non-Catholic Church and is objectively praying with non-Catholics, but he thinks it is an Eastern Rite Catholic Church and the members are Catholic, and therefore he commits no sin. Only a true Pharisee would say such a man had committed a sin. Of course as soon as he finds out it is not a Catholic Church he would be bound to immediately leave and make a public statement of some sort if he created scandal by other Catholics seeing him enter the Greek Schismatic Church. Their public statement would be to the effect that they did not know it was a Greek Schismatic Church when they attended Mass there. (See: RJMI Response: 49.1)

Fr. Egregyi and culpability

Patrick Comment: 62

But Rev. Francois Egregyi did assist in an active manner, and take part in the services of non-Catholics at the time of his ordination. Furthermore recall these facts: Canon 2314, n.1, states: All apostates from the Christian faith and each and every heretic or schismatic incur the following penalties: 1) **ipso facto excommunication**;

Richard, do you agree this applies to Archbishop Lefebvre and Rev. Francois Egregyi?

RJMI Response: 62.1

It applies to if Fr. Egregyi only if he knew of the crimes of the Conciliar Church and the deposition teachings when he joined the SSPX. If he left as soon as both of these facts were manifest to him, then he was never guilty at all, and did not even need to take a private abjuration (See: RJMI Response: 49.1 and RJMI Response: 51.1). Fr. Egregyi left in the SSPX in 1981 at a time when the crimes were not as manifest as they are today. Do you believe Padre Pio died a non-Catholic heretic in 1968 because he believed the Conciliar Church was the Catholic Church and Paul VI was a pope? Or, do you believe what I firmly believe that he died as the saint that he was when he lived?

But, Fr. Egregyi did incur excommunication after he left the SSPX and held the *sede-vacante* position for knowingly giving Holy Communion to non-Catholics, as he admits too, but he has since taken an abjuration and repented and therefore his censures are lifted and he is no longer under excommunication, provided he is not found holding any other heretical or schismatic position. Patrick, you have stated that your private abjuration and then the one you took before lay witnesses, has lifted your censure, your excommunication, and placed you inside the Catholic Church. Why would not the same be true of Fr. Egregyi? But, as I have said, Patrick, your censures have not been lifted, you are still under excommunication and outside the Catholic Church because you deny the use of epikeia, which is the only way you can legally come back into the Catholic Church without access to a Catholic bishop with ordinary jurisdiction. Fr. Egregyi may have the same problem that you have with epikeia, if he explicitly denies its use when it applies, once the facts are made clear to him, then he would re-incur his censures, and he would not be able to validly hear confessions, or publicly teach the Catholic faith. In short he would not be able to function as a Catholic priest because he would be in schism, as you, Patrick, are.

Patrick Comment: 63 **[deleted October 2009]**

Patrick Comment: 64

Pray and pay special attention to what the Church teaches!

1) EVERY bishop and priest who teaches the TRUTH will tell us any cleric who received Orders from Archbishop Thuc, Archbishop Lefebvre or the Old Catholic line of succession does NOT have an OFFICE, AUTHORITY or JURISDICTION. They are NOT “RIGHTLY ordained nor sent by ecclesiastical and canonical authority.”

2) The Church teaches that churches whose clerics do NOT HAVE an OFFICE, AUTHORITY or JURISDICTION are non-Catholic churches. They do NOT have the fourth Mark of APOSTOLICITY!

3) The Church teaches it is SINFUL to receive the Sacraments from or take part in the services of such ministers; and NO PERSON is permitted to commit even a VENIAL SIN for any reason.

RJMI Response: 64.1

(See: RJMI Response: 49.1, RJMI Response: 61.1, **Error! Reference source not found.**)

Patrick Comment: 65

4) It is an ARTICLE OF FAITH that Sacraments received OUTSIDE the Catholic Church, from those who have been neither rightly ordained nor sent by ecclesiastical and canonical authority, do not avail for salvation. Do you believe the above true statements? If you answer NO, please explain why. If you answer YES, please explain in better detail why God’s Infallible Church would encourage Her children to receive the Sacrament on a daily, or weekly basis from those who have received Holy Orders outside the Church.

RJMI Response: 65.1

(See: **Error! Reference source not found.**)

RJ MI’s amended position. Epikeia allows for the public teaching of the faith
Patrick cannot be justified to publically teach because he denies epikeia

Patrick Comment: 66

Again Patrick, I ask you, what bishop has given you authority to teach?

Besides those Bishops named above for the first time you asked this question, I will add: Pope Leo XIII, Bishop of Rome, Sapientiae Christianae:

“14. ...But, when necessity compels, ... Each one is under obligation to show for his faith, either to instruct and encourage others of the faithful, or to repel the attacks of unbelievers.” ... 15. The chief elements of this duty consist in professing openly and unflinchingly the Catholic doctrine, and in propagating it to the utmost of our power... 16. No one, however, must entertain the notion that private individuals are prevented from taking some active part in this duty of teaching, especially those on whom God has bestowed gifts of mind with the strong wish of rendering themselves useful.”

Richard, if you do not accept the above answer, what do you think those people will think of you who know this is what you used to justify, before the world, teaching without Authority from a Catholic Bishop?

RJMI Response: 66.1

It was brought to my attention that my use of Pope Leo XIII's encyclical *Sapientiae Christianae*, does not allow a layman to publically teach the Catholic faith without approval from the local ordinary or priest, nor does it allow a layman to write books and make tapes defending the faith without an imprimatur from the local bishop as stated in the 1917 Code, canon law 1385.1. It only refers to the private teaching of the Catholic faith. (See: RJMI Response: 4.1, RJMI Response: 6.1, RJMI Response: 11.1, RJMI Response: 14.1 (Practical Applications))

As you should know Patrick, the 1917 Code of Canon is the current law in force, and *Sapientiae Christianae*, was written before the code, in 1890. The 1917 Code specifically states that a new law that deals with the same topic overrides an older law.

Code of Canon Law of 1917, Canon. 22: "A more recent law given by the competent authority abolishes a former law, if the new law explicitly says so, or if it is directly contrary to the old law, or if it takes up and readjusts the entire subject matter of the former law."

But, even *Sapientiae Christianae* does not allow for a layman to publically teach the Catholic faith, or publish works defending the Catholic faith without an imprimatur. It was not the mind of Pope Leo XIII to allow a layman to publically teach the faith without approval from one in authority, or to publish works without an imprimatur. *Sapientiae Christianae* is in agreement with canon law 1385.1 with no need to be overridden.

Therefore, my justification to teach the faith comes from the principle of epikeia, not from *Sapientiae Christianae*, even though I did not know this at that time, I never denied the principle and use of epikeia. One does not need to know of epikeia to be justified by using it. I was justified by epikeia at the time I published my Strange Voice book and tape series, even though I did not know it was because of epikeia and not because of *Sapientiae Christianae*. Just as King David and his men were justified when they ate the loaves of proposition by using common sense. The commonsense one uses when they act contrary to the letter of the law in an extraordinary situation justifies them. However, it is certain that a man, who explicitly denies the use of epikeia as you have Patrick, cannot be justified by epikeia. I would have committed the same sin as you have if I denied the use of epikeia for publically teaching the Catholic faith after the truth is presented to me that *Sapientiae Christianae* does not apply to the public teaching of the Catholic faith, or writing books and making tapes without imprimaturs. I have been admonished once on this error of mine and immediately corrected my position (See: RJMI Response: 14.1, Practical Application, 4.1, 6.1, 16.1, 37.1).

Patrick takes RJMI out of context: Epikeia and non-Catholics

Patrick Comment: 67

Another problem presents itself when I read the following sentence in your letter to Rev. Francois Egregyi. **"A non-Catholic cannot apply to any of the Church laws, let alone epikeia."**

1) I think Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi truthfully admits he was still a non-Catholic before he took an Abjuration.

2) Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi seems to appeal to the laws of the Church, and ESPECIALLY **EPIKEIA**, for his method of receiving Jurisdiction and for his method of coming back into the Church by the law of epikeia through the Abjuration he wrote.

3) Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi teaches all the non-Catholics who belonged to the Novus Ordo sect and/or to the Society of St. Pius X can do the same thing, if they repent and do the things he requires.

4) Does Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi believe his own statement: “**A non-Catholic cannot apply to any of the Church laws, let alone epikeia?**”

5) All those in need of the Abjuration are non-Catholic, and Richard truthfully states: “A non-Catholic cannot apply to any of the Church laws, let alone **epikeia**.”

6) It follows that epikeia cannot apply to non-Catholics, which Richard and his followers were when they took *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration*.

RJMI Response: 67.1

The context in which I use the term non-Catholic is meant to represent unrepentant non-Catholics, not those who have repented and are preparing to convert into the Catholic Church and in so doing embrace the Catholic faith.

Patrick, you would agree, that the sacraments of the Church are only available to members of the Catholic Church, except for the sacrament of holy baptism, which is received by repentant un-baptized non-Catholics. The same applies to baptized non-Catholics who have repented and are prepared to convert. These catechumens would then have abjuration available to them, so they can enter the Catholic Church, and only then can they go confession. Therefore, epikeia does apply to them because they are doing what the Catholic Church demands of them, even though they are not yet Catholic, because of their explicit repentance and desire to do what they must to become Catholic. This is a far cry from unrepentant non-Catholics. This is the only exception in which epikeia would apply to non-Catholics (the repentant ones), just as holy baptism is the only sacrament available to non-Catholics.

You are aware of the scripture verse that says, “*For all have sinned and do need the glory of God.*” (Romans 3:23) Does that apply to Jesus Christ and His holy Mother Mary? You see how a dishonest person can take such a statement out of context if he does not consider the other teachings and circumstances of a topic. This is what you have done Patrick, and it is a purely protestant technique.

A Perfect Act of Contrition must be accompanied with a promise to do as the Church demands

Patrick Comment: 68

7) It should be as plain as day and night, black and white, that the reasoning Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi brings forth about epikeia justifying Ordinations, Consecration and Abjuration, as well as laymen possessing jurisdiction by the law of epikeia, are false, insincere, hypocritical, deceitful, dishonest, untrustworthy, unreliable, defective, changeable, and fallacious. Did you know that the GREAT DOCTOR OF PRAYER - St. Alphonsus Maria, wrote the following? **N.B. An act of love is a golden chain uniting us to God. Thomas says: “Every act of love merits eternal life. One act of love i.e. perfect love forgives all sins.”** Therefore make many simple but fervent acts of love and sorrow. Here we have two of the greatest theologians, and Doctors, in the Catholic Church teaching us: “**One act of love i.e. perfect love forgives all sins.**” Do you believe their teaching is true? If you answer NO, please explain why. I believe it is possible for those who repent of their sins to pray and act of perfect love. Even if they belonged to a sect such as the Novus Ordo religion or the Society of St. Pius X, if they fulfill all the requirements, they can pray an act of Perfect Contrition. They can make an act of **perfect love, which forgives all**

sins. My Catholic Faith teaches me that after they make an act of perfect love they are in the State of Sanctifying Grace.

RJMI Response: 68.1

First of all, Patrick, it is the Protestant heresy to state that all that is necessary is a perfect act of contrition (love) without the desire and will to do what the Church demands as it becomes possible for the penitent. Such as going to a Catholic priest to confess your sins as soon as one becomes available, and if one does not the he re-incurs his sins and his original perfect act of contrition would then have been useless, because of his disobedience in not submitting to the Church to ratify his perfect act of contrition. A perfect act of contrition (love) must be accompanied with a promise to do as the Church demands when it can be done, and to amend your life and to publicly condemn the heresies you held and to totally separate from Conciliar non-Catholics once the deposition teaching are manifest to them.

An act of contrition alone, without a promise to do, as the Church demands the first available opportunity, is the Protestant heresy of Luther. A perfect act of contrition must be accompanied by a desire/vow to have a private confession or abjuration confirmed by whatever the Church demands. If a Catholic confesses his sins before God, he must also vow to go before a Catholic priest the first available opportunity. I am sure you would agree with this, although you conveniently left this teaching out in the above discourse.

Council of Trent, on Penance, sess. XIV, cap. IV: The Synod teaches moreover, that, although it sometimes happen that this contrition is perfect through charity, and reconciles man with God before this sacrament be actually received, the said reconciliation, nevertheless, is not to be ascribed to that contrition, independently of the desire of the sacrament which is included therein.

The same goes for a non-Catholic who repents and wants to convert. If the non-Catholic only makes a private confession (abjuration) by denouncing his heretical association, and indicates his desire to be Catholic, accompanied by true contrition, he would be forgiven and his censures would be lifted, only if he did not know what he was supposed to publicly abjure, as the Church demands. He must also be ready to do as the Church demands (submit to the Church) once he knows he must not only publically abjure but that the abjuration must be specific. The penitent must then fulfill as much as he can in accord with what the Church demands—abjuration before a Catholic bishop, priest, or lay witnesses. If he does not he re-incurs the censure.

TRC, p. 152: The obligation to recourse directly affects the penitent and is clearly a grave one, since if it is neglected it entails the recurrence of the same censure.

In other words, Patrick, a convert who has no access to a Catholic cleric or teacher that can tell him what he must do, does not have the right to just make a private abjuration and leave it at that, without the desire to do as the Church demands when a Catholic tells them what he must do. He must also make an effort to seek the truth in learning that if the action he took was sufficient or what he must do in the future to have his actions confirmed. To simply say a perfect act of contrition (love) alone suffices and leave it at that is to deny the role of the Catholic Church in reconciling men with God, which is a Protestant heresy.

Confessions are Private. Abjurations are Public.

An abjuration differs from confession in that confession is private and affects the internal forum, whereas an abjuration is a public act that takes place in the external forum, either officially before proper Church authorities, or unofficially before lay witnesses. (See: RJMI Response: 14.1).

Confessions by Catholics are not to be publicly witnessed; whereas, public heretics or schismatics must publically abjure as the Church teaches and for the common good. The public abjuration, according to the letter of the law, must be witnessed, either by the bishop, or the bishop's delegate and two witnesses. Epikeia allows for public abjurations before a Catholic priest if a Catholic bishop is not available, and if a Catholic priest is not available, then before lay witnesses, and in all cases it must be public. The penitent who publically abjured must still seek to fulfill as much as he can of the law as it becomes available to him.

A Catholic penitent, who confesses his sins privately, because he has no access to a priest, does not need witnesses to make his private confession, but must still go to confession to a Catholic priest the first available opportunity. Therefore, one of the key elements of an abjuration for public heretics or schismatics is that it must be public and it must be witnessed, and a penitent must fulfill as much of this obligation as he can, when it becomes known to him and as he can accomplish it (See: RJMI Response: 49.1).

Patrick, your own action proves this by your taking a second abjuration, after you took a private one. The second one was public and before lay witnesses. Why did you do this, unless you knew that the Church demands abjurations to be public and to be witnessed? I quote from your comment 1.

Patrick Henry, Comment 1: “Who did you take an abjuration before? In about 1972 I took it before the man known as Bishop Francis Konard Maria Schuckardt. Shortly after I left his community in August of 1983 I took it privately before God, just much the way you wrote about on page seven of your letter to Rev. Francois Egregyi. (The first thing you sent me that started this series of email correspondence.) Not long after that I again took it in the presence of several lay witnesses. (Again, much the way you wrote about on page seven of your letter to Rev. Francois Egregyi.)

If your first abjuration, the private one accompanied by a perfect act of contrition (love) was sufficient without the need of any further action as the circumstances demand, then why did you take a second one, publicly and before lay witnesses? Therefore, we see another trait of a true Pharisee, hypocrisy! Above you teach as if a private abjuration accompanied by a perfect act of contrition does not need to be followed by any other actions as the circumstances demand, but you admit by your own actions that the circumstances demanded you to take a public abjuration before lay witnesses. Dear reader, can you not see the true blindness of a Pharisee, it is the same blindness that a liberal has, and both fall into heresy and schism.

Patrick Comment: 69

Those who die in the State of Sanctifying Grace will be in Heaven for eternity. Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi might teach his followers that it is impossible to make an act of perfect love before you evoke epikeia; but I, Patrick Henry, believe you can pray an act of Perfect Contrition without the use of epikeia.

RJMI Response: 69.1

Two points are to be made. One, I never said a private abjuration and a perfect act of contrition could not make a non-Catholic penitent Catholic—bring him into the Church, provided he did not know he must take a public abjuration (See: RJMI Response: 49.1)

Second: The penitent who enters the Church by a private abjuration accompanied by a perfect act of contrition, does so precisely by the use of epikeia, because no Church Law teaches a non-Catholic penitent can enter the Church by a private abjuration accompanied by a perfect act of contrition. If there is one then produce the evidence. The only law of the Church that deals with abjuration teaches it must be public and before a Catholic bishop, or the bishops delegate and two witnesses, therefore it is the virtue of epikeia the exempts a penitent from the letter of this law. Even if the penitent knows nothing of epikeia and was reacting upon good instincts to abjure out of a hatred for his sin and a love of God, he would still be justified by the principle of epikeia. But, to altogether explicitly deny the use and need of epikeia, as you have Patrick, makes it impossible for your censures to be lifted and other sins to be forgiven.

**Patrick denies the Dogma “No Salvation Outside the Catholic Church”
Misinterprets the events of Noe’s Ark as it relates to Bull Unam Sanctum**

Patrick Comment: 70

How many **Catholic** bishops do you think will be openly functioning throughout the world during the time of the Great Apostasy? It has been said, 80 to 90 per cent fell from the Catholic Faith during the Arian Heresy. But that was NOT The Great Falling Away that we are told about in Sacred Scripture. If less than one per cent of the Bishops remained faithful to God and His Holy Church sometime before the end of the world, how many bishops would you expect to see living then? Only Noah and seven other people were on the Ark during the Great Flood. I assume there were millions and maybe even billions of other people living when it began to rain 40 days and 40 nights. Do you believe **ANY** of those people who were NOT on the Ark had a chance to save their soul? Do you believe it is possible that they could have prayed an act of Perfect Contrition before they died? Do you believe it was possible for people living before the Great Flood began to pray an act of Perfect Contrition? If they could pray an act of Perfect Contrition before the Great Flood began, why could they not pray an act of Perfect Contrition just after it began to rain 40 days and 40 nights? If any of them prayed an act of Perfect Contrition just after it began to rain 40 days and 40 nights, were they then in the State of Sanctifying Grace? If they did not commit a mortal sin after being in the State of Sanctifying Grace, did they save their soul? Since they were NOT on the Ark of Salvation, were they in the Church or out of the Church?⁴⁰ I, Patrick Henry, believe those people could have prayed an Act of Perfect Contrition, who were not on the Ark with Noah during the Great Flood. I also believe that those who pray an Act of Perfect Contrition are in the State of Sanctifying Grace. I believe those who die in the State of Sanctifying Grace will be in Heaven for eternity. Most of mankind were not on the Ark with Noah during the Great Flood. The way Divine Providence arranged things, no one who was already on the Ark when the Flood began, pulled anyone else onto the Ark after it began to rain. I have never been taught that ALL EIGHT people who were on the Ark during the Great Flood, will be in Heaven for eternity. However, I have read that one reason God did not kill all of mankind **immediately**, during the time of Noah, was because He wanted to give them **TIME** to **REPENT** and pray an Act of Perfect Contrition, and thereby save their souls.

RJMI Response: 70.1

I will make two main points regarding Noe and his family, and the fate of the rest of the men in the world whom were killed in the flood.

- 1) The first point will deal with the possibility of some of those who died in the flood of repenting before they died.
- 2) The second point will deal with the fact that all that were outside the Ark physically died and how this relates to the Bull *Unam Sanctum* and the dogma, “No Salvation Outside the Catholic Church,” and the opinion of salvation by an explicit desire to be baptized and blood martyrdom. The main point is that just as all of those outside Noe’s Ark had physically perished, so, by analogy, all those who are outside the Ark of the Catholic Church (the Ark of Salvation) are spiritually dead, in a state of damnation. That should be clear to a simple child, but to a liberal and a true Pharisee nothing is clear, because both are equally blinded and confounded.

Point one:

Holy Scripture definitely teaches that some who died during the flood did repent sometime before they died. God punishes men in degrees so that they might repent.

⁴⁰ RJMI Comment: Here is where Patrick proves he holds the heresy of salvation by an implicit faith in the Incarnation and Most Holy Trinity and for Protestants and Schismatics. See end of RJMI Comment 70.1 for further explanation.

“Executing thy judgments by degrees thou gavest them place of repentance, not being ignorant that they were a wicked generation, and their malice natural, and that their thought could never be changed.” (Wis. 12:10)

The worse type of death an unrepentant sinner can die is a quick death in which God he given him no time to repent, because God knew he would not repent. Patrick, if you read my Book Three you would know this is what I believe. So why do you give the reader the impression that I don’t believe this? This is another lie you must publicly repent of.

Those who died in the flood that had repented always believed in the one true God, but were disobedient to Him before the flood, and repented before they died in the flood by a perfect act of contrition. There is no way any man can have any hope at all of being saved unless he first believes in, and worships the one true God. Therefore, in no way can this verse be used to try and defend the implicit faith heresy, nor does it support the opinion of salvation by explicit desire to be baptized or blood martyrdom; point two will deal with that topic. I quote from the Scriptures and will follow it by the Haydock Commentary:

1Peter 3:19-20: *In which also coming he preached to those spirits that were in prison: Which had been some time incredulous, when they waited for the patience of God in the days of Noe, when the ark was a building: wherein a few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water.*

Haydock Commentary: [Regarding those in Abraham’s bosom (*Limbus Patrum*) that were waiting for Christ to free them] “Among these were many who had been formerly at first incredulous in the time of Noe, who would not take warning from his preparing and building the ark, but it may be reasonably supposed that many of them repented of their sins when they saw the danger approaching, and before they perished by the waters of the deluge, so that they died at least not guilty of eternal damnation; because, though they were sinners, yet they worshipped the true God, for we do not find any proofs of idolatry before the deluge.”

Of course the same applies to a last hour private confession of sins by a Catholic who is in mortal sin but does not have access to a priest. It also applies to a last hour conversion of baptized non-Catholic who can privately abjure (reject his false religion and accept the Catholic faith and Church) and privately confess his sins. It also applies to a last hour baptism. These are known as those who were saved in the 11th hour. In these cases their confession, or conversion must be explicit and it must be accompanied by a perfect act of contrition (love), and it is my opinion that the unbaptized must be baptized by water. In all of these cases their conversion and/or repentance places them inside the Catholic Church—it places them in the Ark of the Church (the Ark of Salvation).

Point two:

It is very important when reading Holy Scriptures or Papal Bulls and decrees to make sure you do not try and twist the meaning by taking words and expressions out of context. The fact that some who were outside of Noe’s Ark had saved their souls does not take away from the fact that they had physically died in the flood. The fact that some of these souls were saved by a last minute repentance does not support the salvation by an implicit faith heresy, nor does it support the opinion of salvation by explicit desire to be baptized or blood martyrdom.

Before I quote from my book *Why we lost the Pope, not the Papacy, and the Mass*. I will make some pertinent points. Many times in Holy Scripture we see the use of the word “death.” This term can be used to mean either the death of the body, or the death of the soul, or the death of both.

Matthew 10:28 *“And fear ye not them that kill the body, and are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him that can destroy both soul and body in hell.”*

A man can still be physically living, in his flesh, while his soul is dead. *“For she that liveth in pleasures is dead while she is living.”* (1 Tim. 5:6) Here our Lord refers to a dead man burying a dead man. Matthew 8:22: *“But Jesus said to him: Follow me, and let the dead bury their dead.”* The one who is to be

buried is dead in body in soul, and the other who buried him is dead in soul while his body still lives. In this following verse our Lord speaks of the prodigal son who repented as having been dead. Luke 15:32: *“But it was fit that we should make merry and be glad: for this thy brother was dead and is come to life again; he was lost, and is found.”* Our Lord was referring to his spiritual death, the death of his soul, not the death of his body. And St. Paul says in 1 Timothy 5:6; *“For she that liveth in pleasures is dead while she is living.”* The Haydock Commentary says, *“is dead while she is living, by the spiritual death of her soul in sin.”*

And the reverse is true of those Catholics in a state of grace, although they may be dead in body they live forever. John 11:25-26: *“Jesus said to her: I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, although he be dead, shall live. And every one that liveth and believeth in me shall not die for ever. Believest thou this?”* Our Lord is referring to the eternal life of the soul. The soul is the living element, not the body. James 2:26: *For even as the body without the spirit is dead: so also faith without works is dead.”* So that even when a just Catholic’s body dies his soul lives eternal, and he will even get his body back during the General Judgment.

Catholics, in a state of grace, are also said to be dead to the world, to sin, dead to the body but alive in Christ—the spiritual life of their soul. Romans 6:9,11: *“Knowing that Christ, rising again from the dead, dieth now no more. Death shall no more have dominion over him... So do you also reckon that you are dead to sin, but alive unto God, in Christ Jesus our Lord.”*

And in this final passage we read of both types of death, one, the death of the soul due to sin, and the death of the body to sin and the world of one who has been baptized in Christ and is in a state of grace.

Colossians 2:11-14, 20: *“In whom also you are circumcised with circumcision not made by hand in despoiling of the body of the flesh: but in the circumcision of Christ. Buried with him in baptism: in whom also you are risen again by the faith of the operation of God who hath raised him up from the dead. And you, when you were dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, he hath quickened together with him, forgiving you all offences: Blotting out the handwriting of the decree that was against us, which was contrary to us. And he hath taken the same out of the way, fastening it to the cross... If then you be dead with Christ from the elements of this world, why do you yet decree as though living in the world?”*

The point has now been made that the word “death” is used to mean two completely different things—same word different meaning—depending on the context in which it is used. In one place it refers to the death of the souls, in another the death of the body, and in another a death to the world and sin while still living.

The Bull *Unam Sanctum*, that you will read below, in relation to the Catholic Church, is speaking of the condition of souls, not of physical bodies, that are outside the Catholic Church. It refers to these souls as being dead, just as all those who were outside the Ark in Noe’s day had physically died. A body without a soul is dead. It is the soul of man that is judged according to how he lived when he had his body. The point Pope Boniface is making in regard to Noe’s Ark is that all those outside the Ark had physically died, and he equates this physical death to the spiritual death, the death of souls, that are outside the Ark of the Catholic Church. No other interpretation of this bull can be made without horribly twisting the words of Pope Boniface so as to dilute the whole meaning that he intended.

--- --- ---

Excerpt from Richard J.M. Ibranyi, *Why we lost the Pope, not the Papacy, and the Mass*:

(p. 89): “When God flooded the earth during Noah’s day, only eight survived, there were no life boats attached to the Ark; all that were not explicitly in the Ark, as are the members of the Church, perished in the flood. No lifeboat! No ropes! No invincible ignorance could save the whole rest of mankind from death in Noah’s day; men, women, and children perished. No invincible ignorance! It is not a good idea to do as the Modernist and to abuse the word “mercy” when referring to God. The “mercy” of the modernist is actually sinful presumption that makes a mockery of God’s justice and true mercy.

Bull Unam Sanctum, Pope Boniface VIII, 1302 AD (ed: The portion in brackets I have added. It is not in the book): “[Urged by faith, we are obliged to believe and to maintain that the Church is one, holy, catholic, and also apostolic. We believe in her firmly and we confess with simplicity that outside of Her there is neither salvation nor the remission of sins, as the Spouse in the Canticles proclaims: ‘One is my dove, my perfect one. She is the only one, the chosen of her who bore her,’ and she represents one sole mystical body whose Head is Christ and the head of Christ is God. In her then is one Lord, one faith, one baptism.] We declare, say, define, and pronounce that it is absolutely necessary for the salvation of every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff. At the time of the flood there was one ark of Noah, symbolizing the one Church; this was completed in one cubit and had one, namely Noah, as helmsman and captain; outside which all things on earth, we read were destroyed...”

It is a moot question, of bad will, to ask if all the men who died outside the ark in Noah’s day were damned. We do not even know if Noah’s wife, sons, and daughter-in-laws were saved or damned.

The point of Pope Boniface’s analogy, in the Bull *Unam Sanctum*, is not whether the souls that perished in the flood were eternally saved or damned, but that all outside Noah’s Ark physically perished. Pope Boniface VIII was equating the physical death of those outside the ark during the flood, to the spiritual death of all those who are outside Ark of the Catholic Church. The analogy is clear; Pope Boniface is not referring to a physical death in relation to those who die outside the Catholic Church, but their spiritual death, the eternal damnation all the souls that die outside the Ark of the Catholic Church.”

End of Transcript

--- --- ---

This Bull does not deal with the topic as to whether or not some of the souls of those who died outside of Noe’s Ark were saved. Pope Boniface is using and analogy between the physical death of all those who died outside Noe’s Ark and how it relates to the spiritual death of all those outside the Ark of the Catholic Church. He clearly states in the same Bull regarding the Catholic Church, “*outside of Her there is neither salvation nor the remission of sins.*” Therefore all the souls of those outside the Ark of the Church are dead because their sins are not remitted, even though many of them may still be alive in their bodies (not yet physically dead, but spiritually dead).

If a non-Catholic has a death bed conversion, either by baptism for the unbaptized, or abjuration for the baptized, he is no longer outside the Ark of the Church, but he is inside the Ark of the Church—on board the ship. He is not on the outside of the ship while hanging on by ropes, this is utter nonsense and totally contrary to the events of Noe’s Ark. No one was physically saved during the flood by hanging on to ropes attached to the Noe’s Ark, all, I repeat, all of those outside of Noe’s Ark physically died during the flood, just as all, I repeat, all of those who are outside the Ark of the Catholic Church are spiritual dead, in a state of damnation.

###It is clear in the following teaching by Pope Pius IX that he is referring to the damnation of souls that are outside the Ark of the Catholic Church, when he says they perish in the flood, he does not mean physically but he means the damnation of their souls.

Pope Pius IX, Singulari Quadem, 1854: "For, it must be held by faith that outside the Apostolic Roman Church, no one can be saved; that this is the only ark of salvation; that he who shall not have entered therein will perish in the flood."

The Baltimore Catechism

A schismatic interpretation of Holy Scripture, an outright lie, is found in the Baltimore Catechism that deals with the topic of baptism. It shows a picture of Noe’s Ark with other people being physically saved from the flood by holding on to ropes that are hanging off the Ark. Now, dear reader, a simple child who read the story of Noe’s Ark would know that no such event took place. Only eight peoples lives were spared—all those that were inside the Ark, all the rest upon the face of the earth had died.

Genesis 7:7, 20-22: And Noe went in and his sons, his wife and the wives of his sons with him into the ark, because of the waters of the flood... The water was fifteen cubits higher than the mountains which it covered. And all flesh was destroyed that moved upon the earth, both of fowl and of cattle, and of beasts, and of all creeping things that creep upon the earth: and all men. And all things wherein there is the breath of life on the earth, died.

2 Peter 2:5: And spared not the original world, but preserved Noe, the eighth person, the preacher of justice, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly.

1 Peter 3:20: ... in the days of Noe, when the ark was a building: wherein a few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water.

St. Peter goes on to equate the physical saving the lives of Noe and the eight by water, with the spiritual life of souls that are put in the way of salvation (saved) by baptism with water, which makes them members of the Catholic Church (places them inside the Ark of the Catholic Church (the Ark of Salvation).

1 Peter 3:21: Whereunto baptism, being of the like form, now saveth you also.

Holy Baptism puts a man in the way of salvation without any change in his physical life, his body was alive and soul was dead before baptism and his body is still alive after baptism while his soul lives.

Nobody, I repeat, nobody was hanging on to Noe's Ark by ropes, all the people that were outside the Ark had died, physically perished in the flood. The picture in the catechism shows human bodies being saved from drowning in the flood by hanging onto ropes attached to the Ark thus teaching that more than eight lives were saved from the flood. This depiction in the catechism is an outright lie, a scandal, and attacks the veracity of the Holy Scripture and in so doing has accused God of lying, when He said, as he did, spared only eight!!!⁴¹ This false depiction actually condemns their position, because just as no one's life was physically saved outside of Noe's Ark by some other (outside) connection or attachment to Noe's Ark, likewise, no one's soul can be saved who is outside the Ark of the Catholic Church (Ark of Salvation) by some mystical connection to the Church while not belonging to Her Body.

Not one person that ever lived, previous to this teaching in the Baltimore Catechism, Catholic or even the Protestant heretics, had ever taught there were ropes hanging off Noe's Ark. Those with common sense can see that this is a blatant disregard for Holy Scripture by going against the clear words of the Bible. It is a scandal to teach the simple of good faith this lie for it discredits all the other teachings of the Church in their eyes. God hangs a millstone around the necks of all those who propagate this big lie and casts them into the sea (hell) (Mk. 9:41). It goes against the unanimous consent of the saints, is contrary to common sense, and is a grievous (mortal) sin of schism that is incurred by those who authored and authorized this big lie, and all those who support it.

The Profession of Faith of the Council of Trent: "...I likewise accept Holy Scripture according to that sense which our holy Mother Church has held and does hold, whose (office) it is to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures; I shall never accept nor interpret it otherwise than in accordance with the unanimous consent of the Fathers."⁴²

The Baltimore Catechism has several other heresies and schismatic teachings.

The Root Of Patrick Henry's Corruption

A quote from Patrick's above response # 70 proves he holds the heresy of salvation by an implicit faith in the Incarnation and Most Holy Trinity and for Protestants and Schismatics. I quote:

⁴¹ Anyone who supports this lie cannot defend himself from the other heresies of the day, such as evolution that heretically teaches that men came from apes, instead of dirt, or the schismatic teaching that the Sun is in the center of the universe and not the Earth.

⁴² "Council of Trent," Bull *Iniunctum nobis*, Nov. 13, 1565., D. 995.

Patrick Henry: “Since they were NOT on the Ark of Salvation, were they in the Church or out of the Church?”

Read the whole paragraph and you cannot miss the context in which Patrick asks this question. He is worse than the liberal who hold this heresy. The liberal will say, “There is no salvation outside the Catholic Church,” and craftily teach that these souls are inside the Catholic Church by belonging to Her soul while not being a part of Her Body. Whereas, Patrick has come right out and said, there is salvation outside of the Catholic Church, outside the Ark of Salvation. You see, in this case a true Pharisee who is even worse than a liberal. Patrick does not even craftily attempt to place these souls inside the Church to be saved as the liberal have!

Patrick Comment: 71

Most of mankind was NOT on the ARK with Noah in the EXTERNAL forum, where they were seen to be there by the rest of mankind. However, INTERNALLY, that is to say, between each individual and Almighty God, I believe it was possible that some of those people who died during the Great Flood could have been in the State of Sanctifying Grace.

I believe that materially speaking, those of us who belonged to non-Catholic religions, such as the Novus Ordo sect, were no longer members of the Church in the EXTERNAL forum. However, when we realize our errors, by the mercy of God, we are able to be in the State of Sanctifying Grace if we pray an Act of Perfect Contrition.

RJMI Response: 71.1

All those that were external to the Ark physically died, whereas all those who were internally in the Ark were physical saved, no exceptions. This historical depiction of the physical fate of the bodies that were either outside or inside Noe’s Ark has nothing at all to do with the disposition of their souls; one has nothing to do with the other regarding these facts (See: RJMI Response: 70.1).

Patrick, we know Noe is in heaven, but we do not know if any of his family members are saved. The Ark did not save Noe’s soul; the Ark only saved his physical body. Noe’s Ark was not a religious institution as is the Catholic Church. Noe was saved by his faith and his obedience to God. Those who have the same faith are brothers and members of the one true religion. They don’t have to all be living in the same house nor did they all have to be on the Noe’ Ark. We read that all of those outside the Ark believed in the true God—meaning they were members of the same religion (Church) as Noe—but they were disobedient to God by committing mortal sins of immorality. If any were guilty of idolatry then they would not even be members of the true religion (Church); in order for these to be saved they would have to abjure their false religion and convert by accepting the one true God and then repent of their sins before they died. Not all brothers in the faith will be saved, if they die guilty of one un-confessed mortal sin they will go to hell.

Those who repented, that were not in Noe’s Ark, had placed themselves in a state of grace that made them worthy of heaven. They were in the same Church, body and soul, as Noe was, although they were not on Noe’s Ark. Noe’s Ark was a non-religious vehicle that physically saved the lives of Noe and his family. Whereas, the Catholic Church is much more than just a building or structure, She is Divine; She is the Body of Christ; She is a religious vehicle; the only religious vehicle that can save men’s souls. One belongs to Her, primary because they share in Her faith, not simple because they inhabit the same buildings. A non-Catholic can visit a Catholic Church and attend parts of the Mass, as at one time they could attend the Mass but had to leave after the sermon. Now, these non-Catholics are inside a Catholic church but they are not inside the Ark of the Church, because they do not have the Catholic faith. Also, a Eastern Rite Catholic who wanders into a non-Catholic Greek Schismatic church, thinking it is a Catholic Church, would be physically in a non-Catholic church, whereas they are in the Ark of the Catholic Church because they hold the Catholic faith. You see, it is our faith that places us in the Ark of Salvation (the Church) not

the mere physical location of our bodies. A Catholic can be in China, USA, or Africa and be in the same Church, in the Ark of the Church—they don't all have to be in the same building. It is a Catholic's faith that makes him a member of the Church and places him, body and soul, in the Ark of the Church, and it is obedience to the Church that will save his soul.

One is either inside the Church, body and soul, or outside the Church, body and soul. There is no such thing as a soul that belongs to the soul of the Church while not belonging to Her body, nor is there such a thing as a soul that exist outside the Catholic Church in one sense, but inside in another, nor is there such a thing as a soul that does not externally belong to the Catholic Church while internally belonging to the Catholic Church, to say so would be heresy, and this is one of the main heretical theologies that have developed because of heretics trying to justify and save men by an implicit faith in the Incarnation and Most Holy Trinity, along with trying to save baptized non-Catholics, such as the Protestants and Schismatics. (See: RJMI Response: 14.1)

Patrick's contradictions; inside/outside the Church; bishops/laymen teaching

Patrick Comment: 72

I believe it is possible to pray an Act of Perfect Contrition even before one recites *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration*, written by Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi. The way Divine Providence arranges things, it may be I will never find a Catholic Bishop, that has Ordinary Jurisdiction, who brings me back into the Catholic Church by the formal means of *The Form of Receiving a Convert* as found in the Catholic Liturgy. However, **trusting in the Goodness and Mercy of God, I pray that I will die in the State of Sanctifying Grace, and thereby save my soul.** And this is the same Grace and Blessing that I wish you all. Amen. For a much longer and more complete explanation of much of what has been discussed in this letter, especially about epikeia and jurisdiction, people can contact me and ask about things I have recorded onto cassette tapes. Ask about the tapes: 1) *Which Bishop should I follow?* 2) *Another Evident Contradiction.* 3) *Who is Right and Who is Wrong?* 4) *Is David Bawden a Pope?* 5) *What do Benns and Bawden Teach?*

On true and false prophets (teachers)

RJMI Response: 72.1

Again, Patrick, you say you have not been formally brought into the Catholic Church. I quote, "The way Divine Providence arranges things, it may be I will never find a Catholic Bishop, that has Ordinary Jurisdiction, who brings me back into the Catholic Church by the formal means..." Whereas, you have told me you are inside the Catholic Church (See: Patrick Comment: 3, RJMI Response: 3.1). So, what is it, are you inside or outside the Catholic Church? What you should have said is that you have not yet been officially (formally) retroactively confirmed as having been inside the Church after your private abjuration. The future official act of a prelate, in regards to a Catholic who truly abjured, does not place him inside the Catholic Church, because such a man is already inside the Catholic Church, it only officially confirms (in the external forum) that such a man was inside the Catholic Church at the time he privately abjured, or the time he abjured before lay witnesses. But, as I have said, you are not inside the Catholic Church because you deny the use of epikeia.

Patrick, the same argument about bishops and popes can be used for laymen. By your reasoning not even a layman can teach the Catholic faith because the same confusion will arise. I will rephrase your questions. 1) *Which layman should I follow?* 2) *Another Evident Contradiction.* 3) *Who is Right and Who is Wrong?* You see, Patrick, what is the difference? There are many laymen who are putting themselves forward as teachers of the Catholic faith and many contradict one another in areas of the faith. That means they cannot all be Catholic. So the same question you pose for bishops can be posed for laymen. "*What layman should I follow?*" "*Should I follow Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi, or Patrick Henry, or Hutton Gibson, etc?*" So you see you have missed the point altogether. The answer to the above question is quite simple. "**I will follow the ones who are Catholic.**" Ah, the poor people, the burden is on them, for once in

their life they must make a real persevering effort to learn the Catholic faith and take sides, because in the past they have abused and been disobedient to popes and bishops, and have been slothful in learning their faith, and now they have no choice. Those who are of good will and are truly seeking the truth will migrate to the Catholic teachers. God will see to it that they do. And those of bad will, will remain in the enemy camp, where they belong. This is the separation of the wheat from the chaff and it is a true test of fire, as the Prophet Daniel mentions shall come to pass in these final days. *“Many shall be chosen, and made white, and shall be tried as fire: and the wicked shall deal wickedly, and none of the wicked shall understand, but the learned shall understand.”* (Daniel 12:10.)

If there is a Catholic bishop alive today, or a non-Catholic bishop that truly repents and is now Catholic, how could such a bishop harm the Church, if he is truly Catholic in word and deed? The same can be said of a priest or a layman. Just because there are many impostors does not mean the righteous—the Catholics—should remain silent and not fulfill whatever obligations they must in order to help save souls, be they Catholic bishops, priests, or laymen. For what does a Catholic have to do with a non-Catholic, or the righteous with the un-righteous, or the faithful with the unbeliever, or light with darkness, or a false prophet with a true prophet? What does our Lord teach regarding this?

Ezekiel Chapter 13

God declares against false prophets and prophetesses, that deceive the people with lies.

Ezekiel 13:1-9: And the word of the Lord came to me, saying: Son of man, prophesy thou against the prophets of Israel that prophesy: and thou shalt say to them that prophesy out of their own heart: Hear ye the word of the Lord: Thus saith the Lord God: Woe to the foolish prophets that follow their own spirit, and see nothing. Thy prophets, O Israel, were like foxes in the deserts. You have not gone up to face the enemy, nor have you set up a wall for the house of Israel, to stand in battle in the day of the Lord.⁴³ They see vain things, and they foretell lies, saying: The Lord saith: whereas the Lord hath not sent them: and they have persisted to confirm what they have said. Have you not seen a vain vision and spoken a lying divination: and you say: The Lord saith: whereas I have not spoken. Therefore thus saith the Lord God: Because you have spoken vain things, and have seen lies: therefore behold I come against you, saith the Lord God. And my hand shall be upon the prophets that see vain things, and that divine lies: they shall not be in the council of my people, nor shall they be written in the writing of the house of Israel, neither shall they enter into the land of Israel, and you shall know that I am the Lord God.

Jeremias Chapter 23

God reproves evil governors; and promises to send good pastors; and Christ himself the prince of the pastors. He inveighs against false prophets preaching without being sent.

Jeremias 23:25: I have heard what the prophets said, that prophesy lies in my name, and say: I have dreamed, I have dreamed. How long shall this be in the heart of the prophets that prophesy lies, and that prophesy the delusions of their own heart? ...The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream: and he that hath my word, let him speak my word with truth: what hath the chaff to do with the wheat, saith the Lord?⁴⁴ Are not my words as a fire, saith the Lord: and as a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces? Therefore behold I am against the prophets, saith the Lord: who steal my words every one from his neighbour. Behold I am against the prophets, saith the Lord: who use their tongues, and say: The Lord saith it. Behold I am against the prophets that have lying dreams, saith the Lord: and tell them, and cause my people to err by their lying, and by their

⁴³ The is what a specific abjuration does, that condemns the heresies and heretics of the day by name, it sets up a brass wall, an impenetrable wall in Catholics battle against the enemy.

⁴⁴ Let the Catholic (true prophet) speak, yea, it is the duty of the Catholic to speak and teach in the midst of a multitude of non-Catholics teachers (false prophets) who put themselves forward as Catholics (true prophets).

wonders: when I sent them not, nor commanded them, who have not profited this people at all, saith the Lord. If therefore this people, or the prophet, or the priest shall ask thee, saying: What is the burden of the Lord? thou shalt say to them: You are the burden: for I will cast you away, saith the Lord.

Just because in the days of Jeremias and Elias there were many false prophets does that mean the true prophet must stop teaching. Elias, the sole surviving prophet in his day, had opposed 150 false prophets of Baal and imposed upon the people a choice they must take, a real choice—an abjuration, as you will—to make a real choice and take sides between the true God and the false gods of Baal. Moses did the same at the bottom of Mount Sinai when he demanded all who were to follow the true God to come over to his side and the rest he killed. Real choices Patrick, and real action must be taken, not just empty words that are not backed by demanding action and offering solutions. You are akin to an impotent General who comments about the enemy and points out all their weaknesses but when it comes time to fight, to offer a battle plan you back out, you cower down in the face of the enemy, and not only that you try to take away the weapons from those who are fit to fight, by leaving repentant and converted bishops and priests impotent by not being able to fulfill the duties of a Catholic bishop or priest, because you have no use for epikeia.

The specific abjuration that I composed is a weapon, the most effective instrument to bring one into the Catholic Church and the only instrument that will promote true Catholic unity. Make no mistake about this, that form is pleasing to God, and it was what God demanded that I compose, because it is what the Church teaches and demands.

So, Patrick, God shall choose between you and I, between all the false teachers and I. Why are most of them false teachers? Because they do not have the humility to admit when they are wrong so as to amend their position and eventually become perfect as God is perfect, and to become holy as God is holy. In these days of the great apostasy there is not one of us who have been right in all they we have taught, but God requires us to learn, to amend our position when we are shown to be wrong and move forward. How can we pass our test of fire in which God is burning off the dross, if we hold on to the dross and refuse to be purified? I am not saying I am yet perfect, but my hope and desire is to be perfect. No true man of God, no matter how great he may be, would dare presume that even if he was perfect that he could not fall into imperfection while he lived. The only human creature on earth that was always perfect was the Blessed Virgin Mary, and only in heaven could the other saints be assured of always and eternally being perfect. No saint from the Old or New Testament period of time, while he live upon earth was always perfect, in that they had done no wrong, or could never be wrong. Yes, saints achieve perfection on earth but not without knowing that if it were not for the grace and assistance of God along with their diligent cooperation they would fall into imperfection. **King David** who was a prophet and a king speaks of his imperfections.

Psalms 37:18-19: For I am ready for scourges: and my sorrow is continually before me. For I will declare my iniquity: and I will think for my sin.

Psalms 38:9-14: Deliver thou me from all my iniquities: thou hast made me a reproach to the fool. I was dumb, and I opened not my mouth, because thou hast done it. Remove thy scourges from me. The strength of thy hand hath made me faint in rebukes: Thou hast corrected man for iniquity. And thou hast made his soul to waste away like a spider: surely in vain is any man disquieted. Hear my prayer, O Lord, and my supplication: give ear to my tears. Be not silent: for I am a stranger with thee, and a sojourner as all my fathers were. O forgive me, that I may be refreshed, before I go hence, and be no more.

And we will read of the **Prophet Elias**, who at one point did not believe he was perfect enough to effect true conversions in Israel.

3 Kings 19:3-4, 9-10: Then Elias was afraid, and rising up, he went whithersoever he had a mind: and he came to Bersabee of Juda, and left his servant there, And he went forward, one day's journey into the desert. And when he was there, and sat under a juniper tree, he requested for his soul that he might die, and said: It is enough for me, Lord: take away my soul: for I am no better than my fathers... And when he was come thither, he abode in a cave and behold the word of the Lord came unto him, and he said to him: What dost thou here, Elias? And he answered: With zeal have

I been zealous for the Lord God of hosts: for the children of Israel have forsaken thy covenant: they have thrown down thy altars, they have slain thy prophets with the sword, and I alone am left, and they seek my life to take it away.

And the **Prophet Jonah** who at first did not respond to God's call and later became angry with God for sparing Ninive, whom He was told by God to condemn. Jonah's was not angry that he inhabits had repented and were spared, but because he wrongly felt he had wasted his time and effort in condemning Ninive, when God knew they would repent and convert.

The saints all had the humility to admit when they were wrong and in so doing, they approached perfection on earth to the point where they had many moments of perfection during their earthly life.

Proverbs 15: 5, 10, 12, 32; 21:29: A fool laugheth at the instruction of his father: but he that regardeth reproofs shall become prudent... Instruction is grievous to him that forsaketh the way of life: he that hateth reproof shall die... A corrupt man loveth not one that reproveth him: nor will he go to the wise... He that rejecteth instruction despiseth his own soul: but he that yieldeth to reproof, possesseth understanding... The wicked man impudently hardeneth his face: but he that is righteous, correcteth his way.

Patrick abuses God's mercy

Patrick is akin to an impotent general; promotes inaction and quietism.

Patrick Comment: 73

There is no need to be discouraged. Read the books, (and/or hear them on tapes), by Father John Kearney. Father teaches, among many other things, the important first principle, that we are the creatures and God is the Creator. We belong entirely to God. NOTHING happens without His Holy Will. Therefore there is no reason to be discouraged, upset or rebel about the way God takes care of His Church and ALL the things that happen in this world.

RJMI Response: 73.1

Patrick, it is not I who am discouraged or rebelled, rather, it is you who have rebelled and have discouraged all your readers. It is you who have disobeyed and disregarded Church law. I suspect you were even a rebel under Schuckardt because, as you have told me, he punished you for trying to teach canon law without his approval. Now, at that time you placed yourself under obedience to him and he had a right to tell you this. The Church has never allowed just anybody to study and teach canon law, or else there would be many rogue canonists, as you testify to in your teachings. You prove Schuckardt to be right by banning your teaching of canon law because your pharisaical tendencies would distort and twist the spirit of the law. You rebelled against Schuckardt for punishing you, but in this he was right, it is what the Church teaches Patrick. Your speaking out against Schuckardt on this point was an act of disobedience on your part, which is the trait of a rebel.

Part of the greatest punishment of the great apostasy is that there is no hierarchy to silence rogue canonists as yourself. God has placed a heavy burden upon the people to read the positions of those who put themselves forward as Catholic teachers and to take sides. This is a punishment to the laymen who have abused and been disobedient to popes in the past and have been extremely slothful and learning their faith. How will a layman know you are rogue canonist and I am not? By reading both of our materials and then they must take sides. They have no choice they must learn their faith, as they never have before, as they also should have in the past when we had a hierarchic structure to guide them.

Patrick, I have taken real action and demand others do the same. I have not just presented the problem, but also the solution and have given the people real weapons to enter the Catholic Church and once in Her

to stay united in the Catholic faith in order to fight against the great apostasy. It is you Patrick, who have discouraged many others, as I have witnessed first hand, by your contradictory teachings, by your indecisiveness, and by you offering them no way out. Many of my ex-friends who have tried to follow your teachings have become confounded and fallen into despair and each and every one of them went backward into the clutches of the Conciliar Church. Two of them, because they could not reconcile your teachings, when back to the SSPX, they were kicked of there and now they are going to a Fraternity of St. Peter chapel. The other group of ex-friends is using your writing against me that I am now responding to, to defend their going to Fr. Blanco's Masses that you condemn. You see how thieves and rogues migrate to one another, even when they don't share the same faith. You condemn Fr. Blanco in your writings.

Patrick Henry, *True Church*: Father Lucian Pulvermacher, Father Cyril Town, Father Blanco and all others that joined the Novus Ordo church or tried to obtain faculties from Archbishops Lefebvre or Thuc (or their offspring) LOST THEIR JURISDICTION!

These ex-friends (enemies) of mine—who I still love and pray for their conversion—attend Fr. Blanco's Mass and have used your writings against me to try and support their position, only because of their great malice against me. Malice, rooted in pride and envy, causes one to lose all reason and common sense, as has happened to them and you also, Patrick. Do you now see what I have said is true? Your teachings lead others back into the clutches of non-Catholic heretics, such as Fr. Blanco who is in communion with Antipope John Paul II by allowing Conciliar "Catholics" and SSPXers to approach his altar rail and receive Holy Communion, nor does he ever demand that they hold and practice the full deposit of the Catholic faith. It is these ex-friends that are using your false teachings against me. Well my refutation of you will suffice for those of good will and as an eternal testimony against your deceptively false teachings and by bringing your heresies and schisms to the light I have exposed, by the grace of God, a true Pharisee, Patrick Henry.

You may ask how do your teachings lead to despair? Patrick, it is you who teach that the Church cannot have any more popes. It is you who would have deprived all those of the Roman Rite, from the time of The Council of Trent's *Tametsi* decree to the promulgation of Pope Pius Xth *Ne Temere* decree, of marriage due to the impossibility of accessing a Catholic priest. It is you teach a repentant priest or bishop, in these days without a hierarchy, cannot function as a Catholic bishop or priest. It is you who teach a penitent Catholic that there is no way for him to be fully united to (inside) the Catholic Church when he repents, by saying he is outside the Church in one sense—until he goes before a Catholic bishop with ordinary jurisdiction—while he is inside in another sense, by his act of contrition or abjuration he took without a Catholic bishop. This is a confused, confounding, merciless, cruel teaching. It is you who teach that men can be saved by an implicit faith in the Incarnation and the Most Holy Trinity, and that Protestants and Schismatics can be saved. I don't teach this nonsense. You do! It is you who have violated, ignored, and totally disregard the Church's law regarding the public teaching of the Catholic faith because you deny the use of epikeia. How is a true Catholic to reconcile this inconsistency of yours that involve heresy and schism? These are serious questions for all Catholics because your teachings are contrary to the Catholic faith and therefore you must be avoided like a plague, unless you're repent and convert.

Patrick, yes all things are in the hands of God, but we must cooperate with God, and not sit passively by, and we are not to abandon those who truly repent, be they laymen, priests, or even bishops. We are not to deprive other Catholics, or place stumbling blocks in front of them when they attempt to save souls. Yes, even bishops can repent, and God in His infinite mercy will forgive them and demand they do whatever they can to assist the salvation of souls. God had demanded the writing of the specific abjuration that I composed, and by you opposing it, you are opposing God. Yes, God's hand demands a specific abjuration or condemnation of the great apostasy, as it applies, and by you opposing it you are opposing the work of God.

Patrick Comment: 74

Thank you for your time in reading this letter. I ask you, Richard, to please send a copy of it on to those on your mailing list. Especially send a copy to Rev. Francois Egregyi, because he requested me not to send him anymore email; but I assume he still accepts mail from you. He might want to answer the questions asked and send his information around to let people know if he thinks the same way you do. May Jesus, Mary and St. Joseph grant you every grace you need to live and die in the State of Sanctifying Grace, in perfect Uniformity with God's Most Holy Will. Ora Pro Nobis! In Jesus, Mary and Joseph, Patrick Henry.

Conclusion and the verdict awaits Fr. Egregyi's answers

RJMI Response: 74.1

Patrick, I will ask you to do the same. Send this refutation of you to all those whom you have sent your response to, especially those who have used your attack against me and continue to go to Fr. Blanco's Masses. You have deceived and misled people with your errors, heresies, and schismatic teachings and you are bound to make amends. Not just to them, but you must make an effort to inform all the people who you have sent your false teaching to as part of your reparation. You must also make amends when you have lied about another person, by misrepresenting his position.

Regarding Fr. Egregyi, the verdict still awaits. I will send him this debate and wait for his response. Fr. Egregyi does not outright deny the use of epikeia as you have, but he seems not to apply it to anything. If he does explicitly deny its use when he hears confessions, after he realizes no canon law supports his hearing confessions, then he would be a true Pharisee just as you are. If he does not admit to its use in the preaching of sermons then he would be a true Pharisee just as you are, etc. As I have said, one can be justified by epikeia while not even knowing it, even if he improperly defended himself at first, by acting upon common sense. But, to explicitly deny its use of epikeia, once a man realizes that no canon law supports his actions and that the letter of the canon law actually condemns his actions, would make him guilty of violating those laws, because only by the principle of epikeia can he be exempted from these laws. So, this may be Fr. Egregyi's last big test. I hope he passes it!

I will end up by proving a point I made in Book Two, about true Pharisees, of which you have given me more than enough evidence to prove my case. I quote:

Richard J.M. Ibranyi, *Exceptions to the Law*, p. 7: The Pharisees on the right who have no use for it and the liberals on the left who abuse and misuse it will be confounded. Liberals have no use for the law whatsoever and only pretend to obey the law in order to deceive. The liberals rebel without true reference to the law and are in complete opposition to both the letter and the spirit of the law, and they are perverse, chaotic and foolish. The true Pharisees on the right who are over just, having no room for epikeia, lack true wisdom and charity. These Pharisees exceed true justice and become unjust and full of bitter zeal and pride that blinds them to the truth. These Pharisees, to the degree that they persist in wickedness, will become eccentric, vain, bloated, puffed up, foolish and stupid. "*Be not over just: and be not more wise than is necessary, lest thou become stupid.*" (Ecltes. 7:17)

You will agree with me, Patrick, that a man who falls into heresy becomes stupid. I will now show where you promote heretical works by other authors, besides your own unique heresies. One of the few tapes you sent me, that I listened too, had heresy in it, not to mention the whole Y2K topic that the author talked about was plain old stupid. At the beginning of the tape you mentioned you did not agree with everything the speaker believes in, and that you edited the tape and left in what you thought to be the important parts. Now, before I go to the speaker's heresy, I will bring up some points about this practice of yours that promotes heresy.

First: You are dead wrong, mortally so, if you think your disclaimer at the beginning of a tape or book you promote alleviates your guilt, unless you had totally censured the heretical elements. And even if you

use a source that has heresy in it, leaving out the heretical elements, you must still make this known to the readers, so that if they purchase the book they would know. But, this is not the case; you have left in the heresy for the listener to hear. What good would your disclaimer be in the beginning of the tape if someone starts listening to the tape, but did not hear your disclaimer? What good is your disclaimer if you do not point out exactly where this man is in heresy? You leave it up to the listener to guess what is the heresy and what is the orthodox position, and this is a mortally culpable sin for subjecting sheep that you are supposed to be teaching, to trust they will know what is the heresy and what is not.

Second: It could be that you hold the heresy and that is why you did not censure it or mention it.

I want to make this clear to the reader, it is one thing to present a heretics work so you can refute it point by point, but this is not what Patrick has done, he is promoting this heretic and asks people to make copies of the tape and give it to others, and he never pointed out where he disagrees with (the heresies) of the speaker.

Published by Patrick Henry, *"The Truth about Y2K! The Problem will not be fixed. Be prepared Spiritually,"* by Tom Hurley, part 1 of 2, (about 1 or 3 minutes into the tape): "And I apologize to any of my brothers and sisters here who are not Catholics, if they are Protestants, or Jews, or Agnostics, or whatever."

Patrick, read carefully the underlined portions. Do you agree with this? If not then why, for the love of the God of the Holy Roman Catholic Church, do you put out this trash and tell people to give it to as many people as they can. I believe, Patrick, the root of your problem, as it shows in your writings (your erroneous teachings on external/internal forum and heretical teachings on Soul and Body of the Church), is that you hold the salvation by an implicit faith heresy that states men can be saved under the New Covenant without explicit faith in the Incarnation and the Most Holy and Blessed Trinity, and therefore you have been confounded with the rest of these heretics. Correct me if I am wrong.

And lastly Y2k came and past with a whimper, as I knew would happen. I have friends who are computer-programming experts and they had, long before January 1, 2000, fixed these problems with the big companies. We are going to get a chastisement, that would make the hype about Y2K look frivolous, but God is going to make it clear that this punishment is not because of man's stupidity in not correcting a computer problem, but because men have sinned against God. You should not have overly concerned yourself with this matter.

Patrick, as harsh as all the accusations are that I have leveled against you it is the truth, and was done with a hope of your conversion so that we might work together as walls of brass against the enemies of the Holy Roman Catholic Church, outside of which there is absolutely no salvation. Please pray for the humility to accept the areas in which you are wrong, so as to amend your way and be a final day warrior with real weapons to fight the good battle! We must not be content with simply teaching certain truths, we must demand others embrace them under pain of damnation.

May Our Lord Jesus Christ, through the Sorrowful and Immaculate Heart of Mary,
and the Intercession of St. Joseph Protector of Holy Mother Church,
grant you all the graces you need to save your soul.

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi
"To Jesus through Mary"

Soli Deo Gloria