

# The Minister's Sacramental Intention



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: 8/2007; Current version: 12/2021

**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>WARNING .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>THINGS NECESSARY TO CONFECT THE SACRAMENTS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<i>Form, matter, and intention .....</i>	<i>4</i>
<b>DOGMA AND HERESY REGARDING THE MINISTER’S INTENTION .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>CONSEQUENCES OF EACH OPINION .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<i>How each opinion relates to Holy Orders .....</i>	<i>6</i>
How each opinion affects the heretical and schismatic Society of St. Pius X .....	7
<i>The Talleyrand case.....</i>	<i>8</i>
<i>Status of Holy Orders according to interior and exterior intention opinons .....</i>	<i>9</i>
<b>THE EXTERIOR INTENTION DOGMA .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<i>Held by all the Church Fathers .....</i>	<i>9</i>
Interior intention heresy did not exist until the 12th century .....	10
<i>Apostate Thomas Aquinas held the exterior intention dogma .....</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>The Councils of Constance and Florence in the 15th century allowed for both opinions.....</i>	<i>12</i>
What it means to intend to do as the Church does .....	13
<i>Pagans who do not believe in baptism can baptize.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Protestants who do not believe baptism remits sins can baptize validly.....</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Priests who do not believe in the Holy Eucharist can confect the sacrament.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>A minister’s personal motive or intention is of no consequence for validity.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>To do as the Church does includes acting serious.....</i>	<i>15</i>
The case of a seminary student practicing how to administer the sacrament of baptism .....	17
<i>Held by Ambrosius Catharinus in the 16th century.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Favored by the invalid and heretical Council of Trent in the 16th century .....</i>	<i>18</i>
<b>THE INTERIOR INTENTION HERESY .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<i>The exterior intention dogma was on the decline since the 16th century.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Most modern theologians hold the interior intention heresy .....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>One modern theologian who does not hold the interior intention opinion .....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>An nominal Holy Office decree in the 17th century denied the exterior intention dogma .....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Undecided by apostate Antipope Leo XIII in the 19th century .....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>The exterior intention dogma does not reduce sacraments to form and matter only.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>The interior intention heresy is based upon a heretical confidence in the goodness of men .....</i>	<i>24</i>
Many men are not sincere and lie .....	24
Catholics and other men are not indefectible .....	25
Heretics and infiltrators are liars and not sincere .....	25
<i>A new interior intention heresy refutes the common one .....</i>	<i>28</i>

## WARNING

*The Dogmatic Theology of the Intention of the Minister in the Confection of the Sacraments* by Rev. Raphael De Salvo and the *Catholic Encyclopedia* contain heresies and other errors. I never use books that contain heresy as a definitive source. For want of other English sources, I use them when the teachings conform to dogmas or to doctrines that belong to the ordinary magisterium or to refute the arguments or to expose the heresies in these books.

## Things Necessary to Confect the Sacraments

### Form, matter, and intention

To validly confect a sacrament, the proper form, matter, and intention are necessary. The form is the words used that are necessary to confect the sacrament. The matter is the physical things necessary to confect the sacrament. And the intention is the necessary intention of the minister to confect the sacrament:

Invalid and heretical *Council of Florence*, 1439: “All these sacraments are dispensed in three ways, namely, by things as the matter, by words as the form, and by the person of the minister conferring the sacrament with the intention of doing as the Church does; if any of these is lacking the sacrament is not fulfilled.” (From the Bull *Exultate Deo*, Nov. 22, 1439; D. 695.)

Using a valid rite, which consists of a ceremonial part and an essential part, and acting serious are part of the minister’s necessary intention to confect the sacraments. (See in this book [The Rite Is Part of the Minister’s Intention](#), p. **Error! Bookmark not defined.**, and [To do as the Church does includes acting serious](#), p. 15.)

## Dogma and Heresy Regarding the Minister’s Intention

This book will deal with the minister’s intention when confecting the sacraments. This book teaches about the dogma and heresy regarding the necessary intention of a minister to confect the sacraments: the dogma is the exterior intention opinion, the heresy is the interior intention opinion. I will take the case of a minister who uses a valid Catholic rite and uses the proper form and matter. The only variable will be the minister’s intention. What kind of intention does the minister need to confect the sacrament? These are the two opinions:

1. Exterior Intention Opinion (the dogma): This opinion teaches that the minister only has to intend to do what the Catholic Church does, which, according to this opinion, means that the minister’s personal intention to confect the sacraments does not matter regarding validity. All the minister needs is to intend to do what the Catholic Church does by using a valid rite, form, and matter and acting serious. I believe this opinion is the true one for many reasons.
2. The Interior Intention Opinion (the heresy): This opinion teaches that the minister must interiorly intend to confect the sacraments; that is, he must have the personal intention to confect the sacraments.

We will read about both of these opinions from the introduction and conclusion of a book that deals with this topic:

*The Dogmatic Theology of the Intention of the Minister in the Confection of the Sacraments* [hereafter MI], by apostate Rev. Raphael De Salvo, O.S.B., S.T.L., Introduction: “It is quite true that the sacraments produce their effects *ex opere operato* regardless of the faith or probity of the minister, but at the same time it must be remembered that when the intention is lacking, there is no sacrament present to produce those effects. The theologians who coined the expression presupposed the presence of a true sacrament.

“It was for this reason that the Council of Trent defined the dogma of the necessity of intention in the confection of the sacraments... This intention is to will to do that which Christ willed, since the intention of the Church is the intention and will of Christ. ...Theologians began to speculate on the expression *quod facit Ecclesia* [what the Church does]. What did the Council of Trent mean by the expression? Some held that the true internal intention was necessary and required by the Council. [Footnote 55: Bellarmine, Suarez, De Lugo, Franzelin, etc.] Others held that a sacrament is confected as often as the external elements of a sacrament are done seriously even if by the interior intention the minister does not intend to confect a sacrament. [Footnote 56: Catharinus, Contenson, Salmeron, Farvacques, Serry, etc.]”<sup>1</sup>

MI, Summation and Conclusion: “[p. 94] The present status of the thesis asserting that the internal intention is necessary for the valid confessions of the sacraments is its classification as a theological opinion...<sup>2</sup> [p. 105] J. CONCLUSIONS: The study of the Dogmatic Theology on the intention of the minister in the Confection of the sacraments warrants the following conclusions: 1. The opinion of Catharinus and the school of external intention is not explicitly condemned... 2. The internal intention is required for the validity of the sacraments. This, however, is not a matter of faith.”

According to the interior intention heresy, one can only *presume* that a sacrament is confected if the minister uses the proper rite, form, and matter and does not manifest an intention to not do as the Church intends to do. According to this heresy, no man can ever be certain that a sacrament has been confected because of the possibility that the minister did not personally intend to confect the sacrament and kept his defective intention secret.

According to the exterior intention dogma, it is *certain* that a sacrament has been confected if the minister does as the Church does by using the proper rite, form, and matter and acting serious. If the minister does these things, then it is a certain indication that he has intended to do as the Church does regardless if he personally does not intend to confect the sacrament. The dogma that teaches that a pagan can validly baptize a catechumen is strong proof for the exterior intention dogma. A pagan does not believe in original sin or the sacrament of baptism and hence cannot personally intend to confect what he does not believe in. He only needs to intend to do as the Catholic Church does, which he proves by using the proper form and matter the way the Catholic Church intends these things to be used, and by so doing confects the sacrament when he baptizes the catechumen.

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Dogmatic Theology of the Intention of the Minister in the Confection of the Sacraments* [hereafter MI], by apostate Raphael De Salvo, O.S.B., S.T.L., A Dissertation. The Catholic University of America Studies in Sacred Theology (Second Series) No. 26. *Imprimi Potest*: + Paul M. Nahlen, O.S.B., *Abbas*, Subiaco, Arkansas, August 4, 1948. *Nihil Obstat*: Eugene M. Burke, C.S.P., *Censor Deputatus*, August 5, 1948. *Imprimatur*: + Patrick A. O’Boyle, S.T.D., Archbishop of Washington, August 5, 1948. Catholic University of America Press, Inc., 1949. p. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Footnote 18: Cf. Fenton, J., *The Concept of Sacred Theology*, p. 71; Le Blanc, J., “Children’s Limbo, Theory or Doctrine?” *AER*, 117 (Sept. 1947) 165.

## Consequences of Each Opinion

The interior intention heresy only *presumes* that sacraments are confected because no one can read a man's heart unless that man makes his intention manifest. Because no mere man can know the secret thoughts of another man, the interior intention opinion makes it easy for a malicious or faithless minister to secretly not intend to confect the sacraments and hence the sacraments he administers are not confected and the people have no way of ever knowing. In short, this heresy is a prescription for chaos! No man can know for certain if he validly received the sacrament of baptism, if he validly received the sacrament of penance and hence was absolved of his sins, if he validly received the sacrament of confirmation, if he validly received the sacrament of extreme unction, and if he validly received the sacrament of orders. No priest can ever be certain that he is a priest. He can only presume he is a priest. No bishop can be certain he is a bishop. He can only presume he is a bishop. And no pope can ever be certain that he is the pope because a pope needs to be a priest and then a bishop before he can become the pope.

According to the interior intention heresy, whole lines of bishops and priests could be invalidated without any human way of knowing. If one bad bishop in a line did not personally intend to consecrate a bishop, then every bishop and priest that descends from his line would be invalid. And if this bad bishop kept secret his intention not to consecrate, no one would ever know that the bishops and priests that descend from his line are invalid, are not bishops and priests. Hence every confession these apparent bishops and priests hear is invalid, the penitents are not absolved; every Mass they say, the Holy Eucharist is not confected; all of these apparent bishops' ordinations and consecrations are invalid, etc. This is the strongest argument that condemns the interior intention heresy and hence proves the exterior intention dogma—especially when one considers that in the history of the Catholic Church many men (such as Marranos, Freemasons, and Communists) infiltrated Her and became priests and bishops with the intention to destroy the Catholic Church, which obviously includes destroying the sacraments if they could or at least invalidating them if they could by not having the interior intention to confect the sacraments. Again, this fact is one proof of the exterior intention dogma.

According to the exterior intention dogma, these infiltrators, as well as any minister who does not personally intend to confect the sacraments, have no power to invalidate the sacraments they confect when they use the proper rite, form, matter, and do so in a serious manner, all of which proves they have intended to do as the Church does regardless of the fact that they personally do not intend to confect the sacraments. If they wanted to invalidate the sacraments, they would have to do something that is public and visible to the recipients of the sacraments or others present. They would have to use a defective rite or a defective form or defective matter, and all these things are public and visible to the recipients or others who are present. If any defect was used in conferring the sacrament of orders, it would be detected by the recipient and others present so that they would know for certain the sacrament was not confected. And if there was no defect in the rite, form, or matter and the minister acted serious, then those present would see that there was no defect in these things and hence be certain that the sacrament was confected.

## How each opinion relates to Holy Orders

The validity or non-validity of Holy Orders conferred by infiltrators (such as by bishops who are Freemasons, Communists, or Converso Jews) is a serious problem that cannot be ignored. The interior intention heresy does not solve the problem; the exterior intention dogma does.

The interior intention heresy only presumes validity when the proper rite, form, and matter are used and the minister acts serious. Consequently, this opinion does not solve the problem nor alleviate the crisis to Catholic consciences regarding the validity of the sacraments they receive, especially from infiltrator ministers. If the minister does all the necessary external things to

confect the sacrament by using a proper rite, form, and matter and acting serious, Catholics still cannot be certain that they validly received the sacraments because the minister could have interiorly intended to not confect the sacrament.

Whereas, the exterior intention dogma teaches that validity is certain when the minister uses the proper rite, form, and matter and acts serious. Consequently, this opinion solves the problem and alleviates the crisis to Catholic consciences regarding the validity of the sacraments they receive. If the minister did all the external things he needs to do and hence proves that he has intended to do as the Church does, the minister confects the sacraments and Catholics can know this with certainty by carefully observing what the minister does and how he acts.

### *How each opinion affects the heretical and schismatic Society of St. Pius X*

We will now see how each of these opinions affects the validity of Holy Orders conferred in the heretical and schismatic Society of Saint Pius X (SSPX). The SSPX traces its orders back to the Masonic Bishop Achille “Cardinal” Lienart who ordained the founder of the SSPX, Bishop Marcel Lefebvre, a priest and later consecrated Lefebvre a bishop. Liénart was born in 1884, ordained in 1907, became a Mason in 1912, was promoted to the 30th Masonic degree in 1924, became bishop in 1928, ordained Archbishop Lefebvre in 1929, and became Cardinal in 1930. There is good evidence that Lefebvre was also a Freemason. The Marquis de la Franquerie, a Catholic French historian, was a papal Secret Chamberlain who lived in Luçon, Vendée, France, and specialized in investigating the infiltration of the Catholic hierarchy by French Freemasons. He wrote a book titled *Papal Infallibility (L'Infaillibilité Pontificale)*. In that book on pages 80 and 81 he presents evidence that Achille Lienart was a Luciferian Freemason who attended black Masses:

*Papal Infallibility (L'Infaillibilité Pontificale)*, Marquis de la Franquerie, pp. 80-81: “This attitude of the Cardinal [Liénart] could not surprise those who knew his membership in the Freemasonic and Luciferian lodges. This was the reason why the author of this study [i.e., the Marquis de la Franquerie] always had refused to accompany Cardinal Liénart in the official ceremonies as Secret Chamberlain.

“The Cardinal had been initiated in a lodge in Cambrai whose Venerable was Brother Debierre. He frequented a lodge in Cambrai, three at Lille, one in Valenciennes, and two in Paris, of which one was in a special way composed of parliamentarians. In the year 1919, he is designated as ‘Visitor’ (18th Degree), then, in 1924, as 30th degree. The future Cardinal met in the lodges Brother Debierre and Roger Solengro. Debierre was one of the informers of Cardinal Gasparri who had been initiated in America, and of Cardinal Hartmann. Archbishop of Cologne, a Rosicrucian.

“The Cardinal belonged to the International League against Anti-Semitism, where he met up again with Marc Sangnier and Father Violet.

“It was given to us to meet in Lourdes a former Freemason who, on July 19, 1932, had been miraculously cured of a wound suppurating on his left foot for fourteen years — a cure recognized by the Verification Bureau on July 18, 1933. This miraculously-healed gentleman, Mr. B, ...told us that, at the time when he frequented a Luciferian lodge, he met there the cardinal whom he recognized and was dumbfounded.”

After Lefebvre was presented with evidence that “Cardinal” Lienart was a Freemason, he accepted the evidence as true and acknowledged Lienart as a Freemason in a talk he gave in Montreal, Canada, May 27, 1976. His talk was recorded in Issue No. 51 of *Chiesa Viva*, March 1976. The article is titled “Il Cardinale Achille Liénart era Massone”:

Bishop Marcel Lefebvre, “Il Cardinale Achille Liénart era Massone”: “Two months ago in Rome, the traditionalist periodical *Chiesa Viva*, published — I have seen it in Rome with my own eyes — on the back side of the cover, the photograph of Cardinal Liénart with all his Masonic paraphernalia, the day of the date of his inscription in Masonry..., then the date at which he rose to the 20th, then to the 30th degree of Masonry, attached to this lodge, to that lodge, at this place, at that place. Meanwhile, about two or three months after this publication was made, I heard nothing about any reaction, or any contradiction. Now, unfortunately, I must say to you that this Cardinal Liénart is my bishop, it is he who ordained me a priest, it is he who consecrated me a bishop. I cannot help it... Fortunately, the orders are valid... But, in spite of it, it was very painful for me to be informed of it.”

Hence there is good evidence that proves “Cardinal” Lienart was a Freemason. And there is evidence that Lefebvre was also a Freemason. The important question, then, is, Were the Holy Orders conferred by “Cardinal” Lienart valid or not? If the orders are not valid, then Lefebvre was a layman and all the so-called bishops he consecrated and so-called priests he ordained are also laymen.

According to the internal intention heresy, one can only *presume* that the sacrament of orders was validly conferred by these Freemasons if they used the proper rite, form, and matter and acted serious. And in this case any sane man using common sense alone would have to strongly and overwhelmingly believe that the Holy Orders were not actually conferred by these Freemasons because their goal as infiltrators is to subvert Catholics and destroy the Catholic Church and Her sacraments. And the most effective way for an infiltrator bishop to do this, if the interior intention heresy were true, is simply to interiorly intend to not confect the sacraments every time he administers them. This way catechumens and Catholics would think they validly received the sacraments and would have no way of knowing the sacraments are invalid. Surely, an infiltrator could do no greater damage to Catholics and the Catholic Church and Her sacraments than by secretly invalidating them if it were possible.

According to the external intention dogma, one is *certain* that orders were validly conferred as long as the Masonic bishop used the proper rite, form, and matter and acted serious. Hence infiltrator ministers are given no power to secretly invalidate the sacraments.

### The Talleyrand case

In the history of the Catholic Church, there is proof that the exterior intention dogma has been followed by an apostate antipope. Bishop Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord (1754-1838) was a Freemason who joined the schismatic and Masonic French Constitutional Church in which he consecrated bishops and ordained priests:

Louis Madelin of the Academie Française, Talleyrand’s biographer (New York: Roy 1948): “He [Talleyrand] belonged to all the great masonic lodges, from the Philalatheans, whence sprang the Jacobin Club, to the Re-united Friends, where the great ringleaders of the future were already preparing the Revolution.”

Talleyrand repented and converted four hours before he died and confessed that he was a Freemason:

*Catholic Encyclopedia*, “Charles-Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord,” 1912: “Prince of Benevento, Bishop of Autun, French minister and ambassador, born in Paris, 13 February, 1754, died there, May, 1838. ... He then read the ‘most revolutionary books’, and at length, giving up his priestly life, plunged into the licentiousness of the period. Having, nevertheless, been ordained priest (1779) and appointed general agent of the clergy (1780) he rapidly acquired a reputation as a man of ability. ...Owing to his notorious immorality he obtained an episcopal see only through a promise wrung from the dying king by his father, Comte Daniel de Talleyrand.



Consecrated on 16 January, 1789, and promoted to the Bishopric of Autun, he appeared in his diocese only to be elected a member of the ‘Etats Généraux’. ...Believing the democratic movement irresistible he joined it. As a member of the Constitutional Committee, he took part in the ‘Declaration of the Rights of Man’. He extolled the spoliation of the clergy and took the oath to the Civil Constitution. His chapter, however, having described him as deserving ‘infamy in this world and damnation in the next’, he resigned his see. But he had consecrated several constitutional bishops, given Gobel the Bishopric of Paris, and was excommunicated by pontifical Brief of 13 April, 1791. ...Four hours before his death he signed, in the presence of Abbé Dupanloup, a solemn declaration in which he openly disavowed ‘the great errors which . . . had troubled and afflicted the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church, and in which he himself had had the misfortune to fall’.”

Apostate Antipope Pius VII looked upon Bishop Talleyrand’s consecrations of bishops and ordinations of priests as valid and hence did not order them to be re-consecrated or re-ordained, not even conditionally. Hence he looked upon the Holy Orders conferred by these Masonic bishops as certainly valid, which is the exterior intention dogma. If apostate Antipope Pius VII had held the interior intention heresy, he would have at least had the bishops and priests conditionally consecrated and ordained.

#### Status of Holy Orders according to interior and exterior intention opinions

To conclude, according to the interior intention heresy, the bishops and priests of the Society of Saint Pius X are only presumed to be true (valid) bishops and priests.

But according to the exterior intention dogma, the bishops and priests of the Society of Saint Pius X are with all certainty true (valid) bishops and priests if the consecrating or ordaining bishop used the proper rite, form, and matter and acted serious—all things that can be observed by the candidate and others present.

## **The Exterior Intention Dogma**

### **Held by all the Church Fathers**

None of the Church Fathers, such as St. Augustine, taught that an interior intention is necessary to confect the sacraments. Hence the exterior intention opinion is at least a dogma of the ordinary magisterium:

MI, p. 68: “1. It is objected against the opinion of the necessity of internal intention that the Ancient Fathers never inquired into the matter of internal intention when investigating the sacraments of doubtful validity. They did make investigations as to whether Baptism was conferred with the distinct invocation of the three persons of the Blessed Trinity, whether the matter was applied to the subject, whether the subject externally contradicted the sacrament, and whether the minister externally performed the sacred rite in a playful manner or seriously. But in regard to whether the minister internally withheld his intention, or whether or not he wished to conduct himself as a minister of the Church, no inquiry at all was made. ...And some of the Church Fathers, such as St. Augustine, explicitly taught that the exterior intention suffices for the confecting of the sacraments by the minister.”

MI: “[pp. 37-38] B. ST. AUGUSTINE AND INTENTION - The first speculations on the intention of the minister are said to have come from the pen of St. Augustine

near the end of his writings against the Donatists. He proposed three cases for solution: 1. Whether a baptism is valid if it is conferred and received deceitfully (fallaciter) in the true Church or what is thought to be the true Church: But let us consider the case of someone also giving in deceit, when both the giver and the receiver are acting deceitfully in the unity of the Catholic Church itself, whether this should rather be acknowledged as baptism... To this case St. Augustine gave a solution in the affirmative from the common opinion of the time: 'And yet, if the deceit be subsequently brought to light, no one seeks a repetition of the sacrament; but the fraud is either punished by excommunication or set aright by penitence.'

"[pp. 42-43] The school of the external intention is well represented by Drouin who contended that when St. Augustine used the term 'fallacious' administration, he referred to the minister who had the intention to simulate, i.e., one who confected the sacrament in an apparently serious manner, but inwardly withheld his intention and in reality ridiculed what he did outwardly. He pronounces such a performance a valid Sacrament.<sup>3</sup> This was the pattern of interpretation of almost every member of the school of Catharinus."

Therefore, all of the Church Fathers taught the exterior intention opinion and thus did not teach the interior intention opinion. Hence the exterior intention opinion is a dogma of the ordinary magisterium; whereas, the interior intention opinion is condemned as a heresy by the ordinary magisterium.

#### *Interior intention heresy did not exist until the 12th century*

The interior intention heresy has no link with tradition, with the teachings of the apostles and the other Church Fathers. The first to teach the interior intention heresy was Hugh of St. Victor in the 12th century; that is, if his teachings on the topic were not taken out of context. He was born in 1096 and died in 1141:

MI, p. 47: "To Hugh of St. Victor must be given the credit of being the first theologian of this period to give a clear-cut distinction for the need of intention. ...Although Hugh did not mention the *internal intention* by name, it is clear that the idea of internal intention was in his mind."

#### **Apostate Thomas Aquinas held the exterior intention dogma**

Even though he was an apostate, Thomas Aquinas held the exterior intention opinion even though he may not have held it as a dogma. One reason Thomas defends the exterior intention opinion is because of a well-founded objection to the interior intention opinion. Here is the well-founded objection:

Summa, III, q. 64, art. 8: "Whether the minister's intention is required for the validity of a sacrament? ...**Objection 2:** Further, one man's intention cannot be known to another. Therefore if the minister's intention were required for the validity of a sacrament, he who approaches a sacrament could not know whether he has received the sacrament. Consequently he could have no certainty in regard to salvation; the more that some sacraments are necessary for salvation, as we shall state further on (65, 4)."

And here is Thomas' reply that agrees with this objection:

---

<sup>3</sup> Footnote 24: Drouin, R., *De Re Sacramentaria*, Q. 7, Cap. 3, Migne, *Theologiae Cursus Completus* 20, 1495: Minister fallacis nomine eum intelligit S. Augustinus qui habet animum simulatum, qui nimirum licet Sacramentum serio exterius conferat, suam tamen intus cohibet intentionem, et hac ipsum ridet quod facit; atqui Sacramentum, sic consecratum, integrum validumque pronuntiat.

**“Reply to Objection 2:** Some hold that the mental intention of the minister is necessary; in the absence of which the sacrament is invalid... Others with better reason hold that the minister of a sacrament acts in the person of the whole Church, whose minister he is; while in the words uttered by him, the intention of the Church is expressed; and that this suffices for the validity of the sacrament, except the contrary be expressed on the part either of the minister or of the recipient of the sacrament.”

And Thomas again teaches the exterior intention opinion in his answers to objections posed in Article 9:

Summa, III, q. 64, art. 9: “Whether faith is required of necessity in the minister of a sacrament? ... **I answer that,** As stated above (5), since the minister works instrumentally in the sacraments, he acts not by his own but by Christ’s power. Now just as charity belongs to a man’s own power so also does faith. Wherefore, just as the validity of a sacrament does not require that the minister should have charity, and even sinners can confer sacraments, as stated above; so neither is it necessary that he should have faith, and even an unbeliever can confer a true sacrament, provided that the other essentials be there.

**“Reply to Objection 1.** It may happen that a man’s faith is defective... if his faith be defective in regard to the very sacrament that he confers, although he believe that no inward effect is caused by the thing done outwardly, yet he does know that the Catholic Church intends to confer a sacrament by that which is outwardly done. Wherefore, his unbelief notwithstanding, he can intend to do what the Church does, albeit he esteem it to be nothing. And such an intention suffices for a sacrament: because as stated above (8, ad 2) the minister of a sacrament acts in the person of the Church by whose faith any defect in the minister’s faith is made good.”

And here is an excerpt from *The Dogmatic Theology of the Intention of the Minister in the Confection of the Sacrament*:

MI, p. 65: “F. INTERPRETATION OF ST. THOMAS’ TEACHING ON INTENTION - ... The two principal texts of St. Thomas used by the school of Catharinus are the following:

“ ‘...in baptism and the other sacraments which have in the form the exercised act, the mental intention is not required, but the expression of the intention through the words instituted by the Church is sufficient: and therefore, if the form is observed, and nothing is said externally which would express the contrary intention, he (the catechumen in question) is baptized...’<sup>4</sup>

“ ‘Consequently, others with better reason hold that the minister of a sacrament acts in the person of the whole Church, whose minister he is; while in the words uttered by him, the intention of the Church is expressed; and that this suffices for the validity of the sacrament, except the contrary be expressed on the part either of the minister or of the recipient of the sacrament...’<sup>5</sup>

“The latter quotation was the principal one used in the contention that the role of the minister was merely the external application of the matter and the form to a fit subject. This passage was in reply to the objection that if the mental intention were required, the subject would always be in doubt about having received the sacraments validly. Followers of Catharinus declared that the recipient can be certain that he has received the sacraments only if the bare external ceremonies duly applied constitute a valid sacrament.”

---

<sup>4</sup> Footnote 32: *In IV*, Dist. 6, Q. 1, Art. 3, q. 3, sol. 1 ad 2 (*Opera omnia*, Vol. X, p. 37).

<sup>5</sup> Footnote 33: *Summa Theologica*, III, q. 64, art. 8, ad 2.

## The Councils of Constance and Florence in the 15th century allowed for both opinions

The invalid and heretical Councils of Constance and Florence allowed for both the exterior and interior intention opinion. The first to take up the topic of the minister's intention was the Council of Constance (1414-1418). The Council of Florence (1438-1445) was the next. Both councils carefully worded the decrees on the minister's intention so as to allow for the possibility of both the exterior or interior intention opinion while favoring the exterior intention opinion by implication:

MI, p. 21: "In the fifteenth century the Church came forth twice to proclaim that the minister of the sacrament must have the intention of doing what the Church does. The followers of Wyclif and Huss declared that the validity of the sacraments depended upon the minister's faith and state of grace. It was for this reason that Pope Martin V in his Bull *Inter Cunctas* of February 22, 1418, prescribed that persons of doubtful orthodoxy should be cross-examined and asked a number of questions among which was the following: Likewise, whether he believes that an evil priest, using the correct matter and form, and having the intention of doing what the Church does, truly absolves, truly baptizes, and truly confers the other sacraments.<sup>6</sup> On November 22, 1439, Pope Eugene IV issued the famous *Decree for the Armenians*, which stated explicitly that the intention of doing what the Church does is one of the essential requirements for the validity of a sacrament: All the sacraments are perfected by three things, namely, by things as the matter, by words as the form, and by the person of the minister conferring the sacrament with the *intention of doing what the Church does*: if any one of these be lacking, the sacrament is not perfected.<sup>7</sup>"

- The decree from the invalid and heretical Council of Constance (1414-1418):

"22. Likewise, whether he believes that a bad priest, employing the proper matter and form and having the intention of doing what the Church does, truly consecrates, truly absolves, truly baptizes, truly confers the other sacraments." (From the Bull *Inter Cunctas*, Feb. 22, 1418; D. 672.)

- The decree from the invalid and heretical Council of Florence (1439):

"All these sacraments are dispensed in three ways, namely, by things as the matter, by words as the form, and by the person of the minister conferring the sacrament with the intention of doing as the Church does; if any of these is lacking the sacrament is not fulfilled. Among these sacraments there are three, baptism, confirmation, and orders, which imprint an indelible sign on the soul, that is, a certain character distinctive from the others. Hence they should not be repeated in the same person. The remaining four do not imprint a sign and admit of repetition." (From the Bull *Exultate Deo*, Nov. 22, 1439; D. 695.)

---

<sup>6</sup> Footnote 7: Mansi 27, 1212; (DBU 672): Item, utrum credat, quod malus sacerdos cum debita materia et forma et cum intentione faciendi quod facit Ecclesia, vere conficiat, vere absolvat, vere baptizet, vere conferat alia sacramenta.

<sup>7</sup> Footnote 8: Mansi 31A, 1054 (DBU 695): Haec omnia sacramenta tribus perficiuntur, videlicet rebus tanquam materia, verbis tanquam forma, et persona ministri conferentis sacramentum cum intentione faciendi, quod facit Ecclesia: quorum si aliquod desit, non perficitur sacramentum.

## *What it means to intend to do as the Church does*

### Pagans who do not believe in baptism can baptize

One reason the decrees from the Councils of Constance and Florence do not specifically teach that the minister must personally intend to confect the sacrament is because in the 4th century the Catholic Church infallibly decreed that a pagan can validly baptize a catechumen. In this case the pagan does not believe in original sin nor the sacrament of baptism, and hence it is impossible for him to personally intend to confect what he does not believe in. It is enough that he intend to do as the Church does, which he proves by baptising with the proper form and matter and doing so seriously.

### Protestants who do not believe baptism remits sins can baptize validly

Another reason these decrees do not specifically teach that the minister must personally intend to confect the sacraments is because the Catholic Church has always declared valid the baptisms administered by Protestant ministers who do not believe baptism remits sins when the ministers use a proper rite, form, and matter and act serious. It is certain that these Protestant ministers cannot personally intend to confect the sacrament of baptism because they do not believe it remits sins, they do not believe the sacrament confers grace or confects anything. However, they truly confect the sacrament as long as they intend to do as the Church does when baptizing by using a proper rite, form, and matter and acting serious; hence their internal intention is of no consequence regarding validity:

MI, Chapter 1, pp. 27-29: “F. CONTROVERSY ON PROTESTANT BAPTISMS — INTENTION OF THE EFFECT - The discussion of the intention of doing what the Church does brings to mind a question as to the validity of Baptism performed in non-Catholic sects in which the ministers hold views about this sacrament which are incompatible with Catholic doctrine. This question was the center of a controversy between Dr. Donovan and Dr. Schaaf about a decade ago. In an article appearing in the *Ecclesiastical Review*<sup>8</sup> of February, 1926, Dr. Donovan comes to the conclusion that the beliefs of several of the principal non-Catholic sects are such that the respective ministers do not intend to do what the Church does when they baptize, the result being that the baptism administered by them should be considered invalid.<sup>9</sup> Dr. Schaaf in an article in the same periodical<sup>10</sup> shows from various decrees that the erroneous views of Protestants concerning the indissolubility of marriage do not prevent them from having the intention sufficient for contracting a valid marriage. From this it follows indirectly that Baptism administered by Protestant ministers is considered valid by the Church in spite of the respective heretical views. After citing several decrees of the Holy Office concerning the validity of marriages and baptisms, Dr. Schaaf makes reference to one reply of the Holy See which summarizes his whole argument of presumptive validity of Protestant baptisms.

“The Bishop of Nesqually had addressed to the Propaganda an inquiry concerning the validity of baptisms conferred by Methodists, against the validity of whose baptisms he alleged an insufficient and adverse intention and consequently the presumption of invalidity. The Bishop stated that the Methodists held so many errors about the necessity, the power, and the efficacy of the sacrament of Baptism that they considered it merely an indifferent rite which had been entirely omitted in the past and at a later time had been put into use again for the purpose of deceiving

<sup>8</sup> Footnote 26: “Are Protestant Baptisms Ordinarily Valid?” *ER* 74 (1926) 158—180.

<sup>9</sup> Footnote 27: The sects in question were the Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists and Congregationalists.

<sup>10</sup> Footnote 28: “The Invalidity of Sectarian Baptisms,” *ER* 75 (1926) 358 sqq.

the faithful and attempting to show them that their false religion did not differ from the true religion.<sup>11</sup>

“To this question the Holy Office gave a very detailed answer which is one of the most explicit statements about the intention of doing what the Church does. In substance the reply lays down the following principles:

“1. It is a dogma of faith that Baptism administered by anyone, whether a schismatic, a heretic, or even an infidel, must be considered valid, as long as in their administration those things are present by which the sacrament is perfected, namely, due matter, the prescribed form, and the person of the minister with the intention of doing what the Church does. Hence it follows that the peculiar errors which the ministers profess either privately or publicly do not at all affect baptism or any other sacrament.<sup>12</sup>

“2. The errors which the heretics profess privately or publicly are not incompatible with that intention which the ministers of the sacraments must have, namely, of doing what the Church does. Those errors in themselves cannot give rise to a general presumption against the validity of the sacraments in general and baptism in particular.<sup>13</sup>

“From these principles taken from the decision of the Holy Office it must be concluded that as a general rule the baptisms of heretics are valid in spite of the fact that their ministers hold beliefs entirely incompatible with the Catholic doctrine concerning Baptism, and deny all power of regeneration in that sacrament. Their error does not offer sufficient reason to conclude that they have an insufficient or adverse intention in regard to conferring the sacrament.”

Invalid and heretical *Council of Trent*, 1547; Canons on Baptism: “Canon 4: If anyone says that baptism, even that given by heretics in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, with the intention of doing what the Church does, is not true baptism: *Anathema sit!*”

Therefore heretics who do not believe baptism remits sins can confect the sacrament of baptism if they do as the Church does by using a proper rite, form, and matter and acting serious.

### Priests who do not believe in the Holy Eucharist can confect the sacrament

Another reason these decrees do not specifically teach that the minister must personally intend to confect the sacrament is because priests who do not believe in the Holy Eucharist can change the bread and water into the Body and Blood of Christ during Mass as long as they use valid form and matter.

### A minister's personal motive or intention is of no consequence for validity

The decrees from the invalid and heretical Councils of Constance and Florence make no specific mention of an interior intention but only say that the minister must intend to do as the Church does, which, according to the exterior intention dogma, he proves by using a valid rite,

<sup>11</sup> Footnote 29: Sacra Congregatio Sancti Officii, Jan. 24, 1877—CSCPF, n. 1465, Vol. II, pp. 99 sqq.

<sup>12</sup> Footnote 30: *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 99: Etenim novit...dogma fidei esse Baptismum a quocumque sive schismatico, sive haeretico, sive etiam infideli administratum validum esse habendum, dummodo in eiusdem administratione singula concurrerint, quibus sacramentum perficitur, scilicet, debita materia, prescripta forma, et persona ministri cum intentione faciendi quod facit Ecclesia. Hinc consequitur errores peculiare, quos ministrantes sive privatim, sive etiam publice profitentur nihil officere posse validitati baptismi, vel cuiuscumque sacramenti...

<sup>13</sup> Footnote 31: *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 100: Videt igitur A. Tua...errores quos haeretici sive privatim, sive etiam publice profitentur, non es impossibiles cum illa intentione, quam sacramentorum ministri de necessitate eorumdem sacramentorum tenentur habere, faciendi nempe quod facit Ecclesia, vel faciendi quod Christus voluit ut fieret; et eosdem errores per se non posse inducere generalem praesumptionem contra validitatem sacramentorum in genere, et Baptismi in specie...

form, and matter and acting serious. By not specifically teaching that the minister must personally intend to confect the sacraments, the implication is that the minister only needs to intend to do as the Church does regardless of his personal intention. It is the Church's intention that matters and not the minister's personal intention. As long as the minister does at least what the Church requires to confect the sacrament, then it is this intention of the minister to do as the Church does that matters for validity and not his personal intention to confect or not to confect the sacrament. It does not matter why the minister intends to do as the Church does but only that he intends to do as the Church does. An infiltrator will intend to do as the Church does so as to not get caught; hence even if he personally does not intend to confect the sacrament he nevertheless *does* intend to do as the Church does so as to not get caught. That is the intention that matters for validity not the personal intention of the minister to confect the sacraments and not the reason or intention as to why the minister chooses to intend to do as the Church does.

What motive or intention does a pagan have when he baptizes a catechumen? He certainly does not have the motive or intention to confect the sacrament because he does not believe in the sacrament. One such motive or intention could be that the catechumen is the pagan's friend. In this case the pagan's motive or interior intention to do as the Church does is *friendship*. This pagan's intention is friendship and not that the sacrament should be confected. All that matters is that the pagan does intend to do as the Church does, which he proves by doing it (by baptizing his friend), regardless of the fact that he does not personally intend to confect the sacrament, regardless of the fact that his personal intention in administering the sacrament is friendship and not confection.

So we see that the intention that leads the minister to intend to do as the Church does is of no consequence, be it friendship or deception. The only intention that matters is that he actually does what the Church does, which he proves by doing it. If he did not want to do as the Church does so as to not confect the sacraments, then he should not have done it.

### To do as the Church does includes acting serious

To do as the Church does includes acting serious, which is part of the necessary intention of the minister to confect the sacraments. Acting serious includes the minister's demeanor and the place and time in which he attempts to confect the sacrament. This protects the sacraments from being confected in a joking or mocking way or in an improper place or time. Even though the Council of Trent was invalid and heretical, it teaches the truth that for the sacraments to be confected the minister must act serious:

Invalid and heretical *Council of Trent*, Session XIII, Chapter 6, The Minister of this Sacrament and Absolution: "...The penitent should not so flatter himself on his own faith as to think that even though he have no contrition, and that the intention of acting earnestly and absolving effectively be wanting in the priest, nevertheless he is truly and before God absolved by reason of his faith alone. For faith without penance effects no remission of sins, and he would be most negligent of his own salvation, who would know that a priest was absolving him in a jesting manner, and would not earnestly consult another who would act seriously." (D. 902)

This decree which teaches that ministers must act serious or they do not confect the sacraments favors the exterior intention dogma, which teaches that the minister intends to do as the Church does by using the proper form and matter and acting serious regardless if he personally intends to confect the sacrament or interiorly mocks the sacrament. Trent's decree speaks about ways in which the recipient of the sacrament and other witnesses can know if the minister does not intend to do as the Church does by not acting serious. Acting or not acting serious when attempting to confect the sacraments is a public thing, an exterior thing, that one can detect. This decree does not even consider the interior intention of the minister but only his

exterior intention of acting or not acting serious. It deals with how the minister *acts*, not how he *thinks*.

*The minister's demeanor must be serious*

If it is certain that a minister's apparent confecting of a sacrament is done in a joking or mocking manner, then the minister lacks the necessary intention to confect the sacrament and hence the sacrament is not confected. For example, a faithless priest mocks the sacrament of baptism by publicly saying, "How can anyone believe that pouring a little water over a person's head and reciting a few words can actually do anything to the person's soul! Watch me do it to this unbaptized person and see if there is any change in him after I baptize him." He then baptizes the person using the proper form and matter. In this case the sacrament is not confected because the minister attempted to confect the sacrament in a mocking, unserious way. It is not confected because this is not what the Church does—the Church does not intend that the sacraments should be confected in a joking or mocking way.

It is important to note that it is not this minister's lack of faith in the efficacy of the sacrament that invalidated it, even when he manifested his lack of faith before attempting to confect the sacrament—provided a lack of faith was not manifested in the ritual that he used which would invalidate the sacrament. (See [The Rite Is Part of the Minister's Intention](#), p. **Error! Bookmark not defined.**) The sacrament was not confected because he administered it in an unserious and even mocking way. Take for instance a pagan who baptizes a catechumen. The pagan respectfully says that he does not believe or see how baptism can do anything to the soul. But for the sake of his friend he respectfully and seriously proceeds to baptize him and hence not in an unserious or mocking way. In this case the sacrament is confected because the pagan did as the Church does by acting in a serious and respectful way when administering the sacrament, regardless of the fact that he manifested to the catechumen and others his lack of belief that the sacrament would be confected.

It is also important to note that the minister only needs to *act* serious to confect the sacrament. He does not have to *think* seriously about it. If he mocks the sacrament in his heart but does not manifest his mocking attitude and acts serious before and during his administration of the sacrament, then the sacrament is confected. His mocking or joking or otherwise acting unserious must be manifest before or during his attempted administration of the sacrament to invalidate it.

*The place and time must be serious*

If it is certain that a minister's apparent confecting of the sacraments is done in an improper place, then the minister lacks the necessary intention to confect the sacrament and hence the sacrament is not confected. Take the following example of a minister who attempts to confect a sacrament in an improper place. A priest enters a bakery that contains unleavened bread and wine and pronounces the words of consecration in an attempt to confect the Holy Eucharist. In this case he does not confect the sacrament because the Church does not intend to confect the sacrament in such a place. Certainly this priest is not acting serious in regard to the place in which the Church intends to confect the Holy Eucharist. Even though this priest may have a serious demeanor when attempting to confect the sacrament, he does not act serious in regard to the place in which he attempts to confect the sacrament. No Catholic would take this priest's attempted consecration seriously. It is the same as a man who goes fishing and has all the things he needs to fish (such as a rod, reel, and bait) but he fishes in a cornfield. Now even if he seriously wants to fish and acts serious in doing so, he does not act serious in regard to the place where he is fishing, the cornfield. And no one who observes him would take what he is doing seriously. No sane person would believe he is actually fishing!



### *The case of a seminary student practicing how to administer the sacrament of baptism*

In the case of a seminary student practicing to administer the sacrament of baptism on another seminary student, the sacrament is invalid because of the manifest and thus exterior intention to not validly baptize even though he uses the proper form and matter and acts seriously.

### **Held by Ambrosius Catharinus in the 16th century**

Since the 16th century, the apostate Ambrosius Catharinus has become the mentor of those who hold the exterior intention dogma. But he only held it as an allowable opinion and thus not as a dogma, and hence he was a heretic on this point alone. Nevertheless, he presented a good defense of it in opposition to the new and growing interior intention heresy:

MI, pp. 54-57: “A. AMBROSIUS CATHARINUS - Ambrosius Catharinus (+1552)...is known as the father of the school of external intention or the school of Catharinus... Known as Lancelot Politi, Catharinus was born in Sienna, Italy, in 1487. Upon becoming a member of the Order of Preachers he took the name Ambrosius Catharinus out of love and esteem for the two great saints who had borne those names...

“B. THE DOCTRINE OF EXTERNAL INTENTION - Catharinus was convinced that the intention of doing what the Church does is merely the serious external positing of the matter and the form of the sacrament.

“...Non enim alia intentio ministri requiritur, nisi ut intendat exterius facere quod facit Ecclesia, quamvis ipse neque credat esse Ecclesiam, neque ullum baptismi spirituale effectum, sed satis est ut intendat facere quod Ecclesia jubet per ministros fieri. Namque quod illa per ministros facit, ipsa facere intelligitur. Quid ergo facit Ecclesia per ministros baptizando nisi quod legitima utitur materia, adhibens suam verborum formam? hoc igitur si facit minister profecto illud facere intendit, si sit mente sanus.

“It is the common teaching that the validity of the sacraments does not depend upon the faith of the minister and that it is not necessary that the minister will the effects of the sacraments. This is taken into consideration in the statement of Catharinus. But he makes it clear that the only role of the minister is to unite the matter and the form, and by this alone he necessarily has the intention of doing what the Church does. His opinion is brought out even more clearly in another passage from his *De Intentione Ministri*, where, according to Billuart, Catharinus proposes the question: If the minister performs externally everything that the Church demands, but inwardly intends to baptize mockingly, will this be sufficient for a valid baptism? The answer is in the affirmative.

“Catharinus throws more light on his teaching when he uses the example of a washing as an illustration of the doctrine of external intention. He said in effect that if someone really washes a child, it is impossible not to have the intention of really doing just that. In a similar manner if the minister of Baptism observes all those things which are prescribed by the Church for the conferring of Baptism, he cannot be doubtful about his intention and about the actual conferring of the sacrament. With Catharinus, then, intention and the positing of the matter and the form are inseparably united.

“Alphonsus Salmeron in his first book of *Commentaries on the Epistles of St. Paul* distinguishes a twofold intention of the minister: the first is public and belongs to the Church itself by whose authority it is performed. This intention is sufficiently expressed in the forms of the sacraments themselves, e.g., *Ego te baptizo*, *Ego te absolvo*, etc., since Christ and the Church intend to baptize, absolve, etc., through these words. When they are uttered integrally, the intention is inseparable from

them. Therefore, the great concern of the minister should be the exact rendering of the form.

“The second intention is private and peculiar to the minister himself by which he may believe nothing of those things which he does or do them with a secret scorn or with the contrary intention of not conferring the sacrament, even though he would administer the sacrament in the accustomed manner. It was Salmeron’s conviction that since this intention is private it cannot invalidate the sacrament, although it would be illicit to use it.”

### **Favored by the invalid and heretical Council of Trent in the 16th century**

Catharinus attendance at the invalid and heretical Council of Trent influenced the wording of a decree regarding the minister’s intention so that the interior intention opinion was not defined; instead, the wording of the decree highly favored the exterior intention opinion even more than the invalid and heretical Councils of Constance and Florence:

MI, p. 55: “He [Catharinus] was a man of great learning and was sent as a theologian to the Council of Trent in 1545. On being appointed Bishop of Minori in 1547, he took his place among the Fathers of the Council in the seventh session in which the dogmas concerning the sacraments were defined. There is no reason to suppose that he did not take a personal and prominent part in the discussions preliminary to the definition of the dogma of the necessity of intention in the minister. This can be supposed since he was convinced that the interior intention of the minister of doing what the Church does is not necessary for the validity of the sacraments, but that it is sufficient to perform the merely external rites as long as they are done in a manner which appears to be serious. It must have been a very interesting discussion for him, for while still at the Council he wrote in 1547 a treatise entitled *De Necessaria Intentione in Perficiendis Sacramentis*, known also as *De Intentione Ministri*, in which he defended his views. This work was published in Rome in 1552, and according to Pallavicini, the historian of the Council of Trent, the doctrine contained in the book is not contrary to the doctrine of intention as defined by the Council.<sup>14</sup>”

MI, p. 104: “H. CENSURE OF CATHARINUS BY THEOLOGIAN - ... Since the Church had made no explicit condemnation of the doctrine of Catharinus, it was to be expected that no theologian would be so bold as to condemn it, though many came forth with strong statements against it. Cardinal Pallavicini thought that the doctrine was false but states specifically that it was not condemned by the Tridentine canons.<sup>15</sup>”

Here is the invalid and heretical Council of Trent’s decree on the minister’s intention:

Invalid and heretical *Council of Trent*, Session 7, Canons on the Sacraments in General: “Canon 11. If anyone says that in ministers, when they effect and confer the sacraments, there is not required at least the intention of doing what the Church does, let him be anathema.” (D. 854)

The words “at least” are not contained in the similar decrees from the invalid and heretical Councils of Constance and Florence. And by the addition of these words, the Council of Trent favors the exterior intention opinion even more than did the Councils of Constance and Florence. The words “at least” mean that there are certain intentions of the minister that are not necessary to confect the sacraments. At the very best, then, the minister’s intention is that he personally intend

<sup>14</sup> Footnote 3: Pallavicini, S., *Historia Concilii Tridentini*, Lib. IX, Cap. 6, Tom. II, p. 28.

<sup>15</sup> Footnote 52: *Historiae Concilii Tridentini*, Lib. IX, Cap. 6, n. 2, Tom. II, p. 28: Equidem existimo Catharini sententiam falsam esse, sed non ideo per Tridentinos canones diserte damnatam; quapropter fas illi fuit affirmare, eam Concilio non contradicere. Cf. Lacey, F., “Intention,” *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, Vol. VII, p. 381.

to confect the sacraments, which is the interior intention opinion. But the Council of Trent implies that this intention is not necessary because it teaches what intention is needed in the least. In other words, it can easily be implied that Trent teaches that even if the minister does not personally intend to confect the sacraments, he must at least intend to do what the Church does regardless if he personally does not intend to confect the sacraments. The minister proves he has this intention of doing what the Church does by using a valid rite, form, and matter and acting serious. Another infallible decree from the Council of Trent proves this point:

Invalid and heretical *Council of Trent*, Canons on the Sacraments in General, 1547:  
“Canon 12: If anyone says that a minister in the state of mortal sin, though he observes all the essentials that belong to effecting and conferring the sacraments, does not effect or confer the sacrament: *Anathema sit!*”

Note that this canon teaches that if the minister “observes all the essentials that belong to the effecting of and conferring of the sacraments,” he truly confects the sacraments. It makes no mention of the minister’s interior intention. Hence Trent teaches that confection of the sacraments depends on things observable to others in the confecting of the sacraments, which are the proper rite, form, and matter and acting serious.

## **The Interior Intention Heresy**

### **The exterior intention dogma was on the decline since the 16th century**

Because the invalid and heretical Council of Trent only implies the exterior intention opinion, the interior intention opinion was still allowed and hence still maintained:

MI, pp. 20-22: “The crowning development of the doctrine of intention came with the solemn definition of the Council of Trent on March 3, 1547, when the canon on intention was promulgated: If anyone says that in ministers, when they effect and confer the sacraments, there is not required at least the intention of doing what the Church does, let him be anathema. The dogma of sacramental intention is, then, the technical expression of the traditional practice of the Church... But it must be noted that all these definitions on the part of the Church including that of the Council of Trent, pointed principally to the need of an intention. The Church was not making declarations about the quality of the intention other than that it should be a serious one. This problem of the quality of the intention and its object was to be principally the concern of post-Tridentine theologians. ...In all the preceding decrees of the Holy See [the Councils of Constance, Florence, and Trent] the necessity for a true intention has been shown, but none of them deals directly and specifically with the quality of the object of the intention. They assert the need of intention in the minister, but they do not assert the need for an internal intention.”

Hence the invalid and heretical Council of Trent did not with all certainty teach the exterior or interior intention opinion but only favored the exterior intention opinion by implication.

### **Most modern theologians hold the interior intention heresy**

After the invalid and heretical Council of Trent, the interior intention heresy continued to grow among theologians to the point in the 19th century when almost all of the theologians believed in the interior intention heresy:

MI, p. 55: “Catharinus set forth the doctrine in a manner so remarkably precise and in circumstances so solemn (in a General Council) that the result was a heated controversy. It would be incorrect to say that the doctrine of Catharinus enjoyed a great popularity, although a number of prominent theologians in France and Italy, and a few in Belgium and Spain, made the doctrine their own, especially in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Among those who treated the subject at great length were Alphonsus Salmeron (+1585), a Spanish Jesuit; Francis Farvacques (+1680), a Belgian Augustinian; the French theologians, Vincent Contenson (+1674), Gaspare Juenin (+1696), James Serry (+1727) and Renatus Drouin (+1742).<sup>16</sup>

“[p. 72] Shortly after the Council of Trent there was a strong reaction against this teaching. Although the doctrine of external intention had many followers for the two centuries immediately following the Council, the doctrine of internal intention... gained adherents steadily even during these two centuries, and during the nineteenth century there were very few theologians who taught the doctrine of external intention. Today it is practically the unanimous teaching of theologians.”

The author, Fr. De Salvo, attempts to sway the readers to the interior intention heresy based upon the fact that almost all the modern theologians believe it. Yet the infallible truth is that the common and even the unanimous consensus of modern theologians is fallible and hence cannot make a doctrine part of the solemn or ordinary magisterium. Not even the common consensus of the Church Fathers can do that. The only consensus that can make a doctrine infallible and thus part of the ordinary magisterium is the *unanimous* consensus of the Church Fathers—the last who died in the 7th century. And, as De Salvo correctly teaches in his book, the majority if not all of the Church Fathers never taught about the interior intention opinion but believed in the exterior intention opinion. (See in this book [Held by all the Church Fathers](#), p. 9.) How, then, can De Salvo expect his readers to believe the interior intention opinion based upon the common consensus of modern theologians when the unanimous consensus of the Church Fathers held the exterior intention opinion and thus made it a dogma? Which consensus has more weight? Which consensus came first? Which consensus has a link with sacred tradition? - The consensus that teaches the exterior intention opinion, which was also favored by the choice of words used in the invalid and heretical Councils of Constance, Florence, and Trent.

Now, again, I am not saying that a consensus other than the unanimous consensus of the Church Fathers makes a doctrine a dogma, but only that De Salvo implies that the interior intention opinion is true because the majority of modern theologians believe it while he does not make the same implication regarding the exterior intention opinion that was held by all of the Church Fathers. To be consistent in his way of thinking, De Salvo would have to say that the exterior intention opinion was true because all of the Church Fathers believed it but then it became false when the majority of modern theologians believed in the interior intention opinion.

De Salvo and other modernists like him exalt modern theologians over the Church Fathers, Doctors, and other saints and even over popes. They do this to corrupt Catholics and others with the teachings of these heretical modern theologians who grew in number within the ranks of the Catholic Church as the apostasy progressed. They needed to undermine the Church Fathers, Doctors, and other saints and most importantly the infallible teachings of the popes for the apostasy to become a great apostasy. After all, who are the main architects of the Great Apostasy if not modern theologians? The modernist heretics have one thing, among many, in common: they refer to the modern theologians' many bad books with imprimaturs to justify their heresies and other errors. (See my books *Bad Books with Imprimaturs* and *The Solemn and Ordinary Magisterium*: Cekada heretically has theologians and not popes clearing up obscurities.)

<sup>16</sup> Footnote 4: Other theologians who followed Catharinus were the following: French: Arnaldus (+1694); Nat. Alexander (+1724); Scribonius (+1713); L. Hermenier (+1735). Italian: Parqualigo (1664); Milante (+1749); Ansaldi (+1779). German: Stattler (+1797); Dobmayer (+1805); Waibel (+1852); and more recently Oswald, Haas, Glossner. (Cf. Pourrat, P., *Theology of the Sacraments*, p. 387.)

## One modern theologian who does not hold the interior intention opinion

De Salvo would have his readers believe that from the 20th century onward all of the modern theologians have held the interior intention opinion (heresy), but this is not true. Fr. Peter Joseph is a modernist, apostate priest of the non-Catholic Vatican II Church. He is the vice-rector at Vianney College seminary, Wagga Wagga, and lectures in dogma. He holds the exterior intention opinion but not as a dogma. Even an apostate priest can tell an occasional truth every now and then. He presents a good defense of the exterior intention opinion (dogma) in his article titled “How do we know whether a sacrament is valid or not?” from the magazine *AD2000*, vol. 13, no. 4 (May 2000), p. 6:

“...I have heard people ask, in cases of abuses: ‘How can those Masses be valid? The celebrant openly denies the Real Presence. Doesn’t he have to intend what the Church believes?’ The answer lies in the meaning of the crucial phrase in Trent: ‘to do what the Church does’ (*facere quod facit Ecclesia*). The true meaning of this formula must be understood from history, from theologians who used it and from the ancient practice of the Church. The formula, which was first used in the 13th century, was eventually adopted by magisterial documents and finally canonised by Trent.

“ ‘To do what the Church does’: note it says to do what the Church does, but not what the Church intends or believes. For validity, the minister does not have to intend what the Church intends, or believe what the Church believes, just intend to do what the Church does.

“The Church intends and believes a whole range of things when baptising someone: remission of sin, conferral of grace, membership of the Church, eternal salvation, baptismal character, etc. But the baptiser need not be aware of any of these. It is enough if he wants to baptise, as the Church does.

“Fundamentalists

“It is not required for the minister to intend to confer grace by means of the rite; nor does he even have to believe that this rite contains the power to cause grace. Fundamentalists today generally believe Baptism is a mere outward ceremony, causing absolutely no change in the soul. But if they give Baptism properly, i.e., washing with water and pronouncing the Trinitarian formula, then Baptism truly takes place. If the recipients want to become Catholics later on, the Catholic Church will receive them but not re-baptise them; they are validly baptised already.

“For a sacrament to be valid, therefore, it is not necessary for the minister to have either faith or sanctity. That faith is not necessary for the validity of Baptism is a dogma defined by the Council of Trent: ‘If anyone says that Baptism, even given by heretics, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, with the intention of doing that which the Church does, is not true Baptism, *anathema sit*’ (DS 1617). The Church teaches likewise that Baptism given by a Jew or pagan is valid (DS 646, 1315, 2536). What applies to the minister of Baptism regarding faith applies equally to the other sacraments.

“That the state of grace is not required in the minister of the sacrament is also defined by Trent: ‘If anyone says that a minister who is in mortal sin, though he observe all the essentials which pertain to the confecting or conferring of the sacrament, does not confect or confer the sacrament, *anathema sit*.’ (DS 1612; cf. 1315, 1262, 793). So, according to Trent, Mass offered by a priest in sin is a valid sacrifice. The Donatists of the 4th-5th centuries rejected as invalid sacraments conferred by a public sinner. The Waldensians (12th century), Wycliff (14th century) and the Anabaptists (16th century) repeated the same error.

“This helps us to understand the meaning of the phrase, adopted by the Council of Trent: the sacraments work *ex opere operato* ‘by virtue of the rite performed.’ It is not by virtue of the minister’s holiness or belief. Baptism given by heretics or unbelievers is valid because the condition of their soul does not affect the validity of their act. The reason is that the virtue of what they do comes, not from them, but from Christ. Christ is the principal minister of all the sacraments: i.e., He works through the voice and hands of the earthly minister. St Augustine says that whether it be Peter or Paul or Judas who administers Baptism, it is equally Christ who baptises (Tract on St John, 5, 18).

“Essentials

“This teaching on the minimum intention required is taught by Aquinas. He says, ‘Just as the validity of a sacrament does not require that the minister have charity, and even sinners can confer sacraments, as stated above, so neither is it necessary that he have faith, and even an unbeliever can confer a true sacrament, provided that the sacrament’s other essentials be present. Notwithstanding his unbelief, the minister can intend to do what the Church does, even if he esteems it as nothing. And such an intention suffices for a sacrament, because, as said above, the minister of a sacrament acts in the person of the whole Church by whose faith any defect in the minister’s faith is made good.’ (*Summa*, III, 64, 9 c., ad 1).

“Even a priest who has lost faith in the Real Presence offers Mass validly. Such a doctrine is a consolation to the laity who can, therefore, have perfect confidence in the rites of the Church without needing to know the personal state of the minister. It would be impossible to ascertain the personal belief of every priest, every time he administers a sacrament. It is enough to know if he uses the necessary matter and form, and performs the rite. Christ acts through him to perform the rest.”

### **An nominal Holy Office decree in the 17th century denied the exterior intention dogma**

In the 17th century, the nominal and apostate Holy Office under apostate Antipope Alexander VIII passed a decree that denied the exterior intention dogma:

Errors of the Jansenists, Condemned in a Decree of the nominal Holy Office, Dec. 7, 1690: “28. Baptism is valid when conferred by a minister who observes all the external rite and form of baptizing, but within his heart resolves, I do not intend what the Church does.” (D. 1318)

MI, p. 22: “In all the preceding decrees of the Holy See the necessity for a true intention has been shown, but none of them deals directly and specifically with the quality of the object of the intention. They assert the need of intention in the minister, but they do not assert the need for an internal intention. A step toward the clarification of the exact meaning of the phrase *the intention of doing what the Church does* came from Alexander VIII through the Holy Office in 1690 with the condemnation of the following proposition of Farvacques: ‘That Baptism is valid which is conferred by the minister who observes the whole external rite and the form of baptizing, but inwardly resolves to himself in his heart: I do not intend what the Church does.’<sup>17</sup>”

---

<sup>17</sup> Footnote 12: DBU 1318: Valet baptismus collatus a ministro, qui omnem ritum externum formamque baptizandi observat, intus vero in corde suo apud se resolvit: Non intendo, quod facit Ecclesia.

## Undecided by apostate Antipope Leo XIII in the 19th century

Apostate Antipope Leo XIII was not prepared to settle the controversy over the interior intention opinion (heresy) and the exterior intention opinion (dogma). Therefore, when treating of the minister's intention in his encyclical *Apostolicae Cure*, he presents contradictory views. In one sentence he teaches the interior intention opinion but in the very next sentence he teaches the exterior intention opinion, and more forcefully than the interior intention opinion:

Pope Leo XIII, *Apostolicae Curae*: 33. "With this inherent defect of 'form' is joined the defect of 'intention' which is equally essential to the Sacrament. The Church does not judge about the mind and intention, in so far as it is something by its nature internal; but in so far as it is manifested externally she is bound to judge concerning it. A person who has correctly and seriously used the requisite matter and form to effect and confer a sacrament is **presumed** for that very reason to have intended to do (intendisse) what the Church does. On this principle rests the doctrine that a Sacrament is **truly conferred** by the ministry of one who is a heretic or unbaptized, provided the Catholic rite be employed."

In the first underlined sentence Leo teaches that if a minister uses a Catholic rite and the proper matter and form, the "sacrament is presumed" to be conferred. But in the very next sentence he says that it is a doctrine that the "Sacrament is truly conferred" when a minister uses a Catholic rite, which implies the use of the proper form and matter. Why this contradiction? Maybe the translation is not accurate. But if it is, it seems that Leo is worried about the conscience crisis that Catholics will have if they can only presume and hence never be sure if the sacraments are conferred; and hence in his second sentence he attempts to squash their worries by effectually saying, "Do not worry, as long as a minister uses the proper rite, form, and matter, the sacrament is truly conferred, even if the minister be a heretic who does not believe in the sacrament." Whatever the case may be, it is beside the main point that Leo XIII was an apostate antipope and thus all his teachings, decrees, and acts are null and void.

## The exterior intention dogma does not reduce sacraments to form and matter only

There are some who wrongly believe that the exterior intention dogma requires no real intention at all but reduces the sacraments to the mere administration of the form and matter. The exterior intention dogmas does not just teach that the minister must use the proper form and matter but that he must also act serious, which includes a serious demeanor, place, and time. Without also having the intention of acting serious, the minister cannot confer the sacraments. Hence the exterior intention dogma does not reduce the confecting of the sacraments to the bare performance of the form and matter. If it is clear that the minister has not seriously conferred a sacrament, then it is clear that he has not intended to do as the Church does because the Church does not intend that the sacraments should be conferred in an unserious way.

To protect the sacraments from being conferred in a mocking or joking way when the proper form and matter are used, the Councils have added to the form and matter the necessity of the minister to intend to do as the Church does to confer the sacraments, which means the minister must also act serious. If the councils did not teach this, then the minister could use the proper form and matter and confer the sacraments even if they were joking or mocking or attempting to confer in an improper place or time. Hence the exterior intention dogma, just like the councils, does not teach that the mere use of the proper form and matter suffices to confer the sacrament but that the minister must also act serious, all of which proves he intends to do as the Church does. (See in this book [To do as the Church does includes acting serious](#), p. 15.)

## **The interior intention heresy is based upon a heretical confidence in the goodness of men**

Those who hold the interior intention opinion (heresy) are left with a huge problem that can never be solved: the problem that Catholics can never know with *certainly* that they validly received any of the sacraments. Hence no Catholic can know for certain if he was validly baptized or if he was validly absolved of his sins in confession and no priest can be certain he is a priest, no bishop can be certain he is a bishop, and no pope can be certain he is the pope. And that *certainly* is a huge problem! Every Catholic who is aware of the interior intention opinion cannot but worry, and rightly so, if they validly received the sacraments. It does no good to tell Catholics that they must presume the sacraments are valid if the proper form and matter was used. It does no good to tell Catholics that they can have a moral certainty that the sacraments are valid if the proper form and matter was used and the priest acted serious. The FACT is that a presumption is not a certainty and hence there is always the possibility that the sacraments were not conferred. The FACT is that moral certainty is not true certainty and hence there is always the possibility that the sacraments were not conferred. No one can rightly or justly expect Catholics to ignore or simply forget about this FACT of uncertainty and thus the real possibility that the sacraments were not conferred. The FACT is that a conscience crisis is unavoidable unless a Catholic is brain dead!

The interior intention adherents are aware of the dilemma of the unsolvable crisis upon Catholic consciences of never knowing for certain if they validly received the sacraments. And these adherents attempt to solve this crisis in a most dishonest and even heretical way. They tell Catholics not to worry because men are rational creatures and hence are always good and always sincere:

MI, Summation and Conclusion, p. 106: "As to the objection that no one could be certain of having received the sacraments if internal intention is required, it seems futile. We are living among rational creatures and in the moral order of things we must depend upon one another for the sincerity of these actions as well as other actions of our daily life, and have the assurance that Christ protects His Church and enables her to safeguard and perpetuate the sacraments. Christ promised that He would be with His Church until the end of the world. Although men cannot be metaphysically certain of having received the sacraments, all may, according to common sense, depend upon the fidelity of Christ's ministers in the administration of the sacraments, and according to faith rely upon the indefectibility of the Church and her ministers as a body."

How utterly false, foolish, diabolical, and heretical are these statements! The apostate Fr. De Salvo's statement is not only false and illogical but it also contains two heresies: one, that all men are sincere; and two, that the indefectibility of the Catholic Church means that all of Her members are likewise indefectible and hence are sincere.

### *Many men are not sincere and lie*

God, speaking through his prophets and apostles, tells us that almost all rational creatures of the human race are liars and hence insincere: King David says, "*But vain are the sons of men, the sons of men are liars in the balances: that by vanity they may together deceive.*" (Ps. 61:10) "*I said in my excess: Every man is a liar.*" (Ps. 115:11) St. Paul says, "*But God is true; and every man a liar.*" (Rom. 3:4) And St. John records the fact that many so-called Catholic bishops are also evil liars: "*I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience, and how thou canst not bear them that are evil, and thou hast tried them, who say they are apostles [Catholic bishops], and are not, and hast found them liars.*" (Apoc. 2:2) Among these evil, insincere liars is Fr. De Salvo who tells us that all rational human creatures are always sincere. Jesus tells us that in these final



days almost all rational human creatures are insincere to the point that almost no one truly possesses the Catholic faith: *"I say to you, that he will quickly revenge them. But yet the Son of man, when he cometh, shall he find, think you, faith on earth?"* (Lk. 18:8)

### *Catholics and other men are not indefectible*

Fr. De Salvo heretically says that God's ministers are indefectible. He tells Catholics to "depend upon the fidelity of Christ's ministers in the administration of the sacraments, and according to faith rely upon the indefectibility of the Church and her ministers as a body." The dogmatic truth is that the Catholic Church's indefectibility does not include Her members. Even the pope is not indefectible. Members of the Catholic Church (be they laymen, priests, or bishops) are insincere if they are infiltrators or bad Catholics or nominal Catholics (Catholic in name only, such as occult heretics).

### *Heretics and infiltrators are liars and not sincere*

Dear reader, how can anyone with an ounce of common sense expect that a heretical or infiltrator bishop or priest is sincere simply because he is a rational creature! Many heretic or infiltrator bishops and priests have resided in the ranks of the Catholic Church. And no one would know they are heretics if they are occult heretics (that is, if they keep their heresies secret) or infiltrators whose mission is to appear sincere. For instance, a priest can keep secret his heresy that he does not believe in the Holy Eucharist. Certainly one cannot say that this priest is good and sincere in regard to his denial of the Holy Eucharist. The truth is that this priest has defected from the Catholic faith and His fidelity to Christ and hence is an insincere rational creature. And certainly one cannot expect this priest to personally intend to confect what he does not believe in. (See in this book [Priests who do not believe in the Holy Eucharist can confect the sacrament](#), p. 14.)

From the birth of the Catholic Church many apparent members of the Catholic Church have been infiltrators (be they laymen, priests, bishops, or so-called popes) whose mission is to subvert Catholics and attempt to destroy the Catholic Church. St. Jude says that during his days *"Certain men are secretly entered in [to the Catholic Church], (who were written of long ago unto this judgment,) ungodly men, turning the grace of our Lord God into riotousness."* (Jude 1:4) St. Paul warns Catholics to beware *"of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privately to spy our liberty, which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into servitude."* (Gal. 2:4) And St. Paul tells us that among the ranks of these infiltrators are bishops who pretend to be Catholic in order to subvert others: *"Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops, to rule the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. I know that, after my departure, ravening wolves will enter in among you, not sparing the flock. And of your own selves shall arise men speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them."* (Acts 20:28-30) And the enemies of the Catholic Church testify about their plots to infiltrate the Catholic Church to subvert Catholics and attempt to destroy the Catholic Church:

The Conspiracy of the Alta Vendita of the Carbonari: "We have the little finger of the successor of Peter engaged in the plot; and this little finger is as good for the crusade, as all the Urban II's and all the Saint Bernards in Christendom. ... You will contrive for yourselves, at little cost, a reputation as good Catholics and as pure patriots. This reputation will put access to our doctrines into the midst of the young clergy, as well as deeply into the monasteries. In a few years, by the force of things, this young clergy will have overrun all the functions; they will govern, they will

administer, they will judge, they will form the sovereign's council, they will be called to choose the Pontiff who should reign. ...You will bring friends around the apostolic Chair. You will have preached a revolution in tiara and in cope, marching with the cross and the banner, a revolution that will need to be only a little bit urged on to set fire to the four corners of the world."

Former communist Bella Dodd testified that she placed 1,100 communist infiltrators into the priesthood who have since ascended to the highest ranks within the Catholic Church:

"Communism & NWO: Wall Street's Utopian Hoax," by Henry Makow, Ph.D., March 16, 2003: "Bella Dodd was a leader of the Communist Party of America (CPUSA) in the 1930's and 1940's. Her book, 'School of Darkness' (1954) reveals that Communism was a hoax perpetrated by financiers 'to control the common man' and to advance world tyranny. ...The Communist Party operates by infiltrating and subverting social institutions like the churches, schools, mass media and government. ...Dodd reveals that the CPUSA had 1100 members become Catholic priests in the 1930's."

*Christian Order* magazine (November 2000) recounts how Dodd and her associate, Douglas Hyde, revealed the plan for communist subversion of the Church: "Ex-Communist and celebrated convert Douglas Hyde revealed long ago that in the 1930s the Communist leadership issued a worldwide directive about infiltrating the Catholic Church. While in the early 1950s, Mrs. Bella Dodd was also providing detailed explanations of the Communist subversion of the Church. Speaking as a former high ranking official of the American Communist Party, Mrs. Dodd said: '*In the 1930s we put eleven hundred men into the priesthood in order to destroy the Church from within.*' The idea was for these men to be ordained and progress to positions of influence and authority as Monsignors and Bishops. A dozen years before Vatican II she stated that: '*Right now they are in the highest places in the Church*' — where they were working to bring about change in order to weaken the Church's effectiveness against Communism. She also said that these changes would be so drastic that '*you will not recognise the Catholic Church.*'"

Yet, Fr. De Salvo tells us that so-called Catholic ministers are always sincere, remain faithful to Christ, and can be trusted to have the internal or personal intention to confect the sacraments simply because they are rational creatures. Dear reader, how can anyone with an ounce of common sense expect that an infiltrator bishop or priest is good and sincere simply because he is a rational creature! And how can anyone expect an infiltrator whose goal is to subvert Catholics and destroy the Catholic Church to be good and sincere about anything Catholic, let alone the confecting of the sacraments. The goal of infiltrators is to subvert Catholics and destroy the Catholic Church and Her sacraments. And the most effective way for an infiltrator bishop or priest to do this, if the interior intention opinion is true, is simply to interiorly intend to not confect the sacraments every time they administer them. This way catechumens and Catholics would think they validly received the sacraments and would have no way of knowing the sacraments were invalid. Surely, an infiltrator could do no greater damage to Catholics and the Catholic Church and Her sacraments than by secretly invalidating them.

With these FACTS considered, Fr. De Salvo is a heretical liar for teaching that all ministers are always sincere and indefectible, which only further discredits the interior intention opinion (heresy) as being indefensible and a prescription for disaster.

As a side note, De Salvo's heretical confidence in the goodness and sincerity of men is a prelude to John XXIII's heresy that states modern men are so good and sincere that they no longer need a Church to rule or guide or teach or punish them. They can come to the truth all on their own because they are all good and sincere:

Apostate Antipope John XXIII, Opening speech at the Second Vatican Council: "In the present order of things, Divine Providence is leading us to a new order of human

relations which, by men's own efforts and even beyond their very expectations, are directed toward the fulfillment of God's superior and inscrutable designs. ...Not, certainly, that there is a lack of fallacious teaching, opinions, and dangerous concepts to be guarded against and dissipated. But these are so obviously in contrast with the right norm of honesty, and have produced such lethal fruits that by now it would seem that men of themselves are inclined to condemn them... They are ever more deeply convinced of the paramount dignity of the human person and of his perfection as well as of the duties which that implies."

In his book *On the Sacraments of the Church: A Commentary on the Third Part of Thomas*, vol. 1, Thesis xviii (q. 64. a. 8), the apostate anti-cardinal Ludovic Billot, S.J., also lies about the sincerity of men when he answers the following good objection to the internal intention opinion. He pretends that no man is so evil as to deceive others by externally doing something that he does not internally intend to do:

Billot: "THIRD OBJECTION: An intention is invisible, but all the things necessary for the validity of the sacraments and the impression of the character ought to be visible. Further, one of the reasons that the necessity of faith or of the state of grace in the minister was excluded, was that otherwise all the sacraments would be full of anxiety and uncertainty. But the same reasoning argues against the necessity of an intention at least internal.

"[Billot's answer] I respond, that an internal intention is certainly in itself invisible, but is made visible through the external action with which it is connected, if not with metaphysical or physical necessity, then certainly with moral certitude. This follows from considering the common manner or way in which men act. For it is completely natural that a man internally intend that which he does externally; and so, when he celebrates a sacrament of the Church, through this fact itself he shows that he wishes to do what the Church does, especially since there is no reason for a man to be tempted to simulate, since this simulation does not bring any temporal benefit, as is obvious."

Billot is dishonest when he says that "it is completely natural that a man internally intend that which he does externally." This is not true of all men. Many men are naturally inclined to do evil, which includes lying in order to subvert and destroy their enemies and their enemies' institutions. Spies and infiltrators and heretics do many things externally that they do not internally intend to do in order to deceive and to not get caught. He also lies when he says that "simulation does not bring any temporal benefit." Since when? Tell that to the apostate Jews who can get men to do just about anything that is possible for money or other temporal benefits. Spies and infiltrators get many temporal benefits, financial and otherwise, for simulating. And spies and infiltrators and heretics get spiritual benefits, perverse as they are, in fighting against their enemy, the Catholic Church, from within Her ranks. Many spies and infiltrators and heretics subvert Catholics and attempt to destroy the Catholic Church and Her sacraments to benefit their cause, which is the destruction of the Catholic Church, and not for money or other temporal benefits. Hence, Billot's answer to this valid objection is illogical and plain old stupid. He evades the problem by lying about it. If he were to admit the truth that many men from the birth of the Catholic Church have infiltrated Her with the intention of subverting Catholics and destroying the Church and Her sacraments, then he would have to admit that the interior intention opinion (heresy) that he holds is not viable and therefore only the exterior intention opinion (dogma) solves this very serious problem.

The apostate Billot also tries to make it seem that a moral certitude is as good as a metaphysical (true) certitude and hence Catholics should not worry about the validity of the sacraments they receive. This is another lie because no matter how one tries to quell Catholic consciences by lying about or downplaying the real consequences of something that is only a moral certitude, a moral certitude is still a moral certitude and hence it is not a true certitude and

hence a Catholic can never be certainly sure that he validly received a sacrament, including baptism and confession, which involves the salvation or damnation of his soul.

### **A new interior intention heresy refutes the common one**

A Vatican II apostate theologian, Mr. William Marshner of the theological faculty of Christendom College, attempts to resolve the major problems with the interior intention opinion (heresy) by coming up with a new interior intention opinion of his own that actually does away with any interior intention at all. His opinion should really be called the “no interior intention opinion.” However, this theologian rightly recognizes that the interior intention opinion as held by most of the modern theologians has major flaws and hence is indefensible. He refers to the commonly held interior intention opinion as the strong thesis because most of the modern theologians hold it. And he refers to his new interior intention opinion as the weak thesis because only he or a few others hold it. Mr. Marshner presents his opinion in his book titled *The Problem of What Intention Is Required in The Minister of a Valid Sacrament*. Below is a quote from his book in which he presents the two interior intention opinions, the common one and then his new one. He then correctly points out that the common opinion, the strong thesis, has two serious flaws: One, that it is impossible for a minister who does not believe in a sacrament to intend to confect the sacrament; two, hence this opinion also denies by logical implication the dogma that the minister does not have to have faith in the sacrament to confect it:

“Secondly, regarding the internal intention itself, the arguments against Catharinus have left open two widely different alternatives. They are:

“1) that in order to be intending to do what the Church does in a given rite, a minister must have both the external intention to perform it and also the internal intention (actual or virtual) to confer what the Church confers through the rite; or else

“2) that in order to be intending to do what the Church does in a given rite, a minister must have the external intention to perform it and also must not have an internal intention, actual or virtual, which is contradictory of the intention to confer what the Church confers through the rite.

“The first of these alternatives poses two serious difficulties.

“First, taking baptism as an example, this alternative requires that the minister of baptism have an internal intention to confer the spiritual character and/or grace. ...Now suppose the minister is an occult heretic or a consumer of dissident theology, who believes that baptism has no supernatural effects... Then he cannot possibly intend...to have happen what one believes does not happen. And so it would go for the rest of the Sacraments. Therefore, on this alternative, sacraments conferred by occult heretics as well as other sorts of unbelievers will be invalid.

Thus, as the defenders of Catharinus have always warned, an immense uncertainty will spread over baptisms, over ordinations, and thence over the entire sacramental system of the Church, at least in many minds. This is ‘inconvenient’ to say the least.

“Secondly, this alternative casts grave doubt on the agreed point concerning the non-necessity of internal faith. For suppose, using the same example of baptism, that the minister merely has no conviction at all...has no knowledge even what Christians believe...(though he does know that baptizing is something Christians do). ...It would be at least odd and difficult for the minister to intend that [the sacrament be confected]...

“I call the first alternative the strong thesis on internal intention. None of its difficulties affect the second alternative, which I call the weak thesis.”

So we see that Mr. Marshner has at least correctly refuted the common interior intention opinion, the strong thesis, by pointing out its serious and indefensible flaws. We will now see how Mr. Marshner attempts to resolve these flaws by presenting a new interior intention opinion that he calls the weak thesis, which, as you will see, does away with the necessity of any interior intention whatsoever and hence he should have called it the no interior intention opinion:

“I call the first alternative the strong thesis on internal intention. None of its difficulties affect the second alternative, which I call the weak thesis. For even an occult heretic who strongly believes that [confection will not happen] will have no reason or inclination to intend that [it not happen and hence have any intention contradictory to confection]. The normal intentions of occult heretics or theological dissidents are not contradictory to [confection]. For example, such a person might perform this baptism just to make the parents and godparents happy, or just to welcome the child into the Christian community, or just to keep a job with the diocese, avoid hassles, etc. None of these banal intentions amounts to, or implies, the intention that grace not be conferred by this baptism. In fact, among those who are not good Catholics, no one has less reason to intend the non-efficacy of the Sacrament than someone who positively believes there is no such efficacy. Hence ordinary occult heresy or theological dissidence will pose little danger of hidden invalidity, on this second alternative. What does pose such a danger—almost the only thing that poses it—is something vastly rarer and perhaps infinitely more malicious, namely, the conviction that this Sacrament, validly performed, could confer grace, coupled with the determined intention that it not do so. Such a combination would characterize the mind of a demon.

“Hence the second alternative, which I call the weak thesis on internal intention, preserves intact all of the agreed points, retains all the pastoral advantages of Catharinus’s position... It is the alternative which the present writer defends—not only because it is orthodox but also because it is philosophically cogent.

“...For instance, not believing that Christ becomes really present at the consecration is very different from intending that He not become present. Granted, an ignorant or heretical priest, who fails to believe that Christ becomes present, might also, when celebrating, intend that He not become present; but such an intention would be odd and extraordinarily malicious. The normal thing is that, when a person has no belief that something happens, he has no reason to intend that it not happen.

“...Perhaps one must merely abstain from harboring an intention not to accomplish what he accomplishes.

“...A man who presents a cheque to a bank-teller acts with the intention that the teller should cash it. So, again, whoever intends to do what the Church does either must intend to act with this intention or, at least, must intend to act without any contrary intention.”

Marshner’s new interior intention opinion has two serious and indefensible flaws:

One: He is neutral regarding confection. He has no interior intention at all regarding confection or non-confection. Marshner rightly believes that the minister does not need to intend to confect the sacrament for validity. But he wrongly believes that such a minister can still have an interior intention necessary to confect the sacrament if the minister does not intend to confect the sacrament. In other words, a minister who has no intention one way or the other about confecting the sacrament is said by Marshner to have the necessary interior intention to confect the sacrament. Yet this minister actually has no interior intention at all regarding the confection of the sacrament one way or the other. Marshner admits this is actually a non-intention when he says

“...Perhaps one must merely abstain from harboring an intention not to accomplish what he accomplishes.” Abstaining from an intention means one has no intention. Hence Marshner’s opinion should really be called the no interior intention opinion.

Two: His opinion does not solve the dilemma of preventing a malicious minister, such as an infiltrator, from invalidating the sacraments by interiorly intending by a positive act of his will to not intend to confect the sacrament. He admits that such a minister would invalidate the sacrament but naively implies it is rare or maybe even impossible because only a demon from hell would do such a thing:

“What does pose such a danger—almost the only thing that poses it—is something vastly rarer and perhaps infinitely more malicious, namely, the conviction that this Sacrament, validly performed, could confer grace, coupled with the determined intention that it not do so. Such a combination would characterize the mind of a demon.”

The FACT is that malicious, demonic, infiltrator ministers are not rare. As the apostasy progressed, they grew in numbers within the ranks of the Catholic Church from a minority to a majority to a great majority to a very great majority! Hence Marshner is presented with the same problem that the common interior intention opinion has which he attempted to solve. He is still faced with malicious ministers invalidating sacraments without any way for the people to know. No Catholic can know for sure if he validly receives the sacraments because there is always the possibility that the minister is an infiltrator who keeps his malice secret.

Marshner and others who put forward an interior intention opinion (heresy) are persisting in what they know cannot be defended. For instance, Marshner’s new interior intention opinion (heresy) has more in common with the exterior intention opinion (dogma) than with the common interior intention opinion; but he shies away from going all the way by embracing the exterior intention opinion because he thinks the Holy Office decree that condemned it is infallible. Consequently, he must find a way to make the impossible interior intention opinion work:

Marshner: “Hence the second alternative, which I call the weak thesis on internal intention, preserves intact all of the agreed points, retains all the pastoral advantages of Catharinus’s position, and yet excludes the condemned error of Farvacques. Consistent with all authentic Church teachings on this subject, it is the alternative which the present writer defends—not only because it is orthodox but also because it is philosophically cogent.”

As stated above, this nominal Holy Office decree is null and void and is also heretical.