

NOTES TO BOOK I

1. Louis Bouyer, *The Decomposition of Catholicism*, London, 1970, p. 99. The great liturgist, Fr. Louis Bouyer has stated that there is formal opposition between the liturgy we have and what the Council worked out. The observation of Michael Davies: “The New Mass is not an act of obedience to a decision of Vatican II, it is a calculated rejection of the Liturgy Constitution of that council.”
2. This is what Paul VI called the *Novus Ordo* Mass on Nov. 19, 1969.
3. Pope Leo XIII in *Orientalium Dignitas*.
4. The expressions, “ecumenical dimension” and “new foundation of eucharistic theology” are those used by *Consilium* members A. Bugnini and C. Braga. They will be dealt with below.
5. “Item, (diffinimus) in azymo sive fermentato pane triticeo corpus Christi veraciter confici; sacerdotisque in altero ips(or)um Domini corpus conficere debere, unumquemque scilicet iuxta suæ Ecclesiæ sive occidentalis, sive orientalis consuetudinem.” — Eugenius IV, Conc. Florentinum, *Decretum pro Græcis*, [Ex Bulla “*Lætentur cæli*”, 6. Iulii 1439.]

“Likewise (i.e. We define), whether in leavened or unleavened wheaten bread the Body of Christ truly to be confected, and priests, in either of them, must confect the Body of the Lord, each one according to the custom of his Church, whether occidental or oriental.”

It is, in the cited text, solemnly defined as a dogma of Faith that the priest must confect the Eucharist according to the custom of his own ritual church, and therefore the custom of the same determines which kind of bread must be used. The major premise upon which the dogma is founded and which is verbally contained within the dogmatic formula is: “Priests must confect the body of the Lord each according to the custom of his church”, which in turn is founded on the major premise that “the priest must celebrate the Eucharist according to the custom of his church”, or its more general formulation as a principle: “The law of custom governs the celebration of the liturgy”. Upon these very same premises is also founded the dogma of Trent, according to which the faithful are bound by the profession of faith to the “received and approved rites” of the Church. Since the truth of the dogmatic proposition is founded on the principle which forms its major premise, it follows necessarily, i.e. with strict metaphysical certitude that the same major premise, i.e. that “the law of custom governs the celebration of the liturgy”, pertains to the Deposit of Faith.

The later cited passage from Cardinal Torquemada (*Response to CBCP Admonition* ... pp. 137-138) is founded upon the doctrine formulated and defined by the Council of Florence. Torquemada elaborates the above-mentioned principle upon which the dogma is founded, namely that it is of divine law that the custom and rite of the Church must be followed; and applies that principle to the particular case of a Pope: “if he did not wish personally to follow the universal customs and rites of the Church”, arriving at the conclusions that 1) “without doubt” the Pope would “fall into schism” and 2) “should he go against the universal customs of the Church, he need not be followed ...”

That Cardinal Torquemada has given a correct and orthodox elaboration of Catholic doctrine that is specifically in conformity with aforementioned Florentine dogma is attested to by the fact that the same Pope, Eugenius IV, who de-

fined that dogma also bestowed upon *Torquemada* the title of “Defender of the Faith”. *Torquemada* was the official Papal Theologian during the pontificate of Eugenius IV, and was appointed as the official *Theologian* of the Council in Basel before it was transferred to Florence.

6. “Receptos quoque et approbatos Ecclesiae catholicae ritus in supradictorum omnium sacramentorum sollemni administratione recipio et admitto.” *Professio fidei Tridentina*, [Ex Bulla Pii IV “*Iniunctum nobis*”, 13 Nov. 1564], Dz. 996.

The “received and approved rites of the Catholic Church” are the *traditional rites*, since they are the customary rites (Conc. Trid., Session 7, can. 13) that have been received through the vehicle of *Tradition*.

7. “*disciplinam et ritum ecclesiae, sicut inveni et a sanctis predecessoribus meis traditum reperi, inlibatum custodire, et indiminutas res ecclesiae conservare et ut indiminutae custodiantur operam dare; nihil de traditione qua a probatissimis predecessoribus meis servatum reperi, diminuere vel mutare aut aliquam novitatem admittere.*” [cf. *Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum, Indiculum Pontificis*]
8. “*Si quis dixerit, receptos et approbatos Ecclesiae catholicae ritus in sollemni sacramentorum administratione adhiberi consuetos aut contemni, aut sine peccato a ministris pro libito ommitti, aut in novos alios per quemcumque ecclesiarum pastorem mutari posse: anathema sit.*” – Conc. Tridentinum, Session VII, Canon XIII. The Italian translation of this canon in the bilingual edition of *Denzinger* reads: “Se qualcuno afferma che i riti ricevuti e approvati nella chiesa cattolica e abitualmente usati nell’amministrazione solenne dei sacramenti, possono essere disprezzati o tralasciati dai ministri a loro piacere, senza che commettano peccato, o cambiati in altri nuovi da qualsiasi pastore ecclesiastico; sia anatema.” – *Denzinger, Enchiridion Symbolorum, Definitionum et Declarationum de Rebus Fidei et Morum*, revised by Peter Hünermann, Bologna, 1995, p. 673.
9. cf. *Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum, Indiculum Pontificis*.
10. “Consuetudo est optima legum interpret.” (CIC 1983, c. 27.)
11. “...throughout the history of the development of the sacramental liturgy, the tendency has always been towards growth-additions and accretions, the effort to obtain a fuller, more perfect, more clearly significant symbolism.” — Canon George Smith, *The Teaching of the Catholic Church*, ninth printing, 1955, p. 1056.
12. St. Peter Canisius, *Summa Doctrinae Christianae* – “It behooves us unanimously and inviolably to observe the ecclesiastical traditions, whether codified or simply retained by the customary practice of the Church.”
13. cf. Suarez, *De Charitate, Disputatio XII de Schismate*; and *Torquemada, Summa de Ecclesia*.

This doctrine elaborated by Juan de *Torquemada* O.P., named by Pope Eugenius IV as a “Defender of the Faith”, and Francisco Suarez S.J., named by Pope Paul V “Doctor Eximius et Pius”, is firmly rooted in the above-cited definitions of Pope Eugenius IV and Pope Pius IV and the solemn anathema of the Council of Trent. (Sess. 7, can. 13) The Popes, in their oath of coronation (see note 9) pronounced the ban against themselves should they dare to change or allow anyone to change the ecclesiastical rites which they professed to be of Divine Law (*divina et caelestia mandata*): “*si praeter haec aliquod agere*

præsumpsero vel ut præsumatur permisero, eris (beate Petre) autem mihi in illa terribili die divini iudicii depropius.”

14. Michael Davies, *Liturgical Shipwreck*, TAN Books, 1987, p. 14.
15. The committee appointed by St. Pius V accomplished the restoration of the rite: “... ad pristinam Missale ipsum sanctorum Patrum normam ac ritum restituerunt.” [*Quo Primum*] (they have restored the Missal itself to the original norm and rite of the holy Fathers.)
16. Michael Davies, *Cranmer’s Godly Order*, The Angelus Press, 1980, p. 74. Davies quotes Father David Knowles, *The Tablet*, 24 July 1971, p. 724.
17. Fortescue, Adrian; *The Mass*, London, 1917, p. 173.
18. *Ibid.* p. 213.
19. Joseph A. Jungmann, S.J., *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origin and Development*, New York, Benziger, 1950, vol. 1, p. 194.
20. DS 1745.
21. Jungmann in *Handing on the Faith*.
22. These words, “Legem credendi lex statuit supplicandi” written by Pope St. Celestine I to the bishops of Gaul in the year 422, have been repeated again and again by the popes, most recently by: Pius XI in *Divini Cultus* and Pius XII in *Mediator Dei*.
23. “Who dreamed on that day (when the council Fathers voted for the Liturgy Constitution) that within a few years, far less than a decade, the Latin past of the Church would be all but expunged, that it would be reduced to a memory fading in the middle distance? The thought of it would have horrified us, but it seemed so far beyond the realm of the possible as to be ridiculous. So we laughed it off.” – Archbishop Robert J. Dwyer in *Twin Circle*, Oct. 26, 1973.
24. Owen Chadwick, *The Reformation*, London, 1972, p. 119.
25. Michael Davies, *The Eternal Sacrifice*, Long Prairie, 1987, p. 14.
26. The Cardinal Archbishop and the Bishops of the Province of Westminster, *A Vindication of the Bull Apostolicæ Curæ*, London 1898, pp. 42-43.
27. Fr. Anthony Cekada: “Is it stretching the plain meaning of the 1970 Instructions to claim that, even with all its traditional-sounding phrases, it *still* leads us away from the teaching of the Council of Trent and towards Protestantism? For an answer we turn to an article written five years later by a member of the Consilium, the Rev. Emil Joseph Lengeling: ‘In the [original] 1969 General Instruction on the Missal, an ecumenically-oriented sacramental theology for the celebration of the Mass emerged. ... Despite the new 1970 edition forced by reactionary attacks — but which avoided the worst, thanks to the cleverness of its revisors — it leads us ... out of the dead end of the post-Tridentine theories of sacrifice, and corresponds to the agreements signalled by many of last year’s interfaith documents.’” (*Tradition und Fortschritt in der Liturgie*, in *Liturgisches Jahrbuch*, 25, 1975, 218-9; quoted in *The Ottaviani Intervention* p. 15.)
28. Davies cites Father Peter Coughlin who was a member of the *Consilium*.
29. Father Cekada relates: “Cardinal Bacci had written a laudatory preface to a book which charged that the liturgical reform had betrayed the faith of the Council of Trent, and that the head of *Consilium*, Cardinal Lercaro, was ‘Luther resurrected’.” (That book was *La Tunica Stracciata* by Tito Casini, Rome 1967.)
30. *La Documentation Catholique*, no. 1493.

31. cf. Michael Davies, *Liturgical Shipwreck*, TAN Books, 1987, p.13. — “Father Gelineau was present at the Council as a liturgical expert. He performed the same function after the Council for the *Consilium*, the commission set up to implement the Constitution.”
32. J. Gelineau, *Demain La Liturgie*, Paris, 1976, pp. 9-10.
33. *The Providence Visitor*, Sept. 17, 1971.
34. Pope Paul VI – “We used to believe the Mass to be the traditional and unchangeable expression of our authentic religious worship”. Nov. 19, 1969. Pope Pius VI condemned the proposal to reform the liturgy, “‘by recalling it (the liturgy) to greater simplicity of rites, by expressing it in the vernacular language or by uttering it in a loud voice’ as if the present order of the liturgy received and approved by the Church, had emanated in some part from the forgetfulness of the principles by which it should be regulated” as “**rash, offensive to pious ears, insulting to the Church, favourable to the charges of heretics**”. — *Auctorem Fidei* [33].
35. “an inferior cannot annul a superior’s law” – William Lyndwood, Dean of the Arches and chief official of the court of Canterbury during the reign of Pope Martin V (1417-1431), quoted this *regula iuris* in his comment on Archbishop Pechham’s enforcing a decree of Cardinal Othobon using the words: *Praecipimus inviolabiliter observari* (‘we order that they be inviolably observed’). The Rev. Benedict Allen, O.P. relates that “these words called forth the following comment from Lyndwood: Why is it here commanded that the constitution should be observed, when it is already sufficiently binding? This is an executive precept rather than an authoritative statute. The archbishop may add new penalties to a decree issued by the legate, but he cannot change or do away with these decrees, because *inferior non potest tollere legem Superioris*, and there is no doubt in Lyndwood’s mind that the archbishop is inferior to the legate, just as the legate is to the Pope.” – *The Application of Roman Canon Law in Medieval England*, Benedict Allen O.P., in *The Papacy*, C. Lattey S.J., London 1923, p. 168.
36. “A legislator inferiore lex iuri superiori contraria valide ferri nequit.” See also *Summa Theol. I-II, q. 96, a. 5*.
37. Davies, *The Legal Status of the Tridentine Mass*, Dickinson, 1982, p.35.
38. Cardinal Alfons Stickler in *The Latin Mass*, Summer 1995, p. 14: “Pope John Paul asked a commission of nine cardinals in 1986 two questions. Firstly, did Pope Paul VI or any other competent authority legally forbid the widespread celebration of the Tridentine Mass in the present day? No. He asked Benelli explicitly, ‘Did Paul VI forbid the old Mass?’ He never answered — never yes, never no. Why? He couldn’t say, ‘Yes, he forbade it.’ He couldn’t forbid a Mass which was from the beginning valid and was the Mass of thousands of saints and faithful. The difficulty for him was that he couldn’t forbid it, but at the same time he wanted the new Mass to be said, to be accepted. And so he could only say, ‘I want that the new Mass should be said.’ This was the answer all the princes gave to the question asked. They said: the Holy Father wished that all follow the new Mass.

“The answer given by eight [of the] cardinals in ’86 was that, no, the Mass of St. Pius V has never been suppressed. I can say this: I was one of the cardinals. Only one was against ...

“There was another question, very interesting. ‘Can any bishop forbid any

priest in good standing from celebrating a Tridentine Mass again?' The nine cardinals *unanimously* agreed that no bishop may forbid a Catholic priest from saying the Tridentine Mass. We have no official prohibition and I think the Pope would never establish an official prohibition."

Several years ago *The Fatima Crusader* reported on the findings of the commission of nine cardinals. According to the report, the nine cardinals of the commission were Cardinals: Palazzini, Innocenti, Casaroli, Oddi, Ratzinger, Stickler, Mayer, Gantin, and Tomko.

39. Cf. DS 1636-37, 1739-41, 1746, 1752, 1753, 1756, 1758, 1759.
40. Letter of Cardinal Ottaviani to Pope Paul VI, Rome, Sept. 25, 1969. The magnitude of the break with Tradition becomes evident when one considers the findings of Fr. Cekada. A brief quotation will suffice here to manifest the enormity of what was done to the proper prayers of the Temporal Cycle in the name of *aggiornamento*: "When the revisers altered or abolished these prayers, they destroyed a tradition far more ancient than the 400-year-old Tridentine Missal. Each example cited above appears in the old Missal's Temporal Cycle, where the texts are between 1100 and 1600 years old. By effacing negative concepts from these orations, Paul VI's *Consilium* stripped from the Mass a doctrinal inheritance handed down from the patristic era of Saints Augustine, Ambrose and Jerome." (Rev. Anthony Cekada, *The Problems with the Prayers of the Modern Mass*, p.15.).
41. *Cena dominica sive Missa est sacra synaxis seu congregatio populi Dei in unum convenientis, sacerdote praeside, ad memoriale Domini celebrandum*.

"On 18 November 1969 *Consilium* issued a stiffly worded Declaration 'clarifying' the *General Instruction*. *Consilium* attempted to handle the (Ottaviani) *Intervention's* doctrinal objections to the *Novus Ordo* by claiming the general Instruction was not intended to be a doctrinal statement, but merely a *pastoral* or *rubrical* instruction ...

"Well before the dispute provoked by *The Ottaviani Intervention*, however, members of the *Consilium* subcommittee directly responsible for creating the New Order of Mass were telling a different story. Father Bugnini and the Rev. Peter Coughlan had already stated that the Instruction would treat of 'theological principles', constitute a 'full theological ... exposition' of the new rite, describe the New Mass 'from a doctrinal point of view', or serve as an 'introduction of a doctrinal character'." (*Background to the Ottaviani Intervention*, in *The Ottaviani Intervention*, p. 6.)
42. Si quis dixerit: Missæ sacrificium tantum esse laudis et gratiarum actiones aut nudam commemorationem sacrificii in cruce peracti, non autem propitiatorium; vel prodesse soli sumenti, neque pro vivis et defunctis, pro peccatis, pænis, satisfactionibus et aliis necessitatibus offerri debere, *anathema sit*." (DS 1753)

"If anyone says that the sacrifice of the Mass is only one of praise and thanksgiving, or that it is a mere commemoration of the sacrifice consummated on the Cross, but not one of propitiation; or that it is of profit to him alone who receives; or that it ought not to be offered for the living and the dead, for sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities: let him be anathema."
43. A. Tanquerey, *Synopsis theologiae dogmaticæ*, vol. III, Desclee, 1930: "Omnes

et soli sacerdotes sunt, proprie loquendo, ministri secundarii sacrificii missæ. Christus est quidem principalis minister. Fideles mediate, non autem sensu strictu, per sacerdotes offerunt.” (cf. Conc. Trid. XXII, Can. 2)

The *Catechism of the Council of Trent* teaches:

“The bloody and unbloody Victim are not two but one Victim only, whose Sacrifice is daily renewed in the Eucharist...

“The priest is also one and the same, Christ the Lord; for the ministers who offer the sacrifice, consecrate the holy mysteries, not in their own person, but in that of Christ, as the words of Consecration themselves make clear; for the priest does not say ‘This is the Body of Christ,’ but, ‘This is my Body,’ and thus acting in the person of Christ the Lord, he changes the substance of bread and wine into the substance of His Body and Blood.”

The Short Critical Study also published under the title, *The Ottaviani Intervention*, was composed by a group of twelve Roman theologians. “The task of preparing a suitable text,” Father Cekada relates, “fell to a Dominican theologian and philosopher, Father M.L. Guerard des Lauriers, then a professor at the Pontifical Lateran University in Rome ... Cardinal Ottaviani, for his part, composed a cover letter to Paul VI which supported the *Study’s* conclusions.” – *Background to the Ottaviani Intervention*, in *The Ottaviani Intervention*, p. 3).

44. The renowned Dominican lecturer, Manuel Piñon O.P. observes: “The *Novus Ordo* liturgy is essentially the liturgy framed and put up by the Anglican Archbishop Thomas Cranmer to implement Luther’s inventions and to provide the Anglican Protestants their own liturgy.”
45. It was in fact the intention of the *Consilium* to abolish the Roman Canon entirely, but only the intervention of Paul VI prevented this. In a footnote, Davies mentions that “according to Douglas Woodruff, the *Consilium* wanted this (the Roman Canon) abolished but Pope Paul VI ordered its retention”. So clearly the *Consilium* really did its worst to entirely expunge the notion of a propitiatory sacrifice from the liturgy.
46. The use of the plural here is a reference to the other ordained ministers who accompany the priest in a Solemn High Mass. It is not a reference to the assisting laity.
47. The *Critical Study* makes the following observation:

“In *Prex Eucharistica III* the following words are addressed to the Lord: ‘populum tibi congregare non desinis ut a solis ortu usque ad occasum oblatio munda offeratur nomini tuo’ (You do not cease to gather together a people to yourself *in order that* from the rising to the setting of the sun a pure oblation may be offered to Your name), the *in order that* making it appear that the people rather than the priest are the indispensable element in the celebration; and since not even here is it made clear who the offerer is, the people themselves appear to be invested with *autonomous priestly powers*.”

48. The observation of the *Critical Study* is particularly relevant here: “The *Novus Ordo* changes the nature of the offering turning it into a sort of exchange of gifts between man and God: man brings the bread, and God turns it into the ‘bread of life’; man brings the wine, and God turns it into a ‘spiritual drink’.

“There is no need to comment on the utter indeterminateness of the formulae ‘panis vitae’ and ‘potus spiritalis’, which might mean anything. **The same**

capital equivocation is repeated here, as in the definition of the Mass: there, Christ is present only spiritually among His own: here, bread and wine are only ‘spiritually’ (not substantially) changed.”

49. On the other hand, Craig Heimbichner, in his article “The Talmudic Touch: The Real Story of the Offertory’s Replacement” in the March 2003 edition of the *Catholic Family News*, explains that these Offertory Prayers of the *Novus Ordo* Mass actually appear to come not from the Old Testament, but from the Talmud itself.
50. The *Critical Study*, also known as *The Ottaviani Intervention*, was a document sent to Pope Paul VI in 1969 explaining why the New Mass should not be allowed. See also the last paragraph of Footnote 43.
51. “The punctuation and typographical lay-out: the full stop and new paragraph marking the passage from the narrative mode to the **sacramental and affirmative** one, the sacramental words in larger characters at the centre of the page and often in a different colour, clearly detached from the historical context. All combined to give the formula a *proper and autonomous value*.” (*Critical Study*)
52. “The *anamnesis* (*Hæc quotiescumque feceritis in mei memoriam facietis*) which in Greek is ‘*eis ten emou anamnesin*’ (directed to my memory). This referred to Christ *operating* and not to the mere memory of him, or of the event: an invitation to recall *what* He did (*hæc ... in mei memoriam facietis*) *in the way* He did it, not only His Person, or the Supper. The Pauline formula (*Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*) which will now take place of the old – proclaimed as it will be daily in vernacular languages – will irremediably cause the hearers to concentrate on the memory of Christ as the end of the Eucharistic action, while it is really the beginning.” (*Critical Study*)
53. “In relation to the Church, the priest is now merely one member among others, someone taken from the people. In its treatment of the invocation to the Holy Ghost in the Eucharistic Prayer (the *epiclesis*), the General Instruction attributes the petitions anonymously to the Church. The priest’s part has vanished.” (*Critical Study*)
54. Footnote 15 of the *Critical Study*: “The words of Consecration as inserted in the context of the *Novus Ordo* can be valid by virtue of the minister’s intention. They could also not be valid because they are no longer so *ex vi verborum* (by the force of the words themselves), or, more precisely, by virtue of the *modus significandi* they had in the Mass up to the present time.” Father Manuel Piñon O.P. explains, “In the *Novus Ordo* Mass there is no longer the Consecration of the Eucharistic offerings of the Bread and Wine. *The new liturgical instruction that was given for its celebration, cautions that the priest has no consecrational role to perform, but only a narrative role as he relates the episode of the Lord’s Last Supper*” ... hence, “The Catholic Mass ceased to be valid when it was no longer a sacrifice ... There is no more transubstantiation of the sacramental offerings into the Body and Blood of Christ. The bread and wine remain as before bread and wine. There is no more Real Presence in the eucharistic species anymore. This is the *Novus Ordo* Mass ... I do not say that each and every *Novus Ordo* Mass is simply and automatically invalid, but that, from its nature and the explanation and instruction given for its celebration, and from the historical and situational circumstances attending it, chances are that the celebrating priest does not remedy the limitations I have mentioned and

- therefore that the Mass is invalid whereas it is not so with the Latin Tridentine Mass, which has more guarantees that it is validly celebrated.”
55. “Even for the *mysterium fidei* in the Consecration form, we have evidence from Innocent III, explicitly, at the inauguration of the Archbishop of Lyons. I don’t know if the majority of liturgy reformers know about this fact. St. Thomas Aquinas in a special article justifies this *mysterium fidei*. And the Council of Florence explicitly confirmed the *mysterium fidei* in the Consecration form.” – Cardinal Stickler in *The Latin Mass*, Summer 1995, p. 17. Cardinal Stickler cites *Summa Theol.* III, q. 78, a. 3, ad 5; and DS 1352.
- 55a. *Summa Theol.*, III, q. 76, a. 1.
- 55b. *Lect. in Io.6, lect. 6.*
56. cf. Rama P. Coomaraswamy, *The Problems with the Modern Mass*, TAN Books, 1990, p. 7. — In flagrant contempt of the decree of Paul VI in *Missale Romanum*, the vernacular missals of the New Rite have translated *pro multis* as ‘for all’.
57. “The use of an altar is to make sacrifice upon it; the use of a table is to serve men to eat upon.” – *The Works of Thomas Cranmer*, (London: Parker Society), v. 2 p. 254.
58. In the revised General Instruction the Mass is called *Mass or Lord’s Supper* in order to appear less Protestant than the original name that appeared in the original *General Instruction: Cena dominica sive Missa (Lord’s Supper or Mass)*.
59. Pope Pius XII, *Mediator Dei* (1947) [35-36].
60. *Rev. Greg.*, 1937, p. 79.
61. J.P.M. van der Ploeg O.P.
62. In Volume Three of his *Liturgical Revolution*, Davies devotes an entire chapter to the comparison between Cranmer’s 1549 *Mass or Lord’s Supper* and Bugnini’s 1969 *Mass or Lord’s Supper*. Davies observes, “The extent to which the *Novus Ordo* departs from the theology of the Council of Trent can be best gauged by comparing the prayers which the *Consilium* removed from the liturgy to those removed by Cranmer. The coincidence is not simply striking, it is horrifying.”
63. Hilaire Belloc, *Cranmer*, Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1931, p. 246.
64. T.M. Parker, an Anglican theologian:
- “The first Prayer Book of Edward VI could not be convicted of overt heresy, for it was adroitly framed and contained no express denial of pre-Reformation doctrine. It was, as an Anglican scholar put it, ‘an ingenious essay in ambiguity,’ purposely worded in such a manner that the more conservative could place their own construction upon it and reconcile their consciences to using it, while the Reformers would interpret it in their own sense and would recognise it as an instrument for furthering the next stage of the religious revolution.” — cf. T.M. Parker, *The English Reformation to 1558*, Oxford, 1950, p. 130. Quoted by Davies in *Cranmer’s Godly Order*, The Angelus Press, Dickinson, Texas, 1987.
65. Quoted in: Rama P. Coomaraswamy, *The Problems with the New Mass*, TAN Books, 1990, p. 18.
66. “a major conquest of the Catholic Church” — Who it was that conquered the Church becomes clear when one considers what the Protestants have said about the post-conciliar liturgical reform:

Dr. J.W. Charley: “Much of what Küng has called ‘the valid demands of the Reformers’ has now been met by the Church in the new Eucharistic Prayers ...”

Le Monde, 10 Sept. 1970, a French Protestant wrote: “If one takes account of the decisive evolution in the Eucharistic liturgy of the Catholic Church, ... of the expunging of the idea that the Mass is a sacrifice ... then there is no further justification for the Reformed Churches forbidding their members to assist at the Eucharist in a Catholic church.”

67. *Notitiae*, no. 92, April 1974, p.126.
68. Carlo Braga, *Il ‘Proprium de Sanctis’*, *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 84 (1970), 419.
69. *Faith*, Jan. 1977, p.15.
70. *L’Osservatore Romano* (English edition), Dec. 24, 1984.
71. *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, June 1978.
72. *A Crown of Thorns*, London 1974, p. 367.
73. Quoted by Archbishop Lefebvre, in *The Angelus*, June 1995.
74. “*Tres Abhinc Annos* (TAA) constituted a veritable onslaught on sacred signs and gestures of reverence throughout the rite, even in the most central and sacred places ... forbidding the celebrant to make the supremely important genuflection to Our Lord at the instant He becomes present upon the altar. HOC EST ENIM CORPUS MEUM — there is no longer bread upon the altar, only the body of Christ. Dogma and piety demand an immediate act of reverence — but TAA forbids this.” — Michael Davies in *Pope Paul’s New Mass*, p. 41.
75. Pope Paul VI, *Discourse to the Lombard Seminary in Rome*, December 7, 1968.
76. Louis Bouyer, *The Decomposition of Catholicism*, p.1.
77. Klaus Gamber, *The Reform of the Roman Liturgy*, p. 102. Cardinal Ratzinger has referred to Mons. Gamber as “the great German liturgist” in the preface to the second German edition of the cited work.
78. cf. Cornelio Fabro, *La problematica della teologia contemporanea*.
79. *Critical Study*.
80. “In conferring the sacraments, as also in the consecration in the Mass, it is never allowed to adopt a probable course of action as to validity and to abandon the safer course. The contrary was explicitly condemned by Pope Innocent XI [1670-1676]”. — Fr. Henry Davis, S.J., *Moral and Pastoral Theology*, v.3, p. 27.
81. *Critical Study*.
82. “The Christian faithful have the right to receive assistance from the sacred pastors out of the spiritual goods of the Church, especially the word of God and the sacraments.” — (can. 213)
83. James A. Coriden, Thomas J. Green, Donald E. Heintschel; *THE CODE OF CANON LAW, A Text and Commentary*, Commissioned by THE CANON LAW SOCIETY OF AMERICA, p. 147.
84. Canon 214. *The Catholic Encyclopedia* relates that the customary rite of Milan and Liguoria was the Ambrosian Rite: “*De Rebus Ecclesiasticis*, (xxii), speaking of various forms of the Mass says: ‘Ambrosius quoque Mediolanensis episcopus tam missae quam ceterorum dispositionem officiorum suae ecclesiae et aliis Liguribus ordinavit quae et usque hodie in Mediolanensi tenentur ecclesia’ (Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, also arranged a ceremonial for the Mass and other offices for his own church and for other parts of Liguoria, which is still observed in the Milanese Church). In the Eleventh Century Pope Nicholas II, who in 1060 had tried to abolish the Mozarabic Rite, wished also to

- attack the Ambrosian and was aided by St. Peter Damian, but he was unsuccessful, and Alexander II, his successor, himself a Milanese, reversed his policy in this respect.” Pope Alexander II, Dom Gueranger relates (*Institutiones Liturgiques*), reversed the decree of Nicholas II and declared it to be unjust.
85. “the Christian faithful ... have the right, if they are summoned to judgement by a competent authority, that they be judged in accord with the prescriptions of the law to be applied with equity.” – can. 221, § 2.
 86. “Presbyteri, quamvis pontificatus apicem non habeant et in exercenda sua potestate ab Episcopis pendeant, cum eis tamen *sacerdotali honore coniuncti sunt et vi sacramenti Ordinis*, ad imaginem Christi, summi atque æterni Sacerdotis (cf. Hebr. 5, 1-10; 7, 24; 9, 11-28), *ad Evangelium prædicandum fidelesque pascendos et ad divinum cultum celebrandum consecrantur, ut veri sacerdotes Novi Testamenti*” — *Lumen Gentium*, 28
 87. James A. Provost, *The Hierarchical Constitution of the Church*, in Coriden et al., *Op. cit.*, p. 258.
 88. “Power in the Church is that of Christ, which means *all* power in the Church is truly vicarious, even that which the pope and bishops exercise properly as ordinaries (i.e. in virtue of their offices)”. *Ibid.*, p. 261.
 89. Canon 846 — “The ministers are to celebrate the sacraments according to their own rite.” Custom establishes our traditional Roman Rite as our ‘own rite’: it belongs to us as our sacred patrimony.
 90. “Lex tyrannica cum non sit secundum rationem non est simpliciter lex sed magis est quædam perversitas legis” — St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, I^a II^æ, q. 92, a. 1, ad 4.
 “A tyrannical law, through not being according to reason, is not a law, absolutely speaking, but rather a perversion of law”.
 91. If the pope should ever cease to be in proper communion with the Church, a situation which Pope Innocent III acknowledges can take place, then necessity would create a doubt of law regarding the applicability of canon 1382, thereby bringing about the supplied faculties envisaged in canon 144. Canon 844, § 2 provides supplied faculties for priests to absolve “whenever necessity requires or genuine spiritual advantage suggests”. Therefore the opinion of Mons. Piamonte is false, according to which “it is only in danger of death that Lefebvre priests can validly absolve in the Archdiocese of Jaro”. Canon 976 does indeed grant the faculty to absolve to all priests when there is danger of death, but it does not expressly state that the faculty is not supplied in other cases of necessity, hence, the provision of canon 10 is applicable. Piamonte’s conclusion reflects an extreme form of legalism, which is “a sickness in the system; it places greater value on the observance of formalities than on the granting of true justice.” (Coriden et al., p. 42) Mons. Piamonte quotes the first part of canon 966, which set forth the necessity of faculties for valid absolution, but he cleverly omits all mention of the second part of the canon, which states that “the priest can be given this faculty”, not only by the “competent authority” but also “by the law itself”, i.e. cann. 844 and 144.

Mons. Piamonte errs further when he says, “There can be no doubt that they (Mons. Lefebvre and the four priests) have incurred the automatic excommunication, because it is the Supreme Legislator himself who gives the interpretation of the law.” First of all, the Holy Father was not making a legislative

or judicial pronouncement: The expression “By my Apostolic Authority I declare the following” appears after the pope’s remarks about ‘excommunication’ and ‘schism’. It is not enough that the Supreme Legislator speaks, but he must also clearly indicate that he is acting in his capacity as legislator. Secondly, the Pope was not interpreting the law. No one has any doubt about the meaning of the law, nor does anyone contest the pope’s understanding of it. The Holy Father simply overlooked the provisions of cann. 1323 and 1324. He did not clarify the meaning of the law, but only manifested his ignorance of it.

92. Coriden et al., *Op. cit.*, p. 42, 43: “There is a legal system, but it is not able to protect an important value or to give redress when injustice has been inflicted. Then the value is upheld on ethical or religious grounds, and the law is sentenced (so to say) to pay respect to that value and accommodate itself to that value. Authentic equity, therefore, comes into play when the law is unable to uphold a value important to the community.”

Epieikeia – “Its scope is to bring a corrective into the application of the law whenever it is so warranted. In other terms, the very nature of every law is such that, in some cases, it may grant imperfect justice only, or no justice at all. Then *epieikeia* must enter. ‘The reason is that all law is universal, but about some things it is not possible to make a universal statement which shall be correct’ (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1137b 12-14).”

93. J. Carberry, *The Juridical Form of Marriage*, Washington D.C., Catholic University of America, 1934, p. 142, 155.

94. “lex aeterna” St. Thomas explains, “est divina sapientia in quantum est directiva omnium actuum et motionum”. — *Summa Theol.* I^a II^{ae}, q. 93, a. 1.

“the eternal law is nothing else than the type of Divine Wisdom, as directing all actions and movements.”

95. “The state of necessity and consequently the right of necessity, is one of the arguments put forward by Our Lord Jesus Christ when He wanted to demonstrate the innocence of His disciples, accused by the Pharisees of having broken the laws of the sabbatical rest by gathering ears of grain to allay their hunger: Jesus recalls the episode of David who, driven by the necessity of hunger, ‘entered in the House of God, and ate the Loaves of Proposition, which was allowed to be eaten by the priests alone and not by him or those with him: (Matt. 12:3-4).” — *Neither Schismatic nor Excommunicated*, p. 14.

96. The canonical tradition of the Church makes it clear that wherever possible a Catholic minister is always to be preferred to a non-Catholic one. The *BAC* commentary plainly demonstrates that such has indeed been the constant canonical tradition of the Church. Canon 2261 of the 1917 Code established the principle that a non-Catholic minister cannot licitly administer sacraments, except when certain conditions are present, principally (*maxime*) when there is no Catholic minister available. The Holy Office ruling of August 20, 1671, establishes that schismatics may not baptise unless in case of necessity, *and in the absence of another Catholic person*.

97. *Tridentine Profession of Faith*: “Apostolicas et ecclesiasticas traditiones reliquiasque eiusdem Ecclesiae observationes et constitutiones firmissime admitto et amplector.”

98. “schisma autem per se opponitur unitati ecclesiasticae caritatis.” — St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, II-II, q. 39, a. 1, ad 3.

- “Schism is essentially opposed to the unity of ecclesiastical charity.”
99. The motion, therefore, approved in the Plenary Assembly of CBCP on Jan. 9, 1995, namely: “That the bishops are not giving, and where it has been given, they are withdrawing the faculties in the ministry from those who do not recognise the legitimacy of the ‘*Novus Ordo Missæ*’, and that they are forbidding the people from participating in Masses celebrated by priests who deny the legitimacy of the ‘*Novus Ordo Missæ*’,” is *schismatic ex toto genere suo*.
100. “Porro subesse Romano Pontifici omni humanæ creaturæ declaramus, dicimus, definimus et pronuntiamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis.” — Bulla *Unam Sanctam*, 18. Nov. 1302.
- “Furthermore, we declare, say, define and pronounce to every human creature that it is absolutely necessary for the salvation of every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.”
101. “obediendiæ opponitur 1. *per excessum* servilitas seu obodientia indiscreta, quæ scil. etiam in illicitis obtemperat ...” — Dominicus Prümmer, *Manuale Theologiæ Moralis*, vol. II, p. 457.
102. St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.* II-II, q. 104, a. 5.
103. Innocent III, *De Consuetudine*, quoted by Torquemada.
104. Paul VI, *La Croix*, Sept. 4, 1970.
105. Quoted by Pope Gregory XVI in *Mirari vos*.
106. Rev. L.J. Fallon, C.M., S.T.D., in *The Concise Catholic Dictionary*, 1943, p. 334.
107. DS 1501.
108. DS 3006.
109. Athanasius, *ad Serapion*, 1:28.
110. DS 3020, *Dogmatic Constitution Dei Filius* Vatican Council I. The Constitution quotes St. Vincent of Lérins, *Commonitorium primum* 23, n. 3.
111. Discourse of Dec. 8, 1950.
112. Pius XII, May 13, 1942.
113. DS 3043.
114. Pope Gregory XVI, *Mirari vos*, August 15, 1832.
115. *L’Osservatore Romano*, August 7, 1979.
116. *Mirari vos*, Aug. 15, 1832.
117. CIC 1983, c. 204, § 2. This canon quotes the Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen Gentium* [8] of the Second Vatican Council.
118. “Corde credimus et ore confitemur unam Ecclesiam non hæreticorum, sed sanctam Romanam, catholicam et apostolicam, extra quam neminem salvari credimus.” **Innocentius III** [Ex ep. “*eius exemplo*” ad archiepisc. Terraconensem, 18. Dec. 1208. DS 792]
119. “Sacrosancta Romana ecclesia, Domini et Salvatoris nostri voce fundata ... firmiter credit, profitetur et prædicat, nullos intra catholicam Ecclesiam non existentes, non solum paganos, sed nec Iudæos aut hæreticos atque schismaticos, æternæ vitæ fieri posse participes; sed in ignem æternum ituros, ‘qui paratus est diabolo et angelis eius’ [Mt. 25:41], nisi ante finem vitæ eidem fuerint aggregati: tantumque valere ecclesiastici corporis unitatem, ut solum in ea manentibus ad salutem ecclesiastica sacramenta proficiant, et ieiunia, eleemosynæ ac cetera pietatis officia et exercitia militiae christianæ præmia æterna parturiant. Neminemque, quantascumque eleemosynas fecerit, etsi pro Christi nomine

- sanguinem effuderit, posse salvari, nisi in catholicæ Ecclesiæ gremio et unitate permanserit.” [Ex Bulla *Cantate Domino*, 4 Febr. 1441.] (DS 1351)
120. *Aux sources du renouveau*, p. 259 — Msgr. Wojtyla is quoting *Unitatis Redintegratio* almost verbatim: “*Proinde ipsæ Ecclesiæ et Communitates seiunctæ, etsi defectus illas pati credimus, nequaquam in mysterio salutis significatione et pondere exute sunt. Iis enim Spiritus Christi uti non renuit tamquam salutis mediis, quorum virtus derivatur ab ipsa plenitudine gratiæ et veritatis quæ Ecclesiæ catholicæ concredita est.*” The same heretical proposition is found in Pope John Paul II’s Encyclical, *Ut Unum Sint* (no. 10), and in the New Catechism, the *Catéchisme de L’Église Catholique*, n. 819, which states: “*L’Esprit du Christ se sert de ces Églises et communautés ecclésiales comme moyens de salut dont la force vient de la plénitude de grâce et de vérité que le Christ a confiée à l’Église Catholique.*”
121. cf., Fr. Johannes Dörmann, *Pope John Paul II’s Theological Journey to the Prayer Meeting of Religions in Assisi*. One of the many quotations reproduced and analysed by Father Johannes Dörmann in his withering critique of the heretical ecclesiology of Cardinal Wojtyla reads: “the love of Christ ... the love of the Bridegroom, goes out to every human being ...” The love of the Bridegroom is the Saviour’s love for His Church. Karol Wojtyla’s ecclesiology places the entire human race within the Church.
122. cf. Rev. Daniel Le Roux, *Peter Lovest Thou Me?*, p. 43.
123. cf. Denz.-Schön. 1524, 3869; *The Catechism of Pope St. Pius X*, Apostles Creed, Q. 29; The Sacraments, Q. 17.
124. *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, 1923, p. 179.
125. *L’Osservatore Romano*, 6 May 1980.
126. *L’Osservatore Romano*, 8 July 1980; *Ut Unum Sint*: the “*Saints come from all the Churches and Ecclesial Communities which gave them entrance into the communion of salvation.*” [n. 84]
127. cf. Johannes Dörmann, *Der theologische Weg Johannes Pauls II. Zum Weltgebetstag der Religionen in Assisi*.
128. *Aux sources du renouveau*, p. 12.
129. On Jan. 12, 1966, Pope Paul VI declared: “In view of the pastoral character of the Council, it has avoided pronouncing in an extraordinary way dogmas carrying the note of infallibility.” In his closing discourse to the Second Vatican Council, a document which pertains to the official acts of the Council, Pope Paul categorically declared that the Council did not define any doctrine — “*Nunc vero animadvertere iuvat, Ecclesiam per suum magisterium, quamvis nullum doctrinæ caput sententiis dogmaticis extraordinariis definire voluerit, nihilominus circa plurimas questiones cum auctoritate doctrinam proposuisse suam ...*” — ***Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum II Constitutiones, Decreta, Declarationes; Documenta***, p. 1072.
130. Fallon, *Op. cit.*, p. 209.
131. Francisco Marin-Sola, O.P., *The Homogeneous Evolution of Catholic Dogma*, Manila, 1988, p. 288.
132. Dogmatic Constitution *Dei Filius*, Vatican Council I:
 “Porro fide divina et catholica ea omnia credenda sunt, quæ in verbo Dei scripto vel tradito continentur et ab ecclesia sive sollemni iudicio sive ordinario et universali magisterio tamquam divinitus revelata credenda proponuntur.” — DS 3011.

133. Mgr. Marcel Lefebvre, *Op. cit.*, p. 133. That they knew *exactly* what they were doing has been well demonstrated and elaborated by Father John McKee in his exposé on contemporary Modernism, *The Enemy Within the Gate*. The quotation attributed by Archbishop Lefebvre (and Father McKee) to Father Schillebeeckx is not entirely accurate. Father Wiltgen elaborates: “As early as the second session, wrote Father Schillebeeckx, he had told a *peritus* on the Theological Commission that he was sorry to see in the schema what appeared to be the moderate liberal view on collegiality; he personally was in favour of the extreme liberal view. The *peritus* had replied, ‘We are stating this in a diplomatic manner, but after the Council we shall draw the conclusions implicit in it.’ Father Schillebeeckx had called such tactics ‘unfair.’ During the last month of the third session, he wrote, bishops and theologians had continued to speak of collegiality ‘in a sense which was not expressed anywhere in the schema.’ He pointed out that the minority had understood well that the vague phraseology of the schema would be interpreted after the Council in the strongest sense. The minority, he explained, had not been against collegiality as literally formulated in the text, but had been opposed ‘to that orientation full of hope which the majority of the Theological Commission wished to convey through the text ...’ The majority, he said, had resorted to a deliberately vague and excessively diplomatic parlance, and he recalled that even Father Congar had much earlier objected to a conciliar text’s being ‘deliberately ambiguous.’ (cf. Father Ralph Wiltgen, *The Rhine flows into the Tiber*, p. 242.)
134. Pope John Paul II’s charge against Mons. Lefebvre is pure calumny, since the Archbishop’s elaboration of his notion of tradition was simply a recitation of the Church’s doctrine as set forth by the magisterium.

In Chapter XVII of his book, *An Open Letter to Confused Catholics*, Mgr. Lefebvre briefly elaborates on the topic, “What is Tradition?” “Tradition,” says Mgr. Lefebvre, “is defined as the Deposit of Faith transmitted by the Magisterium down through the centuries. This deposit is what has been given to us by revelation; that is to say, the Word of God entrusted to the Apostles and transmitted unfaithfully by their successors.”

The Archbishop elaborates further:

But now they want to get everyone inquiring, searching, as if we had not been given the Creed, or as if Our Lord had not come to bring us the Truth once and for all. What do they claim to discover with all this inquiry? Catholics upon whom they would impose these “questionings,” after having made them “abandon their certainties,” should remember this: the deposit of Revelation concluded at the death of the last Apostle. It is finished and cannot be touched until the end of time. Revelation is irreformable. The First Vatican Council re-stated this explicitly: “for the doctrine of faith which God has revealed has not been proposed, like a philosophical invention, to be perfected by human ingenuity; but has been delivered as a divine deposit to the Spouse of Christ (the Church) to be faithfully kept and infallibly declared.”

135. Pope St. Pius X, *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*, n. 13.
 136. S. Ioannes Chrysostomus, *In epistulam II ad Thessalonicenses homiliae*.
 137. Cardinal Pericle Felici was the General Secretary of the Council.
 138. Mgr. Marcel Lefebvre, *An Open Letter to Confused Catholics*, p.134.
 139. A very revealing observation of Mgr. Lefebvre is found on p. 126 of his *Open*

Letter to Confused Catholics: “Pere Congar, one of the artisans of the reforms, spoke likewise: ‘The Church has had peacefully its October Revolution.’ Fully aware of what he was saying, he remarked ‘The Declaration on Religious Liberty states the opposite of the *Syllabus*.’”

Fr. Franz Schmidberger comments, “Vatican II’s Declaration on Religious Freedom, *Dignitatis Humanae*, ... constitutes a direct denial of Catholic teaching on the sovereignty of the Word Incarnate over society. Thus we cannot but describe it as blasphemous, extremely detrimental to the dignity of the Church and harmful to the salvation of souls.” (*The Episcopal Consecrations of 30 June 1988*, p. 9) Is he correct in this assessment?

Pope Gregory XVI teaches in *Mirari vos*, “From this poisoned source of Indifferentism is derived that false and absurd maxim or rather that delirium, that liberty of conscience must be procured and guaranteed for everyone.” Indifferentism of the state is condemned: “For men living together in society are under the power of God no less than individuals are, ... since the chief duty of all men is to cling to religion in both its teaching and practice — not such religion that they may have a preference for, but the religion which God enjoins ... it is a public crime to act as though there were no God ... it is a sin not to have care for religion ...” (Pope Leo XIII, *Immortale Dei*) “To separate the state from the Church is a premise utterly false, a very pernicious error ... Thus, the Roman Pontiffs have, in season and out, refuted and condemned the doctrine of separation of Church and State ...” (Pope St. Pius X, *Vehementer*, 11 Feb. 1906)

The Magisterium of the Church categorically condemns both the liberty of conscience for the individual as well as Indifferentism on the part of the state. The post-conciliar Church aggressively promotes both these heresies. This is well demonstrated by Archbishop Lefebvre in *They have Uncrowned Him, An Open Letter to Confused Catholics* as well as in *Peter Lovest Thou Me*, by Father Daniel Le Roux. The heresy of *Dignitatis Humanae* deserves an entire study of its own, and therefore cannot be dealt with here at length.

140. Fr. Peter R. Scott, *Ut Unum Sint and Infallibility*, in *The Angelus*, October 1995, p. 26. On Jan. 12, 1966, Pope Paul VI declared: “In view of the pastoral character of the Council, it has avoided pronouncing in an extraordinary way dogmas carrying the note of infallibility.” In his closing discourse to the Second Vatican Council, a document which pertains to the official acts of the Council, Pope Paul categorically declared that the Council did not define any doctrine — “*Nunc vero animadvertere iuvat, Ecclesiam per suum magisterium, quamvis nullum doctrinae caput sententiis dogmaticis extraordinariis definire voluerit, nihilominus circa plurimas quaestiones cum auctoritate doctrinam proposuisse suam ...*” * — *Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum II Constitutiones, Decreta, Declarationes; Documenta*, p. 1072.

141. “Insuper declarat ius ad libertatem religiosam esse revera fundatum in ipsa dignitate personae humanae, qualis et verbo Dei revelato et ipsa ratione cognoscitur. Hoc ius personae humanae ad libertatem religiosam in iuridica

* “But now it is helpful to point out that the Church, while she wanted no principle of doctrine to be defined with extraordinary dogmatic pronouncements, she nevertheless proposed her doctrine with authority about many questions ...”

- societatis ordinatione ita est agnoscendum, ut ius civile evadat.” — *Dignitatis Humanae* [2]
142. “Haec Vaticana Synodus declarat personam humanum ius habere ad libertatem religiosam.” — *Dignitatis Humanae* [2].*
143. “Huiusmodi libertas in eo consistit, quod omnes homines debent immunes esse a coercitione ex parte sive singulorum sive cætuum socialium et cuiusvis potestatis humanæ, et ita quidem ut in re religiosa neque aliquis cogatur ad agendum contra suam conscientiam neque impediatur, quominus iuxta suam conscientiam agat privatim et publice, vel solus vel aliis consociatus, intra debitos limites.” — *Dignitatis Humanae* [2].**
144. cf. Father Ralph Wiltgen, *The Rhine flows into the Tiber*, p. 161.
145. *Dignitatis Humanae* [2].
146. “Præterea ad libertatem religiosam spectat, quod communitates religiosæ non prohibeantur libere ostendere singularem suæ doctrinæ virtutem in ordinanda societate ac tota vivificanda activitate humana.” — *Dignitatis Humanae* [4]
147. “Communitates religiosæ ius etiam habent, ne impediatur in sua fide ore et scripto publice docenda atque testanda.” — *Dignitatis Humanae* [4]
148. “Potestas igitur civilis, cuius finis proprius est bonum commune temporale curare, religiosam quidem civium vitam agnoscere eique favere debet, sed limites suos excedere dicenda est, si actus religiosos dirigere vel impedire præsumat.” — *Dignitatis Humanae* [3].
149. “Si attentis populorum circumstantiis peculiaribus uni communitati religiosæ specialis civilis agnitio in iuridica civitatis ordinatione tribuitur, necesse est ut simul omnibus civibus et communitatibus religiosis ius ad libertatem in re religiosa agnoscat et observetur.” — *Dignitatis Humanae* [6]
150. “Indoli ergo fidei plene consonum est ut, in re religiosa, quodvis genus coercionis ex parte hominum excludatur.” *Dignitatis Humanae* [10] Et similiter: “Immo haec doctrina de libertate radices habet in divina Revelatione, quapropter eo magis a Christianis sancte servanda est.” — *Dignitatis Humanae* [9]
151. From this heretical premise it follows: “Hinc sequitur nefas esse potestati publicæ, per vim vel metum aut alia media civibus imponere professionem aut reiectionem cuiusvis religionis, vel impedire quominus quisquam communitatem religiosam aut ingreditur aut relinquit.”*** Against these errors St. Thomas teaches: “Alii vero sunt infideles qui quandoque fidem

* “This Vatican Synod declares that the human person has the right to religious liberty.” — *Dignitatis Humanae* [2], **Documents of Vatican II**, Austin P. Flannery, O. P.

** “Freedom of this kind means that all men should be immune from coercion on the part of individuals, social groups and every human power so that, within due limits, nobody is forced to act against his convictions nor is anyone to be restrained from acting in accordance with his convictions in religious matters in private or in public, alone or in associations with others.” — *Dignitatis Humanae* [2], **Documents of Vatican II**, Austin P. Flannery, O. P.

*** “From this it follows that it is wrong for a public authority to compel its citizens by force or fear or any other means to profess or repudiate any religion or to prevent anyone from joining or leaving a religious body.” — *Dignitatis Humanae* [6], **Documents of Vatican II**, Austin P. Flannery, O. P.

susceperunt et eam profitentur: sicut hæretici vel quicumque apostatæ. Et tales sunt etiam corporaliter compellendi ut impleant quod promiserunt et teneant quod semel susceperunt.” (II^aII^{ae}, q. 10, a. 8)

“Humanum regimen derivatur a divino regimine, et ipsum debet imitari. Deus autem, quamvis sit omnipotens et summæ bonus, permittit tamen aliqua mala fieri in universo, quæ prohibere posset, ne, eis sublatis, maiora bona tollerentur, vel etiam peiora mala sequerentur. Sic igitur et in regimine humano illi qui præsentur recte aliqua mala tolerant, ne aliqua bona impediatur, vel etiam ne aliqua mala peiora incurrantur: sicut Augustinus dicit, in II *de Ordine: Aufer meretrices de rebus humanis, turbaveris omnia libidinibus.* Sic igitur, **quamvis infideles in suis ritibus peccent, tolerari possunt** vel propter aliquod bonum ex eis provenit, vel propter aliquod malum quod vitatur.

“Et hoc autem quod Iudei ritus suos observant, in quibus olim præfigurabatur veritas fidei quam tenemus, hoc bonum provenit quod testimonium fidei nostræ habemus ab hostibus, et quasi in figura nobis repræsentatur quod credimus. Et ideo in suis ritibus tolerantur. – **Aliorum vero infidelium ritus, qui nihil veritatis aut utilitatis afferunt, non sunt alicqualiter tolerandi, nisi forte ad aliquod malum vitandum:** Scilicet ad vitandum scandalum vel dissidium quod ex hoc posset provenire, vel impedimentum salutis eorum, qui paulatim, sic tolerati, convertuntur ad fidem. Propter hoc enim etiam **hæreticorum et paganorum ritus aliquando Ecclesia toleravit,** quando erat magna infidelium multitudo.” (II^aII^{ae}, q. 10, a. 11)

“Human government is derived from the Divine government, and should imitate it. Now although God is all-powerful and supremely good, nevertheless He allows certain evils to take place in the universe, which He might prevent, lest, without them, greater goods might be forfeited, or greater evils ensue. Accordingly in human government also, those who are in authority, rightly tolerate certain evils, lest certain goods be lost, or certain greater evils be incurred: thus Augustine says (*De Ordine* ii. 4): *Aufer meretrices de rebus humanis, turbaveris omnia libidinibus.* Hence, though unbelievers sin in their rites, they may be tolerated, either on account of some good that ensues therefrom, or because of some evil avoided. Thus from the fact that the Jews observe their rites, which, of old, foreshadowed the truth of the faith which we hold, there follows this good — that our very enemies bear witness to our faith, and that our faith is represented in a figure, so to speak. For this reason they are tolerated in the observance of their rites.

“On the other hand, the rites of other unbelievers, which are neither truthful nor profitable are by no means to be tolerated, except perchance in order to avoid an evil, e.g. the scandal or disturbance that might ensue, or some hindrance to the salvation of those who if they were unmolested might gradually be converted to the faith. For this reason the Church, at times, has tolerated the rites even of heretics and pagans, when unbelievers were very numerous.”

152. cf. below: *Syllabus*, n. 79.

153. “Presertim libertas religiosa in societate plene est cum libertate actus fidei christianæ congrua.” — *Dignitatis Humanæ* [9].

154. “Der im Evangelium geforderte Glaube ist und bleibt ein freiwilliger Akt des Menschen. Der Mensch kann ihn verweigern. Es liegt in der Freiheit des Menschen, ob er sich bekehrt oder nicht. Die Predigt Jesu und der Apostel

- zielt auf die freie Willensentscheidung. Es geht also zunächst um das Problem der Willensfreiheit des Menschen. Der Freie Wille des Menschen ist überhaupt die Voraussetzung dafür, daß wir von einem sittlichen und religiösen Handeln des Menschen und von einer sittlichen Ordnung reden können. Insofern hat der Mensch auch Christus und Gott gegenüber die Freiheit, das Evangelium, Gott selbst und seine Gebote abzulehnen oder anzunehmen. Diese Freiheit ist auch für den freien Akt der Bekehrung konstitutiv und bleibt im Evangelium unangetastet. Aber hat der Mensch Gott gegenüber auch das *sittliche Recht* der Verweigerung, wenn er die Pflicht hat, das Gebot Gottes zu befolgen? Zum Dekalog gehören auch die ersten drei Gebote. Wie der Mensch zwar die Freiheit, aber kein Recht hat, zu stehlen, zu morden, zu lügen oder die Ehe zu brechen, so hat er auch die Freiheit, aber nicht das Recht, die ersten Gebote des Dekalogs zu liquidieren. Hätte er ein Recht dazu, Gäbe es auch kein Gericht. Ein derartiges Recht ist nicht 'Bestandteil der Offenbarung'. Es ist demnach auch nicht aus der Offenbarung zu begründen." (cf. Johannes Dörmann, *Der theologische Weg Johannes Pauls II. zum Weltgebetstag der Religionen in Assisi*, II/I (12.2), *Der Sendungsauftrag der ökumenischen Kirche und das Recht auf Religionsfreiheit*, Senden, Westf. 1992, pp. 160-170.
155. *Syllabus of the Principal Errors of Our Time*, published together with the Encyclical *Quanta Cura*, Dec. 8, 1864.
156. Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, *They Have Uncrowned Him*, p. 73-74. Mons. Lefebvre provides extensive examples of papal condemnations of errors later taught by Vatican II. Lefebvre even quotes Yves Congar, later made Cardinal by Pope John Paul II, who admitted that *Dignitatis Humanae* says, "quite the opposite from the *Syllabus*" (*Documentation Catholique*. 1704, 789).
157. **St. Alphonsus de Liguori**: "Hoc primum praeceptum iubet dari Deo debitum cultum et honorem" – *Institutio Catechistica, Pars prima de praeceptis decalogi, Cap. I, de primo praecepto: non habebis Deos alienos coram me*.
 "Certum est hominem teneri ex lege naturali ad Deum per Fidem, Spem et Charitatem se convertere, et ideo elicere earum virtutum actus." *Opera Moralia, Lib. II, Tract. I, De Praecepto Fidei. cap. II*.
 "Ad primum praeceptum primo spectant virtutes theologicas, quae sunt Fides, Spes, et Charitas. (...) Fides definitur: *Est virtus theologica a Deo infusa, inclinans nos ad firmiter assentiendum ob divinam veracitatem omnibus, quae Deus revelavit, et per Ecclesiam nobis credenda proposuit.* (...) Itaque obiectum materiale Fidei (nimirum id quod credere debemus) praeceptum est Deus, et inde caetera omnia a Deo revelata, ut dicit S. Thomas: *Fides quae hominem divinae cognitioni coniungit per assensum, ipsum Deum habet sicut principale obiectum. Alia vero sicut consequenter adiuncta.* Obiectum autem formale (sive motivum quo debemus credere) est Dei veritas." – *Homo Apostolicus, Tractatus IV, Cap. I, De virtutibus theologalibus*.
- Pope St. Pius X**: "Con le parole del primo comandamento: *Non avrai altro Dio avanti di me*, Iddio ci ordina di riconoscere, di adorare, di amare e servire Lui solo, come nostro supremo Signore. Il primo comandamento si adempie col'esercizio del culto interno ed esterno. (...) Il primo comandamento ci proibisce l'idolatria, la superstizione il sacrelegio, L'eresia ed ogni altro peccato contro la religione." – *Catechismo Maggiore*, Roma, Tipografia Vaticana, 1905, p. 89.

“With the words of the First Commandment: Thou shalt not have strange gods before Me, God orders us to recognize, to adore, to love and to serve Him only, as our supreme Lord. The First Commandment is fulfilled with acts of adoration both internal and external ... The First Commandment prohibits us from doing idolatry, superstition and sacrilege, heresy and every sin against religion.” – *Catechismo Maggiore*.

The Catechism of the Ecclesiastical Provinces of Quebec, Montreal and Ottawa (1888): “The First Commandment of God is: *I am the Lord thy God, thou shalt not have strange gods before Me*. The first Commandment helps us to keep the great Commandment of the love of God, because it commands us to adore God alone. We adore God by faith, hope, and charity; and by the worship we give Him as Creator and Sovereign Master of all things.

“We break the first Commandment of God: ... by giving false worship to God; ... we sin against the first Commandment of God, when we sin against faith, hope, and charity.

“We sin against faith: 1. When we willfully doubt any revealed truth; 2. When we refuse to believe what God teaches us by His Church; 3. When we are ashamed to pass for a Christian, or when we formally deny our faith; 4. When we neglect to learn sufficiently the Christian doctrine.

“Heretics and infidels are they who refuse to believe what God teaches by His Church.” (pp. 82-83)

158. **St. Thomas de Aquino:** “Virtuti contrariatur vitium. Sed fides est virtus cui contrariatur infidelitas. Ergo infidelitas est peccatum. ... potest intelligi infidelitas secundum contrarietatem ad fidem: quia scilicet aliquis repugnat auditui fidei, vel etiam contemnit ipsam ... et in hoc perficitur ratio infidelitatis. Et secundum hoc infidelitas est peccatum.” – *Summa Theol.*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 10, a. 1.

Vice is opposed to virtue. Now faith is a virtue, and unbelief is opposed to it. Therefore unbelief is a sin... unbelief may be taken by way of opposition to the faith; in which sense a man refuses to hear the faith, or despises it, according to Isa. liii. 1: *Who hath believed our report?* It is this that completes the notion of unbelief, and it is in this sense that unbelief is a sin.”

St. Alphonsus: “Infidelitas generatim est triplex; *Prima* dicitur Negativa, secundum scilicet, qui nihil unquam de Fide audiverunt. Quæ non tam est peccatum, quam pœna peccati: quia, si fecissent quod in ipsis erat, Deus Fidem eis non abscondisset. *Secunda* dicitur Contraria, eorum scilicet, qui Fidem sibi sufficienter propositam vel contemnunt, vel ei contradicunt pertinaciter, ut Hæretici. *Tertia* dicitur Privativa, quod privative opponatur Fidei, & est culpabilis ignorantia, vel error circa res Fidei. *Thom. Sanch. Vasquez, Laym. c. 10.*” – *Opera Moralia*, Lib. II. Tract. I. *De præcepto Fidei.*, caput IV, *De Infidelitate et vitiis Fidei oppositis*. Dubium I.

159. “Ein derartiges Recht ist nicht ‘Bestandteil der Offenbarung’. Es ist demnach auch nicht aus der Offenbarung zu begründen.” (Such a right is not “part” of divine revelation. Thus it cannot be founded on that revelation.) – Johannes Dörmann, *Op. Cit.*, p. 163.
160. “Proinde ipsae Ecclesiæ et Communitates seiunctæ, etsi defectus illas pati credimus, nequaquam in mysterio salutis significatione et pondere exutæ sunt. Iis enim Spiritus Christi uti non renuit tamquam salutis mediis, quorum virtus

- derivatur ab ipsa plenitudine gratiæ et veritatis quæ Ecclesiæ catholicæ concredita est.” — *Unitatis Redintegratio* [3]
161. This false tenet of Ecumenism is entirely alien to the Christian Faith, and is of Jewish origin. The Eighteenth Century Jewish philosopher of Berlin, Moses Mendelssohn, explains: “Pursuant to the principles of my religion, I am not to seek to convert anyone who is not born according to our laws. This proneness to conversion, the origin of which some would fain tack on to the Jewish religion, is, nevertheless, diametrically opposed to it. Our rabbis unanimously teach that the written and oral laws which form conjointly our revealed religion are obligatory on our nation only. ‘Moses commanded us a law, even the inheritance of the congregation of Jacob.’ We believe that all other nations of the earth have been directed by God to adhere to the laws of nature, and to the religion of the patriarchs. Those who regulate their lives according to the precepts of this *religion of nature and of reason* are called virtuous men of other nations and are the children of eternal salvation. Our rabbis are so remote from Proselytomania, that they enjoin us to dissuade, by forcible remonstrances, everyone who comes forward to be converted. The Talmud says, ‘... proselytes are annoying to Israel like a scab.’” (*Memoirs of Moses Mendelssohn*, 1827, pp. 56, 57.
162. Archbishop Lefebvre, *An Open Letter to Confused Catholics*, p. 94.
163. “Corde credimus et ore confitemur unam Ecclesiam non hæreticorum, sed sanctam Romanam, catholicam et apostolicam, extra quam neminem salvari credimus.” Innocentius III, Ex ep. “*eius exemplo*” ad archiepisc. Terraconensem, 18. Dec. 1208.
164. St. Athanasius, *ad Serapion* 1:28.
165. Eugenius IV, Council of Florence (DS 1351).
- 166 “Quicumque vult salvus esse ante omnia opus est ut teneat Catholicam fidem, quam nisi quisque integram inviolatamque servaverit, absque dubio in æternum peribit.”
- “Whoever wishes to be saved must before all else adhere to the Catholic faith. He must preserve this faith whole and untarnished; otherwise he shall most certainly perish forever.”
167. “Fides quid tibi præstat? Vitam Æternam.” (Rite of Baptism).
- “What does Faith give you? Eternal life.”
168. Rite of Baptism, Roman Ritual.
169. *Catéchisme de L’Église Catholique*, n. 819: “*L’Esprit du Christ se sert de ces Églises et communautés ecclésiales comme moyens de salut dont la force vient de la plénitude de grâce et de vérité que le Christ a confiée à l’Église catholique.*”
170. “Christus ... Spiritum suum vivificantem in discipulos immisit et per eum Corpus suum quod est Ecclesia *ut universale salutis sacramentum constituit*”; *Lumen Gentium* 48.
171. Bonifatius VIII: “In hac eiusque potestate duos esse gladios, spirituales videlicet et temporalem, evangelicis dictis instruimur [*Provocatur ad Lc 22, 38 et Mt 26, 52*] ... Uterque est in potestate Ecclesiæ, spiritualis scilicet gladius et materialis. Sed is quidem *pro* Ecclesiæ, ille vero *ab* Ecclesiæ exercendus. Ille sacerdotis, is manu regum et militum, sed ad nutum et patientiam sacerdotis, oportet autem gladium esse sub gladio, et temporalem auctoritatem spirituali

subici potestati. ... Spiritualem et dignitate et nobilitate terrenam quamlibet præcellere potestatem, oportet tanto clarius nos fateri, quanto spiritualia temporalia antecellunt. ... Nam Veritati testante, spiritualis potestas terrenam potestatem instituere habet, et iudicare (Hugo a S. Vitore, *De sacramentis* 1b II c.4, PL 176, 418), ...” [ex Bulla “*Unam Sanctam*”, 18 Nov. 1302]

“And we are taught by evangelical words that in this power of his are two swords, namely spiritual and temporal. [Lk 22:38 and Mt. 26:52] ... Therefore, each is in the power of the Church, that is, a spiritual and a material sword. But the latter, indeed, must be exercised for the Church, the former by the Church. The former (by the hand) of the priest, the latter by the hand of kings and soldiers, but at the will and sufferance of the priest. For it is necessary that a sword be under a sword and that temporal authority be subject to spiritual power.... It is necessary that we confess the more clearly that spiritual power precedes any earthly power both in dignity and nobility, as spiritual matters themselves excel the temporal.... For, as truth testifies, spiritual power has to establish earthly power, and to judge if it was not good....”

Indifferentism of the state is condemned: “For men living together in society are under the power of God no less than individuals are, ... since the chief duty of all men is to cling to religion in both its teaching and practice, not such religion that they may have a preference for, but the religion which God enjoins ... it is a public crime to act as though there were no God ... it is a sin not to have care for religion ...” (Pope Leo XIII, *Immortale Dei*) “To separate the state from the Church is a premise utterly false, a very pernicious error ... Thus, the Roman Pontiffs have, in season and out, refuted and condemned the doctrine of separation of Church and State ...” (Pope St. Pius X, *Vehementer*, 11 Feb. 1906).

172. Quoted by Archbishop Lefebvre in: *Open Letter to Confused Catholics*.
173. Archbishop Lefebvre, *Liberalism*.
174. Encyclical Letter *Ut Unum Sint* of the Holy Father John Paul II, n. 65.
175. St. Augustine, *On the Visible and Invisible Church*, in Otto Karber, *Augustinus: Das Religiöse Leben*, München 1954, p. 249.
176. “Heretics are those of the baptised who obstinately refuse to believe some truth revealed by God and taught as an article of faith by the Catholic Church; for example, the Arians, the Nestorians and the various sects of Protestants.” — *Catechismo Maggiore*, Q. 228, p. 59.
177. Bonifatius VIII: “Unam sanctam Ecclesiam catholicam et ipsam apostolicam urgente fide credere cogimur et tenere, nosque hanc firmiter credimus et simpliciter confitemur, extra quam nec salus est nec remissio peccatorum ...” **Bulla “Unam Sanctam”, 18 Nov. 1302.**
- “With Faith urging us we are forced to believe and to hold the one, holy, Catholic Church and that, apostolic, and we firmly believe and simply confess this (Church) outside which there is no salvation nor remission of sin ...”
178. *The Catechism of the Council of Trent*: “And just as this one Church cannot err in faith or morals, since it is guided by the Holy Ghost; so, on the contrary, all other societies arrogating to themselves the name of *church*, must necessarily, because guided by the spirit of the devil, be sunk in the most pernicious errors, both doctrinal and moral.”
179. S. Augustinus: “non societate unius Ecclesiæ, vel unius fidei, sed societate solius nominis christiani in hoc mundo permiscentur bonis.” *Liber Quæst.*

Evang. in Matth., cap. 11.

180. “Formale autem obiectum fidei est veritas prima secundum quod manifestatur in Scripturis sacris et doctrinae Ecclesiae. Unde quicumque non inhæret, sicut infallibili et divinæ regulæ, doctrinae Ecclesiae, quæ procedit ex veritate prima in Scripturis sacris manifestata, ille non habet habitum fidei, sed ea quæ sunt fidei alio modo tenet quam per fidem.” St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, II^a II^æ, q. 5, a. 3.

“Now the formal object of faith is the First Truth, as manifested in Holy Writ and the teaching of the Church, which proceeds from the First Truth. Consequently whoever does not adhere, as to an infallible and Divine rule, to the teaching of the Church, which proceeds from the First Truth manifested in Holy Writ, has not the habit of faith, but holds that which is of faith otherwise than by faith.”

181. Merkelbach: “Communicatio cum infidelibus et hæreticis distinguitur duplex: 1) *Civilis*, ... 2) *Religiosa*, in rebus sacris ad religionem pertinentibus, uti sunt ritus, dogmata, sacrificia, orationes, etc., et in rebus mixtis quatenus ad religionem spectant, v.g. in ritu religioso matrimonii vel funerum. Hæc spectari potest sive *ex parte infidelium* et hæreticorum, sive *ex parte fidelium*, et ex utraque parte potest esse *activa aut passiva*.

“De communicatione infidelium et hæreticorum cum catholicis dicendum : Infideles et hæretici possunt *passive* assistere non solum prædicationi verbi Dei sed et aliis officiis cultus publici, *non* tamen *active* iis participare, quia id rectæ existimatur ut signum religiosæ unitatis. (...)

“De communicatione religiosa fidelium cum infidelibus aut acatholicis dicendum : Communicatio *Activa* seu participatio in ipsis sacris, scil. Cultus publici, est illicita, quia est implicita approbatio exercitii cultus et agnitio sectæ; *passiva* vero illicita est generatim, sed aliquando licita esse potest ob gravem rationem. Hinc: a) Si fiat cum *hæreticis* (vel schismaticis), ex iure naturali et ecclesiastico *per se et regulariter* est graviter illicita fidelibus ‘vel ob periculum perversionis in fide catholica, vel ob periculum participationis in ritu hæretico, vel ob periculum et occasionem scandali aut seductionis¹, vel ob speciem adhærensionis falsæ sectæ quam per se significat (Rom. 16:17; Tit. 3, 10). ...

c) Cum *infidelibus*, a fortiori est illicita, præsertim quod eorum cultus solet esse falsus et superstitiosus.

¹ Ita ex regula tradita missionariis a S.C. de P.F., 1729.” – Merkelbach, *Op. Cit.*, vol. I, pp. 581-584.

St. Alphonsus: “Infidelium, & hæreticorum, sacris non licet ita interesse, ut ei communicare censearis; alioquin licet, v. Gr. Ut quis spectet tamquam comœdiam, aut famulatum præstet politicum domino suo, exemplo Naaman Syri, de quo vide *Bec. Fil. Sanch. I. C. Laym. l. 2. t. I. c. II.*

“Si Princeps hæreticus mandet sub gravissima pœna omnibus subditis, adire conciones hæreticorum, etiamsi verbis dicat, se hac re aliud nihil exigere, quam obedientiam civilem, nec velle cogere ut a Fide discedant, cum tamen reipsa contrarium velle videatur (& hæc res ex se apta est Catholicos paulatim pervertere, & insuper conciliare auctoritatem hæresi, ac vilipensionem veræ fidei), non licet obedire. Atque ita bis rescriptis Anglis Pius V. Apud *Sanch. I. 2. c. 4. n. 27. Fill.; Azor. ll. cc.*” – *Opera Moralia*, Lib. II. Tract. I. *De præcepto*

Fidei, Caput III.

182. “Ieprosi ergo non absurde intelligi possunt, qui scientiam veræ fidei non habentes, varias doctrinas profitentur erroris ... Hi tamen vitandi sunt Ecclesiæ, ut, si fieri potest, longius remoti, magno clamore Christum interpellant” St. Augustinus, *Liber II quaest. Evang.*, cap. 40.
183. St. Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistula ad Trallianos* — “Ὁ ἐντὸς θυσιαστηρίου ὦν καθαρὸς· Ὁ δὲ ἐκτὸς θυσιαστηρίου ὦν οὐ καθαρὸς ἐστίν.”
184. St. Ignatius of Antioch, *Epistula ad Philadelphenses*.
185. St. Cyprianus, *De catholicae ecclesiae unitate*.
186. St. Athanasius, *Adv. Arianos orationes IV*.
187. *Ecclesia Dei* [4].
188. Dogmatic Constitution *Dei Filius*, (DS 3020). The Constitution quotes St. Vincent of Lérins, *Commonitorium primum* 23, n. 3.
189. *Mortaliū Animos*, n. 14.
190. *The Homogeneous Evolution of Catholic Dogma*, Francisco Marin-Sola, O.P., Manila, 1988; pp. 145-146.
191. Archbishop of Jaro, Iloilo, Philippines.
192. “Hæresis est error intellectus, et pertinax contra Fidem, in eo qui Fidem suscepit. ... Unde patet, ad Hæresim, ut et Apostasiam, duo requiri, 1. Iudicium erroneum, quod est ejus quasi materiale. 2. Pertinaciam; quae est quasi formale. Porro pertinaciter errare non est hic acriter, et mordicus suum errorem tueri; sed est eum retinere, postquam contrarium est sufficienter propositum: sive quando scit contrarium teneri a reliqua universali Christi in terris Ecclesia, cui suum iudicium præferat” – St. Alphonsus M. De Liguori, *Lib. II. Tract. I. De præcepto Fidei*. Dubium III.
193. *Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum II Constitutiones, Decreta, Declarationes; Documenta*, p. 1072.
194. Pope John Paul II’s defective understanding of the nature of the Church’s magisterium has greatly reinforced the false notion of the infallibility of Vatican II’s teachings. Father Dörmann comments on John Paul II’s Encyclical *Redemptor Hominis*: “the council is acclaimed as the voice of the Holy Ghost. This acclaim raises a self-professed pastoral Council, twenty years after the fact, to the highest conceivable theological status. It is declared a ‘super dogma,’ which it by no means is (cf. Ratzinger).” cf. Dörmann, *op. cit.* p. 72.
195. Bishop Emeritus of San Fernando, La Union, Philippines.
196. The term *Conciliar Church*, coined by Cardinal Giovanni Benelli, very aptly designates the heretical post-conciliar Modernist Church begotten by the Second Vatican Council.
197. It is not just I, but even the liberal adherents of the Conciliar Church who refer to the post-conciliar church as a “reformed church”. Father Richard P. McBrien, in *The Catholic Transcript* of June 21, 1996, wrote: “Opposition to this reformed liturgy and to the communal environment in which it occurs is, at root, opposition to the reformed church”.
198. Hubert Jedin, *Letter to the German Bishops*, in *The Latin Mass*, Nov.-Dec.1994, p. 26.
199. S. Hieronymus: “*Abominatio desolationis* intelligi potest et omne dogma perversum: quod cum viderimus stare in loco sancto, hoc est in Ecclesia.” **Liber IV, Comment. in cap. XXIV Matthei.**
200. “For the fathers of the fourth council of Constantinople, adhering to the ways of

the former ones, published this solemn profession: ‘Our first salvation is to guard the rule of right faith.’ (Vatican Council I, Dogmatic Constitution *Pastor Aeternus*, DS 3066.)

201. St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, II^a II^{ae}, q. 5, a. 3, ad 2.
202. Pope John XXII (1316-1334) professed the false teaching that the souls of the blessed do not behold the Beatific Vision until after the Last Judgement.
203. It is not my intention to bring the Holy Father into contempt. St. Thomas explains that “if the faith were endangered, a subject *must* rebuke his prelate even publicly ... Hence Paul, who was Peter’s subject, rebuked him in public, on account of the imminent danger of scandal concerning the faith, and, as the gloss of Augustine says in Gal. 2:11, Peter gave an example to superiors, that if at any time they should happen to stray away from the straight path, they should not disdain to be reproved by their subjects.” This sort of correction “is within the competency of everyone in respect of any person.” – St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, II^a-II^{ae}, q. 33, a. 4.
204. “... it is to be observed”, says the *Roman Catechism*, “that by the word *hell* is not here meant the sepulchre, as some have not less impiously than ignorantly imagined; for in the preceding Article we learnt that Christ the Lord was buried, and there was no reason why the Apostles, in delivering an Article of Faith, should repeat the same thing in other and more obscure terms.”
205. The proposition that “there was ... the heavenly glorification of His soul from the very moment of His death”, is heretical. The *Roman Catechism* explains that in the Article ‘He descended into hell’, “we profess that immediately after the death of Christ His soul descended into hell, and dwelt there as long as His body remained in the tomb; and also that the one Person of Christ was at the same time in hell and in the sepulchre.”
206. “... qui etiam pro salute humani generis in ligno crucis passus et mortuus, descendit ad infernos, resurrexit a mortuis et ascendit in caelum: **sed descendit in anima**, et resurrexit in carne ...” – *Conc. Lateranense IV* 1215, Innocentius III [*Definitio contra Albigenses aliosque haereticos.*] (DS 801)
- “... who, for the salvation of the human race, having suffered on the wood of the Cross and died, descended into hell, arose from the dead and ascended into heaven. But **He descended in soul**, and He arose in the flesh ...”
207. Quod anima Christi per se non descendit ad inferos, sed per potentiam tantum. [*Conc. Senonense* (1140) *Errores Petri Abaelardi*] (DS 738)
208. “Non constat fuisse in anima Christi inter homines degentis scientiam, quam habent beati seu comprehensores.” Condemned error in *Decretum S. Officii*, 5. Iunii 1918 (DS 3645).
- Roman Catechism*: “For God gave not to Him, as to others adorned with holiness and grace, His Spirit by measure, as St. John testifies (Jn. 3:34), but poured into His soul the plenitude of all graces so abundantly that *of His fullness we all have received.*”
209. *A Manual of Instructions in Christian Doctrine*, Provost Wenham, W.J.B.; Richards D.D.; James Carr, Domestic Prelate to His Holiness; London, 1908, pp. 58-59.
210. This is the teaching of the universal and ordinary Magisterium. Some further examples:

“The fifth article of the *Creed* teaches us: that the soul of Jesus Christ, sepa-

rated as it was from the body, went to the Limbo of the holy Fathers, and on the third day it was united again to His body, never to be separated from it again. ... By *hell* is here intended the limbo of the holy Fathers which is the place where the souls of the just were kept while they waited for the redemption of Jesus Christ.” — *Catechismo Maggiore promulgato da San Pio X*, Roma, 1905, *Tipografia Vaticana*, pp. 35-36.

“When Jesus died His soul departed from His body. But His Godhead remained united both to His soul and to His body.

“The soul of Jesus went down to the souls of the good men who had died, and were waiting for their redemption. Among these were the souls of Adam and Eve, of the patriarchs and prophets, and of John the Baptist. They had not as yet gone to heaven, because heaven was not open since Adam’s sin. Now Jesus proclaimed that they were saved.

“The place where the souls of the good were is called hell in the Creed. This is because long ago the word hell meant the kingdom of the dead. This is not the same as the hell of the damned, so it has also another name and is called ‘Limbo’.” — *Catholic Catechism*, Manila, 1961, p. 85.

“After Christ’s death His soul descended into hell. The hell into which Christ’s soul descended was not the hell of the damned, but a place or state of rest called Limbo, where the souls of the just were waiting for Him.” — *Baltimore Catechism*, Baltimore 1885, p. 18.

“Jesus Christ’s soul, separated from His body, descended into hell, that is to say, into Limbo, where the souls of the just since the creation of the world, were detained. ... Jesus Christ descended into Limbo, to display His power, and to impart the fruits of His Passion to the souls of the just imprisoned there. ... While Jesus Christ’s soul was in Limbo, His body was in the Holy Sepulchre.” — *The Catechism of the Ecclesiastical Provinces of Quebec, Montreal and Ottawa*, 1888, p.19.

211. Innocent III, *Sermo 4*. – Pope John Paul II has fallen into *objective heresy*. That alone does not make him a formal heretic. Subjective or *formal* heresy, i.e. the *sin* of heresy which is present when one obstinately denies or doubts what he knows to be the official teaching of the Magisterium, is required for one to be considered a formal heretic. Such a one, if he were pope would cease to be pope: “If ever a pope, as a private person, should fall into heresy, he would at once fall from the pontificate.” – St. Alphonsus Liguori, *Oevres Completes*. 9:232.

“A Pope who is a manifest heretic automatically ceases to be pope and head, just as he ceases automatically to be a Christian and a member of the Church. Wherefore, he can be judged and punished by the Church. This is the teaching of all the ancient Fathers who teach that manifest heretics immediately lose all jurisdiction.” – St. Robert Bellarmine, *De Romano Pontifice*, II.30.

The Canon Law Society of America Commentary: “Communion becomes a real issue when it is threatened or even lost. This occurs especially through heresy, apostasy and schism. Classical canonists discussed the question whether a pope, in his private or personal opinions, could go into heresy, apostasy or schism.” The footnote refers to S. Sipos, *Enchiridion Iuris Canonici*, 7th ed. (Rome: Herder, 1960) “cites Bellarmine and Wernz in sup-

port of his position; this view, however, is termed ‘antiquated’ by F. Cappello, *Summa Iuris Canonici* (Rome: Pontificia Universitas Gregoriana, 1961), 297.”

The *Commentary* continues, “If he were to do so in a notoriously and widely publicised manner, he would break communion and, according to an accepted opinion, lose his office ipso facto (c. 194 par. 1, n. 2). Since no one can judge the pope (c. 1404) no one could depose a pope for such crimes, and the authors are divided as to how his loss of office would be declared in such a way that a vacancy could then be filled by a new election.” – Coriden et al., *Op. cit.*, p. 272.

212. “When the Arian poison had contaminated not only a limited area, but the whole world, almost all the bishops of the Latin Church fell into heresy. Forced by violence or deceived by guile. It was like a fog fallen upon the spirits and hiding which road to take. In order to be safe from this contagious plague, the true disciples of Christ had to prefer the ancient beliefs rather than all the false novelties.” – St. Vincent of Lérins.

213. St. Vincent of Lérins, † ca. 445 a.d.

214. *Religieux et Clercs contre Dieu*, Paris, 1975, p. 12.

215. *The Decomposition of Catholicism*, London, 1970, p. 99.

216. Klaus Gamber, *The Reform of the Roman Liturgy*, New York: Roman Catholic Books, 1993, p. 109.

217. *Ibid.* p. 114.

218. “Ut autem a *sacrosancta Romana Ecclesia* ceterarum Ecclesiarum matre et magistra *tradita* ubique amplectantur omnes et observent, ne ... alias quam iuxta Missalis a Nobis editi formulam decantetur aut recitetur ...”

“Let all everywhere adopt and observe *what has been handed down by the Holy Roman Church*, the Mother and Teacher of the other churches, and let *Masses not be sung or read according to any other formula than that of this Missal published by Us.*”

219. A. Tanquerey, *Synopsis Theologiae Dogmaticae, de SS. Eucharistia*, 880. 2^o ***De forma super calicem pronuntianda.***

220. Aertnys and Damen, *Theologia Moralis*, vol. II, Lib. VI. Tract. IV. Pars I. Caput II. Articulus II. n^o. 120.

221. Giuseppe Frassinetti, *Compendio della Teologia Morale di S. Alfonso M. de’ Liguori*, vol. 1, n. 338.

222. Nicholas Halligan O.P., *The Sacraments and their Celebration*, New York, 1986, p. 67.