Our Lady of Sorrows
The philosophical subject of epistemology is the study of knowledge. Father A. C. Cotter, S.J., who was Father Leonard Feeney’s philosophy teacher, and whose book on the subject was heavily utilized by Brother Francis in his philosophy course, defines epistemology as “the science of the certitude of our cognitions.” *Epistémē* (ἐπιστήμη) is the Greek word for knowledge.

Cognition, I should say, is both (subjectively) the act of the mind by which I know, and (objectively) the thing known. And yes, in a mind that functions rightly, assisted by properly functioning senses, there is a point-to-point comparison between the object known and the knowledge in the intellect. As simple as that last proposition is, and as much as we constantly depend on it in our day-to-day existence, there are many people — educated people — who do not believe it. They question, doubt, or deny the capacity of the human mind to know. The educated among them even sometimes write books about it, which justifies our questioning their sanity, or at least their consistency, for, if we *cannot* know, what is the point of books?

The Greeks and Medieval Scholastics did not have a distinct science of epistemology. They did not need one, since they took the fact of knowledge for granted. Since roughly the days of Descartes (d. 1650), the fact of knowledge is no longer taken for granted, but must be defended.

Father Cotter’s book, above mentioned (recently republished as *The ABC of Scholastic Philosophy*), presents the course of epistemology as a defense of twenty-two theses. In order to give readers a flavor of this subject — and perhaps also to whet your appetite for studying it with Brother Francis as your master — I will present the first three of these, with little explanations of my own.

**Thesis I: “Universal Skepticism is theoretically absurd and practically impossible.”**

Something is theoretically absurd, as Father Cotter points out, if it denies implicitly what it affirms explicitly. (People do this all the time, really!) Now, the universal skeptic holds that *nothing is certain*, but, implicitly, he holds that at least *one thing is certain* — namely, that nothing is certain. Therefore, Universal Skepticism is theoretically absurd.

It may be necessary to read that last paragraph (and some others) over again before it makes complete sense, but such an endeavor would not be wasted.

Something is practically impossible when it cannot be done in practice. Now Universal Skepticism is practically impossible because it would entail doubting everything and living accordingly. A person who really attempted this would be run over by cars, fall off mountains, or drive off cliffs until dead, since he doubts the reality of mountains, cliffs, gravity, life, death, mortality, and is heedless of the medical consequences of the sudden impact that follows a precipitous fall. Nobody really does this — certainly least not the principled skeptics who get paid for writing books about skepticism that nobody should read because the reality of the books themselves is questionable at best.

As Father Cotter says, no doubt with a tinge of humor, “A real skeptic should be taken by the hand and gently led to the psychiatrist; he needs rest of mind and healthy bodily exercise, but his disease is amenable to no arguments.”

There is much more to be said about this, and Father Cotter goes on for pages, but this is only a summary.

**Thesis II: Relativism is absurd and leads to skepticism.**

All truth, according to the relativist, is relative, i.e., conditioned on times, places, persons, circumstances, etc. Such a person does not deny certitudes outright, but makes them so very conditioned that there is nothing absolute. Now, while certain statements are certainly conditioned on circumstances (e.g., “It is a warm day today.”), others are not: (e.g., “Murder, adultery, and robbery are morally
“Universal Skepticism is theoretically absurd and practically impossible.”

so conditioned — namely, that all truths change based on times, places, persons, circumstances, etc. A contradiction!

Yes, it is absurd, but how does relativism lead to skepticism? Because anything that implies that we can never be certain necessarily leads to skepticism. This is so because we can only be certain of something that cannot be false, yet, according to relativism, all propositions may be either true or false. Therefore, we cannot be formally certain of anything. Therefore, skepticism (“nothing is certain”) certainly follows upon relativism. So, what we said above about skepticism applies also to relativism.

The above three paragraphs cannot adequately supply for Father Cotter’s six pages on the thesis, but the kernel of his reasoning is there.

Thesis III: “We have many cognitive faculties and they are per se infallible.”

“Cognitive” means of or pertaining to knowledge (Latin congnoscere means “to know”). A “faculty” is a natural power that man has, such as his intellect, his will, or his internal or external senses. Now, of the powers that man has, some are cognitive (powers of knowing, e.g., the senses and the intellect), while others are appetitive (powers of loving or desiring the good, e.g., the will and the appetites, or passions).

A knowledge power not only apprehends things, but apprehends them as they are. That is its purpose.

“Infallible,” means “without error,” as when the pope teaches infallibly. Here, we are not speaking about the pope’s infallibility in faith and morals, which is a unique spiritual charisma, but the ordinary infallibility that our knowing powers have. But does this mean that our knowing faculties may never err? Well, no. That is why it is qualified with the words “per se.” As Father Cotter explains, “‘Per se’ means ‘as intended by nature,’ hence normally, generally ordinarily.”

Brother Francis frequently pointed out that our senses and our intellect are knowing powers, not creative powers. They do not manufacture reality, but receive it so that the mind may conform itself to reality. (Truth is defined as “the conformity of the mind to reality.”) Without reliable senses, we have no hope of knowing the truth. This is so because, as the scholastics said, there is nothing in the intellect which is not first in the senses. True, God can infuse knowledge into our intellects supernaturally (as He did with certain saints), but this is not only supernatural, but extraordinary. Therefore it has nothing to do with the ordinary way man knows truth. When we say that nothing is in the intellect unless it is first in the senses, we are speaking of the ordinary way that we acquire knowledge.

Each knowledge power that we have has its own area in which it is per se infallible. The sight of one who is not color blind apprehends color, and, in so doing, it sees things that are really there. If my sight were not per se infallible, I could not have certitude that I see something (e.g., the words that you are reading now, and that I saw as I was writing them). And so with all the other senses. Without this per se infallibility, there can be no certitude. When my intellect forms judgments based on the data my senses present to it, there is the possibility of error, and such error often happens. We make mistakes. But the fact that we err when a mistake is made itself shows the per se infallibility of the faculty. In other words, if we were using the faculty of judgment properly, we would not err.

This thesis is explained in eight pages by Father Cotter, so my five paragraphs do not do it full justice.

I end these thoughts with “the Parable of Joe Murphy,” a cautionary epistemological tale I’ve heard numerous times from an eye-witness of the actual event, our dear Brother Francis. For, before he passed into legend, Joe Murphy was a real person, and the tale you are about to read is true, while the quotes are certainly not word-for-word.

In the early days of Saint Benedict Center, when it was a student center in Cambridge, Massachusetts, there was a student named Joe Murphy who attended the Center to hear the lecture one night. His poor mind was so confused by the bad thinking he had been exposed to at his elite institution of higher education, that he was reduced to a bewildering skepticism. In the post-lecture conversation, he objected to many things he had heard that night, for this wayward son of Erin had been robbed of his Catholic certitudes. He was so very skeptical that Father Feeley tried to get him to admit at least one thing with absolute certitude. Pointing to the coffee table in the room they were standing in, Father said, “Joe, at least you are sure that you are not that coffee table, right?” And to that, poor Joe replied with the confused honesty of a true skeptic: “I don’t know.”

That night, the coffee table was christened “Joe Murphy,” and “Joe Murphy the coffee table” has lived as a byword ever since. •
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CONVENT CORNER
STANDING ON A STREET CORNER

Dear Reader,

Recently, sixteen prominent pro-life and pro-family leaders from around the globe were interviewed about the Holy Father’s latest document, Amoris Laetitia. The result of these interviews was a short video entitled, “A Plea to the Pope.” Beginning with Bishop Athanasius Schneider, each of these good and hard-working people begged the Holy Father to come out with “courage” and “doctrinal clarity” regarding life and family issues. Why? Because these essential issues were so detrimentally confused by the Holy Father’s latest document. Several of those who made this plea added that the salvation of souls was at stake until these issues were clarified doctrinally. One even mentioned that this document was causing scandal.

Here is the summary of this plea to the Pope from the video itself:

1. Speak the Truth;
2. End doctrinal confusion;
3. Restore clarity;
4. Be the “holy father” Catholics need.

Dear Reader, to the best of my knowledge, this is the strongest collective appeal to the Holy Father for doctrinal clarity since Saint Benedict Center appealed to Pius XII in the 1940’s, more than 70 years ago. As He always does, God is bringing good out of evil. Yes, from the evil of doctrinal confusion and scandal coming from the hierarchy, God is raising an awareness and zeal for clear doctrine.

Back in 1949, long before the crisis in the Church grew to what it is today, one sign of the universal and incredible disaster about to take place was the silencing of a single American priest. This priest was being silenced for doctrinal reasons. Was he a heretic? No. Instead, the hierarchy was embarrassed by his doctrinal clarity and courage regarding the necessity of belonging to the Catholic Church for salvation. The priest was Father Leonard Feeney. And this, again, was 1949.

Dear Reader, let’s stand on a street corner in 1949. From here, we can cast a glance over the intervening decades up to the present. Yes, in 1949 there are no abortion clinics before which we can pray the Rosary. Boys are growing up to be men, and girls are growing up to be ladies, each easily distinguishable by their dress and demeanor. The marriages that result between members of these two beautifully distinct genders are permanent and normally very productive of children. In the rare but sad cases of married Catholics who get a civil divorce and get “remarried,” it is understood that they have broken communion with the Church and have separated themselves from the sacramental life.

How beautiful! How Catholic! What transpired over the following decades to prompt this recent plea for doctrinal clarity and courage?

Back on our street corner in 1949, let’s continue our glance to the future. In the 1950’s, we see the advent of “rock music” and its inevitable decline to today’s overtly erotic and diabolical variety. We see the immoral revolution of the 1960’s, culminating in Roe vs. Wade and the death of millions of innocent children…and the eventual barbarous practice of selling their precious body parts. Simultaneously, the doctrinal ambiguity of Vatican II is bearing its liturgical fruit in the Novus Ordo Missae (Lex orandi, lex credendi). This doctrinal and liturgical revolution within the Church is quickly accompanied by the emptying of convents and seminaries and a death dive in the number of practicing Catholics.

“...one sign of the universal and incredible disaster about to take place was the silencing of a single American priest...Father Leonard Feeney.”
Finally, we see within the Church, droves of Catholics who are flaunting their disregard for Church teaching.

Today in 2016, as we stand on the same street corner, a full array of hitherto unmentionable immorality is trumpeting and parading its wares before us. In fact, we even feel threatened by it.

Back to our good friends and their plea to the Holy Father. Up until this plea, prominent leaders in the pro-life and pro-family movement have focused their efforts on the practical side of these moral issues. Now, in this plea to the Holy Father, these same leaders are calling for a courageous clarification of true doctrine. Thanks be to God and to His Holy Mother! They are correct that the remedy for these moral evils and detriment to souls is doctrinal clarity and courage, not mere Catholic action. They are correct in their realization that the solution must come from the hierarchy and that their own efforts will be fruitless without the Holy Father’s clear, doctrinal support.

If these good people are successful with their plea, and the Holy Father does come out in a virile and unambiguous manner regarding these moral issues, what will be the result? Well, for those who are of good will, the great light of God’s grace will assist them to do the right thing. Yes, some few people will harken to the voice of the Holy Father as the voice of the Vicar of Christ and make the necessary, if painful, changes in their own lives.

But what about the majority of persons who are blinded and weakened by crass immorality? When they hear the clarity of the Holy Father’s doctrinal statements on the moral issues which are woven into their own lives, they may find it excruciatingly difficult to make the necessary changes in their own moral situation to conform to this clear teaching. At that juncture, the question will naturally arise in their minds: “Why should I listen to the Holy Father anyway? Since his moral teachings are totally contrary to my lifestyle so that I cannot be a practicing Catholic and continue to live in this way, I will join a religion which sanctions my moral depravity. There are many choices for me. After all, in the end, I can be saved in any religion.”

And now, Dear Reader, we have come full circle. The issue raised in 1949 is still the issue: the necessity of belonging to the Catholic Church for Salvation. Yes, as you can see for yourself, our dear friends who are fighting so zealously and courageously for God’s victory in the pro-life and pro-family movement need us to live up to our God-given vocation — the doctrinal Crusade of Saint Benedict Center. And we should not be surprised, Dear Reader, as we imitate these friends in appealing to the Holy Father for doctrinal clarity and courage, that we will suffer opposition and we will be obliged to fight. After all, as Fr. Feeney and the original members of Saint Benedict Center discovered, this is not merely a doctrinal apostolate, but a crusade.

Thank you, Dear Reader, for your encouragement, donations and other support over the years. My special request to you, is that you pray that we, Slaves of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, live up to our fourth vow, “To make the Doctrinal Crusade of Saint Benedict Center the first interest of our lives.” Souls are being lost…. “Crusade! God wills it!” May Our Blessed Mother make use of Her Slaves for the salvation of souls!
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I am so excited I almost can’t sleep!

You are amazing!

-Katherine Bednar

What is all the excitement about? The Saint Augustine Institute will soon be online! Now you can further your Catholic studies at your leisure online with your guide, Sister Maria Philomena. Complete with video, audio and supplementary content, getting your SAI diploma will be more convenient than ever. If you would like more information on the course of studies Br. Francis started, contact Sister at: SMPH@catholicism.org or check out this free sample class: http://bit.ly/2bSXPgj
There seems to be no end to the number of reasons people can give for not facing the doctrine of the necessity of belonging to the Catholic Church for salvation.

“Is that so?” we are asked incredulously. “I find that hard to believe. This is the first time he has ever heard these things. His next question, however, is revealing of the weak spot of his own Faith, for, invariably, he says: “I have greatly erred, inasmuch as I have held and believed doctrines opposed to her teaching.

I now with sorrow and contrition for my past errors, profess that I believe the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic Roman Church to be the only and true Church established on earth by Jesus Christ, to which I submit myself with my whole soul. I believe all the articles of Faith that she proposes to my belief, and I reject and condemn all that she rejects and condemns, and I am ready to observe all that she commands me. And I make the following profession of Faith:

(There follows the profession.)

And, I believe in everything else that has been defined and declared by the sacred Canons and by the General Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent, and delivered, defined, and declared by the General Council of the Vatican, especially concerning the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, and his infallible teaching authority.

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

Our interrogator generally remains silent for a few moments after we have finished reading, and we can understand why. This is the first time he has ever heard these things. His next question, however, is revealing of the weak state of his own Faith, for, invariably, he says:

“My, that’s asking a lot, isn’t it? Do you mean to say people will admit all that about their former religion?”
“But it is the mere statement of the truth. Are you surprised they should speak the truth about heresy? Don’t you believe error should be detested?”

“Yes, I suppose so; but don’t you think it is rubbing it in, especially when they have been good enough to come into the Church?”

“Good enough!” we retort, “it is only right that they should accept the Truth! You are saying that they are good enough to save themselves from hell, good enough to secure themselves heaven — if they live up to the Faith. Furthermore, nothing in the world could pay for the next Gift they receive, after Baptism. Have you ever been with a real convert when he has received his first Holy Communion?”

“No.”

“We have. and if the conversion is a true one, his realization of what has happened to him is a rebuke to the apathy of lifelong Catholics. Lifelong Catholics take for granted the overwhelming Reality of Holy Communion. The convert expects enthusiasm, at least equal to his, from the older Catholic, and instead he gets wondering admiration — not that God should come to man, but that man should be good enough to come to God! This is always disillusioning and confusing to a convert, as well it might be.

THE ATHANASIAN CREED

W hosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith. Which faith except everyone do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. And the Catholic Faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity, neither confounding the persons, nor dividing the substance. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Spirit. But the godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, is all one, the glory equal, the majesty co-eternal.

Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Spirit. The Father uncreated, the Son uncreated, and the Holy Spirit uncreated. The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible, and the Holy Spirit incomprehensible.

The Father eternal, the Son eternal, and the Holy Spirit eternal. And yet they are not three eternals, but one Eternal. As also there are not three incomprehensibles, nor three uncreated, but one Uncreated, and one Incomprehensible. So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Spirit Almighty. And yet they are not three almighty, but one Almighty.

So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God. And yet they are not three gods, but one God.

So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy Spirit Lord. And yet not three lords, but one Lord.

For as we are compelled by the Christian verity to acknowledge each Person by Himself to be both God and Lord, so we are also forbidden by the Catholic Religion to say that there are three gods or three lords.

The Father is made of none, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.

So there is one Father, not three fathers; one Son, not three sons; one Holy Spirit, not three holy spirits.

And in Trinity none is before or after another; none is greater or less than another, but all three Persons are co-eternal together and co-equal. So that in all things, as is aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped.

He therefore that will be saved must think thus of the Trinity.

Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation that he also believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right faith is, that we believe and confess, that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man; God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; and man, of the substance of his mother, born in the world; perfect God and perfect man, of a rational soul and human flesh subsisting. Equal to the Father, as touching His godhead; and inferior to the Father, as touching His manhood; who, although He is God and man, yet He is not two, but one Christ; one, not by conversion of the godhead into flesh but by taking of the manhood into God; one altogether; not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person. For as the rational soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ; who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, rose again the third day from the dead. He ascended into heaven, He sits at the right hand of the Father, God Almighty, from whence He will come to judge the quick and the dead. At His coming all men will rise again with their bodies and shall give account for their own works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting; and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.

This is the Catholic Faith, which except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.
This article is the fourth in a series on the virtues of Our Lady. But, who can know all the virtues of Our Lady? We have previously treated humility, faith, hope and charity. Now we will treat those mentioned in the title.

The chaste purity of the Blessed Virgin Mary seems to be the first virtue mentioned in the Gospels. Some consider it holding first place among all her virtues, “so that devout souls may know that first of all they must direct and apply all their faculties to please Christ, as true brides, in chastity, in imitation of the Virgin, and think, say and do that which the Gospel says Mary thought, said and did on account of her purity. We read in the Gospel that the Virgin, in order to please God most perfectly in her virginal purity, first, made a vow of virginity; second, we read in the same Gospel, that she was engaged to Joseph; and finally, that she asked the Angel Gabriel: ‘How shall this be done [to bear a Savior], because I know not man?’” (Taken from Rule of the Ten Evangelical Virtues of the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, Decum Beneplacitorum, http://goo.gl/aRs3WF)

Catechisms tell us that chastity is the virtue of purity in thought, word, and act; it is a fruit of the Holy Ghost; it is a moral virtue. Chastity, or purity, disposes us to be pure in soul and body. Perpetual chastity is an evangelical counsel; it is what religious aspire to.

The principal dangers against chastity are: idleness, sinful curiosity, bad companions, lack of moderation in food and drink, immodest dress, and indecent books, plays and motion pictures, videos, certain games, etc. To avoid these pitfalls (forbidden by the 6th and 9th Commandments) and preserve chastity, seek God’s help through prayer, frequent Confession, Holy Communion, assistance at Holy Mass, and through a special devotion to the Blessed Virgin.

The Ven. Emmanuel d’Alzon, in Mary, Our Mother, Our Model, Our Queen reminds us, “Impurity is such a tragic source of weakness. The impure person is dominated by his senses and the Spirit of God cannot dwell in such a one because he is but flesh.”

He goes on to point out that Mary remained a virgin and became even more virginal, “through the very purity of the God who was her Son. Mary will be my model. Like
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**SEEKING THAT WHICH WAS LOST... AND FIGHTING FOR IT.**
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“How do I listen?” It’s easy! just log on to **www.reconquest.net**. Listen to great commentary on current events as well as events historical.
Mary, I shall consecrate my whole being to God in order to be purer. Jesus Christ … [in Holy Communion] that brings forth virgins, will help me to live a life totally consecrated to purity.” (Bold emphasis mine throughout — Br. JMV)

“Our Lady is Perfect Perpetual Purity Personified.”

The most excellent Catholic writer, Father Raymond J. Spitzer, in *How to Imitate the Virtues of Our Lady*, informs us that the root of the issues of chastity, purity and virginity is temperance, i.e., the controlling of the appetites and desires of the human body. Those are not limited to food and drink, but include the propagation of humans. Therefore, temperance has to curb the procreative passions so they will be employed only according to the law of God. “The particular virtue that sees to this,” Father Spitzer concludes, “is chastity.” Saint Thomas Aquinas says the word chastity also applies to the right use of reason in that reason chastises concupiscence, “which like a child, needs curbing.”

Father Spitzer adds, “This virtue, practised in its highest degree, was Our Lady’s special delight and achievement. She is the Virgin most Chaste.”

Unbridled physical desires will increase, grow stronger and will, Father assures us, “weaken one’s strength of mind. God helps us with the infused virtue of chastity. Our Lady shows us that it is possible to maintain perfect chastity. Throughout her life she kept her body under the control of her mind.”

Purity and chastity are terms often used interchangeably. “Strictly speaking,” Father writes, “purity is a circumstance of chastity. Chastity has to do with the control of the conjugal act in marriage; purity seeks to control such external signs as looks, kisses and touches…forbidden to anyone who has no right to the conjugal act.” Our Lady is Perfect Perpetual Purity.

In the culture that we have lived in, for at least several decades, these concepts have little to no meaning. So-called freedom and liberty, Father says, in “abuse of sex is more or less taken as a matter of course. The only remedy is the practice of the virtue of chastity. With God's help, it is possible, even though difficult, to maintain the purity which God demands of us…O Mary, make my body pure, and my soul holy!”

Remaining chaste, pure and virginal is not an easy task; however my patron saint, Jean Marie Vianney, points the way, in part of one of his sermons:

“The Devil tries to keep them in this state of blindness until that moment when death opens their eyes. Ah! If they had but the happiness to have recourse to Mary they would not fall into Hell, as will happen to them! No, my dear children, let us not imitate such people! On the contrary, let us follow the footsteps of all those true servants of Mary. Belonging to this number were St. Charles Borromeo, who always said his rosary on his knees. What is more, he fasted on all vigils of the feasts of the Blessed Virgin. He was so careful about saluting her on the stroke of the bell that when the Angelus rang, wherever he was, he went down on his knees, sometimes even in the middle of the road when it was full of mud. He desired that his whole diocese should have a great devotion to Mary and that her name would be uttered everywhere with the utmost respect. He had a number of chapels built in her honour. Now then, my dear brethren, why should not we imitate these great saints who obtained so many graces from Mary to preserve them from sin? Have we not the same enemies to fight, the same Heaven to hope for? Yes, Mary always has her eyes upon us. Do we suffer temptations? Let us turn our hearts towards Mary and we shall be delivered.”

Email Brother John Marie Vianney, at toprefect@catholicism.org
There are four defined dogmas of the Faith concerning Our Lady's divine prerogatives. They are: 1) Her Immaculate Conception, 2) Her Perpetual Virginity, 3) Her Divine Maternity, and 4) Her Glorious Assumption. How fitting it is that she whose fiat brought down the Son of God into her womb should also reign as Queen of Heaven with a glorified body. To be crowned, a queen, like a king, must have a body. Jesus is King of kings and His Mother reigns on the throne forever by His side. It is this fourth dogma, the Assumption, that we have celebrated on August 15. Pope Pius XII, who, on November 1, in 1950, defined the corporeal Assumption of Our Lady in his encyclical *Munificentissimus Deus* also issued an encyclical in 1954 on October 11 on “The Queenship of Mary” establishing it as a feast day on the last day of the Marian month of May.

Pope Benedict XIV, who died in 1758 — two hundred years before the definition of Pius XII — called the Assumption of Mary the common belief of the east and the west, declaring it “blasphemous” to say otherwise. (See Catholic Encyclopedia on “The Assumption”)

Saint John Damascene, who died in 749, wrote:

“St. Juvenal, Bishop of Jerusalem, at the Council of Chalcedon (451), made known to the Emperor Marcian and Pulcheria, who wished to possess the body of the Mother of God, that Mary died in the presence of all the Apostles, but that her tomb, when opened, upon the request of St. Thomas, was found empty; wherefrom the Apostles concluded that the body was taken up to heaven.” (same source, Catholic Encyclopedia)

The earliest testimony in the western Church proclaiming the Assumption of Mary was given by Saint Gregory of Tours who died in 594. He wrote: “The Apostles took up her body on a bier and placed it in a tomb; and they guarded it, expecting the Lord to come. And behold, again the Lord stood by them; and the holy body having been received, He commanded that it be taken in a cloud into paradise: where now, rejoined to the soul, she rejoices with the Lord’s chosen ones.” (Book of Miracles, 1:4)

The three other dogmas concerning Our Lady’s divine prerogatives were defined as follows:

The Council of Ephesus, 431, declared Mary *Mother of God* (Divine Maternity). The feast day for the Divine Maternity is October 11.

The Council of Constantinople II, 553, declared Mary “Ever-Virgin.”

Our Latin liturgy has several invocations to Blessed Mary, Ever-Virgin (as do the eastern rites). Of these we are all well familiar.

The Immaculate Conception was defined by Blessed Pope Pius IX on December 8, 1854, in his encyclical *Ineffabilis Deus*.

It is interesting that no heresiarch of the Protestant rebellion denied the perpetual virginity of Mary — neither Luther, nor Calvin, nor Zwingli, nor Wesley. In fact, they defended it against other ignorant heretics of their time. Except for the heretics Helvidius and Jovinian in the late fourth century (the Ebionite sect, too, earlier added this denial to other peculiar heresies), it was always universally affirmed as of the apostolic Faith.

Saint Jerome (+420) thoroughly refuted the impious Helvidius’ blasphemy denying the perpetual virginity in his treatise *Contra Helvidium*.

The evangelicals in America, by means of their impious tracts, propagated on a wide scale the heresy that Our Lady had other children. These enemies of the Church made abuse of Saint Paul’s reference to the Apostle James the Less as the “brother of the Lord,” (Galatians 1:19) when the term, as customary among the Jews, also applied to cousins.

Hear Saint Augustine (+430): “It was not the visible sun, but its invisible Creator who consecrated this day for us, when the Virgin Mother, fertile of womb and integral in her virginity, brought him forth, made visible for us, by whom, when he was invisible, she too was created. A Virgin conceiving, a Virgin bearing, a Virgin pregnant, a Virgin bringing forth, a Virgin perpetual. Why do you wonder at this, O man?” (Letters 186.1)
The Lateran Council, held under Pope Saint Martin I in the year 649, in its third canon, defined:

“Mary’s Assumption into glory is unique for a creature.”

“If any one does not, in accord with the Holy Fathers, acknowledge the holy and ever virgin and immaculate Mary as really and truly the Mother of God, in as much as she, in the fullness of time and without human seed, conceived by the Holy Spirit, God the Word Himself, who before all time was born of God the Father, and without loss of her integrity brought Him forth, and after His birth preserved her virginity inviolate, let him be condemned.”

Pope Paul IV in the Apostolic Constitution Cum quorumdam (1555), confirmed by Pope Clement VIII in 1603 in the Brief Dominici Gregis, condemned as heretical the following error, namely that “...the Blessed Virgin Mary is not true Mother of God and that she did not remain forever in her virginal integrity, before Christ’s birth, in the birth itself, and perpetually after His birth.” This repeats the traditional formula, ante partum, in partu, et post partum (before giving birth, during birth, and after birth) concerning Our Lady’s perpetual virginity.

Mary’s Assumption into glory is unique for a creature. Yet, so fitting! Had Adam not sinned, there would be no death. But the bodies of the just, who fell into personal sins, and repented, still would have had to wait for the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ before entering into glory. Mary knew no personal sin, nor did she have original sin. She chose to die and be buried in imitation of her Son. And, after forty hours in the tomb, she, just as Jesus, rose from the dead to the joy of the angels who escorted her, body and soul, into heaven where she would be crowned Queen. These are the fourth and fifth mysteries of the Holy Rosary.

Two other divine prerogatives of Our Lady may one day be defined. They are her role as Co-Redemptrix and Mediatrix of all Graces.

For an excellent and exhaustive article on Our Lady’s Perpetual Virginity see Mark Alessio’s treatise on our website at catholicism.org.

Email Brian Kelly at bdk@catholicism.org

Contact our bookstore for this special offer: (603) 239-6485

*The 15 issues offered are a random selection made by the SBC Bookstore. Please, no special requests.
I am honored for having been inducted into the Order of the Slaves of the Immaculate Heart of Mary as a Tertiary this past April 17. My initial interest in the order was due to the wonderful writings of Fr. Feeney, (specifically his theological book Bread of Life), as well as a deep conviction that there is no salvation outside the Holy Roman Catholic Church, whatsoever. This salutary dogma has sadly been undermined by the liberals of our time in their purpose to completely dissolve the Church. Fr. Feeney was right all along in his understanding on how liberalism was taking over the hierarchy. He predicted with amazing accuracy, before anyone else in the traditional Catholic movement, the real root behind Vatican II’s compromised ecclesiology: the denial of a single dogma: Extra Ecclesia Nulla Salus.

In this new-Modernist age, most surprisingly, even the “traditionalist” Orders seem to have forgotten about this truth revealed by God. That is why I was very happy to find the Slaves of the Immaculate of Mary, with their twofold goal of defending the EENS’ dogma and their apostolic zeal for the conversion of America. Modernists think that Catholic heavenly dogmas may be expressed in terms affixed to current human systems; but the words of a dogmatic formula are not to be taken as figurative language, but are to be taken literally with the same sense and meaning for all time. Extra Ecclesia Nulla Salus is a clear example of a dogma that has received a neo-modernist re-interpretation: they do not directly claim that the timeless formula that “there is no salvation outside the Church” must be abandoned; rather they say that salvation is not in, but “through” the Church. People who are not “in” the Church may still be saved “through” the Church; thus, to the modernists the dogma that “there is no salvation outside the Church” means that there is really salvation outside the Church.

Pope St. Pius X explicitly condemned the proposition that dogmas are to be understood as figurative-symbolic, having a merely practical function, and not as immutable truths from Heaven. The defense of the thrice infallible dogma of salvation makes the Slaves of the Immaculate Heart of Mary truly unique in today’s age and a important contributor to the restoration of the Church, and thus, of Christendom. Needless to say, I feel very blessed for being part of it.

Our short stay in New Hampshire visiting the Saint Benedict Center was a wonderful experience for my family and I. After a long wait, we were finally able to visit and personally attend my profession all the way from Seattle, Washington (They say everything worth having is worth waiting for!). The days spent there, in such a tranquil and holy place, were full of enriching experiences for all of us. We had the opportunity to meet very good people, serious and loyal Catholics, who made us feel welcome with their great hospitality. My oldest daughter, who is nine years old, was very fortunate for having been exposed to a true Catholic community of religious brothers and sisters and was able to initiate what we hope to be long-lasting friendships. She was able to play with the school children and even attend a class there. She keeps telling us how she wants to go back. At such an impressionable age, I am sure she will not forget this. The rural landscape was picturesque, and quite charming! Wonderful scenery contrasting our urban surroundings. I am sure all of us will have life-long memories of this trip to the Saint Benedict Center. Thank you all for having made it possible, Ave Maria! ✪
2016 Saint Benedict Center Conference
“Keeping the Counter-Reformation Going”

Come join us on **Friday and Saturday, September 30 and October 1, 2016,** for two days of doing Catholic tradition: Holy Mass, intellectual formation, cultural activity, and Catholic camaraderie.

Speakers will include:

• **Mike Church** — “The English "Deformation": The Great Faith Robbery”
• **Gary Potter** — “Finding Reasons to Keep Going”
• **Charles Coulombe** — “Anglo-Catholicism, the Ordinariates, and the Conversion of the Anglosphere”
• **C.J. Doyle** — “Church Militant Restored: How the Counter Reformation Saved Christendom”
• **Br. John Marie Vianney, M.I.C.M. Tert.** — “The Best Way to Counter the Reformation”
• **Sr. Maria Philomena** — “Just What Do We Keep Going?”
• **Sr. Marie Thérèse** — “The Ultimate Reform”
• **Brother André Marie** — “Lessons from Saint Robert Southwell”

More details will be posted on www.catholicism.org as they become available.

• The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass will be offered according to the traditional Roman Rite (“Extraordinary Form”) during the conference, as it always is offered at Saint Benedict Center.
• There is a limited number of Saint Benedict Center community members who are willing to host conference attendees on a first-come, first-served basis; please call Russell at (603) 239-6485 for details.

**Prices are as follows:**

Both days with meals $175. Without meals $90.
Single day with meals $90. Without meals $45.

For more information or to register by phone:
Call Russell at (603) 239-6485
or register online at:
store.catholicism.org/2016-conference-registration.html
Note: This article was posted on our website on July 1, 2016, just before the two party conventions.

The full force of the nation’s quadrennial general-election campaign season is about to hit us. It will not occur to the majority of the nation’s voters who identify as Catholic to assess candidates in the light of teachings of the Faith. It never does. The proof is how they have voted throughout the twentieth century and now into this one, and especially since the so-called “social issues” began to figure in elections. When has it ever been as they ought? However, a minority who are serious about their practice of the religion will wonder whom they should vote for, or even whether they should vote at all, in the light of Church teaching. They would appreciate some guidance. It exists.

The most recent authoritative Vatican document concerning Catholics and electoral politics was promulgated by the Holy See’s Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in 2003 when Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, the future Pope Benedict XVI, was its prefect. The document’s title: “Doctrinal Note on Some Questions Regarding the Participation of Catholics in Political Life”

There is a line in the document that liberals within Catholicism like to cite as if after 2,000 years the Church has finally decided that a particular form of government, democracy, is so superior to all others that no other should exist. The Church has not decided that, nor will she ever. The reason she will not can be easily explained but will be left for another occasion. We don’t want to be diverted here from what “Doctrinal Note” has to say.

Here is the line liberals like to cite: “The Church recognizes that democracy is the best expression of the direct participation of citizens in political choices.” Now, two things ought to be obvious: 1) democracy is the best expression of the direct participation of citizens in political choices, but 2) the statement is not the same as saying citizens should always participate in political choices or that their participation should always be direct. Further, if the statement is quoted in its entirety and in context, a radically different picture begins to emerge than is given by our first impression — the one liberals intend when they cite the line incompletely and out of context.

The entire statement: “The Church recognizes that while democracy is the best expression of the direct participation of citizens in political choices, it succeeds only to the extent that it is based on a correct understanding of the human person.” That person, according to the document, has a “duty to be morally coherent,” which is to say he should not try to lead two separate lives, a so-called “secular” one and a so-called “spiritual” or “religious” one.

“In fact,” we read, “every one of the faithful’s lives, as different as they are, enters in the plan of God…where the love of Christ is revealed and realized both for the glory of the Faith and service of others.” This is the “correct understanding of the human person” on which the success of democracy is to be judged, and “Catholic involvement in political life cannot compromise on this principle.”

Those words, “cannot compromise on this principle,” want to be underlined because “in this context it must be noted that a well-formed Christian conscience does not permit one to vote for a political program or an individual law which contradicts the fundamental contents of faith and morals.” Thus it is that there are moral principles that “do not permit of exception, compromise or derogation” because what is at stake is “the essence of the moral law which concerns the integral good of the human person.” Political programs and individual laws that bear on “abortion and euthanasia,” on the “rights of the human embryo,” on “monogamous marriage between a man and woman” or the freedom of parents “regarding the education of their children” and also on society’s “protection of minors” — all these, the
document specifies, touch on the moral principles that “do not admit of exception, compromise or derogation.”

One can imagine so-called conservatives, persons on the right wing of our national liberalism who see voting as a civic duty, criticizing the Vatican document for not suggesting, let alone specifying, what the Catholic citizen is to do when he has no choice between candidates who espouse the kind of programs and laws which “contradict the contents of faith and morals.” However, isn’t it perfectly clear? Once again: “A well-formed Christian conscience does not permit one to vote for a political program or individual law that contradicts the fundamental contents of faith and morals.”

Let’s put this another way. Try to imagine the nomination of a major party, or even a minor existing one whose candidate manages to make it onto the ballot of all the states, being secured by someone who calls for an end to no-fault divorce, abortion on demand and same-sex marriage. Wouldn’t he (or she) be the candidate for whom a Catholic should vote? Well, which candidate is that?

Of course there is always “the lesser of two evils” — as long as we ignore that it is still evil.

Nothing said here is meant to suggest that an election is not important. It certainly is. The outcome of the one this year will determine how Americans live for years to come. What is being said is that as long as they live in a society governed by liberal notions of liberty as the freedom to do whatever is humanly possible, including evil as the Church knows it to be, equality of all persons in the exercise of such liberty, as well as the equality of religious beliefs (or non-belief), and the perfectibility of man, Catholics every election season will be trapped in a quandary from which there is only one escape: the conversion of the nation to one whose rulers will enact laws that conform to God’s will.

Is such conversion as unlikely as a genuinely Christian candidate for national office in today’s circumstances? That is not true. We know it is not because God wishes it. He made that clear when He was incarnate. “Make disciples of all the nations” was the last commandment His followers heard direct from His lips. The important question, then, is not how or whether we may vote, but what are we doing, each of us, to fulfill Our Lord’s last commandment? •

---

Can’t make it to the conference?

30% Off if you order now.

MP3's, DVD's, Audio CD's, or flash drive for $28 +shipping/handling

Complete set of talks on the theme: “Keeping the Counter-Reformation Going.”

Call or order online: store.catholicism.org

Bookstore: (603) 239-6485

Preorder audio or video files now!
OUR CRUSADE:
The propagation and defense of Catholic dogma — especially Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus — and the conversion of America to the one, true Church.

EXTRA ECCLESIAM NULLA SALUS

Ex Cathedra: “There is but one universal Church of the faithful, outside of which no one at all is saved” (Pope Innocent III, Fourth Lateran Council, 1215).

Ex Cathedra: “We declare, say, define, and pronounce that it is absolutely necessary for the salvation of every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff” (Pope Boniface VIII, the Bull Unam Sanctam, 1302).

Ex Cathedra: “The most Holy Roman Church firmly believes, professes, and preaches that none of those existing outside the Catholic Church, not only pagans, but also Jews and heretics and schismatics, can have a share in life eternal; but that they will go into the eternal fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels, unless before death they are joined with Her; and that so important is the unity of this ecclesiastical body that only those remaining within this unity can profit by the sacraments of the Church unto salvation, and they alone can receive an eternal recompense for their fasts, their almsgivings, their other works of Christian piety and the duties of a Christian soldier. No one, let his almsgiving be as great as it may, no one, even if he pour out his blood for the Name of Christ, can be saved, unless he remain within the bosom and the unity of the Catholic Church” (Pope Eugene IV, the Bull Cantate Domino, 1441).

Notes:
• Listen to Reconquest on internet radio: www.reconquest.net.
• Stay up-to-date with current issues concerning the Church at Catholicism.org.
• Special thanks to Sailko for his photograph of Our Lady of the Seven Sorrows featured on our cover. (http://bit.ly/2bnxcAG)

Immaculate Heart of Mary School
is back in session!

Thank you for your continued support and prayers for our teachers and students.

Your generosity makes us a success!

To help support our school or enroll a child, contact us at:

Immaculate Heart of Mary School • P.O. Box 627 • Richmond, NH 03470 • Tel: 603-239-6495

www.ihmsnh.org