

# Saints' Teachings



R. J. M. I.

By

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

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

To Jesus through Mary

*Júdica me, Deus, et discérne causam meam de gente non sancta:  
ab hómine iníquo, et dolóso érue me*

Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam

Original version: 1/2003; Current version: 1/2003

**Mary's Little Remnant**  
302 East Joffre St.  
TorC, NM 87901-2878  
Website: [www.JohnTheBaptist.us](http://www.JohnTheBaptist.us)  
(Send for a free catalog)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>SAINTS' TEACHINGS ARE NOT INFALLIBLE .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>SAINTS' SEEMINGLY HERETICAL TEACHINGS .....</b>	<b>6</b>
TAKEN OUT OF CONTEXT .....	8
Poor Use of Words .....	9
Mistaken use of Words .....	9
Circular Arguments .....	9
CORRUPTED, FRAUDULENT, OR MISTRANSLATED .....	11
TAUGHT HERESY AND LATER REPENTED.....	11
<b>HOW TO KNOW IF SAINTS' TEACHINGS ARE AUTHENTIC AND INTERPRETED CORRECTLY .....</b>	<b>11</b>



# Saints' Teachings Are Not Infallible

## Question/Statement:

The teachings of the saints are infallible; therefore, they are a sure guide in learning and defending the truths of the Catholic faith.

## RJMI Answer:

The teachings of the saints are not infallible. Only the pope can teach infallibly.

Pius XII, Allocution to the Gregorian University, Oct. 17, 1953: "The Church has never accepted even the most holy and most eminent Doctor, and does not now accept even a single one of them, as the principal source of truth. The Church certainly considers Thomas and Augustine great Doctors, and she accords them the highest praise; but she recognizes infallibility only in the inspired authors of the Sacred Scriptures. By divine mandate, the interpreter and guardian of the Sacred Scriptures, depository of Sacred Tradition living within her, the Church alone is the entrance to salvation; she alone, by herself, and under the protection and guidance of the Holy Ghost, is the source of truth."

Saints teachings are not part of the Teaching authority of the Church.

*Catholic Encyclopedia*, Certitude, 1908: "The certitude of faith is supernatural, being due to Divine grace, and is superior not merely to moral certitude, but to the certitude of physical science, and to that of the demonstrative sciences. When it is a question whether any particular truth is contained within the deposit of revelation, the certainty of faith can be obtained only from the authority of the 'teaching Church', but a human certitude may be obtained by arguments drawn from the inferior and subordinate authorities such as the Fathers and the 'Schola Theologica'."

Pope Pius XII, *Humani Generis*: "21. It is also true that theologians must always return to the sources of divine revelation: for it belongs to them to point out how the doctrine of the living Teaching Authority is to be found either explicitly or implicitly in the Scriptures and in Tradition. ... Together with the sources of positive theology God has given to His Church a living Teaching Authority to elucidate and explain what is contained in the deposit of faith only obscurely and implicitly. This deposit of faith our Divine Redeemer has given for authentic interpretation not to each of the faithful, not even to theologians, but only to the Teaching Authority of the Church. ... The Church does exercise this function of teaching, as she often has through the centuries, either in the ordinary or in the extraordinary way."

One proof that saints' teachings are not infallible is that some of their teachings contradict one another. And even within the same saint's teachings there are contradictions. Saints' teachings fall into four categories.

- 1) They contain infallible truths that popes had infallibly defined.
- 2) They contain truths that have not been infallibly defined but are part of the ordinary magisterium and thus must be believed.
- 3) They contain opinions that were allowed in the days they lived, being they were not infallibly defined and not part of the ordinary magisterium. In these opinions they can teach error.

4) They are heretical, but corrected before the saints died.

Saints are not infallible. Therefore, under no circumstances can their teachings be used to overrule popes' infallibly defined dogmas. Anyone who uses a saint's teaching, or what they think a saint taught to overrule an infallible papal definition is condemned.

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

After a pope infallibly defines a dogma, the past opinion of saints that contradict it cannot be used anymore as a source of possible truth and must be outright rejected. Thus, no matter what the saints taught, or one may think they taught before an infallible definition from a pope, the pope's infallible definition takes precedence and silences any further dissent. "Many matters that formerly were open to discussion, no longer now admit of discussion." (Pius XII, *Humani Generis*)

## Saints' Seemingly Heretical Teachings

If it seems a saint taught heresy after a pope had already infallibly defined a dogma then the saint's teaching is either,

- 1) taken out of context, either due to a poor use of words, or lack of understanding by the reader who has not considered the rest of the discourse or the other writings of the saint on the same topic;
- 2) corrupted, fraudulent, or mistranslated;
- 3) heretical and the saint amended his position before he died.

Beware of those who attempt to use saints' and theologians' teachings in order to deny infallible decrees from popes. This is a deceitful ploy often used by heretics who lurk within the structures of the Catholic Church in order to undermine the Catholic faith. Popes have exposed their methods.

Pope Clement XIII, *In Dominico Agro*, 1761: "1. ...Evil and deceitful men would exist in the Church of God. The insidious tempters would use their work to try to infect unwary minds with errors which are hostile to evangelical truth. 2. It often happens that certain unworthy ideas come forth in the Church of God which, although they directly contradict each other, plot together to undermine the purity of the Catholic faith in some way. ...Meanwhile the matter is such that diabolical error, when it has artfully colored its lies, easily clothes itself in the likeness of truth while very brief additions or changes corrupt the meaning of expressions; and confession, which usually works salvation, sometimes, with a slight change, inches toward death. 3. The faithful—especially those who are simple or uncultivated—should be kept away from dangerous and narrow paths upon which they can hardly set foot without faltering. The sheep should not be led to pasture through trackless places. Nor should peculiar ideas—even those of Catholic scholars—be proposed to them. Rather, only those ideas should be communicated which are definitely marked as Catholic truth by their universality, antiquity, and harmony."

Pope Clement is teaching that no matter what one thinks a saint or theologian may have taught it can never take precedence over Catholic truth that has been infallibly

defined by popes, or non-infallibly defined truths that are part of ordinary magisterium. Not only do these deceitful heretics take saints' teachings out of context, they also tamper with them. Pope Clement says, they, with "very brief additions or changes corrupt the meaning of expressions." They are easily detected, because they pit isolated teachings of a few saints, most times taking them out of context, or by using corrupted, or fraudulent, or mistranslated documents to overrule infallible decrees from popes. On the one hand they are presented with overwhelming evidence from infallible papal decrees. On the other hand they present a few isolated teachings of the saints taken out of context that seem to contradict the infallible papal definitions, some saints actually contradicting what popes infallibly defined because in the days the saints lived it was not yet infallibly defined, and then bind the reader to what they believe the saints taught instead of what popes have infallibly taught. In every case they are guilty of heresy for presenting saints' teachings as having more authority than infallible papal decrees. They have turned upside down the hierarchic structure of the Church. They are guilty for implying that saints are invested with the charism of infallibility and not the popes. They believe the saints are needed to tell us what the popes mean and not visa-versa. It is the popes, teaching infallibly, who settle disputes regarding real and apparent contradictions among the saints' teachings. It is "the Teaching Authority of the Church itself, which gives such authoritative approval to scholastic theology." (Pius XII, *Humani Generis*) These heretics take the seemingly contradictory teachings of a few saints and give them superiority over the clear un-ambiguous words of infallible papal decrees. The heretics say, "Decrees of the Teaching Church must be explained from the writings of the Ancients." (Pius XII, *Humani Generis*) We do not need the saints to tell us what popes' mean, although that is certainly an important task of the saints. However, we absolutely need popes to tell us what saints' mean, which ones were in error or taken out of context, etc. "The very doctrine of Catholic doctors derives its authority from the Church." Thus, if there is a clear contradiction in what one believes a saint taught and an infallible papal definition, the infallible papal definition takes precedence and must be believed under pain of anathema:

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

Pius XII in "*Humani Generis*" exposes this ploy of the heretics within the structures of the Church.<sup>[1]</sup> He says they are detected by appealing to the Ancient Fathers, especially the Greeks, in order to deny infallible papal definitions (dogmas) and undermine the teaching authority of the Church. He also teaches that once a pope infallibly defines a dogma, no matter what saints have, or are thought to have taught, the dogma must be believed and the past erroneous opinions of saints must be rejected.

Pope Pius XII, *Humani Generis*, 1950: 18. Unfortunately these advocates of novelty easily pass from despising scholastic theology to the neglect of and even contempt for the Teaching Authority of the Church itself, which gives such authoritative approval to scholastic theology. ...What is expounded in the Encyclical Letters of the Roman Pontiffs concerning the nature and constitution of the Church, is

---

<sup>[1]</sup> Sadly, Pius XII stands condemned by his own writings. He taught the heresy of contraception in 1951 by allowing Natural Family Planning and thus became automatically excommunicated and lost his office. (See: Exurge Michael Journal, Issue # 8, Natural Family Planning is Contraception)

deliberately and habitually neglected by some with the idea of giving force to a certain vague notion which they profess to have found in the Ancient Fathers, especially the Greeks. The Popes, they assert, do not wish to pass judgment on what is a matter of dispute among theologians, so recourse must be had to the early sources, and the recent constitutions and decrees of the Teaching Church must be explained from the writings of the Ancients. 19. Although these things seem well said, still they are not free from error. It is true that Popes generally leave theologians free in those matters which are disputed in various ways by men of very high authority in this field; but history teaches that many matters that formerly were open to discussion, no longer now admit of discussion. 20 Nor must it be thought that what is expounded in Encyclical Letters does not of itself demand consent... if the Supreme Pontiffs in their official documents purposely pass judgment on a matter up to that time under dispute, it is obvious that that matter, according to the mind and will of the Pontiffs, cannot be any longer considered a question open to discussion among theologians. 21. ...God has given to His Church a living Teaching Authority to elucidate and explain what is contained in the deposit of faith only obscurely and implicitly. This deposit of faith our Divine Redeemer has given for authentic interpretation not to each of the faithful, not even to theologians, but only to the Teaching Authority of the Church. But if the Church does exercise this function of teaching, as she often has through the centuries, either in the ordinary or in the extraordinary way, it is clear how false is a procedure which would attempt to explain what is clear by means of what is obscure. Indeed, the very opposite procedure must be used. Hence Our Predecessor of immortal memory, Pius IX, teaching that the most noble office of theology is to show how a doctrine defined by the Church is contained in the sources of revelation, added these words, and with very good reason: ‘in that sense in which it has been defined by the Church’.”

“In that sense in which it has been defined by the Church,” means it is the popes who tell us what that sense is not the saints. It is the popes who tell us which saints’ opinions were correct, which were wrong, and which ones are being taken out of context. How false it is to take obscure and peculiar texts from saints, that are odious to pious ears in the way they are presented, and attempt to bind Catholics to it, while either ignoring or subjecting the clear words of infallible papal decrees to their selected teachings of what they believe a few saints had taught.

### ***Taken out of context***

There are two ways heretics take saints’ teachings out of context in order to defend their heresy; One, by using an erroneous teaching from saints that a pope has since infallibly condemned; Two, by misinterpreting what the saints actually meant.

**One:** They use erroneous teachings of saints regarding doctrines that were not infallibly defined in the days the saints lived. They will take the erroneous opinion of a saint and attempt to bind you to it. To do this they either totally ignore the infallible papal definition, hoping the reader does not know of it; or, as in most cases, they will interpret the infallible definition according to the mind of the erroneous teaching of the saint, while rejecting the clear meaning of the infallible decree in the sense the popes have taught it.

**Two:** They misinterpret the words of the saints, taking them out of context and many times not presenting relevant portions of the text that clearly explain what the saints meant.

### Poor Use of Words

Saints could have used a poor choice of words, not meaning what the words clearly lead one to believe. I have made mistakes in my past writings by a poor use of words that could easily be taken in the heretical sense. I did not mean them in the heretical sense. If anyone read the rest of my writings they would know I could not have meant it in the heretical sense. I have since corrected the poorly worded passages so that there can be no mistaking what I meant, and will do so in the future if necessary. If I taught the heretical meaning several other times, so as to remove all doubt as to what I meant, then I would be a notorious heretic.

I will give an example of poor choice of words. Speaking at leisure, I made a statement that can easily be interpreted as heresy, but I did not mean it in the heretical sense. It would be very imprudent to put this statement in writing, but I am now to make a point. A Catholic friend and I read an article in which the Southern Baptist's firmly condemned homosexuality. I brought up the fact that about a year or so ago they called unbelieving Jews to conversion and said they would go to hell unless they believe in Jesus Christ, for that they incurred the accusation of Anti-Semitism. I then said, "The Southern Baptist's are more Catholic than fallen-away Catholics." Well, I did not mean the Southern Baptist's are Catholic in any way, shape, or form. They are 100 percent non-Catholic heretics who will go to hell unless they abjure their false religion and enter the Catholic Church before they die. What I meant was they profess more Catholic truths than fallen-away Catholics, and appear to be more Catholic than fallen-away Catholics, because when God's chosen (Catholics) rebel against Him they get the worst punishment. Taking my statement as it stands, separate from my other writings, one can easily attempt to prove that I taught Southern Baptists could be implicit Catholics, or partial Catholics, or belong to the Catholic Church in some way. But, that is not what I meant at all.

### Mistaken use of Words

A saint could have made a mistake. For example, a saint could be giving a sermon and say, "There are three Gods in one Person." Of course he meant to say, "There are three Persons in One God." But, that is not what he said. If someone recorded his words in writing and gave them to others they would think he is a heretic if they did not know him and have access to his other teachings that clearly prove he made a mistake.

### Circular Arguments

As heretics are want to do, both those lurking outside and those inside the structures of the Catholic Church, they use selected teachings out of context to deny infallible truths. They rely upon circular arguments always taking you back to their selected texts and demanding you submit to them in spite of overwhelming evidence against them. I

will give one obvious example that relates to the Arian heretics' misuse of Bible verses, the same applies to other heretics' misuse of saints' teachings.

It is an infallible truth that Jesus Christ is God. This truth is revealed in the New Testament and infallibly defined in the baptismal vow and earliest creed of the Church, the Apostles' Creed. An apostate who denies the divinity of Christ, such as an Arian heretic, can use isolated Bible verses to try and prove Jesus Christ is not God and is only man. The Arian heretics produced these following Bible verses.

"The Father is greater than I." (Jn. 14:28) "Who hath touched my garment...?" (Mk. 5:30) "And Jesus said to him: Why dost thou call me good? None is good but God alone." (Lk. 18:19) "And Jesus advanced in wisdom and age and grace with God and men." (Lk. 2:52)

By these verses alone it clearly seems to teach that Jesus Christ could not be God because He is not equal to the Father, He did not know who touched His garment and God knows all things, only God is good and Jesus said do not call Him good, and Jesus advanced in wisdom and grace and God is the fullness of wisdom and the source of all grace at all times. Therefore after presenting his selected Bible verses, the Arian heretic will say Jesus is not God.

Now for the other Bible verses that clearly teach Jesus is God that the Arian heretics either ignored, or demoted as being subject to the heretical interpretations of their selected verses.

"I and the Father are one." (Jn. 10:30) "Jesus said to them: Amen, amen, I say to you, before Abraham was made, I AM." (Jn 8:58) "And now glorify thou me, O Father, with thyself, with the glory which I had, before the world was, with thee." (Jn. 17:5) "In the beginning was the Word... the Word was God... And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." (Jn. 1:1, 14)

After the Arian heretic reads these Bible verses that clearly prove Jesus is God he would circle back to his selected texts and say, "But that cannot be the true interpretation. Mine clearly teach He is not God. You have to interpret them in the light of the verses I produced that clearly teach Jesus is not God." And thus the heretic takes you in an endless circle, as do all heretics who quote Bible verses or saints out of context and even corrupting them, always bringing you back to their selected texts and demand you believe their interpretations, in spite of the overwhelming evidence against them, and worst in spite of the clear words of infallibly papal definitions.

What, then, is the context of the verses that seem to deny the divinity of Jesus Christ? Briefly, Jesus Christ condescended to His humanity and hid His divinity. In the beginning of His public ministry, Jesus did not want everyone to know He was God, and only slowly revealed His divinity to the people, even to those closest to Him, such as the apostles. When the Bible says, Jesus grew in wisdom, it means in the eyes of others, that He manifested His wisdom to them at stages, or else they would know He was God before it was time for this truth to be manifest. Also, Jesus is equal to the Father in His divinity and less than the Father in His humanity. Jesus' human nature was in subjection to His divine nature. Many times when Christ condescended to men He would speak from His human nature, while hiding his divine nature.

### ***Corrupted, fraudulent, or mistranslated***

It is a proven historical fact that writings of saints have been tampered with by later additions and subtractions, mistranslated, and misrepresented by fraudulent works. Pope Clement verifies this. He says, the heretics, with “very brief additions or changes corrupt the meaning of expressions.” Heretics have tampered with original texts of St. Jerome, St. Athanasius, and others as proven by Catholic scholars. There have even been texts that were attributed to saints that later turned out to be fraudulent, or were written by some one else.

### ***Taught heresy and later repented***

There could be a case before a saint became holy in which he taught heresy and had since amended his position. There are many cases in which saints have taught errors and have corrected their own writings. St. Augustine wrote a book of corrections and was working on a second book before he died. If one went back far enough, when St. Augustine was a pagan, and used his writings from that time period they can misuse them to try and prove St. Augustine was a heretic. I have corrected some of my earlier erroneous teachings. A bad willed person could use them to either try and discredit me, or put forward my error as the truth.

## **How To Know If Saints’ Teachings Are Authentic and Interpreted Correctly**

What is one to do if presented with a saint’s teaching that seems to be heretical, peculiar, and odious to pious ears? First, you must always bind yourself to what popes have infallibly taught no matter what someone tries to make you think a saint taught. Common sense, with God’s grace, can guide you in detecting some of the most odious and peculiar teachings that contradict infallible dogmas.

Second, make sure the saint’s teaching is not being taken out of context, or is not a corrupted or fraudulent text. Other teachings of the same saint can shed light on ambiguous passages or ones that seem to be heretical. To accuse a saint of teaching heresy for a one time seemingly heretical passage is not enough. The evidence has to be notorious—persistent to the point that there is no doubt the saint meant to teach heresy. To use one seemingly heretical passage from a saint against the bulk of his other writings that clearly condemns the heretical interpretation is the mark of a most obstinate heretic, who wants to believe in the heresy with a passion, so that if one was to come back from the dead and tell him he was in heresy and is a heretic he would not believe. How much further can one go with a heretic who continues to call white black and black white? There is a point when you must no longer speak with him. Before breaking off communication with him you must, again, firmly condemn him as a heretic and tell him he is on the road to hell. To continue arguing with such a fool, after you presented more

than enough evidence, is to place yourself in danger of becoming a fool, and of eventually losing the faith yourself.

Instead of getting caught in the trap of going in circles with these heretics, after you have presented sufficient evidence, a straightforward answer to their misuse of the saints' teachings will get right to the point. Simply say, "Saints are not above the pope. I do not care what you think a saint taught or did not teach you are bound to believe infallible papal dogmas in precisely the same way and sense the popes have defined them under pain of anathema. Peter has spoken! End of discussion." Then present them again with the infallible papal decrees, accuse them of being heretics for denying them, and tell them they are outside the Catholic Church and on the road to hell unless they abjure from their heresy. Then all you can do is pray and sacrifice for their repentance and conversion, and inform others of their deceptions. (See Not Pope: In Out of Context)