

# Against Fr. Francois Egregyi



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

*Judica me Deus, et discerne causam meam de gente non sancta  
as homine iniquo et doloso erue me*

Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam

Original version: 1/2005; Current version: 1/2005

**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

|  |    |
|--|----|
| REV. EGREGYI DID NOT RESPOND TO THIS DENUNCIATION .....  | 5  |
| REV. EGREGYI IS A SCHISMATIC .....   | 5  |
| HE DOES NOT ANSWER GOOD QUESTIONS .....  | 7  |
| SILENCE ON THE CONTRACEPTIVE SIN OF NATURAL FAMILY PLANNING.....   | 7  |
| HE MAY BELIEVE IT IS HERESY TO HOLD THE OPINION THAT BAPTISM BY WATER IS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY FOR SALVATION... | 7  |
| HE IS A PSEUDO-INTELLECT .....   | 7  |
| NO FAITH IN GOD .....  | 7  |
| MORTAL SINS OF IMMORALITY, SCANDAL, AND SUSPICION OF HERESY.....   | 8  |
| HE DOES NOT REQUIRE SPECIFIC ABJURATIONS .....   | 9  |
| HE IS A POISONOUS HIRELING .....   | 10 |
| SUPPLEMENT .....   | 11 |
| <i>Excerpts from RJMI Letter to Rev. Egregyi (1/31/2000)</i> .....   | 11 |



## ***Rev. Egregyi did not respond to this denunciation***

December 1, 2004  
Ferial Day  
Come Lord Jesus!

Rev. Egregyi,

I will give you one month to respond to the below charges and to repent of them. If not, I will post them on my website.

CC: ...William Norris and Mr. Y.

Soli Deo Gloria  
Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

RJMI Comment: As of January 3, 2005, I have not received any response from Fr. Egregyi; therefore, I now make public my denunciation against him.

### ***Rev. Egregyi is a schismatic***

Fr. Egregyi does not deny the principle of epikeia (exceptions of the letter of laws that do not deal with faith or morals in emergency situations) but he does not seem to apply it to anything, especially when it comes to his functioning as a priest without access to a bishop with ordinary jurisdiction.

He does not admit to the need for epikeia when it applies; therefore, he schismatically functions as a priest, which makes him a non-Catholic priest on this point alone. He stubbornly will not admit that the only way he can function as a priest in these days of the Great Apostasy when there is no access to Catholic bishops with ordinary jurisdiction is by the principle of epikeia. He does not admit that the confessions he hears of those not in danger of death can only be legal by the principle of epikeia. Therefore, he violates the letter of the law that teaches that a priest who does not have delegated jurisdiction from a bishop or religious superior cannot hear confession unless the penitent is in danger of death.

*1917 Code of Canon Law*: “c. 872. For the valid absolution of sins, the minister requires, besides the power of Orders, either ordinary or delegated power of jurisdiction over the penitent.”

*1917 Code of Canon Law*: “c. 882 In danger of death all priests, though not approved for confessions, can validly and licitly absolve any penitent from any sins and censures, although reserved and notorious...”

He also denies that the principle of epikeia would allow him to teach the faith to his flock without the approval of a bishop with ordinary jurisdiction, which the letter of the law demands with no exceptions.

*1917 Code of Canon Law*: “c. 1385 1. Without previous ecclesiastical approval, even laymen are not allowed to publish: (1) the books of Sacred Scripture, or annotations and commentaries on the same: (2) books treating of Sacred Scripture, theology, church history, canon law, natural theology, ethics, or other religious or moral sciences... c. 1385 2. The permission to publish books... in this Canon may be given either by proper local Ordinary of the author, or by the local Ordinary of the place where the books... are published, or the local Ordinary of the place where

they are printed... Religious authors must also obtain the permission of their major superior before publication.”

Therefore, he violates the letter of this law by teaching the faith to his flock because he does not admit he is exempted from the above law by the principle of epikeia.

He is also a hypocrite on at least three points:

One, he does not preach sermons because he says that the letter of the law requires him to have the approval of a bishop with ordinary jurisdiction, which is true.

*1917 Code of Canon Law*: “c. 1328. Nobody is allowed to exercise the ministry of preaching, unless he has received a commission from the legitimate superior, either by special faculty or by appointment to an office to which the duty of preaching is attached by the Sacred Canons.”

Yet, he hears confessions of penitents who are not in danger of death and teaches the faith without the approval of a bishop with ordinary jurisdiction, which the letter of the law also requires. To be consistent, if he cannot preach sermons, then he cannot hear confessions of penitents not in danger of death or teach the faith. Or, if he does hear confessions of penitents not in danger and teaches the faith, then he can also preach sermons.

Two, he does not believe Catholic bishops without ordinary jurisdiction can legally ordain priests and consecrate bishops or confirm their flock in emergency situations by the principle of epikeia. Yet, he believes he can legally function as a priest while violating the letter of the laws that deal with hearing confession and teaching the faith.

Three, he recently had dispensed a member of his flock from simple vows so that member could get married. By the letter of the law only a bishop with ordinary jurisdiction can do this. Because Egregyi does not admit epikeia justified his action, he violated the letter of this law. His flock took him to task on this point and rightly denounced and banished him for his hypocrisy. I warned him that this would inevitably happen.

I say Rev. Egregyi is obstinate because I clearly showed him the truth several times and he refused to respond when he was proved wrong. For instance, he never responded to a letter I sent him on January 31, 2000, as found in my book *Epikēia Debate*, which deals with this topic. See the Supplement at the end of this denunciation for a copy of the letter.

I also warned Rev. Egregyi that others would discredit him and prove his bad will if he did not amend his position. For instance, Rev. Anthony Cekada and others have proved Rev. Egregyi to be wrong regarding epikeia. Yet, Egregyi never admitted he was wrong and amended his position, which is more proof of his bad will, obstinacy, and horrible pride. See my article *Fr. Cekada discredits Jurisdictional Pharisees* in the To Whom it May Concern section on my Website or you can order it (8 pp., 40 cents).

To conclude this point, Rev. Egregyi is a schismatic for violating the letter of the laws that deal with hearing confession, teaching the faith, and the dispensing of simple vows because he does not admit epikeia applies in these cases. He does not admit that he is

exempted from the letter of these laws for any reason. To learn more about the principle of epikeia see my book *Exceptions of the Law*.

### ***He does not answer good questions***

Rev. Egregyi has a sinful habit of not answering good questions when proved wrong, which makes him guilty by omission. For instance, he never answered my questions regarding his errors on Epikeia and other topics.

### ***Silence on the contraceptive sin of Natural Family Planning***

He is suspect of believing that the contraception method of Natural Family Planning, also known as the Rhythm Method, is not contraception. He does not condemn it before his flock.

### ***He may believe it is heresy to hold the opinion that baptism by water is absolutely necessary for salvation***

He is also suspect of erroneously believing that it is heresy to believe in the absolute necessity of baptism by water for salvation. See my book *The Baptism Controversy*.

### ***He is a pseudo-intellect***

Fr. Egregyi is a pseudo-intellect. He tries to discredit his opponent's works by accusations of bad spelling and grammar while not addressing the content. He would have a better chance of saving his soul if he were only a spelling or grammar teacher instead of a priest. He also shows an abysmal lack of knowledge of the Holy Scriptures and supernatural faith in God.

### ***No faith in God***

Several things Rev. Egregyi said to me indicated a lack of true faith in God:

1) He asked me, "Are not you afraid to speak out publicly against the Jews?" I said, "No. Only those who do not have true faith in God are afraid to publicly profess the faith. God is more powerful than the apostate Jews. I fear only God."

2) I told him that even if we speak all truth we could not convert the masses unless God goes before us with His power and miracles. He said that God does not operate that way anymore. I said, "Yes, and that is the problem. No one is worthy of true miracles and without them there will be no mass conversions." Egregyi thinks my true faith in God is weird. He attempts to discredit me because I say God speaks to me and that we need God's miracles and power, which are Catholic dogmas—God does speak to certain men; God does perform miracles and manifest His power through men.

3) He asked why I wear a big Miraculous Medal outside my clothing for all to see. He said that I looked like Fr. Grunner. This was an attack against our Blessed Mother. I told him, "I wear it to give public honor to Mary, for protection, and to help witness to our faith. Just because the apostate Fr. Grunner wears one does not mean it is evil or bad. Many bad and fallen-away Catholics pray the Rosary. That does not mean the Rosary is evil or bad."

4) He told me that he met with a Vatican II “prelate” in Poland who was very intelligent. He said he had a very good conversation with him and was impressed by him. I told him, “Did you denounce him and present the truth to him?” Egregyi said, “No.” I then told Egregyi that he committed a sin of omission. This, again, indicated his lack of true faith in God. He places intellectualism above Catholicism (faith). He admires smart pagans, and worse, admires them more than simple Catholics who are imbued with science of the saints even though they are not intellectuals.

### ***Mortal sins of immorality, scandal, and suspicion of heresy***

Recent evidence confirms Rev. Egregyi’s lack of faith. The following mortal sins of Rev. Egregyi came to my attention in November 2004 from those who were attending his masses for sometime. They have since abjured from Rev. Egregyi and entered the Catholic Church. They are now part of Mary’s Little Remnant.

He does not teach and guard his flock the way a priest should. He is grossly deficient in this most important pastoral area. He offers Mass but does not properly teach the Catholic faith, teach his flock how to be good Catholics, or properly discipline them when needed.

Not only does he not properly teach and discipline his flock, he poisons them. He commits mortal sins of immorality and scandal and is suspect of heresy for reading and supporting books and movies that place false religious ideas (heresies, idolatries, etc.) and the occult in a positive light, such as *Lord of the Rings* and *Harry Potter*: both endorse religious falsehoods and the occult. They favor witches, warlocks, wizards, divination, and various other demonic fantasy creatures, which are nothing more than demons or humans inspired by demons. These books and moves also teach false religious doctrines. Therefore, he is guilty of mortal sin and suspect of the heresy of witchcraft and the religious falsehoods propagated in these bad movies and books.

“Go not aside after wizards: neither ask any thing of soothsayers, to be defiled by them. I am the Lord your God.” (Lev. 19:31) “Neither let there be found among you any one that shall expiate his son or daughter, making them to pass through the fire: or that consulteth soothsayers, or observeth dreams and omens, neither let there be any wizard...” (Deut. 18:10)

See my upcoming book *Against Occult Books and Movies*. No Catholic priest would read these books or allow anyone else to read them unless to refute and condemn them. Egregyi does not condemn them; instead, he allows his flock to view these movies and read these books. One family member witnessed him listening to a *Harry Potter* book on cassette tape and he joked about portions of the movie before Mass. He was not listening to *Harry Potter* to condemn it but for entertainment. Some members of that same family watch *Lord of the Rings* and Egregyi allowed them. Some are now watching *Harry Potter*. One can rightly wonder if Egregyi is a warlock. He also allows members of his flock to listen to hard rock-and-roll music and watch other bad movies.

In the past Rev. Egregyi also scandalized others by not just showing them a Masonic handshake—which can be allowed to help expose Masons—but by continuing to do so as a so-called joke. He was told to stop, and he did. A Catholic is forbidden to joke about or use occult things and false religious symbols, for that would be giving them credence. It would be like a so-called Catholic pretending to worship a false god as a joke. “*From all*



*appearance of evil refrain yourselves.*” (1 Thess. 5:22) One can rightly wonder if Egregyi is a Mason.

### ***He does not require specific abjurations***

Rev. Egregyi violates the Church law that requires fallen-away Catholics to make specific abjurations in order to enter the Catholic Church.

*The Delict of Heresy*: “Absolution from Heresy - ...The heretic must make reparation from the scandal given by his delict by endeavoring to arrest the activities of teachers of heresy. To this end, he must denounce any such persons that he knows. Also, he must make known any Catholic clergy who were accomplices in his delict. Finally, he must recant his heresy and make this known to those who heard him manifest his doubts or denials of revealed truth. These denunciations and recantations must either precede the absolution, or else must be seriously promised by the penitent. Secondly, the penitent must abjure his erroneous tenets in the presence of the Bishop or the priest who absolves him. ...The Roman Ritual provides a formula of abjuration and profession of Catholic faith which is designed especially for converts. Delinquent Catholics would be held to make a more specific abjuration of the particular error which was involved in their delict. The essential necessity is that the delinquent abjure his particular error, and profess full belief in the opposite Catholic dogma, together with a sincere acceptance of the doctrinal authority of God and of the Church.”<sup>1</sup>

(See my book *The Abjuration from the Great Apostasy*, “Fallen-away Catholics must specifically abjure.”) Egregyi does not require fallen-away Catholics to specifically abjure from their errors and from the leaders and errors of the non-Catholic sect they belonged to. Because he has never responded to my requests to see what his abjuration form consisted of, I only recently discovered, from a member of his lost flock that converted, that he does not require specific abjurations. He only requires a Profession of Faith, similar to the one composed at the Council of Trent. Consequently, he has no way of knowing what his flock believes regarding the many, prevalent heresies in these days of the Great Apostasy, which are not mentioned or addressed in a mere Profession of Faith.

As a result of this mortally sinful lack of vigilance, he may very well be giving Holy Communion and the other sacraments to non-Catholics. Indeed, I have proof that he is doing just that. What follows is just more proof of the need for specific abjurations for fallen-away Catholics, not that this proof is needed, because the Church demands it is enough proof even if one does not understand why:

On November 14, 2004, four members of Rev. Egregyi’s flock took the specific abjuration I composed and also abjured from their association with Rev. Egregyi and are now members of Mary’s Little Remnant. Two of them live with family members who are still part of Egregyi’s lost flock. After these two Catholics came home, they placed the specific abjuration on the table for the other family members to see. Then, like the bulwark of faith and that it is, like fire separating dross from gold, the specific abjuration with God’s grace did the rest of the work by weeding out heresies the other family members held. It weeded out at least three heresies of the father of the family, whom Rev. Egregyi considered Catholic: The father of the family, 1) believes God created

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Delict of Heresy* (hereafter: DOH), In its Commission, Penalization, and Absolution, A Dissertation, Rev. Eric F. MacKenzie, A.M., S.T.L., J.C.L., of the Archdiocese of Boston, Nihil Obstat: Patrick J. Waters, Ph.D. Censor Deputatus, Imprimatur: +William Cardinal O’Connell, Archbishop of Boston, Boston, June 3, 1932, Catholic University of America Canon Law Series, Chap. 8, pp. 108, 114.

homosexuals and harlots and both are in heaven. 2) He believes in the contraception method of Natural Family Planning. 3) He believes Catholics can pray in communion with non-Catholics.

From speaking to Rev. Egregyi, I think he also believes at least two of these points are heresy, except maybe Natural Family Planning. Yet, all the years Egregyi considered this father a Catholic and gave him the sacraments sacrilegiously. I say sacrilegiously, because it is the priest's duty to examine the faith of his flock, point-by-point, to make sure they are Catholic before he gives them the sacraments. A specific abjuration or position paper does this most effectively. Egregyi requires neither. Also, if Egregyi properly instructed them in the faith during the many years, he would have discovered their heresies. He has not done this either. Hence, he is guilty of the mortal sins of negligence, religious indifferentism, and the sacrilegious administration of the sacraments, which is the mark of a hireling.

I pray especially for these two valiant Catholic family members that they stand fast in the faith and the many persecutions that follow true Catholics. *"Watch ye: stand fast in the faith: do manfully and be strengthened."* (1 Cor. 16:13) *"Therefore, brethren, stand fast: and hold the traditions, which you have learned, whether by word or by our epistle."* (2 Thess. 2:14) *"Let your conversation be worthy of the gospel of Christ... that you stand fast in one spirit, with one mind labouring together for the faith of the gospel."* (Phil. 1:27) *"All that will live godly in Christ Jesus, shall suffer persecution."* (2 Tim. 3:12) And the worst persecution comes from obstinate family members. That is why Jesus said He came to cause divisions in certain families: *"Think ye, that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, no; but separation. For there shall be from henceforth five in one house divided: three against two, and two against three. The father shall be divided against the son, and the son against his father, the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother, the mother in law against her daughter in law, and the daughter in law against her mother in law."* (Luke 12: 51-53) *"Do not think that I came to send peace upon earth: I came not to send peace, but the sword. For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law. And as a man's enemies shall be they of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me, is not worthy of me; and he that loveth son or daughter more than me, is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not up his cross, and followeth me, is not worthy of me."* (Mt. 10:34-38)

Secondly, I pray for their lost family members, who now have a hope of salvation by having their mortal errors brought clearly to their attention along with their consequences: eternal hell if they do not repent, convert, abjure, and lead a good Catholic life. That is what Rev. Egregyi was supposed to do and easily could have done if he was truly Catholic.

### ***He is a poisonous hireling***

As of this date, January 2005, Fr. Egregyi is a poisonous, prideful hireling, a bad tree that bears bad fruit. I saw the rotten evidence: the poor, lost flock he tends. Dear reader, avoid him like a deadly plague, unless he repents, abjures, and amends his ways. There is nothing worse in this whole wide world than a bad priest. (See my upcoming book *Bad Priests*)

January 2005

## ***Supplement***

### **Excerpts from RJMI Letter to Rev. Egregyi (1/31/2000)**

R. J. M. I.

✠ ✠ ✠

J.M.J.

January 31, 2000  
St. John Bosco – Ora pro nobis!

Dear Fr. Egregyi,

#### **The Achille Lienart Affair:**

I believe the SSPX priesthood is valid. You are right, in that some have presented corrupted evidence to try and support their case against the invalidity of the SSPX priesthood. Most of these wish with a vengeance that the SSPX priests are invalid. They have gone too far. I believe that the SSPX priesthood is valid, and even if some have doubts, they are not positive objective doubts and they have no right to say the SSPX priests are invalid or they sin. It is clear from Church teaching, that unless some defect manifested itself in the external rite of ordination, or the bishop had made a public statement to the effect that he did not intend to consecrate or ordain, then no one can question the validity of the ordinations.

#### **Preaching Sermons, Teaching, Confessions, and Episcopal Consecrations:**

Father, the reason it is important to resolve this issue. When other priests convert, and believe they can preach sermons, that would represent a problem for you. This would cause a division, a schism. I am not saying you are wrong to avoid priests whom you believe are in heresy or schism, and that is why the issue has to be resolved according to the truth, the facts.

#### **Teaching:**

The article you sent me about preaching sermons is excellent. It surely tells us why Protestants have no authority to preach. This mission, being sent by proper Church authorities, also extends to written or oral teachings, such as catechisms, catechism classes, or any book or oral teaching that attempts to put forward the Catholic position. Protestants have no right to preach, teach, or write books regarding the faith. Catholics must be authorized not just to preach but also to teach, and write books or tracts. All articles or books that are written by a Catholic, in normal times, must have the approval of an Ordinary, and if a religious he also needs the approval of his superior.

*1917 Code of Canon Law:* “c. 1385 1. Without previous ecclesiastical approval, even laymen are not allowed to publish: (1) the books of Sacred Scripture, or

annotations and commentaries on the same: (2) books treating of Sacred Scripture, theology, church history, canon law, natural theology, ethics, or other religious or moral sciences... c. 1385 2. The permission to publish books... in this Canon may be given either by proper local Ordinary of the author, or by the local Ordinary of the place where the books... are published, or the local Ordinary of the place where they are printed... Religious authors must also obtain the permission of their major superior before publication.”

**Preaching:**

This is the law that bans preaching without being sent by proper Church authorities:

*1917 Code of Canon Law:* “c. 1328. Nobody is allowed to exercise the ministry of preaching, unless he has received a commission from the legitimate superior, either by special faculty or by appointment to an office to which the duty of preaching is attached by the Sacred Canons.”

You can see there is no difference between the ban from preaching and teaching without approval of proper Church authorities. Both cases deal with the divine law because it deals with the teaching of the Catholic faith and morals; this is what is conveyed to the listener, whether by preaching or teaching, the principle is the same. To appeal for an exemption by the use of epikeia for one, would automatically include the other. Pope Gregory XVI makes this clear.

Pope Gregory XVI, *Mirrari Vos*: “8. ...Nor may the priests ever forget that they are forbidden by ancient canons to undertake ministry and to assume the tasks of teaching and preaching ‘without the permission of their bishop to whom the people have been entrusted; an accounting for the souls of the people will be demanded from the bishop’. Finally let them understand that all those who struggle against this established order disturb the position of the Church.”

**Confessions:**

This is the law that bans the hearing of confession unless one is sent by proper Church authorities:

*1917 Code of Canon Law:* “c. 872. For the valid absolution of sins, the minister requires, besides the power of Orders, either ordinary or delegated power of jurisdiction over the penitent.”

“c. 2366. Giving Absolution Beyond Jurisdiction “A priest who presumes to hear sacramental confessions without the required jurisdiction is ipso facto suspended a divinis...”

We will now compare the preaching of sermons to the hearing of confessions. The article you sent, “*Unless They Be Sent*,” proves that confessions and preaching sermons come under the same category. I quote from the book:

“The disciples, therefore, on the commission and by the example of the Master preach only as sent... by the mission the preacher is united to Christ. Confession heard without the necessary jurisdiction cannot lead to valid absolution. So, too, preaching without the necessary jurisdiction, which is conferred by the mission, is invalid. “Preaching and hearing confession are dependant upon both jurisdiction and orders.”<sup>2</sup>

““Monks” who presuming on their sanctity, by their own volition usurp the office of ministers of the Church, namely by absolving sinners and by preaching without the authority of the bishop, which is in no wise permissible to them”<sup>3</sup>

If epikeia exempts a Catholic from the need of faculties and delegated jurisdiction from a bishop for hearing confessions in this emergency situation, then surely the same applies to the preaching sermons. The use of epikeia draws supplied jurisdiction directly from the Church and the Church delegates this jurisdiction to the bishop or priest.

Clearly, we see the hearing of confessions falls into the same category as preaching sermons. No canonical law directly allows for the hearing of confessions in this emergency situation. Canon 882 does not apply.

*1917 Code of Canon Law: “c. 882 In danger of death all priests, though not approved for confessions, can validly and licitly absolve any penitent from any sins and censures, although reserved and notorious...”*

The letter-of-the-law of canon 882 says that priests can hear confession without faculties or delegated jurisdiction from an ordinary only if the penitent is “in danger of death.” If you disregard the phrase “in danger of death” you would be appealing to epikeia to be exempted from this necessary condition as specified by the letter of this law, and therefore canon 882 cannot be used. However, this canon does prove that legal and valid confessions can be heard without supplied jurisdiction from an Ordinary, and that this jurisdiction, which is necessary, is supplied directly by the Church and delegated to the priest who has no faculties for the confession, for one who is in danger of death.

As a matter of fact no canon law can be used to support the hearing of confessions or the preaching of sermons in these days of emergency and this is why we have a clear case of the use of epikeia (an exemption from the law) for a Catholic priest to hear confessions and preach sermons.

Canon law had not foreseen the extent of the great apostasy we are now living through. A Catholic priest, in these days of emergency, must appeal to epikeia in order to justify his legal and valid hearing of confessions, from his flock that are not in danger of death.

The exact same principle applies to the preaching of sermons, which you must admit comes under the same conditions as hearing confessions. One cannot say the hearing of confessions is less important than the preaching of sermons, and if one can be exempted from the law to hear confessions, one can be exempted from the law for preaching sermons, writing books without imprimaturs, or simply teaching the Catholic faith.

#### **Episcopal Consecrations & Ordinations:**

---

<sup>2</sup> Augustine Rock, O.P., S.T.D., M.A., “Unless They Be Sent,” Blackriars Publications, London, 1955, p 113.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 121-122

Code of Canon Law 1917: “c. 953. Episcopal consecration is reserved to the Roman Pontiff; hence, no Bishop is allowed to consecrate another Bishop unless he is certain that he has a papal mandate.... This requirement is for the licitness of the consecration, not for its validity.” “c. 2370. The bishop who, contrary to canon 953, confers Episcopal consecration and the assistant bishops or the priest taking their place, as well as the one who receives Episcopal consecration without having obtained an Apostolic Mandate are suspended *ispo jure* until the Holy See has granted a dispensation.”

Pope Pius XII, *Ad Apostolorum Principis*, June 29, 1958: “47. ...No person or group, whether of priests or of laymen, can claim the right of nominating bishops; that no one can lawfully confer Episcopal consecration unless he has received the mandate of the Apostolic See. 48. Consequently, if consecration of this kind is being done contrary to all right and law, and by this crime the unity of the Church his being seriously attacked, and excommunication reserved *specialissimo modo* to the Apostolic See has been established which is automatically incurred by the consecrator and by anyone who has received consecration irresponsibly conferred.”

Epikeia also applies to Episcopal consecrations and priestly ordinations as I have written about in “*Book Two*.” In order for a Catholic bishop to consecrate and ordain in these days of emergency he is appealing to epikeia to be exempted from the letter of the law as stated in Pope Pius XII’s “*Ad Apostolorum Principis*.” I know what the letter of the law says regarding this document, just as what the letter of the law teaches regarding hearing confessions, teaching, and preaching sermons and epikeia applies in all cases, provided the one who uses it is Catholic. A non-Catholic cannot apply to any of the Church laws, let alone epikeia. Simply put, the next pope will never condemn a Catholic bishop or priest for doing whatever he can to preserve the apostolic marks or the Church (the Episcopacy), the sacraments (the priesthood, and the faith by preaching and teaching. Of course this is all based upon the fact that the bishop or priest is Catholic, not just in word, but also in deed. The next pope would bless and confirm all Catholic bishops and priests who did whatever they could to maintain all the Marks of the Church. How could he do anything else?

#### **Conversions:**

We must be prepared to accept converts from the Conciliar Church and from those who hold the *sede-vacante* position, but are not Catholic due to either their illegal consecrations and ordinations, or their not holding or practicing the full deposit of the Catholic faith. God is merciful; He does forgive.

Father, God has forgiven you for your association with the Society of St. Pius X, and He approves of you carrying out your priestly duties as a form of penance. I know we cannot be easy on converts, and I believe that the hard penance for such converts is precisely to function as Catholic bishops and priests in these days of the great apostasy. This is truly a hard and monumental task that would require a great effort and sacrifice of their time,

patience, and all the virtues. They would then be able to go about making right what they have made wrong for so many years.

If the Church was living through normal times, it would be no excessive burden from them to function as Catholic bishops and priests and would even be a relief due to the more comfortable position of the Church in more normal times when all Her structures are intact, and therefore a penance that deprives them of functioning as bishops or priests for some specified time would be just. But not in these days, it must be demanded of them, as their penance, to function as Catholic bishops and priests and gird themselves for the great sacrifices and persecutions that will follow, and to be prepared to shed their blood for the Catholic faith in expiation for their sins.

### **The Abjuration, Lifting of Censures, and Absolution from Sins:**

Father, what I have said above applies to the taking of an abjuration, and the lifting of a penitents censures in the external forum, before he can go to confession and have his sins forgiven in the internal forum. This can be accomplished without a pope, bishop or priest, if a pope, bishop or priest is not available, in these days of emergency, provided the penitent has a firm purpose to go before a the pope if necessary, or a Catholic bishop or priest the first opportunity. Father, you were lifted of your censures, without following the letter of the law. What priest did you take an abjuration and profession of faith before, and have your censures lifted by his absolution? The letter of the law requires the following:

The Holy Office, 1859: "...Henceforth, then, the abjuration of heresy and the profession of faith would have to be made in the presence of the bishop, or his delegate, and of two witnesses besides."<sup>4</sup>

The simple rule is that a man must keep as much of the law that he is exempted from, as possible. According to the above law from the Holy Office regarding excommunications reserved to the local ordinary, the abjuration and lifting of censures must be done before a bishop, or his delegate and two witnesses. If it is impossible to approach a Catholic bishop or his delegate and two witnesses, then epikeia would apply and a Catholic priest must then be sought. If a Catholic priest cannot be foreseeably approached within a six-month period of time, which is known as a "long duration," then the penitent would then take the abjuration before two witnesses. An article from the Catholic Encyclopedia explains this duration.

*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, "Excommunications," 1907: "They distinguished between obstacles that were more or less prolonged: perpetual obstacles were such as exceed five years; obstacles of long duration were those lasting over six months; and obstacles of short duration, those continuing for less than six months. When the obstacle was perpetual the bishop or, if he could not be reached, any priest might absolve without appealing to the superior; this could also be done, but not without obligation of recourse to the superior on the cessation of the obstacle, when the latter was of long duration, provided there were urgency."

The situation a penitent finds himself in these times of emergency regarding the access to a pope, or a Catholic bishop, and in most cases a Catholic priest, is an obstacle of "perpetual duration." The article goes on to explain what qualifies for an urgent case.

---

<sup>4</sup> Rescript of the *Holy Office*, July 20, 1859, to the Bishop of Philadelphia

Ibid: "As to what constitutes a state of urgency, the reply of 16 June, 1897, is very reassuring, since it permits absolution from censures 'as soon as it becomes too distressing to the penitent to remain in the state of sin during the time necessary for soliciting and receiving from Rome the power to absolve'."

Ibid: "The (2) Urgent Cases - In the chapter "Nuper" (xxix, de sent. excomm., lib. V, tit. xxxix), Innocent III sets forth the principle that governs such cases: "When it is difficult for the excommunicated person to go to him who excommunicated him, he may be absolved by his bishop or even by his own priest, on promising to obey the orders of him by whom excommunication was pronounced." This is the principle that moralists and canonists formulated as an axiom: *Impedito casus papalis fit episcopalis*: in case of one who is prevented from presenting himself to the pope, the excommunication reserved to the pope may be removed by the bishop. But most authors carried the analogy still further: for him who is prevented from presenting himself to the bishop, the excommunication may be removed by any confessor..."

Now there is no doubt this principle could even be carried further if a Catholic priest was not available in that lay witnesses may be approached and if that's impossible, it can be done privately. The principle is the same in that God would never allow a repentant man to languish in damnation due to lack of a Catholic bishop or priest, or lay witnesses. If only one witness can be found, then he takes the abjuration and profession of faith before one witness, and in the extreme case, if the penitent should find himself all alone on an island, then he would take the abjuration privately, between him and God.

A baptized man cannot have his sins forgiven unless he is inside the Catholic Church. Therefore, he would be able to make the abjuration and profession of faith in front of lay witnesses, or privately if he is alone and have his censures lifted, if he cannot get to a Catholic bishop or priest, provided he promises to go before a Catholic bishop or priest the first available opportunity.

The cases in which the penitent is in danger of death teach that the necessary jurisdiction that a priest needs in normal times can be supplied to a priest by the Church, even though he is not sent, does not have faculties from the proper Church authorities.

Ibid: "(3) In Danger of Death - It is a principle repeatedly set forth in canon law that at the point of death all reservations cease and all necessary jurisdiction is supplied by the Church. "At the point of death", says the Council of Trent (Sess. XIV, c. vii), "in danger of death", says the Ritual (tit. III, cap. i, n. 23), any priest can absolve from all sins and censures, even if he be without the ordinary faculties of confessors, or if he himself be excommunicated; he may do so even in presence of another priest properly authorized (Holy Office, 29 July, 1891)."

In the cases of an abjuration that is done privately or only before lay witnesses, the censure would be lifted immediately after taking the abjuration and profession of faith, provided the penitent promises to go before a Catholic bishop or priest the first opportunity to do so. It is the same principle taught in Trent, that a Catholic can be forgiven of their sins, if they cannot get to a Catholic priest, if they have true contrition, confessing their sins to God, with the desire and promise to go before a Catholic priest the first opportunity to do so.

*The Council of Trent, On penance*: "The Synod teaches moreover, that, although it sometimes happen that this contrition is perfect through charity, and reconciles man with God before this sacrament be actually received, the said reconciliation,



nevertheless, is not to be ascribed to that contrition, independently of the desire of the sacrament which is included therein.”<sup>5</sup>

The penitent, after he took the abjuration and the profession of faith, would then confess his sins privately before God with the desire and firm purpose to go confession to a priest the first opportunity to do so, and if he did not the sins would fall back on his head. The Council of Trent, as stated above, teaches this. The same principle would apply to the lifting of censures. If the penitent does not go before a Catholic bishop or priest the first opportunity he has, then the abjuration would be null and void and the censure would fall back on his head (reincidence), along with his other sins. The Catholic Encyclopedia article on Excommunication speaks of reincidence, the re-incurring of the censures and sins of the penitent.

*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, “Excommunication,” 1907: “Finally, the authors drew up a long list of those who were supposed to be unable to present themselves in person to the pope; and this list included almost every one (Gury, *Theol. Moralis*, II, nn. 952 and 375). This practice, far more lenient than was intended by Innocent III, has been recently profoundly modified by a decree of the Congregation of the Inquisition (Holy Office) dated 23 June, 1886. Henceforth “in urgent cases when absolution cannot be deferred without danger of grave scandal or infamy, which is left to the conscientious appreciation of the confessor, the latter, after having imposed the necessary satisfaction, can absolve, without other faculties, from all censure; even those specially reserved to the Holy See, but under pain or reincidence under the same censure if, within a month, the penitent thus absolved does not recur to the Holy See by letters and through the medium of the confessor.” This new method has been more precisely explained and even rendered easier by subsequent papal decisions. The absolution thus given is direct (Holy Office, 19 Aug., 1891), and although recourse to the Penitentiaria is obligatory, its object is not to ask a new absolution, but only to solicit the order of the Church, the penitent, as stated above, having had to make a serious promise to conform to them (*standi mandatis Ecclesie*). The power thus granted in urgent cases is valid for all cases, without exception, reserved by law to the pope or the ordinary, even for the absolution of an accomplice (Holy Office, 7 June, 1899)... If the interested party, though able to appeal to the Holy See, fails to do so... he or she incurs the former censures, which remain effective until there is a new absolution followed by recourse to Rome...”

It is obvious that if Rome, the pope, or any proper Church authority, cannot be approached for a long duration, then the penitent can be absolved of his censure until the first opportunity comes along to go before the proper Church authorities. The penitent in all cases must ultimately apply to the local ordinary if his censure was reserved to the local ordinary, and to the Holy See, if it was reserved to the Holy See.

The penitent incurs the former censures if he does not keep as much of the law as possible by presenting himself to the pope if necessary, or a Catholic bishop if he can, or Catholic priest if he can, or lay witnesses if he can, the first available opportunity. The simple rule is to fulfill as much of the law as can be fulfilled as it becomes possible to fulfill it.

A final comment must be made. A penitent cannot be forgiven of his sins in the internal forum until he makes the abjuration, profession of faith and then has his censures lifted. It is the abjuration and profession of the Catholic faith that places him back in the Church and the absolution in the external forum lifts the censure so that the penitent would now be inside the Catholic Church. Only then can he go to confession or

---

<sup>5</sup> *The Council of Trent*, On penance, sess. xiv, chap. 4; D 898.

receive the other sacraments. All the sacraments, except baptism, are forbidden to non-Catholics.

It is impossible, even heretical, to say that a Catholic can have his sins forgiven in the internal forum, without belonging to the Catholic Church in the external forum - without being inside the Church. The bull *Unam Sanctum* teaches, “*Outside the Church there is no salvation, nor remission of sins.*” This is equivalent to the *formaliter/materialiter* heresy held by Bishop McKenna, that states a pope can belong to the body of the Church, but not the soul, a pope that is materially (physically) the pope, but not spiritually the pope (no jurisdiction). This is the same heresy that teaches a man can be saved by belonging to the soul of the Church without belonging to Her body. Father, I know you do not hold this view, but Patrick Henry does. He believes that a private abjuration is all a penitent can take and he cannot have his censures lifted, because he does not believe epikeia applies to going before a Catholic priest, who does not have faculties from an ordinary, or to go before lay witnesses. His thinking is not logical on this point, because the letter of the law does not allow for private abjurations. If one did take a private abjuration he is appealing to the law of epikeia to justify his action. So why does Patrick not apply the law of epikeia by approaching a Catholic priest, or lay witnesses if a Catholic priest is not accessible, which the law of epikeia would demand of a penitent? Patrick does not even believe the censures can be lifted in these days, and if that’s the case then penitents would still be outside the Catholic Church and cannot have their sins forgiven in the internal forum by confession...