

In 2001 (and somewhat previously) Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi (RJMI) drew me (Patrick Henry) into an email “debate”. The following letter I sent him ended the “debate”. Although I requested that Richard upload and always leave the following letter on his website, Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi has never had the courage, honesty, or integrity to publish my reply to his letter on his website. Maybe I should have made the following letter available to the general public years ago instead of waiting over 13 years to do so. In reading the letter again, I understand that it contains much information that everyone should know pertaining to what has happened in the Catholic Church today – in addition to the information that more specifically pertains to RJMI.

I have made two changes in the original letter to what was written in 2001. 1) I changed the hyperlink where you can read and download [*The Catholic Dogma*](#), by Father Michael Müller, C.S.S.R, copyright, 1888. 2) I updated my own contact information at the very end of the letter.



FRATERNAL CORRECTION AND RJMI

Are you concerned with the importance of *Fraternal Correction*? This letter explains our duty of fraternal correction, as well as Richard Ibranyi’s Abjuration and his claim to be one of the TWO WITNESSES of the APOCALYPSE:

Following Father Hunolt’s sermon on *The Duty of Fraternal Correction* is my response to a letter by Richard Ibranyi. Four of my friends, Ron Elmy, Oldrich Tomanek, Phillip F. McCabe, and Nicholas Wurth have taken Richard Ibranyi’s Abjuration and joined his church. They repeatedly asked me to respond to Richard Ibranyi’s accusations. A number of others have also been led from the teachings of the Catholic Church. In charity, and to fulfill the Duty of Fraternal Correction, I send my response to you, praying that no one else will accept error for truth. May all return who have departed from the truth.

+

JMJ

U.I.O.G.D.

Ave Maria!

Jesus, Mary, Joseph, we love You, save souls

O God come to our assistance. Jesus, Mary, Joseph please make haste to help us!

+++ Jesus, Mary, Joseph +++

Volume 3 - THE GOOD CHRISTIAN

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

The Duty of Fraternal Correction

“He went to Him, and prayed Him to come down and heal his son.” St John 4: 47.

It is no wonder that this man was so anxious for the recovery of the sick person, who was his own son; but why did he come himself? For he was a great man, a ruler, and could have sent one of his servants to our Lord to ask Him to heal his son? But no, he was not satisfied unless he came Himself, for his fatherly love would not let him rest otherwise. And according to his wish and desire he heard from our Lord the consoling words: “Go thy way, thy son liveth.” I have already begun to speak of fraternal correction, by which the souls of our fellow men, sick and dying through sin, can be saved from death and restored to health. I have shown how that correction is required of us by the love of God and the love of our neighbor. But unfortunately in this matter we are as if we were dumb, or as if our neighbor’s welfare did not concern us. Yet it does concern us, and we are bound to further it under pain of sin, as I shall now show.

I. *Many are bound by justice under pain of sin to fraternal correction.*

II. *All are bound to it occasionally by a special law of God.*

I. Everyone is bound in justice to keep to the terms of the contract he has made. Thus, if I were surety for your debtor, I should be bound to do my best to enable you to have the money that is due to you. A steward or servant who has agreed with you for a yearly wage is bound to look after your property and your house, and justice requires him to take all possible care to make your property as profitable as possible and prevent it from being injured by theft or otherwise. He who has undertaken to keep your money, or money's worth, safe for you, is bound to do all he can to prevent it from being lost.

Now, there are many men in the world who, by virtue of their office or position, have entered on a tacit agreement with God by which they bind themselves to look after the welfare of certain souls as best they can, in order to prevent them from being lost forever. Who are they? All superiors, whether lay or ecclesiastical, who have to protect the interests of their subjects in towns or villages: such as parish priests and those who have a care of souls with regard to their parishioners; teachers with regard to their pupils; parents with regard to their sons and daughters masters and mistresses with regard to their servants and other domestics; husbands with regard to their wives; in a word, all those who have any position of superiority or authority over others. When entering on their state or occupation they made a tacit contract with God by which they took upon themselves the care of their subjects, as sureties, stewards, and depositaries of God, binding themselves thereby to use all possible diligence to lead on their subjects to good, to keep them from evil, and to induce them to amend their lives if they are in sin.

Therefore they are bound in justice not only to admonish, warn, and exhort in a fatherly manner those subjects of theirs whom they see to be in sin or in the danger of sin, but also to reprove and punish them if warnings or threats have proved unavailing; so that they who are careless or forgetful of this duty are guilty of all the sins and vices that they failed to correct and prevent in their subjects. We are just as guilty as if we ourselves committed the sinful act; for he who does not correct what should be corrected is guilty of the sin. And God will one day require the souls of those subjects at our hands, as He Himself says: "At the hand of man, at the hand of every man, and of his brother will I require the life of man" (Gen. 9: 5).

And this is perfectly just; for it is a recognized practice even in worldly concerns. If your debtor has run through his property, and has become unable to pay what he owes you, you look to the person who went surety for him, to see that you get what you have a right to; nor can the latter shirk the obligation, for he should have looked better after the man for whom he went surety, and not suffered him to live so extravagantly. If the money you have deposited with another is stolen, or the property you have left in his care injured, then he who undertook the care of it is bound to make restitution to you out of his own goods, if the theft can be traced to any willful and gross carelessness on his part. Why so? He has not stolen your property, nor received a single penny of your money. No matter; he was not diligent in keeping it, as he was bound to be by the contract he entered into; and on account of this carelessness he is bound in conscience to indemnify you out of his own goods. In your absence you have entrusted your house and shop to your Servant; the Servant finds a comfortable seat, and goes to sleep with the door open, so that thieves get into your shop and run off with what they can lay hands on. What will you say to that when you come back? What will you think of your servant when you find out how he has looked after your property? It does not take you long to consider about that! You worthless fellow! you say to him; make good what was lost through your laziness, or else you will soon become acquainted with the inside of a prison, to teach you, and all like you, how to mind your business. But why are you so strict with the poor man? Is that right on your part? What harm has he done? He only fell asleep, and there is surely no great harm in that?

Yes, you answer; but he should have looked after my house and property better I hired him for that purpose; and therefore he should either have shut the door or else kept his eyes open; his going to sleep was the cause of the robbery; therefore he must either pay me or go to prison. And you are perfectly right, nor can any one find fault with your mode of acting under the circumstances.

Suppose that you are well off, and that you undertake to be surety with a man for his debtor. While you are signing the agreement, oh, how friendly the man is to you! He is as polite and cordial as if you were his dearest friend. But wait a little; when the time has elapsed, and the debtor is unable to meet his obligation; what then? Oh, then the creditor acts quite differently; he sends word to you at once, and lets you know that you have to pay. The time is up, he says; you went bail for that man; give me now what he owes me. And if you do not pay immediately he sends the officers of justice to your house to take possession of your proper-

ty, and tries by every means to compel you to pay the debt. Why has he changed so suddenly in your regard? At first he was quite friendly to you; he spoke kindly and was most cordial. Yes, but then he is not now; things are seen in a different light now that the time for payment has come. He is quite a stranger to you; he knows you no longer, unless in so far as he is determined to exact his own from you to the last farthing. So will Christ act with those who by their state or office have charge of the souls of others. Christ is called a stranger, because although he is a friend at the time of the agreement, when one undertakes the charge of the souls of others, "He is a stranger when the day of reckoning comes," if the duty has not been properly performed. Therefore, "my son, if thou be surety" waken up the souls entrusted to you; admonish, reprove them if they have done evil or are in danger. Do not go asleep over your weighty charge, be not negligent save them from the danger, that you may not have to pay for them one day with your own soul.

But alas, how few care about this! How carelessly most people perform their duty in this respect! How many there are who go to sleep, and let thieves enter into the house of God, and have neither eyes to watch over the souls entrusted to them, nor tongues to warn them, nor hands to punish them when necessary? Public abuses, scandals, sins, and vices, are sometimes allowed loose rein in a community, and thereby many souls are betrayed and ruined; while those who could and ought to speak in order to prevent the mischief have not courage to open their mouths: they act as if they were asleep, and allow the temples of God, precious souls, to be robbed and plundered.

Alas, how will they fare when Christ will appear to them as a stranger, and demand an account of the souls that they thus allowed to slip through their hands? To no purpose will they try to excuse themselves by saying: but I have done no harm; I did not lead those under my care into the vices to which they abandoned themselves; I did not tell my servants to swear, or curse, or not to go to church, or to frequent bad company, or to cultivate dangerous intimacies; I did not advise my children to lead idle, useless lives; nor was I pleased to see my wife neglecting her house duties, and squandering our income so foolishly. I neither taught them those evil habits nor did I give them bad example; how, then, can I be accountable for their sins? Ah, that you will soon see! Neither did that surety tell the debtor to squander away his property; he would far rather have seen him able to pay what he owed. The servant who went asleep in the shop did not invite the thief to come in, nor did he show him the goods or ask him to steal them; he would have been far better pleased if the thief had remained away altogether. But he slept when he should have remained awake; and that alone is enough reason for having him punished. All those who have charge of the souls of others, especially masters and parents, need of a certainty commit no other sin to lose their own souls than that neglect of paternal vigilance and correction. A good thing for me, perhaps some one will now say, that I am not a superior, or pastor of souls, or preacher, or master, or father, or mother; I have only myself to look after and be responsible for; so that I am free from that duty and need not trouble about rendering any account for not having admonished or corrected others. True, you are not so strictly bound in justice as those others are; yet do not be in too great a hurry to conclude that you are free from every obligation in that respect. Whoever you may be, you are bound under sin according to your ability and opportunity, to fraternal correction by a special law of God, which he has imposed on all men.

II. It is certain and undoubted that it is the will of God that all sins and vices should be corrected and reformed, in whatever manner it may be done. Now, superiors, parents, and pastors of souls have authority in this way over their own subjects alone, and not over others; neither can they know everything nor find out always where sin is committed. There are millions of sins committed behind their backs that they can know nothing about, and therefore cannot prevent by correction. Hence it is clearly the will of God that all men should perform this duty with regard to each other, and try to help one another to the best of their ability to avoid sin and to amend their lives. Such is the meaning of the words: "He gave to every one of them commandment concerning his neighbor" (Ecclus. 17: 12). "Speak to all the congregation of the children of Israel, and thou shalt say to them thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart; but reprove him openly, lest thou incur sin through him" (Levit. 29: 2, 17). "Reprove a friend, lest he may not have understood, and say, I did it not; or if he did it, that he may do it no more. Admonish thy friend, for there is often a fault committed. Admonish thy neighbor before thou threaten him, and give place to the fear of the Most High" (Ecclus. 19: 13 - 18).

Christ expressly commands us: “If thy brother sin against thee, reprove him” (St. Luke 17: 3). That is, if he sins to thy knowledge, or in thy presence, reprove him. “If thy brother shall offend against thee, go and rebuke him between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou shalt gain thy brother; and if he will not hear thee, take with thee one or two more. And if he will not hear them, tell the Church” (St. Matthew 18: 15, 17). If he will not hear you, tell those who have more authority over him. Hence we are bound to practice fraternal correction, not by a mere counsel, but by a law which obliges us under sin; and he who does not try to correct his neighbor whom he sees doing wrong becomes a participator in his guilt. He who can correct and neglects doing so, certainly participates in the sin.

Now come forward all you who, when there is question of fraternal correction, have in your hearts or on your lips the words of Cain: “Am I my brother’s keeper?” (Gen. 4: 9.) What have I to do with others? I have to look out for myself; it is my own soul that I must try to bring to heaven; let others try to do the same for themselves; let each one bear his own burthen and account for his own actions; I have enough to do to mind myself, and I find so many faults and failings in myself that I have neither time nor inclination to trouble myself about those of others. What is it to me? Ah, fine talk that! What a pity you do not speak and think in that way when you indulge your curiosity about the actions of others, and by rash judgments and unfounded suspicions put the worst construction on them! What is it to me? I have to look out for my own soul. So should you think and say when you backbite your neighbor, or listen eagerly to uncharitable conversation; when you talk about faults that you merely suspect in him, or make his secret faults the subject of ridicule and laughter, causing them to appear much worse than they are in reality. What is it to me? What have I to do with others? So should you think and say when you speak of the known sins of your neighbor to those who cannot correct him, and do that through hatred, dislike, vindictiveness, because he has done you some injury, or out of mere talkativeness. That would be the time for you to say: what is it to me? I have nothing to do with others, I must look after myself and my own soul. Fraternal correction does not require such spying, detraction, talking, and fault-finding. No; such prying and idle talk does not prevent sin, but rather increases it; it does not gain the souls of our brethren, but rather takes away their good name and reputation. But when opportunity offers to give your neighbor a wholesome admonition, when you see or know of him doing wrong, to warn him charitably, to keep him away from evil, and give him a mild reproof if you reasonably hope that it will do him good, that is what concerns you and all men, and what the express laws of God, and the good of souls require.

Therefore if your brother sins, go and rebuke him. Each one will find opportunities enough of doing this, provided he wishes to help his neighbor to amend. Remember how often you have given others scandal and been the occasion of sin to them, thus helping in the ruin of souls. That consideration alone should be sufficient to induce you to be all the more zealous in atoning for the harm you have done and in gaining new souls to God. Consider the example of St. Paul. After his conversion he hardly took time to refresh his body, emaciated as it was by a three days’ fast, but at once set about the work of converting sinners to Christ he who before was a persecutor, as soon as he became a Christian himself, began without delay to induce others to follow his example: “And immediately he preached Jesus in the synagogues, that he is the son of God” (Acts 9: 20). We have another example in David. When he had repented of his sins his first resolution was to become a teacher and an apostle, to warn others, from following the broad road of vice, and to lead them to God:

“I will teach the unjust thy ways; and the wicked shall be converted to thee” (Ps. 1: 15). This was what our Lord said to St. Peter, after having foretold his lamentable fall: “And thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren” (St. Luke 22: 32). His meaning was: thou wilt indeed rise after thy fall; but remember, at the same time, that thou art bound to help thy brethren, and to sustain them by word and example. Follow these examples, and you will atone to God for your former faults. Amen.

NOTE: Hear hundreds of tapes produced at Holy Family Recordings, including this Sermon, and all the Short Sermons by Father Francis Hunolt on cassette tapes.

U.I.O.G.D.

Ave Maria!

Jesus, Mary, Joseph, we love You, save souls

O God come to our assistance. Jesus, Mary, Joseph please make haste to help us!

+ + + Jesus, Mary, Joseph + + +

St. Michael the Archangel,

pray for us and defend us in battle.

September 29, 2001

To Richard Ibranyi and followers,

Richard Ibranyi sent two of his followers to personally deliver the following letter to me Sunday, September 23, 2001. I am adding to his letter paragraph numbers, so I can later refer to that paragraph. I am also changing his letter into ARIAL font.

Patrick Henry is a Schismatic and Heretic

By Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi

September 21, 2001

Ember Friday

St. Matthew, pray for us!

Patrick Henry,

1st Paragraph: As my duty to profess the faith and defend Catholics against schismatics and heretics I, Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi, reprove, rebuke, and condemn Patrick Henry. Just as our Lord Jesus Christ exposed the true Pharisees in His day, so also, as my duty as a Catholic, I also will expose the true Pharisees in these days. To remain silent when crimes are committed, when one must speak up, is to be guilty of the sins and sinner you do not condemn. I will give you nine days to answer this accusation. If you either do not answer, or answer wrongly, I will post this condemnation against you on my Website, and make it freely available to the public.

2nd Paragraph: Patrick Henry is a rebellious schismatic and a heretic. His denial of the use, and need, to be exempted from the letter of the law in emergency situations is absolutely schismatic. He himself has violated the two canon laws regarding the public teaching of the Catholic Faith, Canons 1384 and 1385.

3rd Paragraph: *1917 Code of Canon Law*: "c. 1384. The Church has the right to demand that Catholics shall not publish any books without first submitting them for her judgment and approval, and to forbid for a good reason the reading of books published by anyone. Whatever is prescribed under this title regarding books, shall be applied also to newspapers, periodicals, and all other published writings, unless the contrary is certain."

4th Paragraph: *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.

5th Paragraph: Being that Patrick does not believe he needs to be exempted from these laws, he has violated them, because these canons teach you need a Bishop with ordinary jurisdiction, a local Ordinary, to authorize public teachings, and if the public teachings are in writing you need an imprimatur. Patrick has violated the letter of these laws, and being that he does not believe he needs to be exempted from them, he is absolutely guilty of violating these laws and incurs the penalty of excommunication.

6th Paragraph: *Canon 2318.2*: Authors and publishers who without the proper permission procure the printing of books of the Sacred Scriptures of annotations or commentaries on the same incur ipso facto non-reserved excommunication."

7th Paragraph: Without Epikeia; without an exemption from the letter of these laws, Canons 1384 and 1385, no one can publicly teach the Catholic faith unless they have a Catholic bishop with ordinary jurisdiction. Patrick does not have a Catholic bishop with ordinary jurisdiction to approve of his works before he makes them available

to the public. Patrick publicly teaches without the approval of a Catholic bishop with ordinary jurisdiction, while he says, a Catholic priest cannot function without access to a Catholic bishop with ordinary jurisdiction. The same applies to a Catholic bishop who does not have access to a pope. In this Patrick is a merciless hypocrite and a rebellious schismatic.

8th Paragraph: Patrick schismatically teaches that there can be no exemptions from the Divine Laws that do not deal with faith or morals, and negative laws (invalidating laws) that do not deal with faith or morals. The canonists are unanimous that exemptions to these laws are allowed, but they give different reasons, some say, because of Epikeia, some say, because the law ceases to bind, some say, due to a prudent interpretation they may be exempted. All the canonists and theologians teach that you can be exempted from the letter of the law in these situations, but for different reasons. Patrick denies that there can ever be an exemption for any reason, and that is schismatic.

9th Paragraph: Patrick schismatically teaches there can be no exceptions to God's divine laws because He foresees all things, and therefore, there can be no exceptions to these laws for any reason. This is contrary to the unanimous consent and contrary to historical (empirical) evidence. There is historical (empirical) proof from the past that Catholics have been exempted from these laws in emergency situations (See: Strange Voices, Book Two, Epikeia and the Sacrament of Matrimony). Even God, Himself, Jesus Christ, had exempted Himself from His own laws. Being that God foresees all things, the reason He does not include exceptions in His laws, is for the sake of brevity, so as not to make the law burdensome. The canonist and theologians are unanimous on this fact. When God decreed through Moses to the people, that no one must work on the Sabbath Day, He did not say, except the work of circumcision if it falls on the infant's eight day, or except to pull an ox out of a pit, or to heal someone, etc. God said that King David and his men were justified for eating the loaves of proposition, that the letter of the law only says the Levitical priests could eat, with no exceptions included in the letter of the law. God certainly foresaw these exceptions. But he did not include them in the law for the sake of brevity. Therefore it is schismatic to say God's divine laws cannot be exempted from because God did not include exceptions in His law. God relied upon the common sense of all good willed men, and as a test to weed out the true Pharisees, who did not understand the spirit of the law. A true Pharisee only follows the letter of the law, but with no real understanding of it, because of their pride. They do all their deeds out of a spirit of self-righteousness and self-justification, even appearing to be very humble. There is a false humility that covers sins and faults and is mortally sinful. True Pharisees do not have true wisdom, and only follow the letter of the law to appear outwardly to men righteous, while inwardly they are full of dead men bones and filthiness (Mt. 23:27-29).

10th Paragraph: Patrick also teaches the heresy that a Catholic can be inside and outside the Catholic Church. He teaches that his abjuration placed him internally in the Church, but not externally in the Church until he abjures before an authorized Catholic Bishop. Therefore, Patrick will tell you he is outside (external) and inside (internal) the Church. This is where he proves his eccentricity that all true Pharisee have. A simple child would detect the contradiction of such a foolish teaching. A Catholic is inside the Church, objectively (externally) and subjectively (internally). One cannot belong to the soul of the Church while not belonging to the body. Patrick confuses the external act of the lawgiver that confirms that a subject is indeed in the Church. This future act of the lawgiver does not externally place one who had already abjured in the Church; he was already externally in the Church. The external act of the lawgiver only confirms this.

11th Paragraph: Patrick heretically teaches there cannot be another pope, and thus the papacy has defected, the primary apostolic mark, and the gates of hell prevailed over the papacy. Being that he does not believe in exemptions from the law, there can be no way to elect the next pope, because the last letter of the law requires Cardinals to elect a pope.

Soli Deo Gloria

Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi
"To Jesus through Mary"

In the 1st paragraph Richard Ibranyi wrote: "If you either do not answer, **or answer wrongly...**"

This is a strong indication to me that no matter what I write or do not write Richard Ibranyi is going to post his letter on his Website. Since I am not God, I do not know the exact words Richard Ibranyi thinks I

should write and therefore whatever I write is very likely to be WRONG in his mind. This is one reason why I address this letter to: **To Richard Ibranyi AND followers.**

Another reason I am writing **To Richard Ibranyi AND followers**, is the fact that I believe both Richard Ibranyi **AND** his followers need to take **VERY SERIOUSLY** my request that they read this letter attentively and answer **ALL** the required questions.

Father Lawrence Joseph Riley, A.B., S.T.L., wrote the book: *The History, Nature, and use of Epikeia in Moral Theology*. Copyright 1948, The Catholic University of America Press, INC. Imprimatur: + Richardus Jacobus Cushing. D.D., 7 May, 1948. It seems one of the main points Richard Ibranyi differs from Patrick Henry concerns *The History, Nature, and use of Epikeia in Moral Theology*. I do not know of any of Richard Ibranyi's followers who have read *The History, Nature, and use of Epikeia in Moral Theology*. Therefore, by the Feast of the Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, November 21, 2001 Richard Ibranyi is to do what ever it takes to make a copy of Father Riley's book available on his website. Besides Father Riley's book, Richard Ibranyi is to also make available on his website by November 21, 2001, *The Catholic Controversy* by St. Francis De Sales. In addition to that Richard Ibranyi is to send a printed copy of *The History, Nature, and use of Epikeia in Moral Theology* to everyone who has taken his Abjuration titled: *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration From the Great Apostasy*.

As we read in the 1st paragraph Richard Ibranyi gave his word (threat): "If you either do not answer, or answer wrongly, I will post this condemnation against you on my Website, and make it freely available to the public." Richard Ibranyi therefore is to post **THIS** letter on his website, since it contains both his letter and my response. Richard Ibranyi is to post **THIS ENTIRE LETTER** on his website by the Feast of St. Luke, October 18, 2001. Richard Ibranyi is to leave a copy of this entire letter on each and every website he ever has available to the public, unless he has Patrick Henry's written permission to remove it. Every place Richard Ibranyi has the name Patrick Henry anyplace on his website he is to put a link to **THIS** letter, with a message encouraging his readers to read this letter. Richard Ibranyi is to send a copy of **THIS** letter to every one on his email list and also send a printed copy to everyone he has sent **ANY** of his writings, videos, or other material since he left Most Holy Family Monastery. Richard Ibranyi is to have all the required copies of **THIS** letter sent out no later than the Feast of St. Raphael the Archangel, Oct. 24, 2001.

Richard Ibranyi is to put into writing and post on his website all the heresies and errors opposed to the Catholic Church that he believed from the time he was Baptized until today. Richard Ibranyi is to post on his website **all** the **EXACT** heresies or errors he has corrected in **ANY** of his writings since January 1, 1990; and he is to have this project finished by the feast of Our Lady of the Miraculous Medal, November 27, 2001. Richard Ibranyi is to post all the information requested in this paragraph under the title: *The Errors, Inaccuracies and Mistakes of Richard Ibranyi*.

ALL of Richard Ibranyi's followers, **especially EACH** one that has taken *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration From the Great Apostasy*, are to answer **EVERY** one of the 300 required question asked in this letter that has a number between this kind of brackets{ }. They are to have their answers completed and a copy of their response sent to Patrick Henry by the feast of the Purification of the Blessed Virgin Mary, February 2, 2002.

Richard Ibranyi is to let **ALL** of his followers have until February 2, 2002 to answer the required questions in this letter before he writes **OR GIVES ANY REPLY** to any of this letter either to myself **or to anyone else**. Richard Ibranyi is to let his followers state what **THEY** believe **BEFORE** Richard Ibranyi tells them what to believe!

Especially one hundred per cent (100 %) of his followers who took Richard Ibranyi's *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration From the Great Apostasy* **MUST** answer **ALL** of the required 300 questions **before Richard Ibranyi makes any response to this letter.**

In the case Richard Ibranyi fails to post *The History, Nature, and use of Epikeia in Moral Theology* and *The Catholic Controversy* on his website by November 21, 2001, one hundred per cent (100 %) of his followers who took Richard Ibranyi's *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration From the Great Apostasy* **MUST** still answer **ALL** the required questions by February 2, 2002.

ALL of Richard Ibranyi's followers are to send a copy of their response to myself. Richard Ibranyi is to post his response, to this letter, on his website on February 11, 2002. **AFTER** Richard Ibranyi posts his re-

sponse, his followers are to provide Richard Ibranyi a copy of their response. After Richard Ibranyi posts his response on his website, Richard Ibranyi is to also post the responses of these four men within two weeks: Ron Elmy, Oldrich Tomanek, Phillip F. McCabe, and Nicholas Wurth. The responses of these four men are to remain on Richard Ibranyi's website for at least one year from the time they are posted.

Richard Ibranyi is to send me the Name, U. S. Mail address, E-mail address if he has one, and Phone Number if he has one, of everyone to whom he sends this letter.

Richard Ibranyi is famous, notorious and well-known for **DEMANDING** others to get involved in a debate with himself. He is well-known for saying in effect: "So and So said this; or So and So believes this; or So and So teaches this heresy; etc." Then Richard Ibranyi says in effect: "If So and So does not believe and teach the heresy I accuse him of, he can defend himself against what I accuse him of with a response." To some I might also seem a little demanding in my requests already listed. Nevertheless, I will go on to state that Richard Ibranyi can continue to write or say what ever he wants to about me, but Richard Ibranyi need not expect any further correspondence from Patrick Henry if he and his followers do not fulfill the above listed requests.

If Richard Ibranyi and his followers do NOT fulfill the above requests, let that be a sign of Richard Ibranyi's approval that he wants the world to believe he is NOT a prophet nor Witness as mentioned in Apocalypse; but rather a heretic, schismatic and just another con man with a desire to govern and rule people.

However, even if Richard Ibranyi and his followers do not fulfill **ALL** the other requests listed above, and Richard Ibranyi makes any response to **THIS** letter, let it be in the following manner. Richard Ibranyi is to answer **EACH** and EVERY one of the 300 question asked with a number between this kind of brackets { }. Furthermore, Richard Ibranyi is to put his answer in the proper place for **EACH** question, and provide this **COMPLETE** letter with **ANY** response he makes to Patrick Henry **or anyone else**. He is to leave what I have written in the color BLACK and put whatever he writes in the color BLUE. That way his answers will show up well on his website, and for those who print it on a Colored Printer. It should print well even for those who only print in black. (Red colors on the monitor usually do not show up good if everything is printed just in BLACK.)

{1} Do you believe all those who took *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration From the Great Apostasy*, as compiled by Richard Ibranyi, should know the Catholic Faith and be able to explain it and defend it?

{2} Do you believe the 1917 Code of Canon Law: "1325.1 Obligation to Profess the Faith - The faithful are bound to profess their faith openly whenever under the circumstances silence, **evasion**, or their manner of acting would otherwise implicitly amount to a denial of the faith, or would involve contempt of religion, an offense to God, or scandal to the neighbor."

In the 2nd paragraph Richard Ibranyi wrote: "His denial of the use, and need, to be exempted from the letter of the law in emergency situations is absolutely schismatic."

Richard Ibranyi's statement here is simply false, a rash judgment, and calumny. I have never denied the use, and need, to be exempted from the letter of the law in emergency situations.

Richard Ibranyi should remember that Pope Gregory IX left eleven rules and Pope Boniface VIII eighty-eight for the true interpretation of the law. These rules, according to Canon 20, can supply the defect of the rule in a particular case, as in the case we presently find ourselves. Consequently, the fourth rule of Pope Gregory IX expressly states: "Necessitatem, illicitum efficitur licitum" --- "Necessity makes licit what is illicit."

{3} Do you think these two Popes teach other things besides *Epikeia* and not ONLY **Epikeia** makes licit what is illicit?

{4} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi teaches the **OPPOSITE** of Pope Gregory IX and Pope Boniface VIII?

Father Lawrence Joseph Riley, A.B., S.T.L., wrote the book: *The History, Nature, and use of Epikeia in Moral Theology*. Copyright 1948, The Catholic University of America Press, INC. Imprimatur: + Richardus Jacobus Cushing. D.D., 7 May, 1948.

On pages 459 and 460 Father Riley gives us his own conclusions for Part II of this important book. When you read the book you will know Father Riley did much study and research.

{5} Do you believe Father Riley's conclusions give us the mind of the Catholic Church on the subject of *Epikeia*? Father Riley's 4th, 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th, points are:

(4) *Epikeia* may be used only with the greatest discretion; in the internal forum it may be applied to affirmative precepts and to negative precepts (ecclesiastical and civil), but very infrequently with regard to affirmative precepts, because the latter, binding *semper* but not *pro semper*, are more susceptible of interpretation than of *Epikeia*.

(9) *Epikeia* is not to be identified with Interpretation, Dispensation, Presumed Permission, Excusing Cause, or Popular Acceptance of Human Law.

(10) *Epikeia* may not be applied to precepts of the natural law, nor to precepts of the divine positive law of the New Testament.

(11) It seems probable that the use of *Epikeia* was not permissible in reference to precepts of the divine positive law of the Old Testament.

(12) Human invalidating laws sometimes cease to bind; but *Epikeia* may not be applied to human invalidating laws.

It seems one of the major differences between Richard Ibranyi and Patrick Henry is this: Richard Ibranyi says it is *Epikeia* that exempts him and his followers almost every time he wants to be exempted. Contrary to Richard Ibranyi, Father Riley teaches *Epikeia* may be used **ONLY with the greatest discretion!** Patrick Henry agrees with Father Riley that when there is indeed a true, valid, and lawful reason to be exempted from the letter of the law in emergency situations *Epikeia* can sometimes be used but **ONLY with the greatest discretion!** However, *Epikeia* is not to be identified with Interpretation, Dispensation, Presumed Permission, Excusing Cause, or Popular Acceptance of Human Law. Father Riley also reminds us laws sometimes cease to bind. Please take note that laws sometimes truly cease to bind, validly and licitly **WITHOUT** applying *Epikeia*!

In the 5th paragraph Richard Ibranyi's statement here is simply false, a rash judgment, and calumny. As explained above, I do NOT believe I do not need to be exempted from the laws listed in paragraphs 3 and 4.

{6} Do you think Richard Ibranyi is himself excommunicated for the reason explained in the 6th paragraph if he believes it is *Epikeia* and **ONLY Epikeia** that can exempt him from observing laws? Remember *Epikeia* may be used **ONLY with the greatest discretion!** If you study Father Riley's book, you will learn that *Epikeia* can be used **very seldom**. I think you will find that Father Riley states it will **NEVER** become a habit! Yet Richard Ibranyi claims he uses *Epikeia* over and over again! Richard Ibranyi claims to use *Epikeia* to publicly teach and publish his Newsletters and other material.

{7} Since Richard Ibranyi has information on his website for people to read every minute of every day, would you say Richard Ibranyi daily, hourly and continuously invokes *Epikeia*?

{8} If Richard Ibranyi is not continuously invoking *Epikeia* how does he justify continuously publicly teaching others through his website?

{9} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi claims he uses *Epikeia* **ONLY with the greatest discretion and very seldom?**

In the 7th paragraph Richard Ibranyi clearly states: "**Without Epikeia; ... , no one can publicly teach the Catholic faith unless they have a Catholic bishop with ordinary jurisdiction.**"

{10} Does this prove Richard Ibranyi believes it is *Epikeia* and **ONLY Epikeia** that can exempt him from observing these two laws?

I believe there are times *Epikeia* is lawfully used. Besides *Epikeia* there are other things that justify exemption from the letter of laws.

{11} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi makes statements that are false, a rash judgment, and calumny?

Richard Ibranyi's statements in the 8th paragraph are again false, a rash judgment and calumny. What Richard Ibranyi wrote: "Patrick denies that there can ever be an exemption for any reason" is **NOT** true!

{12} Do you believe it is just another case of Richard Ibranyi making rash judgments, false statements, and coming to conclusions that are wrong?

{13} How much of the book, *The History, Nature, and use of Epikeia in Moral Theology*, had you read before September 29, 2001?

{14} Did you take any form of Richard Ibranyi's Abjuration before you read any part of *The History, Nature, and use of Epikeia in Moral Theology*, directly from the book?

Father Riley covers in his book most of the things Richard Ibranyi wrote about in the 9th paragraph. Of all those who follow Richard Ibranyi, I do not know of even one who has read Father Riley's book. Some of them take the Abjuration Richard Ibranyi wrote without even knowing what the Church teaches about *Epikeia*, while at the same time they claim to invoke *Epikeia* to take Richard Ibranyi's Abjuration.

As you can read in the 1st paragraph, Richard Ibranyi wrote: "I will give you nine days to answer this accusation." Father Riley's book is 460 pages plus the index and so on. I also need to pray, study, and review Father Riley's book. However, nine days was not enough time to do so and still fulfill the other duties and obligations I believe God wants me to do. When I pray, and again study and review Father Riley's book, I might think and believe differently. Not all laws are divine POSITIVE laws. There are times when *Epikeia* is used. As stated above, I believe there are exemptions to laws. Sometimes people are exempted from observing the letter of the law by *Epikeia* and sometimes without *Epikeia*. I also know Father Riley had studied and knows very much more than I know about *Epikeia*!

{15} After all of Father Riley's prayer and study do you believe his last four conclusions are true? This is how Father Riley ends his book:

(9) *Epikeia* is not to be identified with Interpretation, Dispensation, Presumed Permission, Excusing Cause, or Popular Acceptance of Human Law.

(10) *Epikeia* may not be applied to precepts of the natural law, nor to precepts of the divine positive law of the New Testament.

(11) It seems probable that the use of *Epikeia* was not permissible in reference to precepts of the divine positive law of the Old Testament.

(12) Human invalidating laws sometimes cease to bind; but *Epikeia* may not be applied to human invalidating laws.

This is Richard Ibranyi's statement from the tape "*The Father Blanco Affair*" January 11, 2000:

"Anyone who does not require an **abjuration** is going against the Church, and is behaving like a Pope, and is even behaving really above the Pope, **BECAUSE THIS IS A MATTER OF DIVINE LAW** AND YOU WOULD BE BEHAVING AS IF YOU WERE GOD.

Changing something that God has required through his Church, which is abjuration, publicly, of anybody who's been in heresy or in communion with those who've been in public heresy. **THIS IS HOW WE COME BACK INTO THE CHURCH**, through Abjuration.

{16} Is the underlined part of the statement in the above paragraph true or false?

{17} If someone answers it is FALSE, does common sense and reason lead to the conclusion they believe Richard Ibranyi is teaching heresy?

{18} Is Father Riley's 10th conclusion true or false: "**Epikeia may not be applied** to precepts of the natural law, nor **to precepts of the DIVINE positive LAW** of the New Testament"?

{19} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi applies *Epikeia* for those who take his Abjuration, which he teaches **IS A MATTER OF DIVINE LAW**?

{20} Does the Liturgy of the Catholic Church regarding Reception of Converts (the Abjuration) concern **precepts of the DIVINE positive LAW** of the New Testament?

1st contradiction: On the one hand Richard Ibranyi says others are heretics because abjurations (according to the Holy Office of 1859) are a **MATTER OF DIVINE LAW**, and on the other, he attempts **TO CHANGE** Divine Law by saying he can use *Epikeia* to change the way the Holy office is written. (**HERETICS CHANGE THAT WHICH DOES NOT PLEASE THEM**).

{21} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi's version of the Abjuration is a **CHANGE** from the Liturgy of the Catholic Church?

2nd Contradiction: Richard Ibranyi teaches sometimes you cannot use *Epikeia* in matters of Faith or Morals. Richard Ibranyi then hides the truth that Divine Law is a matter of Faith & Morals. Then he condemns others for treating Abjurations as a matter of Divine Law (which he changed) saying we are heretics for not taking the Abjuration **HE** wrote. He then attempts to use *Epikeia* to **change** something that IS a matter of FAITH or MORALS.

We now come to the 10th paragraph. Here something needs to be clarified. I insert here a section found on pages 180 & 181 from *The Catholic Dogma*, by Father Michael Müller, C.S.S.R, copyright, 1888, by Elias Frederick Schauer. [*The Catholic Dogma* can be downloaded at <http://www.jmjsite.com/books.htm>. Many Encyclicals can be downloaded at www.saint-mike.org/library/papal_library/index.html.]

“... God cannot unite himself with a soul that lives in heresy, even though it be only material heresy. As the supernatural sanctifying effects in this case are suspended, so they are for the same reason, destroyed in him who was baptized in his infancy and became a heretic, though only a material heretic, when he came to the use of reason. This person, to be again reconciled with God, must renounce heresy, believe the Catholic Church, and receive worthily the sacrament of penance; or if this cannot be had, he must have perfect contrition or charity with the desire (at least implicit) to receive the sacrament of penance.”

I believe Father Michael Müller teaches a material heretic can obtain Sanctifying Grace without sacramental absolution by means of perfect contrition, if he will renounce heresy and believe the Catholic Church. Because sacramental absolution cannot be had, we assume the material heretic could not receive **ABSOLUTION** from a Catholic Bishop or Priest in the **EXTERNAL** or **INTERNAL** forum. It is evident from Catholic Dogma that out of the Catholic Church there is no salvation. It is equally evident from Catholic Dogma that everyone who dies in the state of Sanctifying Grace will be in Heaven for eternity.

{22} Do you believe after the material heretic renounces heresy and believes the Catholic Church he is able to make an act of perfect contrition **BEFORE** he takes an Abjuration?

{23} Do you believe he is then in the state of Sanctifying Grace and belongs to both the soul and the body of the Church? However, he is **NOT ABLE TO PROVE HIS RECEPTION INTO THE CHURCH**. That is what I meant when I wrote, during earlier correspondence with Richard Ibranyi, that I am not a member of the Catholic Church in the EXTERNAL forum. I am **NOT ABLE TO PROVE MY RECEPTION INTO THE CHURCH** by providing the document signed by a Catholic bishop or priest who received me back into the Catholic Church.

For a while, I was deceived and was a member of the non-Catholic Novus Ordo sect. After that I was a member of the non-Catholic CMRI sect. Since I left the CMRI sect in 1983, I have not met a Catholic bishop or priest with the necessary Jurisdiction to properly follow the Rubrics of the Catholic Church and receive me into the Catholic Church.

{24} Do you believe it is possible for me to again be in the state of Sanctifying Grace without taking Richard Ibranyi's Abjuration and without receiving sacramental absolution?

Neither Richard Ibranyi nor any of his followers can **PROVE THEIR RECEPTION INTO THE CHURCH**, although they have taken one of the numerous forms of the Abjuration Richard Ibranyi put together, *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration From the Great Apostasy*.

{25} Do you believe one positive proof they are not members of the Catholic Church in the EXTERNAL Forum is the fact they still need to take the Abjuration the Catholic Church requires for the Reception of

Converts into the Church before they can be **absolved** and PROVE THEIR RECEPTION INTO THE CHURCH?

{26} Furthermore, I would like to know if Richard Ibranyi or his followers believe that even if they take A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration From the Great Apostasy they still need to be received into the Catholic Church and be **absolved** in the EXTERNAL forum by a Catholic bishop or priest with Jurisdiction if God ever permits them the opportunity?

{27} If any of them do not believe they need to do so, do you believe they have denied Catholic Doctrine?

To understand better the importance of a convert to PROVE THEIR RECEPTION INTO THE CHURCH, I insert a section from The Ecclesiastical Review. [The emphasis given here, and throughout most of this letter, in CAPITAL WORDS, **Bold**, and Underline are mine. P. H.]

RECEPTION OF CONVERTS INTO THE CHURCH

“Question. I. In the Moral Theology by Sabetti-Barrett, N. 666, Quaer. 7, I find the following, concerning the conversion of heretics, as taken from the Instructio Congr. S. Officii:

[Then follows the following three things explained in Latin.]

I. If Baptism is conferred unconditionally, neither ABJURATION nor ABSOLUTION follows; for the Sacrament of Regeneration wipes away ALL the past.

II. If Baptism is to be repeated conditionally, the order to be observed is: FIRST. The ABJURATION, or PROFESSION OF FAITH. SECOND. Conditional Baptism. THIRD. SACRAMENTAL Confession with conditional absolution.

III. Lastly, when the former Baptism is judged to be valid, the ABJURATION or PROFESSION OF FAITH alone is received, followed by the ABSOLUTION FROM CENSURES.”

“Now, unless I am much mistaken, I know that many priests, especially those who have faculties to absolve from cases *speciali modo* reserved to the Pope, after properly instructing those heretics, would proceed to administer baptism sub conditione and to hear their confession, absolving them from censures and sins with the general common formula of the Sacrament of Penance, without even thinking of the **NECESSITY** of requiring the **formal** *abjuratio seu professio fidei*. I have noticed this, particularly in cases of young ladies born of Protestant or schismatic parents who were converted while attending a Catholic college, or a Catholic school of nursing. Of course the priest would do the same in cases of other heretics who are not very prominent; much more if they are occult or if they did not give their names to any sect, but only denied externally and formally one or two articles of Faith. In cases of Protestant leaders or dogmatizantes, perhaps they would refer them to the bishop before they would proceed to give absolution; and even then, I do not know whether they would think they were **obliged** to do so, or at least to require a formal abjuration, **under the pain of mortal sin**...

Response: The declaration of the Holy Office to which our inquirer refers, seems to call for a distinction in the reception of converts - between those, namely, whose baptism is doubtful and those whose baptism is certainly valid. Whereas N. 3 requires the absolution from censure for those who had been validly baptized, N. 2 speaks only of the abjuration of heresy of the profession of faith by converts whose previous baptism is doubtful, without any mention of absolution from censure. Why the distinction? The doubt as to whether a convert had been validly baptized makes it uncertain whether or not he incurred the excommunication for heresy, since it is also doubtful whether or not he was subject to the Church: **now since a doubtful censure is considered not to have been incurred**, [Cf. Canon 2246, # 2.] he is practically not in need of absolution from the censure. Not so the convert who had previously been certainly baptized validly: in virtue of his certainly valid baptism he WAS certainly subject to the Church and therefore, liable to the censure for heresy.

It may be objected that most non-Catholics are in good faith--as so many Catholic authorities suppose--and that this is all the more to be presumed of those who actually submit to the Church; that therefore, they may be presumed not to have sinned grievously by their schism or heresy, and hence must be presumed not to have incurred the censure of excommunication inflicted upon heretics and schismatics. Without discussing the merits of this presumption (something can be said against it), it is entirely a private presumption which has NO LEGAL VALUE. Opposed to it is a LEGAL presumption. The fact of their heresy is notorious and their guilt is presumed until it is proved that they did not act in bad faith.

[See Canon 2200: “When there is the external violation of a law of the Church, malice is presumed in the external forum until its absence has been removed.” P.H.]

There one sees the reason why the Holy Office prescribed that converts who had certainly been baptized validly before their conversion **MUST BE ABSOLVED** from the excommunication and that **NOT in the internal but in the EXTERNAL forum**, as does also Canon 2314, # 2.

Whether the convert's previous baptism is certainly valid or only doubtful, **in either case he MUST make the abjuration of heresy or profession of faith in the EXTERNAL forum, since it is one of the steps by which the convert severs his connection with a non-Catholic sect and is incorporated into the body of the faithful.**

It must therefore be evident that those priests who are content with a simple abjuration from heresy made in the confessional and with **ABSOLVING** those validly baptized **FROM THE CENSURE** IN CONFESSION, are certainly WITHOUT warrant in ignoring the **practice of the Church and the procedure prescribed by Her**. Another ex post factum difficulty is that the convert is **NOT ABLE TO PROVE HIS RECEPTION INTO THE CHURCH**. This is not so unimportant as some may suppose. Take a marriage case in which the question of whether or not the one party was a Catholic, plays a decisive part. Lack of proof of his **having been received** into the Church may compel the judges to decide differently, if that fact could be proved. But how can the convert who was "received" into the Church only in the confessional, prove it?

Canon 2314, # 2 does not offer any reason to suppose that the abjuration of heresy to be made by converts need NOT be made in the EXTERNAL forum. It grants Ordinaries the fullest faculty to absolve either personally or through another from the excommunication, which is inflicted in # 1 and which is reserved *speciali modo* by the Holy See, AND provided it is brought into the EXTERNAL forum. Far from relaxing the former regulations of receiving converts who had been baptized and whose baptism in a non-Catholic sect is certain, Canon 2314 # 2 rather provides a very ample faculty for bishops to absolve them from the censure when they receive them; and this paragraph seems rather to be intended in a special manner for receiving and absolving converts. Therefore the canonists who advert to this phase of the question insist on a reception of certainly or doubtful baptized converts either after the manner outlined in Canon 2314, # 2, or that laid down by the Holy Office in its rescript of 20 July, 1859, to the Bishop of Philadelphia.

From all this it appears quite evident that the reception of converts who had previously been baptized, either validly or doubtfully, **MUST BE RECEIVED** into the Church by making an **ABJURATION** of their heresy by a profession of faith **and those VALIDLY baptized by BEING ABSOLVED from the excommunication in the EXTERNAL FORM**. And it is certainly NOT justifiable that the priests referred to provide for ALL this ONLY IN CONFESSION.

"... Henceforth, then, **the abjuration of heresy and the profession of faith would have to be made in the presence of the bishop (not the vicar general, unless by special mandate) or his delegate, AND of TWO witnesses besides.**"

{28} How many Traditional Movement clerics apply the information: Canon 2314, # 2 does not offer any reason to suppose that the **ABJURATION** of heresy to be made by converts need NOT be made in the EXTERNAL forum?

January 31, 2000, Richard Ibranyi wrote the following on page 9 of his letter to Rev. Egregyi:

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

{29} Why do you think Richard Ibranyi uses the word **lifted** and not **absolved**?

{30} Do you believe **ABSOLUTION** is involved during this part of the Liturgy?

{31} Do you think Richard Ibranyi is teaching in the underlined part of the above paragraph a penitent cannot make an act of perfect contrition until he makes the abjuration, profession of faith and then has his censures lifted (absolved)?

I bring special attention to the word **absolution**. *Epikieia* is *Epikieia* and absolution is absolution.

{32} When Catholics go to confession, to a duly authorized priest, does the priest give them **absolution** or **Epikieia**?

{33} Do you believe this statement is true: *Epikieia is NOT absolution - neither in the external forum nor the internal forum?*

{34} What part of *Epikeia* is **EXTERNAL**?

Father Riley writes on p. 459:

(2) *Epikeia* may be defined as follows: A correction or emendation of a law which in its expression is deficient by reason of its universality, a correction made by a subject who deviates from the clear words of the law, basing his actions upon the presumption, at least probable, that the legislator intended not to include in his law the case at hand.

{35} In the above paragraph do you believe Father Riley teaches *Epikeia* may be defined as **absolution**?

Richard Ibranyi clearly states: “the **absolution** in the external forum lifts the censure so that the penitent would now be inside the Catholic Church” Remember *Epikeia* is not absolution. If it is **absolution** that lifts the censure, it follows it is **NOT** *Epikeia* that lifts the censure.

{36} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi and his followers that took his Abjuration have been **ABSOLVED** at the time they took his Abjuration without any Catholic bishop or priest present?

{37} Do you believe *Epikeia* **ABSOLVES** from censures and sins?

Let us learn from the book: *The Church Prayer Book* Arrangement and Translation by Monsignor Eugene Murphy. Published by Church Printing & Envelope Company. Imprimatur - + D. Cardinal Dougherty June 9, 1932. Let us turn to pages 102 through 109 to learn what the Catholic Church teaches about *The Form of Receiving a Convert*. The first rubric says:

“The priest, sitting before the middle of the altar, with his back to the altar, addresses the convert kneeling in front of him. Then kneeling before the middle of the altar, he says, alternately with the assistants:” [I, Patrick Henry, add that the priest is vested with a PURPLE stole. That is the same way the priest is vested when he hears confessions.]

Next follows the *Veni Creator*. After that we read the second rubric.

“After that the priest sits down, and the convert, kneeling before him, and touching the book of the gospel with his right hand, reads his profession of faith as follows. If he cannot read, the priest reads the profession of faith slowly, so that the convert may repeat it with understanding after the priest:”

Next follows the words of his profession.

“I, N. N., having before my eyes the holy Gospels, which I touch with my hand, and knowing that no one can be saved without that faith which the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church holds, believes, and teaches; against which I grieve that I have greatly erred, inasmuch as, having been born outside that Church, I have held and believed doctrines opposed to her teaching; I now, enlightened by the grace of God, profess that I believe the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church to be the one true Church established on earth by Jesus Christ, to which I submit myself with my whole heart. I firmly believe all the articles that she proposes to my belief; I reject and condemn all that she rejects and condemns, and I am ready to observe all she commands me. And especially I profess that I believe: One only God in three divine Persons, distinct from and equal to each other - that is to say, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost;

The Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation, Passion, Death, and Resurrection of Our Lord Jesus Christ; and the personal union of the two Natures, the divine and the human; the divine Maternity of the most holy Mary, together with Her most spotless virginity; and also Her Immaculate Conception;

The true, real, and substantial presence of the Body of Our Lord Jesus Christ, together with His Soul and Divinity, in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist;

The seven sacraments instituted by Jesus Christ, for the salvation of mankind: that is to say, Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, Matrimony.

I also believe in Purgatory, the resurrection of the dead, and everlasting life;

The primacy, not only of honor, but also of jurisdiction, of the Roman Pontiff, successor of St. Peter, prince of the apostles, vicar of Jesus Christ;

The veneration of the Saints and of their images;

The authority of apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions, and of the Holy Scriptures, which we must interpret and understand only in the sense which our holy Mother the Catholic Church has held, and does hold, to whom alone it belongs to judge of their meaning and interpretation;

And everything else that has been defined and declared by the sacred Canons and by the general Councils, especially by the holy Council of Trent, and by the Council of the Vatican.

With a sincere heart, therefore, and with unfeigned faith, I detest and abjure every error, heresy, and sect opposed to the said Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church. So help me God, and these His holy Gospels, which I touch with my hand.”

Next we read the third rubric.

“Then the priest, sitting down, says, alternately with the assistants:”

Now they pray Psalm 50. Next we read the fourth rubric.

“Then he rises, and uncovering his head, says:”

Now they pray the *Kyrie eleison*, *Pater noster*, a few other prayers, then the *Oremus*. I here give Monsignor Eugene Murphy’s translation of the *Oremus* into English.

Let us pray.

O Lord, whose property is always to have mercy and to spare, receive our supplication, that this thy servant, whom the sentence of excommunication [*] doth bind, the compassion of thy goodness may mercifully absolve. Through Christ our Lord.

R. Amen.

Next we read the fifth rubric.

Here follows conditional baptism.

Then the priest, seated, pronounces the **ABSOLUTION** from excommunication in the following terms:

This is the English translation:

“By the authority of the Apostolic See, committed to me for this purpose, **I ABSOLVE** thee from the bonds of excommunication which thou hast incurred, [*] and restore thee to the holy sacraments of the Church, to the communion and fellowship of the faithful. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.”

[*] *Where it is a matter of doubt whether the penitent has in fact incurred excommunication as a heretic, the priest inserts here the word forsan, perhaps.*

Next we read the sixth rubric.

A SLIGHT PENANCE IS IMPOSED, such as a prayer, or a visit to a church.

Confession and sacramental **absolution** now follow.

Then is said the Te Deum

{38} Did you note a **PENANCE IS IMPOSED**, as is also done for Sacramental Confession?

{39} Did you also note that this sixth rubric, as well as the instructions given at the beginning of this article, include Sacramental Confession as part of the Liturgy for *The Reception of Converts*?

{40} Did you notice **ABSOLUTION** is given **TWICE**? Absolution was first given to absolve and forgive the excommunication and censures in the **EXTERNAL** forum – because the excommunication and censures pertain to the external forum. The second absolution was given to absolve and forgive personal sins that are a matter of conscience in the **INTERNAL** forum.

{41} Did you notice what a variety of **DIFFERENCE** there is between the ceremony of Richard Ib-ranyi’s Abjuration and the Liturgy for the Catholic Church for *The Reception of Converts*?

There are a few more prayers and rubrics given, but one important thing I wanted you to learn is that **ABSOLUTION** is given much the same as **absolution** is given for the Sacrament of Confession.

To examine, analyze, and compare **ABSOLUTION** with **EPIKEIA** let us review the following English translation of the FORM of ABSOLUTION for Sacramental Confession with the absolution given during the Abjuration:

“May Our Lord Jesus Christ **ABSOLVE** thee; and I, by His authority, **ABSOLVE** thee from every bond of excommunication and interdict so far as I can and thou needest. And so **I ABSOLVE** thee from thy sins, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.”

Father Riley informs us on page 344:

“In short, it may be concluded that in regard to matters which touch the essence of the **SACRAMENTS**, the use of *Epikeia* is **ALWAYS EXCLUDED**.”

Father Riley informs us on page 347:

“**In regard to the essence of** these **Sacraments**, (Holy Orders and Matrimony) what has been explained above of all the Sacraments is applicable to them – viz., that **EPIKEIA IS NEVER LICIT.**”

{42} Do you believe the **Jurisdiction** necessary to be **ABSOLVED** after Confession touches the essence of the Sacrament of Penance?

{43} Do you believe that if the priest or bishop did **NOT ABSOLVE** you after you confess your sins to him, that your sins are **NOT** forgiven by the means of the Sacrament of Penance? (For this question I am NOT talking about sins being forgiven by an Act of Perfect Contrition. I am talking about sins being forgiven **ONLY** by means of the **ABSOLUTION** given during Confession.)

{44} Do you believe the **ABSOLUTION** given during Confession touches the essence of the Sacrament of Penance?

{45} Do you believe the use of *Epikeia* is **ALWAYS EXCLUDED** in whatever touches the essence of the Sacrament of Penance?

{46} Do you believe that if a priest or bishop did **NOT ABSOLVE** the Convert, his excommunication and censures would be absolved and taken away?

{47} Do you believe that if the priest did **NOT Absolve** the Convert that the Convert would be restored to the holy sacraments of the Church, and to the communion and fellowship of the faithful?

{48} Do you believe if the Convert did **NOT** receive **ABSOLUTION** that **EPIKEIA** will supply for **ABSOLUTION** and the Convert would be restored to the holy sacraments of the Church, and to the communion and fellowship of the faithful?

Father Riley informs us on page 320:

ARTICLE 3. THESIS: **EPIKEIA** PROPERLY SO-CALLED **MAY NOT BE APPLIED** TO PRECEPTS OF THE DIVINE POSITIVE LAW OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.”

{49} Do you believe **absolution** given during the Sacrament of Confession pertains to THE DIVINE POSITIVE LAW OF THE NEW TESTAMENT?

{50} Do you believe the **absolution** given during the Liturgy of the Catholic Church for the Reception of Converts [the Abjuration] pertains to THE DIVINE POSITIVE LAW OF THE NEW TESTAMENT?

Father Riley informs us on pages 314 and 315:

“Rodrigo’s discussion of the problem is restricted to DIVINE POSITIVE LAW. This law, he points out, embraces three classes of commands. In the first category he places **those matters which are necessary by necessity of means**. In connection with these, **NO EPIKEIA**, the author contends, **IS PERMISSIBLE**. For Christ Himself sufficiently determined when the *votum* may be substituted for the *res*, and when the *res* itself is unconditionally required. It is His to make available in His own way for each individual the possibility of doing what He established as necessary for salvation. If he had intended to admit some excuse, He would have established these matters as being necessary only by necessity of precept.”

{51} Do you believe the absolution for the excommunication and censures are **matters which are necessary by necessity of means**?

{52} Do you believe the absolution for personal sins confessed in Confession are **matters which are necessary by necessity of means**?

Father Riley continues:

“In the second category he considers those things which are necessary for the **validity of the Sacraments. HERE NO EPIKEIA IS POSSIBLE.**”

{53} Do you believe **ABSOLUTION** is necessary for the **validity of the Sacrament of Penance**?

{54} Do you agree with the statement “**HERE NO EPIKEIA IS POSSIBLE**” given for this case is true?

{55} Do you believe **ABSOLUTION** is necessary for the **validity of The Reception of Converts**?

{56} Do you agree with the statement “**HERE NO EPIKEIA IS POSSIBLE**” would apply for Abjurations and **The Reception of Converts**?

{57} If you answer no to the last question, please explain why?

Father Riley continues:

“For these are matters of positive institution; exclusively upon those things determined by Christ did He confer the power to cause what they signify. Consequently (and in support of this conclusion Rodrigo invokes the authority of the Council of Trent,) [Sess. XXI, Cap. 2 and DB 931] human substitution is never to be admitted. Either the Sacrament is administered as Christ instituted it, or it is not administered at all - because the power to cause sanctifying grace is conferred exclusively upon what Christ Himself instituted.”

{58} Do you believe the statements in the above paragraph are true for the **ABSOLUTION** from ex-communication and censures in the external forum given during the Liturgy for the Reception of Converts?

{59} Do you believe the Council of Trent teaches human substitution by Richard Ibranyi, or anyone else, of Epikeia for **absolution** is **NEVER** to be admitted?

Footnote 98: Many, if not most, modern theologians (before 1958 – P.H.) maintain that the use of *Epikeia* is restricted to **HUMAN** law.

{60} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi teaches the **OPPOSITE** of what most modern theologians before 1958 taught?

Review some excerpts from *Mediator Dei*, Encyclical of Pope Pius XII on the Sacred Liturgy November 20, 1947.

“... In the sacred liturgy we profess the Catholic faith explicitly and openly ... The **ENTIRE LITURGY**, therefore, has the Catholic faith for its content, inasmuch as it bears public witness to the faith of the Church.

For this reason, whenever there was question of defining a truth revealed by God, the Sovereign Pontiff and the Councils in their recourse to the "theological sources," as they are called, have not seldom drawn many an argument from this sacred science of the liturgy. For an example in point, Our predecessor of immortal memory, Pius IX, so argued when he proclaimed the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary (Ineffabilis Deus). Similarly during the discussion of a doubtful or controversial truth, the Church and the Holy Fathers have not failed to look to the age-old and age-honored sacred rites for enlightenment. Hence the well-known and venerable maxim, "Legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi"—let the rule for prayer determine the rule of belief. The sacred liturgy, consequently, does not decide or determine independently and of itself what is of Catholic faith. More properly, since **the liturgy is also a profession of eternal truths**, and subject, as such, to the supreme teaching authority of the Church, it can supply **proofs and testimony, quite clearly, of no little value, towards the determination of a particular point of Christian doctrine.**”

{61} Do you believe *The Form of Receiving a Convert* is part of the Liturgy of the Catholic Church?

{62} Do you believe the following words are a necessary part of the Catholic Liturgy for the *Reception of Converts*: “By the authority of the Apostolic See, committed to me for this purpose, **AB-SOLVE** thee from the bonds of excommunication which thou hast incurred, [*] and restore thee to the holy sacraments of the Church, to the communion and fellowship of the faithful. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.”?

{63} Did you know Richard Ibranyi’s *Form of Receiving a Convert*, which he titles: *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration From the Great Apostasy*, does not contain what Catholics believe is a necessary part of the Catholic Liturgy for the *Reception of Converts*?

{64} Are Protestants, non-Catholics, Heretics, and Apostates known to put together their own Satanic inspired Liturgy?

{65} Do those who take part in Protestant, non-Catholic, Heretical, Apostate, Satanic inspired Liturgies receive grace and absolution?

{66} Do they receive forgiveness of their sins, excommunications or censures for doing so?

{67} Is it always forbidden for Catholics to take part in a non-Catholic liturgy?

{68} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi, who made up his own *Form of Receiving a Convert* and changed parts of the Sacred Catholic Liturgy, made a mockery of God’s Catholic Church as explained by Pope Pius XII?

{69} Do you believe that in the sacred liturgy we profess the Catholic faith explicitly and openly?

{70} Do you believe the liturgy is also a profession of eternal truths?

{71} Do you believe the **ENTIRE LITURGY** bears public witness to the faith of the Church?

{72} Do you believe *The Form of Receiving a Convert* is part of the Catholic Liturgy?

{73} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi’s **SUBSTITUTION** *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration From the Great Apostasy* for *The Form of Receiving a Convert* is part of the Catholic Liturgy?

{74} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi has attempted to **CHANGE** the Liturgy of the Church?

{75} Do you believe Canon 436 teaches the TRUTH when it says succinctly: “While the See is vacant **nothing** may be **CHANGED**”?

{76} Do you believe during *The Form of Receiving a Convert* the Liturgy teaches all Catholics it is **NOT Epikeia BUT absolution** that by the authority of the Apostolic See, the Priest can **ABSOLVE** the Convert from the bonds of excommunication and restore him to the holy sacraments of the Church, to the communion and fellowship of the faithful?

{77} Do you believe that anyone who answers NO to the above question is a heretic?

{78} Will those who took Richard Ibranyi’s Abjuration explain how they were **AB-SOLVED from the excommunication in the EXTERNAL FORUM?**

{79} How can the Convert who was “received” into the Church only with Richard Ibranyi’s form of Abjuration, without any Catholic bishop or priest with Jurisdiction present, prove they were **AB-SOLVED** and their censures lifted? Richard Ibranyi makes the statement: “Your censure of excommunication is now lifted in the external forum.”

{80} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi and his followers can quote any Pope or Father of the Church that specifically teaches we do not need **Catholic bishops and priests** with either Ordinary, Delegated or Supplied Jurisdiction to be **ABSOLVED?**

{81} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi teaches the **OPPOSITE** of Pope Pius XII?

Richard Ibranyi ends *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration From the Great Apostasy* with these words:

“Your censure of excommunication is now lifted in the external forum. You are now inside the Roman Catholic Church. **You must now go to confession in order to be forgiven in the internal forum (for your soul to be in a state of sanctifying grace)**. You must confess all your sins, the specific ones against the faith that you were guilty of holding, including your association with any non-Catholic sects, and all of your mortal sins against the moral law.”

{82} Do Richard Ibranyi and his followers (especially those who took *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration From the Great Apostasy*) actually believe what is in the above paragraph?

{83} What do these words mean: You **MUST** now go to confession in order to be forgiven in the internal forum (for your soul to be in a state of sanctifying grace)? This is the way I understand it. Richard Ibranyi and his followers took his form of the Abjuration just as lay people before other lay people. Richard Ibranyi and his followers do not know of a Catholic bishop or priest with Jurisdiction.

{84} Since there is no bishop or priest for the Abjuration, where do they find one for **absolution** from censures in the EXTERNAL forum?

{85} Where do they find a bishop or priest for **absolution** after confession?

{86} Do you agree with Richard Ibranyi's teaching: they must go to confession for their soul to be in a state of sanctifying grace?

{87} What is the purpose of taking the Abjuration if they still cannot be in the state of Sanctifying Grace without Sacramental Confession?

{88} Does it seem to you Richard Ibranyi is teaching it is impossible to pray an act of perfect contrition?

{89} If that is what Richard Ibranyi (and/or his followers) truly believe, do you believe they have denied Catholic Doctrine?

The great doctor of prayer, St. Alphonsus Maria, quotes the prince of Theologians to give us the doctrine of the Catholic Church, namely, that **PERFECT CONTRITION FORGIVES ALL SINS:**

N.B. An act of love is a golden chain **UNITING** us to God. St. Thomas says: "Every act of love merits eternal life. One act of love i.e. **perfect love forgives all sins.**"
Therefore make many simple but fervent acts of love and sorrow.

Here we have two of the greatest Theologians and Doctors in the Catholic Church teaching us: "One act of love i.e. perfect love forgives all sins."

{90} Do you believe the infallible Church teaches perfect love forgives all sins?

{91} Do you believe it is possible to love God above all else just because He is all Good and worthy of all our love?

{92} Do you believe repentant, penitent, and contrite sinners can have perfect contrition before making an Abjuration or before Sacramental Confession?

{93} Do you believe many people living during the Old Testament times made acts of perfect love?

{94} Do you know of another way people living during the Old Testament times could go to Heaven if they committed Mortal Sin?

{95} Do you believe it is easy to make an act of perfect love?

RICHARD IBRANYI'S DOCTRINE:

Epikieia saves our day.
Epikieia takes God's laws away.
Epikieia takes our censures away.
If you Abjure my way.

{96} Do you believe the above four lines sum up Richard Ibranyi's Doctrine about Epikieia and Abjuration?

In "Exúrge Michaël" Issue #3 Richard Ibranyi wrote:

"Where are the Catholic Bishops and Priests? There are no **shepherds**, Catholic bishops or priests. There is not so much as even one! All have gone astray. All have abandoned the

Lord. Therefore, there is **no** Holy Mass, presided over by a Catholic priest, which a Catholic can attend. Daniel's prophecy is fulfilled (Dan. 12:10)."

The Vatican Council (1870) states:

"So then, just as He sent apostles, whom He chose out of the world, even as He had been sent by the Father, in like manner it was His will that there should be **SHEPHERDS** and teachers **until the end of time**"

{97} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi denies this infallible teaching?

In Richard Ibranyi's publication titled: *RJMI, Fr. Egregyi, and Patrick Henry Debate* Richard Ibranyi makes the following statements: [the **bold** and underline are added by Patrick]

"We do not always have to have a pope, and **we do not always even have to have one bishop**, but there must always be the possibility of having a pope and Catholic bishops."

{98} Do you believe the underlined statement in the above paragraph denies Catholic Dogma?

{99} Do you believe that if there was **NEITHER** Catholic **NOR** non-Catholic bishop on earth there would be the possibility of having another Catholic bishop? If you answer yes, please explain how!

{100} Can you explain how there could be the possibility of **ONLY** non-Catholic bishops consecrating a Catholic bishop?

Review from Pope Leo XIII – *Satis Cognitum*.

"But if the authority of Peter and his successors is plenary and supreme, it is not to be regarded as the sole authority. For He who made Peter the foundation of the Church also "chose, twelve, whom He called apostles" (St. Luke vi. 13); and just as it is necessary that the authority of Peter should be perpetuated in the Roman Pontiff, so, by the fact that the bishops succeed the Apostles, they inherit their ordinary power, and thus **the Episcopal order necessarily belongs to the essential constitution of the Church**. Although they do not receive plenary, or universal, or supreme authority, they are not to be looked as vicars of the Roman Pontiffs; because they exercise a power really their own, and are most truly called the ordinary pastors of the peoples over whom they rule."

{101} If the Episcopal order necessarily belongs to the **ESSENTIAL CONSTITUTION** of the Church can Catholics teach: "**we do not always even have to have one bishop**"?

Review some more from Pope Leo XIII – *Satis Cognitum*.

"Christ constituted [Peter] not only pastor, but pastor of pastors; Peter therefore feeds the lambs and feeds the sheep, feeds the children and feeds the mothers, governs the subjects and rules the prelates, because the lambs and the SHEEP form the whole of the Church."

{102} Do you believe Pope Leo XIII taught the truth, when guided by the Holy Ghost, he specifically taught the lambs and the SHEEP form the whole of the Church?

{103} Do you believe there can be *the WHOLE of the Church* without bishops?

{104} Do you believe that if the part that provides **the essential constitution of the Church** no longer existed Jesus Christ lied and failed to keep His promise that His Church would last until the end of time?

{105} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi rejects the teaching of God's Church, as given in the Encyclical letter, *Satis Cognitum*, just quoted?

Please pay special attention to the following teaching of the Catholic Church. It is taken from: *The Church Speaks to the Modern World*. Social Teachings - Pope Leo XIII. Edited by Etienne Gilson - 1954:

“The primary object of an Encyclical is not to define the dogma, that is, the faith, of the Catholic Church. To do so is the proper object of what is technically called the “extraordinary magisterial teaching of the Church.” This “extraordinary” teaching enjoys, in each and every one of its parts, without ANY RESERVATION, the grace of INFALLIBILITY. This grace belongs to the so-called “ecumenical councils,” that is, to councils representing the whole Christian world and, consequently, the preaching of the whole Catholic Church; but, following a decision of the Vatican Council (Session IV, Const. Pater aeternus), the same grace of infallibility also belongs to the pronouncements of the Pope when, speaking in his capacity as pastor and teacher of all Christians, and by virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, he declares that a certain doctrine concerning faith or moral conduct should be held as true by the whole Church. Such infallible pronouncements, therefore, are FINAL and IRREFORMABLE by themselves, and not by virtue of the consent of the Church.

The proper object of the “ordinary” teaching of the Church, as given by bishops to their own dioceses and by the Bishop of Rome, that is, the Pope, to all the faithful, is to diffuse this infallible teaching of the Church, to defend it if necessary, and to apply it to some particularly important problems of the day as they arise in social and political life. The Encyclical letters are the USUAL means by which the Popes exercise this definite teaching function.

These letters are the HIGHEST EXPRESSION of the ORDINARY teaching of the Church. To the extent that they restate the INFALLIBLE teachings of the Church, the pronouncements of the ENCYCLICAL LETTERS ARE THEMSELVES INFALLIBLE.

Moreover, while explaining and developing such infallible teachings, or while using them as a sure criterion in the condemnation of errors, or even while striving to solve the social, economic, and political problems of the day in the light of these infallible teachings, the Popes enjoy the special ASSISTANCE of the Holy Ghost, a higher guidance in which the supernatural gift of prudence plays a decisive part.

This is to say, the teachings of the Popes, as found in their Encyclical Letters, can by NO MEANS be considered as expressing MERE OPINIONS which ANYONE is FREE to hold or to reject at will.

Even though they may NOT BE BINDING as to faith in ALL their parts, the teachings of an encyclical are ALL DIRECTLY related to FAITH by the SUPREME teaching authority of the Church with the special assistance of the Holy Ghost.

There is ALWAYS GRAVE TEMERITY in NOT ACCEPTING THE TEACHING OF AN ENCYCLICAL ON ANY ONE OF THE POINTS IT TOUCHES.

{106} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi teaches the OPPOSITE of Pope Leo XIII?

Let us review: *The Liturgical Year*, by Dom Gueranger, Imprimatur Feb., 1924, Vol. VIII, Pages 130-131:

“This Church is a society, unto which all mankind is invited. It is composed of TWO classes of members; the GOVERNING and the governed; the TEACHING and the taught; the SANCTIFYING and the sanctified.”

{107} Can Catholics teach: “we do not always even have to have one bishop”?

{108} Who are the GOVERNING, TEACHING and SANCTIFYING members of the Church without bishops?

Page 195

“Our Risen Jesus is not satisfied with establishing His Church and constituting THE HIERARCHY which IS TO GOVERN IT in his name TO THE END OF TIME.”

{109} If “we do not always even have to have one bishop” who is the HIERARCHY which IS TO GOVERN the Church TO THE END OF TIME?

“**HIERARCHY** means Sacred Government. It comprises three degrees: the **EPISCOPATE**, priesthood, and diaconate, in which last are included the Orders below it. This is called the hierarchy of Order, to distinguish it from the hierarchy of Jurisdiction.”

Pope Pius XII taught in his address to the 2nd World Congress of the Lay Apostolate, October 5, 1957:
“The HIERARCHY ALONE is responsible before God for the government of the Church.”

The Acts and Decrees of the Vatican Council (1870) teach:

“The Church is a **PERFECT** and **HIERARCHICAL** society. In this respect, She is NOT a society of EQUALS in which ALL the faithful enjoy the SAME rights. Not only because, among the faithful, some are **CLERGY** and others laity, but above all, because there IS IN THE CHURCH A POWER **INSTITUTED BY GOD** in order to SANCTIFY, to TEACH and to GOVERN, which certain ones have received and OTHERS HAVE NOT.”

{110} Do you believe those who teach: “**we do not always even have to have one bishop**” deny, reject, and disagree with the above dogma of the Catholic Church?

In *The History, Nature, and use of Epikeia in Moral Theology* we read on pages 330 and 331:

A consideration of the foregoing truths will lead us to the conclusion that it was the manifest and unmistakable intention of Jesus Christ, the Divine Founder of the Church, to establish it forever as a **hierarchico**-monarchical society. Nowhere in revelation is there any evidence of any intention to permit exceptions to, or changes in, this constitution in future history, by the use of EPIKEIA or on any other basis. Men are physically free, of course, to found other churches, differing in constitution and nature from that established by Christ. But such churches are **NOT** Christ’s, and their very existence is opposed to the will of the Son of God. For **by reason of the positively expressed will of its Divine Founder, the Church in its ESSENCE is to remain unchanged until the end of time.** To maintain that Christ had some intention for the future, contrary to that made manifest in the actual establishment of His Church, is to utter a purely gratuitous assertion. **More than that – it is a refusal to believe in the efficacy of the divine promise to be with the Church until the consummation of the world; it is a denial of the STABILITY, the UNITY, the APOSTOLICITY and the INDEFECTIBILITY of this divinely established institution.**¹³⁶

{111} Do you understand Jesus Christ founded the Catholic Church forever as a **hierarchico**-monarchical society and this can **NEVER** be changed by the use of **EPIKEIA** or on any other basis?

{112} If you believe “**We do not always even have to have ONE bishop**”, can you explain how the Catholic Church is a **hierarchico**-monarchical society?

In the footnote for the superscript number ¹³⁶ Father Riley tells us:

Such is the clear teaching of the Church. [Father then gives some reference sources. Then the footnote continues:] The matter is concisely summarized in the words of Pope Pius XI: “Not only must the Church still exist today and continue always to exist, but it must ever be **exactly THE SAME** as it was in the days of the Apostles.” – Encyclical *Mortalium Animos*.

{113} Do you believe **IN THE DAYS OF THE APOSTLES** there were no Catholic bishops or priests. There was not so much as even **ONE!** ALL had gone astray?

{114} Do you believe **IN THE DAYS OF THE APOSTLES** there were other Catholic Bishops living who were able to elect another Pope when the Pope died?

{115} Do you believe **ANYONE** who believes “**we do not always even have to have one bishop**” contradicts the clear teaching of the Church?

{116} Do you believe ANYONE who teaches: – “**We do not always even have to have ONE bishop.** There are no **shepherds**, Catholic bishops or priests. There is not so much as even **ONE!** **ALL** have gone astray!” – is a heretic who denies a Dogma of the Catholic Church?

{117} Do you believe ANYONE who teaches: – “**We do not always even have to have ONE bishop.** There are no **shepherds**, Catholic bishops or priests. There is not so much as even **ONE!** **ALL** have gone astray!” – is in Schism for rejecting a clear teaching of the Pope on a matter of Faith to the Universal Church?

{118} Can Catholics doubt there will be Catholic bishops until the end of time?

{119} Do you believe ONLY Catholic bishops with OFFICE, AUTHORITY AND JURISDICTION make up the HIERARCHY in the Catholic Church?

{120} Do you believe ONLY Catholic bishops with OFFICE, AUTHORITY, MISSION AND JURISDICTION make up the GOVERNING, TEACHING, and SANCTIFYING class of the Catholic Church?

{121} Do you believe ANY bishop or priest consecrated or ordained in the line of succession of Archbishop Thuc or Lefebvre now have an Office, Authority, Jurisdiction, or Mission in the Catholic Church?

{122} Do you believe ANY bishop or priest consecrated or ordained in the line of succession of Archbishop Thuc or Lefebvre now make up the Hierarchy of the Catholic Church?

{123} If you answer yes to this last question, will you please explain how?

Richard Ibranyi teaches:

“**We do not always even have to have ONE bishop.** There are no **shepherds**, Catholic bishops or priests. There is not so much as even **ONE!** **ALL** have gone astray!”

{124} Do you believe all who have gone astray are non-Catholic?

{125} Do you believe even if they are validly consecrated bishops they are NOT members of the Catholic Church?

The Acts and Decrees of the Vatican Council (1870) teach us the DOCTRINE Catholics believe: “The Church is a PERFECT and HIERARCHICAL society.”

{126} How in the name of Catholic Doctrine can Catholics believe Richard Ibranyi’s church made up of **ONLY non-Catholic** bishops, if **any** bishops at all, is a PERFECT and HIERARCHICAL society?

{127} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi teaches the heresy that validly consecrated bishops who are now **non-Catholics** still make the PERFECT and HIERARCHICAL Catholic Church?

{128} Can you explain how there can be a PERFECT and HIERARCHICAL society with not even **ONE** Catholic Bishop or priest as a member of it?

{129} Do you believe Deacons, Sub Deacons, or those in Minor Orders can consecrate Catholic Bishops?

The Douay-Rheims Bible with a Comprehensive Catholic Commentary compiled by Father George Leo Haydock give the following as part of the footnote for St. Matthew 25: 18.

“... See here the warrant and commission of the apostles and their successors, the bishops and pastors of Christ’s Church. He received from His Father, *all power in heaven and in earth*: and in virtue of *this power he sends them* (even as *His Father sent Him*, S. John xx. 21.) to *teach and disciple*, not one, but *all nations*, and instruct them in *all truths*: and that He may assist them effectually in the execution of this commission, He promises to be with them, (not for three or four hundred years only) but *all days, even to the consummation of the world*. How then could the Catholic Church go astray? Having ALWAYS with her **pastors**, as is here **promised** by Christ Himself, who *is the way, the truth, and the life*.”

{130} Do you believe the above footnote gives the TRUE interpretation and explanation of the Catholic Church for this verse of Sacred Scripture?

{131} Do you believe there will **always be bishops and pastors** in Christ’s Church?

{132} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi teaches the **OPPOSITE** of the way the Catholic Church interprets, explains and understands Sacred Scripture?

{133} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi teaches the **OPPOSITE** of Pope Pius XI in his Encyclical *Mortalium Animos*?

{134} Do you believe as part of the means of salvation, there absolutely **MUST** be Bishops and priests **ALWAYS LIVING** who **ACTUALLY POSSESS** real, lawful, spiritual **JURISDICTION**?

{135} Do you believe even if valid orders exist, where **JURISDICTION** is lacking there is **no** real **APOSTOLICITY?**

{136} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi teaches the heresy that **non-Catholic, heretical** bishops have Jurisdiction in the Catholic Church?

{137} Can Richard Ibranyi and his followers explain which bishops in the world have Catholic Jurisdiction, if there are no Catholic bishops in the world?

{138} Can Richard Ibranyi and his followers explain how the **APOSTOLIC** Catholic Church exists without any **HIERARCHY** or **JURISDICTION**?

{139} Are Apostate, heretical, schismatic bishops live members, dead members, or separated members of the Catholic Church? Think of a flock of chickens on a farm. If there are live, healthy hens that have mated with a rooster they have the potential to lay eggs and more chickens will be the natural result. If all the chickens on the farm are dead how will the hens lay more eggs? If all chickens are separated from the farm then there are no chickens on that farm laying eggs. Without the right kind of eggs how will there be more chickens? If there are neither chickens nor eggs how can there **EVER** be more chickens?

{140} Do you believe Catholic bishops have the potential to validly and licitly consecrate other Catholic bishops?

{141} Do you believe some apostate, heretical, schismatic bishops can validly consecrate other bishops, but they are not Catholic bishops?

{142} Does Richard Ibranyi teach that apostate, heretical, schismatic bishops can use *Epikieia* to be made Catholic bishops if they repent and take his Abjuration and believe as he believes although they do **NOT** receive absolution? **A very important question to answer is this:**

{143} Who actually belongs to the Catholic **HIERARCHY** during this time when Richard Ibranyi believes there is no **CATHOLIC HIERARCHY?**

{144} Did Jesus Christ found His Church with a **CATHOLIC HIERARCHY?**

{145} Is it a Dogma that the Catholic Church will **REMAIN exactly the same** as it was when Jesus Christ founded it?

{146} Were their Catholic bishops with Jurisdiction and a Mission from God, living on earth when Jesus Christ founded His Church? If you answer no to any of the last three questions, please explain why.

{147} If you answer yes, do you understand why it is heretical to believe what Richard Ibranyi teaches: **“we do not always even have to have ONE bishop.** There are no **shepherds**, Catholic bishops or priests. **There is not so much as even ONE! ALL** have gone astray”?

Consider carefully, deliberate upon, and ponder over this section of the book: *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth*, Copyright 1900, by Father Thomas Cox, page 173:

“Those who invent doctrines unheard of before are NOT the successors of the Apostles. Novelty and error are children of the same father-the father of lies. Those who have lost the line of valid ministers leading back to apostolic times, cannot plead the possession of **Apostolicity**. Where there is no ordination, no priesthood, no **AUTHORITY**, no **POWER**, Apostolicity is out of the question. Even if valid orders exist, **WHERE JURISDICTION IS LACKING THERE IS NO REAL APOSTOLICITY**. Schism, as well as heresy, destroys apostolic succession.”

Remember Richard Ibranyi states: “There are no shepherds, Catholic bishops or priests. There is not so much as even one! All have gone astray.”

{148} Are these teachings of Richard Ibranyi Catholic doctrine or heresy?

{149} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi teaches there are no bishops now living that have not fallen into schism or heresy?

{150} Do you believe every cleric that falls into schism or heresy loses all JURISDICTION?

{151} Do you believe WHERE JURISDICTION IS LACKING THERE IS NO REAL APOSTOLICITY?

{152} Do you believe without **apostolic succession** the Catholic Church has changed and ceased to be as it was when Jesus Christ founded it?

{153} Do you believe if the teachings of Richard were ACTUALLY the TRUTH there would be no bishops living with **APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION** and therefore, no fourth Mark of the Catholic Church?

It is now time to respond to Richard Ibranyi's paragraph # 11 in the above letter dated September 21, 2001.

“Patrick heretically teaches there cannot be another pope, and thus the papacy has defected, the primary apostolic mark, and the gates of hell prevailed over the papacy. Being that he does not believe in exemptions from the law, there can be no way to elect the next pope, because the last letter of the law requires Cardinals to elect a pope.”

Richard Ibranyi's statement above is not true, and he should know that it is not true. Sometime after I left the CMRI sect, I read some of the first letters written by Martin Gwynne and John Daly. They taught there could never be another Pope elected. For a while I thought their reasons sounded valid, and I was probably led to believe as they taught. I cannot recall that I ever recorded on any tape or taught in any public way their belief. Later, I prayed and studied more and realized their teaching was not correct.

I have very good reasons to believe Richard Ibranyi and some of his followers possess material I have written, as well as my voice recorded on cassette tape, teaching the exact opposite of Richard Ibranyi's lie, when he wrote: “Patrick heretically teaches there cannot be another pope.” As explained earlier in this letter, it is a lie that Patrick Henry does not believe in exemptions from the law. My true belief is that it is a denial of Catholic Dogma to teach there is no possible way for another Pope to be elected. I believe Pope Pius XI stated the clear teaching of Jesus Christ and His Catholic Church when he wrote: “Not only must the Church still exist today and continue always to exist, but it must ever be **exactly THE SAME** as it was in the days of the Apostles.” When Jesus Christ founded His Church, there was a way to elect another Pope when St. Peter died. Therefore, there must ALWAYS be a way to elect another Pope. This does not necessarily mean a Catholic Pope will be the last man living on earth. It does not necessarily mean another Pope will be elected. However, because the Catholic Church will remain **exactly THE SAME** as it was in the days of the Apostles, the SAME means to elect a Pope must exist.

{154} Do you believe when Jesus Christ founded His Church the Catholic bishops elected the next Pope when St. Peter died?

{155} Do you believe when St. Peter died there were Catholic bishops still living with Jurisdiction and a Mission?

{156} Do you believe there must be Catholic bishops living with an Office, Authority, Mission and Jurisdiction if the Catholic Church must remain the SAME as it was in the days of the Apostles?

If Almighty God's Divine Providence has another Pope elected, this may be one of those times when *Epikeia* is validly and licitly used.

{157} If God brings about the end of the world in the very near future do you believe the election of a Pope will be absolutely necessary?

{158} Do you believe there could be a PERFECT and HIERARCHICAL society without Catholic bishops? When a Pope dies there are Catholic bishops to elect the next Pope.

{159} If ALL the Catholic bishops died, who could consecrate another CATHOLIC bishop?

{160} Do you believe a group of ALL non-Catholic bishops could elect another Catholic Pope?

Richard Ibranyi teaches the heresy “There are no shepherds, Catholic bishops or priests. There is not so much as even one! All have gone astray. All have abandoned the Lord.” Patrick Henry believes the opposite. There are now living Catholic bishops and priests who have not gone astray or abandoned the Lord. There are now living Catholic bishops and priests who have an Office, Authority, Jurisdiction and Mission. I do not know their name or address, but I believe it is Catholic doctrine to believe they do exist and without them the Catholic Church has ceased to exist, which would make Jesus Christ a liar, hypocrite, and fraud.

Review from Pope Leo XIII – *Satis Cognitum*:

“From this text it is clear that by the will and command of God the Church rests upon St. Peter, just as a building rests on its foundation. Now the proper nature of a foundation is to be a principle of cohesion for the various parts of the building. It must be the necessary condition of stability and strength. Remove it and the whole building falls. It is consequently the office of St. Peter to support the Church, and to guard it in all its strength and indestructible unity. How could he fulfill this office without the power of commanding, forbidding, and judging, which is properly called jurisdiction? It is only by this power of jurisdiction that nations and commonwealths are held together. A primacy of honor and the shadowy right of giving advice and admonition, which is called direction, could never secure to any society of men unity or strength. The words—and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it—proclaim and establish the authority of which we speak. "What is the it?" (writes Origen). "Is it the rock upon which Christ builds the Church or the Church? **The expression indeed is ambiguous, as if the rock and the Church were one and the same. I indeed think that this is so, and that neither against the rock upon which Christ builds His Church nor against the Church shall the gates of Hell prevail**" (Origenes, Comment. in Matt., tom. xii., n. ii). The meaning of this divine utterance is, that, notwithstanding the wiles and intrigues which they bring to bear against the Church, it can never be that the church committed to the care of Peter shall succumb or **IN ANY WISE FAIL.**”

{161} Do you believe this truth: “The Church can never succumb or **IN ANY WISE FAIL**”?

{162} Could this be true without Catholic bishops on earth with an Office, Authority, Jurisdiction, and Mission?

{163} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi teaches any heresy?

{164} Do you believe heretics are non-Catholics?

{165} Do you accept the teaching of the IV Lateran Council: “We decree that those who give credence to the teachings of heretics, as well as those who receive, defend, or patronize them, are excommunicated.”

{166} Do you believe the Abjuration of Error is part of the liturgy?

{167} Do you believe the liturgy of Richard Ibranyi’s Abjuration is different from the Abjuration of Error that is part of the liturgy of the Catholic Church?

{168} Do you believe it is customary, normal, and expected among non-Catholics to write their prayers and liturgy?

{169} Do you believe it is part of the Catholic Faith or non-Catholic faith for any of the laity who wants to do so, to take it upon himself to pick and choose what should be in the Abjuration he and his followers should take?

{170} Do you believe Catholics follow the liturgy of the Catholic Church while non-Catholics make up their own liturgy?

{171} Do you believe those who take part in the liturgy of non-Catholics are excommunicated?

{172} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi speaks the truth when he claims to be one of the two witnesses St. John speaks of in the eleventh chapter of the Apocalypse?

{173} Have you read the book: *The End of the Present World and Mysteries of the Future Life* by Father Charles Marie Antoine Arminjon? The copy I am about to quote from was translated in 1985 by Peter McEnery. Printed and bound in Great Britain by Antony Rowe Ltd, Chippenham, Wilts. The book was first published in 1881 before Father’s death in 1885. It initially sold well in France, running fairly swiftly

through three editions. I find the following information, together with my questions asked in between some of the paragraphs, on pages 32 and 33:

Just when the tempest is at its most violent, when the Church is leaderless, when the unbloody sacrifice has everywhere ceased and everything seems humanly lost, two witnesses, St. John tells us, will be seen to arise.

These two witnesses will be two strange men, appearing suddenly amidst the world, without any one being able to say of what birth or origin they are, nor from what place or family they have come.

{174} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi qualifies to be one of the two men described in the above paragraph?

This is how St. John speaks of them in the eleventh chapter of the Apocalypse:

“And I will give unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy a thousand two hundred sixty days, clothed in sackcloth. These are the two olive—trees and the two candlesticks that stand before the Lord of the earth.”

St. John does not tell us expressly that the two witnesses whom he mentions will be Henoah and Elias, but it is clear from the context that, by the two candlesticks and the two olive-trees, he does not mean any two saints or preachers, but two definite personages, endowed with an extraordinary power and holiness. Now — pondering all the facts and circumstances foretold to us about the life and death of these personages, and recalling all that we are told about them by Scripture, especially in Ecclesiasticus 48 and by the prophet Malachias, concerning the mission they will one day be called upon to fulfill — Bede, St. Anselm, St. Augustine and **a large number of the Fathers assure us** that the two witnesses of whom the Apocalypse speaks are **NONE OTHER THAN HENOCH AND ELIAS**, and that they were miraculously preserved from death for no other purpose than **TO FIGHT AGAINST ANTICHRIST**, and bear testimony to Jesus Christ, at the **END OF THE WORLD**.

{175} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi’s claim to be one of the two Witnesses is directly contrary to **a large number of the Fathers** of the Church?

No tongue can express the sheer amazement which will grip mankind, at the sight of these two men, strangers to our passions and affairs, one of them having lived six thousand years, the other thirty centuries, in some ethereal region or other, beneath firmaments and upon spheres inaccessible to our senses and understanding. Yet, neither of these witnesses is alien to the human family. One of these candlesticks and olive—trees is Henoah, the great—great—grandfather of Noe, the direct ancestor of the whole human race. The other is the prophet Elias who, as the Saviour has said, is destined to restore all things.

{176} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi has lived thirty centuries?

{177} If you answer no to the last question, then how can you believe Richard Ibranyi speaks the truth when he claims he is Elias and one of the two Witnesses mentioned by St. John in the eleventh chapter of the Apocalypse?

He will come a second time to stem the tide of wickedness, more reckless and unrestrained than it was in the days of Achab. It will also be the hour of the redemption of Israel. The great prophet will convince the posterity of Abraham that the Messiah has come, and will remove the veil of ignorance and darkness which has lain heavy upon their eyes for nineteen centuries.

What sort of appearance and bearing will these strangers from another age present? What venerable majesty will shine forth from their persons? What inspired language will flow from their lips? Holy Scripture does not tell us. It teaches us that they will prophesy for one thousand two hundred and sixty days, clothed in sackcloth, their garments and features bearing the marks of humility and penance. According to Daniel, the persecution of Antichrist will last for one thousand two hundred and ninety days; so the preaching of Henoah and Elias will be thirty days shorter. Hence it follows that **they will appear in the period when the persecution is unleashed with the greatest violence.**

{178} If Richard Ibranyi is on of the Witnesses, why is he around preaching so long **BEFORE** the one thousand two hundred and sixty days are to begin?

{179} If the one thousand two hundred and sixty days have already begun, who and where are Henoah and Antichrist – the man of sin?

Cornelius a Lapide tells us that it is a certain truth, **almost of faith, fidei proximum, that Henoah and Elias did not die.**

{180} Do you believe that Henoah and Elias did not die?

Tertullian, in book LVIII on the Resurrection, calls them “candidates of Eternity”, in order to make us understand that they are freed from all misery and suffering, and incapable of sin. St. Irenaeus, bk. IV, ch. V, calls them coausplicants immortalitatem, which means that they have the certain presage and omen of immortality. **Neither Henoah nor Elias are yet glorified in their bodies; since they continue to be enveloped in flesh, from which, like us, they will one day be separated by death.**

{181} Do you believe the last sentence given above is true or false?

{182} Do you believe Henoah and Elias are still alive and will one day be separated by death; and therefore the real Elias, who is now about 30 centuries old, will be one of the actual Witnesses mentioned in Apocalypse and Richard Ibranyi does not speak the truth when he claims to be this Witness?

The Fathers teach that Henoah was taken up into paradise, which is also the teaching of Ecclesiasticus 44:16.

The Douay-Rheims Bible with a Comprehensive Catholic Commentary compiled by Father George Leo Haydock give the following as part of the footnote for Ecclesiasticus 44:16.

The Latin fathers suppose that Henoah was translated to heaven, or to the earthly paradise. It is the tradition both of Jews and of Christians that he is still alive, and will come to oppose Antichrist, (Apoc. Xi. 3. Gen. V. 22. Heb. Xi. 5.) when he will preach penance, chiefly to the Gentiles, while Elias will address himself to the Jews.

The Douay-Rheims Bible with a Comprehensive Catholic Commentary compiled by Father George Leo Haydock give the following as part of the footnote for Genesis 5: 22.

“Thou it is not an article of faith, whether Henoah be now in that Paradise, from which Adam and Eve were driven, or in some other delightful place; yet the holy Scriptures affirm, that God translated him alive, that he might not experience death,” S. Chrys. Hom 21. with whom the other fathers agree, cited in the Douay Bible; so that it is matter of surprise, how any Protestant can call it in question. He is the other witness, who will come with Elias, before the great day of the Lord, to perform the same office to the nations, as the latter will to the Jews. Malac. Iv. God preserves these two alive, perhaps to give us a striking proof how He would have treated Adam and his posterity, if they had not sinned; and also to confirm our hopes of immortality, when we shall have paid the debt of nature.

The Douay-Rheims Bible with a Comprehensive Catholic Commentary compiled by Father George Leo Haydock give the following as part of the footnote for Hebrews 11: 5.

Henoah was translated so as not to die nor see death. ... By these words, *that he should not see death*, it is the general exposition of the ancient interpreters, that he is not dead.

The Douay-Rheims Bible with a Comprehensive Catholic Commentary compiled by Father George Leo Haydock give the following as part of the footnote for Apocalypse 11: 3.

... It is a very common interpretation, that by these two witnesses must be understood Henoch and Elias, who are to come before the end of the world. It is true this is what we read in several of the **ancient** Fathers, insomuch, that Dr. Wells in his paraphrase, calls it the “consent of the primitive fathers,” and in his notes says, it is of “unexceptionable authority.” This opinion (at least as to Elias) is grounded on those words of the prophet Malachy (4: 5) *behold, I will send you Elias, the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord*; and also on the words of our Saviour, Christ, (St. Matthew 17: 11) where He tells His disciples: *Elias indeed shall come, and restore all things.*

Rev. Father Phelan, S. J., in his book *The Straight Path or Marks of the True Church*, copyright 1918, states,

“By what test do you prove the doctrine of the Church today to be Apostolic or not? We have a simple, conclusive and effective one. Here is the canon of doctrinal criticism recognized in every age. Whatever is in harmony with the uninterrupted chain of apostolic teaching is true, whatever contradicts it is false...”

{183} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi’s claim to be one of the two Witnesses is in contradiction or in **harmony** with Sacred Scripture, the Fathers of the Church, and the uninterrupted chain of Apostolic teaching?

Richard Ibranyi’s Abjuration titled: *A Roman Catholic Form of Abjuration From the Great Apostasy* contains the following paragraph as what Richard Ibranyi and his followers profess as their belief.

The apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions and all other observances and constitutions of that same Church I most firmly admit and embrace. I likewise accept Holy Scripture according to that sense which our Holy Mother Church has held and does hold, whose [office] it is to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures; I shall never accept nor interpret it otherwise than in accordance with the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

We have reviewed part of apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions, the interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures in that sense of our Holy Mother Church, and the **unanimous consent** of what the **Fathers** teach about Henoch and Elias.

{184} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi can believe he is Elias and one of the Witnesses mentioned in Sacred Scripture and still speak the **TRUTH** when he professes to believe: The apostolic and ecclesiastical traditions and all other observances and constitutions of that same Church I most firmly admit and embrace. I likewise accept Holy Scripture according to that sense which our Holy Mother Church has held and does hold, whose [office] it is to judge of the true meaning and interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures; I shall never accept nor interpret it otherwise than in accordance with the **unanimous consent of the Fathers**?

{185} Do you believe anyone who took Richard Ibranyi’s Abjuration professed a **LIE** during their Abjuration if they believed Richard Ibranyi is one of the two Witnesses?

Richard Ibranyi claims to be one of the “two Witnesses” described in Chapter 11 of the Apocalypse. Richard Ibranyi will admit this to those who ask him, and he has admitted this in his January 2000 Newsletter “Exúrge Michaël,” January 2000, p. 5.

Chapter 11 of the Apocalypse describes how the two Witnesses have the power to shut heaven so that it does not rain in the days of their prophecy. They have the power to turn the waters into blood. They have the power to strike the earth with plagues as often as they will. They have the power to make fire come out of their mouths to destroy their enemies.

{186} Do you believe that Richard Ibranyi has these powers?

{187} Do you believe the Holy Ghost taught the **TRUTH** when describing some of the powers the two Witnesses will definitely, absolutely, and positively possess?

{188} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi teaches the **TRUTH** by claiming to be one of the two Witnesses while at the same time he definitely, absolutely, and positively does not possess the required powers?

{189} Do you believe either of the two Witnesses mentioned in Apocalypse will ever be in schism, heresy, or apostasy?

{190} Do you agree Richard Ibranyi calls all traditional chapels in America without exception, “non-Catholic churches”?

{191} Did you know Richard Ibranyi himself attended many of these “non-Catholic churches” from at least **1986** to **1997**, including the Society of Saint Pius X, Indult Masses, Eastern Rite Churches, and Independent Chapels under Antipope John Paul II?

{192} Did you know Richard Ibranyi has been claiming to be a prophet since at least **1986**? So during the time he claimed to be a prophet he was attending what he now calls a “non-Catholic church.”

{193} Do you believe this proves beyond a shadow of a doubt that Richard Ibranyi is not a prophet, but a false prophet (one who claims to be a prophet and is not)?

Since 1986, Richard Ibranyi has changed his position on many **VERY IMPORTANT** issues.

{194} Do you believe the true Witnesses will change their teachings and later teach, hold and embrace the exact **OPPOSITE** position on many **VERY IMPORTANT** issues?

In a talk given in 1995, called *The Mystical Body of Christ Crucified*, Richard Ibranyi said that the consecration in the New Mass is **VALID**.

In his video, *The Second Coming of Jesus Christ*, 1996, Richard Ibranyi states that John Paul II is the false prophet but he is still the Pope.

Richard Ibranyi rejected the Sedevacantist position until some time in 1997.

My point is not that one cannot be wrong, for who has not been wrong before? My point is that Richard Ibranyi claims to be an **INSPIRED PROPHET** of God, foretold in the Apocalypse.

{195} Do you believe a truly **INSPIRED PROPHET** would err on crucial, decisive and vital matters?

Richard Ibranyi gives an example, in Exúrge Michaël, issue #4, of the many, many corrections, revisions and reconsiderations he is forever making in his attempt to make his work conform to Catholic doctrine:

My books “Faith Before the Mass,” “Strange Voices, Book One,” “Strange Voices, Book Two,” “Strange Voices, Quick Reference Manual,” have been **substantially** undated, simplified, and **corrected** where needed.

{196} Would a truly **INSPIRED PROPHET** need to correct himself in the books and articles he wrote and in the videos and cassettes he made?

{197} Do you believe God would inspire a truly **INSPIRED PROPHET** immediately with the truth?

{198} Do you agree Richard Ibranyi has very often changed and corrected what he wrote or spoke, even to the point of it being almost a continual process?

{199} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi made corrections to over 50% of his books and articles?

{200} Do you believe many of Richard Ibranyi’s views, teachings and actions were heretical, knowing he had to **substantially** change them to be conformed to Catholic Dogma?

{201} How do you know when the teachings of Richard Ibranyi are Catholic or non-Catholic?

{202} Do you believe it is safe to follow and accept the teachings of a man who is forever changing his belief?

{203} Do you believe that Richard Ibranyi now says that those will go to Hell who attend Traditional Masses, including the Society of Saint Pius X, Indult Masses, Eastern Rite Churches, and Independent Chapels under Antipope John Paul II?

{204} Can anyone remain Catholic and still believe the two Witnesses will take part in non-Catholic services while they fulfill their very important and special duties to lead many back to the **TRUTH**?

{205} Do you conclude as certain that Richard Ibranyi is not the prophet and Witness he claims to be since he took part in non-Catholic services during the time he claimed to be a prophet?

{206} Do you realize why Richard Ibranyi thinks he is a prophet?

{207} Does this explain why he makes the rash judgments and condemnations that he has no authority to make?

{208} Does Richard Ibranyi believe he must do this in order to fulfill his role as a “prophet”?

On Richard Ibranyi’s website under the section: Test and Answers on the Catholic Faith Regarding the Great Apostasy the 16th Q. and A. read thus:

Q. 16 - Can a heretic be elected to the papacy? A. No. If a heretic was elected to be pope his election would be null and void (invalid) and thus he could not be pope. (*Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio*, Pope Paul IV, Feb. 15, 1559)

Please read attentively from Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio by Pope Paul IV, February 15, 1559:

“We declare that if EVER a Bishop, Archbishop, Patriarch or Primate, a Cardinal or a Legate, or even a Sovereign Pope, had, before their elevation to the Cardinalcy or Pontificate, deviated from the Catholic Faith or **FALLEN INTO SOME HERESY**, the promotion or elevation -- even if it had taken place with the unanimous assent of ALL the Cardinals -- **is INVALID and NULL**, without value and one cannot say that it is VALID because the person concerned accepts the Office, receives the Consecration and then enters into possession of the government and administration [of the Office], or by the homage rendered to him by all; **one CANNOT accept him as LEGITIMATE, and NONE of his acts of POWER or ADMINISTRATION may be deemed VALID whether Bishops, Cardinals OR SOVEREIGN POPE.**

ALL their words, deeds and actions, their administration and ALL that proceeds from them -- ALL these are WITHOUT VALUE and have NO AUTHORITY or COMMAND over ANYONE. These men, so promoted and elevated, will by the same fact be DEPRIVED of ALL dignity, place, honor, title and power.”

{209} Do you believe Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio by Pope Paul IV is something **ALL** Catholics accept and believe?

{210} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi teaches the TRUTH or a **HERESY** when he states: “There are no **shepherds**, Catholic bishops or priests. There is not so much as even one! All have gone astray. All have abandoned the Lord”?

{211} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi’s statement means that even if there are men living now who were once validly consecrated Catholic bishops all of them have by now deviated from the Catholic Faith or **FALLEN INTO SOME HERESY**?

{212} Do you believe that even if one of them takes any form of Abjuration Richard Ibranyi approves of, Pope Paul IV gives the Catholic doctrine when he declares **one CANNOT accept him as LEGITIMATE, and NONE of his acts of POWER or ADMINISTRATION may be deemed VALID whether Bishops, Cardinals OR SOVEREIGN POPE**?

{213} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi teaches the **OPPOSITE** of Pope Paul IV?

Review again Richard Ibranyi’s statement: “We do not always have to have a pope, and we do not always even have to have one bishop, but there must always be the possibility of having a pope and Catholic bishops.”

Now review the FACTS.

FACT # 1 - Richard Ibranyi teaches: “There are no **shepherds**, Catholic bishops or priests. There is not so much as even one! All have gone astray. All have abandoned the Lord.”

FACT # 2 - If Richard Ibranyi teaches the **TRUTH** every validly consecrated Catholic bishop has by now deviated from the Catholic Faith or **FALLEN INTO SOME HERESY**. Which means there is not **so much as one** validly consecrated bishop living on earth that is not a heretic!

FACT # 3 - Richard Ibranyi continued: “but there must always be the possibility of having a pope and Catholic bishops.”

FACT # 4 - From all he has written, I assume Richard Ibranyi claims he can us *Epikeia* to do what ever it takes to elevate a non-Catholic **HERETIC** to being a **CATHOLIC** bishop or even a Catholic Pope.

FACT # 5 - Thankfully the Holy Ghost, through Pope Paul IV, told Catholics what the results of Richard Ibranyi's operation would be: "one CANNOT accept him as LEGITIMATE, and NONE of his acts of POWER or ADMINISTRATION may be deemed VALID whether Bishops, Cardinals OR SOVEREIGN POPE."

{214} Do you believe the five facts listed above teach all men, women and children of sound mind and good will that Richard Ibranyi teaches heresy?

Richard Ibranyi made the following response to Patrick Henry: [His followers have taken his lead and told me about the same thing.]

"You teach of a god who is merciless. A god who points out men's SINS, and then leaves them no way to be reconciled through his Catholic Church. Your teaching leaves the readers in DESPAIR and HOPLESSNESS."

How much **HOPE** do they have who accept Richard Ibranyi as their personal savior?

FACT #1 - Richard Ibranyi claims to be the Witness and Prophet without any concrete proof he is anything except a **SELF**-appointed Witness.

FACT #2 - Richard Ibranyi, and at least some of his followers, say it is NECESSARY to invoke *Epikieia* and take the Abjuration before you can be in the state of Sanctifying Grace, if you were a member of any non-Catholic sect.

FACT #3 - Richard Ibranyi teaches those who take his Abjuration: "You **MUST** now GO TO CONFES-SION in order to be forgiven in the internal forum (for your soul to be in a state of sanctifying grace)."

FACT #4 - Richard Ibranyi teaches: "There are no shepherds, Catholic bishops or priests. There is not so much as even one! All have gone astray. All have abandoned the Lord. Therefore, there is no Holy Mass, presided over by a Catholic priest, which a Catholic can attend."

FACT #5 - Pope Paul IV teaches that even if Richard Ibranyi's non-Catholic bishops should repent, "ALL their words, deeds and actions, their administration and ALL that proceeds from them -- ALL these are **WITHOUT VALUE** and have NO AUTHORITY or COMMAND over ANYONE. These men, so promoted and elevated, will by the same fact be DEPRIVED of ALL dignity, place, honor, title and **power**."

FACT #6 - God's Infallible Church teaches Catholic bishops and priests are NECESSARY for sacramental **ABSOLUTION** in the Sacrament of **Confession!**

{215} Do you believe the conclusion follows: If Richard Ibranyi teaches the **TRUTH**, he and his followers could not regain sanctifying grace?

{216} Do you believe those who accept Richard Ibranyi's statement: "You teach of a god who is merciless. A god who points out men's SINS, and then leaves them no way to be reconciled through his Catholic Church. Your teaching leaves the readers in DESPAIR and HOPLESSNESS." applies to their belief in its fullness?

"Not to oppose error, is to approve it, and indeed to neglect to confound evil men, when we can do it, is no less a sin than to encourage them."

{217} Do you believe Pope St. Felix III (483-492) teaches the truth in the preceding sentence?

Richard Ibranyi sent the following, via email, to some people October 3, 2001.

St. Theresa of the Little Child Jesus, pray for us!

To Whom It May Concern:

Patrick Henry was personally delivered the attached accusation (Richard Ibranyi's letter as found at the beginning of this letter, dated September 21, 2001 – P.H.) against him, at his house in Arizona. It was delivered by Ron Elmy and Oldrich Tomanek nine days previous to October 2, 2001, with the

warning that I would post it up on my website if he did not respond, or responded incorrectly. As of yet he has been totally silent and it is ten day since. I will now make this public to you few that this email has been sent to, along with the charges against him that are attached in a Word 2000 document. I will give him another ten days, and will post it as soon as I return from a trip out of town, sometime after October 11. If he either does not respond, or responds and persists in his schismatic and heretical teachings, it will be posted.

May Jesus, through the Sorrowful and Immaculate Heart of Mary, grant Patrick the grace he needs to repent, convert, and take a specific abjuration, in order for him to have a hope to save his soul.

Soli Deo Gloria
Richard Joseph Michael Ibranyi
"To Jesus through Mary"

Consider well Richard Ibranyi's last paragraph.

May Jesus, through the Sorrowful and Immaculate Heart of Mary, grant Patrick the grace he needs to repent, convert, and take a **specific abjuration**, in order for him to **have a hope** to save his soul.

{218} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi is again putting forth his belief that it is **IMPOSSIBLE** for anyone today to **save** their Soul without taking a **specific abjuration**?

{219} Do you believe sinners can have perfect contrition for their sins before they take a **specific abjuration**?

{220} Do you believe sinners can have perfect contrition for their sins before they receive absolution during Sacramental Confession?

{221} Do you believe Almighty God can forgive every sin, censure and excommunication without the use of Sacramental Confession or absolution from any bishop or priest if the sinner has true and perfect contrition?

{222} Do you believe baptized Catholics who fell away from the Faith can be forgiven and have their soul in the state of sanctifying grace before they take some version of the Abjuration?

{223} If you answer yes to Q. 222, are they in the Church or out of the Church in the external forum?

{224} If you answer yes to Q. 222, will you explain why Richard Ibranyi and some of his followers insist on the necessity of taking his form of the Abjuration?

{225} Do you believe baptized Catholics who fell away from the Faith can be forgiven and have their soul in the state of sanctifying grace **WITHOUT** the use of *Epikeia*?

{226} Do you believe baptized Catholics who fell away from the Faith can be actually **absolved** by the **SOLE, SOLITARY and EXCLUSIVE** use of ***Epikeia***?

Let us join St. Francis De Sales, and accept the teaching of this great Doctor of the Catholic Church. We read in *The Catholic Controversy* by St. Frances de Sales 1567-1622. Translated by Rev. Henry Benedict Mackey O.S.B. Under the direction of Right Rev. John Cuthbert Hedley, O.S.B. Bishop of Newport and Menevia. Tan Books & Publishers. (See page 26)

"He then who would be so rash as to boast of extraordinary mission without immediately producing miracles, deserves to be taken for an imposter. Now it is a fact neither the first nor the **last** ministers have worked a single miracle: therefore they have no **extraordinary mission.**"

{227} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi teaches there are no bishops or a pope that ever gave him a Mission?

{228} Do you believe therefore since Richard Ibranyi claims to have an **extraordinary mission**?

{229} Do you believe St. Francis De Sales, a great Doctor of the Church, states the Catholic belief?

{230} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi deserves to be taken for an imposter?

The previous quote was provided from the book published by Tan Books & Publishers. Let us reflect on the 4th Chapter taken from an older copy of this important book.

From the Library of St. Francis De Sales

III. The Catholic Controversy

Benziger Brother = 1909

CHAPTER IV.

“AN ANSWER TO THE TWO OBJECTIONS WHICH ARE MADE BY THE SUPPORTERS OF THE THEORY OF IMMEDIATE MISSION.

I have not been able hitherto to find but two objections amongst your masters to this reasoning which I have just made, one of which is taken from the example of Our Lord and the Apostles, the other from the example of the Prophets.

And as to the first—tell me, I pray, do you think it right to place in comparison the vocation of these new ministers and that of Our Lord? Had not Our Lord been prophesied as the Messiah? —had not His time been determined by Daniel? —did He do a single action which had not been described almost exactly in the books of the Prophets, and prefigured in the Patriarchs? He changed the Mosaic Law from good into better; —but had not this change been predicted? He consequently changed the Aaronic priesthood into that of Melchisedech, far better is not all this according to the ancient testimonies? Your ministers have not been prophesied as preachers of the word of God, nor the time of their coming, nor a single one of their actions.

They have made a revolution in the Church much greater and bolder than Our Lord made in the synagogue; for they have taken all away, only putting back certain shadows: but testimonies to this effect have they none. At any rate they should not elude their obligation of bringing forward miracles in support of such a change, whatever pretext you may draw from the Scriptures, since our Lord dispensed NOT Himself from this, as I have shown above. But whence will they show me that the Church was ever to receive another form, or a like reformation to the one which our Lord made?

And as to the Prophets, I see many persons under a delusion. It is supposed that all the vocations of the Prophets were extraordinary and immediate. A false idea: for there were colleges and congregations of the Prophets approved by the Synagogue, as may be gathered from many passages of the Scriptures. There were such in Ramathia, in Bethel, in Jericho where Eliseus dwelt, on Mount Ephraim, in Samaria; Eliseus himself was anointed by Heli; the vocation of Samuel was recognized and approved by the High Priest; and with Samuel the Lord began to appear again in Silo, as says the Scripture: whence the Jews regard Samuel as the founder of the congregations of Prophets.

It is supposed that all those who prophesied exercised the office of preaching; —which is not true, as appears from what occurred with the officers of Saul and with Saul himself: in such sort that the vocation of the Prophets has no bearing on that of heretics or schismatics. For (1.) it was either ordinary, as we have shown above, or else approved by the remainder of the Synagogue, as is easy to see in their BEING IMMEDIATELY RECOGNIZED, and in their being HIGHLY esteemed EVERYWHERE amongst the Jews, who called them “men of God:” and he who will attentively examine the history of that ancient Synagogue will see that the office of priests was as common among them as that of preachers amongst us. (2.) Never can be pointed out Prophet who wished to overthrow the ordinary power; on the contrary, all followed it, and spoke nothing contrary to the doctrine of those who sat upon the chair of Moses and of Aaron; indeed, some of them were of the priestly race, as Jeremias son of Helcias, and Ezechiel son of Buzi. They have always spoken with honour of the priests and the sacerdotal succession, though they have reprehended their lives. Isaias, when about to write in a great book which was shown him, took Urias the priest, though the things were yet to come, and Zacharias the prophet as witnesses, as if he were taking the testimony of all the Priests and Prophets. And does not Malachy bear witness that *the lips of the priest shall keep knowledge,*

and they shall seek the law at his mouth: because he is the Angel of the Lord of hosts? —so far were they from ever having withdrawn the Jews from the communion of the Ordinary. (3.) **How many miracles did the Prophets work in confirmation of the prophetic vocation?** I should never end if I were to enter upon the computation of these: but at such times as they did a thing which had an appearance of EXTRAORDINARY power, **immediately miracles followed.** Witness Elias, who, setting up an altar on Mount Carmel according to the instinct which the Holy Spirit had given him, and offering sacrifice, **showed by miracle** that he did it to the honour of God and of the Jewish religion. (4.) And finally, it would well become your ministers to usurp the power of the Prophets—they who have never had either their gift or their light! It should rather be for us to do so; — for us, who could bring forward an infinity of Prophets on our side. For instance, S. Gregory Thaumaturgus, on the authority of S. Basil; S. Anthony, on the testimony of Athanasius; the Abbot John, on the testimony of S. Augustine; S. Benedict, S. Bernard, S. Francis, and a thousand others. If, then, there is question between us of the prophetic authority, this is on our side, be it ordinary or be it extraordinary, since we have the reality; not with your ministers, who have never given the shadow of a proof of its possession; — unless they would call a prophecy Zwingle’s vision in the book called, *Subsidium de Eucharistid*, and the book entitled *Querela Lutherii*, or the prediction he made in the twenty-fifth year of this century that if he preached two years more there would remain no Pope, nor priests, nor monks, nor belfries, nor mass. Truly there is but one defect in this prophecy—**just want of truth.** For he preached nigh twenty-two years longer, and yet there are still found priests and belfries, and in the chair of Peter sits a lawful Pope.

Your first ministers then, gentlemen, are of the prophets whom God forbade to be heard, in Jeremias: Harken not to the words of the prophets that prophesy to you and deceive you: they speak a vision of their own heart and not out of the mouth of the Lord. . . . **I did not send prophets, yet they ran: I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied** . . . I have heard what the prophets said, that prophecy lies in my name, and say, I have dreamed, I have dreamed. Does it not seem to you that it is Zwingle and Luther, with their prophecies and visions? That it is Carlostadt, with his revelation which he pretended to have had about the Lord’s Supper, and which gave occasion to Luther to write his book *Contra scelestos prophetas*. At any rate they certainly possess this property of not having been sent; it is they who use their tongues, and say, The Lord saith it. **For they can never prove any right to the office which they usurp; they can never produce any legitimate vocation.** And how then shall they preach? One cannot enroll oneself under any captain without the approval of one’s prince: how then were you so ready to engage yourselves under the command of these first ministers, without the permission of your ordinary pastors, and so far as to leave the state in which you were born and bred, which is the Catholic Church? They are guilty of having made this disturbance by their own authority, and you of having followed them, **in which you are inexcusable.** The good little Samuel, humble, gentle, and holy, having been called thrice by God, thought all the time that it was Heli who was calling him, and only at the fourth time addressed himself to God as to the one calling him. It has seemed to your ministers that God has thrice called them, (1.) by peoples and magistrates; (2.) by our bishops; (3.) by his extraordinary voice. No, no Let them not bring this forward, that Samuel was called thrice by God, and in his humility thought it was a call by man, until, instructed by Heli, he knew that it was the divine voice. Your ministers, gentlemen, allege three vocations of GOD, by secular magistrates, by the bishops, and by His extraordinary voice. They think that it is GOD who has called them in those three ways: but you do not find that when they are instructed by the Church they acknowledge that theirs is a vocation of man, and **that their ears have tingled to the old Adam**; by no means do they submit the question to him who, as Heli did, now presides in the Church.

Such then is the first reason which makes your ministers **and you also inexcusable**, though unequally so, before God and men in having left the Church.

On the contrary, gentlemen, the Church, who contradicted and opposed your first ministers, **and still opposes those of the present day**, is so clearly marked on all sides that no one, blind as he may be, can pretend that his is a case of ignorance of the duty which all good Christians owe her, or that she is not the true, sole,

inseparable, and dearest Spouse of the heavenly King, which makes the separation from her all the more inexcusable. For, to leave the Church and disregard her commands is evermore to become a heathen and a publican, let it be at the persuasion of an angel or a seraph. But, at the persuasion of men who were sinners on the largest scale against other private persons, **who were without authority, without approval, without any quality required in preachers or prophets save the mere knowledge of certain sciences**, to break all the ties of the most religious obligation of obedience which is in the world, namely, that which is owing to the Church as Spouse of our Lord! —this is a fault which cannot be covered **save by a great repentance and penitence**—to which I invite you on the part of the living God.”

St. Francis De Sales provides ample evidence that anyone (such as Richard Ibranyi who is the **last** one I have head about) who claims an **extraordinary Mission** should be **IMMEDIATELY RECOGNIZED!** “At such times as they did a thing which had an appearance of extraordinary power, **immediately miracles followed.**”

{231} As soon as Richard Ibranyi claimed to be one of the two Witnesses, which is an extraordinary Mission, do you believe **immediately miracles should have followed?** What does St. Francis say about self-appointed, false prophets and those who followed them? “They are guilty of having made this disturbance **by their own authority**, and you of having followed them, **in which you are inexcusable.**”

{232} If you believe Richard Ibranyi teaches only the **TRUTH** and has an extraordinary Mission from God, will you **PLEASE prove it!**

{233} Do you believe some words of Scripture would apply to Richard Ibranyi as a self-proclaimed Witness: “*Thou giveth testimony of thyself, thy testimony is NOT true*”?

{234} Do you believe those who believe Richard Ibranyi is one of the two Witnesses hold beliefs **CONTRARY** to many of the Doctors and Fathers of the Church?

{235} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi teaches the **OPPOSITE** of Saint Francis De Sales, a Doctor of the Church?

On his website under the section: Test and Answers on the Catholic Faith, Richard Ibranyi gives question 46 and his answer:

“46. When there is no access to a pope can a Catholic bishop consecrate bishops without an explicit papal mandate?

A. Yes. When there is no access to a pope a Catholic bishop can consecrate bishops in an emergency situation.”

The following information is found in Richard Ibranyi’s work titled: RJMI, Fr. Egregyi, and Patrick Henry Debate:

Episcopal Consecrations & Ordinations:

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 ipso 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 *Epikēia* 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 *Epikēia*. 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?

{236} Do you believe that a **non-Catholic** cannot apply to any of the Church laws, let alone *Epikēia*?

{237} Do you believe that **BEFORE** Richard Ibranyi and his followers took his Abjuration that they were non-Catholics or Catholics?

{238} Do you believe that **AFTER** Richard Ibranyi and his followers took his Abjuration that they were non-Catholics or Catholics?

{239} Do you believe any laws of the Church apply to non-Catholics, although Richard Ibranyi teaches that non-Catholics cannot apply to any of the Church laws?

Study more from *Ad Apostolorum Principis*, Pope Pius XII, June 29, 1958:

Bishops and the Holy See

“38. For it has been clearly and expressly laid down in the canons that it pertains to the one Apostolic See to judge whether a person is fit for the dignity and burden of the episcopacy, and that complete freedom in the nomination of bishops is the right of the Roman Pontiff. But if, as happens at times, some persons or groups are permitted to participate in the selection of an Episcopal candidate, this is lawful **ONLY** if the APOSTOLIC SEE has allowed it in express terms and in each particular case for clearly defined persons or groups, the conditions and circumstances being very plainly determined.

39. Granted this **exception**, it follows that bishops who have been neither named or confirmed by the Apostolic See, but who, on the contrary, have been elected and consecrated in defiance of its express orders, **enjoy no powers** of teaching or of jurisdiction since **JURISDICTION passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff** as We admonished in the Encyclical Letter *Mystic Corporis* in the Following Words: “...As far as his own diocese is concerned each (bishop) feeds the flock entrusted to him as a true shepherd and rules it in the name of Christ. Yet in exercising this office they are not altogether independent but are subordinate to the lawful authority of the Roman Pontiff, although enjoying ordinary power of jurisdiction which they receive directly from the same Supreme Pontiff.”

{240} Do you believe it should be obvious that none of the Bishops consecrated in the line of Archbishops Thuc and Lefebvre are confirmed by the Apostolic See?

{241} Do you believe not one of them **enjoys** Episcopal **powers** of teaching?

{242} Do you believe Pope Pius XII provides here the proof that none of them have jurisdiction since **JURISDICTION passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff?**

{243} Do you believe without Jurisdiction they do **NOT** have Apostolicity, the Fourth Mark of the Church founded by Jesus Christ?

40. And when We later addressed to you the letter *Adsinarum gentem*, We again referred to this teaching in these words: “The power of JURISDICTION which is conferred directly by **DIVINE**

RIGHT on the Supreme Pontiff comes to bishops by that **SAME RIGHT**, but only through the successor of Peter, to whom not only the faithful but also **all bishops** are bound to be **constantly** subject and to adhere both the reverence of obedience and by the bond of unity.”

NOTE WELL: {244} Do you believe all Jurisdiction comes to the Pope and Bishops by **DIVINE RIGHT**?
{245} Do you believe all Jurisdiction comes to Bishops **ONLY THROUGH** the successor of Peter?

41. Acts requiring the power of Holy Orders which are performed by ecclesiastics of this kind, though they are valid as long as the consecration conferred on them was valid, **are yet gravely illicit, that is, criminal and SACRILEGIOUS.**

{246} Do you believe the Holy Ghost was protecting Pope Pius XII from teaching error when the above paragraph was written?

{247} Can you read the message given through Pope Pius XII and still convince yourself the consecrations coming from Archbishops Thuc & Lefebvre can take place **without SIN AND SACRILEGE**?

{248} Do you believe the end NEVER justifies the means! It is never permitted to commit any sin?

42. To such conduct the warning words of the Divine Teacher fittingly apply: “ *He who enters not by the door into the sheep fold, but climbs up another way, is a thief and a robber.*” The sheep indeed know the true shepherd's voice. “*But a stranger they will not follow, but will flee from him, because they do not know the voice of strangers.*”

The Vatican Council

45. Well known are the terms of the Vatican Council's **SOLEMN** definition: “Relying on the open testimony of the Scriptures and abiding by the wise and clear decrees both of our predecessors, the Roman Pontiffs, and the general Councils, We renew the definition of the Ecumenical Council of Florence, by virtue of which all the faithful **MUST** believe that ‘the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff hold primacy over the whole world, and the Roman Pontiff himself is the Successor of the Blessed Peter and continues to be the true Vicar of Christ and head of the whole Church, the father and teacher of all Christians, and to him in blessed Peter our Lord Jesus Christ committed the full power of caring for, ruling, and governing the Universal Church...’

46. “We Teach... We declare that the Roman Church by the Providence of God holds the primacy of ordinary power over all others, and that this power of JURISDICTION, of the Roman Pontiff, which is truly Episcopal, is immediate. Toward it, the pastors and the faithful of whatever rite, and dignity, both individually and collectively, are bound by the duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, not only in matters which pertain to faith and morals, but also in those which concern the **discipline** and **government** of the Church spread throughout the whole world, in such a way that once the unity of communion and the profession of the **SAME** Faith has been preserved with the Roman Pontiff, there is **ONE** flock of the Church of Christ under one supreme shepherd. **This is the teaching of the Catholic truth from which no one can depart without loss of faith and salvation.**”

47. From what We have said, it follows that no authority whatsoever, save that which is proper to the Supreme Pastor, can render void the canonical appointment granted to any bishop; **that no person or group, whether of priests or 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 is being seriously attacked, AN 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.

{249} Did you NOTE WELL it is the **UNITY of the Catholic Church** that is being seriously attacked?

WAKE UP, DEAR FRIEND, WAKE UP! Through Pope Pius XII, the Holy Ghost tells us the First Mark of the Catholic Church is **SERIOUSLY ATTACKED** when Thuc and Lefebvre consecrated bishops without the mandate of the Apostolic See. Without **UNITY** there is no Catholic Church!

{250} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi teaches the **TRUTH** when he states: “**EPIKEIA ALSO APPLIES TO EPISCOPAL CONSECRATIONS AND PRIESTLY ORDINATIONS**”?

{251} Do you believe *Epikieia* can be applied to destroy the **unity** of the Church?

{252} Do you accept the TRUE FACT that Thuc and Lefebvre and ALL those bishops coming from them do NOT have UNITY with the Catholic Church and are EXCOMMUNICATED?

{253} If you answer no, please explain why?

{254} If they are excommunicated and the sects they started are NOT the Catholic Church, because they do NOT have all four Marks of the Catholic Church, why do you have anything to do with them?

If Richard Ibranyi and/or his followers continue to teach “**EPIKEIA ALSO APPLIES TO EPISCOPAL CONSECRATIONS AND PRIESTLY ORDINATIONS**” let us find out when *Epikieia* **FIRST** began to apply to **EPISCOPAL CONSECRATIONS**.

{255} If a Bishop consecrated another Bishop without a papal mandate three days before Pope Pius XII died, would they commit Sacrilege and be excommunicated? {256} If you answer no, please explain why?

{257} If a Bishop consecrated another Bishop without a papal mandate three days after Pope Pius XII died, would they commit Sacrilege and be excommunicated? {258} If you answer no, please explain why?

{259} If a Bishop consecrated another Bishop without a papal mandate three months after Pope Pius XII died, would they commit Sacrilege and be excommunicated? {260} If you answer no, please explain why?

{261} If a Bishop consecrated another Bishop without a papal mandate three years after Pope Pius XII died, would they commit Sacrilege and be excommunicated? {262} If you answer no, please explain why?

{263} If a Bishop consecrated another Bishop without a papal mandate seven years after Pope Pius XII died, would they commit Sacrilege and be excommunicated? {264} If you answer no, please explain why?

{265} If a Bishop consecrated another Bishop without a papal mandate ten years after Pope Pius XII died, would they commit Sacrilege and be excommunicated? {266} If you answer no, please explain why?

{267} If a Bishop consecrated another Bishop without a papal mandate fifteen years after Pope Pius XII died, would they commit Sacrilege and be excommunicated? {268} If you answer no, please explain why?

{269} If a Bishop consecrated another Bishop without a papal mandate thirty years after Pope Pius XII died, would they commit Sacrilege and be excommunicated? {270} If you answer no, please explain why?

{271} Will you Please give an **exact** date, with your explanation, when Bishops were permitted to consecrate other Bishops without a papal mandate since the death of Pope Pius XII.

{272} If you cannot give an **exact** date and truly justifiable reasons for the change, then why do you accept the belief of Richard Ibranyi, and many members in the Traditional Movement, that Bishops may now consecrate other Bishops without a Papal Mandate?

{273} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi and the many members in the Traditional Movement will have **UNITY** in their answers to the questions in this section?

{274} Do you believe there is **UNITY** in the Novus Ordo church?

{275} Do you believe there is **UNITY** in the Traditional Movement churches?

{276} Do you believe there is **UNITY** in the Richard Ibranyi church?

{277} Do you believe Richard Ibranyi and all his followers will answer all the essential, vital, crucial, and decisive questions in **THIS LETTER** with the same answer?

{278} Can those who believe everything the Council of Trent taught, believe that Bishops and priests without Jurisdiction can absolve you?

{279} If you believe everything the Council of Trent taught, how could you believe Bishops and priests without Jurisdiction can found Religious Congregations and accept Religious Vows in the name of the Church?

{280} If you believe everything the Council of Trent taught, is it possible to accept and believe the Novus Ordo church is the true Church?

{281} If you believe everything the Council of Trent taught, is it possible to accept and believe the Traditional Movement churches are the true Church?

{282} If you do not believe everything the Council of Trent taught could you **TRUTHFULLY** claim to be a Catholic?

“An error which is not resisted is approved; a truth which is not defended is suppressed.”

{283} Do you believe Pope Leo XIII, *Inimica Vis*, taught an important lesson in the preceding sentence?

People want to know where Catholic Bishops are at this time, since the True Church is also **VISIBLE**. On the first Pentecost Sunday 99 and 9/10th percent of the world's population could NOT tell anyone where there was a Catholic Bishop.

{284} Was the Church Visible? There were ten Bishops living plus a True Pope and thousands of lay people. Not ONE person in America, Africa or Rome knew where to find a Catholic Bishop and the visible Church; but nevertheless It **DID EXIST!**

There were millions of people living in North, Central and South America before 1492. Yet not ONE of them could tell anyone else where a Catholic Bishop existed.

{285} Did that mean there were NO Catholic Bishops living when Christopher Columbus and some Catholic Priests walked on American soil for the first time in 1492?

Thousands of Catholics lived in Japan during the great persecution there. Not one percent of them could tell his neighbor when a Catholic Bishop would be in their area for Confirmation and Ordinations.

{286} Does that mean NO Catholic Bishops existed on earth?

{287} Was the Church still visible?

{288} Can you tell me the names, and where they lived, of fifty or ten or even five **TRUE CATHOLIC** Bishops that were living during the worst part of the Arian heresy?

{289} Do you believe St. Athanasius always knew where a true Catholic Bishop and the visible Church existed?

{290} Do you believe not **ONE PERCENT** of his flock knew where St. Athanasius was at 90 percent of that time? Read the Lessons in the Divine Office for his feast. You will learn St. Athanasius was **IN HIDING MUCH OF THE TIME TO SAVE HIS LIFE.**

{291} Do you believe St. Athanasius did the Holy Will of God by remaining **IN HIDING?**

{292} Do you believe St. Athanasius in anyway defected from the Faith or ceased to be a Catholic Bishop because he remained in **HIDING?** If you answer yes to this last question, please explain how and when he was received back into the Catholic Church.

{293} Do you believe there are truly Catholic bishops living today with an Office, Jurisdiction and Mission who have never defected from the Faith or ceased to be Catholic Bishops although they remain in **HIDING?**

{294} Do you believe that during the Arian heresy 80 % to 90 % of the Catholic Bishops left the Church? The Holy Ghost told us in the Bible that during the **GREAT APOSTASY** there would be a great falling away!

{295} If 80 to 90 percent fell away into the Arian heresy, how many **CATHOLIC** Bishops do you expect to see every day during **THE GREAT APOSTASY?**

{296} Is it obvious there are more **TRADITIONALIST MOVEMENT** “Bishops” visibly present throughout the world today than there were Catholic Bishops visible during the Arian heresy?

{297} Do you believe we are living during the time of **THE GREAT APOSTASY**, if all of the Traditionalist Movement “Bishops” are **TRULY CATHOLIC?**

{298} Do you believe Patrick Henry is a Schismatic and Heretic as Richard Ibranyi taught at the beginning of this letter?

{299} Do you believe St. Thomas teaches correctly when he says: “The truth only hurts those living in error”?

{300} Do you believe Jesus, Mary and St. Joseph desire you to share this letter with others?

May the Divine assistance remain **ALWAYS** with us. Amen.

Note added January 4, 2009: The above letter was sent to Richard Ibranyi and his followers as explained toward the beginning of this letter. To this day, Richard has never answered any of the 300 questions or had the courage to post this letter with his answers on his website. Note my change of address below from what it was in 2001. I invite you to visit <http://www.JMJsite.com> for much other information. Thank you.

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen. (The last words in the bible – Apocalypse 22: 21).

In Jesus, Mary, and St. Joseph,

Patrick Henry
Holy Family Publications
7350 S. Highway 191, Apt. 4
Safford, AZ 85546
928-468-3295
JMJ@JMJsit.com
www.JMJsite.com