

RJMI's Retractions (5-2026)

By Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	3
REGARDING MY ERRORS	3
<hr/>	
BASIC DOGMA I DENIED.....	4
REGARDING RELIGIOUS COMMUNION WITH NOMINAL CATHOLICS.....	4
<i>The heresy that Catholics are allowed to be in religious communion with nominal Catholics</i>	4
I held this heresy and have since abjured from it on 11/21/1999.....	4
REGARDING MY 2013 ABJURATION	4
<hr/>	
DEEPER DOGMAS I DENIED	5
REGARDING THE GLORIFICATION OF IMMORALITY	5
<i>The heresy that the notorious glorification of immorality is not heresy</i>	5
REGARDING THE SUSPICION OF HERESY	5
REGARDING HERETICS.....	6
<i>My different opinions on heretics</i>	6
REGARDING THE HOLY EUCHARIST.....	6
<i>The heresy that the Holy Eucharist is Christ's living human nature and thus contains his soul.....</i>	6
<i>The heresy that each species of the Holy Eucharist is Christ's body and blood</i>	6
<i>The heresy that the reception of only one species of the Holy Eucharist is necessary for salvation.....</i>	6
<i>The heresy and sacrilege that Catholics are allowed to receive only one species during Mass.....</i>	7
<i>The heresy that infants must not receive the Holy Eucharist.....</i>	7
<i>The heresy that it is sacrilegious for laymen to receive the Body of Christ in the hand.....</i>	7
<i>The heresy that it is sacrilegious for laymen to stand while receiving Holy Communion</i>	7
REGARDING CONFIRMATION	8
<i>The heresy that Catholic infants must not receive confirmation</i>	8
<i>The heresy that Catholics must not receive confirmation until sometime after they have the use of reason.....</i>	8
REGARDING CONFESSION	8
<i>The heresy that perfect contrition remits mortal sins when a priest is available to confess to</i>	8
<i>The heresy that the faithful must or should re-confess their remitted sins in the confessional</i>	8
<i>The heresy that the mortal sins that God remitted when a priest was not available to confess to must be re-confessed to a priest when one becomes available</i>	9
REGARDING CATECHUMENS	9
<i>The heresy that catechumens, those preparing to enter the Catholic Church, are not Catholic</i>	9
REGARDING CANONIZATIONS	9
<i>The heresy that canonizations are infallible</i>	9
REGARDING THE BIBLE	10
<i>The heresy that the Clementine Vulgate contains no errors.....</i>	10
REGARDING CONCEPTION	10
<i>The heresy that life begins at conception</i>	10
REGARDING OFFICEHOLDERS	11
<i>The heresy that non-Catholics can hold offices in the Catholic Church</i>	11
REGARDING INFANTS BAPTIZED OUTSIDE THE CATHOLIC CHURCH	11
<i>The heresy that infants baptized outside the Catholic Church are Catholic</i>	11

REGARDING SINS OF OMISSION	11
<i>The heresy that a sin of omission does not make the offender equally guilty</i>	11
REGARDING FAVORING, DEFENDING, OR SUPPORTING HERETICS IN THEIR HERESY	11
<i>The heresy that the favoring, defending, or supporting of idolaters or heretics in their idolatry or heresy does not make the offender equally guilty as long as he does not believe in the idolatry or heresy</i>	11
REGARDING THE MINISTER’S SACRAMENTAL INTENTION	12
<i>The heresy that it is a non-heretical error and thus not heresy to believe that the minister must interiorly intend to confect the sacraments for them to be valid</i>	12
REGARDING THE ORDINARY MAGISTERIUM	12
<i>The heresy that ordinary magisterium teachings are not dogmas but are error free doctrines</i>	12
<i>The heresy that the ordinary magisterium was not promulgated and used before the solemn magisterium</i>	13
REGARDING SCHOLASTICISM (AKA THEOPHILOSOPHY).....	13
<i>The heresy that scholasticism (aka Theophilosophy) is not heretical</i>	13
<hr/>	
ERRORS REGARDING ALLOWABLE OPINIONS THAT I HELD	14
REGARDING THE JUSTIFICATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT ELECT.....	14
<i>The error that the Old Testament elect were justified in vow and thus not partially justified</i>	14
REGARDING REVELATIONS THAT CONSTITUTE THE OBJECT OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH	14
<i>The error that revelations that constitute the object of the Catholic faith ended with the death of the last apostle</i>	14
REGARDING DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE.....	14
<i>The error that a Catholic spouse can never divorce and remarry if both spouses are alive</i>	14
REGARDING SEXUAL PLEASURE	15
<i>The error that all sexual pleasure, and thus between a husband and his wife, is sinful or a fault</i>	15
REGARDING THE TERM ACTUAL SINS.....	15
<i>The error that voluntary sins should be called actual sins</i>	15
REGARDING THE TERM ACTUAL GRACE	15
<i>The error that assisting grace should be called actual grace.....</i>	15
REGARDING ST. MARY MAGDALEN	16
<i>The error that St. Mary Magdalen was an adulterer and prostitute</i>	16
REGARDING BAPTISM OF DESIRE AND BLOOD	16
<i>The error that baptism of desire or blood for catechumens is heretical.....</i>	16
<hr/>	
ERRORS REGARDING FACTUAL INFORMATION.....	17
REGARDING ANTIPOPE, INVALID COUNCILS, AND INVALID CANON LAWS.....	17
REGARDING ANTIPOPE, ANTI-CHURCH FATHERS, SCHOLASTICS, THEOLOGIANS, AND ANTI-SAINTS	17
<i>The Anti-Church Fathers and others before the 8th century</i>	17
<i>The scholastics and others after the 8th century until 1250.....</i>	17
<i>Heretical or apostate antipopes before Innocent II in 1130</i>	18
<i>All of the theologians since 1250</i>	18
REGARDING FALSE SEERS AND APPARITIONS	18
REGARDING SACRAMENTALS	19
<i>The Brown Scapular is heretical because of its message and promises.....</i>	19
REGARDING FORTY-DAY LENT FAST	19
<i>The error that it was heretical to not do a Forty-Day Fast during Lent</i>	19

Introduction

Regarding My Errors

“The just (which I hope I am) is first accuser of himself.”
(Proverbs 18:17)

Some of my errors were allowable opinions and thus not heretical. Hence, one is free to agree with my new or old allowable opinion or not.

However, some of my errors were heretical, in which I denied one basic dogma and some deeper dogmas.

- The denial of a basic dogma places the faithful outside the Catholic Church as either a formal heretic if his denial is culpable, or as a catechumen if it is not culpable.
- The denial of a deeper dogma only places the faithful outside the Catholic Church as formal heretics if their ignorance is culpable. Therefore, the non-culpable doubt or denial of a deeper dogma by the faithful does not place them outside the Catholic Church because they are only material heretics and thus not guilty of the mortal sin of heresy.

(Regarding heresy and culpability, see my [Catechism Excerpt 1: On Revelation, Infallibility, Dogmas, Heresy, and Schism](#). Also see my article [On RJMI Works](#).)

Basic Dogma I Denied

Regarding Religious Communion with Nominal Catholics

The heresy that Catholics are allowed to be in religious communion with nominal Catholics

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it on 11/21/1999.

- It is a basic dogma that Catholics are forbidden to knowingly be in any kind of religious communion with non-Catholics, which thus includes nominal Catholics. Hence Catholics are forbidden to pray with them, to receive any sacraments from them, to administer any sacraments to them, to attend their sermons or religious meetings or conferences, to read their religious works without a dispensation, and to participate in their Masses or other religious services in their non-Catholic churches or anywhere else.¹

I believed in the heresy that a Catholic is allowed to be in religious communion with nominal Catholics, as long as he does not believe in their heresies or idolatries. The last nominal Catholics I was knowingly in religious communion with were Fr. Blanco and the members of the church he said Mass at in Durango, Colorado, which was around 9/1999. I abjured from this heresy on 11/21/1999.² That is when I entered the Catholic Church, after many years of searching.

Since then, I have inculpably doubted or denied deeper dogmas and thus was only a material heretic; and hence, I was still a member of the Catholic Church.

Regarding my 2013 Abjuration

In the abjuration I took on 7/26/2013, I listed four basic dogmas I doubted or denied. But three were deeper dogmas, regarding the favoring, defending, or supporting of heretics in their heresy. They are listed in this retraction as deeper dogmas that I denied.³ The only one listed in my 2013 abjuration that was a basic dogma was my heresy that Catholics are allowed to be in religious communion with nominal Catholics, as stated above. Hence, I have removed my 2013 abjuration from my website.

¹ See my article [Dogmatic Ban on Religious Communion with Heretics](#).

² See my refutation [Against Fr. Mario Blanco](#).

³ See in this book "Regarding Favoring, Defending, or Supporting Heretics in Their Heresy," p. [11](#).

Deeper Dogmas I Denied

Regarding the Glorification of Immorality

The heresy that the notorious glorification of immorality is not heresy

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it.

- It is a basic dogma that Catholics who promote, support, or allow the desecration of places with images against morals are guilty of the mortal sin of immorality. But it is a deeper dogma that if these desecrations are notorious, then they are also heretics and thus not Catholic for denying a moral dogma.⁴

I held the basic dogma that the desecration of places with images against morals is immoral. But I denied the deeper dogma that these desecrations are also heretical if they are notorious.

This deeper dogma is related to the deeper dogma that the doubt or denial of a moral dogma is heresy and not just immoral. For example, a baptized man who commits adultery is guilty of a mortal sin of immorality. But if he not only commits adultery but also believes adultery is acceptable or not a sin, then he is guilty not only of a mortal sin of immorality but also a mortal sin of heresy and thus is a formal heretic for denying a moral dogma; which, in this example, is the basic dogma of the natural law that adultery is evil and sinful.

Regarding the Suspicion of Heresy

- It is a deeper dogma that Catholics who are suspect of heresy, which includes the grave suspicion of heresy, are not to be considered heretics or presumed heretics.

I believed in the heresy that Catholics who are gravely suspect of heresy are presumed heretics. That is not true. I have since abjured from this heresy.

Suspicion of heresy, which includes the grave suspicion of heresy, means that there is a suspicion (some probability but no certain evidence) that a person believes in heresy. Hence an apparent Catholic who is suspect of heresy may or may not believe in heresy and thus may or may not be a heretic, unlike formal heretics and material heretics in which there is certain evidence that they believe in heresy and thus are heretics. Because there is no certain evidence of heresy regarding those who are suspect of heresy, they must be considered Catholic until their guilt or innocence is proved. If their guilt is proved, then it is certain that they are heretics. If their innocence is proved, then it is certain that they are not heretics. The primary way a Catholic who is suspect of heresy removes the suspicion is by condemning the heresy he is suspect of.

⁴ See my book "The Desecration of Catholic Places. ...[Places notoriously desecrated with images of immorality are non-Catholic places.](#)"

Regarding Heretics

My different opinions on heretics

Over time in studying the Catholic faith and the many errors held by nominal Catholic theologians, I had different opinions regarding formal heretics and material heretics in relation to their guilt and how they should be treated. I finally came to the only conclusion and thus the truth regarding this matter, as recorded in my [Catechism Excerpt 1: On Revelation, Infallibility, Dogmas, Heresy, and Schism](#). So any opinions I held that are not in line with this article, I no longer hold.

Regarding the Holy Eucharist

The heresy that the Holy Eucharist is Christ's living human nature and thus contains his soul

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it.

- It is a deeper dogma that the Holy Eucharist is the dead body and blood and living divine nature of Jesus Christ and thus does not contain his human soul.⁵

The heresy that each species of the Holy Eucharist is Christ's body and blood

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it.

- It is a deeper dogma that during Transubstantiation, the bread is turned into Christ's body and the wine is turned into his blood. Hence the Holy Eucharist under the appearance of bread is only the body of Christ and not his blood. And the Holy Eucharist under the appearance of wine is only Christ's blood and not his body.⁶

The heresy that the reception of only one species of the Holy Eucharist is necessary for salvation

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it.

- It is a deeper dogma that the reception of both species of the Holy Eucharist is necessary for salvation: the eating of Christ's body under the appearance of bread and the drinking of Christ's blood under the appearance of wine.

⁵ See my book "Some Dogmas and Heresies regarding the Holy Eucharist and Confirmation: [Jesus' Dead Body, Dead Blood, and Living Divine Nature Are in the Holy Eucharist](#)."

⁶ See my book "Some Dogmas and Heresies regarding the Holy Eucharist and Confirmation: [Jesus' Body Appears as Bread and His Blood as Wine](#)."

I believed in the heresy that only one species, the reception of Christ's body under the appearance of bread, was necessary for salvation, because I believed in the heresy that it also contained his blood. I have since abjured this heresy.⁷

The heresy and sacrilege that Catholics are allowed to receive only one species during Mass

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it.

- It is a deeper dogma that during Mass, Catholics must receive both species, Christ's body under the appearance of bread, and Christ's blood under the appearance of wine.

Pope St. Fabian, 3rd century: "We decree that on each Lord's day, the oblation of the altar should be made by men and women in bread and wine..."

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

Even though some Catholics received only one species of the Holy Eucharist under certain circumstances (such as at home when sick), they nevertheless had to receive both species at least once in their lifetime to be saved. And if they attended Mass, they had to receive both species.⁸

The heresy that infants must not receive the Holy Eucharist

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it.

- It is a deeper dogma that Catholic infants must receive the Holy Eucharist.⁹

The heresy that it is sacrilegious for laymen to receive the Body of Christ in the hand

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it.

- It is a deeper dogma that Catholics are allowed to receive Christ's body under the appearance of bread in their hands.¹⁰

The heresy that it is sacrilegious for laymen to stand while receiving Holy Communion

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it.

- It is a deeper dogma that Catholics are allowed to stand when receiving Holy Communion.

⁷ See my book "Some Dogmas and Heresies regarding the Holy Eucharist and Confirmation: [The heresy that the reception of only one species is necessary for salvation \(one-species heresy\), 13th century.](#)"

⁸ See my book "Some Dogmas and Heresies regarding the Holy Eucharist and Confirmation: [On the reception of one species by the sick – in context.](#)"

⁹ See my book "Some Dogmas and Heresies regarding the Holy Eucharist and Confirmation: [Catholic Infants Must Receive the Holy Eucharist.](#)"

¹⁰ See my book "Mass Deceptions: [Communion in the hand.](#)"

To kneel or stand when receiving Holy Communion is a disciplinary matter that can change. The Eastern Rite Catholics stand when receiving Holy Communion.

Regarding Confirmation

The heresy that Catholic infants must not receive confirmation

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it.

- It is a deeper dogma that Catholic infants must receive the sacrament of confirmation as soon as possible.¹¹

The heresy that Catholics must not receive confirmation until sometime after they have the use of reason

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it.

- It is a deeper dogma that all Catholics, infants included, must receive the sacrament of confirmation as soon as possible after they are baptized.¹²

Regarding Confession

The heresy that perfect contrition remits mortal sins when a priest is available to confess to

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it.

- It is a deeper dogma that venial sins of the faithful can be remitted without confessing them to a priest. But it is a deeper dogma that their mortal sins can only be remitted by a priest if one is available to confess to, and thus they cannot be remitted by perfect contrition. If perfect contrition remitted their sins before confession, then this would undermine the sacrament of penance. However, perfect contrition, as well as imperfect contrition, remits mortal sins only when a priest is not available in the foreseeable future. Hence, God does not punish penitent Catholics by making it impossible for their mortal sins to be remitted for want of a Catholic priest to confess to.¹³

The heresy that the faithful must or should re-confess their remitted sins in the confessional

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it.

- It is a deeper dogma that the faithful must not re-confess their remitted sins in the confessional. However, for spiritual direction, the faithful can seek counsel from

¹¹ See my book "Some Dogmas and Heresies regarding the Holy Eucharist and Confirmation: [All the faithful, even infants, must receive confirmation as soon as possible after baptism.](#)"

¹² See my book "Some Dogmas and Heresies regarding the Holy Eucharist and Confirmation: [The law of not confirming until 7 years old is heretical and harmful](#); and [The law of not confirming until after 7 years old is even more heretical and harmful.](#)"

¹³ See my "Profession of Faith for the Days of the Great Apostasy: ...[On perfect and imperfect contrition.](#)," and see my book "Sacraments without a Priest: [The Sacrament of Penance without a Priest.](#)"

a priest in the confessional regarding remitted sins. Hence it is a heretical and harmful law to tell the faithful that they must or should re-confess to a priest in the sacrament of penance their sins that have already been remitted. It is an affront to God's mercy, as if God did not really remit their sins; or if he did, he still holds them accountable. It is also a scandal to the faithful by making them think their sin was not remitted or only partially remitted; or worse, their sins were remitted but God will always remember them and always hold their sins against them.¹⁴

The heresy that the mortal sins that God remitted when a priest was not available to confess to must be re-confessed to a priest when one becomes available

I held this heresy but have since abjured from it.

- It is a deeper dogma that the mortal sins God remitted when a priest was not available to confess to must not be re-confessed to a priest when one becomes available, for the reasons given in the preceding section.¹⁵ But the mortal sins the faithful commit when a Catholic priest is available must be confessed to the priest for them to be remitted.

Regarding Catechumens

The heresy that catechumens, those preparing to enter the Catholic Church, are not Catholic

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it.

- It is a deeper dogma that catechumens, those who are preparing to enter the Catholic Church, are Catholic.¹⁶

Regarding Canonizations

The heresy that canonizations are infallible

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it.

- It is a deeper dogma that canonizations are not infallible.

What follows is an excerpt from my book *Canonizations Are Not Infallible*. I am in the process of revising this book, and thus it is not on my website:

During the canonization process when judging and declaring a person to be a saint, the pope does not teach but judges. He is judging the sanctity of a person. The pope cannot infallibly judge

¹⁴ See my book "Sacraments without a Priest: [The Sacrament of Penance without a Priest](#)", and my "Profession of Faith for the Days of the Great Apostasy: ...[The heresy of re-confessing remitted sins](#)."

¹⁵ See in this book "The heresy that the faithful must or should re-confess their remitted sins in the confessional," p. 9.

¹⁶ See my article "Catechumens, Religious Communion, and RJMI's Former Heresies: [1\) Heresy: Catechumens are not Christians and thus not Catholic](#)."

that a living or dead person is sanctified because that person may have secretly embraced heresy or secretly committed some other mortal sin, even if just by thought:

“Who can understand sins? From my secret ones cleanse me, O Lord.” (Ps. 18:13)

“Prove me, O God, and know my heart. Examine me and know my paths. And see if there be in me the way of iniquity, and lead me in the eternal way.” (Ps. 138:23-24)

“For I am not conscious to myself of anything, yet I am not hereby justified, but he that judgeth me is the Lord.” (1 Cor. 4:4)

The only infallible judgment a pope can make regarding the condition of a person’s soul is that a person is not in a state of grace when the person’s original sin or mortal sin is notorious. Those notoriously guilty of original sin are pagans, apostate Jews, Moslems, etc. Those notoriously guilty of mortal sin are those whose mortal sins and guilt are known to the public. Not only the pope but also all Catholics can infallibly make these same judgments and are bound to when the situation presents itself. This type of judgment is known as a factual judgment and is infallible because it deals with the violation of dogmas of faith or morals. But factual judgments cannot be made regarding the sanctity of a person because that person may have concealed his mortal sin from others.

Hence men cannot have infallible certainty that a canonized saint is truly a saint, unless he is referred to as a saint in the Bible. The most certainty that one can have that a canonized saint that is not mentioned in the Bible is a saint is a moral certainty, which means one is certain based upon all of the available evidence but not infallibly certain because of the possibility of hidden evidence or motives that prove the person could not be a saint.

The moral certainty that a canonized saint is a saint is based upon all of the available evidence that shows that the apparent saint held the Catholic faith, led a holy life, bore good fruits, and did miracles. However, there is always the possibility of hidden evidence and motives that would prove the person to be a heretic or immoral and hence not a saint. And thus the miracles attributed to this apparent saint were from the Devil or based on false testimony.

Regarding the Bible

The heresy that the Clementine Vulgate contains no errors

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it.

- It is a deeper dogma that the Clementine Vulgate contains errors, including heresies.¹⁷

Regarding Conception

The heresy that life begins at conception

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it.

- It is a deeper dogma that life does not begin at conception; first the body is formed, then, after some time, the soul is created in its body.¹⁸

¹⁷ See my book [On the Clementine Vulgate’s Errors and On Heretical Commentaries](#).

Regarding Officeholders

The heresy that non-Catholics can hold offices in the Catholic Church

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it.

- It is a deeper dogma that non-Catholics cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church.¹⁹

Regarding Infants Baptized Outside the Catholic Church

The heresy that infants baptized outside the Catholic Church are Catholic

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it.

- It is a deeper dogma that infants baptized outside the Catholic Church are not Catholic. And, hence, if they die as such, they are damned to Gehenna.²⁰

Regarding Sins of Omission

The heresy that a sin of omission does not make the offender equally guilty

I held the heresy that sins of omission only make the offenders suspect of guilt.

- It is a deeper dogma that sins of omission make the offenders share equally in the sin or sinner they do not condemn.²¹

Regarding Favoring, Defending, or Supporting Heretics in Their Heresy

The heresy that the favoring, defending, or supporting of idolaters or heretics in their idolatry or heresy does not make the offender equally guilty as long as he does not believe in the idolatry or heresy

I held this heresy because I believed they were only guilty of the grave suspicion of idolatry or heresy. I have since abjured this heresy. But I always held the basic dogma that if they also believe in the idolatry or heresy, then they are idolaters or heretics.

- It is a deeper dogma that a so-called Catholic who favors, defends, or supports idolaters or heretics in their idolatry or heresy shares equally in their guilt and thus is guilty of idolatry or heresy, even if he does not believe in the idolatry or heresy. Hence he is a nominal Catholic idolater or heretic.

Even though the Fourth Lateran Council was invalid and heretical, it teaches the truth in this regard:

¹⁸ See my book *Life Begins in the Womb: [The Dogma That the Body Is Conceived First and Then after Some Time the Soul Is Created in Its Body](#).*

¹⁹ See my book *[Non-Catholics Cannot Hold Offices in the Catholic Church](#).*

²⁰ See my book "Salvation Dogma and Related Topics: [Baptized Non-Catholic Infants and Children](#)."

²¹ See my book *[Sins of Omission](#).*

Invalid and heretical *Fourth Lateran Council*, 1215 AD: “We decree that those who give credence to the teachings of heretics, as well as those who receive, defend, or patronize them, are excommunicated.”

This dogma was held and practiced by the Catholic Church from AD 33 until modern heretical laws replaced this dogma by making the offenders only gravely suspect of idolatry or heresy. And thus, according to this heretical law, the offenders did not share equally in the guilt of the idolaters or heretics.

Beware of those who refer to disciplinary laws that ban Catholics from defending or supporting idolaters or heretics in their material needs and apply it to the dogmatic law that bans Catholics from defending or supporting them in their idolatry or heresy, in spiritual things.

In the former case, it is a disciplinary law that Catholics who defend or support idolaters or heretics in their material needs (such as by giving them food or shelter) are to be punished if the law says so. But because this is a disciplinary law, it can be abolished or modified depending on the circumstances. Hence it is not intrinsically sinful for Catholics to support idolaters or heretics in their material needs.

However in the latter case, nominal Catholics who defend or support idolaters or heretics in their idolatry or heresy always share equally in their guilt and thus are idolaters or heretics because this is a *dogmatic* law which thus cannot be abolished or modified.

Regarding the Minister’s Sacramental Intention

The heresy that it is a non-heretical error and thus not heresy to believe that the minister must interiorly intend to confect the sacraments for them to be valid

I always believed this was an error, but I did not believe it was a heretical error and thus believed it was an allowable opinion. I have since abjured from this heresy.

- It is a deeper dogma that to validly confect a sacrament the minister must intend to do as the Catholic Church does by using a valid rite, valid form, valid matter, and acting serious, which is known as the exterior intention. Hence only his exterior intention matters and thus his interior intention is of no consequence.

Therefore, it is heresy to believe the interior intention opinion, which states that for validity the minister must interiorly intend to confect the sacraments. According to this heresy, no one can be certain that he received a sacrament; such as, baptism, confession, Holy Orders, and the Holy Eucharist.²²

Regarding the Ordinary Magisterium

The heresy that ordinary magisterium teachings are not dogmas but are error free doctrines

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it.

²² See my book [The Minister’s Sacramental Intention](#).

- It is a deeper dogma that the teachings of the unanimous consensus of the apostles and other Church Fathers on faith and morals are dogmas of the ordinary magisterium.²³

The heresy that the ordinary magisterium was not promulgated and used before the solemn magisterium

I held this heresy and have since abjured from it.

- It is a deeper dogma that the ordinary magisterium (the unanimous consensus of the apostles and other Church Fathers on faith and morals) was promulgated and used before the solemn magisterium (papal infallibility) and that both were promulgated on Pentecost Day in AD 33. Hence, on Pentecost Day the dogma of the ordinary magisterium was first promulgated and then the ordinary magisterium promulgated the dogma of the solemn magisterium, of papal infallibility.²⁴

At one time I held the opposite—that the solemn magisterium was first promulgated and used before the ordinary magisterium.

Regarding Scholasticism (aka Theophilosophy)

The heresy that scholasticism (aka Theophilosophy) is not heretical

I believed that scholasticism was not heretical and was good. I have since abjured from this heresy. After studying it for some time, I discovered that it is vain, sinful, harmful, evil, and heretical.

- It is a deeper dogma that scholasticism (aka Theophilosophy) is heretical because it glorifies philosophy either by using the philosophical methods or terminologies, or by glorifying pagan philosophers or pagan philosophies. This heresy is also part of the heresy of the Hellenization of Christianity.²⁵

²³ See my article [History of the Solemn and the Ordinary Magisterium](#), and my “Catechism Excerpt 1: On Revelation, Infallibility, Dogmas, Heresy, and Schism: [The ordinary magisterium](#).”

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ See my book *The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics: ...[The Ways That Philosophy or Mythology Are Glorified](#)*.

Errors regarding Allowable Opinions that I Held

Regarding the Justification of the Old Testament Elect

The error that the Old Testament elect were justified in vow and thus not partially justified

I held the allowable opinion that the Old Testament elect were justified in vow.

- I now hold the allowable opinion that the Old Testament elect were partially justified.²⁶

Regarding Revelations that Constitute the Object of the Catholic Faith

The error that revelations that constitute the object of the Catholic faith ended with the death of the last apostle

I held this allowable opinion based upon Pius X's encyclical *Lamentabili Sane*. But I have since discovered that he was an apostate antipope, and thus all his teachings are null and void.

- I now hold the allowable opinion that revelations that constitute the object of the Catholic faith did not end with the death of the last apostle and thus are ongoing.

For example, there is no record that anyone living in the days of the apostles believed in the Immaculate Conception. Consequently, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception came from revelations sometime after the death of the last apostle.²⁷

Regarding Divorce and Remarriage

The error that a Catholic spouse can never divorce and remarry if both spouses are alive

I held this allowable opinion but no longer hold it.

- I now hold the allowable opinion that there are circumstances in which a Catholic spouse can divorce and remarry when both spouses are alive; such as for fornication.²⁸

However, it is a deeper dogma that divorce and remarriage is not intrinsically evil. Therefore, it is heresy to believe that divorce and remarriage when both spouses are alive is intrinsically evil because during the Old Testament era spouses were allowed to divorce and remarry when both spouses were alive, and thus it was not sinful.

²⁶ See my article Brief on "The Old Testament elect's sins were covered but not remitted: [The just men during the Old Testament era were partially justified.](#)"

²⁷ Because Pius IX was an apostate antipope, his attempted infallible definition on the Immaculate Conception in 1854 in his encyclical *Ineffabilis Deus* was null and void. Hence the Immaculate Conception remains an allowable opinion, one that I hold, until a future pope infallibly defines it. See my book [Miracle of the Immaculate Conception.](#)

²⁸ See my [Brief on Divorce and Remarriage.](#)

Regarding Sexual Pleasure

The error that all sexual pleasure, and thus between a husband and his wife, is sinful or a fault

I held the allowable opinion that sexual pleasure between a husband and his wife is sinful or a fault. And thus they must resist as much as possible the pleasure of the marital act. I no longer hold this opinion.

- I now hold the allowable opinion that the sexual pleasure between a husband and his wife is good when they perform the marital act for the right reason, in the right way, in the right time, and in the right place.²⁹

Regarding the Term Actual Sins

The error that voluntary sins should be called actual sins

I used the term actual sins for sins men commit as opposed to original sin, which is inherited. I no longer use this term.

- I now refer to actual sins as voluntary sins instead. Voluntary sins are sins that men commit themselves and thus are not inherited or imparted. They are commonly called actual sins. But this is not the best term because it could be taken to heretically mean that only voluntary sins are actually sins and thus inherited and imparted sins are not actually sins, not real sins.

For example, the apostate Thomas Aquinas held the heresy that original sin is not a real sin, is not actually a sin, but only the character of sin. That is why he held the heresy that dead unbaptized infants are happy and united to God.³⁰

Regarding the term Actual Grace

The error that assisting grace should be called actual grace

I held the allowable opinion that actual grace should be the term used for graces given by God to make men think and do good and holy things, as opposed to sanctifying grace which remits sins.

- I now hold the allowable opinion that the term assisting grace should be used instead. Assisting grace is that help of God which enlightens our hearts and minds and enables our will to shun evil and do good.³¹

During the days of the Great Apostasy, assisting grace came to be called actual grace. But this can imply that sanctifying grace is not actually a grace. Hence the better term is assisting grace.³²

²⁹ See my book [When Sexual Pleasure Is Good](#).

³⁰ See my book "*The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics*": Thomas Aquinas: [His heresy that original sin is not a real sin that causes guilt](#) and [His heresy that infants who die with original sin are happy and united to God](#)."

³¹ See my "*The Profession of Faith for the Days of the Great Apostasy*": [On Grace](#)."

³² Ibid.

Regarding St. Mary Magdalen

The error that St. Mary Magdalen was an adulterer and prostitute

I held this allowable opinion, but no longer hold it.

- I now hold the allowable opinion that St. Mary Magdalen was not an adulterer or a prostitute.³³

Regarding Baptism of Desire and Blood

The error that baptism of desire or blood for catechumens is heretical

I held this allowable opinion, but I no longer do.

- I now hold the allowable opinion that baptism of desire or blood for catechumens is not heretical and thus is an allowable opinion, one I do not hold. I hold the allowable opinion that the reception of the sacrament of baptism is necessary to be saved and thus with no exceptions.³⁴

However, it is heresy to believe that non-Catholics can be sanctified by baptism of desire or blood. Only members of the Catholic Church and catechumens are Catholic. Catechumens believe in the Catholic Church and faith and are preparing to enter the Catholic Church.

³³ See my article [Erroneous or Improbable Opinions Regarding Mary Magdalen and Mary of Bethany](#).

³⁴ See my book [Baptism Controversy Revision](#).

Errors regarding Factual Information

Regarding Antipopes, Invalid Councils, and Invalid Canon Laws

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. 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.

Regarding Antipopes, Anti-Church Fathers, Scholastics, Theologians, and Anti-Saints

Here is a list of some Antipopes, Anti-Church Fathers, Scholastics, Theologians, and Anti-Saints who were nominal Catholics. Some I always knew were nominal Catholics. Others I have since discovered were nominal Catholics.³⁵ Hence if I refer to them as saints or Catholics in my earlier works, know that they are not saints and not Catholic.

The Anti-Church Fathers and others before the 8th century

- Justin Martyr, Tatian, Pantaenus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Firmilianus, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Pamphilus of Caesarea, Lactantius, Arius, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Eusebius of Caesarea, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzus, Didymus the Blind, Evagrius Pointicus, Rufinus of Aquileia, Synesius of Cyrene, Jerome, Ennodius, Boethius, Isidore of Seville, John Damascene.

The scholastics and others after the 8th century until 1250

- Rabanus Maurus, John Scotus Erigena, Gerbert of Aurillac, Berengarius of Tours, Anselm of Bec, William of Champeaux, Bernard of Chartres, Hugh of St. Victor, Peter Abelard, Gilbert of Poitiers, Theodoric of Chartres, Bernard of Clairvaux, William of Conches, Gratian, Peter Lombard, Hildegard of Bingen, John of Salisbury, Peter of Poitiers, Alexander of Hales.

³⁵ For detailed information, see my book [The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics](#), and my book [Non-Catholics Cannot Holy Offices in the Catholic Church](#), and my book [The Great Apostasy](#).

Heretical or apostate antipopes before Innocent II in 1130

Some may have only been immoral but not heretical or apostate and thus were popes. The ones listed here are the ones I have thoroughly studied and thus were heretical or apostate antipopes.

- St. Marcellinus (who abjured and died as a saint), Stephen I, Liberius, Anastasius II, Vigilius (who abjured and died as a Catholic), Honorius, John XII.

There may be more. There are some I plan on studying thoroughly if and when I have time.

All of the theologians since 1250

- Such as Robert Grosseteste, Adam Marsh (de Marisco), Roland of Cremona, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, Raymond of Penafort, Robert Kilwardby, Albert the Great Wretch, William de la Mare, John Pecham, Roger Bacon, Vincent Ferrer, Jean Gerson, Girolamo Savonarola, Thomas More, Ignatius of Loyola, Alphonsus de Liguori.

Regarding False Seers and Apparitions

Any so-called heavenly apparition, message, or devotion to God, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the angels, or saints that is heretical or immoral or erroneous in any other way is false and of the devil, as well as the seer that propagates it.³⁶ What follows is a list of a few of many:

- Francis of Assisi³⁷; Hildegard von Bingen³⁸; Bridget of Sweden³⁹; Teresa of Avila; Therese of Liseux; Veronica Leuken and the Bayside apparitions; the Medjugorje apparitions; Fr. Stephano Gobbi and his Marian Movement of Priests; Luisa Piccarreta and the Divine Will apparitions; Maria Valtorta; Anne Katherine Emmerick⁴⁰; Maria Esperanza; Sister Faustina Kowalska and the Divine Mercy apparition; Padre Pio⁴¹; Mary Jane Even; Sister Agnes Katsuko Sasagawa and the Akita, Japan apparitions; the Garabandal apparitions; the LaSalette apparitions; and the Fatima apparitions⁴².

Two apparitions of the Blessed Virgin Mary that I believe are true are Our Lady of Guadalupe and Our Lady of Lourdes.⁴³

³⁶ See my [Brief on Signs and wonders](#). See my lecture Faith before Signs and Wonders ([video/audio](#)).

³⁷ As of 5/2026, I am in the process of completing a book titled *On Riches, Poverty, and Possessions and against Francis of Assisi*. It should be posted on my website soon.

³⁸ See my book “The Hellenization of Christianity by the Anti-Church Fathers and Scholastics: ... [Hildegard of Bingen](#).”

³⁹ See my article When Naked Does Not Mean Totally Naked: [Perverts who glorified nakedness](#).

⁴⁰ See my refutation [Against Catherine Emmerich and Padre Pio](#).

⁴¹ See my refutation [Against Catherine Emmerich and Padre Pio](#).

⁴² See my refutation [Against Fatima](#).

⁴³ See my article [On So-Called Apparitions of the Blessed Virgin Mary](#).

Regarding Sacramentals

The Brown Scapular is heretical because of its message and promises

I had promoted the Brown Scapular but no longer do. It promises salvation to those who simply wear it with no regard to believing in the full deposit of the Catholic faith, obeying all of God's commandments, doing good works, confessing your sins, and amending your life. It gives all those who wear it a false confidence that they will be saved as long as they wear it.

Regarding Forty-Day Lent Fast

The error that it was heretical to not do a Forty-Day Fast during Lent

I held this error but no longer do. I have since discovered that the Lenten fast for the Catholic Church during the first three centuries (from the 1st to the 4th centuries) was only for six days of Holy Week, the 2nd day of the week until the 7th day.⁴⁴ So that fast is mandatory for all Catholics. Hence any other fast during Lent can be modified or abolished. Here is the Lenten Fast I impose on members of Mary's Little Remnant⁴⁵:

- A light fast during Lent until Holy Week. No fasts on the Lord's Day and Holy Days of Obligation. Holy Week is a regular fast from the 2nd weekday to the 7th weekday
- Light Fast: Two meals a day, no meat; alcohol and one dessert are allowed.
- Regular Fast: One meal a day, no meat, no alcohol, no dessert.

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

Original version: 5/2026; Current version: 5/2026

Mary's Little Remnant

302 East Joffre St.

Truth or Consequences, New Mexico 87901-2878, USA

Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us

⁴⁴ See my article On Mandatory Fast Days: [The Lenten Fast](#).

⁴⁵ For more information on fasting and abstinence, see my article Things Catholics Must Believe and Do: ... [Do Penance](#).