

Good-without-Grace Heresy Taught by Aquinas and Apostate Antipopes

By Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

The heretics Thomas Aquinas and Apostate Antipopes Pius V, Gregory XIII, and Clement XI held the Pelagian Good-without-Grace heresy. It is a deeper dogma of the solemn magisterium and probably a deeper dogma of the ordinary magisterium that without God's actual or sanctifying grace (any grace from God) men cannot think or do good with a good motive and hence can only think and do evil. I say "with a good motive" because it is possible for an evil man to do a good thing but with an evil motive and thus even the good thing he does is not for a good reason and thus is attributed to him as an evil: "*And if he do good, he doth it ignorantly and unwillingly.*" (Eccus. 14:7) St. Paul speaks of evil men who preach the gospel for evil motives and thus the preaching of the gospel to them is attributed as an evil even though good comes from it:

"And many of the brethren in the Lord, growing confident by my bands, are much more bold to speak the word of God without fear. Some indeed, even out of envy and contention; but some also for good will preach Christ. Some out of charity, knowing that I am set for the defence of the gospel. And some out of contention preach Christ not sincerely: supposing that they raise affliction to my bands." (Phili. 1:14-17)

Therefore every thought of a man void of God's grace is set upon evil. No matter how many good things he may do, he does them for an evil motive. This is the meaning of the dogma that men cannot do anything good without God's grace:

"I know, O Lord, that the way of a man is not his: neither is it in a man to walk, and to direct his steps. (Jer. 10:23) No man of himself [without God's grace] is innocent before thee. (Ex. 34:7) Say not: I am sufficient for myself. (Eccus. 11:26) Not that we are sufficient to think any thing of ourselves, as of ourselves: but our sufficiency is from God. (2 Cor. 3:5)"

Catholic Commentary on 2 Cor. 3:5: "**Of ourselves:** This maketh first against the heretics called Pelagians, that hold our meritorious actions or cogitations to be of freewill only and not assisted by God's special grace..."

St. Augustine, *Tractate 5 on John*: "1. ...Those things which proceed from man are false, as our Lord Jesus Christ Himself has said, 'He that speaketh a lie speaketh of his own.' No one has anything of his own except falsehood and sin. But if man has any truth and justice, it is from that fountain [grace] after which we ought to thirst in this desert, so that being, as it were, bedewed by some drops from it, and comforted in the meantime in this pilgrimage, we may not fail by the way, but reach His rest and satisfying fullness."

St. Augustine, *A Treatise on Rebuke and Grace* (De Correptione et Gratia), 426 or 427: "(2) The Lord Himself not only shows us the evil we are to avoid and the good we are to do (which is all that the letter of the law can do), but also helps us to avoid evil and to do good—things that are impossible without the spirit of grace. If grace is lacking, the law is there simply to make culprits and to slay; for this reason, the Apostle said: 'The letter killeth, the spirit giveth life.' He, therefore, who uses the law according to the law learns from it good and evil, and, trusting not in his own strength, has recourse to grace, which enables him to avoid evil and to do good... (3) This is the right understanding of the grace of God through Jesus Christ our Lord, by which alone men are freed from evil, and without which they do no good

whatsoever, either in thought, or in will and love, or in action; not only do men know by its showing what they are to do, but by its power they do with love what they know is to be done... The avoidance of evil and the performance of good are given us by the Lord God.” (p. 1, c. 2, par. 2-3)

This dogma, which is probably an ordinary magisterium dogma, was solemnly defined and thus made a solemn magisterium dogma in 418 at the Sixteenth Council of Carthage, in 451 at the Council of Ephesus, and in 531 by Pope Boniface II when he confirmed the Second Council of Orange. Therefore it is a dogma that if man had freewill only but not God’s actual or sanctifying grace working in his heart, he could not think or do any good and thus could only think and do evil. Even in the Garden of Eden, Adam and Eve in their original justice (in a state of sanctifying grace) needed God’s grace to think and do good, as do the angels and saints in heaven.

The graceless man’s freewill is not destroyed, but he can only use it to think and choose evil things—to think or do this evil or that evil. That is the condition of the devils and damned humans. That is why God gives actual grace to pagans and other non-Catholics to make it possible for them to think and do good and to convert. Once God pulls back all of His grace from a man and thus hardens his heart to the highest degree, that man can only think and do evil. He has no true love in his heart but only sinful hatred. That is one of the worst curses men can be under other than for committing the unforgivable sin against the Holy Spirit.

The notorious heretic Thomas Aquinas held the Pelagian heresy that man can think and do a natural good without God’s grace. He taught that man without God’s grace but by his natural endowments and God’s help in sustaining his strength and life can do a natural good. Hence he believed that men can do good things without God’s grace working in their hearts, which is a Pelagian heresy. This fits with his Pelagian heresy that original sin is not a real sin but only the character of sin and his Pelagian heresy that infants who died with original sin are happy and united to God.¹

Dogma Man cannot do good without grace	Heresy Man can do good without grace
<p>Popes St. Zosimus and St. Celestine I, 418 & 431: “Whoever says...that what we are ordered to do through free will, we may be able to accomplish more easily through grace, just as if, even if grace were not given, we could nevertheless fulfill the divine commands without it, though not indeed easily, let him be anathema.” (<i>Sixteenth Council of Carthage</i>, Can. 5, 418 AD (D. 105); <i>Council of Ephesus</i>, 431 AD, Catalog of Authoritative Statements, Chap. 2 (D. 131), Chap. 5 (D. 134), Chap. 6 (D. 135), Chap. 7 (D. 138))</p>	<p>The notorious heretic Thomas Aquinas: “I answer that: Man by his natural endowments could wish and do the good proportionate to his nature... Yet because human nature is not altogether corrupted by sin, so as to be shorn of every natural good, even in the state of corrupted nature it can, by virtue of its natural endowments, work some particular good, as to build dwellings, plant vineyards, and the like; yet it cannot do all the good natural to it, so as to fall short in nothing...” (<i>Summa Theologica</i>, I-II, q. 109, art. 2)</p>

Note well that the “help” Aquinas refers to in his below quote is not God’s grace but God’s aid that He gives to men to sustain their life and strength. This is why Aquinas very carefully chooses to use the word “help” instead of “grace.” As a matter of fact, he

¹ See RJMI book *Damned Infants: “Aquinas’ Heretical Beliefs That Damned Infants Are Happy and United to God”* and “Aquinas’ Pelagian Heresy That Original Sin Is Not a Real Sin That Causes Real Guilt.”

never uses the word grace but only its equivalent once, which he calls gratuitous strength. He correctly believes that man cannot do a supernatural good without gratuitous strength (grace) but heretically believes that man can do a natural good by his natural strength (graceless strength):

The notorious heretic Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*: “I answer that, Man’s nature may be looked at in two ways: first, in its integrity, as it was in our first parent before sin; secondly, as it is corrupted in us after the sin of our first parent. Now in both states human nature needs the help of God as First Mover, to do or wish any good whatsoever, as stated above (1). But in the state of integrity, as regards the sufficiency of the operative power, man by his natural endowments could wish and do the good proportionate to his nature, such as the good of acquired virtue; but not surpassing good, as the good of infused virtue. But in the state of corrupt nature, man falls short of what he could do by his nature, so that he is unable to fulfil it by his own natural powers. Yet because human nature is not altogether corrupted by sin, so as to be shorn of every natural good, even in the state of corrupted nature it can, by virtue of its natural endowments, work some particular good, as to build dwellings, plant vineyards, and the like; yet it cannot do all the good natural to it, so as to fall short in nothing; just as a sick man can of himself make some movements, yet he cannot be perfectly moved with the movements of one in health, unless by the help of medicine he be cured. And thus in the state of perfect nature man needs a gratuitous strength superadded to natural strength for one reason, viz. in order to do and wish supernatural good; but for two reasons, in the state of corrupt nature, viz. in order to be healed, and furthermore in order to carry out works of supernatural virtue, which are meritorious. Beyond this, in both states man needs the Divine help, that he may be moved to act well.” (I-II, q. 109, art. 2)

The example Aquinas gives about the sick man proves he believes that man can do a natural good by his natural endowments and without God’s grace. He says “a sick man of himself” can do some good (make some movements) and thus by his natural endowments alone. But this man cannot be completely cured without “the help of medicine,” without grace. Hence he believes that fallen man, just like the sick man, can do some good by his natural endowments and with God sustaining his life but without God’s grace (without medicine), which is a Pelagian heresy, even though Aquinas correctly believes that man cannot do any supernatural good without God’s grace.

This is also proved when Aquinas says that men need “gratuitous strength” (the strength of grace) to do a supernatural good as opposed to “natural strength” (graceless strength) by which man can do a natural good by his natural endowments.

And he ends by saying that men cannot do any good, natural or supernatural, without “the Divine help” and thus avoids using the word grace because by “help” he means God’s aid in sustaining man’s strength and life and not God’s grace working in the hearts of men. The help God gives to men to sustain their strength and life is not grace working in their hearts. God helps the devils and damned humans to sustain their life and strength so that they may suffer all the more. But who would dare call this a grace; instead, it is a curse. Hence for men to think or do good, God must not only help them by sustaining their life and strength, as Thomas correctly teaches, but God must also give them grace, which Thomas does not believe men always need to do a natural good, which is heresy. Even though the help God gives to men to sustain their life and strength is necessary for them to think or do good, it is not enough. They also need God’s grace working in their hearts to think and do not only a supernatural good but also a natural good. The only difference between the heretic Aquinas and a full-fledged humanist is degree. Aquinas

believes that men without God's grace can do a natural good but not a supernatural good; whereas, the full-fledged humanist believes that men do not need God's grace to do any good.

The notorious heretic Aquinas also heretically believes that the building of a house or planting of a vineyard is intrinsically good. The things that men do to survive can be good, neutral, or evil. For a man who does not have any grace from God, these things are evil. Without God's grace man cannot truly love anything but only hate all things. Hence even the good things graceless men appear to do are done for evil motives and thus are evil: *"And if he do good, he doth it ignorantly and unwillingly."* (Eccus. 14:7) Even the things the graceless man does to survive (such as eating, building shelter, and making clothes) are a means for him to do evil, so that he may live to do evil:

"For they [evil men] sleep not except they have done evil: and their sleep is taken away unless they have made some to fall. They eat the bread of wickedness, and drink the wine of iniquity." (Prv. 4:16-17)

After all, graceless devils can plot, build, and plan. But who would dare say that these things are good, that devils can do good. Aquinas would—by implication! All these things the devils do for evil motives to sustain and promote evil and attack and destroy good. God can use for good the evil the devil does, but that does not mean the devil did good.

In imitation of their idol Thomas Aquinass, the Apostate Antipopes Pius V in 1567 in *Ex Omnibus Afflictionibus*; Gregory XIII in 1579, who re-published Pius V's *Ex Omnibus Afflictionibus*; and Clement XI in 1713 in *Unigenitus* all condemned orthodox propositions that upheld the dogma that men cannot do good without God's grace.

Dogma Man cannot do good without grace	Heresy Man can do good without grace
<p>Popes St. Zosimus and St. Celestine I, 418 & 431:</p> <p>“For no one is good of himself, unless He gives [him] a participation of Himself, who alone is good... That all the zeal and all the works and merits of the saints ought to be referred to the glory and praise of God; because no one pleases Him with anything except with that which He Himself has given... That God thus operates in the hearts of men and in the free will itself, so that a holy thought, a pious plan, and every motion of good will is from God, because we can do anything good through Him, without whom we can do nothing (Jn. 15:5)... Whoever says...that what we are ordered to do through free will, we may be able to accomplish more easily through grace, just as if, even if grace were not given, we could nevertheless fulfill the divine commands without it, though not indeed easily, let him be anathema.” (<i>Sixteenth Council of Carthage</i>, Can. 5, 418 AD (D. 105); <i>Council of Ephesus</i>, 431 AD, Catalog of Authoritative Statements, Chap. 2 (D. 131), Chap. 5 (D. 134), Chap. 6 (D. 135), Chap. 7 (D. 138))</p> <p>Pope Boniface II, 531:</p> <p>“Canon 22. Concerning those things that belong to man. <u>No man has anything of his own but untruth and sin.</u> But if a man has any truth or righteousness, it is from that fountain [grace] for which we must thirst in this desert, so that we may be refreshed from it as by drops of water and not faint on the way.” (<i>Second Council of Orange</i>, 529 AD (D. 195); Confirmed by Boniface II, <i>Per Filium Nostrum</i>, 531 AD (D. 200))</p>	<p>Apostate Antipopes Pius V and Gregory XIII, <i>Ex Omnibus Afflictionibus</i> (Errors of Michael du Bay (Michel Baius)), 1567, 1579:</p> <p>“Condemned proposition 27. Free will, without the help of God’s grace, has only power for sin.” (D. 1027)</p> <p>Apostate Antipope Clement XI, <i>Unigenitus</i> (Errors of Paschasius Quesnel), 1713:</p> <p>“Condemned proposition 38: Without the grace of the Liberator, the sinner is not free except to do evil. (D. 1388)</p> <p>“Condemned proposition 39: The will, which grace does not anticipate, has no light except for straying, no eagerness except to put itself in danger, no strength except to wound itself, and is capable of all evil and incapable of all good. (D. 1389)</p> <p>“Condemned proposition 40: Without grace we can love nothing except to our own condemnation. (D. 1390)</p> <p>“Condemned proposition 41: All knowledge of God, even natural knowledge, even in the pagan philosophers, cannot come except from God; and without grace knowledge produces nothing but presumption, vanity, and opposition to God Himself, instead of the affections of adoration, gratitude, and love.” (D. 1391)</p>

In 1140 the Council of Sens and Apostate Antipope Innocent II also taught the dogma:

Council of Sens, 1140: “Condemned Proposition 6: That free will is sufficient in itself for any good, condemned.” (D. 387)

Apostate Antipope Pope Innocent II's approval of the *Council of Sens* in *Testante Apostolo*, 1140: “And so we...have condemned by the authority of the sacred canons the chapters sent to us by your discretion and all the teachings of this Peter (Abelard) with their author, and we have imposed upon him as a heretic perpetual silence. We declare also that all the followers and defenders of his error must be separated from the companionship of the faithful and must be bound by the chain of excommunication.” (D. 387)

If Innocent II had been the pope, then his approval would have been infallible.

The Apostate Antipope Pius V so idolized Thomas that he had the sacrilegious audacity to place Aquinas' heretical, philosophy-glorifying, trashy *Summa Theologica* on the altar next to the Bible and papal dogmas:

Heretical *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Thomas Aquinas, 1912: "But the chief and special glory of Thomas, one which he has shared with none of the Catholic doctors, is that the Fathers of Trent made it part of the order of the conclave to lay upon the altar, together with the code of Sacred Scripture and the decrees of the Supreme Pontiffs, the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas, whence to seek counsel, reason, and inspiration. Greater influence than this no man could have."

In this we see that the notorious heretic Aquinas was made equal to the Bible and to all the Church Fathers and infallible papal decrees. This applies equally to all the scholastics and other modern theologians who have effectively replaced the magisterium of the Catholic Church as the ultimate source of truth.² It is no wonder that the heretical, idolatrous, and immoral Fathers of the invalid Council of Trent idolized Aquinas and his heretical *Summa* because they worked in a Vatican and Rome that were infested with art that glorified pagan philosophers, the false gods and false religions of mythology, and grotesque deformity and with art that was immodest and pornographic and infested with sins of sodomy, fornication, adultery, astrology, humanism, usury, and simony.

Apostate Antipopes Pius V's, Gregory XIII's, and Clement XI's condemned propositions in *Ex Afflictionibus* and *Unigenitus* were not protected from error by the Holy Spirit because they were not true popes. They were apostate antipopes. Hence their condemned propositions are illegal and invalid, null and void.³ One proof that these apostate antipopes condemned an orthodox proposition is the great stir it caused among theologians who tried their dishonest best to explain away the heresy, as recorded by the heretic Bishop Joseph Hefele, who himself tried to explain it away:

A History of the Christian Councils, by Bishop Charles Joseph Hefele, Second Synod at Orange, and Synod at Valence, 529 AD:

"22. That which man has of his own is only falsehood and sin. What he possesses in truth and righteousness he has from God.

"Nemo habet de suo nisi mendacium et peccatum; si quid autem habet homo veritatis atque justitiæ, ab illo fonte est, quem debemus sitire in hac eremo, ut ex eo quasi guttis quibusdam irrorati non deficiamus in via.

"From Augustine, *Tractat. V. in Joann.* n. 1 (Migne, t. iii. p. 1414). The 323rd Sentence in Prosper. This *Capitulum* [22 of the Second Synod of Orange] seems, at first sight, to be identical with the propositions of Bajus [*Ex Omnibus Afflictionibus*], rejected by Pius V and Gregory XIII, No. 25: *Omnia opera infidelium sunt peccata et philosophorum virtutes sunt vitia*, and No. 27: *Liberum*

² See RJMI book *The Magisterium of the Catholic Church*: Scholastic and other modern theologians effectively replaced the magisterium. As of 6/4/2014, this book is not yet complete.

³ And even if they had been popes, these condemned propositions would have been fallible and null and void because either the censures are non-specific or meaningless or the condemned propositions are unintelligible or ambiguous. Some condemned propositions contain a variety of censures at the end of the list, such as heresy, erroneous, and suspect of heresy, and thus do not attach a specific censure to each condemned proposition. Some of the censures are meaningless, such as the close-to-heresy censure. Some of the condemned propositions are invalid because they are unintelligible. Some of the condemned propositions can be taken in either an orthodox or a heretical sense and thus are ambiguous. And some condemn orthodox propositions. This new, sloppy, and incompetent way of censuring errors began in the 13th century and was invented by the scholastics and is an evil fruit of scholasticism. These null and void condemned propositions cause scandal and undermine the condemnation of heretical propositions and thus give heretics an excuse to hold their heresies. They also endanger the souls of Catholics who may condemn the orthodox instead of the heretical meaning of an ambiguous proposition and fall into heresy. (See RJMI book *The Magisterium of the Catholic Church*: Null and Void Condemned Propositions.)

arbitrium sine gratiæ Dei adjutoria non nisi ad peccandum valet. The Capitulum 22 of our Synod, together with the similar statements of Augustine and Prosper, has therefore become a real *crux* of the theologian, and for centuries not a few have exercised much acuteness in reconciling the statement[s]...⁴

Apostate Antipopes Innocent XIII (1721-1724), Benedict XIII (1724-1730), and Clement XII (1730-1740) confirmed Apostate Antipope Clement XI's *Unigenitus* and hence are heretics also on this point alone.

Original version: 10/2012; Current version: 6/2014

Mary's Little Remnant

302 East Joffre St.

Truth or Consequences, New Mexico 87901-2878, USA

Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us

(Send for a free catalog)

⁴ *A History of the Christian Councils*, by Bishop Charles Joseph Hefele, D.D. Translated from the German and edited by William R. Clark, M.A. Published by T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1894. V. 4, sec. 242, pp. 161-163.