

Cajetan's and Bellarmine's Heresies on Formal Heretics and Loss of Papal Office

By Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

Like all scholastics, the notorious heretics Cajetan (Tommaso de Vio of Gaeta) and Robert Bellarmine think like pride-filled bumbling fools and fall into one heresy, contradiction, and stupidity after another to cover their lies, formal heresies, and other errors.

Beware of notorious heretics, such as Cajetan and Robert Bellarmine, who hold the deeper dogma that a non-Catholic cannot hold an office but deny the basic dogma that an occult formal heretic is not a member of the Catholic Church and not Catholic. They hold the formal heresy, introduced by the scholastics, that an occult formal heretic is a member of the Catholic Church and Catholic. Hence they believe that an occult formal heretic can hold an office because they heretically believe he is a member of the Catholic Church and Catholic:

The notorious heretic Robert Bellarmine, *De Romano Pontifice*, 16th century: "This principle is most certain. The non-Christian cannot in any way be Pope, as Cajetan himself admits... The reason for this is that he cannot be head of what he is not a member; now he who is not a Christian is not a member of the Church, and a manifest heretic is not a Christian... Occult heretics are still of the Church, they are parts and members, and therefore the Pope who is an occult heretic is still Pope... Occult heretics are united and members [of the Church]..." (Bk. 2, c. 30)

It is an ordinary magisterium dogma from Pentecost Sunday and a solemn magisterium dogma from at least 553 that all formal heretics, and thus even occult (secret) formal heretics, are automatically excommunicated from the Catholic Church, not Catholic, and not members of the Catholic Church in any way, shape, or form.

An occult formal heretic is as much a formal heretic as a public formal heretic. Hence both are automatically excommunicated from the Catholic Church, both are not Catholic, and both are not members of the Catholic Church. A baptized man who secretly believes that Jesus is not God is as much a formal heretic in the eyes of God as a baptized man who publicly professes that Jesus is not God. In both cases the mortal sin of heresy is first committed in the heart. Jesus says, "*I say to you, that whosoever shall look on a woman to lust after her, hath already committed adultery with her in his heart.*" (Mt. 5:28) Likewise, "I say to you, that whosoever shall think in his heart that Jesus is not God hath already committed the mortal sin of heresy in his heart." Heresy is first hatched in the heart of man before it is made known to others. Hence the heart is the source of heresy:

"The things which proceed out of the mouth, come forth from the heart, and those things defile a man. For from the heart come forth evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false testimonies, blasphemies." (Mt. 15:18-20)
"Cursed be the man that maketh a graven and molten thing, the abomination of the Lord, the work of the hands of artificers, and shall put it in a secret place: and all the people shall answer and say: Amen." (Deut. 27:15)

Douay-Rheims Commentary on Deut. 27: "Ver. 15. Though the sins were secret, yet the offenders were cursed: public sins were also publicly punished."

In 553 at the Second Council of Constantinople, Vigilius infallibly defines that a formal heretic is automatically cut off from the Church by the mere fact of his heresy and thus any baptized man who even thinks a formal heresy in his heart is anathema:

Vigilius, *Second Council of Constantinople*, 553: “The heretic, even though he has not been condemned formally by any individual, in reality brings anathema on himself, having cut himself off from the way of truth by his heresy...”

Vigilius, *Second Council of Constantinople*, 553: “Canon 11. If anyone does not anathematize Arius, Eunomius, Macedonius, Apollinarius, Nestorius, Eutyches and Origen, as well as their heretical books, and also all other heretics who have already been condemned and anathematized by the holy, Catholic and apostolic Church and by the four holy synods which have already been mentioned, and also all those who have thought or now think in the same way as the aforesaid heretics and who persist in their error even to death: let him be anathema.””

Hence baptized men become formal heretics and anathema (automatically excommunicated) even if they only “think in the same way as...heretics” and thus without the need to manifest their heresy to anyone during their whole life. Even though Apostate Antipope Eugene IV teaches fallibly because he was not the pope, he nevertheless confirms the dogma that anyone who formally holds a contrary opinion is separated from the Church, and thus he makes no distinction between publicly or secretly holding a contrary opinion:

Apostate Antipope Eugene IV, Invalid *Council of Florence*, Decree for the Jacobites, 1441: “The Holy Roman Church condemns, disapproves, anathematizes, and declares to be separated from the Body of Christ, which is the Church, everyone who holds any contrary opinions.” (D. 705)

And the heretical and invalid 1917 Code of Canon Law correctly teaches that all formal heretics and hence occult formal heretics incur the penalty of automatic excommunication:

Invalid and heretical *1917 Code of Canon Law*: “Canon 2314, § 1. All apostates from the Christian faith, and all heretics and schismatics: (1) are *ipso facto* [automatically] excommunicated.”

Apostate Antipope Pius IX teaches that so-called Catholics who have learned a deeper dogma, such as the deeper dogma of the Immaculate Conception, and then think otherwise in their hearts are “separated from the unity of the Church” and thus have incurred the penalty of automatic excommunication from the Catholic Church:

Apostate Antipope Pius IX, Invalid *Ineffabilis Deus*, 1854: “Hence, if anyone shall dare—which God forbid!—to think otherwise than as has been defined by us, let him know and understand that he is condemned by his own judgment; that he has suffered shipwreck in the faith; that he has separated from the unity of the Church...”

Therefore even occult formal heretics who only “think” the formal heresy in their heart are “separated from the unity of the Church” and thus are automatically excommunicated, not members of the Catholic Church, and not Catholic. And if the offender held an office, he would automatically lose it because he is not Catholic and not a member of the Catholic Church. Even though they appear to be members of the Catholic Church, they are not members in any way:

The notorious heretic Rev. Joseph Clifford Fenton, 1950: “Very recently Fr. Francis X. Lawlor, S.J., has written in *Theological Studies* and has ‘endeavored to show that according to the teaching of the encyclical [Mystici corporis], occult heresy is incompatible with membership in the visible Church of Christ.¹ ... The fourth opinion was given its adequate form by Francis Sylvius. It held that no man could be a member of the Catholic Church unless he possessed the outward bonds of unity, the baptismal profession of faith, the communion of the sacraments, and subjection to legitimate ecclesiastical authority, but taught, at the same time, that true internal faith was also required.² ... Sylvius’ opinion was upheld by the tremendously influential Billuart.³ ... Tepe and Hurter followed Franzelin in declaring that the occult heretic is not properly and truly a member of the Church, but belongs to it only in appearance.^{4,5}”

Here is a quote from the notorious heretic Rev. Lawlor’s article:

Occult Heresy and Membership in the Church, the notorious heretic Rev. Francis X. Lawlor, S.J., 1949: “When Bellarmine addresses himself formally to the problem, whether or not occult heretics are members of the Church, ... he denies that such union [by faith] is needed to make one, minimally, a member of the body of the Church. His arguments in support of this view may be found in the tenth chapter of the *De Ecclesia Militante*. There is no point in rehearsing them here; it may be remarked that nearly all the subsequent authors who have defended Bellarmine’s opinion have receded from one or more of the arguments which he found in some measure cogent... Bellarmine’s position is one that is difficult to defend with consistency; and he makes only a half-hearted attempt to do so...”

“Bellarmine’s view [RJMI: Bellarmine’s heresy] that occult heretics are members of the Church is explicitly rejected by Suarez; for ‘such a heretic is not truly a member of Christ.’⁶...”

“ ‘The Eternal Father wished it (i.e. the Church as a perfect juridical society) to be the “kingdom of the Son of His predilection,” but it was to be a real kingdom, in which all believers would make the full obeisance of the intellect and will...’⁷ The explicit reference to the Vatican Council (*DB* 1789) shows that there is question here of the internal virtue of faith, by which all the faithful (“credentes omnes”) render to God the full homage of the intellect and will. Occult heresy cannot be said to be a plenary homage of the intellect, nor does it allow for the intimate and vital union of the juridical and pneumatic mission of the church which the Pope urges not merely on the social but also on the individual level...”

¹ Footnote 3: “The article is entitled ‘Occult Heresy and Membership in the Church.’ The citation is from *Theological Studies*, X, 4 (Dec. 1949), 553.”

² Footnote 13: “Cf. *De praecipuis fidei nostrae orthodoxae controversiis com nostris haereticis*, Lib. III. au. 1, articles 2, 3, and 7, in Sylvius’ *Opera Omnia* (Antwerp, 1698), V, 236 ff.”

³ Footnote 26: “Cf. *Summa Sancti Thomae hodiernis academiarum noribus accommodate sive cursus theologiae juxta mentem Divi Thomae, de regulis fidei* diss. 3, a. 2, in the edition of Paris, 1904, V, 97 f.”

⁴ Footnote 29: “Cf. Franzelin, *Theses de ecclesia Christi* (Rome, 1887), pp. 407 f; Tepe, *Institutiones theologicae in usum scholarum* (Paris, 1894), I, 379 f; Hurter, *Theologiae Dogmaticae compendium*, 2nd edition (Innsbruck, 1878), I, 207 f.”

⁵ The notorious heretic Rev. Joseph Clifford Fenton, “The Status of St. Robert Bellarmine’s Teaching about the Membership of Occult Heretics in the Catholic Church,” contained in *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, vol. 122, no. 3, March 1950, p. 207. Beware of this article. The heresy that occult formal heretics are members of the Catholic Church is presented by Fenton not as heresy but as an allowable opinion. Hence he is a heretic for denying the ordinary and the solemn magisterium dogma that all formal heretics, both public and occult, are not members of the Catholic Church in any way. It is typical for scholastics and other modern theologians to teach heresies as allowable opinions and go un denounced or unpunished. Rev. Fenton also denied the Salvation Dogma. (See RJMI book *Bad Books on Salvation*: Fr. Joseph Clifford Fenton.)

⁶ Footnote 17: “*De Fide Theologica*, disp. IX, sect. 1, no. 24.”

⁷ Footnote 45: “Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis*, 224, par. 63 [64].”

“As charity is not required for real membership and as hope does not concern us here, we may fix our attention on what the Pope says of faith.

“The Christian faith binds us no less closely with each other and with our Divine Head. For all who believe, “having the same spirit of faith,” are illumined by the same light of Christ, are nourished by the same food of Christ, live under the jurisdiction and teaching authority of Christ. If the same spirit of faith breathes in all, we are all living the same life ‘in the faith of the Son of God,[...]’⁸

“Here again it is clear that the Holy Father is teaching that our union with Christ the Head through the social Body of the Church is founded on the twofold juridical and pneumatic mission, and that among the pneumatic elements internal faith occupies in the generic order the first place...”⁹

Hence, again, we see that an occult formal heretic is not Catholic and not a member of the Catholic Church. And it is a deeper dogma that non-Catholics and non-members of the Catholic Church are banned from holding offices. Thus even secret formal heretics are banned from holding offices:

Protector of the Faith, by the heretic Thomas M. Izbicki, 1981: “[Cardinal Juan Turrecremata [d. 1468] insisted...without membership in the Church through faith, it was impossible to hold the power of the keys, and thus a heretic pope ceased to be head of the Church. Fallen from the rock of Peter’s faith, he lost his judicial immunity along with his tenure of office, making him subject to the jurisdiction of lesser prelates assembled in council. This was true even in a case of secret heresy...”^{10,11}

Therefore if an occult (secret) formal heretic held an office, he would automatically lose it because he is not a member of the Catholic Church and non-members of the Catholic Church cannot hold offices in the Catholic Church. (See RJMI article “Banned from Office for Simony or Secret Heresy.”)

In order to defend his heresy that occult formal heretics are not automatically excommunicated and hence are members of the Catholic Church, the notorious heretic Robert Bellarmine lies and contradicts himself. He wants his readers to believe that the Church Fathers taught that *manifest* formal heretics but not occult formal heretics are automatically excommunicated and not Catholic. On the one hand he correctly says that the Church Fathers teach that all heretics, and thus without making any distinction for public or secret formal heretics, are outside the Catholic Church and thus automatically excommunicated, not Catholic, and banned from offices:

The notorious heretic Robert Bellarmine, *De Romano Pontifice*, 16th century:
“Finally, the Holy Fathers teach unanimously not only that heretics are outside of

⁸ Footnote 50: “Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis*, 227-8, par. 71.”

⁹ Contained in “Theological Studies,” X, 4 (Dec. 1949), pp. 541-554.

¹⁰ Chap. 4, Footnote 95: “‘Si vero hoc papa agere noluisset, cum tunc videatur esse pertinax, et incorrigibilis, et haereticus formatus, tunc concilium praelatorum congregatum debet iuris auctoritate procedere ad depositionem illius,’ CSD D17 ante c1.q3 (1:149); *S.E.* II c.112 fol.260v, ‘Si Romanus pontifex efficitur haereticus ipso facto quo cadit a fide Petri cadet a cathedra, et sede Petri,’ SE 2.112.260v; ‘Claves sunt datae ecclesiae...ergo existens extra ecclesiam non habet eas...Haereticus est ab ecclesiae corpore separatus ergo ipso facto quod est haereticus est privatus honore et potestate ecclesiasticae iurisdictionis,’ SE 4 (pt. 2) 18 .391v-392r. See SE 4 (pt. 2) 18 .390v, 392v. On occult heresy, see SE 4 (pt. 2) 20. 394r. See also Antoninus de Florentia, *Summa theologica* (Verona, 1740), vol. 3, cols. 1207-9; Mario Midali, *Corpus Christi mysticum apud Dominicum Bañez eiusque fontes* (Rome, 1967), p. 207. A mad pope could be removed as though he were dead, see SE 3.8 .283r.”

¹¹ *Protector of the Faith* (Cardinal Johannes de Turrecremata and the defense of the institutional Church), by Thomas M. Izbicki. Publisher: The Catholic University of America Press, 1981. Chap. 4, p. 91.

the Church, but also that they are *ipso facto* deprived of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction and dignity. St. Cyprian (lib. 2, epist. 6) says: ‘We affirm that absolutely no heretic or schismatic has any power or right’; and he also teaches (lib. 2, epist. 1) that the heretics who return to the Church must be received as laymen, even though they have been formerly priests or bishops in the Church. St. Optatus (lib. 1 cont. Parmen.) teaches that heretics and schismatics cannot have the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, nor bind nor loose. St. Ambrose (lib. 1 de poenit., ca. 2), St. Augustine (in Enchir., cap 65), St. Jerome (lib. cont. Lucifer.) teach the same.”

Hence the Church Fathers make no distinction between manifest formal heretics and occult formal heretics—all formal heretics are outside the Catholic Church, automatically excommunicated, not Catholic, not members of the Church, and banned from holding offices. For example,

Church Father St. Paul: “Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ, and the dispensers of the mysteries of God. Here now it is required among the dispensers, that a man be found faithful.” (1 Cor. 4:1-2)

Church Father St. Cyprian, Epistle 74, to Magnus, 3rd century: “No heretics and schismatics at all have any power or right...”

Church Father St. Optatus (Bishop of Milevis), *Against Parmenian (Against the Donatists)*, Book 1, circa 372: “X. ...Therefore none of the heretics possess either the keys, which Peter alone received, or the Ring, with which we read that the Fountain has been sealed, nor is any heretic one of those to whom that Garden belongs in which God plants His young trees... XII. ...Rightly hast thou closed the Garden to heretics; rightly hast thou claimed the Keys for Peter; rightly hast thou denied the right of cultivating the young trees to those who are certainly shut out from the garden and from the paradise of God; rightly hast thou withdrawn the Ring from those to whom it is not allowed to open the Fountain.”

Church Father St. Jerome, *Dialogue against the Luciferians*, c. 379: “20. ...But, to go back to our starting point, on the return of the Confessors it was determined, in a synod afterwards held at Alexandria, that, the authors of the heresy excepted (who could not be excused on the ground of error), penitents should be admitted to communion with the Church: not that they who had been heretics could be bishops, but because it was clear that those who were received had not been heretics.”

And the Church Father St. John teaches that among Catholics there are baptized men who thus appear to be within the Catholic Church but are not. He says that this is made known when they physically separate themselves from Catholics and the Catholic Church—their separation being a manifest sign that even when they were among Catholics as secret formal heretics or secret formal schismatics they were not Catholic:

“They went out from us, but they were not of us. For if they had been of us, they would no doubt have remained with us; but that they may be manifest, that they are not all of us.” (1 Jn. 2:19)

Catholic Commentary on 1 Jn. 2:19: “*They were not of us* ...God was pleased to make it manifest that they were not of his faithful members. Such were Simon Magus, Cerinthus, Ebion, Nicolas of Antioch, &c. That is, they were not Christians otherwise they would have remained in the Church. God permitteth some to go out, that the true and tried faithful may be known.”

Clearly, then, St. John teaches that among Catholics there are baptized men who are secretly not Catholic and thus not members of the Catholic Church. Before a baptized man physically separates from the Catholic Church, he has already separated from Her in his heart by formal heresy or formal schism or else he would not have physically

separated himself from the Catholic Church. This is more proof from the Church Father St. John that occult formal heretics are not Catholic and not members of the Catholic Church in any way, shape, or form, even though they appear to be Catholic and appear to be members of the Catholic Church.

Yet in the same article Bellarmine implies that the Church Fathers teach that only manifest formal heretics and thus not occult formal heretics are not Christians. But, as you have read, the Church Fathers make no distinction between secret and public formal heretics. They teach that *all* formal heretics are not Christian. And when they do teach that manifest formal heretics are not Christians, this is of course true. But they do not mean that occult formal heretics are Christians. They just do not happen to be addressing the topic of occult formal heretics:

The notorious heretic Robert Bellarmine, *De Romano Pontifice*, 16th century: “This principle is most certain. The non-Christian cannot in any way be Pope, as Cajetan himself admits (ib. c. 26). The reason for this is that he cannot be head of what he is not a member; now he who is not a Christian is not a member of the Church, and a manifest heretic is not a Christian, as is clearly taught by St. Cyprian (lib. 4, epist. 2), St. Athanasius (Scr. 2 cont. Arian.), St. Augustine (lib. de great. Christ. cap. 20), St. Jerome (contra Lucifer.) and others; therefore the manifest heretic cannot be Pope... Occult heretics are still of the Church, they are parts and members, and therefore the Pope who is an occult heretic is still Pope... Occult heretics are united and members [of the Church]...”

While it is true that in many places the Church Fathers teach that manifest formal heretics are not Catholic, it is not true that the Church Fathers teach that occult formal heretics are Catholic, as proved by the above quotes in which the Church Fathers teach that all formal heretics are automatically excommunicated, not Catholic, and banned from holding offices. For example, a man who says that “The cows in the open pasture are giving milk” does not mean the cows hidden in barns are not also giving milk. Just because one says that manifest heretics are automatically excommunicated does not mean that occult heretics are not also automatically excommunicated. What follows is a chart showing Bellarmine’s deception:

The Notorious Heretic Robert Bellarmine’s Deception	
All formal heretics are automatically excommunicated	Only manifest formal heretics are automatically excommunicated
<p>“Finally, the Holy Fathers teach unanimously not only <u>that heretics</u> are outside of the Church, but also that they are <i>ipso facto</i> deprived of all ecclesiastical jurisdiction and dignity. St. Cyprian (lib. 2, epist. 6) says: ‘We affirm that absolutely <u>no heretic</u> or schismatic has any power or right.’ ... St. Optatus (lib. 1 cont. Parmen.) teaches <u>that heretics and schismatics</u> cannot have the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, nor bind nor loose. St. Ambrose (lib. 1 de poenit., ca. 2), St. Augustine (in Enchir., cap 65), St. Jerome (lib. cont. Lucifer.) teach the same.”</p>	<p>“He who is not a Christian is not a member of the Church, and <u>a manifest heretic is not a Christian</u>, as is clearly taught by St. Cyprian (lib. 4, epist. 2), St. Athanasius (Scr. 2 cont. Arian.), St. Augustine (lib. de great. Christ. cap. 20), St. Jerome (contra Lucifer.) and others; therefore the manifest heretic cannot be Pope... Occult heretics are still of the Church, they are parts and members, and therefore the Pope who is an occult heretic is still Pope.”</p>

In the quote on the left, the Church Fathers refer to all heretics as being excommunicated and banned from holding offices and thus make no distinction for

public or secret formal heretics. But in the quote on the right, Bellarmine presents the Church Fathers' teachings that manifest heretics are excommunicated and banned from holding offices, which is true. But he deceptively implies that by teaching this, the Church Fathers mean to exclude occult formal heretics, which is not true. Instead, the unanimous consensus of the Church Fathers teaches that *all* formal heretics are excommunicated and banned from holding offices. It is odious and against Catholic common sense to believe that one apostle or other Church Father ever believed that a man who is guilty of the mortal sin of heresy can be a Catholic and member of the Catholic Church in any way, shape, or form even if he appears to be Catholic because he keeps his formal heresy secret. Hence we see that Bellarmine contradicts himself regarding what the Church Fathers teach about formal heretics and takes the Church Fathers' teachings out of context to defend his heresy that occult formal heretics are not automatically excommunicated and thus are Catholics and members of the Catholic Church.

One thing that does differ between occult formal heretics and manifest (or public) formal heretics is that manifest formal heretics can be judged, denounced, sentenced (by a declaratory sentence), and formally deposed (by a declaratory deposition) by men because their heresy is manifest.¹² Whereas, the occult formal heretic is judged, denounced, sentenced, and deposed automatically by the Church law and Jesus Christ who is the ultimate head of the Catholic Church. But even manifest formal heretics are automatically judged sentenced, denounced, sentenced and deposed by the Church law before men judge, denounce, sentence, and depose them. Hence in this case, the sentence and deposition by men is merely a declaratory sentence and declaratory deposition.

The notorious heretic Cajetan's heresies regarding formal heretics and loss of papal office are more heretical and illogical than Bellarmine's. Like many scholastics, Cajetan first presents opinions that are not his own, but one would not know this until well into his work. Scholastics like to switch from one position to another to keep their readers guessing and without any sure way of knowing the author's position until later. And just when the reader thinks he knows the author's position, the author throws a curve ball and again the reader is not sure. This is all calculated to throw the mind off balance so that when a truth is presented, the reader is not sure about that either.¹³ This is the way of the devil; of deception; of double talk; of weasel words; of hairy heads, brains, and tongues. And even worse, they treat dogmas and heresies as allowable opinions and thus leave the reader free to deny the dogma or embrace the heresy and, in many cases, actually incline or lead the reader into denying the dogma or embracing the heresy. For example,

- The heresy that infants who died with original sin are happy and united to God, which was condemned by the ordinary magisterium on Pentecost Sunday and by the solemn magisterium in 418 by Pope St. Zosimus at the Sixteenth Council of Carthage, was taught by scholastics and other modern theologians from the 13th century onward. And even the

¹² See RJMI book *Ban on Holding Offices: Deposition Can Follow Tacit Resignation of Office*.

¹³ Even good theologians, such as the Church Fathers, have contradictions in their works, but these are not planned or calculated. If a contradiction is pointed out to them, they correct it and retract one opinion and keep the other. And they do not keep the reader wondering as to which position they hold and which one they are condemning. They put the heart and faith first and not the brain and intellect.

theologians who opposed it did not condemn it as heresy but presented it as an allowable opinion, a non-heretical error.

- The conciliarist heresy,¹⁴ which was condemned by the ordinary magisterium on Pentecost Sunday and by the solemn magisterium in 431 by Pope St. Celestine I at the Council of Ephesus, was taught by scholastics and other modern theologians from the 14th century onward. And even the theologians who opposed it did not condemn it as heresy but presented it as an allowable opinion, a non-heretical error.
- The salvation heresy, which was condemned by the ordinary magisterium on Pentecost Sunday and by the solemn magisterium in the 4th century by the profession-of-faith definition titled the Athanasian Creed, was taught by scholastics and other modern theologians from the 16th century onward. And even the theologians who opposed it did not condemn it as heresy but presented it as an allowable opinion, a non-heretical error.
- The pope-is-not-infallible heresy, which was condemned by the ordinary magisterium on Pentecost Sunday and by the solemn magisterium in 517 by Pope St. Hormisdas in his profession-of-faith definition titled *Libellus Professionis Fidei*, was taught by scholastics and other modern theologians as part of the conciliarist heresy from the 14th century onward. They taught the heresy that a council of bishops, and not the pope alone, makes infallible definitions. And even the theologians who opposed it did not condemn it as heresy but presented it as an allowable opinion, a non-heretical error. Even at the invalid Vatican Council of 1870¹⁵ there were many theologians who denied papal infallibility and were considered Catholic and were never condemned as heretics.
- The heresy that occult formal heretics are members of the Catholic Church and Catholic, which was condemned by the ordinary magisterium on Pentecost Sunday and the solemn magisterium in 553 by Vigilius at the Second Council of Constantinople, was taught by scholastics and other modern theologians from the 15th century onward. And even the theologians who opposed it did not condemn it as heresy but presented it as an allowable opinion, a non-heretical error.

As a result of not condemning these heresies as heresies, the theologians who held the heresies were not denounced as heretics and thus were allowed to remain in religious communion with the other theologians and prelates and to propagate their heresies in one

¹⁴ The conciliarist heresy teaches that the pope does not have supreme power in making laws, judgments, and dogmas. It also teaches that a council of bishops has equal or greater power than the pope in doing these things. The former teaches that a pope's laws, judgments, and definitions on faith or morals must be approved by a council of bishops to be valid and binding. The latter teaches that a council of bishops can do these things without the pope or his approval. The conciliarist heresy destroys monarchic governments, which are ordained by God, and leads to and justifies the heresy of democracies—democratic forms of government.

¹⁵ See RJMI article "Invalid Vatican Council of 1870."

imprimatured book after another. Hence the scholastics and other modern theologians show utter contempt for dogmas and thus for the unanimous consensus of the Church Fathers (the ordinary magisterium) and infallible papal definitions (the solemn magisterium) by denying dogmas that were infallibly defined or by defending heresies that were infallibly condemned or at least by presenting them as allowable opinions that can be held or rejected.

For example, a scholastic who writes about homosexuality may start out by saying, “We will now examine if homosexuality is natural and thus not sinful.” Hence he leaves the reader believing that this is an open discussion regarding an allowable opinion.¹⁶ He then sets out defending the immoral opinion for several pages. Now the reader does not yet know where the author stands. And weak readers are led into believing the argument that homosexuality is natural and thus not sinful. Only later does the author present his opinion that homosexuality is sinful and not natural. But then he only presents it as an opinion that one is free to accept or reject. And even worse, one may find that the same author in another of his works defends the heresy that homosexuality is natural and not sinful. Or the scholastic starts out with the dogmatic position for several pages, such as the true position that upholds the Salvation Dogma, and then later says the infamous “however” and proceeds to refute the dogma.

This is what the notorious heretic Cajetan does in his work *On the Comparison of the Authority of the Pope and Council*. He first presents the true and dogmatic position that all formal heretics are automatically excommunicated, not Catholic, not members of the Catholic Church, and thus are automatically banned from holding offices, which satisfies a good-willed reader. But later he refutes it, which disheartens and confuses the good-willed reader. Here is the true and dogmatic position he first presents but later refutes:

The notorious heretic Cajetan, *On the Comparison of the Authority of the Pope and Council*, 1511: “When the pope becomes a heretic, he is deprived of the papacy *ipso facto* by divine law, according to which the distinction between believers and unbelievers is made. When he is deposed by the Church on this account, it is not the pope who is either judged or deposed, rather he who has been judged already because he does not believe (in accordance with what the Lord says in John 3:18) and who already has been deposed, since, having become an unbeliever, he has been removed by his own will from the body of the Church, is [formally] declared judged and deposed...

“Next, in regard to the consequences of being outside the faith and the Church, many texts can be cited saying that, as a result of being outside the faith and the Church, the sheep become and are outside the communion of the faithful, without the keys, power, honor, the pastoral office. [The following texts] banish heretics from the communion of the faithful. First, the Lord says, *Depart from the tents of these wicked men* [Num. 16:26], namely, the schismatics Dathan and Abiram, for it is obvious that all heretics are schismatics. Then Paul says, *[If] an angel from heaven preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema* [Gal. 1:8], and, *We charge you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you withdraw yourselves from every brother walking disorderly, and not according to the tradition which they have received* [2 Thess. 3:6], and *Bear not the yoke with unbelievers. What participation hath justice with injustice? Or what fellowship hath light with darkness? What concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath the faithful with the unbeliever?* [2 Cor. 6:14-15]. Finally, John the

¹⁶ This makes him suspect of heresy. A Catholic theologian starts out by saying, “I will now refute the abominable heresy that homosexuality is natural and not sinful and show you the dogma that it is sinful and unnatural.”

evangelist says, *If any man come to you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house nor say to him, 'God speed you,'* [2 John 1:10].

“Ambrose explains the loss of the keys in pastoral matters, found in c. *Verbum* [De poen. D. 1 c. 51], ‘The Lord wished there to be equal power to bind and loose’; and he adds, ‘It is certain that both are licit for the Church; heresy has neither.’ Cyprian proclaims loss of honor and power in c. *Novatianus* [C. 7 q. 1 c. 6], ‘Whoever observes neither the unity of the Spirit nor the communion of peace and separates himself from the bond of the Church and the college of priests can have neither the power nor the honor of a bishop.’ And he says in c. *Didicimus* [C. 24 q. 1 c. 31], ‘All heretics and schismatics entirely lack power and right.’ Gelasius says the same in c. *Achatius* [C. 24 q. 1 c. 1]. ...Thomas [Aquinas]¹⁷ expressly says the same thing, insisting that the power of spiritual jurisdiction does not remain with heretics in respect of either its exercise or its substance, so that, whatever they may have done, nothing is achieved. Augustine¹⁸ denies [heretics] the office of feeding sheep in the sermon on the shepherds, dealing with the text, *Feed thy goats* [Cant. 1:7], saying, ‘To Peter, who remains, is said, *Feed My sheep* [John 21:17], to the heretic, who departs, *Feed thy goats.*’ And he repeats the same opinion in the letter to Vincentius.¹⁹

“From all of these the basic proposition that faith makes one a member of the Church is self-evident... This argument is confirmed by the fact that a heretic pope is excommunicated, as is obvious from the [ordinary] gloss on c. *Achatius* [C. 24 q. 1 c. 1], which says, ‘This is a case in which pope can bind pope, in which a pope falls under a canon imposing a sentence.’ Nor does the rule that equal cannot loose or bind equal²⁰ matter, because, if the pope is a heretic, he is less than any catholic, as is found in c. *Scimus* [C. 12 q. 1 c. 9]. Huguccio²¹ says the same at c. *Inferior*.²² Even he is subject to accusation; indeed the [ordinary] gloss on c. *Si papa* [D. 40 c. 6] says that the pope cannot make a law that a pope cannot be accused of heresy. He is subject to judgment, as is held in the said c. *Si papa*. All these things argue that a heretic is not pope but an inferior.

“...Thomas, arguing to the same end,²³ when dealing with that text in Galatians [2:11] relating how Paul opposed Peter to his face, says that prelates should not be corrected by subjects in the presence of the multitude unless there is imminent danger to the faith. In that case the prelate would become an inferior, if he lapsed into unbelief, while the faithful subject would become the superior. It is obvious that we are speaking not of superiority or inferiority in charity, since this is common to every mortal sin, but [of superiority or inferiority] in power, in respect of which a prelate is superior to a subject. Therefore, [the consequence follows] as before.

“From these points it can be inferred that, in both ways in which an undoubted pope, while living, can cease to be pope, there is the same source of deposition, namely, the will of the one who himself is pope. For he abdicates being the Church’s head by a voluntary act of will; he gives up being a member of the Church, and, consequently, being head, by embracing heresy of his free own will...”²⁴

¹⁷ Footnote 160: “II^a II^{ae} q. 39 a. 3: *Opera* (Parma), vol. 3, p. 155.”

¹⁸ Footnote 161: “Sermon 46, XV, 37: CC 41.565.”

¹⁹ Footnote 162: “Letter 93, IX, 29: PL 33.336.”

²⁰ Footnote 163: “See above n. 129.”

²¹ Footnote 164: “The text has *Hugo*.”

²² Footnote 165: “Ordinary gloss to D. 21 c. 7.”

²³ Footnote 166: “*In IV Sent.* D. 19 q. 2 a. 2 qa. 3 ad 1: *Opera* (Parma), vol. 7, pt. 2, p. 852, treating Gal. 2:11.”

²⁴ Quoted from *Conciliarism and Papalism* [hereafter CAP], Edited by J. H. Burns and Thomas M. Izbicki. Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought. Publisher: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Contains the English translation of selected works of Cajetan, Almain, and Mair. Cajetan, wk. 1, c. 17, pp. 74-77.

After presenting the dogmatic position, Cajetan then sets out to refute it. Like Bellarmine, Cajetan also holds the heresy that an occult formal heretic is not automatically excommunicated, is Catholic, and is a member of the Catholic Church:

The notorious heretic Cajetan, *On the Comparison of the Authority of the Pope and Council*, 1511: “A bishop who is a heretic only by internal act... is not excommunicated...”²⁵

Now for some of Cajetan’s contradictions. On the one hand Cajetan teaches that a non-Christian (non-Catholic) and thus a non-member of the Catholic Church cannot hold an office in the Catholic Church:

The heretic Robert Bellarmine, *De Romano Pontifice*, 16th century: “This principle is most certain. The non-Christian cannot in any way be Pope, as Cajetan himself admits (ib. c. 26)...”

The notorious heretic Cajetan, *On the Comparison of the Authority of the Pope and Council*, 1511: “In order for Peter to become Pope... some dispositions are required of Peter of absolute necessity... the things required of absolute necessity are two, being willing and being a Christian. Never has anyone, however elected, been pope without his consent; and, similarly, he is not pope unless he is a member of Christ.”²⁶

But on the other hand Cajetan teaches that a pope who becomes a formal heretic, even a notorious one, does not automatically lose his office but must be deposed by a council of bishops:

The notorious heretic Cajetan, *On the Comparison of the Authority of the Pope and Council*, 1511: “Therefore, it is certain that a pope who has become an incorrigible heretic is not deposed *ipso facto* and must be deposed by the Church... The Cardinals cannot depose a heretic pope; this is a matter of the universal Church... I declare, such a council should be summoned. The first is if a pope must be deposed on account of heresy; for then, if he refused, although asked, the cardinals, the emperor, the prelates can cause [a council] to be assembled, in which will reside not the care of the universal Church but only the power to depose the pope”²⁷...²⁸

Hence Cajetan has a so-called pope who is a notorious heretic (a public formal heretic) and thus is not Catholic and not a member of the Catholic Church holding the papal office before he is deposed by a council of bishops. But above he teaches that non-Catholics and non-members cannot hold offices. How does he solve this dilemma? He makes the notorious heretic pope a member of the Church and a Catholic by teaching the heresy that formal heretics, even public formal heretics, are members of the Catholic Church and Catholic since they have the indelible mark. And this is yet another heresy because he believes the indelible mark alone makes one a member of the Catholic Church and Catholic. Consequently, he believes yet another heresy that Protestants and Schismatics are members of the Catholic Church and believers (Catholics) because they have the indelible mark:

²⁵ CAP, wk. 1, c. 19, p. 79.

²⁶ CAP, wk. 1, c. 26, p. 113.

²⁷ That a pope can be tried, convicted, and deposed by a council of bishops is true regarding crimes that do not cause automatic ban from office, such as notorious immorality or usury. But this is not true for crimes that cause automatic loss of office, such as formal heresy and simony, because no trial or conviction or deposition by a human is needed in order to be banned from office in these cases, although a council of bishops could make a declaratory sentence and declaratory (formal) deposition for the record and the common good.

²⁸ CAP, wk. 1: c. 20, p. 88, and c. 21, pp. 92-93, and c. 16, p. 70.

The notorious heretic Cajetan, *On the Comparison of the Authority of the Pope and Council*, 1511: “It is certain that the proper and inseparable effect of the sacrament of faith (which is baptism, of course) is the mark alone, as is evident when a heretic is baptized according to the Church’s form and intention; for he receives nothing other than the mark. If we raise the mind’s eye even higher, we will understand that someone who only has the mark of faith is a believer and an unbeliever at the same time, a member of Christ and the Church, yet outside their membership in other respects... As long as the mark remains, he does not cease totally to be a member of Christ. Because the mark never ceases, therefore he always will be included among the members of Christ... Accordingly, a pope who has become a heretic, although he may have lost even unformed faith, retains, even against his will, the sacrament of faith whereby someone first is established in what it is to be a member of Christ. ... Therefore, the arguments and texts which are based on the fact that faith—at least unformed faith—is required to be a member of Christ, cannot carry the implication that he is not a member of Christ and, therefore, has been deposed *ipso facto* by divine law... A heretic remains an unwilling Christian because of the indelible mark...”²⁹

If anyone wonders where the dead-and-in-hell notorious heretic Fr. James Wathen got his “Once a Catholic, always a Catholic” heresy, now you know! Don’t let Cajetan’s “mind’s eye” mesmerize you. It is the evil eye of black magic that actually *lowers* the eye into the pits of hell. He denies the dogma that one needs three things to be a member of the Catholic Church and thus to be Catholic. He needs the indelible mark of baptism; he must hold the Catholic faith (and hence not be a formal heretic); and he must adhere to the Catholic Church (and hence not be a formal schismatic). If any one of these things is lacking, he is not Catholic nor a member of the Catholic Church in any way, shape, or form. While a baptized Schismatic or Protestant is subject to the Church because of the indelible mark, he is not a member of the Catholic Church in any way. It can be compared to people who are subject to a nation because they live in it but are not citizens of the nation, such as the Jews during the Old Covenant era who were held captive in Babylon. The notorious heretic Bellarmine refuted Cajetan’s belief that the indelible mark alone makes one a member of the Catholic Church in one sense and a Catholic in one sense:

The notorious heretic Robert Bellarmine, *De Romano Pontifice*, 1511: “This principle is most certain. The non-Christian cannot in any way be Pope, as Cajetan himself admits (ib. c. 26). The reason for this is that he cannot be head of what he is not a member; now he who is not a Christian is not a member of the Church, and a manifest heretic is not a Christian... To this Cajetan responds (in Apol. pro tract. praedicto cap. 25 et in ipso tract. cap. 22) that the heretic is not a Christian ‘simpliciter’ [i.e. without qualification, or absolutely], but is one ‘secundum quid’ [i.e. in a relative sense]. For, granted that two things constitute the Christian—the faith and the character—the heretic, having lost the faith, is still in some way united to the Church and is capable of jurisdiction; therefore, he is also Pope, but ought to be removed, since he is disposed, with ultimate disposition, to cease to be Pope: as the man who is still not dead but is ‘in extremis’ [at the point of death]. Against this: in the first place, if the heretic remained, ‘in actu,’ united to the Church in virtue of the character, he would never be able to be cut or separated from her ‘in actu,’ for the character is indelible. But there is no one who denies that some people may be separated ‘in actu’ from the Church. Therefore, the character does not make the heretic be ‘in actu’ in the Church, but is only a sign that he was in the Church and that he must return to her. Analogously, when a sheep wanders lost in the

²⁹ CAP, wk. 1: c. 22, pp. 95-97, and c. 27, p. 120.

mountains, the mark impressed on it does not make it be in the fold, but indicates from which fold it had fled and to which fold it ought to be brought back. This truth has a confirmation in Thomas who says (Summ. Theol. III, q. 8, a. 3) that those who do not have the faith are not united 'in actu' to Christ, but only potentially—and Thomas here refers to the internal union, and not to the external which is produced by the confession of faith and visible signs. Therefore, as the character is something internal, and not external, according to Thomas the character alone does not unite a man, 'in actu,' to Christ." (Bk. 2, chap. 30)

Even though the notorious heretic Bellarmine refuted Cajetan's belief, he did so insufficiently. He did not condemn Cajetan's belief as heresy. And thus he did not denounce Cajetan as a notorious heretic. Hence Bellarmine is a formal heretic on this point alone by sins of omission and for defending and patronizing a heresy and a heretic by presenting the heresy as an allowable opinion and the heretic as not a heretic:

"If any one sin, and hear the voice of one swearing, and is a witness either because he himself hath seen, or is privy to it: if he do not utter it, he shall bear his iniquity." (Lev. 5:1)

"And as they liked not to have God in their knowledge, God delivered them up to a reprobate sense...being filled with all iniquity, ...contention, deceit, malignity, whisperers, ...hateful to God, contumelious, proud, haughty, inventors of evil things, ...foolish, dissolute, without affection, without fidelity, ... Who, having known the justice of God, did not understand that they who do such things, are worthy of death; and not only they that do them, but they also that consent to them that do them." (Rom. 1:28-32)

Vigilius, *Second Council of Constantinople*, 553: "It is clear to all believers that when a problem about the faith comes up it is not only the heretical person who is condemned but also the person who is in a position to correct the heresy of others and fails to do so."

That is the way of scholastics when dealing with their brother scholastics. God forbid that they should stifle their intellectual freedom and perverse curiosity. For example, the notorious heretic Bellarmine dare not condemn Cajetan's error as heresy and denounce him as a heretic or else another scholastic could condemn Bellarmine's heresies (such as his heresy that occult formal heretics are members of the Catholic Church and Catholic) and could denounce him as a heretic. The scholastics and other modern theologians expound the most abominable heresies and do not condemn one another's heresies as heresy nor denounce one another as heretics. Instead, they refer to their heresies as errors or some other non-heretical label. They are all guilty of the mortal sins of omission, non-judgmentalism, and non-punishmentalism and hence are formal heretics for not condemning heresy as heresy and not denouncing heretics as heretics. Consequently, they are automatically excommunicated on this point alone:

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."

And they are also guilty of mortal sin for being in religious communion with heretics, which also makes them formal heretics. They are no different from a mob or cabal of gangsters who protect one another in their abominable crimes.

Cajetan's formal heresy that the indelible mark alone makes one a member of the Catholic Church and Catholic allows his formal heretic pope to be a member of the Catholic Church and Catholic and thus to not automatically lose his office. Hence he

teaches that a formal heretic pope must be deposed by a council of bishops in order to lose his office, as you read above. And yet he falls into a trap, as all liars and formal heretics do. If the indelible mark alone makes one a member of the Catholic Church and Catholic, then even a pope who is deposed by a council of bishops is still a member of the Catholic Church and Catholic because he still has the indelible mark. And thus such a pope would still hold the office even when he is deposed by a council of bishops. Of course, Cajetan's formal heretic pope could even join a Protestant or Buddhist sect and still be pope since, according to Cajetan, he is still a member of the Catholic Church and Catholic because he has the indelible mark.

This heresy of Cajetan's led to the heresy of calling Protestants and Schismatics "separated brethren" and to the salvation heresy which places Protestants and Schismatics in the way of salvation and to the heresy that Catholics must respect Protestant and Schismatic religions and to the heresy that Catholics can be in religious communion with Protestants and Schismatics and to the heresy that praises and justifies Protestant and Schismatic heresiarchs, such as Martin Luther. Thirty-one years after Cajetan taught the heresy that Protestants and Schismatics are members of the Catholic Church and Catholic, Albert Pigghe (Pighius) denied the Salvation Dogma in 1542 in his work titled *De Libero Hominis Arbitrio*. And Pigghe may not have been the first one to do so. (See RJMI book *Bad Books on Salvation: Albert Pigghe*.)

We have yet another contradiction by Cajetan. On the one hand he teaches that a formal heretic pope needs to be deposed by a council of bishops. But on the other hand he teaches that the pope is not subject to any ecclesiastical censures:

The notorious heretic Cajetan, *On the Comparison of the Authority of the Pope and Council*, 1511: "Last, what is cited from the [ordinary] gloss of the Decretum [C. 24 q. i c. i], that the pope, falling into a condemned heresy, falls into excommunication, is false, for since every excommunication, which is an ecclesiastical censure (and that is our subject), is based on positive law, which does not have coercive power over the pope in the ecclesiastical forum, whereas excommunication implies coercion in the ecclesiastical forum, we must conclude the pope cannot incur any censure.... Wherefore we must not allow what is said by those who extend all the laws about heretics to a heretic pope. While he is pope he is subject to deposition alone; once deposed, however, [he is] subject to the law, just like anyone else... The pope...cannot be excommunicated nor subjected to positive law."³⁰

If the pope were not subject to any ecclesiastical censure, then how can he be subject to being judged and sentenced by his inferiors? And if the pope were not subject to any censure, then he cannot incur the censure of deposition. For Cajetan does have the pope being judged as a pope, sentenced as a pope, and deposed as a pope. In Cajetan's contradiction, there is another heresy—that the pope is above divine and dogmatic laws. It is a dogma that all formal heretics are automatically excommunicated because they do not possess the Catholic faith, because they have defected from the Catholic faith. No pope can change or modify this dogma. Hence a pope cannot legally and validly make a law that says "Catholics who fall into formal heresy are no longer anathema (automatically excommunicated)" or "If a pope falls into formal heresy, he is not anathema (automatically excommunicated)" any more than he can legally make a law that says "Catholics who commit adultery are no longer guilty of mortal sin" or "If a pope commits adultery, he is not guilty of mortal sin." If a pope did so, his law would be not

³⁰ CAP, wk. 1: c. 22, p. 99, and c. 27, p. 129.

only null and void but also formally heretical; and thus he would be an automatically excommunicated formal heretic and hence automatically lose his office. Hence popes are subject to all dogmatic laws. So beware of those who teach the heresy that the pope is above the law. Popes are even subject to disciplinary laws even though they have the supreme power to modify or abolish them. What kind of pope would impose disciplinary laws upon all Catholics and think himself exempt from obeying them or from any consequence when he violates them. If a pope wanted to disobey a disciplinary law, all he would have to do is abolish it and thus he would not be disobeying it.

In order to defend his heresy that officeholders cannot be automatically excommunicated or automatically lose their offices, Cajetan also summoned up from hell another lie to try to prove that officeholders need to be judged, convicted, and deposed by human authority. He teaches that because an officeholder got his office by a judgment from a man (such as the pope being elected by Cardinals), he can only be excommunicated or lose his office by a judgment from a man (such as a pope being excommunicated and deposed by Cardinals or a council of bishops). Hence he denies the dogma that officeholders incur automatic penalties and thus without the need of human intervention:

The notorious heretic Cajetan, *On the Comparison of the Authority of the Pope and Council*, 1511: “A bishop who is a heretic only by internal act is subject to the judgment of no man on account of this... such a heretic is not excommunicated; the Church cannot excommunicate what it cannot judge; therefore, much less is he deprived of the power of jurisdiction, which is by man’s appointment. Both giving it and taking it away belongs to human judgment...”

But here comes another of his contradictions. Cajetan also teaches that a man who simply whispers his heresy to himself and with no witnesses is automatically excommunicated because he is liable to a judgment from a man even though no man is present and thus no man can actually judge him, as you will read. Hence Cajetan believes in another heresy by teaching that the instant before this man whispered his heresy to himself he was not automatically excommunicated, as if the heresy in his heart needed to be heard by his ears or liable to a judgment from a man before he gets excommunicated. This denies the dogma that God knows and judges what is in the hearts of men and the dogma that automatic excommunications are not liable to the judgment and sentence of men. Also take notice that when Cajetan says that the Church Fathers and other Doctors teach that a secret heretic is automatically excommunicated, he wants you to believe they do not mean a heretic who keeps his heresy internal (which Cajetan calls an internal heretic) but a heretic who manifests but conceals his heresy (which Cajetan would call “a whisperer”). Hence he tries to drag the Church Fathers and other Doctors into his heresy by having them mean that internal formal heretics are not automatically excommunicated and thus are Catholic and members of the Catholic Church:

The notorious heretic Cajetan, *On the Comparison of the Authority of the Pope and Council*, 1511: “A bishop who is a heretic only by internal act is subject to the judgment of no man on account of this... such a heretic is not excommunicated; the Church cannot excommunicate what it cannot judge; therefore, much less is he deprived of the power of jurisdiction, which is by man’s appointment. Both giving it and taking it away belongs to human judgment... The power of jurisdiction in the papacy is immediately from God... However, that the papacy itself, which has this power, is vested in this individual is from man... for this man is elected by man to receive the papacy... Therefore, the position of the pope and other bishops is the

same in regard to the loss of the power of jurisdiction derived from God or divine law. Since in both cases it is from God through the mediation of human judgment, it follows that it is not taken away by God directly, but through the mediation of human judgment. [p. 81] For this reason, it is not taken away by that which, by its very nature, is not subject to human judgment, namely, heresy hidden in the heart. ... That the Church cannot concern itself with covert heresy, may give rise to hesitation, because the doctors say that even secret heretics are excommunicated, and because, in c. *Multorum* [Clem. 5:3:1], Inquistors who fail to act out of love or hate, are excommunicated—in which case the Church is judging concerning internal motives of love and hate. [In reply,] it can very easily be shown that heretics as such, subject to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction, are excommunicated on the ground of concealing their heresy, and not as heretics by internal act alone. Accordingly, if anyone falls into heresy internally and, being alone, expresses that heresy to himself with spoken words in the merest whisper, he is excommunicated, although this is entirely hidden, because the act of speaking aloud in itself subjects him to human judgment as such, although [the act] may lack witnesses.”³¹

Hence the notorious heretic Cajetan contradicted himself. On the one hand he says that all formal heretics who hold offices must be judged by men in order to be excommunicated and lose their offices. But he also teaches that a formal heretic officeholder is automatically excommunicated merely by being liable to being judged by a man and thus without actually being judged, convicted or sentenced by a man, as long as he at least *whispers* his heresy to himself.

Need to be judged by a human	Need to be liable to human judgement
<p>The notorious heretic Cajetan: “A bishop who is a heretic only by internal act is subject to the judgment of no man on account of this... such a heretic is not excommunicated; the Church cannot excommunicate what it cannot judge... Therefore, the position of the pope and other bishops is the same in regard to the loss of the power of jurisdiction derived from God or divine law. Since in both cases it is from God through the mediation of human judgment, <u>it follows that it is not taken away by God directly, but through the mediation of human judgment...</u>”</p>	<p>The notorious heretic Cajetan:</p> <p>“If anyone falls into heresy internally and, being alone, expresses that heresy to himself with spoken words in the merest whisper, <u>he is excommunicated,</u> although this is entirely hidden, because the act of speaking aloud in itself <u>subjects him to human judgment</u> as such, although [the act] may lack witnesses.”</p>

So how does Cajetan get his formal heretic pope who whispers his heresy to himself off the hook of automatic excommunication and thus automatic loss of office? By waving his magic wand and teaching that the pope cannot incur any censures, as you read above, and by teaching that even if the pope were automatically excommunicated he would still be a member of the Catholic Church and still be Catholic, as you also read above. But of course, this denies his above teaching that a pope who whispers his formal heresy to himself would lose his office because he is liable to human judgment and thus automatically excommunicated. But then he might change to his other position that such a pope needs to actually be judged, sentenced, and deposed by a human and thus not merely be liable to human judgment.

³¹ CAP, wk. 1: c. 19, pp. 79-81.

And there is yet another contradiction by Cajetan. He says that “the Church cannot excommunicate what it cannot judge.” Hence he believes that a formal heretic must at least whisper his heresy to be liable for the Church to judge and excommunicate him. But how does the Church automatically judge and automatically excommunicate a formal heretic? It is not by a judgment or a sentence from any man on earth. A formal heretic is automatically excommunicated not only by the law (*ab jure*) itself, which imposes automatic excommunication upon all formal heretics, but also by Jesus Christ Himself, the ultimate Head of the Catholic Church, who is the One who actually judges and excommunicates the formal heretic. The law itself cannot judge or enforce itself. It is just a dead piece of paper and ink if no one enforces it. And Jesus Christ does not need to hear a formal heretic whisper a heresy to know that that man believes in heresy in his heart. To deny this is to deny the dogma that Jesus Christ is all knowing, that He knows the hearts and thoughts of all men not just when they think their thoughts in their hearts but before the world was even created:

“For the Lord knoweth all knowledge, and hath beheld the signs of the world, he declareth the things that are past, and the things that are to come, and revealeth the traces of hidden things. No thought escapeth him, and no word can hide itself from him.” (Eccus. 42:19-20) “For all things were known to the Lord God, before they were created: so also after they were perfected he beholdeth all things.” (Eccus. 23:29) “Every heart is understood by him.” (Eccus. 16:20) “The Lord knoweth the thoughts of men, that they are vain.” (Ps. 93:11)

So we see that Cajetan has actually placed the pope above God. When it comes to the pope, Cajetan’s god is ignorant, stupid, blind, and powerless. The greatness of the pope simply overwhelms Cajetan’s god and makes his god dumb in the mouth so that he cannot bark (condemn) or bite (punish). The formal heretic’s greatest offense is against God Himself, who sees the heretic and the heresy in his heart, and then against the angels and saints (the Catholic Church Triumphant), even if not one person on earth sees it. Angels and devils also have the power to read the hearts of men. Hence God in the Divine Person of Jesus Christ, the ultimate Head of the Catholic Church, automatically excommunicates the formal heretic to preserve His justice, to maintain and enforce His laws, to make reparation, to prevent scandalizing the Church Triumphant, and to give Catholics the power and authority to denounce and avoid the occult formal heretic as soon as he makes his heresy manifest and thus even before any judgment by a competent judge on earth:

“Doth the seat of iniquity stick to thee, who framest labour in commandment?” (Ps. 93:20)

Catholic Commentary on Ps. 93: 20: “*Doth the seat of iniquity stick to thee?* ... That is, wilt thou, O God, who art always just, admit of the seat of iniquity; that is, of injustice, or unjust judges, to have any partnership with thee?”

Cajetan’s and Bellarmine’s formal heresy that occult formal heretics are members of the Catholic Church and Catholic is prevalent among the scholastics and other modern theologians. For example,

The notorious heretic Noldin: “To incur the excommunication it is necessary that the interiorly conceived heresy be exteriorly manifested by some sign, word, action or writing—even when nobody is present or hears.” (*Coml. de Poenis Eccl.*, v. 1, p. 48)

The notorious heretic Rev. Joseph Clifford Fenton, 1950: "...Robert [Bellarmine] held that all and only those who retained an outward and public profession of the faith, and ecclesiastical communion in or access to the sacraments, and subjection to the rule of legitimate ecclesiastical superiors could rightfully and properly be designated as parts and members of the true Church of Christ on earth. A man who possessed these characteristics would remain a member of the Church, albeit an utterly unworthy one, even though secretly guilty of sins of heresy or apostasy.³² ... With varying degrees of emphasis, the text books most frequently employed in American theological seminaries support...Robert's teaching on conditions for membership in the Church on earth. Billot, Herve, Tanquerey, and Van Noort are in substantial agreement on this point."³³

Truly do the words of our Lord Jesus Christ and King David apply to these notorious heretics who teach that a baptized man can externally profess the faith but deny it in his heart and be Catholic and a member of Christ's Holy Catholic Church:

"Well did Isaias prophesy of you hypocrites, as it is written: This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. And in vain do they worship me, teaching doctrines and precepts of men. For leaving the commandment of God, you hold the tradition of men [in this case a heretical tradition]." (Mk. 7:6-8)

"And they loved him with their mouth: and with their tongue they lied unto him: But their heart was not right with him: nor were they counted faithful in his covenant." (Ps. 77:36-37)

I end this part on Cajetan with a sample of his heretical scholastic talk, his theophilosophy talk, which I call Scholastic Babble or TP Talk, and which Gregory IX in 1228 in his encyclical *Ab Aegyptiis* calls a "perverse dogma"³⁴:

The notorious heretic Cajetan, *On the Comparison of the Authority of the Pope and Council*, 1511: "[Chap. 20, p. 86] It is held even more certainly that the ability to make or destroy the conjunction of Peter and the papacy is one thing, and having power over the pope is another. ...Nor should you, who profess philosophy, wonder that a power over the conjunction of form with matter is found which is not over the form, because the conjunction of form with matter follows the form. Your wonder will cease if you consider that the conjunction of form and matter can be achieved from both sides—namely, on the part of matter and that of form—and that someone who has power over the conjunction of form and matter, either in respect of both or in respect of the form, also has power over the matter, but someone who has power over that conjunction in respect of the matter need not have power over the form...

"[Chap. 26, p. 114] The argument is obvious from these points; and it can be formulated briefly thus: only contraries to the conditions required of necessity for being pope render a pope deposible; but among crimes unbelief alone is contrary to the conditions required of necessity to be pope; therefore, unbelief alone among crimes renders the pope deposible. The first proposition is obvious from the fact

³² Footnote 1: "Cf. ...Robert's *De ecclesia militante*, c. 2."

³³ See footnote 5.

³⁴ "Therefore, lest a rash and perverse dogma of this kind 'as a canker spreads' (2 Tim. 2:17), and infects many and makes it necessary that 'Rachel bewail her lost sons' (Jer. 31:15), we order and strictly command by the authority of those present that, entirely forsaking the poison mentioned above, without the leaven of worldly knowledge, that you teach theological purity, not 'adulterating the word of God' (2 Cor. 2:17) by the creations of philosophers, lest around the altar of God you seem to wish to plant a grove contrary to the teaching of the Lord, and by a commingling of honey to cause the sacrifice of doctrine to ferment which is to be presented 'with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth' (1 Cor. 5:8). But content with the terminology established by the Fathers, you should feed the minds of your listeners with the fruit of heavenly words, so that after the leaves of the words have been removed, 'they may draw from the fountains of the Savior' (Isa. 12:3); the clear and limpid waters which tend principally to this, that they may build up faith or fashion morals, and refreshed by these they may be delighted with internal richness." (D. 443)

that being deposed is not to be pope, and everything continues in being if a contrary does not intervene. A man would never cease to be unless something contrary to his being intervened, and is like that in other cases...

“[Chap. 27, p. 124] On the contrary, since causes should be proportional to effects, as superior causes correspond to superior effect, and, since, among secondary causes, human providence supported by the Church’s authority is a cause of a lesser order than prayer, which is placed by God in the supreme order of secondary causes, which is obvious from the fact that every corporal and incorporeal creature is subject to it, and since provision concerning a faithful pope is among the supreme effects in the Church, the consequence is that God most wisely provided in the Church a remedy concerning a faithful pope, not human providence, to which He subjects the rest of the Church, but prayer...

“[Chap. 27, p. 127] If it is urged against these points that, because prayer is the common remedy for all evils that occur, whereas a specific remedy is required in this matter, just as in other cases, besides a common cause, a specific one must be assigned, the answer is that the supreme causes, although they may be common ones in regard to inferior [effects], nevertheless, are specific in regard to superior effects; and, therefore, prayer, because it is among the supreme secondary supernatural causes, is a common cause in respect of inferior effects...”

Be not over just and be not more wise than is necessary, lest thou become stupid.
Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of the world!
(Ecclesiastes 7:17; 1 Corinthians 1:20)

Original version: 12/2012; Current version: 11/2013

Mary’s Little Remnant

302 East Joffre St.

Truth or Consequences, NM 87901-2878, USA

Website: www.JohnTheBaptist.us

(Send for a free catalog)