

Patrick,

Recently I have reread your article from December 8, 2023 concerning the lack of jurisdiction of all traditionalist and sedevacantist bishops and priests. I noticed a typo in the article when you cite the book *Supplied Jurisdiction According to Canon 209*. For instance, on page 6 you cite a quote from p. 168 of the book; however, in the article you have it as p. 68.

While we're on the topic of jurisdiction, what are Catholics who stay at home supposed to do about the sacraments, especially when we are in danger of death? If we cannot receive validly the Sacrament of Confession or of the Eucharist, or Extreme Unction, what of our souls? Sometimes I am fearful that by staying at home, I am putting my soul in danger. But where can we go? So, at the point of death, is there any clergy we can confess to and receive Last Rites? Perhaps from an Eastern Catholic priest, or even from a schismatic Orthodox priest? Or do we go it alone? I trust in God's mercy and in the Blessed Virgin Mary's intercession and in perfect contrition for my sins, but sometimes I do get scared. Please advise.

††† Jesus Mary Joseph †††

Our Lady of the Miraculous Medal, pray for us.

November 27, 2025

Friend,

Praise be Jesus, Mary, and St. Joseph now and forever. Thank you for the notification about the wrong page number. Your next paragraph about the reception of the sacraments from Traditional Movement clerics, an Eastern Catholic priest, or even from a schismatic Orthodox priest, especially at the point of death, requires much prayer, study, and correspondence with the grace of God. Therefore, trusting that we have spent time in very serious prayer, let us begin by studying, examining, and pondering these facts and teachings of the Catholic Church.

Apostolic Mission and Jurisdiction

Why the Traditionalist Movement's Position is Theologically and Canonically Unsound

Introduction

The Catholic Church has always taught that the sacramental life of the faithful depends upon the divinely instituted hierarchy. The bishops, in communion with the Roman Pontiff, are successors of the Apostles in both power of order and power of jurisdiction. The priesthood, while it confers the ability to consecrate the Eucharist and absolve sins in principle, requires jurisdiction from the Church in order to exercise the latter validly. For this reason, the Magisterium has consistently condemned the notion that episcopal consecration alone, apart from canonical mission, is sufficient for legitimate apostolic succession or for valid jurisdiction in the tribunal of penance.

In recent decades, members of the Traditionalist Movement – such as the CMRI, SGG, SSPX, and similar groups – have claimed that their priests and bishops, although lacking canonical mission from the Pope, may nevertheless validly absolve sins and provide sacramental ministry on the basis of epikeia, supplied jurisdiction (c. 209, 2261 §2, 1917 Code), or an extraordinary divine mandate that they speak of as the *Mission of the Church jurisdiction*. Yet the authoritative teaching of the Popes, the Councils, Doctors of the Church, and the approved theologians demonstrates that such claims are theologically and canonically unsound.

This article will examine the magisterial texts and the testimony of approved authors, showing why the Traditionalist argument collapses under Catholic doctrine.

1. Orders vs. Jurisdiction

St. Thomas Aquinas clearly distinguished between the *power of order*, which all priests receive in ordination, and the *power of jurisdiction*, which only the lawful pastors of the Church possess:

“Some distinguish between the key of Orders, which all priests have, and the key of Jurisdiction in the tribunal of judgment, which none have but the judges of the external tribunal. Nevertheless, God bestowed both on Peter (Matt. XVI, 19), from whom they are derived by others, whichever of them they have.”¹

Thus, while ordination gives the power to absolve in principle, actual exercise **requires jurisdiction granted by authority**. This distinction is foundational for the Church's canonical tradition.

{1} Do you agree that, in addition to a valid ordination, the Catholic Church requires that the priest or bishop must have jurisdiction **granted by authority** in order to be able to absolve sins?

2. The Teaching of the Magisterium

The Church's magisterium has repeatedly affirmed that bishops and priests cannot exercise jurisdiction apart from papal mandate.

a. Pope Pius XII in the encyclical letter, *Ad Sinarum gentem*

"The power of jurisdiction...comes to bishops...only through the successor of Peter."

b. Pope Pius XII, *Ad Apostolorum Principis* (1958)

Pope Pius XII condemned illicit episcopal consecrations, teaching:

"Bishops who have been neither named nor 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."²

c. Pope Leo XIII, in *Satis Cognitum* (1896), teaches that no apostle, no priest, no bishop has mission or jurisdiction independently of Peter and the unity of the Apostolic See:

"...there is nothing to show that the Apostles received supreme power without Peter and against Peter. Such power they certainly did not receive from Jesus Christ."

This confirms the principle: **jurisdiction flows through Peter.**

These declarations are unambiguous: episcopal consecration alone, even if valid, confers no jurisdiction.

{2} Do you agree that the Magisterium teaches infallibly: (a) Jurisdiction passes to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff, and (b) Such power of jurisdiction clerics certainly do not receive directly from Jesus Christ or through any *Mission of the Church*, without this jurisdiction passing to bishops only through the Roman Pontiff?

d. The Oath Against Modernism (St. Pius X, 1910)

Saint Pope Pius X required clergy to call upon God as their Witness and to avow, declare, and insist that they believe it is heretical and a misrepresentation to teach that dogmas ever evolve or change:

"I sincerely hold that the doctrine of faith was handed down to us from the Apostles through the orthodox Fathers in exactly the same meaning and always in the same purport. Therefore, I entirely reject the heretical misrepresentation that dogmas evolve and change..."³

{3} Do you agree that the claim that the *Mission of the Church* supplies jurisdiction in an "emergency" independently of the Apostolic See represents precisely such an evolution of doctrine, contrary to the Church's constant infallible teaching?

3. Approved Theologians and Apologists

Catholic theologians and apologists consistently affirm that apostolicity requires both order and jurisdiction.

a. Fathers Devivier & Sasia, *Christian Apologetics* (1924)

"A Christian society whose bishops go back to the Apostles only through the power of order, and not also through the power of jurisdiction, cannot claim to be apostolic, and consequently cannot be the Church of Christ."⁴

b. Father Thomas Cox, *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth* (1900)

"Even if valid orders exist, where jurisdiction is lacking there is no real Apostolicity. Schism, as well as heresy, destroys apostolic succession."⁵

c. Father Schulze, *Manual of Pastoral Theology* (1923)

"Jurisdiction rests with the hierarchy – the Pope, as head of the Church, and the bishops in their respective dioceses. This jurisdiction the bishop does not obtain through episcopal consecration; it is conveyed to him by the authority of the Holy See in the Apostolic brief appointing him... A priest by his ordination has no jurisdiction."⁶

d. Dom Guéranger, *The Liturgical Year*

"All spiritual authority comes from Peter; all comes from the bishop of Rome, in whom Peter will continue to govern the Church to the end of time."⁷

{4} Do you agree that even if some Traditional Movement bishops and priests received valid Orders, jurisdiction is lacking because not one bishop in the Traditional Movement living today received jurisdiction through a lawful successor of Saint Peter?

{5} Do you agree that the correct Catholic theology teaches that a Christian society whose bishops go back to the Apostles only through the power of order, and not also through the power of jurisdiction received through a lawful successor of Peter, consequently cannot be the Church of Christ?

{6} Do you agree that the NEW teachings of Rev. Anthony Cekada and CMRI found on their website, “The jurisdiction we traditional Catholic priests possess has been *delegated* to us from Christ Himself” and “Those whom Our Lord has bound by divine law to confer sacraments, then, simultaneously receive from Him the *legitimate deputation* and the *apostolic mission* to confer them” are nothing less than the pretension to an *extraordinary mission* independent of apostolic authority?

On page 167 from *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth*, we read more concerning other things necessary to belong to the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church founded by Jesus Christ:

“The pretension to an **extraordinary mission**, independent of apostolic AUTHORITY, by would-be guides of mankind, is but one phase of a human insanity that is more common than many of us have any idea of.”

We read in *The Catholic Controversy* by St. Francis de Sales:

“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.”

{7} Do you agree that it is a fact that although each and every one of them is duty-bound, compelled, and obligated to produce miracles immediately, not even one bishop or priest in the entire Traditional Movement has worked a single miracle, and therefore they have no extraordinary mission?

{8} Do you agree that, therefore, it is a lie, falsehood, and deception to teach that they receive this extraordinary *mission of the Church jurisdiction*?

4. Canon Law and the Limits of Supplied Jurisdiction

Traditionalists often appeal to Canon 209 and §2 of Canon 2261 of the 1917 Code. Yet authoritative commentators make clear that these provisions apply only to clergy already possessing canonical mission or acting within the visible unity of the Church – not to those entirely outside it.

Canon 209: jurisdiction is supplied by the Church “for the common good” **only** in cases of common **error** or positive doubt. It presupposes a cleric lawfully deputed in some way, not one wholly without mission.

The clerics have publicly, openly, and visibly taught the truth **many** times that none of them possess ordinary or delegated jurisdiction, and therefore, **Canon 209 cannot supply jurisdiction for them**. There is abundant proof, in their own words, from public YouTube videos of public talks and conferences, where the bishops and priests of the Traditional Movement explain that Traditional Movement bishops have never received ordinary or delegated jurisdiction. If the bishops have never received ordinary jurisdiction, it is impossible for any priest to receive delegated jurisdiction from them.

{9} Do you agree that there cannot be a common error or positive doubt left among the clerics or laity of the Traditional Movement when they are repeatedly taught in writing and in public talks that no one in the Traditional Movement had ordinary or delegated jurisdiction?

Canon 2261 §2: permits the faithful to request the sacraments from an excommunicate *toleratus* when necessity urges, **but does not grant jurisdiction to clerics who never had it or lost it through schism**.

Also, Fr. Riley explains:

“Epikieia can excuse the individual from the precept, but it **can never confer the capacity to act**. Epikieia **cannot bestow** upon him the power which he does not now possess, nor can epikieia restore the power which the law has withdrawn.”⁸

{10} Do you agree that thus, neither epikieia, nor supplied jurisdiction, nor *the Mission of the Church*, nor emergency circumstances, can create apostolic mission ex nihilo (from or out of nothing)?

5. The Ecclesiological Consequence

It is a fact that the Traditionalist Movement claims jurisdiction apart from Peter, thereby implicitly denying the very structure of the Church. As *Christian Apologetics* concludes, such a society **cannot** claim to be the Church of Christ. By their own admission, Traditionalist bishops lack a canonical mission from the Apostolic See; therefore, however valid their orders may be, they lack Apostolicity.

{11} Do you agree that Apostolicity is one of the four characteristic marks of the Catholic Church, and every sect lacking Apostolicity is non-Catholic?

{12} Do you agree that all branches of the Traditional Movement lack this *necessary* canonical mission and jurisdiction from the Apostolic See, making the entire Traditional Movement a non-Catholic sect?

The faithful are warned by Dom Guéranger:

“If they claim our obedience without having been sent by the bishop of Rome, we must refuse to receive them, for they are not acknowledged by Christ as His ministers.”⁹

Conclusion

The teaching of the Magisterium and of approved theologians leaves no ambiguity: jurisdiction flows only through the successor of Peter. Without papal mandate, there can be no mission, no apostolicity, and no valid absolution. The Traditionalist Movement’s attempt to claim otherwise rests on a distortion of canon law, an abuse of epikeia, and a denial of ecclesiological first principles.

{13} Do you agree that to adhere to these unauthorized clerics is to risk separation from the one true Church, outside of which there is no salvation?

The Catholic faithful, therefore, must heed the perennial doctrine: all spiritual authority comes from Peter, and through him alone does Christ continue to govern His Church.

Footnotes

1. St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Supplement, q. 22, a. 1, ad 1.
2. Pius XII, *Ad Apostolorum Principis* (1958), §39.
3. St. Pius X, *Sacrorum Antistitum* (Oath Against Modernism), 1910.
4. Fathers W. Devivier & J. Sasia, *Christian Apologetics* (New York: Joseph Wagner, 1924), 217.
5. Father Cox, *The Pillar and Ground of the Truth* (1900), 182.
6. Father Frederick Schulze, *A Manual of Pastoral Theology* (1923), 295.
7. Dom Prosper Guéranger, *The Liturgical Year*, Imprimatur, 1924, Vol. IV. Pages 282-287
8. Father Riley, *The History, Nature, and Use of Epikeia in Moral Theology* (1948), 387.
9. Dom Prosper Guéranger, *The Liturgical Year*, Vol. IV.

††† Jesus Mary Joseph †††

Having considered the above, I do not understand how the Traditional Movement has all four marks of the Catholic Church, or how their bishops or priests receive the necessary jurisdiction to absolve those who confess to them. You asked about receiving sacraments from perhaps an Eastern Catholic priest, or even from a schismatic Orthodox priest. Are not the Eastern Catholic priests and the schismatic Orthodox priests also lacking that jurisdiction necessary for absolution? How do they receive jurisdiction if they have never received jurisdiction from a lawful successor of St. Peter? Are the Eastern Catholic priests and the schismatic Orthodox priests Catholic or non-Catholic?

In the book, *Priests’ Problems*, the author gives these Church teachings:

“295. RECEPTION OF SACRAMENTS FROM A NON-CATHOLIC MINISTER.

Can there be a good cause, apart from danger of death, justifying reception of the sacraments from the minister of a non-Catholic sect who is known to be validly ordained and capable of ministering certain sacraments validly?

1) - Relying on Canon 2261 alone, one might unthinkingly give an affirmative reply to the question submitted; for the non-Catholic minister is not normally in the condition of an excommunicated person in section 3 of the Canon, and it would therefore, seem that any grave cause justifies receiving sacraments from his ministrations. When, however, it is remembered that an

excommunicated person as such does not normally cease to be a Catholic, it is evident that the content of Canon 2261 relates chiefly to **Catholics** who may be excommunicated for a variety of reasons. **The question of receiving sacraments from non-Catholics, whether excommunicated or not, is ruled by Canon 1258.**”

2) - “*Communicatio in sacris*, an extremely difficult matter on the fringes of the law, offers no problem whatever when the non-Catholic rites or ceremonies or prayers are in themselves heretical in character or expression. To share in them is forbidden by natural or divine law at all times, including the hour of death, and no reason whatever can justify the action.”

{14} Do you agree that, therefore, it becomes extremely important to understand whether the clerics from whom we desire to receive sacraments are Catholic or non-Catholic?

Let us refresh our memory of what the Catholic Church teaches in Canon 1258/1:

“It is unlawful for the Faithful in any way actively to be present at or take part in the religious services of non-Catholics.”

{15} Do you agree that to share in or take part in non-Catholic services is forbidden by **natural or divine law at all times, including the hour of death, and no reason whatever can justify the action?**

Let us turn again to the book, *Priests’ Problems*, to learn more about the evil of *communicatio in sacris*, which is communicating (or taking part) in non-Catholic services:

“Moreover, even though the rites are in themselves orthodox, the same natural or divine law forbids our participation if there is scandal or danger of perversion.

Let us use the thesaurus to understand better the meanings of *perversion*, and then we will see that the same natural or divine law forbids our participation when there is distortion, falsification, misrepresentation, misapplication, or misinterpretation. Well, there you have it! The thesaurus, so to speak, just described the Novus Ordo and Traditional Movement. Those religions and what is taught by their ministers is *perversion*, distortion, falsification, misrepresentation, misapplication, misinterpretation, and double-talk!

Please read this article <https://jmjsite.com/f/info-sspx.pdf> and consider the teachings of SSPX carefully. Twenty times or more, the leading clerics in SSPX provide proof that the Novus Ordo is a *new religion*. It has always been Catholic Dogma that Saint Peter and his lawful successors are the head of the Catholic Church, and not that of a *new religion*. The Society of Saint Pius X teaches that the heads of the non-Catholic, Novus Ordo *new religion* are the lawful successors of St. Peter. It follows that the Society of Saint Pius X denies Catholic dogma and is therefore a non-Catholic sect.

{16} Do you agree that everyone who has been known as a pope of the Novus Ordo sect has been the head of a non-Catholic sect, as the clerics of SSPX proved, and therefore, it is impossible that the Novus Ordo popes can remain Catholic or be the head of the Catholic Church founded by Jesus Christ?

{17} Do you agree that it follows that the SSPX is a non-Catholic sect because of their teachings that are a perversion, distortion, falsification, misrepresentation, misapplication, or misinterpretation?

{18} Do you agree that Catholic doctrine teaches that even if the rites used in SSPX, CMRI, SGG, and other Traditional Movement sects are in themselves orthodox, the same natural or divine law forbids our participation because there is scandal or danger of perversion, distortion, falsification, misrepresentation, misapplication, misinterpretation, and double-talk?

You can find a transcription of his video on SSPX, Resistance, and Sedevacantism in London 2013 at <https://jmjsite.com/f/cr.pdf>, where Bishop Donald Sanborn explains that SSPX has always been in schism **since its very beginning**. That PDF file provides a more in-depth study of who belongs to the Catholic Church. Always remember that it was in this SSPX, non-Catholic, schismatic sect that “The Famous Nine” priests received their training and went through the ceremonies of receiving Holy Orders. “*Surely thou also art one of them; for even thy speech doth discover thee*” (Matthew 26:73).

Let us now read a transcription of part of Rev. Anthony Cekada’s sermon on June 22, 2008. “First of all, Pius X Society, they promote in effect error, **schism**, and apostasy! The notion that you can recognize someone as a pope, but not do any blessed thing he says if you decide not to do that. **You set a private judgment over each**

papal teaching and law. You have the idea, you promote the notion the Church Authority can give evil laws and false doctrine. You maintain it is permissible to defy the man you say is the Pope by maintaining a parallel hierarchy. These notions are *schismatic* and embody false doctrine. And at the same time, the organization promotes union with the one world church of the antichrist, with Ratzinger's constant negotiations with them to achieve this end... So just get along with what? The sin of *Schism*; invalidly ordained priests; error and ignorance of sacramental principles; or denials of Church Doctrine? The issue is **DOCTRINE!** You cannot just say: Well, just get along and ignore that point."

"Surely thou also art one of them; for even thy speech doth discover thee" (Matthew 26:73).

Therefore, all of the bishops consecrated and priests ordained by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, including Rev. Anthony Cekada, Bishop Donald Sanborn, Bishop Daniel Dolan, Bishop Kelly, Rev. Jenkins, and the others, correctly teach that they were members of, and received their Power of Orders in a schismatic sect. They have never produced evidence that they abjured their errors and were received back into the Catholic Church after belonging to a non-Catholic sect.

Bishop Pivarunas consecrated Rev. Daniel Dolan when they both belonged to a non-Catholic sect, and at that time Bishop Pivarunas said they all belonged to the SAME church. "You know, it is not the Thuc Bishops or the Lefebvre Bishops or the Thuc Priests or the Lefebvre Priests or this Group or that Group - we are Roman Catholic! It is not this Society or that Society or this Community - we are Roman Catholic, and as such, we work together. We belong to the **same** church!"

"Surely thou also art one of them; for even thy speech doth discover thee" (Matthew 26:73).

Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre and other clerics of SSPX, Bishop Pivarunas and priests of CMRI, Bishop Donald Sanborn, Bishop Daniel Dolan, Bishop Kelly, Rev. Anthony Cekada, Rev. Jenkins, and other members of the Traditional Movement often correctly remind us that the Novus Ordo is a non-Catholic sect. Bishop Thuc and those others were members of this non-Catholic, Novus Ordo, and were never received back into the Catholic Church. I have never seen or even heard about any one of them showing proof that they made a Profession of Faith, and abjured their errors, and were received back into the Catholic Church by anyone, and especially not by one who still had the NECESSARY ordinary or delegated jurisdiction to absolve them and receive them into the Catholic Church in the external forum.

Remember, the Catholic Church teaches in Canon 1258/1: "It is unlawful for the Faithful in any way actively to be present at or take part in the religious services of non-Catholics."

You asked, "So, at the point of death, is there any clergy we can confess to and receive Last Rites?" You asked me to "Please advise." My advice is to please send me your answers to the numbered questions between these kinds of brackets {}. By answering the questions and writing down our answers, we can better compare each answer with the others. It also helps the mind think more clearly and come to the knowledge of the truth. Send me your answers that you will wish to present to Jesus Christ at the moment of your Particular Judgment. Think of having your answers published before the whole world to read now, just as everyone will clearly know your answers on the day of the General Judgment. Please let me know of any Catholic priest or bishop who belongs to the Catholic Church founded by Jesus Christ. Otherwise, I remind you and myself: "to take part in non-Catholic services is forbidden by **natural or divine law at all times, including the hour of death, and no reason whatever can justify the action.**"

My advice is to be very, very faithful in living a spiritual life, and not to neglect to live a life of prayer and penance in the continual presence of God. Go to www.JMJsites.com and listen to the audiobooks, including PERFECT CONTRITION, GOLDEN KEY TO PARADISE. Frequently listen to the sermons. Read the PDF files, and especially review part or all of this one <https://jmjsites.com/f/motives-to-excite-a-lively-sorrow-for-our-sins.pdf> daily or at least weekly.

In Jesus, Mary, and Saint Joseph,

Patrick Henry