# Post 1: Is SSPX schismatic / Protestant?

Author: melbtest-commenter

Score: 0

Comments: 6

URL: https://i.redd.it/6kt3krjh0dsf1.jpeg

DorbJorb (3): Neither, what kind of a question is that?

craft00n (2): Nop, if you have faith in the dicastery for oecumenism :https://laportelatine.org/formation/crise-eglise/rapports-rome-fsspx/non-la-fraternite-saint-pie-x-nest-pas-schismatique-edward-cardinal-cassidy-3-mai-1994?utm.com

WallachianLand (1): Lol

melbtest-commenter (0): One posed by Catholics in communion with Rome

DorbJorb (1): SSPX \*are\* catholics in communion with Rome...

melbtest-commenter (1): Technically yeah

# Post 2: Pope Leo XIV releases his prayer intention for the month of October, inviting the faithful to pray for "collaboration between different religious traditions." | Vatican News

Author: HiberniaDublinensis

Score: 5

Comments: 0

URL: https://i.redd.it/5h1fvlhixcsf1.png

# Post 3: "Courage of the Soul: Quotes from the Saints on Martyrdom"

Author: Krzysztof76

Score: 8

Comments: 1

URL: https://i.redd.it/785jnkujxcsf1.jpeg

Saint Augustine:"The martyrs of the last times will be the greatest of all, because the first fought against emperors, and the last will fight against Satan."Saint Irenaeus of Lyons:"Do not fear those who kill the body but cannot kill the soul. For greater power belongs to the one who rules over the soul than to the one who rules over the body."Saint Cyprian of Carthage:"Let our blood, if necessary, be a seed of salvation for the Lord. The greatness of martyrdom is measured not by suffering, but by faithfulness to the end."Saint Ambrose of Milan:"Those who give their lives for the faith become sharers in Christ's victory over Satan. Their suffering is an eternal crown that no one can take away."Saint Leo the Great:"The greatness of a man does not lie in the strength of the body or the power of earthly rulers, but in the steadfastness of the soul, which remains faithful to God in the face of all evil."

Sad\_Mud\_5012 (1): Totally agree

# Post 4: There exist traditional catholic jesuit group?

Author: Much\_Storm\_8203

Score: 5

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1nugevz/there\_exist\_traditional\_catholic\_jesuit\_group/

There seem to be Traditional Dominicans( Avrille ) Franciscans (Morgon) and several Traditional Benedictine communities. However, I’ve never heard of any Traditional Jesuit groups. Do any exist? Even if a sedevacantist jesuit group?

Sad\_Mud\_5012 (4): Very good question hehe 👍🏻👍🏻👍🏻

EducationalTip3093 (1): there are traditional catholic jesuits in Massachusetts but they are sedes so stay far away!

Much\_Storm\_8203 (1): Who are them? Just for curiosity

# Post 5: Supporting SSPX priests, what are the things to consider?

Author: athanasiuspadovano

Score: 12

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1nu40lf/supporting\_sspx\_priests\_what\_are\_the\_things\_to/

In theory:1. If a bishop restricts the Latin Mass in a Diocese, would it have any effect on the SSPX? 2. If a family has a private chapel dedicated for TLMs, maximum capacity of 100, would the SSPX likely accept the invitation to celebrate masses there regularly? (Given that it has a guest house beside the chapel.) The SSPX priests have been celebrating TLMs in unusual places like funeral homes, considering this option would help them, how much would they need in order to sustain celebrating TLMs more regularly (instead of every other week)? They have to travel approximately 250km.3. Does a bishop have any right to close a private chapel given that it is NOT a property of his diocese, but a property owned and funded by a private entity? Would it not backfire him in court as it is against freedom of religious expression?

forbiddenq (6): 1. No. Example: After TC, Costa Rican Conference of Bishops issued a nationwide total ban on the TLM, even sent a Diocesan who wanted to continue the TLM to mental health therapy, they basically kicked out FSSP and ICKSP overnight who had a small but steady presence. The SSPX stayed and continues to grow. Virtually the only TLM offered aside from a couple of sede priests and some private hidden diocesan latin masses I hear rumors about. 2. Depends on many factors, but early founding SSPX missions in Latin America usually begin with private masses held in people's living rooms. The first chapel here was held in a private property, not owned by SSPX. Still is, proper chapel still hasn't begun construction. 3. No, Bishops can't interfere, these are private domiciles.

Spiritual-Anybody-18 (3): You cannot obey prelates although exercising legitimate authority they have abandoned the faith by teaching heresy and order you to attack God. You can only obey the legitimate commands that he does, that is that don't attack faith and either are neutral or just personal in nature (like he treating you wrongly or unjustly but that is not an attack on the faith or he ordering something good for the faith). The SSPX is operation survival of tradition. "bishop have any right to close a private chapel given that it is NOT a property of his diocese" he has an ecclesiastical right but cannot be obeyed by the SSPX because most likely he would not provide the faithful with the true mass and sacraments. Legally he cannot do it (funnily thanks to the secularization of the society this same clergy promoted see latest comments of Pope Leo asking for a "Responsible secularization"). But would depend on the country.

sparkle-possum (2): 1. Is a no for sure. The SSPX has been a literal godsend both in the years before Summorum Pontificum (when Pope Benedict allowed for more widespread celebration of the TLM) and in the more recent years of bishops basically banning it from much of their diocese. My bishop is heavily suppressing the TLM in our area and many people have started or plan to start attending the local-ish SSPX church.2. Not sure, this will probably depend on individual circumstance and location. 3. As far as I know, no. Following COVID, when some of our local NO parishes decided to remove some of the '70s innovations and try to instill more tradition and reverence into their parishes, a group of people started having their own Mass at a local rec center with a retired priest officiating. If that is allowed, then I really don't see how they could disallow it in somebody's private chapel.

realdenvercoder (1): Our parish. St. Isidore in Watkins, CO started out on someone’s back porch. Then they bought a house in Denver and turned it into a church. Now we have this beautiful chapel. The land and the building were donated by a local farmer so our patron is St. Isidore the Farmer.

realdenvercoder (1): https://youtu.be/AlQdK8Hf5g4?si=B12IL5a5qVqS3rFb

# Post 6: The Catholics you've never heard of | Tradition & Testimony

Author: HiberniaDublinensis

Score: 5

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uN4vE2P3qKQ

# Post 7: Men and women

Author: Altruistic\_Baby3035

Score: 0

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1nrysix/men\_and\_women/

Hiis the authority men have over women limited to husband and wife or general?

Due\_Wolverine3725 (2): It is limited to marriage.

BroadMaintenance2986 (4): Authority is linked to responsibility. One does not have authority over someone they're not responsible for in any way or form.In that sense, it is expected from men (oldest to youngest) to take leadership and responsibility in a group setting, for example, saying the prayers, ordering food... which does not mean they are immediately an authority, but rather, that they are capable of handling responsibility and, consequently, capable of ruling.

StelIaMaris (8): Legitimate question, why are you being downvoted? This seems like a very reasonable response

# Post 8: Traditional Catholic Resistance

Author: HiberniaDublinensis

Score: 21

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z1ILXUjtXm8

Krzysztof76 (3): "May I publish this video on my Facebook group?"

Blue\_Celica (2): Pray for the liberation of the church for error and rupturous documents as well.

RevolutionaryDust841 (2): AVE AVE CHRISTUS REX!!! Mary of Buen Suceso of The Purification, Pray For Us!

HiberniaDublinensis (2): Of course

# Post 9: Fasting days

Author: GunGal7

Score: 2

Comments: 19

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1nqouai/fasting\_days/

As a member of the SSPX, do you fast on Ember days?

Willsxyz (5): I don’t think anyone here is a member of the SSPX.I can tell you that the ember days this week were announced from the pulpit as traditional, but no longer obligatory, days of fast and abstinence.

ardaduck (2): Members of the SSPX aren't allowed to have a Reddit account.

Sola420 (2): Here's what our sspx parish saysWednesday Friday and Saturday if this week are ember days, formerly days of penance through fasting and partial abstinence. We encourage all to keep this observance even if it is not binding under pain of sin.

JustANerd-22 (2): Eu tenho colegas que jejuam, mas quem retirou as têmpora foi o papa Paulo VI, então acho que só a galera sede vai considerar obrigatória, ou no mínimo os seguidores do padre Álvaro Calderon que creem que os papas pós conciliares minaram a autoridade por medo dela. É complexo de explicar kkk

DorbJorb (1): I fast on ember days yes, but i also fast every single day regardless (not full day dasting but I only eat once a day so the rest of the time is technically a fast).I only eat more than once on feast days or celebrations like birthdays etc.

GunGal7 (2): Oh interesting. I thought there would be some SSPX parishners in the group

GunGal7 (1): I might be misunderstanding what a member actually means too

GunGal7 (2): Thanks! That's very helpful :)

GunGal7 (2): That’s some very solid fasting. Good for both spiritual and health

Cathain78 (3): There is, but technically it’s a priestly fraternity so the only actual members are clergy (and arguably some affiliated religious).But I’m sure those stating that there are no members on here knew exactly what you meant regardless 😉

Spiritual-Anybody-18 (3): This is so dense, why people make the same mistake. If you go to mass with the benedictines would you become a benedictine? I mean you could consider joining but you would have to become one deliberately and then become a priest.

Adventurous\_Check\_42 (2): You're good. Some people just like to virtue signal about how only the priests are technically members every chance they get. Most people here are members of an sspx chapel

DorbJorb (2): Thanks, I've been doing it the best I can for the last 2 years.

Willsxyz (3): It is an important distinction, because actual members of the SSPX, including 3rd order members, voluntarily put themselves under obedience in a way that the faithful who attend chapels of the SSPX do not. That means that it might be well be obligatory for actual members of the SSPX to fast and abstain on ember days (although I don’t know this to be the case) while it isn’t obligatory for anyone else.

GunGal7 (1): Good to know, thanks. The SSPX website gives fasting and abstinence guidance and at the bottom is the guidance for members of the SSPX. I wasn’t sure if members meant parishners or just the priests and members of the orders

Willsxyz (0): There is no such thing as a member of an SSPX chapel. At some (but not all) SSPX chapels, one can register oneself as an attendee (although this is entirely voluntary). But this is just a matter of providing contact information and not any kind of formal membership.

Cathain78 (1): Yes agreed, the distinction is important. But in context, I think it’s understood what the OP meant and explaining the distinction to them would probably be better than to simply say that there likely isn’t any SSPX members here, which would only cause confusion (and apparently did).

Spiritual-Anybody-18 (2): No, it's not mandated, we follow the church prescriptions for fasting. The pope sets the discipline of fasting. Yet if one is religious or belongs to a third order the superior might order fasting to you.

GunGal7 (1): Much appreciated.

# Post 10: Theological articles

Author: Jacques230

Score: 5

Comments: 0

URL: https://courrierderome.org/boutique

Sspx position and existence is based on theological judgements (some doctrine of the Roman authority is wrong, not catholic, etc.). Then how do you get informed of their theological «researchs» / answers to attacks ?For French speaking there is the Courrier de Rome journal (with father Gleize especially) but what about other languages?

# Post 11: How would you respond to this?

Author: Catman192

Score: 4

Comments: 2

URL: https://catholicstand.com/did-vatican-ii-change-the-doctrine-no-salvation-outside-the-church/

This article claims Vatican II did not change the Church's teaching on salvation outside the Church. It essentially argues that through ignorance, many people who aren't Catholic, are still part of the Church due to their innocence. Hence, it claims that the Church's teaching of No Salvation Outside the Church isn't compromised when Vatican II makes claims of non-Catholics achieving salvation.Is this true? If not, what is the best response to it?

Blue\_Celica (4): Yes that’s true. The problem isn’t the declaration of invincible ignorance because Trent left space for it as well, and yes in probably very rare cases on could attain salvation through extraordinary means. It’s the documents on ecumenism that seem to be ambiguous on Islam and Judaism.

Willsxyz (4): I do not wish to respond to the entire article, but I will respond to this part:>One of the most obvious problems with the claim that there is “no salvation outside the Church,” is that it seems unjust. In the case of those who have never heard about Christianity, how can their salvation depend upon faith + baptism? Denying them salvation seems to be punishing them for something that is beyond their control.The writer is making an error here in equating damnation with punishment. In fact, due to original sin, human beings are all born without the right to Heaven. For this reason, damnation is the default condition of human souls and not a punishment. This has been well understood for centuries, if not millennia. e.g. Dante placing the souls of virtuous pagans in the first circle of Hell.When we speak of justice, we are concerned with whether someone has, or has not, attained that to which they have a right. If I have a right to something, but that thing is denied me, we call that injustice. If I don't have a right to something, and that thing is denied me, we don't call that injustice. So to say that is "unjust" for those who have never heard of Christianity to be refused Heaven is like saying that it is unjust for kindergarten children to be turned away at the polling station or the liquor store.It is baptism that gives us the right to Heaven. The unbaptized therefore have no right to Heaven, and their damnation is therefore not unjust.Ok, so if the damnation of those who are unbaptized through no fault of their own is not unjust, is it nonetheless somehow "punishing them for something that is beyond their control"? Well, the Church teaches that all persons will receive their due reward or their due punishment, and that the degree of reward or punishment depends on what the person has done during their life. Although an unbeliever may not attain Heaven, it does not necessarily follow that they suffer torments in Hell. We can imagine a "virtuous unbeliever", who did his best to follow the natural law, and did penance for his failures having little or no pains of sense in Hell, much as we can imagine the unbaptized infants -- although not enjoying the beatific vision and therefore technically damned -- existing in a state of natural bliss.

# Post 12: Elbows on Communion Rail

Author: seawatercomplex

Score: 3

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1nont0u/elbows\_on\_communion\_rail/

Is it considered disrespectful to put your elbows on the communion rail while waiting for your turn to receive communion? I had my elbows on communion rail with my hands folded and meditated while I waited my turn. The priest walked over, patted my arm and said take your elbows off.I did some research and I couldn't find any source that forbids it?

GunGal7 (2): Good to know, wasn’t aware it can be disrespectful

SnowWhiteFeather (2): When I was going through catechism a few years ago our priest told me not to touch the communion rail. If I remember correctly he said something along the lines of:The communion rail is the boundary between the sanctuary and the nave. The sanctuary is where Gods presence dwells much like Heaven. The nave is where the congregation worships. Touching the communion rail is like trespassing into Heaven.

HammerAndArm (2): I wonder the same thing. My son actually bumped me and said, "that's rude papa!" 😄I guess I need faith like a child's.

Cathain78 (1): Our communion rail isn’t high enough to make this an option, but if it were I wouldn’t rest my elbows on it. No real reason I’m aware of but would just feel like bad manners somehow. And I say that as someone who is guilty of putting their elbows on dinner table 😊

Piklikl (1): It’s not a huge deal, but it seems like it’s a common practice to not put your hands above the communion rail as Sacred Particles may be present on the surface and while the priest is distributing communion if the Host drops it will fall onto the rail and not onto your hands/arms.In general though, it’s always best to have an attitude of respect and attention, I’ve heard many priests use the phrase “it’s not a lounge!” Again it’s not a huge deal, no one probably even noticed, and it’s not a bad thing to comply with a priest’s minor requests even if there’s not much of an apparent reason for the request.

nishka\_luv2 (1): In a lot of older traditional parishes we put our hands under the rail and covered by a cloth.

seawatercomplex (2): HAHA! one thing I thought of that's similar is table etiquette which you're not supposed to put elbows on the table while eating.

# Post 13: The New Mass vs. the Traditional Latin Mass of All Time

Author: Krzysztof76

Score: 25

Comments: 6

URL: https://i.redd.it/h4ihsbczlrqf1.jpeg

1. The New Mass and the Destruction of FaithThe Holy Mass is the source and summit of the life of the Church (Council of Trent, De Sacrificio Missae). If the source is corrupted, the entire spiritual life of a Christian is endangered.St. Pius X taught that the liturgy shapes faith: “Lex orandi – lex credendi” (the law of prayer is the law of belief).The New Mass (Novus Ordo Missae, 1969) was deliberately “de-Protestantized,” meaning it was stripped of numerous elements expressing the sacrificial nature of the Mass, while the emphasis was shifted toward the communal meal and fellowship.As a result, the faithful began to see the Mass not as the Sacrifice of Calvary, but as a gathering and shared meal. This leads to the loss of Catholic faith in the Real Presence and the sacrificial character of the Eucharist.---2. Mass ApostasyMore than half a century has passed since the introduction of the New Mass. The statistics are clear:A dramatic decline in priestly and religious vocations.Empty seminaries and monasteries.Millions of Catholics in Europe and America leaving for sects, atheism, or complete indifference.Pope Pius XII warned that “when the liturgy is distorted, the faith of the faithful weakens and perishes” (Mediator Dei). This is exactly what happened – through the deformation of the Mass, the process of spiritual denationalization of Catholics began.---3. Pentecostalization of the ChurchThe impoverished New Mass, stripped of majesty and the sacred, created a vacuum.In place of silence, adoration, and the sacred, emotionalism, guitar songs, clapping, and spontaneous prayers emerged.This opened the way to charismatic spirituality – that is, Protestant pentecostalization.Catholics, finding no mystery or sacrifice in the Novus Ordo, began seeking “religious experiences,” “emotional uplift,” or the “power of the Spirit,” often imitating Pentecostal patterns.As early as 1976, Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger wrote that “the New Mass is the product of a committee, not the organic development of Tradition” and that it led to “the banalization of the liturgy.” This banalization opened the door to Protestantization and emotionalism.---4. Pre-Conciliar WarningsSt. Pius V, in the bull Quo Primum (1570), commanded that the Roman Mass should never be fundamentally changed.Pius XII warned: “No one, not even a priest, may dare to arbitrarily add, remove, or change anything in the liturgy” (Mediator Dei).Leo XIII taught that “the surest path to losing the faith is changing the public worship of the Church.”What the popes predicted came true precisely after Paul VI’s reform.---5. The Fruit of a Poisoned TreeThe New Mass was created by a commission led by Archbishop Annibale Bugnini, who collaborated with Protestant observers. Cardinal Ottaviani – Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office – wrote to Paul VI that the Novus Ordo, “in its entire structure and individual parts represents a startling departure from the Catholic theology of the Mass formulated by the Council of Trent.”The fruit of this “new rite” is:The widespread disappearance of faith in the Real Presence (most faithful in the USA or Germany no longer believe in it).Profanation of the Eucharist through Communion in the hand.Treating the priest as the leader of the assembly rather than as the one offering the Host to God.---6. SummaryThe New Mass is the root of the crisis:It destroys faith because it changes the way it is professed.It destroys the Church because it leads to empty seminaries and mass apostasy.It opens the door to the spirit of Protestantism and emotional religiosity instead of to the Sacrifice of the Cross.For this reason, the Society of St. Pius X has defended the Mass of All Time from the beginning as the only certain antidote to the crisis – like an antibiotic that heals the source of the illness, not just the symptoms.Fideles Traditionis Group

Super\_Steve55 (3): I strongly feel like it would be important to note however that Spiritual Growth is very much possible within the Novus Ordo when done correctly and Faithfully (case and point: me), however restrained or something, it does still have the Real Presence (if one doesn't mess up the Mass entirely), as it is fundamentally a Valid Mass. Because, I share the belief that the Tridentine Mass will always be superior, as it is Infallibly Confirmed (and the Novus Ordo likewise isn't), but to say "never go at all costs avoid avoid because protestant yadda yadda" jeopardises some 1 billion Catholics, who, either out of necessity in knowledge or unknowledge, may still Faithfully seek Christ, and seek the unchangeable Sacrifice of the Mass, even if such Truth ends up diluted, it can't be forsaken without forsaking the Validity of the Mass.

CincyGuy2025 (2): It's a heresy to say that the Church makes use of ceremonies that are incentives to impiety... (Trent Session 22)Be careful about saying the "n.o. vatican 2 sect" is the Church yet makes use of a ceremony that is harmful to souls.Either the new "mass" is good for souls or the sect using it isn't the Church.

munchinerara (1): The world of 2025 is not the world of 1962, nor 1915, nor any other time. Fashions come and go. Beliefs ebb and flow.

Willsxyz (2): Do you think it is ever possible for a valid mass to be offensive to God?

west\_ham\_vb (1): When I was debating between Catholicism and Orthodoxy, I ended up in the Byzantine Rite church. NO mass just doesn’t do it for me. Good for those it does, but I just try to avoid attending mass at the RCC because of it. I will go to a TLM though.

Super\_Steve55 (2): Very much possible. Even in terms of the old catholics who would celebrate the Tridentine Mass in a liberal fashion (and denial of Dogma), or even the sspx resistance with toleration of sedeprivationism and beyond. One needs the correct Faithful mindset and outlook for Celebrating any Mass (whether the beloved Tridentine or Novus Ordo).

# Post 14: “The Holy Mass of All Ages”

Author: Krzysztof76

Score: 65

Comments: 6

URL: https://i.redd.it/qi61jrzr5hqf1.jpeg

1. St. John Chrysostom (4th century)> “Do not say, ‘O Lord, I am not worthy.’ The Lord is not for you to be worthy, but to receive life. Go, therefore, and receive the bread of eternal life.”---2. St. Ambrose of Milan (†397)> “The Holy Mass is the sacrament in which we do not only remember the Passion of the Lord, but make the sacrifice present. Time and place do not change, for it is a sacrifice eternal in itself.”---3. St. Augustine (†430)> “When we offer the sacrifice, it is not a human offering, but God’s. What happened on Golgotha occurs before our eyes in the Church. The Mass is eternal in its essence, because the Lord is unchanging.”---4. St. Leo the Great (†461)> “The priest at the altar does not make a new sacrifice, but at the same time and of the same sacrifice makes it present again in the Church, which endures through all ages.”---5. St. Thomas Aquinas (†1274) – Summa Theologica (III, q. 83, a. 1)> “The Holy Mass is the same sacrament that was at Golgotha: truly the sacrifice of Christ, not merely a remembrance of His death.”“It does not change, because Christ’s sacrifice is one, everlasting, and the Church only makes it present in time and space.”---6. Pope Pius XII (Mediator Dei, 20 November 1947)> “The Eucharistic sacrifice is the sacrifice of the same Jesus Christ, who offered Himself once and for all on the Cross. The Mass is not a repetition, but a real making-present of the sacrifice.”“Through the Holy Mass, the Church remains in memory and in the saving reality of Christ’s work, which is eternal.”---7. St. Alphonsus Maria Liguori (†1787)> “There is no greater grace on earth than participating in the Holy Mass. Every Mass exists in time and beyond time – as the Eternal Sacrifice.”

GabrielKazakhstan (3): What is the name of the painting? 🙏🏻

melbtest-commenter (0): Lovely. But Novus Ordo in Latin is the future

Krzysztof76 (1): "Unfortunately, I don't know."

Spiritual-Anybody-18 (5): Only a fool would fetishize language. The new mass has theological problems.

GabrielKazakhstan (1): thank you anyway

melbtest-commenter (0): I disagree respectfully

# Post 15: Pope Leo taking the sensible “middle road” when it comes to LGBTIQA+ Catholics - embracing all children of God, but reaffirming the Church teaching on traditional marriage. Blessings of gay couples still very much valid. How will SSPX go forward with this in mind? Accept or reject Papal authority?

Author: mygeneroussoul3

Score: 7

Comments: 10

URL: https://i.redd.it/z43cec8r29qf1.jpeg

Due\_Praline\_8538 (38): “Blessings of gay couples is valid” is incorrect. Blessings persons who happen to be gay is valid, blessings their union is not. Pope Leo said as much.

No-Test6158 (17): The SSPX is part of the church. So yes, they will continue to accept papal authority. The Catechism of St Pius X doesn't talk about same sex attraction (hence forth abbreviated to SSA) so the only authoritative teaching we have are from the more recent 1992 Catechism (which is structured in a similar form to the Catechism of St Pius X - but has its own problems).Specifically, we refer to article 2358:>The number of men and women who have deep-seated homosexual tendencies is not negligible. This inclination, which is objectively disordered, constitutes for most of them a trial. \*\*They must be accepted with respect, compassion, and sensitivity.\*\* Every sign of unjust discrimination in their regard should be avoided. These persons are called to fulfill God's will in their lives and, if they are Christians, to unite to the sacrifice of the Lord's Cross the difficulties they may encounter from their condition.This is continued in article 2359:>\*\*Homosexual persons are called to chastity\*\*. By the virtues of self-mastery that teach them inner freedom, at times by the support of disinterested friendship, by prayer and sacramental grace, they can and should gradually and resolutely approach Christian perfection.So for those people who have SSA, they are called to live a life of chastity, uniting their struggle with that of Our Lord's on the cross. This is no different to any person who is not SSA who also experiences lust or temptation to sin in a grave way.The church cannot bless sin, but it can facilitate those of us, of which there are many, who are in a state of sin, a path to sacramental grace.

Numbainne47 (12): Saying "accept or reject papal authority" carries some unnecessary connotations

jaqian (3): >Accept or reject Papal authority?OP would you throw off the mantle of the Church so easily?

craft00n (5): Well business as usual : accept Papal authority as it is, the authority not to change fundamental beliefs or laws.

Cathain78 (3): Accept Papal authority or blindly accept anything even when it oversteps the bounds of Papal Authority? That’s the question. And the answer should be obvious.

iphone5su93 (2): blessing people in mortal sin is forbidden if their sin is public

Willsxyz (1): Unless the Pope were to actually ask or require the SSPX to do something, then there is nothing for the SSPX to either accept or reject.If you think that the Pope has the authority to change Catholic doctrine and are asking whether the SSPX will go along with the “new” doctrine, then your premise is wrong.The Pope has no authority at all to change Catholic doctrine.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (4): Correct. The Father James Martin crowd are the ones that pushed the erroneous statement that those couples can receive some sort of blessing for their relationships.

Spiritual-Anybody-18 (1): Not at all if you are to confess and the priest cannot give you the sacrament because you are in a state of sin, i.e like not married in church. They can certainly guide you about what to do, and bless you.

# Post 16: Why aren’t people satisfied with the new Mass being done fully in Latin. Surely this is the way forward? Happy to hear differing opinions though

Author: melbtest09

Score: 0

Comments: 16

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1nlp1g6/why\_arent\_people\_satisfied\_with\_the\_new\_mass/

hardeho (20): I don't have time to even go all the way into this, but this would only make sense if the primary problem, or complaint, or deficiency, however you want to look at it, with the new Mass, was that it was in the vernacular. I don't think that even makes the top 10 problems with the new Mass.

Cathain78 (17): Due to the fact that the language is actually the least of the problems with the New Mass. First you need to understand the TLM and its theology, then compare it to the New Mass. Also interesting is to compare both with Cranmer’s Transitional Mass for the Anglicans. Finally, you can read numerous books or publications on the problems inherent in the New Mass. The Ottaviani Intervention is one I would recommend.Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi.There is a reason why Catholic Churches have emptied, vocations dried up, and even amongst those who remain, core Catholic beliefs are widely rejected by both laity and clergy.

HMX5000 (13): The Novus Ordo Mass has facilitated millions of liturgical abuses. It doesn't matter if it's in Latin. Even if it's technically valid, it's still a rite invented by people who despised the Roman Rite.

Willsxyz (7): Your error is in thinking that traditional Catholics love Latin more than anything else. In fact, the language is irrelevant. The problems with the new mass are doctrinal, not linguistic, in nature.

realdenvercoder (6): 1) The Novus ordo was stripped down and a lot of parts were taken out. 2) The priest facing the people can inspire pride. “Do they like my Mass?”. “How does my hair look?” “I need to be cool or they won’t like me.”3) EMHCs4) Communion in the hand. Imagine if you went to Costco and the lady was handing out cheese samples. Imagine how odd it would be if you knelt, closed your eyes, stuck your tongue out, and tilted your head back. It seems odd and out of place. They would think you’re mentally ill. Now imagine taking the most Holy Eucharist and reaching out and grabbing it with your filthy hands. Seems equally out of place. 5) Altar girls. Altar serving is supposed to allow young men the ability to have a taste of what it would be like to be a priest. Girls can’t be priests. So a) they’re wasting their time and b) they’re taking that position from boys who may be interested.The gist is that the language is the least of my concerns. I would rather attend a TLM in English than an NO in Latin.

NtGiL\_29 (2): A Tridentine Mass (with all usual mannerisms of Communion on the tongue, appropriate music, etc.) said in English is a much better path forward than a Novus Ordo said in Latin. There's a reason why they haven't caught on - who wants to say "Suscipiat Dominus sacrificium de manibus tuis..." etc. in the response for the Orate Fratres? Very few people.

sparkle-possum (2): Have you looked at the two side by side to see all of the changes that are made other than the language? Here's one comparison I found, with the TLM translated into English to make it easier to follow and compare: https://www.latinmassschedule.com/Resources/A%20COMPARISON%20between%20the%20old%20and%20new%20liturgy.pdfBut, like others have said, it's not just the language but changes in the Mass itself and a certain other things like the difference in the way the priest faces, the orientation and type of altar, etc. that also subtlety change the whole orientation of the Mass.Attending both, even without much background in the mass itself or the theology behind it, It's pretty easy to see that the traditional Mass is a sacrifice presented to God by the priest, in persona Christi, on behalf of the people and the Church, and he is facing the same way as us, oriented toward God and leading us in this. The newer Mass leans much and more into this idea of the Eucharist as a communal meal like the Last Supper and you can see it in the shift from the high altar to the more table-like altar facing the people and the priest facing them so they can see everything that's going on, and that also shifts the orientation of the Mass as something that is seen as, while still being offered to God, is viewed more as offered for the benefit of the people gathered there.It's subtle but, even if it was not intended to be that way, in practice this ends up shifting a lot of people's entire understanding of the Mass away from its true purpose - to glorify God, thank Him, atone for sin, and ask for His grace and blessings through the Sacrifice of Christ on Calvary made present on the altar - to a more Protestant understanding of worship that sees it as primarily to "feed" us spiritually in terms of edification (spiritual self-improvement) and what the people gathered obtain from it.

CincyGuy2025 (1): No victim in the new mass - neither Latin nor vernacular.Only bread and wine which earth has given and human hands have made.No consecration but simply an "institutive narrative."

Sad\_Mud\_5012 (0): Is there or is there a new mass in Latin right now? When was it patented? Anyone who can explain this???

Next-Antelope-5887 (0): Wouldn't doing the new mass in Latin be a step backwards?

Sad\_Mud\_5012 (2): I partially think the same, but I recognize that society has also promoted atheism in a constant and excessive manner with the media and other types of misinformation and therefore we would have to make an effort to know at least the best possible our traditional doctrine, which is not new that many people through public and academic opinions do not stop saying that Latin is a dead language and with this they greatly discredit the work that can be achieved, in addition others claim that they do not understand it but are unaware that the missals or manuals are in both languages, Latin-English, Latin-Spanish

sparkle-possum (1): Yes, I'm pretty sure it came out in 1969 right after V2. My former home parish used to have a Novus Ordo Mass in Latin on Fridays and I think it was fairly common for a while in some places. What people don't seem to get is that yes it's in Latin but it still retains all of the other changes that were made, so it's not really any different than going to a Novus Ordo in Spanish or French or whatever other vernacular language.

sparkle-possum (1): It's a great talking point for those who still want to destroy or suppress the TLM because most people don't understand how different the two forms are and think it's only about the language. It's their way of being able to say, what's the problem you've got your Latin mass now. That's I think part of why people opposed focus solely on the language, rather than even acknowledging the many other differences and omissions that were made.

Sad\_Mud\_5012 (1): Ok, I understand the case, but unfortunately I don't agree with you, because the criticism of reason teaches us that the liturgy was not only translated or changed language according to the region where it was celebrated, but also its gestures and so on were modified.You know who talks a lot about this topic and is a survivor of this CVII event, a priest who has a YT channel called Isidro Puente who now, noticing in recent days that the reforms of Francisco PP., were of no use but rather increased the gap in the reconciliation of tradition with the people of God, he decided to become a Sedevacantist.

sparkle-possum (2): I'm definitely not defending it as the same as or even similar to the TLM. That might have not been very clear but what I was saying is that the Novus Ordo in Latin is not really any different than in English or Spanish or any other language. It's not a "Latin Mass" in the sense most people mean, where they are shortening Traditional or Tridentine Latin mass to just the last two words, not referring only to the language

Sad\_Mud\_5012 (1): Well ok I understand. Furthermore, these things about the automatic translator change even the words
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“The whole world groaned in horror, realizing that it had become Arian,” observed St. Jerome in the 4th century. Today he would cry out: “The whole world uttered a death scream, realizing that it has become ecumenical.”Fr. Karl Stehlin, FSSPX---“What matters is not so much when, or even whether, we will manage to build a universal, global, Christian culture and civilization — what is important is that we make every possible effort in this direction.”Fr. Karl Stehlin, FSSPX
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HiThis is a stupid question, I know, but I‘m at the very start of converting to Catholicism at my SSPX church. I‘m too afraid to ask the priest about it since I don’t want to seem dumb and I don’t have any catholic irl friends or relatives.Don‘t get me wrong, I know how to pray the Rosary, I know briefly what the breviary is, I know the basic prayers, I‘m able to follow along at mass and understand about 20-30% of the Latin words.But how do you pray? I try to pray the rosary daily (even though I struggle to focus on it) and a few times a week I read scripture and study the catechism.But I don’t feel like I love God the way I should or that I have a relationship with Him. When I was protestant, years ago, before a long period of agnosticism that lasted until recently, I always talked to Him throughout the day like a friend, even though I barely knew anything about Him. Now matter how wrong protestants are about theology, I miss how emotional and personal everything was.Now, the more I learn about theology, He seems more and more overwhelmingly abstract (we can literally not understand God as humans) and I feel like I don’t even know who I‘m praying to anymore since God is so infinite and complicated. I‘d even say I experience rather what’s called fide informis than fide formata. No clue how to fix this feeling of detachment.Do you talk to God using your own words? Do you only pray official prayers?

Cathain78 (3): In one sense God is beyond our ability to understand fully, but that’s not to say we can’t begin to understand him at all. He has given us the capacity to love, to feel joy, and all manner of positive emotions. He has given us families so that we may understand paternal love, maternal love, filial love, etc. In such ways, we can begin to understand our relationship with God, Our Lady, etc. God also became incarnate as a human himself, and we can relate to the humanity of Christ in order to bring us closer to His divinity as well.As for praying, I tend to mix both personal prayer and formal. The beauty of formal Catholic prayer ensures my mind is lifted up to God and reminds me of the things I need to pray for, to give thanks for. But I also add a bit of my own thoughts and words in so that it remains personal and from the heart too. Remember God already knows our hearts and minds, and knows exactly what we need. I would recommend some formal prayers but it doesn’t have to be one or the other imo.

merinw (2): At its most basic, talk to God. You can do it any where. Formal prayers are great and have their place. A simple, heartfelt prayer in your own words is sometimes what we need the most. I spend the time at Mass during the consecration and the communion doing that. I talk to God. I thank Him for my blessings in the past week. I ask for blessings for those I love and for myself. I think about what Jesus suffered for us and commit to the next week of doing better. I do all this in my head,not spoken. I believe nothing is hidden from God.

GiantMary (2): I understand there are some here who are not fans of Hallow or Father Mike Schmitz, but I’m doing Catechism in a Year Podcast led by Fr. Schmitz and am in Section IV on Prayer. It has been really good- it begins on day 328 of the Podcast, 2558 in the Catechism. My prayers are with you!

TwoWeimsAZ (2): Don't be afraid to ask the priest about this. It is their job to guide you through your conversion process. My wife converted via the SSPX and the priests involved in the process were very kind and helpful.

CincyGuy2025 (2): Try to read "Conversation with Christ"Visit Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament and speak to Him as you like. He's there. He's listening.https://a.co/d/2lL0y9f

CincyGuy2025 (2): P.S. It's not a dumb question.And the priest knows you don't know anything. Quit trying to impress or hide your ignorance.

sparkle-possum (1): You can still pray using your own words. Formal or pre-written prayers definitely don't have to co-op or replace spontaneous prayer and it is fine to just talk to God, whether in longer prayers or little short ones as you go about your day.I was raised in two forms of protestantism that were both very emotional based and very focused on a personal relationship with Jesus but I feel like I've actually found more of that close relationship and devotion as a Catholic than I ever had back then. If you have time are looking for something structured, the Divine Office or Roman Breviary is great, and if you are only pray parts of it each day (Matins, Lauds, & Compline are a great start). You could also look into traditional devotions are some of the litanies to see if any of those really click with you, or Lectio Divina (contemplative reading).

Overall-Thanks-1183 (1): You can and should still talk to God like that, it's one of the higher forms of prayer. You should both do the pre written ones and talk to God with your own words that's how a healthy prayer life looks like

GunGal7 (1): I pray official prayers in the morning and evening, but often talk to God throughout the day and will also talk to him after my prayers in the morning too. I often just talk to him in my mind like I would talk to an actual person. When I say the rosary I sometimes struggle with staying focused and I have found that saying it out loud with intention, and thinking of myself in church at the same time, keeps me more focused. Also thinking about the mysteries that go along with the rosary helps as well. I recently went to one of the SSPX retreats and it was truly amazing. The Christian Warfare book is very good and has a lot of prayers and other helpful material for someone new to the SSPX. It comes in a regular size book or a pocket size which you can carry around with you. The Imitation of Christ is also another good one.

Asleep-Tonight-523 (1): Thanks!

Asleep-Tonight-523 (2): Thank you!!🙏
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Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (15): What is a synodal latin mass?

HMX5000 (9): Isn't the word "synodal" a way of saying something is "immoral"? For example, the "synod on synodality" could well be called the "synod on immorality".

GementesEtFlentes (12): Isn't this a good thing? All he seems to be saying is that he wants to open discussion between VO and NO churchgoers. It's not like restrictions could be much tighter, so isn’t any result pretty much guaranteed to be a positive development? I guess I could be reading this wrong

Spiritual-Anybody-18 (3): synodality, as in a ecumenical council maybe. The church can't be democratic like this modernist think it ought to be, they are completely deranged.

GeorgiaCatholic (5): I think we can look at this in a positive light. The previous pontificate claimed that the bishop’s report was against the TLM. That has been shown to be a lie.Leo saying that it’s an issue that has to be looked with “synodality” could mean that he’s going to say “let’s go back and listen to what the bishops actually said.”

Pizza527 (2): The bishop on CLT is cancelling the TLM on 10/2 unfortunately

CincyGuy2025 (2): Right into the devil's den you go... 🤦♂️

silent\_pilgrim (1): So basically Holy Father is trying to protect one heresy(mass of paul xi) with another(synodality).

HiberniaDublinensis (11): Good question. Unfortunately it seems like we're all about to find out.

silent\_pilgrim (1): What His Holiness refers to is settling the issue of Traditionalism and modernism through a synodal approach.

Didi\_Schwiedie (2): I can tell you an interesting story from my priest 😅The word "synodal" is the new favourite word of the church. They are using this word every time they can. In the past this word was "Vatican II". They only talked about this council and now they are only talking about synodal stuff because of inclusion etc. It isn’t even necessary that this stuff has something to do with synodality because they changed the whole concept and definition of it - especially the German Catholic clergy.

sparkle-possum (2): Maybe but I thought I read it more article they were talking about the Novus Ordo in Latin which has already been an option. It sidesteps the point and focus is on the language only not the removed parts and changed liturgy, which usually works against us because it takes the focus off on the changes and puts it on the tangential argument over whether or not people can understand the language

K28478 (3): I think you’re right. We are a church of paperwork too. I read this as “we have to see what is written, and work with and around it.”

GementesEtFlentes (2): If that's the case, that would be just as bad as banning it altogether! Yikes!

sparkle-possum (4): That's my concern, that the push is going to be for a Latin NO because the majority of people don't really understand the difference and it's just going to be framed as "See, they've got their Latin Mass and they're still not happy". I attended a parish that had a Latin NO for a while and it is profoundly different (which is probably obvious to everyone here but not to the world at large).And another fear, for me, is we'll see what was evidently planned and slowly slipping into my own diocese which is a push alongside this to ban or restrict more reverent practices in the NO as well (such as removing or not allowing the use of altar rails, heavily discouraging kneeling at all or even on the tongue, prohibiting the use of the Latin language and regular Sunday masses even for hymns and propers, prohibiting or heavenly discouraging ad orientum, etc).
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Suppose a Catholic monarchy somewhere proclaimed that he wanted the SSPX specifically to be the established religion of his country. Is that even possible? Would the SSPX go along with that? I realize resources aren't as abundant as with the mainstream Church but as an established church it would also have access to state funding which could theoretically rev up seminaries and maybe invest in worldwide recruitment of men discerning the priesthood, yeah?

feelinggravityspull (11): Well, SSPX isn't a religion, so that's a non-starter. But if a nation expressly acknowledged the rights of Christ the King, then the government would also take steps to insure that the faithful had access to Catholic tradition, which could mean favoring the SSPX.

PaxBonaFide (6): Well the SSPX bishops would have no jurisdiction over the dioceses in the country so I don’t think that’s possible, though a nation could theoretically be SSPX-friendly and support their chapels and stuff within the country

Willsxyz (8): No. That would be schismatic. The bishops of the SSPX have no territorial jurisdiction. The SSPX could not do this without claiming jurisdiction and thus going into schism.

hardeho (2): Well, considering the SSPX is an order of Catholic Priests, not a religion, I think it'd be weird.

iphone5su93 (2): there's not gonna be any Catholic monarchy anytime soon so don't worry about it although I wish it did happen Also state Churches aren't a thing in Catholicism

frankklinnn (2): The Holy See will negotiate with the monarch and come up with some secret agreement. Then, the holy father will order current bishops to step down and appoint SSPX bishops. It’s much like the Holy See-China agreement, in which the Holy See condoned Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association’s practice to consecrate bishops without Papal consent.

craft00n (-2): That's a fun thought experiment. May be something on what SSPX priests could disagree one with another.

CathHammerOfCommies (2): That's the angle I'm taking. I'm imagining a nation where a king proclaimed that error has no rights, only Catholics were granted citizenship, other religions were disallowed and immigration was only granted to Catholics; a nation where blasphemy and sodomy laws are upheld, family is protected and incentivized (like in Hungary), abortion obviously completely illegal under all circumstances and of course as you mentioned already: the Social Kingship of Christ.In my head it feels like novus ordo bishops would actually get in the way of that; they'd probably fight for a pluralistic society, and push for indiscriminate immigration. But I don't see SSPX bishops doing that.

CathHammerOfCommies (3): That's why it's just a hypothetical, a thought experiment.

Spiritual-Anybody-18 (2): The sspx is just a religious congregation and his bishops hold no territoral jurisdiction (they only exist to dispend sacraments and ensure the survival of tradition) this was clearly stated by Lefebvre.
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"Engaging in dialogue with error means placing God and the devil on the same level."– Archbishop Marcel LefebvreThis statement by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre is strong and requires calm reflection. Let me explain it step by step:1. What is error?In the Catholic understanding, error is falsehood opposed to the truth revealed by God. And revealed truth is Christ Himself, “the Way, the Truth, and the Life” (John 14:6). Therefore, error is not just an intellectual mistake, but something that opposes God.2. What is dialogue with error?If someone tries to “dialogue” with error on equal terms—that is, treating falsehood and truth as equally valid positions—then in practice he gives falsehood the rank of truth. This is dangerous, because it makes one behave as if one could choose between God and Satan as between two opinions.3. Why does Lefebvre speak about “placing God and the devil on the same level”?God is the source of truth.The devil, from the beginning, is the “father of lies” (John 8:44).If one accepts that truth and falsehood can be discussed and negotiated as equals, then one is treating God and the devil as if they were equal “partners at the table.” In other words: giving the devil a place equal to God.4. Practical consequencesA Christian has no right to treat error as something that can serve as a basis for compromise.Dialogue with a person in error—yes, because we must help him reach the truth. But dialogue with error itself—no, because truth cannot negotiate with falsehood.Within the Church, Lefebvre’s statement was directed against the idea of “interreligious dialogue” and “ecumenism” understood as putting all religions on the same level. In his view, such an attitude meant a betrayal of the exclusivity of Christ’s truth.5. For us personallyThis sentence is a call to vigilance:that we should not try to “reconcile” sin with grace in our hearts,that we should not consider every opinion or ideology as equally good as the Catholic faith,that we should have the courage to stand on the side of truth, even when it is difficult.
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Chaplet of the Seven Sorrows of the Most Blessed Virgin Mary (1880)Beginning of the Chaplet:In the Name of the Father †, and of the Son †, and of the Holy † Spirit. Amen!O God, come to my assistance.O Lord, make haste to help me.Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit.As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.Offering of the Chaplet:Most Sorrowful Mother, I offer You this Chaplet in honor of Your Most Holy Sorrows endured on earth; in thanksgiving for the graces You have obtained for me through them from God; and to implore, through the merits of those same Sorrows, the graces which You know and see to be most necessary for my soul, and especially the grace of Your most special protection at the hour of my death. Amen.Most Sorrowful Mother, grant that I may accompany You in the Sorrows of the Death of Jesus Christ.---FIRST SORROW 🖤 The Prophecy of SimeonO Mary, Sorrowful Mother! I grieve with You for the first sword which pierced Your Heart when the aged Simeon in the Temple foretold to You all the outrages of the Passion which Your Beloved Jesus was to endure from men, and which You, Mother, foresaw and understood. By this dreadful vision which so tormented Your Heart, I beg You, O my most merciful Lady! obtain for me this grace: that all throughout my life and at my death I may ever keep deeply engraved in my heart both Your Sorrows and the Passion of Jesus, Your Son.1 x Our Father7 x Hail Mary---SECOND SORROW 🖤 The Flight into EgyptO Mary, Sorrowful Mother! I grieve with You for the second sword which pierced Your Heart, when seeing Your innocent Son scarcely born, already persecuted and sought unto death by those whom He came to save, You were compelled to flee secretly by night into Egypt. By the fear, hardships, and labors which You endured in the company of the Infant Jesus, Your Son, during that long and weary journey through unknown lands, and by Your dwelling as a stranger in Egypt, poor and humiliated, I beg You, O most gracious Lady, obtain for me patience in enduring the hardships and adversities of this wretched life, that I may thereby escape the eternal pains of hell, which by my sins I have deserved.1 x Our Father7 x Hail Mary---THIRD SORROW 🖤 The Loss of the Child Jesus in the TempleO Mary, Sorrowful Mother! I grieve with You for the third sword which pierced Your Heart when Your beloved Jesus, Your Son, remained in the Temple of Jerusalem for three days without Your knowledge. Not seeing near You Him Who was Your only Love, nor knowing the reason for His absence, You passed all that time without rest, and the nights without sleep, weeping and sighing for Him Who was Your only and supreme Good. By all those tears and that sorrow which You endured in those three most long and bitter days, obtain for me the grace never to lose my God, but always to live and die united to Him.1 x Our Father7 x Hail Mary---FOURTH SORROW 🖤 Meeting Jesus Carrying His CrossO Mary, Sorrowful Mother! I grieve with You for the fourth sword which pierced Your Heart when You beheld Your beloved Jesus, Your Son, condemned to an innocent and cruel death, bound with chains, covered with Blood and wounds, crowned with thorns, staggering beneath the weight of the Cross, led to die for us out of Love. Meeting Him on the way, You saw His holy Countenance disfigured, and that sight became a cruel sword piercing Your Heart and His Heart burning with love. By this incomprehensible sorrow, I beg You, obtain for me the grace of perfect resignation to the Will of God, and of bearing with patience and joy all trials and sufferings even to the end of my life.1 x Our Father7 x Hail Mary---FIFTH SORROW 🖤 The Death of Jesus on the CrossO Mary, Sorrowful Mother! I grieve with You for the fifth sword which pierced Your Heart on Mount Calvary, when You beheld the cruel death of Your beloved Jesus, Your Son, Who before Your eyes, in unspeakable pains, on the hard bed of the Cross, in the midst of mockery and derision, was dying. I beg You, most merciful Mother, by those mortal sorrows which You endured with Your dying Son, Who from the Cross for the last time addressed You, commending us to You as Your children, and then inclined His Head and gave up His Spirit into the Hands of the Eternal Father: obtain for me the grace from Your beloved Jesus, that I may henceforth die to all creatures and live only for God my Creator, and so at last attain to Heaven, there to praise and behold Him forever.1 x Our Father7 x Hail Mary---SIXTH SORROW 🖤 The Body of Jesus Placed in the Arms of His MotherO Mary, Sorrowful Mother! I grieve with You for the sixth sword which pierced Your Heart, when You saw the Heart of Your Son, so full of love for mankind, pierced through and through, after He had endured a most cruel and bitter death for their salvation, and even after death outraged by them. By this sorrow which so cruelly rent Your Heart, obtain for me the grace of dwelling in the Wound of the Heart of Jesus, pierced for me, that I may think of nothing but God and His mercy, love Him above all things, and keep His holy commandments.1 x Our Father7 x Hail Mary---SEVENTH SORROW 🖤 The Burial of JesusO Mary, Sorrowful Mother! I grieve with You for the seventh sword which pierced Your Heart, when You beheld upon Your bosom the lifeless Body of Your beloved Son, taken down from the Cross, disfigured, covered with wounds and blood. At the sight You cried: “Ah, dearest Son! To what has the love of men brought You?” And when He was borne to the sepulcher, You accompanied Him, desiring with Your own hands to lay Him in the tomb, and there, bidding farewell to Your Son Jesus, You laid also within it Your Heart overflowing with sorrows. By all these sorrows of Your Heart, O Mother of most pure Love, obtain for me forgiveness of all my sins, of which I repent with all my heart; defend me from every temptation, especially at the hour of my death, that through the merits of Jesus Christ and Your intercession I may enter Heaven, there to praise and glorify Jesus, Your Son, and You forever. Amen.1 x Our Father7 x Hail Mary---V. Pray for us, O Virgin most Sorrowful.R. That we may be made worthy of the promises of Christ.Let us pray:O God, in Whose Passion, according to the prophecy of Simeon, the most sweet soul of the glorious Virgin Mother Mary was pierced with a sword of sorrow, mercifully grant that we who devoutly call to mind her Sorrows may obtain the blessed fruits of Thy Passion. Who livest and reignest world without end. Amen.Let us pray:O Most Holy Mary, Most Sorrowful Mother, through the Seven Sorrows of Your Most Precious Heart, which I have desired to honor by the recitation of this chaplet, I humbly beg, entreat, and implore You: obtain for me the grace of rising from my sins, perseverance in the grace of God, preservation from even the least offense against Him, and in the hour of my death, come, O Mother of Mercy, come and receive my soul, which even now, and for that moment, and forever, I entrust and commend into Your hands. Amen!3 x Hail Mary...🙏🏼🩵---Source: “Arka Pociechy, czyli zbiór nabożeństwa dla powiększenia chwały Pana Boga na ziemi,” collective work, published by the Augustinian Fathers, University Press, Kraków, 1880.

WinterBaroness (3): I have bought that chaplet in Fatima! It was really hard to find even if that area is full of stores selling religious stuff
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Blue\_Celica (1): The worse look was the pride parade they let happen in there.
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Ucieczka do Serca Maryi bolejącego pod Krzyżem Jej Syna (1881r.):"Serce Maryi, najpewniejsza Ucieczko strapionych, ulituj się nade mną! Ty jesteś po Bogu moją jedyna nadzieją: przybądź mi na ratunek! O najlepsza i najczulsza z Matek, połóż koniec mym grzechom, które są źródłem wszelkich boleści, jakie mnie tu na ziemi trapią, usłysz łaskawie moje westchnienia i jęki, wejrzyj na łzy moje, które niech zmyją wszelkie nieprawości, jakie popełniłem od dnia, w którym grzeszyć zacząłem aż do tej chwili; ratuj mnie, Bogarodzico, bo jestem dziecięciem Twojej Boleści. Łono Twego Miłosierdzia otwarte wszystkim grzesznikom: czyliż ja sam jeden na ziemi mam być odrzucony od Najczulszego Serca Twego? O Matko Bolesna! uciekam się do Twych Łez: racz osuszyć źródło łez moich. Pokaż się mej duszy, powróć jej życie i daj mi uczuć, że stojąc pod Krzyżem i mnie przyjęłaś za Syna Swego i że jesteś Opiekunką, Pośredniczką, i Matką moją. Amen!"🙏🏼🩵Flight to the Heart of Mary, Sorrowful at the Cross of Her Son (1881):"Heart of Mary, most sure refuge of the afflicted, have mercy on me! You are, after God, my only hope: come to my aid! O best and most tender of Mothers, put an end to my sins, which are the source of all the sufferings that afflict me here on earth; graciously hear my sighs and groans, look upon my tears, which may wash away all the iniquities I have committed from the day I began to sin until this very moment; save me, Mother of God, for I am a child of Your Sorrow. The bosom of Your Mercy is open to all sinners: shall I alone on earth be rejected by Your Most Tender Heart? O Sorrowful Mother! I flee to Your Tears: deign to dry the source of my tears. Reveal Yourself to my soul, restore its life, and let me feel that standing at the Cross, You have also accepted me as Your Son, and that You are my Protector, Mediatrix, and Mother. Amen!"------------------------Z modlitewnika: "Głos Duszy. Zbiór nabożeństwa Katolickiego", praca zbiorowa, wydane nakładem i drukiem Józefa Zawadzkiego, Wilno, 1881r.

# Post 25: Anima Sola is OK, right?

Author: Christ\_is\_\_risen
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URL: https://i.redd.it/cisx1ynee7pf1.jpeg

Anima Sola is a pretty popular devotion and I like the idea of it a lot, but I am worried about how prevalent it is in Santeria. I like how it is a personification of the Holy Souls but I'm not 100% sure it's OK considering how it is pretty popular in Santeria circles. Santeria is truly diabolical. They are perveting beautiful Catholc things I love so much such as the Scapular and O.L of Charity and I was wondering if Anima Sola is even still Catholic anymore at this point. If anyone has any information on this, please tell me if this devotion is legit.

CincyGuy2025 (2): The poor souls can help us but not themselves.The picture is immodest and should be removed.

Willsxyz (1): I had to go look it up online to see what it was, but what I read would make me, personally, want to stay away.Catholics do not pray \*\*to\*\* the holy souls in purgatory, but rather pray \*\*for\*\* them. And we certainly don’t pray to pictures.

BrodyJerome (1): You pray for the holy souls in purgatory. This is a devotion that is pretty popular in the part of the world that I live in. It is originally a Catholic devotion, even if some occultists have appropriated it.

feelinggravityspull (1): I asked my priest about this, and he confirmed that you can pray to the souls in purgatory. They are, after all, on the way to heaven. He said that there's some debate about whether they can intercede for you now, or not until they get to heaven, but either way you can still ask for their intercession.

# Post 26: Enviem-me vossos números para eu criar um grupo de WhatsApp tradicionalista, por favor.

Author: TostaIX
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URL: https://i.redd.it/1ine061w57pf1.jpeg

Sad\_Mud\_5012 (1): 9361573119

# Post 27: Saint John Chrysostom

Author: Krzysztof76
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URL: https://i.redd.it/8g5rdjdoa6pf1.jpeg

Saint John Chrysostom reminds us that faith is sacred and unique. When others mock it, they often do so out of ignorance, pride, or a hardened heart. Instead of responding with anger or offense, we should respond with prayer—interceding for those who err and do not understand God’s truth.He also emphasizes that our earthly time is fleeting, and the true moment of reckoning will come on the Day of Judgment. Then all mockery and ridicule will lose their meaning, and everyone will face the truth. This is a call to patience, humility, and love toward those who do not respect our faith, because true strength lies not in revenge or anger, but in prayer and fidelity to God.

Highwayman90 (2): The love shown here is convicting. In fact, we should want that person who laughs to have the opportunity to repent.

# Post 28: feminism and liberalism

Author: ashbowie\_

Score: 10

Comments: 12

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ng7ucp/feminism\_and\_liberalism/

HiI‘m a 17 year old girl from a liberal-protestant family, but I‘m genuinely curious about your worldview since I‘m very interested in Catholicism.I‘m struggling to understand what exactly you mind about feminism.I have a few questions:1. I‘m sure you know about the waves of feminism: The first one (late 19th - early 20th century) focused mainly on the right to vote, to own property and to access education. I understand that you struggle with the later waves that focused on abortion, sexual freedom and LGBTQ, but what about early feminism that secured equal rights and freedom for women?2. Do you support women going to university or work? I get that you criticise if a woman values her career more than her family, but what if she’d study/work until she has children and once they leave, she can work again.My mother did that; she had a career and was in a leading position, but when she had me, she stopped and only started to work again PART time when my sister and I were old enough to go to school (which is full day here).What’s the issue?3. Women refusing to get married… When I hear terms like „male loneliness epidemic“ and people talk about how no women want to settle anymore and choose to be single instead… Why don’t men start asking themselves why women prefer working 9-5 and being alone over being with them? I know very few men/boys I‘d be willing to live with for the rest of my life. When I look at the guys in my class, I see a bunch of sexist, lazy, immature and gaming-addicted boys who expect girls to do all the work. Fortunately, not all men are like that, but many are… Why would we choose to stay with someone like that? Is feminism bad for letting us choose who we want to be with and raise our kids with? For having standards (such as having a responsible, respectful partner)? Is feminism bad for letting us divorce a man who’s lazy, disrespectful or even abusive?4. It often sounds like feminism just appeared from nowhere or that communists created it or that it’s moral decay. I view it as the obvious reaction to the industrialisation:Friedrich Engels, a 19th century Marxist, noted that women's work in feudal societies was closely linked to the household. They grew food, wove fabrics and produced what the family needed. Legally, women were considered inferior, but their work was important and socially recognised.Industrial capitalism changed this and factories took over production and workers were treated as commodities. Domestic labour no longer counted, even though women were still expected to take care of the household. At the same time, many were forced into wage labour. Capitalists profited from the fact that women provided cheap labour, while their unpaid housework, feeding, clothing and caring for the workforce kept the system running at no extra cost. This double exploitation meant that women were overburdened at home and at work. Feminism did not emerge as a random protest, but as a reaction to the injustice inherent in the system.I understand why traditionalists see disorder in modern life, and in many ways I agree with them. But I think the problem is liberal capitalism, which has destroyed the old balance and devalued labour, which has always been important.I listened to a talk by Gregorius Hesse about Liberalism and free masonry and I honestly very much agreed with him, but the average rTraditionalCatholicism user does NOT make Capitalism responsible for what’s going on (unfortunately I can’t post there)5. My last question is, what I‘d be supposed to do if I was a trad cath. I‘m 17, as I mentioned before, and my biggest interests are philosophy, history and art history. I don’t want to work as a nurse or a kindergarten teacher. I enjoy debates and writing essays. I don’t dislike children, but I can’t handle being around people all day, it drives me crazy. I‘m not very emotional or romantic, but instead a very logical and rational person. I don’t feel the urge to have a family and am not really interested in romance or intimacy.Do I see myself as a housewife with three children in 10 years? Absolutely not. What’s your response to that?-I‘d be really curious about hearing your thoughts. I‘m absolutely open to changing my mind and noticed that I agree with many traditionalist views when I started getting into the topic. But I struggle with these few things.Thank you :)

craft00n (7): Hi, french trad cath here. Philosophy student, psychology therapist at the end of the year, one of my brothers and one of my uncles are priests in SSPX. US SSPX catholics tend to be influenced by protestantism, and therefore to be a bit more "conservative" on social issues than authentic catholicism. So take the answers with a good pinch of salt.[1] The problem isn't the right to vote or anything like that. Feminism has two major problems :- The fact that its goal is "more freedome for women" and not "the greater good". Tbh, the right to vote was 100% a good idea in terms of greater good, but the intentions behind feminism is rotten to it's core. Fighting for consent, women's right to vote, wage equality (when inequalities are real), and ending things that could reasonably be called "rape culture" (like blaming the foolish victims so much that you don't even condemn the perpetrators), are very good things, but feminism do so for bad reasons.- The last waves of feminism, because they want women's right and not the greater good, have progressively fought for objective wrongs like abortion and contraception. We could write more about that if you want.[2] All things equal, the more people are educated, the best. "Then you will know the truth, and the truth will set you free." (John 8:32). The problem is that women's education is frequently motivated by the idea that women should be "self sufficient", whereas NOBODY is self sufficient. You'll always depend on your husband/spouse/parents, and furthermore one your fellow parishioners and co-workers. Education should be pursued for the greater good and because beauty and perfection of the mind is a good thing per se, not because it's a way to individualism.[3] You're globaly 100% right : modern males and females are not wedding material, so no male or female want to get married and everybody ends lonely. But because mariage in a non christian world is slavery of the woman to the man's desire (Leo XIII, Arcanum, 1880), the men are the first complaining about loneliness.[4] I myself am very much interested in catholic anticapitalism (Chesterton, Belloc, Mainvielle, Sarda y Salvany, Saint-Simon), and I 100% consider that capitalism is the main cause of the destruction of traditional family, with how the nobility used mariage during the middle age being the second cause. Trad caths are sometimes very reluctant to go full anticapitalism because, in the modern world, the alternative is communism, which is at least as false than economic liberalism (which is the ethic behind capitalism)[5] Very very interesting point. All humans have the same natural end, being animals : having children. But some lack natural ease to do so. The very question is : how could you be the most useful for the greater good. Being a good mother is the most obvious way as a woman, the same as being a good father is the most obvious way as a man. But it is best to be a good single doctor/scientific/other than a bad mother. So you should simply pray God for the strength to do as is best in His will : apparently, for now, mother doesn't seem the best for you (you're still a bit young, it could change, but let's say it won't), so maybe you'll end as a nun (could be very mystical, or teaching, or even studying theology or something else, as dominicans have always done), or something else like a uni teacher or anything else.Edit : Looking into your reddit history, I see that you seem to speak fluent german, are interested in dialectical materialism, and have already asked a question about women here, which I tried to give an answer that you seem to have been interested in. I'm very interested in marxism too, as it's my worst enemy, as a thomist. Marxism is the second most strong philosophy/worldview, behind thomism, sooo yeah I better know it. In short : you will have to choose between marxism and catholicism. Maybe read "Divini Redemptoris" (Pius XI, 1937) to get where catholicism is opposed, and then maybe learn a bit about thomism, starting with the 24 theses and Pascendi (Pius X, 1907), and after that, well, you'll be ready to take a look at Saint Thomas himself, or maybe through Ed Feser, or many other english thomist channels... Long story short : welcome to philosophy and theology sis.

Willsxyz (4): \*\*Answer (2/2)\*\*4. You are moving into intellectual areas with which I am unfamiliar. My sense is that, in general, traditional Catholics should not be ideological capitalists. Traditional Catholic social teaching is that the right to own property, and to buy and to sell, to gain profit from one's work is God-given, and therefore unassailable. However, that does not mean that the economic system of the USA is in conformity with Catholic social doctrine. Corporations and businessmen here seek to increase their own wealth without end, even when the result is the financial destruction of their own workers and associates. I am reminded of a scene in the movie "The Founder" about the beginning of the McDonald's hamburger restaurant chain. In this scene, Ray Kroc, the "founder" of the McDonald's corporation explains to the McDonald brothers, from whom he has wrested control of the business, that his approach to business is such, that if he saw a drowning man (his competitor in business), instead of saving him, he would put more water in his mouth to drown him more quickly. It is apparent that this attitude is immoral.You might be interested in some of the writings of Pope Leo XIII on this topic. They are from the late 19th century, but still relevant:[https://www.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_l-xiii\\_enc\\_15051891\\_rerum-novarum.html](https://www.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\_l-xiii\_enc\_15051891\_rerum-novarum.html)[https://www.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_l-xiii\\_enc\\_28121878\\_quod-apostolici-muneris.html](https://www.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\_l-xiii\_enc\_28121878\_quod-apostolici-muneris.html)5. You have no obligation to marry. You are free to pursue your interests. You might wish to marry at a later time or, having completed your studies, enter a religious order, or simply remain single. You should remember, however, that our goal on Earth is to know, love, and serve God as best we can, and whatever we choose to do in life, it should primarily serve this purpose. If some other person were to criticize you for your life choices (assuming that you are not living a life of sin) then it is best to simply ignore them. You are obviously an intelligent young woman and I wish you the best.

Willsxyz (3): \*\*Answer (1/2)\*\*Hi. I think you have already gotten some good answers, but I will give you my perspective. Unfortunately, unlike u/craft00n, I have not studied philosophy so please consider my answers to be coming from my instinct rather than from knowledge of traditional Cathollic philosophy and theology. You should also know that I am American and I have daughters around your age, two already at university, one still in school.Ich habe vier Jahren in Deutschland gelebt und dort die deutsche Sprache erlernt. Ich kann also Deutsch sehr gut lesen. Weil aber mein Aufenthalt in Deutschland vor 20 Jahren beendet worden ist und ich mich kaum noch mit der deutschen Sprache beschäftige, ist meine Schreibfertigkeit etwas nachgelassen. Daher schreibe ich lieber auf Englisch, damit ich nicht allzu lange Zeit verbringe, und nicht allzu viele Fehler der Grammatik und Rechtschreibung machen. Okay?1. As I said, I have two daughters already in university, so I have no problem with women studying at university. I am in favor of women receiving education, if they wish, and of women having the right to own property. I will tell you that among traditional Catholics in the USA, there are many whose daughters do not go to university, but also many of their sons do not go to university, even if the father and mother did attend university. I think this is because these families do not wish to send their children to secular universities (which are, indeed, awful in many ways), but there are few good Catholic universities, and they are expensive.As far as voting goes, I like to tell my children that democracy is not a Catholic value. By that, I do not mean that I dislike democracy, but rather that, for Catholics the system of government is less important than the nature of government. Catholics should desire a confessional state. That is, a state in which the government is explicitly Catholic in confession, and the government and Church work together harmoniously to build a Catholic society. Of course we Catholics may not accomplish this by violence, but rather by conversion of the people. Whether the political system in this state is a democracy, a constitutional monarchy, an absolute monarchy, etc. is less important than the fact that the society and government are Catholic.Having said that, since we do live in a democracy, Catholics (both men and women) should vote and, in principle, I am not opposed to women voting. However, I do think that husbands and wives (assuming both are Catholic) should agree among themselves for whom they will vote and both should cast their votes for the same candidates.2. I do not oppose wives working outside the home when there are no children, or if it is a matter of true financial necessity (not the necessity to go on holiday, but the necessity to pay the rent). When there are children, however, it is best for the mother to be at home to take care of the children. Even when the children go to school, I don't think it is a wise idea to allow them to come home to an empty house.3. You are absolutely correct about the problems we see among the youth. It is no surprise to me that young women are not interested in marrying young men who act like small children and who display no maturity. It is very important, in my opinion, for Catholic parents to make sure that their children do not fall into the trap of extended immaturity, and other specific vices such as addition to porn, gaming, tiktok-doomscrolling, etc. Therefore, I do not allow my children to access the internet without supervision until they go to university (where I can not supervise them in any case). Of course this also means that they may not possess a smartphone. We also have no television in the house. Nonetheless, my children are permitted to watch some TV shows, and some movies, and I try to expose them in a limited manner to pop culture and the wider society. I do not want my children to get out "into the world" and think that I have been keeping them trapped in a Catholic bubble. Children who are kept from all secular influences while growing up often experience a crisis of faith, or lose their faith entirely, when they finally leave their parents' home.The other point you mentioned that I want to address is divorce. The Catholic church teaches that marriage is indissoluble. Once a man and woman are validly joined in holy matrimony, there is no possibility of divorce. It can happen that a woman marries a man who (presumably later) turns out to be lazy, or treats his wife disrespectfully. That is a problem, but divorce is not an acceptable (or a possible) answer. In some cases of abuse the Church does allow separation, but separation is not divorce, and it is not possible for either the husband or wife to find a new partner after the separation. Indeed, they should still cooperate in raising their children, and be willing to live together again if the problem that caused the separation is overcome.

undeadcookie123 (2): Others have given great answers but I thought I'll add my own two cents if it helps.1. Feminism itself has fundamentally unchristian beginnings. I'd suggest reading "The End of Woman: How Smashing the Patriarchy has Destroyed Us" by Carrie Gress along with more of her books on the subject. I think you will find it quite interesting. In a nutshell, at least the way I understood, feminism is correlated with dechristianisation of the west as gender roles began to lose their foundation as there was no logical or philosophical reason, at least one that was objectively grounded, to maintain them. Feminism, at its core, sought to make women the same as men and early feminists despised housewives, and marriage in general, as they saw it only as enslaving of women. Most, if not all, of early feminists were divorced promiscuous women, which are not good fruits to be judged by. Ultimately, since they have removed God from the equation, marriage became enslavement instead of a mutual self-giving rooted in love.2. It is not wrong for women to work or study period. However, as you said, she cannot value her career more than her family, as her primary duties lie in the latter. I feel like the following verse is applicable as well: "For where thy treasure is, there is thy heart also." (Mt. 6:21). Most women, like most men, have historically always worked, and the way I see it is that the question really is trying to ask if women can work outside the home, which also is not fundamentally wrong, though not ideal. As u/Willsxyz said, you do not want children to come back to an empty house. But even children aside, the woman cannot really be a good wife while also working full-time outside the home, at least it seems too strenuous to me to do without good reason.3. Very valid issue, both men and women in the younger generations, to which I also belong, predominantly do not possess the qualities that would make them good partners. Most young people in the west have no care in the world, and if we are talking about non-religious then it is virtually hopeless, and it is similar in modern Catholic circles too. I have met quite a few decent men and women in Traditional Catholic circles though, so that's where I would suggest to look. I have heard it is a common trope among radical conservatives that women should do all the work, you know the redpill nonsense, but it has nothing to do with Catholic gender roles so if you ever want to find a good man to marry, he should be a good Catholic to treat you well.4. You are exactly right with your observation that women were overburdened with work and household duties, however, I do not think it is necessarily an issue which resulted from industrialisation as much as it is a feminist issue at its core. Correct me if I'm wrong, but feminists fought for the right to work, and then realised it is extremely arduous to be a wife, mother and employee at once (as I mentioned in the answer to paragraph 2), but unwilling to let go of the work, the alternative being enslavement and dependance on their husbands, they began outsourcing the wifehood and motherhood to other women whom they would also employ, which is an issue remaining to this day. You say domestic labour no longer counted, but to whom? Do you think good husbands did not appreciate and value their wives' work? That the capitalist machine which seeks to extract all the bit of monetary value out of every individual did not value the output of a mother is wrong on every level and this is where I think is what as Catholics we need to do to change the world for the better. Capitalist, in essence, is not evil, as it is merely an economic model, but unchecked Capitalism is. The governments must place restrictions on Capitalism in their countries in order to ensure the tool works for the benefit of the nation that the benefit of the few at their expense. I will admit I am not well-versed in economic theories, so I cannot provide a detailed answer as to how things should be, but following the guidelines in Pope Leo XIII's encyclical Rerum Novarum would be a good start.5. You don't have to confine yourself to be a nurse or a kindergarten teacher. Considering your age, I'd suggest pursue your faith first and foremost, do follow what you are passionate about, and perhaps in a few years you will find a man who shares your interests whom you will want to marry. Since you lack much of an interest in romance as of now, if that remains, you may consider religious life, as someone else here mentioned. You could pursue your passions and dedicate your life to the ultimate good which is God, while also not having to be around people all the time. In any case, you need to grow in your faith and with time the right decision will seem clearer to you. May God bless you and guide you in your searching for answers.

ashbowie\_ (3): Hi!Regarding 1.:I’d be very interested in hearing more about your thoughts on the latest waves of feminism.Regarding 2.:I absolutely agreeRegarding 3.:This sounds very interesting and makes sense. Is it from “Arcanum Divinae Sapientiae”? Regarding 4.:Could you recommend any books on Catholic anti capitalism for a beginner? I read Marxist theory so far, but no other critics of capitalism.I understand that Communism sounds like a worse alternative to capitalism to Catholics.Regarding 5.:I thought only monks study theology while nuns work in hospitals or care for elders…Thank you so much for your answer, sounds very reasonable and not anti-feminist 😭

craft00n (2): "I have not studied philosophy", he said just before giving a long and coherent explanation including many crucial explanations.Wisdom is clearly not a matter of diploma. Thanks for what you added.

ashbowie\_ (1): Thank you for your comment, please excuse the delayed response!Re 1: In my opinion, your arguments on democracy and elections are very reasonable, and your concerns about secular universities are also understandable.Re 2: That's fair!Re 3: That also seems justified; looking back, I wouldn't want my younger self to have unsupervised access to the internet either. But yes, I always felt that it would be harmful to completely shield one's children from the modern world, as they would then be unprepared for adult life in our liberal society. I am glad that you have found a way to deal with the discrepancy between Catholic faith and atheistic worldview.Re 4: Thank you very much for your contribution, I will look into the works of Leo XIII. :)Re 5: Thank you very much 🙏🥹 I really appreciated your input, but I have to disagree with you when you say that you are not familiar with these topics or do not know much about them. What you said was not only helpful, but also very wise. Don't sell yourself short :)I wish you and your children a blessed life.

craft00n (4): Following on 1 :Well it would be simply basic moral philosophy and theology. A "good" action is what follows the natural end of the one acting. The natural end of sex is producing children (aristotelian teleologic biology), so all sexual act should be open to conception, even tho it can be motivated by... Well... The fact that it's quite nice to have sex with someone you love.Following on 2 :Consensus is frequently observed between wise people 😎 (That's 100% humor)Following on 3 :Yep. Sub-title is "On christian mariage".Following on 4 :J.K.Chesterton, "The outline of sanity" is a very renound book from a very renound author but I have yet to entirely read it 🫣Following on 5 :I know multiple dominican nuns who are active members of the scientific community, publishing in history. They are quite based and their work is of high quality, even though they are not publishing in globaly indexed journals so their work doesn't get to be known if it's not re-cited by other authors.For the last sentence :All that I said is 100% anti-feminism because I only want rights for women (and men, tbh) when it's justified by the greater good. Arcanum Divinae includes similar things : the Pope emphasizes on the fact that mariage before catholicism was horrible, but he's never "women need to be free", and more like "the human nature implies that men and women need to cooperate in growing children, each one doing it's best, so women, as responsible adults, need to give the best that they can give, so they shouldn't be considered as possessions or children".

sparkle-possum (3): I can't answer your questions on theory as deeply as some others here but for number 4 I did want to point out that it's not so much that Communism sounds like a worse alternative but did it has been specifically condemned or rejected by the church and many popes, along with socialism (which makes sense if you look at socialism in the Marxist sense as a prelude to communism, because for the many things Marxist theory gets right, it ultimately leads to totalitarianism and is a very materialist worldview which places economics and the market above individualism at almost always ends up placing it above human rights as well). At the same time, and also rejects pure capitalism that places materialism above human rights and the rights of workers, but in the past two centuries it has been communist and socialist societies that have persecuted the Church more directly.>The Church has rejected the totalitarian and atheistic ideologies associated in modem times with "communism" or "socialism." She has likewise refused to accept, in the practice of "capitalism," individualism and the absolute primacy of the law of the marketplace over human labor.207 Regulating the economy solely by centralized planning perverts the basis of social bonds; regulating it solely by the law of the marketplace fails social justice, for "there are many human needs which cannot be satisfied by the market."208 Reasonable regulation of the marketplace and economic initiatives, in keeping with a just hierarchy of values and a view to the common good, is to be commended. 207. Cf. CA 10; 13; 44.208. CA 34.- [Catechism of the Catholic Church 2425](https://share.google/bicyQABe9J3RbWVEt)The closest view/system that's fully compatible with Catholicism would be distributism, which I admit I still have a lot more to learn about, but the article below gives a kid explanation of it and also recommends some books for further reading: [Reading on Distributism] (https://share.google/CUQu5Hhu6KKqfY4hW)You will probably also want to read the two people encyclicals that it is grounded in: Rerum novarum (1891, Pope Leo XIII) & Quadragesimo anno (1931, Pope Pius XI).Finally, yes it's very common for nuns to be educated and there are even a few female doctors of the church. Saints like Catherine of Siena & Teresa of Ávila were educated and their writings influenced theology, philosophy, and even both secular and papal politics. For much of history, religious life was actually the best chance a woman had at pursuing higher education and devoting herself to study and teaching. Think about it, even those orders that do nursing and teaching require education for those roles and Dominican orders especially have study and preaching is part of their charism and often include an in-depth study of theology, including for women.As the other responder pointed out, a lot of what is labeled traditionalism in America is very influence by fundamentalist and evangelical religion, which is very influenced by right-wing politics and often a disordered obsession with gender roles as interpreted through the lens of of a modernist and ultimately Calvinistic view of patriarchy (I know that last part sounds counterintuitive but Calvin's blends of secular philosophy and political thought with religion was part of the early modern movement which set the groundwork for modernism).Many of these guys would make the same mistakes regarding gender roles that communists and hardcore socialists make regarding the place of economics and materialism in social thought and, making that error and giving those things primacy above religious and interior life, would have probably condemned many women who have been canonized or have otherwise lived pious lives that sought to advocate for the greater good through education and influenced and sometimes even challenged religious and secular authorities.

ashbowie\_ (1): Hi, I somehow procrastinated replying for nearly 2 weeks, I’m sorry!Everything you said sounds very reasonable (and even based?!), thank you for sharing your points! I’ll definitely look into the books you recommended and research the Dominican order a bit more.

craft00n (1): Good point : a difficult point about capitalism is that it's not directly condemned by the Church, so it's 100% normal to be less critical of capitalism than of communism. I shouldn't have forgotten to say that.

craft00n (2): Thanks, you're welcome ! Don't hesitate to ask if you want to ask things about catholic philosophy and theology.
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“When I discuss with pagans, I use reason; with Jews – the Old Testament; with heretics – the whole Sacred Scripture.”– Saint Thomas Aquinas

# Post 30: Ksiądz- Boży posłaniec.

Author: Krzysztof76

Score: 9

Comments: 2

URL: https://i.redd.it/6ucmyfb8vwof1.jpeg

Kim jest ksiądz?Ksiądz nie jest zwykłym człowiekiem, nie jest liderem społecznym ani nauczycielem moralnym w ludzkim rozumieniu. Ksiądz jest wybranym przez Boga posłańcem, człowiekiem, którego Pan ustanowił ambasadorem swojego Królestwa wobec ludzkości. To on staje się mostem między Niebem a ziemią, między Wszechmogącym a grzesznikiem.W jego rękach spoczywa największy skarb – sakramenty. To on prosi Boga o miłosierdzie dla żywych i umarłych, wznosi modlitwy, które mogą odmienić los duszy. To on jest świadkiem, strażnikiem i przewodnikiem w drodze ku świętości.Święty Jan Chryzostom przypomina nam, że kapłaństwo nie jest funkcją polityczną ani społeczną – to powołanie absolutnie święte, wymagające całkowitego oddania. Ksiądz w swojej codziennej posłudze staje w obronie dusz, walczy duchowo z grzechem, ofiarowując modlitwę, cierpienie i serce za innych.Kiedy patrzymy na kapłana, nie widzimy tylko człowieka – widzimy narzędzie Boga, którego słowa, ręce i serce mogą prowadzić do zbawienia. Każda jego modlitwa, każda Msza, każda spowiedź to akt niepojętej wagi duchowej, która obejmuje cały świat: żywych i umarłych, sprawiedliwych i grzeszników.Kapłaństwo to tajemnica miłości Boga wobec ludzi, powołanie do służby, której nikt inny nie może pełnić w taki sposób. Ksiądz nie jest panem dusz – jest ich najwierniejszym sługą, który staje między człowiekiem a Bogiem, by prowadzić go ku światłu i miłosierdziu.

WineTerminator (5): Panie Krzysztofie, to forum anglojęzyczne, proszę wrzucać materiały po angielsku!

Krzysztof76 (1): Dobrze postaram sie przetłumaczać tekst na angielski.

# Post 31: Is it licit to have doubts about wether or not sedevacantism is really an invalid theological position?

Author: Mailemanuel77

Score: 7

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1nfflcv/is\_it\_licit\_to\_have\_doubts\_about\_wether\_or\_not/

Of course not making any formal judgment, but being slightly just very slightly open to the idea that there is information that we might never be able to know, yet if there was ever a possibility that these theories are true, only the Cardinals have the authority to determine it, of course it is possible that they are also involved and never reveal the secret, it is possible that they are not involved but have been deceived and the ones who knew the "secrets" are already dead, they destroyed all evidence, the secret died with them. But that it beyond our power and we should not focus all of our attention to events that happened 60+ years ago, but rather focus our attention in practicing our Faith. We ought to recognize the Pope, wether we like him or not, and if it ever sedevacantist claims are true, God will not judge us because we don't have any means to know it, nor the authority nor explicit evidence to come to that formal conclusion, some sort of Pascal wager.

RiskKeepsMeEmployed (8): i am about as aligned with SSPX as is possible, but I find it insane if someone claims we can know for sure that no future Pope or Council will ever depose even one of these modernist Popes.Hesse, Lefebvre and De Castro Meyer all said it was possible anyway in not so many words.But perhaps as you are alluding to, it is also clear to me that no lay person and no individual or set of priests and bishops have the right or precedence to declare sedevecante without a act of the Church.

BallFragrant7650 (0): Same! I find myself gravitating more to that conclusion. The Roman Missal from 1962 is clearly inferior, and removed feasts from the calendar, prayers from the Breviary, proper last Gospels, etc… why would I stick around for the 1962 changes to become standard and for the church to still promote Vatican II? And it is crazy to think the Society of St. Pius X does not follow the same Missal as its patron.

Mailemanuel77 (3): Of course, all it takes is the Pope to declare a council invalid, to undone all actions made by previous Pope(s) to release evidence if it still exists, but it's practically impossible and theologically paradoxical to affirm that the magisterium has been co-opted by the enemies of Christ as it would imply that gates of hell have prevailed. But going sede is a risky wager on one's soul, if sedevacantism is true nothing happens, you managed to be one of the enlightened, but if it isn't your negligence to submit to the authority of the magisterium and adherence to schismatic groups is going to be a huge risk to your soul. After all common peasants in the middle ages weren't aware of the issues of the Church during the Western schism, would God punish them for submitting (due to ignorance) to an antipope, although there are resources and there is no such thing as total ignorance and there is a complete rabbit hole, the final conclusion is not only impossible because of lack of non deniable evidence, but also it's outside of our jurisdiction.

Jerailu (1): That's not sedevacantism, that's opinionism (saying the identity of the pope or the lack of one is an opinion) and even as a counciliar there's arguments for it due to the western schism.

# Post 32: Ks. Karl Stehlin FSSPX

Author: Krzysztof76

Score: 16

Comments: 10

URL: https://www.reddit.com/gallery/1nf88ir

Willsxyz (3): I had the pleasure of meeting Fr. Stehlin in the short time that he was district superior of Asia.

BasedEurope (2): He gave me Conditional baptism in Tallinn, very intelligent man

Blue\_Celica (2): \*\*Scream if you love Poland\*\*

Krzysztof76 (2): I am very happy, wonderful Priest.

Krzysztof76 (1): Yes, that’s true.

WinterBaroness (1): he was even in my country but I never had an opportunity to meet him 😂 maybe next year if God wills it

Krzysztof76 (1): “I sincerely wish you that, many Graces of God and a blessed day.”

Krzysztof76 (1): I am from Poland, from Wrocław, and Fr. Karol often comes to our chapel.

WinterBaroness (2): That's so cool :) I'm from Portugal so he goes to often to Fatima which we obviously know it's his favourite Marian apparition site. But again i never saw him in real life since i rarely go there haha

Krzysztof76 (1): "Maybe there will still be an opportunity to meet Fr. Karol; I was in Portugal for the 100th anniversary of the Fatima apparitions in 2017."

# Post 33: Św. Augustyn z Hippony

Author: Krzysztof76

Score: 5

Comments: 0

URL: https://i.redd.it/qaoyk5cehrof1.jpeg

Św. Augustyn przypomina, że każdy człowiek niesie za sobą jakąś historię. Nawet święci nie byli wolni od słabości i błędów w przeszłości. Ich droga do świętości była często drogą nawrócenia, walki z grzechem i wytrwałości w łasce Bożej. To pokazuje, że świętość nie jest „gotowym stanem”, ale owocem współpracy z łaską Boga, która przemienia serce.Z drugiej strony — nikt, nawet największy grzesznik, nie jest pozbawiony nadziei. Bóg zawsze daje możliwość powrotu, odrodzenia i rozpoczęcia nowego życia w łasce. Chrystus przyszedł „nie dla sprawiedliwych, ale dla grzeszników” (por. Mk 2,17). Historia Kościoła zna wiele przykładów osób, które żyły w ciemności, a potem stawały się wielkimi świętymi – wystarczy wspomnieć samego Augustyna, wcześniej znanego z rozwiązłego życia, a później wielkiego Doktora Kościoła.To zdanie jest więc wezwaniem do pokory i nadziei:Pokory, bo nikt nie może powiedzieć: „Jestem lepszy, nigdy nie zgrzeszyłem”.Nadziei, bo nikt nie może myśleć: „Dla mnie już nie ma ratunku”.Świętość jest drogą otwartą dla każdego, a miłosierdzie Boże jest większe niż każda przeszłość.

# Post 34: „Nie można zmusić serca do łaski”

Author: Krzysztof76

Score: 2

Comments: 0

URL: https://i.redd.it/h08y8zqrlpof1.jpeg

„Bóg stawia człowieka nad źródłem życia i prawdy. Otwiera przed nim strumienie łaski, wskazuje drogę, daje światło i moc ducha. Lecz nie może zmusić go, by napił się z tej wody – bo serce, które odwraca się od Niego, samo odrzuca dar życia. Tak jak można doprowadzić konia do wody, tak Bóg daje każdemu możliwość zbawienia, ale wolna wola decyduje, czy ją przyjmie. Miłość Boża czeka cierpliwie, nie narusza naszej decyzji, ale wzywa: „Przyjdź, pij, a odnajdziesz życie”.”

# Post 35: Tradycja Koscioła Katolickiego FSSPX

Author: Krzysztof76

Score: 8

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/gallery/1nexjbt

Potrzeba dziś bezkompromisowego opowiedzenia się po stronie Wiary Katolickiej i Tradycji, tak jak czynili to Machabeusze. Oni wiedzieli, że każdy kontakt z poganami, każdy kompromis wobec świata, prowadzi do odejścia od Boga, utraty wiary, tożsamości i kultury. Nie było dla nich wahania – walczyli do ostatniej kropli krwi, aby pozostać wiernymi Panu.My, katolicy, stoimy przed tym samym obowiązkiem. Nie możemy iść na kompromisy, nie możemy ulegać modom i trendom świata. Każdy z nas musi jasno i zdecydowanie stanąć po stronie Boga, Kościoła i Tradycji. Nie ma innej drogi – wierność wymaga odwagi, determinacji i całkowitego poświęcenia.Wierny Tradycji

storman\_sten (1): hehe why is so many posts in polish on this sub?

Blue\_Celica (1): Real

Blue\_Celica (2): Bc Poland is awesome

Krzysztof76 (1): I am Polish. Blessed night.

Krzysztof76 (1): Yes 😊

Krzysztof76 (1): Thank you very much, God bless you.

storman\_sten (1): Yes, I had that suspicion ;)

# Post 36: Do you only veil during mass?

Author: Asleep-Tonight-523

Score: 4

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1newo5o/do\_you\_only\_veil\_during\_mass/

Hi,To all the women:Do you only veil during mass and adoration or everytime you’re entering a catholic church?If I’m entering a Catholic church for sight seeing reasons for example, am I supposed to veil?If I’m going to a NO mass for whatever important reason, should I veil?Thanks!

BroadMaintenance2986 (6): I was taught to always veil inside of a church because of the real presence of Jesus in the Eucharist

Asleep-Tonight-523 (2): Thanks, makes sense :)

sparkle-possum (1): Same, I veil in the presence of the Eucharist, whichever type of church as long as it is Catholic.I usually put my veil on before entering the church but a lot of ladies will put it on before entering the sanctuary (or chapel if it's a church with a separate chapel for adoration). So also wear a veil if you're taking part in a Eucharistic procession or if for some reason Mass is being celebrated somewhere outside of a church.

# Post 37: „Na znak obecności Pana – zwyczaj klękania przed Najświętszym Sakramentem”

Author: Krzysztof76

Score: 27

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/gallery/1neweos

W dawnych czasach, gdy kapłan szedł z Najświętszym Sakramentem, np. by zanieść Komunię Świętą choremu, panowała głęboka cześć i skupienie. Przed kapłanem kroczył ministrant z dzwonkiem, który dźwiękiem ogłaszał obecność Pana Jezusa. Na ten dźwięk, gdziekolwiek się ktoś znajdował – czy w domu, czy na polu, czy na drodze – ludzie natychmiast klękali.Klękano nieraz na gołej ziemi, na bruku, w błocie czy w śniegu, bez względu na to, w jakich warunkach człowiek został zastany. Mężczyźni zdejmowali nakrycia głowy, kobiety pochylały się z wielką pokorą. Nawet przechodnie i podróżni, gdy tylko usłyszeli dzwonek i zobaczyli kapłana niosącego puszkę z Najświętszym Sakramentem, klękali na znak adoracji.Cała wieś czy miasteczko, w jednej chwili, na dźwięk tego małego dzwonka, zamieniało się w cichy kościół. Panował szacunek, cisza i pobożność – każdy wiedział, że w tej chwili przechodzi sam Chrystus, ukryty w Hostii.1. Św. Tomasz z Akwinu:> „W tym Sakramencie jest obecny sam Chrystus, prawdziwy Bóg i prawdziwy Człowiek; dlatego nie ma takiego aktu czci, którego byśmy Mu nie zawdzięczali.” (Summa Theologiae, III, q. 75, a. 1)2. Papież Pius XII:> „Nie tylko w kościele, ale i na ulicach i placach, gdy kapłan niesie Najświętszy Sakrament, wierni winni z największą pobożnością oddawać należną cześć Chrystusowi.” (Mediator Dei, 1947)3. Św. Alfons Liguori:> „Gdy przechodzi kapłan z Najświętszym Sakramentem, padnij na kolana, choćby ziemia była zimna i mokra; bo oto idzie twój Bóg i Zbawiciel.” (Praktyka Miłości Jezusa Chrystusa)4. Św. Jan Maria Vianney, proboszcz z Ars:> „Gdybyśmy naprawdę rozumieli obecność Pana w Eucharystii, upadalibyśmy na twarz, nie na kolana.”Grupa Wierny Tradycji

Piklikl (7): Translation:In ancient times, when a priest walked with the Blessed Sacrament, for example, to bring Holy Communion to the sick, profound reverence and concentration reigned. An acolyte walked before the priest with a bell, which announced the presence of the Lord Jesus with its ringing. At this sound, wherever one was—whether in a house, a field, or on the road—people immediately knelt.Kneeling was often done on bare ground, on pavement, in mud, or in snow, regardless of the conditions. Men removed their head coverings, women bowed with great humility. Even passersby and travelers, as soon as they heard the bell and saw the priest carrying the ciborium with the Blessed Sacrament, knelt in adoration.In an instant, at the sound of this small bell, the entire village or town would transform into a silent church. Respect, silence, and piety reigned—everyone knew that Christ himself, hidden in the Host, was passing by at that moment.St. Thomas Aquinas:"In this Sacrament, Christ himself is present, true God and true Man; therefore, there is no act of worship that we do not owe to Him." (Summa Theologiae, III, q. 75, a. 1)2. Pope Pius XII:"Not only in church, but also in the streets and squares, when the priest carries the Blessed Sacrament, the faithful should pay due worship to Christ with the greatest devotion." (Mediator Dei, 1947)3. St. Alphonsus Liguori:"When the priest passes by with the Blessed Sacrament, fall on your knees, even if the ground is cold and wet; for behold, your God and Savior is coming." (The Practice of Love of Jesus Christ)4. St. John Mary Vianney, Curé of Ars:"If we truly understood the presence of the Lord in the Eucharist, we would fall on our faces, not on our knees."Faithful to Tradition Group

Piklikl (9): Just a general note: if you see the Blessed Sacrament being carried exposed, you should kneel (eg in a Corpus Christi procession), you should stand out of respect for a priest (eg when he enters/leaves the church at the beginning of liturgical ceremonies). If the Blessed Sacrament is exposed, you should remain kneeling even when the priest enters.

# Post 38: Manipularz

Author: Krzysztof76

Score: 17

Comments: 1

URL: https://i.redd.it/tci43c8ghlof1.jpeg

Manipularz – to bardzo szczególny element stroju liturgicznego, związany wyłącznie z Mszą świętą w rycie rzymskim przedsoborowym. W Tradycji ma on głęboką symbolikę i choć dziś rzadko spotykany w liturgii posoborowej, dla kapłanów wiernych wieczystemu dziedzictwu Kościoła pozostaje znakiem ofiary, pokuty i cierpienia złączonego z Chrystusem.---🔹 WyglądManipularz to wąska taśma materiału, zbliżona do stuły, ale znacznie krótsza.Ma kolor zgodny z kolorem dnia liturgicznego (biały, czerwony, zielony, fioletowy, czarny).Zdobiony jest haftem, krzyżem, frędzlami, często pięknie wykonany, by ukazywał godność ołtarza.Zakłada się go na lewą rękę, na przegub, zwykle przypinając agrafką, aby nie spadał.---🔹 GenezaPochodzi ze starożytnego sudarium – chusty, której używali kapłani do ocierania potu i łez podczas sprawowania świętych czynności.Z czasem przeszedł z praktycznego użytku w symboliczny – znak pracy, trudu i łez, jakie wiążą się ze służbą Bogu.---🔹 SymbolikaW Tradycji Kościoła manipularz oznacza:1. Trud i cierpienie – przypomina, że kapłaństwo to nie zaszczyt, ale ofiara; ciężar Krzyża Chrystusowego.2. Pokutę – kapłan nie sprawuje liturgii w wygodzie, ale w zmaganiu się ze sobą i światem.3. Nagrodę wieczną – choć teraz trud i ból, to w wieczności radość i chwała.---🔹 Modlitwa przy zakładaniu manipularzaKapłan przed Mszą, zakładając manipularz, odmawia modlitwę pełną ducha pokuty:> „Merear, Domine, portare manipulum fletus et doloris; ut cum exsultatione recipiam mercedem laboris.”(Spraw, o Panie, abym godzien był nosić manipularz płaczu i boleści, ażebym z weselem otrzymał zapłatę za trud.)Ta modlitwa ukazuje esencję kapłańskiego życia – teraz cierpienie i ofiara, później chwała i odpocznienie w Bogu.---🔹 Rola w TradycjiW rycie trydenckim manipularz był obowiązkowym elementem stroju kapłańskiego do Mszy (podobnie jak alba, stuła, ornat).Bractwo Kapłańskie Św. Piusa X (FSSPX) oraz inne wspólnoty tradycyjne używają go nadal zgodnie z przepisami Mszału Rzymskiego św. Piusa V.Po reformie Pawła VI (Novus Ordo Missae) manipularz został zniesiony, uznany za „zbędny”. Jednak w Tradycji nie ma nic zbędnego – każdy znak ma głębokie znaczenie.---👉 W skrócie: manipularz to znak krzyża kapłana, jego łez, trudu i wyrzeczeń. To przypomnienie, że Msza święta jest ofiarą – i że kapłan wraz z wiernymi uczestniczy w cierpieniu Chrystusa, aby dojść do Jego chwały.

Sad\_Mud\_5012 (2): Manipulator w języku hiszpańskim

# Post 39: Praying in mortal sin

Author: Altruistic\_Baby3035

Score: 6

Comments: 19

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ne5kp7/praying\_in\_mortal\_sin/

HiWhat’s the catholic teaching regarding this?I’m baptised at a different denomination (afaik it was valid) but only in the process of converting (I’m at the very beginning). Obviously I can’t confess and I’m constantly in the state of mortal sin, which is already stressing and horrible enough.I read this on a pre-Vatican 2 theology server: “In a state of mortal sin, one is alienated from God and their prayers are ineffective. One should still pray because God may consider those prayers after you have received absolution.”I’m pretty sure that God did answer two of my prayers because what I specifically asked for happened and one ended up being one of the main reasons why I started going to mass and the other the final push to start the conversion program.So uh… those very specific things that helped me a lot were coincidences because God doesn’t hear me until I’m Catholic? Is me praying for others only pointless or even harmful? Is there a point in talking to God or should I just recite and read?If that’s true, I feel stupid for even assuming God intervened.

craft00n (14): You can't get sanctifying grace but praying can get you to win actual grace and grow your natural virtue of piety. So carry on, don't worry.For the "God didn't answer to what I asked for"... God never does as we hope or think, God does as is better and gives us the grace to do best with that, whether we're in grace state or not.

kawaqcosta (3): I'm not sure exactly where you got the information that the prayers of people in mortal sin are ineffective, or what the precise meaning of whoever said this is.This is not mentioned in the Catechism of St. Pius X as a consequence of mortal sin for the soul:>\*\*\*Q.\*\*\*\*\*What injury does mortal sin do the soul?\*\*>\*A.(1) Mortal sin deprives the soul of grace and of the friendship of God; (2) It makes it lose Heaven; (3) It deprives it of merits already acquired, and renders it incapable of acquiring new merits; (4) It makes it the slave of the devil; (5) It makes it deserve hell as well as the chastisements of this life.\*One thing is certain: prayers and good works cease to be meritorious for the soul in mortal sin; however, they do not cease to be good and dispose us to conversion.Therefore, it is always necessary to practice them. Furthermore, those in mortal sin must seek perfect contrition, and good works help us in this quest.

No-Test6158 (2): I was always taught, and St Alphonsus Liguori agrees, that if you are \*\*not\*\* in a state of mortal sin then you should pray and if you \*\*are\*\*, you should pray even harder.Don't be hard on yourself. God isn't as legalistic as people believe. He has rules, but, given that He is omniscient and compassionate, He understands that we may not have intended to cut ourselves off from Him by sinning. He will always listen to our prayers, if they are heartfelt and in His honour.

Massa-damnata (1): What is about praying the prayer of Perfect contrition? It is said to 100% absolve you from your sin, although as fast as possible you should ordinarily confess with a priest.As catechumens, who cannot confess yet this is absolutely necessary, otherwise you might just have 1,5 years of ineffective prayers?!

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): [deleted]

Altruistic\_Baby3035 (1): >For the "God didn't answer to what I asked for"...But He answered to what I prayed for... I can't remember asking for anything else in the past months that could be answered directly (in those two cases I asked for very specific things connected to my faith and it happened within less than 12 hours both times, I can explain more via DM), other things I prayed for were more general or long term. In the end I don't know whether it was Him or not, but it was scarily obvious both times. I'm simply scared of falsly assuming it was Him and implying He would have the mercy to answer even though I'm not in a state of grace and offending God by thinking that.Thank you very much for your answer <3

CathMode (3): Exactly—also OP could see if he can speak with a priest about it to clarify. Keep praying: 💯. OP, look up “actual grace” vs sanctifying grace.

Altruistic\_Baby3035 (2): Thank you 🙏🫶

Altruistic\_Baby3035 (1): My goal is to confess as soon as possible, yeah, but I guess that is going to happen around summer 2026... About the prayer: I'm not sure whether my remorse is perfect or imperfect and I don't want to pray the act of perfect contrition without real perfect contrition.>otherwise you might just have 1,5 years of ineffective prayers?!That's what I'm wondering about. But the whole idea of prayers being ineffective or not is a bit confusing to me.

Altruistic\_Baby3035 (1): I can’t go to confession…

Altruistic\_Baby3035 (1): What?

craft00n (2): Sry, I didn't understood well your first message.Everything good is from God, one way or another. Don't worry. Just, don't underestimate God : usually, he doesn't even need to do miraculous things to get what he wants, so you can always assume that he didn't do anything. And that's the thing with faith : seeing God's love in things that people without faith would just see as "normal" things. These things are indeed normal, because God's love is everywhere. And yes, God has the mercy to give actual grace to people outside of state of grace, that's how he motivates you to come back into state of grace.

Altruistic\_Baby3035 (2): Thanks, I’ll look it up. I’m a bit scared of approaching a priest outside of catechism class, they always seem quite busy, but you’re right.

Massa-damnata (4): Don't stress about it my brother in Christ! Perfect contrition means out of love. If you just pray it devoutly its strutcture makes you HAVE contrition out of love more than fear of hell automatically. The saints said as much as that if prayed devoutly it works 100% . So don't be imprudent, and take away valid fonts of Grace! I myself can say, praying it just when I feel I might have commited Mortal Sin, I feel uneasy until I prayed it and feel my prayers working really well when I did it and guilty when not. I know feeling is not a valid indicator but even Saints had many good feelings when in Grace, so know the Devil does not tempt you more than he is allowed to do, that is more than you can handle!The prayer:O my God and Lord, I am heartily sorry for all the sins of my whole life.Not only due to the temporal or even eternal punishment, I do deserve, from you my just judge,Moreso for the Ingratitude I have shown to Thee my greatest benefactor!Most of all having offended Thee, my God, Who are all good and deserving of all my love. I firmly resolve, with the help of Thy grace, to confess my sins, to do penance, and to amend my life.\*Oh Jesus please give me the Grace to do so! Amen.\*Have a good conversion my brother! Wish you all the best, connected in prayers!

craft00n (1): He says that because you didn't understand well what mortal sin implied, and that a good SSPX priest could have reassured you.

None (1): [deleted]

Massa-damnata (1): Sadly this prayer is as so much, abridged after the poisonous Council, my version is a translated version of the old one recommended by Saint Pius X in his Catechism, with minor changes. Here the link to its effecaciosness and the need to pray it duly:[https://americaneedsfatima.org/prayers/making-a-perfect-act-of-contrition](https://americaneedsfatima.org/prayers/making-a-perfect-act-of-contrition)

Altruistic\_Baby3035 (1): I’m quite sure that the priests at my local parish are very good, but as I said, I’m converting from protestantism, so mortal sins are one of the few things that are completely new to me.and I’m sure a priest could help me, but I don’t want to ask a bunch of questions at the catechism class and outside of that don’t want to bother them, especially if it’s things like that, where I can at least try to find answers online instead of annoying someone who’s busy enough. Thanks tho :/

Altruistic\_Baby3035 (1): Neither?

craft00n (2): It's not a problem at all, and I'm very happy for you that you're converting to catholicism. I don't think you would be bothering the priests.

Altruistic\_Baby3035 (1): Thanks a lot for the advice and your time 🙏

# Post 40: What do you use for veiling?

Author: Altruistic\_Baby3035

Score: 3
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ne2c7w/what\_do\_you\_use\_for\_veiling/

Hi 👋 How do you (or the women at your parish, if you’re male) veil?I’m relatively new to Catholicism and attend SSPX masses.At my parish, around 60% of the women veil, so I never stood out for not doing so. But lately I’ve felt like I should start veiling at mass because, besides the humble symbolic gesture a veil is, it feels disrespectful to not wear one and considering all women wore head coverings at mass until the 60s, I even more feel obligated to do the same.I’ve seen some (older) women wearing silky scarfs, while most younger women wear a Mantilla and some few women with rectangular modal scarves (I think they are more common for orthodox women).I’d intuitively wear a Mantilla because everyone does and I really don’t want to stand out. But it feels a bit off since Mantillas weren’t common AT ALL in my country until a few years or decades ago. Traditionally, women wore silk scarves or hats here. Wearing a white lace veil feels like a trend… you know?Also, I ordered one anyway but it takes time to arrive. I have plain white, rectangular modal scarves at home that I could use for veiling, but as I said, very few wear them at my parish and I generally see them more often worn by orthodox women…What do you wear? Triangular Mantilla? D shaped chapel veil? A scarf? A hat?Thanks!

HiberniaDublinensis (3): Traditionally in Ireland they women didn't have any special head coverings for Mass, they just wore what they always wore around their necks and over their heads as part of the traditional dress of the country. A lot of women also wear a type of scarf over their head.Mantillas are a Spanish thing and had no presence in this part of the world until in the past few years young girls started seeing them on the internet and copying them, ordering them online. It's a bit cringe to see but they'll snap out of it eventually. More and more young people are taking an interest in their national heritage and slowly but noticeably the number of women at the Latin Mass covering their heads with something that's actually part of their culture and not something they got off the internet because they saw it online is increasing.I don't know where you are but my advice would be to find something that's part of the local tradition. Probably ask your grandmother what she and her mother and grandmother covered their heads with at Mass. You mention silk scarves or hats, those are fine things to wear to Mass and there's nothing wrong with it. If you don't have it then wear whatever you have. Something is better than nothing.I wouldn't worry about standing out. I mean, by attending the TLM you're already standing out from the other 99.9% of society.>But lately I’ve felt like I should start veiling at mass because, besides the humble symbolic gesture a veil is, it feels disrespectful to not wear one and considering all women wore head coverings at mass until the 60s, I even more feel obligated to do the same.Given how new you are you may not have heard it before but head covering for women is more than just a gesture, it's a Biblical teaching. The same goes for men uncovering their heads. Both are equally important.

Routine-Message5122 (3): During the winter, I wear whatever scarf is best for the outfit and move it to conceal my hair during mass. During the summer, I wear a black lace veil (I just prefer black for the vibes). I’m not sure if this is only my opinion, but I really avoid the more transparent veils and scarves. Seems to kind of negate the purpose. Veiling is wonderful, and use whatever works!

Habemus\_Username (2): Honestly, whatever suits your style.In Europe we get a mixture of lace-veils (white is usually for unmarried ladies, black/other colours is for married women traditionally) and the most common alternative is veiling with silk-like scarves, like the ones that people used to wrap around the handle of handbags etc. Hats are also a good idea, especially in the context of more formal occasions - but sometimes people who aren't in the know might tell you to remove your hat in church. (In the UK they know that women are usually expected to keep their hats on in church).

HiberniaDublinensis (3): >Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ. Now I praise you, brethren, that in all things you are mindful of me: and keep my ordinances as I have delivered them to you. But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God. Every man praying or prophesying with his head covered, disgraceth his head. But every woman praying or prophesying with her head not covered, disgraceth her head: for it is all one as if she were shaven.>For if a woman be not covered, let her be shorn. But if it be a shame to a woman to be shorn or made bald, let her cover her head. The man indeed ought not to cover his head, because he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man. For the man was not created for the woman, but the woman for the man. Therefore ought the woman to have a power over her head, because of the angels.>\*"A power": that is, a veil or covering, as a sign that she is under the power of her husband: and this, the apostle adds, because of the angels, who are present in the assemblies of the faithful.\*>But yet neither is the man without the woman, nor the woman without the man, in the Lord. For as the woman is of the man, so also is the man by the woman: but all things of God. You yourselves judge: doth it become a woman, to pray unto God uncovered? Doth not even nature itself teach you, that a man indeed, if he nourish his hair, it is a shame unto him? But if a woman nourish her hair, it is a glory to her; for her hair is given to her for a covering.[The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians 11:1-15](https://www.drbo.org/chapter/53011.htm)

Altruistic\_Baby3035 (3): Oh yes, I’m aware of 1. Corinthians 11, I kinda meant to include that in my statement about it being mandatory until the 60s 😭My whole family, even grandparents, is atheist or liberal-protestant, so I doubt I have any living relatives who ever wore a head covering to church. I absolutely agree, I find Mantillas a bit odd for the same reasons you mentioned, but on the other hand… culture is always changing and it’s only natural that the style we use for head coverings changes, but the tradition to cover your head some way is kept… right?Thanks for the input, I’ll look a bit more into this and maybe ask older women at my parish about it. :)

Altruistic\_Baby3035 (1): Thank you! Aren't most lace veils generally very transparent? Where did you buy yours?

Altruistic\_Baby3035 (1): Thanks! I also feel like hats are more formal and even though mass is an occasion for formal wear, I feel like wearing a hat at my local parish would rather look overdressed and look oriented, since, like you said, most women wear scarfs or lace veils for mass.

HiberniaDublinensis (3): Culture is always changing of course but unless you're Spanish then mantillas aren't part of our culture. A covering at all is the main thing but ideally it's something that's actually part of life. And yeah old women in parishes are a source of great knowledge and information. I'd even ask the priest if he's from the same country.

Routine-Message5122 (2): I bought mine at a tiny local shop because Catholicism is not very popular here :( but some veils have bigger patterns on them, so they are not as transparent, if that makes sense…? It’s a very nit-picky personal opinion, and I had a hard time finding a more solid veil myself.

Habemus\_Username (2): I think it's also about matching what you'd wear with the appropriate occasion. Hats are usually fascinators and go with a particular outfit rather than a weekly thing. Unless you're going for the 1920s style small hats, even then they might draw attention. There is a trend for younger, late teens-early twenties girls to wear silk scarves and that seems to work quite well too. Especially if it works as part of a cohesive/coherent outfit. Otherwise, just get yourself a veil that you like and just focus on uniting yourself spiritually with Our Lord at mass. Honestly, it'll be fine!

# Post 41: History of SSPX in Argentina.

Author: Spiritual-Anybody-18

Score: 3

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7MvGReFLsxc

# Post 42: Pope Leo XIV has suppressed 2 Chinese dioceses established by Pope Pius XII. He has instead recognised the "diocese" of the "Chinese Catholic Patriotic Association" which is run by the communist party.

Author: HiberniaDublinensis
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Comments: 5

URL: https://i.redd.it/cbeq4qjsnbof1.png

Cathain78 (6): I mean, I assume nobody here is surprised?

craft00n (0): Vatican chinese strategy is a complex thing, we shouldn't have too harsh a priori on this

StelIaMaris (1): Communist controlled “bishops” are bad. End of story

craft00n (1): Well, it was my original opinion, but since then a SSPX priest who was in east asia for 20 years told me that many Communist bishops are in reality double agents, secretly following the Pope's order. It's not rare that a recently party appointed bishop sends a letter to the secret church to ask for a valid consecration. In fact, the whole Pope Francis recognizing the CCP Church could be a "lol the majority of your bishops are secretly with me, you lost, kiss", in the eyes of this priest. So yeah, as usual, investiture controversy is a complex topic.

# Post 43: SSPX parishes

Author: norton777
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1nczlh5/sspx\_parishes/

Do you guys know what sspx parish is the biggest?

GeorgiaCatholic (11): Does the Immaculata in st. Mary’s Kansas have any close competition? I can’t imagine so. The new church is larger than most cathedrals in the US.

Internal\_Ad1735 (8): Immaculata - St. Mary's is the biggest in the world. Then St. Nicolas du Chardonnet in Paris.

Spiritual-Anybody-18 (3): Common misconception the SSPX does not have parishes just chaples.

realdenvercoder (2): See I always thought St. Isidore was big but it sounds like we’re tiny in comparison. 😂

norton777 (1): I think it’s the biggest in size but what about total parishioners has the sspx released anything on attendance

norton777 (1): Thank you

Internal\_Ad1735 (2): They basically run like parishes.

Willsxyz (2): There is nothing official, but the numbers usually thrown around are "about 5000" for Masses on Sunday. This is believable to me, because when I was there the Church was packed full for 8:30 am and 11:00 am Sunday masses.

badger-dagger (1): Why do you ask?

Huge-Explanation-358 (2): Sure, but its not a parish. If the SSPX created any parish they would be in schism.

norton777 (1): ok thank you

norton777 (1): No particular reason I’m just into demographics

norton777 (2): Aren’t they basically parishes in everything it name

# Post 44: Baptism/Godparent of non Catholic

Author: GrandHospital8399
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URL: /r/Catholicism/comments/1nc7ceu/baptismgodparent\_of\_non\_catholic/

APXO-ICXC-NIKA (2): You must turn them down unless they promise to baptize in the Catholic church and raise the child in the Catholic faith (which is unlikely) - while it may be a valid baptism, it’s held outside the Catholic church so it is illicit because YOU know that the sacraments belong to the Church and as a Catholic Godparent you have the responsibility of seeing to the spiritual wellbeing of your Godchild which is already hampered with a lapsed Catholic father and an upbringing in a heretical sect. Further, I was advised by my SSPX priest to not even attend a protestant baptism because it is illicit, so that’s something to consider as well.

GrandHospital8399 (1): Thanks for your response. It’s a very tough situation, but I agree with you. I don’t think my brother understands the importance of it all.

APXO-ICXC-NIKA (1): You bet - it’s difficult and I get it - I’ve had to skip baptisms and will have to skip an upcoming wedding. Unbelieving family don’t get it but you do the most for everyone by not participating (sometimes it triggers upset family to do research about why “you’re so crazy” and boom, conversions start happening)

# Post 45: Is the Divine Worship better than novels order?

Author: jeff\_likes\_bread\_120
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1nc0n0y/is\_the\_divine\_worship\_better\_than\_novels\_order/

For those who do not know what the Divine worship is, it's a Roman Rite, that is celebrated by old Anglican priests that became Catholic priest its not a separate rite from the Roman Rite, it's said in in the country's language, most commonly English and it takes some liturgical elements from the Anglican liturgy.However it contains almost all the elements from the old rite form what I can see, and it contains many prayers not currently present in the Novus Order mass.My parish priest says almost all the priest prayers in Latin, but the prayers he says in silence.From what I can record though there's no Confiteor

Internal\_Ad1735 (3): Of course it's better. It retains many pre-Vatican II prayers (like the prayers at the foot of the altar and the Last Gospel) that the Novus Ordo doesn't have.The Canon in the Ordinariate liturgy is identical to the TLM one. There are no options like in the Novus Ordo.The Ordinariate liturgy is always celebrated ad orientem. Chants are always traditional. Communion is received on the tongue at the altar rail. There is a clear distinction between Low, High, and Solemn Mass. There are no liturgical abuses. They have Ember Days in their calendar. They retain rich prayers of exorcism for baptisms. They retain "olive oil only" for confirmation. The Ordinariate liturgy also retains sacrificial language.

ViveChristusRex (2): Is water wet?Nonetheless, it still pales in comparison to the Tridentine Mass.

GeorgiaCatholic (1): So in Divine Worship the prayers at the foot of the altar and last gospel are options that the priest can choose to use, or not. The Roman canon is required for most Sunday Masses, but the short EPII from the NO is an option for weekdays. The priest can also choose to use the Offertory prayers from the TLM or the NO/ Jewish prayers. Music tends traditional, but there are Ordinariate guitar Masses. Lived relatively close to one until about a year ago. Communion on the hand is an option like any NO. Like the NO, there is NOT a formal distinction between Low, High, and Solemn Masses. (Some Ordinariate parishes try to adhere to the traditional practice, others don’t). I’ve compared the Traditional, NO, and Ordinariate baptism rites before, and while it’s an improvement over the NO, I’m still going to jump through whatever hoops necessary to ensure that my children have a traditional baptism.

jeff\_likes\_bread\_120 (-1): Do you know what are the differences besides ofc the language, in a sense what is it missing?Also it's a better option right in case I I cannot go to Tradition mass?

jeff\_likes\_bread\_120 (-1): I guess what I'm trying to say is what is it missing so it gets to the level of tridentine mass???

# Post 46: Sermon from the Immaculata in St. Marys Kansas 9/7/2025

Author: Willsxyz
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URL: https://www.youtube.com/live/1NJDHY5bJY8?si=k-ppThvceC\_wOCbn&t=3096

The link should go straight to the start of the sermon, which is about 10 minutes long.

Willsxyz (1): \*\*Beginning of transcription for those who (as I do) prefer to read (1/3)\*\*Know you not what the scriptures say of Elias? How he has called on God against Israel? Lord, they have slain thy prophets. They have torn down thy altars. But how does God answer him? I have left 7,000 men that have not bowed their knee to Baal.Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant selected out of grace. In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Hhost. Amen. Dear reverend father dear brothers and sisters, dear faithful just a few days ago we celebrated the feast of the venerable patron St. Pius the 10th and I want to speak on the situation in the church today and on the foundation of our beloved society by Archbishop Lefebvre in response to this present crisis.St. Paul says that the things of the Old Testament were written as an example for us for our instruction and correction. So follow this analogy, if you can, that I've made just between the history of the Old Testament kingdom of Israel and Judah and the comparison it bears with the New Testament kingdom of the Catholic Church centered in the papacy in Rome. So first we'll look at the Old Testament history.So after many years of a unified rule that began under King David and lasted until the death of King Solomon, that's when the northern tribes of Israel started to break from the true worship that was in Jerusalem. And they started a false religion, a new worship that included some elements of the true worship, but they mixed it with pagan idolatrous symbols as well, such as the golden calf. And soon these tribes were deported and dispersed amongst all the nations because of their false beliefs and practices.And of course, the true worship continued in the kingdom of Judah, in the city of Jerusalem, in the temple, until a new syncretic religion was developed that combined true elements with false doctrine, which led to an invasion from foreign lands and the deportation of God's people into Babylon. The holy city was left in ruins. The temple was destroyed. The altar of sacrifice was desecrated. The holy vessels necessary for the true worship were stolen. And it was only the severely persecuted prophet Jeremias and a few of the most insignificant people that remained in Jerusalem. because the vast majority including the king and his whole royal house and most of the priesthood were carried away like the wind so that no official or solemn worship could be lawfully practiced until the time of punishment was completed. And then so we see after 70 years of captivity, their descendants, because that first generation passed away in captivity, their descendants began to return back to Jerusalem. The city was rebuilt and the true worship was started again and flourished.So in my analogy which is obviously not de fide, okay, it's just my observation one can see though a true correlation between Protestant northern Europe breaking from the Catholic Church and being carried away in every direction with strange doctrine and worship while the true worship continued in Rome. But then we could see in the 1960s we see a new religion start to emerge after the council involving the priesthood, the prelets of the church, even involving the popes. The churches were liturgically vandalized in the name of the council, sacred vessels and vestments were thrown out. The sacrifice is desacralized with the novus ordo mass. It's no longer sacred and most of the clergy are carried away into doctrines and worship that are foreign to the traditional Catholic faith.

Willsxyz (1): \*\*Continuation of transcription (2/3)\*\*And so we should be very thankful for his excellency Marcel Lefebvre to have the prophetic insight to see what was happening in the church back in the 1960s and 1970s and to take a stand against the changes with a preference for what the church has always believed and taught and practiced and against all these novelties and change which, by the way, are code words for the communist and the modernist. And so he preferred to be firmly attached to eternal Rome instead of being carried away by every wind of doctrine of the day. So let us recall for a moment the reasons why Archbishop Lefebvre named the newly founded religious order after Pope St. Pius 10th. It was a calculated, deliberate and a prayerful choice. I will give you three reasons.Well, first the archbishop explained that since the purpose of the society of St. Pius the 10th is all the works necessary for the formation of the priest. The seminaries must ensure that priestly formation achieve its main goal which is priestly holiness. So the society was placed under the patronage of St. Pius the 10th because his primary concern as pope was the integrity the integrity of the priesthood and the sanctity that flowed from it. So as the priest goes so do the faithful. When the priest is holy the people will generally be holy as well.The second reason, another reason for the name, the present crisis that has poisoned the church since the second Vatican council is the neo-modernist heresy, the synthesis of all heresies and the various secular philosophies that St. Pius the 10th viewed as being incompatible with Catholic dogma. So both he and the archbishop promoted thomistic scholastic theology as the principle philosophical method to be taught which is the antidote for all the poison that is being spewed by these so-called doctors who as St. Pius the 10th said "although they know many things they don't know anything".And then third finally since all the self-inflicted destruction that has occurred in the church over the last decade it made good sense to keep with the motto of his pontificate which is to restore all things in Christ.But as we know, the ideas at the heart of liberalism and modernism did find their way into the church and flourished in the aftermath of the council and the council with its application and its interpretation and now virtually dominates the whole entire Catholic world. And the church authorities demand adherence to these new beliefs in the manner of the Pharisees who would throw anyone out of the synagogue if they professed belief that Jesus was the Messiah.Since faith is a supernatural virtue and thus greater than the moral virtue of obedience, the archbishop had to say no. And he describes this act as true obedience by saying, "Now our disobedience is motivated by the need to keep the Catholic faith. And to be forced to submit to the second Vatican council to the postconcilary reforms, to the acts which are undermining our faith and destroying the church... It is impossible for us to do so. To collaborate in the destruction of the church is to betray the church and to betray our Lord Jesus Christ. So all the great theologians of the past have taught that if the pope by his acts destroys the church, we are not to obey him."

Willsxyz (1): \*\*Continuation of transcription (3/3)\*\*And so this is where we find ourselves today. The Catholic Church which has existed for almost two millennia is being replaced by another religion filled with contempt for the sacred and which bears the stamp of vulgarity which will only lead to further lead to the loss of faith and to atheism. The new theology is a syncretistic mixture of socialism and Christianity. And the only real true solution to end this crisis is the same as it was then to return back to the true faith of our fathers and to holiness. And no one can do this without God's grace and without the imitation of our Lord Jesus Christ.So, one last story. Just a few weeks ago, the society of St. Pius the 10th gathered together over 7,000 pilgrims in Rome for the Jubilee year. They they assembled for mass only a few steps away from the Colosseum where thousands of mortars shed their blood for our Lord Jesus Christ. And just as today, in reminiscence of the pantheon of ancient Rome, where everything was tolerated and no false religion was left out, just as long as everyone agreed to burn a few simple grains of incense to all the gods. But the first Christians said no. They would not compromise the truth for a false peace. They would not they would rather lose their life for the true faith in Jesus Christ than to accommodate to the world and to the intolerance that it has for the truth and for the rights of God and for the kingship of our Lord Jesus Christ. And so here we are again today, 2,000 years later, to bear witness to that same faith. The faith that conquered the world, the faith that overcame paganism.Our superior general, Father Pagarani, in his sermon asked this question during that mass. What do we ask of the church and of its hierarchy? We demand the faith. This faith does not take as its mission to conform to the world and to dialogue with it but to convert it to the true and only savior our lord Jesus Christ. We will not bow our knee to Baal. We will not offer incense to the false religions of this world. And this is what we want to bear to those in the Vatican. We want this faith to be pro professed in its entirety. It is this faith that made the lepers well in today's gospel.The city of Rome has been invaded, occupied, pillaged, burned many times, but it always seems to rise again. And so can the church because it is divinely founded by our Lord who could restore it even if it's even at a period of 70 years, which we're even coming close to that in just a few years. You figure the 1960s to about 2030, that's about 70 years. And the this can even coincide with the anniversary of the 2,000-year anniversary of our savior's passion and resurrection from the dead. So maybe we could see in our lifetimes the church rising out of its ashes as well. We can only hope and pray and just let events run their course according to divine providence. I'll close with a verse here from the Athanasian creed:"Whoever wishes to be saved, it is necessary above all that he hold to the Catholic faith. Which faith, unless it is kept whole and undefiled, without a doubt, he will most surely perish. This is the Catholic faith which unless a man believes it faithfully and firmly, he cannot be saved."In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.
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Author: Educational\_Cup\_7848

Score: 10

Comments: 29

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1nba17y/what\_to\_do\_during\_low\_mass/

I like to occasionally attend the low mass at a local SSPX chapel. I love the reverence, but I don’t really know what to do during it. Some prayed the rosary, some people online have said to engage in mental prayer. I tried to follow with the Mass via my grandfather’s old missal but found myself not appreciating the mass while my face was buried in a book. Any tips?

Willsxyz (9): When I first started attending the traditional mass, I just watched and listened. I did not purchase a missal until I had already been attending for many months and already sort of knew what was going on.

Highwayman90 (4): I would keep trying to pray the Holy Mass along with the priest. That seems in line with the guidance of St. Pius X himself.

merinw (4): You can subscribe to Benedictus ($5/monthly) and follow along. Latin in the left, English on the right. You will get more out of it if you know what is going on and can join in with the responses. IMHO.

Spiritual-Anybody-18 (2): I don't understand you don't respond to the priest? Is SSPX more conservative liturgically in USA?

Cathain78 (1): I found attending Sung Mass (Missa Cantata) more beneficial for learning when I first started attending the TLM. And of course, it’s the same Mass just with more parts audible which helps you understand where you are in the Mass, which makes it easier to understand the structure. Once you know where the Kyrie, Gloria, Gospel, Credo, Preface, Sanctus, Pater Noster, Agnes Dei, Communion, Last Gospel are (as you will stand and often join in at those points in the Sung Mass), then you can use them as sign posts and start to follow the Missal and work out where the Priest is at other times around those parts (eg. Introit, Collect, Epistle, Gradual, Offetory, Canon, etc). Once you start to memorise the Ordinary of the Mass which are repeated unchanged each time, and then understand the basic structure of the Mass in relation to them, then you can do less flicking back and forward in the Missal and concentrate on the Propers for that day. Personally I don’t usually check the Epistle or Gospel because our priest will read them again in the vernacular prior to his homily.For me, getting to know the Mass this way was easiest. After that. Low Mass made more sense once I understood the structure, even though the kneeling, sitting and standing change and much is inaudible. Getting a missal or guide which notes when to sit, kneel and stand during High and Low Mass is also useful in helping you find where you are in the Mass.This is assuming you want to follow along with the Mass. I prefer to do so, and as someone else said - Pope St Pius X also recommended this way. However it’s not absolutely necessary. You can pray privately or say the rosary. The Mass is still effective in doing its work and obtaining graces for you. Unlike the Novus Ordo which is very much a crowd participation event, the TLM is done through the priest acting on your behalf and simply praying reverently and earnestly at the foot of the cross is enough.

Wide\_Bee1087 (1): You have to keep going

NtGiL\_29 (5): I think this is the best approach. If you're struck by the reverence, just take in the ceremonies until you know your way around and can recognize/anticipate what comes next. Then, move to the missal if you prefer.

Educational\_Cup\_7848 (4): Thanks! I will try doing this next time.

Educational\_Cup\_7848 (4): I’ll look into this.

Educational\_Cup\_7848 (2): The church provides mass guides, I have complete access to the Mass and its parts but my issue is burying my face in the bloomer through the Mass and often missing things due to flipping pages. I guess I’ll just try to memorize parts of it (that is, it’s general layout, not exact wording)

Spiritual-Anybody-18 (1): btw I would recommend you to study your missal at home so you know the mass very well, and give yourself time once you understand the mass the book won't detract from the experience.

Cathain78 (1): OP mentioned it being a Low Mass. Any responses would normally be done by the servers.

ardaduck (1): Yes, outside Europe praying the altar server prayers out loud is unpopular

Educational\_Cup\_7848 (1): I am currently unable to attend a high mass since I serve at the local Byzantine parish which I consider my main parish. I occasionally attend the low mass on weekdays every once in a while.

Good\_Common3802 (1): you only do this in a dialogue mass.

No-Test6158 (1): You get to know how it's structured in the end, so the days of flipping pages don't last too long. Do learn how to set your ribbons though! This will help a great deal. I tend to work in an order - I always have a ribbon set for the ordinary, then I go to the mass page (Sundays before the ordinary, feasts afterwards) and read what needs to be set and where. It's a good thing to set the preface as a ribbon alongside the texts of the propers (the bits that change).Be mindful that, some weekday masses will involve you having to move between many pages! This is why it's helpful to have a few cards in your Missal to use!The best thing about this is it then translates to other things. I recently acquired a Roman Diurnal that I like to use and this is structured in a very similar manner! I have yet to get any ribbons for it though!

Spiritual-Anybody-18 (1): Eventually you'll learn the mass and the book won't detract from the experience.

Spiritual-Anybody-18 (1): really? I didn't know we do the server responses here

Spiritual-Anybody-18 (1): Maybe this is just an USA thing, in South America we say prayers out loud.

Spiritual-Anybody-18 (1): They don't mind you going to SSPX?, You'll eventually be forced to choose.

Educational\_Cup\_7848 (2): Thanks for the insight.

Educational\_Cup\_7848 (1): Ok, thank you.

Cathain78 (1): Only some of them at a High Mass or Missa Cantata. Even then some are done by the MC. And this is the UK.

Educational\_Cup\_7848 (1): My priest requested I don’t attend it for my Sunday obligation. I will continue attending the Byzantine church on Sunday.

Spiritual-Anybody-18 (1): and isn't that strange to you? That you don't attend on Sunday?, how is that logical? if it's bad it's always bad.

Cathain78 (1): And yet Rome has said that attending a Society Mass does fulfil your obligation, and there is no penalty of sin or suchlike for doing so. This is clearly a case of personal dislike where the priest is not in accord with Rome.

Educational\_Cup\_7848 (1): Could I see the citations for your statement? I'm generally going to trust my Priest's word as he is my spiritual father.

Cathain78 (1): Here is a couple for starters:“Absolutely nobody incurs any punishment by attending the Masses of the Society. Of course one can fulfill one’s Sunday obligation by attending a Sunday Mass in a chapel or church of the Society.”Dr. Georg May, Professor of Canon Law, Mainz University 2003“Catholics who frequent the chapels of the Society of St. Pius X do not incur any sin or canonical delict by doing so”Pontifical Commission for Ecclesia Dei, 23rd May 2008Of course, there is also simply the Code of Canon Law which states without qualification that any valid Mass attended fulfils one’s Sunday obligation

Educational\_Cup\_7848 (2): Ok, thanks for the information.

# Post 48: Is this peak Woke? Not. A. Real. Saint.

Author: sydneyvision

Score: 0

Comments: 27

URL: https://i.redd.it/lvzqcwm1iqnf1.jpeg

vehicularmanburger (11): whats the issue with Carlo being a saint i dont get it

jaqian (5): Either the Church has the power to declare saints or it doesn't. We should be so lucky to become saints (whether recognised by the Church or not).

hardeho (4): Seemed like a really great kid though, too bad we have to drag him through the mud to tear down the Church. If we had millions of teens like him, rather than the teens we have, what a difference that would make in the world. Whether that qualifies him as a Saint, IDK, and it doesn't explain the cringe iconography, though we can hardly blame him for that.

Next-Antelope-5887 (9): I believe that is Saint Mckintosh. The patron saint of Silicon Valley.

therese\_m (7): I don’t understand the usage of “woke” here tbh. I don’t think woke works here whether this kid was being canonized or not.

ourladyofcovadonga (6): There's something really off about the whole thing

Successful\_Sink\_2099 (2): Some jew is pissed off because of him

3amoFakroun (3): Hi could you elaborate on why he isn't a Saint?I'm not criticizing or anything, genuinely curious.Is it something with the rules since V2 to a Saint being declared is different? Again genuinely curious I'm not educated on the subject.

jeff\_likes\_bread\_120 (1): He's a real saint!

BallFragrant7650 (1): Wher/What church is that from?

Impossible-Mind9143 (3): who knows

realdenvercoder (2): I think it’s the process more than Carlo. The fact that there are truly great people that preceded him that should be canonized. There’s no Devil’s Advocate any more. I mean, my guess is we’ll have a transgender pro-abortion activist with a nose ring as the next canonized saint. 🤷♂️

Friendcherisher (3): It is Dominic Savio but in the 21st century.

neilyy21 (2): I think the OP meant the church hierarchy, including the pope. I’m pretty sick of the woke Church myself. I can’t really even stand it anymore.

realdenvercoder (1): He IS a saint. To say he’s not is foolish. They have canonized him and he is a saint. That being said, I won’t be praying any Novenas to St. Carlo anytime soon. But that shouldn’t be an issue. I don’t pray to St Mary of Egypt either. 🤷♂️

jeff\_likes\_bread\_120 (1): I think it's s in London is the church where he was baptised Corpus Cristi church is a very good church! Actually worth a visit

Willsxyz (8): With the minor difference that Dominic Savio was canonized 97 years after his death with the full traditional canonization process and a glowing biography written by an impeccable 1st hand witness to his life: Don Bosco

therese\_m (1): Sorry, I still don’t understand, I think I dont understand the question “is this peak woke” for this situation?? Idk sorry

BallFragrant7650 (1): Yeep! found it [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Corpus\\_Christi\\_Catholic\\_Church,\\_Maiden\\_Lane](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Corpus\_Christi\_Catholic\_Church,\_Maiden\_Lane) Thank you jeff\\_likes\\_bread\\_120

norton777 (1): Their is a saint in medieval times that was canonised in a little less than a year

neilyy21 (0): Maximum woke or ultra liberal and modern values rather than Catholic.

Willsxyz (1): Who was it?

therese\_m (1): I don’t understand how this is ultra liberal and modern I guess? I guess I’m leaning towards this not being PEAK woke??? Idk thank you for taking the time

norton777 (1): Saint Peter of Verona

norton777 (1): Another quick canonisation is saint Francis of Assisi

Willsxyz (1): thanks I’ll look him up tomorrow.

Friendcherisher (1): Yes, 2 years.

# Post 49: Vernacular TLM?

Author: Mailemanuel77

Score: 8

Comments: 15

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1nag5kv/vernacular\_tlm/

What would be the stand of the SSPX if the Pope declared that Latin Mass must return, but it must be celebrated in vernacular, and the implementation in some regions might not be possible to deploy fully but only partially at important locations like cathedrals and basilicas possibly excluding regular smaller parishes of lesser historical importance due to resources limitation in forming priests capable of celebrating the TLM.

Filipino\_Thomist1999 (17): Archbishop Lefebvre said “I’d rather have the Traditional Mass in French than the Novus Ordo in Latin.”So it’s not an issue of language. It’s an issue of doctrine.

Willsxyz (14): If the traditional mass were celebrated in the vernacular then any priest whatsoever would be capable of celebrating that mass. All you have to do is read the book and follow the instructions, which would be in the vernacular. So the second part of your hypothetical situation doesn't make any sense.Apart from that, I am sure the SSPX would welcome such a move, because it would, at a stroke, resolve all of the serious problems with the new mass. That doesn't mean however, that they would stop celebrating the mass in Latin and, indeed, no Pope would ever say that the mass must be celebrated in the vernacular because Trent anathematized the proposition that the mass be celebrated only in the vernacular.

WilliamCrack19 (4): Then, by definition, it would not be the TLM.

Internal\_Ad1735 (7): This is honestly what should have happened. A good example is the similar Ordinariate liturgy. It is not the TLM, but it is close enough to give us a taste.https://youtu.be/Hi5YgbiNB1U?si=UFQMvB5aJ4yphlkg

Murky\_Question\_9362 (3): It's not the language we like... its the Mass, the ordo of mass, the reverence that comes with it

SomeoneinHistory (2): Most likely they are pertaining to resources on vestments and even altars since it is an unfortunate fact that a lot of parishes have terrible architecture where the tabernacle has been disfigured by being relegated to the side instead of the center where it must be.

Mailemanuel77 (6): Neither Novus Ordo.

AquinasDestiny (1): The official nomenclature of the Mass in Latin, is not the TLM (Traditional Latin Mass). This is a modern name.

Willsxyz (3): I disagree that this should have happened in the 1960s, since the Second Vatican council never asked for the mass to be celebrated in the vernacular, but rather asked that the faithful be taught to say the parts appropriate to them in Latin.However now that the novus ordo disaster has already occurred, it would make sense to allow the traditional mass to be celebrated in the vernacular as a replacement of the new mass.

Miserable\_Key\_7552 (2): As a member of the Anglican Communion who’s had the chance to attend an amazing Saturday vigil Mass at an Anglican Ordinariate parish, their use of the Roman Rite is very beautiful and comforting in its similarities with the prayer book tradition I’ve grown fond of as an Anglican. However, the English Missal might be a more fitting representation of the Tridentine Mass in English, as it was published as a nearly direct translation of the Tridentine Mass into Elizabethan English by early 20th century Anglo-Catholics. It’s never been a super common choice, even amongst die hard Anglo-Catholics, but I’ve heard that both St. Clements Episcopal Church Philadelphia, and the Episcopal Church of the Resurrection NYC still use the English Missal, so that could be a good place to look to see what an English rendition of it might look like.

Willsxyz (5): The traditional mass can be celebrated with the ugly vestments and table altars currently existing in novus ordo parishes. It would not be ideal, but it can be done and would be a huge improvement over the new mass using the same vestments and altars.

Willsxyz (3): Mr. WilliamCrack19 was not being obstinate but rather pointing out that “TLM” is an abbreviation for “Traditional \*\*Latin\*\* Mass”. So a TLM couldn’t possibly be in the vernacular.

APXO-ICXC-NIKA (2): Yep. The whole ambiance changes even with dreadful post V2 architecture when you follow TLM rubrics.

borgircrossancola (1): Mass of St Gregory.

SomeoneinHistory (1): Yeah that's true

# Post 50: What kind of veil do you wear?

Author: Asleep-Tonight-523

Score: 2

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1n970be/what\_kind\_of\_veil\_do\_you\_wear/

HiI‘m from a middle European country where about 50-60% of the women in my parish veil. What kind of veil do you wear?I feel like the Mantilla hype is kind of weird, since it’s traditionally Spanish and wouldn’t have reached Middle Europe without the Spanishs bringing the Mantilla to the Americas and the Americas now influencing us over here.On the other hand, nobody at my parish wears hats or other scarfs, so by choosing the traditional option, you‘d stand out, which is also something you‘d want to avoid.Then there’s the simple rectangle scarf, but it’s giving off orthodox vibes.What do you wear? A hat? A d-shaped/v-shaped mantilla? A rectangular (modal) scarf? Something else?

EpeeGorl (1): I wear both infinity veils and long scarf-like veils. The second option is my favorite.

# Post 51: Thoughts on St. Josemaria Escriva de Balaguer?

Author: icxcnikahnd

Score: 5

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1n8wapj/thoughts\_on\_st\_josemaria\_escriva\_de\_balaguer/

I hear many controversies about him but what do TradCaths think of him

No-Test6158 (1): I feel very much the same way as I do about "Saint" Theresa of Calcutta. They were most definitely good and holy people, but do they deserve the title of saint? Hmm, we cannot know for certain. We must trust that God knows and pray for them. If they are in heaven then they will receive our petitions - if they are not, then they will receive our prayers to help them pass through purgatory.There is a definite desire, and I had a long chat with an SSPX priest at a pub in Nottingham about this, to canonise the second Vatican council, so the church can make an argument of "look at how many saints it produced". I don't buy this. I think the church is playing politics.In these times, it is prudent to trust in tradition and keep your head down. As many faithful have done over the centuries.

# Post 52: Feast Day Of St Pius X

Author: Calm\_Vegetable1532

Score: 17

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1n88foq/feast\_day\_of\_st\_pius\_x/

Yesterday was the feast day of St. Pius X. In my eyes he was a true hero of the faith, a fearless crusader in a time when the Church faced the rising tide of modernism. He stood firm against error and compromise with courage and clarity, defending the faith when so many were willing to bend. Looking back, it may seem that the battle against these dangers was lost, but in his time his efforts were monumental and inspiring. It is sickening to see that they have placed him in the Vatican, right at the front, in the midst of all the chaos. He is turning in his tomb. Yet we remember him, we honor him, and we give thanks for his tireless work, including his most famous encyclical Pascendi Dominici Gregis, which remains a powerful shield against error. If you go to Mass this Sunday, ask him to pray for you, ask for his intercession. Yesterday there was a special Mass in my SSPX chapel for him, and it was truly magical, a moment that reminded me of the hero he was and still is. Pray for us, St. Pius X.

Internal\_Ad1735 (3): We also had a Solemn High Mass for the feast at my local SSPX church. And a special parish lunch to honor him. A holy saint indeed!

realdenvercoder (2): Most people don’t mention this but he saved a lot of Gregorian chant and brought it to the forefront. I’m so happy that we have only Sacred Music and Silence at our church.

# Post 53: Can a female-presenting trans woman become a SSPX Priest if they are still biologically male?

Author: mygeneroussoul3

Score: 0

Comments: 12

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1n7sgkw/can\_a\_femalepresenting\_trans\_woman\_become\_a\_sspx/

4gyt (12): Disgusting question

Breifne21 (10): No, since it would result in a grave scandal to the faithful.

Count\_Erfit (8): Really stupid question, here honestly.

HMX5000 (5): I don't think so because lying is a sin. Using surgical camouflage is a way of lying. And promoting lies is also a source of scandal.

BrodyJerome (5): No

ViveChristusRex (5): Ew

Blue\_Celica (3): No

GrandHospital8399 (3): Lol

Willsxyz (2): This post should be deleted

Piancol (4): Even as a pure hypothetical, this question makes no sense, and it's both a waste of time and a morbid curiosity symptomatic of some intellectual deficiency.

WinterBaroness (4): I agree, I think the bishops wouldn't allow it

Full-Comfortabledumb (1): Obviously troll question shocked mods haven’t taken it down

# Post 54: Happy feast day

Author: TwoWeimsAZ

Score: 14

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1n7msfn/happy\_feast\_day/

Cathain78 (12): St. Pius X, pray for us

# Post 55: Bishop Williamson and the Resistance

Author: Then-Huckleberry9036

Score: 6

Comments: 20

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1n7k9xh/bishop\_williamson\_and\_the\_resistance/

Curious observation. Bishop Williamson himself likens the Resistance to HERDING CATS. Whether intentional or not, his later actions, including creating a parallel Resistance, raise serious questions about leadership and fidelity. The analogy is revealing especially given how fragmented the TRAD landscape has become.https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tc7INAMBapw

Realistic\_Company239 (1): Sedevacantists Is that true is no pope at Rome? Sedevacantism is good do you think that is good I don’t think so, not even Abp lefebvre was sedevacantist, when the things is resolved in Rome you’s go back that it was his words, sedevacantism is a Protestantism in traditional way, and put your hand in conscience and tell me if I lied about my comment

Realistic\_Company239 (1): If sedevacantism is good remember Judas it was also a disciple of JESUS

Realistic\_Company239 (1): Who am I to say is no pope, you see to mutch craziness in internet 🛜😈 tradition yes but not craziness, sedevacantism lost they reason, am people from sspx have to open they eyes and say no to sedevacantism, do you remember Martin Luther ok we also was catholic remember

Realistic\_Company239 (1): Saying bad about the pope 25 hours a day it is going to take to haven?really. If everyone how sometimes don’t agree for what is happening in Rome going to sedevacantism, today sedes it was the big church, but they go, no, you know why they don’t, because they know where is home and HOME IS IN ROME

Realistic\_Company239 (1): I’m so fed up of this sedevacantists, sspx they were to Rome and know this sedevacantists cult just saying bad about sspx, what, sedevacantism Protestants cult if is no pope for you’s don’t say anything wait for your pope after 500 or 1000 years

kacfm2506 (-4): the late Bp Williamson and the resistance are the true hairs of Abp Levevbre, neo SSPX is sadly compromised, Bp Fellay can still turn around the ship but is not looking good nowadays, a practical deal with the novus ordo anti church would be suicide for the Society

Willsxyz (5): Bishop Fellay is not the superior of the SSPX and, by the way, did your comment just travel through time from, like, 2012 or something ?

kacfm2506 (0): Fr Pagliarani maybe superior general but Bp Fellay is the one who calls the shots, groveling to be taken back by the conciliar borg, this is the reality of the situation "95% of vatican 2 can be interpreted in light of tradition" he is compromised

Willsxyz (3): > Fr Pagliarani maybe superior general but Bp Fellay is the one who calls the shotsIn that case, Bishop Fellay is the superior general, since that’s what “calls the shots” means. Comeon my dude, both the 2000s and the 2010s are over and all of the dire predictions you Henny Pennys made have not come to pass.My suggestion: wait until the SSPX actually puts its future in the hands of the modernists and \*\*then\*\* start screaming about the sky falling.

kacfm2506 (0): they are already taking in novus ordo priest without conditional ordinations, they already follow 1983 novus ordo code of canon law which is riddled with heresy, they've been granted faculties for confession and marriages from the novus ordo, this stuff is NOT good

Willsxyz (2): So are you openly sedevacantist or just cryptosedevacantist?

craft00n (2): Multiple point :- No. We just don't know what they are doing exactly, because they don't speak about it.- Absolutely not, they still use the 1917 canon even tho they know that, as positive law, it is currently supplanted by the 1983 canon.- They don't have any responsibility in being given the faculty for confession and mariage. They can literaly do nothing about what the Pope decides, and it doesn't imply any change on their side.Take your pills idk

kacfm2506 (1): neither, my grievances against the neo sspx has nothing to do with sedevacantism, these were positions the society had before but has abandoned to be nice with the conciliars, I mean you read in this very forum how some neo sspxers have no problem recommending attending the indult latin mass or the fssp which Abp Lefebvre called traitors, is very sad

Willsxyz (1): Ok, so if you aren't sedevacantist, you acknowledge that there is a pope and that he has the power to change canon law. So you therefore agree that John Paul II had the right and the authority to promulgate the 1983 code and to abrogate the 1917 code. Which means that you must also agree that the 1917 code is really and truly no longer the canon law of the Catholic Church, and the 1983 code really and truly is the canon law of the Catholic Church.Now to address the claim: "1983 novus ordo code of canon law ... is riddled with heresy"Please give an example of heresy in the 1983 code. Please quote directly from the code in order to justify your claim. Here's the link: [https://www.vatican.va/archive/cod-iuris-canonici/cic\\_index\\_en.html](https://www.vatican.va/archive/cod-iuris-canonici/cic\_index\_en.html)

kacfm2506 (1): no, all vatican 2 popes are heretics, they are formally popes but you can't use their jurisdiction because of heresy , 1983 code of canon law allows for catholics to receive sacraments from schismatics there's prbly more things but off the top of my head that's one, look it upso you are an SSPXer and you accept vatican 2? you understand Abp Lefevbre was EXCOMUNICATED from the conciliar church correct? [https://dominicansavrille.us/devotion-to-the-holy-face-and-the-golden-arrow-2/](https://dominicansavrille.us/devotion-to-the-holy-face-and-the-golden-arrow-2/)

Willsxyz (1): Ok. Cryptosedevacantist it is.Abp Lefebvre wasn't excommunicated from anything. Pope John Paul II claimed that Archbishop Lefebvre, and Bishops de Castro Mayer, Williamson, de Mallerais, de Galarreta, and Fellay had automatically excommunicated themselves, but he was wrong.Here is an except from his sermon on the occasion of the episcopal consecrations [https://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/Episcopal-Consecration.htm](https://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/Episcopal-Consecration.htm)>... This ceremony, which is apparently done against the will of Rome, is in no way a schism. We are not schismatics! If an excommunication was pronounced against the bishops of China, who separated themselves from Rome and put themselves under the Chinese government, one very easily understands why Pope Pius XII excommunicated them. There is no question of us separating ourselves from Rome, nor of putting ourselves under a foreign government, nor of establishing a sort of parallel church as the Bishops of Palmar de Troya have done in Spain. They have even elected a pope, formed a college of cardinals... It is out of the question for us to do such things. Far from us be this miserable thought to separate ourselves from Rome!Here is a link to an essay exploring the so called excommunication, and refuting it: [https://sspx.org/en/neither-schismatic-nor-excommunicated-30934](https://sspx.org/en/neither-schismatic-nor-excommunicated-30934)>1983 code of canon law allows for catholics to receive sacraments from schismaticsCome on now, give us the link so we know exactly what the code says. Then we can evaluate whether it is heresy. It is, however, not heresy to say that the eastern schismatics have valid sacraments.

kacfm2506 (1): Didn't Pope St Pius X of blessed memory said that modernism is the synthesis of all heresies?Aren't the conciliars modernists? Everything that spawned from the judas council of vatican 2 is tainted with heresy, the mass, the divine office, code of cannon law , the sacraments , doctrines, disciplines , new catechism etc. you should be honest and accept the reality of the situation, Our Lady of La Salette said it, Rome will lose the faith and will become the seat of the antichrist

Willsxyz (1): I see. You cannot back up your specific claims about the 1983 code with evidence.Tell me, do you think that the Catholic Church has ceased to exist contrary to Christ's promise?

kacfm2506 (1): you sound like a novus ordite or an indulter, are you? maybe not even neo sspxer

Willsxyz (1): lol

# Post 56: Confusion about the SSPX

Author: Snowboardpizzamaker

Score: 3

Comments: 13

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1n656ix/confusion\_about\_the\_sspx/

I was raised NO Catholic my whole life, became Eastern Orthodox about a year ago. Lately, I started missing some aspects of Latin spirituality. I still feel the Orthodox church is the unchanged church, and theologically I still think it’s correct. However, as of lately I started reading about the SSPX, I have a friend who is in the SSPX and he told me they are in “irregular communion”.I honestly feel Vatican 2 was totally infiltrated by the Protestants and other non Catholic groups. My old NO parish does a pretty reverent Mass IMO (no Eucharistic ministers, Altar rail) but I feel if I were to rejoin the Catholic Church it would be through the SSPX. I have a few questions on the general state of the modern Catholic Church, that I have confusion about:1. If Vatican 2 made the mass irreverent and brought in some questionable teachings, why would God allow that to happen?2. What makes Latin a sacred language? From what I can tell, the Liturgy has always been done in the vernacular throughout church history, at least in the east.3. Not going to lie, the idea that the SSPX thinks the NO is irreverent yet is still in communion with the Pope is what’s giving me the most confusion. If someone can explain to me why you haven’t left communion with the pope, I’d like to know.Thank you!

SomeoneinHistory (15): Commenting on the second point of LatinLatin was the lingua franca of the West which was the jurisdiction of the Pope during the Age of the Pentarchy and so it was only natural for Latin to become the language of the Church in Rome.Today no single culture can claim Latin and because of that the Church sees it as a sign of unity and harmony because it equally belongs to all Catholics.Not Roman, not Greek, not Syrian, not Ruthenian, not Chalcedonian, but all Catholics.Further because of how set apart it is from modern culture, Latin is in a similar role to how Hebrew was for Israel because it is solely intended for worship.Just as the East gravitated towards Greek as its sacred language, the West was guided towards Latin not because it was superior to other languages but because Latin became the universal bond of unity throughout the Universal Church.In Veterum Sapientia(1962) by Pope St. John XXIII:" Of its very nature, Latin is most suitable for promoting every form of culture among peoples. It gives rise to no jealousies, it does not favor any one nation, but presents itself with equal impartiality to all and is equally acceptable to all."So, while Our Lord Jesus Christ used and sanctified the four languages of Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, and Latin, the Holy Spirit led the Church to choose Latin as the universal sacred tongue of Rome for unity and clarity.

Fallen-Monk83 (13): To point 1: why would God allow anything bad to happen? Not trying to be a smart aleck by answering your question with a question, but that's the way I see it. In this world, less than ideal things happen. that's just the reality of it. Point 2: Honestly, i'm not the most educated on this matter. I know traditionally, the church used Latin and it is important in that aspect. Hopefully someone more knowledgeable than me can answer that. Point 3: As a Catholic, you believe that the Catholic Church is the church that Christ instructed St. Peter to build (Matthew 16:18) Also adding that "the gates of hell shall never prevail against it". For that reason, Catholics put their faith in that promise even when the Church is going through times of division and turmoil that it is not lost. As such, leaving the church isn't viable. Hope this helps.

Principal-Moo (6): I joined the Catholic Church in 2009 and was “traditional” by all accounts before joining the EO. Now I want to return. I can provide personal insight to the Latin. One of the big draws for me to join the Church was the thought that I could go to Mass anywhere in the world and be able to participate. Also, there is something about Latin that, once you learn the prayers in Latin, you never forget them. I often find myself praying in Latin when I’m stressed or need guidance. I don’t know if that’s why it’s the universal language, but those are some benefits. You are fortunate that you are near an SSPX priest. I am an American living in Vietnam and would have to fly to the Philippines to return to the Church.

No-Test6158 (3): \* On Irreverence in the New and why God would permit it.It's worth digging into how the church was before the council. Let's just say that the many priests who happily took to the NO were ordained in the old rite. Many people had such a lukewarm experience of Catholicism. You'd be lucky if you got a sung mass outside of a cathedral or significant church. Most places had a low mass with 4 hymns, the priest would garble through the mass (given that most of it wasn't audible, he could do this). Sermons would be either non-existent, parish notifications/requests for donations or long rambling diatribes about bliz-blaz and him-ham to a largely indifferent congregation who would just be reciting their rosaries. In short, the Tridentine Mass was a pearl thrown before swine. I think the situation we find ourselves in now, with respect to the Old Rite, is very much a better place. Better that it be insulated against people who say it with no care, or those who treat it irreverently. \* Regarding the use of Latin - this isn't the gripe of many traditional Catholics. Our main issue isn't the use of a particular language, but how the new mass was a stark departure from what went before. Certainly where I live, those of us who are traditionalists who don't have the confidence to go to the SSPX, often end up attending the Ordinariate Use, which is the Tridentine Mass translated into English. It isn't so much about the language but the intent. Pray in Latin, pray in Greek, pray in Aramaic, pray in English. It's about the substance and intent. A heartfelt prayer in the proper form in the vernacular is much more important to Our Lord than many hundreds of mumbled, half understood Latin prayers.This being said, Latin binds us together as \*\*Roman\*\* Catholics. It is fitting that as Roman Catholics, we should use the shared liturgy and culture of our faith. Just as Greek Catholics use Greek! It brings us together. In the past, it meant that people from diverse origins could all worship together and all hold an equal understanding of the faith. A point to remember is that Greek was the language of the Roman Empire. Latin was the language of Rome.\* On fidelity to RomeWe must hold to this position. Our alternative is to embrace Protestantism - which we can't do. We hold our fidelity to the Modern church out of compassion. Like a family member who is going through a rough phase and doing things we don't approve of. We don't abandon them, we walk with them, giving an example of what they should do, but also being a helping hand up when they eventually realise the gravity of what they are doing/have done. We are Roman Catholics.

kawaqcosta (2): I have a personal consideration regarding the liturgical language. Of course, the liturgy was initially constructed with the listeners' understanding in mind, beyond the worship of God. However, once the liturgy is crystallized in a certain form, with specific prayers and rites, I believe it is very difficult to make substantial changes to it, including the liturgical language used. The main point is not so much the listener's understanding as the worship offered to God through the liturgy, maintaining it as it was received.Another, related consideration is that, even if the liturgy is composed in what was initially a vernacular language, it gradually de-vulgarizes and becomes less comprehensible to speakers over time. This is notable for Latin, as it has become a dead language, but it also occurs to some extent with Eastern languages. Their ancient forms are not identical to modern forms, although they retain some intelligibility, to a greater or lesser degree.This is my general impression of the history of the liturgy.

Willsxyz (1): 1. Humans have free will. God allows people to do bad and destructive things. What he does not allow is for the Church to formally teach error. The documents of Vatican II contains “questionable” statements, seemingly at odds with traditional Catholic doctrine. This can be easily explained by the fact that the council declared no dogma and anathematized no error. That is, its declarations are fallible.2. There are good reasons to use Latin in the liturgy but actually the language of mass is a minor issue. At the moment, traditional Catholics have to cling to Latin because 1) there are no approved translations of the traditional mass in vernacular languages and 2) since Vatican II the use of the vernacular has been abused to alter the sense of the text of the mass in order to obscure or eliminate the Catholic doctrine of the mass as dogmatized at Trent.3. To break communion with the bishop of Rome is to leave the one Church that Christ founded. There is one Church, one Faith, one Baptism and not two or three or more Churches. And that one Church founded by Christ is the Catholic Church whose visible head is the bishop of Rome.

Spiritual-Anybody-18 (0): The Latin langue is kind of Sacred by virtue of being one of the Languages wrote in the Cross and by the use of the Church by the Centuries it becomes a sort of sacramental and demon fear it, has attested by many exorcist even modernist ones. But It shouldn't be fetishized think, and many trads do.

Snowboardpizzamaker (4): Thanks for the answers. As for your first answer, yes God absolutely allows bad things to happen, but I thought the church was supposed to be protected from it, it especially doesn’t seem likely that God would allow the liturgy of the church to become irreverent.

YellowSquirrel556 (3): Latin is effectively a dead language in the sense that no country speaks Latin as a way to communicate with one another. Ecclesiastical Latin used in the Liturgy is unique because it is a language used exclusively for the worship of God.

Spiritual-Anybody-18 (2): Many part of the liturgy are in silence specially the consecration parts, even Greek liturgy has parts done in silence. Listeners have nothing to do with it, it's all about God. It's done in human languages because we have to know what we pray, in that sense we must not fetishize latin.

Fallen-Monk83 (7): Protected from fully succumbing to the "gates of hell" but so long as humanity is involved, things won't be perfect. The way I see it, God allowed the Israelites to turn away from him and worship the golden calf and other deities throughout the Old Testament. He allowed the Pharisees to reject the Messiah promised to them. I don't see irreverent liturgy occuring as a contradiction.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): The Arian heresy nearly took over until St. Athanasius took back the Church. Many describe Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre as a modern day Athanasius.

Snowboardpizzamaker (3): True

# Post 57: Please sign my petition for the Return of the Latin Mass in my Diocese

Author: sainthyacinthordrowa
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# Post 58: Is it sinful or not? What is considered gossip.

Author: GunGal7
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1n2bkpw/is\_it\_sinful\_or\_not\_what\_is\_considered\_gossip/

Hoping for some thoughts from fellow Catholics here. I recently took a job that is in cubicle land so there is quite a bit of chatter throughout the day with people talking to their customers. Myself and a coworker work on analytical type work that requires concentration so the chatter can be quite distracting. But there are two people who are very very loud and their voices travel across the whole floor. One in particular spends their day telling everyone about their personal life so it gets frustrating. I have told him in the past that he is very loud but that fell on deaf ears. Yesterday most of them went to a meeting for over an hour and the silence was deafening. My coworker and I were commenting on how lovely it was and how much easier it was to focus and get work done. Then we specifically spoke about the one individual and how neither of us want to hear about his personal life and that maybe he needs to be given more work to do. So that's how the conversation went and now I'm wondering if that was considered gossiping about the fellow and what type of sin that might be. I plan to ask my priest, but sometimes it's hard to get a hold of one of them right away. Any and all thoughts/comments are welcomed.

Internal\_Ad1735 (6): It’s usually when someone’s personal struggles, flaws, or drama get rehashed behind their back for no real good reason. The Catholic Church basically says: “Everyone has a right to a good name. If you’re trashing their reputation, you’re breaking the Eighth Commandment”. - \*\*Detraction:\*\* You spill true but embarrassing info about someone they’d rather keep private.- \*\*Slander/calumny:\*\* You spread lies, or exaggerate, making someone look worse than they really are.If you’re trying to solve a work problem, keep it factual, avoid piling on, and don’t make it personal—probably not sinful. If you’re mocking, exaggerating, or enjoying someone’s embarrassment, or making others dislike them? Yes, that’s gossip, and it is spiritually unhealthy. It’s toxic for your peace and the whole work vibe. Most people don’t even feel better after gossiping. It just leaves you with a “blah” feeling, maybe even guilty.The “pro move” isn’t just biting your tongue, it’s actively filling the air with charity. Say something genuinely kind, change the subject, or just don’t play the game. If someone is causing havoc, the advice is to talk to them directly—don’t just talk about them.St. Padre Pio put it bluntly: “When you gossip about a person it means you’ve removed them from your heart.”If silence feels awkward, try: “I can’t comment on that.” It’s low-key, but does the job.

GunGal7 (1): Good words thank you 🙏

# Post 59: Do SSPX Catholics think of NO Catholics as immitation Catholics?

Author: Straight-Rice5563
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1n20xuu/do\_sspx\_catholics\_think\_of\_no\_catholics\_as/

Do SSPX Catholics really believe Jesus is not present in the NO? Do SSPX Catholics believe NO Catholics are like a cheap copy of a more original product?

Sir\_K9206 (6): Is that something that you believe?

BroadMaintenance2986 (4): I've been to tlm for 8 years now. Never heard of such. We think NO catholics are real catholics that would benefit incredibly - just as we do - from going to tlm.

GabrielKazakhstan (4): SSPX position is that NO eucharist is valid but illicit

Internal\_Ad1735 (3): The NO Mass is valid (Jesus is present), but a lot of “Protestant flavor”, and loss of old prayers and rubrics.Truthfully, I am more sad than snooty about Catholics who go to the NO. I look at the NO and see a spiritual fast food joint: gets the job done, but lacks substance. But deep down, I know most Catholics are just following what they were given, not intentionally seeking a “cheap copy”.If the (Novus Ordo) Mass is done by the book, Jesus is present—He promised, after all. But the danger is that the NO makes it easier to forget what you’re actually kneeling before, and abuses or laziness in the NO are rampant.They’re living with less: less beauty, less clarity, less connection to the spiritual heavyweights of Catholic history. But Catholics who go to the NO are not fakes, especially if they are devout. For most of them, they have never seen a TLM and might not even know it exists. Let's remember most practicing Catholics worldwide are not in the Western world, and TLMs are very rare outside of the West.

None (2): I know that you are asking on the form of a question, but even suggesting this could be the case approaches the grave sin of calumny. I don't even know what side of the issue you are on, but this is not the position of the SSPX and it never was from the very beginning. Most people I know, including myself, are either former Protestants or Novus Ordo attendees. Not only were we NOT looked down upon, but in fact the SSPX Priests were nothing but compassionate in both understanding differences and in taking the time and effort to make a logical case for the deficiencies of the New Mass (and Protestant "traditions").Real respect for differences means acknowledging them truthfully and addressing them. The SSPX merely refuses to settle for deficiencies in the Latin Rite, and doesn't accept the line that the NO and the VO/TLM "are the same rite." It has absolutely nothing to do with the parishioners. These deficiencies do not result in the invalidity of the Eucharist, though they do pose a danger to the laity; a fact which is undeniable statistically and corroborated anecdotally.I hope, if you ever believed that the SSPX and/or her Parishioners are driven by pride or pretension, that you disabuse yourself of that false notion immediately. Uninformed and low effort thinking like this is the reason the SSPX gets constantly slandered falsely by everyone from laypeople to Bishops in the larger Church, who simply have no idea what they are talking about.

Straight-Rice5563 (-3): I feel that way, yes, that SSPX Catholics think like that. I could be wrong though.

Straight-Rice5563 (-4): That is also what the NO believes about the SSPX Mass, that it is valid, but illicit. It is like saying it is valid, but it is not.

Straight-Rice5563 (0): I am not going to say that there's no sincere people in the SSPX, but their own website says to avoid the NO Mass, except for weddings and funerals of family members. SSPX priests treat the NO as if it was the plague.

Willsxyz (4): You are wrong.

GabrielKazakhstan (3): No, saying that it's valid means the miracle actually happens there, but illicit means the you shouldn't attend it. It's the same case for Orthodox liturgy, it is valid but Catholics shouldn't attend it.

None (1): How did you reach the conclusion that they think the Eucharist is invalid, or, even more erroneously, that we think poorly of Novus Ordo Catholics? There is no evidence to support those non-sequiturs.You are ascribing motive when it isn't appropriate to do so. Three things can be true at the same time. One can believe the Novus Ordo is deficient and dangerous, also believe that it is still technically valid, and believe that the Churchmen who attend should not be judged for what they genuinely believe to be an act of obedience. In point of fact, this is overwhelmingly the position of both the SSPX clergy as well as the laymen.We see Novus Ordo Catholics as Catholics who are being underserved by a Church establishment that sold out for Modernism. The issue is with the Church as an institution and with the errors that is has promulgated. Being a Catholic in the main Church is like playing on hard mode. It is something to be pitied and not mocked, and most of us were there at one point.I would encourage you to do more research rather than casually assume the worst with apparently no basis for doing so.

Straight-Rice5563 (1): What would you say about "modernist Popes" like JP II, Ben XVI and Francis meeting people with terminal cancer, giving them their blessing and those people later making a full recovery? God is still present in the NO. How did you discover the SSPX Church?

None (3): A Pope fallibly expressing Modernism does not mean they do not possess the authority of the Pope. That authority simply ends where the errors begin, and \*only\* where these errors are espoused. The position of the SSPX is that these Popes are still the Pope, which is why we pray for the Pope during the Mass. Presumably these Popes performed these miracles because God gave them the grace to do so. Much as he gave St. Peter the power to walk on water and heal countless sick people, even though Peter also denied Christ several times and was a notable Judaizer, which is an early heresy for which he was rebuked by St. Paul. God gives us graces according to our station, but nobody has the authority to be mistaken - not even the first Pope. But God's grace is not all or nothing, and he works with imperfect people, even imperfect Popes.Incidentally, on a related note, this is also the reason that we see Eucharistic miracles in hosts consecrated in the Novus Ordo. It's because it really is the Body of Christ. But the SSPX makes no claims to the contrary.Personally I think it's pretty clear that most people that criticize the SSPX are criticizing an accidental strawman.To your second question, I discovered the SSPX church when it sent a mission to my rural and mostly Protestant area, and showed me that there are still Catholic Priests out there who did not succumb to the insufferably boomer outcomes of the cultural revolution - Priests who traveled literal hours every week at great personal expense for the care of souls. Long story short, were it not for the SSPX, I would not be Catholic. I truly believe this organization deserves credit for growing the flock at a time when the NO church is frankly collapsing in the West, and they are doing it by being genuine. The truth is attractive, and contagious - as it always was.

TerriblyGentlemanly (2): The "SSPX church"? You have used a lower case c, which technically refers to a building... but the phrasing and context suggest that you think that the SSPX is a "Church", as in its own religion, as opposed to the Catholic Church. That is a misconception. The SSPX is a validly and canonically founded society \_of the Catholic Church\_, and always has been. It is not some outside entity.

Straight-Rice5563 (1): Not in full communion with Rome, it has irregular canonical standing.

TerriblyGentlemanly (2): I know that. That doesn't mean it is a new church, or sect, or denomination.

Straight-Rice5563 (1): Well, when the SSPX priests specifically say to avoid the NO Mass, it is like they are in a way saying, "we have our own church."

TerriblyGentlemanly (2): No, it isn't. They are saying one thing, and you are inferring another. No SSPX priest would ever say "we have our own church". They will tell you explicitly and without qualification that The Church is The Church and The Pope is the Pope.

# Post 60: “Pope” Michael of Kansas
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Hello. I recently watched the documentary on David Baden “pope Michael” who claimed he was the legitimate pope. He begs in his career as a seminarian in armada Michigan, but was kicked out after a year or two. He never gave a clear explanation on why he was dismissed. Looking to see if there’s additional information that I haven’t seen.

Willsxyz (13): >He was kicked out after a year or two. He never gave a clear explanation on why he was dismissed.I think it is fair to assume, given that this is a guy who eventually proclaimed himself Pope, that the seminary had sufficient cause related to his conception of ecclesiology and his perception of his own place in the Church, to deem him unworthy of ordination.I am unfortunate enough to know of several young men who, having been refused ordination at traditional Catholic seminaries, went on to found independent cults or sects. In this we can see that the seminary staff was diligent in their appraisal of the candidates and was able to correctly identify those unworthy of ordination.

GabrielKazakhstan (7): I might be wrong but from what I've heard this guy invited a bunch of sedevacantist bishops to his house for a conclave but no one came so he elected himself as pope

Successful\_Sink\_2099 (1): Most sane conclavist be like

rschafe8787 (1): Thank you. It probably is something as small as “this is not the vocation for you.” Kind of situation.

Piklikl (8): Word is there were 6 votes, including his mother and the cat. A local business now owns the place where the “conclave” was held, making for some fun local trivia.

PangolinEater19 (3): His "successor" has a YouTube channel. It's Pope Michael II and you should definitely look it up for a laugh

GabrielKazakhstan (2): Lol conclavists are really insane

WinterBaroness (1): A CAT?

According\_Rip\_543 (1): We're CATholic after all

WinterBaroness (2): Haha I was just so shocked, sometimes these type of sedevacantists who long so much for traditionalism that they end up going against Tradition by thinking a cat has enough conscience and will to vote

# Post 61: The SSPX Responds to Cardinal Arborelius
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Hi, I have been doing some research and have been hearing a lot of good things about the SSPX such as keeping tradition and Latin Mass. I was wondering if theres a difference between SSPX and Parishes that celebrate the Extraordinary Form of the Latin Mass? There’s not any SSPX Parishes in my city but there is one closeby that celebrates Latin Mass; is that still fine to attend? I heard the SSPX say how the Novus Ordo is a danger to the faith? How so?

Blue\_Celica (11): So the Novus Ordo is a danger to the faith because it transmitted the ambiguity of the 2nd Vatican Council into the liturgy. It basically stripped and protestantized the liturgy. The Judica Mei (Psalm 42) and prayers at the foot of the alter, some of the offetories and the last gospel among other things that I’m probably not remembering were stripped. The priest also went from facing God to having his back to Him. It’s attempt to get the laity more involved with noble in theory caused confusion on how it was to be interpreted and also got rid of the sacred silence and strict rubrics that organically developed in the Latin Rite for centuries. It’s not a development of liturgy, it’s a rupture and a completely new rite. Pope Benedict XVI acknowledged it was a new rite. Sacrosanctum Concilium needs to be repealed. And yes, both SSPX and the Diocesan TLMs use the 1962 missal. There may be a few minute differences but they will fundamentally will be the same. If it is all that is available to you then yes. Please go, don’t go out of your way. The mass of the ages is the same everywhere. The rubrics are always the same.Edit: SSPX admits that though the NO is valid it opens the faithful up to heresy because of the reasons I mentioned above.

Didi\_Schwiedie (10): If it wouldn’t be, you would start Sedivanticanism (or how it’s called 😉) and the SSPX wouldn’t be a part of the Catholic Church and faith anymore - so of course it is ok. The SSPX does not see every catholic priest and parish as problematic and if it is a real TLM, the SSPX wouldn’t say anything against it. The only thing they could say is: It would be better if you attend to an SSPX mass - in general or to support the society but that’s it. But the SSPX sees the Novus Ordo as irregular.

Internal\_Ad1735 (16): Of course it is fine. The Latin Mass is not the SSPX's property. The liturgy is for the whole Church. You can attend any Latin Mass, whether it's diocesan, FSSP, ICKSP, Institute of Good Shepherd, Oratorian, or any other. The only advice the SSPX gives you is to not attend the Novus Ordo because it is damaging to the faith.Many people (including me) who go to an SSPX chapel also go to other Latin Masses if they are nearby. Sometimes, my SSPX chapel doesn't have early Mass on weekdays, so I go to some other Latin Mass parish before school. For the Assumption of Mary, my SSPX chapel didn't have a High Mass, only a Low Mass. I went to the (larger) FSSP church where they had a Solemn High Mass. After Mass, we had a parish dinner and I recognized at least 30-40 people from the SSPX chapel.In most of the world, there is no option. Many places (like in Italy) don't have a lot of SSPX parishes, but have a lot of FSSP and ICKSP churches. Go to any Latin Mass available to you.

kawaqcosta (6): Read this excelent article of Fr. Paul Robinson:["Father, Should I Attend That Mass?" Advice on Attending Non-SSPX Latin Masses | District of the USA](https://sspx.org/en/news/father-should-i-attend-mass-advice-attending-non-sspx-latin-masses-26188)

Willsxyz (5): I refer you to this post of mine from last week:[https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1mqri0t/comment/n8tn0b7/?utm\\_source=share&utm\\_medium=web3x&utm\\_name=web3xcss&utm\\_term=1&utm\\_content=share\\_button](https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1mqri0t/comment/n8tn0b7/?utm\_source=share&utm\_medium=web3x&utm\_name=web3xcss&utm\_term=1&utm\_content=share\_button)

kacfm2506 (-1): only go to SSPX chapels, do not go to a diocesan TLM or any of the ex ecclesia dei groups like Fraternity of San Peter, first issue is their clergy is ordained by novus ordo bishops so they have doubtful sacraments, second issue is they have fully accepted the judas council of vatican 2 and its errors, stay away

iphone5su93 (2): doesn't FSSP use 1955?

None (2): This is the answer

Unlikely-Attempt-246 (2): Hello, I watched this video and heard how the SSPX Priest advises against attending a Parish that performs both TLM and Novus Ordo; as they could be distributing Novus Ordo Hosts? As well as the individual status of the Priest? Feeling kind of stressed out because there aren’t many TLM Parishes nearby and no SSPX Parish in my city.

Spiritual-Anybody-18 (4): sspx does not re ordain novus ordos priest on principle unless requested by those priest, your position is your own,

Blue\_Celica (1): No they use the 1962

None (3): Don't sweat it. You are doing your part to discern the most prudent outcome. God will give you the graces to meet you where you are at.The SSPX is the best option because they are principled and have terrific formation. But you will still do well to go to any TLM available to you, if the SSPX is not. It is a good time to remember that God will not judge us for what we were never able to do. He only expects us to do our best with what we have.

kacfm2506 (0): so you accept bogus ordo tampered with holy orders, how traditional of you, look up Sacramentum Ordinis Pius XII apostolic constitution in relation with what's necessary for VALIDITY of holy orders

Spiritual-Anybody-18 (3): Sspx position is that they are valid in principle. There is no thought to your response other than " it was messed up therefore invalid". I know this things are sensible to some people but you cannot go saying those things without thought. It would be best to return to tradition, yes, but that does not mean it's invalid.

# Post 63: What do SSPX laity mean when they call post Vatican II Popes modernist?
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Would it be okay to call SSPX laity traditionalist? Would it be okay to call Bishop Lefebvre a traditionalist?

Internal\_Ad1735 (14): We mean these Popes drank way too much from the Kool-Aid of the 1960s, embraced change, tried to update the Church for the modern world, and basically put Catholic tradition on life support. It means ditching timeless teachings, watering down doctrine, swapping mystical Latin liturgy for guitars and hand-holding. Modernism is the root of all crisis and confusion—the source of chaos in the Church today.Now, calling SSPX laity “traditionalists” couldn’t be more on the nose. We straight-up are the guardians of old-school Catholicism—mass in Latin, rules from pre-1962, rosaries everywhere, no ambiguity about salvation or morality. We don’t just accept the label “traditionalist”—we wear it like a badge of honor, or, sometimes, a shield against everything we see as wrong with what’s new and “modern.” Same goes for Archbishop Lefebvre: he is the grandfather of Catholic traditionalism and the guy who said, “No way, not on my watch,” when Vatican II started pushing changes. Lefebvre is a legend—sometimes even talked about like a saint—because he stood firm and gave Catholics a place to retreat when their parishes went “full modernist”.

Willsxyz (5): Read this:https://sspx.org/en/pascendi-exposes-modernist-tactics-30350https://www.vatican.va/content/pius-x/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\_p-x\_enc\_19070908\_pascendi-dominici-gregis.html

craft00n (1): "We"... Are you an SSPX priest ? Be careful about that."Modernism" is a heresy which has poisoned the whole Church, including SSPX priests and faithfuls. As proof, many (if not the majority of SSPX faithfuls) believe that miracles are proofs of God's existence (an idea coming from protestants apologetics and contradicted by Saint Thomas) or that some prophecies and private relations can be used to guide our action in this crisis, overruling classical Church organisation (that's contrary to the idea that revelation is closed and that the Church is perfect).Furthermore, Gleize's paper from February 2013 is very clear on the fact that one shouldn't oppose the Catholic Church and the "Conciliar Church", the Pope being in the second. The Conciliar Church is a trend inside the one Catholic Church, and everybody's influenced by this trend.I firmly believe that SSPX's current actions are just, and that Lefebvre did right in 1970, 1976 and 1988, but one shouldn't create too much of a dichotomy between the Pope and SSPX, as SSPX exists only as an organ of the Church, not the most perfect or useful, but of the ones whom necessity is the highest for our human eyes, and for this reason SSPX isn't against the Pope, but here to help the Pope, whereas in a particular way that could lead to confusion if we forget that all of this is perfectly guided by God through grace.

Internal\_Ad1735 (5): Read the question again. There's the word "laity" in it.
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# Post 65: Does anybody know who these priests are?
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I know there are some Eastern Catholic groups affiliated with FSSPX but does anyone here recognize these ones in particular? (pic from FSSPX jubilee pilgramage)

Internal\_Ad1735 (13): Those are Ukrainian Catholic priests of the Priestly Society of Saint Josaphat, affiliated with SSPX. I don't know their names though.

icxcnikahnd (4): They are priests of the FSIPD. (Priestly Society of St John Precursor of the Lord) They are Eastern Catholic Byzantine rite priests associated with the SSPX. They are the polar opposites of the Latinized SSJK

No-Test6158 (2): Are they not the French district's Fraternity of the Transfiguration?

icxcnikahnd (4): Nope

BasedEurope (1): I Just realized I recognized the FSPID priest from when I attended liturgy with them in Riga, It was almost exactly like the Russian Orthodox ones i've attended

Jacques230 (1): No

# Post 66: Gaza's Catholic priest says that Israel has issued an evacuation order for the whole city, including the area where Holy Family Church is. The church was most recently hit by Israeli military a month ago, killing 3 people. | Michael Haynes
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# Post 67: Refutation of John Salza
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Has anyone responded or refuted John Salza's article on SSPX Sunday obligation?God bless

BeneficialJeweler832 (4): The Vatican did in 2003 as per the following exchange from Ecclessia Dei found here: [link](https://l.instagram.com/?u=https%3A%2F%2Fweb.archive.org%2Fweb%2F20070323131541%2Fhttp%3A%2F%2Fsspx.agenda.tripod.com%2Fid71.html&e=AT2JMuPiEU0p5JqGt78Nb5bFyxi9ryNgTn5Z04iaoURpyezoYf2WkWXtLLkWKZd3BoCxhf37u-Fyt8gSRPP8S8-dX7zrlC9mXJv3Fjx4gd1PWryIQHEiu3jvBa0EK7m\_RROD2SDqxKoH) where they say although we cannot recommend it, if one attends without schismatic reasons, it is not sinful and fulfils your obligation.

Sad-Boysenberry-9578 (4): He is self refuting. He is also a “former” 32nd degree Freemason, who flip flops and jumps sides, and creates chaos.He also conveniently never discusses the J question, as modern day Judaism is the Synagogue of Satan.

CorCarmeli (3): https://youtu.be/zv\_FOamD5rc

# Post 68: How is SSPX doing in France?

Author: Ok\_Mathematician6180
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1mt3uzo/how\_is\_sspx\_doing\_in\_france/

Basically the title, I know few French people that go to SSPX, but overall what percent of practicing Catholics in France are going to SSPX (I know Catholicism is in a pretty bad shape in France rn)

Internal\_Ad1735 (12): They're doing good, and growing. Churches in France are empty, but the SSPX (and FSSP, ICKSP) ones are full. Plenty of French seminarists in Écône next door in Switzerland. I don't know the percentage of Catholics in France who attend SSPX chapels, but a devout Catholic in France is either :1. An African immigrant or international student2. A Middle Eastern Catholic 3. A traditionalist Catholic

Jacques230 (1): I would be more nuanced. French churches aren’t empty. And some sspx chapels are struggling.France district superior called for vocations during the Chartres pilgrimage because Econe is half empty

Internal\_Ad1735 (2): I was talking about what I saw with my own eyes around France. Except for some cathedrals and shrines (like Notre-Dame de Paris or Lourdes), most parishes are almost empty. But Latin Mass parishes are mostly full. In Lille, the ICKSP church is always full, while all other parishes in the city are empty. In Paris, St-Nicolas-du-Chardonnet and Sainte-Eugène are full, but most other parishes are quite empty except Montmartre and Notre-Dame. In Marseille, same thing. Only the cathedral has people. In Lourdes itself, the FSSP and SSPX churches are overflowing on Sundays. The basilicas have a lot of people too, but proportionally to their size, the Latin Mass parishes attract more people. In villages around the country, it's a catastrophe. Village parishes are closed on many Sundays of the year due to low attendance. They have one priest for the whole region.It's true that a few Latin Mass parishes are struggling, mostly due to their odd location. If they are in a city, they are not struggling. Only the ones in the middle of nowhere are.

# Post 69: Good Friday | Traditional Latin Rite at Holy Cross Catholic Church Kenya | Society of Saint Pius X in Kenya

Author: HiberniaDublinensis
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URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yYt57by2MCw

# Post 70: What are your thoughts on the FSSP?

Author: Own-Associate-7945
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1msof34/what\_are\_your\_thoughts\_on\_the\_fssp/

outsidelookinIN\_1 (3): Love them as well as the sspx, both are great

# Post 71: How to interview an SSPX priest?

Author: Mailemanuel77
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Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1msft71/how\_to\_interview\_an\_sspx\_priest/

I want to conduct a personal research project (nothing formal to be published, just personal intellectual and spiritual inquiry) about the state of the Church in Latin America. Asking about the post conciliar crisis, libertarion theology, CIA backed evangelical ministries that led to an abandonment of a Catholic culture that stood for centuries but was severely wounded in the matter of a few decades, and the numbers don't stop. Cold War, the lack of support from the Vatican, the loss of reverence in the liturgy and other issues concerning the crisis in the Church that no other priest would be willing to discuss, but only a traditionalist priest (the SSPX is the only Traditionalist Catholic organization (as far as I know) in the country and the only ones who offer the Latin Mass, while others even the conservatives just offer a more reverent version of the Novus Ordo). I'm seeking answers and clarity. How should I ask them if there is a priest available an willing to either connect to a video conference or have a personal meeting at their chapel. I really want to get answers, but unlike the US where there are plenty of trad influencers commenting in the issue, here is my country there are few online resources besides the Wikipedia and some articles and thesis from journalists and academics (mentioning the issue but not being the main focus and more of a secondary issue or observation).

Internal\_Ad1735 (3): Just search for your local district on the SSPX website, find the contacts of the priests in your country, and then send an email asking for an interview. If you don't get any answer after 2 weeks, look for the Mass times and go to Mass at the nearest SSPX chapel. Then after Mass, you can strike up a conversation with a priest.

dbaughmen (2): I could give you the number of the SSPX District Superior of Mexico if you’re interested, dm me

Mailemanuel77 (1): Thanks, but I'm from Guatemala from the Central America and the Caribbean district.

# Post 72: August 21, 2025 Pilgrimage Listed on Official (Modernist Rome) Vatican Jubilee Website

Author: Sad-Boysenberry-9578
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ms4fn4/august\_21\_2025\_pilgrimage\_listed\_on\_official/

The official Vatican Jubilee 2025 website lists a pilgrimage by the SSPX on August 21, 2025. The event includes a public Rosary, a Solemn High Mass, and a procession through the Holy Door of the Lateran Basilica. The Vatican still calls the group “canonically irregular,” but this listing shows visible participation in events organized by Modernist Rome.[Source: https://www.iubilaeum2025.va/it/pellegrinaggio/calendario-giubileo/pellegrinaggi/pellegrinaggio-fraternita-sacerdotale-san-pio.html]

Internal\_Ad1735 (3): Because it is licit and valid to attend a Mass celebrated by an SSPX priest. Rome can't deny it. "Canonically irregular" simply means "not under the local bishop". But in the territory of the diocese of Rome, they are not "canonically irregular". The Pope, who is bishop of Rome, is giving the SSPX a green light for the pilgrimage.

Sad-Boysenberry-9578 (1): Unfortunately this a rotten fruit of this new SSPX of Bishop Fellay.

# Post 73: The Cristero War | Christopher Ferrara

Author: HiberniaDublinensis
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URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jy2f4FP0yb0

# Post 74: Happy Feast of the Assumption

Author: EarthCharming3968
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Comments: 2

URL: https://i.redd.it/fu4rbxgcmajf1.jpeg

Zalamb1500 (5): Lady in front of me had that exact Bishop Tissier card in her missal as a bookmark. 😳

EarthCharming3968 (4): May God rest his soul

# Post 75: What is the church's view on the coup de grace?

Author: XaviGamer144
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1mr71z8/what\_is\_the\_churchs\_view\_on\_the\_coup\_de\_grace/

Is it viewed as suicide or murder?

# Post 76: Sexual question(NSFW)

Author: None
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1mr6amw/sexual\_questionnsfw/

Hi everyone,Sorry for the explicit language. I’m asking this here because I know this sub has good catholic answers. I’m married and was having sex with my wife. During intercourse, I was also stimulating her clitoris. After I ejaculated, I continued stimulating her for maybe a minute or two so she could reach orgasm .Our sexual activity was open to life, as we fully intend to conceive, so I understand that sexual acts during intercourse aren’t inherently wrong. However, I’m unsure if continuing stimulation after ejaculation could be considered sinful, or even a grave sin, especially since I didn’t know at the time.I’ve confessed worse sins in the past, but this is something that would be very difficult for my wife to confess herself. I’d appreciate guidance or insight.God bless.

Piklikl (10): During my marriage prep the SSPX priest (Fr Loop) said that there is a certain justice in the man ensuring completion for the woman, but both should happen (completion for the husband and the wife) as part of the same “event”; he said roughly speaking the window of time is an hour.

Internal\_Ad1735 (10): You’re good, man! Helping your wife finish after sex is actually kind of awesome in Catholic eyes, as long as the main act is open to life (no barriers to conception, no pulling out, etc.). The Church isn’t counting seconds or treating pleasure like a sin. Once you’ve completed the marital act properly, it’s totally okay—and even loving—to make sure your wife enjoys herself too.This isn’t just “not a sin”—it’s part of being a good, attentive husband. The whole idea is: sex is supposed to be about BOTH of you, not just one person. The Church gets that, and most priests will straight up tell you that you don’t need to stress about this at all. If your heart is in the right place and you’re open to life, you’re living Catholic marriage the way it’s meant to be.So relax, enjoy your marriage, care for each other, and don’t sweat the technicalities. You’re making love, not breaking rules.

StillFigure7472 (6): Generally speaking, it is not sinful what you are doing assuming you ejaculate in her and not outside. Stimulating her after that is fine. Just don't use toys as I have seen that discussed as a grey area, and should be avoided if possible. You could also talk to a priest in confession to ask if you are personally having scruples about it. There are also numerous sources online from NO priests on this topic. I believe we would have the same view as the NO on this issue

TheologyRocks (5): St. Alphonsus Ligouri explicitly argues that what you're describing is ethically licit, and basically all theologians who have written about the matter in question share his view about what you're describing being ethically licit. I'm actually not aware of any theologians who have argued the opposite (and it's often hard to get theologians agreeing!). So, it sounds like you're just suffering from a scruple.

None (2): Thank you all

craft00n (2): Father Barbara says it's okay, so are saying all the traditional moralists I've red (I'm a philosophy student). Trying to give pleasure to your spouse like that is open to life and is part of mutual support, so it's 100% legit.

None (-2): What you do in your bed with your wife is holy, and between you two. You shouldn't share it.

None (3): That’s great thank you for sharing that. In my marriage prep the deacon barely even spoke about anything theology related unfortunately

None (1): Thank you my brother

None (1): Thank you so much

None (1): Thank you!

None (10): Well, not everything is holy right

None (10): I think you might be suffering from scruples. Enjoy and love each other.

craft00n (2): Any sexual act must be "open to life" and mutually supportive. If you have sex only to feel good, without any interest in your sexual partner, there's definitely is a sin.

None (2): You’re probably right. Thank you

# Post 77: Boston auxiliary bishop says he ‘wept’ first time after celebrating Traditional Latin Mass: Bishop Robert Reed’s social-media post welcomed by Latin Massgoers. | Matthew McDonald for the National Catholic Register

Author: HiberniaDublinensis
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URL: https://www.ncregister.com/news/boston-auxiliary-bishop-says-he-wept-first-time-after-celebrating-traditional-latin-mass

# Post 78: Fiducia Supplicans | To uphold or to reject? | Africa's perspective | Society of Saint Pius X in Kenya

Author: HiberniaDublinensis
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URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I\_ZyeIM0WOc

# Post 79: Why can’t you go to NO?

Author: Altruistic\_Baby3035
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1mqri0t/why\_cant\_you\_go\_to\_no/

Hi!I don’t understand how missing Sunday mass at all is better than attending a NO mass. Could someone explain it to me? And also, would you rather go to ICKSP/FSSP than missing sunday mass? (If there is no FSSP in the area) Thanks :)

Willsxyz (13): None of the answers so far reflect the SSPX position on the matter. The best source of information about this is the SSPX’s own videos on the topic. They shouldn’t be hard to search up on Youtube.To giver an extremely brief summary, every reference to distinctively Catholic doctrine was removed from the novus ordo mass (most notably the idea of the mass as a propitiatory sacrifice) in order to make it acceptable to protestants.The SSPX says that this makes the novus ordo mass a danger to the Catholic faith, since the Catholic doctrine of the mass as described at Trent has been stripped out of the mass. They then argue that a mass that represents a danger to the faith cannot be obligatory for Catholics.This argument does not seem to support the avoidance of traditional masses offered by other groups, but some people argue (not an official position of the SSPX) that the ordinations of novus ordo and “ecclesia dei” priests are doubtful and that therefore one should avoid traditional masses celebrated by them also.

Internal\_Ad1735 (17): We're not just being moody about guitars and felt banners. The NO (“Novus Ordo” Mass) is kinda... meh. Too casual. Sometimes the priest treats it more like a hangout, music is cringe, prayers feel rushed or made up. Mass is a glimpse into heaven, not a community talent show. Most trads are worried that the watered-down vibe & loose liturgical rules could mess with our faith (or our kids’ faith), so they’d rather skip than end up spiritually confused, frustrated, or scandalized. This is also the SSPX's position.Church says, unless you’re sick, caring for someone, or traveling without options—you gotta go to Mass on Sunday. It's a big deal. Some trads will say: “If the only option is an irreverent, possibly sketchy NO that drives me nuts or risks my soul, better to stay home and pray hard.” Others say, “Suck it up, go, just don’t receive Communion if you’re really uncomfortable.”\*What if there’s ICKSP or FSSP, but no SSPX?\*Oh, that’s the jackpot (for me personally)! They do old-school Latin Mass, the whole reverence package. If you got those in town, you win—no controversy, no drama. Fulfills your obligation and gives you the spiritual experience you want.My opinion : if there's ANY valid Catholic Mass (NO, TLM, Byzantine, whatever)—go. Only skip if you absolutely can’t, and ideally, only if your confessor/priest says it’s OK in super rare cases.ICKSP, SSPX, and FSSP: Full-on trad, fully legit, absolutely go if you can.Don’t let pride or ideology make you cut yourself off from the sacraments. Jesus is bigger than liturgical drama.Honestly, in the end: Go to Mass. If you can pick, pick the most reverent one. If you hate your local Mass, get creative, travel, or find the least painful option. But don’t ghost God on Sunday—He’s waiting to see you!

WinterBaroness (10): There's SSPX videos on yt which explain that topic, but basically the new Mass was created in favor of protestants so there are a lot of elements which are missing or have been substituted for more protestant things (for example to usage of a table instead of an altar, which makes the Mass feel like a meal). And also, not sure if it's catechism or canon law, but you are dispensed from going to Mass if that could harm your faith, so that applies if you live in an area with only the New Mass.Meanwhile, on the second topic, yes I'd go to a non-SSPX Latin Mass but I know there might be people here who might not agree with me, since FSSP was created as a Vatican II-aprooved Latin Mass group. But my opinion is that any traditional Mass matters, what people tell me about is to be wary sometimes of the homilies which could be pro-Vatican Ii

almeidathecatholic (3): Hail Mary, dearest.There we go. The Novus Ordo Missae is the worship of men and not the worship of Our Lord! Faith has been relativized, the Holy Eucharist is treated as a banquet, the Holy Mass through this profane liturgy is diminished as a liturgy performed for thanksgiving. It is the result of disobedience between God and man, totally ignoring the Sacred Tradition and disrespecting the lex orandi and lex credendi that make up the Holy Mother Church. Its liturgical structure goes completely against what the Church has always said. In the third canon of the twentieth and second session of the Council of Trent it says the following: Canon III – If anyone says that the sacrifice of the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; or that it is a mere commemoration of the finished sacrifice on the cross, but not a propitiatory sacrifice; or that it benefits only the one who receives it; and that it should not be offered by the living and the dead for sins, pains, satisfactions and other needs; be anathema.(Council of Trent, July 15th MDLXII — XXI Session, Canon III) It is a total disrespect for the Most Holy Sacrifice of the Mass and the most important dogma declared by the Holy Church, the Holy Mass of Always.In the year 1570, Saint Pius V through his bull Quo Primum Tempore declared the Holy Mass of Always as incorruptible and irreplaceable, as he says according to sections 6, 11 and 14 of the same. Saint Pius V also in Quo Primum Tempore dogmatically proclaimed that this Mass can be celebrated without restrictions or prohibitions, as he says in session no. 7.Pope Paul VI himself stated the disrespect for this dogma in his letter Missale Romanum written by him at the Second Vatican Council.This is what Paul VI said: "The Roman Missal which, in accordance with the decree of the Tridentine Council, was promulgated in 1570 by our predecessor Saint Pius V, is counted among the many and admirable fruits that that Holy Synod spread throughout the Church of Christ. In fact, for four centuries, the priests of the Latin rite had it as a norm for the celebration of the Eucharistic sacrifice, and the holy heralds of the Gospel introduced it to almost the entire earth. In it also many Saints copiously nourished their piety towards God, drawing it both from readings of Holy Scripture and from their prayers, the main part of which was organized by Saint Gregory the Great.But, since the desire to promote the sacred liturgy began to grow and strengthen among the Christian people - a desire that, according to the words of our venerable predecessor Pius XII, must be considered a favorable sign of Divine Providence towards the people of our time and a salutary passage of the Holy Spirit through his Church - it became evident that the formulas of the Roman Missal should be restored and enriched."(Pope Paul VI, 1969 — Missale Romanum, Second Vatican Council)A dogma is a truth of faith that cannot be tampered with, much less denied, so do not accept a profane rite such as the Novus Ordo Missae.I hope you understand, my dear. Free Deo!

GabrielKazakhstan (2): In my opinions NO is still better than nothing on sunday, as long as it's reverent.

thatwannabewitch (2): As a mother of young children, my husband and I together decided that despite the fact that we very much liked the local NO priest who himself is very conservative and traditional, the things that are allowed to happen in the NO (female “altar boys”, CITH, etc) would be dangerous for the spiritual formation of our kids, especially our 4 and 6 year old boys. We regrettably can’t make it to a TLM every week because it’s a 2 hour drive and nearly impassible in winter in some cases because of snow, but we try our hardest and devote every Sunday we can’t make it to Mass to teaching the kids about the faith and doing the readings.

RosaryRanch (1): The NO Mass is damaging to your faith. What’s next “There’s no TLM or NO near me so I’m just going to go to “Rock And Roll Baptist Church” to fulfill my Sunday obligation? 😂

Willsxyz (5): https://youtu.be/0Yfo63OiNeo?si=3mwAQxSdUcAaUaOehttps://youtu.be/ZiuXKo0CwoM?si=NZWaPIAlqAwNkXWKhttps://youtu.be/5hZrRGMs6CY?si=to9o7LUW1eucXXJm

Pizza527 (1): Which, this is kind of crazy, bc, you have priests who learn to say the TLM, clearly they believe it is the true Mass, but are forced by the bishop and Pope to say the NO as well. They oblige bc if they don’t, they’ll be fired and none of the parishioners will have access to the TLM.

ThePatriot131313 (2): What elements are missing in the NO? Not trolling, honestly asking.

Sad-Boysenberry-9578 (1): The Novus Ordo Mass is intrinsically defective and must be avoided for grave matter. Even if it were valid, it would be a schismatic rite, and in any case its validity is at least positively doubtful. For these reasons, the faithful cannot rely on it to fulfill their Sunday obligation, regardless of how reverent it may appear.

Altruistic\_Baby3035 (3): Thank you for your answer! :)

Intelligent\_Peak\_591 (1): Do you already utilize latinmass.live or livemass.net (FSSP) ?

CorCarmeli (4): The easiest thing to do is to simply compare the prayers of the New Mass with those of the Tridentine Mass. From there it will become quite clear how much from the Tridentine Mass was stripped for the New Mass. You may also be interested in reading Fr. Anthony Cekada’s book \*Work of Human Hands\*, where he goes into heavy detail the theological issues with the New Mass.

WinterBaroness (1): Not a lot of things came to mind, I think it's more of a case of substitutions.If you want an example, I don't remember hearing the full Confiteor in the NO. Maybe it's different from each country, and amid the NO there are some more reverent than others. But in my case I remember in Portuguese Masses, instead of doing a Confiteor, the priest asks us to generally confess our sins to God in our minds, so it's just a few seconds of (somewhat awkward) silence. Update: So I just checked and that usually is what is done on Years B and C; Year A is the most similar to the Tridentine Mass one but still there are names of Saints missing.I'll just send you a Latin version I translated from ChatGPT and check with the Latin Mass their differences: Confiteor Deo omnipotenti, et vobis, fratres, quia peccavi nimis cogitatione, verbo et opere: mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa. Ideo precor beatam Mariam semper Virginem, omnes Angelos et Sanctos, et vos, fratres, orare pro me ad Dominum Deum nostrum.Additionally, check out this animation of the difference between two missals: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kXA-Nsd2VTI](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kXA-Nsd2VTI)

RosaryRanch (1): There’s a 3 part series on YT called “The Mass of the Ages”. It’s really good about explaining what was removed (and added) to the NO Mass.

None (3): I’m not a NO fan either, but If the Pope says it’s valid how can we say it isn’t?

GabrielKazakhstan (3): I understand that NO was a mistake but it is still valid, i'm not saying that I would go to NO, I would only if there was no traditional rite available near me. It still is the eucharist and we have miracles that prove it.

thatwannabewitch (3): My husband's home parish he grew up in has a Livestream of their Latin mass and we really like the priest's homilies so we just watch that

ThePatriot131313 (2): Thank you for your response. I will look at the things you suggested

ThePatriot131313 (1): Thanks for the response. Much appreciated. God bless

Sad-Boysenberry-9578 (1): We can’t say for certain either way, we can only say it is positively doubtful.

# Post 80: Woman "priestess" concelebrates at Mass with bishops in Italy | Doctor Taylor Marshall Podcast
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URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-LAUPXVgZLs

# Post 81: Can holy obedience oblige Catholics to disobey? Modernism, infiltration & tradition | Society of Saint Pius X in Kenya

Author: HiberniaDublinensis
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URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RoBh2Ua2Ftg

DravidianPrototyper (6): Look no further than Sts. Athanasius of Alexandria and Hermenegild as historical precedents for rightful disobedience; saints who were both excommunicated by their heretical superiors (Arians) under the grounds of insubordination due to fidelity to the true unblemished Faith.

londonderry99 (1): \*\*Judges 3:12–30\*\* \*\*12\*\* The Israelites again did what is evil in the sight of the Lord God, and the Lord God gave strength to Eglon king of Moab against Israel, because they had done what is evil in the sight of the Lord God. \*\*13\*\* Eglon allied himself with the Ammonites and the Amalekites, marched against Israel, defeated them, and captured the City of Palm Trees. \*\*14\*\* The Israelites were subject to Eglon king of Moab for eighteen years. \*\*15\*\* Then the Israelites called on the Lord God, and he raised up for them a saviour, Ehud son of Gera, a left-handed man from the tribe of Benjamin. The Israelites sent him with tribute to Eglon king of Moab. \*\*16\*\* Ehud made himself a double-edged sword, a cubit long, and strapped it under his clothes on his right thigh. \*\*17\*\* He presented the tribute to Eglon king of Moab, a very fat man. \*\*18\*\* When he had finished presenting the tribute, he sent away the men who had carried it. \*\*19\*\* But he himself turned back from the idols near Gilgal and said, ‘I have a secret message for you, O king.’ The king said, ‘Silence!’ and all his attendants withdrew from his presence. \*\*20\*\* Ehud went in to him; he was sitting alone in his cool upper room. Ehud said, ‘I have a message from God for you.’ And the king rose from his seat. \*\*21\*\* Ehud reached with his left hand, drew the sword from his right thigh, and thrust it into Eglon’s belly. \*\*22\*\* The hilt also went in after the blade, and the fat closed over the blade, for Ehud did not pull the sword out of his belly, and the filth came out. \*\*23\*\* Then Ehud went out onto the porch, shut the doors of the upper room behind him, and locked them. \*\*24\*\* After he had gone, the servants came and found the doors of the upper room locked. They said, ‘He must be relieving himself in the cool room.’ \*\*25\*\* They waited until they were embarrassed, but still he did not open the doors of the upper room. So they took the key and opened them; there lay their master dead on the ground. \*\*26\*\* Ehud escaped while they delayed. Passing beyond the idols, he escaped to Seirah. \*\*27\*\* When he arrived, he sounded the trumpet in the hill country of Ephraim, and the Israelites came down from the hills under his leadership. \*\*28\*\* He said to them, ‘Follow me, for the Lord God has given your enemies the Moabites into your hands.’ They followed him and seized the fords of the Jordan leading to Moab; they did not allow anyone to cross. \*\*29\*\* At that time they struck down about ten thousand Moabites, all vigorous and able-bodied men; not one escaped. \*\*30\*\* So Moab was subdued that day under Israel’s hand, and the land had peace for eighty years.

Powerful-Bee-932 (1): St Athanasius went into exile after his excommunication. He didn’t exercise any kind of ministry without having been given faculties from the church first. He waited to be called to Rome and have the excommunication lifted. He didn’t display any disobedience. He bowed to the will of his superiors and trusted that God had everything handled.

# Post 82: Spain: collapse of religious practice and vocations | InfoCatólica (translated by FSSPX News)
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# Post 83: African bishops discuss polygamy document | Gloria.tv

Author: HiberniaDublinensis

Score: 3

Comments: 1
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DravidianPrototyper (1): "The Church in Africa is booming and thriving! Just look at how vehemently opposed they are to the abominable 'encyclical' that is Fiducia Supplicans. Why, even in certain Christian-majority parts of the sub-Saharan continent, men are either beaten or stoned to death on the mere suspicion that they are homosexual. Verily, verily, I tell you all most solemnly, the future of the Church is in Africa!" - Trad Inc.Ok, now do polygyny and Charismania/'speaking' in 'tongues', Michael Matt of TheRemnantTV. Not to mention the prosperity gospel preachers by the dozen, as well as self-professed prophets and apostles performing exorcisms and healing sick people outside the authority of Holy Mother Church.Lastly, when presented with the opportunity to partake of the Mass either in the Novus Ordo in their own respective native language or the TLM, what are the odds of them willingly wanting to commemorate Christ's One and Eternal Sacrifice on the Cross for all mankind in a vernacular that is not only completely alien/foreign to them, but is perceived to be 'colonial' in nature as well? - Precisely.My point is, just because Africans are generally significantly more socially conservative than your average Westerner, that doesn't mean that they don't have their fair share of moral and theological problems to deal with either.

# Post 84: Question about music

Author: EarthCharming3968
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1mnvj62/question\_about\_music/

I have heard quite a bit of criticism of emotional and sensual music (rock, pop, country) from SSPX and traditional non-SSPX priests. I want to make sure the music I listen to doesn't endanger my soul but I also don't want to listen to just Gregorian chant. What suggestions do you guys have? Preferably not only genres but also artist and maybe even a link or two to a Spotify playlist. May God bless you for reading my post and helping me!

Blade\_of\_Boniface (4): Music is kind-of sensual and emotional by its nature. The criticism is more geared towards the lyrics/industry but even then they usually specify that it's a common source of temptation/occasion rather an intrinsically sinful. If you want my two-cents then it's only worth being scrupulous of if you're actually observing spiritual consequences and/or you're specifically directed by a Priest to do so.That being said: How do you feel about [shanties](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=49FWp7WLYKw) and [other](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3XddOIbMONk) folk music?

Next-Antelope-5887 (3): You might give Gwar a listen.

undeadcookie123 (2): Fr. Ripperger has given some strong opinion on the topic. You can read his in-depth analysis on music in Introduction to the Science of Mental Health. Also, Dr. Kwasniewski has written extensively about music and how most music nowadays uses syncopated rhythm and how that affects its influence on us.I personally stopped listening to secular music on my own although I do believe some of it is perfectly fine, such as shanties, folk, and classical, which I like enjoying in good company. Different styles of chant is what I usually go to if I listen to anything on my own.

None (2): If I want to actually listen to music actively, it's usually classical or music from the 30's (think early Bing Crosby). I have moved away from actively listening to music, however, since my duty of state as a father usually eats up "leisure time." Reading a book is a deeper and more engaging way to get in touch with the true, good, and beautiful in this season of my life.I do like lo-fi music for working specifically. It is boring and uninspired by design, so it doesn't get stuck in your head the way other songs can, but it is pleasant enough. It's not for everyone and some might find it to be too vapid for their tastes. Lo-fi girl on yt has quality music that is still produced by real people, as far as I can tell.So long as you make sure the music isn't itself inherently filthy, that it isn't a bad spiritual influence for you as an individual, you should be alright. Blade of Boniface basically nailed it in an earlier comment.

Far-Air3908 (2): Music is a tough one, because we’re all different in how we react to it. Outside of traditional hymns and chants, I listen to metal for the most part. If you avoid the edge-lordy satanic stuff in metal, then it’s actually an amazing genre, filled with tons of creativity and great song structure.Many songs speak on things such as corruption, unjust war, and the human condition, with many bands doing so in philosophical ways.The problem with metal is it can arouse specific emotions if you’re not careful. It varies from person to person. It calms me down ironically, because there’s just something about guitar work and masterfully crafted riffs that ease me when I’m anxious. Just be careful with what you listen to, and if a band says negative things about anything regarding our faith, cut it out.

EducationalTip3093 (2): I feel it mostly has to do with the lyrics of the songs and not just that type of music in general so if it is like classical music or music with no lyrics it is probably safe to listen to but mostly it has to do with if the song is leading you to temptation or not

None (1): Use your own discernment, people you cant ask everything to your priest.

EarthCharming3968 (1): Thank you for the response. I have read much of what Fr. Ripperger has to say on the topic and I was mostly asking for practical advice

undeadcookie123 (1): Apologies since I didn't answer your question directly, but it seems to me that since you have heard what Fr. Ripperger has to say, and assuming that you're somewhat familiar with Dr. Kwasniewski's opinion on music, you will continue to struggle to find music that doesn't endanger your soul at all, as that kind of music is hard to come by these days. My suggestion would be to allow the truth to transform your desires, which would free you from the burden you are carrying at the moment. But, on a practical note, older 20th century music is a lot more likely to be safe to listen to. Sorry that I can't give you any recommendations off the top of my head. Edit: I saw another comment and it reminded me of the catholic lo-fi playlist which I loved listening to when studying. This, and in particular the song "Paula Laughing": [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7oijjSxs1ic](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7oijjSxs1ic)
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Priestly Fraternity of Saint Pius X \*is\*, just that, a Society of Roman Catholic Priests. However, having holy orders within SSPX does not require a specific ideology, occult initiation, or any exclusive body of knowledge. There are ways that SSPX is exceptional compared to, say, the Priestly Fraternity of Saint Peter. However, I can say both from my studies and personal experience that the SSPX encompasses a variety of cultures, opinions, and activities that can't be reduced to an "SSPX identity" beyond what people choose to assign to \*their\* reflections and conclusions imposed on SSPX the way Christians naturally assign movements of the intellect to their Priests. If someone asks me "What does SSPX think about X?", "What would SSPX do if Y happened?", or "What would the Archbishop think/do about Z?" then they're calling me to speculate based on \*my\* imperfect intellect. It's also something better answered by someone who's not a laywoman. The Society goes to great lengths to post [articles](https://marcellefebvre.info/en/successful-venture-34575) and [videos](https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLonegYXBrLbS9l74Oxl28eopEN1rT8jPi) accessible even to Catholics who were barely catechized. If there's any broad sweeping statements I could make about the Priests and others, they're eager and adept at conveying the Sacred Tradition to people from many different contexts and levels of involvement and that (contrary to certain opinions) we're generally accommodating and inclusive. We're not any "more" or "less" Christian, someone is either a Christian or they're not. We're sinners and walkers with God. Related, many of us are heavily involved "outside the Society" which I put in quotations because the Society is inside the same Church as every other Roman Catholic Christian. We're not huddled in our corner of Christendom conspiring against the Novus Ordo, we're nurturing, protecting, and sharing the Tradition that is the custody of the Universal Church as a whole. This is even something I see TradCaths get cloudy on because they think in terms of being part of a "clique" instead of Christ's community. Glory has its beginning and end in the Mystical Body of Christ with the overarching goal being fellowship in the Kingdom of Heaven. That being said, if you'd like to ask a married laywoman questions, feel free to do so in the comments.

EarthCharming3968 (8): This is a wonderful post. Good job and may God bless you and your family

athanasiuspadovano (3): I am a discerning Catholic and not sure which path to take. I have 2 Spiritual advisors- 1 Diocesan and 1 SSPX. I have been learning a LOT from my SSPX Spiritual advisor, without being abruptly/ forcefully invited to join the society. I can see his objective is to spread teachings consistent with the Catholic doctrine as it has been passed on from generation to generation.There are so many priests out there who aren't genuinely willing to help out or who aren't dedicated to the faith, and this ticks me off, honestly speaking. It's like playing dodgeball every time I pose a question, they use lame excuses to avoid answering questions. They barely get back to me, always "busy with pastoral work". I don't think they're busier than I am. Given the nature of my job, I work at an executive level, but still I manage my work and leisure time just fine.I am having doubts if the NO priests are really trained enough in the seminary or they're just ignorant.

Count\_Erfit (-11): Schismatic.

Blade\_of\_Boniface (8): Thank you! Christ be with you and yours as well.

EarthCharming3968 (14): You be like:😇 The Pope proclaiming borderline heresy😡 The Pope proclaiming that the SSPX is not in schismCope harder

None (0): Great arguments Satan.

Infamous\_Ad\_3678 (-6): I couldn’t agree more. Thank you for having the courage to say so. God bless you.

# Post 86: Questions about your views on women
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1mmn5t2/questions\_about\_your\_views\_on\_women/

Hello!I'm not catholic, but I’d like to understand you better.Some things I noticed when reading posts from subs like this one by many self-proclaimed trad caths:1. According to them, women shouldn't work or go to university2. According to them, women shouldn't wear trousers3. According to them, women should be either wives or nunsRegarding No. 1:How is a family with children supposed to survive with only one working partner? A lot of people even need to work 2 or more jobs. This seems highly unrealistic to me.Regarding university: I know many women who are incredibly intelligent and capable - more capable than most men I know. They studied law, philosophy, different sciences and so on. Why would God create them like that, as logical thinkers with high intelligence, if He intended them to clean a house all day?Regarding No. 2:I often hear this when the topic is modesty. They view it as more traditional for a man to wear suits and a woman to wear dresses, but usually this seems to be more about preserving 50s-60s fashion than actually being modest. They pick a decade that's associated with traditional, romantic values and decide that you have to act like the people back then to be truly modest and Christian. Why don't we wear medieval clothing? Or what Romans wore around year zero? I don't see why women shouldn't wear trousers like wide suit pants, which are imo modest without cosplaying the sixties. (Nothing wrong with doing so, but forcing it is weird). Regarding No. 3:Why can't a woman be a single, working and pursuing career? I'm genuinely curious here. Is it for both genders wrong to choose a rather individualistic lifestyle by being a "secular single"? Are you supposed to either focus on God and choose a spiritual path or focus on marriage, no matter if you're male or female?———Many of these things seem to me like they’re rather about preserving a romantic view on the 50s and 60s, even though many weren’t able to live such a life style back then, no matter if it’s about clothing, work or family. I can imagine that this is kinda because of the Vatican II reforms being implemented in the 60s, so you view the decade before that as ideal, but isn’t that rather how you, individually, live out tradition and not something you have to do as Catholics? A lot of the things many of you view as a part of traditionalism seem to be rather modern, capitalist ideals. For hundreds of years it was normal for AVERAGE women (by that, I mean those who weren’t rich) to work in their family businesses or be employed before marriage. I completely understand that you view changes, such as liturgical reforms critically, but truly can’t understand the romanticised conservatism. I'm curious to hear what you think and open to change my opinion!

Fallen-Monk83 (13): Speaking for myself personally, I don't particuarly hold those views. Nor do I know anyone that does. For example, I have never had someone irl tell me that women shouldn't go to university or have a job, etc. Honestly, I see a lot more people complaining about these "trad cath" views than I see trad caths actually espousing them.

Internal\_Ad1735 (3): Okay, so first off — a lot of this stuff gets exaggerated online. The \*real\* thinking isn’t “women = no brain, stay in kitchen,” it’s more like “God set up men and women differently, and the family is the central thing society rests on.” Everything else in trad thought kind of flows from that. \*\*On women working / going to uni:\*\* No one’s saying women can’t ever have a job or go to college — it’s about priorities. Ideally, you set up life so that when kids come, mom can be home with them. That’s not because she’s “less” than her husband — it’s because kids actually \*need\* both parents, and moms usually have a special touch in early formation. But yes, in the real world? Rent, groceries, inflation — sometimes a wife works, and that’s fine if it’s necessary. It’s more “this is the ideal” than “or else you’re sinning.” \*\*On pants vs skirts:\*\* The anti-pants thing comes from a mix of modesty concerns and the idea that men and women should dress distinctly. Deuteronomy 22:5 - not wearing clothes of the opposite sex, but also — historically, pants were a man thing, skirts/dresses a woman thing. That’s just the visual line in the sand. And yes, the 50s aesthetic gets romanticized, but it’s not \*about\* the 50s. It’s about keeping clothing modest, feminine, and respectful. If you rock a long, loose, modest pair of pants, you’re probably not scandalizing anyone, but some trads still just prefer the skirt standard as a rule. \*\*On “wife or nun”:\*\* In the Catholic worldview, your life is meant to be a gift — either to your spouse/kids in marriage or to God directly in religious life. The “career-focused single person” thing is culturally normal now but doesn’t have a theological foundation. Not saying you can’t be single for a long time — some people never meet the right person or discern religious life — but in trad thinking, permanent “me first, no commitments” isn’t the goal. \*\*On the nostalgia for the past:\*\* It’s not about thinking the 50s were perfect. Those decades just happened to still have a culture that lined up more with Catholic social teaching — intact families, faith in the public square, local communities that actually functioned. SSPX people look at that and say, “See, that’s closer to what works” compared to what we’ve got now. It’s not “women bad, men king” — it’s “men and women both have a mission, and society works better when those roles complement each other like they’re designed to.” Everything else, like skirts or staying home, is an application of that principle.

craft00n (5): Hi. French trad cath and philosophy student here. You're 100% right IMO.1. Mothers should be as clever as possible, because being it's a perfection that's very valuable for the children.2. The problem with trousers is about modesty and distinction : women and men should simply dress in a modest way, with garments clearly distinguishing between men and women.3. In marriage, men and women are here to take care of the children and each other. Usually, it's done with a working husband and an at home mom, but the only rule is "what is best for the children".Us trad caths are very deeply influenced by rigid protestantism. As an example, they are overly attached to young earth creationism (100% prot theory, traditional catholic teaching isn't like that), and it's also visible through the rigidity of some social norms.

Admirable-Mud443 (4): As a woman who attends a large Sspx parish, I have plenty of firsthand experience with people who hold the extreme views you mentioned. It seems to me that there are certain people who warp the traditions and rules of the Faith into something it’s not. Unfortunately this can happen with any worldview or religion, where people use misinterpreted facets of it and use it as an excuse to behave poorly. To my understanding of the Catholic faith, it’s about balance, which can be more difficult to see clearly in the modern world. For example, there is nothing in our Faith that says it is sinful to live a single life. However, there are more graces that can be obtained through the sacraments of Marriage and Holy orders (priesthood), and the idea is that either of these vocations create a defined path to guide us to the ultimate goal of Heaven. The Church does not teach that it is sinful for women to work or go to school, but oftentimes it is seen as preferable for women to focus on giving all of her energy to raising children while in the season of motherhood. Contrary to how extreme “trads”, and those of the opposite side of the spectrum think of it, putting our all into our children should use our full intellect, rather than neglect it.

None (2): [deleted]

SnowWhiteFeather (1): Lets set tradition aside for a moment and talk about hormones. Men and women are different. We have different hormones that change our cognition."Estrogen significantly influences cognition, generally enhancing functions like memory and executive processing by acting on brain regions such as the prefrontal cortex and hippocampus. It particularly supports verbal memory and can improve learning and memory performance. Higher lifetime estrogen exposure is linked to lower risk of cognitive decline, with benefits in memory, reasoning, and neurogenesis. However, in older postmenopausal women, effects may be neutral or absent, especially with short-term hormone therapy or combined progestogens, and declining levels during menopause can impair sleep, mood, and cognitive performance.Yes, estrogen impacts nervousness (anxiety). Stable or higher levels, particularly estradiol, reduce anxiety-like behaviors and subjective anxiety by modulating stress responses and enhancing brain inhibition. Low estrogen increases vulnerability to anxiety, mood disorders, and conditions like PTSD, while fluctuations (e.g., during menstrual cycles or stress) can heighten nervousness, depression, and emotional dysregulation. Hormone replacement therapy may alleviate anxiety in some cases, though results vary.Estrogen also affects attention, improving selective attention and reducing impairments in attention-related tasks, especially under stress or cognitive challenges, leading to better focus and cognitive speed." –Grok"Estrogen levels decrease sharply after childbirth. During pregnancy, estrogen (especially estradiol) rises significantly to support fetal development and other changes. After delivery, particularly after the placenta is expelled (a major estrogen source), levels drop rapidly within hours to days, returning to pre-pregnancy or near-menopausal levels. This can contribute to mood changes, cognitive shifts, and increased anxiety. Breastfeeding may keep estrogen suppressed longer due to elevated prolactin, which inhibits ovarian estrogen production." –GrokBefore childbirth estrogen makes women feminine. After childbirth we see a drop in estrogen that makes a mother more nervous and have a diffuse attention. This is great for taking care of a young child and protecting them from danger.Even newborns have different neurochemical responses to mothers and fathers. How a child relates to each parent is special and unique. A father cannot occupy the role of a mother and a mother cannot occupy the role of a father.If a child does not get to have a relationship with their mother and father they are losing something that they were meant to have. If the parents –particulairly the mother– aren't the primary caregiver for a child until roughly the age of four or five that child is losing something that they were meant to have.A mother and father have a unique responsibility towards children and the relationship that parents have with their children means that they care significantly more than any other caregiver about fulfilling the needs that a child has. You also learn the cues or language that each child has, which makes you more responsive. The habits and patterns that you learn also let you address problems before they fully manifest. This intimacy of parenthood can't be replaced by daycare.Given Church teaching on contraceptives and what science and reason tell us about a mothers role in childcare there isn't a lot of room for a career and an education is a significant financial burden.If a woman wants to be educated it may be a financial obstacle to motherhood. If a mother wants to have a career it is probably an injustice to her children.It is a tough choice for some people. It is an easier choice when mothers are shown respect and dignity for the incredibly important role that they fulfill in raising well adjusted and flourishing children.So what about work and pants?People need purpose. If a woman doesn't have children she needs to be occupied with a purpose and a job can provide that. Education can fill that purpose too. Though good judgement should be excercised, because some jobs have a lot of interaction with vulgar and degrading people. Higher education can be a particularly terrible environment both in terms of culture and ideology.Pants can be modest. However, dresses are beautiful and feminine. As Catholics we should desire to present ourselves well as children of God. Catholic men and women should both be distinguished in our behavior and by extension our clothing.

None (0): I've re-read your post and it reads like a thesis. I doub many people will be willing to answer such lengthy exposition with bias and argumentation. It requieres the reader to write a counter thesis to satisfy your dubts regarding YOUR views of the opinion they hold according to YOU. Is very very dense, please reflect on these things. Why are you even interested in this subjects. Like get a Job dude.

None (0): [deleted]

ashbowie\_ (-1): I read a letter by Bishop Williamson today that talked about this. I‘m aware that he was kicked out of the fraternity, but I don’t think he’s the one one who had this opinion. I‘m not sure how much you know about their history, but in my local church is also one of the „OG members“, an SSPX priest who joined them in the early 70s and has similarly conservative views from what I know. I know that many of you don’t share these views, but I met a significant amount of people who do. Thanks for your reply!

ashbowie\_ (1): Thank you!

ashbowie\_ (1): Thank you! Makes sense :)

ashbowie\_ (1): I see, thank you, this helped me to understand yall a bit better

craft00n (2): Hi, why would education be a financial obstacle to motherhood ? Except for the whole student debt thing, I guess.

SnowWhiteFeather (0): I would also add that having one working partner is easier than you would expect. In cases where it isn't possible marriage might need to be put off until the finances can accomodate.Daycare costs usually eat up most of one parents income when both parents work.If both husband and wife work or get an education until marriage they should either have savings or a higher earning potential. If they wait until marriage to start having children they should be reasonably well established before their expenses increase. If they live at home until marriage they should be able to save even more. If they have family or community support it will cut down on costs because they will have access to secondhand toys, furniture, clothes, and have more access to trusted babysitters who will ask for much less.Children and having a stay at home wife is mostly about priorities though. Most people aren't willing to make the sacrafices, but that doesn't mean that they couldn't.As an additional perk having a stay at home wife often means that meal quality is better and that more energy can be put into raising children.Well behaved children are much less stressful and demanding. They are more pleasant to be around and learn how to contribute to the household at a significantly earlier age, which in turn allows the children to feel like they are valuable and capable.

ashbowie\_ (1): What‘s wrong with me being curious? I was more open until I read a letter by Bishop Williamson today that condemned those things very harshly. When I wrote my post, I was pretty anti-sspx because of that statement, but some kind people who replied to my post changed my opinion.

ashbowie\_ (2): Thank you:)

None (1): Ita seems to me that you already make up your mind. There is no need for this thread.

None (0): Well it seams to me that you are on your very own personal battle, if trouser and jean wearing makes you fall I don't know what to tell you.Our civilization is falling apart because people cannot form traditional families. Atheist capitalist society played a good one on Christianity, and the balance between being of the world but not in it has become really complicated. Rejecting everything is in line with Christ teaching. Don't let that make you fail, try your best.

craft00n (3): Hi. His points are quite good, and are in fact reasonable if we want to save traditional families, because a high level of women's education is a very good thing for children.
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Hi everyone, I've always been curious about attending a Traditional Latin Mass (TLM), but unfortunately, there are no communities like FSSP and SSPX near me.I found out that in my city there is only one traditional community, composed of sedevacantists. A Father who studied at the SSPX seminary and was ordained by Lefebvre, but later left the SSPX and became sedevacantist.I’ve done some research but still have doubts about the validity and licitness of the sacraments he administers. Would it be a sin to attend, go to confession, and receive Communion there? if I only attend once, just to experience the Mass? I’m not intending to join or get involved long term.Any advice or experiences are welcome!

craft00n (9): Don't go there. Non una cum mass are illicit, exactly like Ortho masses, and they don't have a sufficient reason not to name the Pope (because the Pope is indeed Pope, so they should name him).

Exciting-Giraffe-837 (4): Valid but not licit.

None (3): Wouldn’t suggest it. O teu username parece português, és Português?

Fallen-Monk83 (4): I don't think there's any doctrine forbidding it, especially for one time, but personally, I probably wouldn't. If you do choose to, I'd kindly suggest you refrain from partaking in their "eucharist".

EarthCharming3968 (2): Valid not licit as others have said and also very dangerous to the salvation of your soul

realdenvercoder (2): Father Robinson, (SSPX) had a great sermon a few weeks ago about sedevacantism.It starts at 48:00.https://www.youtube.com/live/QWSeWR2tjRA?si=F5juoCswHlOEaSUL

Vaidoto (1): Brasil

mattrixx (1): > I'd kindly suggest you refrain from partaking in their "eucharist". I do understand at least some of the problems of attending an illicit but valid mass, particularly the potential for scandal and the danger to the soul that you're straying from the Church, but if it's a validly consecrated host, why the quotes as if it's not still the real presence? I'm not sedevacantist of course, and haven't been to a sede mass.

Fallen-Monk83 (2): Is the host from a sede mass validly consecrated? I'm not asking this as a rhetorical question, I genuinely don't know the answer and couldnt find much info on the topic, hence why eucharist was in quotes.

mattrixx (1): Ahhh the quotes make sense then. I would assume it is valid, provided the priest was validly ordained, had the right intention, had the right bread/wine, and said the right words (good matter + form and all that), just like any other sacrament.That said, IMO sede masses are almost certainly illicit.I do wonder if theres any issue receiving communion from them though. Doubt its a grievous sin, but at a minimum you could be participating in scandal, or maybe putting yourself in danger of splitting from the church (maybe because of sede teachings in the homily or something). That said, I'm usually going to the parish in which I live (the one with jurisdiction over me) unless I'm traveling or something, so this sort of issue would be rare for me to come across too.

Fallen-Monk83 (1): I suppose it's not impossible for their eucharist to be invalid, but in my view, you probably shouldn't partake regardless for the following reasons:If the host is validly consecrated: then it'd be the same attitude as we have towards orthodox eucharist. Catholics can only partake if there is no Catholic mass/eucharist available. If not valid: then its the Protestant approach, whereas their sacraments aren't valid, do not partake. But again, i'm just another layman with an opinion. I don't hold any concrete ruling on the matter and fortunately, this isn't an issue that affects me directly.

mattrixx (1): > If the host is validly consecrated: then it'd be the same attitude as we have towards orthodox eucharist. Catholics can only partake if there is no Catholic mass/eucharist available.> > If not valid: then its the Protestant approach, whereas their sacraments aren't valid, do not partake.That definitely seems to be the prudent take to me. I go to the SSPX and NO (SSPX is further away), so it isn't a problem for me either.That said, some members of my family started going to the "Resistance" (they don't call themselves that, they just say they're the original SSPX, and that the current SSPX has left Lefebvre's principles), so come Christmas when I go visit there's a chance they ask me to go to their mass... I do wonder what the prudent decision is there. I don't want to be associated with the Resistance, but it \*should\* be a valid mass.
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Christ\_is\_\_risen (5): Protestantism isn't Christianity.

HiberniaDublinensis (-2): Did you watch the video?

Christ\_is\_\_risen (3): Yes
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Do they get enough funding once they retire from ministry?

Willsxyz (11): Is there such a thing as a retired SSPX priest?By which, I mean a priest who, although older, is perfectly capable of priestly duties, but just doesn't perform them because he is considered to be retired?I hope not.

SnowWhiteFeather (4): I would have to ask. I don't think retirement is common. It seems like they do as much as their health permits.

No-Test6158 (4): So I think their needs are provided for. I met one whilst I was on retreat a few months ago. He lives at the retreat house - gets to say his mass in his room and says the office when he can get down to the chapel.I don't think they have a yearning to retire to a condo in Boca Raton. I think most of them are happy to retire to somewhere where they can be looked after and meditate upon the sacred mysteries.Plus a priest never truly "retires". Padre Pio said mass until the day he died!

ourladyofcovadonga (2): "well-provided for".. the curse of the modern age. Saints used to die terrible deaths for Christ. The modern priest wants pensions and provisions for his earthly abode. God forbid he endures a lengthy trial.

ardaduck (1): You mean emeritus, no such thing as a retired priest. However yes when their age doesn't permit their usual pastoral duties they get taken care of:-In a priory by other priests -In a retreat house-Live 'independent' near a chapelA lot stays the same it's mostly practical responsibility that gets mitigated to a younger priest.

forbiddenq (6): There isn't as far as I know, sure their duties and responsibilities are diminished but they continue offering the sacraments and all.

athanasiuspadovano (4): That, I am not sure of. I know diocesan priests who are in retirement homes but are poorly supported. I feel very sorry for them.

athanasiuspadovano (3): I wish all priests have that option. I am not sure why, but at least in my area, they are somewhat allowing priests to retire. I met one who was forced to do so.

athanasiuspadovano (3): I might have used the wrong wording for that. Sorry. What I meant to say was, do they have enough support for their medical needs, food supply, etc?I volunteer at a senior home and there was one priest there who was forced to retire early due to half of his body being paralyzed. He felt discarded and it seems he isn't getting enough help to support his needs. He only has few clothing with so many holes in them and he even tries to use a broken wheelchair.In another country, I met another retired priest who now lives in a cemetery and barely has enough money to survive.

Jerailu (1): All priests usually continue to offer the sacraments but they generally do just that. In regards to the SSPX they have a retirement home in France I believe.
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NextAd8013 (-5): Should christians support Islamic respublic of Iran, Hezzbolah and Hammas instead, better to be neutral

Far-Air3908 (2): Being anti-Israel, isn’t being pro any Islamic state. You’re allowed to condemn the actions of Israel against Palestinians while not endorsing Muslim control of the region.

NextAd8013 (1): Fair enough

# Post 93: Poland: decline in priestly ordinations | FSSPX News
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Is the 1981 Carthusian rite heretical and illicit like the Novus Ordo, or is it OK?

None (3): It's heavily modified I've just checked. It's less worse than general novus ordo but still pretty bad.

dbaughmen (3): It’s modernistic, at best. It is in the vernacular which is a no no

Christ\_is\_\_risen (1): Thank you

Christ\_is\_\_risen (0): What about in the U.S charterhouse where it is in Latin? Is that OK?

dbaughmen (3): Not necessarily, as the problem is the Mass itself and the deep core of prayers, like the novus ordo, they are flawed

Christ\_is\_\_risen (1): That is too bad

dbaughmen (1): Are you discerning monasticism?

Christ\_is\_\_risen (1): I am just learning

# Post 95: Vatican II specific quotes

Author: Mailemanuel77
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Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1mh1rgz/vatican\_ii\_specific\_quotes/

Is there an official list of quotes from Vatican II that showcase why it contains error, I know it is important to read them first rather than just quoting those who criticize it, it would be like trying to destroy communism without reading Marx. Currently I have read the four constitutions and I have to say that although there are some beautiful passages, a lot of them are ambiguous or don't tell anything at all, the muslims sharing the faith of Abraham part felt out of context like it was introduced by force, and Gadium et Espes was very boring like reading a constitution of human rights, tries to tell something that it's meant to be "blow minding illuminating truth" but tells nothing at all, and it's plagated with 60s hippie overly optimistic humanism, that no reasonable person would dare to rewrite today. Which other documents should I read so I can refute the "But you haven't read the documents (the other person has neither read the documents just listening to Pro V2 documents).

Sad-Boysenberry-9578 (4): Quotes of Archbishop Lefebvre - On the Vatican II Council“The more one analyzes the documents of Vatican II, and the more one analyzes their interpretation by the authorities of the Church, the more one realizes that what is at stake is not merely superficial errors, a few mistakes, Ecumenism, Religious Liberty, Collegiality, a certain Liberalism, butrather a wholesale perversion of the mind, a whole new philosophy based on modern philosophy, on subjectivism… A wholly different version of Revelation, of Faith, of philosophy! Very grave! A total perversion! How we are going to get out of all this, I have no idea, but in any case it is a fact, and as this German theologian shows (who has, I believe, another two parts of his book to write on the Holy Father's thought), it is truly frightening.So, they are no small errors. We are not dealing in trifles. We are into a line of philosophical thinking that goes back to Kant, Descartes, the whole line of modern philosophers who paved the way for the Revolution.” (Two Years After the Consecrations, September 6, 1990)“…it is nonetheless certain that the Council was deflected from its purposes by a group of conspirators and that it is impossible for us to take any part in this conspiracy, despite the fact that there may be many satisfactory declarations in Vatican II. The good texts have served as cover to get those texts which are snares, equivocal, and denuded of meaning, accepted and passed.” (fromI Accuse the Council)“We believe we can affirm, purely by internal and external criticism ofVatican II, i.e. by analyzing the texts and studying the Council’s ins and outs, that by turning its back on Tradition and breaking with the Church of the past,it is a schismatic council.”(Archbishop Lefebvre,Le Figaro, August 4, 1976)“It is stupefying to read in theDocumentation Catholiquethat the Lutheran-Catholic Commission of the Secretariat for Christian Unity, and thus an official Roman commission, said in effect that numerous points in the Council were drawn from the teachings of Luther…”(Conference in Germany, October 29, 1984)“Some say the Council was good and has good,but only the reform is bad. But that is not true!Why? Because when Rome gave the reform,they always say the reforms they do, they do in the name of the Council. In the name of the Council! It is evident that all reform came from the Council, and if the reform is bad, it is impossible that the Council is good and all reforms are bad.Because that is the authentic interpretation of the Council by Rome!”(Conference, May 11, 1976)“This Council gives the same rights to error as to Truth!That is impossible.”(Conference, May 11, 1976)[CONTINUED ON NEXT POST]

Sad-Boysenberry-9578 (3): “It is stupefying to read in theDocumentation Catholiquethat the Lutheran-Catholic Commission of the Secretariat for Christian Unity, and thus an official Roman commission, said in effect that numerous points in the Council were drawn from the teachings of Luther…”(Conference in Germany, October 29, 1984)“Some say the Council was good and has good,but only the reform is bad. But that is not true!Why? Because when Rome gave the reform,they always say the reforms they do, they do in the name of the Council. In the name of the Council! It is evident that all reform came from the Council, and if the reform is bad, it is impossible that the Council is good and all reforms are bad.Because that is the authentic interpretation of the Council by Rome!”(Conference, May 11, 1976)“This Council gives the same rights to error as to Truth!That is impossible.”(Conference, May 11, 1976)“We refuse, on the other hand, and have always refused to follow the Rome ofneo-Modernist and neo-Protestant tendencies which were clearly evident in the Second Vatican Council and, after the Council, in all the reforms which issued from it. ...This reform, since it has issued from Liberalism and from Modernism, is entirely corrupt. It comes from heresy and results in heresy, even if all its acts are not formally heretical. It is thus impossible for any faithful Catholic who is aware of these things to adopt this reform, or to submit to it in any way at all.To ensure our salvation, the only attitude of fidelity to the Church and to Catholic doctrine, is a categorical refusal to accept the reform. ... That is why we hold fast to all that has been believed and practiced in the faith, morals, liturgy, teaching of the catechism, formation of the priest and institution of the Church, by the Church of all time;to all these things as codified in those books which saw day before the Modernist influence of the Council.” (Declarationof Faith, November 21, 1974)“We can think that there is Rome and Rome: [on one hand,] there is the Rome which is eternal in Her Faith, Her Dogmas, Her concept of the Sacrifice of the Mass; [on the other hand,]there is the temporal Rome which is influenced by the ideas of the modern world, an influence which the Council itself did not escape.” (October 13, 1974)“The Church, in the course of the 1960's, thusduring the Council, acquired values that have come from outside the Church, from the liberal culture -due secoli- from two centuries of liberal culture. It is clear:these are the "rights" of man, it is religious freedom, it is ecumenism. It is Satanic.” (Conference, December 13, 1984)"Without rejecting this Council wholesale,I think that it is the greatest disaster of this century and of all the past centuries, since the founding of the Church." The AngelusA Matter of Principle“I never…I don’t accept the Council! Because you are destroying the Catholic State in the name of the Council!It is sure! It is evident!…This Council gives the same rights to error as to Truth!That is impossible…This new faith, it is a new religion. It is a protestant religion. That is a fact!How is it possible that the Pope gives the authorization to this change? How it is possible that the pope can sign this constitution (on liturgical change)? It is a deep mystery…If I take the position of the Council, I am betraying my Mother Church.” (Archbishop Lefebvre, conference, 1976)We [Bishop de Castro Mayer and the Archbishop] fought together to preventthe errors of Liberalism, which are a cancer in the doctrine of the Church, spreading themselves in the texts of the Council. ... Unfortunately, this Liberal principle has been adopted by Vatican II. ...If one does not want to believe that these texts are Liberal, one has just to see the consequences: ecumenism (all religion on an equal footing), and the laicization of the states.Ordination Sermon 1988And, so I said to him [Cardinal Ratzinger], "What is the source of these bad fruits? For me,it is the Councilofaggiornamento; that signifies the Council of the changes. What changes?Changes in the sacraments, changes in catechisms, changes in the Bible, so that we are no longer Catholics [but] are like Protestants. ... And he said, "No! No, no, no, that does not come from the Council; it comes from bad interpretations of the Council; it comes from abuses of the reforms." I said, "That is not true.That comes from the new orientation of the Church in the Council, especially by ecumenism."Changes in the Sacraments...We are like Protestants 1985“It is stupefying to read in the Documentation Catholique that the Lutheran-Catholic Commission of the Secretariat for Christian Unity, and thus an official Roman commission, said in effect thatnumerous points in the Council were drawn from the teachings of Luther…” (Conference in Germany, October 29, 1984)The Church has always dreaded novelties, even in her vocabulary and that is why she has held on so strongly to the Latin language in the principal form of Tradition, viz. the Roman Church.For it is by a tendency to novelty that heresies, schisms, and errors have come about.This spirit of novelty, mutation, and change has succeeded in entering into the Church. It necessarily tends to destroy Tradition.The Second Vatican Council, which wished to be the Council of "up-dating," opened the door to this spirit of change and novelty.(Principles and Directives -1982 General Chapter)“The Council should have been the occasion of the reaffirmation of the Truth of the Church and the necessity of the social reign of Jesus and Mary against the errors of Protestantism and Teilhardian naturalism and against socialism and communism. Ordinary Protestants would have been converteden masse. They were disposed to it and their debacle was profound on the eve of the Council.But the Modernists, traitors to the Church, used the Council to favor their compromise with all the modern errors, profiting from a weak pope and a pope disposed to radical changes.All of the commentators on the Council recognize the triumph of the liberals who did not hide their satisfaction and who neutralized or drove from the Roman Curia all of the conservatives and who took the reins of government, centralizing power in the Secretariat of State in order to be certain of managing the ecumenical revolution so much desired by the enemies of the Church. The work was quickly carried out in all fields.Destruction also followed quickly. In this pastoral Council the spirit of error and lies was able to work at its ease, placing time-bombs everywhere which, in due course, would destroy the institutions.(Principles and Directives -1982 General Chapter)

Mailemanuel77 (2): Interesting, but how is it possible to explain that the Pope gave consent to a false council, not guided by the Holy Spirit but the spirit of Lucifer, without losing his authority in the process. I know the Church has never been perfect and has had very dark phases, but no attempt at subverting the true religion in such a large and "successful" scale like the current crisis.

# Post 96: How can I learn to chant the Breviary?

Author: icxcnikahnd
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1mgy3vc/how\_can\_i\_learn\_to\_chant\_the\_breviary/

Do you guys know how I can learn to chant the Breviary? (1962) I can’t find any video.

Christ\_is\_\_risen (1): Ask on r/divineoffice

realdenvercoder (1): I bought a course on Udemy about chanting and it was really good.

# Post 97: Books on what happened at Vatican 2?

Author: Apprehensive-Hat426
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1mg1s3k/books\_on\_what\_happened\_at\_vatican\_2/

Hi all,As the title says. It doesn’t necessarily have to be on Vatican 2. More so the entire liberalist movement from 1850 to the present day. Everything from Vatican 2, to Novus Ordo, freemasonry, the Jewish spurs at the Vatican, communist infiltration etc. anything on how foreign entities have subverted Holy Mother Church.Thanks.

Piklikl (6): Iota Unum is a must readhttps://angeluspress.org/products/iota-unum

S-AugustineLearner04 (5): De Mattei, but its in Italian

calls32 (6): A very good one on this type of subject is "Infiltration: the complot to destroy the Church from within" by Dr. Taylor Marshall. I really recommend it.

hardeho (2): "Trojan Horse in the City of God" by Dietrich Von Hildebrand is pretty good, he wrote it in 1967, and was still thinking the documents were fine, and the sprit of V2 was the problem. He later harshened his stance on the documents as well."Pope John's Council" by Michael Davies, part two of his Liturgical Revolution Series. Excellent, should be mandatory reading.

kacfm2506 (2): "Work of human hands" by Fr Cekada, and "The great sacrilege" by Fr James F. Wathen

Thomas-Aquinas101 (2): I recommend Theological Highlights of Vatican II by Joseph Ratzinger (Pope Benedict XVI).https://lci-goroka.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/benedict-xvi-theological-highlights-of-vatican-ii.pdf

athanasiuspadovano (2): The Rhine Flows into the Tiber by Ralph Witgen, SVD.

Thomas-Aquinas101 (1): I can also recomend this commentary on Dignitatis Humanae- https://www.lenouvelesprit.com/vatican-ii-articles/dignitatis-humanae-part-i1 - https://www.lenouvelesprit.com/vatican-ii-articles/dignitatis-humanae-part-i2- https://www.lenouvelesprit.com/vatican-ii-articles/dignitatis-humanae-part-i3- https://www.lenouvelesprit.com/vatican-ii-articles/dignitatis-humanae-part-ii1 - https://www.lenouvelesprit.com/vatican-ii-articles/dignitatis-humanae-part-ii2- https://www.lenouvelesprit.com/vatican-ii-articles/dignitatis-humanae-part-iii- https://www.lenouvelesprit.com/vatican-ii-articles/dignitatis-humanae-part-iv

Apprehensive-Hat426 (3): Thankyou!

Apprehensive-Hat426 (3): Thankyou

Apprehensive-Hat426 (4): I’m about 20 pages from finishing this book. It’s fascinating! I was under the impression that modernism began at vatican 2, but the book has compelled me to revise that typical understanding.

Apprehensive-Hat426 (1): Thankyou!

Apprehensive-Hat426 (1): Thankyou!

Apprehensive-Hat426 (1): Thanks!

Apprehensive-Hat426 (1): Thanks!

# Post 98: How can I find a spiritual director?

Author: nobisquoque
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1mg1d3i/how\_can\_i\_find\_a\_spiritual\_director/

I am a cradle Catholic and I have been attending the TLM, often at SSPX Church, for about 15 years. I feel like I could benefit from having a spiritual director, but I don't know how to go about finding a good traditional one. The priest at my local SSPX church travels here only to say Mass on Sunday. Any suggestions or ideas would be greatly appreciated.

HiberniaDublinensis (3): You are better asking your priest this question

# Post 99: Does SSPX hold a formal position on liturgical dance? And to what extent is music seen as an act of the devil? I guess it comes to the type of music?

Author: IloveErinP
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URL: https://i.redd.it/qsdi4b5nimgf1.jpeg

Highwayman90 (5): Music is obviously not of the devil inherently at least. Does the SSPX not have chant in its own Holy Masses?

Christ\_is\_\_risen (2): I have a friend who used to do liturgical dance, but she isn't traditional. Liturgical dance is irreverent and stupid but I don't think the SSPX has a position on it. Just ask any SSPX priest.

Bot\_man21 (1): Was King David the first to perform a liturgical dance?

None (1): Not during the holy sacrifice.

Mailemanuel77 (3): It was outside the Temple

# Post 100: Does my non-Catholic mom have to veil in Church?

Author: sainthyacinthordrowa
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1mffcoq/does\_my\_noncatholic\_mom\_have\_to\_veil\_in\_church/

I'm going to be traveling across my state soon with my mom to an SSPX Chaple. I myself am a practicing Catholic, but my mom isn't Catholic and really isn't religious for that matter. She wants to go with me for the trip which will most likely mean she is going to the Mass. I know it's rare to see women in a SSPX mass without a veil, and I was wondering if my mom should wear one considering her beliefs. I want to be respectful of the SSPX Chaple, but dont want my mom to feel uncomfortable by the request. Thank you all and may God bless you, and have mercy on us all.

merinw (6): She might avoid stares if she wears one.

Piklikl (6): No, she doesn’t; however as u/merinw pointed out she’ll probably get a lot of stares from nosey people if she doesn’t. Most if not all SSPX chapels in the states will have veils she can borrow if she wants to give it a try, but it’s not mandatory.

psalm23allday (2): When my secular younger half sister visited me last year I explained to her modesty requirements for Mass attire to be sure she brought an appropriate dress for Mass. veiling is not required nor is it sinful to not veil in an SSPX chapel or any other Catholic Church/in the presence of the Eucharist, however it is customary so it depends on the personal devotion and comfort of the individual. My little sister gladly veiled when she was visiting me. I lent her one of my own for the 2 weeks she was staying with me and accompanying me.

No-Test6158 (2): This is fascinating - at the chapel I go to, we really aren't bothered. As long as no overtly sexualised outfits are on display, it's not usually a bother. Women can choose to, and it's encouraged that they do, veil. We have a box of spare veils at the door when you enter the chapel!Our website says :>As befits the house of God, all the faithful are asked to be modest in their mode of dress. It is normal for ladies to follow the custom of covering their heads.But we're an urban parish, in a severely deprived area so we're generally relatively tolerant.So to OP - I would encourage your non-Catholic mother to veil, but don't force her. Hopefully social pressure will win out!

GoneFishin56 (1): Nobody has to veil in church. Women do it because they wish to be reverent.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): The veil a woman wears needs to be an external expression of the internal "veil" of modesty she wears over her heart.I remember a woman I tried to date, a friend of mine told me to watch out because, even though she wore a veil at Mass, she didn't really wear the veil "on the inside".

realdenvercoder (1): Is she going to be wearing pants?

S-AugustineLearner04 (0): All women should veil, period.

sainthyacinthordrowa (2): Thank you. I don't want to pressure her too much, but I think she would understand that because it isn't you NO parish you can't wear whatever. Cause the SSPX follow the pre V2 dress code. But I hope she does and hopefully she sees the truth of the Catholic Church while visiting the Church.

realdenvercoder (1): At St. Isidore we realize that new people don’t know that most women veil and wear dresses. If everyone was rude to women not veiling we wouldn’t be the welcoming community we are.So she should expect some glances if she doesn’t but mostly it will be people wondering if she’s new to tradition.When my wife and I see people that have that deer in headlights look or women that aren’t veiled we make a point to approach them after mass and welcome them. Not to say, “hey, these are the rules”, but to make them feel more comfortable and welcome.It’s sad when people turn away from the TLM because someone browbeat them over a veil or wearing pants.

No-Test6158 (1): Absolutely - just be open and assume that she doesn't know anything and hopefully, through the grace of God, she'll get there!

# Post 101: What Is a Layman Supposed to Do When No One Will Answer?

Author: Sad-Boysenberry-9578
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A couple of you may remember that I shared a Catholic Trumpet video here last week about Novus Ordo ordinations. I was not trying to promote anything. I was sincerely asking if the Society had publicly clarified its current practice, especially in light of Archbishop Lefebvre’s insistence on conditional ordinations to remove all doubt.Since then, I have been thinking more about the issue. The replies last time were mixed. Some were thoughtful. Some dismissive. But what stood out most was the silence. Not only here, but also more broadly. And that silence is troubling, considering what is at stake.This new video from the same channel goes deeper. It is the first in a new series titled For the Man in the Pew, and the episode is called He Will Not Kneel to Error. It is not an attack. It begins with a prayer. It speaks calmly and seriously. And it reflects the position I believe many of us are in. Grateful for what we received through Tradition. But deeply concerned about what is happening now.I am not trying to stir controversy. I am sincerely asking: If Archbishop Lefebvre always demanded conditional ordination to protect the faithful from doubt, then why would that principle no longer apply? And more importantly, should faithful laymen really be treated as divisive simply for asking that question?

Piklikl (3): I think you’re blowing things out of proportion and also not considering the Archbishop’s positions in the context of the time.“What stood out most was the silence” buddy give the drama a rest. This is pretty dead subreddit, not much goes on here. Sorry nobody cares enough about the exact same things you do enough to comment on it, that has no bearing on the discussion.Archbishop Lefebrve was right to be skeptical of all Novus Ordo ordinations at the time because the Novus Ordo at the time was truly a lawless wasteland. For better or worse the Novus Ordo has reeled things in a bit; and as long as a sacrament has been validly conferred then there’s no reason to re-administer it, even conditionally.Honestly though, it seems like you’re either shilling for this YouTube Channel, or some other sedevacantist entity, not genuinely seeking the truth.The SSPX leadership is definitely flawed and has lots of issues, but broadly speaking they are still steering the ship in the same direction as the Archbishop.

Sad-Boysenberry-9578 (2): I appreciate the response. I am not trying to be dramatic. I am just asking the same question Archbishop Lefebvre asked. If there is doubt about a sacrament, why not remove the doubt?He conditionally ordained priests from the Novus Ordo because the form, matter, and intention were not always clear. That was not based on emotions or optics. It was based on the principle that doubtful sacraments must be treated as invalid until the doubt is resolved. That principle has not changed.The Novus Ordo may look more organized today, but the rite itself is the same. The intentions behind it, the theological mindset that shaped it, and the crisis that Archbishop Lefebvre saw still exist. That is why I am asking. Not to stir controversy, but to hold the same line he held.I am not a sedevacantist. I am promoting the original Society Archbishop Lefebvre founded the one that stood for doctrinal clarity, conditional ordinations, and the full rejection of modernism. If the Archbishop insisted on conditional ordination to protect the faithful, why would we stop doing that now?

Piklikl (0): “I am promoting the original Society Archbishop Lefebvre founded” is resistance/sedevacantist phrasing, which is disingenuous at best and flat out Protestant at is worst. I have no idea if you’re affiliated with either of those movements, so I’ll just assume you’re ignorant and attempt to rectify that.Every priest who was ordained in the NO is investigated to ascertain if the proper matter, form, and intention for the Sacrament of Holy Orders was conferred. If the investigating priests find no cause to doubt the validity of the sacrament, then there’s no reason to conditionally reordain. This is how it has always been done, including while the Archbishop was alive.Immediately following the liturgical “reforms” brought about by Vatican II, things got quite crazy and there were plenty of cases of abuse and invalid sacraments being administered. This is why there were so many conditional ordinations back in the day, because they were necessary. The conciliar Church has reigned things in a bit (not so many invalid sacraments), and while the sacraments are being dispensed under the new rite, they are nevertheless valid.Archbishop Lefebvre never thought the new rite was invalid, only that it is worse than the Tridentine Rite.

Sad-Boysenberry-9578 (1): You mentioned that conditional reordinations were only done “back in the day.” But Archbishop Lefebvre said in 1988:“All sacraments from the modernist bishops or priests are doubtful now. The changes are increasing and their intentions are no more Catholic.”(Letter to Mr. Wilson, Oct 28, 1988)He also stated plainly:“I have done this reordination many times.”And in 1983:“We must perform an examination… before we can say they are valid or invalid. We must study each case.”(Ridgefield conference, April 1983)This was not some isolated pastoral judgment. It was the public and theological policy of the SSPX itself, reflected in seminary formation and confirmed by the Society’s own 2001 Doctrinal Declaration, which warned of “doubts regarding the validity and liceity of the new rites.” That position remained until the shift after 2012.So it is neither Resistance nor sedevacantist to repeat Archbishop Lefebvre’s words. It is fidelity to him, to Catholic theology, and to the priesthood without doubt.

Piklikl (0): Can you answer me plainly if you’re genuinely pursuing an authentic line of questioning, or if you’re merely trying to spread resistance propaganda by posing as someone asking “innocent” questions?You’re remarkably well researched for someone who doesn’t really seem to know what’s going (or is pretending to), but I would hope if you’re not you wouldn’t lie about it.Also you’re misinterpreting what I said, I was merely commenting on the sheer volume of conditional ordinations, at no point did I say they only happened back then and not now. I’m certain conditional ordinations still happen at SSPX seminaries, but it makes sense that that they don’t happen as often because the conciliar Church has toned down the liturgical abuse.

Sad-Boysenberry-9578 (2): I’m not playing games. I’m genuinely trying to understand how today’s approach lines up with what Archbishop Lefebvre actually taught.In 1988, he wrote:“These sacraments coming from the modernist clergy are doubtful now, and the changes in the rites and intentions are increasing; their intentions are no longer Catholic.”(Letter to Noël Barbara, Oct. 28, 1988)He also said reordinations were simply “a matter of common sense.”(Spiritual Conference, Econe, Sept. 9, 1988)That does not sound like a temporary reaction. That sounds like a principled stance.So if formation, theology, and intention are still compromised, how could the doubt be gone? I am asking sincerely because the priesthood should never carry uncertainty.If I have missed where the Archbishop said this principle no longer applies, I am open to seeing it.

# Post 102: Is anyone able to elaborate on this incident? Never heard about it

Author: sydneyvision
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URL: https://i.redd.it/qnvple1x17gf1.jpeg

Willsxyz (28): The first bullet point is generally correct as to what happened. The second bullet point is the absurd part. Suppose I find a holocaust denier working at Walmart (there are some, no doubt). Does that make Walmart a Nazi organization?As to why Bishop Williamson was not immediately expelled from the SSPX, his personal opinion on historical matters is mostly irrelevant to his job as a bishop of the SSPX, which is to dispense the sacraments.

PaxBonaFide (21): Williamson would have called these accusations an example of modern society’s “push-button” minds. Nobody thinks anymore. They hear “Nazi” or “fascist” and immediately go into a shaking delirium, without actually thinking about if said accusations are credible. To be clear, Williamson while wrong in his disobedience to the society, was completely right on the issue of the “Holocaust” and the JQ. If we simply call his position “antisemitism,” then we have to label traditional Catholic doctrine the same. Catholics (including Williamson) do not hate the Semitic races. He simply opposes the ideology of Judaism, which is inherently anti-Christian. That isn’t anti-Semitic, that’s called standing up for Christ Jesus as a Catholic ought to do.

TheIrishman26 (15): He was right

No-Test6158 (3): Bp. Williamson was wrong about the Holocaust\*\*However\*\*He was absolutely right that people use the holocaust as a kind of defense against any criticism of the Jewish people - and I think it is obvious now why this is a problem (both the actions of the so-called state of Israel and the disproportionate representation of Jewish people in positions of power, looking out for themselves and their friends). We have to start looking at things a bit more critically.To even speak critically of a Jewish person will result in you being accused of anti-Semitic, even if you aren't.But yes, he made an ill judged remark on the holocaust and then started associating with a number of holocaust deniers and ultra-far right types.Just for reference, extreme right wing politics is just as abhorrent as extreme left wing politics.But the Jewish people, historically and today, are an exclusive ethnoreligious group that, unlike the Catholic church, is not open to all, does not care for logic and protects its followers to the exclusion of the gentiles. This is why we must pray that the veil be lifted from their hearts.

Huge-Explanation-358 (2): He is right, what do you mean? Did you even try to do the math using the commonly used numbers? It's physically impossible for the holocaust to have happened the way it is taught nowdays.

Previous-Plan-3876 (1): Well it wasn’t just the Nazi like comments but also the use of a nazi attorney in Germany for his defense. Floored me when I learned that and completely turned me off of the SSPX. I love the people but the organization has a ton of issues.

Mahwah66 (0): ?

Mahwah66 (-1): A People are not disliked or hated for what they are. An Ethnicity is disliked or hated for how they act, and what they do.

ourladyofcovadonga (12): He was a bishop. He was more than entitled to talk about reality, history, and the enemies of the Church and the truth. To say that a bishop's job is \*only\* to dispense sacraments is ludicrous.He was right that the society lost a ton of its bite with regards to fighting for the truth. Seems they rather rack up millions in donations and become a milquetoast group lurking in their own shadow, a once grand institution.

IowaGuy127 (2): This is the correct answer.

UnapologeticCritque (2): Wait...to clarify, are you saying he was right regarding there being only 2- to 300k Jews killed in the Holocaust?

MutantZebra999 (1): Bruh what the fuck? Williamson alleged that the gas chambers are fakes. This is not “standing up for Christ Jesus”, and a Catholic ought not to spread horrible lies that attempt to minimize the evilness of one of the most evil events in all of human history.

neilyy21 (8): ❤️

No-Test6158 (2): And the reason he was kicked out of the society was for \*\*disobedience\*\* - it had nothing to do with his views.

Far-Air3908 (1): Explain. I’m not disagreeing, I’m simply curious as to how it’s impossible

Willsxyz (4): The SSPX has proportionally the same amount of issues as any other society of priests or religious in which, in general, there is a real attempt to cultivate holiness.

Willsxyz (-1): Bishop Williamson was a bishop of the SSPX. As Archbishop Lefebvre himself made clear at the consecration, the bishops he consecrated have \*\*no\*\* jurisdiction and \*\*no\*\* authority by virtue of their ordination.Bishop Williamson had the right and duty to preach the truth — that is, the Catholic faith in its fullness. He had no duty to preach his private opinion about historical matters that \*\*are not\*\* part of the deposit of faith.And make no mistake, the assertions that Bishop Williamson made in 2008 were his opinions, not facts.

ourladyofcovadonga (3): Lol a bishop can't talk about the affairs of the world and about people that hate Christianity? So priests can't talk about politics, government, the world at large? About reality itself? What an asinine statement. You have much to read in regards to history.Edit: it IS a deposit of faith. You're brainwashed or clueless to think otherwise.1 Thessalonians 2:14-15... \*the Jews who both killed the Lord Jesus, and the prophets, and have persecuted us, and please not God, and are adversaries to all men.\*

Willsxyz (2): A bishop \*\*can\*\* talk about the affairs of the world, politics, and history. However, it is not his duty to do so, and his superior can legitimately forbid him from doing so, and he is obligated to obey.However, no one has the authority to forbid a bishop from speaking about the truths of the faith.And, no, whether or not millions of Jews were murdered by the Nazi government of Germany is \*\*not\*\* part of the deposit of faith.

ourladyofcovadonga (1): Read the Holocaust Narrative by EMJ. You have no idea what you're talking about.

Willsxyz (1): The point is that it doesn’t matter whether the Nazis actually killed millions of Jews or not. This historical matter is not part of the deposit of faith.

# Post 103: Bridal Veil Rules

Author: Admirable-Mud443

Score: 4

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1md8619/bridal\_veil\_rules/

I am a member of an SSPX parish where i will be getting married in soon. I have recently been informed by the Church office that brides are required to wear veils that cover the entire head (I.e. forgoing the style of wearing a comb veil in a low bun for example). Is this typical of most parishes, and if so, is it based on a church teaching at all? Genuinely trying to understand.

Huge-Explanation-358 (5): This is a local rule. The prior has the authority to adjust this kind of rule, talk to him if it bothers you, but he can simply deny your request.

Piklikl (7): It is customary in most (if not all) SSPX locations in the US for women to veil during Mass, and this would include the bride. This is based on the traditions of Catholics in times past, though is not mandatory thing in a woman’s day to day life (and most female attendees of SSPX locations in Europe don’t follow it either).The SSPX does not want to encourage worldly fashion and has a conservative dress code when it comes to wedding attire. The SSPX worldwide does encourage women to veil as it is a traditional practice that emphasizes the sacredness of women, and St Paul does mention that women should be veiled in the Bible as well.Famously the SSPX does not consistently apply this dress code (for example it’s common for the priest to leave the approval of the wedding party dress to an older, out of touch woman with little to no sense of fashion or style; also different families get different treatment depending on how much said lady likes you or how much your dad has donated), so prepare yourself for a lot of frustration.

PleasantStorm4241 (2): My pastor requires that he sees photos of all brides', bridesmaids' and flower girls' gowns to ensure they are modest. (I completely agree with this as so many brides wear little more than lingerie as their gowns.) I learned this from a newlywed wife a few years ago. She didn't mention anything about the veil. She did say how difficult it was to find modest dresses for flower girls. How sad.

Admirable-Mud443 (2): Gotcha. I can understand the reasoning, just feeling a bit confused as I was told rather last minute and i haven’t seen this practiced in past weddings. Anyway, thank you.

Admirable-Mud443 (3): I wear a veil to Mass every Sunday. My confusion lies in the seemingly arbitrary rules around how many inches of hair can be exposed on the wedding day specifically, haha.

Jerailu (1): Idk seems simple to me, just wear something that covers at least the shoulders and doesn't show too much of the legs (covering at least up to the knee when sitted is a good bare minimum) + either a veil or a hat.

Piklikl (3): My guess is it’s a general rule that has been forced to be specific because people have taken things too far (for example my cousin’s wedding veil was so far back that from the front it didn’t look like she even had a veil, I’m willing to bet that the rule has now been updated to try to prevent that kind of style from being used again).

# Post 104: How do I respond to this

Author: None

Score: 30

Comments: 63

URL: https://i.redd.it/zsd3ujyfcxff1.jpeg

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (39): The people who would have disobeyed the Pope in the time of Pius X are those who love to throw the obedience card around. Pius IX said if the Pope is to ever teach heresy just don’t listen to it. I’m sure Pius X understands this too.“If a future Pope teaches anything contrary to the Catholic Faith, do not follow him.”The modernist looks for simple minds who are troubled by ridiculous memes like this. It’s child’s play really.

PaxBonaFide (7): Pius X said this under the assumption that the Pope would remain orthodox

craft00n (6): Saint Athanasius is Saint.

Die\_ElSENFAUST (3): Submit to Rome🇻🇦

kawaqcosta (5): It's simple. This applies to normal times, not to times of crisis like ours. Absolute obedience to today's pontiffs results in a denial of previous teachings, and the new teachings are obviously false in light of what the Magisterium has always taught. Saint Pius X could never have imagined what would happen in the Church today.

Mibic718 (2): Come home to Orthodoxy brother, stop doing backflips to try to defend a clearly flawed system of tyrannical hierarchy, where the "leader of the body of Christ" is undeniably more commited to globalist agendas and woke policies than to God's commandments.

WallachianLand (2): You can't.That's the weakness of the Recognize and Resist, lol

S-AugustineLearner04 (1): you dont

rgarrigou-lagrange (1): If you're willing to read Vatican I (which you can do very quickly), you will not be confused. The dogma of papal infallibiilty makes clear that a valid pope can not give heretical teachings. Vatican II and Vatican II "popes" have given numerous heretical teachings. Therefore they can not be valid popes, and Vatican II can not be a valid council.

Emotional\_Regret5067 (1): The truth is between the two

alejosoyyo (1): The only way a Pope speaks to the Church through all times, is by infallibility, own opinions must be taken into context. Pius X was facing modernism, therefore, his words go straight to all modernist that refused to obey what the Pope and sacred tradition states. Nowadays, modernism, repressed by Pius X for several years through the oath against modernism, has reached the hierarchy of the Church, therefore, we must remain loyal to what the Church has taught clear and infallibly.

AllisFever (1): Was that an infallible quote?

cdsouzaexpdia (1): SSPX is irregular canonically …

Exciting\_Location\_59 (1): context is important when establishing what is trying to be communicated. Taking quotes and using them out of context is a very protestant practice

Party-Score-565 (1): Lol, I stumbled upon this sub and it's hilarious how y'all just use the same arguments as protestants 😂

Same\_Host\_1428 (0): Just say it false doctrine

Thomas-Aquinas101 (0): Vatican II was not modernist and di not abolish the true faith. You haven't read the documents of Vatican II.

TugboatAtNight (-5): Catholics are so gay and are noting more than an appeal to authority

kawaqcosta (5): Just one observation, as far as I could see this sentence attributed to Pius IX is spurious.

None (4): I’m being tested with sedevacantism again, apparently Lefebrve used the 62 because the 55 wouldn’t ever let them reconcile

Sad\_Lawfulness\_1849 (0): No, according to the theologians present at Vatican I, a cardinal asked the question of a heretical Pope and guess what?"The question was also raised by a Cardinal,"What is to be done with the Pope if he becomes a heretic?" It was answered that there has never been such a case; the Council from she moment de becomes heretic he is not the head or even a member of the Church.The Church would not be, for a moment, obliged to listen to him when he begins to teach a doctrine the Church knows to be a false doctrine, and he would cease to be Pope, being deposed by God Himself."(Abp. John B. Purcell, quoted in Rev. James J. McGovern, life and life of Pope Leo XIII [Chicago, IL: Allied Printing, 1903], p. 241; Imprimatur by Abp. James Quigley of Chicago)

CincyGuy2025 (1): Submit to PETER! And remember, "the gift of Truth and never failing Faith was divinely conferred upon Peter and his successors.

Willsxyz (0): Suppose my father told me to feed my little sister jellybeans every day for breakfast and I objected to this on the grounds that eating jellybeans every day for breakfast would be harmful to her health.Would you say “Submit to your father!”

CincyGuy2025 (2): What day did "normal times" end? Oh... Maybe at the death of Pius XII?

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (2): With divorce, marriage 3+ times, semi arianism and iconoclasm? No thanks. We will stick with Peter. And calling Christs chosen hierarchy of His apostles is unsettling.

HiberniaDublinensis (1): Take your poison elsewhere orthodog

ComparisonRoutine359 (3): I can and I got my answer

CincyGuy2025 (0): ...but even St. Peter taught error. /s (sarcasm)The SSPX literally teaches this rubbish at their schools. I've even gotten into arguments about this with SSPX priests.

CincyGuy2025 (1): He who heareth you, heareth me.Oh, but did Our Lord have the "infallibility" button on when He said that? /sGo read something other than propaganda of the SSSPX. Peter doesn't err. Ever.Not that everything Peter teaches is DOGMA, but Peter doesn't teach error.

None (2): Which arguments? I will concede the SSPX position appears superficially Protestant, which may be why it appeals to many converts from Protestantism actually, but there is an important distinction most people on the outside miss. It results in a strawman of the SSPX position.

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (2): There is good reason to think it’s an authentic quote.

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (23): Ummm, no that’s not why, it’s because there are rules and we must obey the Pope and the Church as long as the faith isn’t compromised. The ‘62 does not compromise the Faith. It is the Mass of Pius V in every detail that matters. Read this: https://sspx.org/en/why-sspx-uses-1962-missal-30158Sedevacantism is just as vile of a heresy as modernism. It is traitorous. The Pope is still entitled to your respect of his office, no matter how terrible he may be.

BangersNmashx (3): I asked a good modern(idk how to distinguish the different types) Roman Catholic friend of mine if he would kill me if the Pope ordered it. He said he would kill me no questions asked. Really set me aback.

Die\_ElSENFAUST (1): I like the Extraordinary Rite as much as anyone else. But we owe obedience to the Bishop.I think you may be misrepresenting the issue, while I love the Reverence of the Tridentine Mass, the Novus Ordo is still valid. You must submit to Rome and accept that, though you can still prefer the Pre Vat II, (which I do) the Novus Ordo is valid. You may prefer regular eggs, but dad says that we can eat just the whites too.

Mibic718 (0): You're right. Do you know any good lawyer's I can hire to defend me on the day of judgement?But jokes aside, how in the world can you claim Orthodoxy is iconoclastic? 😂 Have you ever seen an Orthodox Church?

Mibic718 (1): Nice one guy, very Christian of you to call me a dog.I guess wearing a cross pendant, following a bunch of legalisms and going to Church on Sundays is your idea of the faith. It's okay to be a hateful person, as long as you confess on the weekend, you'll get into heaven 👍It's people like you that stereotypes are built upon.

kawaqcosta (1): >One of the things that has impressed me most about the young people here is your capacity for interfaith dialogue. This is very important because if you start arguing, “My religion is more important than yours...,” or “Mine is the true one, yours is not true....,” where does this lead? Somebody answer. \[A young person answers, “Destruction”.\] That is correct. \*\*All religions are paths to God. I will use an analogy, they are like different languages that express the divine.\*\* But God is for everyone, and therefore, we are all God’s children. “But my God is more important than yours!”. Is this true? \*\*There is only one God, and religions are like languages, paths to reach God. Some Sikh, some Muslim, some Hindu, some Christian.\*\* Understood? Yet, interfaith dialogue among young people takes courage. The age of youth is the age of courage, but you can misuse this courage to do things that will not help you. Instead, you should have courage to move forward and to dialogue.\*Pope Francis, 13 September 2024\*: [Apostolic Journey to Singapore: Interreligious Meeting with Young People in the Catholic Junior College (13 September 2024)](https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/speeches/2024/september/documents/20240913-singapore-giovani.html)

kawaqcosta (2): The idea behind this statement is correct, but there's no reason to assume it's an authentic quote, as I've never found the source for this quote, although a nonexistent letter is usually cited as the source.Therefore, I dispute the authenticity of this one. If you have a solid source, please share it. Otherwise, it's best to avoid reproducing false quotes.

No-Test6158 (3): I was speaking to a district superior about this a couple of months ago. He said that it is an ambition of the SSPX to go back to some form of the 1954 Missal but their main objective is to try to get Rome to see sense about tradition and they (Rome) would never accept a jump to the 54 Missal. The response of Rome would simply be "John XXIII issued this Missal, so it's the only one that you can use." And there is, as you said, nothing that compromises the faith in the 62 Missal. I personally use a 1960 Missal which is nearly the same except the feasts are ranked slightly differently and there's no St Joseph in the canon.He went on to say, it's one thing at a time. And to be fair, the Pacellian reforms weren't all bad. The permission to offer mass in the evenings was a wonderful addition and Pius X almost certainly would have accepted this. As was the relaxing of the Eucharistic fast. The ranking of feasts also needed reform - as it has been observed - by the early 20th century, green vestments were almost never seen. This was not good as the real core of the faith is in the Sunday masses. So I think in time, the society will probably go back to the 1954 Missal but definitely not in the near future. There are some communities that are now using the pre-55 Missal - some that are regular (FSSP/ICKSP and some Oratorians) and some that are irregular (the Benedictines at Brignoles - where my friend from university is a priest).

Willsxyz (1): Your response is wordy but does not address my post. Why don’t you just answer the simple question I answered?

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (1): Yes I have. Very beautiful paintings, but you are anti statue for some reason. Would you prefer “halfway” iconoclast?

None (1): [removed]

TheologyRocks (1): It's a real quote from a speech he gave onNovember 18, 1912. You can read the speech on the Vatican website:https://www.vatican.va/content/pius-x/it/speeches/documents/hf\_p-x\_spe\_19121118\_unione-apostolica.html

Die\_ElSENFAUST (1): I did answer it, your question is not relevant. But no, in that instance, I would not submit to hypothetical father.

Mibic718 (0): My brother, we are not "anti statue", I myself have a little 3D printed statue of Archangel Michael in my icon corner.Don't get me wrong, statues are beautiful, but they are a simple snapshot of a specific instant in time. They lack the symbolic depth and timelessness of traditional icons.And many are simply biblically innacurate, a good example are the Cherubim depicted in Catholic Churches. Did you know the origin of these baby angels is the depiction of the Greek pagan god Eros? They were later adopted by the Romans called who called them "putti". (I'm not saying you're venerating pagan gods by representing Cherubs as cute little fat babies)Angels are formidable forces that should be intimidating and imposing, not something you want to tickle when you look at it. I live in Spain, a mainly Catholic Country, and can appreciate the beauty of Catholic Churches and Cathedrals. The problem is this style of art at one point or another became more focused on the skill of the artist and worldy beauty than the logos or reason behind the images themselves: to glorify GodA rennaisaince style statue would simply look out of place in an Orthodox Church, I personally have nothing against them.

HiberniaDublinensis (0): I see this was removed.

kawaqcosta (1): We are not discussing the phrase of St. Pius X, but of Pius IX.

Willsxyz (1): Suppose the father said: "It is not for you to determine what is an acceptable breakfast food. The authority to make that decision is mine alone. So you must obey and feed your little sister only jellybeans every day for breakfast."What then?

TheologyRocks (1): The meme contains two pictures of Pius X and names "Pius X."

Die\_ElSENFAUST (1): Again, your question is an inaccurate representation of the issue.So therefore I would still refuse to feed my sister Jelly Beans

kawaqcosta (1): We're not talking about the meme! We're talking about the quote attributed to Pius IX that the person quoted above!

Willsxyz (1): That means you would disobey your father's explicit command, despite the fact that you own him your obedience. And you would do so correctly, because your father has exceeded the limits of his authority in making his demand. In the same way, there are limits to the Pope's authority, and no one is obligated to obey his command when the command is harmful to the Church and to the faithful.Perhaps you will say, "the Pope hasn't commanded anything harmful to the Church and the faithful." Very well, then you are the guy feeding his little sister jellybeans for breakfast every day and claiming that "Hey, jellybeans are food so they are not harmful."Perhaps you will say, 'it is impossible for the Pope to command something harmful to the Church:. In that case, you are not only wrong, but blind. The Second Vatican Council and the Liturgical Reform resulted in a collapse in mass attendance and practice of the faith by the faithful, a collapse in priestly and religious vocations, an exodus of priests out the religious state, an exodus of religious out of their monasteries, and the wide spread of every kind of heresy throughout the priesthood, the seminaries, and the laity.

TheologyRocks (2): I'm really sorry. I missed that. The source I found was about the quote in the meme.I think you're right about the quote mentioned by Pius IX is apocryphal.

Die\_ElSENFAUST (1): Now I pose a few questions to you.1: Do Cheese Pizza and Supreme Pizza both serve as food?2: What makes a person a Catholic?3: Why have you decided to call all those in the past who rebelled against Christ's Vicar incorrect but now decided that you are in the right?To be clear, I do not dispute the factual part of your statement, mass attendance dropped, belief in Catholic beliefs among the faithful dropped as well, and again: I PREFER THE EXTRAORDINARY RITE!

None (1): Rando SSPXer who just wants to help get to the root of the point here. Food analogies only go so far. I think the major question is always twofold:1. Have the Popes since VII taught errors that are harmful to the Faith which is also in contradiction to previous correct teaching, and2. Are we currently in, and can we ever juridically be, in a position to assert this as a matter of fact even if our intuition tells us it is true.Preferring the old rite doesn't really make a difference. One could even personally prefer the new rite and still admit as a matter of fact that, that despite its validity, the NO is still lacking the fundamental aspects of a licit Mass and therefore it is dangerous.Me, I see 1 as a matter of fact which can be demonstrated both logically and historically, with evidence and using reason. However it was critical that Abp. Lefebvre had the position he had, and that we continue to have Bishops, if a good case for 2 being affirmative is still to be made. We aren't just deciding ourselves to be disobedient, we are concurring with those who were/are authoritatively in teaching positions inside the Church, who disagree with others in the same visible institution. The question is not settled, which is why it is an irregular but not severed connection to the larger Church.What constitutes a Catholic is the same for both - generally, adherence to the doctrines and dogmas promulgated authoritatively by the visible Church founded by Jesus Christ - but the difference lies in what those doctrines and dogmas are, and whether they were authoritatively promulgated. Modernism cannot ever be promulgated by anyone in any circumstance since it is an error.The difference between a reluctant NO attendee trad and a patron of the SSPX is usually in how they would answer 2.

Die\_ElSENFAUST (1): I'm sure Arius and Nestorius looked at themselves as you did.Why would God just decide to allow his Vicar to fall into error after almost 2 millennia?

None (2): That's a fair point. But so too did Athanasius. The rightness or wrongness of a Bishop in dissent is not decided by rank necessarily, in cases where truth can be demonstrated. I think everyone agrees that nobody can authoritatively teach an error - only accidentally promulgate a mistake - but determining the rightness or wrongness of a teaching is something that usually takes a few generations to bear out. That bearing out is happening right now.To answer your second question, the SSPX position as I understand it (and I agree with it) is that teaching a heresy by itself is not necessarily "falling into error" in the formal or irredeemable sense. Casual and non-infallible allusions by several Popes made to a purely pastoral council that was highly political in hindsight are regrettable, confusing, and dangerous, but it isn't like the determination that there were demonstrable errors at VII disproves the papacy. If anathemas were issued or infallibility invoked, etc, then it would be different.

Die\_ElSENFAUST (1): So Because Vat II did not declare things in the way that say Nicea I did, it does not disprove the papacy?

None (1): Correct. Nicaea convened by all accounts to settle fundamental matters of Faith, and then it did so. The products of the council are foundational to the Catholic Faith. Vatican II, in contrast, was convened explicitly as a pastoral council, in order to find a way to repackage the Faith in a way more conducive to "Modern man" (whatever that is), but not to fundamentally change anything in matters of Faith or morals. Both John XXIII and Paul VI said that exact same thing - it is merely a question of the Church's strategy in modernity, not in its substance. Now the SSPX maintains while this may have been the original intention, that ultimately there were demonstrable ideological changes that have had an obvious effect on the life and mind of the Church as an institution. These changes were due to the Council being hijacked by an extremely prepared and well-coordinated ideological contingency devoted, sadly, to the Modernism that Pius X warned about explicitly throughout his entire Papacy. But, because the council was unambiguously non-dogmatic, questioning its implementation and promulgation is not questioning Papal authority, nor is it questioning the Faith. We can acknowledge that Pope Paul VI earnestly desired to reform the Church for his day, that as Pope he certainly ordered people to implement the reform, that the reform is imperfect and it itself needs clarification on all doctrinal points which were ambiguous on purpose (with some clarification essentially refuting certain statements on the most egregiously weaponized ambiguities), and we can still submit to the Pope. The Pope is allowed to be wrong when there is no expectation of infallibility, even when he, and a majority of the Church under him, insists that he is right. This is the position of the SSPX. I adopted it because it seems reasonable to me. I think we can eat our cake and have it too on this one. When you love someone then you correct them fraternally, and we ought to love each and every one of our Holy Fathers, and desire sincerely that Christ's will be done as effectively as possible in the visible institution of the Church. A reform that does a service for one moment in time may be doing it a disservice in the next moment.As an American, I look at it like our border laws. The laws never changed between administrations, but we had one administration that upheld them, and another one that claimed it upheld them, but from a visible standpoint it was clear that the change in strategy resulted in the laws not achieving their stated goals. Regardless of how one feels about the laws, the laws themselves did not change substantively; only the political will to implement them in a certain way changed. I would like to believe that it was ignorance and not malice that resulted in the change in tactics by those with the authority to uphold the law. But either way, the laws don't need to change to fix the problem, we just need strong leaders to do what we already said we were going to do on paper. So too with the crisis in the Church, and with Her laws. The Faith itself is the remedy to problems that stem primarily from strategic ambiguity.

Die\_ElSENFAUST (1): I'm gonna do some research on this response👍

None (1): I highly recommend it. I recommend reading what the SSPX has to say about it in their own materials, if you want to know their true position, since their position is usually strawmanned by very uninformed but perhaps well-meaning people. It is not as harsh as many are led to believe, and many of their questions are both theologically tenable as well as unsettled juridically.It's not an easy question, and as Catholics, we shouldn't take even the possibility of anything that could even potentially be misconstrued as disobedience lightly. It was something I had to look at very carefully myself. It is a fact that the SSPX is superficially disobedient in certain matters. The questions that need answered are, what is real obedience, what are the limits of authority, and in what way is authority rightly exercised; and these questions need to be answered in the context of the indefectible teaching of the one, holy, Catholic, and apostolic Church.I don't believe in following any organization blindly, so here's another resource I found helpful which makes the case from the other side:https://www.wordonfire.org/vatican-ii-faq/#:~:text=%E2%80%9Cpastoral%E2%80%9D%20council?-,No.,merely%20dealing%20with%20pastoral%20matters.This is a refutation of the SSPX claims done by Word on Fire (Bishop Barron's publication). WoF is usually really good, and I listen to Bp. Barron speak regularly. If anyone can make an honest effort to oppose the SSPX, I believe it would be them. But the logic holes in this argument further convinced me that the SSPX could be on to something. For example, I don't consider a ban on the Mass said by the Church for thousands of years, the placement of radically ideological appointments who produced unprecedented and unjust outcomes (I am cancelling your Masses for your own good, I promise!) and the ensuing chaos in the Faith (expressed in apostasy rates, poor catechesis, and an explosion of liturgical nonsense) as legitimate acts of an"obviously authentic" (but not infallible) magisterium. The SSPX just says these things actually look very much like mistakes when judged in the light of Tradition, and that owning up to them and undoing them, rather than doubling down on them, is the only way to restore the broader Institution. I also don't understand the claim that pastoral material not declared infallible is still "under the protection of the Holy Spirit." The Holy Spirit does not will, nor protect, error. It sounds like they are ginning up technical infallibility where it is juridically inappropriate to do so. SSPX gets criticized for Ultramontanism (hyper-Papalism) because of their reliance on encyclicals from anti-Modernist Popes. But Modernists do the same thing with their preferred Popes and writings. This is essentially why this matter is juridically unsettled, since there are opposing claims produced by the same visible institution which are unresolved.It is a bit like what CS Lewis said in Mere Christianity: if it can be demonstrated that we are headed in the wrong direction, the most progressive person is the one who starts going backward first. And we avoid false antiquarianism because we are only returning to the precise moment before the trouble effectively starts - a Missal approved and promulgated by the very same Pope that convened VII - and we lose no dogma or doctrine in the process, aside from fallible materials produced in VII that Modernists and Boomers have been pretending is infallible for decades now.Anyways, SSPX still accepts 95% of VII, mostly because, by design (see Bugnini), the council was designed to be ambiguous. So material lacking in substance is easy to accept because it doesn't really say anything. It is only certain statements regarding religious liberty, ecumenism, and collegiality that they take issue with. These statements, far from a "reinterpretation" of doctrine, directly and demonstrably contradict previous teachings of the indefectible magisterium of times past. These issues, when researched, become clearly connected with the structural issues of today's visible institution of the Church, which began resulting at the very same time - not as a coincidence, but as a direct effect of these novel teachings, the SSPX argues.God bless you as you ask the tough questions! Even if you ultimately disagree, please remember that the SSPX loves the Church, we love Novis Ordo goers, and in large part we hope sincerely for a proper reunion for the sake of the world's souls. We are just working out our salvation with fear and trembling in the meantime at the Mass of the Ages.EDIT: Let me know if you have any questions as I would be happy to answer them

# Post 105: Bishop Fellay Doctrinal Preamble

Author: Ferrari\_Fan\_16

Score: 8

Comments: 0

URL: http://www.archbishoplefebvre.com/uploads/1/0/3/2/10321570/\_bishop\_fellays\_doctrinal\_preamble.pdf

I am curious about this. Lots of questions. And I will take all comments with a big lump of salt and just ask my priest about it.Is this even authentic? Did Bishop Fellay retract this or did Rome just say it was insufficient? This says it’s from 2012 but several years later you can see in YouTube videos His Excellency seems to have different opinions than this. Even just 2 years after this he says his condition for receiving a canonical status was that the SSPX retains the right to criticize the new mass and the council. Archbishop Lefebvre also signed the council documents so maybe he is saying we must at least attempt to interpret them the way he did and the rest of the Roman Curia did during it.

# Post 106: No comments, just cringe

Author: BasedEurope

Score: 6

Comments: 10

URL: https://i.redd.it/n9jen9oi1hff1.jpeg

DravidianPrototyper (6): Of course, only r/Catholicism would praise the modernist look of the consecration of the Hosts during the Offertory by saying that it "goes hard".Either OP has never been to the TLM or abhors it with all of his/her life.

Zalamb1500 (3): Where do you even begin with this photo.... Majestic Christ, save Your Church!

Fallen-Monk83 (3): Perhaps i'm out of the loop here, but what is going on in this Pic?

Murky\_Question\_9362 (2): Novus Disordo

IowaGuy127 (1): Ugh. So gross.

S-AugustineLearner04 (1): Banned both from Catholic memes and Catholic subreddit. Theyre hilarious man

CincyGuy2025 (1): It's 100% Catholic according to the SSPX.

CincyGuy2025 (1): I'm sorry, but there is no consecration at a n.o. supper service.There's a preparation of gifts, followed by a eucharist prayer and an institutive narrative.Study!

CincyGuy2025 (1): That's not Christ's Church! 🤦🏻♂️

catholicGirllyGirl (2): I also wanna know

# Post 107: The Head Will Fall… But the Neck Will Guide: 100 Years of Delay at Tuy

Author: Sad-Boysenberry-9578

Score: 6

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1mat6lx/the\_head\_will\_fall\_but\_the\_neck\_will\_guide\_100/

The Pope must consecrate Russia—by name—in union with all the bishops of the world, as Our Lady solemnly requested at Tuy, Spain, in 1929. In 1931, Our Lord warned it would be done… but late.2029 will mark 100 years since Heaven’s request.Just as the King of France delayed the consecration to the Sacred Heart—and lost his throne—we too will be left without a head. But we are not without a neck.Our Lady is the neck.She alone remained steadfast beneath the Cross.When Christ was wounded, the Apostles fled. His Mystical Body now suffers the same Passion—abandoned, betrayed, scourged by His own.And once again, only Our Lady keeps the Faith.Hold fast to her. The hour is late. But her Immaculate Heart will triumph.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (2): Yeah, I hope it's not something like nuclear war.

# Post 108: How can the Pope be in error and still be the Pope?

Author: Mailemanuel77

Score: 6

Comments: 19

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1m9vlqo/how\_can\_the\_pope\_be\_in\_error\_and\_still\_be\_the\_pope/

How can a Pope be in error by promulgating a council that contains error, promulgate a new theology a new Mass that is not cohesive to the tradition of the Church, involve in scandals, and even explicitly say heresy like : All religions are a path to God? Crisis in the Church is nothing new, but unlike previous crisis where the Church was filled with corrupt wicked clergymen, they didn't attempted to subvert the teachings of the Church. How is it possible that the gates of hell have not prevailed against the Church, if a large number of predominant clergymen have fallen into error. How is it possible to handle the thin line between accepting or ignoring the crisis and it's causes, and (in the other extreme) going sedevacantist. Do you hope that Tradition is going to be restored and the Church will return to it's former glory? Or do you have abandoned all hope, and the Church will indeed return but it might be smaller and poorer but stronger in Faith?

GoneFishin56 (6): All Popes have been in error. All. Except when they spoke ex cathedra.

CincyGuy2025 (3): He actually said all religions are a path to the attainment of God, which is definitely a heresy. The Vatican Council: the See of Peter always remains unblemished by any error... and the gift truth and never failing faith was divinely conferred upon Peter and his successors.We have the promise of Our Lord that the Church cannot fail.Regarding you-know-who, you decide...

filiustimaei (1): It’s not possible. Your two options are either (1) the Catholic Church is not the true Church, or (2) you are mistaken in your own judgment as to what constitutes error and heresy. For my own part, I’ll follow the judgment of the magisterium.

StrangeManOnReddit (1): Papal infallibility is a recent concept, like nineteenth century recent.There was a time where you could march your army against the Pope.

kacfm2506 (0): novus ordo vatican 2 church is not catholic , true Catholic Church is indefectible, can't have your cake and eat it too

mineuserbane (-2): If Vatican II contains errors and contradictions with other councils, the sedevacantist position is correct. If it doesn't contain errors then a true Vicar of Christ sits on the throne and rules with valid authority. We can accept that the route Vatican II took in attempting to steer the Church through modern times failed, but it has massive ramifications if it erred. Catholicism is false if it erred.

Mailemanuel77 (0): That's a way of looking. But isn't the Pope infallible with regards to Faith and morals, then why did the Pope promulgate a council that says that mvsl1ms and j3ws worship the same God, when it is clear that is false.Not only an error, but a very serious heresy, because if it is true, it means that the Church, that Christianity is flawed and there is nothing to believe in, in the first place.

mineuserbane (3): >He actually said all religions are a path to the attainment of God, which is definitely a heresy. A path to God and an end to attaining him are two totally different things. A path indicates it is not the destination. >The Vatican Council: the See of Peter always remains unblemished by any error... and the gift truth and never failing faith was divinely conferred upon Peter and his successors.>We have the promise of Our Lord that the Church cannot fail.As you quoted Rome cannot err, so are you wrong or is Vatican I wrong?

Mailemanuel77 (1): It doesn't respond to the question, it just leaves room for more speculation. If the Church can't proclaim error, then those who proclaimed error are not "members of the Church" I might accept the fact that there are heretical bishops in Germany, or Latin American communists, but the Pope, The Vicar Of Christ proclaiming error is something hard to comprehend. It defies the validity of everything that came before. Unless we didn't comprehend how the promise actually works. Out of malice or ignorance, actively contradicting Church's tradition but not triumphing but causing significant harm. Maybe it could be like the OT kingdom of Israel were they had ocassions where the literal incarnation of evil was crowned but still the fulfilment of God's promise was delivered with the fulfilment of the coming of the Messiah and the stabling of a new Kingdom not of earthly but heavenly authority...

Mailemanuel77 (1): Then Vatican I contains error also but I don't see any trad complaining about Vatican I and the pontificate of Pius IX nor his successors.

Mailemanuel77 (1): By that logic the Pope is not the Pope, but the SSPX is not sedevacantist. They criticize him but never call him antipope.

None (0): Ill repeat, since you like to post the same thing over and over again: maybe some future orthodox catholic pope will clarify things for us. For now, we must trust the Lord, and not make judgments that are not reserved for us.

Leather\_Midnight\_314 (2): St. Robert Bellarmine, Francisco Suarez, St Augustine, the Catechism of St. Pius X, St. John Damascene, St. Gregory the Great, Pope St. Gregory VII, St. Raymond of Penefort, and other Saints and Popes affirm that Jews and Muslims worship the same God (primarily the Father) as the Christians, but that their worship is not pleasing to God nor salvific

GoneFishin56 (2): The Pope is not infallible “with regards to faith and morals”. They are only infallible when they speak ex cathedra.

CincyGuy2025 (1): I think a path that doesn't lead to the attainment of God isn't actually a path to God.Nevertheless, I think you're preaching to the choir.

None (1): maybe some future orthodox catholic pope will clarify things for us. For now, we must trust the Lord, and not make judgments that are not reserved for us.

mineuserbane (0): Or VII doesn't contain error, the recent Popes have not erred, and the gates of Hell have not prevailed against it. It is possible to frame something extremely close to error but still be within the framework of church doctrine. If you look around among mainstream Catholic sources, you'll find explanations for how our recent Popes have not erred, but it may seem like it. Generally if the decision comes down to: The Pope has fallen and Rome has erred OR I am misunderstanding or refusing to accept the truth, the error is probably mine. I think we can call Vatican II a failed pastoral council, but I don't think we can say it has erred. Please note that the original comment on this thread is from a sedevacantist.

kacfm2506 (1): do you really think a "pope" can try to impose a false religion upon the Church and still be catholic? that's what the v2 popes did, this is an elephant in the room type of situation, quite obvious

Sad-Boysenberry-9578 (2): The Pope must consecrate Russia—by name—in union with all the bishops of the world, as Our Lady solemnly requested at Tuy, Spain, in 1929. In 1931, Our Lord warned it would be done… but late.2029 will mark 100 years since Heaven’s request.Just as the King of France delayed the consecration to the Sacred Heart—and lost his throne—we too will be left without a head. But we are not without a neck.Our Lady is the neck.She alone remained steadfast beneath the Cross.When Christ was wounded, the Apostles fled. His Mystical Body now suffers the same Passion—abandoned, betrayed, scourged by His own.And once again, only Our Lady keeps the Faith.Hold fast to her. The hour is late. But her Immaculate Heart will triumph.

# Post 109: FBI Spied on SSPX Priest Confirmed

Author: Ferrari\_Fan\_16

Score: 14

Comments: 0

URL: https://youtu.be/RwguaGAHQeY?si=p2fGUU-\_C\_pfZ-Eh

# Post 110: New video raises serious questions about Novus Ordo ordinations. Has the SSPX addressed this?

Author: Sad-Boysenberry-9578

Score: 4

Comments: 9

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1m5ruyw/new\_video\_raises\_serious\_questions\_about\_novus/

I’m grateful for all the SSPX has done to preserve the Faith. I recently came across a video that respectfully compares Fr. Paul Robinson’s remarks on the new rite of ordination with Fr. Hewko’s response.Fr. Robinson seems confident that Novus Ordo ordinations are valid as long as form, matter, and intention are present. Fr. Hewko strongly warns that Archbishop Lefebvre always insisted on conditional ordinations to ensure the priesthood is without doubt.This isn’t meant to stir controversy. I’m sincerely wondering if the SSPX has issued any official clarification in light of recent cases of invalid baptisms and ordinations in the Novus Ordo.The video is here if anyone wants to watch: https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=lfc\_vhDMscM

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (11): Yes they have addressed it. Look up “why the SSPX doesn’t always conditionally ordain”……Also all you had to say was Father Hewko…..the man is a doomer who says mass in someone’s living room. You need authority, not opinionated rad trad priests who can’t be convinced on anything. He was expelled for a reason.There’s also a reason why I blocked “Catholic Trumpet” on YouTube because of stupid videos like this.

kacfm2506 (2): I personally wont receive the sacraments from any sspx priest that came from the novus ordo without conditional ordination, I recommend others to do the same, who knows how the novus ordo bishop that ordinated him did it, and how that novus ordo bishop receive his own holy orders, don't risk it

CincyGuy2025 (1): Why would they? They believe in n.o. everything now.

Sad-Boysenberry-9578 (3): The issue isn’t personality or platform. It’s sacramental certainty.If a priest is ordained in the new rite by modernist bishops, and there’s real doubt about form, matter, or intention, then conditional ordination isn’t optional, it’s necessary.That’s not an opinion. That’s the principle Archbishop Lefebvre held to the end.When the line of certainty is blurred, the priesthood is no longer protected. That should concern everyone, regardless of which chapel they attend.

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (5): Okay. Then in those cases it’s necessary. It’s not necessary all the time though which is the position of the SSPX. I don’t see what your problem or Father Hewko’s problem is.

None (1): Are you just another sede pretending to make "guy i dont know" post to just spit your conclusions. You didnt take long to show your colors.

Sad-Boysenberry-9578 (4): The problem isn’t personal it’s theological. Archbishop Lefebvre explicitly condemned the new rite of episcopal consecration as “doubtful at best,” and required conditional ordinations for priests formed in it. So the real question is: Why is the new SSPX now less cautious than Lefebvre was himself?

Sad-Boysenberry-9578 (2): I am not a Sedevacantist!

# Post 111: Archbishop Lefebvre: Our Future is Our Past

Author: DravidianPrototyper

Score: 18

Comments: 0

URL: https://youtu.be/zybpKjDkAj4?feature=shared

Oh, how far we have fallen!Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre - The canary in the coal mine of our beloved Church.

# Post 112: Does anyone know what SSPX branch convicted triple murder Erin “Mushroom” Patterson went to on a few occasions? Looks like there’s one 50 minutes away from where the court case happened

Author: IloveErinP

Score: 0

Comments: 3

URL: https://i.redd.it/27rxphh7vzdf1.jpeg

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (8): What on earth is this?A brand new account, apparently dedicated to a multiple murderer just asking random questions about her? What leads you to believe she went to any? Or what's the fixation with her? Just spam or a bot?

CincyGuy2025 (8): If you love her, wouldn't you know that already? How should we know?

Successful\_Sink\_2099 (1): AI bot

# Post 113: Is the Novus Ordo a false religion your Opinions?

Author: BasedEurope

Score: 6

Comments: 50

URL: https://i.redd.it/v8ts29f6rtdf1.jpeg

Willsxyz (25): What is the value in asking for people’s opinions? You have no idea who is responding or of they are giving a sincere and truthful response or not.If you want to ask “Does the SSPX consider the novus ordo a false religion?” Then the answer is: no.

londonderry99 (7): I'm pretty sure Archbishop Lefebvre thought that all the sacraments and ordinations post Vatican 2 \*were valid\*, but he also thought that \*\*maybe they could also not be valid.\*\* The problem lies in the uncertainty, and all priests are reordained in the old rite if they join the FSSPX from the ordinary church.And also all the anti-catholic statements in Vatican 2. I'm pretty sure Archbishop Lefebvre thought most things could be "tolerable" even if pretty bad but a good 20%-10% are simply blasphemous and couldn't be compromised. No one should attend a Novus Ordo mass though since if everyone only attended to Latin masses the church would be obliged to ditch the Novus Ordo, same with all the pastoral stuff from Vatican 2.

BrianW1983 (4): No but that guy should have worn pants at least.

CincyGuy2025 (8): I don't see how it cannot be considered a new religion. The Catholic Church is by nature One. The simple fact that you can distinguish it from what you know without doubt to be true Catholicism indicates that it is not Catholic. To claim that it is NOT a new religion, you would have to say that nothing of "substance" has been changed in it from true Catholicism. You would have to say that there were only "accidental" changes and that the entire sect is otherwise indistinguishable from the 2000-year old religion. Can you honestly say that? With new doctrine, new catechism, new code of canon law, new method of worship, all of which contradict the 2000-year old religion, I think it is dishonest to consider the whole "novus ordo sect" to be substantially the same as true Catholicism. The idea that it is somehow a "failed pastoral practice" and not a new religion is a dishonest analysis.

CincyGuy2025 (3): No more questions, your honor. 🤣(https://imgur.com/QDMuEnj)

SleepHalfNaked (5): From my understanding there have been a handful of legitimate Eucharistic miracles in NO Masses; so if God doesn’t think it’s a false religion, why would i?

dbaughmen (2): Yea. But not completely a different religion, as they occupy Catholic institutions.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (2): False? No. It's just missing too much clarification on doctrine.The only contradictions Archbishop Lefebvre refused to go along with were the new interpretations on religious liberty and Church and State relations.

Sad-Boysenberry-9578 (2): Of course it is a false religion.

idespisemyhondacrv (1): It’s valid. Is picking and choosing parts of church doctrine you adhere to valid?

Holy\_juggerknight (1): Your acting as if NO is whole different religion instead of a certain way or style of mass 😭

Catholic-Convert-34 (1): Converted to what exactly? Lol. OP says "ask a priest, they are all super helpful". Oh, oh you poor soul 🤦🏼♂️

PaxBonaFide (1): It certainly isn’t a genuine representation of the Catholic faith

IloveErinP (-18): Novus Ordo is absolutely the real deal. If anything SSPX is brought into question as it is breakaway from the unified Church. And some in the SSPX community asserting that Mary is the real Messiah concerns me.

CincyGuy2025 (-6): A follow-up question is how does the SSPX honestly say that the "novus ordo" sect, the one with whom they refuse to worship, the one whose catechism they refuse, the one whose code of canon law they refuse, the one whose calendar they refuse, the one whose primary method of worship they refuse, the one whose canonizations they refuse, the one whose breviary they refuse, is somehow no different in "substance" from their own religion. That is, how can the SSPX say that the "novus ordo" operation, other than some "accidental" differences, is otherwise indistinguishable from true Catholicism?

tinkywinkysgooch (3): Most, but not all priests who come to the Society are conditionally ordained, each case is investigated thoroughly.

IowaGuy127 (2): Drives me bonkers dude. I seriously need to just switch to sspx. I'm so tired of this nonsense. Girls wearing booty shorts to Mass. Guitars playing at Mass. Seriously, I'm so tired of the disrespect and lack of respect at my parish.

BasedEurope (5): I agree with this the most

IowaGuy127 (1): The deacon at my parish wears Nike white and black shoes during Mass. It drives me insane.

CincyGuy2025 (1): You've been misunderstanding...One of the recent fake miracles was supposedly caused by reddish mold.And the outfit you wear in your pictures is considered immodest, if you don't already know that. Your "handle" is also immodest.I'm not quite sure what you are doing hanging out in this subreddit, but maybe being paid by some liberal organization to promote the NO? In either case, dispose of your clothing and get something modest as you will have to answer for it on the last day.

BasedEurope (-2): there is no publicly displayed miracle however Orthodox Liturgical books prescribe what to do if a miracle happens to the elements and the language in the rubrics heavily imply that they happen, so a Liturgy does not need to be licit for there to be a miracle, and all the Miracles in the NO show is that the mass is valid

CincyGuy2025 (2): Just because they occupy the buildings doesn't mean they have the Faith. Claiming that the Church makes use of ceremonies that are "incentives to impiety" is condemned by ANATHEMA at Trent. Be careful. You don't want to find yourself in the hot seat on the last day.

farmerganj (3): I mean it kinda is the lack of respect for the Eucharist and not even having a proper altar as well as extremely casual dress code and language definitely seem like a different religion. Not to mention teaching that Islam and Christianity worship the same god and that all religions can save you.

Cathain78 (2): You know the first thing Cranmer did ?

CincyGuy2025 (1): You're not wrong. Now, ask yourself: Can the Catholic Church not genuinely represent the Catholic Faith?

StelIaMaris (18): Nobody has ever said that

NearbyTechnology8444 (6): grandfather grab snatch familiar groovy smile shocking amusing wide deer \*This post was mass deleted and anonymized with [Redact](https://redact.dev/home)\*

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (7): You’re high

CincyGuy2025 (3): How much do you get paid to be here?

forbiddenq (4): This is bearing false witness and a slanderous lie, repent and go to confession.

None (2): What your doing, is wrong, and could be a sin if you have bad intention and not just ignorant.

VariedRepeats (1): "Center of our faith" is not the same as "the real messiah.I holmpe you realize you will have to account for misciting something.That you may not like people in SSPX does not give you license to deceive or be careless

CincyGuy2025 (3): Investigated how? By judging the interior intention of the minister?If we can judge the interior intention of the minister, should we start questioning Leinart?

BrianW1983 (1): You can politely mention it to your pastor. I did once and he put the phrase "Worship the Lord in Holy attire" on the outside of the church for 6 months.

cath\_monarchist (1): so because what other people do you would risk your salvation?

Willsxyz (0): I suggest you go read all of his post history.

SleepHalfNaked (2): I’m being paid by the jesuits to patrol niche subreddits and leave comments that are mildly supportive of ecclesiastical unity. Yes. Totally doesn’t make us TLM-goers look like a bunch of conspiratorial loonies.

None (3): "The orthodox" celebrate a Catholic rite actually. The rite belongs to the church. And yes both Saint Basil the great and John Chrysostom rites are valid.

IloveErinP (-11): An SSPX did:https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/s/NE7niLoAh3

Piklikl (11): If I banned people for being idiots I’d have to ban myself unfortunately.

IowaGuy127 (2): I should. My pastor is a good man. He has been a good confessor. I'll have to bring it up to him.

CincyGuy2025 (3): It says nothing different than what I have written here.Be careful about associating labels with your belief. Your belief should be based on the teaching of Our Lord Jesus Christ and his Vicar, which is all the same, because "when we hear the voice of Peter, we hear the very voice of Christ himself."

CincyGuy2025 (2): Ok. Whatever. You should take those pictures down, though...and change your username if you're serious about saving your soul.And, there is no unity whatsoever between the new religion and the religion of Our Lord Jesus Christ. It's not possible to honestly say there is no substantial difference between the NO religion and the 2000-year old religion. Unfortunately, the SSPX tries to claim unity with the modernists. They are lying to themselves and to you.If you do get rid of those clothes, I'd be happy to send you some money for new, modest clothing.I truly wish you all the best.

Trengingigan (1): I think that ny Orthodox he meant Vetus Ordo Catholic

Willsxyz (13): Instead of linking a thread, please be specific. Which specific response says “Mary is the real messiah” and show that the person who said that speaks on behalf of the SSPX or, for that matter, is even a member of the SSPX.You have the responsibility to do this, since you are the one making calumnious accusations against the SSPX.

StelIaMaris (5): Lmao

NearbyTechnology8444 (5): cake lush bag bow heavy many money coordinated market saw \*This post was mass deleted and anonymized with [Redact](https://redact.dev/home)\*

BrianW1983 (1): Godspeed.

SleepHalfNaked (2): I wish i could change my handle. Sadly, not possible afaik. Hope i don’t get sent to hell for my Reddit username; that’d be the end of me. Also, i guess it’ll take some time until i can buy some proper nice clothing. Money is hard to come by as a Uni student. God bless.

LuxCaelestis (2): You sound like a Protestant.

# Post 114: Young Earth Creationism

Author: Christ\_is\_\_risen

Score: 5

Comments: 12

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1m3jxma/young\_earth\_creationism/

Second Council of Nicaea (AD 787), Sess. 6: “In the year 5501 Christ our God came to mankind and lived with us for thirty-three years and a little less than five months.”Is this a dogma? Are we required to believe this? If so, wouldn't that mean that the Earth is only 7526 years old?

Willsxyz (13): Does the council place the denial of this statement under anathema?

craft00n (3): If there's no anathema in the text, certainly not.Furthermore, Augustin of Hippo was 100% against Bible literalism (explicitly quoting chronology as something that shouldn't be taken literally when reading the Bible) and was never condemned for that. And, in fact, the vast majority of great theologians weren't chronological literalists either.Other point : I'm Humani Generis, Pius XII lists a few heretic things that could be implied by evolutionism. These things are :- Humans were not created volontarily by God- There's no immortal soul- There was no original human couple from which all humans are descendingNever in the text does the Pope talk about the age of our world, despite it being widely discussed by the evolutionary scientists at the time. Ergo, the age of the earth isn't a point of dogma.Young earth creationism is a modern thing coming from protestants and protestant-influenced American catholics.

None (1): The year 5501 according to the jewish calendar?

CincyGuy2025 (1): If you're wondering about P.Rob's book, I would avoid it.

kawaqcosta (1): Read this text by Father Paul Robinson, SSPX: [Biblical Chronology Podcast](https://therealistguide.com/blog/f/biblical-chronology-podcast)

outsidelookinIN\_1 (1): Any cstholic books about YEC

Huge-Explanation-358 (-2): Exactly.

HippoBot9000 (0): HIPPOBOT 9000 v 3.1 FOUND A HIPPO. 2,991,913,223 COMMENTS SEARCHED. 61,242 HIPPOS FOUND. YOUR COMMENT CONTAINS THE WORD HIPPO.

craft00n (2): Exactly not, as we know since Augustin of Hippo that Bible chronology isn't historically accurate.

Christ\_is\_\_risen (1): What do you mean?

craft00n (1): Exactly not, as we know since Augustin of Hippo that Bible chronology isn't historically accurate.

HippoBot9000 (1): HIPPOBOT 9000 v 3.1 FOUND A HIPPO. 2,991,899,880 COMMENTS SEARCHED. 61,240 HIPPOS FOUND. YOUR COMMENT CONTAINS THE WORD HIPPO.

# Post 115: Alex Jurado, also known as "Voice of Reason", has been placed under formal investigation by the Eparchy of Phoenix, the Byzantine diocese to which he belongs. His Grace Eparch Artur Bubnevych, who is his bishop, has restricted Jurado from all activity or involvement in Eparchy facilities and events.

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 12

Comments: 5

URL: https://i.redd.it/9dy9ffa8kgdf1.png

Highwayman90 (3): Well, may Vladyka Artur get to the bottom of this.

Murky\_Question\_9362 (2): At least some bishops care about their flock

Jerailu (1): That's good he did this. I really think people who speaks publicly about the faith should have a more formal authorization kindda like an imprimatur.

west\_ham\_vb (1): Never heard of Alex Jurado. Met Bishop Artur before. Awesome person and I really enjoyed meeting him.

idespisemyhondacrv (-3): That’s crazy coming from someone who doesn’t even respect the authority of their local bishop

# Post 116: Alex Jurado Denies Claims

Author: Piklikl

Score: 3

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/Catholicism/comments/1m0u28y/catholic\_influencer\_alex\_jurado\_denies\_claims\_of

# Post 117: The Voice of Reason Debacle: The Dangers of Influence and Fame | Avoiding Babylon

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 8

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YK3SEMBZjrk

# Post 118: Is sedevacantist confession valid?

Author: Christ\_is\_\_risen

Score: 3

Comments: 10

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1m0laah/is\_sedevacantist\_confession\_valid/

Also, is independent traditional Catholic chapels or SSPX resistance confession valid?

Willsxyz (10): Formally speaking, no, due to a lack of jurisdiction, which a priest requires in order to validly absolve.Practically speaking, there is the argument that such confessions enjoy “supplied jurisdiction.” This. however, is controversial and disputed.

No-Test6158 (3): If I, as a lay person, went into a confessional and set up \*"as the priest"\* and you confessed your sins to me and I absolved them, despite having no authority to do so, and you then died, I believe your sins would be absolved as Our Lord is merciful and it is, ultimately, He who absolves our sins.However, you'd have to have gone to me with good faith that I \*\*\*was\*\*\* a priest. If you go to a sedevacantist or independent Catholic priest in full knowledge that they are what they say they are, then I believe it would not be valid.This same logic applies to Anglican clergy who offer confession.So no, their confession is not valid, unless it needs to be. Better to go to a card carrying diocesan or SSPX priest.

craft00n (0): Supplied jurisdiction can't be invoked to go to heretic churches now that we have normal jurisdiction for SSPX churches

freakViLLian (0): Yes it's valid

Christ\_is\_\_risen (1): Why is "orthodox" confession valid then?

CincyGuy2025 (-2): I think the heresy is claiming that the New Mass is a danger to one's faith and at the same time saying that the Church makes use of it...This is condemned by anathema in Trent Session 22, Canon 7.Might want to double check who the heretics are. Cheers!

Willsxyz (3): I am no expert on the matter so my answer is: I am not sure that "orthodox" absolutions are valid. If they are, then it is a result of "orthodox" bishops having valid orders and apostolic succession.The requirement for approbation or faculties for the valid hearing of confessions is, as far as I know, a matter of canon law, and not a matter of any inherent defect in the power of a priest to dispense the sacraments. "Orthodox" clergy however, being schismatics, are not subject to the canon law of the Catholic Church, and so may indeed be able to validly hear confessions and absolve sins so long as they are validly ordained.Edit: This of course shows once again that the SSPX are in communion with (are part of) the Catholic Church. If they were schismatics, they would not require faculties to hear confessions (putting the question of supplied jurisdiction aside.)

craft00n (2): Are you saying that Rome is lying to the faithful since 1970 ?Because no-one in Rome ever condemned SSPX for heresy, but for disobedience (1977) and schism (1988). In 1992, Card Cassidy, head of the dicastery for oecumenism, explained that he was not involved with SSPX at all, because it wasn't a heretic institution.Might want to double check what the current catholic authorities are saying. Cheers !

CincyGuy2025 (0): If the New Mass is harmful to souls as the SSPX says, how is it possible that the Catholic Church makes use of it when Trent says:CANON VII.–If any one saith, that the ceremonies, vestments, and outward signs, which the Catholic Church makes use of in the celebration of masses, are incentives to impiety, rather than offices of piety; let him be anathema.Do you see a problem?

craft00n (1): Your argument is quite interesting, I'm sure that the Dicastery of the Doctrina of Faith would be very thankful if you sent it to him. Especially now that the Pope has given full jurisdiction to SSPX priests, it's very harmful for the faithful ! Well in fact it's a major crisis, you may want to join a Catholic organisation trying to fix this crisis where the Pope is giving privileges to enemies of the Church.

# Post 119: Best Bible in Spanish?

Author: Mailemanuel77

Score: 4

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1m05lsy/best\_bible\_in\_spanish/

Which is the best Bible in Spanish equivalent the Douay Rheims Bible? I am also looking for a study Bible it would be better if it was in Spanish, but if the English translation has better commentary I'll go with the English translation.

dbaughmen (3): I heard that the Torres-Amat was good. I know not what I say though

thebingeeater (2): Hispanic here, the best ones are Nacar Colunga, Torres Amat and the BAC. The pre VII Straubinger translation is great too.

BeatusCervus (1): Anyone know if the Reina Valeria is good? It's the only one I have in Spanish.

Mailemanuel77 (1): Thanks

Mailemanuel77 (1): Beautiful ancient Spanish but it is a Protestant Bible...Kinda like the King James Bible.

# Post 120: Synodality Continues Under Pope Leo w/ Michael Haynes

Author: DravidianPrototyper

Score: 4

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.youtube.com/live/NzTblbe62ik?si=L89Jy8VyNGWmmjDd

# Post 121: Catholic apologist, Alex Jurado of the Voice of Reason program, is accused of sexually grooming minors. This is extremely serious. | Lepanto Institute

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 6

Comments: 1

URL: https://x.com/LepantoInst/status/1944603284376805456

NtGiL\_29 (2): Can we all please just pray for him and move on instead of recirculating articles about allegations and accusations?

# Post 122: Near-prophetic: "Catholics" (1973)

Author: DravidianPrototyper

Score: 2

Comments: 0

URL: https://archive.org/details/the-catholics-1973

An unfortunately very possible future which awaits us Traditionalists, especially in light of the 3-year Synodal Plan which is being undertaken right now, as we speak: https://press.vatican.va/content/salastampa/it/bollettino/pubblico/2025/07/07/0484/00885.html

# Post 123: Traditionalist Catholics see evangelization potential of Latin Mass | Jonathan Luxmoore for Our Sunday Visitor News

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 12

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.osvnews.com/traditionalist-catholics-see-evangelization-potential-of-latin-mass/

# Post 124: Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre apology form

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 28

Comments: 0

URL: https://i.redd.it/pmlky4xyyfcf1.jpeg

# Post 125: What is the stance of the SSPX with conservative N.O groups like Opus Dei?

Author: Mailemanuel77

Score: 4

Comments: 14

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1lxn2qy/what\_is\_the\_stance\_of\_the\_sspx\_with\_conservative/

Does the SSPX rejects them too, or do they recognize them as a more moderate way to implement Vatican II and the Novus Ordo Mass. I have not attended a TLM yet, but I have attended Mass at diocesan parish, religious parishes (Jesuit) and Opus Dei Mass. (In Latin America) The only Mass where I felt reverence and I felt somewhat uncomfortable (in a good way) was at an Opus Dei Mass, while on the other parishes it felt like it wasn't actually done with enough seriousness, (specially from the layman side). Is it mandatory that someone who receives the sacraments with the SSPX exclusively attend TLM, or can he attend at N.O parishes (for location convenience), attending TLM whenever is possible.

Internal\_Ad1735 (14): The stance of the SSPX is that the Novus Ordo Mass is harmful for the faith of a Catholic and should not be attended no matter how reverent it looks like. But this is only a good advice. The SSPX does not have, and does not claim, authority to order the faithful to do one thing or another.

Willsxyz (11): The SSPX does not endorse Opus Dei in any way.To answer your last question, the SSPX has no authority to command or forbid anything to the lay faithful. They can advise, but that’s all.The SSPX advises strongly against assisting at novus ordo masses and from receiving novus ordo sacraments. There are a number of people who attend SSPX chapels, but who do not exclusively attend SSPX chapels. But you are far more likely to find these people attending other TLM communities rather than novus ordo parishes.

Due\_Praline\_8538 (5): They reject them.

Christ\_is\_\_risen (3): Look up "Fr. Hesse Opus Dei"

RiskKeepsMeEmployed (3): With Opus Dei specifically there are concerns this is a secret society like the freemasons within the Church. I know high wealth people that have been approached by them, they want serious donations in exchange for connections and influence. There isn't too much solid to research but I expect this to Change. JD Vance is connected to Opus Dei, they were involved in his conversion.....

Numbainne47 (4): No it is not mandatory, the sspx generally advises against attending the NO but at the end of the day its your decision. I know quite a few people at my sspx chapel, myself included, who will attend a reverent NO if our chapel doesn't have anything on that certain day.

None (2): Podes asistir a la Fraternidad sin estar de acuerdo con su posición, ellos lo que hacen es brindar los sacramentos tradicionales. Pero entende que para un fiel, funcionan básicamente como parroquias, nadie te esta preguntando que tan católico sos. Tenes un miedo irracional. El opus dei es bastante mas osco y "sectario" que una capilla de la Fraternidad.

BertBlyleven (2): From what I understand the SSPX particularly does not like Opus Dei primarily because of how hostile Opus Dei has always been towards the SSPX and traditionalism in general - starting from the very beginning in the 70s.

Mailemanuel77 (2): There is no TLM community besides the FSSPX in my country, only some who offer a more reverent Novus Ordo. In regard to this problem, would it still be a sin to not attend Mass on Sundays not because it was not possible to attend, but because I'd rather personally not attend Mass if it's not reverent, because even if I do not receive communion, it feels like attending by force rather than having an internal spiritual predisposition, while attending during the rest of the week to a reverent Novus Ordo is possible.

Mailemanuel77 (3): Thanks

Mailemanuel77 (2): De todas las conversaciones que he tenido con gente de mi país, no tradicionalistas pero si tirando por esa línea debido a los conflictos post conciliares y el impacto que tuvo en el declive del catolicismo en la región, me han recomendado asistir a Misa del Opus Dei, he ido y me ha gustado la misa, aunque no me dieron información (estas personas) acerca de RCIA porque ninguno con los que hable se habían convertido simplemente crecieron en una familia católica por cultura pero no realmente fieles, recibieron los sacramentos pero abandonaron la fe y luego retomaron por cuestiones intelectuales. Aunque de contextos bastante distintos. No en lo económico precisamente, pero simplemente son mundos aparte, crecí en una familia evangélica, estudie en colegios privados evangelicos, y de mi familia solo una tía que ya falleció hace años seguía practicando el catolicismo. (Tanto del lado de mi madre como mi padre, mis abuelos eran católicos por cultura y luego abandonaron la iglesia para ser evangélicos a una edad donde mis padres no eran lo suficientemente grandes para poder recibir los sacramentos y luego decidir si seguir en la fe). No conozco a absolutamente ningún católico en mi círculo social, al menos un católico de verdad. Pregunte con algunos sacerdotes pero no me dio mayor información que no supiera previamente, al parecer no ofrecen catecismo para adultos, y lo único que ofrecen es para adolescentes. Ya que me dijeron en las mismas parroquias y en la catedral. Pero viviendo en Guatemala a como estan las cosas lejos de motivarme solo terminara decepcionandome más. Solo me queda la FSSPX como un lugar donde pueda recibir una catequesis decente, aunque el asunto es que no soy tan tradicionalista, sino mas bien crítico de las decisiones tomadas después del concilio, no tanto por cuestiones de fe sino simple sentido común, cualquiera puede ver el caos y deducir las causas sin ser un teólogo.

None (2): Digamos un tradicionalista de closet? jaja, "Solo me queda la FSSPX como un lugar donde pueda recibir una catequesis decente, aunque el asunto es que no soy tan tradicionalista, sino mas bien crítico de las decisiones tomadas después del concilio, no tanto por cuestiones de fe sino simple sentido común, cualquiera puede ver el caos y deducir las causas sin ser un teólogo." Ni se te ocurra decir esto en una parroquia ordinaria o te van a tratar de loquito tradicionalista, pues esta es la posición del 99% de los que estamos con la tradición. Personalmente no voy mas a misa novus ordo, voy a una misa tradicional diocesana, al FSSPX o a una iglesia melkita-catolica de rito griego aveces. Vivo en Buenos Aires y puedo elegir, claro.

Mailemanuel77 (1): Si jajaja, un tradicionalista de closet. Tal vez creo a lo que me refería con no ser tradicionalista me refería mas a cuestiones no relacionadas a la fé. Es tentador criticar, hechar la culpa a los liberales a los modernistas y anhelar un pasado que nunca existió, cuando la culpa la tienes tú por haber fracasado en ser fiel a la fe no solo en papel sino en acciones, ya que el enemigo aprovecha esta debilidad este fracaso para vender luego la idea de una falsa iluminación y una falsa liberación de un mal que pudo evitarse en un tiempo cuando practicamente se tenía todo y aun asi se fracaso. Se que la mision de la Iglesia no se trata de crear una utopía sino de llevar el Evangelio, pero se han cometido tantos errores a un nivel humano. Pero eso no quiere decir que la Iglesia no cuente con la verdad absoluta (dada por gracia divina, de lo contrario es prácticamente imposible que el humano por su propia cuenta llegué a decretar un dogma, una verdad universal, de no ser por una intervención sobrenatural que trascienda las limitaciones del entendimiento humano...), y que por los pecados de sus miembros deje de der Santa. Pero aún asi el lado humano de la ecuación sigue siendo un problema, pero si espero a obtener una respuesta a todas las preguntas existenciales jamas voy a tomar una decisión y jamas se va a llegar a un consenso. Es mejor estar a medias convencido del lado correcto de la historia que estar con los otros que quizas son mas afables y son menos rígidos pero es una trampa. Jajaja me oye mi Padre evangélico y me tacha por loco, por fariseo neonazi fascista si así crítico a la Iglesia Católica moderna no digamos a la Iglesia evangélica en la que creci y me volvió un agnóstico con una repulsión pero no al cristianismo en si, sino a esta falsa version del cristianismo que ni siquiera puede llamarse como tal, pero nuestros lideres no lo señalan como tal porque tienen miedo a sonar políticamente incorrectos y a ofender las sensibilidades ajenas.

None (2): Yo jamas escuche a un cura de la fsppx bajar linea política. Si crees en la doctrina de Cristo sin adulterar, es ahí donde la vas a hallar.

# Post 126: What are the specific problems in the Vatican 2 documents?

Author: augustine456

Score: 2

Comments: 13

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1lx7pn4/what\_are\_the\_specific\_problems\_in\_the\_vatican\_2/

I am looking for specific quotes that are problematic in the Vatican 2 documents. Thanks.

rebornrovnost (6): Perhaps read them first?

ourladyofcovadonga (5): Hey bro. Sspx YouTube has a few vids on these topics. Straight from the source. Just look up sspx vatican II. Take the time to watch and learn rather than get bullet points from laymen

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (3): Archbishop Lefebvre refused to sign two of them. They were the documents on Church and State relations, and Religious Liberty.Neither conform with previous understanding of doctrine on those two issues.They got him to sign by telling him it was an attendance sheet.

RiskKeepsMeEmployed (1): these 3 6 minute and shorter vids do a great job. i never really paid attention to collegiality, and then I heard this and it blew my mind how much of an aberration it was just on its own. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NxkOWOcdIuM](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NxkOWOcdIuM)[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TcdfFbh33Rw](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TcdfFbh33Rw)[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MiZrlHNCt1s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MiZrlHNCt1s)

augustine456 (0): If they are so bad, why would I devote lots of time to reading them?

augustine456 (2): are you talking about the video titled "Contradictions of Vatican II - SSPX Sermons"?

SanctusFranciscus (1): Source

rebornrovnost (7): How else do you intend to criticize a text, if not by reading it for yourself first?

ourladyofcovadonga (3): That's one sermon but I think their crisis video series is much better. You can start with the crisis in the church series. They have a playlist

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): [https://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/Interview\\_With\\_Archbishop\\_Lefebvre.htm](https://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/Interview\_With\_Archbishop\_Lefebvre.htm)

augustine456 (1): I have too many Catholic texts that I still need to read. I am not finished with St Maximos the Confessor's 4 centuries on love, nor have I gotten started on Margaret Mary Alocoque or Therese of Liseux. Why would I give substantial time to reading a document who's Catholicity is questionable? I have read enough to know that it is offensive to pious ears. I just want to hear justification for SSPX's argument going as far as you do.

rebornrovnost (6): Then stick to accusing what you know for sure to be offensive, instead of presuming to speak of what you have not studied for yourself.

augustine456 (1): I have read large portions, so I know them to be offensive. You don't have to read very far into them to be offended.

# Post 127: Absolute Dystopia: The 3-year long Synodal Plan to dismantle the Church from within

Author: DravidianPrototyper

Score: 4

Comments: 0

URL: https://youtu.be/MloW5gPTLrg?si=eX1-0OO-E1fXPAkm

This is nothing short of utterly mortifying - like, Alta Vendita in action and its culmination.As a commenter pointed out, the end goal of this Synod appears to be reminiscent to the plot of 'Catholics' by Brian Moore (and its 1973 TV adaptation starring Martin Sheen).

# Post 128: How was your marriage prep classes? Any advice for us?

Author: Agitated-Agent1612

Score: 5

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1lvqrqx/how\_was\_your\_marriage\_prep\_classes\_any\_advice\_for/

We just had our first class, and it was like a...lecture? I expected it to be more conversational but our priest just went straight to the content of the classes. Nothing much we didn't already know about since it was our first class, and the content was mostly basics. From my sensing, the rest of the classes will also mostly go through the Church's teachings on marriage. I heard that it's important for couples to discuss finances, conflict management, etc. before getting married, so I was surprised to see such a lecture-like structure.He did give us a reading on the 5 love languages, though. How was your experience like? Did you discuss anything else beyond the marriage preparation lessons? Do you have any advice for us?

Piklikl (3): That’s what my experience was as well. I was also hoping for something more conversational, but I think the priests have an explicit list of things they are wanting to say regardless of if it needs to be said or not. I don’t think it hurts to bring it up to the priest though.That being said, don’t let the lack of conversation with the priest stop you from having those very important conversations (especially about finances). There’s no end of resources out there to help walk you through those conversations (my wife and I used AI to create a structure for a weekly meeting based on our circumstances), a good book is 101 Questions to Ask Before You Get Engaged by H Norman Wright (we started going through it after marriage but it’s still really good).

NearbyTechnology8444 (2): start market ink crush nose imminent knee weather rhythm aback \*This post was mass deleted and anonymized with [Redact](https://redact.dev/home)\*

MonkeyKing\_1 (2): The church's marriage preparation course does not address marriage from all possible perspectives, but only from a religious perspective.The 1917 canon law itself outlines the content as follows (c. 1033 CIC/1917):\*"A pastor shall not omit, according to the varying conditions of persons, to instruct spouses\*\* \*on the sanctity of the sacrament of marriage and\*\* \*on the mutual obligations of spouses and\*\* \*of parents toward children;\* \* \*likewise he shall strongly exhort them to confess their sins diligently before the celebration of marriage and to receive piously the most holy Eucharist."\* For the sake of completeness, I also quote the new canon law, which is formulated somewhat more vaguely (c. 1063 CIC/1983):>Pastors of souls are obliged to ensure that their own church community provides for Christ s faithful the assistance by which the married state is preserved in its christian character and develops in perfection. This assistance is to be given principally:>\[...\]>2 by personal preparation for entering marriage, \*\*so that the spouses are disposed to the holiness and the obligations of their new state\*\*=> The priest does not speak as a marriage counselor, psychologist, financial advisor, lawyer,... but marriage preparation course is part of the Church's proclamation, insofar as it prepares for the reception of the \*\*sacrament of marriage\*\* (analogous to the instruction for First Communion and Confirmation).

Agitated-Agent1612 (1): Ah this makes sense! I'm still sad seeing my friends in their local parishes having a more rounded marriage prep course, but I guess we can always implement our own supplementary learnings :) After all, the 3 main reasons for failed marriages are finances, sex, and children. I think it's important for couples discerning marriage to explore these practical topics on top of the theology of marriage.

MonkeyKing\_1 (1): Additional information is always useful, as long as it comes from a reliable source.You can, of course, also ask your priest if he can speak to you about specific topics or recommend good literature on these topics.From a Catholic perspective, I can only recommend that you thoroughly read and meditate on Pope Pius XI's encyclical on marriage. It summarizes all the essentials of Catholic marriage.[Pius XI. - Casti connubii (31 December 1930)](https://www.vatican.va/content/pius-xi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\_p-xi\_enc\_19301231\_casti-connubii.html)(The date of the encyclical should not be an obstacle to reading it, since the structural principles of marriage instituted by God and the essence of human nature have remained the same at all times.)

# Post 129: The Society of Saint Pius X in Kenya - interview with Father Pierre Champroux

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 5

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=02G5K3DN12M

# Post 130: Closest Latin mass in Heidelberg, Germany?

Author: Zorrgo

Score: 3

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1lupcv3/closest\_latin\_mass\_in\_heidelberg\_germany/

My mother is interested exploring the latin mass. Where can I find best resources on valid and good Latin masses in Germany?

BurtonC123 (3): https://www.latinmass.com/find-latin-mass This has a list of all sspx, diocesan and other traditional groups. There appears to be an sspx parish near Heidelberg as well as several fssp ones.

Internal\_Ad1735 (2): [Sankt Anna](https://www.latinmassdir.org/venue/sankt-anna-saint-anne-heidelberg-germany/)Website in German : https://www.summorum-pontificum-heidelberg.de/

Zorrgo (2): Great! Thanks!!

ardaduck (1): [This](https://fsspx.org/en/mass-centers) is also the SSPX only map.

# Post 131: I need help finding a Latin Mass

Author: josefernandez612

Score: 9

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1lunuq8/i\_need\_help\_finding\_a\_latin\_mass/

Hello,Hopefully, I will be in Scotland in a few days, and I'm trying to find a Latin Mass in St. Andrews.I searched through a couple of Latin Mass finder maps, but I didn't find any.I wanted to send a message to ask if somebody could help me find a Latin Mass, since maybe not EVERY Traditional Latin Mass is in those maps.Thanks.

Calm\_Vegetable1532 (2): Hi there,Yes, you’re absolutely right — not every Traditional Latin Mass is listed on the usual online maps. In Scotland, TLMs are quite limited, and as far as I know, there isn’t currently a regular Latin Mass in St. Andrews itself.The closest options are likely in Edinburgh or Glasgow. The FSSP have a presence in Edinburgh at St Andrew’s Church in Ravelston, and the SSPX have chapels in Glasgow (St. Andrew’s Church, Whifflet) and Edinburgh too.I’d recommend reaching out to either the FSSP in Edinburgh or the SSPX in Scotland directly to confirm Mass times. Let me know your travel plans and I can help check options based on where you’ll be on Sunday.Hope that helps!

Internal\_Ad1735 (2): You'll have to go to Dundee or Edinburgh (Ecclesia Dei communities) [St. Joseph's Convent - Dundee](https://www.latinmassdir.org/venue/seipeal-clocair-naoi%e1%b9%81-eosa%e1%b9%97-saint-josephs-convent-chapel-dundee-united-kingdom/)[Saint Andrew's Church, Edinburgh](https://www.latinmassdir.org/venue/eaglais-naoi%e1%b9%81-anndra-saint-andrews-church-edinburgh-united-kingdom/)For SSPX, you have the Church of Saints Margaret and Leonard110 Saint Leonard's StreetEdinburghEH8 9RDUnited KingdomMass times here (scroll down to Scotland) : https://fsspx.uk/en/mass-times-calendars-32157You can also download the weekly or bi-monthly bulletin for the entire UK at the top of the page.

# Post 132: Torn apart inside...

Author: ChildOfEurope

Score: 13

Comments: 12

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ltwu33/torn\_apart\_inside/

Hi everyone!So, my friend asked me how was the TLM and I said it was good and I went to the SSPX priory a few times. I told him, "Man! I felt something good out there! You have to come and see some time!"And a couple hours later we were texting each other, and he said, "Hey man! I support your explotation of SSPX. Maybe it is where God is leading you, I cannot know any better."We had a good conversation after that.A couple of weeks later, we were texting again , and ge brought up the SSPX again( at this point I wish I had my mouth shut when I told him I went to the priory). He reached out the local archdiocese to clarify if a Catholic can attend the SSPX Mass. They gave him a vague answer. He showed me an email...Ok, I knew they would not tell him anything I knew already before. Than we met for a cup of coffee and started talking about the SSPX again. My friend is a devout Catholic, I love and respect this guy, he is knowledgeable, and whatnot. I told him that Archbishop Lefebrve signed 14 out of 16 Vatican II documents. He responded that Lefebrve back out from it pretty fast, JPII( I am sorry, but I cannot call this man a saint) gavr him time to come back and repent, and he also promised Lefebrve two( or four?) bishops in two years...Then, of course, we talked about the TLM. I said that this Mass was orgsnically developed. He said it wasn't. He brought up some "experts" from YT( to which , of course, he did not provide the links). He also said, "Apostles did not say the TLM!"He also swears by GIRM and keeps blaming the laity for not living out the prescriptions of Vatican II.Next day, after the Mass, I told him that we should close that topic because I didn't think we were heading anywhere and we would not find the right answer, abd I just wanted to make my peace with with God, and be faithful to Eternal Church. I love and respect what SSPX does and I did not hear anything anti-Catholic and anti-Vatican comkng from their side...And my friend's overseeing of my religious journey( I am a fresh convert from Orthodox Church) and his "I know it all, you should do this for your benefit" vibe( all of these from my perception, not trying to badmouth him here!)Make me feel so empty and torn apart. I feel like I have to police my every move, my every word and my every thought with him...What you guys think?Sorry for the long post. Hope it makes some sense. Have a wonderful one!Cheers

londonderry99 (13): It's funny to me how people who attend the NO tend to like more other religions or protestants than trad cats lol. Also John Paul II the Polish patriot carrying that crooked cross around said that "every man is God", if anything you should be happy to side with Lefebrve instead of him.As far as I am aware, although it is normally expected that a saint should be praised by the community, legalistically speaking it only means that said person went to heaven. Nothing else. Maybe you should try to speak more about other things to your friend than to dwell too much in the current crisis and anything directly related to it, although it's hard to ignore some stuff.

SnowWhiteFeather (2): Humility goes a long way.You can make claims about what you believe and you can make claims about what you know. If you are doing the former you should have a solid argument to back up what you are claiming.As long as you aren't overextending yourself on what you can defend you don't have any reason to censor yourself, because you won't reasonably come under scrutiny.If your friend has weak arguments you can ask him the questions that lead toward what you have established to be true. This is sometimes better than debating, which can become confrontational.If he wants to accept the truth he will arrive at it in time. Giving him the opportunity to engage in communication is generous if he is acting in good faith.Do the best you can and pray that God will make up the difference, because that is what a loving father will do.

None (2): If you are going to tradition, prepare for persecution, from the authorities, from the laity, from non traditional priest, etc. If you cant handle it, ask Christ for strength.

ChildOfEurope (5): I noticed that too! They have no problems if you hit the other religion. But if you say that you treated your self nice abd went to any parish thst offers the TLM, they will be like, "Why? It is so ancient and rigid!"What a time to be alive!

rebornrovnost (1): Sorry? John Paul II? You mean Saint John Paul II, who was directly quoting Jesus, who was quoting Scripture itself, as in John 10, 34.Does this community lack respect for canonized saints?

londonderry99 (1): No, I'm not sorry.I do not condone this channel's stance and many other things that they say, but their arguments still stand here, watch this video and tell me if you keep your opinion that he was "quoting Jesus".[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zlJ1-Tnh12s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zlJ1-Tnh12s)He was at least Nestorian, which is blasphemous. But he did say every man is God, which is not the same that Jesus said.[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bVtiF-GbYFc](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bVtiF-GbYFc) He also committed blasphemies against the holy spirit.

rebornrovnost (1): Honest question, brother, how can you believe that God would allow the Church that He has spilled His own blood for to have been lost to the point of now wrongly canonizing men who have been damned? If what your community claims is true, indeed the gates of Hell have prevailed over the Church, because it has been lost by all save a few “chosen ones”, and we know that it cannot be so.

londonderry99 (1): When did I say that I believe he was damned? Also when did I say that I believe in the Most Holy Family Monastery's claims regarding sedevacantism? I stated clearly "I do not condone this channel's stance and many other things they say" lol. I was specifically claiming only that he did commit blasphemies many times and it is proven, also some other very wrong things mostly regarding religious indifferentism. Therefore I do not like him. It's simple.

rebornrovnost (1): A blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is a sin that cannot be forgiven in this life or the next, according to Scripture… And you did say Saint John Paul II has committed said blasphemies. Just trying to understand you, bro.Maybe you don’t condone sedevacantism, but if you affirm that a canonized saint has committed a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit and was actually a heretic, you are directly opposing the Holy Catholic Church and holding your understanding as superior to Her.

londonderry99 (1): A blasphemy against the holy spirit is not \*\*- only -\*\* what you mentioned, if I say something against the holy spirit like an offense it is also a direct blasphemy against him, since he's a personal being. And regardless of that both can be forgiven if someone goes back to being in a state of grace. Therefore even if he was a blasphemer he could have repented before death and he could be in heaven now, and therefore de facto a saint, so I don't see a contradiction. It is my belief that something mysterious happens when someone is in deathbed, if that weren't the case virtually everyone would go to hell without a doubt, even believers.But none of that equals to him being good, the videos prove he was a blasphemer and condoned religious indifferentism, how can he be an example of faith and the voice of God for you?Do you think Saint Peter would have kissed a book blaspheming against Jesus, his mother and his teachings etc like John Paul II did? Do you think Saint Peter would have said all religions save and would have blessed the icon of a demon inside the most holy church?

rebornrovnost (1): My brother, I believe you should study further what consists a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. Regarding the links, I believe they show a subjective (and quite partial) analysis of SJPII’s actions. [In no moment did he affirm that all religions save](https://www.catholic.com/video/is-pope-francis-a-heretic), for instance. His theology (deeply misunderstood) is one that requires careful study. About kissing the Quran, I definitely don’t think that Saint Peter would have done it, considering it didn’t exist at the time. But Saint John Paul II, polish, having lived through World War II and witnessing the catastrophe of interreligious disputes, perhaps he felt the personal responsibility to, as Head of the Church of Christ, express his complete disregard for the same hatred that burned the world, all those years ago. Perhaps kissing the Quran was not the right move, but the Pope acted with the intention of peace, and this should suffice on what we ask of a human being. If there is any judgement to be made on this, we would be wise on leaving it to God, who knows all things.Again, no matter your personal intuitions, do stop saying that he has committed the unforgivable sin (which is blasphemy against the Holy Spirit).

londonderry99 (1): My second question was a reference to Francis, actually. As I said, John Paul II did offend the Holy Spirit directly with what he said as the video shows, so he did commit blasphemy against him. It may not be what you're referring to, but that's not what I meant. John Paul II was very close to this, but only Francis directly said all religions save. And I don't see how the great wars were based on religion. Nazis were secular, Soviets atheists. The first world war also had nothing to do with religion since the catalyst was a terrorist seeking to have his home region annexed by the country of his ethnic group, if anything, both were based on nationalism and race but not religion directly by any means. Catholic French and Catholic English people killed each other for hundreds of years, Sunni Muslims and pagans too between themselves, and the list goes on. To further explain, as I previously said, the holy spirit is also a personal being so if you for instance curse him you are committing a blasphemy against the holy spirit, I did not mean that in the sense of "blasphemy against the spirit of truth by refusing to accept the truth or denying the Catholic religion or miracles or the mercy of God or spirituality". The video proves he offended him directly with what he said.

# Post 133: War and Peace | Society of Saint Hugh of Cluny

Author: Duibhlinn
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URL: https://sthughofcluny.org/2025/05/war-and-peace.html

# Post 134: Holy Cross Catholic International School in Lavington, Kenya

Author: Duibhlinn
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Comments: 0

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W-5viuvdQSA

# Post 135: There's nothing wrong with the novus ordo, submit to Rome!

Author: Duibhlinn
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URL: https://i.redd.it/yy1g29r4i1bf1.png

# Post 136: Was my baptism valid?

Author: Dear\_Ad\_9316

Score: 2

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1lrnqzu/was\_my\_baptism\_valid/

I was baptized at a norvus ordo Church when I was a baby. If there's heresies in Vatican 2 and they agree, and also considering the sacrilege that happens by improper care of the Eucharist, does this mean the sacrament was not valid? Should I be re baptized at the traditional Latin Mass?

BasedEurope (6): Unless you have positive doubt in Matter, Form or intention you should not get a conditional baptism

CatholicBean (5): “If any one saith, that the baptism which is even given by heretics in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, with the intention of doing what the Church doth, is not true baptism; let him be anathema.” - Council of Trent, Canon IV on BaptismYou are probably fine.

VanSensei (3): Yes if matter and form are correct. If Novus Ordo baptisms are all invalid, we are in major, global crisis levels of trouble.

Jerailu (2): Really and I insist really don't do that it's,sacrilegeous to be rebaptised unless you have reasonable doubts it was invalid.

# Post 137: April 2020 Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith questionnaire on the implementation of Summorum Pontificum as part of the consultation of bishops on the application of the motu proprio Summorum Pontificum & a collection of quotations drawn from the responses received from the dioceses

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 5

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.reddit.com/gallery/1lrh4lt

# Post 138: Are there any Dominicans affiliated with the S.S.P.X in the U.S?

Author: Christ\_is\_\_risen
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1lq5e4z/are\_there\_any\_dominicans\_affiliated\_with\_the\_sspx/

Open\_Helicopter9577 (9): The SSPX-associated Dominicans seem to be mostly present in France. However, it seems like some SSPX Dominican teaching sisters have a presence is the US.

dbaughmen (5): As a community, no. But Fr Albert OP is residing at the seminary.

nishka\_luv2 (3): Love Father Albert!

# Post 139: Is this real?

Author: neilyy21
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Comments: 16

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1lpy9xu/is\_this\_real/

https://youtu.be/-2lBaaLQaMY?si=qbXZykauqQBnQaMTIt shows 3 “Catholic” priests at a Protestant service. One of the priests I recognize as fr. Frankie. I just am in shock (even though I know how disordered the novus ordo is)The pastor is Rodney Howard Browne.

Comprehensive\_Set594 (6): This is actually insane.

Princess\_peaches2554 (5): It does appear to be Father Frankie. He has a popular YouTube channel. I think he might even be on hallow app.

iphone5su93 (4): This is saddening

childishnickino (4): Catholic priests even showing up to that is embarrassing.

CincyGuy2025 (3): "Father" Frankie?

Piancol (3): This is embarrassing and revolting to watch.

Beneatheearth (2): This charismatic bs needs to stop.

UnkownMalaysianGuy (2): Anyone with a sane spiritual mind shouldn't even think of going to a place like this. This is saddening

Extreme-Promotion892 (1): I call bullshit on these priests actually being Catholic in their hearts. Might dress and even act like priest but I doubt they believe in the Catholic Church and all her teachings

ElloPoppettttttttt (1): Radical Christianity is trying to infiltrate the Catholic church and you all need to realize they are the threat, not the Pope. Look up “7 mountain mandates” and “operation higher court”

AJ-54321 (1): Looks AI generated

neilyy21 (1): You must mean the novus ordo? Lefebvre was right when he said that the NO is a Protestant rite.

opportunityforgood (1): Novus ordo is instituted by the church.So it is valid.Jesus told Peter hell will never overcome the church.

ourladyofcovadonga (1): Yeah the tlm is still here.

opportunityforgood (1): And thats great!Both are valid.Look, only God knows if what they decided in Vatikan ll were good decisions. But we should never doubt the Church's authority in these matters. Things can be reversed. Or become worse. We dont know, but we can choose to trust in Jesus. And focus on becoming holy ourselves and help others.

ourladyofcovadonga (1): You don't understand Church authority. The Church can decide if something is good or bad for the faithful. That's the point of the Church. If a document contradicts previous magisterium, then it is certainly to be spat out and rejected. V2 and the Paul VI mass have already been criticized enough for you not to be ignorant of the facts. Your blindness is appalling and making vague acts of faith just makes you sound like a hippie protestant. Spiritual acts of mercy include instructing the ignorant and admonishing sinners.

# Post 140: Does anyone know anybody belonging to the SSPX chapter in Menzingen, Switzerland?

Author: Dismal-Reason-8658
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1lpr69o/does\_anyone\_know\_anybody\_belonging\_to\_the\_sspx/

I am looking to visit as I will briefly be in Switzerland in the summer. I was wondering if I could get in contact with anyone.

# Post 141: Traditional Latin Mass in Kenya

Author: Duibhlinn
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Comments: 0

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Hxac11k5VrU

# Post 142: Abstaining on first class solemnities

Author: Ok\_Translator\_5898

Score: 4

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1loqutk/abstaining\_on\_first\_class\_solemnities/

Hello, I have an sspx calender which includes the fish icon for the days that abstaining from meat is required. Can anyone share why abstaining is required on feast of the Sacred Heart even though it is a Friday class solemnity? Thank you!

MonkeyKing\_1 (0): "Solemnity" is a term used in the modernist conciliar church; it has no meaning in the traditional rite.Whether abstinence is to be observed depends solely on whether or not there is a feast \*\*of precept\*\*. See my post here: [Abstinence](https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1lmd94c/comment/n06wwbr/)The feast of the Sacred Heart is a feast (even a first-class feast), but not a feast of precept, therefore the Friday on which it is celebrated is a day of abstinence.

Ok\_Translator\_5898 (1): Thank you so much! So does that mean we are obligated to follow the tradition on keeping abstainance even on first class solemnities or can we follow the norm of our country regarding that (I live in a country where every Friday of the year, abstainance is required unless it's a first class feast)

MonkeyKing\_1 (1): A distinction must be made between what is obligatory and what is recommended. This is a subreddit for the SSPX, so it's more about pre-conciliar customs and laws. Even if these laws are often no longer obligatory today, they are still recommended and followed voluntarily for the sake of spiritual progress.In the strict sense, you are only obligated (under grave sin) to what current canon law prescribes, even if the SSPX makes additional recommendations.Current canon law states on abstinence in c. 1251 CIC/1983:>Abstinence from meat, or from some other food as determined by the Episcopal Conference, is to be observed on all Fridays, \*\*unless a solemnity should fall on a Friday\*\*.In addition c. 1253 CIC/1983, which grants bishops' conferences the possibility of making changes, should be taken into account:>The conference of bishops can determine more precisely the observance of fast and abstinence as well as substitute other forms of penance, especially works of charity and exercises of piety, in whole or in part, for abstinence and fast.(I would like to point out again that the term "solemnity" is a \*technical term\* from the conciliar church. It has no exact equivalent in the realm of Tradition and should therefore not be used.)

# Post 143: Cardinal Burke appeals for restoration of Traditional Latin Mass | Kristina Millare for Catholic News Agency

Author: Duibhlinn
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URL: https://www.catholicnewsagency.com/news/264773/cardinal-burke-asks-pope-leo-to-lift-latin-mass-restrictions

# Post 144: Conditional Baptism

Author: MathFederal4094
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1lnh4vc/conditional\_baptism/

I'm a convert from Anglicanism. My Anglican baptism was assumed valid in the local novus ordo and I was confirmed Catholic at the same novus ordo parish. I've since come into tradition to find the society doubting the validity of Anglican baptism due to defect of intention. I know conditional baptism would mean conditional confirmation also so I'm not so concerned about that. I just need someone to articulate the defect of intention the SSPX fear in an anglican minister as pertains to baptism, because the matter and the form were otherwise correct and proper.

londonderry99 (3): Well if you have any doubts I would ask for it to be done again. But it should be fine imo

Total-Wedding8871 (1): Most, if not all, “traditional” main-line protestant sects to include Anglicans baptize validly - the trinitarian water baptism with the intention “to baptize as the Church intends to baptize” is not a high bar to hurdle. Anglicans will obviously not have the exact understanding or intention of Roman Catholic theology but as long as they are saying the black and doing the red and not play-acting, they can have a muddled understanding and still validly baptize methinks. We are not donatists after all.

MathFederal4094 (1): Yeah I struggle to find anything directly to pick apart as questions of intention are all speculation. My concern would be if an Anglican vicar didn’t intend to perform a sacrament (some of them sound like they don’t even believe in God). What if they just intended to perform a naming/welcoming ceremony?

MathFederal4094 (1): Yeah that makes sense. My only concern is if the minister intended to merely perform a ‘naming ceremony’ type of thing and not a sacrament. Such a positive counter-intention could cause problems

DependentPositive120 (1): Anglican Priests use the trinitarian formula. Some have been filled with crazy liberal ideas, but they are still all required to affirm the Nicene Creed. Unless you have reason to believe otherwise, I would assume your baptism is valid.

# Post 145: Annual observations

Author: londonderry99

Score: 5

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1lnbws2/annual\_observations/

Is there a chart or PDF with every single traditional holiday, mass, fast etc that we are supposed to observe?

dbaughmen (2): I recommend the app Santifica, which has all the devotions, prayers, Dom Gueranger, Mass propers and liturgical calendar. It even sends you reminders before days of fast and opportunities of plenary indulgences

# Post 146: Do National Holidays Trump Days of Abstinence?

Author: realdenvercoder

Score: 5

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1lmd94c/do\_national\_holidays\_trump\_days\_of\_abstinence/

We are new to the Trad Catholic thing and as such we are trying to follow things to the letter. We now fast on every Friday of the year, we observe Ember Days, etc. We have this huge party planned for the 4th of July (American Independence Day). I looked at my wife just now and said, “The 4th is on Friday this year.” She said, “I know.”I said, “And what can we NOT do on Fridays”. So can we/do we need to get permission from our Priest?Do national holidays supersede days of abstinence?

MonkeyKing\_1 (10): The rule in the "old" canon law of 1917 (valid until 1983) stated:>On Sundays or feasts \*\*of precept\*\*, the law of abstinence \[...\] ceases (c. 1252 §4 CIC/1917 = Code of Canon Law)Which feasts of precept are there in the 1917 Code? => 1247 §1 CIC/1917:>Feast days under precept in the whole Church are only: All and every Sunday, the feast of the Nativity, Circumcision, Epiphany, Ascension, and the most holy Body of Christ, the Immaculate Conception, and Assumption of Mary the Mother of God, of Saint Joseph her spouse, of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and of All the Saints.This answers your question: National holidays \*\*do not\*\* suspend the law of abstinence.It is therefore necessary to ask for a dispensation (which the priest can grant, but is not obligated to grant). However, even in pre-conciliar times, it was customary for a diocesan bishop to grant a dispensation to the entire diocese if July 4th was a Friday.

dbaughmen (4): This would normally, before V2, require a dispensation of a local ordinary of a diocese.

# Post 147: SSPX Mass outside SSSPX chapels?

Author: Mailemanuel77
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Comments: 9

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1llxc17/sspx\_mass\_outside\_ssspx\_chapels/

Given it's canonical status can the SSPX celebrate Mass outside their chapels, or does it need special permission from the bishop. For example, if I wanted to celebrate a TLM wedding at the Cathedral, would it be allowed that SSPX priest celebrate the Mass instead of the parish priest?

Internal\_Ad1735 (11): Yes, it happens all the time. Just in my region (Quebec), the SSPX will celebrate Mass at the [Basilica of Sainte-Anne-de-Beaupré](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Basilica\_of\_Sainte-Anne-de-Beaupr%C3%A9) on August 2. And on September 27, Mgr Fellay will celebrate a Pontifical High Mass at the [Shrine of the Canadian Martyrs](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shrine\_of\_the\_Canadian\_Martyrs). Every year, they celebrate Mass at the [Basilica of Notre-Dame-du-Cap](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Notre-Dame-du-Cap\_Basilica) and last year Mgr Fellay celebrated Mass at the [Saint Joseph's Oratory](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saint\_Joseph%27s\_Oratory) after a procession throughout the city.SSPX priests will, most notably, celebrate Mass in the papal basilicas in Rome in the upcoming pilgrimage of the Jubilee Year.

Mailemanuel77 (5): Awesome. I'm from Latin America and it saddens me to see no reverent Mass from historical churches, it's such a shame that such beautiful parishes do not celebrate a reverent Mass, I know it's not about the building, but these buildings were built for one purpose, if these buildings were meant for Novus Ordo then these churches would be no different than the thousands of evangelical churches with not appeal in particular. I really appreciate architecture but it saddens me to not have a reverent Mass, while conservative reverent NO groups and TLM buildings are small chapels and oratories which are very warm, but it would be better if the ambience and reverence was widely available for all the Catholic population.

TwoWeimsAZ (4): I just attended an SSPX Mass in the Basilica of St. Sebastian in Rome.

ardaduck (3): For the yearly silent procession SSPX uses the FSSP church in Amsterdam.

dbaughmen (5): As a Latin American myself, I know how difficult it is to see the faith so sucked dry in our countries. It is the region which has been struck the most by V2, modernism and masonry

Mailemanuel77 (3): Americans are fortunate to have traditionalist groups, here no one seems to care, even the so called conservative are too focused on supporting hypocrite corrupt elites that clearly contradict Catholic social teaching but don't seem to care about Faith at all.

merinw (2): It is not evenly distributed in the US. We are four hours away from an SSPX church and it greatly saddens me. Every week.

Internal\_Ad1735 (3): If we count FSSP, ICKSP, Institute of Good Shepherd, and diocesan TLMs, basically every major and medium-sized city in the US has at least one TLM church. We can't say the same about Latin America.

merinw (2): Not our part of TX.

# Post 148: Mass of Paul VI vs. Mass of the Ages

Author: DravidianPrototyper

Score: 50

Comments: 8

URL: https://i.redd.it/5wn14ioh6g9f1.jpeg

The costs in tailoring the liturgical vernacular to that of modern men, among other detriments.

Christ\_is\_\_risen (8): The changes made to the mass are of the devil.

No-Entrepreneur4791 (7): A good rule of thumb for ancient churches is to not make there mass protistant the second the world starts to change. Huh maybe the church should stay the same and not change anything major or anything that literally contradicts past church teachings.

merinw (4): I converted because I was exposed to the traditional Mass. Truly transcendent. Now I live where the closest traditional Mass is 4 hours away. It breaks my heart. At communion, our parish sings a Randy Scruggs country western song, “Lord, Prepare Me.” I cringe every week it is so disrespectful.

Next-Antelope-5887 (2): Well, you still got Santa Claus.

DravidianPrototyper (3): It was authored/innovated by an alleged crypto-Freemason (Annibale Bugnini); Freemasons, who are acolytes of Satan himself.

ourladyofcovadonga (2): 🤣

DravidianPrototyper (2): I'm very sorry to hear that and my heart goes out to you, friend.Have you considered watching live streams of the TLM online to make up for the lacklustre Novus Ordo Mass you attend on Sunday so as to keep your obligation? Sure, you won't be able to partake of Our Lord's Body and Blood online, but at least the rest of Mass can be more than made up for.

Christ\_is\_\_risen (2): Bugnini is absolutely a freemason. He had been destroying the mass since Pius XII.

# Post 149: New Mods needed

Author: Good\_Common3802
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Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1lkcjmv/new\_mods\_needed/

My first post here but ive seen lots of posts on the subreddit that allign with the beliefs of the sspx. I dont know why these posts are still up. Also lots of stupid questions are being asked that should have never been accepted. Thanks

Piklikl (7): Okay I know I’m not the most active person in the world but I think you’re being ridiculous. The most recent questions in the sub are quite alright I think, and I’ve removed a lot of the trolls. There’s also no “acceptance” of questions and people can post whatever they want, get off your high horse and remember that instructing the ignorant is a corporal work of mercy.Of course I know this yet another dummy account created to try and take over a fairly inactive sub, good luck with that.

Willsxyz (6): > ive seen lots of posts on the subreddit that allign with the beliefs of the sspx.I don’t see the problem with that. I would expect that people posting here would agree with the SSPX. Or maybe I don’t understand what you’re trying to say.

No-Test6158 (2): >Also lots of stupid questions are being asked that should have never been accepted. Thanks Oh you sweet summer child - don't go to the main Catholic sub, or the "Askapriest" one either!

dbaughmen (2): Most our mods are probably inactive

Blade\_of\_Boniface (4): In my opinion, the level of moderation should be proportionate to the size of the subreddit. It makes sense for a <2,000 sub to leave newbie questions up.

Piklikl (3): And even then my intuition is that a redditor interested in the SSPX probably isn’t super familiar with reddit anyway, so I’m find with erring on the side of too many newbie questions (of course I should do due diligence and ensure that it’s a genuine newbie and not a troll).

# Post 150: What is the Church's teaching/interpretation in the distinctions between apostles and prophets?

Author: DravidianPrototyper
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Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1leb4fh/what\_is\_the\_churchs\_teachinginterpretation\_in\_the/

Aside from the obvious - that being that the apostles were charged with the duty/obligation by Our Lord to build up the Church He instituted, and prophets, well, prophesy against the iniquities committed by ancient Israel and of the coming of the Saviour, has the Church ever clearly defined as to what the distinctive duties are between the two offices?

Blade\_of\_Boniface (3): Both are integral to the Universal Church as a whole, before and after the Incarnation. We don't believe the Old Testament is lesser than the New anymore than the present has any intrinsic superiority to the past. The main difference is that the current Israel isn't a person, geographic location, or bloodline, it's the global society of Believers in Communion with the Church.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (2): There is crossover. St. John the Divine was both. Apostles are usually associated with direct contact with Jesus during His time on Earth and the "bishop" status that the Apostles had, which is why St. Paul was considered an Apostle. Prophets are all over the time-line with saints after the Apostolic age who received visions that came true considered "Prophets".Some good examples include the saints involved in the Great Monarch and Three Days' Darkness prophecies.

# Post 151: The Mass of All time

Author: alejosoyyo
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Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1le7p4j/the\_mass\_of\_all\_time/

Hi guys, I have a question for people who know about liturgy or history: why is the TLM called the mass of all time as if the latin rite were the only rite that the Catholic Church has? Rites like coptic or maronite are also present today, so why some people refer to the latin rite in this term? I am asking this from my mere ignorance as I don’t know which rite is more ancient for example, or if other rites have also had changes from Vatican II.

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (7): Well yes other rites have had some influences after Vatican 2 but that’s not important. Define the “Mass of All Time” as the theology of the Mass taught by the apostles, which not only includes the Roman Rite, but the Byzantine Rite as well for example.The Novus Ordo does not fit in this category since its understanding of what Mass is differs greatly from every ancient rite of the Catholic Church.

kawaqcosta (4): It is called this for two reasons: one referring to the \*past\* and the other to the \*future\*.1st Like all, or most, legitimately Catholic rites, it has an apostolic origin and has developed organically over the centuries. In addition, it enjoys special divine assistance, in comparison to other rites, because it was preserved in the Church of Rome, the See of the blessed apostle Peter. A See that has always inviolably preserved the dogma of the faith.2nd It is argued that the Roman Rite must always be preserved in its integrity, without substantial modifications as occurred in 1969. In other words, a radical reform of a centuries-old rite of the Catholic Church is illegitimate. The bull \*Quo Primum Tempore\* is often used to support this claim.Thus, the Mass is called the "Mass of all time", because it \*has always\* been this way and always \*must be\*.

ourladyofcovadonga (2): Lefebvre said that we merely tolerate the eastern rites. I don't know what he meant by that and there was no additional context in the text.

No-Test6158 (2): The oldest rite in the church is probably the Antiochene rite - which is dated to around the 3rd century AD. We find that there are many things in this that are common across the Eastern and Western rites, such as the mass of the catechumens who were dismissed, an offertory, an epiclesis (laying on of hands - Hanc igitur in the Latin rite) and distribution of communion.The Roman Rite naturally \*evolved\* from this, in the same way that the Eastern Rites \*evolved\* - bits were added that enhanced it and to which suited the cultures it was part of. It was formally codified in this period from the 3rd century through to the 16th, when Pius V finally issued the definitive edition with the Papal Bull - \*Quo Primum\*. It's worth remembering that prior to this, the Roman Rite was not at all uniform across the west. There were lots of regional variations. Where I am from, we had the use of Sarum, the use of York, the use of Durham and the various monastic and religious rites - but there was a lot of commonality - and the Anaphora (the canon - or "Eucharistic Prayer" to use a modern term...) was consistent to all of them.The Eastern churches that reconciled with Rome were encouraged to gently conform their liturgy with the Latin forms. But they had a lot of practices that were alien to the Roman Rite, not least, the use of Coptic, Slavonic, Syriac and Greek instead of Latin.In the wake of the 2nd Vatican Council, the Eastern Catholic churches were encouraged to change their liturgy too, in the spirit of the Romans. They encouraged more lay participation - prior to this, the Eastern rite was clearly divided into the laity and the clergy, and the use of vernacular language was encouraged away from the use of either Latin or the various liturgical languages of the East.The church is not divided into East and West - they can be considered two sides of the same body. Lungs if you will, from which the breath of the faith (the \*spiritus\* or \*πνεύμα\*) comes forth.There were many Eastern Catholics who were unhappy - they formed the Society of St Josephat Kuntsevych who are affiliated with the SSPX.So in short, yes, short hand is the Mass of All Time to refer to the Tridentine Mass, simply because, it's the most commonly celebrated rite within the traditionalist movement. But there are other traditional liturgies available.As a slight aside, I will add that the Eastern Orthodox are not immune to these types of splits. The Old Believers emerged in the Russian Orthodox church in the 17th century, in response to the reforms made by the then Patriarch of Moscow, Nikon. The old believers persist in their practice to this day, despite being anathemised.

SnowWhiteFeather (1): I would also add that a priests right to practice it is also ensured.

# Post 152: What version of the Roman Missal does the SSPX use for its Latin Masses?

Author: Economy-Gene-1484
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ldx7ul/what\_version\_of\_the\_roman\_missal\_does\_the\_sspx/

I know that authorized Latin Masses in the Catholic Church are celebrated according to the 1962 Missal and the 2002 Missal, and the FSSP can use the pre-1955 liturgy only for Holy Week. But for the canonically irregular SSPX, which version of the Roman Missal is generally used? For regular Sunday Masses, for Holy Week, and for weddings?

Breifne21 (12): 1962

Pizza527 (3): I thought they used the Fr.Lasance

dbaughmen (6): This is a long controversy in the SSPX, they use the 1962 missal to favour the Vatican. As Abp Lefebvre said to the American priests that the Vatican would never reconcile with them or accept them with the pre-55, as at the time the only ones using the pre-55 were the Americans. On very very few occasions they use pre-55 holy week, but in secret. There are many problems with the 62, and the SSPX knows and accepts this, but has never done anything about it.

No-Test6158 (2): This is what spurred the nine to leave the SSPX after a meeting at Oyster Bay Cove, NY in 1983. They were not happy with Abp Lefebvre's acceptance of the 62 Missal or his tolerance of the second Vatican council. For reference, the position of the SSPX is that the second Vatican council is valid and binding in about 90% of its texts - it's just that the 10% is particularly egregious in how it affects the faith (recommend reading \*They Have Uncrowned Him - Abp Lefebvre\* for full details).The 55 revisions were the first dip in the water for the ultimate revisions of the Mass. Many Catholics at the time were completely unaware and it really empowered Fr Bugnini to be able to push on with his more radical reforms. But the fruits of the rebellious nine became clear, as they were soon suckered into open Sedevacantism and left the Society.I cannot deny their faith and for me, I prefer the pre-55 ceremonials. The hand Missal I use was published in 1960 which is a bit of a weird middle ground between 55 and 62. It has both the pre-55 and post-55 Holy Week and the name of St Joseph is not included in the canon. But, we are called to be obedient to Rome to a point. We cannot accept heresy but as the 62 Missal is generally in conformity with Roman Catholic tradition, it remains acceptable to use.So, if I could find a group that was both obedient to the Holy See and also followed the 54 Missal, I'd jump on it, but the SSPX holds a very great position in terms of Roman Catholic tradition.And to add to this, I recently spoke with a fairly senior priest within the society who said that the 54 Missal remained on the table, but was a goal of the Society once they had managed to get the main church to return to more normal Traditions. But we still have a long way to go. Bishop Fellay said it, in a sermon some years ago, that the traditional movement is like a seedling in the early spring. If it grows too fast and too quickly without putting down solid roots, then a frost will come and kill it, so great care must be taken in how we proceed. But Our Lord will triumph in the end!

Highwayman90 (2): I believe the 1962 is used because the SSPX considers it to be the last legitimate form of the Roman Rite.Someone please correct me if I'm wrong about the rationale: that's just what I have heard.

ExpertSalesCopy (1): There's no controversy; the SSPX uses the 1962 in all chapels in every country.

Internal\_Ad1735 (1): 2002 Missal is not the Latin Mass. It is the Novus Ordo. The last edition of the Missal before Vatican II was 1962. Sedevacantists use the pre-1955 liturgy. SSPX, FSSP, ICKSP, and all other Latin Mass communities in communion with the Pope use the 1962 Missal.

realdenvercoder (4): Some PEOPLE use the Fr. Lasance as hand missals.

None (7): [deleted]

Trengingigan (2): What are the problems with the 1962 Missal? I’m trying to learn more about the subject.

ourladyofcovadonga (2): Lefebvre claimed that the '62, although reduced in quality from the '55, at least did not harm the faith. Since he did not have a schismatic mentality, he obeyed the will of the Church authority to use the '62 and the society still uses it today. Many priests admit the older version is better.

Pizza527 (3): What do the non-people use lol. I’m guessing you meant SOME people use it. So it’s not a hard and fast requirement I guess?

dbaughmen (3): The adding of St Joseph to the canon was a slap in the face to Catholic Tradition. This topic had been debated since the Roman Canon came out 1000 years before. The intention to which this was done, and in the specific place where it was destroys the untouched Sacred Canon

asimovsdog (1): https://www.restorethe54.com/

realdenvercoder (3): I just meant they don’t use it for mass but a lot of people have it. I would say at St. Isidore I mostly see the 1962 but there are maybe 30% have the 1945

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (3): What exactly is the problem with adding St. Joseph?

dbaughmen (5): Adding the canon was disturbing the peace of the 1000 year old untouched Tradition of \*\*only martyrs\*\* in the canon. This was done as a give-in to modernists.

Willsxyz (6): The problem is not with Saint Joseph himself, but rather with the fact that adding Saint Joseph was done by Fr. Bugnini to see if he could get away with changing the canon of the mass. When he saw that he could get away with it, all bets were off and just a few years later, the entire traditional mass was destroyed.

seeking\_0333 (2): It doesn’t really matter though does it? This is a silly reason to not want the 62 missal. Much bigger fish to fry out there.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (2): Has there ever been a compilation of evidence of Bugnini's actions and any real concerted effort to undo all that he did? I know it wouldn't solve everything, but why hasn't there been a real effort or movement targeting what he did, specifically? Why isn't social media spreading at least a hashtag (I'm half joking, but it's a good example) that says #UndoBugnini or something to that extent?

Economy-Gene-1484 (2): While he was in Iran, Archbishop Bugnini himself wrote a very long book in Italian explaining and justifying all the liturgical changes. Published after his death, the book has been translated into English and is entitled \*The Reform of the Liturgy, 1948-1975\*. Another participant of the Council, Louis Bouyer, offers a different perspective on the same events in his memoirs.

# Post 153: "The true renewal of the Church comes from within - from renewal of the clergy first." - Saint Gregory Barbarigo, Cardinal Bishop of Padua (1625 - 1697)

Author: Duibhlinn
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URL: https://x.com/TempusFugit4016/status/1934803103611490643

# Post 154: Michigan bishop allows Latin Mass to continue after it was set to end due to Pope Francis: the Traditional Latin Mass in the Diocese of Saginaw was set to end on June 13 due to Traditionis Custodes | Emily Mangiaracina for LifeSiteNews

Author: Duibhlinn
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Comments: 1

URL: https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/michigan-bishop-allows-latin-mass-to-continue-after-it-was-set-to-end-due-to-pope-francis/

No\_Construction5455 (1): Good on him, Praise GOD!

# Post 155: Just wanted to share a relic cross i bought from antique shop (after consulting a priest) that contains both 1st and 2nd class relics. It will be a gift for a friend who is getting ordained this year.

Author: Murky\_Question\_9362
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Comments: 9

URL: https://www.reddit.com/gallery/1lcn57f

MonkeyKing\_1 (8): This is a very appropriate and beautiful gift. St. Agnes is also mentioned in the canon at every Holy Mass.

LittleAlternative532 (3): Would love to buy some relic items. Is there any place specific online I could look?

alejosoyyo (1): Isn’t buying a relic simony?

Murky\_Question\_9362 (3): I bought it out of care and because I didn't want it to get in the wrong person's hands but laypeople shouldn't be in possession of such stuff.

No-Test6158 (1): Fluminalis has a large collection of items recovered from many churches in Europehttps://www.fluminalis.com/inventory/reliquary-relicsYou will need to contact them though. Just for reference, it \*\*is\*\* sinful to make a profit from the sale of relics (or any other religious item for that matter) so exercise prudence and care.

CincyGuy2025 (2): It's more like paying a ransom to get it back

Jerailu (1): Yes it is but if you have a choice between buying this or it falling into the wrong hands that's bad.

ExpertSalesCopy (1): Think of it as buying the cross and as a double effect, saving the relic.

Jerailu (1): Laypeople can be in possession of relics, it was very common in the XIXth century, but you need an explicit authorization from a higher up.I know a guy who asked his bishop who then had to asked the Holy See and his possession is treated as him being the "custodes" of the relics so he regularly transport them to poor parishes in order for the locals to venerate them.

# Post 156: Is the SSPX in crisis, with reconciling with Rome? All these folks like Kennedy hall and Taylor Marshall are wanting to prove there in full communion and wishing full communion? This is not what Lefebrve wanted.

Author: ComparisonRoutine359
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1lcf9kn/is\_the\_sspx\_in\_crisis\_with\_reconciling\_with\_rome/

CV-CR-CI (11): No. The SSPX is likened to a life raft on a sinking ship. Not ideal, but necessary for survival. Lefebrve providentially saw the signs of the coming changes and made the choice to preserve the sacraments & priesthood no matter the cost.

SnowWhiteFeather (10): If you are going to make substantial claims you need to have substantial evidence. The SSPX position is well documented and reasoned.If you are confused you should ask a question. If you have a contrary opinion you should make an argument.

kawaqcosta (2): [The SSPX and the Conversion of Rome to Tradition | FSSPX News](https://fsspx.news/en/news/sspx-and-conversion-rome-tradition-17117)

luke-jr (2): If you're willfully not in full communion with Rome, you are heading to Hell period.+Lefebvre was just a man, not even a pope. But he certainly never wanted to break with Rome

asimovsdog (1): There is substantial evidence, see https://drbo.org/sspx.htm and the [List of 101+ compromises of the SSPX](https://www.cathinfo.com/c.html)

Straight-Rice5563 (1): Do you think the SSPX is about to be in full communion with Rome?

ComparisonRoutine359 (-9): I’m worried that the SSPX is reconciling

ComparisonRoutine359 (-1): He said Rome was apostates and not to communicate with them

SnowWhiteFeather (3): That question doesn't make sense. Do you know what communion is?

Straight-Rice5563 (3): What makes you think that SSPX is about to be in full communion with Rome?

luke-jr (2): I think you're taking something out of context... But even if he truly did want to break with Rome and never repented, it would mean he's damned. He's not God

Straight-Rice5563 (1): Yes...okay, you know what I mean. I think I meant to say official canonical standing. Do you think this happens, how soon?

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (10): They have always had full communion. Irregular administration from necessity.Rome needs to expel its Modernists yo comr into full communion with Tradition.

ComparisonRoutine359 (-2): Just the biggest SSPX YouTubers desire “full” communion with them

ComparisonRoutine359 (0): Have you never read his books? Or even the titles? One of the books is named “They have uncrowned him” indicating these apostates have uncrowned Christ.

SnowWhiteFeather (1): That wasn't what I meant. The SSPX is in Communion.

rathdrummob (-1): Communion with the Catholic Church would necessarily mean that they submit to the authority of the Catholic church. Until they do that, or receive some canonical status, (which would be the same thing, a filial submission), they operate outside of the visible church. It isn’t really a nuanced point. They hold the faith, and have valid orders, etc., but they do not submit to any legitimate authority. And sadly for them, that submission is necessary for communion.

mineuserbane (-1): It is irregular communion. If the SSPX has full communion, these words of Benedict XVI would not make sense. "In order to make this clear once again: until the doctrinal questions are clarified, the Society has no canonical status in the Church, and its ministers – even though they have been freed of the ecclesiastical penalty – do not legitimately exercise any ministry in the Church.In light of this situation, it is my intention henceforth to join the Pontifical Commission "Ecclesia Dei" – the body which has been competent since 1988 for those communities and persons who, coming from the Society of Saint Pius X or from similar groups, wish to return to full communion with the Pope – to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. This will make it clear that the problems now to be addressed are essentially doctrinal in nature and concern primarily the acceptance of the Second Vatican Council and the post-conciliar magisterium of the Popes."Benedict XVI - March 10, 2009.

ComparisonRoutine359 (-6): People are now desiring full communion with the modernist

Straight-Rice5563 (2): I had this one woman I was trying to date tell me SSPX was in full communion with Rome and not to be repainting lies. And this was a very intelligent woman with a graduate degree.

luke-jr (0): +Lefevbre would certainly be a sedevacantist if he were alive today

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (2): Obedience to any authority assumes that the authority itself is subject to God's truth. The SSPX upholds the Catholic Church's true teachings.Obeying a hierarchy that is, perhaps unwittingly, acting contrary to Christ's will, isn't true obedience.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): No. It's full communion but irregular administration.Excommunication can only be lifted if the guilty party repents. The SSPX repented of nothing because they have nothing that needs repenting.Pope Benedict acknowledged that the Excommunication wasn't valid. Which is what he argued as Cardinal Ratzinger.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (5): Communion with the heresy or just regularization of the administrative issues?

ComparisonRoutine359 (-1): Lefebrve desired not to have communication with them

ComparisonRoutine359 (-1): He probably would

mineuserbane (1): You are mistaken on this. Read the words of Benedict XVI. They immediately precede the quote above from the same letter: "Another mistake, which I deeply regret, is the fact that the extent and limits of the provision of 21 January 2009 were not clearly and adequately explained at the moment of its publication. The excommunication affects individuals, not institutions. An episcopal ordination lacking a pontifical mandate raises the danger of a schism, since it jeopardizes the unity of the College of Bishops with the Pope. Consequently the Church must react by employing her most severe punishment – excommunication – with the aim of calling those thus punished to repent and to return to unity. Twenty years after the ordinations, this goal has sadly not yet been attained. The remission of the excommunication has the same aim as that of the punishment: namely, to invite the four Bishops once more to return. This gesture was possible once the interested parties had expressed their recognition in principle of the Pope and his authority as Pastor, albeit with some reservations in the area of obedience to his doctrinal authority and to the authority of the Council. Here I return to the distinction between individuals and institutions. The remission of the excommunication was a measure taken in the field of ecclesiastical discipline: the individuals were freed from the burden of conscience constituted by the most serious of ecclesiastical penalties. This disciplinary level needs to be distinguished from the doctrinal level. The fact that the Society of Saint Pius X does not possess a canonical status in the Church is not, in the end, based on disciplinary but on doctrinal reasons. As long as the Society does not have a canonical status in the Church, its ministers do not exercise legitimate ministries in the Church. There needs to be a distinction, then, between the disciplinary level, which deals with individuals as such, and the doctrinal level, at which ministry and institution are involved. In order to make this clear once again: until the doctrinal questions are clarified, the Society has no canonical status in the Church, and its ministers – even though they have been freed of the ecclesiastical penalty – do not legitimately exercise any ministry in the Church."He makes it clear that the lifting of excommunication was a move of mercy, not an indication that the Vatican was wrong. Don't take his olive branch as something else.

ComparisonRoutine359 (0): Dr Taylor Marshall said, he wants Leo to write down, SSPX are in full communion. And the problems will be solved

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): Pope Benedict said what he needed to in order to keep the Modernists happy, but he did effectively undo the mistake of thr Vatican in 1988.Schism can only apply when the conditions of separation and establishment of a parallel hierarchy are both met by any group. The SSPX did not commit either action.You don't lift penalties out of mercy, but he likely had to make it look like that for the sake of satisfying the Modernists.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (4): It'll help the rest of the Church for the authorities to admit that the SSPX did nothing wrong and has always been in gull communion.Don't you think so?

ComparisonRoutine359 (1): Accept it man… the SSPX isn’t the same..

mineuserbane (1): The Bishops were not excommunicated for schism. They were excommunicated for violation of Canon 1382 (1387 current edition):"Canon 1382. A bishop who consecrates some one a bishop without a pontifical mandate and the person who receives the consecration from him incur a latae sententiae excommunication reserved to the Apostolic See."This was clearly violated. The Pope has the authority to lift the excommunications for whatever reason he sees fit, at any time. Benedict XVI clearly acted out of mercy for the Bishops in response to their appeal. His stated desire was to prevent further separation, not to indicate that they operate licitly or that the prior decision was a mistake. You are inventing a rational to fit your view of the world, not seeing it for the way it is. Benedict XVI's words contradict your views.

ComparisonRoutine359 (-1): This wasn’t lefebrves intention to be recognised by apostate authorities

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): It has had the same plan and taken the same actions it always has. Rome has approached, made promises and did last moment bait and switches.And every time, there are people watching, insisting the SSPX will sell out and they still haven't.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): But we go by the spirit of the law, not the word of the law. That Canon was written in response to the Chinese Communist Party government consecrating bishops for their "Chinese Patriotic Catholic Association" which is a schismatic Catholic Church run by the CCP.The intention the Canon was to avoid schismatic groups from forming, not to allow the Modernists to control traditionalist groups. We are not legalists. And it's as Christ did when the High Priests accused Him of "working miracles on the Sabbath". Jesus broke the letter of the law without violating the spirit of the law.Doing the will of Christ is supposed to be the ultimate end of law, not be detrimental to serving Him.It's interesting to note that Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre asked for a Canon Law trial and the Vatican refused knowing he'd win.

Willsxyz (3): I don’t think Archbishop Lefebvre would have minded at all if the Holy See had just said: You’re good. Go right ahead with what you are doing. We’re cool with it, without making any demands of him.What he refused to do was compromise the faith in order to gain approval, which is what he kept being asked to do.

mineuserbane (1): >But we go by the spirit of the law, not the word of the law.We? Who is we? The word of the law was directed at Lefebvre by the Pontiff himself who said it applied. >Doing the will of Christ is supposed to be the ultimate end of law, not be detrimental to serving Him.We are called to obey his Vicar on earth. Even Christ obeyed his earthly superiors. Regardless of how any of us feel about it, Lefebvre disobeyed and violated Canon Law. The Pope declared him to be excommunicated for it. >It's interesting to note that Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre asked for a Canon Law trial and the Vatican refused knowing he'd win.You can't appeal higher than the Pope. A Canon Law trial would have done no good after the Pope has spoken. You cannot be sentenced by a King and appeal to a magistrate.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): Right. Pope Benedict didn't lift the excommunications, he clarified that the SSPX wasn't excommunicationed to begin with

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): No. It was the head of the Congregation for Bishops who made that call. JP2 just delegated the task to him and trusted he made the right call. JP2 wasn't a scholarly man. He's a Saint for his personal piety, nit his administration of the Church, which wasn't so great. It's why Pope Benedict did what he did, he knew the wrong call got made when he was still Cardinal Ratzinger.The Apostles rebuked St. Peter when he was wrong. They didn't "unPope" him and they weren't wrong to rebuke him.The Pope doesn't just do as he pleases. Even he has rules he can't break. St. Robert Bellarmine pointed out that if a Pope made a decision that was unjust, it was null and void.

ComparisonRoutine359 (1): The SSPX itself say there was a “lifting”

mineuserbane (1): >No. It was the head of the Congregation for Bishops who made that call."In itself, this act was one of disobedience to the Roman Pontiff in a very grave matter and of supreme importance for the unity of the church, such as is the ordination of bishops whereby the apostolic succession is sacramentally perpetuated. Hence such disobedience - which implies in practice the rejection of the Roman primacy - constitutes a schismatic act.(3) In performing such an act, notwithstanding the formal canonical warning sent to them by the Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation for Bishops on 17 June last, Mons. Lefebvre and the priests Bernard Fellay, Bernard Tissier de Mallerais, Richard Williamson and Alfonso de Galarreta, have incurred the grave penalty of excommunication envisaged by ecclesiastical law."Signed by JPII himself, July 2nd, 1988 in [ECCLESIA DEI](https://web.archive.org/web/20150129194411/https://www.vatican.va/holy\_father/john\_paul\_ii/motu\_proprio/documents/hf\_jp-ii\_motu-proprio\_02071988\_ecclesia-dei\_en.html). >The Pope doesn't just do as he pleases. Even he has rules he can't break. St. Robert Bellarmine pointed out that if a Pope made a decision that was unjust, it was null and void.You are treading on very thin ice here regarding Catholic teaching on papal infallibility and jurisdiction. Bellarmine also said that no one is able to judge a Pope. You can argue how you disagree with the excommunications, but not that they occurred. "So, then,if anyone says thatthe Roman pontiff has merely an office of supervision and guidance, andnot the full and supreme power ofjurisdictionover the whole church, and thisnot only in matters offaith and morals, but also in those which concern thediscipline and governmentof the church dispersed throughout the whole world; or thathe has only the principal part, but not theabsolute fullness, of this supreme power; or thatthis power of his is notordinary and immediateboth over all and each of thechurchesand over all and each of thepastorsandfaithful:let him beanathema." Vatican I - July 18th, 1870.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): Doesn't matter. They always argued from the standpoint of necessity for the consecrations of 88.

ComparisonRoutine359 (1): Now they build modernist style churches, matrimonies by Novus ordo priests etc

# Post 157: 'Tis the season to reject/rebuke heretical misconceptions about Pentecost and the gift of tongues

Author: DravidianPrototyper
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URL: https://i.redd.it/pqwqwkvovr6f1.jpeg

'Tis the season to reject and rebuke neo-Montanists/Albigensianists who have a hint of Adoptionism ("Baptism in the Holy Spirit", as if that wasn't the case when one partakes in the Sacrament of Baptism) in them as well.

Duibhlinn (10): Please don't post AI slop to this sub

dulcissimabellatrix (7): 'Tis also the season to reject AI images

Highwayman90 (2): Speaking in tongues per se is not heresy. However, my understanding is that it typically is a gift of REAL HUMAN languages for the purposes of evangelization.I'm definitely skeptical of any weird personality cults that emerge with a thin patina of "Catholicism" though.

Jerailu (1): Please do not use AI to depict Our Lord.

# Post 158: Letter from Archbishop Weisenburger regarding the celebration of the traditional Latin Mass in the Archdiocese of Detroit

Author: Duibhlinn
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URL: https://www.aod.org/announcements-newsroom/newsroom/2025/june/letter-from-archbishop-weisenburger-regarding-the-celebration-of-the-traditional-latin-mass

# Post 159: The Dangers of Sedevacantism - SSPX Sermons

Author: Duibhlinn
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URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tktlEwHFQAk

# Post 160: Bishop Martin is out of touch | Jayd Henricks for First Things
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URL: https://firstthings.com/bishop-martin-is-out-of-touch/

# Post 161: SSPX Initiation Sacraments?

Author: Mailemanuel77
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1l8j88g/sspx\_initiation\_sacraments/

Are the SSPX initation sacraments universally recognized in case I would like to receive ordination or matrimony outside the SSPX?

Piklikl (5): The SSPX has never been questioned when it comes to Baptism and Confirmation as they exclusively use the old rites that leave no room for doubt. Post V2 administration of those sacraments require investigation because the ministers of those sacraments take extreme liberties with the matter and form.

Mailemanuel77 (2): Thanks, so there wouldn't be any problem regarding the legal aspect?

craft00n (2): To my knowledge, no.

# Post 162: Father John Zuhlsdorf on the Talmudic origin of the Novus Ordo offertory prayers
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# Post 163: The twilight of French Catholicism | FSSPX News
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# Post 164: Visited SSPX Parish on Pentecost Sunday...
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Hi, everyone!I hope everyone is having a blessed Sunday, and Happy Feast of Pentecost!Just wanted to share my experience with Christ the King Priory ran by SSPX in Langley, British Columbia. It was my second in total, and my first proper visit.The first time I was confused , and I had to leave early because I was a bit under the weather and I had to see my friend who I haven't seen for five years...Anyways...I loved the community! Today, I saw a pious priest, God loving, friendly folks around.Very friendly! Got to know a few of them. I felt the Mass and the Sermon were straight to the point. Real and raw. And that is what I have been missing.I am not new to the Tridentine Mass, but the SSPX made me feel like I was at home I really needed.Looking forward to attending more Masses out there!Cheers!

dbaughmen (3): Deo Gratias! God bless you!

# Post 165: Record 19,000 young Catholics to walk Paris-Chartres pilgrimage amid Vatican scrutiny | Bénédicte Cedergren for Catholic News Agency
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Piklikl (4): The SSPX does this pilgrimage, but after the Episcopal consecrations the company that arranges the Paris to Chartres route wouldn’t let them participate so the SSPX has been walking the opposite direction ever since (Chartres to Paris). I’ve been 3 times, I highly recommend everyone go at least once!

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (2): Just finished it. Wonderful time.

# Post 166: Pope Leo XIV faces an early challenge: how to deal With Pope Francis’ restrictions on the Latin Mass. Several options are available to the Holy Father, who has pledged to heal divisions and build bridges within the Church. | National Catholic Register
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URL: https://www.ncregister.com/news/pope-leo-xiv-faces-an-early-challenge-related-to-the-old-mass
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If you don’t properly adhere to a fast on a fasting day, is that considered a mortal sin?

No-Test6158 (2): It depends on your motivation for not adhering to the fast.If it was an error (you forgot) or you went to a friend's house and they served you meat, not knowing you were fasting, then no, it would not be sinful to not abstain.However, if you, with full faculties and reason, chose to not abstain, then it would be sinful. In the examples above, if you went to your friend's house for a meal, fully knowing they were going to serve you meat, just so you could, then it would be sinful.As others have said, the society kinda keeps a position somewhere between the 1917 and 1983 CCL, so it's hard to pin down an exact position here. But, for ease of argument, let's assume that the society's position is aligned with Rome. Consult the CCL 1983 with respect to this - Canons 1244-1253.Ultimately, it is down to the local ordinary to decide what days are penitential. This would mean that, for priests of the society, this power rests with the Superior General.For the laity, it is your local bishop, or bishops' conference.

dbaughmen (1): The Society tends to flip flop on this. They give you an option to adhere to the 1917 code or Canon Law or the modernist one of 1983. If you follow the old law, it tends to be a sin, depending on the situation.

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (9): Even if what you’re saying is true, they are not doing anything wrong, they’re just being honest. Although it’s unfortunate what happened, it’s still within the competence of the Church to change fasting laws. Nobody is hung up on that problem. The SSPX is part of the Catholic Church so they have to listen when the faith isn’t compromised.OP, you may gain less out of fasting by following the code of 1983 but you don’t commit a sin by not adhering to the 1917 code, although it is recommended. And if you really want to gain something out of it try an even more aggressive fast if you’re comfortable with it.Edit; Turns out I’m right I think [Fasting Laws](https://sspx.org/en/fast-abstinence-rules-32623)

# Post 168: If you are a Latin Catholic who criticizes those who escape the banality of the NO by going to the SSPX, yet you yourself escape the banality of the NO by going to an Eastern Catholic parish, you are not only a hypocrite, but also a traitor to your culture and patrimony. | Avoiding Babylon

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 37

Comments: 10

URL: https://i.redd.it/npoiscnpla5f1.png

Numbainne47 (7): I absolutely agree. This tends to be especially common among mainstream Catholic YouTubers.

Murky\_Question\_9362 (1): LOUDER FOR THOSE IN THE BACK

NtGiL\_29 (0): Can we not take these guys seriously, please?

Blade\_of\_Boniface (0): "Traitor to your culture and patrimony" is a bit harsh but it's definitely hypocritical.

None (-2): [deleted]

Blade\_of\_Boniface (2): I don't pay much attention to YouTubers; is that a thing?

Highwayman90 (2): It's a bit of an exaggeration given that the Latin patrimony is disproportionately Italian in origin and other Western liturgical and spiritual traditions were exterminated.

Duibhlinn (2): You do realise that your post history is public, right? We can see everything. This is a post you recently made on r/ExTraditionalCatholic:# Reporting sect/cult trad activities to the authorities>Has anyone ever considered reporting the SSPX, Sedes, or ICKSP etc for illegal cult manipulation? I actually have, and am still considering it.[https://www.reddit.com/r/ExTraditionalCatholic/comments/1k9sjai/reporting\\_sectcult\\_trad\\_activities\\_to\\_the/](https://www.reddit.com/r/ExTraditionalCatholic/comments/1k9sjai/reporting\_sectcult\_trad\_activities\_to\_the/)

Duibhlinn (4): >exterminatedPlease be serious

Due\_Praline\_8538 (2): Thats eastern propaganda lol

AquinasDestiny (0): Sounds reasonable to me. Evil is evil.

# Post 169: Question on 4th commandment

Author: ComparisonRoutine359

Score: 2

Comments: 10

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1l3ebmd/question\_on\_4th\_commandment/

My parents are conservative, and I hold political beliefs contrary to them and I research it and have stuff on my phone and they would probably get mad if they found out about this stuff, but the political belief is not contrary to Catholicism and actually a natural response. Is it a sin?

hardeho (5): You don't have to believe what your parents believe, even in secular matters such as politics. The commandment is to honor them. Treat them with respect, grace/charity, and if you are underage or living with them, you are obliged to follow the rules of the household unless it contradicts the faith. If they don't want you to visit some political website, or hang some political banner for example, you would be obliged to obey. But you are not obliged to obey a command to think or feel differently than you do.

craft00n (1): I frequently have strong disagreements with my father on political, economic or religious issues with my father, who's a tradcath like me. The importance is remaining respectful in every conversation, with or about him.

ComparisonRoutine359 (1): but I can hold that belief still yes?

ComparisonRoutine359 (1): and they never told me directly just indirectly

WallachianLand (2): Yes

hardeho (1): It doesn't sound like a sin. Your aren't \\*doing\\* anything. You are holding beliefs that your parents wouldn't like, and I think that is way outside what the 4th commandment is covering.

ComparisonRoutine359 (1): WellI’m going into political things my parents would probably disapprove of

hardeho (1): Yes, you made that clear and I took that into account when I offered my first bit of advice which remains unchanged.

ComparisonRoutine359 (1): They never told me not too there just brainwashed to believe it’s bad

ComparisonRoutine359 (1): What if I keep what I’m doing private so it doesn’t cause clash, my dads basically has these beliefs but the world has corrupted this belief making it look bad

# Post 170: SSPX Podcast Crisis in the Church series episode 45: Are the new canonisations infallible? | Society of Saint Pius X

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 5

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UI9FVR2Dfbc

# Post 171: Do you think Pope Leo XIV will rescind TC?

Author: Christ\_is\_\_risen

Score: 12

Comments: 14

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1l2t0wv/do\_you\_think\_pope\_leo\_xiv\_will\_rescind\_tc/

ViveChristusRex (19): I remain optimistic that the restrictions will at least ease. I do not know if we will return to Summorum Pontificum, but Pope Leo might lessen the restrictions and place the decision in the hands of bishops. Like Dr. Taylor Marshall said, I think that—although it is important for TC to be rescinded—the best thing that Pope Leo XIV can do is to celebrate a Traditional Latin Mass, just a Low Mass on a weekday. This will show the world that there is nothing wrong with the TLM. Rumors even say that Cardinal Prevost privately said the Mass according to the 1962 rubric. However, only time will tell what will happen. The best we can do is pray.

Blade\_of\_Boniface (12): Considering how Novus Ordo parishes are only shrinking and declining more and more while the TLM continues to steadily (if not more rapidly) grow in many places, he has better reasons than ever. There are theologians and clergy who have gone on the record to declare SP a "failed experiment" and they believe TC is necessary to mitigate schism but this position is looking more and more untenable as time moves forward. The TLM has a major advantage; it stands and grows on its own merits. It's extropic; it highlights and emboldens the Christian intellects and wills.

asimovsdog (1): Who cares, this is the SSPX subreddit, not the FSSP one. We want to fix the doctrine, not just the Mass. And as long as Gaudium at Spes is not condemned, nothing is really "fixed". TC does not affect the SSPX because we understand that no pope has the authority to supress the Latin Mass and if Pope Francis said so, then well, we're just not going to obey, simple as.

Blade\_of\_Boniface (11): >Like Dr. Taylor Marshall said, I think that—although it is important for TC to be rescinded—the best thing that Pope Leo XIV can do is to celebrate a Traditional Latin Mass, just a Low Mass on a weekday. A lot of people, Catholic and otherwise, stereotype traditionalist communities as a bunch of extremists despite us being culturally/ideologically diverse. This has had a self-fulfilling effect of attracting bad faith actors. The more the TLM can be treated without some ingroup hangup, the better for the Church.

ViveChristusRex (14): I believe the quote (allegedly) from St. Augustine was “The truth is like a lion; you do not have to defend it. Let it loose; it will defend itself.”

Tasty-Ad6800 (1): What’s wrong with Gaudium et Spes?

Christ\_is\_\_risen (1): I care because a lot of people could get Latin Mass that they live close to and can attend.

No-Test6158 (6): >A lot of people... stereotype traditionalist communities as a bunch of extremistsThis is where the Resistance has been such a blessing in disguise. When I first started going to the society, about 10 years ago, there were some really toxic people floating around. When our district superior left the mainstream SSPX to join the resistance, these people left with him.The SSPX I attend now is now much more aligned to the Roman Catholic church I knew when I grew up. One formed of many people from many backgrounds who share One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Faith and it is much less a secret "club".I also think that TC had the side effect of stirring up waaaay more division than there ever needed to be and the restriction on advertising the TLM meant that once again it returned to its position as being a "special club" for the initiated followers.I honestly think, in the next few years, the mainstream church may start to look at the SSPX as a model for success and, God willing, will start to reflect some of the things that we do and will slowly start to, as the great Pope St Pius X said, \*"Restore all things in Christ."\*.

jrichpyramid (5): Exactly the TLM belongs to EVERYONE.

asimovsdog (3): > According to the almost unanimous opinion of \*\*believers\*\* and unbelievers alike, all things on earth should be related to \*\*man\*\* as their center and crown.>> -- [Gaudium et Spes 12](https://archive.is/jI78Q#selection-417.4-417.153)This sentence perfectly sums up the Newchurch and their New Mass. Heresy and blasphemy, as all things on earth should be related to God, not man. They put man in the place of God, that's the core of their entire theology. "If we glorify man first, then we also glorify God, because man is made in the image of God." - read Fr. Calderon, "Prometheus", he explains it better than I can.It's a shame how many SSPX parishioners have completely lost track of what the fight is about, it's not about the Mass, it's about the faith. The FSSP says that the above sentence is completely orthodox and can be interpreted in the light of tradition or whatever nonsense excuse. The SSPX is the SSPX because they reject any communion with people who sign off on this.

Tasty-Ad6800 (1): I'm not a theologian and will not pretend to be one. I think there is more to it than just taking one quote and associating it with an opinion. For example, "For Sacred Scripture teaches that man was created "to the image of God," is capable of knowing and loving his Creator, and was appointed by Him as master of all earthly creatures(1) that he might subdue them and use them to God's glory.(2) "What is man that you should care for him? You have made him little less than the angels, and crowned him with glory and honor. You have given him rule over the works of your hands, putting all things under his feet" (Ps. 8:5-7)."There is no doubt there is a new mass, but a new church? If you believe that, go ahead. "The SSPX is the SSPX because they reject any communion with people who sign off on this." - This is the operational definition of being in schism.

Christ\_is\_\_risen (1): The FSSP pretends to accept stuff like this, but there are some FSSP priests who are very traditional who even think Vatican II was not a real ecumenical Council, believe in absolutely no salvation outside the Catholic Church, etc...

asimovsdog (1): > I think there is more to it than just taking one quote and associating it with an opinion. It's not an opinion, it's their modus operandi for the past 60 years: It's an opinion when we're called out on it but if you don't sign it, we won't give you bishops and also you're in "schism".They teach this "opinion" as doctrinal truth and declare you to be in "schism" if you don't hold their opinion. They have doubled down on this quote for 60 years, at some point you have to say "this is their philosophy, this is not just a quote".> This is the operational definition of being in schism.First, please read [ST III](https://isidore.co/aquinas/summa/TP/TP082.html#TPQ82A9THEP1): "Whether one should take communion from heretical priests?" (short answer: no). We are not in communion with people who formally declare the heresy that everything on earth should serve man - even if they're not yet excommunicated, as they should be for their apostasy. We are Catholics, they are - at least formally - heretics.We are in schism from the Conciliar Church, not the Catholic Church. To "schism" means to cut yourself off (from tradition). Now, who cut himself off "the Church", they or us? Who invented a "New Mass", several "New Rites", a "New understanding of Tradition" - they or us? They were the ones who invented new, schismatic doctrine, a new, schismatic Mass, a new schismatic everything. We keep to the same, eternal faith. I think it's pretty evident who did the schism.Their error is to equate mans glory with Gods glory. Mans soul (not body) was created in the image of God, but it was created to worship and extend Gods glory, not to be worshipped himself. Man is most definitely not the center of everything on earth. Second, man is tainted by original sin, so he needs Christ as the redeemer to be able .> There is no doubt there is a new mass, but a new church? If you believe that, go ahead.Yes, they are a new "church":- A new philosophy centered on serving man- A new Hegelian understanding of Tradition (tradition now has to be constantly moving and changing and rock-n-rolling, otherwise it's a "dead, static tradition")- A new faith built on "religious experiences" (i.e. "faith" is now an experience, which explains their idiotic New Mass, to give people a good experience), which explains why there is now salvation in any religion- An ecumenist pope who prays together with Muslims- A new understanding of the priest being merely a "presider over a meal", not the Catholic understanding- An ecclesiology built on a co-governing Synodal Church, instead of the Catholic hierarchy of "pope - bishops - priests - laity"- A new, schismatic Mass riteIt is a "Newchurch", a ship of Theseus: At what point does it stop being the "Catholic Church" if everything that is Catholic is changed into something new, step by step? Is it then wrong to say "this is not the \*Catholic\* Church anymore - we don't know what it is, but compared with 100 years ago, this is something else"?The term "Newchurch" was coined by Lefebvre, I believe (not sure). It's to express that whatever these people believe they're doing, it's at its core built on a new philosophy that puts Man as the center and crown, not God. There are remnants of the Catholic Faith in the Newchurch, but it's definitely not 100% Catholic anymore, in practice. They have the buildings, we have the faith and the faith is more important for getting to heaven.> I'm not a theologian and will not pretend to be one.My comment was a very, very condensed version of [Prometheus: The Religion of Man by Fr. Calderon SSPX](https://angeluspress.org/products/prometheus). My comment was indeed based on a theologian. Read the book, it explains it far better than I can. Also, at least read the [Open Letter to Confused Catholics](https://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/OpenLetterToConfusedCatholics/index.htm).

asimovsdog (1): I know, but that's material Catholicism. They SSPX is now more liberal than the FSSP (which is why I'm usually with the Resistance, not the SSPX). Problem is, they still formally sign off on heresy and would not resist the bishop if push comes to shove. And, well, their orders are doubtful, thanks to them getting orders from NO bishops. But that's another story.

# Post 172: Question on impure thoughts

Author: None

Score: 4

Comments: 13

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1l1l6an/question\_on\_impure\_thoughts/

How would you know if you consented to an impure thought if you're not sure if you consented to it and also if you had another similar thought really soon after but you're sure you rejected the latter thought. Would rejecting the latter thought show that your will wasn't fixed on the evil thing?Salve Maria!

Numbainne47 (4): I think your being scrupulous. The thought popped into your head and upon sufficient reflection you rejected it. And to add upon that afterwards your asking your self "what if i consented to it" if you have to ask yourself that, chances are you didn't consent to it.Mortal sin is a choice, you have to choose it. It doesn't just "happen" it doesn't just "pop up in your head".

nishka\_luv2 (2): A second thought could indicate that since he failed to tempt you the first time, the devil is trying again, hoping to get you this time.If you immediately rejected the thought and moved on to something else, so sin was committed. Being tempted isn’t a sin.But why are you sure you rejected the latter thought, but are unsure about the first one?

GunGal7 (2): The devil is always trying to temp us and put us in sinful situations. The closer you get to God the more you are attacked.

Total-Wedding8871 (2): A wise priest told me an impure thought becomes mortal when your conscience/will “catches up” so to speak to what your carnal nature is doing and your conscience tells you “this is wrong”, thats when you make the choice and if you pretty much say to yourself “this is seriously wrong but I don’t care I’ll keep going” then we have entered mortal sin territory. Otherwise it’s likely venial if you are slow or half-hearted in putting on the brakes. FWIW

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (1): Of you didn't make a conscious delicious to accept it you're grand. Nonetheless I'd recommend chatting to your priest.

None (1): Stop watching women sexy pics on social networks (or better leave social network behind) and stop looking at baldy dress woman on the street and you'll improve. Don't lie to yourself, you consented if you lingered on the thought, just occupy your mind with other things.

craft00n (1): When you're not sure and feel guilty about it, you're being scrupulous. Talk about it during your next confession.

Next-Antelope-5887 (-5): Just don't tell anyone about it.

None (1): You dont always say to yourself "ok i will mortal sin now", you know is more insidious than that.

None (1): Because I openly remember being disgusted by the thought but the first thought just popped into my mind and it took a while until I completely realized and moved on

Numbainne47 (3): It's true mortal sin can be subtle sometimes and not always so clear, but its important to remember especially given this example that by definition mortal sin requires consent, you cannot even in principle commit a mortal sin accidentally.If he had impure thoughts, then upon realizing the error, made the conscious decision to stop, he didn't commit a mortal sin.

Putrid-Category6923 (1): No, but at the same time it’s like feeling I know this is wrong but I want it and I’ll do it anyway type of thing. Especially with impure thoughts or lustful looks. How do you differentiate between just finding someone attractive and desiring them in a disordered way? It’s exactly that

nishka\_luv2 (5): This is common with many who have had a long history with impurity. You become rather desensitized to it so it can take longer to realize them. But if you didn’t consciously take pleasure from the thought and moved on once you realized, then the most you likely could have committed was venial. Because you can’t accidentally commit a mortal sin. I highly recommend reading the Confessions of St Augustine. He writes about his struggle with purity after a life of promiscuity and I think most would be extremely surprised with how relatable and reassuring he is

# Post 173: St. Faustina

Author: dca12345

Score: 1

Comments: 9

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1l0w9q3/st\_faustina/

What are your opinions of this saint? What do you think of her diary? How do most people in SSPX see her?

Kogos\_Melo (7): Ah yes, divine mercy, the western devotion to Jesus that does not include neither the Most Sacred Heart nor the Scars

GunGal7 (5): I believe you’re talking about the Divjne Mercy and it was initially condemned three times. There is a good sermon by Father Burfitt from SSPX on YouTube from about a year ago. I think the YouTube channel is St Anthony Padua RadTrad.

dayakcowboy (5): Hope this helps.https://docs.google.com/document/d/15P9qIayrMKBtI8XhDl4Tj\_WIvi8aD0255vi64\_JeAu8/edit?usp=drivesdk

asimovsdog (4): feel good garbage with "sola mercy" tendencieshttps://realdivinemercy.org/Check [Ascent of Mt. Carmel](https://www.youtube.com/@ascentofmountcarmel438/videos) on YT, the entire channel is about debunking Faustina

mattdamon992 (-5): Divine mercy is a gift from God that we all rely on.No one earns their way to heaven.Look up father Chris Alar. He handily deals with all the typical rad trad objections to divine mercy.PS divine mercy is just the other side of the sacred heard devotion 'coin'. They're closely linked. The Mercy is always there. We need to soften our hearts and accept it and reject sin.

Single\_Copy2460 (2): Trust it, Jesus told her she is the person He loved the most, even more than Mary, His own mother lol

Christ\_is\_\_risen (5): Fr. Chris Alar hates the SSPX and is a modernist.

mattdamon992 (0): Lol he's a trad

Christ\_is\_\_risen (3): You don't know what a "trad" is.

# Post 174: A hypothetical

Author: Pale-Roof9278

Score: 3

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kznm6w/a\_hypothetical/

Hello Brothers and Sisters in Christ,Respecting that many are on the spectrum somewhere between “the local NO sucks enough I seek to reverence Christ in the Indult (TLM) Mass exclusively” to “there hasn’t been a valid Papacy since the death of (at least) Pius XII in 1958”, I was left with a hypothetical question. Granting that somehow the current man claiming the chair of Peter in the succession of the Holy Apostles has a possibility for legitimacy, is this at all dictated by the actions/ attitude/ beliefs of said individual? Again this would pivot between him blatantly dispensing with Catholic teaching in a very public and determinate way, to literally being a living saint who with every ounce of his being and piety ONLY declares Tradition and Dogma regardless of the precedent of the last 67 years (or more). Like beyond a shadow of a doubt and the possibility of unaided ‘natural’ human intervention. Or does the next legitimate heir have to come from the shadows of a preserved line of Apostolic succession to satisfy the restoration of the Church in its legitimate institutional form?

Duibhlinn (9): >is this at all dictated by the actions/ attitude/ beliefs of said individual?No. His legitimacy is based on whether or not he was legitimately elected as the pope under the rules that the Church has set forward. The procedure has changed over time but the current procedure is the conclave.Modern times aren't the first instance of having bad popes. Pope Benedict IX who was pope during the 11^(th) century is the only pope to have ever sold the papacy. He was initially elected due to bribery and his papacy was so scandalous that it led to a revolt by the Roman population. Pope Victor III in his third book of the \*Dialogues\* talks about>\[Pope Benedict IX's\] rapes, murders and other unspeakable acts of violence and sodomy. His life as a pope was so vile, so foul, so execrable, that I shudder to think of itHe committed multiple murders and had multiple adulterous affairs, all while pope. Saint Peter Damian, Doctor of the Church, wrote in his \*Liber Gomorrhianus\* about Benedict IX's engagement in acts of sodomy, bestiality and his frequent sponsoring of orgies.This is not the only instance of horrific medieval popes. Pope John XII died while in the middle of the sexual act with a married woman. The woman's husband returned home and, while John XII was defiling his wife, he took a rock and caved his skull in with it.The Church regards both Benedict IX and John XII as valid popes and if you deny that either were valid popes then you are a schismatic and a heretic.Keep these facts in mind when you ponder whether the validity of someone's papacy is determinate on such criteria.

alejosoyyo (6): St. Pius X at the end of his catechism recognizes that there were few people unworthy of the seat of Peter, “where every stain seems most grave”. So no, devious acts, attitude or beliefs will not depose a pope as there has been few examples in the past that of true popes with bad on some or all of the 3 points you mention.

CincyGuy2025 (0): Bad, as in sinful... Is that even a question? I'm fairly certain only Our Lady never committed a sin. Bad, as in taught error? No such thing. This "bad dad" argument is just some insanity propagated to destroy the sacred Primacy of Peter."The See of Peter always remains unblemished by any error." Are you going to believe The Vatican Council or the Lefebvrists?Be careful!

# Post 175: How strict is the “Sunday Best” requirement?

Author: Ferrari\_Fan\_16

Score: 5

Comments: 18

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kzhv29/how\_strict\_is\_the\_sunday\_best\_requirement/

I will take everyone’s responses with a grain of salt and ask my priest. Clearly there are posted rules about what one needs to wear, but these just seem like recommendations for the average/common person. And since it’s for the common person, it is therefore the generally observed custom. Let me explain.If a poor person, who doesn’t have a suit or tie or dress pants/shoes wants to go to mass at a traditional chapel, I feel it would be a grave sin to stop them. To me, “Sunday Best” means dress as nice as you personally, possibly can. I would have to wear the suit coat etc. because it is the BEST I can do. But my best clearly might not be the best of someone else.It would also be a very generous and pious thing if you notice a poor person in your parish, and personally offer to buy them nicer clothes for Mass. Our Lord even said we have a responsibility to clothe the naked.

None (7): In Argentina, Buenos Aires specifically, people are poor in a lot of cases so there is no realistic way to impose it, nor it would be charitable. Just be presentable, women cover their heads, but this is also not strictly enforced.

Duibhlinn (5): In my experience the commonly understood application of that term among traditionalists is that it's the best that a person can reasonably manage. There are some people who act uncharitably about the attire of others but it's thankfully an extreme minority. There are arseholes in every sphere of life, the traditional movement isn't immune from that problem. Generally people starting arguments with others because they don't approve of their attire is not looked kindly upon. It's petty, effeminate behaviour that's unbecoming of a Catholic to engage in.Now that said, everything I'm saying is within reason, but the cases that aren't within reason are extremely rare. You generally aren't going to be seeing people show up to Mass looking like they walked straight out of a nudist colony.The standards in the diocesan Latin Masses are generally not as high so it's unfortunately not as uncommon as it should be to see women at the diocesan TLMs attired in a not so modest fashion, even by secular standards. I'm sure it does happen occasionally but it's definitely far rarer at SSPX Masses.It's also heavily dependent on what country you're in and what the culture there is. A man attending the Latin Mass in Ireland who is attired as a traditional or old fashioned Irishman would be is going to look quite different to an American, a Russian, a Korean etc. Seeing Hanfu at a Latin Mass in China is not unusual, but if you saw it in Europe it would probably be a bit strange.Once you have a degree of common sense you should be fine.

Severe-Direction333 (3): At least when it comes to men you can find cheap suits that are really good at charity shops that are pretty good quality. For example I’ve found great suits at Goodwill in Canada for $10-$20, M&S outlets in the UK have full suits for under £50, there really isn’t any excuse for most people. Whilst there are some people who are actually too poor to purchase nicer clothes and it would be a corporal work of mercy to buy then nicer clothes, I would say many times a lot of people use arguments along this line of thought, or of being “uncharitable” to other, or invoking some false humility masked with a naturalistic humanitarian view saying “oh so and so saint or Our Lord didn’t dress like that”. All this as an excuse to be lazy and shamelessly dress like a slob and ultimately disrespect the sacrifice of the Mass.

Piklikl (5): IMO unless a priest specifically deputizes you to criticize someone's outfit (eg an usher specifically instructed to do so), you should in charity refrain from such direct action. It is common for SSPX priests to have to remind the faithful not to do this. Instead, you should consider the indirect approach and attempt to form some sort of genuine relationship and attempt to influence them for the better. Also it probably wouldn't be very charitable to offer to buy someone you think is poor nice clothes, you'll either humiliate the genuinely poor person or end up humiliated yourself (a lady once tried to offer an oncologist who was attending Mass on vacation money because she thought he was homeless). I don't think any of this is grave matter (if someone is going to actually apostosize because of negative comments from some rando about their outfit, that's more their problem), but it is certainly very rude to be so forward to a total stranger.

No-Test6158 (2): Shirt and trousers for men. Blouse and skirt/dress for women. But we're reasonable. Work clothes are usually acceptable and we never condemn someone if they are short on funds!The idea is modesty not "best".I will ribtickle some of my friends if they show up in jeans or trainers but I'll never say it seriously!For me, personally, I always wear a suit and tie but that's just me!

ourladyofcovadonga (2): I am always under dressed. This is an unpopular trad opinion I have but I don't care what I wear as long as it's covering my legs and arms, is modest, has no logos or anything that calls attention to my outfit. I think suits are uncomfortable (I have a bespoke quality suit, don't @ me), and I think they give off pretentious vibes. Looking like a bourgeois cuck for appearances is not a virtue in my eyes. Sspx definitely advocates for and prefers men in suits but they will never kick you out unless you're wearing some egregiously inappropriate outfit, which I have never seen happen. I sometimes see boomers in short sleeve Hawaiian shirts and khaki pants. I don't care what they wear and I don't think Christ will care on judgment day.Sspx bare minimum attire is long sleeve button up and long pants with dressy shoes. No one will bat an eye if you come into church with this minimum.Some sspx chapel will have loaner jackets for men but again, I've never seen this implemented or enforced.

Duibhlinn (11): The SSPX in Argentina is famous all around the world for the great work they've done for the poor, especially in the slums of Buenos Aires. One of the main reasons why Pope Francis had such a positive attitude towards the Society.

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (1): You just reminded me of the scene from “Napoleon Dynamite” where he buys a suit from a thrift store

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (3): I’m not going to act like an expert on the enforcement of this and I personally have never tried to do so myself, nor will I ever reprimand someone without having the authority to do so. Assuming such a thing would be wrong, but is it so negative to give something nice like clothes to a person you know for a fact is poor? On Christmas Eve last year I had a spare hoodie in the backseat of my car, and it was cold outside. There was a homeless man at a gas station and I gave him my sweatshirt. I don’t think that was an imprudent or rude gesture, I was trying to be kind. He put it on and appreciated it too. I don’t see how it would be different in a church setting, of course minus the making assumptions part.

ourladyofcovadonga (1): I'd love to see the uncharitable reaction of modern trad cats lose their mind if someone like St Francis of Assisi came to mass wearing a tunic or robe, while wearing their grossly fitted suits

PleasantStorm4241 (8): Thanks for sharing! I had wondered why Pope Francis had been positive towards the Society.

Severe-Direction333 (1): haha

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (2): That is why I view it as, quite literally “dress your best” depending on your personal situation, with an emphasis on modesty. The habit of Saint Francis certainly is his Sunday best, it’s his vocation after all. The SSPX from my experience isn’t crazy about enforcing specifics even though there are guidelines. As long as you’re modest and visibly trying to dress your best then they don’t bother you. The thing is, most people are financially and personally capable of wearing a suit and otherwise nice clothes to a job interview. How much more important is God compared to a prospective employer? Infinitely more so. That is why I try to wear my suit jacket and feel more or less obligated to. It’s not about how I appear to others, that’s silly. Also maybe watch it on the “bourgeois cuck” accusations? That’s not very charitable either

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (4): But at the same time he was the arch inquisitor of the traditionalists. Make it make sense

ourladyofcovadonga (1): Adopting a Victorian era mason dress code will never sit well with me. Catholicism is not about suits

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (2): It’s not ABOUT suits just like it’s not ABOUT genuflecting. It’s just a respectful external gesture, and any external gesture in admiration of God cannot legitimately be despised. This is the same kind of thinking that these monster Bishops use to say “It’s not about vestments, or altar rails etc.”….it is alien to Catholic thought.Do what you gotta do, I am not the “Sunday Best” police but I want to caution you against accusing someone who wears a suit to Mass out of respect for God and the Church of being a “bourgeois cuck”

ourladyofcovadonga (1): Lol I'm not saying everyone who wears a suit is a cuck. I'm just sick of seeing ill fitted thrifted suits on radicals trads trying to flex on genuine souls who don't wear that uniform

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (1): Well you’re right it’s not about “uniform” as much as it is modesty. I think any good hearted Catholic would agree with that

# Post 176: Opinion on Ecclesia Dei communities?

Author: originalcatholic

Score: 9

Comments: 18

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kzg7po/opinion\_on\_ecclesia\_dei\_communities/

What’s your opinion on Ecclesia Dei communities, specifically the ICKSP and FSSP? Which do you prefer (ICKSP vs FSSP)? Would love to hear everyone’s thoughts on them.

ViveChristusRex (14): I know this is the opposite of what you asked, but I mainly attend ICKSP (I have an SSPX chapel nearby though). Two ICKSP priests that I have talked to have a very positive opinion on the SSPX, stating that parishioners can go there for the TLM and are not penalized for attending their Masses. One stated that Archbishop Lefebvre should be canonized, but that it would unfortunately likely not happen in our lifetime due to the politicization of the topic.From what I have heard, the ICKSP is much more preferable to the FSSP, and are—on average—more sympathetic to the SSPX (which makes sense, considering how the FSSP was formed). Although I do believe that individual FSSP and ICKSP priests are significantly more traditional than their respective communities’ official stance.

Piklikl (8): Well obviously they're all wrong. The SSPX does the best job of highlighting the Crisis in the Church, the Ecclesia Dei Groups are just at varying levels of head-in-sand about it. I'd say the ICKSP is probably the least bad as they are more honest about the fact that they don't really think much about the liturgy and doctrines and all that stuff, they're just in it for the smells and bells. FSSP is probably the worst because they are the most duplicitous: their priests will tell Rome and the Bishops what they want to hear and turn around and tell their faithful the opposite.

MaterMisericordiae23 (5): I would say I am largely indifferent. Obviously, my preference is the SSPX, but I wouldn't be looking left and right before I enter an ICKSP or FSSP parish. When I was living in Europe, I attended TLM regularly celebrated by an ICKSP priest. He is phenomenal and very much sympathetic to the SSPX and Monsignor Lefebvre. But if all of them are in my neck of the woods, my preference would be:\* SSPX\* ICKSP\* FSSP\* Diocesan

kacfm2506 (3): I wouldn't set foot in an ecclesia dei group chapel/parish since they have accepted vatican 2 heresies AND they lack valid traditional bishops so their priests' holy orders are at least doubtful, that's a no no

colekken (3): You can't forget about IBP (Institute of the Good Shepherd). :)I love them all! I pray that the SSPX will join Ecclesia Dei 😁🙏I've only been to FSSP Masses in person but I like to watch ICKSP Masses on YouTube. The closest ICKSP parish to me is 6 hours away.

asimovsdog (1): > The Fraternity of Saint Peter officially agrees with Vatican II, and officially agrees with the present pope’s encyclicals. So they are not Catholics, officially, objectively. They are formally not Catholics… Formally, they’re in heresy because they sign and affirm, officially, formally, objectively, heresy, which means Vatican II.>> — Fr. Hesse: "On the SSPX, FSSP, ICKSP and Sedevacantists"

4gyt (-1): Novus novus

PleasantStorm4241 (9): As an SSPX attendee, I appreciate your sharing that. I wonder whether the charitable sentiments are common among the ICKSP. The closest ICKSP is several hours away, and I have hoped to visit it when I travel to visit a friend who lives close to it.The priests at the FSSP parish neighboring my SSPX chapel are anti-SSPX. Certainly, they are not the only ones out there. As one of my priory priests has said, the opinion of FSSP priests about the SSPX varies from priest to priest. Short answer to the OP:I am willing to attend Masses of the Ecclesia Dei communities, but I still believe the SSPX remains the community who is the best at preaching overall and standing against modernism.Long answer:I used to attend the FSSP parish mentioned above for Mass or confession occasionally when my chapel (Mass on Sundays only) did not offer either, but I cannot bring myself to go anymore. As someone once said, "Archbishop Lefebvre founded two orders," and, at the least, the FSSP priests should show some charity towards their roots, some gratitude towards Archbishop Lefebvre, even though they disagree with what happened and the SSPX's not only surviving but also prospering.Speaking for myself, I will attend an FSSP church (other than the one above) or an ICKSP church if an SSPX chapel is not available. However, I do know hardcore SSPX attendees who will go ONLY to SSPX chapels. I disagree with that as they are making, in my opinion, the SSPX its own church and its priests as infallible; the SSPX has been disappointing in some areas in recent years and I will leave my thoughts at that. If you share with fellow SSPX attendees that you attend Masses other than those of the SSPX, reactions will range from shock, with perhaps some disgust, to, "we go elsewhere, too, sometimes." I am careful with whom I share such information.However, in support of the SSPX-only crowd, I found sermons at the above-mentioned FSSP parish, when I attended, to be soft. Not in error, necessarily, but bland, as though the priests were afraid to speak out on the difficult issues most in the current public forum. The most recent bishop of that diocese was sadly quite progressive and dismantled two TLM communities as soon as Traditiones Custodes came out, so I suspect that could be the reason why their sermons were not as strong as SSPX sermons.

Jattack33 (8): Yes from my experience the ICKSP is more sympathetic to the SSPX When I was abroad, an ICKSP canon told me it was fine to attend the SSPX that Sunday, and when I was on retreat at an ICKSP apostolate, they had the Archbishop Lefebvre biography in the library

No-Test6158 (4): I love the IBP. I wish they had a presence in my country. Unfortunately, Ecclesia Dei was dissolved by Pope Francis. But I wish the church could see the good being done by all these communities!

Willsxyz (3): I think almost every young man who goes to an FSSP seminary does so as a conscious rejection of the SSPX, so it is no wonder that they are negative about the SSPX as priests.I think it would do them well to consider that the founders of the FSSP had no problem with “disobedience” when it came to using the 1962 missal and the “illicit” ordination of priests while they were members of the SSPX. Fr Bisig was rector of the SSPX seminary in Zaitzkofen and participated in these “illicit” ordinations on a yearly basis. He and the others apparently had no problem with exercising their priesthood despite being formally suspended a divinis.They only objected to the 1988 consecrations of the four bishops. Why they made a distinction between “illicit” priestly ordinations, which they were just fine with, and “illicit” episcopal consecrations, which they found unacceptable, only they can say.

iphone5su93 (2): do you go to the novus ordo too or know anyone who does in SSPX attendees?

colekken (3): Yeah, but according to this article that I read "The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith now handles the commission's duties" so they still have protections.

BertBlyleven (3): Just speaking from my experience as a former FSSP seminarian (a while ago), the hardliners against the SSPX were the minority. Majority disagreed with +Lefebvre's decision (obviously) but were ambivalent/unsure as to whether you could attend. I would say a large minority would attend the SSPX if that was all that was available. At least one professor believed +Lefebvre would be canonized. Fr. Bisig and the other priests spoke very highly of +Lefebvre and viewed the consecrations as a bad decision that didn't invalidate the good he had done. There were many guys (myself included) who only knew FSSP and did not have an SSPX presence nearby our homes. Personnel have changed a lot at the seminary since so I'm not sure what the tone is now.You also have to remember that the +Lefebvre had an agreement with Rome which he backed out of. Had +Lefebvre gone nowhere in dealing with Rome leading up to 1988, I'm not sure they would have been as opposed to the consecrations.

PleasantStorm4241 (4): Yes to both. For one couple (who has strong ties to the SSPX), there is no SSPX or other TLM close to their adult child's home, so they attend Mass with that child and family when visiting. I live far from the SSPX and any TLM (and even Eastern Catholic) and always drive solo. I have no one with whom to share a ride, and have often struggled to stay awake on my drives. There have been close calls. It would be absolutely crazy out of the way for anyone at my chapel to pick me up and drive me. I go when I am up to it, and when I cannot, I go to an NO that is one of the better ones. I focus on the readings, I pray the Confiteor and Pater Noster in Latin, I focus on the consecration (as abbreviated as it is), I veil, I dress modestly. (I try to sit away from people to avoid the handshake...ugh.) While the NO I attend has the problems intrinsic to the NO, liturgy and external, it is at least average, maybe a little better than average. The priest has the congregation pray for the pope, pray for vocations and pray the St Michael prayer. Plus I was stunned when it had the blessing of candles for Candlemas a couple years ago. I never saw that in the NO before, never heard of it when growing up in the NO. Yes, the bar is low, and I will take the positives that I can.

iphone5su93 (3): I have went to the NO all my life I wish one day to be able to go to the the TLM and I have seen the blessing of candles but It is something that seems to be rare in the NO although I have only seen people veiling on rare occasions and the handshakes really seems to depend on the Mass sometimes everyone will do it or sometimes no one like today and this is all in the same small town since there is no TLM here

Massa-damnata (1): How come your not downvoted into the depths of the ocean, for going to the NO? I mean I expected different. However I sympathsize with you a lot on that matter.

PleasantStorm4241 (1): Downvotes do not have any bearing on my life, or anything important. I do not let others' potential dislike of what I'm going to say stop me from sharing my situation, nor make me apologize for it. In charity, they could offer prayers that I may some day be in a much better one where I am very close to an SSPX chapel, and secondary to that, being close to Ecclesia Dei communities.One thing I didn't mention: I could not bring children to the NO. As an adult, I can recognize "the wheat and the chaff" in an NO Mass and (for lack of a better expression) take what I can from it, focusing on those things I mentioned above. A child would not be able to discern, so it would be counter productive to have to explain the negatives to a child. "Yes, people receive our Lord in their hands, but you should never do that." "No, you cannot be a Eucharistic Minister when you grow up. Distributing Our Lord in the Host should be done only by a priest with his consecrated hands." "No, we are not wearing shorts and t-shirts to Mass like that family over there is. We dress appropriately to show reverence and modesty to God." A child would be utterly confused as to why his mother would take him to something that has so many problems.

# Post 177: Kinda lost: Happy I can take Communion, but I can't really become Catholic?

Author: Senior-Concern-618

Score: 3

Comments: 10

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kz2jsz/kinda\_lost\_happy\_i\_can\_take\_communion\_but\_i\_cant/

Hey everyone, So, I'm in a weird spot and could really use some advice or just to hear if anyone else gets this.I was baptized Orthodox, but I've been feeling this strong pull to the Catholic Church and really want to, you know, officially join. I've talked to a couple of priests where I live (don't wanna say where, if that's cool) and even with two bishops about wanting to be received into the Church.Here’s the thing: they’ve all said that since my Orthodox baptism is valid, I can just receive Communion in the Catholic Church. And honestly, I am really happy about that, truly grateful I can receive the Eucharist. But then they also say I don't need to go through any formal "joining" process or get anointed. And that’s where it just guts me. Yeah, I can take Communion, which is amazing, but it feels like I can never actually be a member. It makes me feel super excluded in the long run, like I'm just this outsider who's allowed to show up for Communion, but not really Catholic. This whole thing has me pretty shaken up. It feels like a really important part of faith and belonging is just being brushed off. The thought of just going to Mass and taking Communion forever without ever being formally "in" just feels… off. Like I'm on the outside looking in, even though I want in so badly. Honestly, it's gotten to the point where a part of me doesn't even want to go to those churches anymore because of how this makes me feel. But then another part of me thinks, "Should I just go anyway, for Jesus?" It's a real struggle. I know some people might say "check out SSPX(and I really would like to be part of that church) or traditional Latin Mass spots, but there's literally nothing like that near me. Not even in cities close by. So that's not really an option. I'm just really torn. I'm thankful I can receive Jesus in the Eucharist, but this whole "not really a member" thing is hitting me hard and making me pretty sad, and now I'm questioning if I should even go there. Anyone ever been through something like this, or have any thoughts on what I should even do? Feeling pretty lost and confused about where to go from here with my faith.Thanks for listening.

Greedy-Sort-1525 (21): You were not baptized Eastern Orthodox. You were baptized into the Catholic Church by an Eastern Orthodox priest.There is one baptism.However you are correct in thinking that there should be some event that marks your formal entering into the Church (you were separated from the Church immediately after your baptism -assuming you were of the age of reason- by not being in communion with the Catholic Church), because there is supposed to be. You should be making a confession, and a profession of faith.[https://dcgary.org/sites/default/files/2020-02/Reception-Orthodox-Christian.pdf](https://dcgary.org/sites/default/files/2020-02/Reception-Orthodox-Christian.pdf)Find a priest who knows how to actually receive you, and see if you have any Eastern Catholic parish (preferably one of your own proper Rite) near you.Vive Christus Rex!

konstantin1453 (1): Tou shouldn't receive eucharist if you haven't confessed yet. It would ne sacrilege.

None (1): Just go to confession and say you rejected the true church and that's it, get absolution for that

Catholic-Convert-34 (1): These priests and bishops sound awful

Jumpy\_Cardiologist61 (1): I agree with the other posters that the priests/bishops who told you that are wrong: they are saying that because of modern ecumenism, not because that's genuinely Catholic teaching. As you probably already know, there is a crisis in the Church.If they aren't allowing you to make an official profession of faith, I would do something public to make it clear that you no longer adhere to the Eastern schism, so as to not cause scandal. For example, you could update your Facebook/Instagram to say "Roman Catholic". You should also go to confession and confess the sin of schism.In the absence of more official options due to the crisis in the Church, I think this would suffice.I would also e-mail the priest at the closest SSPX church and ask them what to do, just to confirm. They are used to situations like this and can assist you.

Senior-Concern-618 (1): I even talked to the priests of the Eastern Catholic Parish.. I was told the same :(

LittleAlternative532 (1): >You were not baptized Eastern Orthodox. You were baptized into the Catholic Church by an Eastern Orthodox priest.Actually the formal name used in EO documents etc. is the \*Othordox Catholic Church\*

Senior-Concern-618 (1): Yep, I know that. Thanks anyway ^^

konstantin1453 (5): Cuz they are mostly modernists... Either go to SSPX/SSJK or other traditional fraternity, and confess there. Or ask around. Where are you? Europe? US?

LittleAlternative532 (1): I would seriously consider some more formal method of reception - not for the reception but for the religious instruction (such as OCIA) that goes with reception. Rome has a very different theology than Constantinople.

# Post 178: Eastern Orthodox Saints?

Author: None

Score: 4

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kys955/eastern\_orthodox\_saints/

At around the 12 minute mark of the video linked below, Wagner quotes someone who seems to imply that sanctity can be achieved in Eastern 'Orthodoxy' (albeit I'm not sure I'm phrasing it entirely correct). What is one to believe about this? I understand they have valid sacraments but I'm still unsure.Video: https://www.youtube.com/live/sKl7r3oTuU8?feature=shared

ExpertSalesCopy (6): Sanctity could be achieved by anyone, even someone outside of the Catholic faith, but they would still be saved through the merits of the Church. However, they could not knowingly hold to a heresy or schism. Suppose a person grew up in the EO faith, and they believed all the things the EO taught, but somehow they were ignorant of the Catholic faith.This seems unlikely in modern times, but it's theoretical.

Christ\_is\_\_risen (1): Scholastic Answers is not a good source of information. He loves Vatican II, misleads Protestants into thinking non-Catholics can go to heaven, Is overly critical of Mollinism for no real reason, is arrogant, has people using foul language on his videos, and calls people names.

dca12345 (0): What if they know about the Catholic Church but don’t agree with it?If you studied the Orthodox saints—their lives, writings, miracles, both while alive and after death—you would be hard pressed to argue that they are not in heaven.It seems to me that the only true mystic saints left in this post-V2-period are in the Orthodox Church. The Catholic Church has become full of false seers, false apparitions, false mystics (charismatics), and hyper-Protestantized emotionalism. We are not in a position to judge the Orthodox.

Duibhlinn (1): "We"? A few days ago you were on the orthodox subreddit trying to convince protestants to convert to orthodoxy. You must think we're stupid.https://www.reddit.com/r/OrthodoxChristianity/comments/1kyova7/comment/mv204sn/?context=3

dca12345 (0): I’m an Orthodox inquirer.Do you have any substantive contribution to make, or just want to pat yourself on the back for being clever in looking up my post history?Oh and there’s nothing wrong with a Catholic trying to convince an Oriental Orthodox to check out an Eastern Orthodox church over staying with a local Protestant church out of convenience. I think all Catholics would agree with me on this one.

Jumpy\_Cardiologist61 (1): Encouraging someone to attend a schismatic church (Eastern Orthodox) instead of a heretical church (Protestant) is not an improvement. Schism and heresy are both mortal sins.

dca12345 (1): It’s a huge improvement.If what you say is true, then why does the Catholic Church now allow mixed Catholic/Orthodox couples to marry in the Orthodox Church and raise their kids Orthodox? I thought schism was a mortal sin. Could it be that those who were never in the Catholic Church are held to a different standard?https://www.usccb.org/committees/ecumenical-interreligious-affairs/pastoral-statement-orthodoxroman-catholic-marriages

# Post 179: Is there a way we could add more mods?

Author: None

Score: 14

Comments: 31

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kykdmr/is\_there\_a\_way\_we\_could\_add\_more\_mods/

We currently only have one mod and I've noticed a lot of trolls and sedes on here disseminating stuff that goes contrary to some of the SSPX's positions and some more mods would be helpful to stop this.

Willsxyz (6): This sub is so low traffic that it doesn’t need more than one mod, but that one mod ought to at least check the sub a couple of times a day to see what’s going on.I am the sole mod of a sub with considerably more traffic than this, and generally only need to look in twice a day for a few minutes.

Piklikl (4): I'm open to adding more mods, but it's a question of trust as I don't know anyone here IRL. Sure u/Duibhlinn is fairly active on here, they're probably my first choice, but even then this sub doesn't have enough activity to really get a read on anyone (seems like some users recognize each other from other subs that I have no interest in spending time in) or how well they would promote discussion of SSPX-related topics and not power trip. To be honest, I'm not the best suited for a reddit mod since I'm not really online all that often, but I do know that I can fulfill the primary strategic purpose of this sub which is to not let the SSPX position be too misunderstood. Side question, your account is 6 days old, that seems strange.

Duibhlinn (1): The subreddit is under the sole control of the one moderator who is both incompetent and barely active. They openly said they were aware of the problem with trolling and anti-Catholic hate posts and said they had no intention of doing anything about it. They even tried to make out that it was only 2 people on the whole subreddit who had any issue whatsoever with it.This subreddit is rapidly degenerating into a dumpster fire. It should be a lesson in what happens when you have bad moderation.The sedevacantism is a perpetual plague that has been allowed to fester due to the apathy and incompetence of the aforementioned sole moderator. As I said to them in a private message:>If you're not going to moderate the subreddit you should hand the moderator's chair to someone who willAnd as I said in a comment on this subreddit which they sneakily, silenly deleted in a rare display of activity:>[The moderator] is clearly not interested in moderating this subreddit. They should step down and appoint someone who actually is.

WallachianLand (-7): Cry about it.Lol

Duibhlinn (3): >Sure u/Duibhlinn is fairly active on here, they're probably my first choice, but even then this sub doesn't have enough activity to really get a read on anyone (seems like some users recognize each other from other subs that I have no interest in spending time in) or how well they would promote discussion of SSPX-related topics and not power trip.I appreciate the vote of confidence but I decline the offer. I'm likewise not well suited for a moderator's role here and I don't have any great interest in assuming the powers of a moderator. I'm not opposed to helping out here or there but I wouldn't be a good fit as a moderator. It isn't that I'm completely without any instincts there, but that I'm not deluded about my own capabilities and I know that there are most certainly other, better qualified people for such a role and would rather see them appointed.If you're seriously considering appointing another moderator then in my opinion u/Araedya would be a good candidate for a moderator role.>but I do know that I can fulfill the primary strategic purpose of this sub which is to not let the SSPX position be too misunderstood.I mean this with all due respect but you have not been fulfilling that strategic purpose. This subreddit is \*\*flooded\*\* with sedevacantism and people advocating for that erroneous position. Any uninformed observer just reading this subreddit could quite easily come to the misunderstanding that the SSPX are sedevacantists. You are surely aware of the long standing and widespread sedevacantist plague on this subreddit yet, for some reason, have chosen to do nothing about it. The reasons why I genuinely cannot fathom. If you want to fulfil that strategic purpose then I would start there, by actually doing something about the plague of sedevacantism which has infested this place for a long time. It's either r/SSPX or another outpost of r/Sedevacantists, it's up to you which you want this place to be.

None (-1): I think you might as well let u/Duibhlinn become mod because you’re not really fulfilling your role.

Duibhlinn (2): u/PikliklComment removed once again

citizensparrow (-1): Wow, an SSPX subredditt getting flooded with Sede content? Who could have imagined such a thing could ever happen?Hey SSPV. Didn't see you there.

None (1): Tem que ser sempre esses brasileiros sedevacantistas kkk

Araedya (2): I appreciate the thought but I’m not sure I’m the best fit or active enough. I do think the sub needs some help though or at least someone that pays closer attention to what’s going on. And it’s certainly not just us two that have brought this up, there are other comments, with multiple upvotes, on other threads that have requested moderator action in regards to obvious troll accounts.>Any uninformed observer just reading this subreddit could quite easily come to the misunderstanding that the SSPX are sedevacantists.Yeah, agree with this. Discussion is one thing, promotion is another. There’s got to be some rules that are enforced. Not to mention there are some users here (that I’ve already mentioned in a previous comment)who are only around to stir the pot and make the sub look bad.

mattrixx (3): Brand new account, then deleted everything, seems like this guy was trying to force a takeover of the sub. Like what happened in the famous XZ backdoor vulnerability. Sock puppet account, trying to push a new person as mod...https://www.akamai.com/blog/security-research/critical-linux-backdoor-xz-utils-discovered-what-to-know

Duibhlinn (1): I appreciate the vote of confidence but I'm not a good candidate for the role. There are better options.

Piklikl (4): My guy, your comments are getting auto flagged by Reddit’s filters, I’ve never deleted anything of yours.I also never said that only 2 people in the entire subreddit care think there’s an issue (obviously it’s 3).I’m sorry that I haven’t formulated a solution to the issue, I’m not chronically online but it seems like maybe I should add someone on the mod team who is.

WallachianLand (1): Não sou eu que faço post chorando que não tem moderação.

mattrixx (3): That said, more active moderation would help this sub IMO, but it's probably nearly impossible to find new help.

Duibhlinn (2): If the implication is that me and whoever the person was who deleted his account are the same person then you are mistaken. While yes people can say anything on the internet I think it's fairly obvious that that is not the case.Whoever that person was proposed me as a moderator, yet that isn't something I want and I've stated it on here twice already before this comment you're reading now. It wouldn't make much sense for someone to create a new fake account and propose themselves as a moderator if they had absolutely no interest in such a position. I appreciate the vote of confidence from whoever that person is but as I said to them and to u/Piklikl I'm not well suited to wield such authority in this place and as there are others who are better suited I think the best course of action is to pass it on to them to take up.

Duibhlinn (2): >I also never said that only 2 people in the entire subreddit care think there’s an issue (obviously it’s 3).Are you serious? There are way more than 3 people in this subreddit who think there is an issue. If you even skimmed the subreddit over the past few weeks you'd clearly see that.>I’m not chronically online but it seems like maybe I should add someone on the mod team who is.You don't need to be chronically online to see that this subreddit has gone to the dogs. You should have a bit more respect and take the valid concerns of posters on this subreddit seriously rather than just turning around and insulting them when they voice those concerns.

Jake\_Cathelineau (3): >My guy, your comments are getting auto flagged by Reddit’s filters, I’ve never deleted anything of yours.That happens on \*our\* sub too. It’s that “likely harassment” flag, right?

None (1): Mas se é a verdade?

Piklikl (1): I’m always open to the discussion of adding more mods, nobody really seems to want to have any sort of dialogue about it.

Piklikl (0): It’s a mixed bag, people use all sorts of phrasing on this sub, I hesitate to approve because I certainly don’t want the sub to get on anyone’s radar.

WallachianLand (1): Façam outro.O sub sede foi abandonado pelos moderadores, migramos pra um novo.Agora só tem um mod ativo, eu também era, mas agora eu deixo os malucos falarem mais pra eu rir da cara deles, lol, só gente doida

Duibhlinn (1): How do you define dialogue? The need for new moderators has been a common point of discussion for at least the past few weeks.

Jake\_Cathelineau (0): Most of the time that I clear them they stay cleared. But there have been a very few that went back down after an hour or two, and I wasn’t able to clear them again.Strange new feature. I had started to think it was “attached” to certain users, but now it seems it’s a sitewide filter that picks out words or phrases.

None (1): Até que tens razão lol. Vás a quê Missa Tridentina em Brasil?

WallachianLand (0): Nenhuma, não tem perto, nem da FSSPX nem sedevacantista, a mais perto é mais de duas horas de distância.Tem uma una cum feita por modernistas, mas como pode já saber, não vou pq é feita por um sacerdote Novus Ordo, eu até ia na FSSPX, parei.Quer rir? Não ligo, eu odeio sedes tanto quanto o pessoal daqui os odeia, não faço questão de achar nenhum online

None (1): Que pena, a capela da Sociedade mais perto de mim acho que é quase meia hora mas é bem pequenina

WallachianLand (0): Meia é?Tá perto até, onde ia no priorado demorava de uma hora hora a 2, a depender do trânsito e de imprevisto de trem

None (1): 1-2 horas indo e voltando tudo junto ou indo era 1 hora? Acho que a minha é próxima só com o engarrafamento que as vezes demora mais.

WallachianLand (0): Indo.3-4 horas de viagem a depender do trânsito, trem, metrô, a pé, transferência de linha.Se for BR, sabe que SP é caótica, se for tuga, então saiba que a cidade é caótica, porém, eu vejo vantagem no seu caso, obviamente nunca falaria pra você ir na missa deles por razões obvias, mas parece vantagem, especialmente se for na mesma cidade

None (1): Sim, felizmente é na mesma cidade

# Post 180: Sunday obligation missed due to travel for religious retreat .

Author: GunGal7

Score: 2

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kyfqik/sunday\_obligation\_missed\_due\_to\_travel\_for/

Wondering if anyone has any thoughts on this. I’ll be going to a religious retreat and I have to drive 8 hours and be there Monday morning. I was planning on driving Sunday most of the way, but that would mean I miss mass at our church because it’s in the afternoon. Would attendance be excused because travel is for the retreat?

ourladyofcovadonga (4): Society priests have always told me that making a holy hour is sufficient but definitely talk with your confessor

MaterMisericordiae23 (3): Does the area where your retreat is taking place have TLM in the afternoon? If so, you can drive early in the morning and then arrive in time for Mass.Or if you have an early Mass in your area, you can attend it and then leave right after. You'd still arrive in time for the retreat.If both are absolutely not possible, then you should devote at least 1 hr into prayer and Sunday readings.

MonkeyKing\_1 (2): If attending a traditional Holy Mass along your route is possible with minimal effort (time, money), you must take advantage of it. If this isn't possible, you can still go ahead with your trip without any doubt. The moral rule for this is: \*Lex positiva non obligat cum gravi incommodo\* – The positive law \[= attend mass on Sunday\] does not oblige in cases of grave inconvenience.(Note: If you are exempt from Sunday observance for any reason, there is no obligation to do anything in lieu of it. If the opportunity exists, it is certainly a good idea to offer prayers (e.g. praying the rosary while driving) as a substitute, but there is no obligation to do so.)

GunGal7 (1): Thank you.

GunGal7 (2): I wont get to the retreat until Monday morning, but they have mass there. I’m driving 6 hours Sunday then the final two hours Monday morning. My church doesn’t have an early morning mass but maybe I can find another church that has one in the morning .

ourladyofcovadonga (1): No problem. Also, this advice was for when I couldn't make Mass during a long travel day. This wasn't for a lazy day or other improper reason to avoid Mass.

GunGal7 (1): Yes of course

# Post 181: The letter which four priests of the Diocese of Charlotte sent to their bishop before his draconian restrictions on the TLM, urging him to change course

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 18

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/gallery/1kx12e3

CV-CR-CI (6): Get ready folks, the Church will soon descend into the catacombs until the Second Coming of Christ out of necessity.

GYEvanID (2): …or alternatively, the global repetition of the Chastisement of Sodom and Gomorrah.

# Post 182: “They’d rather no church than a church with trads” has rarely been put so clearly in black and white.

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 12

Comments: 1

URL: https://i.redd.it/y4ecqgbjid3f1.jpeg

CincyGuy2025 (0): At some point, y'all might realize that the Vatican 2 sect is opposed to Catholicism...meaning it's NOT the Catholic Church!The Church is not divided against herself. But, carry on in your delirium so you can have your fake pope who you don't listen to anyway because he isn't Catholic. How, My Lord, did we get to such insanity? My Jesus, Mercy!

# Post 183: Leaked memo shows wicked bishop's strategy to quell resistance to TLM suppression | Anthony Stine

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 6

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yNkee3oTvIg

# Post 184: "Tradition and the Church" by Msgr. George Agius

Author: kawaqcosta

Score: 6

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kwjflc/tradition\_and\_the\_church\_by\_msgr\_george\_agius/

Hello! Does anyone know this book? I read it in Portuguese and really liked it.However, there are some passages that involve traditional ecclesiology that I imagine are generally a bit difficult to deal with in our position in the face of the crisis.I would like to know what a priest thinks about this book (I sent an email to Father Paul Robinson, but he didn't know him).[Tradition and the Church: D.D. J.C.D., George Agius: 9780895558213: Amazon.com: Books](https://www.amazon.com/Tradition-Church-George-Agius-J-C-D/dp/0895558211)

Cool-Importance6004 (0): ## Amazon Price History:\*\*Tradition and the Church\*\*\* Rating: ★★★★☆ 4.7\* Current price: \*\*$24.95\*\* 👎\* Lowest price: $14.99\* Highest price: $24.95\* Average price: $16.67| Month | Low | High | Chart ||--------|------------|------------|------------------|| 01-2025 | $24.95 | $24.95 | ███████████████ || 07-2018 | $19.26 | $19.26 | ███████████ || 04-2018 | $19.95 | $19.95 | ███████████ || 04-2017 | $14.99 | $16.06 | █████████ || 03-2017 | $15.00 | $15.00 | █████████ || 09-2016 | $18.94 | $19.95 | ███████████ || 05-2015 | $19.95 | $19.95 | ███████████ || 02-2015 | $15.16 | $15.55 | █████████ || 01-2015 | $15.44 | $15.71 | █████████ || 12-2014 | $15.48 | $15.63 | █████████ || 11-2014 | $15.28 | $16.83 | █████████▒ || 10-2014 | $15.89 | $15.89 | █████████ |Source: [GOSH Price Tracker](https://gosh.app/?utm\_source=redditbot&utm\_medium=sspx&utm\_campaign=2025-05-27)^(Bleep bleep boop. I am a bot here to serve by providing helpful price history data on products. I am not affiliated with Amazon. Upvote if this was helpful. PM to report issues or to opt-out.)

FakespotAnalysisBot (0): This is a Fakespot Reviews Analysis bot. Fakespot detects fake reviews, fake products and unreliable sellers using AI.Here is the analysis for the Amazon product reviews:>\*\*Name\*\*: Tradition and the Church >\*\*Company\*\*: None>\*\*Amazon Product Rating\*\*: 4.7 >\*\*Fakespot Reviews Grade\*\*: A>\*\*Adjusted Fakespot Rating\*\*: 4.7>\*\*Analysis Performed at\*\*: 05-27-2025 [Link to Fakespot Analysis](https://fakespot.com/product/tradition-and-the-church) | [Check out the Fakespot Chrome Extension!](https://chrome.google.com/webstore/detail/fakespot-analyze-fake-ama/nakplnnackehceedgkgkokbgbmfghain)\*Fakespot analyzes the reviews authenticity and not the product quality using AI. We look for real reviews that mention product issues such as counterfeits, defects, and bad return policies that fake reviews try to hide from consumers.\*\*We give an A-F letter for trustworthiness of reviews. A = very trustworthy reviews, F = highly untrustworthy reviews. We also provide seller ratings to warn you if the seller can be trusted or not.\*

# Post 185: This is His Excellency Michael T. Martin OFM Conv., the Most Reverend Bishop of the Diocese of Charlotte who issued a decree last Friday ordering the cancellation of all Latin Masses in diocesan parish churches by the 8th of July 2025

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 17

Comments: 10

URL: https://i.redd.it/vgllu6l0t33f1.jpeg

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (7): Sacrilege

Pale-Roof9278 (3): Apparently it’s been published that pushback from the local clergy may have mercifully rescinded this decision?

CincyGuy2025 (2): Are you not ONE with these people? That means you approve, otherwise you're not "One"

Pizza527 (3): There is a Church in Greensboro, NC called St.Pius X, is this an SSPX church or just a NO parish named after Pius X? Thank you.

ComparisonRoutine359 (0): Why do you call this mean most reverend when he is a apostate from the faith

Duibhlinn (1): As much as we would all be relieved if that were the case, unfortunately not. That's regarding a second document which wasn't yet publicly issued but was circulated privately in the diocese. It would issue new restrictions in the novus ordo, banning for example all ad orientem in the novus ordo missae and all use of the Latin language.

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (3): Based on a quick google search….It is a NO

Willsxyz (3): [https://fsspx.today/chapel/nc-charlotte/info/](https://fsspx.today/chapel/nc-charlotte/info/)

GunGal7 (3): I made the same mistake where I live and went to a NO mass because it was named St Pius X. Soon realized it was not a TLM. This is awful to see the girl up there dressed like that.

Pizza527 (2): Yeah it looks like it is.

# Post 186: Abp. Lefebvre’s comments about “The Nine”

Author: Ferrari\_Fan\_16

Score: 12

Comments: 9

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kvgo8c/abp\_lefebvres\_comments\_about\_the\_nine/

These words from His Excellency really put into perspective his commitment to Rome, and the Holy See. It completely destroys the notion of liberals that he was a schismatic. I’m also compelled by his reasons to use the ‘62 missal. [“The Nine”](https://sspx.org/en/only-when-faith-question-30349)

pnzrbttln1 (3): Heres the link to what the 9 asked of the society and why they ultimately left.https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://traditionalmass.org/articles/article.php%3Fid%3D48%26catname%3D12&ved=2ahUKEwia-sq3vMCNAxX3wvACHY-JHFgQFnoECAwQAQ&usg=AOvVaw0LwcORIWZ0MjkvvdDYu5oO

CincyGuy2025 (2): And here is what Pius XI says about trueness to "Rome" -Casti Connubii 104"For it is quite foreign to everyone bearing the name of a Christian to trust his own mental powers with such pride as to agree only with those things which he can examine from their inner nature, and to imagine that the Church, sent by God to teach and guide all nations, is not conversant with present affairs and circumstances; or even that they must obey only in those matters which she has decreed by solemn definition as though her other decisions might be presumed to be false or putting forward insufficient motive for truth and honesty. Quite to the contrary, a characteristic of all true followers of Christ, lettered or unlettered, is to suffer themselves to be guided and led in all things that touch upon faith or morals by the Holy Church of God through its Supreme Pastor the Roman Pontiff, who is himself guided by Jesus Christ Our Lord."

Duibhlinn (3): That is a sedevacantist website which I'm sure you're already well aware of given the fact that you are a frequent poster on r/Sedevacantists.

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (3): I agree with this. Wanna know what’s so funny about this though? The Novus Ordo doesn’t seem to be interested in following the Church, Her Tradition, and all teachings on matters of Faith and morals. They made the new mass, they don’t enforce confession before receiving Our Lord, they don’t believe in the Social Kingship of Christ as the Church defined and practiced,……I could go on.You know what Pius IX also said ? Even with him being a big proponent of ultramontanism, said if the Pope were to say heresy you simply disregard and don’t obey! I (an SSPX parishioner) is not the one who is disobedient. It is the Novus Ordo and modern man that is disobedient

pnzrbttln1 (1): Yeah. Also just a pdf. highlighting some things that I dont think the original posted article did a good enough job at highlighting.

Tasty-Ad6800 (0): Did you read it? It's their version of the story. When you learn more, you're less ignorant.

mattdamon992 (0): The response from Ferrari\_Fan\_16, critiquing the Novus Ordo Mass and referencing the SSPX, requires a thorough rebuttal rooted in the Magisterium and proper Catholic doctrine, always in union with Rome.The Novus Ordo, promulgated by Pope Paul VI in 1969 following Vatican II, is a legitimate expression of the Roman Rite, approved by the Church’s supreme authority. Vatican II’s \*Sacrosanctum Concilium\* (paragraph 4) reaffirms the Church’s right to adapt liturgical forms while preserving their substance, ensuring continuity with tradition. The claim that it lacks fidelity to Church teaching is unfounded, as upheld by popes like St. John Paul II and Benedict XVI, who emphasized its validity and encouraged reverent celebration.Specific criticisms such as the lack of enforced confession before receiving the Eucharist or diminished emphasis on the Social Kingship of Christ - reflect misunderstandings or misapplications, not liturgical defects. The Church teaches the necessity of grace for Communion (Catechism, 1385), with enforcement left to pastoral discretion. The Social Kingship of Christ, detailed by Pius XI in \*Quas Primas\* (1925), is rearticulated in modern teaching, as in \*Gaudium et Spes\* (paragraph 43), to address contemporary contexts.The SSPX, however, has placed itself outside full communion due to its unauthorized 1988 consecrations, deemed schismatic by Pope John Paul II in \*Ecclesia Dei\*. Its rejection of Vatican II and the Novus Ordo contradicts the Church’s living tradition. Benedict XVI’s 2009 letter with \*Summorum Pontificum\* clarified that both the Tridentine Mass and Novus Ordo are valid forms of the same Rite, countering the SSPX’s narrative of rupture.The accusation that the Novus Ordo and modern man are disobedient mischaracterizes the issue. Disobedience lies in rejecting papal authority and the Council, as the SSPX has done, not in the liturgy offered by Rome. True fidelity means embracing the Church’s full tradition, including its living Magisterium, under the successor of Peter, guided by the Holy Spirit.

Duibhlinn (3): Lmao I couldn't care less about "their version of the story"

# Post 187: Deo Gratias! after a talk with Father Danel I decided sedevacantism is false.

Author: ComparisonRoutine359

Score: 22

Comments: 24

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kv6sot/deo\_gratias\_after\_a\_talk\_with\_father\_danel\_i/

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (8): Don’t listen to Marcellus. He goes around r/TraditionalCatholics blatantly breaking the rule about promoting sedevacantism, poisoning innocent minds with a smile. Always listen to a traditional priest over some nobody on Reddit please. Not sure why there isn’t a rule about that on here either considering you will get expelled from the SSPX if you hold such an opinion.

Nice-Horror5010 (1): What do you believe "sedevacantism" to be? Which part of your discussion/which argument convinced you that your beliefs about "sedevacantism" were false?

ViveChristusRex (1): Deo Gratias

BertBlyleven (0): Fr Danel is a good priest, if you're struggling and still continuing to struggle with making sense of everything - which we all do - I would not hesitate to speak with him no matter how difficult the subject may be. I can almost assure you he's considered all aspects of the sede position and has steel manned the position as best as possible.I know a number of really good guys at that church that have struggled with the sedevacantism question in the past, they'd be great resources if you want perspectives from other men. They're all in their 30's and 40's, if you strike up a convo with any regular parishioner in his 30's with younger kids I'm sure he'll be happy to talk, or at least point you to someone who has stronger opinions one way or another. Don't feel like discussing it is taboo or that you'll be labeled with a scarlet "S" if you do so.

MarcellusFaber (-7): Why would that merit thanks to God? Is there any other explanation that can explain this crisis with the indefectibility of the Church intact? Of course, they will ask where the hierarchy of the Church is, and I, unlike most Sedes, will say that there must be at least one Catholic diocesan bishop left taking office through common error, though I cannot name him. This is at least an answer to show that my position is at least possible, but the mainstream SSPX cannot pretend that they do not suffer from the same problem: a hierarchy which teaches heresy is just as problematic as no hierarchy at all, and the hierarchy the mainstream SSPX suggests has taught a huge number of heresies, frankly in a way that would fulfil the conditions of the ordinary and universal magisterium and thus be infallible. Invoking the Vincentian canon does not resolve this since the interpretation required is a novelty (See Cardinal Franzelin on this, thesis XXIV).In short, no other explanation resolves the problem of an infallible Church apparently contradicting Herself and teaching heresy, or being prima facie an unreliable guide to salvation, giving the faithful poison, other than a long-term vacancy of the Holy See. The objection of the visibility of the hierarchy posited cannot defeat it as a heretical hierarchy is just as much of a problem as no hierarchy, and this whole problem is not explained away by so-called ‘R&Rers’ without twisting Catholic theology and creating novelties.

None (2): They can only expell priest.

WinterBaroness (2): for real and there are lots of sedevacantists here on this subreddit! it gives other ppl Catholic or not a false perception on the SSPX...

ComparisonRoutine359 (0): No I like Marcellus -!: I like sedevacantism

MarcellusFaber (0): \*”Goes around posting inconvenient theological texts which I can’t explain.”As to always listening to a traditional priest, I know plenty who agree with me, including one who was a member of the SSPX for 7-8 years. We would not be here without doing our own research, and considering how much traditional priests disagree with each other, appealing to them as an authority, to the detriment of one’s own reason and research, seems not to have a solid starting point.

ComparisonRoutine359 (1): He said that we don’t have the authority to judge the pope which we don’t but we’re using the Authorirty of the Popes and the Saints

ComparisonRoutine359 (3): Sedevacantism makes a lot of sense of my head still but apparently I don’t have authority sitll

ComparisonRoutine359 (2): I would like to talk with you in dms about stuff if your happy

ComparisonRoutine359 (1): I said that, but he said the church can err if it’s mot ex cathedra and he explained the new rite is valid because the matter and form matter and Pius the Twelth said the laying of the hands is main part of the ordination.

Willsxyz (2): The SSPX can expel any member who espouse sedevacantism. So, they can also expel bishops, priests, seminarians, brothers, and sisters. I suppose they can also expel SSPX third order members.

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (2): Exactly. Not many people know about the story of “The Nine”. It’s a compelling example of the SSPX commitment to Rome, the Holy Father, and the true principle of obedience.

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (2): You’re joking right ?

MarcellusFaber (0): Yes, certainly.

MarcellusFaber (1): The Church is infallible in many ways other than just in ex cathedra definitions. She is infallible in proposing something as divinely revealed through the ordinary magisterium also (the ‘R&R’ claim that the ordinary magisterium is infallible only when it repeats something previously taught is an absurd novelty. See the text from Franzelin on the Vincentian canon in my post history). See Vatican I’s Dei Filius. She is also infallible in judging the certainty of things which are not divinely revealed, but without certainty of which divine revelation itself would be imperiled (for example, philosophy of identity with regard to Christ‘s nature). This includes what are termed the secondary objects of infallibility (canonisations, disciplines, the rules of religious orders, etc.), and relate more to the Church as a sure and reliable guide to salvation.Whilst it is conceivably possible that an error of an unimportant theological note could be taught non-definitively, it is completely against the accepted ecclesiology to suggest that the universal ordinary magisterium could teach heresy or pernicious error. The very basis of the UPA argument which anti-Sedes constantly use against us is that the Church cannot adhere to a false rule of Faith, since then the whole Church would be led into error, which is impossible. The same reasoning is used by the theologians to demonstrate that the consensus of the theologians or of the Fathers cannot be erroneous, since their teaching is so connected with the UOM that the whole Church would be led into error if they taught it with a consensus, but since it’s impossible for the UOM to teach error, this cannot happen.Frankly, I don’t see why the people who attack this standard theology are so keen to be part of a fallible Church. It sounds very Gallican.

None (2): I was talking about lay people

WinterBaroness (1): i have to be honest I am not familiar with the story as well 😅

ComparisonRoutine359 (0): Not the entire just expects

ComparisonRoutine359 (-1): No, I read a archbishops book about a heretical pope

Willsxyz (2): Well sure they can't be expelled because they aren't members of the SSPX in the first place.

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (2): You and Marcellus can go to r/sedevacantists until you change your mind. We don’t want that here

# Post 188: Charlotte Latin Masses shut down | Interview with Steve Cunningham (Sensus Fidelium) | Catholic Family News

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 3

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XiZ9MWh2uSc

# Post 189: Pope Leo and the SSPX need for bishops: what will he do? | Kennedy Hall

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 6

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p3YuFgGWg6E

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (2): Would be nice of course, but is this anything more than speculation?

Duibhlinn (1): No nothing more as of yet.

# Post 190: Question about SSPX from former Methodist

Author: Successful\_Bet\_9874

Score: 5

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ktcv0b/question\_about\_sspx\_from\_former\_methodist/

Intro:I’m a former Methodist that is is fed up with the problems that resulted from the doctrine of Sola scriptura which has led to relativism and liberalism infiltrating Mainline Protestant denominations. In a nutshell, basically any denominations and theologians can interpret the Bible however they want which had led me to discern Catholicism.My Question:It is to my understanding that SSPX despise the Novus Ordo since, it introduced modernist rituals like facing the people, shortening or emitting some prayer (prayer at the altar, Eucharistic prayer, introit etc.), using the vernacular, clown mass (to a limited extent), irrelevant and potentially sacrilege music, minimalist vestment and architecture. However, what would y’all say about the Eastern Catholic or Anglican Ordinance liturgy and practices (I’m aware some of them use Syriac(Chaldean and Maronite), Armenian (Armenian Catholic) Arabic (Melkites), various Slavic languages (ex:Ukrainian Greek Catholic or Ruthenians) )? I’m aware that they also use the vernacular, have different hymns and prayers that are not in Latin, and completely different practices (Ex:Jesus prayer, Akathist, Paraklesis, married priest, icons)? (PS:I don’t mean any disrespect to any Catholics (NO or SSPX traditionalists), Eastern Catholic, Protestants, or any other Christian denominations. This is merely for information purposes.)

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (12): You misunderstand. Latin is used liturgically because it's a dead language and dead languages don't change definitions, making it more difficult to mess with doctrine and interpret it in a heterodox manner. Not impossible, but far more difficult.Take a look at the people who claim the US Constitution is a "living document". It was written in modern English, yes, but it's closer to the archaic modern English, and the context of writings of the same authors is needed. The "living document" interpreters seek to toss out context and change the meaning of the text for various political ends.The vernacular of the other rites isn't an issue, as long as they stick to the Faith. The problem with the Novus Ordo isn't that the SSPX clergy "despise" it for being in vernacular. The TLM could be in vernacular instead of Latin and it wouldn't have most of the problems of Novus Ordo parishes. The Novus Ordo's biggest problem is that it was written as an experiment to attract Protestants by removing anything in the prayers that would be "overly" Catholic and off-putting to them. The Church has long held to the time tested idea of "Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi", the way of prayer is the way of belief. It's why medieval peasants, though largely illiterate, knew their doctrine better than you'd expect. The prayers reflect a greater fullness of the Faith. The liturgy developed slowly and organically over a long period of time, not the result of some grand experiment based on bad assumptions.Since "Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi" seems to be true, most Catholics now act and believe more like Protestants do. We have less Protestants converting than we did before the Novus Ordo was made available for use, and far more Catholics leaving the Faith. Before, even if a Catholic did leave, they were less likely to become hostile toward the Faith, have misconceptions about it, or join a non-Catholic sect. Married priests are also just an administrative issue, not an issue of doctrine or dogma. We used to have married priests in the West, but got rid of them because too many "careerist" clergy were leaving Church property to their children and overall cronyism was rampant.

mineuserbane (3): The eastern liturgies I've attended have been beautiful with vibrant communities.

Open\_Helicopter9577 (2): The SSPX opposes the Novus Ordo both for it's problematic text, and the various abuses it allows, which downplay the sacrificial nature of the mass. It also believes that Latin is the liturgical language for the Roman Rite, and the vernacular shouldn't be used. Basically, Lefebvre and therefore the SSPX oppose the Novus Ordo because it downplays the sacrificial nature of the mass in multiple ways and therefore protestantizes it. The SSPX is not opposed to the eastern rites of the Church, but is definitively Latin-rite. The novus Ordo of the Anglican-use ordinariate is still a Novus Ordo, and is opposed by the SSPX.

Successful\_Bet\_9874 (0): The Anglican Ordiniriate don’t use Novus Ordo. They use a modified high church Anglican liturgy that reflect Catholic doctrines. Basically, TLM but in English

boleslaw\_chrobry (1): Which in itself is a very beautiful liturgy imo, when done well comparable to the TLM but in English as you mentioned.

Open\_Helicopter9577 (1): It's basically using a protestant mass then which is what Lefebvre condemned. While it may be better than a NO, it's still a modified version of the Mass of Trent. It's funny that the NO is more protestant than basically an Anglican service though.

Successful\_Bet\_9874 (1): If that’s so why can’t the same be said for the Ukrainian Catholic Divine Liturgy since that’s basically a modified Eastern Orthodox liturgy with the only difference being prayer for the Pope?

# Post 191: Do you think Vatican II is not a real council?

Author: Christ\_is\_\_risen

Score: 8

Comments: 14

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kt30qq/do\_you\_think\_vatican\_ii\_is\_not\_a\_real\_council/

I agree with Fr. Hesse and I personally think Vatican II is an invalid robber council for a couple of reasons.1. It teaches heresy2. It didn't have any intention of declaring dogma/making infallible statements3. There was no (real) crisis that caused Vatican II to be called

No-Test6158 (15): Hmm, this is an interesting one. Vatican II was definitely a real council, but I agree, it was seized by certain influences (modernists, masons etc.) who made every effort to suppress the Catholic faith.It was necessary to call a council in the days after the 2 world wars and the massive social revolution. But the church should never have decided to conform with society.The position of the society is that about 90% of the council documents are acceptable, but the 10% that isn't is particularly egregious and needs further clarification to ensure that it cannot be interpreted in a terrible way.I would recommend that you should read "They have uncrowned Him" and "I accuse the Council" by Abp Lefebvre.

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (7): I like Father Hesse but he does seem to go off the deep end at times. The SSPX position is that Vatican 2 was a very real council. I also disagree with your opinion that there was no real crisis to justify calling it (as another comment states, WW2 happened, the sexual revolution happened, communism was raging etc.) Just because it is a real council does not mean it must be perfect. There are 2 modes of extraordinary magisterium (which is perfect): council, or ex cathedra papal teaching. Paul VI said very plainly and explicitly that Vatican 2 was completely a use of ordinary magisterium, which is not infallible/perfect but binding. However, when ordinary magisterium contradicts previous ordinary magisterium, it can’t possibly undo the original teaching on something.This is why the SSPX does not approve of the teachings on religious liberty, collegiality, and ecumenism. Other than those things Vatican 2 is acceptable according to Bishop Fellay. What’s even more concerning is the hierarchy today use Vatican 2 as some sort of wildcard that can mean literally anything. Taken in its original interpretation the hierarchy contradict Vatican 2 in many ways.

Murky\_Question\_9362 (3): I agree with fr. Hesse on this one

asimovsdog (3): Fr. Hesse says the solution right in his talk "Why Catholics may doubt VII was a valid council":> But the point I’m making is, a council has by its very own nature extraordinary Magisterium, not ordinary Magisterium. This is universally agreed to by almost all theologians. Now, what happened at Vatican II, the council itself declares that it has ordinary Magisterium. This is what I call a beautiful example of legal suicide. If a council that by its very definition and nature has extraordinary Magisterium says about itself that it has ordinary Magisterium. >> Does it say that? You don’t believe me? Switch on this beeping pile of plastic of yours called computer, go onto this funny thing called website with the W-W-W-W-W such com dot et cetera, and look up the documents of Vatican II. You will find Lumen Gentium, the so-called dogmatic, means only its teaching, Dogmatic Constitution of the Church, Lumen Gentium. >> As an appendix to this, you will find a declaration by the secretary of the council, Archbishop Felici, who later on became cardinal and happened to be one of my best friends in Rome when I was there for 15 years. He died, unfortunately, in 1982. But he himself confirmed to me what I’m saying now, and he confirmed that to Archbishop Lefebvre too, that the council actually does not pretend infallibility. It does not pretend the extraordinary Magisterium because in this appendix to Lumen Gentium, it says:>> „Whatever has been said in this council enjoys the power of ordinary Magisterium, unless otherwise stated.‟ There is no unless otherwise stated in the entire collection of the conciliar documents. And therefore, how can you say this was a council if it doesn’t even correspond to the very essence of a council being of extraordinary Magisterium?And he's right:> "Taking conciliar custom into consideration and also the \*\*pastoral purpose\*\* of the present Council, the sacred Council defines as binding on the Church \*\*only those things in matters of faith and morals which it shall openly declare to be binding\*\* (note: it didn't declare anything to be binding). The rest of the things which the sacred Council sets forth, inasmuch as they are the teaching of the Church's supreme magisterium, ought to be accepted and embraced by each and every one of Christ's faithful according to the mind of the sacred Council (note: the "Spirit of Vatican II"). The mind of the Council becomes known either from the matter treated or from its manner of speaking, in accordance with the norms of theological interpretation."> > -- Lumen Gentium, Appendix ISo, Vatican II itself says that Vatican II is not binding. If they didn't include that note we'd have more problems, but thankfully the liberals suicided themselves legally.

Blade\_of\_Boniface (1): Vatican II is valid in its stated intent and jurisdiction but fundamentally flawed in its form and defective in its results.

luke-jr (1): Do you think Ephesus II is not a real council?

AquinasDestiny (1): This is all wrong. The SSPX only say that they disagree with six paragraphs. Fr. Hesse is not the SSPX.

Melbtest04 (0): Vatican II is real and deserves respect in the same way that professsives should respect FSPS

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (6): They try to hide from people today the fact that this is not the first time a council has needed to be fixed because of a grave error. Pius XII personally edited the text of Florence because it made a mistake regarding Holy Orders.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (2): To be clear, it must be a "dogmatic council". Vatican II was pastoral, not dogmatic.Also, past dogmatic councils have been considered failures by later councils. Not sure if Popes have made the call to declare a council a failure, too. It could happen, but I don't know enough history of the Church. And Archbishop Lefebvre,ultimately, refused to sign only two of the sixteen documents. They got him to sign them by lying to him and telling him he was, basically, signing an attendance sheet. Very sketchy.

No-Test6158 (2): >thankfully the Liberals suicided themselves legally.This is it. If you want to see the action of the Holy Spirit in this council, it is there, but it is not in how many of the modernists interpret it.Before V2, many priests said the Traditional Mass in a very irreverent way. Mumbling through with little interest. The priests who wanted to stick to it were the ones who did not and they were exactly who went on to lead the nascent traditionalist movement.Sure, some got sidetracked or went too far - but the traditional mass we enjoy now is a far cry from the state of it in the late 1950s. And I know this because I have relatives who were in their 20s at this time and saw first hand the attitude of many clergy. These clergy didn't disappear suddenly after the council (though many did) - these were the ones who adopted the Novus Ordo with gusto. And in whose legacy, many were unfortunately trapped.

Trengingigan (1): Really?

Friendcherisher (3): If "Anathema" is the buzzword you are looking for in Vatican II, you'd be disappointed.

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (1): Maybe not explicitly but implicitly yes when they act like those who have apprehensions about V2 are extremists that are outside the Church.

# Post 192: Victory! Fr. Martin Cancelled After Catholic Protest

Author: DravidianPrototyper

Score: 13

Comments: 6

URL: https://youtu.be/Bww36B7iCxk?si=8iAeVAyU9CTQkIqD

Viva Cristo Rey!

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (6): Can the apostolic penitentiary be used as an actual prison? If so put Father Martin in there. We should go back to when the Church could legally try clergy members

the\_woolfie (2): TFP is great, they are a bit weird, but they actually go and do for and against things, while most of us cry online.

Duibhlinn (-2): The TFP are an unhinged cult. Please don't post their filth on this subreddit.

MaterMisericordiae23 (2): How are they an unhinged cult? Genuinely curious

Duibhlinn (1): u/Piklikl why was my comment removed?

Piklikl (1): Reddit’s auto filters removed it, I approved it though so it should be good.

# Post 193: When the Faith Is No Longer Passed On: A Pew Research Center Survey

Author: BasedEurope

Score: 9

Comments: 0

URL: https://fsspx.news/en/news/when-faith-no-longer-passed-pew-research-center-survey-52566?utm\_source=twitter&utm\_medium=social&utm\_campaign=tweepsmap-FSSPX-News

# Post 194: And now time for some light-hearted SSPX fun. I bring you: The Nice Creed

Author: melbtest06

Score: 3

Comments: 5

URL: https://i.redd.it/qtznypfjo42f1.jpeg

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (1): Can you keep the same profile picture for more than 1 hour

None (1): sort disarm test stupendous absorbed yoke direction sparkle makeshift fear \*This post was mass deleted and anonymized with [Redact](https://redact.dev/home)\*

Christ\_is\_\_risen (1): There is a typo in my copy of the Catechism of the Council of Trent and it says the "Council of Nice"

Next-Antelope-5887 (0): Amen

jaqian (0): Still better than the Sparkle Creed lol

# Post 195: Does SSPX see Mary as an absolute equal to Jesus?

Author: Melbtest04

Score: 0

Comments: 8

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1krquvv/does\_sspx\_see\_mary\_as\_an\_absolute\_equal\_to\_jesus/

XaviGamer144 (9): This troll posts aren't even funny

Indigo-Meadow (8): Get new material.

ourladyofcovadonga (8): Mods need to ban this guy. Atrocious post history

GunGal7 (5): Seriously?

Trengingigan (3): The SSPX is Catholic. Catholic doctrine teaches that Mary is a creature, Jesus is God.They are as equal as God and his creation.

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (3): This is the consequence of “open border” posting policy

Next-Antelope-5887 (2): Mary is a woman, so no.

Christ\_is\_\_risen (1): I have been seeing a lot of posts like this lately. "Is Mary really the center of the faith?" stuff like that.

# Post 196: How to respond to this accusation against Abp. Lefebvre?

Author: Ferrari\_Fan\_16

Score: 11

Comments: 13

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1krj2ga/how\_to\_respond\_to\_this\_accusation\_against\_abp/

Recently I came across someone on Reddit that accused Abp. Lefebvre of hailing the Nazi regime collaborator Marshal Philippe Pétain. These accusations are all over the internet so I can see where this person got it from.This is very hard to believe especially considering what the Nazis did to Abp. Lefebvre’s father for aiding the French Resistance and British intelligence, (murdered him in a concentration camp) as well as hundreds of other French Catholic priests.Honestly though I can imagine Bishop Williamson having these views since he publicly denied the holocaust and got kicked out of the SSPX for refusing to stop commenting on it among other things. So I wonder where he got all of that from.Has the Society ever addressed this accusation against Lefebvre though?

Duibhlinn (11): The insinuations that Archbishop Lefebvre was some sort of national socialist are ridiculous and as you point out deeply insulting to a man whose family was murdered in a German death camp for being a member of the French Resistance to the German occupiers. The Archbishop was a Catholic, and if anything was a highly reactionary monarchist like his father René was. Archbishop Lefebvre, as far as I know, supported a restoration of the monarchy in France. The German ideology is another strain of modern liberalism to which all traditional Catholics have always been opposed.For foreigners, especially non Europeans and most especially Americans they generally haven't got a clue what actually happened in France between 1940 and 1945. Marshal Pétain wasn't a "nazi regime collaborator". I mean you no offence but this is a child's understanding of modern history.Marshal Pétain was a war hero from the First World War having been Commander in Chief of the French army. 1 week before France was defeated by Germany the French Prime Minister resigned and made a request to the French President, Lebrun, that Pétain be appointed Prime Minister to help the government deal with the crisis. The government agreed and Pétain was appointed, by the French President and government, to be the last Prime Minister of the Third French Republic.When France was finally totally defeated by Germany the government, including Prime Minister Pétain, negotiated terms of surrender with the Germans. They managed to negotiate surrender terms where the Germans would directly occupy the northern half of France but would allow the southern half of the country a degree of self rule and autonomy, the legal entity of the French state continuing to exist but being basically under the thumb of the Germans, similar to how Poland and Hungary were technically independent countries after World War 2 but were de facto controlled by the Russians.Pétain is a controversial figure. Some French people think he worked with the German occupying enemy. Other French people think he did his best to preserve what little autonomy the French government could maintain, and protected the southern half of the country from being directly occupied and controlled by the Germans. Regardless of one's opinion on Pétain, the intention of his actions was to preserve that remained of France and to allow the country to survive without being totally destroyed by the Germans who had completely defeated them.There were actual French collaborators at the time, people who were directly and intentionally collaborating with the Germans, not those who were doing what Pétain and his government were trying to do. The German army and SS was full of divisions and brigades made up exclusively of French and also Bretons, such as the Charlemagne Brigade and the Bezen Perrot.Something important to understand if you're not European and familiar with southern France during World War 2 is that the Catholic Church was very supportive of Pétain and his government. The fight with the Germans was over, they had lost badly, but Pétain and his government attempted to do their best to build a Catholic France in the territory the Germans hadn't taken from them. The Church made Her position clear, and issued statements telling all French Catholics that it was their obligation to support Marshal Pétain and his government and that his government was the legitimate French government (i.e. not the Germans). French Bishops even went so far as to say that the French should obey Pétain, not General de Gaulle who was attempting to restore the Freemasonic French Republic. Notably, and you most likely won't have heard this, in the early years of Pétain's prime ministership the government voted to basically roll back the French Revolution. They renamed the state to the French State, or just France, rather than the French Republic and they even got rid of "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" and replaced it with "Work, Family, Fatherland". Pétain's Catholic government undid all the anti-Church laws passed since the 1700s and gave all the Church property that had been stolen by the Republic back to the Church. They passed laws allowing religion to once again be let back into public schools, and allowing public funds to fund Catholic schools once again.Pétain was no perfect man. He wasn't really practising, "married" a divorcee and had multiple affairs during his life that produced no children. He did, however, with his government roll back much of the French Revolution and that is why so many European traditional Catholics think positively of him. Far from being a nazi collaborator, the Germans actually illegally arrested Pétain who under the law was a foreign head of state and abducted him, taking him and deporting him against his will to Germany where he was basically a prisoner. Pétain was motivated by an attempt to restore Catholicism, despite his personal failings, and to prevent France's total destruction at the hands of the Germans.To the French who think positively of Pétain, the Marshal and his government were victims of the Germans, not active participants in nazi German collaborationism. The Church made their opinion on the southern French state quite clear and have since then received mountains of criticism for their support, up to and including popes Pius XI and Pius XII. Pétain isn't an exact 1:1 to Franco but he is in some ways the French version of general Franco.>Honestly though I can imagine Bishop Williamson having these views since he publicly denied the holocaust and got kicked out of the SSPX for refusing to stop commenting on it among other things.A correction on this, Bishop Williamson wasn't expelled from the SSPX for his view on World War 2. He was sanctioned basically for a lack of obedience to his lawful superiors. He administered over 100 confirmations in Brazil without permission, and against instruction from his superiors which was one of the big acts of disobedience. Another was when he circulated an open letter calling for the Superior General to resign. His World War 2 views were certainly not universally shared but they were ultimately besides the point, he was expelled for disobedience. The Society put out a statement basically saying that Bishop Williamson had gradually distanced himself from the Society's leadership and government over a period of a few years and refused to show the respect and obedience deserved by his legitimate superiors. You can probably find the letter online if you search for it.

asimovsdog (2): The quotes are true. It's not hard to believe, because Marshal Petain and the Vichy Regime weren't the bad evil guys you're indoctrinated to think they are. What should Lefebvre have backed instead: the liberal Jewish communists of the 1920s or the social-communist Jewish-Russian atheists? Lefebvres father was convicted to death because he was a spy for British intelligence, any other nation did the same to spies, and worse.Nazis mainly removed the Judeo-Masonic Republican government that occupied France in the 1920s and left France mostly to itself during their "occupation" (more of a liberation, really). They even respected France so much that any soldier raping French women was put to death (can't say that about the Russians). 1920s France was EXTREMELY degenerate, same as Weimar Germany, thanks to the ruling Jews. So, of course Lefebvre backed Petain, Franco and collaboration with the Nazi regime over collaboration with Russian communism and liberal degeneracy. Because if the Nazis / Francoists are known for one thing, it's that they absolutely hated degeneracy, unlike the communists.The Nazis didn't have particularly Catholic ideals, I'll give you that - but they to some extent at least respected the Church / Christianity to exist (unlike liberals and the Jewish communists). Now please don't cite me the misguided Pius XIs bull, who himself engaged in Ostpolitik with Russian communists, nerfed the Cristeros by promoting compromise (thanks to Gasparri) and falsely excommunicated the Action Francaise (Pius XII kindly reverted that mistake, but by that point it was too late). Pius XI condemned nationalism and thought he could "talk it out" with the communists, only to leave a complete mess to his successor who had to find out the hard way that communists simply demand more concessions if you give them what you want. Anyone who will now post "mit brennender sorge" to paint Nazi Germany as the supposed mortal enemy of Catholicism will get ignored until he [reads up on some more history on Pius XI](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VimsP2I-uFE). The more I study Pius XI, the worse it gets, really. One cannot be nice to communists and at the same time further Catholicism, it doesn't work. That's not an endorsement of NatSoc, by the way.Lots of people are still so brainwashed on "muh Nazis are literally devils murdering anyone while Jews were innocent lambs who did nothing", it's amazing how deep the brainwashing goes. Lefebvre was simply redpilled on the fact that Judeo-Communist Masonry hates the guts of Catholic monarchy, so obviously he backed Petain / Franco (both monarchist) rather than de Gaulle (a Republican) and saw collaboration with Nazi Germany as the lesser problem to Catholicism. Williamson continued that and spoke the truth about the Jews - obviously that will get you hated in the modern world, which is sadly controlled by Jews.Lefevbre did preach on the Judeo-Masonry and on freemasons in Econe, but obviously the Fellayite-SSPX won't tell you that anymore, since they believe in Holocaustianism and being nice to Jews. So currently (post 2012), they just try to ignore the issue, thinking they can play both sides. It really comes down to whether you believe the mainstream Holocaust narrative, and that's it. Once you start questioning that, both Lefebvre and Williamsons actions start to make sense. If you still believe the Jews are innocent little lambs slaughtered by the bad evil Nazis, then I can't help you and you'll never understand Lefebvres quotes. But they don't need to be "excused" or "defended", both of them spoke the truth.

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (4): Well that makes sense. The media and history would certainly like to make a fool of a man who loved the Church and his country. And in order to do so they would have to lie about 2 different people. Not the first time history has used masonry and liberalism to demonize the church for something (the inquisition for example is not hard to support if you have the Catholic faith). If you do any kind of search of Pétain you will hear the words “nazi collaborator” over and over again no matter where you look so that’s unfortunately where I got that from.And I knew Williamson was mainly in trouble for other things concerning the society. I’m not anti Bishop Williamson either, I know he had the faith and he did good things for the Church but I don’t think the SSPX was wrong for removing him either given the circumstances. I also know Williamson wasn’t expelled for his views specifically, but his refusal to stop talking about them publicly and in his newsletter were just one example of his unlawful disobedience to SSPX superiors.It just wasn’t adding up for me that Lefebvre did what the media says he did. It’s quite impossible actually.

Blade\_of\_Boniface (3): This is an excellent overview of a complicated topic. Nazis have replaced demons in the secular imagination. Many find it hard to actually imagine people at the time existing within a specific historical context. Their thinking is Cartesian: "Either they were for Hitler or they were against him!" Roman Catholics (whether historians consider them traditionalist, conservative, liberal, or otherwise) were consistently harsh critics of Hitler and the NSDAP even if this had to be balanced by:1. \*\*Threat of a fascist [Kulturkampf](https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08703b.htm) -\*\* The German government and various anticlerical factions had already tried to systematically erase Catholicism from public/economic life. They \*failed\* but not for lack of enthusiasm. Meanwhile the NSDAP welcomed Lutherans, Calvinists, neopagans, atheists, agnostics, Gnostics, and [literal occultists.](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thule\_Society) The strongest bases of support were in the most anti-Catholic areas and vice versa. Hitler himself vacillated between affirming all Germans' religious freedom and proclaiming that Christianity was a "Jewish slave creed" and expressing praise for Islam's "warriors." 2. \*\*Potential for the USSR to expand -\*\* The French Revolution already facilitated a continent-straddling campaign to supplant the Roman Catholic Church and put [deism](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deism#Deism\_in\_France\_and\_continental\_Europe) (among other bad ideas) in the place of Christianity. Communism (rightfully) seemed roughly as scheming and ill-advised. The Russian Civil War produced numerous horror stories of murder and torture. During the Spanish Civil War, anarchists were burning down farms and small businesses while Leninists were promising to seize every bit of life and land from those with holy orders. The KPD didn't seem like a lesser evil to European Christians. 3. \*\*Fear of a Second Great War -\*\* World War I was extremely destructive and traumatic. Not since the [European Wars of Religion](https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/14648b.htm) had people seen such destruction. It's easy to be an armchair general and say that the Third Reich should've been confronted sooner/harder, but even the USSR who saw Germany as their worst geopolitical competitor carefully stalled so that their system could industrialize, the Red Army could further militarize, and Soviet agents could ply allies around the world. The Roman Catholic Church herself had her ability to act as international authority progressively whittled away for decades in the name of nationalism/liberalism/commercialism. I could make this list longer but these are the three biggest reasons. SSPX has denounced the French Revolution for good reason. One can draw a line from Luther to Robespierre to Bismarck to Hitler.

ourladyofcovadonga (1): Franco wasn't monarchist - he nerfed the Carlists by having them integrate into the Spanish military. Otherwise, good post

Blade\_of\_Boniface (2): Either way, it's important not to put any Archbishop on a pedestal. Do your research and decide with your own intellect while keeping in mind our Church's teachings and history.

Duibhlinn (3): Thank you, and your post is a great contribution to the discussion as always. I agree with everything you've posted. The Church has always been surrounded by enemies on all sides yes, no one denies that, but that took a more active and direct sense after the protestant rebellion. In the aftermath of the First World War the Church was truly under siege by numerous hostile enemies. The Church was like a man locked in a prison cell with 3 felons: liberalism, communism and national socialist / fascist ideology, all of whom are in a 3 way fight to the death, meanwhile the Church is trying to both defend itself and avoid getting hit or caught in the crossfire in this death struggle. The only thing that changed after world war 2 was that the death struggle lost 1 participant and became a 2 man fight, both of whom still totally hostile to the Church.Every single one of the ideologies that were battling for supremacy between World War 1 and the end of World War 2 were children of the French Revolution and its liberalism, who were themselves children of the protestant rebellion. They all changed over time but on the genetic tree they originated from the exact same poisonous point.Catholics during this period did all they could do, their best. Late in the war when the Germans took more direct control over Italy it became even more difficult of a situation. The Germans basically turned the pope and the Vatican into a hostage. There were [SS plans to invade the Vatican, sack it, steal all of the valuables, arrest the pope and kidnap him to Germany](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=i-5XSCiBHms). The more things change, the more they stay the same. The Papacy in Rome has for most of its history been surrounded by hostile powers trying to kill each other, and sometimes trying to kill the Papacy. There's very little difference between barbaric pagan German tribes killing each other over who gets to loot the corpse of the Western Roman Empire and.... barbaric pagan German tribes wearing SS uniforms using the Colosseum as an arms dump.The whole nazis as demons thing is quite accurate, it's essentially an American new age religion. And, especially egregiously among Catholics, it fails to recognise that the German side in that three way death struggle is not the only one that was hostile to the Church. The other two also were, and still are. The forces that vanquished them are even worse enemies to the Church in many ways, especially the communist side of the conflict.At the end of the day you have to wonder, what exactly do some of these ideologues want the pope to have done? He is the vicar of Christ, not a global dictator whose job it is to personally step in every time an unhinged madman whose brain is tainted by an ideological fruit of the French Revolution goes on a rampage. We as Catholics don't believe in utopianism, or that it is even possible to have a utopia on Earth. We know these sufferings won't end. What our primary job here is is to preserve the Church and the faith, regardless of how badly the society deteriorates philosophically, politically and ideologically. Minds tainted by libralism cannot comprehend this.

Duibhlinn (6): A good point and I agree with you. I have a great deal of respect and admiration for the Archbishop, more than I have for almost any other bishop of the past half a century bar perhaps Bishop de Castro Mayer of Campos in Brazil. However it's important to not let our admiration for those we consider to be great men to cloud our minds.Archbishop Lefebvre wasn't perfect, nobody is, and I know that's obvious but it's important to keep ourselves grounded and in touch with reality. Like looking at a bright light can make it hard to see in the shadows, the heroic actions of those we consider to be great men can make it more difficult to see their flaws. I do think that he was a holy man, and a heroic great man figure, but he wasn't a demigod and it's not only unrealistic but also unfair to treat his memory as if he was. No one can hold up to the standard of perfection and it's in a way uncharitable to try to hold someone to that.The fact that we are flawed beings is what makes acts, and lives, of heroic greatness even more admirable. Heroic virtue practised by an angelic being of pure goodness is far less admirable than the same being managed by a being who has to struggle against original sin.

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (4): I don’t put Lefebvre on a pedestal. I’m not going to go as far as say he was a saint but saying he was a national socialist just didn’t make sense considering his deep patriotism, his upbringing, and last but not least his Catholic faith.

Blade\_of\_Boniface (3): >At the end of the day you have to wonder, what exactly do some of these ideologues want the pope to have done? He is the vicar of Christ, not a global dictator whose job it is to personally step in every time an unhinged madman whose brain is tainted by an ideological fruit of the French Revolution goes on a rampage. We as Catholics don't believe in utopianism, or that it is even possible to have a utopia on Earth. We know these sufferings won't end. What our primary job here is is to preserve the Church and the faith, regardless of how badly the society deteriorates philosophically, politically and ideologically. Minds tainted by libralism cannot comprehend this.There's a Catch-22 among liberal Christians. Catholics are principled pillars of their community embodying the love of Christ when they give women and children aid but Catholics are treated as clericalist cretins when they say that abortion is hostile to womanhood and childhood. They may even see the \*former\* as unacceptably intrusive. I suspect this is a factor behind how a lot of United States' Roman Catholic organizations are under the sway of social democrats, liberals, and neoconservatives. Classical conservatism, social traditionalism, and post-liberalism are treated like black sheep of public-facing church life. The winds may be turning though.

Blade\_of\_Boniface (3): Exactly, not to us, but to Him belongs the glory.

Blade\_of\_Boniface (3): That's the right approach. May the Lord be with you.

# Post 197: Young Trad Catholics React to Pope Leo XIV | Catholic Family News

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 6

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r2zjVqv40ak

# Post 198: There’s a difference between being a trad and a dissenter

Author: Ferrari\_Fan\_16

Score: 14

Comments: 29

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kqrkll/theres\_a\_difference\_between\_being\_a\_trad\_and\_a/

Not much to say but it really bugs me when some ignoramus accuses the SSPX of being too nice to Rome. Like yeah? They’re Catholics aren’t they?They won’t listen to them if they say to abandon the Catholic faith but we will always be open to talking with Rome at the very least.One of the sad consequences about the post V2 period is that this modernism has crept into both sides of the aisle in a way. Look at the resistance types, the sedevacantists, the feeneyites. It’s truly a mess. The priests, bishops, and laypeople of the SSPX still have a sense of obedience.

Blade\_of\_Boniface (11): Humility is the "exorcising virtue"; it's the quality that best repels the diabolical. We should all look to Scripture, pray to God, talk to the Saints, receive Sacraments, and do Works of Mercy. We're members of the Church that belongs to Christ above all.

dayakcowboy (5): Trvthnvke. Billions will agree to your statement.

asimovsdog (1): > They’re Catholics aren’t they?Modern Rome aren't Catholics. Anyone who signs Gaudium et Spes famous line "everything should be centered on man" has, at least formally, left the Catholic Faith. As long as Rome doesn't take that back 100%, I don't care, they are, at least formally, heretics and any "obedience" would be a sin.Now, whether the pope loses his office is a secondary topic, but Lefebvre always first fought about the faith (which differentiates us from the FSSP, who don't care about the Faith, just the Mass).> The priests, bishops, and laypeople of the SSPX still have a sense of obedience.Obedience to what? To modernist Rome? Then it's a sin to be obedient. We must obey God more than men.Man, people will truly lose their common sense at the Church door over the "obedience to the Pope".

None (0): We? Are you a priest? You cant be SSPX unless you are a priest.

iphone5su93 (0): feeneyism is true and not sedevacantism

LittleAlternative532 (-6): Unpopular opinion here: The SSPX should abandon this "irregular canonical status" with Rome, formally enter a schism and become "Old Catholic". And become a true particular Church with "partial communion". Why: Too much time and resources are being spent on the Vatican which is \*never\* going to make the changes the Society feels necessary for it to return to the true faith. \*Pope Leo has already said he wants to his pontificate to centre around the implementation of Vatican II, so that's going to be Rome's stand for the next two decades.\* Are you still willing to wait for something you're being told you're not going to get? In the meantime the SSPX could do so much good work, for those who have yet to be introduced to the "faith once delivered".

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (3): AMEN

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (1): Dissenter 🚨

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (11): No I am not but you know what I mean. I am a member of an SSPX parish. You didn’t have to do the typical redditor thing.Edit: I edited it for you. You’re welcome

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (1): Nope. Bye.

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (6): How about : No. Schism is sin

jaqian (5): The Old Catholic church that ordains women?

LittleAlternative532 (-5): I don't know. There are strong arguments that the SSPX is already in schism.

LittleAlternative532 (2): You are confusing the "Old Catholics" with (1) Scranton - which is very Lutheran in politity or (2) Utrecht which is very Anglican in its doctrine or (3) independent [Who really shouldn't be calling themselves "Old Catholic"] and whose theology lies all over the place (very common in the US). The \*Assembly of Old Catholic Churches\*, is the appropriate body for the SSPX, it's a federation of Churches around the world that is essentially a Western Rite Orthodox Church (though they hate being described this way), though they have the same theology of the Orthodox (Sacred Tradition + Sacred Scripture), so see the Pope as the first among equals and don't pay much attention to Rome after that, worship in the Tridentine (TLM) form, and have primarily celibate but \*male only\* clergy. It grew out of the Old Roman Catholic Church of Great Britain, which was founded to protect the faith of English Catholics, from Protestant invaders, but which separated from (1) and (2) above when their faith and practices went astray.PS The only changes the SSPX would have to make are to abandon the filioque, as well as Papal Supremacy (the Popes don't want the SSPX anyway). In exchange they will have intercommunion that will literally triple their size over the world. Allowing them to share resources and to \*get busy with real Christian work (taking the Gospel to all nations)\* rather than being a static quazi-Protestant accretion on Rome.

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (4): Wrong ones. Even the Roman authorities know that is false.

Willsxyz (2): >PS The only changes the SSPX would have to make are to abandon the filioque, as well as Papal SupremacySounds like they'd have to abandon a few more dogmas of the Church too. In short, they'd have to abandon the faith and, with that, the hope of eternal salvation.

jaqian (1): I always thought that "Old Catholics" were those who broke away after Vatican I but it's such a mess it's impossible to tell which group is which.Do you have a link for the Assembly because all I'm finding is variations of Utrect

iphone5su93 (1): this is just protestantism/eastern "orthodoxy" plus incoherent

LittleAlternative532 (2): Any citations you care to provide (I'd really like to see those from "the Roman authorities")?

LittleAlternative532 (0): The Old Catholics (WAOCC) looks exactly like the Church of the first millennium. If you're afraid to look like that then you have to wonder about how sound your dogmas really are?

LittleAlternative532 (1): The Old Roman Catholic Church in Great Britain had to derive Apostolic Succession from those who left after Vatican I to ensure the validity of its ministry but it was formed in 1909. >but it's such a mess it's impossible to tell which group is whichNot if you're a Church Historian. If you're some armchair critic, yes it may look impossible to you.

LittleAlternative532 (1): So it's "Protestant" and "incoherent" but it has partial communion with Rome and full communion with Constantinople.Now that's a strange one???

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (4): Bishop Schneider in his book “Christus Vincit” in the chapter about the SSPX where he talks about his visit to their seminary. He was tasked to do so by Rome, and gave the conclusion I just said.

jaqian (2): Neither. Just an ordinary Joe trying to understand. Whenever I Google "Old Catholic Church", I never come across the assembly, doesn't help when similar organisations use the same name.

LittleAlternative532 (-1): This is a debate I'd rather not have on this sub. Pax!

LittleAlternative532 (2): Yes. Unfortunately when you Google you will find some really strange churches using the name. Talk about doctrines of demons.One of the founding members is The Old Catholic Church (www.theoldcatholic.church). All the members have the same faith, morals, worship etc.

Willsxyz (4): You're the one who brought it up. Here's an except from a letter from the President of the Dicastery for Promoting Christian Unity (the purpose of which is to dialog with non-Catholic Christian communities).: “… Regarding your inquiry (March 25, 1994) I would point out at once that the Directory on Ecumenism is not concerned with the Society of St. Pius X. \*\*The situation of the members of this Society is an internal matter of the Catholic Church. The Society is not another Church or Ecclesial Community in the meaning used in the Directory.\*\* Of course the Mass and Sacraments administered by the priests of the Society are valid. The Bishops are validly, but not lawfully, consecrated…. I hope this answers your letter satisfactorily.”

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (2): Good thing it wasn’t a debate. It’s a settled matter.

# Post 199: Is a Sedevacantist confession valid?

Author: GunGal7

Score: 6

Comments: 37

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kqp4qz/is\_a\_sedevacantist\_confession\_valid/

I have been attending an SSPX church lately and found a closer latin traditional mass under the Religious Congregation of Mary Immaculate Queen, also known as (CMRI). They are Sedevacantists though and SSPX does not support Sedevacantists. If I go to confession with one of their priests, is that a valid confession?

mineuserbane (9): For a confession to be valid, a priest must be granted the faculties to hear confessions. This faculty can be granted by the local ordinary. The CMRI does not have the faculty to hear confessions so their confessions are not valid. The SSPX has been granted the faculty by the Pontiff himself, so their confessions are valid. Relevant Canon Law: https://www.vatican.va/archive/cod-iuris-canonici/eng/documents/cic\_lib4-cann959-997\_en.html#CHAPTER\_II.

None (3): Under emergency, supposing they are validly ordained, they can confer confession. The church supplies jurisdiction. That is to say if you have SSPX close to you, who have the pertinent permission you are not "under emergency" unless you are dying.

asimovsdog (3): Well it would be definitely licit, because the jurisdiction (for all sacraments) doesn't come from the Pontiff, but from emergency jurisdiction, because of the obvious Crisis in the Church. Same justification as the SSPX, although the SSPX tries to sweep that under the rug, under Fellay they tried to go back under modernist Romes jurisdiction, although not all agreed. Bishop de Gallereta once called that "gift" by Rome "a poison pill", as I've been told, because it changes the jurisdiction from "emergency" back to the Pontiff, as if the emergency is over and can be simply ignored.Now, I don't recommend going to sedevacantists (sedes are wrong, but that's another topic), but since the confession is licit (thanks to emergency), it depends on whether the priest is a valid priest. CMRI priests are Thuc-line, which derive their priests from Guerard de Lauriers. [Thuc line bishops are definitely valid](https://archive.is/wip/OysPa), there's an extensive examination by Bp. Sanborn on the "doubts" that have been raised. The problem are the scandals in that line, but that doesn't affect validity.I would say: don't go unless you absolutely have to (i.e. mortal sin). Lefevbre warned us from sedevacantism and for good reason.

iphone5su93 (1): No as they're manifest heretics I believe

dbaughmen (-3): It would indeed be valid!

GunGal7 (1): So they were denied faculty to hear confessions? Am I reading that correctly?

GunGal7 (1): Is receiving Holy Communion from them valid?

dbaughmen (1): So what you’re saying is that before the Pontiff granted faculties to the SSPX (they had been in existence since the 70’s and received “faculties” in the 2010’s) all their confessions are invalid before that?

GunGal7 (0): But what if the Pontiff is not legitimate? Then the faculties that are granted are not legitimate either right? I know there has been Popes in place but they certainly haven’t been practicing Catholics.

alejosoyyo (0): A sacrament is valid if minister, matter and form are correct, and there it is a right intention to do what the Church does. The faculties given to hear confessions only makes them licit, nothing to do with validity. Therefore, the sacraments from sedes are valid, but illicit.

asimovsdog (1): The "emergency jurisdiction" comes from the emergency of the Crisis, it doesn't depend on whether OP has a personal emergency. The SSPX has always had jurisdiction, not just for dying people. It doesn't change the "quality" of the jurisdiction or give them "extra jurisdiction". The "extra" papal jurisdiction can more or less be ignored, it doesn't add anything and just confuses people.

luke-jr (1): What doctrine is denied?

mineuserbane (1): Says the sedevacantist.

mineuserbane (3): Confessions require the use of the power to bind and loose. This is a power supplied through the Roman Pontiff alone. Priests that have valid orders do not validly absolve sins without the Pope (or his representative in the local Bishop) supplying the power to bind a loose. Someone who rejects the entire office of the Papacy has cut themselves off from the one who can provide them with the authority to absolve. It is less the Church cutting them off than the priests of the CMRI of obstinately rejecting their God given authority (and with it, their ability to absolve sins).

mineuserbane (1): They possess valid holy orders, so have the true presence, but the Mass is illicit. Going there would be the equivalent of going to the Palmarian Catholic Church.

mineuserbane (1): >the PontiffI appreciate that.

mineuserbane (-1): No. What the Church teaches is that after Misericordia et misera, they had the faculties to hear valid confessions. They did not have the faculties before that.

mineuserbane (5): See the discussion above regarding Canon 144 and supplied jurisdiction in cases of common error. However, false premise. >But what if the Pontiff is not legitimate?By whose authority would he be declared illegitimate? >I know there has been Popes in place but they certainly haven’t been practicing Catholics.By your own authority? This is a protestant argument.

mineuserbane (3): "Can.966 §1. The valid absolution of sins requires that the minister have, in addition to the power of orders, the faculty of exercising it for the faithful to whom he imparts absolution."Canon law specifies validity, not licit use. It is due to how confession is tied to the authority to bind and loose. This authority is supplied from Rome. The minister in this case is only correct with both orders and faculty. This is the case for confession and matrimony.

None (1): This is factually wrong the bishop of Rome can confer jurisdiction, like it does to opus dei and other communities. He has absolute jurisdiction, and should not be ignored.

mineuserbane (1): "Therefore,if anyone says thatit is not by the institution of Christ the lord himself (that is to say, by divine law) that blessed Peter should have perpetual successors in the primacy over the whole church; or thatthe Roman pontiff is not the successor of blessed Peter in this primacy:let him beanathema." July 18th, 1870. 4th session of Vatican I. They deny that Blessed Peter has perpetual successors. This is anathematized heresy.

GunGal7 (1): Why do they take confessions if they don’t have the authority to do so?

dbaughmen (4): The SSPX used the same principle all sedevacantists use, that of supplied jurisdiction due to a \*\*state of necessity\*\*, this is what is used to justify the false “excommunications” and the 1988 consecrations.

dbaughmen (0): Right so you’re teaching that before 2016, all SSPX confessions are invalid since they “did not have faculties”

GunGal7 (3): Yeah I realized after I posted that would be a Protestant argument and not a valid argument

luke-jr (1): The Church teaches no declaration is necessary to impede a heretic from becoming pope. By whose authority do you overrule Divine Law and decide he's legitimate anyway?

alejosoyyo (2): Wow! Thanks friend, I didn’t know about that and it makes all sense. Thanks a lot 😊

luke-jr (1): Nope, we don't deny that.

mineuserbane (1): They believe the Catholic Church no longer exists as you or I believe it does. They see themselves as the few remaining valid churches on earth and that all other churches are invalid.

Willsxyz (6): Confessions aren’t really the same thing. Confessions (actually absolutions) require jurisdiction for validity. Ordinations/Consecrations don’t.Therefore, what the SSPX claimed to have before they received universal jurisdiction to absolve was “supplied jurisdiction”.Supplied jurisdiction is a well known concept, but it’s generally something provided on a case-by-case basis when the circumstances warrant. Blanket supplied jurisdiction, as the SSPX claimed to have, is a novelty. That doesn’t mean the SSPX was wrong about it, but it’s pretty bold to stake eternity on a novel theological theory.

mineuserbane (0): Exactly why I don't make that argument.

mineuserbane (4): No. Those are not the same arguments. Canon 144 (common error) is applicable in some situations. I do not make the other argument for supplied jurisdiction. I don't think it holds water. As such, I (and the entire Church magisterium) do not recognize any supplied jurisdiction for sede priests.

Willsxyz (3): All confessions heard by SSPX priests before 2016 in which the penitent was unaware that jurisdiction is generally required for validity or was unaware that the priests of the SSPX had not been granted jurisdiction would have been certainly valid due to supplied jurisdiction.A confession in which the priest and penitent are both aware that jurisdiction is required and also that the priest has not been given jurisdiction is problematic. The SSPX claimed supplied jurisdiction in this case also. They may have been right, but it seems awfully risky to me.But if you go somewhere else, you have risks there too: the possibility of invalid ordination, contrary intent, incorrect matter, etc.

mineuserbane (1): >The Church teaches no declaration is necessary to impede a heretic from becoming pope.Where is this taught? >By whose authority do you overrule Divine Law and decide he's legitimate anyway?This is backwards. The Church magisterium has elected a Pope and told us he is legitimate. Who are you to determine he violates Divine Law and has lost his Seat?

luke-jr (1): Pope Paul IV's \*Cum Ex Apostolatus Officio\*It also explicitly dismisses unanimous support as an excuse. (Besides, literally every single bishop who recognizes Leo14 as pope, is himself a heretic anyway)

mineuserbane (1): >Pope Paul IVYou've appealed to an authority you do not recognize. You do not hold his Bull to be Church teaching as he is not a true Pope according to Sede beliefs. It's ironic. Again I ask, who judges him to be a heretic? The Church magisterium teaches that none of the people you name as heretics are, indeed, heretics. Who is right? You or the entire Church magisterium and the Pope? Who can take the appeal to get an infallible ruling on it? You put yourself in a self defeating position that relies on your own private judgement in contradiction to Church authority. This is protestantism.

luke-jr (1): You don't know what you're talking about.

# Post 200: If Jesus had returned during the Papal Conclave, would the Conclave be cancelled? And what would the SSPX position be?

Author: melbtest06

Score: 0
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kpbvkc/if\_jesus\_had\_returned\_during\_the\_papal\_conclave/

Piancol (13): This is going past trolling into absurdist comedy territory! The second question is the real punchline lol

CRAAAZYYYY (8): Guys if the pope went and had to use the bathroom what would the SSPX position be? 😭😭😭😭😭

iphone5su93 (5): what is it with those questions about the sspx position 🤣

CV-CR-CI (5): If Jesus returned during the conclave; in the clouds and to the sound of trumpets—I suspect many participants in the conclave would die of shock, thus indefinitely postponing the election of the Pope.The SSPX would naturally celebrate the occasion—for order would be restored to the Church on earth.

None (3): Someone please ban this guy

CincyGuy2025 (0): The SSPX would say.... "Don't listen to Him. Listen to us. We have the grace of state to know better."Just like they do already. If you didn't hear ... When we hear the voice of Peter we hear the very voice of Christ himself. The SSPX claims to know more than Christ Himself.Either go sing kumbaya with all the false religions of the world or admit these dudes aren't popes. But please don't destroy the Primacy of Peter instituted by Our Lord Jesus Christ.

Willsxyz (1): So if the Pope says Chicago deep dish is the best pizza, that’s the voice of Christ?Of course not. The Pope is fully capable of saying false or misleading things and capable of making prudential errors. (Pope Francis did both repeatedly)The Pope is even capable of doing things that harm the Church, in response to which other Catholics have the right to call him out and to refuse to go along with harmful policies. (But when Cephas was come to Antioch,I withstoodhim to the face, because he was to be blamed.)

CincyGuy2025 (-1): 1) We're not talking about deep dish pizza... But he does tell you which toppings are allowed on your pizza! Why listen to that? 2) "The See of St. Peter always remains unblemished by any error." -Pastor AeternusEither Francis had no errors or he wasn't the pope. Your idea that Peter needs sifting is a novelty. The Church has never taught that.3) St. Peter never taught error. Prudential errors aren't teaching error. It was exactly that: an issue of PRUDENCE. Peter doesn't have impeccable prudence. But he does have "the gift of truth and never failing faith." -Pastor AeternusRenounce your errors and spend the rest of your life repairing the damage you have done to the scared primacy of Peter!

Willsxyz (1): I am glad to hear that you agree that the following statements are false and are to be condemned:Every man is free to embrace and profess that religion which, guided by the light of reason, he shall consider true.Man may, in the observance of any religion whatever, find the way of eternal salvation, and arrive at eternal salvation.The Church ought to be separated from the State, and the State from the Church.In the present day it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion should be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other forms of worshipThe Roman Pontiff can, and ought to, reconcile himself, and come to terms with progress, liberalism and modern civilization.

CincyGuy2025 (-1): And why don't YOU agree that those statements are false? If you believe in Lefevbrism, you believe every man is free to embrace and profess that religion which, guided by the light of reason, he shall consider true.Lefevbrists have "Tradition" as their rule of faith. Protestants have "Scripture" as their rule of faith. Catholics have the Magisterium as their rule of faith. We're not the same.Catholics don't compare the teaching of the magisterium to "Tradition" to determine what is true and what is not. The magisterium tells you what is and is not part of Tradition. SSPX has it backwards and has set themselves up as the Golden Sifter."When we hear the voice of Peter, we hear the very voice of Christ himself" ... even when he tells you what toppings you're allowed on your pizza, how many times you may eat pizza, how much pizza you are allowed to eat and if your crust may have leavening. If Peter tells you to only eat Chicago deep dish pies on Thursday, you better obey, whether you like it or not.If you don't believe me, go find one teaching of the Church (not some dufus like Salza or Siscoe either) where She says to beware of Peter who can lead you astray by false teaching. Seriously. Please beg St. Anthony to find one single text saying that the teaching of Peter needs examined. (BTW, it will be the only thing ever that St. Anthony can't find. But I bet the Hammer of Heretics will find you some texts that say you may NOT sift the teaching of Peter.)I remain faithfully yours in the Most Sacred Heart.

# Post 201: Anyone know any French speaking Trad YouTubers?
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kod2tj/anyone\_know\_any\_french\_speaking\_trad\_youtubers/

iphone5su93 (1): \*\*Abbé Matthieu Raffray\*\*\*\*Napo\*\*[https://www.youtube.com/@LECATHO/videos](https://www.youtube.com/@LECATHO/videos)Archidiacre[https://www.youtube.com/@Archidiacre](https://www.youtube.com/@Archidiacre) these are those that I can remember right nowI would recommend you to just search "apologetique catholique" instead of "catholique" since it's mostly Priests or Laity that sometimes have modernist adjacent opinions, or atleast seem to be more for a audience of atheists and lukewarm Catholics since their videos half the time just seem to be things praticing Catholics already know or they present Catholicism like an atheist would maybe they do it with good intention but you don't pass off the Faith as if it was the same and as legitimate as protestantism,eastern schismatics or other religions, and in rare cases they're just manifest heretics which is why I would refrain from searching "catholique" "catholicisme" aloneI would also like to say to beware since there's many sedevacantist channels though

dbaughmen (-2): L’abbe Damien Dutertre a quelques vidéos - https://youtu.be/Gg1hFzxefkI?si=FrvI8yaSVGZ5cybZhttps://youtu.be/yfGcswXxafk?si=B5c7I3GpcgfrnA7D

# Post 202: NO harmful to the faith?
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ko3njs/no\_harmful\_to\_the\_faith/

How does the SSPX argue for the claim when to say that the New Mass is intrinsically harmful to the faith of Catholics denies the infectibility of the Church, since it is impossible for the Church to universally promulgate a rite that is harmful when said according to the text and rubrics approved by the Church?

SnowWhiteFeather (9): The Pope is human, which means that he has free will. God doesn't turn him into an automaton as soon as he is elected. He can sin, he can teach error, he can become a heretic.Papal infallibility refers to the infallibility of the papacy, not of the individual. When the Pope speaks "ex cathedra" (from the throne) his teaching is infallible.The indefectibility of the Church has similar limitations. No particular person is guaranteed to be free from error or sin. Indefectibility means that the Church will continue to live until the end of time and that it won't abdicate its role as the salvation of the faithful. It does not mean that it won't suffer abuses, scandals, and heresies –which should be apparent when looking at Church history.Councils are likewise not infallible –except when the Pope is teaching ex cathedra.There is nothing stopping priests from committing liturgical abuses. There is nothing stopping the Pope from permitting rites that are likely to be abused.The NO isn't inherently invalid. It is irreverent and its formulation is likely to lead to neglect of the proper intentions of priests, which are required for the Mass to be valid.

Jerailu (1): This is one particular instance where I cannot agree with most of the SSPX.

CincyGuy2025 (1): They are heretics. Trent condemned what they teach. N.O. is not the Church. SSPX might be controlled opposition or they are just useful idiots.

asimovsdog (1): It was never validly promulgated, the Holy Spirit prevented that.> The same Holy Spirit kept Paul VI from making the new mass obligatory. Pope Paul VI put his personal signature under the \*Constitutio Apostolica Missale Romanum\*. That's a document that says, "I like this book here." He published the missal in 1969, the new so-called Roman Missal. The first one that did not have documents of the other popes in there, but only Paul VI. >> It was a new book with a new mass, a new rite, Paul VI said so himself. And the book says, "I like this," and there are only two points of decree: one is, from now on, there are four Eucharistical Prayers. It doesn't say we have to use them. It says, "There are four Eucharistical Prayers, and I want the formula of consecration, the words of consecration, to be the same in all forms." That's the only part of the decree. >> So that concerns, again, the book itself, but not the use of the book or the obligation to use it. The obligation to use the Roman Missal was pronounced by Pope Paul VI orally in his speech at the consistory of May 26, 1976, and before that, there was a notification of the congregation. Now, I'm sorry, I got \*Quo Primum\* of Pius V saying, "No new mass must ever be written up. This document cannot be changed." And then there's a notification of the congregation saying I have to use the new missal. The notification is null and void. \*Inferior non potest tollere legem superioris\*: an inferior cannot take away the law of the superior, and the congregation is bound to any pope whatsoever.>> -- Fr. Hesse, "A conversation with Fr. Hesse, Part 1"This is classical liberal tactic: make it \*seem\* so that it is binding while actually never doing anything (and then using "authority" when it's pleasant to them to scare Catholics).Also, as other said, they are heretics (same as the FSSP) by signing off on Vatican II. And communion in sacris with heretics is... well. See Aquinas: ["Whether it is permissible to receive communion from heretical priests, and to hear mass said by them?"](https://isidore.co/aquinas/summa/TP/TP082.html#TPQ82A9THEP1).The Church’s indefectibility means she cannot \*universally\* promulgate error \*as binding dogma\* or defect from the Faith. It does not mean every papal disciplinary act is wise, prudent, or cannot be resisted if it demonstrably harms souls or the Faith. The Holy Spirit's assistance protects the Pope from \*defining\* heresy, not necessarily from personal error or harmful non-infallible actions.

LittleAlternative532 (5): > It is irreverent and its formulation is likely to lead to neglect of the proper intentions of priests, which are required for the Mass to be valid.It has also been promulgated to so low a practice that it is almost indistinguishable from Protestant liturgies which deny real presence. This leads people (what's the latest stat 70%?) to doubt. A recipient's faith is necessary for the sacrament to be fruitful, meaning for them to receive the grace offered. Over time if the recipients faith is eroded the less grace it will provide.

None (0): So you’re saying a rite promulgated by Church is irreverent? Wouldn’t that also be wrong?

CincyGuy2025 (0): Our Lord said to Peter, He who heareth you, heareth me. He didn't say to sift Peter. Not everything Peter says is dogma, but when you hear the voice of Peter, you hear the very voice of Christ himself.You have been brainwashed by the SSPX, unfortunately.They destroy the Primacy of Peter."Bob" is most likely the seventh head of the seven-headed beast. The n.o. sect is an anti-Church.

SnowWhiteFeather (4): Yes, a rite that has been promulgated by the authorities of the Church is irreverent.Yes, it is wrong, but not necessarily invalid.Here is a video from an SSPX priest that covers the topic in much more detail than I can:https://youtu.be/ftzfRi5TZrY?si=OX9Z1e17pPvmDzTzThe whole series is excellent at covering what the priests (members of the SSPX) and laity (those who are served by the SSPX) believe.I would also recommend Archbishop Lefebvres "An Open Letter to Confused Catholics":https://youtu.be/XcG733oDZ58?si=RluzUvX9BOCdLTJV

SnowWhiteFeather (1): God also gave us faculties of reason, so that when a Pope is teaching heresy it can be disregarded.There have been bad popes in the past. Recent history is not new in nature, but in scope. This affliction upon the Church is far worse than anything that has come before it.If you are going to call me brainwashed you should at least present an argument instead of reiterating worn out talking points.

CincyGuy2025 (1): Sweetheart, please don't confuse "bad" with "erroneous." There has NEVER been an "erroneous" pope. Papal sinners? Yes. Imprudent popes? Yes. Erroneous popes? No.Vatican I: the See of Peter always remains unblemished by ANY ERROR.Vatican I: the gift of truth and never failing faith was DIVINELY CONFERRED upon Peter and his successors. Vatican I defined when a pope is able to define a dogma. It did not say that everything else is suspect. That's the error of the SSPX. Not everything the pope says is dogma, but NONE of it is erroneous.This idea of the SSPX was condemned by Pius XI: "It is quite foreign to everyone bearing the name of Christian to trust his own mental powers with such pride to agree with only those things which he can examine...or that they must obey only in those matters which she has decreed in solemn definition." -Pius XI, Casti ConnubiiSincerely ask your SSPX Priest this: What good is your "cardboard" pope if... you won't worship using his ceremonies or rituals you won't use his breviary you won't use his calendar you won't use his catechism you won't bless the sodomites he wants you to bless you won't join his synods you won't pray with him you won't support him you won't accept his councils you won't accept his code of Canon Law you won't accept his canonizations you won't accept his mysteries of the Rosary you won't submit your will to him you won't believe anything he says ...unless you can examine it first... or unless it's decreed by solemn definition?According to Pius XI, they cannot even bear the name Christian.I'm not saying the priests are not hard-working and of goodwill (I know many of them). But they are seriously misinformed about Catholicism. Please pray that this gets fixed.

SnowWhiteFeather (1): Popes have contradicted and corrected themselves, they can be in error personally. If they couldn't be in error personally the phrase "Ex Cathedra" would serve no purpose. Everything the Pope says would be ex cathedra.Yes, the See of Peter remains unblemished, but not necessarily the man who occupies it.When reading "Chapter 4 On the infallible teaching authority of the Roman pontiff" of The First Vatican Council it is very clear that the Blessing of Papal Infallibility is being defined narrowly:"But since in this very age when the salutary effectiveness of the apostolic office is most especially needed, not a few are to be found who disparage its authority, we judge it absolutely necessary to affirm solemnly the prerogative which the only-begotten Son of God was pleased to attach to the supreme pastoral office."It then goes on to define the definition I am using and that you say is inadequate."So then, should anyone, which God forbid, have the temerity to reject this definition of ours: let him be anathema."You are rejecting the definition...From what I have seen the SSPX goes to great lengths to be compliant with Rome in all matters that aren't in error or sinful. It is one of the most endearing qualities of the society and its priests.

CincyGuy2025 (1): My dear, Our Lord doesn't contradict himself. And neither does his Vicar.Go read Humani Generis. Go read Pius X on How the Pope should be loved.Here are a few more quotes from various popes, councils and the systematic index of a book called "The Church" by the Benedictine Monks of Solesmes regarding the true nature of the papacy:"the supreme teacher in the Church is the Roman Pontiff""this See of St. Peter always remains unblemished by any error""this gift of truth and never-failing faith was therefore divinely conferred on Peter and his successors""No man can contemn the primacy without destroying the constitution of the Church and compromising his eternal salvation""The Pope is...Vicar of Christ...and with Him making but one single head of the Church""When we hear the voice of the Pope, we hear the very voice of Christ Himself...even in the 'ordinary' teaching authority""This 'ordinary' teaching, e.g., which is to be found in Encyclicals, requires assent""This ordinary magisterium is of divine authority and is infallible""It is an error to believe that one can adhere to Christ while rejecting His Vicar on earth""the teaching and the decisions of the Apostolic See are binding on all men, and are not subject to scrutiny""no distinction between the pope of the past and the pope of the present moment""the priest must place in his first rank of duties that of obedience to the Pope""We do not oppose to the pope's authority that of other persons-no matter how learned""for where there is holiness, there cannot be disagreement with the Pope""Union of minds, therefore, requires, together with a perfect accord in the one faith, complete submission and obedience of will to the Church and to the Roman Pontiff, as to God Himself.”"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"The idea that the Ordinary Magisterium is only infallible when it repeats what is already defined is false and has been condemned by Pius XII in Humani Generis. The idea that Peter can teach error, even heresy, is false. The idea that the Church can make use of ceremonies that lead to impiety is condemned by anathema at Trent. Scrutinizing Peter is condemned. The idea that the Church can provide harmful discipline is condemned.At this point we're not even discussing the "private" errors of a pope. We're discussing public official encyclicals containing heresy, councils, codes of canon law, official catechisms, canonizations made with supreme authority (go read the actual text and don't buy the lie that is the process), and the list goes on. Why do you insist on having a pope who you refuse submission to precisely because he isn't Catholic? It's kind of insane. Please show one document of the Church which says to sift the Teaching of Peter.Casti Connubii104. Wherefore, let the faithful also be on their guard against the overrated independence of private judgment and that false autonomy of human reason. For it is quite foreign to everyone bearing the name of a Christian to trust his own mental powers with such pride as to agree only with those things which he can examine from their inner nature, and to imagine that the Church, sent by God to teach and guide all nations, is not conversant with present affairs and circumstances; or even that they must obey only in those matters which she has decreed by solemn definition as though her other decisions might be presumed to be false or putting forward insufficient motive for truth and honesty. Quite to the contrary, a characteristic of all true followers of Christ, lettered or unlettered, is to suffer themselves to be guided and led in ALL things that touch upon faith or morals by the Holy Church of God through its Supreme Pastor the Roman Pontiff, who is himself guided by Jesus Christ Our Lord. (Emphasis added: capitalized ALL)I remain faithfully yours in the Sorrowful and Immaculate Heart.

# Post 203: What's the deal with all the people asking what the SSPX's teaching on certain things is?

Author: No-Test6158

Score: 30

Comments: 13

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ko115i/whats\_the\_deal\_with\_all\_the\_people\_asking\_what/

Like, the SSPX is a Priestly Fraternity within the Catholic church. They don't teach anything that the Catholic church doesn't teach. Canonically Irregular \*\*does not mean\*\* outside of the Catholic church.So why suddenly has this sub been flooded with people asking what the Society teaches on certain things? The society just does what the rest of the church does (should be doing).If anyone's reading this and is wondering what the society teaches about certain things - just go and look up what the church teaches. Ideally go and read the Catechism of Pius X/Council of Trent before you ask here.It'll save you a load of time and effort.

ourladyofcovadonga (12): Some are trolls but tbh I bet some are sincere. We live in a confused time where if you asked a NO priest something it would be different from a society priest's response. Unfortunately the best answer to most questions is to talk to a priest in person

Piancol (9): "The SSPX doesn't teach anything that the Catholic Church doesn't teach" is, sadly, a very debatable statement nowadays. And not because of the SSPX's fault. In reality, the Catholic Church is teaching many things that go against the Catholic Doctrine, or at the very least leave ambiguous holes in their teachings for all sorts of errors to slip in.So, what some people are really asking here is: "What is the Traditional Catholic teaching on this or that topic?"And then there's also trolls, of course.

nishka\_luv2 (15): It’s mostly trolls honestly. If you look at their post/comment history, some of them are clearly just trying to be controversial

PaxBonaFide (6): Troll accounts

SnowWhiteFeather (4): "Trolls" are usually people who come from a different ideology and want to "score points" by asking leading questions that feed into their narrative.These conversations aren't always beneficial for the troll, but they are happening on an open forum where a third party may benefit. Sometimes a good answer will surprise a troll and give them cause for introspection.There are enough people here who give sufficient context and strong enough answers that it collapses any merit that the ridiculous questions may have had –under the contemplation of a reasonable person.The people who are going to take offense at a Catholic answer have already made up their minds.The truth defends itself.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (2): They want to make sure the SSPX are Catholic, since Novus Ordo celebrating clergy aren't very consistent with their accusations against the SSPX and they're also inconsistent with Catholic teaching.

None (2): They think the SSPX is heretical. That's why.

afogleson (2): Yes... I would have worded it "they teach what the catholic church has traditionally taught, the doctrines that cannot be changed but vatican II at "best" watered down and in some cases the church now does not "teach" them even if they have not changed

Piklikl (5): While I’m inclined to allow anyone, even the trolls, to ask questions, does it seem like there’s a genuine influx of trolls? Is it to the point that we need more moderation and removal of those trolling posts? A few users have messaged me with complaints already.

Duibhlinn (7): >does it seem like there’s a genuine influx of trolls?Yes. And it's mostly the same small handful of individuals spamming posts. The majority of the posts on this entire subreddit are now from obvious troll accounts.>Is it to the point that we need more moderation and removal of those trolling posts?Yes, and with respect it has been at that point for a while and has long since passed it. I don't personally see why any toleration whatsoever should be given to obviously hostile troll posts.

Araedya (7): I think it’s a case by case scenario but some of them are just looking to stir the pot and paint the sspx/trads in the worst possible light.Good example - melbtest06 created an [inflammatory post](https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1k489bv/finally/)here (ultimately removed) and then cross posted it to other subs under the username melbtest04, concealing the similar username of course.https://www.reddit.com/r/ExTraditionalCatholic/comments/1k49hda/sspx\_again/https://www.reddit.com/r/awfuleverything/comments/1k49gxa/sspx\_catholics\_an\_illegitimate\_wing\_of\_the\_church/

Piklikl (0): As you can see by this comment thread, you and u/araedya are but two people on a post with over 1k views saying that there’s a problem. And while I was vague in my comment, you’re actually the only person who has said there’s an issues.There’s also nothing wrong with leaving up low effort content like that because it’s an opportunity to demonstrate Catholic charity in our responses.

Duibhlinn (3): I don't think the total views are the most relevant number. There are only 8 commenters who aren't moderators, and not all of those 8 people have voiced an opinion on whether or not there's a problem. Even going by what you say about myself and u/Araedya being the only 2 people who say there's a problem, that's already 25%, and would represent 250 of the viewers.Only 2 people actually responded to your comment asking whether or not there's a problem and 2 of 2, 100% of them, said there was a problem - myself and u/Araedya. Look at the numbers beside our posts and you will see that we are not the only ones who think this.With all due respect I think it's a bit ridiculous to say that it's only 0.2%, 2 out of 1,000, that have an issue when 100% of those who directly answered your question clearly expressed their opinion that there certainly is a problem. If you want an accurate barometer you should make a post with a poll, and I guarantee you that more than 2 people on this subreddit have an issue with the status quo: the fact that the moderation has allowed it to be overrun with spam, anti-Catholic thinly veiled hate posts from people who clearly hate us. I have found this influx to be highly offputting from reading the subreddit recently.>There’s also nothing wrong with leaving up low effort content like that because it’s an opportunity to demonstrate Catholic charity in our responses.We should be charitable to those with addiction issues for example, but it is not sane nor charitable to allow the local drug addicts to move into your front garden and turn it into a dangerous drug den. We are the children in the house in this analogy and you, the moderator, are the parent who is justifying allowing the local drug addicts to begin setting up a drug den outside our bedroom window.There is also a massive difference between "low effort content" as you call it and what the actual issue here is, thinly veiled hate content. These are troll posts written by people who, if you take 5 seconds and check their post history, clearly hate us. A low effort post from someone who could have easily googled the answer is not the same thing as deliberate attempts to derail a subreddit with troll posts. The former is indeed an opportunity to exercise charity, but the latter is a different matter entirely and the two are nothing alike.

# Post 204: Primacy of Conscience

Author: braq18

Score: 1

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1knn2ry/primacy\_of\_conscience/

What's the SSPX position on following the dictates of one's conscience when it violates Church teaching? If your conscience compels you to do something that violates Church teaching, are you committing a sin by violating your own conscience or Church teaching? Ex: A Catholic supporting expanding access to birth control despite the Church teaching it's a sin, because this person has come across quite a bit of research that shows it's very effective at reducing abortions. Another example would be a Catholic supporting the Respect for Marriage Act that gave federal protection to gay marriage, because even though the Church doesn't support gay marriage, the law also protects interracial marriage, which the Church does support. The logic for this would be based on Matthew 19:6: "So they are no longer two, but one flesh. Therefore what God has joined together, let no one separate.”

MonkeyKing\_1 (7): The teaching of the SSPX is identical to the teaching of the Church. The teaching of the Church is that one is obligated to form one's conscience, that is, to align oneself with the teaching of the Church. Therefore, anyone who knows that the Church teaches something different on a particular topic than one's own beliefs are sinning if they follow their own (false) decision of conscience.

konstantin1453 (3): No, the Church teaching has primacy over the conscience.

ExpertSalesCopy (2): Wd need more information to answer the question.

braq18 (1): Are you wanting an example of one's conscience going against Church teaching?

mattrixx (1): Yes

braq18 (1): I edited my post and gave a couple of examples.

# Post 205: Help for friend

Author: Internal\_Ad1735

Score: 5

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1knd0v4/help\_for\_friend/

I don't know how to get help for my friend. I occasionally go to the SSPX church of my region. My friend, who was baptized Catholic, was "re-baptized" in a Baptist church. He has been telling me he has sexual dreams and temptations for many months now (even before his "bsptism" in the Baptist church). He is very distressed and keeps dreaming about demon girls being in bed with him, and last night he dreamt about doing it with his sister. He woke up screaming and crying. He can't sleep properly because of his experiences with those demons. Me and my other Catholic friends have suggested talking to a Catholic priest about it, but I'm thinking diocesan priests won't take this seriously. I'm aware exorcism is pretty much nonexistent in most dioceses. I don't know if I should ask help to the SSPX priory and have a priest travel to our city. Will the SSPX priest accept to come see and talk to my friend even if he is Baptist (baptized Catholic as a baby)? If yes, how should I ask and what should I do?

mineuserbane (4): Someone like that needs the sacraments to heal. You're asking if a consultation with a doctor will heal someone who needs medication but isn't willing to take it. Doctors advice will not heal when you need medication. Exorcism is for possession. Sexual dreams are not possession. That seems more like an overactive libido being denied. Normal concupiscence. Regular Catholic sacraments and continual self denial will heal that. Christ instituted Confession and the Eucharist for this. Your friend is rejecting the medication required to heal.

None (2): This he just needs confession and the sacraments.

No-Test6158 (1): You are right in thinking that exorcism is rare - but this has always been the case. The dreams you've described sound normal to me. We've all had dreams where we've woken up and are grateful that it was just a dream. I know I've had all sorts. Things where I've broken the law and everything is falling apart, things where I've sinned against the 6th commandment in particularly nasty ways. It's just a dream. Holding onto them is like trying to hold onto sand. Your friend needs counselling from a decent, Catholic counsellor (a lot of secular counsellors will just try and bring out the anti-religious spiel) and he needs your prayers and compassion to help him come back to the church!And regarding the topic of exorcism, there is a process. Every diocese has an exorcist who will lead this. Often working with mental health professionals in order to discern who genuinely needs spiritual intervention.SSPX priests \*can\* do this but they will most likely refer to the diocese. In any case, most SSPX priests are immensely busy!

afogleson (2): I dont know if we can say this does not need an exorcism..... certainly confession and sacraments will help

# Post 206: I am conscious of grave Sin but I go up for Communion anyway because in my mind and heart I know that Our Lord forgives me. Is there a way of communicating this to my Parish Priest?

Author: melbtest06

Score: 0

Comments: 12

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kn4amk/i\_am\_conscious\_of\_grave\_sin\_but\_i\_go\_up\_for/

Tough\_Progress8678 (23): Go to confession

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (19): You still can't receive without confessing it.

None (10): [deleted]

Masterofluck11251 (9): Troll post

KingLuke2024 (3): Go to confession and speak to your priest about it. You shouldn't receive while knowing you're in a state of grave sin.

melbtest06 (-21): I confess to God privately in my own mind

Araedya (11): >post historyJudging by his post history I suspect he’s just a troll looking for reactions

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (21): Sorry but this is not Catholicism.

None (8): [deleted]

melbtest06 (-21): Whatever.

CincyGuy2025 (1): Well he's not one of those either 🙁

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (13): I recommend just chat to your priest about it. He knows more than either of us and should benapproachable and helpful.

# Post 207: Do you anticipate changes within the Society as a result of the new American pope?

Author: WineTerminator

Score: 6

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kn3wz6/do\_you\_anticipate\_changes\_within\_the\_society\_as\_a/

The Society has always tended to be somewhat Eurocentric, with German and French influence dominating. Do you think the new pope will have an influence on the SSPX, as the Argentinian pope did previously?

Willsxyz (5): In pretty much any organization, strength lies in numbers. The SSPX has been very French influenced since its founding because its founder was French and France was its stronghold in terms of numbers of priests, seminarians, faithful, etc.However, these days the American district is close to the same size as the French district and that (not the nationality of the Pope) will eventually result in a larger American influence inside the society. I'm not sure whether that bodes well or ill. Hopefully the former.

ExpertSalesCopy (1): No.

Next-Antelope-5887 (1): Yes, we need to respond to the appointment of this man as Pope. Brothers and sisters, band together to become more exclusive, shun all who aren't in the Society, and look down onto the unwashed. He's a frickin Sox Fan! Oh please help us Lord.

Willsxyz (8): The only people who are "in the Society" are the priests, seminarians, and religious of the SSPX. The laypeople who attend SSPX masses and receive the sacraments from SSPX priests and bishops are not "in the Society".

Araedya (5): For such a small sub there sure are a lot of trolls that manage to find their way here

Dark-Empath- (1): Probably the local Eucharistic ministers acting in bad conscience as usual.

# Post 208: Cardinal Hollerich believes Leo XIV will reinterpret Fiducia Supplicans | FSSPX News

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 6

Comments: 0

URL: https://fsspx.news/en/news/cardinal-hollerich-believes-leo-xiv-will-reinterpret-fiducia-supplicans-52427

# Post 209: The Divine Mercy is a product of the Novus Ordo, and of freemasonry. It seeks to uncrown the Sacred Heart

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 11

Comments: 13

URL: https://i.redd.it/827d48a51v0f1.jpeg

BasedEurope (6): I recommend you read [This Document](https://docs.google.com/document/d/15P9qIayrMKBtI8XhDl4Tj\_WIvi8aD0255vi64\_JeAu8/edit?usp=sharing) from the Prior of the FSSPX in Kaunas

Christ\_is\_\_risen (5): I absolutely agree with you!

LegitimateMaybe9995 (5): Very based

iphone5su93 (3): It definetly got a strange context to it

ardaduck (2): The SSPX chapel I'm in has a 2 meter painting of the icon put in by the fraternity itself and every Divine Mercy Sunday the priest preaches about it

therese\_m (4): Christ Jesus I trust in you!! Have mercy on us on the whole world amen amen

Melbtest04 (1): Why can’t you just let people the way they want? Divine Mercy is valid.

adveniatpermariam (0): And yet you are in communion with the creators of this satanic divine mercy cult

dbaughmen (4): https://youtu.be/IQuJF70AX3I?si=DVuSNKfQagdpHBNF

Willsxyz (10): Is your question directed at Cardinal Ottaviani?

dbaughmen (2): https://youtu.be/IQuJF70AX3I?si=DVuSNKfQagdpHBNF

Christ\_is\_\_risen (2): "Divine Mercy" was made by devils.

Street-Tree-8126 (4): Who is ?

# Post 210: The Challenges Of Our New Pope - Sermon by Fr Gomis (11 May 2025)

Author: DravidianPrototyper

Score: 7

Comments: 0

URL: https://youtu.be/sKUVHLKs39Y?si=7i9j5P9Npd4jtwfp

# Post 211: What is the SSPX standpoint on heretics? Is this the just punishment sought by SSPX?

Author: londontest11

Score: 0

Comments: 9

URL: https://i.redd.it/00kq60xhls0f1.jpeg

Huge-Explanation-358 (19): You're either a troll or you need to see therapist as soon as possible. Get out of the internet.

None (19): I'm going to give you what you came for: Yes I'm SSPX, all whole of it, it is me!, Yes this is what I want, Burn heretics.Signed SSPX.

Willsxyz (11): I have no idea what the SSPX would say but I personally say that executing public heretics (no matter by what means) would only make sense in a society that is approximately 100% Catholic and that has little to no contact with other non-Catholic societies.The point being in that case, that eliminating public heretics would eliminate the very few sources of doctrinal error that would tend to lead some people to eternal damnation. If sources of error are plentiful, such as they would be in a society in which Catholics are the minority or in which there is a significant non-Catholic population, or in which contact with non-Catholics is common, then executing public heretics would do nothing to preserve souls because they would be insignificant compared to all of the other sources of error.Also just to make sure you understand the history here. No one was ever burned or otherwise executed for privately having heretical opinions. The issue was people who insisted on trying to teach others their heretical ideas and continued to do so after being warned repeatedly to stop.

SnowWhiteFeather (6): It isn't clear to me what you are asking. If you elaborate someone will be able to give you a better answer.

MarcellusFaber (6): The proposition ‘It is against the will of the Spirit that heretics be burned’ was condemned infallibly by Leo X in Exsurge Domine.

Next-Antelope-5887 (2): Nobody expects the Spanish Inquisition!https://youtu.be/D5Df191WJ3o?si=1CKccMDupqJxqA0l

No-Test6158 (1): I'm going to respond in the most boring way possible.The SSPX holds to the 1983 Code of Canon Law and hence:>\*\*OFFENCES AGAINST THE FAITHAND THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH (Cann. 1364 - 1369)\*\*\* Can. 1364— § 1. An \*\*apostate from the faith, a heretic or a schismatic\*\* incurs a \*\*latae sententiae excommunication\*\*, without prejudice to the provision of can. 194 § 1 n. 2; he or she may also be punished with the penalties mentioned in can. 1336 §§ 2-4.§ 2. If a long-standing contempt or the gravity of scandal calls for it, other penalties may be added, not excluding dismissal from the clerical state.\* Can. 1365— A person who, apart from the case mentioned in canon 1364 § 1, teaches a doctrine condemned by the Roman Pontiff, or by an Ecumenical Council, or obstinately rejects the teaching mentioned in canon 750 § 2 or canon 752 and, when warned by the Apostolic See or the Ordinary, does not retract, is to be punished with a censure and deprivation of office; to these sanctions others mentioned in can. 1336 §§ 2-4 may be added.\* Can. 1366— A person who appeals from an act of the Roman Pontiff to an Ecumenical Council or to the College of Bishops is to be punished with a censure.\* Can. 1367— Parents and those taking the place of parents who hand over their children to be baptised or brought up in a non-Catholic religion are to be punished with a censure or other just penalty.\* Can. 1368— A person is to be punished with a just penalty who, at a public event or assembly, or in a published writing, or by otherwise using the means of social communication, utters blasphemy, or gravely harms public morals, or rails at or excites hatred of or contempt for religion or the Church.\* Can. 1369— A person who profanes a sacred object, moveable or immovable, is to be punished with a just penalty.Regarding Canon 1336 from the above:>Can. 1336— § 1. Expiatory penalties can affect the offender either for ever or for a determined or an indeterminate period. Apart from others which the law may perhaps establish, they are those enumerated in §§ 2-5.§ 2. An order:1° to reside in a certain place or territory;2° to pay a fine or a sum of money for the Church’s purposes, in accordance with the guidelines established by the Episcopal Conference.§ 3. A prohibition:1° against residing in a certain place or territory;2° against exercising, everywhere or inside or outside a specified place or territory, all or some offices, duties, ministries or functions, or only certain tasks attaching to offices or duties;3° against performing all or some acts of the power of order;4° against performing all or some acts of the power of governance;5° against exercising any right or privilege or using insignia or titles;6° against enjoying an active or passive voice in canonical elections or taking part with a right to vote in ecclesial councils or colleges;7° against wearing ecclesiastical or religious dress.§ 4. A deprivation:1° of all or some offices, duties, ministries or functions, or only of certain functions attaching to offices or duties;2° of the faculty of hearing confessions or of preaching;3° of a delegated power of governance;4° of some right or privilege or insignia or title;5° of all ecclesiastical remuneration or part of it, in accordance with the guidelines established by the Episcopal Conference, without prejudice to the provision of can. 1350 § 1.§ 5. Dismissal from the clerical state.

Ferrari\_Fan\_16 (1): Read this article please. https://sspx.org/en/defense-inquisition-30851

craft00n (-2): As for any other wrong doers, the vast majority of heretics doesn't deserve to be killed. The high kill ratio of Spanish inquisition was a problem, and that's why the Pope created the Roman Inquisition, who was far more chill, chiller, in fact, than local powers (there's a letter from Saint Louis to Joinville where he complains about Inquisitors being too soft)

# Post 212: A well written post I saw by someone brave enough to post on the main Catholic sub

Author: BasedEurope

Score: 16

Comments: 0

URL: https://i.redd.it/1ymttgn2im0f1.jpeg

# Post 213: Am I excommunicated for receiving the Eucharist in the Anglican Church?

Author: None

Score: 4

Comments: 12

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1km1428/am\_i\_excommunicated\_for\_receiving\_the\_eucharist/

dbaughmen (6): Absolutely not! It is not even a valid consecration, it might be a sin though.. please consult a Traditional priest

MonkeyKing\_1 (5): Thats certainly a grave sin and at least [c. 1381](https://www.vatican.va/archive/cod-iuris-canonici/eng/documents/cic\_lib6-cann1364-1399\_en.html#OFFENCES\_AGAINST\_THE\_SACRAMENTS) of the Codex Iuris Canonici comes into consideration: \*"One who is guilty of prohibited participation in religious rites is to be punished with a just penalty."\*

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (4): Talk to your priest about it.

Internal\_Ad1735 (3): You didn't receive the Eucharist. You received a piece of bread from a layman cosplaying as a priest.

ExpertSalesCopy (3): No. It's a mortal sin though, so go to confession asap.

PaxBonaFide (2): No but it is a grave offense

Kogos\_Melo (1): No

rathdrummob (-4): Yes! Straight to Hell. Do not pass GO. Do not collect $200. /sSorry buddy. Take it easy. Go to confession if you’re worried about it. Go on with your life

None (0): It was a woman

CamazotzRising (-2): Definitely,Archangel Michael himself will come down and beat you senseless for being an incurable heretic. /s, obviously

dayakcowboy (2): How did that even happen?

None (0): Some Anglican churches admit women to the priesthood

# Post 214: r/MissaTridentina - a subreddit for Portuguese speaking traditional Catholics

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 8

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/missatridentina/

# Post 215: A large print 1962 missal will soon be available from Angelus Press

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 14

Comments: 0

URL: https://x.com/AngelusPress/status/1921626360470204881

# Post 216: "Several Vatican sources have indicated that [Pope] Leo will soon lift restrictions on the Latin mass." | Conclave Secrets — Why Prevost Won, Parolin Lost | John Gizzi for Newsmax

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 21

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.newsmax.com/john-gizzi/pope-leo-vatican-catholic-church/2025/05/12/id/1210597/

# Post 217: SSPX Walton

Author: Emergency\_Series1610

Score: 7

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kkvnj6/sspx\_walton/

I am looking for input. How is Our Lady of Assumptions boys school? Would you recommend? I am finding little to no information, other than that they are building a large school. It looks like they are not near finishing it. Do they have good teachers? etc. Give me all the input!

No-Put1673 (3): It is funny, I found it difficult to find information before I moved here as well. Not sure how many responses you will get as I am unsure how many other Walton SSPXers are on Reddit. My take:I am very pleased with the school. It is not perfect, but no school is. My family moved here a little over three years ago from Southern California and we are very happy here. Don’t get me wrong, it was an adjustment, but well worth it. I also have some experience with the Dominican girls school across the street as well. Honestly, both schools are great. Your children will not get a “world class education” and the only thing constant is growth and change. However, with proper perspective on the world, The Church, and everything in between, I think that this school is great. The teachers are very good in my opinion. DM me if you want to chat more. Happy to provide more feedback. There is definitely some nuance here and it may be a lot to write. Curious to see other people weigh in.

NtGiL\_29 (1): Don't really have any firsthand info on the school but a larger family from my then-parish moved down a handful of years ago and stayed, so that at least counts for something

# Post 218: Pope Leo: "I would like us today, together, to renew our full commitment to the path that the universal Church has been following for decades now, in the wake of the Second Vatican Council. [...]"

Author: Mattia\_von\_Sigmund

Score: 5

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DVBKwYe5FOM

Street-Tree-8126 (7): Yup this was a pinch right in the heart. Sad, truly. But we can’t lose hope.

StelIaMaris (2): I mean did we really expect anything else?

# Post 219: So according to this website, 34% of SSPX recognise Mary as the centre of our faith instead of Jesus. Is that correct?

Author: londontest11

Score: 0

Comments: 16

URL: https://i.redd.it/gr3ynwqn8uze1.jpeg

WinterBaroness (20): That website is heretical, avoid reading it. Also, the SSPX officially doesn't support that heretical claim, I don't know about each SSPX person I know but I haven't seen one who believes in that

Christ\_is\_\_risen (17): This is not correct. Don't believe anything off of that website. I have researched it thoroughly after stumbling upon it a while ago, and it is very strange. It is incoherent gnostic conspiracies. The guy who runs it is an eastern catholic priest who lost touch with reality. A really sad story actually. He unfortunately has a community of maybe 20 to 40 people who follow him. They believe the bible is evil, the Lord from the bible is evil, Jesus and Mary from the bible are evil, he's made his own mass where he has completely omitted large parts, and it is interesting that it seems to be based on the tridentine mass considering he thinks the GREAT SAINT Pope St. Pius V is an evil antipope, I can keep on going... The website does not make sense and this man is in his own world.Also don't look on the website too much if you're squeamish. There are some very disturbing, violent, images that serve absolutely no purpose.

Christ\_is\_\_risen (8): Ah, I see you looked up that weird website I told you about.

rmlenz (3): Are this sub admins still alive?

iphone5su93 (2): seems like the heresies of the palmarians

BleuBoy777 (-2): Sounds right to me..."No one comes to the Father but by me .."Sspx - hold my beer... Let's make Mary "co mediatrix."But sure... Let's talk about tradition and biblical teachings.

Christ\_is\_\_risen (14): That website is more than heretical. It is just plain diabolical. It is run by a priest who has lost touch with reality and has definitely lost touch with God.

iphone5su93 (1): Has anyone got in contact with this priest in real life and tried to get him help?

ourladyofcovadonga (1): Protestants hate when people use reason in apologetics, per Luther who said that reason is the devil's whore.

WinterBaroness (11): It's even worse when it's a priest running it, he's helping losing souls instead of saving 😥

BleuBoy777 (1): Luther...the former priest, yes?Yeah ...

Christ\_is\_\_risen (6): Don't worry. He's not loosing many souls. The average person sees that website and is instantly repulsed. Especially if they see the images I mentioned or him calling the rosary or The Lord, evil.

ourladyofcovadonga (1): Yup your heresiarch, the guy that created the religion you follow now that is not Christianity

BleuBoy777 (0): Not sure where he got his ideas from... As a former Catholic priest. Just made em all like... Like the Catholic Church does.... Which means he learned pretty good from you guys.And I don't have a dog in the fight - I ain't protestant either. Tho I do think it's cute that they call you non Christians and you to the same to them.

# Post 220: The Rise of Francis 2.0 by the Catholic Esquire

Author: DravidianPrototyper

Score: 0

Comments: 3

URL: https://youtu.be/IQ6UXKKjkl8?si=30XITWR2KcfLWrP6

Highly recommended to give it a watch/listen. Doves into the potential new strategy to be employed by the likes of the Modernists at the helm of the Vatican in regard to the gradual deconstruction of the Catholic Faith by way of synodality while simultaneously neutralizing the Traditionalist movement by appeasing the sensibilities of semi-trads and 'glad-trads'.

Complex-Session-3180 (2): This is a good take on what the new pope actually believes regarding tradition.

BrodyJerome (1): He has not done anything yet. People don't seem to understand that we are owed filial charity to the pope. It is unjust and imprudent to begin condemning a newly elected pope before he has acted in his papal office.Archbishop Lefebvre never condemned Pope John Paul II until he observed actions, and even the SSPX waited to critique Pope Francis until his words and deeds.We should really not be posting an obese retard that is literally wearing a fedora judging the pope by presuption.

Street-Tree-8126 (1): I I watched this and made a detailed summary of the points he make and wether they seem to make sense or not. One thing I noted is he says American are rebellious in nature as if that was a good thing when it comes to religion. Rebellion in religion has led to either sedevacantism or Protestantism. Overall I think he’s having too much of a conspiratorial tone to describe it all. He exaggerates. Apparently he’s long been in the political sphere and it explains a lot of his over the top take on scheming in the conclave.

# Post 221: Who is Cardinal Robert Francis Prevost, now Pope Leo XIV?

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 2

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gjvQ7ep\_nhw

# Post 222: Make Catholicism Great Again!

Author: londontest11

Score: 30

Comments: 43

URL: https://i.redd.it/zo6p82zwflze1.jpeg

CHICAGOSTYLE23 (17): There are signs that we should be cautiously optimistic. Traditional Papal name and vestments, blessing and prayers all in Latin. A quick hard swing to ultra conservative would’ve been great but also too rough for the Church. I believe there must have been a strong call from the cardinals to return to tradition but they saw it imprudent to elect a pope that would do it abruptly. Let’s hope there is wisdom in that decision. We know the future of the Church lies in tradition.

iphone5su93 (10): it's gonna be another rough papacy

None (3): How liberal is pope Leo XIV?

HomeApprehensive2914 (2): https://www.ccwatershed.org/2025/05/08/robert-cardinal-prevost-pope-leo-xiv-privately-offered-the-tlm-in-his-private-chapel/

LittleAlternative532 (2): He intends to fully implement Vatican II - This opens up a huge gulf between him and the SSPX for the next decade and a half. I see the SSPX become Old Catholic after the reception of a new Bishop.

BleuBoy777 (6): Rats. I thought she sure we'd get a Pope dedicated to tradition and bring sspx rule back.... Maybe next time. Let's continue to talk about the crisis!!

Street-Tree-8126 (1): Well said

None (1): I don't understand, many sspx believers are in favor of prison for gays and adulterers. I didn't understand the "brusque to the Church" part.

Street-Tree-8126 (1): You’re a prophet now ?

GovernmentBudget4214 (5): He's a centrist, definitely right of Francis but he's got the pastoral nature

Traditional\_Sail\_641 (3): Best case scenario he won’t be worse than Jorge

londontest11 (6): Never. Progressive from now on for decades

feelinggravityspull (6): Are you just bored? What are you doing here? Go back to r/traps and stop trolling.

DravidianPrototyper (11): Man is also pro-synodality...not a good sign at all.

rmlenz (2): New Benedictus or New Johannes Paulus?

PleasantStorm4241 (10): This is no surprise cosidering how Francis stacked the deck. Still, I am saddened. I expect a rough road ahead for the TLM and the SSPX, and the Church as a whole.

BleuBoy777 (-4): Not trolling... Ridiculing? Probably. I'll go flog myself in reparation for Russia.... Or something

Street-Tree-8126 (1): More like Pope Benedict I believe, but I hope not.

iphone5su93 (3): Repent

Street-Tree-8126 (1): Ridiculing, certainly. Trolling, you’re trying your best but still unwaveringly even at that. But hey, take at least the W (if we can call it that) for outdoing yourself in self-deprecation. Gotta ask, is that another one of your kinks alongside gay posts you make on NSFW subs which your profile is swamped in ?

BleuBoy777 (-4): It's such a long list .... And I kinda liked it

BleuBoy777 (0): I thought humility was the mark of a good Catholic? So... No? Self depreciation is bad now? Do y'all change the rules based on the situation or what?

iphone5su93 (1): ??

Street-Tree-8126 (1): Poor thing, self-deprecation is all except humility. I wont expect you to know that. You have so much more on your plate as it is.

BleuBoy777 (1): My repent list!

BleuBoy777 (0): Ahh... So you just make it up as you go... Got it! Blessed be and under his eye.Am I doing and right?

iphone5su93 (1): that's not something to be proud off

BleuBoy777 (1): Yet - here we are!

Street-Tree-8126 (1): Tell us, from your own sad life experience. How does it feel to be such scum ? Do you like wake up everyday and thank your father Satan for it, in hopes of one day being reunited with him ? Cause you definitely will keeping this up 😂😂😂 One has to wonder looking at you, why would someone willingly choose condemnation. Laugh while you can buddy. We’ll be laughing last.

BleuBoy777 (1): Ah, the rallying cry of the weak - "some day you'll be sorry!" Sure, Jan. Keep telling yourself that

BleuBoy777 (0): Ps...my father Satan? My dad's name was Robert. Weirdo.

Street-Tree-8126 (1): Well I am not telling myself that. I am telling YOU. I am well aware of that already. You might choose noot to believe in God’s Justice, which is an absurd choice btw, but it doesn’t mean it won’t befall you. If anything it’s the rallying cry of the sensate. As a matter of fact, what do you believe ? lol that people sin, offend God and then join Him in kumbaya-fashion. And you still don’t want to be warned ?! Hahahah

Street-Tree-8126 (1): Is he gone ? That explains a lot. Specially if this happened early in your life.

BleuBoy777 (1): Your aware? From all that solid evidence, eh? Bunch of random dudes looking to control society... How should we do it? I know! "Sin! We'll threaten people with a benevolent being... Who will smite them if they don't follow our rules... But he totally loves us too."I guess Catholics do have a lot in common with trump. Both love the poorly educated.

BleuBoy777 (1): He probably should have beat me and Mom more like a good traditionalist.

Street-Tree-8126 (1): Ah took you long enough to bring trump into it lmao. How ironic of you to talk about the uneducated when you’re on the very top of that list, as amply evidenced up to this point. You said it yourself, you have to google some basic concepts to get the slightest idea of what Catholic Doctrine is. You keep throwing random facts up in the air, like Traditionalists going above their ways to show their wives who rules hahahah, that transubstantiation is magic although it’s all but; you even dare tell Catholics what is the “right” way to be when it comes to the Pope. Aren’t you the smuggest excuse for a joke of them all ? You know nothing about anything that you’re in any catholic sub discussing. Nor anything about life itself it must be said pitifully. We finally got to it: it’s not even that you’re not a catholic. You don’t believe in God, period. Let alone religion. I see. Why didn’t you say so earlier? lol I would’ve prefaced some things differently and it would’ve saved everyone time. You must be right about Catholics loving the poorly educated. That must probably be why the Church single handedly created Universities beginning in the 12th century (and even before through Cathedral Schools in the 8th century onwards). In the very Middle Age (times of darkness according to humanists), and why why we have them all over the globe today. Is it cause you’re a dropout that you didn’t have a clue about that ?

Street-Tree-8126 (1): Bro you don’t know what transubstantiation is. I won’t even ask you how on earth did you even remotely form the idea that this type of behavior (the father beating his family) is of the traditional repertoire.

BleuBoy777 (1): Weird how Catholicism was so opposed to letting the average person learn to read - specifically the Bible - whilst you ramble on about Catholic investment in "education "You jailed scientists (Galileo) because... He dared present evidence contrary to closely held religious beliefs and most sspx women are encouraged to attend higher education only to find a husband.Ps .. You think I really had to "Google"the big words? Though... Not surprising. You do seem easily duped.

BleuBoy777 (1): I googled the big word... So think I'm good there.But I know enough sspxers to know they like showing their woman who the head of the house is.

Street-Tree-8126 (1): Oh you googled. Changes everything I guess. You’re perfectly capable of understanding it now, although we’re dealing with the supernatural. You must be gifted. Someone who understands complex theological notions by a simple google browse. lol

BleuBoy777 (1): The bureaucracy is expanding to meet the needs of the expanding bureaucracyKinda like theology - "let's make a religion... But call it really complicated so that people need priests or ministers to explain it to them... And then let's keep laying in more and more complexity to tell people they can't possibly understand it - but - and it's a big but... If they just give more money... We can build a hierarchy that will explain the complexities that we manufactured."

Street-Tree-8126 (1): More money ? I think you have us mistaken with Protestants.

BleuBoy777 (1): Right. The church was never interested in power and money (Alexander 6, Pope leo)... The cathedrals aren't lined with gold from parishes scraping money together from church goers.It's all a conspiracy to make you look bad, right?

# Post 223: Will this be woke pope?

Author: Melbtest04

Score: 10

Comments: 102

URL: https://i.redd.it/4h35j5qqdlze1.jpeg

jaqian (19): Give him a chance before you cancel him

alejosoyyo (10): Only God knows why He allowed his election. We are in God’s hands, we must pray for him.

GovernmentBudget4214 (14): It's not all bad, he's definitely right of Francis, and his views on morals are entirely orthodox from what I gather

Absurdharry (7): We really don't know. Some say he's more liberal, but there have been Popes elected in the past who seemed liberal as Cardinals, but went on to be conservative.

DravidianPrototyper (12): He's liberal from what I gather (potentially modernist), but only time will tell.

CRAAAZYYYY (7): but the full vestments and name is a good sign

Lanky-Independent-27 (5): Worth a read https://www.conclavewatch.org/press-releases/survivors-respond-to-pope-leo-xiv

No\_Construction5455 (5): He is a registered Republican, and has voted as such when in the US. He is pro life, and wore the traditional Papal attire, and spoke Latin to the crowd. Also he spoke on synodality, so a mixed bag. We can hope and pray that the same conversion will happen to him, as it did Leo IX, and Leo XIII.

Proper-Notice-519 (5): https://collegeofcardinalsreport.com/cardinals/robert-francis-prevost/

lupenguin (4): I heard that he’s more moderate than anything so only time will tell. I have hope

MaterMisericordiae23 (8): We just have the Successor to Saint Peter inaugurated today and some people's reaction is to be critical of him right off the bat?Let's give him a chance. He IS our Holy Father after all. Being so critical right away when the man is not even one day in is such a sedevacantist mindset.

colekken (3): From what I've read, he is very traditional when it comes to Church doctrine but a little liberal when it comes to the poor and immigrants.

TagStew (3): I mean his stance is against gender ideologies and abortion and his first mass was Latin I’d say it’s a decent start. Only notable woke things up to this point is immigration and climate change everything else checks out including potentially covering up a rapey priest. He’s a moderate that leans a bit right at worst for the moment. Idk aside from the coverup folly seems like a decent fella. Best to give him his shot.

Previous-Plan-3876 (3): Well I’ve read that the German bishops have already expressed their concerns about him so if they don’t like him then I do 😂

CRAAAZYYYY (2): We should not assume since he hasn’t really said anything much a 100% with him we might just have to wait and see

HomeApprehensive2914 (2): https://www.ccwatershed.org/2025/05/08/robert-cardinal-prevost-pope-leo-xiv-privately-offered-the-tlm-in-his-private-chapel/

Vinobianca (5): Woke is caring about injustice. That's a good thing.

Automatic-Effect-252 (4): He's generally considered to be pastorally aligned with Pope Francis in tone and priorities, rather than leaning toward a more conservative or traditionalist stance typical of many American bishops. It's too early to tell but he seems to be a good choice.

Traditional\_Sail\_641 (2): We are cooked

Next-Antelope-5887 (1): I'm confused, are you all talking about Pope Leo and Pope Francis or Biden and Trump?

Next-Antelope-5887 (1): https://youtu.be/K2S-0ZjtFXA?si=WrFArVzkUiLKjB0L

Next-Antelope-5887 (1): If you mean by woke, that he will be against racism, sexism, social inequality, and discrimination. And that he will be an advocate for people of all races and social economic classes, then I hope he is the wokest Pope ever. You stupid S.O.B., this is not the president we're talking about. It's the frickin shepherd of the flock of humanity. Oh, by the way, Jesus was a socialist!

BleuBoy777 (-9): If only we could have gotten a Pope dedicated to tradition. Get back to racking protestants...oh well, let's get back to flogging ourselves in reparation of ... Something

konstantin1453 (10): I was giving Francis a chance till he died, as was God.And if someone continues to be on a wrong path he deserves to be criticised.

rathdrummob (7): Could it be that we have the church God wants us to have in this our time?

Traditional\_Sail\_641 (4): I wouldn’t call supporting FS and the synod “entirely orthodox”

Automatic-Effect-252 (7): They were extremely close with similar views

Trengingigan (2): He allegedly agrees to give communion to unrepentant adulterers

Blade\_of\_Boniface (2): I'd say where they're most similar is collegialism and liberal relationship with secular authority.

MarcellusFaber (2): They’re not. He promotes collegiality, which is heretical.

Street-Tree-8126 (2): Wow, like whom ? That’s something I didn’t know.

konstantin1453 (18): Every cardinal/bishop/priest in the novus ordo is a modernist for me until proven otherwise.

Next-Antelope-5887 (1): You all talk like being a liberal is a bad thing.

Street-Tree-8126 (1): A very good sign indeed

Street-Tree-8126 (1): What’s your take on that ? I for one find it ironical the name of the network is SNAP but I guess that’s purposeful

craft00n (1): Well the church, as any other human society, deals really badly with abuse cases. Not new, not specific : not interesting to get an opinion on the new Pope.

Street-Tree-8126 (1): Amen

Street-Tree-8126 (1): I have a lot of hope. Let us pray.

Willsxyz (4): > We just have the Successor to Saint Peter inaugurated today and some people's reaction is to be critical of him right off the bat?If it’s justified. For example, his brother says he’s a White Sox fan. 🤦♂️

Street-Tree-8126 (1): Uncalled okay, but sedevacantist mindset ? That’s an exaggeration

angelkowoj (6): As should be. What’s wrong with the poor and the migrant?

Street-Tree-8126 (1): Let’s just hope he isn’t a practical defender of the theology of liberation as was Pope Francis, God rest his soul

Street-Tree-8126 (1): He supports V2, NO and synodality I wouldn’t call that being very traditional to Church Doctrine.

Street-Tree-8126 (3): I’ve seen some say that this cover up was debunked and didn’t in fact happen. And even if it did, that’s no theological stance thank God, it would just be a mistake along the way for which he can be forgiven easily.

Willsxyz (4): It is good to be against that which one perceives to be injustice as long as one is capable of correctly identifying injustice. Not every dissimilar outcome is unjust.

Next-Antelope-5887 (2): Amen!

konstantin1453 (8): How can be someone aligned with Francis a good choice?

Street-Tree-8126 (1): Why would we be cooked ? It’s too early to resort to such consideration

Willsxyz (7): >Jesus was a socialist!Doubt.

None (13): Are you lost?

jaqian (11): We want a Pope who preaches the gospel

Street-Tree-8126 (2): Continues to be ? Man has barely started his role as Pope

Addicted2Weasels (6): I think that’s always the case

Street-Tree-8126 (1): Well in that case it might be a good sign, cause someone less modernistic than Pope Francis is a step towards the right direction.

Street-Tree-8126 (2): I find this hard to believe. What is the source to support that claim ?

Street-Tree-8126 (1): What does collegiality refer to exactly ?

ourladyofcovadonga (3): I don't know why people are so surprised. Anyone with a v2 formation is de facto modernist

Street-Tree-8126 (1): That’s the hard truth indeed. But you have modernists that can more easily be swayed back into the right path, specially being a new and very special recipient of an uncountable number of graces like is the case for a new Pope.

craft00n (1): Ok I'm going sedevacantist.

Next-Antelope-5887 (1): It's a known fact that all White Sox fans are liberal and receive communion in their hand.

colekken (3): Never said there was.

colekken (1): Well, there are rumors that he supports the old Mass and the new Mass. I'm waiting to see if they are true.

TagStew (1): I said it in jest he was accused of knowing but no one proved it his track record doesn’t exactly fit with “let it slide let it hide” like I said I got fairly decent hopes for the guy seems likable seems in line with what’s expected of a Pope and seems to have an affinity to Our Lady. And he hit the ground running with a Latin Mass. I’d say for a moderate conservative he’s starting off well. Catholicism sits conservative middle by itself liberals love the the climate and immigration stance and we love everything else 😂

Next-Antelope-5887 (1): In the name of the god of one's mind, no man is wrong.

Next-Antelope-5887 (1): "Blessed are you who are poor, for yours is the kingdom of God" (Luke 6:20) and "Sell your possessions and give to the poor" (Luke 12:33)

BleuBoy777 (-7): That feels like a double entendre.But no...I'm quite aware of where I am, thanks!

BleuBoy777 (0): No - you want a Pope who adheres to your version of what you think is Catholic.

Next-Antelope-5887 (0): Progressives always win.

Street-Tree-8126 (1): lol

Street-Tree-8126 (1): He has a good reverence for liturgy apparently. Prayed in Latin in the NO mass, which is a step.And brought back traditional vestments. Plus he’s against wokism apparently, which is great.

Next-Antelope-5887 (1): Mark 10:21-22Jesus, looking at him, loved him and said, ‘You lack one thing; go, sell what you own, and give the money to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; then come, follow me.’

Street-Tree-8126 (1): Dude you have posts asking how to get your behind violated. You are just a troll pretending to be of a religious denomination you can’t begin to even grasp. As a matter of fact the moderator here should maybe take a look at your profile. You are most assuredly lost. No doubt in that.

jaqian (7): Isn't that what you want? 🤣

Street-Tree-8126 (1): Not what history and current news show

Next-Antelope-5887 (1): Psalm 82:3-4)“Defend the weak and the fatherless; uphold the cause of the poor and the oppressed. Rescue the weak and the needy; deliver them from the hand of the wicked.”

BleuBoy777 (1): Will you help find me? Pretty pretty please? You finding my hidden shame has made me revisit all my life choices and I want to be more like you...a judgemental douche. Just like Jesus wanted us to be!Give me a break Catholicism is soooo hard to comprehend? Calling them mysteries do not, in fact, make them mysterious.I could call myself Honda - but I'm not a car.Here's the harsh reality for you - st Paul struggled with "the flesh" ... Jesus never said one word against homosexuality.... You're looking for an echo chamber where everyone utters "blessed be" and no one has fault. So .. Who's the more Catholic here? You... Who has chosen to pickup the stone whilst in a glass house? Or me... The wicked sinner who hasn't crawled your comments looking for a way to insult you?Hmmm....

BleuBoy777 (2): Nope. I want the Pope to be Pope. "Keys to the kingdom" and all that ... Kinda how it was meant to be. Not - "ohhhh, I don't like this, I'll just ignore what the Pope says because it can't be correct."

NATA4RC (1): Only if you live in your Seppo bubble

Next-Antelope-5887 (1): (Proverbs 14:31)“Whoever oppresses the poor shows contempt for their Maker, but whoever is kind to the needy honors God.”

jaqian (3): You want a Pope "dedicated to tradition", I'd prefer a Pope who preaches the gospel and adheres to the teaching of the Catholic Church but that isn't the same as "tradition"

Next-Antelope-5887 (1): Matthew 25:40)“The King will reply, ‘Truly I tell you, whatever you did for one of the least of these brothers and sisters of mine, you did for me.’”

BleuBoy777 (1): I don't want a Pope dedicated to tradition - I want a Pope doing what was asked of him regardless of if that takes a Pope away from what language the magic words are said in.

Willsxyz (4): Now explain how all of those quotes relate to socialism, or demonstrate that Jesus Christ was a socialist.Actually I suspect you don’t know what socialism is, so maybe read up on that first.

Willsxyz (6): The language is irrelevant. the content is critical.

Street-Tree-8126 (0): Again are you lost ? Cause a pope that does what is asked of him as a Pope is a Pope who is dedicated to Tradition lol. Are you new here ?

Christ\_is\_\_risen (3): I'll explain. They don't.He doesn't know what he's talking about, and by speaking rashly, he commits blasphemy.

Street-Tree-8126 (2): For real, there’s a universe of difference between social justice and social equality defended by socialists.

BleuBoy777 (1): Yet...."engrish is bad" in mass.Perhaps you are lost?

Next-Antelope-5887 (2): First of all, how dare you refer to me as he. You assume you know me, but you don't. I am a cradle Catholic with a Catholic school education. I just don't get why you all have your panties in a wad on if the Pope is conservative or liberal, Republican or Democrat, or who he voted for. Are true Catholics only Republicans?

Street-Tree-8126 (1): Ah I see you’re not even catholic. lol a troll is all. You think the mass is “magic”… smh

Street-Tree-8126 (1): Are you on an acid trip ? Or you posted your comment in the wrong spot ?

BleuBoy777 (0): But only if you wave your arms and say the magic wordsI am Catholic, but not the absurd "it must be in Latin" Catholic

BleuBoy777 (-1): How is it not "magic?" Transubstantiation = magic

Street-Tree-8126 (1): Oh God… here’s a much needed advice anyone here could give you (even modernists catholics as a matter of fact): choose your battles wisely! instead of going down on Tradition with such mediocrity, focus first on fixing your totally improper understanding of what Mass is, which is the core of the Religion. And being clueless to what is transubstantiation opens you up to this kind of embarrassment: saying in public that it’s magic. Here’s food for thought to get you going: how can transubstantiation be magic if God abhors magic (the occult) and condemns it ? A miracle (something impossible) doesn’t equate to magic.

BleuBoy777 (0): You said food for thought ... Was that meant to be a funny? I hope it was meant to be a funny."Magic, at its core, refers to the use of supernatural or unseen forces to influence events or human behavior, often through rituals, spells, or incantations."Trying to figure out what that sounds like ... It'll come to me in a bit, I bet.

Street-Tree-8126 (1): To be “a” funny ? “engrish is bad” took a new meaning lol

BleuBoy777 (1): You got a wife and 8 kids yet? You got an awful lot of time on your hands...

# Post 224: What is the SSPX official position on who we are endorsing as Cardinal Pope? I am hearing whispers that the Filipino Cardinal (pictured) is front runner

Author: Melbtest04

Score: 0

Comments: 3

URL: https://i.redd.it/xunfg80ikjze1.jpeg

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (9): This is not a healthy post. 'We' endorse noone. Most people on here have no links to the society beyond going to Mass there or having an interest. The SSOX endorse noone. They wait for the conclave to be over and then accept the pope as the pope. This shouldn't be a game of politics. Maybe when we know who the pope is the leaders of the society will feel relief or trepidation but it makes no difference. Their reaction is the same. The entire church does not need to push behind one cardinal or another.

Key\_Maintenance1487 (4): This is the best reply, you don't need another. We'll done

# Post 225: Therapy

Author: Similar\_Gap8437

Score: 3

Comments: 15

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kheh4c/therapy/

Have SSPX priests ever recommended therapy? Do any priests practice as psychologists themselves? Do they discourage people from doing therapy and working with psychologists?

SnowWhiteFeather (7): Using my own words, but repeating the sentiment:Therapy is a tool. Tools can be helpful or they can be misused. There are concerns associated with secular therapists. Being aware of them and being properly catechised will mitigate those risks.

CatholicBean (2): A former priest of mine recommended it for me and he underwent it himself.

Proper-Notice-519 (1): There’s a priest of the society with a mother that is a clinical psychologist. They definitely recommend it!

BleuBoy777 (0): Well if it's marriage therapy - you should definitely seek the opinion of an unmarried man. That should work out brilliantly!

ExpertSalesCopy (-6): Therapy is almost always a way to make your situation worse. Neither Jung nor Freud were good guys, nor did they understand mankind.

Similar\_Gap8437 (1): SSPX?

Henotrich (3): Should I reject doctors because they didn't got cancer or diabetes?

craft00n (2): As a young therapist : priests can be surprisingly well educated about what's good and bad in a relationship. The reason is they hear a lot about it in confession, and the Church has 2000 years of writings about it.

CatholicBean (4): This is a pretty bad over-generalization. I think you’re right in that the modern world does have a tendency to pathologize the human condition and people are definitely over-medicated, but, speaking to my own experience, I suffer from pretty bad obsessive compulsive disorder and my Catholic therapist has genuinely helped me deal with it. Not all therapy is Freudian.

craft00n (2): Thank God freudians and jungians are now a small minority worldwide.

CatholicBean (2): Yeah.

BleuBoy777 (1): Wrong metaphor - don't go to the vet for a human. A priest without relationship context is irrelevant.

BleuBoy777 (-2): Several thousand years of Hinduism writings too.... So, Hindu is on par with the priest?

Henotrich (3): It is not irrelevant if we are talking about Godly and Holy marriage advice based on Scripture and Tradition. Of course, there would be things that he will miss out. Of course, there would be things that he would not get about. But he does try his best to study about this and he is a very reliable source of advice from the Church's perspective. It doesn't harm to ask his advice since in Catholicism, marriage is Holy thing, so it helps. Also, there is nothing wrong with seeking the advice of both clergy and married people.

BleuBoy777 (1): "of course he'll miss things .." ..."what harm can it do?"You answered your own question, bub.And then the couple gets divorced .. Not the poor priests fault .. But the couple is damned to ... What? Forever single? Hell?What a gig....

# Post 226: Is Mary actually the centre of our Faith?

Author: Melbtest04

Score: 0

Comments: 9

URL: https://i.redd.it/ijm9oq1zjfze1.jpeg

Holy\_juggerknight (16): The center? No.An important part? Yes.

ExpertSalesCopy (9): No.

Street-Tree-8126 (2): Well it really depends the description you make of f this reality. All that matters is proper understanding and conveying of the truth about Her. She isn’t the absolute center. But she’s also not marginal. Infinitely far from it. She hovers around the center. She’s central but obviously nowhere not THE center. She is at the center of our Savior’s Project of Redemption. He chose her to operate His Salvation, which makes Her the most important single creature when it comes to the Salvation of Humanity. She’s like the Moon to the Sun (God) when it comes to earth (us). The Sun shines its light, the moon reflects it. She lights Earth at night using the same light emanating from the Sun. This is why the Moon is usually a representation of Her.

dbaughmen (3): The Mediatrix of All Graces, she is our Holy Interceder.

elsro (1): Of course!She is the Mother of God, Theodokos! She is Our Mother as well! The Incarnation and salvation of souls was done through Her Fiat. Ave Maria, gratia plena!

None (-15): [deleted]

iphone5su93 (5): repent anglican

Street-Tree-8126 (2): Thanks for the laugh of bs.

None (-2): [deleted]

iphone5su93 (7): it's a honour to be called a papist by a heretic

Street-Tree-8126 (5): Indeed lol. 😂 these morons don’t even know the difference between an insult and a compliment. That’s how confused they are in life.

# Post 227: Is MSGR Brynes (Novus ordo ordained) a valid priest?

Author: None

Score: 1

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kgm9sb/is\_msgr\_brynes\_novus\_ordo\_ordained\_a\_valid\_priest/

BertBlyleven (2): As far as we know, yes - which is all we can really say about anyone presumed to be validly ordained. The SSPX holds that the new rite of episcopal consecration is valid in and of itself. I'm not sure what the current practice is but it used to conditionally ordain anyone who had doubts as to the validity of the ordination based on intention or some other issue with the priestly ordination.Here's some food for thought if you're having doubts, the author is a sede fwiw: [https://akacatholic.com/the-1968-rite-of-episcopal-consecration-valid/](https://akacatholic.com/the-1968-rite-of-episcopal-consecration-valid/)

CincyGuy2025 (1): Did you ever think that the SSPX says that the new rite of consecration is without doubt valid because if they didn't, they would have to say the last few guys weren't popes?

CincyGuy2025 (1): He's not been conditionally ordained AFAIK.

Willsxyz (2): A few months ago I spoke with a priest of the society from the Philippines (where apparently priests coming to the SSPX from the novus ordo is not so uncommon) who told me that it is the decision of the priest who comes to the SSPX about whether or not to be conditionally ordained, and that most do so choose.

CathMode (2): This is helpful for me as well (my 13 yr old boy is expressing concern about the rite of episcopal consecration since we discussed at the table a couple wks ago). I don’t find the argument by Fr Cekada fully compelling on the first read, yet not put off by line of questioning/reasoning, and I might have to return to his or similar arguments for a closer look. I think there is more in the sentence under scrutiny than “governing spirit” and seems to my (unqualified) eye to contain enough of the substance (especially specifying “apostles” as the type of power in question, which the false denominational church leaders don’t possess). Edit: I didn’t realize the author was about to agree with me, as I hadn’t finished the last bit of the article. Sorry for too quickly posting; glad I came to the same conclusion though. New rite seems ok (though the new wording is annoying and it’s deeply annoying that we are in this predicament and we would all be less nervous with a return to tradition!).

None (1): I’m sedevacantist so this helps a ton

# Post 228: Any ex-SSPX seminarians on here?

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 3

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kgk9g1/any\_exsspx\_seminarians\_on\_here/

ExpertSalesCopy (1): I know a handful of them. Why?

Spare-Finding-490 (1): I know two, one is a Catholic priest now and the other Catholic seminarian. May I ask why?

# Post 229: In essence, isn’t Sedevacantism just disagreeing with the views of progressive Popes?

Author: Melbtest04

Score: 0

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kghsah/in\_essence\_isnt\_sedevacantism\_just\_disagreeing/

None (18): No, sedevacantism is believing that the Pope or multiple Popes are not the Pope. Sede Vacante, means that the chair of Peter is empty. Currently, we are all sedevacantists, to be semantic.A typical sedevacantist believes there has been no occupant of the Papacy since Pius XII in 1958. There are some sedevacantists who more recently have varied on this view, some believing Francis was not Pope but Benedict XVI was.

ExpertSalesCopy (1): No.

CincyGuy2025 (1): It's about the belief that Peter cannot lead you astray... SSPX believes that Peter needs "sifting" (word of AbL.) Sede believes Our Lord Himself who said to Peter, "He who hearerh you, heareth me."Sede believes the Ordinary Teaching is infallible while not being dogma. SSPX believes Ordinary Teaching is suspect and needs to be run thru the SSPX Golden Sifter.

# Post 230: Are novus ordo ordinations valid or valid doubtful

Author: None

Score: 2

Comments: 14

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kfsahe/are\_novus\_ordo\_ordinations\_valid\_or\_valid\_doubtful/

mineuserbane (8): Valid. The argument they are not valid is very, very flawed. The matter and form of the sacrament of holy orders is pretty simple at its root. The laying on of hands and the words from the Bishop. The words have changed throughout the ages and differ between rites. It's a stretch to say that a change to the ordination rite invalidates it.

iphone5su93 (2): how does one adress the argument that Pope Leo XIII condemned anglican ordinations and that he said they were invalid for lacking the same two things that i've heard novus ordo ordinations also lack?

Willsxyz (3): What does your catechist say?

kawaqcosta (3): I have seen texts by Father Álvaro Calderón, a professor at the Seminary in Argentina, that seem to lean towards the second case: they have doubtful validity. It is not that they \*are\* invalid, but that they \*could be\*. I saw these texts by chance in some chats with friends, it is not something that interests me now.I also don't know what the SSPX's practice is in this regard. I think conditional ordinations are especially rare, since I'm not aware of many so far (I've never heard of any, in fact).

No-Try7513 (2): Potentially invalid. In the least they are questionable and should be avoided at all costs

ExpertSalesCopy (1): Valid.

None (-5): [deleted]

DaCatholicBruh (1): The Church cannot contradict itself, the Church has said that these ordinations are allowed, therefore, they must be valid. The Anglican ordinations were condemned because they lacked form and intent. The Novus Ordo ordinations have neither of these issues.

None (2): I attend SSPX with one novus ordo ordained and one re ordained

None (1): Msgr brynes might be invalid

Willsxyz (8): Either you are joking and I don’t get the joke, or you are very wrong. Hopefully the former is true.

mattrixx (1): IIRC that's only the case if the matter and form stayed the same, and there is a valid line of succession/ordinations all the way back to apostolic times. It would still be illicit though. (Valid/invalid and licit/illicit are different things).I think most splits from the church quickly lose some necessary part for an ordination to be valid since they start making changes that would make it invalid.Please correct me though if I'm wrong.

iphone5su93 (1): I think it was more on words used and yes I agree that the Church cannot contradict tiself which is why I often saw those points made by sedevacantists

kawaqcosta (2): Here in Brazil we have some priests from Novus Ordo. I guess that no one was ordered subconditione.

DaCatholicBruh (1): The form they were using, their words, was lacking, hence their intent was also, which is one of the reasons why it was condemned. Well, that would explain why \*\*\*that\*\*\* argument is being made if it's a sedevacanist . . .

# Post 231: A Legacy of Tradition: Fifty Years of Saint Thomas Aquinas Seminary - FULL DOCUMENTARY | Society of Saint Pius X

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 9

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qoC2PGp9ICM

Odd-Bed-9260 (2): Loved that documentary very beautiful and touched my heart

# Post 232: I was wrong about the Sspx (confession)

Author: Crusaderhope

Score: 25

Comments: 13

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kejbg0/i\_was\_wrong\_about\_the\_sspx\_confession/

I ( diocesen seminarist) once posted here because was considering adhering to the sspx vocational and wanted to understand the order, obviously not understanding the stances of the fraternity, I disagreed with the responses here, since I was interested because of a rejection of the "modern church", not because I was convinced, but was angry with bad clergy.After studying the crisis we are under, and reading books written by Dom Marcel lefebvre, I understood the problem to be much deeper than bad homilies, and poorly celebranted masses, it was with vatican 2 itself, and its tendencies, being conservative isnt enought, the new rite of mass made after the council is morally ilicit per canon law understanding, and it is a disgrace to our faith, the new movements and its accreations are supported by the intentional ambiguity of the council. A lot of high ranking men in the church want to destroy it, and use its corpse for political reasons. And after attending a couple of times in the sspx here in my town, I feel in love with it, and now am being analised for the pre-semimary of the fraternity. Im just sad to took so long to see that Dom Marcel, and Dom Antônio de Castro Mayer, were right, this is the faith of our fathers, and those before them, in a line directly connected to Christ.Tldr: I was wrong for so long and I am sorry, so please give me advice if you have any.

kawaqcosta (2): É brasileiro?

CincyGuy2025 (1): Please don't fall for the SSPX line that the Pope and Church can lead you astray. Neither Peter nor the Bride of Christ can lead you astray.You are correct in that Vat2 IS the problem. Therefore Vat2 doesn't come from the Church as bad fruit doesn't come from a good tree. Ab.Lefebvre was correct in many things but not when he says Peter needs sifting.The moral of the story is ... Keep going in your search and realize that the Vat2 "popes" are imposters pushing a new religion.

BleuBoy777 (0): Please join us as we flog ourselves in reparation. I'll shall endeavor to remove a finger for that time I dared question sspx

Crusaderhope (6): Sim

Crusaderhope (1): I already did my homework, im not stupid enought to be sedevacantist, furthermore you contradicted yourself when you conceed error from vatican 2, it was aproved by Popes, that in their hearts believed they were helping the church.Its just a fruit of its time, furthermore even if the Pope was a heretic and the church didnt pronounced he was one, he would still be rightfully the Pope per canon law, but wouldnr have the right to promote changes that contradict, the Church ordinary universal magisterium. Which is the continuous teachings of the fathers.I used to think exactly like you about the sspx and sedevacantism, you can even see a post where I debated everyone here defending some points that add to your argument.

Specialist-Echo-9592 (1): Bem-vindo!

CincyGuy2025 (1): I do not believe the "Vatican 2" claimants were Catholic and therefore do not believe they were popes.No contradiction on my part. Vatican 2 and it's new religion are the contradiction to the Catholic Faith.The SSPX religion of having your pope and sifting him too is not Catholic. Nor can the pope be a public heretic as "the See of Peter always remains unblemished by any error" (Pastor Aeternus).Pius XI also condemned the idea of examining everything that isn't de fide. He says you cannot even bear the name Christian if you do that.Be careful! The SSPX is running right into the devil's den. They destroy the primacy of Peter as taught by Our Lord.

Crusaderhope (1): Thats your misinterpretation, and you are dogmatizing a thesis from 1 theologian (St robert belarmine) when many already disagreed with him, (so its not Catholic) even canon law. The Pope is the Pope even if he isnt catholic, until the see reconizes that. Also Saint Robert would never defend a layman to reconize and judge the heresy on The Papacy. Futhermore RCR is as old as Saint Athanasius, we are not examining things we just dont obey when a Pope wants to disobey the ordinary universal magisterium. For Pastor aeternus also says the autority of the Pope is to judge tradition not invent new doctrine, therefore the see is always unblemished for the Catholic church was built to have errors never be binding, and the sspx is catholic and you are a apostate. For the cardinals were appointed by valid Popes, and we cannot see nor judge without a speck of doubt that the Popes in vatican wished to apostate knowing they were teaching heresy against something the church considerated imutable, and even if they did per canon law they would be juridically the Pope, but their decrees would not be binding, for the autority is from Chirst not from the man in the see. thats nonsense and you are insane.

CincyGuy2025 (1): Here are a few quotes from various popes, councils and the systematic index of a book called "The Church" by the Benedictine Monks of Solesmes regarding the true nature of the papacy:"the supreme teacher in the Church is the Roman Pontiff""this See of St. Peter always remains unblemished by any error""this gift of truth and never-failing faith was therefore divinely conferred on Peter and his successors""No man can contemn the primacy without destroying the constitution of the Church and compromising his eternal salvation""The Pope is...Vicar of Christ...and with Him making but one single head of the Church""When we hear the voice of the Pope, we hear the very voice of Christ Himself...even in the 'ordinary' teaching authority""This 'ordinary' teaching, e.g., which is to be found in Encyclicals, requires assent""This ordinary magisterium is of divine authority and is infallible""It is an error to believe that one can adhere to Christ while rejecting His Vicar on earth""the teaching and the decisions of the Apostolic See are binding on all men, and are not subject to scrutiny""no distinction between the pope of the past and the pope of the present moment""the priest must place in his first rank of duties that of obedience to the Pope""We do not oppose to the pope's authority that of other persons-no matter how learned""for where there is holiness, there cannot be disagreement with the Pope""Union of minds, therefore, requires, together with a perfect accord in the one faith, complete submission and obedience of will to the Church and to the Roman Pontiff, as to God Himself.”"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"The idea that if it's not de fide, it's subject to scrutiny is condemned. The idea that the Ordinary Magisterium is only infallible when it repeats what is already defined is false and has been condemned. The idea that Peter can teach error, even heresy, is false. The idea that the Church can make use of ceremonies that lead to impiety is condemned by anathema at Trent. The idea that the Church can provide harmful discipline is condemned.Are you going to tinker with the Catholic teaching to be able to "have your Pope" (to whom you then refuse submission precisely because he does not teach Catholicism), or are you going to leave Catholic teaching untouched and instead simply "walk by Faith, and not by sight" (2 Cor 5:7), knowing that although the Holy See can be vacant or impeded, the Faith can never be false?

CincyGuy2025 (0): "It is quite foreign to everyone bearing the name of Christian to trust his own mental powers with such pride to agree with only those things which he can examine...or that they must obey only in those matters which she has decreed in solemn definition." -Pius XI, Casti ConnubiiI sincerely ask you this: What good is your "cardboard" pope if... you won't worship using his ceremonies or rituals you won't use his breviary you won't use his calendar you won't use his catechism you won't bless the sodomites he wants you to bless you won't join his synods you won't pray with him you won't support him you won't accept his councils you won't accept his code of Canon Law you won't accept his canonizations you won't accept his mysteries of the Rosary you won't submit your will to him you won't believe anything he says ...unless you can examine it first... or unless it's decreed by solemn definition?

Crusaderhope (1): Because no one when defined vatican 1, believed the Pope is infalliable at every breath he takes, for even Peter knowing the truth in Acts taught error, and made a jewish christianity, even tho he knew the truth, so Paul corrected him, we have Pope honorious condemmed as a heretic, we have Pope Liberius that was not enforcing the faith in the semi arian crisis, ans since you are a belarmist, you would be familiar that St belarmine says that this was enought to condemm him a heretic. Furthermore we even had a 20 year old as Pope, we had 3 Popes, we had a Pope which made a male prostitute as a cardinal, we had a Pope killed for adultery, we had a Pope use his autority to judge a corpse, and yet you think the see is vacant only now? This is the same argumwnt from.protestants, how can we trust a corrupt Church? This is you, when we read vatican 1, and see that even the void act thesis was accepted a s possibility for invalidity of ex catedra we can be sure, nobody believed the Pope could never want to do harm to the church for selfish and humane reasons. Yet you claim the see is vacant? Since when? Vatican 2? Well Ibrahim ex mhfm believe is since the 1100s, Juan Miguel pasamani belives or believed it was since the 890. Since when the church which is always taught to be visible defected? And whose infalliably said so? Luther? Calvin? You and me? The see either develops from Tradition or its not magisterium

Crusaderhope (1): Well i dont use my mental powers (rationalism), I just read what has already been taught and see if its possible to reconcile, isnt that the method you use to say a Pope is not a Pope? Are you using your mental powers aswell? For there is no pride in me, for it would be much easier to just accept any definition they throw at me, yet not even the bishops are supposed or predicted to do that in canon law, infact vatican 1 had this as its mais concern, a Pope does not superceed, previous Popes, that reading of the text is such a fruit of scrupple it would make luther blush.In Vatican 1 Pastor aeternus it says the autority of the Pope only exists for keeping the tradition, not of being a independent Oracle that makes new doctrine, much like Saint Peter would try to do when he wanted Jesus to not be crucified, thats why he was called Satan, as not even Saint Paul obeyed Saint Peter in his judaization of the faith, which he already knew was false. Since the ordinary universal magisterium(infalliable) is evident throught history, and the saints teach Papal resistence in error, either your wrong about this reading or the whole church MOU throught ages got contradicted by Pius XI.Furthermore if thats your criteria you should reject benedict XV whose avoided excomunicating heretics, and Pius XII whose elected people you call manifest heretics for vatican 2, and thr list goes on, until we get in the middle ages

Crusaderhope (1): St vincent of Lérins What then should a Catholic do if some portion of the Church detaches itself from the communion of the universal faith? What, surely, but prefer the integrity of the whole Catholic Church to a corrupt and infected member of it? [...] And if some new contagion seeks to infect not merely an insignificant part of the Church, but the whole, then his great concern will be to cleave to antiquity, which at this day cannot possibly be seduced by any deceit of novelty.”(Commonitorium, ch. 3, §7)About resisting even the PopeSometimes a whole council may err. Sometimes even the very See of Peter may err temporarily—not in the sense of a formal and universal error in faith, but in the sense of tolerating or failing to condemn heresy in a timely way.”(Commonitorium, implicit in §6–7; this is supported by historical context, e.g., Pope Liberius during the Arian crisis.)St Robert Belarmine (which you love)Romano Pontifice, Book II, Chapter 29:“Just as it is lawful to resist the pope if he invaded a person’s body, so also it is lawful to resist him if he attacked souls, or disturbed the state, or tried to destroy the Church. I do not say it is lawful to judge him, or depose him, or punish him — for he is a superior — but it is lawful to resist him by not doing what he orders and by preventing the execution of his will.”St Thomas Aquinas (which I love)Where there is danger to the faith, subjects are bound to rebuke their prelates even publicly. Hence Paul, who was subject to Peter, rebuked him publicly because of the imminent danger of scandal in a matter of faith.”(Summa Theologiae, II-II, q. 33, a. 4, ad 2)St Bruno of Segni If the Pope is mistaken and errs against Catholic faith, then we are to resist him; for it is better that he be opposed than that the truth of the faith be abandoned.”(Source: Chronicles of the Investiture Controversy)So I do not care for your stance as its only conclusion is conclavism, which is ridiculous, I Will stand on this Church

# Post 233: Article on Americanism

Author: Willsxyz

Score: 8

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ke1orc/article\_on\_americanism/

In this article, Bishop Williamson writes about how the freemasonic ideals upon which the USA was founded lead directly to the erroneous declaration on religious liberty at Vatican II. As an American myself, who has been aware for some time of the close relationship between freemasonic ideals and American ideals, it is quite interesting to me, and I now find that I need to learn more about traditional pre-liberal European conservatism, about which I was never taught in school.[https://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/SiSiNoNo/1996\\_April/Americanism\\_and\\_VaticanII.htm](https://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/SiSiNoNo/1996\_April/Americanism\_and\_VaticanII.htm)

CRAAAZYYYY (7): American is founded on protestantism which naturally must end at a weird liberation theology type of thing. That’s why you see the infiltration of all the errors of modernism. Don’t get me wrong modern Catholicism has its flaws but it still the last bastion of tradition and anti modernity in this world, even if it could use some reforms.

ourladyofcovadonga (2): Being an American Catholic is weird. The more I learn about the US from a traditional perspective, the more I detest it - even though I was born and raised here.

BleuBoy777 (1): I detest myself for having watched the sound of music. Pray for my evil, Bishop

None (1): This bishop was crazy

None (1): Come to Catholic Brazil and see the wonders of a true nation

ourladyofcovadonga (1): Yeah right. I have Spanish citizenship and hesitate even going to Spain. No Catholic nation exists

# Post 234: Father Michel Simoulin died today

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 15

Comments: 4

URL: https://x.com/StephenWohltman/status/1918443614331363567

dbaughmen (4): Requiescat in pace, aniam suam Deus benedicat.

melbtest06 (-9): Good.

pottyflower (3): Goodness gracious..your comment is truly not of Christ!

dbaughmen (2): Was he bad or something?

# Post 235: Italy: freemasons pay tribute to Francis | FSSPX News

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 7

Comments: 0

URL: https://fsspx.news/en/news/italy-freemasons-pay-tribute-francis-52147

# Post 236: Religious Item Suggestions?

Author: ViveChristusRex

Score: 7

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kdjwnq/religious\_item\_suggestions/

Hello, hope everyone is having a great day so far!I recently turned 18, and was looking to purchase a few religious items (such as prayer books, catechisms, devotional, etc.). I discovered the TLM a little more than a year ago, and have been attending since. I attend an ICKSP (Pre-55) Church, but am sympathetic to the SSPX and Lefebvre.I was wondering what items you would suggest that I purchase. If it helps, for content, I am a male, and currently plan on starting to serve at the Mass in a couple of weeks. I currently have a: Rosary, Brown Scapular, Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Douay-Rheims w/ Clementine Vulgata, Blessed Be God prayer book, Fr. Lasance Missal, Angelus Press Missal, Missal Covers, and Deliverance Prayers (Fr. Ripperger).Any suggestions are greatly appreciated!

None (3): [deleted]

Christ\_is\_\_risen (2): Make sure you get a real 1582 Douay Rheims bible, Imitation of Christ, and True Devotion to Mary.Get books by Rev Fr. Paul O'Sullivan O.P.Get The Glories of Mary by St. Alphonsus.Get Cathechism of the Council of Trent.Get Sermons of St. Alphonsus.You don't need all of these, but definitely get Imitation of Christ and True Devotion to Mary.

ViveChristusRex (2): Thank you!

ViveChristusRex (1): Thank you for all of the suggestions! I am looking for more prayer / doctrine items (e.g. CCT, Little Office, prayer books, devotional, etc.) Do you have any additional suggestions? I will definitely get the Imitation of Christ and True Devotion to Mary, as well as the Roman Catechism.

# Post 237: Why aren't you a sedevacantist?

Author: Christ\_is\_\_risen

Score: 5

Comments: 26

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1kdj84n/why\_arent\_you\_a\_sedevacantist/

HammerAndArm (29): I will be, up until we have a new pope.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (9): Good question. Not sure why you're getting downvoted. The sedevacantists fail to make a distinction between material and formal heresy. That's a big one. They're writing the death sentence of their own groups. It establishes a precedent that they can't work away from.

ViveChristusRex (11): I attend a Pre-55 Church run by the ICKSP, although I am sympathetic to the SSPX and many of its holy and reverent priests. I am not a sedevacantist because all of the various sedevacantist, sedeprivationist, and conclavist groups fail to present a clear solution for the future (I guess the latter provides a solution, even though it is wrong). Furthermore, the division between the various sedevacantist groups makes everything even more confusing. I think the sheer disunity in the movement as a whole speaks for itself. Finally, like Dr. Taylor Marshall once said, “even if the waters are rough, you don’t jump off the ark, because otherwise you will drown.” I believe that—even though the previous Pontificate was confusing and disastrous for tradition—we never leave Jesus because of Judas, or the Church because of wolves in sheep’s clothing. Even though sedevacantists are often some of the most zealous, pious, and devoted people in terms of religious fervor (which makes their entire movement appear tempting), I believe their core beliefs and claims are flawed to such a degree that I do not see their assertions as a possibility.

alejosoyyo (4): Because it is a rather imprudent position. The explanation of the Father Gregory Hesse on this matter is the best I’ve ever heard.

ardaduck (2): You can't even talk with sedevacantists unless they are right. They are not homogenous, they have as many theories as there are sedevacantists. Their vision doesn't have light at the end of the tunnel. I can keep on going.

ExpertSalesCopy (2): I'm Catholic.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): because the Church has no mechanism or act to depose a Pope until a future Pope declares it thus. Happy to sympathize with those that hold it as a private opinion. I even lean that way, it appears a future Pope declaring these anti-Popes is the easiest way out of the crisisEvery single sedevecantist today has read private opinions of the saints, at best, applied it in their own way to our own time, and decides they know best. There is nothing concrete to show their position could possibly be so correct that others would be reprimanded for dissenting.

jeff\_likes\_bread\_120 (1): Because I have a pope

ViveChristusRex (9): Based

luke-jr (2): The distinction is irrelevant. The V2 antipopes are formal heretics. Note that a declaratory sentence is a separate issue. The Church explicitly teaches no declaration is needed to impede them becoming pope

None (0): is this a troll post? sppx is not sedevacantist.

Christ\_is\_\_risen (1): Wouldn't it be a problem if, for example, Pope Leo XIV declared all the Vatican II popes invalid? Wouldn't that make him invalid because the Cardinals who elected him were invalid? Or would he just have to get elected again but by the bishops?

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (2): ^ A good example of why I'm not a sedevacantist. Dismissing a distinction as irrelevant. If it was irrelevant, the distinction wouldn't exist.

ViveChristusRex (1): My post? I never said the SSPX are sedevacantist. I even said I am sympathetic to the SSPX and Lefebvre.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): don't know. i dont concern myself too much with future hypotheticals. otherwise we'd walk ourselves in circles day in and day out.

luke-jr (2): It's irrelevant because they're formal heretics anyway

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): The Petrine defining of dogma hasn't been used for heresy.

luke-jr (1): Irrelevant. You're saying Martin Luther wasn't a heretic because he didn't use that formula??? 🤡

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (0): Martin Luther publicly expressed heresy as doctrine. No Pope has said, "I formally declare this (erroneous) doctrine to be the correct one and let all others espousing another (correct) one, be anathema!" Martin Luther did plenty of that.

luke-jr (0): Heresy is heresy without that

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): The ultimate authority one claims to have is what counts. Martin Luthher made plenty of doctrinal declarations. He wasn't a Pope, but he did see himself as some sort of "highest authority". And using that authority he claimed to have, he claimed what heretical things he did.

luke-jr (1): No, it doesn't matter what authority you claim to have. Denying defined doctrine is heresy period

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): The Church has distinguished between the positions an individual holds from their office, though. Or was St. Thomas Aquinas a heretic for denying the Immaculate Conception? Hindsight is 20/20, sure. But I really do think the clergy have gotten watered down versions of doctrine and can't fully be blamed for being somewhat heterodox on some points of doctrine.The postV2 Popes haven't tried to impose errors on others, and that may lend credence to them being antiPopes if they did. But even the Novus Ordo sacraments were just made "available for use". The bishops made the decision to switch but there was no anathema, no declaration or command to use the new sacraments.The insidiousness of Modernism is that the vague statements and versions of doctrine that are left open to interpretation are left in a sort of critical thinking limbo, and clergy who were raised by and surrounded by those who would teach with that mindset wouldn't know any better.^ That's most Catholics now. It sucks. But you can't make up someone else's mind for them.One big problem with sedevacantists is that they see themselves as the last real Catholics, and the danger there is that this mindset makes them feel justified to be jerks.I know a sedevacantist who seems to impose his opinion on the SSPX over what the SSPX actually says. He doesn't really understand their positions. Hee was raised in a sedevacantist Church and I think his wife was too. I've been trying to learn about the crisis in the Church since I found out about it in 2005. He seems to think I'll jump over to his side of the fence and he's only known me since 2024.

luke-jr (1): The Church teaches heretics cannot hold office. St Thomas Aquinas did not deny the Immaculate Conception. He also lived long before it was defined.God will judge if a specific heretic is culpable for his heresy, but it is still heresy regardless. Paul 6 & later have also imposed Vatican2, despite the false claims of SSPX clergy. But that is above and beyond the minimum needed to disqualify them from the papacy.Your subjective judgement that certain people are "jerks" is not relevant to the facts on these matters.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): I mean, slapping your kid for crying during Mass and the kid looks terrified, while the parent looks like he's gonna murder someone... yeah, jerk.Or telling me to cheat my employers through laziness because they're so understaffed, they'll keep me around even if I don't do anything, stressing your spouse out until he cheats on her, etc.People problems. I know. No one is perfect, but when I hear things widely condemned, like beliefs in racial hierarchies, or the con artists and cults of antiPopes like the Palmarians, "Pope" Michael, the Dimond Brothers, etc. and the one thing they have in common is sedevacantism, it doesn't give me a good picture for how sound of mind the idea could be.I meet priests of the SSPX and they explain the position of sedeplenism, respecting the office and its holder, while simultaneously recognizing that the sacraments of the 62 are objectively better at expressing our Faith than the sacraments of 69, and that rejecting the use of the New sacraments, while recognizing their validity is a reasonable position, and the priests go out of their way to condemn the racists without going a woke route... the SSPX position is very reasonable and this reasonable mindset shows in their other takes on society and living what Jesus gave us.

luke-jr (0): Now you're just dishonestly trolling

# Post 238: Monseigneur Lefebvre appreciation post

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 51

Comments: 7

URL: https://i.redd.it/1vgu1425h2ye1.jpeg

Pray for us in the Church’s hour of need, during this Conclave; may the Apostasy end! May the Archbishop be canonised soon.

Masterofluck11251 (15): The Church treated the Archbishop so terribly and even today still continues to tarnish his legacy.. he didn’t deserve any of it

Admirable-Still8627 (7): Is this Lefebvre with Padre Pio? I was confirmed by Lefebvre in the late 1970s

dbaughmen (7): This hatred has been passed on to the Society nowadays, blessed are we who are persecuted for having the Catholic Faith when so many don’t

dbaughmen (6): Indeed, the Archbishop met with Padre Pio - https://fsspx.news/en/news/archbishop-lefebvre-and-padre-pio-21409

jeff\_likes\_bread\_120 (1): Oh cool didn't know that gonna send to my mom hehehe she will really enjoy seeing this!

Admirable-Still8627 (3): Very special

iphone5su93 (1): wow

# Post 239: Novena for the election of the Supreme Pontiff

Author: Absurdharry

Score: 41

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/gallery/1k9z5g2

The novena begins today. Please pray for the election of a Holy Pope.

Absurdharry (6): [https://sspx.org/en/news/novena-election-sovereign-pontiff-52150](https://sspx.org/en/news/novena-election-sovereign-pontiff-52150)

Upstairs\_You\_2272 (5): Amen Dear Brother, Thank You for that =)).

BleuBoy777 (1): This is it! This is where we elect the right Pope and bring those evil NOs to tradition! The crisis is almost over....I can almost see women in their head covers again ... In the kitchen, doing my bidding. Men in charge telling women what's up again ...Perhaps we can even convince Trump to arrest and deport evil Protestants from the US. Blessed be!!! Church militant

# Post 240: Opinion - during this Sede Vacante, SSPX should consecrate bishops!!!

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 6

Comments: 17

URL: https://i.redd.it/ply0pj2i6hxe1.jpeg

CV-CR-CI (36): Doing so would send the wrong message. The society should always seek unity with Rome.

AAR1999 (10): Absolutely not. While the Econe consecrations were a noble act, the SSPX wants to avoid the problems it led to with Rome so a future consecration should take place with Papal approval.

Absurdharry (9): Hard disagree. If the new Pope will not allow the necessary consecrations of new Bishops for the Society, then that's another matter. But we pray for a Holy Pope and should trust in the Church.

None (15): I thought of it, but I think us the faithful should stop thinking the SSPX authorities are stupid and don't think about all this. They probably think about it much more than we do, and know better what's at stake.If one really wants to be part of the decision making, he can simply join the seminary and show he's competent enough to be put in high position, instead of making reddit posts!

ExpertSalesCopy (6): Terrible idea. Give the next Pope the proper respect.

Breifne21 (19): No. It should seek permission to do so.If Rome refuses and it becomes a desperate situation, they should consecrate more bishops while making their adherence and loyalty to the Catholic faith, the Holy Father and Rome absolutely crystal clear and labour the point that they are only consecrating out of absolute need.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (5): Eh. But it wasn't the Pope who tried to counter Archbishop Lefebvre back in 1988. It was the head of the Congregation for Bishops. John Paul II merely delegated the task and trusted the head of that Congregation to do the job correctly, since JP2 wasn't a very scholarly man like Benedict XVI was. Pope Benedict XVI didn't "undo" what JP2 did, so much as provide recognition that the excommunications weren't valid to begin with. If they were "removed", which they weren't, the SSPX would have had to recant to be reconciled. The SSPX hasn't changed their position, rather the Vatican under Benedict XVI had to recognize the mistake made under JP2. So, sede vacante would not do much since it wasn't even the Pope the first time in 88 who attacked the SSPX.

None (1): This is what is making me convinced of sedevacantism all these SSPX parishioners want communion with Rome. No no no Rome is in apostasy

adveniatpermariam (-3): Absolutely.

dayakcowboy (8): Exactly.

None (-4): Rome is in apostasy lol

Willsxyz (1): If possible.

None (1): A modernist should be resisted

Willsxyz (18): >If Rome refuses and it becomes a desperate situation, they should consecrate more bishops while making their adherence and loyalty to the Catholic faith, the Holy Father and Rome absolutely crystal clear and labour the point that they are only consecrating out of absolute need.In other words, they should do the same as last time, right?Every person who attends SSPX masses or receives the sacraments from SSPX priests should understand and accept that the SSPX \*\*will\*\* consecrate bishops soon, hopefully with the approval of the Holy See, but if necessary without such approval, because consecrations are absolutely necessary for the work of the SSPX to be able to continue, and the work of the SSPX is necessary for the Church. Anyone who cannot accept the possibility of unapproved consecrations might as well just head down to their local Ecclesia Dei group chapel right now. No need to wait. Just know, if the SSPX weren't around, that Ecclesia Dei group chapel would be suppressed quasi instantly.

None (7): "lol" That levity would make it a terrible option

Breifne21 (8): More or less.Though I think we should be \*very\* careful to emphasise we are loyal to the Holy Father and Rome, not so much for the sake of the Roman authorities, as for the faithful themselves. I've been a Society attendee for 24 years, and I've noticed some very concerning attitudes coming to the fore from the laity with regard to Rome.

Willsxyz (5): I suppose that makes sense. 1988 was a long time ago. I'm sure many people have started attending SSPX Masses in the meantime who don't really understand the crisis in the Church or the canonical situation of the SSPX, and thus are not in a position to understand why new consecrations are necessary, even without the approval of the Holy See.

# Post 241: Where to start

Author: vivacristo20

Score: 11

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1k99cfj/where\_to\_start/

Happy Sunday. I was Baptized last year. I’ve become interested in the SSPX, where do I start to learn about your society? Where do I start learning about Catholic theology in general? Thanks

SnowWhiteFeather (11): Happy sunday! I am happy to hear about your conversion.The Baltimore Catechism is commonly used for covering the basics of Catholic education. (Not particular to the SSPX)When I converted our priest used "This is the Faith" by Canon Francis Ripley for my catechism. It was an excellent book. It is written for converts, especiallyfrom a protestant background. (Not particular to the SSPX)My wife says that "The Catechism Explained" by Rev. Francis Spirago is oriented toward an adult audience.(Not particular to the SSPX)Archbishop Lefebvre (the founder of the SSPX) wrote a book that is free as an audiobook on YouTube called "An Open Letter to Confused Catholics". It is a fairly short book that is definitely worth reading or listening to.The "SSPX News" YouTube channel is a good resource. I particularly like the "Crisis in the Church" series. It isn't really a news channel as I would think of it.Mere Tradition with Kennedy Hall is another YouTube channel that does a good job of covering news and various topics. Kennedy Hall has several books that are worth checking out as well.Feel free to ask any other questions. I am happy to try and help.

CatholicDismas (1): Good afternoon. I did most of my original OCIE via catechismclass.com and bought the adult 1 lessons. It’s everything you need to become steeped in tradition and the basics of the faith. My SSPX priest and the one I work with at the hospital were surprised at the depth of it. From there, you can see that most of your garden variety parishes especially i. The US don’t hold to tradition much and seem to almost defy the faith that they’ve been handed down in favor of modern conveniences, etc. it’s truly sad. But back to your question, take the class mentioned above. It will take you a few months but you’ll get a GREAT formation. God bless.

vivacristo20 (3): Thank you for your comment

vivacristo20 (1): I appreciate your comment, thanks

# Post 242: Modern saints

Author: CathMode

Score: 4

Comments: 12

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1k7u6xg/modern\_saints/

A question: how does SSPX generally deal with saints canonized since V2. Are the canonizations up in the air (non-infallible?); do we exercise caution? Or out of obedience/faith generally trust the process? Innocent until proven guilty (assume canonization is appropriate unless reasons for scandal)?

Duibhlinn (11): Episode 45 of the Crisis in the Church series of lectures on the SSPX YouTube channel covers this exact topic.[Crisis Series #45: Are the New Canonizations Infallible?](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UI9FVR2Dfbc)>Don Tranquillo will join us once again to look at the question of Canonizations since the time of the Second Vatican Council. Are the New Canonizations infallible? To answer this, we’ll need to see whether or not Canonizations in the past were infallible. It’s commonly understood by most Catholics that Canonizations are one of the things that are infallibly proclaimed by the Pope. How then can we square this seeming infallibility with some of the new saints, who contradict previous saints?>Note: This is one way of looking at the issue - theologians, in the last 250 years have had varied opinions on the infallibility of canonizations. It is still today, both in traditional and Vatican circles, debated.This is the best explanation of the topic I've personally seen. The only difficulty you may have is Don Tranquillo's strong Italian accent.A brief summary is that since the entire canonisation process was changed under the pontificate of John Paul II, it's not the same thing that's being talked about in sources such as Saint Thomas Aquinas' writings on the infallability of canonisations. The new process is more doubtful than the previous one as a result, and due to that element of doubt (and until a truly traditional pope comes in and says yes, no, yes, no while going through the list of recent canonisations) it's imprudent to publicly venerate such people declared saints under the new rules. They may be saints, and it's perfectly fine to for example privately venerate Padre Pio and pray for his intercession, but public veneration due to that element of doubt is not prudent.

CathMode (1): This is helpful thank you

SnowWhiteFeather (4): It's an excellent series.

None (3): My local sspx chuch has an icon of padre pio and there is general veneration going on.

Murky\_Question\_9362 (2): Exactly

tradrcrthings (3): Because Padre Pio still celebrated Tridentine Mass until his death in 1968 despite of ongoing promulgation of Novus Ordo and he vigorously refused to to accept Vatican II reforms. That's why he still acknowledged as Saint within SSPX circle.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): no offense but that is fake news. completely made up. the novus ordo wasnt even completed in 1970, in many cases the 1965 interim mass was not required especially of those old and infirm. No one would make a old holy celebrity priest begin a new mass at the end of his life. Do you have any source that says Padre Pio stated an opinion on v2? Don't you think it appears acceptable to venerate him because Padre Pio bi-located, levitated and had the stigmata lol. If this is how cult-minded you think the SSPX is about saints and canonization, and simply refusing V2/NOM make one near perfect, you must have a very rotten perspective of SSPX and Lefebvre.

Duibhlinn (1): Don Tranquillo says otherwise. Who might I highlight is an SSPX priest speaking on an official SSPX lecture series on the official SSPX YouTube channel.

Mattia\_von\_Sigmund (1): I'm from the Priory of Italy, and there was a pretty big statue of Saint Padre Pio in my nearest priority, and the Fraternity priests there said openly that he was with no doubt a valid Saint lol

Duibhlinn (1): >I'm from the Priory of ItalyAs is Don Tranquillo.

Mattia\_von\_Sigmund (1): Don Tranquillo left the SSPX pal

mattdamon992 (1): Really?? Wow. That's a big deal?

# Post 243: My dad says that one of the problems with the modern catholic church is that it allows freedom of religion?

Author: Holy\_juggerknight

Score: 12

Comments: 15

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1k7rigd/my\_dad\_says\_that\_one\_of\_the\_problems\_with\_the/

About a week ago as my dad was driving me to school, he was going on about the problems with the modern catholic church, one of them he said was freedom of religion, which didn't make sense to me because religion shouldn't be restricted nor forced.Can anyone explain this to me, or did I interpret my dad's words wrong, or something

None (10): Hi!This is a huge subject, but I hope I'll be able to sum it up.What is freedom? For us moderns, the most common definition is "the right to do whatever I want as long as I don't step on anyone else's freedom."If you think of it though, it doesn't really make any sense; because it would mean that preventing someone from doing something that's bad for him would mean reducing his freedom. Also, what exactly is the limit of how much you can't step on other people's freedom? Because insulting someone is part of my free speech; but one could argue he has a right not to be insulted; so where exactly is the limit? Well, there isn't one, that's the thing: people aren't bubbles walking around, we live in a society, every action we have, no matter how personal, has consequences, big or small, on society.This is why the traditional definition of freedom is: "the ability to do chose what's good".So, not letting someone chose something that's wrong for them (like for example, not letting a kid eating too much candy, or not letting a man commit suicide) isn't limiting their freedom.That doesn't mean enforcing people to do what's good is always the good thing to do, sometimes it's even counter productive.So that's the problem of "freedom of religion"; it implies that a Catholic state has a moral duty to accept any false religion and to let people spread it, no matter how evil that false religion is. And if you think of it, all of them are evil, since they lead people away from the true religion. Traditionally, the Catholic church accepts to "tolerate" an evil only when repressing it would be a greater evil (which is a common thing actually). A famous example is saint king Louis IX who wanted to close brothels; this ended up making prostitution even worse, because it was happening in the streets and getting out of control, so he decided to "tolerate" it (tolerate in the traditional sense I explained).So yes, before our time, everyone in the world believed that it wouldn't make sense to have a moral duty to accept anything false and evil.That's why freedom of religion is wrong, but forced conversions are wrong too; there is a difference between banning a cult and forcing its believers to get baptized!If you don't agree with a part of what I said or if you want more explanation, don't hesitate!

dbaughmen (8): “Freedom of religion” means giving rights to other religions and say other religions are acceptable and “hold some of the Truth of the Catholic Faith” (as some of the modern popes say). This is blasphemous, as the Catholic Church of all time teaches that only \*Truth\* has rights, only the Catholic Church has the right to exist. As Catholics, we are called to tolerate other religions and their existence, but not embrace them. This is practically one of the main problems with the “modern” church. God bless!

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (2): Religious Liberty vs Liberty of the Church. All power and authority come from God, and only from God's One True Church can anyone learn to properly make use of either.So, the state must recognize that, in order to survive, it's use of power and authority must be guided by truth, and only in the Church that God gave us can we find the greatest fullness of truth on this side of creation. The state must look to the Church and it would only serve to, ultimately, undo and cause harm to the state to allow the spread of error.

SnowWhiteFeather (4): If a five year old is told by their parents not to go on the road it is very easy to listen.If a five year old child is told to listen to their babysitter it is very easy to listen.If a five year old child is told by their babysitter that their parents are wrong and that it is okay to play on the road, they will feel conflicted. That is what is going on in the Church right now.Our babysitter is telling us that religious freedom is a moral good and that all faiths contain truth, which contradicts the authority of past Popes and Church teaching.It has previously been taught that there is no salvation outside of the Church. If you do not come to the Church and die in a state of grace you will go to Hell.Everyone has free will. They can choose to accept Christ or deny Him. People who don't have access to the Church still have this choice, even if they may have far fewer graces. They still have grace sufficient to make the proper choice. In cases where people are seperated from the Church and have sought after God there have been wonderful miracles that brought them into the Church.Because people have free will the Church teaches that it is wrong to coerce people into being religious, which is not the same as freedom of religion.This is an excellent video that covers the topic:https://youtu.be/AoZPouA8jxc?si=iGPMHhFXJol3d4NWThis is probably the most difficult Church teaching. I struggled to accept it until I focused on what I know about God. He is merciful, He is loving, He is infinitely more intelligent than we are. We can depend on Him to judge justly. We cannot trust ourselves and our fallen human nature to judge justly. We should always strive to use our rationality and intellect to understand and love God, but we are blind by comparison to Him.

asimovsdog (2): Nobody can be forced to believe against conscience (conversion at gunpoint scenario), but Vatican II goes in the 100% opposite extreme, saying that false religions such as Islam, Orthodoxy, thousands of Protestant sects (esp. Pentecostalism) and, by logical exension, even Satanism have a "right to exist". However, error non habet ius - error has no rights. The state is subordinate to the morals of the Church, as the goal of the state is to be an institution that leads people to heaven. It can't force people to convert, but it can certainly nudge people, promote Catholicism in schools, courts, censor books against the Faith, ban indecency, etc. The core of this problem goes a lot deeper, starting with the Hegelian evolution of history, evolution of dogma, Napoleon separating Church and state, the new "living tradtion" nonsense that has infiltrated the Church for the past 300 years, etc. Your Dad is both correct and slightly wrong: freedom of religion is a symptom, the real problem is modernism (read Pascendi) or rather the rejection that absolute truth exists, whether I want it to or not. The modern Church thinks that religion is a subjective experience that is evolving and therefore we need to make the Church nice and welcoming so that everyone has a nice experience. Religion now comes from "within", from my personal experience of whatever I perceive to be. Therefore, we need a democratic church, as the faith now comes from the believers experiences, not from authority. That's a rough summary of modernism. What is right or wrong doesn't matter anymore as religion is merely an experience: of course other religions have their religious experiences, therefore they are all a-ok and deserve to exist. "But that won't lead souls to heav..." - oh shut up grandpa, nobody believes in that superstitious nonsense anymore.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): for 1900 years the Church taught that error has no rights.

BleuBoy777 (1): We need the good ol crusades again. People having choice is a sin. If they aren't with us, they are against us. Let's take them out in the holy name of Jesus. That will show we are the one, true faith.

CincyGuy2025 (1): Error has no rights.Two conflicting religions cannot both be true. No one has a God-given right to practice or promote a false religion. Your dad is correct. Freedom of religion leads to atheism.

Holy\_juggerknight (1): God gave us the choice to follow or to not follow, seems better to just leave them alone no?

Holy\_juggerknight (1): So your saying we should force everyone to be catholic and prevent other people from being in othet religions?

BleuBoy777 (1): Agreed - but many traditionalists don't share your enlightened view. They think force is the answer... In the name of the "greater good."Take it from a bullied, k-12 "educated" (former) traditionalist.

CincyGuy2025 (1): The true Catholic Church is the only true church. It was instituted by God Himself. Every other sect is/has been setup in opposition to the Truth.No other sect has any right to exist. There is no salvation from any other sect.The Church of Christ is called the Ark of Salvation. No one outside the Ark of Noah survived. Outside the Church there is no salvation. Can a person be a member of the soul of the Church without being a member of the visible Body? Only God knows who those people are. What WE know is that membership in the True Church is a necessity, albeit a necessity of precept. Therefore, we must strive to bring all into the true fold of Christ.

Holy\_juggerknight (1): While true, I feel like people should be able to choose to believe or not, and that "not" includes believing in other religions.

CincyGuy2025 (1): They don't technically have that right. The civil laws should not allow other false religions to flourish or even exist.Only the Truth and the True religion have rights.While the Church doesn't "force" people to believe, the non-believers have no rights whatsoever to promote their errors.

Holy\_juggerknight (1): Ehhhh, it just feels wrong to think that only us generally get to be the only religion.Like obviously we are the one true faith, but It just feels wrong to object people of their own faith in something they are truly devoted to.Like think of it from another perspective, like what if we were suddenly denied our faith because we aren't the one true faith, the faith that we have spent our lives on.It feels wrong to deny people the thing that they have spent their lives on, be it the true faith or not.

# Post 244: Post from a Polish user "Question about Sedevacantism"

Author: Willsxyz

Score: 3

Comments: 0

URL: /r/TraditionalCatholics/comments/1k6t9qv/post\_from\_a\_polish\_user\_question\_about/

# Post 245: Would it be sinful, for a Catholic athlete to do the ESPN body issue?

Author: VacationSea28

Score: 2

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1k6fs3w/would\_it\_be\_sinful\_for\_a\_catholic\_athlete\_to\_do/

ourladyofcovadonga (4): A society priest told me to avoid any movies with nudity. So I imagine that the slightly pornographic display of one's body would be at least venially sinful. The reasoning being that the naked body is not meant to be adored by others except your spouse.

Total-Wedding8871 (4): Just say no Harrison Butker

None (1): Stop right there Dirty Harry.

johnjohn2224 (1): Is the intent art or just porn?What is the communication purpose of the image?There are many nude statues and paintings within Vatican City that feature and celebrate the human form. Some say the most beautiful were created by Michelangelo, the Catholic artist, for the Sistine Chapel. Controversial in it's time. Maybe still today! :) Nudes inside sacred Vatican spaces. Catholics are not Puritans. We have sex and paint nudes.Because beauty and stuff :)Imho. These are good and also old questions applied to modern situation of ESPN bodies, gladiators of our time. Be well!

BleuBoy777 (0): All I know is .. I'm so glad sspx forces - I mean, encourages - modesty for our women. Especially those moms who've had 7 babies and weigh a good extra 100lbs than I. Them being modest, keeps me from lusting over such prime beef....

# Post 246: Have the Vatican II pope's lost their authority or some of it?

Author: Christ\_is\_\_risen

Score: 1

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1k4p88v/have\_the\_vatican\_ii\_popes\_lost\_their\_authority\_or/

is there any canon law or theology to back this up? not sedevacantism or sedeprivationism.

dbaughmen (2): Well, here’s an example of this. https://youtu.be/UI9FVR2Dfbc?si=5I-3c3HYQN\_HGwIO let me know if you have any questions!

CincyGuy2025 (1): Did they ever have authority? You have to be Catholic to have authority in the Church.

Christ\_is\_\_risen (1): thank you very much. I've seen that video before. it was very good.

# Post 247: Why do you reject Vatican II?

Author: CRAAAZYYYY

Score: 12

Comments: 37

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1k3x63y/why\_do\_you\_reject\_vatican\_ii/

Hi, I am a catholic who has been getting interested in researching Vatican II and the problems with it as well as the new liturgy and how it was created (Example: reported free masonic connections with some clergy involved and how a lot of sister/nuns and clergy left the church after it) and honestly i don’t want to agree with the SSPX as i believe it was a valid ecumenical council but i do happen to find myself agreeing with some of what the SSPX claim and I really don’t want to but there are really good points. So I am asking you all why are you SSPX? Do you reject vatican II? If so, why? ORDo you think it was and is Valid but there is some mistakes with certain documents? ORDo you accept it but reject the new liturgy? OR anything else? Please tell me in full detail I want to read everyone’s opinion and views! Also I’ve been reading a pretty old SSPX article but I agree with a lot of the points in it( I am only in the middle of it so far) It is called: Judaism & the Church: before & after Vatican II. I will be reading more and I am very interested! Happy easter and He Has Risen ✝️(EDIT: Also if you recommend any materials for researching about this topic or any topic SSPX please let me know them.)

tradrcrthings (24): Vatican II fruits in my country (Southeast Asia)1. Irreverent Novus Ordo mass2. Female altar server3. Communion in hand4. No high altar and zero presence of altar rail. Using table like Cranmer Table in Anglican church.5. Liturgical abuse (Priest bringing a smartphone and taking a picture during Mass)6. Charismatic style music used during Mass7. Abandoning the usage of Latin language8. Dancing in the altar (with sometimes half naked male and female)9. Inculturation with ancient pagan tradition10. Priest's homily that teach all religions are path to reach God and non-Catholics can be saved11. Emphasising about diversity of religions, instead of EENS doctrine12. Extraordinary Minister of Holy Communion (male and female)13. Sign of peace during Mass14. Permission granted to non-Catholics to actively participating in Mass and taking part of certain moment15. In many Catholic institutions, ironically from Primary School until University, Catholic education is no longer taught, aka "Catholic in the name only".

None (12): We accept every canon and anathema of Vatican II.

psalm23allday (10): The book ‘Infiltrated’ by Dr Taylor Marshall is not specific to SSPX at all but a helpful book re Vatican II. I also recommend the book ‘Our Lady of Good Success & Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre’ by E. Mary Christie.

tradrcrthings (9): Vatican II teachings contain1. Modernism2. Ecumenism3. Religious liberty and indifferentism4. Collegiality5. Novus Ordo (Protestant service)

tradrcrthings (7): 1.Priests in my country often preaching to their parishioner during sermon, that conversion from other faiths to Roman Catholic are not needed anymore, because according to Vatican II, non-Catholics can be saved (signifying one world religion).2. Catechumens in their OCIA/RCIA period are only given lessons about Vatican II, using 1983 Code of Canon Law and 1992 Catechism. Vatican II is considered a "final, binding, and infallible council" and primary source of the Faith. Hence, pre-Vatican II Ecumenical Councils are considered "redundant in use".3. Syllabus of Religious Education in Catholic institutions only contains Vatican II doctrines and dogmas, which i'm considering this as a part of "spirit of Vatican II propaganda". Catholic pupils barely know about Council of Trent, Vatican I, First and Second Council of the Lateran, etc. 4. Traditional Latin Mass's celebration is strictly permitted. In my Archdiocese, as of 2025, there is no TLM celebrated in parish churches, chapels, and cathedrals. Thankfully, there is one small underground SSPX chapel in my country's capital city. Bishop Tissier visited my country during Confirmation last year, 2024. SSPX parishioners are flourishing and growing every single day of the year.5. Jesuit in my country is the WORST cause of declining moral values and very liberal (sometimes pro abortion and same-sex marriage). Jesuits often encouraging their Catholic pupils to attend inter-religious prayer meeting in school. During graduation ceremony, prayers of 6 religions are said in Jesuit institutions.6. Unfortunately, famous "pope" in my country is post-Vatican II popes like John Paul II and Francis. Catholics know NOTHING about pre-Vatican II popes like St Pius V, St Pius X, and BI Pius IX, due to their "Vatican II propaganda" upbringing from Primary School until High School.Dear God, my country is absolutely cooked and devastated with Vatican II fruits, please help us.

Huge-Explanation-358 (7): Read the what Cardial Felice wrote at the end of Lumen Gentium. The council only defines as dogmas of Faith what it explicitly declares, which it doesnt do anywhere. VII literally doesnt define any dogma or condemn any error, its more like an open letter.

SnowWhiteFeather (5): Listen to the book "An Open Letter to Confused Catholics" by Archbishop Lefebvre on Youtube.

CRAAAZYYYY (8): I see most of those in America also

afcolt (5): These are many parishes in the United States, as well. It is a true embarrassment to the Faith.

Sola420 (2): Explain dancing half naked at the alter 🤣 I cannot imagine that. For number 14 do you mean non Catholics receiving communion? If not that what?

ChainOne5541 (2): I’m surprised this is from Indonesia as this list completely and accurately describes the current worsening situation in my country The Philippines. I didn’t know that you have the same problems over there.

CRAAAZYYYY (2): i’m struggling to see how the ecumenism in the documents was ever a good thing.

ChainOne5541 (2): After scrolling down the comments: Do they have a playbook somewhere? I am totally aghast as these are exact things happening in The Philippines! It is doubly sad because my country is called “the only Christian nation in Asia” but the decline of faith and religiosity here is palpable. May God steer the stewards of His garden to the right path.

CRAAAZYYYY (1): basically the same in America except we have the TLM pretty widely available. I’m trying to accept Vatican 2 as an infallible council but man with certain documents and seeing the fruit of the council in modern day like the Archdiocese of Detroit completely banning the TLM and non reverent Novus Ordo Mass it is hard trying to see how this new liturgy or the second Vatican council was a good thing.

tradrcrthings (2): St Patrick's Cathedral in New York has the worst choir performance EVER in the USA....watching Mass from their Youtube Channel makes me wonder how their choir is well trained or prepared 🤦♂️ also i have seen plenty of communion in hand, female altar server, and laity in the altar 😌

tradrcrthings (2): I can say that your country is a bigger version of my country, with multicultural faiths and ethnicities 😓☹️

tradrcrthings (1): My country is a former Hindu Buddhist kingdoms since 6th century then turned into Islamic kingdoms in 12th century, with several areas rapidly getting islamized by 1500s. Catholic mass in my country often incorporating ancient "pagan" practices during offering procession in mass that include liturgical chicken dancing 🐤🐤🐤. Inculturation with ancient pagan tradition is seen as a product of Vatican II (from my country's catholics' perspective)Non-Catholics are permitted to participating in "reading mass intention" during Mass, and even giving homily or political speech from pulpit.

tradrcrthings (4): A couple of weeks ago, female Anglican "priests" concelebrated with Catholic priest during Mass in Brazil.....yikes 😬🥲

tradrcrthings (3): I have heard that Jesuit institutions in the USA are very liberal and far from Catholic teachings, such as Georgetown that has multifaith chaplaincy and mosque in campus 😬🤦♂️

Huge-Explanation-358 (2): The council itself says its not infallible why would try to see it as such, eve the popes aftter vatican II say its not infallible, Paul VI said he never anything infallible at all even outside the council.Come on man watch some lectures on the topic before trying to do anything. Watch the interview with pe Gregory Hesse its very straight forward

Odd-Bed-9260 (1): It's only widely available in certain regions of the US, millions in the US still don't have easy access to TLM IF you don't count the SSPX or sedes like the CMRI, if it weren't for the SSPX millions of more would be out of luck.

CRAAAZYYYY (1): i’ve only ever been to it once and not for a mass but our archbishop Cardinal Timothy Dolan is still a pretty good Archbishop he’s said some things that have really confused me for lack of a better word but he allows Latin mass and I go to a more traditional Parish that celebrates the Missa Cantana and only male altar servers but i’m not sure about there novus ordo but he still allows Latin mass unlike other bishops/archbishops who ban in all out like the archbishop of detroit or others who restrict it but Cardinal Timothy Dolan has said he sees the value in both so i respect him for that

CRAAAZYYYY (2): I don’t really know any Jesuits in person or been to any of their campus but what Jesuit priests say on the internet makes me wonder how are they not excommunicated

CRAAAZYYYY (2): where does it say it’s not infallible what document?

tradrcrthings (4): Exactly, Fr James Martin is a disgrace and embarrassment to the Church! Sometimes Jesuit priest is pro abortion and same sex marriage as well 😓

Huge-Explanation-358 (6): Read the what Cardial Felice wrote at the end of Lumen Gentium. The council only defines as dogmas of Faith what it explicitly declares, which it doesnt do anywhere. VII literally doesnt define any dogma or condemn any error, its more like an open letter.

Huge-Explanation-358 (4): Cardinal Ratzinger, July 1988, Address to the Chilean Episcopal Conference, Il Sabato“Certainly there is a mentality of narrow views that isolates Vatican II and which provoked this opposition. There are many accounts of it, which give the impression that from Vatican II onwards, everything has been changed, and what preceded it has no value or, at best, has value only in the light of Vatican II. [...] The truth is that this particular Council defined no dogma at all, and deliberately chose to remain on a modest level, as a merelypastoralcouncil.”

CRAAAZYYYY (2): as well as the german synod of bishops that actively preached anti-catholic teachings and some still do

CRAAAZYYYY (2): also may i ask what country in south east asia from what you’ve said i assume Indonesia or Philippines maybe?

tradrcrthings (1): Fortunately, there are SSPX and FSSP seminaries in Germany and Traditional Latin Mass is booming with large faithful Catholics 🇩🇪✝️🇻🇦

tradrcrthings (1): 🇮🇩🇮🇩🇮🇩🇮🇩🇮🇩

CRAAAZYYYY (2): Yes it is!

CRAAAZYYYY (2): I’ve been to Bali all the Pagan temples are sad but i know there is a small catholic community with a couple churches i never visited them tho

tradrcrthings (1): Bali is and always has been a Hindu majority province. I am not living in Bali, but i have only visited Bali twice, during lower and upper secondary school study tour in 2020 and 2023. Despite being a Hindu majority province, Bali has highest tolerance index towards other religions though and their people are living in harmony 🥰

CRAAAZYYYY (2): oh yes besides the paganism Bali is beautiful and the people are wonderful i felt very safe. But the catholic churches in south east asia are struggling I saw priest saying that people are just scrolling on their phone during mass. (fruit of vatican 2)

tradrcrthings (1): Sunday Mass attendance in my country is high and stable compared to other Protestant denominations and other religions ✝️🇮🇩🇻🇦

CRAAAZYYYY (2): Mass attendance is pretty good in non western countries but it’s also kinda stabilizing in the west but hopefully it will rise again!

# Post 248: Are NO Catholics Antagonistic toward SSPX?

Author: LittleAlternative532

Score: 17

Comments: 29

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1k3mcau/are\_no\_catholics\_antagonistic\_toward\_sspx/

Recently a Society Priest (with over 20 years of pastoral experience) was asked by a redditor to help answer a question on the "Catholic" forum. New to Reddit this Priest (who doesn't use social media often) simply answered the question from an account he rarely uses. Immediately he received a notification message from a mod asking him for "clerical verification". When he did provide verification and the mods could see he was a Priest of the Society, they slapped the following restrictions upon him. > You are, however, welcome to participate in our subreddit, provided you do not reference any ordination/priestly orders, and provided you follow all our other rules. This includes not promoting the SSPX, and not "promoting disobedience to Church teachings".Recently he noticed a post in the AskAPriest sub, which was a question regarding the SSPX. It was answered by a Priest who said that "SSPX clergy are still in the lay state", which is obviously untrue. When he posted a follow up comment, it was removed because it's a forum for "answers from Priests only" and the question thread was subsequently locked, meaning members of the lay faithful will be left with grossly incorrect information. Surely if we are praying for healing of the rift between the Church and the Society this should show in our behaviour? But if this behaviour is anything to go by, it's likely this Priest will not answer anymore questions and his account will be shelved again.Any thoughts?

None (12): The average Catholic on r/Catholicism would bow to an actual schismatic priest (e.g., an EO or OO priest) before bowing to a Priest of the Society.

SnowWhiteFeather (9): The average NO layperson has only heard bad things about the SSPX. They lack the education to navigate the issue. The people who say bad things are mostly repeating what they have heard from authorities, who themselves weren't that well formed. Some of the problem is ignorance and some of the problem is an unwillingness to correct in light of the truth.It is the same as it has always been. Christ is persecuted and those who follow Him are persecuted in his likeness.I have found that the extent of the willingness to listen is commensurate with how aware they are of the crisis in the Church. The culture does seem to be slowly shifting in favor of tradition, though. I know in our parish we have been seeing a rise in attendance generally and from people from the NO, while the NO has continued to lose attendance. We have even had a fairly reasonable amount of conversions –myself being included among them.Considering that the SSPX is the largest traditional group, that they are growing at a fast rate, and could be growing faster if we had the priests I think we can be hopeful of even larger victories in the near future.It is the continued effort at dialogue that is bringing people in, so I would encourage Father to continue engaging where he can if he is inclined. The fullness of truth in an educated and well reasoned statement is compelling to those who are ready to hear it.

None (14): [deleted]

realdenvercoder (5): I would say a good number of Catholics have never heard of the SSPX. I was an NO attendee for 12 years and I had never heard of them. Once I did, I had only good experiences with them. It wasn’t until I was pretty immersed in learning what the SSPX was that I encountered any animosity, and that was only on X or YouTube. I told my NO priest that I was attending SSPX now thinking he was going to be mad or yell at me. He said, “Oh, say hi to Fr. Robinson for me. I wish I could get down there more often.”To use an Olde English phrase, “I was shooketh.” 😂

thesloth-man (3): In my small experience (I'm still only new. Decided on Catholicism but hadn't attended mass at all in my life untill recently, in my "research" watched a TLM on youtube and found what I'd expected as a catholic mass, I've never attended nor seen a full NO mass but have been to fssp mass many times now due to location, and sspx twice) there is layers. Speaking with those that attend NO, they'll regard fssp as a bit holier than thou and either have never heard of sspx or label sspx incorrectly as schismatic etc. Fssp people council me to just get baptised before worrying about my level of traditionalism but either speak of sspx as the same kind of hollier than thou as the NO says of fssp or, they wish the sspx chapel wasn't hours away. It's like FSSP is the gateway to SSPX to an NO parishioner and each one is just a step up or down the "self righteous" ladder. Then there are those I talk with that attend SSPX that tell me I'm so lucky to have never attended NO and I have the chance to come into the church via the SSPX. That even FSSP is selling myself short. OrNO people telling me SSPX isn't a valid pathway into the church. In saying all that, ive encountered more staunch and steadfast NO people than either of the other two. More willing to argue thier case where as FSSP and SSPX in general urge me to pray on my options to decide. With a handful of the strongly motivated staunch types steering me away from NO. It's funny to me as it's so typical of human behaviour to pick a "team" and stand by it.In actuality, I find the same mix of likeable/less likeable people in any of the groups.What I've seen of NO mass though, reminded me of Anglican services and that put me off and I wasn't sure if eastern orthodox wasn't my option. I don't take my "having found God" lightly. My heart and head tells me it's very important to connect back to the begining as completly as possible. I've read and researched a lot as is my style and I think I have a better grasp on church history that 99% of NO attendee's I've met and am friends with. And I'm about 50/50 with the other two. In the end, for myself I'd dearly love it if the sspx chapel wasn't roughly 2 hours away but I have FSSP next to where I work or 20 mins away from my Dads house where I am every 2nd week to help him out. The NO just doesn't appeal to me at all from what little experience I've had with it, and the parishioners at my two local options aren't really my type of people. Busy body, self righteous, gossiping know all/know nothing types 🤣 They have come across as the holier than thou types out of all the groups I've met. Very judgemental. With the TLM attendee's being the more genuine types of charachter. Sorry. I've made this mountain of a reply. 🤣I'm in need of discussing all the research and interactions I've been having in my journey.

Trengingigan (3): Most NO Catholics don’t know what SSPX is, or have vaguely heard about it as the most famous group that celebrates “Latin Masses” and is “ultra-conservative”. 99.99% of their time they don’t even think about SSPX.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (3): Most mainstream Catholics don't know the SSPX or traditional Latin Mass even exist. But for those that do... Yes, Catholics who attend the Novus Ordo are usually anti-SSPX (and by extension, against the laypeople who attend sacraments provided by SSPX clergy), but it's not their fault. They're usually lied to by mainstream Catholic media and clergy, who are themselves, likely, not intentionally spreading lies about traditionalists in general, and the SSPX specifically, but were likely lied to themselves. Ultimately, the enemies of tradition in the Vatican let their enmity trickle down to everyone else through lies. "They're schismatic. They believe our sacraments are invalid. They're sedevacantists. They're Feeneyites." I've heard all of these lies spread about the SSPX and more, even from well educated clergy who were absolutely certain of the lies they were told of the SSPX and the laypeople that attend the sacraments provided by SSPX clergy.

naruto1597 (2): Yes.

naruto1597 (2): r/Catholicism has been anti catholic for years now. I’m still banned for simply supporting the SSPX.

johnjohn2224 (2): No, NO Catholics are not antagonistic vs SSPX.- Most NO Caths don't know what SSPX is.- (Most NO don't know what the Eucharist is)- Most NO Boomers don't care.- Most NO Gen X don't care / don't attend.- Most NO Millennials are absent / exhausted - I don't see Gen Z at NO mass.

ExpertSalesCopy (2): Half are hostile, half have no idea.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (2): reddit is a product of woke liberal hive mind.

asimovsdog (2): Yes, but while that's bad for their souls, it is what led me to the SSPX. Whenever reddit mods hate, censor and ban something, you know it's based. Just do the opposite of whatever a reddit moderator does and you'll be fine (in life).

Sir\_K9206 (3): I am predominantly a NO mass attending Catholic, but I have nothing but the utmost respect and admiration for Archbishop Lefevbre, the man, and for what he did in forming the SSPX. My homeland is New Zealand, and where I live, the TLM can be very difficult to get to. The SSPX has a presence in our country but is roughly 3 or so hours away. The FSSP is 4 and a half hours away. If the opportunity presented itself, I would have absolutely no problem in hearing mass and receiving the sacraments from a priest of the SSPX. Their masses are valid, as are the sacraments they offer. People who say that they are in schism or even worse, sedevacantists don't know what they're talking about and need to stay away from talking heads like John Salza, Michael Lofton, and their ilk. God bless Archbishop Lefebvre and the SSPX. Their priestly society is needed more than ever.

rathdrummob (1): These kind of questions miss the mark, supposing that the SSPX or the traditional movements have some meaningful impact on the 96% of the Catholic faithful in the world. If you mean the Catholic faithful at large, they’re generally unaware of the SSPX or the “traditionalist” groups. I spent my whole life (50 years ) in SSPX churches, trained to believe that the whole visible Catholic Church was not the church, but the SSPX was the church, with no connection to our local diocese. I raised my family the same way that I was raised, and thankfully two years ago, I converted to Catholicism, along with my family. It’s been an incredibly joyful period that has brought us closer as a family, and expanded our faith individually and as a family. It’s a personal story that I’ll engage in through DM if anyone is interested. The SSPX is not as big a deal in the big picture as they claim to be. Bp Fellay had a great opportunity to bring them into communion in 2012 and for whatever reason he decided to keep the society out of the church. Since then the attitude that the SSPX is interested in a regular status seems to have disappeared. I fear they’re just going the way of the Old Catholics or the Orthodox. I have family and a lifetime worth of friends caught up in the SSPX world- God will sort this mess out his way I guess.

WallachianLand (-1): Yes.But it's common among the various "sects"FFSPXers don't like NO or sedes.Sedes don't like NO and FFSPXersAnd NO don't like sedes or FFSPXersAnd if anyone's cries because of the word in quotation marks, I don't care

ardaduck (6): Realistically they don't bow to any priests because there is a lack of reverence in modernism

nishka\_luv2 (7): Most aren’t aware of the “inadequacy,” as you say. All they know is someone is telling them about it and they feel attacked.They automatically take that criticism of the new Mass as SSPXers are being all “holier than thou” and they see that as us claiming that the Society has the truth and they don’t. Which they then see as them claiming that the SSPX is the only one with the truth. Which of course would be heresy and solidify the idea of us being in schism. That’s the issue with the NO attitude towards the SSPX. However…SSPXers do tend to just attack the NO Mass primarily instead of being more focused on promoting the TLM, which would put anyone on the automatic defensive and puts the Society at a disadvantage.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (2): this is rare, but becoming less so

None (3): go to your nearest traditional parish

Willsxyz (3): > What I've seen of NO mass though, reminded me of Anglican servicesHow surprising!Well actually not that surprising considering that the author of the Novus Ordo Mass wrote this:“We must strip from our Catholic prayers and from the Catholic liturgy everything which can be the shadow of a stumbling block for our separated brethren“

Willsxyz (4): >the SSPX was the churchThe SSPX does not teach this.>I converted to Catholicism, along with my family.That was not possible, because people who are baptized and catechized by SSPX priests are Catholics. You can't convert from Catholicism to Catholicism.>he decided to keep the society out of the church.He couldn't have decided that because the SSPX is part of the Catholic Church.You are very confused, and you obviously did not and do not know what the SSPX itself actually says about its own status and place in the Church, or what the official visitors of the Holy See have said about the SSPX, or what the Holy See itself has said about the SSPX.

None (3): "trained to believe that the whole visible Catholic Church was not the church". You are a sad individual, inclined to victimization in the best scenario. You are hiding your true problems behind your post, trying to do damage for a perceived retribution form the wrongs you feel you suffered.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (4): they would bow to any priest from any religion that stated something they wanted to hear.

seeking\_0333 (5): Well said

rathdrummob (1): Yes I do understand all of those things. I know, obviously better than you, the word salad that justifies the SSPX position. I’ve been defending it for decades. It just doesn’t hold water. I’m finally, truly, in actual communion with the real, visible TRUE Catholic Church. No longer “theoretical“ communion, true communion. I’m not going to suppose anything about you like you have about me, but I’ll just say that your arguments are naive and ad hominem. The same level and type that inevitably come from those (many close friends and family) who are still confused by this very confusing situation in the world. I’m not confused, or sad, or vindictive, as others have said. I’m sympathetic. I’ll pray for you, Reddit stranger, that you find the peace that i have thankfully stumbled across.

rathdrummob (0): Me thinks thou dost protest too much, my friend:) but thank you for unearthing my true, deep self hidden beneath my comments! I have seen the light! It really is incredible that the Holy Spirit has given you this amazing gift of discerning the motivations of others, and especially those with whom you disagree. As fantastic as it is for me, a stranger only touched through the ether of social media, how much more incredible must this gift be for those fortunate enough to be in your physical presence! Truly, if one were to start ascribing a victimhood mentality to others, it isn’t necessary to read into anything beyond what words are actually said. And only a casual perusal of SSPX, or really any “traditionalist” or Catholic fundamentalist pages anywhere, would display a very consistent attitude of self righteous victim identity running throughout. This isnt foreign to me, it’s always been a turnoff, but I was on board for a long time, way too long. So if I’m sad, it’s for my older children, who received mediocre educations and some abuse in SSPX schools; and for the many years spent in error outside the church. But looking back doesn’t do anyone any good. So I’m very happy now, as is my family, thank you very much! And I sincerely hope that your deep inner sadness and feelings of being victimized are somehow relieved. Keep praying for truth, it will come. Christ told us so:)

Willsxyz (1): >Yes I do understand all of those things.I see. So you agree that the SSPX does not claim that the SSPX is the church, and yet you claim that you believed that. Why would you have believed that?And you agree that people catechized and baptized by the SSPX are Catholics, and yet you claimed that you "converted" to Catholicism. Why would you claim something which you agree is false?And you agree that the SSPX is part of the Catholic Church, and yet you claimed that Bishop Fellay "kept the society out of the Church". Why would you claim something which you agree is false?Notice that neither in this post, nor in my prior post did I attempt to "justify" the SSPX position. Rather, I just stated that several things you said make no sense when considering the objective facts -- and by objective facts, I am not referring to arguments made by the SSPX, just the facts that 1: The SSPX does not claim itself to be the Catholic Church. 2. The Holy See considers the SSPX to be part of the Catholic Church.If your conscience has led you away from the SSPX, that is fine with me. I have no interest in trying to convince you otherwise. However, I do think you ought not make statements that are at variance with the facts.

None (1): no holy spirit required for your obvious antics/

rathdrummob (1): 😂

# Post 249: Pre-55 Easter Vigil at Society Chapel in Riga, Latvia

Author: BasedEurope

Score: 10

Comments: 1

URL: https://youtu.be/76Anb2VwXI0?t=7226

I thought that the mixing of 3 clerics from different rites was interesting

hambeejee (1): Such a rare instance of a Society chapel doing pre-55 Holy Week liturgy

# Post 250: 41% of children in Vienna's elementary and middle schools are Muslim. Within living memory, Vienna will become a Muslim city.

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 12

Comments: 1

URL: https://x.com/Raphfel/status/1912167494195806660

Highwayman90 (2): Time to evangelize.

# Post 251: Died SSPX have anything to do with the church’s new mascot? Does it have a point of view / stance on the mascot?

Author: melbtest06

Score: 0

Comments: 12

URL: https://i.redd.it/kb5rbfl8hove1.png

None (19): It’s super gay, so probably not…

nishka\_luv2 (13): I very highly doubt the SSPX would’ve been invited to the conference that came up with the mascot, nor would the Society have been interested in attending had they indeed received that invitation. I’m not sure we have an official stance, however I’m pretty sure the general consensus is that it’s ridiculous and pointless. Oh, and gay. From what I’ve gathered from FB posts lol.

Street-Tree-8126 (5): Died?

BasedEurope (2): It's only the Jubilee's not the church's

PersimmonSorry91 (4): After going beyond surface level investigation and doomer social media posts of the mascot I like Luce and her symbolism 🤷 she carries Venerable Archbishop Fulton Sheen's missionary rosary. Pray for the conversion of the artist that he leaves his life of sin. She's not supposed to replace or be regarded as the same as any sort of iconography or anything like that. Literally just a child's mascot for the jubilee year. My spiritual director doesn't like her. I imagine as whole there's no stance by the society other than it's fruit of the modernists. The yellow raincoat Luce wearsrecalls the colours of the flag of Vatican City, yellow on the hoist side and white on the fly. This choice is not accidental. Luce’s raincoat, along with her muddy boots, represents the challenges faced along every Christian’s path, their journey through life’s storms. A journey in which Luce is not alone: the missionary cross around her neck and the rosary highlight her Christian identity, instilling courage and enthusiasm in the face of daily challenges. That same enthusiasm shines through her bright eyes, where a stylised scallop shell, a traditional symbol of theCamino de Santiago de Compostela, is depicted. This detail represents the hope that this character is meant to inspire, the desire for spirituality and connection with the divine, in line with the Jubilee’s universal message of peace, under the emblem expressed by its logo:Pilgrims of Hope.

adveniatpermariam (-2): Sspx having a copium overdose as usual when dealing with the conciliar church. Yes, you’re literally in communion with this cringe gay mascot.

rathdrummob (-3): We? Are you a cleric in the SSPX?

rathdrummob (1): I love this take.

nishka\_luv2 (6): 99.9% sure SSPX clerics don’t have Reddit so obviously OP wasn’t asking actual SSPX authorities to answer. The SSPX is a Society, and I’m part of the Society, so yes, “we.”

Piklikl (2): It’s not as simple as that. The SSPX is a priestly society, the best you can hope for as a lay person is to become a tertiary member, ie a member of their third order, but even then you wouldn’t be considered a true member of the SSPX.

rathdrummob (2): They’re pretty careful about who speaks for them. You can speak for the “Priestly Society of St Pius X”?

nishka\_luv2 (1): I’m not sure who OP was asking, if not members of the Society. Obviously, I cannot speak for them, but I’m pretty sure I can answer this question based off what I have seen because again, who else was this question for?

# Post 252: The Truthfulness of the Pre-1955 Good Friday Prayer for the Jews | Doctor Peter Kwasniewski for New Liturgical Movement

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 6

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.newliturgicalmovement.org/2020/12/the-truthfulness-of-pre-1955-good.html

Odd-Bed-9260 (2): So why is the SSPX so afraid to permit it now?

# Post 253: Oremus et pro perfidis Judæis: ut Deus et Dominus noster auferat velamen de cordibus eorum, ut et ipsi agnoscant Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum.

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 6

Comments: 0

URL: https://x.com/TempusFugit4016/status/1913028796128649228

# Post 254: Kennedy Hall's new book on the crisis in the Church is already a #1 best seller

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 7

Comments: 0

URL: https://x.com/kennedyhall/status/1912522903406473361

# Post 255: On Good Friday, what would happen if a devious or mad person ordered the Priest at gunpoint to give them Communion when it is only reserved for the Priest on Good Friday?

Author: melbtest06

Score: 0

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1k1epez/on\_good\_friday\_what\_would\_happen\_if\_a\_devious\_or/

A-B-C-1-2-3-D-4-5 (10): Communion is given out on Good Friday, it just isn’t consecrated that day. The communion on Good Friday was consecrated the day before.But to answer your question, I don’t see how it is any different than this scenario on any other day of the year.

SuperGrapeSoda (2): I like what has been said already. But wouldn’t a good and holy priest embrace martyrdom with joy ?

fredtheunicorn1 (1): Isn’t the main issue here a crazy person waving a gun around? Not that he gets a cracker he shouldn’t have?

MacduffFifesNo1Thane (2): In the pre-1955 version, Communion isn’t given. Which I presume OP is thinking.

mattdamon992 (1): 1955 is the only valid rite rah rah rah. Lol. :(

MacduffFifesNo1Thane (1): You know that, and I know that, but would the NO bishops recognize the difference?

# Post 256: Confusion why TLM is better than NO

Author: skoopt

Score: 3

Comments: 14

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1k0lvyn/confusion\_why\_tlm\_is\_better\_than\_no/

I’ve always felt more fulfilled after I attend a Latin Mass but I still believe that NO is fully valid. Recently my friend introduced me to the community of SSPX and I’m confused what this community’s beliefs/origins are. Can someone give me a summary?

ourladyofcovadonga (15): YouTube 'sspx novus ordo' and you'll find like 3-4 videos all around 45-60 minutes that will give you the best information, straight from the source. In short, the new mass is catered to protestants, was made with the help of heretics and Jews, deleted critical segments, made things vague and watered down, cut down prayers in length and scope, elevated the "congregation" to the level of priest, introduced more involvement by the laity, among other things

Oak-tr333 (5): I don’t know the exact details, I heard this from my husband who is the theologian and Catholic history enthusiast of the family, but essentially the Catholic Church says that Anglican ordinations are not valid because they leave out a certain part of the ordination. After Vatican, 2, they removed this part from the Catholic ordination but it’s still deemed valid even though we said that Anglicans don’t have valid ordination for doing the exact same thing. I hope and pray that NO still has valid ordinations because if they don’t, I don’t want to think about all the people who could be led to hell. I guess we’ll never know for certain so all you can do is hope and pray.It’s also my understanding the FSSP does the new ordinations and SSPX is the only one that still does old right ordinations (thank you Archbishop Lefebvre)

dayakcowboy (2): No offense, but you saying it's "valid" just reveals that you haven't studied the issue extensively. The SSPX does not have any qualms about the validity of the NO but rather, the liceity of the NO (ie, does the Church have the lawful authority to implement the NO and take away the TLM? The SSPX would say no, the Church must hand down the traditions faithfully, which includes the Liturgy).I recommend that you spend your time (don't just skim through) judging the arguments from the different sides (SSPX, Ecclesia Dei, NO) so that you get a sense of what they say. Only then, decide what your position is, based on practicality and soundness of the position. I say this because I assure you that nobody online can give an adequate answer to this question, the internet debate surrounding this is not only messy but nasty as well. Its up to you to discover what the SSPX and others opposing the SSPX say on the issue. God bless you :)

BasedEurope (2): Here's a [document](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1EVpSMJR3HKBbU-yLQ1r7dK4UEO4y\_hU9\_OHiQAxGBDs/edit?usp=sharing) one of my friends made

realdenvercoder (2): “Better” is a subjective term. Like “Why is cookie dough ice cream better?”I wouldn’t listen to anyone on here. I would go and talk to an SSPX priest.In my experience they are VERY available. Ours come downstairs after mass and chat with us but you could make an appointment to speak with them. I had qualms about the SSPX but after several sessions with an SSPX priest I now only attend SSPX services, my daughter goes to an SSPX school and through the grace of God we were able to move 15 minutes away from the church/school. 🤷♂️

mattdamon992 (1): The SSPX (Society of St. Pius X) was founded in 1970 by Archbishop Lefebvre out of concern for perceived errors after Vatican II. While they validly celebrate the sacraments, they lack full canonical status and are in an irregular situation with Rome. The Church urges caution: we must love tradition without separating ourselves from the Church's visible unity under the Pope. The Latin Mass is beautiful, but the Ordinary Form (Novus Ordo) is fully valid, approved by the Magisterium, and nourishes countless saints in the making today (including blessed Carlo!)

mattdamon992 (3): That claim is both historically and theologically false. The Novus Ordo was promulgated by Pope St. Paul VI under the authority of the same Church Christ founded. It maintains the essential structure of the Mass and the Real Presence. Protestant observers had no authority in its formulation. The suggestion that Jews or heretics designed the Mass is a serious misrepresentation. Vatican II emphasises the active participation of the faithful (and gives more emphasis to Scripture), as seen in the early Church. Attacking the Ordinary Form weakens unity and risks pride disguised as zeal.

nishka\_luv2 (1): Wonderful response!

mattdamon992 (3): The Church has definitively affirmed the validity of post Vatican II ordinations. The comparison with Anglican orders fails because the Anglican rite was deemed invalid due to a defective intention and doctrine, not merely missing words. Catholic ordinations post Vatican II retain the essential form, matter, and intention required for validity. Pope Benedict XVI himself reaffirmed this. SSPX bishops were consecrated illicitly - valid but not licit. Trust Christ’s promise: “I will be with you always.”

mattdamon992 (1): The bishops and popes possessed exercised—the lawful authority to reform the liturgy. Obedience to that authority is not optional if we wish to remain in full communion with the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church.All this talk of "sspx would say no, because x y z" reveals that it all depends on their (or Lefebvre) interpretation. That's not a catholic response to uncertainty.

PersimmonSorry91 (2): ^^^ best reply here

ourladyofcovadonga (1): You could read the sources for what I'm saying in the Catechism of the Crisis published by Angelus Press. The society is not in the business of fabrication or deceit. The novus ordo mass could be said in like 10 minutes. I didn't even mention the real presence, which doesn't matter because the problem with the new mass isn't the real presence but rather the bastardized, gravely deficient, and truncated liturgy. A black mass could have the real presence, that doesn't make it good to attend. And your last point about increased scripture (obviously appeasing protestants) and returning to what the church did before is called antiquarianism. Antiquarianism was condemned by Pope Pius XII.

Willsxyz (1): The SSPX has never denied that Pope Paul VI had the authority to promulgate a new rite. Rather, the SSPX assert that the Novus Ordo is defective, because it no longer makes explicit the Catholic doctrine of the Mass, as dogmatized at Trent. In particular, all reference to the nature of the Mass as a propitiatory sacrifice has been removed.The fact that the protestant observers "had no authority" is irrelevant, because they certainly gave their opinions, and the Novus Ordo mass is, by the admission of Annibale Bugnini himself, designed to appeal to protestants.Additionally, the Novus Ordo Mass does not conform to the requests of Sacrosanctum Concilium, and those requests could easily have been met with appropriate modifications to the traditional Mass without, for example, eliminating the entire offertory.

Willsxyz (2): >Obedience to that authority is not optional if we wish to remain in full communion with the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church.Catholics are under no obligation to obey instructions from authority that are damaging to souls, to the Faith or to the Church, much as a child is under no obligation to obey instructions from his father that are damaging to his physical or spiritual health.It is beyond obvious, when looking at the developments of the last 60 years, that the II Vatican council and its aftermath have been devastating to the Catholic Church, and that uncounted souls have been lost as a result. It is not only allowed -- it is actually necessary -- to resist the source of such destruction, and to preserve the traditional Catholic faith and practice until such time as it is restored to its rightful place throughout the Catholic Church.And there is no doubt that this will happen. The errors of Vatican II will be repudiated, and the even greater errors of the "spirit of Vatican II" will be anathematized. It is only a matter of time. The modernists cannot win, for they are fighting God.

# Post 257: Archbishop Lefebvre's 60th jubilee sermon: translated and dubbed into English, Archbishop Lefebvre gave this sermon at Le Bourget, Paris in France on the 19th of November 1989 before the 23,000 people who attended the celebration of the 60th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 10

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M1KzeDMUnrg

# Post 258: The Catholics who have to worship somewhere else: how the Latin Mass split the Church | Francis X. Rocca for The Atlantic

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 5

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2025/04/latin-mass-pope-francis-church/682354/

# Post 259: How do the SSPX interpret this?

Author: Alternative-Cry-3682

Score: 9

Comments: 4

URL: https://i.redd.it/90azet52fute1.png

BrodyJerome (10): True obedience ≠ false obedience.There's an entire book by archbishop Lefebvre about it if you were to pick up a book and read instead of posting on Reddit

mattdamon992 (2): It's a great quote. I would have thought you meant the emphasis on discipline and governance rather than the uncontroversial faith and morals....PS Who sent the clergy of the sspx?

CincyGuy2025 (1): 1) The SSPX mixes up obedience and believing.Nevertheless ...2) Peter cannot teach error.3) Peter cannot enact harmful disciplineThere was once a God-Man who walked the Earth (you may have heard of Him) whose name is Jesus the Christ. He said regarding Peter, "He who heareth you, heareth me."When we hear the voice of Peter, we hear the very voice of Christ Himself. We don't "sift" the words and discipline of Peter.The SSPX is destroying the sacred Primacy of Peter. This hybrid "Have your pope and sift him too" is not Catholic!Either Vat2 and N.O. are Catholic or the promoters of it are not.

siriusreddit (5): https://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/OpenLetterToConfusedCatholics/index.htm

# Post 260: Is the Latin mass the only valid mass?

Author: Ok\_Direction5416

Score: 4

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1jub6df/is\_the\_latin\_mass\_the\_only\_valid\_mass/

Sir\_K9206 (16): No. If you think that it is, then I’m pretty sure the 23 Eastern Rite Catholic churches with their unique traditions and liturgies would have something to say about that.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): The New Mass is valid, but validity is insufficient. if it was sufficient, attending sacraments with the aorthodox schismatics would be ok. Same with the Church of England's ultra old school "Anglo-Catholics", since some of them got conditionally ordained by some Orthodox back in the 1800s.So. Valid? Yes. But validity is insufficient.

melbtest06 (-7): Novus Ordo and TLM are equally valid. As are the Orthodox and Anglican rites.

StelIaMaris (4): The Anglican rites too? Do you mean the Ordinariate or the actual Church of England?

jeff\_likes\_bread\_120 (2): Not Anglican bro 😭

jeff\_likes\_bread\_120 (1): The Anglican rite was valid in some points in history, but not anyone, and it has been a long time ever since, there where some Anglo Catholics ordained priests by the orthodox church in the 1800's today I imagine they are long gone, but there might still be a few of them around... However we must remember that there was also a liturgical reform in the Anglican church.Even if it's valid it would be such a small number.

# Post 261: Thoughts on Brian mccall?

Author: Ok\_Direction5416

Score: 2

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1jtygvw/thoughts\_on\_brian\_mccall/

He writes for Catholic family news

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (2): his son is a SSPX priest. So I imagine he is pretty okay.

# Post 262: Are eastern/roman Catholics valid?

Author: Ok\_Direction5416

Score: 5

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1jtvryc/are\_easternroman\_catholics\_valid/

Highwayman90 (6): Eastern Catholics have been recognized as part of the Church long before Vatican II (and many of the reunions happened centuries before: a few Churches like the Maronites and arguably Italo-Greeks were fully in communion without ever having formally been in schism).In fact, my priest says SSPX and related groups tend to prefer to come to him for Holy Mysteries than to go to NO priests, so evidently at least some of them are more than comfortable.

VanSensei (3): Why wouldn't they be?

# Post 263: Good Commentaries?

Author: himalayancandlepower

Score: 7

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1jt53du/good\_commentaries/

Just curious about how commentaries like "The New Jerome Biblical Commentary" (1990/the middle edition) and "A New Catholic Commentary On Holy Scripture" (1953/1975) vs. things like "Haydock's Commentaries On Sacred Scripture" are held with regards to SSPX viewpoints. Many thanks.

TooEdgy35201 (2): New Jerome's Biblical Commentary is full of historical-criticism. It is modernist drivel aimed at treating the faith as a man-made tradition with no regard to supernatural events. Haydock's Commentary fulfils the standard of piety and orthodoxy.

siriusreddit (2): Honestly go w/ the Haydock, the levels of scholarliness are just off the charts. Learned so much.

himalayancandlepower (1): Thank you for your time.

himalayancandlepower (2): Thanks so much.I like Rev Haydock. His story is quite the experience.

siriusreddit (2): Here it is online free: https://haydockcommentary.com/ :)

himalayancandlepower (2): Many thanks. I'm collecting the paperbacks and plan to have my local public library put that slightly textured and durable clear book covering material on them, as it's something they do for free.

# Post 264: Looking for a contact to ask 1 on 1 about the SSPX

Author: YellowSquirrel556

Score: 7

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1jrqnee/looking\_for\_a\_contact\_to\_ask\_1\_on\_1\_about\_the\_sspx/

For context I’m a fairly new, male convert to Catholicism (baptized as an infant in a Protestant church with the Trinitarian formula, confirmed into the Catholic Church in the Ordinary Form). I am interested in the SSPX and its strict adherence to Tradition but I have too many questions to list out on a Reddit post so I would like for a mature dialogue over direct message with someone well versed in its history and beliefs. Thank you much

Duibhlinn (7): The best people to contact would be the SSPX themselves. I don't know where you are but regardless of where you live the best course of action would be to find whatever your local SSPX location is and to reach out to the priests there.[https://fsspx.org/en/mass-centers](https://fsspx.org/en/mass-centers)This website has a map of all of the places in the world where the SSPX is. You'll also be able to find contact information. It's probably a good idea to go check out an SSPX Mass and to approach one of the priests afterwards and introduce yourself. The SSPX is a massive, global order and they get tons and tons of emails. In person you'd be able to talk face to face with a real person. The SSPX often have lunches after Mass so there's a good likelihood you can approach an SSPX priest in a relaxed environment without it being too formal or nerve wracking.The SSPX, as all other orders do, have programmes for welcoming new converts into the Church. They run catechism lessons and undertake the formation of new catechumens. You could always ask your local SSPX priests if they'd allow you to sit in on some of these classes. Even though you're already confirmed I don't see any reason why they would refuse you.It may be useful talking to people who attend SSPX Masses but there really is no substitute for getting it straight from the horse's mouth.

None (6): I'm open to PM if you want, but as it has been said above the SSPX priests should be available for you to talk with!

# Post 265: El Salvador: Anglican “Bishop” Actively Participates in a Mass | FSSPX News

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 3

Comments: 0

URL: https://fsspx.news/en/news/el-salvador-anglican-bishop-actively-participates-mass-51592

# Post 266: To what extent is Mary present within the Eucharist since it was her own DNA on the Cross?

Author: melbtest06

Score: 0

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1jpla99/to\_what\_extent\_is\_mary\_present\_within\_the/

Trengingigan (11): According to Catholic doctrine, Mary is NOT present within the Eucharist. Only the second Person of the Holy Trinity is present in the Eucharist. It would be like asking “To what extent is a chimpanzee present within the Eucharist since humans and chimps share a significant percentage of DNA?”.With this reasoning, every single life form on earth would be present in the Eucharist, since, to some extent, all life forms share some DNA. Furthermore, everytime you adore the Euchartist, you would be adoring also all life forms that share DNA with Jesus, thus committing idolatry.Funnily enough, the dogma of the presence of Mary in the holy Host has been promulgated by the Palmarian Church 😅

BertBlyleven (6): Not worth speculating about. But if you applied those that logic anywhere else the answer would be zero. Your parents aren't considered present in you because you share DNA. By that same logic the vast majority of the tribe of Judah would also be present.

CincyGuy2025 (2): Her DNA is not present. DNA is "accidental." Only the "substance" changes. The accidents are bread.

None (0): Is not dogma when some schismatics says so. Don't lower the value of the word.

# Post 267: Would you burn Protestant so-called Bibles?

Author: MaterMisericordiae23

Score: 17

Comments: 15

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1jphkk2/would\_you\_burn\_protestant\_socalled\_bibles/

I can't look at Protestant "Bibles" the same way anymore. Every time I see one, I look at it with disgust. It's as abhorrent as the "Book of Mormon".I am looking for copies in my house that I might have accepted from Protestants years before I took my Catholic faith seriously in order to burn them.

MarcellusFaber (17): St Pius X teaches that Protestant Bibles should be burned or handed into one’s parish priest in his catechism, I believe.

None (5): Yes.

Cathain78 (3): The Church burned erroneous and faulty bibles in the past, so I don’t see why not. They could mislead people into heretical conclusions and as such be occasions of sin. I think the question is whether it would be sinful NOT to dispose of them.

Duibhlinn (5): I'll copy [the comment I made](https://www.reddit.com/r/TraditionalCatholics/comments/1jpz2ow/comment/ml3cnpj/) on the version of this post that you made to r/TraditionalCatholics as it covers essentially the same topic, though obviously my references to that subreddit are not being made to this one:>Would you burn Protestant so-called Bibles?Absolutely, and without a single doubt or question in my mind. Anyone who gives you any answer other than yes is a modernist and is certainly not a traditionalist. These vile abominations should be rejected with absolute disgust and put where they belong, which is on the fire. I've done so on numerous occasions, and I would gladly and happily do so again if I were to come into contact with any other such texts in the future.This is what His Holiness Pope Saint Pius X taught on the topic of protestant mistranslations of the Holy Bible and what should be done with them:>32\*Q.\*What should a Christian do who has been given a Bible by a Protestant or by an agent of the Protestants? \*A.\*A Christian to whom a Bible has been offered by a Protestant or an agent of the Protestants should reject it with disgust, because it is forbidden by the Church. If it was accepted by inadvertence, \*\*it must be burnt as soon as possible or handed in to the Parish Priest\*\*.>33\*Q.\*Why does the Church forbid Protestant Bibles? \*A.\*The Church forbids Protestant Bibles because, either they have been altered and contain errors, or not having her approbation and footnotes explaining the obscure meanings, they may be harmful to the Faith. It is for that same reason that the Church even forbids translations of the Holy Scriptures already approved by her which have been reprinted without the footnotes approved by her.[The quote is from the section "On Holy Scripture" in the Catechism of Pope Saint Pius X from 1910 A.D.](https://www.ewtn.com/catholicism/library/catechism-of-st-pius-x-1286)Don't be surprised if you see naysayers crop up in the comments section of this post and not only dare to disagree with His Holiness Pope Saint Pius X's teaching on this matter but even go so far as to say that it's alright to read these vile texts. I've seen such clowns numerous times on this very subreddit. Never, ever forget that like all subreddits this place has open borders and that literally anyone can post here.His Holiness Pope Leo X taught in his [Papal Bull \*Exsurge Domine\* in 1520 A.D. condemning the errors of protestantism](https://www.papalencyclicals.net/leo10/l10exdom.htm) that the faithful are to regard as condemned, reprobated and rejected these errors and that all Catholics are restrained in the virtue of holy obedience under the penalty of automatic major excommunication. His Holiness Pope Leo X forbid every one of the faithful, in virtue of holy obedience and under the aforementioned penalty of major excommunication to be incurred automatically, to "read, assert, preach, praise, print, publish, or defend" these texts. That includes protestant mistranslations of the Holy Bible.So, to all you naysayers, enjoy your automatic major excommunication while you read the filth in the king james mistranslation and fanfiction of the Holy Bible. The rest of us will continue to read the Douay-Rheims and other actually Catholic translations of the Latin Vulgate, and we will also continue to reject your vapid suggestions that we join you in polluting our minds and souls by exposing ourselves such vile filth as you seem to do on a regular basis. Do us all a favour and cease your filth merchant carry on, or at the very least take it elsewhere.

None (1): I would strongly advise against this. A Bible with missing books is still a Bible. To put this on the level of a heretical work such as the Book of Mormon is utterly blasphemous. I say this with no contempt for the traditional teachings of the Church, but from respect for the word of God. Saint Dominic always carried on him the Gospel of St. Mathew along with the Epistles of St. Paul, not an entire Bible. Of course the Protestant canon is not something we can be indifferent about, but the issue is that it is incomplete, not heretical.

None (-2): [deleted]

MaterMisericordiae23 (5): Ahh, would you look at that. Our Society's eponym continues to be based. Holy St Pius X, ora pro nobis!

None (3): [deleted]

kawaqcosta (12): A corrupted translation is not the "word of God." It is not the source of the translation that matters, but the translation itself. As a rule, Protestant translations are despicable.Furthermore, the Catechism of Saint Pius X gives exactly this instruction about Protestant Bibles: burn them or give them to the parish priest.

None (5): I dont know about this person but i can read the vulgate without a dictionary and pretty much at the same speed i read english. Personally think all traditional Catholics should be versed in Latin.

None (-3): [deleted]

kawaqcosta (3): Yes, some parts are often translated in a way that contradicts the Church. The Bible of Jehovah's Witnesses, for example, has an absolutely heretical translation. The other Protestant Bibles do too, to some extent. That is why there was an order in the Catechism of Saint Pius X to burn them or give them to the parish priest. I do not understand your insistence on contradicting this.

MaterMisericordiae23 (5): They're missing 7 books and have mistranslations. They're just as credible as the Book of Mormon

None (1): [deleted]

None (-2): [deleted]

kawaqcosta (3): And I ask: so what? There may be translators with excellent qualifications, but any translation involves interpretation of the text. And this is where Protestant theological influence comes in.Perhaps there is a translation without problems, and I am not saying that every Protestant translation is wrong in every sentence, that is practically impossible. But Protestant texts should be rejected by Catholics, as a rule.

MaterMisericordiae23 (5): Are you even a Catholic? What nonsense are you promoting here?Look at Luke 1:28 how the Holy Virgin is portrayed in Catholic translations vs Protestant translations. KJV downplays the holiness and sinlessness of the Mother of God.KJV is a work of the devil and is as credible as the Book of Mormon

None (-3): [deleted]

MaterMisericordiae23 (2): Unfortunately, Protestants now think Luke 1:28 doesn't show Mary is graced because their version says she's "only favored", therefore Immaculate Conception cannot be possible.That's the confusion KJV and other works of the devil have done to lead people away from the Church. The Catholic Church also declared the 7 books as part of the Biblical canon. Protestant so-called Bibles separate them as "apocrypha" or outright excluding them. Again, that's a work of the devil. St Jerome was holy, and as such he ultimately left it to the Church to determine the official canon. Didn't you know St Pius X promoted the burning of Protestant "Bibles"?

None (-1): [deleted]

None (5): What are you even trying to do. WE ARE NOT PROTESTANT, THEY WORKS CONTAINS ERROR, Get rid of it.... You sir are absolutely baffling. Stop defending heretical works

# Post 268: Who would you like to see consecrated as a Bishop/ as Bishops for the SSPX?

Author: adveniatpermariam

Score: 8

Comments: 20

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1jp8kpb/who\_would\_you\_like\_to\_see\_consecrated\_as\_a\_bishop/

Willsxyz (12): The ideal candidates for this would be those holy priests whom we don't know or hear of, unless we happen to attend the chapel where they labor.

A-B-C-1-2-3-D-4-5 (5): There’s definitely a list floating around in the District offices and Econe

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (5): Fr Burfitt and Fr Franks :D

MariaEtCrucis01 (3): I'd say our chaplain, Fr. Michel Boniface, but he's seriously needed in our country at this time. There's the regional superior for Central America and the Caribbean, Fr. Ezequiel Rubio, but again, very much needed in his role currently. Unfortunately, all the priests that come to my mind are very important where they are. In our region, and particularly in my country, things are tough for Catholicism.

GYEvanID (1): For Asia, there are three: Father Summers for South Asia and Middle East, Abbe Jean-Michel Gomis for Southeast Asia, and Father Onoda for East Asia.

hambeejee (1): Fr. Etienne Demornex, Fr. Carlo Magno Saa in my opinion

mattdamon992 (0): Whoever the pope agrees to!

No\_Construction5455 (0): Just about any of the seminary instructors at St. Thomas Aquinas Seminary.

adveniatpermariam (2): I hope its gonna be Fr. Michael Johnson

adveniatpermariam (3): Yeah, Latin America is a rough spot at the moment.

Practical\_Beyond\_910 (2): Father Boniface is too old! Father Rubio... maybe, but I sincerely believe that the candidates will be limited to Seminary Directors and District Superiors of larger districts. Father De Lassus from La Reja is a perfect candidate in my opinion.

adveniatpermariam (2): Bergoglio wont thats the thing.

Practical\_Beyond\_910 (8): Father Johnson is too old, the candidates will be on the younger side.

ourladyofcovadonga (1): 😂 he's based but come on man, he's about to keel over

sapphirewaves87 (6): SSPX still recognizes the Holy Father

jaqian (4): Pope Francis not Bergoglio, have some respect

A-B-C-1-2-3-D-4-5 (1): Fr Rutledge is probably the most obvious one that’s gonna get a lot of consideration. At least out of the Americans. I’m sure there’s a French and a Spanish one that’ll get it too.

adveniatpermariam (3): Thats not my point

EmanatedOne (1): “The Pope said ‘call me Jorge’”0:33 - 0:42https://youtu.be/85j4KGNE8d4?si=-v6nXzg-kegD4Zy0

Practical\_Beyond\_910 (1): Wherever they come from, I hope that all the candidates are hardliners, even if they are all French (I'm Mexican) haha

# Post 269: "Those who are servants of Mary, and for whom Mary intercedes, are as secure of paradise as if they were already there."
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1jn9pnn/those\_who\_are\_servants\_of\_mary\_and\_for\_whom\_mary/

Taken from best book explaining Mariology: "Glories of Mary" by St. Alphonsus, Doctor of the Church:[https://www.saintsbooks.net/books/St.%20Alphonsus%20Maria%20de%20Ligouri%20-%20The%20Glories%20of%20Mary.pdf](https://www.saintsbooks.net/books/St.%20Alphonsus%20Maria%20de%20Ligouri%20-%20The%20Glories%20of%20Mary.pdf)And also, if you want to enroll in\*\*the most spiritually enriched community in the Church\*\*, richly blessed with indulgences—the Confraternity of the Rosary—read this post:[https://www.reddit.com/r/Catholicism/comments/1heqjp2/join\\_the\\_confraternity\\_of\\_the\\_most\\_holy\\_rosary/](https://www.reddit.com/r/Catholicism/comments/1heqjp2/join\_the\_confraternity\_of\_the\_most\_holy\_rosary/)
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I’d appreciate the insight of some people that came to the society from a diocesan background and left the Novus Ordo behind. I’m in a tricky situation because I’m in a mind to stop attending the NO but being such a monumental decision means I feel I have to do more research first. So if you’re someone that left the NO for the TLM exclusively I’d love to hear how long it took you to assent to the SSPX position, as I don’t want to be overly cautious or reckless in the decision to leave or not leave the new mass. I have a wonderful parish community and I’ve been discerning the priesthood with my Archdiocese for about a year now. I’ll have to depart from both to some extent so in addition to advice from my spiritual director, I’d like to hear from people that have walked this path also.

SnowWhiteFeather (9): I realized the truth of the Catholic faith about five years ago. I started attending the SSPX a year later and was baptized a year after that.One of the primary reasons for my conversion was the cultural hegemony of modernist ideology. You can't hold any standards when you are a relativist. You can't be happy as a hedonist.Religion is the only way to be happy and to live a life that is internally congruent. Happiness is most strongly correlated with the virtue of love, so that lead me to "Christianity". I ruled out protestantism immediately, because it has no internal consistency. Every single protestant believes something different, practices their own way, and rarely improves. It's like a glass pane smashed to pieces. Everything is there, but it is disordered, confused, and broken. Protestantism is ultimately a modernist ideology, because it is relativistic.So I turned to Catholicism. It celebrated love in a way that no other religion does. Everything that I learned was congruent. It fit together like puzzle pieces in a way that was pleasing and confounding. Some of the teachings confused me, but my lack of understanding didn't indicate that Catholicism was confused. As I continued to learn Catholicism quickly replaced any contending beliefs.When I attended the Novus Ordo I made several friends who were a bit younger than me. They kept complaining about the SSPX and how traditional they were –tradition being the antithesis of modernism. I knew that I needed to go there when my friends proclaimed the desire for women to be priests. My friends were confused.The next week I attended the SSPX.

Duibhlinn (8): Well the first step would be to attend the Latin Mass, have you done that yet? There's little point in reading books etc. on something that will be entirely hypothetical and intellectual to you if you haven't actually experienced and witnessed what they are talking about at least a few times.I was raised nominally Novus Ordo but followed a similar trajectory in that I first merely preferred the Latin Mass and then stopped attending the Novus Ordo entirely. My stopping going to the new Mass had nothing to do with the SSPX really, and it isn't "the SSPX position" as you call it. Most traditionalists de facto exclusively attend the Latin Mass when given a choice. My attitude towards the Novus Ordo changed when I began attending a diocesan Latin Mass regularly. If a child is raised exclusively on highly processed frozen food their entire life and then later on is able to regularly eat real, homemade food for the first time they aren't going to want to willingly go back to the slop. It was a pretty obvious and self evident natural conclusion to me: if given the choice, why would I willingly go back to the novus ordo when the Latin Mass is superior by every metric? Why have a hamburger when you can have steak?I was largely unfamiliar with the nuts and bolts of the liturgy at the time, I was simply looking at what was plainly before my eyes. I have more substantial reasons for my attitude now but it began by just looking at what was in front of me.>So if you’re someone that left the NO for the TLM exclusively I’d love to hear how long it took you to assent to the SSPX position, as I don’t want to be overly cautious or reckless in the decision to leave or not leave the new mass.People attending the Latin Mass don't have to sign a contract at the front doors saying they will never attend the Novus Ordo again. Just go yourself and experience it. There really is no substitute for just going and seeing it yourself. Ultimately most people, the longer they attend the Latin Mass and are exposed to the traditional liturgy, end up naturally, in and of themselves, desiring to stop attending the novus ordo. It's not something we do to gain acceptance into some sort of trad club, it's a natural consequence of repeated exposure to a Mass that is superior to the novus ordo in every regard.>I have a wonderful parish communityI understand why you're bringing this up but it that's completely besides the point. You aren't going to Mass, well at least you shouldn't be going to Mass, for the community. That's what protestants do in their made up fake religion. All the ancient pagans who converted to Catholicism did so despite suffering greatly socially, and they did it because it was true. It's as simple as that. We aren't Catholics for a social life, perhaps your diocesan seminary might not be communicating that to you but it's simply not what Catholicism is. A healthy community is a natural byproduct of people who are adhering to the truth who have gathered together but it's not the goal. Traditionalists who are going to the Latin Mass are doing so because they are interested in religious truth and they believe that's where they'll find it. They certainly aren't going out of their way to attend the TLM because they think it'll be good for their social lives.Ultimately if you want to be a priest you need a more serious attitude. The primary purpose of a parish is to provide the Sacraments, not to be a social club. You're there to get the Sacraments and to receive religious truth, anything else is just a bonus. If priests spent a little less time pretending they're social workers and a little more time doing their jobs as priests the Church wouldn't be in as terrible a state as it is today.The question of Latin Mass or Novus Ordo is ultimately about truth, not about how many friends you're going to make. If all we cared about was community none of our ancestors would have converted from paganism. I completely understand that what you said about community is only one part of your post but I in complete sincerity say to you that it's important to examine your emotional motivations when appraising the situation before you. We are all humans who can be easily swayed by our attachments to the things of this world, but ultimately the call of the Christian is to attempt to look beyond those worldly pushes and pulls and to try and seek the truth. If the question of "what is the community like" is even entering your mind when considering the question of whether you should attend the Latin Mass or the novus ordo then I sincerely say to you that you most probably need to take time to consciously reexamine your calculus and the motivations influencing your thought process.

Intrepid-Today-4825 (4): I left the NO; our first three children were baptised in a NO church. I got a bit of friendly criticism from both sides

None (5): I am lucky enough to be born in the SSPX, so I don't correspond to your criteria, but I'll pray for you! And if you have any question for someone born in it instead of someone who came from the NO, let me know!

PleasantStorm4241 (3): I left the Novus Ordo about five years ago...Mostly. I live far from the closest SSPX chapel and drive alone, so I attend twice a month, more at times. Not attending Mass on those weekends when I didn't drive to the SSPX chapel had ALWAYS gnawed at me in those first few years when it was the TLM offered by the SSPX or nothing. If the NO Masses are valid (albeit problematic), and the Host is truly consecrated, becoming the Body of Christ, I can't not be there. (Unless the Masses offered locally were worse than they are.) Plus I do get to hear Scripture and the Gospel. My local NO parishes have the usual problems: Immodest and/or sloppy dress, Eucharistic ministers, Communion in the hand, awful modern music, women handling the ciborium and opening/closing the tabernacle, female lectors, and so on. It's depressing and makes me appreciate the TLM and SSPX more.Some circumstances have cut down drastically on my ability to travel to the SSPX chapel so I've been attending a local parish since last year. However, the parish I attend (populated by some other "refugees," as I call them, from our former parish run by a couple of priests who are likely a couple) is dying. Two of three Masses are maybe 1/4 full, the largest maybe 1/3 full. It has a lot of debt, too. I give it two years before it's closed. Ironically, so I heard, that before Traditiones Custodes, this parish was going to get one TLM. It has the three steps to the altar, and the lack of an altar rail could easily be remedied by a few kneelers. If it had the TLM, I'd instead give it two years to flourish.Anyway, I know my SSPX friends would be horrified that I attend an NO. I'd also tell them that if they were so bothered by it they could come pick me up drive me there and back. I doubt I've have takers. God willing, there will come a day when I live close to an SSPX chapel and I can be done with the NO.

None (1): I left the new rite but didn't left the church, personally I go to divine liturgy(Catholic Melkite rite) and also the society masses, and some times a diocesan mass that does the Old Latin Rite. I might be a minority some people are purist of the Latin Church, but I think is important to be in communion has much as possible so I frequent Divine Liturgy.Also The Society is not the magisterium so you don't have to agree a 100% with them to attend.

Cathain78 (1): I left our NO parish 1.5 years ago and stopped our children attending Mass at our parish church with the school. It wasn’t easy, it caused arguments with some family, but it was absolutely worth it. The first time we attended High Mass at the SSPX chapel we were amazed and knew immediately we had found our way back home. I would say that anyone interested in attending the SSPX has been given and incredible grace. And yes, it does often involved us picking up our cross and enduring some hardship to follow Christ, but my family’s spiritual life has blossomed. Instead of being bored at NO Mass, my young son came out of his first TLM and declared his desire to be an altar server, which now he is. He made is First Confession and First Communion at the Society and my daughter will do the same.As others have said, once you start attending you will find it increasingly difficult to go back. The scales will fall from your eyes and your conscience will make it very difficult to attend a NO again. When you do, it becomes a penance in itself.

Duibhlinn (4): I presume they were baptised before you left the NO. People could do with being more charitable in that regard, not everyone was raised in a traditional enclave and people simply aren't mind readers with perfect universal knowledge. I would have received my own confirmation for example in the traditional rite if I was able to but I didn't have perfect onmiscient knowledge as a literal child who had never even heard of a Latin Mass. If people are giving you guff for that they can safely be ignored.

Duibhlinn (5): I'm not wading into the debate on whether one should attend the Novus Ordo or not, but I do want to address what you said about validity. I know you know this, but for the benefit of those reaidng, it's not that the SSPX or most trads think the Novus Ordo is invalid. It's not, when done according to the text.The SSPX view that Catholics should not attend the Novus Ordo derives from, and is in line with, what had always been traditionally believed about the obligation to attend Mass. When you essentially said, paraphrasing, that since it's valid and the Real Presence is truly there that you "can't not be there" is completely out of step with Catholic teaching. The Eastern Orthodox have valid Mass, would you also say that you "can't not go" to an Orthodox divine liturgy? The Arians had valid liturgy too, as did most schismatic groups in history. It's obviously not true that mere validity is enough to bind, or even enough to indicate you should attend. When many Greeks schismed from Rome there were also many who didn't, and the two groups used the same liturgy. Just because the Eastern Orthodox schismatic Greeks were using a good liturgy did not mean that it was okay to attend their Mass either.In actuality the traditional teaching on the Sunday obligation was rather lenient to the laity. Generally speaking the norm was that the laity were dispensed from their obligation in a few cases. Serious illness, very far travel distance etc. One of these cases was if attending said Mass presented spiritual danger, for example if the priest is a known heretic who denies dogma. Catholics living during the Arian heresy or the Nestorian controversy were not, for example, bound by Sunday obligation to attend an Arian or Nestorian Mass. The idea is ludicrous. Church law is ultimately, in its most basic principle, ordered for the good of your soul. It cannot bind you to do something which is bad for your soul.The actual debate among traditionalists is whether the Novus Ordo, in and of itself, when you completely set aside \*how\* it is said but only take into account what specifically the Novus Ordo is at its core, falls under that broad category. Some traditionalists think that if a Novus Ordo is celebrated with minimal liturgical abuse that it does not constitute something that is damaging or dangerous to the faith of those who attend and thus it does not dispense from the obligation. Other traditionalists, including the SSPX, believe that the Novus Ordo has intrinsic problems that are not effected by how it is said, but rather are part of its very DNA and that those problems do constitute danger and potential damage to the faith and souls of those who attend.What your opinion on the debate is is one thing, but it's important for everyone to be on the same page and for us to be clear about what the debate in question actually is. The SSPX isn't subjectively saying, based on the authority of their own opinions, that people shouldn't go because it's bad. What they are saying is based on the constant position of the Church from the very beginning, that Catholics are not bound to attend a Mass which presents a danger to their souls or is potentially damaging to their faith; their view, having studied the Novus Ordo extensively, is that such danger and potential damage is present within the DNA of the Novus Ordo, regardless of how it is said. That is why they give spiritual guidance on the matter to the effect that the Novus Ordo cannot bindingly obliate a person to attend it, given that in their view it is inherently dangerous and potentially damaging so it is incapable of exerting a binding obligation.>Anyway, I know my SSPX friends would be horrified that I attend an NO. I'd also tell them that if they were so bothered by it they could come pick me up drive me there and back. I doubt I've have takers.And have you tried asking? It sounds like you haven't.

PleasantStorm4241 (0): My friends know how far I have to travel and the obstacles to my attending weekly. At times it's been weeks since they've seen me. None live in my direction and none have volunteered to drive me - not surprising, nor do I blame them as the drive is about 350 miles roundtrip.
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Did you guys vaccinate? Absolutely no judgment as I know it’s turned in to a super personal and taboo thing these days. My husband and I are uncomfortable with the use of fetal cell lines in research and development of some of them, even though the Vatican says it’s fine we’re still squeamish about the idea. I have a bachelors in biology and my husbands mom is a nurse so we have definitely done our research in that regard and we’re still on the fence. It seems weird to me to give my baby a vaccine against an std, like he is 7 months old I do not see the point. Any insight or your personal thoughts would be appreciated as we’re figuring this out for our family. I stay at home and we don’t use any child care. Thank you!!

SnowWhiteFeather (5): Disregarding professional medical advice isn't something that should be done lightly unless it is for valid religious reasons.There are a lot of things that modern medicine does well. There are also several failures that are foundational to the way medicine is practiced. I am generally skeptical of risk assessment and decision making.We chose not to vaccinate our children yet. When our eldest is five I will review the decision.

DeRonehan (2): Regardless of how people feel about the presenter of this show, the guest outlines why you should have reservations about vaccinating young children.https://youtu.be/4JVJb8I3V7Q?si=21oDyvntyJiDhf5EI decided against it for our boys (aged 5 and 4). I did as much research as I could about the safety profile of what was being pushed on us, and concluded it's near impossible to fully discern. Eventually we decided the risks of vaccine injury outweighed the risks of contracting the illnesses they purport to prevent; especially in the West.

CathMode (2): When I researched this for our kids we came up with something like…. Step one: At the very least pick and choose what specific vaccines seem most important. (As you say, STD vaccine would be a no). Step two: dramatically draw out the schedule which ends up allowing you to skip some doses. The easiest to pin-down reason being the aluminum—when ingesting aluminum the system filters it out; injecting aluminum is not safe, to put it simply. So injecting large quantities into persons with small body mass is probably harmful. Step three: [my family becomes Christian and then Catholic and then “traditional”] “wait a minute is all of this just a really bad idea??” Probably there are real medical reasons to vaccinate and real moral reasons not to! One thing I’ve gotten into recently is plant medicine—not to sound flakey but if we only knew what abundant helps there are in plants … that God provides to us … for example many of the best medicinal plants are invasive, as opposed to rare bizarre mountain lichens or something… just saying that when the viruses hit, there are ways to deal with them that are generally forgotten and surprisingly effective.

seeking\_0333 (1): For sure not mRNA tech (covid shots). Slowly becoming skeptical of traditional vaccines but doing some reading.

Oak-tr333 (1): You make so much sense thank you for your input:)

CathMode (0): I’m glad! I don’t know anyone at (FSSP) church who vaccinates their kids, not that I’ve directly inquired but that’s the general take, and certainly not the Covid shots. On Substack, Happy Despite Them, by Leila Marie Lawler, has some posts about vaccines. She’s a good Catholic Voice of Reason. https://open.substack.com/pub/leilamarielawler/p/vaccine-questions-claims-and-resources?r=naw70&utm\_medium=ios
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Fr. Aumann O.P. is considered by traditionalists a sound Dominican theologian from before Vatican II who codified Mystical Theology. There can be no doubt that his credentials are traditional. I have been aware for a while now that Infused Contemplation is the physical manifestation of the presence of God in the soul (the heart) so that you knew that God was physically present (it relates to 'Did our hearts not burn within us'). This is a common theme in pre-Vatican II spiritual writings. I was looking for evidence that this was true and then found this definition (see below) by Fr. Aumann O.P. that validates what others say about infused contemplation. I wondered why the SSPX do not teach this. Whilst it is clear that not everyone will experience infused contemplation, all the major spiritual theologians (like Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange) state that Infused Contemplation is necessary for the heights of holiness. As this is agreed on by all the main pre-Vatican II spiritual theologians, and it is necessary for the heights of holiness, then why do the SSPX not teach it? After all they are saying all the time that we have to reach for the heights of holiness. I researched the internet and the SSPX do not teach this, and I have never heard it directly from the SSPX priests.\*\*Fr. Aumann O.P. A Spiritual Theology\*\*Characteristics of Infused Contemplation1. An experience of the presence of God. Many authors of mystical theology place great emphasis on this characteristic and consider it the essential note of infused contemplation. God gives to the soul an experimental, intellectual knowledge of his presence. This characteristic is essential for mystical contemplation but not for mystical experience in general because the soul may lack the experience of the presence of God when it is undergoing the passive purification of the soul, which St. John of the Cross describes as a "purgative" contemplation.(14)2. The invasion of the soul by the supernatural. The soul feels in an unmistakable manner that it is permeated with something it cannot describe with precision, but feels clearly is something supernatural. It is, in fact, an effect of the operation of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, which inundate the soul with supernatural life.

SnowWhiteFeather (3): I don't know, but here are my guesses:History has taught us the cost of errors, so the emphasis is placed on dogmatic teachings. Humility is an important virtue.When you are teaching you meet people where they are at. Infused contemplation is interesting to think about, but that isn't the objective in practice. Penance, prayer, and mortification are going to be what most people need to focus on.

CathMode (1): I remember reading a quote from Aquinas on why the purgative phase has to come first. “Because charity can be corrupted.” My personal interpretation of that is that people can look for signs and manifestations of God but be easily led astray especially early in the spiritual life. An example of getting the order wrong would be the Charismatic movement … signs and wonders. On the other hand if a person were to follow the teachings and methods of one of the tried-and-true saints such as St. Teresa, St. John of the Cross, the Ignatian exercises… or even just informally following the writings of St. Therese of Lisieux, St. Louis Marie de Montfort …. If the person then experiences what Fr. Aumann describes, it seems like they would know it’s God and not need to hear it from the pulpit ?

AquinasDestiny (1): Yes, I agree, but I do find it concerning that Christian perfection (be ye perfect, as your Father in Heaven is perfect) is only attained in the unitive stage of spiritual development, and therefore it is necessary to at least engage with this, as it is commanded by Jesus Himself, but there is very little teaching coming from the SSPX on this issue.
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Duibhlinn (2): >\*A new film sheds light on the divide in the Catholic church between traditionalists who desire the right to practise the Latin Mass and progressives who see the old rite as an outdated relic. With the Pope’s health in question, many are contemplating what the future holds for the Tridentine Mass. Francis is known in traditional communities for his implementation of restrictions on the mass through Traditionis Custodes. Now, many are asking what will happen to the Latin Mass after his death. Will the pontiff's successor continue the restrictions, or be more flexible on its practice? This documentary explores the deeply held convictions behind the headlines and the theological debates fuelling the divide.\*
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Hey all. This may be a silly question, but I'm wanting to attend an SSPX chapel, but I really want to continue to believe Francis is the Pope and all. Is this compatible at all? Or is it either or? Sorry if the question is really silly!

lupenguin (12): Pope Francis is the pope. I remain more neutral than anything on him. I don’t think he’s a “bad” pope but he’s certainly not the best one either. We aren’t sedes, he is the Vicar of Christ and that’s the end of the matter. You can disagree on his politics for example but not on ex cathedra statements in general

mineuserbane (7): The SSPX challenges Vatican II but upholds the Papacy.Is the reason you want to attend due to the liturgy or other reasons?

ourladyofcovadonga (6): All society masses include prayers for the pope, especially first Saturday's (or Friday I forget.)

GoneFishin56 (3): The SSPX also loves Pope Francis. They just disagree with him.

None (2): Rome is in apostasy, Lefebrve has stated this many times. We recognise and resist.

rmlenz (1): As pessoas precisam separar definitivamente o sucessor de Pedro do homem no cargo.Eu amo o Papa, posso gostar do Jorge Bergólio, mas ele é argentino, isso é tão difícil para um brasileiro como eu.

AquinasDestiny (1): Bare in mind that whilst there are problems, trad mass media people like Taylor Marshall have been caught out misrepresenting PF, and then it spreads like Chinese whispers. For instance, TM states that PF said that traditionalists were being accused of the heresy of Gnosticism, when in fact PF actually only stated that they were following some aspects of Gnosticism, highlighting only elitism. I am very careful now to not listen to bad sources that lack credibility.

CincyGuy2025 (1): If you love Peter, be a Sede. The SSPX destroys the papacy.

CV-CR-CI (0): The conversation about Bergoglio’s role in the Church is really heating up and seems to be heading toward a tipping point soon. To me and some others, including clergy, it’s pretty clear that Bergoglio was never the true Pope, and the Church is going through its Passion, much like Christ did, as we wait for the Second Coming.Yet, a lot of well-meaning Catholics aren’t ready to face this reality. It feels like something big has to happen for people to really get it. Sure, there are private revelations—like those from Our Lady of Garabandal, St. Faustina’s diary, and the Book of Truth by Maria Divine Mercy—that talk about the Illumination of Conscience being just around the corner. But honestly, you don’t need those to see the signs of the times; they’re pretty hard to ignore.Just think about what St. John Chrysostom said: “The Church is a place of refuge for the afflicted, a source of strength for the weak, and a testament to the endurance of faith through suffering.” And then there’s that verse in Matthew 24:21-22, where Jesus talks about great tribulations that will come—basically, a reminder that tough times are part of the journey. So, while some may resist acknowledging what’s happening, we really can’t overlook the reality of the Church’s struggles as we wait for God’s promises to unfold.

DevilishAdvocate1587 (7): Has he even made any ex cathedra statements? That would mean the statements are infallible.

LittleAlternative532 (2): The SSPX are not sedevacantist, we love the Pope and specifically commemorate him in the Canon of every Mass that we celebrate internationally. He is the visible head of the Church which includes the SSPX.

None (4): Liturgical/traditional reasons, yes! When you say “challenges V2”, does that mean they deny parts of V2? I’m still learning. Cheers!

None (1): Additionally, however, I have heard that the sacraments might not be valid in an SSPX chapel? Should I be concerned about this at all?

None (1): It also says all orthodox believers of the faith right after, so if he isn’t that excludes him just in case- my priest, Msgr brynes

None (1): You don't talk in place of the fraternity priest. Shut up.

lupenguin (8): He hasn’t no.

LittleAlternative532 (2): Vatican II, which was supposed to be a "pastoral council" DID make definitive ("infallible") statements about faith and morals, which every Pope since has dutifully followed.

rmlenz (1): No Pope after Pius XII did it

Willsxyz (11): The position of the SSPX is that the documents of Vatican II contain errors -- that is, statements that contradict earlier magisterial doctrine. As Pope Benedict XVI himself said, about Vatican II:"The truth is that this particular councildefined no dogmaat all, and deliberately chose to remain on a modest level, as a merely pastoralcouncil."In that case, then, everything the Second Vatican Council said must either 1) be understood in such a way as to agree with previously defined Catholic doctrine or 2) be in error. (\\*)Pope Benedict XVI claimed that option #1 is always the case when Vatican II seems to be at variance with traditional Catholic doctrine. The SSPX says that option #1 is often possible, but that certain statements of Vatican II cannot be reconciled with traditional Catholic doctrine, so that option #2 is the only possible way to explain those statements.(\\*) This should not be interpreted as implying that a council can contradict previous Catholic doctrine by defining a new dogma. It cannot. However, any non-dogmatic statement by a council is susceptible to error, and since Vatican II did not make any dogmatic definitions, all of its statements are susceptible to error.

Fair\_Wear\_9930 (3): I don't know much on this topic, but yea, they deny the changing of the liturgy in vatican 2 and a whole bunch of other things like confirmation. From what I heard, vatican 2 was pastoral and not echumenical, meaning no one really ever had to accept it, but now it seems like you kind of have to "pick a side" because it was causing problems in the parishioners communities, having the 2 different forms of liturgy at the same parish. Was a little divisive I guess. At least that's what I've been told. Maybe a bunch of other reasons.SSPX sentiments I've seen are the novus ordo is valid, but not licit. And many of the priests to such a degree as to say you shouldn't attend novus ordo because it's not licit, and because of canonical stuff, in times of crisis, you wouldn't be failing to uphold your Sunday obligations if you only have novus ordo parishes near and refuse to go. I don't think all the priests have that view. But I think you should know some of the sentiments I got when I attended my sspx for a couple months.

SnowWhiteFeather (3): You can learn a lot about the SSPX and its stance on Vatican II by reading or listening to Archbishop Lefebvres (SSPX founder) "Open Letter to Confused Catholics".You can find an audiobook version for free on YouTube. It is relatively short, but has lots of good information.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): that is absurd no one real has ever claimed this. you need to understand thoroughly definitions on key concepts like validity, liceity, and jurisdiction.

ourladyofcovadonga (1): For first Friday or Saturday, I don't remember which one, sspx offers specific prayers for the pope and say his name. Sspx isn't sedevacantist. Whether or not Francis is a true pope is a problem that is solved by a future council, not by conjecture and theological debate

CV-CR-CI (2): I want to clarify that I’m not speaking “in the place of a fraternity priest,” and that was never my intention. Instead of replying, could you pray for me? I’d really appreciate a few Ave Marias. 🙏 Thank you!

Jerailu (1): There's some debate about JP2.

SnowWhiteFeather (1): That was a particulairly good explanation.

None (1): Wow, that was a really well put together explanation. Thank you for that! Is it universally understood that V2 is a "merely pastoral council" that is "susceptible to error"? Or is this up for debate? For some context, I'm a recent convert out of Orthodoxy and yearn to be in communion with Rome (currently looking for a parish, possibly an SSPX chapel). Thank you again!

None (1): Yes but he is a modernist, he is the Pope and a silent apostate

AquinasDestiny (1): Bare in mind that whilst there are problems, trad mass media people like Taylor Marshall have been caught out misrepresenting PF, and then it spreads like Chinese whispers. For instance, TM states that PF said that traditionalists were being accused of the heresy of Gnosticism, when in fact PF actually only stated that they were following some aspects of Gnosticism, highlighting only elitism. I am very careful now to not listen to bad sources that lack credibility.

rmlenz (1): The relativism of modern mind prohibit absolute truths

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (2): Rome itself has said v2 can be questioned. see [https://www.lifesitenews.com/blogs/this-dissertation-on-vatican-ii-influenced-romes-decision-to-lift-the-excommunications-of-the-sspx-bishops/](https://www.lifesitenews.com/blogs/this-dissertation-on-vatican-ii-influenced-romes-decision-to-lift-the-excommunications-of-the-sspx-bishops/)

ourladyofcovadonga (1): Great! You're not the Church and until the Church pronounces that, it's just a theory

Jerailu (1): Nope not at all.

None (1): I know I’m not the church, I’m following Lefebrve

ourladyofcovadonga (2): Who was against sedevacantistism... You can have your doubts. You may even be right. However, until a pronouncement from the chair, it's merely conjecture.

# Post 277: Are sedevacantists catholic?

Author: Christ\_is\_\_risen

Score: 12

Comments: 47

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1jj068k/are\_sedevacantists\_catholic/

I read about saints who followed antipopes or thought the true pope was an antipope most of their lives.Are sedevacantists like CMRI or SSPV considered catholic?I have also heard "As to schism, those who refuse submission to the Roman Pontiff due to reasonably doubting the validity of his election are not schismatic"So are groups like the SSPV or CMRI not schismatic?I am SSPX and believe that Bergolio is the Pope. I just wanted to know if sedevacantists are considered catholic and if they are even considered schismatic.

AtaturkIsAKaffir (16): Sedevacantists are right to be reasonably concerned with the validity of the post 58' Pontiff's considering how visibly evil their works have been. If Sedevacantists are wrong, they lose nothing for simply being loyal to the tradition

None (8): [deleted]

Pale-Roof9278 (6): It’s a weird climate. Technically the SSPX, SSPV (sede vacantists) in all their forms do not meet the conditions of being schismatic. However, whether unduly loyal to some arbitrary “norm” or simply to afraid or too lazy to look beyond the status quo, most NO will just throw out the gaslighting tactic of declaring them “schismatic” while doing mental acrobatics to justify the actions of the mainstream. I pray for these souls. I was once one of them. It’s comfortable but ultimately a life of denial. The Truth sets us free in Christ. What I do find refreshing about those who don’t try to justify anything but the Truth, is their logic is straight forward. No zig zags. Tradcast, for example, is sensible to follow.

pnzrbttln1 (6): Rome would say we are. Rome also says the SSPX is. Rome is also the ones currently riding against the faith for 6 decades now.

None (2): Sedevacantists are Catholic. They do not reject any of the dogmas of The Church. In their circles, they will debate stuff like BOB, BOD, jurisdiction, etc. I would say those in the Novus Ordo are not Catholic. Its an entirely new religion, with new rites and new sacraments. Rejecting the post-conciliar claimants, or saying the papal chair is vacant, is not something that would put you outside The Church. If that was the case, layman in opposing factions during the Babylonian Captivity would have been non-Catholics then Catholics and back again frequently. In order to be outside of The Church, one has to be a formal heretic, who obstinately denies one or more articles of faith. In the Novus Ordo, you will find many formal heretics, and occult heretics as well.

PaxBonaFide (2): Yes, they simply have trouble believing that the Popes after Pius XII are valid, considering the many doctrines they taught that seemed to be on the verge of manifest heresy. It’s also important to note that they aren’t some kind of “Protestant”, since it’s not the office of the Papacy itself that they reject, just the idea that the currently elected Pope is a legitimate holder of that office.

mineuserbane (1): By Catholic, do you mean a part of the visible Church instituted by Jesus Christ? No. Communion with Rome is a requirement to be a part of the Catholic Church. The Orthodox have beautiful liturgy and tradition but receive much less grace than the much more popular Sedevacantists here. By Catholic do you mean are they culpable for the sin of schism? That is on the individual and their level of knowledge. I've been going back over the letters of Ignatius of Antioch recently. With how much he stresses to do everything with the approval of the local Bishop, I don't think he would be a fan of the sedes. Behind subject to the authority of the Bishop is a belief dating back to the apostolic times. Since then it has been a requirement and it continues till now. They must give account for their actions depending on how they lead the faithful. We must give account as to how we obey in humility.

freakViLLian (1): Yes they are catholicCheck out this website for their stance https://thethesis.us/

WinterBaroness (1): I've heard from the opinions of SSPX and Resistance that sedevacantism is very imprudent decision/theory and it could lead to heresy/schism so yes, most probably not catholic. According to priest Muñoz, even though there were many saints who resisted against the Pope in the past (for example, St. Catherine of Siena), there was never a sedevacantist saint.

Christ\_is\_\_risen (1): So they are not schismatic?

mineuserbane (3): The same could be said for a variety of of other non-catholic institutions including the Orthodox. They have beautiful liturgy and valid sacraments. It is even more true for Latin rite Orthodox. This is the same view as the ecumenical position most traditionalists fight so hard against.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (2): "Schism" means two things: 1. Separate hierarchy to the Church's own hierarchy. 2. Parallel hierarchy to the Church's own hierarchy.The SSPX does not meet either requirement. Some, but not all, sedevacantists do meet both requirements, especially if they have their own anti-Pope, like "Pope Michael" and his followers (pray for his soul and the souls that followed him, he is now deceased).

seeking\_0333 (1): This is simply not true. Rome does not say SSPX is in schism.

None (1): But they have their bishops. Bishop here in your quote doesn't talks about the Pope.

MarcellusFaber (1): You are correct that communion with the Pope is necessary to be a member of the Church. However, if Sedes are schismatic because they are not in communion with Bergoglio, then the SSPX is also. Communion does not exist simply because one claims it does.To be in communion with the Pope, one must submit to him in his laws & teaching. If one does not do this, then one is not in communion with him, & verbal recognition does not fix this.

None (2): What about Palamas now is a Catholic saint apparently, also Nestorius.

AtaturkIsAKaffir (8): It is the Novus Ordo who are Schismatic, one cannot be called a schismatic for how they attempt to combat a heresy as grave as the Novus Ordo

None (2): [deleted]

sssss\_we (1): With the difference that the Orthodox are heretics, in so far as they reject Papal supremacy and the filioque. And they allow divorce, etc.

Pale-Roof9278 (1): Thanks for clarifying with canonical terms. I was looking at more from an ontological/ moral perspective insofar as there is not full intention or full knowledge to willfully reject Rome.

pnzrbttln1 (3): https://www.catholicworldreport.com/2023/03/14/answering-six-objections-from-the-sspx/Good read, me thinks.

mineuserbane (2): Correct. So if two Bishops claim authority over the same individual, who will mediate that claim? You've ended up with Western Rite Orthodoxy. Or we can talk about the priests operating within a diocese without the authorization of the local Bishop. Canon law is clear about who the authority is.

WinterBaroness (1): I don't know if there was any canonisation on Palamas but normally what SSPX teaches is that the canonization process after John Paul II was changed, one of many examples is that he removed the position of devil's advocate. In that sense, post-John Paul II canonizations are seen by the SSPX as uncertain, confusing and deficient, so SSPX doesn't venerate post-conciliar saints like Palamas. It is a mistake from these last Popes, yes, but that doesn't mean they cease to be PopesAlso as far as I know, no Pope has canonised Nestorius since he rejected the dogma of the Mother of God

mineuserbane (8): The NO is not a heresy (as much as I don't like defending it, I will defend truth). Rejecting the Pope is heresy.

mineuserbane (1): >"Do they not believe the same Roman Catholicism you do? Are they not celebrating the same liturgy? I find it incredibly modernistic to base your entire Roman Catholic identity on who is or isn't the current pope, considering most Roman Catholics in the medeival era wouldn't have even known who the current pope was."This is ecumenism. This is compromising on belief for the sake of liturgy. To paraphrase: We believe \*almost everything\* that they believe, and they have the same liturgy. This is excusing a heresy around the denial of the Papacy because of liturgical and doctrinal similarities. It is false ecumenism. I believe in reaching out. I believe in evangelization. I believe in true ecumenism. I reject any notion of excusing heresy for similarities in other areas. There is no salvation outside the Church for those who are not ignorant. We are called to teach and preach the truth. We cannot compromise on foundational doctrine in the process.Edit: misspelling

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (3): That depends on what you mean by "Rome". look the crisis with the three Popes in the Middle Ages, which involved the Pope having to be in Avignon, France for a while. "Rome" was not in Rome for a while.Nowadays, it's not the same, it never is. "Rome" can mean the Holy Father, but does it mean excluding all loyal Popes in the past to accept novelties that conflict in the present?That would mean the "Novus Ordo Catholics" accept Rome now, but are rejecting the Rome leading up to the present Rome where they conflict with one another.What Catholics did in the past was stick with what has always worked and reject novelty. the Arian crisis is a good example. One could argue "Rome" fell. The Pope at the time didn't join the heretics, but he was effective surrounded by them and made mostly ineffective in dealing with the Arian heresy, leaving St. Athanasius to restore as much of the Church as he could on the Pope's behalf.Our situation has differences. Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre sought permission, initially got it, had it removed after being falsely accused of teaching heresies like denying the True Presence, said, "No, the reasons for taking my permission away to continue tradition are lies, I'm gonna keep going." The Pope believed the lies or didn't really know what was going on because of all the delegation modern Popes do. And now we have a Modernist crisis that the SSPX is effectively resisting, but most Catholics aren't aware of, and the few that do believe the lies about the SSPX.The question: Can one be loyal to the present Rome if it requires denying the Rome of ages past? Or vice versa: Can one be loyal to the Rome of ages past if one accepts the current Rome that conflicts with it?Jesus said "by their fruits you shall know them" and Vatican II is rotting, while the SSPX is largely doing well.

None (2): But the point stands, the fathers of the church say to obey your bishop, not who the bishop has to be.

AtaturkIsAKaffir (2): The Novus Ordo goes explicitly against the Tradition of the Church. The Church cannot err in regards to sacred doctrine and calling this satanic service a “Mass” is an error. Whether through Sedevacantism or Sedeprivationist one must come to terms with the objective reality that the post v2 Faith is substantially different to the Faith handed down by Christ

tradrcrthings (0): Novus Ordo is and always a form of heresy, due to its invention by six Protestant clergy and Freemason Annibale Bugnini. When i watched Anglican service from Westminster Abbey on Youtube, Novus Ordo barely has zero difference with Protestant liturgy.

None (5): [deleted]

mineuserbane (2): Correct. This is the root of the great schism. The Pope alone holds the authority to declare who your Bishop is. Canon law specifies that as the local ordinary. You are attempting to prove that you can choose your own Church leadership. The Catholic Church is not a democracy. The Church provides your authority and your ministers. If another church claims to do the same, it is not the true church.

None (3): Satanic? You don't talk truth.

mineuserbane (3): Yet Christ said his Church would never perish. You describe a church vanquished by satan. Vatican I stated that the papacy would extend until the end of time. This disproves Sedevacantism as there is no possibility for a future Pope under that model. Vatican I also states: "So, then, if anyone says thatthe Roman pontiff has merely an office of supervision and guidance, and not the full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole church, and this not only in matters offaith and morals, but also in those which concern thediscipline and government of the church dispersed throughout the whole world; or that he has only the principal part, but not the absolute fullness, of this supreme power; or that this power of his is not ordinary and immediate both over all and each of the churches and over all and each of the pastors and faithful:let him be anathema."It specifically addresses the separation of powers the Sedeprivationists attempt to hold. Both reject the authority of the position and refuse to accept the possibility of error. I don't like the NO, but the 62 missal is not the perfection of liturgy either. It is better, but not perfect. The NO is not satanic. Christ is truly present there. You disrespect Him.

Necessary\_Reach\_3921 (1): Holy moly! Satanic?! That's really strong language. May I ask if you have first-hand experience or are you getting your information from folks like Peter Dimond? Have there been abuses? Yes. But there have been abuses throughout the church. But just like in the past we don't leave Jesus because of Judas. Like our great saints before us like Catherine of Siena and Francis of Assisi we stay with the Church and fix her from the inside.

mineuserbane (1): There is no way to defend that position without undermining the entire institution in a way contrary to Vatican I. It didn't mention him by name, but he fulfils every requirement to be the Pope. He is validly elected and possesses the authority of the Chair. You cannot undermine Francis without undermining the Chair.

None (1): I'm not personally questioning the papacy, I'm just trying to make you see that what you quoted is not exactly what you are asserting with your arguments. You quoted church fathers on obeying your bishop, Okey, so I say I'll choose the most orthodox ones. That does not contradicts your quote.

pnzrbttln1 (1): >Vatican I also states: I feel like this whole paragraph sums up the R&R position quite well.

tradrcrthings (1): "It is better, but nof perfect" then why are you joining this sub reddit that against SSPX's stand?

AtaturkIsAKaffir (0): Christ is not present in the NO Mass as the consecration method is completely faulty

sssss\_we (1): The great schism of the West is an example of that. You can go for the wrong "pope" and you would still be Catholic (and a Saint).

MarcellusFaber (1): That is rubbish & begging the question. A large part of the argument is that the election wasn’t valid because he was a heretic beforehand, and only Catholic men with the use of reason can be elected.

mineuserbane (3): In the context of the apostolic church, you had no option to choose your own Bishop. You are assuming a choice here where none is given. If you lived in a certain area, your options were to accept your local Bishop, separate yourself from the church, or move to another area with another Bishop. This is still the case today. Bishops are supplied jurisdiction over certain areas or groups of people. You belong to a group of people with a specific Bishop in authority over you. Generally he supplies jurisdiction to local pastors who are your spiritual authority. Circumnavigating this authority structure leads to partial or complete separation from the Church Christ instituted. You cannot choose your Bishop. The Church specifies who your Bishop is. Attempting to read your point into Ignatius doesn't work. Given context and reading it at face value, that point still fails.

mineuserbane (3): Look into the early church history. You would probably argue that most of those consecrations are also invalid. The correct matter and form are present in the NO. There is no way to defend this position without arguing that the Catholic Church and the Papacy has ceased the exist and all prophecy and Divine revelation to the contrary is wrong. All of those roads lead to heresy.

mineuserbane (0): Are you making the claim that Francis alone is invalid or does this extend to other recent Popes?

None (1): So if I where, during the Arian Crisis, avoid the masses of the arians and say go to mass with John Chrysostom during his persecution I would be outside the church?

MarcellusFaber (1): Let’s keep to this question before going on to anything else. You stated that Bergoglio ‘fulfils every requirement to be the Pope’ because he was validly elected. I replied that this is not the case as he was a heretic at the time of the election, which everyone is agreed would invalidate an election (the disagreement concerns what would happen were a validly elected Pope to become a heretic). This can be confirmed through reading his books (On Heaven & Earth, for example) & by researching his beliefs & actions whilst he was in Argentina. How do you respond?

mineuserbane (0): >everyone is agreed would invalidate an electionFirst I would challenge this statement. First of all, not everyone agrees with this. You would need to prove this theory. An alternate theory is that Heretics cannot be Pope, any any heresy would be rejected and the office would reform the man. Secondly, you would need to prove the mechanics of how an election would be invalidated, who would determine it to be invalidated, and who would depose the Pope.Your theory dies when examining the details. Your theory leads to a situation where either the heretic Pope would retain his authority (sedeprivationism) or that the church would lose its Head (sedevacantism) Both results are condemned by Vatican I, so by the fruit of that argument, it fails.

MarcellusFaber (0): It is agreed by every single canonist & theologian who comments on the matter without exception. This includes Wernz-Vidal, Cardinal Billot, Dorsch, & Capello. Coronata states the following:“Appointment to the Office of the Primacy — What is required by divine law for this appointment… Also required for validity is that the one elected be a member of the Church; hence, heretics and apostates (at least public ones) are excluded…” - Institutiones Iuris Canonici [1950]As to this claim about mechanism: the reason that a heretic cannot be elected is that one cannot be the head of a society without being a member of it, and a heretic is not a member of the Catholic Church, hence he cannot be the head of the Catholic Church. It is due to the Church‘s nature as per the divine law, not any human legal obstacle. Therefore, there is no mechanism; the election simply holds no force. Practically speaking, a person who illegitimately intrudes upon the Holy See (i.e. has the appearance of occupying the office) must be deposed by a council of bishops, but this does not mean that such a person would have been Pope prior to the deposition. In fact, it is impossible since a true Pope can be judged by nobody; only an illegitimate intruder who is not the Pope could be deposed by the bishops.As to being condemned by Vatican I, I deny that. See the text I recently posted in which it is stated that Archbishop Purcell raised the question and was told that a heretical Pope would fall from office ipso facto.

mineuserbane (0): It is agreed in the case of formal heresy. It is not in the case of material heresy. This is a point of debate and has been for centuries (or longer). Your answer on mechanism does not suffice. >Therefore, there is no mechanism > must be deposed by a council of bishops Which is it? I think you are muddling several ideas. Perhaps because it would be too lengthy to write out here, but you're not making distinction between formal heresy and material heresy or a distinction between a loss of ability to define faith and morals and a loss of authority over the Church. These are the differences between sedevacantism and sedeprivationism. What argument are you making? That Francis is and was a formal heretic or material heretic? That he has lost all power of the Papacy and ceases to be Pope or just his ability to define faith and morals? Is a council of bishops required to depose him or not? Additionally, until the council of bishops does depose him, are we required to obey his leadership when he speaks from his position of authority? What happens if he is never deposed by a council of bishops? I am arguing about the premise, but the conclusion and practical effects of these arguments can clearly show that the premise must be false. I'd also challenge your appeal to authority. The only appeal that works in this case is the appeal to Church magisterial statements or Scriptural teachings. Neither have appeared in your comments yet. Purcell said it was answered, he does not say by whom. This did not end up in VI. Secondly, I believe he is referring to a formal heresy and alludes to a loss of his infallibility to define faith and morals, not the loss of his authority. Thirdly, this is a private opinion that has not been defined by the magisterium and is still subject to debate.

MarcellusFaber (0): 1. Neither material nor formal heretics are members of the Church; it is an inaccurate usage to call mistaken Catholics material heretics. Material heretics properly speaking are the baptised, typically raised in heresy, to whom the divine origin of the Catholic Church has not been sufficiently proposed, such that they do not adhere to the Church as their rule of Faith, whilst formal heretics are pertinacious. It is hard to see how a Pope could not have had the divine origin of the Church sufficiently proposed to him, nor know that Luther was wrong about justification, for example, but, to head off the argument that the Modernism/bad philosophy of the post-Conciliar Popes prevents them from realising the contradiction between the traditional teaching & the new teaching, such people would also be incapable of adhering to the Church as their rule of Faith, and would be material heretics, and as such would not be members of the Church.2. The anti-Popes of history were not Popes, yet they were deposed, hence, as I said earlier, it is not required that a man be Pope to be deposed from the Holy See, only that he have the appearance of being Pope. Deposition in the case of a putative Pope is the formal recognition that he either never held the office or has fallen from office ipso facto, not the deprivation of the office itself.3. There can be no separation in the person of the Pope of his authority and his ability to define dogma. Since you are making this distinction, it falls on you to cite a source that supports it. Otherwise, it is gratuitously asserted, and therefore gratuitously denied.4. My position is that Francis is a formal heretic and therefore that he cannot be head of the Church, but if he were a material heretic due to his Modernism, that would make no difference.5. The deposition by a council of bishops would be required to elect a true Pope for practical reasons, but it would not cause the heretic to lose office, since he is prevented from holding office due to the Church’s nature as per her divine constitution.6. No, we are not bound to obey him or listen to him before the deposition since he would not be the Pope prior to the deposition.7. Your claim that only magisterial statements or scripture can be accepted as authorities is simply not how theology works, but I refer you to Mystici Corporis Christi, Satis Cognitum, and canon 188.4 of the 1917 code.8. Things can and are known with certainty without formal definition, for example the existence of guardian angels, or that Christ had a sense of humour.9. To state that this question is still subject to debate is to ignore the fact that all but a handful of theologians agree with what I am saying. If it is still subject to debate (which was explicitly contradicted by a German canonist in his Lehrbuch on Kirchenrechts), it must be accepted that your side has been losing and a minority for some centuries.

# Post 278: Ive made up my mind

Author: thesloth-man
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Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1jife1h/ive\_made\_up\_my\_mind/

I don't want to sound dramatic with this story but I want to share it as the way Ive interpreted a series of events has convinced me that the sspx is where I need to be.As concise as I can make it...I'm a 50yo Australian man that has never been baptised and have gone through atheism as a kid into playing at Satanist in my rebellious 20s then settling on a germanic paganism up untill I was around 40. Never married and was in a couple of medium term relationships amongs the many short term. I Prayed to Jesus in desperation one night and started to read the bible. My 1st real wake up call in life.90% of who I was changed considerably over the following couple of years.Over the last 12 months I've really dedicated my time in researching the true tradtional Christian religion and had bought it down to eastern orthodox and roman Catholicism. That's where I hit a road block for many reasons.After looking into roman Catholicism I was unsure about the unchanged consistency of its more recent history. I found out about the couple of groups that still do latin mass and felt drawn back but was still confused about who and why? I continued praying and researching and emailing and speaking with the closest sspx people and local fssp people along with my local catholic "regular" people. The standard catholic literature didn't feel much different to the Anglican literarure I'd picked up a couple of years ago and the conversations I'd had with fssp weren't completly convincing in their conviction. I wondered if it was just me being stubborn?Anyway, my dad recently had a stroke and was diagnosed with brain cancer. I prayed in earnest asking for his outcome to be my sign. Hoping for best case outcomes for my dad but not asking for that. Just asking for a sign in all of this and that I'd dedicate myself fully based on this.Whilst looking after his house one day I found a town near his house had an fssp sung mass on that Sunday so I decided to go for the very 1st time, to church, for mass. Not just to meet and talk with clergy. Dad had gone for surgery the day before and was in ICU recovering.That morning his dog got out and I thought I'd be late but I found him in time and got him back safe.On my way to the chapel google maps kept taking me to a locked gate and not the main entrance. I finally worked it out looking at the map but then my car choked and spluttered and wouldn't accelerate at all. It's 4 years old so very wierd with no history of troubles. I wondered why I had these road blocks put up stopping me from getting to this service? I left the car and walked the 2 klms around the block to the front entry. Followed a few people in and made it with 10mins to spare. I introduced myself the the man helping that day and told him it was my 1st time. He greeted me with a huge smile and big handshake and showed me the holy water to cross myself with, gave me printouts and a booklet and showed me in. He assured me to be calm and said to just do what others do and stay kneeling and pray whilst everyone else took communion etc. I prayed to God mostly through all the service but asked Mary to guide my prayers and aid me as I was completely ignorant and most likley not even worthy after my life of complete rejection of God, Denial of the holy spirit and unforgivable blasphemy against Jesus. The mass was deeply moving and I felt like humbleness was knocked into me like i got hit in the head with an iron pole. After the mass I felt exhausted but filled with warmth and confirmation I'd finally done the right thing.Before I left, I had a chat with a couple who asked what I thought as I was obviously brand new. After telling them my reasons for coming to the Latin mass and not the regular church, they quietly explained their reasons for attending this fssp parish was they needed to travel 3 hours to attend sspx but that was their fullest preference. They explained why and They confirmed my thoughts with their stories as we spoke for 20 mins.On my walk back to the car I got a call from my dad explaining he was feeling great, had movement in his limbs again that he didn't have pre surgery and he'd be coming back to his local hospital in 2 days. The surgeons were thrilled with his recovery and surprised with how simple the removal was. It was more bloodclot than cancer contrary to what they 1st thought. He's now going onto immuno therapy with no need for further surgery or chemo. I got to my car and rembered it had failed me on my arrival, but now armed with so much good news I determined to just look it over and call roadside assistance if I couldn't get it going. It's still under warranty. To my surprise it started 1st go and was as if nothing was wrong in the 1st place. My thoughts on what had happened that day in the feeling something was trying to stop me attending and the "coincidence" of the great news about my dad, the car being fine and these people explaing their experiences with sspx make me feel like one of those people that testify in showy baptist churches. This isn't my personality. But what happened is undeniably the sign I'd been asking for. I'm completely open to criticism here. Having been so anti religious all my life I'm still trying to find reason in it all but can't other than it is the sign I'd asked for.I told some friends this story and they laughed it all off as crazy coincidence. Cool, but coincidence. I told dad in a longer call that night and he said he'd asked God for a sign in all this. He's not a religious man. Baptised Anglican at his mother's request but his dad was catholic. Pop died due to injuries in ww2 not long after and I never got to meet him. Dad told me he was going to speak to the priest at his local catholic church (in his street) once he gets out of hospital as, in his words "I won't look a gift horse in the mouth" 🤣. The closest sspx chapel is just over an hour from me but I'm going to go and see them in the coming weeks. At least 3 hours from Dad.My time is full with work, traveling 3 hours to Dads to look after his house and dog on my days off and soon to help while he recovers and regains his strength and motor skills. But I did just pick up a couple of different catechisms (st pious x, baltimore and 2nd edition of catechism of the catholic church) to read in the mean time.Phew! That was meant to be a short concise story 🤣Any advice and/or feedback is much appreciated.

Willsxyz (5): Thank you for your story.I hope you are able to begin your catechesis and be welcomed into the Church soon!

CathMode (4): It all makes complete sense. Just so you know!

None (3): I don't have much time and I should work, but I wanted to say this is a great story, congratulation for your perseverance, welcome to the family, and don't forget prayer and charity are the saint's legs!

thesloth-man (2): Thanks mate. Me too. I have a strong sence of urgency about getting started. I need to slow my mind a little and just get on with it all one day at a time. Each step is a step forward.

thesloth-man (2): Thanks mate. It's a jumble of words and thoughts that reflect the turbulence of my situation in life right now. I think I just needed to get it off my chest.

thesloth-man (1): Thanks mate. I appreciate your words and advice.

# Post 279: Does ‘Traditionis custodes’ have a future? | Luke Coppen for The Pillar

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 5

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.pillarcatholic.com/p/does-traditionis-custodes-have-a

Pale-Roof9278 (1): I read this article. While it’s just a series of quote stringing, I think it gives the Cardinal too much credit. V2, but its own admission, was never a “legislative” council like the former eccumenical councils. The Cardinal’s claim is the reflection of an interpretation of the Council and following apostolic exhortations, etc (again not intended to be legislative by their nature). Then again it was this mentality that got us into this “irregular canonical status” mess. Bigger issue is: communion is communion. It can’t be by degrees like how a sacrament is never “incremental”. It either binds or loosens or it doesn’t. So likewise, communion is absolute and so is so called legislation IF legitimately exercised. It’s not a schismatic or illegitimate act to question a juridical or ontological “process” that has no canonical distinction. Then again, as always, the smoking gun is “interpretation” and “implementation” of the law. Which I do believe under the Peronist mindset hasn’t seen its lowest degree yet.

# Post 280: Recommended books

Author: None

Score: 5

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1jg22az/recommended\_books/

Any good Theology books?

None (1): \*Sacrae Theologiae Summa\*

# Post 281: Latin Novus Ordo

Author: None

Score: 7

Comments: 8

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1jg1kh2/latin\_novus\_ordo/

I recently joined a NO parish since there is no TLM Masses near me, and being a university student, It's too hard to travel 4 hours to one.So, over the last 3 months, I pushed/ strongly advised with me tremendously helping the laity with learning Latin. We went from no Latin in the Mass to a full Latin Mass apart from the reading and homily, Roman Canon and Communion on the Tongue.I've been to a TLM before, and there isn't much difference, yes I know its still a simplified version but it's beautiful.It's a great shame this isn't the standard for NO since Sacrosactum Concilium clearly states all these things.I just wanted to see people's thoughts.

Willsxyz (18): A Latin Novus Ordo still has all of the defects discussed in the Ottaviani intervention, most notably the elimination of the Offertory, which eliminated the notion of propitiatory sacrifice from the text of the mass.

hambeejee (11): No such thing as "simplified", only bastardized.

None (9): A latin Novus Ordo is still a Novus Ordo. The Latin Novus Ordo, as Lefebvre said, is still infected with the spirit of Protestantism. You can have the gregorian chant, the incense, the bells, the "ad orientem", and even throw in a "dominus vobiscum"; it is still a false liturgy.

Masterofluck11251 (6): Still a bastardized rite, and I don’t understand why Novus ordites love to say they can have a reverent novus ordo with Latin, ad orientum and smells and bells. Why not just go back to the Mass of Pius V at that point? The novus ordo mass was never made to be done reverently, it was always done to be like a Protestant service…

tradrcrthings (2): A reverent Novus Ordo "mass" that celebrated with Ad Orientem and Latin language is still a "pig" mass because it was created by 6 Protestant ministers and Freemason Annibale Bugnini. Remember, that Archbishop Lefebvre rebelled against reverent Novus Ordo mass, not "clown" Novus Ordo mass.

Pale-Roof9278 (1): Novus Ordo is Novus Ordo. Although this may be less offensive than the hippie ‘mass’ I agree that it’s not the Mass of All Time. Every time I ‘must’ attend the NO in any form it seems empty to me now.

None (0): I would disagree. It's just a simplified version,but also I don't have much to work with.

ourladyofcovadonga (6): Seriously.. if you're a true novus ordite then you essentially have to despise the old mass since you follow every word Francis says, i.e., all the negative things about the TLM.

# Post 282: The Question of a Heretical Pope at Vatican I: Archbishop Purcell Testifies

Author: MarcellusFaber

Score: 6

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/gallery/1jetthd

Duibhlinn (1): As frequent posters on either this subreddit or r/TraditionalCatholics will be aware, our good friend Marcellus here is a self admitted sedevacantist. I say this because Marcellus rarely if ever admits this to those who he speaks to, which is something quite common among the sedevacantists who plague this website. Even if the moderators refuse to do anything about the sedevacantist infestation on this subreddit, you should at the very least be aware of exactly who it is that you're speaking to.

Duibhlinn (0): [u/Piklikl](https://www.reddit.com/user/Piklikl/)[u/andrewplatham](https://www.reddit.com/user/andrewplatham/)Why was this comment removed?

# Post 283: From diocesan Latin Mass to the Society of St. Pius X, young traditionalists blur the lines: more young Catholics devoted to the Traditional Latin Mass attend both diocesan parishes and the Society of St. Pius X, but this fluidity may be tested by potential new episcopal consecrations

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 12

Comments: 5

URL: https://international.la-croix.com/religion/from-diocesan-latin-mass-to-the-society-of-st-pius-x-young-traditionalists-blur-the-lines

AcceptableMaize8955 (6): Im a SSPX enjoyer but attend a Diocesan TLM

None (4): cover memory cause angle rinse rock lock seed meeting obtainable \*This post was mass deleted and anonymized with [Redact](https://redact.dev/home)\*

Duibhlinn (5): This is a link to the Internet Archive's Wayback Machine which will allow you to read the article in case you are having any issues accessing it through the link in the OP:[https://web.archive.org/web/20250227104457/https://international.la-croix.com/religion/from-diocesan-latin-mass-to-the-society-of-st-pius-x-young-traditionalists-blur-the-lines](https://web.archive.org/web/20250227104457/https://international.la-croix.com/religion/from-diocesan-latin-mass-to-the-society-of-st-pius-x-young-traditionalists-blur-the-lines)

BasedEurope (3): In Tallinn this is very Normal, Whenever they have Diocesean Latin mass (2x a month) the attendance at the FSSPX chapel is usually a bit less and a few people like myself attend Both masses in the same day.

Pale-Roof9278 (1): Communion is or it isn’t. Just like a sacrament is valid or it isn’t. While some “authorities” maybe try to occupy a grey area between the two that doesn’t exist, even from the institutional words of Christ, the apostolic successors bind or loosen. It’s absolute. It’s a misnomer and total manipulative gaslighting (hyperbole for effect) to undermine our devotion to the Holy Eucharist. After all a truly “schismatic” act takes full knowledge and intention. The intention ha NEVER existed. We continue to be lied to. Divided we fall; united we stand. Don’t continue to buy their Peronist tactics. Mic drop 😂

# Post 284: Books on Purity

Author: operakitti

Score: 5

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1jdkece/books\_on\_purity/

I am looking for suggestions on books that talk about the virtue of purity for lay people. Single adults in particular.

LiliumInterSpinasXV (3): I recommend ‘Chastity: Reconciliation of the Senses’ from Mgr. Varden.

# Post 285: What is "speaking in toungues" really?

Author: Blackbeeyellowbee

Score: 5

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1jdcbdr/what\_is\_speaking\_in\_toungues\_really/

Hello everyone :)So, one of my best friends has become a passionate evangelical in the last couple of months (coming from a non practicing catholic background) and, long story short, she just got the "gift" of "speaking in tougues".Thus, the point of this post is to ask the following question: what do you think \*really\* happens when evangelicals "speak in toungues"?I definitely believe that it \*does\* happen, but I don't believe it comes from God. And it just doesn't make sense. Why would God make us pray in a language we don't understand?Are there any good and \*serious\* sources on this (aka. not some random reedit post or something like that)? Has anyone ever explored this topic?What's so frustrating about this phenomenon is that it holds souls prey to evangelicalism, as it is so obviously supernatural.Thank you so much in advance for your insights :) God bless

CathMode (6): Kennedy Hall talks about this. He has a recent book out so also has recent videos on the topic. Re “charismatic”.

None (2): In the bible, it made the apostle be understood by other people that didn't speak the apostle tong. So it's like you were to address a lets say a Japanese person that knows no English and still be 100% understood like if you where talking Japanese. It's a miracle.

adustsoul (2): It is purely delirious, just that. You can see by the context in the Bible that speaking in tongues is really the gift of learning and speaking many languages for preaching the gospel. See St. Maximilian Kolbe, he learned japanese in 40 days to preach for the japs. That is the gift of speaking in tongues.

ourladyofcovadonga (1): Sspx has good video and article on the charismatic movement as well as Vatican Catholic on youtube. The latter is a sketchy source but the video is excellent

thesloth-man (1): It looks like total fakery. If it's not fake, it looks evil.

# Post 286: 🚨🇫🇷 Another church attack in France. The church of Santa Teresa destroyed and the statue of the Madonna cut off. The attackers are alleged to be a group of Afghan migrants.

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 13

Comments: 0

URL: https://x.com/RadioEuropes/status/1898678733499691318

# Post 287: Does attending the Saturday evening mass for Ember Saturday fulfill the Sunday obligation?

Author: seeking\_0333

Score: 7

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1jccpxg/does\_attending\_the\_saturday\_evening\_mass\_for/

There was no homily and the Mass felt generally short so we weren't sure! We are new at attending SSPX masses. As in this is our second one ever! Thank you in advance.

MacduffFifesNo1Thane (7): The question is if you feel comfortable with following post-Vatican II Canon Law.Because the answer is yes, if the Mass itself started after 4 PM.In the 1917 Code of Canon Law, which was in force with the archbishop founded the Society, the answer is no, especially since evening Masses didn’t exist then.Saying that, if you are comfortable with the 1983 Code, then yes, your obligation is met if the Mass started after 4 PM. Personally, I very rarely do vigil NO Masses but if I do go to a TLM Vigil (like the Easter Vigil) or a TLM Mass where it takes place after 4 PM using the Sunday propers, I do count it towards the Sunday obligation.Edit: there was a place in my college town for a few months that had Saturday evening TLMs with the Sunday propers. It eventually stopped but it was my favoritest thing.

Pale-Roof9278 (1): Technically I’ve got to go with the first poster, BUT as Kennedy Hall reminds us we still have a commitment to Sunday. This doesn’t mean if by distance or weather etc we are impeded from getting to a TLM that we can’t do some other form of devotion to make the commitment.

dbaughmen (-1): I believe this goes against common sense and violates the 4th commandment. The whole centre of Sunday is the Holy Mass, it is essential to keeping the day holy. The 1917 Code of Canon Law, and not the New Code which contains much error finds it wrong to do only the “vigil” mass.God bless you!

# Post 288: Anybody have a good prayer schedule they could offer me

Author: None

Score: 6

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1jbzdgw/anybody\_have\_a\_good\_prayer\_schedule\_they\_could/

My prayer schedules all messed up you know, could you give me yours guys dailySchedule so I could at least get a idea. It doesn’t need to be just prayers but just a good Catholic daily routine

Duibhlinn (2): If you are just beginning then start small and build your way up from there. A good starting point is the Rosary, it includes many of the basic prayers such as the Our Father and Hail Mary. A good place to begin is saying a full set of mysteries once per day, and over the days and weeks you will gradually begin to learn and memorise the basic prayers through natural absorption and retention. Starting in your native language and then learning it in Latin is recommended.The Mass itself is one of the greatest prayers there is. The Missal is a good text for prayer. You can, in a sense, pray the Mass or pray the Missal. You naturally absorb it by exposure to Mass but it's fruitful to sit down and prayerfully read the text of the Mass, the ordinary first and foremost. More familiarity with the Mass will let you get more spiritual benefits out of attending Mass as well.J.R.R. Tolkien had the entire Mass memorised and on days where he was unable to attend daily Mass he would pray the entire Mass in Latin on his own.As a note, the \*ordinary\* of the Mass is a term that means those parts of the Mass that mostly the same every Mass such as the Pater Noster. The \*propers\* are the parts which change most Masses, like the Gospel and Epistle readings, the Collect prayer etc.The best advice I can give is to try not to overload yourself too fast. Prayer is like spiritual exercise. If you've never seriously exercised and you try to run for a mile you will be in bits, but if you slowly build up to it that same mile will eventually be far easier.

ourladyofcovadonga (1): Not perfect, just giving you my thing.I do a daily 10-15 minute daily offering upon waking (https://traditionalcatholicprayers.com/2019/10/05/morning-prayers) + the Angelus. I don't do all the morning prayers on the website but I have some favorites I like to recite. I end with a 1-2 minute mental prayer.I also do 5 decades daily whenever the time is right. Sometimes lunch, sometimes evening. Evening prayers are a struggle for me but the website I listed has some. I'm trying to get better at evening prayers. My sspx priest just recently told me that even my morning offering and rosary are more than most Catholics do, so don't be like me and feel guilty for not enough prayer. My priest recommended 10-15 minutes of spiritual reading or Scripture if I want to increase my prayer life.

asimovsdog (1): Level 1 Basic routine: - Wake up- Morning prayer (2min) + Angelus (1min)- Breakfast / work- Angelus 12AM (1min)- Work- Rosary in the evening (can be anything from 30min to 2 hours, because I make sure that I PRAY the rosary not just recite it, so for me it takes much longer because I repeat Hail Marys when I become unfocused)- Angelus 6PM (1min)- Evening / bedtime prayer (2min)= total: 25 - 35 minutes.Level 2 Extended routine (Laudes - Sext - Vesper):- Wake up- Laudes (20min) + Angelus (1min)- Breakfast / work- Sext (10min) + Angelus 12AM (1min)- Work- Rosary- Vesper (20min) + Angelus 6PM (1min)- Evening / bedtime prayer (2min)= total: 1 hourLevel 3 Extreme routine (full divine office + 1 - 3 rosaries):- 6 AM: Matins 40min + Laudes 20min- 7 AM Breakfast- 7:45 AM Prime 10min- 9 AM Terce 10min- First rosary- 12 AM Sext- Second rosary- 3PM None- Third rosary- 5:30 Vesper- 8PM Compline, bed= total: 3 - 4 hours, depending on how many rosaries you want to prayThe key is to get up early in the morning. The last routine is of course pretty extreme, but most of the prayer time is in the morning. The Divine Office is online [here](https://www.divinumofficium.com/cgi-bin/horas/Pofficium.pl), it's relatively simple to pray and it gives a structure to the day, I pray in Latin, even though I don't understand it.I also make sure that I PRAY the rosary, just reciting the words is completely worthless as the thoughts and contemplation are what make the prayers go to heaven. I know people who "pray 3 rosaries per day", but aren't growing spiritually very much because they just speedrun the rosary, that's not the point.I'm definitely not perfect so it matters on a day-to-day basis. On average I'm somewhere between Level 1 and 2.

None (2): I usually say 3 rosaries a day and morning and evening

Duibhlinn (1): That's impressive for a catechumen, good job. The Stations of the Cross might be a good next step, or learning the Angelus. The Angelus in particular is a good short one you can do a few times per day.

None (2): I have a strong love for Catholicism for some reason, out of the blue I converted and my dad reconverted too.

# Post 289: Trying to “De-Modernize”.

Author: realdenvercoder

Score: 11

Comments: 19

URL: https://i.redd.it/sid33zjt9roe1.jpeg

I’m looking to de-modernize in all the media I consume. I switched from Hallow to Sanctifica and I stopped listening to “Novus Ordo” podcasts. I found a list of “Trad” podcasts. (Below)Does anyone know of any others?

Duibhlinn (7): "What Catholics believe" is run by the SSPV, the Society of Saint Pius V, who are sedevacantists.They were formerly SSPX priests but Archbishop Lefebvre expelled them for their unrepentant sedevacantism, financial fraud and theft of money and property.The last 3 listed relate to a church property they were supposed to be purchasing on behalf of the SSPX. They basically took the money, and the property, and ran. They kept all remaining change and didn't hand either the money, both what was left and what had been spent, and the property.It's basically like if you asked your friend to go to the shop to get you a can of coke and you gave him enough money where there would be change. Then he spits in your face, keeps the can of coke and pockets your change. Oh and then refuses to repent of sedevacantism.I don't know what website you are reading but if they are recommending the SSPV they are a rag unfit to even mop animal urine off a dirty barn floor with.And by the way there are numerous sedevacantists who prowl both this subreddit and the main trad subreddit pushing their poison so don't be surprised if the sede mujahideen come rushing into this comments section to take issue with what I have said. I don't know why the mods haven't dealt with the sede cockroach infestation yet, it's even worse here than it is on the main trad subreddit which is infamous for its non enforcement of the rules.

operakitti (5): SSPX has two podcasts: SSPX Sermons & SSPX Podcast. Father Paul Robinson, SSPX, also has his own sermons Podcast, Sermons of Fr Paul Robinson. Catholic Culture Audiobooks posts classic writings. I don’t know who runs it but I haven’t seen anything post V2.

himalayancandlepower (3): I enjoy Sensus Fidelium, Old Roman TV, Father Mawdsley, St Stephen PDX, Frank Pavone, Ampleforth Abbey, Fr Rick Wendell, Our Lady of Victory and many others.

himalayancandlepower (3): If you like Fr Chad Ripperger, check out the app Auxilium Christianorum...

operakitti (3): Traditional Latin Mass Gospel Readings by Ken Hagen. Readings of the Gospel from the Traditional Latin Mass for every day. Uses “The Saint Andrew Daily Missal”. Douay Rheims translation.

MaterMisericordiae23 (4): How about reading more books? While it's good you listen to traditional and pro-SSPX podcasts, it's very much beneficial to take your eyes off the screen once in a while.May I suggest the Holy Bible (Douay Rheims of course) or the autobiography of Archbishop Lefebvre written by the late Bishop Tissier de Mallerais (I'm currently reading it!).

None (3): Send me link or whatever this is I love it

None (3): [deleted]

asimovsdog (0): > The last 3 listed relate to a church property they were supposed to be purchasing on behalf of the SSPX. They basically took the money, and the property, and ran. That's a complete lie and when I corrected you last time on this, you told me don't want to bother to read [the whole story](https://www.traditionalmass.org/images/articles/NineVLefebvre.pdf). Since you apparently cannot be bothered to read "sedevacantist nonsense" (aka a simple PDF), I've summarized your claims:## "They were expelled for unrepentant sedevacantism."\*\*Fr. Cekada\*\*: While some of the Nine already inclined to the sedevacantist position in 1983, others did not. Fr. Cekada explains (pp. 4–5) that many of the main disagreements with Archbishop Lefebvre at that time concerned:- Use of the 1962 (‘John XXIII’) Missal vs. older pre‑1955 rubrics.- The acceptance of phony diocesan annulments that the Archbishop had begun to recognize in practice.- Toleration of doubtful priests ordained with the post‑Vatican II form (e.g., Fr. Stark, who refused to be conditionally ordained).- The archbishop’s sudden switch to a more conciliatory stance toward the Vatican II establishment ( “negotiations” with Rome) and imposition of new “party lines.”\*\*Fr. Cekada\*\*: Archbishop Lefebvre had taken a much harder stance against Paul VI than he took against John Paul II. The archbishop had evidently softened after Paul VI died (1978), and by 1979–1981 was negotiating with the Vatican for an arrangement—something the older U.S. priests (the “hardliners”) rejected.In early 1983, the Archbishop \*\*threatened to expel priests even for not switching to the John XXIII Missal\*\* (p. 6). The new demands caused major friction. The Nine’s March 25, 1983 letter to the Archbishop shows multiple doctrinal/liturgical reasons for the dispute.\*\*Fr. Cekada\*\*: A central cause of separation was the Archbishop’s willingness to bargain away important “traditionalist” principles, such as unwavering rejection of the new sacraments, or unconditional refusal to accept the modernist annulment machinery. The priests believed “loyalty to the Church” (and her perennial Tradition) outranked “loyalty to the Society” or one prelate’s changing stance. Multiple issues were in play, many having nothing to do with whether any priest privately held the Holy See to be vacant. Indeed, by the time of the April 1983 “showdown,” not all Nine were yet fully sedevacantist.## "They stole money and property, basically took everything and ran."\*\*Fr. Cekada on "Who contributed the funds?"\*\*: The chapels in dispute were (with one or two exceptions, e.g., Ridgefield Seminary) paid for by local faithful, not the SSPX’s European headquarters.- Page 2: "With the exception of the seminary building in Ridgefield CT, the local congregations that we served contributed all the funds for the purchase and operation of these facilities. The overwhelming majority of lay members in each place supported our stand."- \*\*Lawsuits originated from Archbishop Lefebvre, not from the Nine:\*\* The archbishop demanded that all these local non‑profit chapel corporations be signed over to him (pp. 7–8). The Nine, whose names and local directors were on those civil corporations, refused, so the Archbishop sued—not the other way around. “He sued, we sued back,” Fr. Cekada says (p. 2).Thus, the idea that the Nine “ran off with property” ignores the fact that \*\*the Archbishop was the one who first went to the civil courts to take local chapels away from them\*\*. After four years of complicated legal battles across multiple states, they settled. Some chapels ended up with the Archbishop/SSPX. Others remained with the priests and faithful who opposed the Archbishop. An actual payment was made to the Archbishop/SSPX: they accepted $350,000 (later effectively $205,000 after the new mortgages). This was a “buy‑out” arrangement so that property disputes would cease.Both parties signed a legal release settling all claims. The PDF states, “Once SSPX did so and actually accepted money from us, the principles of Catholic moral theology on 'condonation' require that SSPX and its supporters \*\*forever refrain from claiming that the Nine 'stole' property from them.\*\* For the discounted price of $205,000, we bought ‘em out, fair and square.” (p. 13).Summary:- No court found “financial fraud” by the Nine.- Both sides ended with certain properties.- The faithful at those chapels, by large majority, wanted the Nine to remain and did not regard them as thieves.- The final settlement involved money going to the Archbishop’s side.## "They pocketed leftover money that didn’t belong to them."The parishes in question customarily formed lay, non‑profit corporations in America. The original purchase cost of these chapels was generally raised from local faithful, under local boards; this was standard among independent Traditional Catholic missions in the 1970s–80s, particularly to prevent a future “sell‑out” to the diocesan establishment.- No direct evidence in any lawsuit proved that the Nine were using parish money for personal gain. - The Archbishop’s side alleged that the Nine were “trustees” or “agents” who held property on behalf of the SSPX, but: They never obtained an official ruling supporting the notion that the Nine personally “pocketed” sums.In fact, the judge eventually pushed the parties to settle, seeing that \*\*the corporations and property were predominantly funded and deeded by local people, not by the European Society\*\*.Conclusion: There is \*\*nothing\*\* in the lawsuits or in the PDF to substantiate that the Nine “pocketed” leftover funds or spent them on themselves. On the contrary, the final buy‑out indicates that money flowed the other way: \*\*the Nine’s corporations paid the Archbishop/SSPX to finalize settlement\*\*.## “They refused to repent of sedevacantism.” Sedevacantism was not the only doctrinal disagreement. The 25‑March‑1983 letter from the Nine to Archbishop Lefebvre had six major points about practice and doctrine. “Refusing to name John Paul II in the Canon” was just one dimension that had appeared much earlier (p. 3). Far more immediate in 1983 were:- The acceptance of phony annulments,- Use of John XXIII rites aka 1962 Missal (as opposed to the pre-1955 one)- Sanctioning priests ordained in doubtfully valid rites, etc.- Many of the Nine did gradually adopt a sedevacantist conclusion, not all were sedevacantist- Archbishop Lefebvre’s own wavering, trying to be a diplomat to "get a deal" with modernistSome (e.g., Fr. Jenkins, Fr. Collins) moved to that position later; some (Fr. Kelly) was reticent earlier; some (Fr. Cekada, Fr. Sanborn, Fr. Dolan) leaned strongly that way earlier.The friction with Archbishop Lefebvre also hinged on the contradiction of the post‑Vatican II popes making or permitting “manifestly heretical” changes to the Sacraments.\*\*Fr. Cekada\*\*: In the 1970s, the Archbishop himself said things that logically hinted at vacancy of the Papal See. He would disclaim officially that it was his position but simultaneously allow that “One can say the Pope is not the Pope” (p. 3, quoting the Archbishop’s remarks). So the question was never so clear‑cut as “they are purely unrepentant rebels.”The break did not boil down to “sedevacantism or no.” Some among the Nine ended as open sedevacantists after leaving, but the break originally had multiple causes. The PDF does not support that they were simply “expelled for unrepentant sedevacantism.”---Also: \*\*Calling other Catholics "cockroaches" for having doubts really exposes your own nature.\*\* Note: I'm not sedevacantist myself, I'm with the Resistance, I even pray for Pope Francis - but I'm not going around calling other people "cockroaches" or lying. Please repent from your pride, especially in this time of Lent.

realdenvercoder (4): Yeah. Fr Robinson is my pastor. 😂

realdenvercoder (5): My first Bible was a Douay-Rheims, I’m reading Archbishop Lefebvre’s Bio right now and I just picked up The Ottaviani Intervention. I’ll check out the last one you mentioned.

realdenvercoder (2): It’s from ACatholicLife.blogspot.com

Duibhlinn (2): >One of the worst parts about stumbling on that channel was hearing them slander Bishop Williamson (before and even after his death) by accusing His Excellency of being invalidly ordained by Archbishop Lefebvre.Absolutely disgusting and utterly contemptible. The absolute audacity of those cretins to be throwing stones at His Excellency the late Bishop Williamson when they live in a house made of glass. An absolute embarrassment upon the traditional movement. And to continue with such filth even after his death... Archbishop Lefebvre was right to sever that cancer from the SSPX.>Truly shameful but it goes hand in hand with their sedevacantist nonsense as you correctly pointed out.Many such cases unfortunately. That crowd appears in many instances to be devoid of the capacity to feel shame. A bit of self awareness would do them good.

asimovsdog (-1): That's complete nonsense, Fr. Jenkins did a stream where he admitted that he just never got a clarification on the issue of Bp. Williamsons ordination. He asked for it to be clarified, but never got a "straight" answer, so he was careful about calling him a bishop. He didn't have any personal animosity towards Bp. Williamson, he got corrected on that issue and [then apologized on livestream](https://youtu.be/3kCX8qZWYLE?t=178) and asked for prayers for Bp. Williamsons soul.Also, Fr. Jenkins is not "dogmatic sedevacantist", he says he has doubts about it and the issue why he split was not because of sedevacantism, but because Lefevbre wanted to force them to use the 1962 instead of the 1955 missal as a compromise with modernists, to get a "deal". Which is a fact even documented by Wikipedia. Plus, there was no "financial fraud", read [this](https://www.traditionalmass.org/images/articles/NineVLefebvre.pdf) for the entire story.I don't agree on all issues with Fr. Jenkins (specifically his views on interracial marriage being perfectly fine), but please stop spreading lies.Note: I'm not sedevacantist, I'm with the Resistance, but I hate lies, even about people I don't agree with.

Duibhlinn (1): >That's a complete lie and when I corrected you last time on this, you told me don't want to bother to read[the whole story](https://www.traditionalmass.org/images/articles/NineVLefebvre.pdf). Since you apparently cannot be bothered to read "sedevacantist nonsense" (aka a simple PDF), I've summarized your claims:Since you're referencing our previous conversation on this matter which took place more than 2 months ago, I'll quote exactly what I said for the benefit of the vast majority of the other people reading this post who most likely haven't read that conversation and probably have no idea what you're referencing. [This is exactly what I said](https://www.reddit.com/r/TraditionalCatholics/comments/1i1nrre/comment/m78xa8o/):>No offense man, I understand that you're not a sedevacantist and I believe you, but I am not reading a 15 page propaganda essay written by an infamous sedevacantist priest.My answer hasn't changed, what I said 2 months ago is precisely what I have to say to you now. You'll get the same answer 2 months from now, 2 years from now and 2 decades from now. I'm not interested in the propaganda essay you keep trying to get me to read. I'm also not going to read your summary of it either because again, I have zero interest in the unhinged ravings of infamous sedevacantist priests.

MaterMisericordiae23 (1): [This is](https://angeluspress.org/products/marcel-lefebvre-biography) the one I'm reading by the way.I also recommend [Kennedy Hall's book about St Joseph](https://www.amazon.ca/Terror-Demons-Reclaiming-Traditional-Masculinity/dp/1505122546).

Duibhlinn (3): >Fr. Jenkins did a stream where he admitted that he just never got a clarification on the issue of Bp. Williamsons ordination. He asked for it to be clarified, but never got a "straight" answer, so he was careful about calling him a bishop.Sorry, I wasn't aware we had to run the SSPX episcopal consecrations by "Father Jenkins" first to get his approval. And sedevacantists wonder why people regularly ridicule and mock them. These people are clowns.>Which is a fact even documented by Wikipedia.Haha unironically appealing to Wikipedia. That's a first I have to admit.

None (0): [deleted]

asimovsdog (0): > I have zero interest in the unhinged ravings of infamous sedevacantist priests.So you're just going around knowingly spreading lies a second time and thinking that that pleases God? I don't like Fr. Cekada, nor sedevacantists, but I'm not going to call other people cockroaches based on complete fabrications of my own mind. I critizice sedevacantist based on their theology, but I give them credit where credit is due. I separate between the argument and the person, you don't.

Cool-Importance6004 (0): ## Amazon Price History:\*\*Terror of Demons: Reclaiming Traditional Catholic Masculinity\*\*\* Rating: ★★★★☆ 4.7\* Current price: \*\*$32.50\*\* \* Lowest price: $27.39\* Highest price: $34.43\* Average price: $32.92| Month | Low | High | Chart ||--------|------------|------------|------------------|| 02-2025 | $32.50 | $32.50 | ██████████████ || 10-2024 | $32.50 | $34.34 | ██████████████ || 07-2024 | $32.50 | $32.50 | ██████████████ || 02-2024 | $33.57 | $33.59 | ██████████████ || 12-2023 | $32.50 | $33.91 | ██████████████ || 11-2023 | $33.95 | $34.43 | ██████████████▒ || 10-2023 | $33.66 | $34.29 | ██████████████ || 09-2023 | $33.68 | $33.68 | ██████████████ || 07-2023 | $33.04 | $33.72 | ██████████████ || 06-2023 | $32.81 | $33.08 | ██████████████ || 04-2023 | $33.72 | $33.72 | ██████████████ || 02-2023 | $34.06 | $34.06 | ██████████████ |Source: [GOSH Price Tracker](https://gosh.app/?utm\_source=redditbot&utm\_medium=sspx&utm\_campaign=2025-03-15)^(Bleep bleep boop. I am a bot here to serve by providing helpful price history data on products. I am not affiliated with Amazon. Upvote if this was helpful. PM to report issues or to opt-out.)

asimovsdog (-1): He explains that he had two sources: one telling him nothing had happened, the other one telling him the consecration was invalid. Also, he calls Bishop Williamson "Bishop" in the title of the video and asks for prayers. If in doubt, be charitable. You're not going to win anyone to your side with this "you should be banned" stuff.> And quite frankly you're the one spreading lies and defending people who insulted Archbishop Lefebvre by disobeying their lawful superior.Your response to my refutation of your comment was "I don't want to read". You're feigning ignorance, while going around calling other people liars and cockroaches, while being the liar yourself and knowingly ignoring any evidence to the contrary. It's extremely stupid and childish. I cite a literal lawsuit done by an non-partisan third party and in response you're still insisting that I'm the liar and the SSPV stole money. What's wrong with you? I thought you were pretty intelligent.And yes, I can criticise ABL or +W while being part of the Resistance. They were very holy men, but not perfectly without flaw. I have criticized +Ws apparitionism and NO comments just as much as I will criticize ABL for forcing priests to give communion to invalidly-annulled people. It's objectively wrong, until some other argument can prove otherwise. It doesn't matter who does the sin. I can also say "well, this was a flaw", without immediately disposing of their entire person. I am relatively sure that they're both on their way to heaven, but it was wrong nevertheless.

# Post 290: Low-frequency warfare against Jerusalem Christians | FSSPX News

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 4

Comments: 0

URL: https://fsspx.news/en/news/low-frequency-warfare-against-jerusalem-christians-51191

# Post 291: Syria: Christians are at risk | FSSPX News

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 10

Comments: 1

URL: https://fsspx.news/en/news/syria-christians-are-risk-51179

Pale-Roof9278 (2): The biggest Christian crisis of our moment and very few are paying attention. Bigger than Zelenskyy or Trudeau. Praying daily for these truly courageous souls in the land of our Lord.

# Post 292: Lent is not Catholic ramadan | Father Louis-Marie Berthe, SSPX for La Porte Latine | FSSPX News

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 13

Comments: 0

URL: https://fsspx.news/en/news/lent-not-catholic-ramadan-51180

# Post 293: First Time attending Christ The King Priory in Langley, BC

Author: None

Score: 8

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1j9bozq/first\_time\_attending\_christ\_the\_king\_priory\_in/

Hi everyone!I hope everyone is doing great today!I have decided to attend the SSPX priory down in Langley, BC. I will be around and just want to see what is going on and , hopefully, talk to the priest out there. Has anyone attended( still attends) this priory? What is the experience?Thank you so much!God bless!

MaterMisericordiae23 (5): The Prior at that Church is Fr Rusak. He is amazing. I used to live in Kits, which is far from Langley, and I didn't have a car, which I told Fr. Rusak. He made sure I was able to go on Sunday Masses, so he reached out to a churchgoer, and I was able to carpool every Sunday.You should definitely attend. The people there are great and welcoming. I love chatting about current events with them at morning coffee after Sunday Masses :)

# Post 294: Photos of Lefebrve

Author: None

Score: 28

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/gallery/1j7zrt1

MaterMisericordiae23 (12): Monsignor Lefebvre WILL be vindicated and canonized one day. I'm currently reading the autobiography of him written by the late Bishop Tissier de Mallerais and I'm not surprised why he did what he did. The man feared God more than anything else

None (3): Source for the 2nd?

jaqian (-6): And at one time Henry VIII was declared Defender of The Faith.

None (6): Love him so much

# Post 295: Only 29% of U.S. Catholics say they attend Mass weekly or more often | Pew Research Center

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 14

Comments: 5

URL: https://i.redd.it/t0r8t7yxgfne1.png

MaterMisericordiae23 (8): That's what happens when the sacredness of the Real Presence is undermined by communion in the hand, extraordinary ministers, no emphasis on Confession, lack of head coverings, etc.

Duibhlinn (2): >\*\*About three-in-ten U.S. Catholics (29%) say they attend Mass weekly or more often.\*\* Larger shares say they pray on a daily basis (51%) and say religion is very important in their lives (44%). By comparison, Protestants are slightly more likely to say they do or believe each of these things.>Overall, 21% of U.S. Catholics say they attend Mass weekly and pray daily and consider religion very important. By contrast, 10% say they attend Mass a few times a year or less, pray seldom or never, and consider religion not too or not all important.[10 facts about U.S. Catholics, Pew Research Center](https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2025/03/04/10-facts-about-us-catholics/)

None (2): sink arrest dam test punch direction unique abounding smell insurance \*This post was mass deleted and anonymized with [Redact](https://redact.dev/home)\*

ardaduck (2): Relatively, for these days the US is probably doing better than most countries but Historically not

Huge-Explanation-358 (2): In Brazil its like 10%

# Post 296: Under what circumstances is it permissible to ask for a dispensation from perpetual vows in a religious congregation?

Author: brazilian\_investor\_

Score: 1

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1j63cbd/under\_what\_circumstances\_is\_it\_permissible\_to\_ask/

I am a young man discerning a vocation. Initially, I felt called to the priesthood, but since the seminary in my diocese is extremely corrupt (doctrinally and morally), I ruled out that possibility. From what I've heard, SSPX would not accept me (I've heard of other people that tried). I've considered secular lay celibacy, but within that, I could not think of a very magnanimous way in which I, in my conditions and talents, could offer my life to God and to the brothers - it's hard to beat the priesthood and the religious life in this sense. And I see that people really need good priests. I am now a postulant in a monastery in my hometown, which serves several chapels in the city. My calling here would be to serve God and my brothers as a religious priest.But, if I could, I believe I would choose the secular priesthood... I believe that many of you know the state of degradation in which many religious congregations find themselves. In this scenario, I don't see much point in cutting off ties with my family and uplifting friendships because of the cloister. Furthermore, the relationship with the superior ends up being more like that of a boss and employee (but every day and 24/7) than that of a spiritual father and his disciple, and the living with the other monks is not always the most edifying.For this reason, the idea of taking perpetual vows in the monastery distresses me. While I am a postulant or novice, and even when I make temporary profession, there is a certain reversibility to the situation. But my fear is that after taking perpetual vows, the situation will change here. Whether another abbot will no longer allow certain contact with the family, or moral degradation will take over, or the monastery will close and I will have to be transferred to another city/country...That is why I sometimes feel that I am not being authentic in my monastic vocation, but merely embracing it out of love for God so that I can serve Him as a priest.I have been dealing with this resistance with my spiritual director, but I confess that I am not getting very clear guidance.Hence the question: under what conditions could I request a dispensation from perpetual vows?If the monastery deteriorates further or closes and I have to be transferred to another one (considering that I am well-established in the city and chose this one precisely because of this), would that be sufficient grounds for such a request for dispensation?Furthermore, what advice would you give me in my current situation?

Duibhlinn (8): >From what I've heard, SSPX would not accept me (I've heard of other people that tried).Why would the SSPX not accept you? You don't have to go into too many details if you don't want to but usually they have pretty serious reasons for not accepting a candidate for the priesthood.If you're in Brazil as your username indicates, have you looked into the [Personal Apostolic Administration of Saint John Mary Vianne](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Personal\_Apostolic\_Administration\_of\_Saint\_John\_Mary\_Vianney)y? They're a pretty big traditional group in Brazil. I say group because technically they're not exactly an order, they're technically a diocese but in practical terms they're an order like the FSSP or ICKSP are.>Furthermore, what advice would you give me in my current situation?Well if I were you I wouldn't permanently lock myself into what sounds like a bad situation.

check\_101 (3): If you’re asking if you can get out of perpetual vows before you even take them… then that monastery is not for you.

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): Regarding the SSPX, I say this based on reports from young men, who I believe have good vocations, who were rejected for no apparent reason. I have heard that they end up having a certain preference for Europeans and Americans (I don't know if this is true). A friend of mine is starting the vocational process there, let's see what happens...As for the Apostolic Administration, based on some reports, it is also very difficult to get in there.>Well if I were you I wouldn't permanently lock myself into what sounds like a bad situationThe situation does not seem so bad now. I see that it is quite possible to carry on with the vocation in this monastery and provide fruits under the current conditions. My concern is what will happen in the next years.Maybe I need to trust more in Providence and accept that in any state of life I embrace (whether in marriage, secular lay celibacy, secular priesthood or religious priesthood), I will always have risks and uncertainties, and that it is God's will that it be this way?

Duibhlinn (3): >I say this based on reports from young men, who I believe have good vocations, who were rejected for no apparent reason.The SSPX absolutely doesn't reject candidates for no reason. The Church needs every priest it can get these days.>I have heard that they end up having a certain preference for Europeans and Americans (I don't know if this is true).The SSPX priests mainly being from the Americas or Europe is primarily due to traditionalism being the biggest in those regions. There are plenty of Asians and Africans who have either already been ordained or are in the seminary. There's also the fact that that's where the seminaries are located.>As for the Apostolic Administration, based on some reports, it is also very difficult to get in there.Well they have high standards, as they should. They have twice the amount of seminarians as they do priests, they have no need to lower standards to get more seminarians nor should they. High standards produce the best clergy for the Church.>The situation does not seem so bad now.Well it doesn't sound like it. Is this a traditional monastery or is it Novus Ordo?>I will always have risks and uncertainties, and that it is God's will that it be this way?Regardless of your state in life you will always have uncertainty.

brazilian\_investor\_ (0): >Well it doesn't sound like it. Is this a traditional monastery or is it Novus Ordo?Currently, Novus Ordo. Anyway, I think the core of my question is, actually, about the lawfulness of this act that I described.

# Post 297: Brevarium Romanum

Author: realdenvercoder

Score: 3

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1j5p2ha/brevarium\_romanum/

I want to get either the Baronius Press 3 Vol set or the Angelus 2 Volume Set. Having trouble choosing. I was going to get the Baronius last week but waited. Now it’s out of stock. The Angelus was out of stock last week and now it’s in-stock. 🤷♂️Just wondering if anyone has ACTUAL experience with either and if anyone has Pros/Cons. If they were $100 I’d just get both but I can’t afford $700 for books right now. \*\*\*\*\*\*UPDATE: I bought the Angelus Press version because they have a LENT2025 discount code for 20% off. So it was like $50 off so I had to.\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

AquinasDestiny (2): I would go for the Baronius set

Duibhlinn (2): Baronius Press is run by the Fraternity of Saint Peter while Angelus Press is run by the Society of Saint Pius X, if that's something you care about. I don't have personal experience with the books in question but I've found that books printed by both Baroinus and Angelus tend to be high quality. You'd probably have to ask a priest for the differences in both.

realdenvercoder (1): UPDATE: I bought the Angelus Press version because they have a LENT2025 discount code for 20% off. So it was like $50 off so I had to.

# Post 298: Belgium: Dramatic Drop in Numbers of Priests and Faithful: For the seventh consecutive year, the Catholic Church in Belgium has published its report which provides an overview of its activities and staff numbers for the year 2023 | FSSPX News

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 3

Comments: 2

URL: https://fsspx.news/en/news/belgium-dramatic-drop-numbers-priests-and-faithful-51050

Duibhlinn (1): Total number of priests in Belgium\* 2016: 4,979\* 2023: 3,441 (-31%)Total number of diocesan priests in Belgium\* 2017: 2,774\* 2023: 1,764 (-36%)Total number of seminarians in Belgium\* 2023: 40Total Mass attendance on the 3^(rd) Sunday in October in Belgium\* 2016: 286,400\* 2023: 167,400 (-42%)Total number of baptisms in Belgium\* 2017: 50,867\* 2023: 34,826 (-32%)Total number of marriages in Belgium\* 2017: 7,869\* 2023: 5,241 (-33%)Total number of confirmations in Belgium\* 2017: 41,060\* 2023: 29,580 (-28%)Total number of first communions in Belgium\* 2017: 38,394\* 2023: 33,853 (-12%)

No\_Construction5455 (1): Are these numbers from the NO or the SSPX?

# Post 299: Is there any Catholic Military orders that still exist?

Author: The\_doctor10161

Score: 11

Comments: 10

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1j3v9ai/is\_there\_any\_catholic\_military\_orders\_that\_still/

I'm just wondering if there are any Catholic military orders that still exist and plus still do actual military training.

No\_Construction5455 (3): [https://www.knightsrepublic.com/](https://www.knightsrepublic.com/)[https://www.templarstoday.us/about/](https://www.templarstoday.us/about/) (though last time I checked, you could not be a part of the SSPX, which I have challenged)[https://www.militia-sanctae-mariae.org/uk/index.htm](https://www.militia-sanctae-mariae.org/uk/index.htm)[https://stmichael.com/](https://stmichael.com/) I am a member of the first and third, working on the second.

DatGuyKilo (3): Air Force here, thanks for posting these

The\_doctor10161 (2): thx ur a legend

The\_doctor10161 (2): no worries mate

No\_Construction5455 (3): Knights of the Republic is the one I am most active in, as it is for the protection and safety of our chapel and our parishioners during our masses. The MSM performs the little office of the BVM , and members share the hourly times to pray our portion of The Hours.

konstantin1453 (2): The MSM is experiencing an internal split right now. I know because one of my friends is a member.

Duibhlinn (1): What is the split over?

No\_Construction5455 (1): Possibly why I have not heard from them in a while. I do, though, highly recommend The Knights of the Republic.

konstantin1453 (2): Some people, including the old leader(Le Roy), disliked some things the new leader did(he commited perrjury and violated the rules it says in their claim), so they said he is illegitimate and started their own thing.The new leader(Losapio) only gave a statement that they gone crazy and that's more or less it. It looks like a personal issue, as none if the sides is really open about the reasons of the conflict.

No\_Construction5455 (1): Reached out and it appears to be old news now, and the dust has settled.

# Post 300: Trad Catholic Bible Study

Author: realdenvercoder

Score: 10

Comments: 8

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1j25cp2/trad\_catholic\_bible\_study/

I’m looking for a traditional Bible study. Preferably something with video lessons. I know what you’re probably thinking, “The Bible is the Bible dude” but we’ve looked into a few “Bible Studies” from places like Ascension press and a few laypeople on YouTube and they always seem to get some “modernist creep”. Meaning they read the Bible verse, (which doesn’t change), but then the interpretation/study part can introduce some personal opinions or modernist bias. I found a series on YT where the priest is in a cassock and uses “Holy Ghost” so we might do that one. Just wondering if anyone knows of a good one (preferably from an SSPX priest).

None (7): [deleted]

No-Test6158 (4): Download the iPieta app and read the Catena Aurea for commentary on the gospels.As Catholics we don't have quite the same focus on biblical criticism. There are some Catholic books of academic commentary on the Bible but most are from after the council. The Jerome Biblical Commentary is the most authoritative - \*\*but\*\* it is historical-critical which Leo XIII condemned in \*Providentissimus Deus\* but was liberated by Pius XII in \*Divino Afflante Spiritu\*. The 1968 edition is probably the least overtly modernist. It still has issues.What is the historical-critical method? It is a form of textual criticism that appraises the world behind the text - in effect, what were the circumstances that led to certain word choices.It's up to you really. But bear in mind that prior to the council there basically was no Catholic biblical criticism and any group that was concerned with it before the council ended up embroiled in modernism. The traditional Catholic way of approaching scripture is to read it in a prayerful way and listen to it and see how it works within the tradition of the faith as handed down, allowing God to speak to you through the words. The Catholic way of viewing things is that scripture and tradition must walk together to bring forth fruits.

None (7): Bible studies are a Protestant thing, you didn’t find any before Vatican II.

Jumpy\_Cardiologist61 (3): I'd highly ecommend this book. I think it's the best traditional Catholic Bible commentary. It's amazing.[https://www.amazon.com/Practical-Commentary-Holy-Scripture/dp/0895557576/ref=monarch\\_sidesheet\\_title](https://www.amazon.com/Practical-Commentary-Holy-Scripture/dp/0895557576/ref=monarch\_sidesheet\_title)As for classes / videos, I don't know of any. I think it's a traditional Catholic blind spot. There aren't many good options for traditional Catholic kid's Bibles either.

None (1): Hippo

None (-1): [deleted]

asimovsdog (2): > It's up to you really. But bear in mind that prior to the council there basically was no Catholic biblical criticism and any group that was concerned with it before the council ended up embroiled in modernism.Well, Bible study isn't really "criticism" as Catholics understand it - as a former Protestant, it's more like talking about certain passages, usually with someone more experienced highlighting parallels / cross-references, commentary, talking about common misconceptions, playing "Devils advocate", taking different positions, etc. Despite obviously twisting Scripture with error, it's ironically one of the few things Protestants are actually good at (the other one being organizing / networking). Catholics are more like "I have to ask a priest for everything", okay but priests are few and far in between and busy. Even Jesus was lecturing in the temple about scripture and knew it well to refute the Jews who tempted him.Bible study is basically training in apologetics as you go along, not criticizing. If you don't train, you can't fight. Our priest occasionally does a "catechism for adults", but that's not exactly the same.

Duibhlinn (1): Lord have mercy. Catholics were writing massive tomes as thick as a your arm is long containing extensive Biblical study a thousand years before protestantism existed. Where did you get the notion that Biblical study is protestant?

realdenvercoder (0): HiphopAnonymous

None (0): The studying of the Bible for catechism is Protestant. Mea culpa

# Post 301: Post from Poland

Author: BasedEurope

Score: 39

Comments: 5

URL: https://i.redd.it/9yv1dltvpqle1.png

Duibhlinn (16): Better to have the king in a stable than to have a pig adorned in the finest robes in a grand palace.

None (9): [deleted]

MaterMisericordiae23 (6): I've been to SSPX Churches in Poland and while they are not the grandest in appearance, I love the humble and reverent worship I witnessed

ourladyofcovadonga (6): A humble chapel mass trumps a novus ordo cathedral family meal

mineuserbane (6): To the contrary, the altar was preserved from what I can tell. The table, however, is equally bad before and after. I might like the new one better. God willing, we will see the altar put to use again.

None (3): [deleted]

mineuserbane (3): > wobbly egg thingProbably a better definition than Altar

# Post 302: In England and Wales, Catholicism is raising its head: while Catholicism is still a minority faith in England and Wales, Sunday worship has confirmed an upward trend over the years, at a time when Anglicanism is going through an unprecedented crisis that threatens its very existence | FSSPX News

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 11

Comments: 1

URL: https://fsspx.news/en/news/england-and-wales-catholicism-raising-its-head-50886

No-Test6158 (3): Does this mean they'll give us our churches back?What a joy it would be if the 10th century Saxon parish church in the village I grew up in was returned to the true church. Even better if it was given to the SSPX!

# Post 303: Brazil: anglican “minister” “concelebrates” with priests: the scene took place in the Cathedral of San Antonio de Chapecó, a Brazilian diocese elevated to metropolitan rank on November 5, 2024 by Pope Francis | FSSPX News

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 8

Comments: 1

URL: https://fsspx.news/en/news/brazil-anglican-minister-concelebrates-priests-50761

dbaughmen (0): Apostasy

# Post 304: Rome raises the issue of a female diaconate again | FSSPX News

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 7

Comments: 1

URL: https://fsspx.news/en/news/rome-raises-issue-female-diaconate-again-50847

dbaughmen (2): Not an issue, not Catholic. Period.

# Post 305: I'm not sSPX but, i'm closer than i've ever been to joining/attending my local chapel. one question i have is...

Author: CathHammerOfCommies

Score: 14

Comments: 27

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1iyijxd/im\_not\_sspx\_but\_im\_closer\_than\_ive\_ever\_been\_to/

Does the SSPX make people jump through hoops to baptize their children the way a lot of diocesan parishes do? I ask because my wife and I had our second child on January 14th and have been wanting to baptize him ASAP, but our priest basically slowed us down, told us we need to go through the classes with our sons future godparents, and then they do a big group baptism on a set date. I asked if that was necessary because we're both well formed in the faith, I'm a convert and she's a revert. We know what we're getting into and we don't want to commit mortal sin by failing to baptize our son immediately.So it had me consider finding out about baptizing our son at the SSPX chapel. Does the SSPX have the same rules surrounding baptism?

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (14): Normally baptism is just within a week or two of the child being born. (Depending on the condition of the child/mother, distance, etc)

realdenvercoder (9): I don’t know where you are at but I’m pretty sure my local SSPX would baptize relatively quickly. My wife and daughter (9) are being baptized after about 3-4 months of private instruction. So I would assume a baby would be much quicker. 🤷♂️

None (9): People get their newborns baptized quickly from I've seen.

None (4): You should definitely get in contact with an SSPX priest, I'm sure they'd be able to help you with that!

Jumpy\_Cardiologist61 (2): My wife and I go to the SSPX priory in Sanford, Florida. My wife and I have a 3 month old. He was born on a Monday and baptized on Saturday. It was just us and the priest and whoever we invited.We e-mailed the office when her due date got close to give them a heads up. When he was born, I followed up and we scheduled a time. They didn't make us do any kind of baptism prep the way they did with our marriage prep.The impression I got from the SSPX is to baptize your child within 1-2 weeks of the child's birth or you're sinning through negligence (barring some kind of unusual circumstance). Everyone at the chapel baptizes their kids ASAP. People have lots of kids so there are constant baptisms.We did marriage prep through our SSPX chapel so they already knew us. The godparents go to a different SSPX chapel so that was also no issue.I'm assuming if you're a random person they've never met before, they're going to want to meet with you beforehand to make sure you're legit and that you're picking legit people as godparents.I honestly didn't know that kind of mandatory delay for baptizing babies was even a thing.

Piklikl (-2): Making you take classes is a not a bad thing. You would not be committing a mortal sin by following the directives of your parish priest, no matter if he is Novus Ordo. The priest has a duty to ensure that true consent is being given and that the parents and godparents truly desire to raise the child in the Faith, that is the purpose of the classes. Infant baptism is only tenable if the people speaking on behalf of the child truly intend to raise the child in the Faith (not because it’s family/cultural custom to baptize, the parents are afraid of the child going to hell, etc).If your child is in danger of death then anyone can baptize, otherwise you need to have a priest baptize the child (it would actually be a mortal sin for you to baptize without the need to, and there is no penalty for delaying infant baptism at the direction of your priest).The Novus Ordo has lately been using delays to ascertain how serious someone is about practicing their Faith (eg long baptism prep courses, long marriage prep courses). Lots of people get on religious kicks and for a few weeks are super gung ho about everything, but then they run out of gas and go back to their normal, worldly ways. A priest administering a sacrament in this day and age needs to ascertain that that is not the case, that someone has a deep and sustainable desire to the practice the Faith. If you’re willing to wait a few months to receive a sacrament and follow through the requisite classes, then you probably aren’t going to be a flake.The SSPX doesn’t really have an established way of doing the same ascertaining, so it’s down to the individual priest. SSPX priests, for better or worse, will typically just have a conversation with you to figure out how serious you are about the sacrament in question and then make a decision there, not make you wait months.It’s certainly a faster way to get things done, but you should definitely keep in mind the fact that you and the godparents will be held responsible before God on Judgement Day if the child does not follow through with the promises made at baptism.

seeking\_0333 (-7): If you feel the situation is warranted, and that is your decision to discern as his father, you can baptize him yourself in your home. You shouldn’t need classes and months to make your child a child of God. The sacrament is effective! You can worry about the classes after the fact. My opinion only but there’s canon for this, I’d have to look it up.

himalayancandlepower (3): I wasn’t baptized until June of ‘84 after having been born in October of ‘83. Both of my godparents were/are Catholic, along with my father, being a sibling to both of them. My mother is Protestant, and I’m assuming she was involved in some sort of education prior to the wedding and/or baptism...but her side of my family’s vehement opposition to Catholicism is palpable and disturbing, to say the least. I’m wishing you well!

CathHammerOfCommies (1): That's what I was hoping for, I think the only thing that may have held us up was my wife was recovering from the c-section.

realdenvercoder (5): Our NO parish said it would be 2 years to baptize them both for some perspective.

CathHammerOfCommies (2): I think I might inquire at my local chapel, I just don't want to "use" them since I'm not a member there. But it's important that we baptize our son.

CathHammerOfCommies (1): That's what I wanted, my son was in NICU for about a week but as soon as I came home I wanted to have him baptized then. Wasn't an option though.

CathHammerOfCommies (2): I think I might since there won't be anymore baptisms in my diocese until Easter Vigil now.

None (2): It is a mortal sin not to baptize the children, you make no sense, if you don't know don't teach.

CathHammerOfCommies (1): I don't disagree with you, I think it's important for baptismal promises to be kept if only that could be held in tension with the necessity to baptize a child ASAP.

None (6): there reaaaaaaally isnt warrant for that in this situation. the only reason that can be done is in danger of death.

CathHammerOfCommies (1): I was prepared to do that while he was in NICU but it was only because he was a tad underweight and they wanted to monitor him for a bit, nothing life threatening. All the same, I remember learning from Taylor Marshall that I could validly baptize him (or anyone) in an emergency situation. I just gotta have the right form and matter.

None (4): They don't believe baptism to be salvific or necessary, hence there is no hurry. Flee from this people.

None (1): Personally, I would baptize the baby in NICU myself or even call a priest to come to the hospital since the situation is critical.

Piklikl (1): Obviously it’s a mortal sin to intentionally delay the baptism for no good reason, but if you parish priest is directing you to fulfill other criteria before you can have your baby baptized, that is not intentionally delaying your child’s baptism for no good reason.It would be a mortal sin for the priest to baptize an infant not in danger of death whose parents and/or godparents have no intention of helping the child fulfill the promises made at baptism.It would be a mortal sin for a priest to allow two people to get married who have no intention of staying true to their marriage vows. Priests have a duty to ascertain how serious someone is about fulfilling their vows.

seeking\_0333 (0): Right but infants can die and we don’t know the hour… we have five children and almost lost two in childbirth and you just never know. Personally I did this with one of ours because the church was just flat out unworkable with us (administratively) and I felt too much time was going by.I did bring this to confession and felt it warranted an explanation to be sure I was being in best effort with God. Anyway, I’m open to correction here but it can be a tough dilemma for a parent.

CathHammerOfCommies (2): Fortunately it wasn't life threatening, he was premature by a few weeks so he was a few pounds underweight and they wanted to monitor him. He was out after about 5-6 days. But your point is well made.

None (1): You dont need to know much about the faith to be baptized. And children know nothing and we baptize them too. You cannot justify yourself, know when to quit.

How-re\_ya\_Mate (2): Honestly.As crazy as times are.All Baptisms should be filmed.(\*If one can.)

How-re\_ya\_Mate (1): Some people who thought they were priests, realized only after watching videos of their "baptisms" getting botched, that one was never confected, and that they actually (hence) never were.Even bergoglio expresses this in a letter.As Since times of Ancient, all know that: 1. Necessity of Baptism is absolutely essential to actually enter Christ's Holy Church. 2. If one isn't baptized.. you then cannot become a Validly Ordained Priest.

None (1): Glad to hear.

Piklikl (1): Notice I’ve never said anything about knowledge of the Faith; you’re right, you need to know very little knowledge of the Faith to be baptized.The issue at stake is whether or not the person is going to keep their baptismal promises.Think of it like co-signing a loan from bank to buy your child’s car. The bank must do its due diligence to make sure that not only will the child pay off the loan, but if something happens you can also pay at off the loan.Too many people these days have been getting their children baptized with no intention of raising them in the Faith; not only does that damn the child even more (it’s piously believed that the devils in Hell punish baptized souls more than the unbaptized) but also damns the parents and the godparents for failing to raise the child in the Faith as well as the priest who neglected to do his due diligence.

# Post 306: Future consecrations: an approaching deadline? | English translation of an article written by Father Jean-Michel Gleize SSPX, Professor of Ecclesiology at the Seminary of Saint Pius X in Écône, which first appeared in French in Courrier de Rome no. 682 | Society of Saint Pius X, District of the USA

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 5

Comments: 3

URL: https://sspx.org/en/news/future-consecrations-approaching-deadline-50846

AtaturkIsAKaffir (4): Interesting if the Society is waiting for the Sede Vacante period to consecrate

dbaughmen (2): May the Consecrations not be under the auspices of the Novus Ordo, God willing.

dbaughmen (0): Even if they consecrate during Sede Vacante (in normal times) it would still be as schismatic to consecrate during this period.
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Hello everyone.I will try to make this as quick as possible.Basically I have been learning about the faith since quite some time by now. I have mainly focused on Political Traditonalism and now I support the Carlist cause, but I have also been learning about Theological and Liturgical Traditionalism.I have developed an appreciation for the TLM, but I'm from Uruguay and here only the SSPX offers it once a month in a place more than 2 hours from where I live.Therefore I have some questions regarding the SSPX, and I think this will be a good place to ask them.-What is the official position of the SSPX regarding the Second Vatican Council, in the sense that which specific changes are in their eyes to be rejected?-Related to the last question ,what is the official position of the SSPX regarding the Novus Ordo? Does assiting to it fulfill one's Sunday Obligation in their eyes?-In the case that I do eventually assist an SSPX service, what should I expect as a life-long NO goer that has never experienced the TLM?Those are the main doubts, anything else I should know feel free to comment it.Thanks and God bless you all.

SnowWhiteFeather (13): Archbishop Lefebvre established the SSPX. I would suggest reading or listening to his book "An Open Letter to Confused Catholics". It covers the questions you are asking and the position of the SSPX. It is available for free on YouTube as a six and a half hour video. (I would link it, but some subreddits don't do well with links.)Our priests have advised us that it does fulfill our Sunday obligations, but that it is probably better not to attend.

None (12): Hi!I'm always impressed by people who made such a journey as you did towards tradition. Go for it, you'll encounter obstacles but you won't regret it!Vatican 2: the SSPX considers this Council as containing claims contradicting Tradition on 3 issues: ecumenism, religious freedom, and counciliarism. I can give more detail if you wanna, but you can find everything by just googling one of those words and "SSPX".Regarding the NO, the SSPX uses the brief critical exam of the new mass as their main summary of their position (you can find it online on the Angelus Press site it's short and informative). Basically, it considers the NO Mass as going away from the traditional vision of Mass, and therefore thinks that we should back to the TLM in the entire Church. That doesn't make all the people who go to it without knowing how dangerous it has been bad people of course, that's an important point to keep in mind.As an ex NO goer you'll certainly not feel alone, many people are among SSPX parishioners, and the rest love to see people who were brave enough to make that journey. There'll always be close minded judgmental people, but don't waste your time caring about what they say!

Jumpy\_Cardiologist61 (5): The SSPX recognizes Vatican II as a valid ecumenical council. It thinks some parts are fine, other parts are ambiguous, and other parts cannot be squared with traditional Catholic doctrine.Since it is a pastoral council and not a dogmatic one, and therefore not infallible, the SSPX rejects the parts that are contrary to traditional Catholic doctrine. Specifically, religious liberty, ecumenism, and collegiality.The SSPX thinks the Novus Ordo has been altered to make it more man-centered, liberal and ecumenical. It thinks that certain essential parts of Catholic teaching have been systematically obscured or downplayed, like the sacrificial nature of the Mass. It recommends that people not attend the Novus Ordo because it can gradually undermine your faith.Speaking as someone that used to go to the Novus Ordo, just expect for there to be a learning curve with the Latin Mass. It will take a few times to get a feel for things. Just soak it in and don't worry too much about following along. I recommend going to a High Mass if you're able to so you get the full experience.The people will be very pious and politically conservative. Men and women will be dressed formally and modestly. Women will be wearing chapel veils. It will be very reverent.I would recommend the SSPX podcast series on the crisis in the Church. It's very good. They have episodes on all of these topics. I'd start with the 4 Questions one I've linked: it's a great summary of their position.[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yAEtsJ60Wkw&list=PLonegYXBrLbStENq\\_HPyOb4Qy9\\_qE3\\_2w&index=52&t=2s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yAEtsJ60Wkw&list=PLonegYXBrLbStENq\_HPyOb4Qy9\_qE3\_2w&index=52&t=2s)To get a feel for the Latin Mass, just go here and watch a Mass under the "Sundays and Important Feast Days" section:[https://www.youtube.com/@SSPX-STAS/playlists](https://www.youtube.com/@SSPX-STAS/playlists)

dbaughmen (0): Hello! - The official position of the Society on Vatican II is that it has irreconcilable differences that are not compatible with Catholicism, and are heretical. Such as the documents regarding Religious Liberty, and the Church. And also the reform that came from Vatican II, the Novus Ordo and its modernist and protestant character.- I believe the Society teaches that the NO does fill Sunday obligation. (I could be wrong)I came from the Novus Ordo too, and I know the chance is drastic, especially in Latin American countries where the NO has no reverence. Expect beauty and something totally different, I encourage you to study the rubrics and for your first Mass don’t try to follow it, just take it all in. Perhaps start with a Low Mass as it is less confusing.May God bless you and your pursuit of Truth, DM me with any other questions you might have!

WilliamCrack19 (3): I see, thanks for the suggestion and the response.

WilliamCrack19 (3): I see, thanks for the response.This brings a further doubt to me; considering the only TLM in my country is the one I mentioned, which for me it's quite hard to attend, would I be justified in attending the NO taking in consideration my situation, according to the view of the Fraternity?

WilliamCrack19 (2): Thanks for the response!

WilliamCrack19 (4): I see, thanks for the response, and thanks for the disposition to help! If I get more questions I will gladly ask you.

kawaqcosta (4): A respeito do Vaticano II e do recente Magistério, Dom Marcel Lefebvre diz o seguinte:\> "Sem que a infalibilidade do magistério da Igreja tenha sido envolvida, \*talvez mesmo sem que quaisquer heresias propriamente ditas tenham sido mantidas\*, estamos assistindo à autodemolição sistemática da Igreja." \*Eles O Descoroaram\*, capítulo XXI.Eu diria que “heresia” não é o termo mais adequado para se referir ao Concílio. Talvez o “erro” seja mais apropriado e suficiente (afinal, não há nenhuma verdade de fé que seja diretamente negada).

None (7): Just a few details, the SSPX considers some points of Vatican 2 to be contradictory to tradition, but not to be formally heretic.Regarding NO, the SSPX's official stance is that it only is acceptable for people who aren't fully available of how Protestant it is; for someone who is fully aware of how non Catholic it is, it's better to avoid it.

None (2): Hi!Sorry for answering late, I'm currently traveling in a different country and I don't have internet!I think that even that sounds like a big step, moving to a place where you would have the TLM sounds like the best solution. Maybe if you find enough potential parishioners, the SSPX could even send you a priest!Regarding the NO, I don't think the SSPX would think you are necessarily commiting a sin by going to it, however you might want to talk to an SSPX priest about it. You can find how to contact them online!

tradrcrthings (6): You can also reading the SSPX's stance and position regarding Vatican II, Novus Ordo, and Ecclesia De on their website and their channel (SSPX News-English) on Youtube. 😁✌️

WilliamCrack19 (1): Hmmm I see, thanks a lot for the response then!
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Piklikl (13): No.

None (3): In that debate, one should not forget that the people accusing us have the burden of proof; instead of waisting time proving them wrong, start by asking them proof

dbaughmen (7): This debate is absolutely pointless and was made up to install fear in the Faithful attending and wishing to attend SSPX churches. Who cares if we are in schism from authorities that Abp Lefebvre called apostates.

BleuBoy777 (0): Schism? Ehhh...Cult? Yup

peppers\_yeppers (6): "We are not in schism. That is a lie""Who cares if we are in schism"

dbaughmen (1): Yes, who cares if we are in schism from false Roman authorities who have no jurisdiction. We are absolutely not in schism from the Roman Catholic Church

mineuserbane (6): You believe the Roman Catholic Church no longer exists with a visible head. Not caring about schism from a Pope you reject is one thing. The rest of us faithful Catholics actually care about anathemas.

seeking\_0333 (4): The SSPX adheres to Francis as pope

dbaughmen (-1): “While we are certain that the faith the Church has taught for 20 centuries cannot contain error, we are much further from absolute certitude that the pope is truly pope.” (Archbishop Lefebvre, Le Figaro 1976)

mineuserbane (5): Yes. That comment was directed at u/dbaughmen, a sedevacantist.

mineuserbane (5): "Therefore, if anyone says that it is not by the institution of Christ the lord himself (that is to say, by divine law) that blessed Peter should have perpetual successors in the primacy over the whole church; or that the Roman pontiff is not the successor of blessed Peter in this primacy: let him be anathema." First Vatican Council, July 18th, 1870.
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Hi! I hope you are having a great day!My friend, who calls himself a devout Catholic showed me some good quotes regarding " No Salvation Outside the Church" teaching. I appreciated those quotes and asked him why would Our Mother Church make moves towards ecumenism. for this, he dodged my question, and said that is the topic for another time( I really don't understand what he meant by that). I was a Muslim in my early childhood, then I became an Orthodox, now, I am converting to Catholicism( the RCIA classes I have with diosecan parish are outstanding: we just watch some videos, and no discussion ever occurs), and Traditionalist communities are the people who moved my heart towards the truth. A bit later, my friend returned to me and said that the salvation of a non-Catholic is decided by the Church( more confusion!). So, Baltimore Catechism is wrong? Why would our Lord reach out to all the sinners and bring good news? I do not want to give up on Catholicism, and with all due respect to my friend, his comment was discouraging...What is your take on this one guys? Any advice to keep searching? How to stay true to the well established Catholic teachings when so many people seem to forget what it is all about and contradict themselves?Thanks!

None (9): Hi!Regarding salvation outside of the Church, it's theoretically possible for someone with "invincible ignorance" of the Catholic faith (meaning someone who has no possibility to know the Catholic faith) to be saved; but he won't be saved by his false religion, he'd still be saved by Christ's sacrifice and therefore by the Catholic Church, even if he doesn't know it.That person would need to live in accordance with natural law, to not have committed mortal sins, and more importantly, to receive a special grace from God.Non traditionalists usually don't believe in the dogma of "No salvation outside of the Church", which is why they often aren't able to find a precise position on that issue.Congrats for your path of conversion, and make sure to talk to an SSPX priest about that issue, you'll get all the answers you need! Sadly we live in a time of Church crisis, so we have to picky who we consider a reliable source for Catholic faith.

WallachianLand (5): He dodged the question because Vatican II teaches "ecumenism", all non-traditional Catholics can't answer this question without bringing the problem of the "Vatican II Council" which brings this and more troubles to the table.First, there's no salvation outside the Church, what can happen is perhaps a person could reach God in his last moments of life and convert, and that's pretty much it, that saidYou shouldn't put your faith in people, since they're most likely, disappoint you as you already can see for yourself that you are, the catechism of Baltimore is correct and therefore it doesn't matter what a lay person or a "priest" says otherwise.Also, to be sure about the righteousness of someone's take, is to simply study about the doctrine and the magisterium, if the magisterium and the doctrines says something, then it's true, I recommend seeing everything before the 60s, because of the Vatican II Council, which is a touchy subject

asimovsdog (3): > I appreciated those quotes and asked him why would Our Mother Church make moves towards ecumenism. Well, it wasn't Mother Church, it was infiltrating freemasons. They did plan it for more than 150 years, starting in 1717 with the French Revolution (against Catholics), infiltrating universities in the 1800s, launching Communism in 1917, liberation theology, etc. Which is IMO an argument for Catholicism, because why would judeo-masons conspire to infiltrate Catholics specifically instead of Orthodox, Anglicans, etc.A couple days ago, I was interested in what arguments Orthodox have against Catholics and I discovered [this site](https://www.trueorthodoxy.org/polemics/heretics\_roman\_catholics.shtml) from the "Genuine Orthodox Church of America", which lists ecumenism as "a heresy stemming from the 20th-century Freemasonic takeover of the Vatican". It's ironic that Orthodox heretics are more honest than even some Catholics. Currently, there is a war between "Catholic Authority" (the people in the Church buildings) and "Catholic Faith" (the people outside of the buildings, but preaching the Catholic doctrine). To what percentage both are united, nobody knows. Sedevactantists say its 100% - 0%, Resistance / SSPX varies between 99% - 1% and maybe 80% Authority - 20% Faith (i.e. praying for the pope, but otherwise ignoring what he says until he comes back to his senses).Your friend - as I presume most diocesan-taught people - is indoctrinated to think that people outside of the Church building (i.e. the diocese, in submission to a modernistic bishop, in submission to a modernist-influenced pope), cannot be saved, which is wrong. In the end, the Faith is far more important than the pope. He avoided the question, but that doesn't invalidate Catholicism, it just means we're going through a very rough phase, in which "cultural Catholicism" is purged (good!).> Why would our Lord reach out to all the sinners and bring good news?He reaches out to people, but he can't force anyone. He wants a heaven full of people, not robots. People are either going to accept or not. We must pray for them and try to be just, because the prayer of a just man is worth much more than the prayer of an unjust man. A lot of people certainly feel that there is something wrong with the modern world, but very few investigate. Very few dig deep down on what the issue actually is (people glorifying freedom, instead of using their reason to submit to Gods will). I've talked with a lot of people who came pretty close and then totally rejected some dogma (i.e. I had a Protestant that was close to converting multiple times, even prayed to Mary, and then turned around and said Catholics worship cookies, I just... anyway). They will go to hell (not a deep hell, but certainly not heaven), because they did not seek God with "all their strength". God cannot condemn anyone who tries his/her best to get to heaven. He can save people despite of their religion, even Protestants despite their error (not because of it). But many people fall into distractions, give up searching, distract themselves, etc. That doesn't mean it's okay for them to go on being Protestants.> I do not want to give up on Catholicism, and with all due respect to my friend, his comment was discouraging...We are attached to the eternal Rome, not the temporal, infiltrated Vatican. Right now the pope is a Jesuit, likely immolated from a slew of yes-men and corrupt clergy since childhood. We say that "yes, he's the pope, but his mind is basically a slush of ecumenism, modernism, trying-to-be-nice-ism". When a good, strong pope cleans up the heresies of Vatican II, I'll be the first to hail the pope. I don't reject the papacy, but the "submission to the Roman pontiff" does not mean that we have to follow a weak pope into ecumenist error.> we just watch some videos, and no discussion ever occursI wouldn't count that as "good" if no discussion is happening. Anyway. Read the [1910 Catholic Encyclopedia](https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/), it's very solid. The Baltimore Catechism isn't bad, but you might not get all the context from your diocesan priest watching YT videos, as most non-traditional priests today are poorly formed.Pray the rosary every day, get into practicing prayer, [Divinum Officium](https://www.divinumofficium.com/), [LOBVM](https://www.lobvm.com/), Jesus Prayer, etc. You can go to heaven even without the Mass (certainly useful if you have it), but not without prayer. Research apologetics and ignore any advice that encourages you in complacency.

SnowWhiteFeather (2): This is a good video that explains in depth:https://youtu.be/AoZPouA8jxc?feature=shared

Jumpy\_Cardiologist61 (1): I recommend the book "Deadly Indifference: How the Church Lost Her Mission, and How We Can Reclaim It" by Eric Sammons. It's a whole book on this topic:[https://www.amazon.com/s?k=Eric+Sammons+book&crid=1FOPZK5KF6ENL&sprefix=eric+sammons+book%2Caps%2C120&ref=nb\\_sb\\_noss\\_2](https://www.amazon.com/s?k=Eric+Sammons+book&crid=1FOPZK5KF6ENL&sprefix=eric+sammons+book%2Caps%2C120&ref=nb\_sb\_noss\_2)The other answers are correct. "Outside the Church there is no salvation" is Church dogma. The Church is the Ark of salvation, and everyone else is outside in the Flood: Protestants, Jews, Muslims, Hindus, atheists, etc.It is theoretically possible for non-Catholics to be saved if they have "invincible ignorance", where they aren't culpable for their lack of belief. This is rare and not something to count on: the analogy that the Baltimore Catechism uses is a few people clinging on to the outside of the Ark with ropes. We are called to bring everyone we can into the Ark and save their souls.Since Vatican II, Church leaders have basically sold this dogma down the river because they think it's outdated, narrow-minded, and mean. Instead, they promote ecumenism, where basically you say that other religions are praiseworthy, that people can be saved without becoming Catholic, and you just endlessly dialogue with them instead of trying to convert them.This has dramatically undermined both evangelization (if you don't need to become Catholic to be saved, why go through all the hassle?) and Catholics' own attachment to their faith (if being Catholic isn't essential for salvation, why does it matter if I don't practice my faith or switch to a different religion?).Your friend can't give you a straight answer because he would have to say that most modern Church leaders are wrong and are undermining a dogma of the Church, which he doesn't want to do.As for advice, I'd recommend going to the closest Latin Mass. SSPX would be ideal. Don't go to the Novus Ordo. It sucks.[https://www.latinmass.com/find-latin-mass](https://www.latinmass.com/find-latin-mass)Also, pray the rosary every day and read this book. It's a pre-Vatican II catechism intended for adult converts:[https://www.amazon.com/Brief-Catechism-Adults-Complete-Handbook/dp/0895554925/ref=sr\\_1\\_1?crid=HW1MVZFWYPT2&dib=eyJ2IjoiMSJ9.ot9i\\_0Q0xgZDgtbQTOY164V6zMS8dziQ98mfHekWUqY.FlOqS45YYDgbwyvSNVoXQVxTRbk6XkBjtPd8OUWS8I8&dib\\_tag=se&keywords=a+brief+catechism+for+adults+fr.+william+j.+cogan&qid=1740062188&sprefix=a+brief+catechism+for%2Caps%2C118&sr=8-1](https://www.amazon.com/Brief-Catechism-Adults-Complete-Handbook/dp/0895554925/ref=sr\_1\_1?crid=HW1MVZFWYPT2&dib=eyJ2IjoiMSJ9.ot9i\_0Q0xgZDgtbQTOY164V6zMS8dziQ98mfHekWUqY.FlOqS45YYDgbwyvSNVoXQVxTRbk6XkBjtPd8OUWS8I8&dib\_tag=se&keywords=a+brief+catechism+for+adults+fr.+william+j.+cogan&qid=1740062188&sprefix=a+brief+catechism+for%2Caps%2C118&sr=8-1)

None (1): Thanks for the most informative reply! I meant RCIA to be "outstanding" in a sarcastic way

# Post 313: The Sino-Vatican agreement births a new bishop | FSSPX News

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 1

Comments: 0

URL: https://fsspx.news/en/news/sino-vatican-agreement-births-new-bishop-50605

# Post 314: I love Pope Francis

Author: MaterMisericordiae23

Score: 22

Comments: 14

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1iny4ll/i\_love\_pope\_francis/

Yes, I disagree with and am disappointed in many of his actions and statements. I am very much disappointed of modernism metastasizing within the Church under his rule.However, I love him because he is the Holy Father and I pray for him every time I pray the Rosary. He is the head of the One True Church and the successor to St Peter. I hate it when people call him Bergoglio as to diminish his role as Pope. As our Holy Father and the head of the household, we need to honor and give him respect.

asimovsdog (19): \>the absolute state of the SSPXAnyway, I only love that he makes it easier for people to see the NWO agenda. Would be a lot harder with Benedict.

Odd\_Glove7043 (4): One cannot deny his charity and humility, especially towards those in prison and the poor

HammerAndArm (13): As much as you'll get down voted and hated on, I agree! I can't stand a lot of what he says and does, but I'm not going to abandon Christ's true Church and the see of Rome.

None (12): Well … I suppose we are supposed to love and pray for our enemies

Glittering\_Dingo\_943 (6): I love pope Francis too ❤️

SanctusFranciscus (5): “Pangs of a trad conscience: a novel about a souls journey”

merinw (5): It is my understanding that it is a long standing tradition in Europe to refer to Popes by their given surname. Not necessarily disrespectful but it depends on who is saying it.

dbaughmen (9): Very Bishop Fellay of you OP

kawaqcosta (1): Isn't this simply what any SSPX Catholic should do?

ourladyofcovadonga (4): Lol. Reminds me when a parishioner took down Francis' portrait from the vestibule and our priest was livid. (Sspx)

Duibhlinn (8): It's common on the continent. When there were, for example, in the 1960s multiple Popes with the regnal name Pius in the last few years it is more clear to refer to their surname rather than their regnal name. It's not inherently out of disrespect for the men or their office. If you're discussing "Pope Pius" in that era you could easily be speaking about any one of 4 different people.

rathdrummob (8): I would definitely consider that a compliment OP! However, I doubt it was meant to be.

dbaughmen (3): It was! I have a soft spot for Bp Fellay

rathdrummob (4): My apologies! Great to hear!

# Post 315: How bad was the Metz Agreement? A Russian Catholic perspective | Maxim Grigorieff for One Peter Five

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 2

Comments: 1

URL: https://onepeterfive.com/how-bad-was-the-metz-agreement-a-russian-catholic-perspective/

None (2): I had never heard of that argument, yet this is my city haha

# Post 316: British SSPX

Author: None

Score: 12

Comments: 8

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1in7asc/british\_sspx/

Hi are there any British SSPX members?

None (5): That's good I'm thinking of joining

Duibhlinn (5): I'm not an anglo myself but I hear that the SSPX is doing quite well over there. The district superior over Ireland, Britain and a few other places is a fellow Irishman, Father David Sherry.

MarcellusFaber (6): Yes.

No\_Construction5455 (2): [https://fsspx.uk/en](https://fsspx.uk/en)

StelIaMaris (2): Not sure, but the priest at my chapel in America is English, so presumably decently well

dbaughmen (4): Me!

None (3): Really? I didn’t know that

None (3): Hi how are you?

# Post 317: Zaitzkofen: Ordinations to Minor Orders, Tonsures, and Taking of the Cassock – 2025 | Sacred Heart of Jesus Seminary, Society of Saint Pius X | FSSPX News

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 8

Comments: 2

URL: https://fsspx.news/en/news/zaitzkofen-ordinations-minor-orders-tonsures-and-taking-cassock-2025-50572

Duibhlinn (3): # February 1st: Ordinations to the Four Minor Orders>\*The Church rejoices at the arrival of the recipients of new minors. On Saturday, February 1, 2025, which is the feast of St. Ignatius of Antioch, 13 third-year seminarians received ordination to the first minor orders (porter and lector) from the hands of Bishop Alfonso de Galarreta: 1 Croatian, 1 Dane, 5 Germans, 1 Hungarian, 1 Dutch, and 4 Poles.\*>\*Four fourth-year candidates were ordained to the second minor orders (exorcist and acolyte) during the same ceremony: 1 Belarusian, 2 Germans, and 1 Hungarian.\*# February 2: Tonsure and Taking of the Cassock>\*The feast of Candlemas is always a special day at the Zaitzkofen seminary. Indeed, in accordance with the will of Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, the ceremony of the taking the habit and tonsure takes place on February 2. This year, 12 first-year seminarians received the clerical habit from the hands of Bishop de Galarreta: 1 Austrian, 2 Belgians, 1 Estonian, 6 Poles, 1 Slovak, and 1 Slovenian.\*>\*Another 12 second-year candidates were solemnly admitted to the clerical state under the gaze of their confreres and relatives: 2 Germans, 1 Croatian, 7 Poles, 1 Slovak, and 1 Czech.\*

dbaughmen (1): Deo Gratias!

# Post 318: What should I do if there’s no sspx near me?

Author: greenlight144000

Score: 13

Comments: 39

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ilsivy/what\_should\_i\_do\_if\_theres\_no\_sspx\_near\_me/

The closest sspx to me is 2 hours away and what do you think I should do? Should I go to the new mass or avoid it? There’s an fssp near me but I know they broke off from sspx would it be okay if I went there? Or even an eastern catholic church?

madmonk323 (11): Personally for me, I'd go in this order:1. SSPX 2. Any other TLM3. Novus ordo massI personally have no experience with eastern catholic or any other rite so I can't speak on that.

himalayancandlepower (8): According to SSPX ideals, if you can get 10 people to show up in a room for Mass, they will send a priest to you to celebrate it and allow you all to communicate and receive the Eucharist. Look into it! 🌹☺️

Duibhlinn (5): I recommend checking the [Latin Mass Directory](https://www.latinmassdir.org/).

None (4): You're lucky, I'd go to the FSSP. Many people don't have access to a close TLM. Don't go to the NO.

PaxBonaFide (4): Go to the nearest Latin Mass that you can find, if none of those are available within a couple hours drive or so, then perhaps try to find a Byzantine Rite Mass, rather than going to the New Mass. The Novus Ordo should always be last on the list.

BasedEurope (5): FSSP and Eastern Catholic churches are alright to attend

Highwayman90 (2): I'm a member of a Byzantine mission parish. You're welcome at our liturgies, but just be aware that our traditions are very different than those of the Latin Church and please don't go in expecting the Byzantines (or any non-Byzantine Easterners) to accommodate Latin practices.All of that said, I'd especially recommend Melkite (Arab Byzantine) or Ruthenian (often "Byzantine" with no ethnic marker) parishes, as they are quite traditional oftentimes (especially Melkite ones). Romanian and Ukrainian ones can often be quite ethnic, but not all are; I go to a very non-ethnic Romanian mission (though I am canonically Romanian Greek Catholic).I can't speak as much for other Eastern Catholic Churches, but I would say that the Maronites are heavily latinized/modernized (though some of that is going back to tradition), and the Chaldeans and Syro-Malabars are somewhat that way too. The Armenian Church is one I haven't personally visited but I've been to an Armenian Orthodox liturgy and it is beautiful, so the Armenian Catholic one probably is, too.From the SSPX perspective, the Eastern Churches didn't have a liturgical reform in the way the Latins did in the 1960s-1970s, so I would imagine Eastern parishes would at least in some ways be more "acceptable."

Jumpy\_Cardiologist61 (1): Here's an SSPX video on this topic. Short version: yes, it's fine to attend mass at FSSP, Institute of Christ the King, diocesan Latin masses, etc.My local SSPX priory hosts a yearly get together for Latin Mass priests where they all hang out.[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lgCv5Rohu24&t=188s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lgCv5Rohu24&t=188s)

asimovsdog (1): No, don't go there, just sanctify the Sunday, there's a PDF online on how to do it (it's one rosary + some extra prayers). Here's what Lefevbre had to say on that matter:> And we must not waver for one moment either in not being with those who are in the process of betraying us. Some people are always admiring the grass in the neighbor’s field. Instead of looking to their friends, to the Church’s defenders, to those fighting on the battlefield, they look to our enemies on the other side.“After all, we must be charitable, we must be kind, we must not be divisive, after all, they are celebrating the Tridentine Mass, they are not as bad as everyone says” – but THEY ARE BETRAYING US – betraying us! They are shaking hands with the Church’s destroyers. They are shaking hands with people holding modernist and liberal ideas condemned by the Church. So they are doing the devil’s work.> Thus those who were with us and were working with us for the rights of Our Lord, for the salvation of souls, are now saying,“So long as they grant us the old Mass, we can shake hands with Rome, no problem.”But we are seeing how it works out. They are in an impossible situation. Impossible. One cannot both shake hands with modernists and keep following Tradition. Not possible. Not possible. Now, stay in touch with them to bring them back, to convert them to Tradition, yes, if you like, that’s the right kind of ecumenism! But give the impression that after all one almost regrets any break, that one likes talking to them? No way! These are people who call us corpse-like Traditionalists, they are saying that we are as rigid as corpses, ours is not a living Tradition, we are glum-faced, ours is a glum Tradition! Unbelievable! Unimaginable! What kind of relations can you have with people like that?> This is what causes us a problem with certain layfolk, who are very nice, very good people, all for the Society, who accepted the Consecrations, but who have a kind of deep-down regret that they are no longer with the people they used to be with, people who did not accept the Consecrations and who are now against us. “It’s a pity we are divided”, they say,“why not meet up with them? Let’s go and have a drink together, reach out a hand to them” – that’s a betrayal! Those saying this give the impression that at the drop of a hat they would cross over and join those who left us. They must make up their minds. We cannot compromise.” > –Archbishop Lefebvre’s address to his priests,September 6, 1990

None (-4): Go to the SSPX. If you can't go, stay at home and pray there. You are under no obligation to go if you can't go.

Duibhlinn (8): I've been to an eastern rite Mass and it was significantly less bad than the novus ordo. How much of that was due to the language barrier I cannot say. They do only have Communion on the tongue though, no laymen touching the Eucharist so that's a plus. Even though the Slavic deacon was literally in a stereotypical tracksuit looking like someone straight out of a 1990s Russian commieblock it was still less irreverant than the usual novus ordo circus.

ardaduck (5): I would put Eastern Rites at 3 and then to place Novus Ordo Mass

greenlight144000 (6): Oh that’s interesting!

greenlight144000 (2): The fssp is 30 minutes away for me so I’m not sure if that’s considered close or not. I’ve been there one time and I loved it

Duibhlinn (2): There are traditional Catholic orders among eastern Catholics but they are few. The main one is [the SSJK, the Priestly Fraternity of Saint Josaphat](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Priestly\_Society\_of\_Saint\_Josaphat).

greenlight144000 (1): What’s the PDF called?

Best\_Food190 (7): Why can’t he go to the FSSP?

Duibhlinn (8): 30 minutes is close for a Latin Mass. Most people have to travel longer than that to get to one. I've often travelled 2 hours to reach a TLM.

No\_Construction5455 (3): We have people traveling further than two hours to our SSPX chapel. Not saying that's for you, just putting it into perspective. The local bishop here has allowed the TLM offered by the FSSP to be in only two locations.

asimovsdog (1): Uh, because they are heretics, at least pro forma? They sign off on the heresies Vatican II, but only keep the TLM, so they live a complete lie. They do nothing but prolong the crisis. Lefevbre told us to stay away from them, because we'd be complicit with the suicide of the Church.

dbaughmen (1): Watch Fr Robinson’s video on this topic on why the Ecclesia Dei groups aren’t worth it

None (2): Because they are ordained by concilliar bishops. Very doubtful. Archbishop Lefebvre would always conditionally ordain priests who were ordained in the New Rite or by bishops who were consecrated in the New Rite. Furthermore, the FSSP is a group of modernists who hate the SSPX. They accept all the false doctrine of V2. They are false traditionalists, believing in heresy but saying the True Mass.

ourladyofcovadonga (-1): Neutered priests

greenlight144000 (3): So the bishop said only a few fssp locations are okay to go to?

Willsxyz (10): The SSPX argues that the novus ordo mass cannot obligate a Catholic because of its serious deficiencies. However, the traditional mass celebrated by an Ecclesia Dei group has none of those deficiencies. So how can one claim that one is not obligated to attend holy mass on Sunday when there is a nearby traditional mass?N.B. This is not about supporting the Ecclesia Dei group in any general sense, but rather just hearing mass.

Willsxyz (4): i have been told by an SSPX priest familiar with several specific cases that priests who were ordained in the new rite who come to the SSPX are conditionally ordained at their own request. That is, if they do not wish to be conditionally ordained, then they are not. However most do so wish.Since you have made the claim that new rite ordinations are “very doubtful” — thus claiming that Pope Francis, for example, is “very doubtfully” the Pope — I think you owe it to us to provide a reference to a statement from the SSPX backing up your claim so that we can be assured that this is the considered position of the Society and not just the uninformed personal opinion of “NkdGuy\\_101”.

Willsxyz (5): FSSP priests most likely do sometimes constrain their publicly spoken opinions so as not to “rock the boat”. But does this eliminate the obligation to hear mass on Sunday and other holy days? If so, what is the rational and intellectual argument for the elimination of the obligation?

No\_Construction5455 (3): Yup, two locations in Northern VA. That is after he said priests could offer the TLM outside of the parish, in other word in a location different from the church. He then removed that and said that the only locations for the TLM would be the two I mentioned.

asimovsdog (2): > So how can one claim that one is not obligated to attend holy mass on Sunday when there is a nearby traditional mass?Because it's about the faith, not about the Mass. You can go to heave without the Mass, but not without the faith. The FSSP signs off on ecumenism, but keeps the TLM "pro forma". The justification is not because of "deficiencies", the justification is because of the silent support of heresy signed off by the FSSP priests.Supporting the FSSP / indult in any way is an evil act, because of the silent support for its heresy and it's just prolonging the crisis. Going to Mass is a good act, supporting heresy is an evil act. A Catholic principle is that the end does not justify the means, so therefore it is better to sanctify the Sunday in other ways rather than to pound Canon Law, but commit an evil act in the process.

None (2): In 1988, Lefebvre wrote the following letter to a “Mr Wilson”, evidently answering another letter about conditional ordinations for priests ordained in the new rites:I agree with your desire to reordain conditionally these priests, and I have done this reordination many times. All sacraments from the modernists bishops or priests are doubtfull now. The changes are increasing and their intentions are no more Catholics. We are in the time of great apostasy. We need more and more bishops and priests very catholics. It is necessary everywhere in the world.7 (Typos in original.)

asimovsdog (1): > Since you have made the claim that new rite ordinations are “very doubtful” — thus claiming that Pope Francis, for example, is “very doubtfully” the Pope — I think you owe it to us to provide a reference to a statement from the SSPX backing up your claim so that we can be assured that this is the considered position of the Society and not just the uninformed personal opinion of “NkdGuy\_101”.It's on the sspxasia site, Google helps: https://www.sspxasia.com/Newsletters/1998/December/Priestly-Ordinations-New-Vs-Old-Rite.htm - archive: https://archive.is/EZAjDSame thing for the rite of old / new bishop consecration.

asimovsdog (1): > But does this eliminate the obligation to hear mass on Sunday and other holy days?Nobody can be obligated by the Church to commit an evil act and supporting the FSSP is definitely an evil act, because going to their Masses means you silently support them signing off on the heresies of VII.

ourladyofcovadonga (0): Those compromised priests might endanger someone's faith because of their loyalty to modernist Rome. You can make your day holy in other ways. When there is danger to the faith, you're not obligated to go. Also, fssp priest ordination is dubious. Again, not worth the risk.

Willsxyz (2): In all of the SSPX webpages I have found, it's about the Mass. Here are a few. They argue that one has no obligation to attend a novus ordo mass and should not do so, because the novus ordo mass is deficient and its deficiency makes it a danger to faith: [https://sspx.org/en/must-catholics-attend-new-mass-30441](https://sspx.org/en/must-catholics-attend-new-mass-30441)[https://sspxpodcast.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Episode-25.pdf](https://sspxpodcast.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Episode-25.pdf)Additionally, on this webpage (which by the way, quite clearly states that it is not an official statement of the SSPX), an SSPX priest says that, although he can very clearly and without hesitation advise the faithful to stay away from novus ordo masses, he cannot do the same about non-SSPX traditional masses. He says, rather: "it depends".[https://sspx.org/en/news/father-should-i-attend-mass-advice-attending-non-sspx-latin-masses-26188](https://sspx.org/en/news/father-should-i-attend-mass-advice-attending-non-sspx-latin-masses-26188) Finally, I would argue that hearing mass is not the same as supporting the priest or the group that the priest represents. For example, there are some SSPX resistance supporters who do not like the SSPX and do not want to support the SSPX, but nonetheless attend SSPX masses because they have no other option.I would appreciate it if you could provide a web resource from the SSPX that supports your assertion that Catholics may never (or should never) attend a traditional mass celebrated by a member of an Ecclesia Dei group. So far, I haven't found one.

Willsxyz (1): Thanks for the link. This page, however, does not claim that novus ordo ordinations are doubtful. It claims that they would be doubtful IF the ordaining bishop did not have an intention to ordain a Catholic priest, but instead rather to ordain a "simple preacher".

asimovsdog (1): > He says, rather: "it depends".Yes, Fr. Robinson is known to be a liberal. He got flak for that from Resistance priests for exactly that reason: https://archive.is/khAsKThe direction of Lefevbre was pretty clear on the FSSP:> Thus those who were with us and were working with us for the rights of Our Lord, for the salvation of souls, are now saying, “So long as they grant us the old Mass, we can shake hands with Rome, no problem.” But we are seeing how it works out. They are in an impossible situation. Impossible. One cannot both shake hands with modernists and keep following Tradition. Not possible. Not possible. Now, stay in touch with them to bring them back, to convert them to Tradition, yes, if you like, that’s the right kind of ecumenism! But give the impression that after all one almost regrets any break, that one likes talking to them? No way! These are people who call us corpse-like Traditionalists, they are saying that we are as rigid as corpses, ours is not a living Tradition, we are glum-faced, ours is a glum Tradition! Unbelievable! Unimaginable! What kind of relations can you have with people like that?> This is what causes us a problem with certain layfolk, who are very nice, very good people, all for the Society, who accepted the Consecrations, but who have a kind of deep-down regret that they are no longer with the people they used to be with, people who did not accept the Consecrations and who are now against us. “It’s a pity we are divided”, they say, “why not meet up with them? Let’s go and have a drink together, reach out a hand to them” – that’s a betrayal! Those saying this give the impression that at the drop of a hat they would cross over and join those who left us. They must make up their minds. We cannot compromise.”> – Archbishop Lefebvre’s address to his priests, September 6, 1990If the Fr. Robinson and the neo-SSPX don't want to preach the position of its founder anymore or put this quote on their website (so stop asking me to cite from the neo-SSPX website please), that's their choice. I stick to what Lefevbre said one year before his death, because it makes sense.> I would argue that hearing mass is not the same as supporting the priest or the group that the priest representsOn a personal-conscience level, the priest might not agree to Vatican II, but an FSSP priest at least formally signs that he is perfectly okay with material heresy. Add onto that the doubt about ordinations in the New Rite, bi-ritualism in the FSSP, etc. And if you take "communion" from such a priest (while knowing that he is okay with heresy), what does that make you in your Last Judgement?The case with the Resistance members going to SSPX Masses is a bit of a false equivalent, because the SSPX has at least formally not signed off on heresy yet. The Resistance argument is that the SSPX is "drifting" in that direction and is therefore equal in "shaking hands with Modernists" to the FSSP already. Some Resistance priests like Fr. Hewko, also advise to avoid the SSPX Masses, for that exact reason. But in difference to the FSSP there is not a "clear-as-day" indication as there is with the "full communion" aka Ecclesia Dei communities (all "full communion" communities have to SIGN IN WRITING that they fully accept Vatican II). With the neo-SSPX there is always plausible deniability as the change was more subtle.I personally support Fr. Hewko in his opinion, because over the course of the last year the shift at my local parish got very obvious (my priest is a complete liberal, I can't trust him with my soul), but it's not as clear everywhere that "the SSPX is lost". Formally, the SSPX will certainly tell you otherwise, that they're still fighting. The FSSP will not tell you that, as they are "in communion" with modernist Rome and not fighting anything.

asimovsdog (1): > It claims that they would be doubtful IF the ordaining bishop did not have an intention to ordain a Catholic priest, but instead rather to ordain a "simple preacher".It doesn't claim that. It claims:> It claims that they would be INVALID if the ordaining bishop did not have an intention to ordain a Catholic priest, but instead rather to ordain a "simple preacher".See the error? The doubt already is the fact that it "can be invalid or not". This doubt comes from the fact that we cannot look into the bishops heart, which is why even Novus Ordo ordained priests themselves ask to be re-consecrated, despite the fact that they might already be validly consecrated priests. There is "doubt" due to the rite, because with the new rite we cannot to 100% certainty know what the bishop intented, did he intend to create a priest or a preacher? That is what the word "doubtful" means.Also, try and tell the lay faithful that they need to check every single priest, every single bishop, etc. In the old rite there was no doubt, in the new rite there is doubt. The SSPX used to require conditional re-ordination (at least up until their sellout in 2012 AFAIK).

Willsxyz (1): Ok. Thanks for your explanation.

# Post 319: Does anyone else kiss the priest's hand?

Author: MaterMisericordiae23

Score: 18

Comments: 15

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1il7a15/does\_anyone\_else\_kiss\_the\_priests\_hand/

Every time I shake the hand of the priest for the first time as a greeting or the last time before I go, I always kiss his hand.I don't view my priest as "any other guy" and I see him as my mediator and healer. His hands are consecrated and he gets to touch the same God who created me and died for my sins.Whenever I kiss the priest's hand, my love and devotion to the Holy Eucharist simply increase.

GYEvanID (8): It is preferred in Indonesian customs, especially within the >! Former Muslim families !< , because it is considered honorable to do so towards the higher ones.

None (5): I know that this is a good thing to do but there isn't really an opportunity to do it with my priest. You would have to pull his hand towards you or something so I'm not going to bother

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (10): Depends on the culture really. Most priests I know (Western priests in western countries) would definitely rather people did not.

None (3): It's the women who mostly do it in my case, I've only seen one man do it. Men go straight for the handshake.

dbaughmen (5): Indeed! This custom should be seen more often, as it is in the Mass. I love that you do this! God bless

kawaqcosta (2): This is common here in Brazil. I have been doing this since I started asking for the blessing of priests in the Novus Ordo. In fact, it was also common to ask for the blessing of parents.

hardeho (-3): And people think Trads are weird.

MaterMisericordiae23 (8): Interesting, most priests I've met accept my hand kissing graciously. I notice tho that the anti-hand kissing potentially comes from a Protestant mindset of the West cuz Protestants simply view their pastors as an ordinary guy, like a buddy

MaterMisericordiae23 (4): I started the trend in my circle of TLM-going friends and it was pretty nice to see us one by one kissing the priest's hand when we greet him after Mass. It's like children greeting their father. In this case, our spiritual father

ourladyofcovadonga (6): It's a traditional custom. Nothing weird about it unless you have a perverted, sick brain

MaterMisericordiae23 (10): Eating the Body, Blood, Soul and Divinity of Jesus Christ is already weird for non-Catholics. So I could care less what the world thinks :)

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (0): Not in most of the world. I know many priests would consider it very strange.

Duibhlinn (2): Most priests in the world consider it strange to receive the Eucharist kneeling and/or on the tongue, the barometer of what "many" modern priests consider to be strange is at this point almost irrelevant to what is good or bad.

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (0): Fair but I think most traditional priests (or at least within my experience, so let's western priests in western countries) would be quite taken aback and would prefer less ceremony and formality.

Duibhlinn (2): What they want does not actually matter. It's a sign of respect for their office, not for them personally as men.

# Post 320: His Excellency Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre on the rights of truth and error

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 19

Comments: 0

URL: https://i.redd.it/eej066lfkzhe1.jpeg

# Post 321: Prayer request

Author: None

Score: 12

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ik6h48/prayer\_request/

Hello, can someone please pray for me I’m a Sedevacantist, but I keep thinking about the SSPX. I want to be part of the true Catholic faith thank you God bless you all

dbaughmen (5): God bless you! As a sort of not-staunch almost SSPX sede, I pray that God leads you to Truth. The SSPX has many great qualities

None (1): As an SSPX convinced parishioner, I offer you my prayers! If you wanna talk about it I'm available!

None (2): Hello thank you so much!

None (1): Hello thank you God bless you :)

# Post 322: BREAKING: A man, reportedly Romanian, broke through barriers at the Vatican today and kicked the candles and altar cloths off the high altar. Footage was posted earlier today on social media. | Michael Haynes

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 4

Comments: 2

URL: https://x.com/MLJHaynes/status/1887951807982583901

GYEvanID (2): Should we do the 54-day Rosary Novena Crusade for \*that incident?\*

dbaughmen (-6): Well… I hope he kicked off Pachamama’s witchcraft too. The Basilica needs some exorcising

# Post 323: Flavigny: Taking of the Cassock – February 2, 2025: 24 seminarians receive the cassock (20 Frenchmen, 1 Spaniard, 1 Englishman, 1 Swiss & 1 Lebanese) | Holy Cure of Ars International Seminary, Society of Saint Pius X

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 6

Comments: 0

URL: https://fsspx.news/en/news/flavigny-taking-cassock-february-2-2025-50460

# Post 324: A Benedictine Monastery Reconnects to the Society of Saint Pius X | FSSPX News

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 6

Comments: 0

URL: https://fsspx.news/en/news/benedictine-monastery-reconnects-society-saint-pius-x-50372

# Post 325: Tridentine Mass vs Novus Ordo...Which one is considered to be more "authentic"?

Author: None

Score: 7

Comments: 8

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1igj02k/tridentine\_mass\_vs\_novus\_ordowhich\_one\_is/

Hi there!The second post this day...Wow:)So, I am debating with my friend who is a devout Catholic ( call him Bob ). Bob is a "Traditionalist", however, strongly vouches for an Ordinary form of Mass. My journey to Catholicism started with attending a low mass. I just fell in love with the Tridentine Mass after attending the Sung Mass!Bob and I were discussing what would be different if V2 hadn't ever happened. He said that " the problems with laity would persist...". He also added that Latin is not that easy( seriously???)...And then I brought up an infamous argument of similarities between the NO and Lutheran Service. He objected and said that the Tridentine Mass was a product of counter reformation and NO is closer to the very early traditional form of the Mass in this case...So here is my question...IS NO actually close to the early form of worship or is it just a made up thing?Could you recommend any good resources to refute this?Thanks and God bless!

PaxBonaFide (8): Here’s the thing, even if the NO WAS more similar to the worship of the early church, to say we therefore must return to it would be to reject the development of doctrine, and would commit the heresy of false-antiquarianism

No-Test6158 (13): Even though he was a sede, Fr Anthony Cekada's book \*"Work of Human Hands"\* is considered an excellent resource on this matter.There are elements of the Novus Ordo that are from the traditions of the church - the inclusion of the "Bidding prayers" for example, is something that would have been fairly normal in the pre-counter reformation church. But it's more a matter of what the New Mass removes that is of concern than what the New Mass has.Elements like the Offertory were radically altered to \*de-emphasise\* (because Bugnini knew that he couldn't outright deny) the sacrificial quality of the Mass. The prayers at the foot of the altar and the introit were removed entirely, the collects were changed to de-emphasise things that were \*"too Catholic"\*. The Offertory verse was suppressed outright. The Offertory was changed to remove references to transubstantiation and the sacrificial quality. The prayer to the Holy Trinity over the gifts was removed. The Canon was outright vandalised. The Canon is the oldest and singularly untouched part of the Mass. It was common to all expressions of the Roman Rite. It has its origins in the very words of St Peter. To reform it to be 4 "Eucharistic Prayers" really does damage the sacredness of this point of the Mass. This is a clear departure from the ancient practices of the church. The communion verse was re-branded as the "communion song" and the post-communion became almost part of the dismissal.In terms of ceremonial, the new missal is a stark departure from what went before. The most striking is the shift from Ad Orientem to Versus Populum. Yes, the New Mass can be said, in Latin, Ad Orientem but that doesn't make it any better. Vestments like the maniple, the cincture and the amice were suppressed. Even really small things like the stole were reformed. In the pre-62 rites, a priest crossed his stole. Only a bishop was entitled to wear it straight down. The number of signs of the cross were radically reduced. The priest makes the sign of the cross 52 times in the 62 Missal. He makes it far fewer times in the 1970 reformed missal. The Gloria Patri isn't present in the new mass so there is no reverence at this point. The priest makes no bows at any of the Holy Names. The ringing of bells only occurs at the epiklesis and the elevation. The second Confiteor is suppressed. The Kyrie is now a back and forth and not a 3 fold reflection of church teaching. The priest and the people confess together (misereatur nostri vs. vestri/tui in the old Mass). The Domine Non Sum is only recited once. And the priest no longer strikes his breast at the Agnus, the Nobis Quoque or the Domine Non Sum.It is also a false flag to declare the Missal of Pius V as a \*"creation"\* of the counter reformation. All Pius V did was formally codify the Roman Rite to ensure more unity in the church. But if one attended a Sarum Use Mass or a Dominican Use or even an Ambrosian, one would find they would all be strikingly similar - because they share a common origin. Pius V declared in Quo Primum that any liturgy with an origin of greater than 200 years prior to the Council of Trent could continue. He was actively suppressing the new forms of "Mass" that were emerging during the reformation that denied key Catholic teachings.So, no, the new-mass is not a return to ancient liturgical customs. It is an entirely new creation entirely. It apes the traditional mass, but it cannot be considered a worthy change or anything to be proud of. It is valid, but validity is not the mark of quality. The position of the SSPX is that it is valid, but spiritually and intellectually deficient and that it poses a grave risk to the faith. I'd like to think that these fruits are coming forth and the SSPX are being thoroughly vindicated. Especially with research suggested 4/5s of Catholics do not believe in transubstantiation.In terms of reading, alongside Cekada's aforementioned work, I'd also recommend Fr Adrian Fortescue's \*"The Mass: A Study of the Roman Liturgy"\* which gives a stirling overview of the development of the Roman Mass over the centuries.

found-0717 (4): Read the church father’s description of the mass. St Ignatius of Antioch, st Justin martyr. A book is recommend is “the mass of the early Christian’s”

realdenvercoder (1): We all used to poop in diapers. Doesn’t mean I wanna go back to doing that. 🤷♂️

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): The organic developments of Liturgy mustn't be thrown out because they've stood the test of time. They've run the various gauntlets.An experimental mix of Liturgical practices isn't necessarily good because of where they got taken from or just because the bishop has given permission.Our clergy are supposed to be guardians of tradition, not DJs mixing together trendy, catchy showpieces.

Willsxyz (8): I will add to this excellent response the fact that the Second Vatican Council did NOT ask for the novus ordo Mass. It's quite easy to take the 1962 missal, apply the changes asked for in Sacrosanctum Concilium and see what you get -- it isn't the novus ordo.Also, your friend "Bob" is tilting at windmills when he says it's not easy to learn Latin. No layman has to learn Latin to understand what is going on at Mass. It is not hard to learn to follow along with a hand missal, and even if you don't want to do that, it doesn't take much experience to figure out what it going on at various times in the Mass.Having said that, however, even though the Second Vatican Council explicitly asked for Latin to be retained in the Mass, the change to the vernacular language is actually the least objectionable of all the changes made in the novus ordo Mass. All of the serious deficiencies of the new Mass would be completely eliminated if we just celebrated the traditional Mass in English or some other vernacular instead.

None (3): Quite an elegant write-up.

No-Test6158 (6): >the change to the vernacular language is actually the least objectionable of all the changes made in the novus ordo Mass.This is it, hitting the nail squarely on the head. If they had simply translated the Old Mass into the Vernacular it would not have been such a problem. It was because the Mass which had held the same form (even if little things within it had changed - the general \*sensum\* was consistent) was suddenly, and dramatically changed. It didn't even resemble that which went before it.Priests were now given options and instructed to use them that they had never been formed to use. I can't imagine how bewildering that must've felt and no wonder so many priests left the priesthood in the 70s.

# Post 326: So in 2012 when Bp Fellay was wrapping up negotiations with Rome, why didn’t the SSPX end up reconciling?

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 14

Comments: 13

URL: https://i.redd.it/b8h8svgktsge1.jpeg

GYEvanID (14): Because Rome broke the promise before the deal was even signed. Archbishop Lefebvre (RIP) was right on that issue and so does Bishop Williamson (RIP).

AtaturkIsAKaffir (12): Because it is impossible to “reconcile” when we have two competing positions. We can only “reconcile” with a Rome that renounces the heresy of Vatican 2 and accepts that it is a substantial deviation from the faith Our Lord delivered to us.It was always our unbreakable condition, and Rome only ever enter “dialogue” with us because they think they can convince us to accept V2

Huge-Explanation-358 (5): Oh boy

kawaqcosta (5): "Reconciliation" with Rome was not possible because the minimum condition required by the SSPX, which was to maintain our positions regarding Vatican II and the New Mass, was not accepted. Rome requires the full acceptance of these things for there to be a canonical regularization.The SSPX does not require Rome to convert entirely for an agreement to be reached between us, only that it accept us as we are (although such a conversion would be highly desirable and, undoubtedly, for Rome to accept us, there must be at least a principle of conversion). This is what distinguishes us from the Resistance.There is an excellent article by Fr. Paul Robinson on this: [The SSPX and the Conversion of Rome to Tradition | FSSPX News](https://fsspx.news/en/news/sspx-and-conversion-rome-tradition-17117)

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (5): What is there to reconcile?I remember a sedevacantist web comic from the 00s. it had Fellay on the phone with the Pope. Fellay says, "OK. We'll accept Vatican II of you agree to accept the rest of the Church's councils... Hello? ...Hello?"It's not an accurate portrayal of the SSPX position on Vatican 2, but it portrays the politics with the Vatican pretty well.

None (10): Stupid to think that you need to "reconcile" with a Rome that doesn't even hold the Catholic Faith. I agree with Bp. Williamson's position on Fellay and the whole "reconciliation"

LucasLoboFerr (2): I see that a part of the members of reddit SSPX aren't actually SSPX's faithful.

None (3): Unity, yes, but in doctrine. Today we speak about unity all day, yet we've never been so divided: there is one Christ, there is one Church, there is one Faith, this should be our unity. The Vatican was asking for doctrinal compromission, and this is non negociable.

dbaughmen (1): What was the deal??

dbaughmen (3): Amen

Willsxyz (4): It doesn't hurt to talk. But it would be a mistake to trust any promises made, especially given the fact that the next pope elected could just suppress you.

dbaughmen (2): ? I attend an SSPX chapel, serve at one, making me an SSPX faithful?

GYEvanID (7): End the debate about Vatican II and its application within SSPX.

# Post 327: St Thomas Aquinas Seminary Candlemas: Seminarians take their cassock and receive clerical tonsure, please pray for them as they enter the Clerical state!

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 27

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/gallery/1ig8s5p

No\_Construction5455 (6): Deus Vult! Nobis Domine, nobis, sed nomini your da gloriam Nobis Domine, nobis, sed nomini your da gloriam

# Post 328: Not attending the Mass( Ordinary Form) on Sunday due to weather conditions

Author: None

Score: 8

Comments: 8

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ig2k13/not\_attending\_the\_mass\_ordinary\_form\_on\_sunday/

Hi there!I qm hoping this posy is not gonna be deleted:) We have snow here on the island in BC, Canada. My vehicle is not adequately prepaired for the winter ride. So, I did not make to the NO mass today( the only mass available localy). Instead, I came back home and read the Latin Mass, read the cermon for today. Still feel guilt for not attending the mass though. I did not attend the Mass a couple of weeks ago because I had to deal with some legal issues( thanks to our bylaws and governement)....In case of uncontrolled circumstances and consequent inability to attend the mass( even ordinary form), would it suffice to stay home and read the mass/pray yourself yo fullfill the obligation?PS. I am converting and not a Catholic yet( and strongly gravitating towards the traditional form)Thanks for reading and God bless!

Pale-Roof9278 (3): https://youtu.be/gyH0DZaY5vo?feature=sharedThis may lean towards a radical viewpoint but we are never obligated due to conditions outside of our control (like Canadian winters) to put ourselves in mortal or spiritual danger to attend mass. My take away is even if the NO would have it that the obligation is fully dispensed by poor weather or health keeping the sabbath on our own is always the dutiful path. Certainly there were (months) during 2020 and sporadically since this remained the only option in light of demonic circumstances blockading our reasonable passage to communal celebration of the Holy Eucharist.

CathMode (3): We lived in your region until 2023. Just saying hello and God bless you in your journey. No guilt if you can’t make it to mass for external reasons.

None (2): The Novus Ordo is not a Catholic Mass, it is a humanist service as it is based on people. It is not the way that God wants to be worshiped and we can doubt that the men saying this 'Mass' are even validly ordained priests.For the sake of your own soul, I would avoid the Novus Ordo like the plague.Is there any SSPX churches near you at all? If there isn't, I would strongly advise moving where there is one if you are serious about converting to the Catholic Faith.

dbaughmen (3): Well, the Ordinary/Extraordinary form is not a good distinction that Benedict XVI made. When I have heard and spoken too SSPX, they tell me that if only the NO is available, one should not go and simply do what you did and listen to a sermon and all of that. So don’t feel any guilt!! You’re not obliged to attend the NO.God bless!

BleuBoy777 (1): Flagilate yourself repeatedly. This is a grave offense

CathMode (1): P.S. but yes, keep the day holy. Good idea to do the readings, pray, as you did.

None (1): Here is a list of all of the SSPX chapels in Canada:[https://sspx.ca/en/list-sspx-chapels-4](https://sspx.ca/en/list-sspx-chapels-4)

BleuBoy777 (1): Yes.... Quit your job ... Leave your family .. But dear God, find an sspx near you ...or else

# Post 329: How can we strive to communion with apostates (IF YOUR SEDE DO NOT ANSWER!!)

Author: None

Score: 3

Comments: 8

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ifh6sp/how\_can\_we\_strive\_to\_communion\_with\_apostates\_if/

PaxBonaFide (5): If you want to commune with the true Rome go to SSPX chapel

Breifne21 (5): Who are the apostates you mention?It surely cannot mean Rome & the Holy Father since to make such a comment would imply we are not in communion with Rome and the Holy Father.

adveniatpermariam (1): lol

dbaughmen (0): um

dbaughmen (1): This ^

None (1): Lefebrve said rome is in apostasy

Breifne21 (9): There are apostates amongst the hierarchy, and the purity and glory of Holy Mother Church is disfigured and veiled at this moment by modernism.However, Rome remains and ever will remain, the heart of the faith. To willfully seperate ourselves from the Holy Father is nothing less than apostasy itself. We do not possess the capacity to judge definitively on the matter, so, for now, we must content ourselves to rely entirely on the purity and soundness of Catholic doctrine and dogma.We disobey only where we must.

SnowWhiteFeather (2): We disobey only what is illicit.

# Post 330: Is Rome in apostasy?

Author: None

Score: 12

Comments: 19

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1iesa55/is\_rome\_in\_apostasy/

PaxBonaFide (5): 👍

dbaughmen (2): Yes most definitely, the Abp emphasised this greatly.

adveniatpermariam (1): Yes.

Huge-Explanation-358 (1): Yes. And yes it's still Rome. If you're gonna ask as you did on other comments: Praying. Teaching the Truth and condemning the error. If they're teaching 1% of the Truth, SSPX will be in communion with this 1%. Always aiming for the end of the crisis within the church. Always obeying when it's not against the Faith.

None (1): how can we strive to communion with them?

None (1): how can we strive to communion with them?

None (1): how can we strive to communion with them?

None (1): Thank you!

dbaughmen (-1): We can’t, the Archbishop said we can’t. However Bp Fellay says otherwise

adveniatpermariam (1): We should not. Why would we srive for communion with apostates?

None (2): so your sspx mc

None (1): the SSPX does.

Duibhlinn (1): He's a sedevacantist

dbaughmen (-2): No im not, but its common sense

adveniatpermariam (1): Bishop Fellay does. Most of the SSPX doesn't. Again, why would they

ComparisonRoutine359 (1): your sspx mc right

adveniatpermariam (0): Sede

None (3): why are you answering this

adveniatpermariam (0): A question was asked twice and i gave an answer twice. 😊 although i don’t agree with the position of the sspx, i admire their determination to preserve the true Catholic faith and teaching. And i would be very sad if they join communion with the novus ordo.

# Post 331: Communiqué from the General House: Passing of Bishop Richard Williamson | FSSPX News

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 12

Comments: 2

URL: https://fsspx.news/en/news/communique-general-house-50222

Duibhlinn (9): # Communiqué from the General House>\*\*\*Passing of Bishop Richard Williamson\*\*\*>\*We learn with deep sorrow that Bishop Richard Williamson has been called to God yesterday, 29 January 2025, at 11.23pm.\*>\*Following a cerebral hemorrhage, he was rushed to hospital on the evening of January 24, after having received extreme unction. He was 84 years old, having been born on March 8, 1940.\*>\*Ordained to the priesthood by Archbishop Lefebvre on June 29, 1976, he taught at the seminary in Weissbad for a year, then at Écône for five years. After a year as vice rector in Ridgefield, he directed the seminary in the United States for twenty years, then in Argentina for six, before retiring to England.\*>\*Consecrated bishop on June 30, 1988, he also served as the Society’s second Assistant General between 1988 and 1994.\*>\*Sadly, his path and that of the Society separated many years ago.\*>\*We recommend the eternal rest of his soul to your fervent prayers.\*>\*R.I.P.\*

GYEvanID (4): >\*Sadly, his path and that of the Society separated many years ago.\*Almost 13 years, if I recalled my memory correctly, right?Within those years, four bishops (excluding Michal Stobnicki, with doubtful legitimacy) were consecrated by +Williamson, as well as Archbishop Carlo Maria Vigano was conditionally re-consecrated.

# Post 332: Bishop Richard Williamson died tonight at 11.23pm GMT. His final agony was only a matter of minutes.

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 70
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URL: https://i.redd.it/1k4p9ckct0ge1.jpeg

fridericvs (11): Will he be buried at Econe?

GYEvanID (9): Requiem aeternam dona ei, Domine.et Lux perpetua luceat ei.

ourladyofcovadonga (7): RIP to a real one

Pale-Roof9278 (14): Eternal rest grant unto them O Lord, and let perpetual light shine onto them.

latkd (7): A true giant. RIP ❤️🕊️🙏

HMX5000 (6): 🙏🙏🙏

merinw (7): 🥲 🙏 ❤️

himalayancandlepower (7): 🙏❤️

lars83norway (7): It's so over. He was the best...💔😓

BleuBoy777 (1): Does this mean I can watch the sound of music again?

dbaughmen (7): God willing.

PatriciusIlle (3): Are you kidding? He didn't die as a member of the SSPX. I think a burial at Ecône is very unlikely.

How-re\_ya\_Mate (0): Unto thine?(I think you mean).

None (0): Eternal rest grant unto THEM, Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon THEM. In this case you would replace them with him.Know your Catholic prayers!

How-re\_ya\_Mate (2): 15 Decades.That's what we were all asked to do.

How-re\_ya\_Mate (0): and yes.(Evil does exist).His Excellency (if I may say), was correct on much.On a plethora of topics;I don't think he accurately knew how bad it really was/is.

dbaughmen (1): Haha. No. Bishop Sanborn is still alive

Pale-Roof9278 (3): Edited

Pale-Roof9278 (2): I’m not sure why this is turning into a legalist argument over offering prayers for the repose of a soul of a gratefully departed servant of God. 🤷🏻♂️

lars83norway (3): He was absolutely right about everything. People are grieving. Don't say negative things about him please... Pray Rosary for him

BleuBoy777 (1): Dang it....

rmlenz (8): Wellcome to the catholic internet

None (0): Its not, I just think that every Catholic should know that prayer

Piklikl (2): He absolutely wasn’t right about everything, unfortunately he let his pride run the show in the latter days. He desperately needs our prayers for sure.

dbaughmen (1): Soon!!!!

lars83norway (2): It's funny. I know what he was like, I don't need someone's opinion, especially a false one, in such a sad period

Piklikl (0): What on earth is funny about this matter? You’re pushing this clearly false narrative that His Excellency was somehow this perfect shining example of a cleric when he was obviously deeply flawed. On top of it, you’re weaponizing his death as an excuse to shy away from the truth and instead whitewash all over his failings which I am very concerned would have the effect of diminishing the prayers he very much needs.

lars83norway (1): Leave me alone. We have different views on his teachings and his personality. I am not here to argue. And I don't use his personality, all I've been doing these days is trying to ask people to pray and keep them updated. And you start arguing and want to prove to me that he is bad? I have my own opinion about him. And yours does not interest me.

lars83norway (1): And I didn't make his personality perfect, I just hate guys like you who, while a person is dying or dead, you start talking badly about him and try to prove that he was bad. What is this for??? The situation is different now, calm down. Maybe you have the conscience to leave this? Unlike you, I do not insult or talk bad about Fellay or others

InterestingMemory911 (1): The man just died are u kidding me ur a joke who’s opinion on his excellency is irrelevant at this time

Piklikl (1): If anything being reminded of the grave situation he was in is even more relevant. Given the suddenness of his decline we don’t know if he had time to repent of his very public and very wrong decisions.

InterestingMemory911 (1): What wrong decisions may I ask?

InterestingMemory911 (1): Just because u may feel in ur heart that his opinions were wrong that’s fine but his opinions had a lot of truth to them… and he has brought many people closer to the church and the faith so may god bless him and give him his eternal reward

Piklikl (1): First and foremost letting his pride lead him to insubordination to his lawful superior, as well as encouraging others to follow the same path. While some might say that’s exactly what the Archbishop did, they insult the effort that the Archbishop went to in never insulting and demeaning his lawful superiors. Bishop Williamson did not hesitate to become nasty and publicly insult his lawful superiors once he was expelled. The Archbishop was pained to be forced to part ways with Rome and constantly sought to repair things (to this day the SSPX continues this attempt), Bishop Williamson seemed glad to be rid of the SSPX and to my knowledge never attempted to repair things.Next the most egregious act was his rampant, unwarranted episcopal consecrations, making just about any unhinged cleric a so called bishop. Again some might say that’s what the Archbishop did, and yet the Archbishop made it quite clear the amount of vetting (obviously not enough) that went into the candidates, as well as the extreme state of necessity for the SSPX’s episcopal consecrations. Bishop Williamson never bothered to make that clear, just treating the rumor mill as infallible and making anyone who asked into a bishop.These are all public and well known things, frankly it’s scandalous that so many people want to forget simply because he gave a rousing sermon they happened to hear in the 90’s and that somehow makes him a saint. He let his pride get to him in the end, and never seemed to recover, and that’s why he needs our prayers.

Piklikl (0): For every person he brought to the Faith, it’s sad to say he probably drove 2 more away.It has nothing to do with what I feel in my heart or what my opinion is, the objective facts speak for themselves. He left this world in a precarious state and he needs all the prayers for it.

# Post 333: Does anybody have any info or tips on how to visit Econe for the day?

Author: dbaughmen
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Comments: 8

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ibvh5e/does\_anybody\_have\_any\_info\_or\_tips\_on\_how\_to/

I was thinking of attending mass there on a Sunday

Piklikl (2): I've emailed them in the past to ask about visiting and they we very helpful in their responses (I ended up not making the trip over).

Jacques230 (2): Call the phone number

dbaughmen (1): Thank you!! Did you correspond in French?

dbaughmen (1): My French isn’t enough to get by

Piklikl (2): Nope, English! They're Swiss, they speak all the major European languages.

BrodyJerome (-2): Then you can't visit Écône

dbaughmen (1): Amazing! Did they offer you a tour of the whole place?

Piklikl (1): We didn't correspond long enough for me to ask, but they offered to pick me up from the train station and asked how long I would be staying. Definitely worth it to reach out and ask!

# Post 334: What’s the stance on owning/using a copy of the new Ignatius Study Bible?

Author: himalayancandlepower

Score: 5

Comments: 12

URL: https://i.redd.it/5hb0pugyxnfe1.jpeg

operakitti (5): My rule of thumb is to avoid books not published by Angelus Press. Tan Books is also a good publisher, just be cautious

dbaughmen (7): The traditional Catholic standard is the Douay-Rheims version of the Bible. I don’t know much about Ignatius Bibles, but if they don’t use that I wouldn’t use it.It is a modern commentary too, and I personally do not like to use anything modern, unless it is by a Traditional priest specifically.

BertBlyleven (2): Not sure on the commentary within the Ignatius study bible, but I haven't heard any serious criticism of the RSV-2CE from Catholics. It's a Greek translation as opposed to the DR which is a Latin vulgate translation. It's the translation used by Byzantine Catholics, Ordinariate, and is commonly used among the Orthodox. I don't say that to give credence to schsimatics, but only to show that the Greeks do not find issue with the text as a Greek translation.A lot of trads will treat it as some kind of boogeyman bad thing since it isn't the DR, or will not recommend it because it is "modern," but beyond that have little to say. I have read and use both and would recommend either. I haven't heard a position of the SSPX on it, but the SSPX generally doesn't get too in the weeds when it comes to scriptural translations other than just recommending the DR.Read about it here: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Revised\\_Standard\\_Version\\_Catholic\\_Edition](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Revised\_Standard\_Version\_Catholic\_Edition)

himalayancandlepower (0): Wish I had mentioned SSPX’s stance in my post’s request ... please and thank you☺️

himalayancandlepower (1): I’m guessing there’s no justifying my purchase, although it’s not on you to be burdened by it...just that the timing of my having pre-ordered this last year prior to it’s release in November and it coinciding with my new life attending the SSPX Mass (01 December) is separated by only a handful of weeks.Sort of wish I had learned earlier on about the weariness or disdain for Bibles outside of the Douay-Rheims, which will always be my favorite beloved. From what I’m gathering online, this IB is more conservative (I know not SSPX conservative) with regards to how Scott Hahn and Curtis Mitch built it over the past 25+ years. I’m going to guess that all of the references to the 1990s Catechism would play a big part in one steering clear of it?

himalayancandlepower (1): RSV2CE

dbaughmen (3): I don’t mean any offense!Does it mention JP2’s CCC?

himalayancandlepower (1): Yes...

himalayancandlepower (1): It can’t ALL be wrong, could it be?

Willsxyz (2): I think it is useful to have more than one type of bible around, even though I prefer the Challoner Douay-Rheims. Don't worry about it too much.

himalayancandlepower (1): Indeed, I agree. I’m unsure what to make or say of those I’ve met who may or may not go tag sale hopping to purchase non-Catholic religious literature, just to set it alight to see less books in the world smoldering ablaze. Are they doing anyone a favor? Asking for a friend.

himalayancandlepower (1): Thank you

# Post 335: Does anyone attend or know the priests of Our Lady of Angels in Arcadia, CA?

Author: dbaughmen
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ibsjzf/does\_anyone\_attend\_or\_know\_the\_priests\_of\_our/

ourladyofcovadonga (2): I've been there many times. I might be of assistance

dbaughmen (1): Do you know if the main line is the one used for sacramental emergencies? I have a relative in grave health in that area and I want to keep in contact with the priests or something just in case

ourladyofcovadonga (1): I'm not sure. I believe most parishes list the number that connects to the phone that is physically at the church. Typically the priory number is listed in the church bulletin for sacramental emergencies. I would call and ask for the number to the priory. The priests there will help you 100%

ourladyofcovadonga (1): If you are unable to reach them let me know. I can get the number for the priory from one of the priests

dbaughmen (1): Thank you very much! Could you possibly get the number for me?

# Post 336: Has the SSPX anywhere put out any statements w/ regard to Bp Williamson?

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 21

Comments: 3

URL: https://i.redd.it/wx5mr6unumfe1.jpeg

lars83norway (3): Urgent Prayer Right Now

Piklikl (1): I doubt they would say anything. His Excellency has made it clear that he wants nothing to do with the SSPX, so the SSPX will likely honor his wishes. Perhaps in the event of his death something might be said, but I could see it going either way. His Excellency has done much harm since he left the SSPX, we should all be praying for him.

dbaughmen (4): My chapel asked for prayers for him in a very respectful manner, and my chapel is serviced by the seminary professors. However I really hope they do a requiem for him, or maybe he could even be buried at Econe as he did love the Abp.

# Post 337: Cardinal Sarah vigorously defends the traditional Mass | FSSPX News

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 15

Comments: 0

URL: https://fsspx.news/en/news/cardinal-sarah-vigorously-defends-traditional-mass-50192

# Post 338: Confused on SSPX position on attending the NO

Author: Similar\_Gap8437

Score: 5

Comments: 21

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1iaxzpo/confused\_on\_sspx\_position\_on\_attending\_the\_no/

The SSPX priests I’ve spoken to have said that it’s better to never attend the NO (other than for social functions like a wedding, funeral, etc).I’ve read various SSPX and non-SSPX commentaries on the NO about how it is a danger to the faith. That much is convincing. But I’m concerned about a few things related to this. And have a few questions and don’t really feel comfortable contacting the SSPX priests in my area. They’re just a small sample size. Do all SSPX priests say, for a catholic who understands that the NO is dangerous to the faith due to its deficiencies, and scandals, etc, that one should never attend the NO mass?What about attending a very reverently celebrated NO mass when none other is available? Would every SSPX priest discourage people from attending this? What if it’s more convenient? As an example, there’s a NO mass near the office where they celebrate mass at noon or right at the end of work that doesn’t cause scandal.What about someone who accepts that it’s dangerous, but prepares themselves, accepts the danger, and practice devotion, spiritual reading, and associating with faithful orthodox friends while still going to the NO?What about confession with a NO priest? Spiritual guidance and direction? Deliverance and exorcism? Do all SSPX priests counsel people to never seek assistance from a NO priest under any circumstances?Intellectually, the argument that the NO is dangerous, allows for or promotes heresy, is tightly connected to revolution in the Church that deserves to be publicly opposed and rejected, all of that makes sense intellectually. But then saying that one should never attend the NO under any circumstances leads to consequences that don’t quite make sense…Not all NO Catholics are faithless and impious. Many never attend the TLM but hold onto orthodoxy and practice their faith seriously. Shouldn’t traditional Catholics be encouraged to associate with them?Just because a priest has SSPX next to his name doesn’t mean he is virtuous, wise, and can help you spiritually. Many times NO priests will go the extra mile to give spiritual guidance and help in many ways. Should these NO priests just be avoided altogether? What do you do if you have SSPX priests in your area that you don’t really trust to help you in spiritual matters, but you know NO priests that you do trust? It doesn’t make sense to avoid them just because you only go to the TLM and take a traditional stance on the issues in the Church.Would all SSPX priests tell you to never seek spiritual and moral help from NO priests?I guess I’m less concerned about the intellectual reasonings behind why the NO mass should be rejected, and more concerned about the practical consequences of saying one should never attend the NO. My current thought is that if a faithful Catholic seeking the traditions and goes to the TLM exclusively and occasionally goes to the NO mass to pray and receive communion, there is nothing wrong with that. Or if one attends the TLM but goes to NO priests for counsel and sacraments, there is nothing wrong with that. But then these positions I hold seem to be contrary to what the SSPX says about never attending the NO.Thoughts? Comments? Answers?Thanks for reading through my thoughts in this long post.

None (6): Hi!It's easy from me to say because I live in France and there are TLMs everywhere, so I don't have any dilemna, but I happen to agree with the SSPX on that issue. To answer your points, it seems you're using both human arguments and doctrinal arguments.Yes, there are SSPX priests who are not virtuous, wise etc. ; there are NO Catholics who are pious and can humble us by their charity etc.However, in order to have a final judment about the NO, one needs to define what exactly is wrong with it. On the outside perspective, which is ours (the faithful), no big difference can be found between a reverent NO Mass in latin and a TLM. However, when the "Brief Critical Exam of the NO" was released, the NO they analysed was a reverent NO in latin, and they still saw major problems with it. Sure, the problems aren't easy to spot for us, but if you pay attention to the "script" and compare it to the TLM's, you'll notice the sense of sacrifice of Christ (which is the definition of Mass) is completely missing; rather, it's a vague sense of communal meal that's left. So if a priest celebrates it with a traditional mind (meaning believing the Mass is the sacrifice of Christ), it doesn't change the fact the rite is in itself uncatholic.When Luther created the lutheran "Mass", he made sure to only change very superficial looking aspects, hoping explicitly (he says it in his books) to change people's faith without them even realizing. That's a historical exampleof why us the faithful should be extremely prudent about rite.Finally, regarding the NO faithful and faith, sadly they often have a non catholic belief regarding many beliefs relating to the Christ the King dogma; most of them believe in Free Speech, in tolerance of false religions, and that false religions aren't essentially evil and that people can be saved through them, etc., and regarding the Mass many of them relativize the Catholic meaning of Mass etc., so we can see the consequences of the NO.

Ok\_Creme3233 (7): Archbishop Lefebvre says one can attend the Novus Ordo:“If one does not have the choice and if the priest celebrating Mass according to the Novus Ordo is faithful and worthy, one should not abstain from going to Mass.” -Archbishop Lefebvre, 1970This is one of many quotes where Archbishop Lefebvre recommends attending the Novus Ordo if one is unable to attend the Traditional Latin Mass. This is a position that can be endorsed. A person might believe the Traditional Latin Mass is the best expression of the Catholic faith, but if unable to attend the Traditional Latin Mass, one should seek out an orthodox Novus Ordo Mass.“Make every effort to have the Mass of St. Pius V, but if it is impossible to find one within forty kilometers and if there is a pious priest who says the New Mass in as traditional a way as possible, it is good for you to assist at it to fulfill your Sunday obligation." -Archbishop Lefebvre, 1972Once again, Archbishop Lefebvre supports the opinion that the Novus Ordo can and should be attended if no Traditional Latin Mass is available. It is important to note that currently the SSPX holds a different view. Let’s take a look.The Society as of 2024:-The Novus Ordo is intrinsically offensive to God.-The Novus Ordo is intrinsically sinful to attend.-The Novus Ordo does not fulfill one’s Sunday obligation.Archbishop Lefebvre, 1972:-There are times when the Novus Ordo Mass can be “good for you to assist at”.-The Novus Ordo is not intrinsically sinful to attend.-The Novus Ordo can fulfill one’s Sunday obligation. The Society writes this discrepancy off by explaining that Archbishop Lefebvre wanted to be cautious about condemning the Novus Ordo too soon. However, even five years later, he still was open to the possibility of assisting at the Novus Ordo:“To avoid conforming to the evolution slowly taking place in the minds of priests, we must avoid—I could almost say completely—assisting at the New Mass." -Archbishop Lefebvre, 1977Here we run into the first issue of the SSPX. They hold that the Novus Ordo is both objectively and intrinsically offensive to God. This must imply that a simple reading of the text of the Novus Ordo Mass is sufficient to definitively determine that it is a sacrilegious rite and offensive to God. However, this view does not seem to match the historical evidence. If a simple reading of the text is enough to determine its intrinsic sinfulness, why did it take Archbishop Lefebvre at least eight years to figure it out? Additionally, here Archbishop Lefebvre states he believes that the Novus Ordo can be celebrated with a totally Catholic faith.“[The Mass] is ambivalent and ambiguous because one priest can say it with a totally Catholic faith in the sacrifice, etc., and another can say it with a different intention, because the words he pronounces and the gestures he makes no longer contradict [other intentions]."-Archbishop Lefebvre, 1975Early on, Archbishop Lefebvre saw the Novus Ordo as both dangerous and ambiguous, but never as intrinsically and objectively evil, as the SSPX does today. Here is a quote from Marcel Lefebvre: A Biography that reinforces his thoughts:“When Archbishop Lefebvre was absent on a Sunday, the seminarians would go and assist at Mass together at the Bernadine convent of La Maigrauge where an old monk celebrated the New Mass in Latin.”If the Novus Ordo can be good enough for his seminarians, surely it can be good enough for us! Archbishop Lefebvre emphasized that well-trained, orthodox priests, can provide a Novus Ordo Mass that one can, and at times should, assist at. This is a striking departure from the current language of the SSPX today.However, even if the current SSPX doesn’t agree with Archbishop Lefebvre, I do. The Traditional Latin Mass is beautiful, reverent, and full of catechesis. It should be attended when possible. However, if no Traditional Latin Mass is available, one should seek out a reverent and orthodox Novus Ordo Mass to attend. By Archbishop Lefebvre’s ownmetric, this should be done if there is no Traditional Latin Mass within a mere 40 kilometers (25 miles)! That is not a very far drive. Archbishop Lefebvre says that a person should attend a orthodox Novus Ordo Mass if no Traditional Latin Mass is available. He says that this “objectively, inherently, and intrinsically offensive” Mass can, and sometimes should, be attended. There is an obvious disconnect, a break, between these words of Lefebvre and the current position of the SSPX. This should be looked at and considered seriously. Is the Novus Ordo inherently offensive to God or not? If Archbishop Lefebvre has said the Novus Ordo can be good to attend and can fulfill one’s Sunday obligation, why does the SSPX now endorse the exact opposite belief? And if the Novus Ordo is objectively, inherently, and intrinsically offensive, how could this change?

dbaughmen (5): Yes, it is possible that the people who attend the NO have the Faith, some NO priests have the Faith too. However, they are in error and attend a Mass that is a generic and faulty rite, even if it not through their fault. Sure, they can be pious, but so can Protestants and even the Orthodox.The question of the “reverent NO” commentated on by SSPX priests, put in simple terms is “lipstick on a pig.” They try to make it beautiful but the very core, the very prayers of this Mass are doctrinally deficient.As for NO confessions, only when it is absolutely necessary, maybe even danger of death. I personally would never receive guidance from a NO priest, because they simply are not trained well at all, I grew up in the NO and speak from experience.Also, yes there can be SSPX priests who are less than ideal, no one is perfect, but their Faith is whole, whilst the NO faith is not.God bless you!

Similar\_Gap8437 (1): This seems incredibly reasonable. Whereas the position to never attend the NO no matter the circumstances seems much more extreme and requires a lot more assumptions about the priest, the community, the faithful attending, etc

None (1): You're forgeting something: the crisis of the Church is so complex that even archbishop Lefebvre hesitated on many things, and sometimes he ended up changing his mind. This is even true about Vatican 2. You're implying that the SSPX betrayed archbishop Lefebvre's position, he actually changed it himself during his lifetime, the SSPX is just following his definitive thoughts.[https://sspx.org/en/what-archbishop-lefebvre-said-about-new-mass-30166](https://sspx.org/en/what-archbishop-lefebvre-said-about-new-mass-30166)

None (1): I answered this already, but I wanna ad one point; it's interesting that the SSPX is constantly accused by the resistance to be too light compared to Archbishop Lefebvre's positions; and now a new accusation would be the opposite, the SSPX would have secretly become harsher than the archbishop! I think it doesn't make sense to accuse the very structure that studies Archbishop Lefebvre not to know his position on central and essential points

Similar\_Gap8437 (0): YES!!!! This is what I was looking for!!!!! Thank you!!!!!!!!!Are there any priests in the SSPX that still secretly agree with Abp. Lefebvre’s position here, where he is serious about the dangers of the NO mass but still encourages someone to attend if they can find a faithful and orthodox priest celebrating reverently?Don’t these statements from Abp. Lefebvre vindicate the most conservative of Ecclesia Dei priests from the attacks of the SSPX on them?Why did the SSPX shift their position on this in the last couple decades? Is it out of reaction to the Ecclesia Dei communities? A frustration with the hierarchy on recognizing their ministry?

Dark-Empath- (2): Agreed. The Archbishop always comes across as having being prudent, never rushing to conclusions, always trying to give the benefit of the doubt. There is never a rush to condemn or separate, which is a hallmark of the schismatic. Rather, always at pains to do the opposite until he could not continue in good conscience.However, I’m fairly certain that I read in the early days of the Society that some officials from Rome tried to entice him to celebrate the Novus Ordo Missae, telling him that even if he would perform it just once then all the troubles for him and the Society would disappear. The good Archbishop refused. Not even once.

Ok\_Creme3233 (1): Hello! Thanks for responding. And thanks for adding the citation for the quotes I used. I realized later that I didn't include it, and wanted to do so when I got home from work. But you did it for me. Appreciate it. I suppose I have two thoughts. First, yes, I acknowledge that Lefebvre's opinion changed, or at least hardened over time. But I think my point is that SSPX holds that the NO Mass is intrinsically offensive to God, and that one could look at merely the text of the Mass to determine this. Would it really take 5+ years for Lefebvre to determine this? Was reading the text really what changed his mind, or something else? Also, from your link which you kindly included above it states at the end, "Soon, Archbishop Lefebvre would no longer tolerate participation at Masses celebrated in the new rite except passively, for example at funerals." But it doesn't offer any direct quotes from Lefebvre. It does cite the Spiritual Conferences at Econe in March and April in 1974. I can't find the text of these anywhere online. Any chance you know where one can find them? I'm curious to put his words into context and see exactly what he said. In fact, I have not been able to find ANY quotes of his directly saying that one should never attend the NO Mass. So, if you know of any of quotes of his saying that one should never attend the NO, I'd appreciate those too. Thanks!

Ok\_Creme3233 (1): I glad to hear that I helped. These discussion require a lot of wisdom and discernment. I'll pray for both of us in my rosary tonight that we can have those gifts. I feel a bit out of my comfort zone, but I'll do my best to answer the questions you posed. I don't know of any SSPX priests who would openly and publicly encourage someone to attend the NO mass, even if done reverently. That being said, I imagine that there are situations where they would hold that it is actually the best thing to do. For example, as far as I know there are no Latin Masses in Peru, so imagine this: A Peruvian family somehow stumbles across the teachings of the SSPX and decides their positions are the true ones. However, there are zero Latin Masses in their country. To simplify, they have two options: find a reverent and sacred NO mass they can attend, or never receive any more sacraments (I know they could move or something, but for this hypothetical let's just imagine that it isn't an option for whatever reason). I firmly believe that the best option for them would be to find a really good NO mass to attend and start going, to let their children receive the graces from valid sacraments, and do their best to adhere to the true orthodox faith. Similarly, if someone in prison desires to become Catholic and the only recourse to the faith they have is a NO priest. What should they do? They should seek out that NO priest and receive the sacraments. These are both extreme examples, but I would like to believe that if posed with these scenarios, that a SSPX priest would agree with these outcomes. However, I don't know if any SSPX priests would come out and say this publicly, but perhaps privately. How can we explain the shift from allowing the NO Mass at certain times to it now being offensive to God? I don't have an answer. But, here is my theory. As time went on Lefebvre did become harsher toward the NO Mass, and I can hardly blame him. There were more and more abuses going on. More and more reports of priests doing crazy things. Sacrilege. Blasphemy. Irreverence galore. And in this age before the internet, the lay people were left to their own devices. Largely, they didn't have access to church documents, and they couldn't look online to see if their priest was the right thing or not. They were completely left on their own, unless they just happened to have books to help them look up orthodoxy. Did their priest slyly teach heresy from the pulpit, how were they to know? In this type of circumstance, yeah, swearing off all NO Masses might be the best thing to do. Lefebvre saw the way the tide was flowing, the Masses were getting worse, and who knows when it would stop. His position, and the position of the SSPX, as a safeguard became hardened against the NO Mass. However, now we are in a different scenario. The NO Masses hit rock bottom, and then slowly began to improve. More and more there are priests working hard to make their NO Masses solemn and reverent. They, once again, are celebrating the Mass in a way that brings back the reverence and sacredness of the sacrament. They, once again, are celebrating the Mass in a way that Lefebvre would probably let his seminarians attend if they didn't have any other options. But the SSPX has this problem: in rejecting the NO Mass when it was at its worst, they don't have a way to open it back up now that it is better. Their stance is locked against the NO mass. There is no one who can change it. They're stuck against the NO even as more and more reverent and sacred NO Masses happen around them. So, in short. The NO mass was tolerable for Lefebvre at the start. He felt people could go, especially if they didn't have other options. As things became worse he hardened against the NO. This stance was later codified by the SSPX. Now the NO masses are improving, but the SSPX doesn't have a way to soften their stance. They are stuck in their stance and seem to be holding on to it even though there are reverent and pious NO masses that people ought to be able to attend if they don't have other options.

None (-1): So you were looking for... What you already believed in. It's sad you didn't bother answering the opposite side of the argument.

None (1): Well the crisis of the Church is such a grave and complicated subject, it makes sense taking a long time before having a definitive answer. I think this is not simply that his position hardened with time, but simply that as the crisis became worse and worse he was forced to go back to the root of the crisis. Archbishop Lefebvre was actually like that for many other issues! We always forget that he really wasn't a controversy seeking person, and everything but a natural rebel against papal authorityHere is a compiling of the different quotes in the original French showing the evolution (I encourage you to use [deepl.com](http://deepl.com) for the most accurate translation.)[https://laportelatine.org/formation/crise-eglise/nouvelle-messe/mgr-lefebvre-et-la-nouvelle-messe-abbe-raphael-dabbadie-darrast-juin-2017](https://laportelatine.org/formation/crise-eglise/nouvelle-messe/mgr-lefebvre-et-la-nouvelle-messe-abbe-raphael-dabbadie-darrast-juin-2017)

Similar\_Gap8437 (1): Thank you for your answer. This really helps me out. It seems for the SSPX to soften the stance towards the NO would completely rock the boat. Many faithful and priests could be upset with them and leave or cause divisions.Or maybe this is about doing exactly what Lefebvre taught and then they’re in a bind.Very interesting history!!!!! Thank you so much for your perspective, it really cleared things up for me. It makes more sense that Lefebvre hardened against the NO as a practical measure, rather than a purely theological analysis of the text. There must be other factors, like you said. If that’s the case, then we should consider all factors in deciding when and how to attend the NO, not just the text and the political dangers of a liberal hierarchy pushing it.

None (1): To answer your whole example, the premice would need to be defined. Is the NO dangerous in essence? If yes, literally no reason would allow anyone to participate to it, no matter how grave. If you had no chance to meet the Catholic church at all, let's say you lived in a Protestant African tribe and the next Catholic chapel was thousands of kilometers away, would you be able to go? No. One last thing, I'm not judging anyone, my family has made me serve the NO many times in my childhood and like 99% of people going there I had no way knowing it was wrong (meaning I don't think I or most of those people commited a sin). Having the conclusion that one thing is bad doesn't mean that people doing it are commiting a sin, especially in very complex and twisted situations like the Crisis of the Church

Similar\_Gap8437 (0): The above comment helped clarify my confusions. I have no problems in accepting the NO is dangerous to the faith. But to say one should never go and that it is sinful to attend requires a strictly technical reading of the text of the new missal, completely separate from the intentions and behaviors of the priest and faithful involved. The comment above clarified that very well for me, referring to Abp. Lefebvre’s own comments on the issue. My uneasiness stems from precisely my difficulty in accepting the position that it’s always a sin to attend the new mass while seeking to understand and practice in a traditional catholic way, and agreeing with the core points of the traditional catholic movement.

Ok\_Creme3233 (1): I was just looking at a few more things, and I found this quote:“In the case of the New Mass, it is evident that while still upholding its intrinsic validity, the Archbishop has adopted a more negative stance towards assisting at it than he did in earlier years. This is not surprising, because, as the years have passed, the manner in which the New Mass is celebrated has become consistently more unacceptable in many parishes.”Here is the SSPX saying Lefebvre hardened his position, not because of anything intrinsic, but rather because of how it was celebrated.Also, in 1980, Lefebvre said the NO Mass can fulfill the Sunday Obligation:“Those who feel themselves obliged in conscience to assist at the New Mass on Sunday can fulfill their Sunday obligation.”A belief that the SSPX currently rejects.Here’s the link where these came from:https://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/Apologia/Vol\_two/Chapter\_40.htm

None (1): I'm not saying it's always a sin, it's always a sin when one does it with full knowledge of the problem of the NO; if you doubt it, it's not the same.I agree that the SSPX's position might seem extreme, it is however true that it is the SSPX's position, and that archbishop Lefebvre, after thinking it true, is had this position. My point was, you only answered the comment going you way, and I don't think it's a good way to seek the truth

Similar\_Gap8437 (1): Thank you. This is really helpful!

None (1): [https://laportelatine.org/formation/crise-eglise/nouvelle-messe/mgr-lefebvre-et-la-nouvelle-messe-abbe-raphael-dabbadie-darrast-juin-2017](https://laportelatine.org/formation/crise-eglise/nouvelle-messe/mgr-lefebvre-et-la-nouvelle-messe-abbe-raphael-dabbadie-darrast-juin-2017)

Similar\_Gap8437 (1): Understood. I may not have engaged with the SSPX’s present position deeply in this thread, but I have thought about it. The other comment chain about how the SSPX’s changes in position show that it has nothing to do with some intrinsic problem in the text, but rather is about other external factors in addition to intrinsic factors, answers my concerns. The change really isn’t explained any other way, contradicting the SSPX’s current position.My position so far is that I understand the issues with the NO, but I want to go anyways, albeit with sorrow, as I do not want to stay away, and I want to participate in the sacraments as they are available to me.

None (1): One thing first, I'm not judging your decision whatever it's gonna be; a close friend moved to Africa for 2 years and decided to go to the NO there. However, I'd firstly say that this is not the "SSPX's" changes, but the Archbishop's, because the former implies the changes were made after the Archbishop's death, implying they betrayed him.Secondly, I'd say that the archbishop's position is mostly about the very text of the NO; he sure studied and understood the NO better than we both did, and his conclusions are based on that (just like the SSPX's position is based on the Brief Critical Study of the NO:[https://angeluspress.org/blogs/catholic-doctrine/a-brief-critical-study-of-the-novus-ordo-missae](https://angeluspress.org/blogs/catholic-doctrine/a-brief-critical-study-of-the-novus-ordo-missae) I think the main reason the archbishop took his time because having this harsh but true position, not only because he saw the consequences of the NO, but mostly because the right of necessity (which is necessary to the SSPX's position) doesn't work as well if the NO isn't essentially problematic. I know it seems your local SSPX priests don't seem the best and I'm sorry about that, I think you should try to find an SSPX priest anywhere and to talk to him!

# Post 339: Why do SSPX bishops give Pontifical Mass at the Throne, if they don’t have diocesan jurisdiction?

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 12

Comments: 18

URL: https://i.redd.it/jfql25vs6gfe1.jpeg

Jacques230 (8): I don’t know the requirements to use the throne BUT sspx priests have the supplied jurisdiction

found-0717 (2): Where is this photo from? What diocese

MarcellusFaber (1): Good question.

Jacques230 (7): Btw I think it’s the same situation with Asperges Me at the beginning of the mass : it is only authorised to priests having the jurisdiction. Even if sspx priests don’t have the regular jurisdiction, the state of necessity of the catholics justifies the supplied jurisdiction.

How-re\_ya\_Mate (1): Ecclesia Supplet.The Church supplies for what is lacking.(\*Or, in cases of minor error(s), for what is wrong.)

dbaughmen (1): Probably Chartes

Jacques230 (3): Bishop Tissier de Mallerais explained the situation [here](https://youtu.be/tplBs\_2EBnI?feature=shared)

dbaughmen (2): You need jurisdiction to do the Asperges??

found-0717 (1): So to understand the OP, does the SSPX bishops say this mass in their own SSPX church or in the diocesan cathedral

Jacques230 (2): I think you need to be the main priest of the parish, owner of the local jurisdiction, to do the Asperges

dbaughmen (1): SSPX bishops and priests aren’t allowed to say Mass in Cathedrals

found-0717 (2): Okay yeah that’s what i thought….

Piklikl (1): I’m guessing you mean they aren’t allowed to say Mass at the main altar in Cathedrals… I’ve attended a few Masses celebrated by an SSPX priest in cathedrals in Europe, including St Peter’s Basilica.

dbaughmen (2): However, using a Throne during Pontifical Mass corresponds only to the Diocesan ordinary, not even the auxiliary bishops.In contrast, all other Bishops should use the faldstool

dbaughmen (2): Even if they were allowed to celebrate at the High Altar, they could never use the throne as that is for the Diocesan bishop

found-0717 (1): Yikes!

None (2): You honestly think that the modern church even cares about those things, or even know what they are and their purpose. Not saying you are not right, just saying that the church is in full dissolution.

dbaughmen (1): Very very true, I was just curious

# Post 340: Roman Catholic Daily Missal
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1iasyzx/roman\_catholic\_daily\_missal/

I recently got a Daily Missal and I am not really sure how to properly use it. Could someone explain or make a video.

Piklikl (3): Not sure which one you have but they all are usually organized the same way: in the middle of the Missal you'll have the Mass itself, or rather the prayers of the Mass that stay the same for every Mass (called the Commons). There are parts of the Mass that change based on the day, called the Propers, these are the Introit, Collect, Epistle, Gradual/Alleluia/Tract, Gospel, Offertory, Secret, Communion, and Post Communion.On the "left" of the Commons, or in the earlier part of the Missal you'll have the Propers for the Sunday Masses. On the "right" of the Commons, or later on in the Missal you'll have the Propers for the weekday Masses. If there's no Mass for a feast day that's called a Ferial and the priest will usually say the Mass from the preceding Sunday, though sometimes he'll say a votive Mass instead (and typically the priest will announce what votive Mass he is saying).Every Mass starts off the same with the Prayers at the Foot of the Altar (part of the Commons), then after that the priest will say the Introit (part of the Propers), so if you're following along you flip to the Introit for the Mass of the day, then you'll flip back to the Commons for the Kyrie and Gloria, then flip to the Propers for the Collect, Epistle, and Gradual/Alleluia/Tract, then flip to the Commons for the Mundae Cor Meum prayer, flip to the Propers for the Gospel, etc etc.Typically most Missals will have more directions and page numbers "teaching" you how to use the Missal for the First Sunday of Advent, so if you find that in your Missal it should help you figure it out.It would be swell if someone made a video explaining how to use the Missal, I think a lot of things would end up being improved because we would all benefit from it.Also if you go [this website](https://www.divinumofficium.com/cgi-bin/missa/missa.pl) it will have everything you need on one webpage so you don't need to worry about knowing where to find things. I typically travel without my missal and just use my phone during Mass to follow along.

himalayancandlepower (1): Which one have you got now?

# Post 341: Firing Line with William F. Buckley Jr.: The Fight over Catholic Orthodoxy featuring Michael Davies, Malachi Martin & Monsignor Joseph Champlin | Hoover Institution Library & Archives (22nd of April 1980)

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 4

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ERPQaQ1Gn5U

Duibhlinn (2): [Hoover Institute Digital Collection - The Fight over Catholic Orthodoxy](https://digitalcollections.hoover.org/objects/6590/the-fight-over-catholic-orthodoxy)>\*Although Mr. Buckley's introduction focuses on Pope John Paul's repudiation of the teachings of Hans Kung and Edward Schillebeeckx, the discussion that follows centers not on doctrinal theology but on what the ordinary worshipper encounters at every Mass: the shape of the liturgy. Specifically, on the conflict between traditionalists (like Messrs. Buckley and Davies) who loved the Tridentine Mass, and reformers (like Monsignor Champlin) who support the Novus Ordo mandated by Vatican II. JC: "You liked the old worship because the 'I' was able to pray, and you weren't kind of impinged by the priest or other people? That kind of notion? ..." WFB: "It gave me a sense that the priest was there as a mediator between me and God, whereas it seems to me that the existing approach tends to be sort of crowd-oriented." JC: "I think that's the key thing right there.... Before Vatican II, when I was ordained in '56, the Mass was very much a mystery. I was a priest with my back to the people, in Latin, there was silence in the congregation.... The Council, then, going back to the best traditions of the early Church, said it's both 'I' and 'we' together. It's a vertical worship, yes, but it's also a horizontal worship."\*

# Post 342: Triumph over Isis

Author: AcceptableMaize8955

Score: 7

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/gallery/1ialvla

None (2): i know you! its me michael well my user is now stephen

BrodyJerome (3): Delete this bro, this is profane

AcceptableMaize8955 (1): Not Profane, it replaces islam with Christianity. Its triumph

# Post 343: Pray for BP Williamson

Author: AcceptableMaize8955

Score: 50

Comments: 2

URL: https://i.redd.it/9v68e51ry2fe1.jpeg

lars83norway (6): So sad. Terrible news😥😞

How-re\_ya\_Mate (2): Well.I think we're all in the worst of Emergencies (as of) now.

# Post 344: We need more bishops

Author: AcceptableMaize8955

Score: 25

Comments: 31

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1i9g8ic/we\_need\_more\_bishops/

Word is, Bishop Williamson has just received Last Rites and is dying. This being after another SSPX bishops death, this would be two in one year. We need more SSPX episcopate ordinations.

AtaturkIsAKaffir (10): Petition our Priests to offer Masses for the repose of the Bishop’s soul this Sunday

None (13): Regarding the last sentence of the post, I think we should trust our superiors; they obviously have much more intel on the situation, on what is at stake, and on who should or shouldn't be consecrated. This is indeed a very serious subject and it is normal we would be concered with it, but let's be careful not to engage in political speculation. As the archbishop told someone who was sharing his concerned about the future of the SSPX: "Well it's simple, either the SSPX is from God and will continue, or it isn't and and it will stop!"

Breifne21 (10): May God grant him mercy and rest. I won't lie; I'm not Bishop Williamson's greatest fan, but its sad to see Archbishop Lefebvre's bishops go to their eternal reward.

GYEvanID (4): I hope Fathers Karl Stehlin, Patrick Summers, Timothy (forgot the surname, the MI one), and/or Davide Pagliarani be the bishops.

ardaduck (3): We need a Bishop for Northern Europe (France), Southern Europe/Africa, Asia, North America and South America.

dbaughmen (4): Wait……. Back upWHAT about Bp Williamson? Where did you hear this??

MarcellusFaber (2): +Williamson consecrated at least five himself.

Previous-Plan-3876 (1): Pray for Bishop Williamson he is still alive but that’s all I know. But he isn’t in SSPX he was expelled in 2012. From what I can tell it was a very just action by the SSPX. His hospitalization and unfortunately his likely passing doesn’t mean the SSPX has lost another bishop because he was lost to the SSPX in 2012.

Naft\_814 (1): I'm not sure how that quote makes any logical sense. I could replace sspx with anything else: it's simple, either protestantism/Eastern Orthodoxy/the resistance/the sspv/the CMRI/Islam/Mormonism etc etc is from God and will continue, or it isn't and it will stop.

GYEvanID (11): Indeed. First is Mgr. Tissier (RIP), and now \\*him\\*?!

Willsxyz (13): Archbishop Lefebvre wanted pastoral men, rather than potential leaders to be bishops. That's why he didn't consecrate Fr. Schmidberger, whom he had appointed to succeed him as Superior General. Archbishop Lefebvre was clear, the bishops of the SSPX exist to dispense the sacraments, not to rule. It is the fact that the bishops of the SSPX don't claim authority by virtue of their consecration that makes their consecration non-schismatic.I think the leadership of the SSPX would do well to select holy men, who have \*\*not\*\* been deemed good leadership candidates, and who have shown no signs of ambition.

Breifne21 (8): Father Summers would be excellent. Incredible priest.

AcceptableMaize8955 (11): Yes tonight news broke that Hes in a Hospital (in czechia if om not mistaken) call me a soy chud but i saw this in the SSPX server that there was a announcement he has just received Last Rites. Check the Czech SSPX

None (2): The point of that quote is that if the SSPX fails, then it wasn't of the Church anyway; not really that if it lasts then it was necessarily of the Church

GYEvanID (2): Indeed, and ideally, there should be at least one bishop (ideally two) per regions: North America (2, Mainland North and Central and Caribbeans), South America (1), West Europe (2, Anglophone and Francophone), East Europe (3, Poland, Balkan, and Former Soviet Regions), Middle East and Saharan Africa (1), Sub-Saharan Africa (2, Central and Southern), Asia (4, Korea and Japan, South Asia, Southeast Asia and China, and The Philippines), and Oceania (2, ANZ and Pacific). What do you think?

dbaughmen (2): Could you provide me a source for this? Sorry I can’t read Czech haha

Willsxyz (2): >Check the Czech SSPXOr maybe Czech the Check...

Naft\_814 (2): If that's the case then it's not a good quote. Again, the first thing Archbishop Lefebvre says is "Well it's simple, either the SSPX is from God and will continue" so the fact that it's still continuing would make one believe based on what he said that it's from God. But what I'm pointing out is the same logic could be applied to false groups that have been around for hundreds of years. If it's not of the Church then it's an endangerment to souls

Breifne21 (13): I think 17 bishops would be overkill to be honest. 1 per 100,000 faithful is pretty general for dioceses. That would be 6-7-8 Bishops, depending on who you ask. I just pray for them to be holy and prudent. 1 saintly bishop is worth 1,000 mediocre ones.

AcceptableMaize8955 (5): The only issue is getting papal approval, it would be emergency scenario of illicit ordinations. Lefebvre wasnt quick to do illicit ordinations, its a last option scenario

rothlou0 (3): I found only that on my side https://www.instagram.com/p/DFOw9wbPuDp/?utm\_source=ig\_web\_button\_share\_sheet

None (1): I agree that simply saying "if something continues then it is from God" could be applied to anything else. I think that all he meant was that we shouldn't worry about all of this like if we weren't in the hands of God, he wasn't trying to prove that the SSPX was of God simply because it "continued", this would be false indeed!

None (1): You are the one assuming too much from the phrase.

Breifne21 (6): My understanding of the situation is that Rome will neither approve nor condemn new consecrations.In other words, Menzigen will request permission, be denied, but Rome will not issue a condemnation of the consecrations which will be performed as a necessity. Leaving everything as ambiguous as it currently is.

Naft\_814 (1): I'm not sure why you think I'm assuming too much from the phrase when I quite literally am using the quote word for word, unless the quote isn't actually real/worded differently, then I would concede that Archbishop Lefebvre never actually said that. I know why Jackleclash used it, and we would agree on various things. Certainly, Jackleclash and I would agree on things such as if the sspx were to discontinue then its an obvious sign it wasn't from God. But what I'm pointing out is the first part of the quote and saying that it's a problem. Just because it is continuing does not mean it's from God. But one who supports the sspx would see that quote, see that the sspx is continuing, and therefore logically conclude that the sspx is from God. But what I'm simply pointing out is that isn't sufficient because that same logic can apply to other positions. I could be a Baptist pastor and tell someone in my congregation the same thing about our church. That would alleviate their worries but it doesn't mean that it's correct. It's either from God or it isn't, if it's from God then it's good for your soul, if it isn't then it's not good for your soul, simply remaining in existence doesnt make it of God. However, you have to know whether or not it's from God and can't gamble on waiting around to see if it ends or not. What if the sspx ended tomorrow, what about all of the souls who followed the sspx that passed before seeing that it ended? Many people believe the sspx to be the best means of salvation, so much to where if a family member of theirs is still Catholic but no longer goes to and supports the sspx then they're seen as putting their soul in danger. So the root question is what if the sspx position is wrong but still continuing? Is it still of God, is it still ok for one to follow their position?

rathdrummob (4): You have a very poor understanding of the situation. Another consecration without explicit authorization would be far less “ambiguously necessary” than the last ones. And as for Bp Williamson, he did inestimable damage the traditional cause. He is far too intelligent for it to be unintentional. I’ve spent time with the man and had him for dinner in my home. He’s a provocateur. Always has been. Not really ever a shepherd.

Willsxyz (2): >Another consecration without explicit authorization would be far less “ambiguously necessary” than the last ones.Can you explain this assertion? The SSPX needs bishops in order to continue to be able to ordain priests, and it needs priests in order to continue to be able to maintain traditional Catholic doctrine, contradict modernist heresy, continue the traditional formation of priests, in short to preserve Catholic tradition until the crisis in the Church ends.That is to say, if the SSPX is reduced to two bishops, as it already is, then there is demonstrably a need to consecrate bishops. If the SSPX were to be reduced to one bishop, then the need to consecrate would be urgent. If the SSPX were reduced to one aged and infirm bishop, as it was in 1988, then the need to consecrate would be immediate.

Breifne21 (1): \*And as for Bp Williamson, he did inestimable damage the traditional cause. He is far too intelligent for it to be unintentional. I’ve spent time with the man and had him for dinner in my home. He’s a provocateur. Always has been. Not really ever a shepherd.\*I agree. As I said in another comment; I was never a fan. \*You have a very poor understanding of the situation. Another consecration without explicit authorization would be far less “ambiguously necessary” than the last ones.\*I didn't say that. My own preference is that the Society would receive canonical recognition. IMO, the best structure would be a personal ordinariate, rather than a prelature, but thats a detail issue. Nonetheless, if we do not receive recognition, I believe it is still nessecary for episcopal consecrations to ensure the continuance of the Society. Obviously, it would be best for the Vatican to give permissions, but failing that, withholding condemnation is the next best thing.

rathdrummob (1): It would stand to reason that any "necessity" would need to be determined by Rome to avoid a reimposition of the excommunications of the same bishops who had their prior excommunications lifted. The whole purpose of lifting their previous excommunication was to make reconciliation possible. Therefore, in my totally irrelevant opinion, another illicit consecration by the SSPX would remove any doubt that they have no interest or intention toward working for any form of regularization of their standing within the Catholic Church, and are willfully choosing to run out the possibility for the future. I doubt that this Holy Father or any who would follow would give them another chance.

Willsxyz (3): I see. I did not know at first that you were discussing from the point of view of one who thinks that there is no reason for the SSPX to exist, and that it would be best if the SSPX simply folded itself into the FSSP (with their probable suppression shortly thereafter). I suppose you would have also counseled Archbishop Lefebrve to stop being recalcitrant and just go ahead and celebrate the Novus Ordo Mass The SSPX does not agree with your point of view. Neither do I.Still, let me add that excommunications were never "imposed" on the bishops. Rather, the motu proprio Ecclesia Dei stated that they were (automatically) excommunicated as provided for in canon law. The distinction is important, because whether or not they were excommunicated depends not on a single sentence in canon law, but rather the whole of canon law. I am not trying to debate whether or not they were excommunicated here, just pointing out that there is a difference between your assumption about what happened and what the motu proprio actually said. Even at the time there were professors of canon law who stated that the motu proprio was wrong and that the SSPX bishops were not actually excommunicated. Of course there were also those who took the opposite position.In any case, the position of Archbishop Lefebvre and of the SSPX is that there is a crisis in the Church and that it is necessary for the SSPX to continue maintaining the traditional doctrine of the Church and the traditional formation of priests until the crisis is over, and that this necessity requires the SSPX to continue to ordain priests and thus also to consecrate bishops.

rathdrummob (1): Ok, semantics, the archbishop and the 4 were excommunicated latae sententiae, I misspoke. It was a consequence that they "imposed" upon themselves and yet it was rescinded by the pope. The 2 remaining bishops are not currently excommunicate, I'd imagine that they would like to keep it that way. As to your first point, that isn't a correct characterization of my point of view regarding the Society. My opinion right now is that they don't seem to have any will towards any type of licit status inside the church, while still claiming that they are "in communion" with the church. They seem quite comfortable on the sidelines, safely out of the fray. At least in my experience around the US, they operate their chapels and "missions" absent any contact or concern regarding the local Ordinary of the Diocese. This was not so much the case before. There are very practical concerns at this point that make the question of any sort of arrangement with Rome seem self defeating. If they did end up with some agreement, probably half their supporters would leave, probably with a significant number of priests. (Look what happened when it was just mentioned as a possibility, especially Bp Williamson, who spun that situation way out of control) Conversely, if thy were to consecrate new bishops, they would be faced with the opposite problem. A bunch of people and priests would leave, like last time, it would just be other group. I've discussed this with an SSPX priest and this was his take. (So one man's opinion, but a very well reasoned one) So the practical reality of any substantial erosion of support could be catastrophic to the society just from the standpoint of maintaining the amount of real estate that they own. I really feel that they have boxed themselves into something of a corner. They're smart guys, but it's going to take a pretty nuanced maneuvering to get through it and manage the blowback. And one last point, since this thread is getting hijacked, I suppose in some part by me, so I'll stop after this. I really am surprised by all of the sentimentality on display over Bp Williamson by supporters of the SSPX. The guy really went off the rails, he spent his last decade in public opposition to the SSPX, headed up the Resistance group, consecrated like 7 (?) illicit bishops... he was an incredibly intelligent, and charismatic man, who held much influence over many souls- but he had a major problem with pride and discretion and consequently fostered much confusion and distress among well meaning and trusting people. I hope he can rest in peace, but he lead a public life in unrepentant public scandal.

# Post 345: Question

Author: Significant\_Cable721

Score: 7

Comments: 13

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1i8w6ay/question/

Can anyone explain the difference between sedesvacantist, fssp and sspx?

dbaughmen (4): The chart pinned in the sub explains it very well!

SanctusFranciscus (3): Sedevacantist - No present Pontiff, not in communion with present hierarchy. SSPX - Pontiff and Church are real but there are concerns about their orthodoxy and liturgical praxis. Not invited by local Bishop, irregular communion (not no communion).FSSP - Pontiff and Church are real and the situation is such that you can adhere to the modern Church, remain in normal communion and still be traditionally minded. Invited by local Bishop.

None (1): You can find many different private positions depending on the priest; here are the official positions: Sedevacantism : The Pope's seat is vacant since \~ Pius XII. There are no Pope since then, the people claiming to be Popes are heretic usurpers. The NO Mass is invalid, the NO bishops and priests are invalid too.The SSPX : Vatican 2 contradicts the Faith and cannot be adhered to for a Catholic. The NO Mass is dangerous for the faith and should not be attended to/celebrated. This doesn't mean Francis isn't the Pope, but it does mean that the situation is dangerous enough for the faith for traditional priests/bishops to use the right of extraordinary jurisdiction (the right to give sacraments without the authorization of the Pope)The FSSP (an most other ex ED institutes, but there are differences): Vatican 2 doesn't essentially contradict the faith and can be adhered to. The difference between the NO and the TLM is essentially a question of personal preference, the NO is a fertile rite as well (but in private most priests say that the NO is at least not as good as the TLM, and has some issues with it). The situation is not grave enough to use the right of necessity to get extraordinary jurisdiction. Other differences: sedes have many bishops, the consecrate them when they think it useful. The SSPX has few bishops, it considers that it cannot consecrate bishops without grave need. The FSSP has no bishops, its priests are ordained by conservative bishops.If you need more precisions don't hesitate to ask!

Significant\_Cable721 (1): thanks alot! The majority is sspx right? The only sedevacantists i know are the dimond brothers

None (0): "not in communion" -> being in communion isn't very well defined, but it is not claimed that the SSPX is not in communion in any current papal document; the fact the Pope gave faculties for confessions to the SSPX implies the opposite. "traditional minded" -> I'd say conservative, because "traditional" is more precise and doesn't really work with the FSSP' position regarding Vatican 2

None (1): Depends where, but yes the SSPX is the biggest, however if you combine all of the institutes that are similar to the FSSP, it gets similar in size to the SSPX.

dbaughmen (1): There is a difference between sede and the dimond brothers, the Dimond Brothers are heretics and not Catholic. But sedevacantists are

Significant\_Cable721 (1): can you elaborate?

mineuserbane (1): This is backwards. To anyone else reading this u/dbaughmen is a sedevacantist and is attempting to justify his position. To clarify but not defend: the teachings of Fr. Feeney are suppressed. Some of his followers adhere to a heretical version of Feeneyism, some are in full communion with the church and have been allowed to continue his work as long as they don't cross the line into heresy. To the contrary, sedevacantism has been condemned universally as heresy. Anyone adhering to it is anathema per Vatican I. Feeneyites may be heretics depending on their interpretation of Ecclesiam Nulla Salus or may be hardline traditional Catholics. Sedevacantists are outside of the fold of the Catholic Church for multiple reasons.

dbaughmen (1): Well the problem with MHFM is that they follow the teachings of Fr Leonard Feeney, who was a priest condemned by Pope Pius XII because they rejected Baptism of Desire and Baptism of Blood. I would not recommend anything from them or “Vatican Catholic.” God bless!

mineuserbane (0): OP, see my comment above.

Significant\_Cable721 (1): yeah that vatican catholic guys always seemed autistic

# Post 346: Moving soon - do I stick with the sspx or go to the parish with a larger community and daily mass?

Author: Murky-River1413

Score: 9

Comments: 9

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1i8foy9/moving\_soon\_do\_i\_stick\_with\_the\_sspx\_or\_go\_to\_the/

Hello, I currently attend a thriving SSPX chapel with a great community. However, I am moving across the country for a new job soon and am torn about where to go to mass. The city I am moving to has a very small sspx chapel - only one low mass a week (on Sunday). There is also a much larger FSSP parish closer to where I’m going to live in town as well as several diocesan TLM parishes. I told my my priest at my current chapel that I was moving and considering going to the fssp parish because it is bigger and I don’t know anyone in my new town so I need to meet people and get plugged into a community. When I said this he kind of frowned and said to “stick with us”. I used to be somewhat on the fence about the sspx but as time has gone by I’ve become more and more convinced of their position on the crisis in the church, but I don’t really see anything wrong with the fssp as a layman. Maybe if I was a priest the differences would be more important but as a layman I figure the fssp is still traditional enough for my purposes. I am planning on visiting both parishes and seeing what the community is like, talking to the priests, etc. I just want to know what would you do in my situation? Stick with the sspx at the smaller church or go to the fssp for access to mass outside of Sunday, a presumably better community, and high masses/sacred music?Discuss

Piklikl (11): The Faith is about so much more than just the Mass on Sunday; the FSSP is a blatant affront to the traditions of the Church (most diocesan priests can be given the benefit of the doubt, but all Ecclesiastical Dei priests have explicitly been made aware of and willing embrace the innovations of V2).It sounds cliche, but be the change you want to see in the world. You don’t like the smaller SSPX community? Get involved and see what you can do to help grow it. Offer up to God the difficulties you have and the sacrifice you are making by doing so.While no raindrop can be blamed for the flood, I certainly think that we will all be held to account for our contribution to the crisis in the Church (laypeople quite a bit less so than the clergy). The large FSSP/diocesan communities you’re scoping out clearly have no need for more people, and the SSPX community clearly needs more. It seems like you’re wanting to make the selfish decision to go where no work, no contribution is required from you, and I urge you to resist that temptation.

ourladyofcovadonga (3): As someone who's had to switch to fssp due to distance, I can anecdotally say that the caliber of sspx priests and even parishioners is much higher. There's a spirit of defeat that looms in the heart of fssp priests . That's not to say they're not capable of being great priests but sspx priests are truly on another levelEdit: I also wish to add that the sspx position is the best position in the church right now. That alone makes me hesitant to support any other dissenting factions

None (4): Hi!I'm an SSPX parishioner, but I often go to FSSP Mass on Sundays because I'm a scout chief in an FSSP parish.I had the dilemma of giving up being a scout chief to go solely in an FSSP parish. Here are the 2 arguments in favor of that:- getting communion from a priest symbolizes being in communion with him; officially, the FSSP accepts V2 and the NO. Therefore, getting communion would mean being in communion with those- going to an FSSP parish means getting FSSP friends, FSSP sermons, FSSP parish catechism, etc. : it's impossible not to be influenced, "a man is nothing but the sum of his friends".So my conclusion was that the first argument doesn't necessarily work (since the priest in this FSSP parish doesn't formally accept Vatican 2), but the 2nd definitely does. However, the 2nd also depends on some factors: if you're really well formed, going to the FSSP in rare and exceptional occasions won't hurt too much. I personally became more and more strongly convinced of the SSPX's position since I started being in touch with the FSSP. But I also came to the conclusion that going there "full time" as regular parish.So I understand your reasons, it does sound very tempting, sometimes the SSPX seems to be a refuge for social outcasts, but so was early christianity, doctrine goes before social life even if it is sometimes a big sacrifice. Once you start going to a parish, if you appreciate the community, you might be tempted to go there more and more.Don't forget the FSSP is allowed to be installed everywhere the SSPX is: this shows that the Vatican's goal is to drain the SSPX into the FSSP. Let's not fall in the trap liberal bishops we keep complaining about! Most of the FSSP parishioners/priests are very good people, but sadly their official positions aren't good, and the don't have bishops like the SSPX does that could save tradition. An SSPX parish is small and boring? Let's make it thriving ourselves!

None (5): Go to the SSPX. Why bother even making this post when you have already got an answer from a priest?! The people who fill the pews at SSPX Masses nowadays aren't even traditionalists. Most of you just go for the Latin Mass. What we fight against, as Catholics, is not just the Novus Ordo, but the Council. Unfortunately, the FSSP are modernists who fully accept the non-Catholic Rome that we have at the minute. Clearly you do not take the faith seriously.

kawaqcosta (1): You are in heaven, my dream is to have Sunday Mass. At the moment I have Mass every two months (before there were only a few during the year).

Kogos\_Melo (1): Go to SSPX, it's the only mass you can trust nowadays. The salvation of your soul and correctly honoring Christ is more important than having friends.

rathdrummob (2): If you’re moving to a new city and you want to build a community then you’re way better off with a bigger community. If you have a family, please do them the favor of not posting in a small inactive community. We all need friends and companions if you want them to be like mind, then the option of a large active parish will offer many more opportunities for socialization. Without having to rely on coworkers, hobbies for social opportunities.

Piklikl (4): This is an SSPX forum, and we go to the trouble of distinguishing between the SSPX and Ecclesia Dei groups. The FSSP will always be a compromise and fundamentally crippled by its acceptance of Vatican 2.Also your comment doesn’t make sense, in order to build a community OP should go where clearly there’s no need for a community to be built and instead neglect the smaller SSPX location that presumably could use more people to try and build a community? Sounds quite selfish to me.

rathdrummob (-1): Thanks, I know where I am and the SSPX position on things. I’m just answering a question because it was asked. And my advice is based on my own experience. No honest person anywhere in any SSPX congregation (they’re not parishes) would ever say that the communities don’t attract a pretty odd crowd. And in the smaller groups, you really don’t get a big enough sample to be able to find “your people” so to speak, especially if you’re young and/or single. So if a person wants to make friends and give themselves a shot at finding like minded friends, they’ll need to pragmatically join a community that would maximize the chance of that. I lived in SSPX priories and missions for 5 decades all over the country and I would never advise anyone to look to a small SSPX mission for community. They might find it, but most likely won’t. But that’s my opinion, you might disagree and that’s fine.

# Post 347: I would like some Traditional Catholic ideas to put in my One Note Notes

Author: None

Score: 6
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1i6zy94/i\_would\_like\_some\_traditional\_catholic\_ideas\_to/

Like could you give me some things I should put in my one note to integrate catholicism in my life even more or just things I should have

Bolivar687 (3): A picture of Our Lady of Perpetual Help.I was recently struck by this in the Roman Catechism: "As a relish for food usually indicates a healthy state of the body, so with regard to the soul, if a person relishes \*whatever things are true, whatever modest, whatever just, whatever holy\* (Phil 4:8), and experiences within him the sweetness of heavenly things, this we may consider a very strong proof that such a one has risen with Christ Jesus to a new and spiritual life."

Internal\_Ad1735 (2): I will give you my notes of this week. Maybe it can inspire you.Morning Offering: I begin my day by storming Heaven with a Morning Offering consecrating every moment, every action, and every thought to the Sacred Heart of Jesus through the Immaculate Heart of Mary. I wrote: “All for Thee, O my Jesus, all through Mary, Your most pure Mother, all in union with Your sufferings for the conversion of sinners and the triumph of the Church.”Daily Rosary: The Rosary is my battle weapon. I dedicated a section to Our Lady of Victory with meditations on each Mystery, contemplating the triumph of God in history. I wrote: “Every bead is a hammer against the gates of Hell!”Angelus: I honor the Incarnation thrice daily as the very rhythm of time bows to God made Flesh. I wrote: “At the tolling of the bells, Heaven itself stoops down to remind us that the Word became Flesh.”Examination of Conscience: I added a militant edge—listed sins as “attacks on my soul,” highlighting virtues as weapons of spiritual warfare. I included this resolution: “I will confess my sins promptly, for the delay of penance is the seed of damnation.”Devotions to the Sacred and Immaculate Hearts: I created prayers of reparation to the Hearts pierced by the sins of men, crowned with thorns by the blasphemies of a rebellious world.•Traditional Fasting and Abstinence: I wrote:“I will discipline my flesh as a soldier disciplines his body, for the glory of God and the conquest of Heaven. Fridays shall be meatless; Lent shall be rigorous. The Cross, not comfort, is the Christian's standard.”The Saints' Triumphs: I added daily saint summaries emphasizing their unyielding zeal: “They shed their blood, conquered kingdoms, and rose to Heaven in a blaze of glory!”Mass Notes: I recorded profound reflections from the Traditional Latin Mass, noting the sublimity of the ancient rites. I wrote: “Here, the priest ascends the altar as another Christ; here, Heaven and earth meet in the unbloody renewal of Calvary.”Confession Tracker: I titled this: “The Tribunal of Mercy and Justice.” I wrote: “Here, I kneel as a sinner; here, I rise as a soldier purified for battle!”Eucharistic Devotion: I included quotes from saints like St. Alphonsus Liguori: “O my Jesus, how much it has cost Thee to remain with us in this Sacrament of love!”Dogmas of the Faith: I cataloged the unchanging doctrines with thunderous clarity. I wrote: “These are the walls of the Church, immovable, imperishable, and unyielding against the heresies of the age!”Council of Trent: I dedicated a section to Trent’s anathematic proclamations, a bulwark against the modernist decay.Church Fathers and Doctors: I quoted their fiery defenses of the faith: “The floor of Hell is paved with the skulls of erring bishops” (St. John Chrysostom).BooksImitation of Christ (Thomas à Kempis): “The world is a battlefield; we are not born for comfort, but for conquest.”True Devotion to Mary (St. Louis de Montfort): “She will crush the head of the serpent!”The Glories of Mary (St. Alphonsus Liguori): “No one is saved but through her intercession.”Lives of the Martyrs: I recorded their heroic sacrifices, like St. Lawrence roasting on the gridiron: “Turn me over; I am done on this side.”Sacred Space: I outlined steps to enthrone the Sacred Heart in my home. I wrote: “Christ is King of this house. Let no blasphemy, impurity, or worldly vanity enter!”Traditional Catholic Parenting: I included advice from Pope Pius XI’s encyclical Casti Connubii: “Train children as saints, for they belong not to the world, but to God.”Responses to Heresies: I included sharp responses to Protestant and modernist errors, such as: “Faith alone? Show me your faith without works, and I will show you my faith by my works!” (James 2:18).Quotes from Saints and Popes: St. Pius X: “Modernists are the enemies of the Cross of Christ!” St. Athanasius: “They have the buildings, but we have the faith!”First Fridays and First Saturdays: I wrote: “I will console the Hearts of Jesus and Mary, so wounded by the cold indifference of this age!”Novenas: I kept a section for powerful novenas, especially Our Lady of Perpetual Help and St. Joseph the Terror of Demons.Prayers for Battle: I added St. Patrick’s Breastplate: “Christ with me, Christ before me, Christ behind me…”Armor of God (Ephesians 6): I wrote a meditation: “I will stand firm, girded with truth, armed with faith, and wielding the sword of the Spirit against the forces of Hell!”Daily Martyrdom: I remind myself: “This world will hate me, for it hated my Lord first. I will bear my cross with joy, for the scorn of men is the price of eternal glory.”Social Media and Apostolate: I kept a section to use online platforms as a modern mission field. I wrote: “I am an ambassador of Christ, bound to proclaim the Truth unflinchingly.”

# Post 348: Latin Mass in peril: the situation in the French Diocese of Fréjus-Toulon following the deposition of Bishop Rey
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# Post 349: Mass Obligation
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1i4yoj6/mass\_obligation/

Over the years I have found some really good resources defending the premise of Sunday Mass obligations being met with SSPX attendance. Do you have a principal resource that you go to when you are sharing that with others?

Internal\_Ad1735 (10): Pontifical Commission Ecclesia Dei (1998, Msgr. Camille Perl):“In the strict sense you may fulfill your Sunday obligation by attending a Mass celebrated by a priest of the Society of Saint Pius X.”Pontifical Commission Ecclesia Dei (2003):"The Masses celebrated by the priests of the Society of Saint Pius X are valid but illicit, that is, contrary to canon law... One does fulfill the Sunday obligation by assisting at a Mass celebrated by a priest of the Society of Saint Pius X."Pontifical Commission Ecclesia Dei (2015):"The faithful who attend Mass at an SSPX chapel out of devotion to the Tridentine Mass fulfill their Sunday obligation. However, they must not do so with the intention of separating themselves from communion with the Holy See or the local bishop."Here are even more authoritative quotes to provide a comprehensive understanding of the Church’s position on attending SSPX Masses:Pontifical Commission Ecclesia Dei (July 18, 1994):"We have already stated that the Masses celebrated by the priests of the Society of Saint Pius X are valid, though illicit. As far as fulfilling the Sunday obligation is concerned, we have affirmed that this is satisfied under certain conditions, that is, if the intention is not to separate oneself from the communion of the Church."Pontifical Council for Legislative Texts (2000):“A Catholic may fulfill the obligation to assist at Mass on Sundays and holy days of obligation at a Mass celebrated by a priest of the Society of Saint Pius X, but this is not encouraged if it involves an attitude of rebellion against the Church.”Cardinal Ratzinger (Later Pope Benedict XVI, 2000):"The SSPX priests administer sacraments validly but illicitly. Catholics should be encouraged to attend Masses in full communion with the Church whenever possible. However, one fulfills the obligation if attending SSPX Masses without intending to reject the magisterium."Pontifical Commission Ecclesia Dei (May 23, 2008):"Participation in these Masses does not constitute a sin, nor does it entail a schismatic act. However, it is necessary to distinguish between the valid celebration of the Eucharist and the question of legitimate celebration. The latter refers to the recognition of the authority of the Pope and the communion with him."Pontifical Commission Ecclesia Dei (September 27, 2002):“The Society of St. Pius X remains in an irregular canonical situation. Faithful who attend these Masses fulfill their obligation, but the Church strongly recommends that they attend Masses in full communion with the Church, especially to avoid any risk of fostering division.”Pope Francis (Misericordia et Misera, 2016):“I have decided to extend the faculty to hear confessions validly to priests of the Society of St. Pius X beyond the Year of Mercy, trusting that in the near future solutions may be found to recover full communion with the priests and superiors of the Society.”Though not directly addressing Sunday obligation, this acknowledges the validity of SSPX sacraments.

rathdrummob (3): This only acknowledges the validity of confessions, in this case. In my experience, supporters tend to view this as some vindication, or even a sort of ’gotcha’, towards the pope. Like he had to admit that they’d been right all along. I remember first hearing about this and reflecting that it was very rarely, if at all mentioned by the priests in a public way, since obviously it would infer an admission that prior to this SSPX priests didn’t have the authority to hear confessions (because they didn’t). As a lifelong supporter of the SSPX until fairly recently, their generally casual attitude towards legitimate local authority (I’m in the US) has always seemed at odds with their rigid stance on the authority of their own hierarchy. And instead of acknowledging this, what should be described as a mercy from the Holy See to the benefit of the faithful like myself who have been receiving the sacrament from SSPX priests my whole life, it seemed pretty self serving not to be outwardly thankful for what truly amounts to a benevolent gesture towards the faithful supporters of the SSPX who have been receiving absolution in good faith for decades.

mattdamon992 (1): These are interesting, particularly the ecclesei dei parts. Are any of these available online? Can you post links? I can only see a couple on the SSPX website, and just extracts. [What is the canonical status of the SSPX? | District of the USA](https://sspx.org/en/what-canonical-status-sspx-30842)

Willsxyz (3): \>it seemed pretty self serving not to be outwardly thankful for what truly amounts to a benevolent gesture[https://sspx.org/en/news/sspx-misericordia-et-misera-8304](https://sspx.org/en/news/sspx-misericordia-et-misera-8304) The Society of St. Pius X expresses its gratitude to the Sovereign Pontiff for this fatherly gesture.
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Hi!Was wondering what the SSPX uses for the Cathechism? Books, resources, etc.

Numbainne47 (7): My SSPX chapel uses one called "my catholic faith" and while it's a little expensive it is very good.

merinw (3): The Baltimore Catechism.

Jumpy\_Cardiologist61 (2): For adults, they use "A Brief Catechism for Adults" by Fr. Cogan. I've read it. It's very good.[https://www.amazon.com/Brief-Catechism-Adults-Complete-Handbook/dp/0895554925/ref=sr\\_1\\_1?crid=YH4Y1LTGGRR6&dib=eyJ2IjoiMSJ9.Z-nqkxsY5nrOOybVhOV19TQnZPM2iLT9sHWWUgt-s2e2cuKTb0O3tMZDcR9v68kmeAZjwKwaFaICHB8J8I8D\\_u2AdTd9S2DB6Be8Bep0aoa0BU7KHcZr4mc-PjmUjebis42tyACL4T5TNxIKsAwcFV666h8Y0tK1-Xb4XLy0V1mmzwe\\_d31905noP-ZsjCXCDEN7qeCJROF\\_6lNQ4hT1vVeEBLNg9CTGjAfSrtwd6zs.R\\_9eGLAFiM2VXVbQqeqhvz3iudma0yI\\_\\_Tu99xkCiAo&dib\\_tag=se&keywords=a+brief+catechism+for+adults&qid=1737265538&sprefix=a+brief+catechism%2Caps%2C118&sr=8-1](https://www.amazon.com/Brief-Catechism-Adults-Complete-Handbook/dp/0895554925/ref=sr\_1\_1?crid=YH4Y1LTGGRR6&dib=eyJ2IjoiMSJ9.Z-nqkxsY5nrOOybVhOV19TQnZPM2iLT9sHWWUgt-s2e2cuKTb0O3tMZDcR9v68kmeAZjwKwaFaICHB8J8I8D\_u2AdTd9S2DB6Be8Bep0aoa0BU7KHcZr4mc-PjmUjebis42tyACL4T5TNxIKsAwcFV666h8Y0tK1-Xb4XLy0V1mmzwe\_d31905noP-ZsjCXCDEN7qeCJROF\_6lNQ4hT1vVeEBLNg9CTGjAfSrtwd6zs.R\_9eGLAFiM2VXVbQqeqhvz3iudma0yI\_\_Tu99xkCiAo&dib\_tag=se&keywords=a+brief+catechism+for+adults&qid=1737265538&sprefix=a+brief+catechism%2Caps%2C118&sr=8-1)

None (1): [deleted]

None (5): I read it, actually! I am converting to Catholicism with a local diocesan church, and a priest who does the RCIA course is focusing on " Catholicism for Dummies", which is exremely dense... That was a bit discouraging that he gave me that one to read(and the book is indeed not for "dummies")I wish I was close to either SSPX or FSSP

Numbainne47 (2): Mine took roughly 6 ish months, but it depends on how often you go. I was doing only 1 hour a week.

merinw (1): We were going to an SSPX church in our previous state and our pastor, very new and young, referred me to a very reverent NO parish for baptism last year. I did 115 classes in Catholic School Online, plus several houses of classes with the reverent parish, and 35 classes with the SSPX parish (caught up with all of them this past summer after we moved). I learned a lot on the adult RCIA classes on COS. It was profound many times and I cried. I wish we didn’t live so far from TLM of any sort! Four hours each way to Albuquerque or OK City. We attend a NO parish. I wear a veil, take communion on the tongue, do not wear slacks to church, but it is like running a parallel religion along side them. We have a good priest. He is the canon lawyer for the diocese. But the church in TX has been under assault and I think priests walk a careful line to avoid being Stricklanded. We have to pray for the expansion of SSPX. In the meantime, I read the scriptures daily, and pray. God knows our hearts.

None (1): [deleted]

Numbainne47 (2): It was one on one with a priest, which in my opinion is much better.

None (1): [deleted]

Numbainne47 (3): Not sure what you mean by the sacraments being done privately, all our sacraments are done like in any other catholic church. Now as for confirmation essentially anyone in the chapel who had to be confirmed would sign up and then would be confirmed by bishop fellay. [pretty much like in this video ](https://youtu.be/uMpOm2kwGZc?si=rS9JIWOz24zltvjk)
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Is it the same as the novus ordo?

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (8): I usually just stay in my seat.

dbaughmen (9): Just stay at the seat. The receiving the blessing thing doesn’t apply at the TLM

No-Test6158 (4): Stay in your seat and pray an act of spiritual communion. You are under no obligation to receive Holy Communion more than once a year. It is fruitful to do so, if one is properly disposed, but otherwise once a year within the season of Easter is the requirement.

Murky-River1413 (1): Stay in the pew. As a taller person, If I know I won’t be receiving communion then I will try to sit at either end of the row so I can get up and stand outside the pew to let everyone else in/out so they don’t have to awkwardly climb past me

MacduffFifesNo1Thane (3): Especially since 5 minutes later is “Benedictio….”

# Post 352: Is the Vatican preparing a Charismatic Mass? | Mere Tradition with Kennedy Hall
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dbaughmen (11): I honestly do not understand why Charismatics are allowed. It absolutely degrades the very existence of the liturgy, it disgusts me.

PaxBonaFide (4): I hope not

# Post 353: Catholic Mass around the world: The Church prays in one voice... a montage of Catholic Masses from churches all around the world | Apostles of the Sacred Heart

Author: Duibhlinn
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URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sKytWsSR0Ww

Sir\_K9206 (8): Makes me so thankful to be a Catholic.

# Post 354: Bible recommendations
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What is the best Catholic Bible? I’ve been attending SSPX for almost 4 yrs, went from being a “holiday catholic” to Calvary Chapel to NO and now at an SSPX. Wish it would’ve happened sooner. I only have a NLT Bible. So I’m looking to get a more appropriate Catholic Bible.

No-Test6158 (9): Douay-Rheims is the standard. There have been revisions made to it. The American Edition of 1899 is the version that is most commonly used in the US. There are some other versions. Rt Rev Challoner made some changes to it in the 1700s and Mgr. Knox made some further revisions in the 1900s. My large bible is Knox OT and Douay-Rheims Challoner NT. The latter two are the more common text for English speakers in Europe.It's a matter of choice though - if the traditional language isn't your cup of tea, any Catholic Bible will do. Or if you want to challenge yourself, you could look for a copy of the Clementine Vulgate!

Duibhlinn (4): Echoing what other posters have said, the Douay-Rheims is the best translation in English followed by the Knox translation.

Kogos\_Melo (5): Sistus-clementine vulgata (the one from the council of trent) is the official bible the church uses if I'm not mistaken

BasedEurope (3): Douay-Rheims is like the catholic KJV but a more modern version is the Knox bible.

Special\_General1355 (1): I'd recommend a Douay-Rheims bible (either TAN Publishing or Baronius Press) or if you like a more modern text get a Douay-Confraternity (Douay OT and Confraternity NT, harder to find but available on ebay. Get one printed BEFORE 1953). If you want one with all the bells, whistles, and commentary spring for the expensive Douay-Rheims with Fr. Haydock Notes from Loretto Publishing.

mama\_di4\_amori (1): That’s not similar to the RSV? This is all new to me

None (2): [deleted]

BasedEurope (0): I would say Knox Bible has an RSV feel but if you want another more RSV like New testament I would recommend the Confraternity version

mama\_di4\_amori (2): Is there a study type Bible similar to the NLT ones, where they have footnotes and explain certain parts of the Bible.

himalayancandlepower (1): Haydock !

# Post 355: SSPX edit on YouTube

Author: None

Score: 10

Comments: 0

URL: https://youtu.be/5VCfQmETEBk?feature=shared
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Is it allowed for us catechumens, to pray the Eucharistic prayers before mass In front of Jesus in the most blessed sacrament? And what about during mass?

ExpertSalesCopy (2): Yes, you may pray them silently.

dbaughmen (2): I myself do it every mass! You could even add your own intentions in

# Post 357: Confirmation question…
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If I’m confirmed this year at an SSPX Church, am I going to be valid when I ultimately end up attending weddings and funerals at Novus ordo Masses? Does it matter either way?

Duibhlinn (5): What do you mean will you be valid? What is your actual question?Sacraments are valid or invalid, but people aren't. They're just people.

ExpertSalesCopy (4): You're either validly confirmed or not. It has nothing to do with all these hypotheticals.I suggest you spend some time on the SSPX website. Ignore the haters.

Piklikl (4): As other users have commented, the sacrament is valid or not, not you the person. If for some reason your confirmation by a bishop of the SSPX was invalid, you would still be a Catholic and can participate in the other sacraments; it wouldn’t really affect anything (though once you learn that it’s invalid you should of course do what can to remedy it). The only sacrament that has effects on other sacraments is Baptism because the character you receive at Baptism is what allows you to receive the other sacraments.Most of the snarky comments I’ve received from NO Catholics stem from them thinking that you can’t fulfill your Sunday obligation at the SSPX, which is simply false.

Jumpy\_Cardiologist61 (4): You can go to the Novus Ordo for social reasons like a wedding/funeral. I went to a friend's Novus Ordo wedding this past weekend and just didn't receive communion.I go to an SSPX church and I don't know anyone that would refuse to go to a Novus Ordo wedding/funeral. I don't think that's a thing.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (2): I think the SSPX position is that while the Novus Ordo sacraments are valid, the wording of the prayers has had Catholic doctrine watered down to the point that it's easier for the Novus Ordo priest to invalidate the Novus Ordo sacrament, especially if the Novus Ordo priest is poorly formed in the Catholic faith, as is the case with many Catholics nowadays.It used to be that whenever you bumped into an ex-Catholic, they'd be less hostile to the Catholic faith and more educated on it. Now you have still practicing Catholics who don't believe in the true presence of Christ in the Eucharist and say things that are incorrect, like "I was born Catholic." We are baptized Catholic, to be clear.And the ex-Catholics nowadays don't seem to know anything about their former faith and are extremely hostile to it.It's rare to meet an ex-Catholic who just didn't believe and has no personal grudge and is very well educated on their former faith.... and one can't help but suspect the Novus Ordo sacraments and the watering down of Catholic doctrine in the wording of the prayers has something to do with it.That old axiom comes to mind: "Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi", the law of prayer is the law of belief.

Fravashi\_Yazatas (1): Everyone I’ve met at SSPX refuses to attend NO, and many people tell me that SSPX is not attached to Rome properly. My old NO priest “hates” me right now. It took months of me demanding my baptismal certificate so I could show SSPX priest that I’m not married, and without nearly all sacraments, but was enrolled and attending NO OCIA until I went to first SSPX Mass on 01 Dec last year and haven’t been back to NO since…I know they know where I’m going and the one time I showed up at the learning hall I was needled by their comments, even though they tried to camouflage them. If I’m confirmed at an SSPX and let’s say they’re all cutoff from Rome in October for any reason , am I actually confirmed or not?

Duibhlinn (11): Well first of all the SSPX is not "all cutoff from Rome". All SSPX priests are validly ordained Catholic priests, and the SSPX Bishops are validly ordained Catholic Bishops. All the Sacraments provided by the SSPX priests and Bishops are valid, real, Catholic Sacraments. If you are confirmed by an SSPX Bishop then you have received a valid Confirmation from a Catholic Bishop.The people you have met who refuse to attend the Novus Ordo probably won't attend because that Mass is inferior to the Mass which came before it, which is what the priests of the SSPX say. Many books could, and have been, written on why but for your purposes the exact details probably aren't that important or relevant. That is simply the reason why. The position of the SSPX is that the Novus Ordo Sacraments are valid but basically inferior to the older ones. Baptism for example is particularly inferior to the older rite.

Fravashi\_Yazatas (1): Why does everyone at my new choice of location for Sunday Mass absolutely refuse to set foot back in a church that only does NO? What am I to do when I’m forced to attend funerals for my father’s side of the family, being Catholics, and/or friends weddings that aren’t being particularly called to come with me to SSPX quite yet, or maybe never?

Duibhlinn (3): >Why does everyone at my new choice of location for Sunday Mass absolutely refuse to set foot back in a church that only does NO?Well I'm not a mind reader so I can't say what every single person there thinks, but generally traditional Catholics such as those who attend the Latin Mass which the SSPX offers have various reasons why they don't attend the Novus Ordo. Have you tried asking them? You're clearly quite new to all of this, if you just ask them, or ask the SSPX priest, and say you genuinely just don't have a clue why, then they will probably tell you why. It isn't because they are somehow not Catholic. People attending the SSPX Mass are attending the same Mass that their parents and grandparents going back for centuries have, it's practically the same Mass as the 6th century Mass with minimal differences.The answers you hear vary from person to person but most generally agree that the old Mass is superior, and that there are to one degree or another deficiencies in the new Mass which are not present in the old Mass. I mean think of the Sacrament of marriage: the most abuse, hateful marriage and the most loving, holy marriage may both be valid marriages, but you know which one of them you would prefer to have. The same is true of the new and old Mass, both are valid but one is far better than the other.

Numbainne47 (1): They refuse to because they choose not to for whatever reason, it's there choice. If you know someone having a wedding at a novus ordo and you want to attend, then do it. Plenty of people at my sspx chapel will refuse to attend a novus ordo, and i know plenty that have no problem attending a novus ordo and do so semi regularly when the sspx doesnt have mass. At the end of the day it's your choice.

mineuserbane (-3): Refusing to be in communion with those in communion with Rome incurs automatic excommunication. I'd be careful walking along the edge of a knife if I were you.

Own-Masterpiece-3301 (1): So should we be walking with the heretic Pope Francis? or should Trad Catholics remain faithful to the liturgy that ALL the great saints attended?Ill stick with those who went before me than some new modern guy who thinks gays should be allowed to be together in sin

mineuserbane (1): It's most important to walk in the truth. I assume you hold a sedevacantist view of the post Vatican II Church? If so, you disagree with the SSPX view of the Church and have separated yourself from the one, true Catholic Church.

# Post 358: I am unable of going to Tridentine Mass. What should I do?
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I live in a city where there is no SSPX (which by itself is a reason why I want to move out of here). It does has archdiocesan TLM and Institute Good Shepherd.The archdiocesan mass' schedule is simply impossible for me. I can't leave my house at sunday 11 AM for reasons out of my control and all the other times it's when I'm having classes in my UniversityThe IGS mass fits my schedule but it's far away. I do not have either the money nor the means to constantly travel there.There are multiple Novus Ordo near my home which I could go daily, by the way.What should I do?

PaxBonaFide (7): Just don’t go to the new mass

dbaughmen (9): I do not recommended going to the NO under any circumstances. \*\*You can not miss mass if you do not have a mass to miss!\*\* I’d say simply do your prayers, pray the rosary. Watch a Mass livestream.There are many people in your predicament that do not have a mass near them. God bless!Since you have a IGS mass that you could go too occasionally, try to go maybe once a month or periodically to get the sacraments you need, that can help you a lot even if you don’t always go.

adustsoul (2): Try this:https://archive.org/details/sanctification-method

puritan\_gnosis (2): Go to New Mass.

Jumpy\_Cardiologist61 (2): This video from the SSPX addresses your question about going to the Novus Ordo:[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sZpbnoyd1zg](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sZpbnoyd1zg)In short, I wouldn't go to the Novus Ordo. It is dangerous to your faith. Realistically what would happen is you would either be angry/depressed every time by irreverence/priests saying stuff that isn't Catholic teaching, or you would gradually assimilate.Especially since you're a new Catholic: you won't have the formation to be able to tell what's right and what's wrong so you'll just drink it in.There are many Church-approved circumstances for when the Sunday obligation ceases to bind.My copy of "Moral Theology" by Fr. Heribert Jone (a pre-Vatican II moral theology manual for priests) says this:"III. Excuses from assisting at Mass. Any moderately grave reason suffices to excuse one from assistance at Holy Mass, such as considerable hardship or corporal or spiritual harm either to oneself or another."If you regularly attend the Novus Ordo, there is a very good chance you will suffer spiritual harm. Therefore, you are not obligated to go.If the Institute of the Good Shepherd Mass is an hour or less away, I would do that. A lot of people at my SSPX church travel 45 minutes-1 hour to be there. If not every Sunday, at least 1-2x per month, as another person said.I would also try to re-arrange your class schedule to make it more compatible with the Archdiocesan Latin Mass. You should be able to choose other classes at different times, do some classes online, etc.If you need to, you could watch a live-streamed Latin Mass on YouTube on Sunday, but that isn't a long-term solution.With the baptism and formation thing, I would figure out a game plan with the priest. They are correct about the emergency baptism thing, that's more for if there's imminent danger of death. You should be able to read a traditional catechism on your own and meet with them periodically 1-on-1 to ask questions.In the meantime, our SSPX priest had my wife and I read this catechism for our marriage prep and it was very good:[https://www.amazon.com/Brief-Catechism-Adults-Complete-Handbook/dp/0895554925/ref=sr\\_1\\_1?crid=37RT7NAMENI5B&dib=eyJ2IjoiMSJ9.Z-nqkxsY5nrOOybVhOV19YBGBb1yKNcgdW0MjhfDqMQjBR-U09wv4Z\\_zrVW0Yii1\\_PIemb4gTE93eist\\_L5bTNweTU1L-pebBEcEQyvzh\\_VYio1-YO\\_CaPUany1NjFU0BX8Tld91w8Pehu8vByTioQ.HDh\\_FJCrVqGBJ1Bgyd7aUJA\\_Cqh0eDkMtal8lGp3E4I&dib\\_tag=se&keywords=cogan+catechism&qid=1736612193&sprefix=cogan+catechism%2Caps%2C124&sr=8-1](https://www.amazon.com/Brief-Catechism-Adults-Complete-Handbook/dp/0895554925/ref=sr\_1\_1?crid=37RT7NAMENI5B&dib=eyJ2IjoiMSJ9.Z-nqkxsY5nrOOybVhOV19YBGBb1yKNcgdW0MjhfDqMQjBR-U09wv4Z\_zrVW0Yii1\_PIemb4gTE93eist\_L5bTNweTU1L-pebBEcEQyvzh\_VYio1-YO\_CaPUany1NjFU0BX8Tld91w8Pehu8vByTioQ.HDh\_FJCrVqGBJ1Bgyd7aUJA\_Cqh0eDkMtal8lGp3E4I&dib\_tag=se&keywords=cogan+catechism&qid=1736612193&sprefix=cogan+catechism%2Caps%2C124&sr=8-1)If you have specific questions, you can also ask [mastercatechism.com](http://mastercatechism.com)

How-re\_ya\_Mate (1): Hi, it's past 3:00 in the morning..So please firgive me if in my tiredness i mess this up (of being coherent).. (But, I'd like to give you what Christ's Holy Faith teaches on this matter. If you'd like.)Moral Theologians have exclaimed long since before the N.O. 'service' that if there's:(and I must clarify.)Obviously, not by your (or) anyone's intentions/desires (of your (or) their heart and/or mind |In wicked thought|. To be this far from Validly Ordained Hierarchy and Our Lord's Holy Sacraments.e.g. Plusyou're (they're) not harboring the intent of, or an(y) idea(s) like: Whooo, I'm excused! Yay!. I don't have to go and be in the Assemblies of Our Lord's Faithful in Him!!(Or, some other Obligation of God's Children. Which Sacred Scripture Infallibly states that you're a Child of God by Adoption through Baptism.)As, this would be Mortally sinful against He.(and, believe it or not.. some actually (in their iniquity) eventually succumb to think of cop-out ridiculous thoughts like this sadly in certain instances..)Instead of desiring to seek out His mercies and graces that He freely wants to give us each day.But, instead of such wickedness specified earlier.. You're desiring to be part of our Lord's Faithful, and True a Servant unto Him.If: There's not being within your area: Any valid Parish, Oratory, Chapel, where you know you can (with Moral Certitude) find Our Lord's (Sacrifical) Priesthood that'sHolding His valid (Catholic) Holy Mass (of Our Lord.. as the entire Mass is a grace unto us, and a Holy prayer of benediction unto Him.) for the faithful of His to attend. If such isn't in an (1) Hour Distance of you (or 3 miles, which-ever happens to be first) that you're (within the bounds of Moral Certitude of Holy Mother Church) excused of attending Mass as a part of the Divinely given Precepts of the Faith.But, you still have to keep Our Lord's day Holy.

BleuBoy777 (1): Move. Leave your family if you have to. Leave your job.... But don't you dare do NO!

GoneFishin56 (3): Wrong. Go to the NO if there is absolutely no alternative - ICK, FSSP, SSPX. It is a valid Mass, though illicit.Do not jeopardize your soul!

Kogos\_Melo (3): By the way, I'm not baptised yet and no traditional priest is willing to baptize me as an "emergency" (I can't constantly go to mass so it's an emergency thats my line of thought). What should I do?

Kogos\_Melo (2): New Mass is an offense against Christ

Cool-Importance6004 (1): ## Amazon Price History:\*\*A Brief Catechism For Adults: A Complete Handbook on How to be a Good Catholic\*\*\* Rating: ★★★★☆ 4.5\* Current price: \*\*$14.95\*\* 👎\* Lowest price: $11.51\* Highest price: $14.95\* Average price: $12.72| Month | Low | High | Chart ||--------|------------|------------|------------------|| 01-2025 | $14.92 | $14.95 | ██████████████▒ || 12-2024 | $13.29 | $14.95 | █████████████▒▒ || 08-2024 | $12.29 | $13.29 | ████████████▒ || 04-2024 | $13.27 | $13.29 | █████████████ || 01-2024 | $13.29 | $13.29 | █████████████ || 11-2023 | $13.21 | $14.95 | █████████████▒▒ || 10-2023 | $13.21 | $13.21 | █████████████ || 07-2022 | $11.51 | $11.70 | ███████████ || 06-2022 | $11.58 | $11.89 | ███████████ || 05-2022 | $11.74 | $11.99 | ███████████▒ || 04-2022 | $11.99 | $11.99 | ████████████ || 03-2022 | $11.99 | $11.99 | ████████████ |Source: [GOSH Price Tracker](https://gosh.app/?utm\_source=redditbot&utm\_medium=sspx&utm\_campaign=2025-01-11)^(Bleep bleep boop. I am a bot here to serve by providing helpful price history data on products. I am not affiliated with Amazon. Upvote if this was helpful. PM to report issues or to opt-out.)

How-re\_ya\_Mate (1): P.S.Unfortunately:This' my current scenario at the moment.(Good night / Morning Y'all.I'm out.)

Kogos\_Melo (1): This means I can go or not to a NO parish

None (6): Contact an SSPX priest and find a concrete solution with them!

Piklikl (6): You do need to go through catechumen classes before you receive the sacraments. It might be worth it to take a year off of classes to live somewhere where you can be closer to a traditional Catholic community and take these classes.It’s definitely a good thing to attend Mass when you can, but since you’re not baptized no obligation exists and you can’t participate in the other sacraments anyway.

dbaughmen (5): On one of these visits to the Mass, perhaps maybe you can come to an agreement with a priest and you can do Online Catechism or something. He will be charitable and will help. God bless you on your journey!

None (4): Well you should try to find a solution with the priests! Ask them!

mineuserbane (3): OP, this poster is a sedevacantist and outside the fold of the catholic church. It is wrong to teach that it is acceptable to miss mass on Sundays when a valid mass is available. Find a reverent NO or make it a priority to make it to a TLM. Prioritize your religious education and obtaining baptism. It is better to do this at a diocesan parish than not at all. Don't neglect the other Catholic traditions. Most cities have other Catholic rites that celebrate in a traditional form. Look for them if you haven't yet.

puritan\_gnosis (2): For what reason? Would the magisterium, with the prudential assistance of the Holy Spirit, promulgate an offense against Christ?I'm really intrigued, forgive me, I don't mean to offend you.

Jumpy\_Cardiologist61 (4): This isn't accurate. There are many Church-approved circumstances for when the Sunday obligation ceases to bind.My copy of "Moral Theology" by Fr. Heribert Jone (a pre-Vatican II moral theology manual for priests) says this:"III. Excuses from assisting at Mass. Any moderately grave reason suffices to excuse one from assistance at Holy Mass, such as considerable hardship or corporal or spiritual harm either to oneself or another."If he attends the Novus Ordo regularly, there is a very good chance he will suffer spiritual harm. Therefore he is not obligated to attend the Novus Ordo.Also, he should not get his religious education through a Novus Ordo parish. I did RCIA at a diocesan parish myself as did several of my family members. It is almost guaranteed to either be sketchy (for example, my aunt was explicitly taught in RCIA to receive on the hand) or lacking in substance.He would be much better off reading a traditional catechism on his own (like A Brief Catechism for Adults by Fr. Cogan) and periodically meeting with a traditional priest individually.

dbaughmen (6): Who cares about theological positions. The SSPX itself explicitly teaches that the NO is intrinsically evil. And one is not binded by it.

mineuserbane (1): You offer no reason why attending the NO would cause him to suffer spiritual harm. As the catholic church is today, the Novus Ordo is the ordinary method provided to fulfill one's Sunday obligation. The church magisterium would disagree that attending the NO causes spiritual harm. As you state "a very good chance" is also not a guarantee of spiritual harm. What if that chance is not so good? You leave the OP with advice that will absolutely cause spiritual harm. This is a question for his spiritual advisor, not the Internet. As the entire church magisterium disagrees with you, you have a large hurdle to overcome proving that the NO absolutely causes spiritual harm. If it does not, your position is untenable. As it is, you appeal to your own authority. Write your grievance down and nail it to the door of a church.

mineuserbane (1): That the SSPX teaches it does not make that position correct. That is an appeal to authority. The SSPX teaches that the NO is valid. That is enough for the "reasonable man" to go to fulfill his Sunday obligation versus the clear alternative that refusing to go is a grave error.

Willsxyz (1): >The SSPX itself explicitly teaches that the NO is intrinsically evil.Since, as far as I know this is false, I'm going to request a citation for this assertion.To my knowledge, the SSPX teaches that the new mass is \*\*objectively deficient\*\* (by design), not intrinsically evil, and that the nature of the deficiency is such that attending the new mass can (not "will certainly") harm the Catholic faith of those in attendance, assuming that they hold the Catholic faith in the first place. This is because prayers and actions in the traditional mass that expressed defined dogmas of the Church were intentionally stripped from the new mass for bad reasons (whether to please protestants, or to destroy the Catholic faith itself, etc.).Therefore SSPX priests refuse to celebrate the new mass and advise the faithful to not attend a new mass, arguing that no one has the authority to obligate Catholics to attend a mass that is deficient in such a way. Nonetheless this is advice, and not a command.

PinTimely9396 (2): I agree. I’d rather consult the magisterium rather than some one opining on Reddit.

Jumpy\_Cardiologist61 (1): First, I'm just going off the stats, dude. Statistically, the Novus Ordo will probably do to him what it has already done to most other Catholics.If I choose 100 Novus Ordo Catholics at random, how many of them go to Mass on Sundays, don't use contraception, etc.? 1 or 2?It is possible that the OP will be part of the 1-2%, but it is more likely that he'll be part of the 98-99%. Those are not odds I feel comfortable recommending to him.Second, every Catholic-related statistic has collapsed since the 1960s. Mass attendance, baptisms, marriages, fertility rate, seminarians, number of priests, number of nuns, conversions, etc.Jesus says "By their fruits you shall know them" and the fruits of the Novus Ordo have been a complete and utter catastrophe.Third, it's not "the entire magisterium." Off the top of my head, I can think of Cardinal Ottaviani, Cardinal Bacci, Cardinal Heenan, Archbishop Dwyer, Bishop Schneider, Bishop Strickland, and Bishop Huonder who all share my assessment."The Novus Ordo represents, both as a whole and in its details, a striking departure from the Catholic theology of the Mass as it was formulated in Session XXII of the Council of Trent." \-Cardinal OttavianiCardinal Ottaviani was head of the Holy Office. When the main guy in charge of doctrine at the Vatican says something like that, there's a problem.

dbaughmen (5): Orthodox liturgies are valid. Would that make it a grave error to attend an Orthodox church nearby too? Just because something exists and is valid does not make it Catholic

mineuserbane (2): To start, I don't attend the Novus Ordo and am not in the habit of defending it. However, it is a valid mass and is the ordinary method provided for fulfilling the Sunday obligation. I am not arguing the Novus Ordo is beneficial to the church, I'm arguing it is better to attend the Novus Ordo than miss Mass. Missing Mass on Sundays, without a valid dispensation, is a mortal sin. The Novus Ordo existing is not a valid dispensation. The 1-2% stat is pulled out of thin air. I would argue that this number is not anywhere near realistic. If it is realistic, the argument still fails. Your argument relies on the fact that a Catholic would lose their faith due to bad influence from other Catholics. If someone's faith is so weak that this would be true, they wouldn't be able to go out into the world and live a normal life. They would not be able to go to work and associate with the rest of society as it would be a danger to their soul. This is not how the Church teaches you should live your life. The entire premise of your argument fails. Regarding the entire magisterium, of the prelates you mentioned, only two are alive. Those two, Schneider and Strickland, celebrate the Novus Ordo regularly and would completely disagree with you on this point. From what I know of the others, they also celebrated the new mass despite sounding the warnings of some of its abuses. The main guy in charge of doctrine at the Vatican now also disagrees with you. No one holding valid authority would agree with you on this point. As a result, you DO appeal to your own authority in disagreement with the authority the church provided for you. That is a very dangerous moral position. It's even worse to preach this lie.

mineuserbane (0): That is correct. Canon Law requires attending a mass in full communion with Rome. For that reason neither an Orthodox liturgy nor a sedevacantist mass would fulfil one's obligation. Yet a diocesan NO would.

# Post 359: What do you think the orbs are in New Jersey and second thing

Author: None

Score: 0

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1hy7mho/what\_do\_you\_think\_the\_orbs\_are\_in\_new\_jersey\_and/

Are they angels? Or what and secondly I'm very scared of end times any words of encouragement

No-Test6158 (5): No idea, but they're highly likely to have a fairly terrestrial origin. I can't find any reputable news outlets with this news which makes me think that it's either (most likely) nothing of significance or (less probable but still possible) someone high up has asked for news about it to be suppressed. If this is the case then it's probably military testing or surveillance that they'd rather not talk about given the current global climate. The same way they covered up the development of experimental warplanes. Chances are we'll find out in about 15 years time.It's not worth worrying about things like this. There's a lot of sensationalist coverage online. The best thing you can do is keep going to Mass and confession and stop paying attention to conspiracy theorists who peddle in fear.

Piklikl (4): As Our Lord said “sufficient to the day is the evil thereof”, which is to say that God will not allow more evil in our times than we can handle with the Graces that He makes available to us. Continue to pray to God and ask for peace of soul. If something is not giving you peace of soul (obsession with the end times), it likely does not come from God.On a recent Ignatian retreat the priest gave an addendum to the discernment of spirits conference for Traditional Catholics in this day and age. He specifically denounced excessive preoccupation with the apocalypse/end times (also included was diabolical stuff, theological opinions of non clerics, cults of personality especially of clerics, and inventing our own path to sanctity). Obsessing over the end times prevents us from building and making things perfect “on earth as it is in Heaven”, when the end of time comes God will give us the Graces to handle it.

SnowWhiteFeather (3): I have a bit of an interest in ideology. There has been a big push to convince the general population of aliens. That area 51 is full of alien space ships that the U.S. has been reverse engineering. That they have learned how to create anti-gravity propulsion systems and that China is also learning how to do so.There are reasons and incentives for lies and propoganda. Some of it could be true. Nuclear power isn't a whole lot stranger than anti-gravity. Nuclear power also doesn't dictate the way that I am living my day to day life.It's interesting to contemplate, but inconsequential.

None (-2): The orbs though not the drones

# Post 360: Marian Corps
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1hxhtd7/marian\_corps/

Hello I've recently gained interest about the traditional latin mass Ive heard about the SSPX being one of the society that offers it as I was looking for I nearby chapel I came across sspxmc by the name of Fr. Francois Chazal are they somehow related to the main line SSPX or another faction? Can I attend their services? Can someone enlightened me about their status thanks!

Willsxyz (13): there’s a lot of history there are that we don’t need to go into. Fr. Chazal used to be an SSPX priest. now he’s basically off on his own. The SSPX-MC isn’t actually a priestly society like the SSPX it’s more a loose grouping of like minded ex-SSPX priests.I think the charitable thing to say about Fr. Chazal is that he is doing what he thinks is right. He is following his conscience, such as it is. But personally, I would not attend his Mass.

Duibhlinn (5): There are various different names used but from what I understand the priests under that name are priests who were formerly SSPX priests but left the order.

LingonberryOk7009 (2): Extreme priests. The laity there are also extreme. They are purely catholics but they have missing pieces of their puzzle. Starting from humility, misunderstandings, wisdom, charity, etc. These are only my observations. As I encounter them online through their behavior to Rome and to Catholic churches, even shrines and attacking and condeming priests of the SSPX, accusing the whole society and to Bishop Fellay that the good bishops sold the SSPX to Rome as they're allergic to novus ordo parishes. I'm Not judging them but You shall know by their fruits. but I admire their perseverance to the faith except I'm just being cautious to be near them. If our BVM and Our Lord is in their care, so be it as they are still Catholics holding on to salvation.We still already have the majority of the SSPX institution/congregation. 3 Bishops where still united for the salvation of souls and we have to stay in the channel. If feel home when I got first attend Latin Mass celebrated by the SSPX and I trully great full to Christ Our Lord.

No-Test6158 (3): The SSPX-MC, SSPX-SO etc. are another attempt to fracture the Society. Again, as others have said, there's a huge amount of history here that starts with the departure of "the nine" and has twisted and morphed its way into something else.For all intents and purposes, these groups can be considered "Independent Catholics" - they have no real oversight and just do their own thing. At best, they have no real presence and just continue doing their particular thing, serving chapels in village halls or converted barns. At worst, they can become drawn into more extreme views such as the sede camp. The resistance as it has come to be known, has become a bit of a rallying point for Catholics with views that are, for lack of a better word, extreme. They have a tendency to be inclined towards a more conspiratorial view of the world. They are often aligned to the now excommunicated Bishop Williamson. And that's a whole different story.Do not be tempted by false pomp and tales of how they are "protecting tradition" - this is a ploy designed to take you out of the church. Only attend their Masses out of absolute necessity - that is to say, if there is literally no other traditional Mass in the area. If there are SSPX or some other Traditionalist group nearby, attend there.

ExpertSalesCopy (1): You should avoid unless you have no other option.

None (1): If you can't go to the SSPX, I would definitely go.

dbaughmen (-1): They’re not aligned with the Society. However I see no problem attending their masses

asimovsdog (0): Yes, you can attend their services. They are "in resistance" to Bp. Fellay in 2012 when he wanted to sign a "practial agreement" with Rome so that they could get the SSPX "officially recognized" by the Vatican. There is a complete timeline [here](https://www.therecusant.com/reference-materials), judge for yourself. The declaraction was never signed, but the Resistance suspects Fellay to still wanting to sign it, so they stay out of the SSPX and accused Fellay of being a modernist who wants the Society to basically be a new FSSP / ICKSP. The talks between Rome and the SSPX came to a stop after Williamsons famous interview on the holocaust.Williamson was told to stop his "Eleison Comments" newsletter, which he didn't, and Fellay kicked him out because of "disobedience" (but really, it was about the direction of the SSPX: uniting with Rome on a practical, but not dogmatic level and risking liberalism or staying separate from Rome and getting accused of schism).Since Williamson was then the only bishop in the world to not bow to Zionism (like both Ratzinger and Fellay), he went ahead and consecrated four new bishops, citing the same jurisdiction of emergency as Lefevbre in 1988. Fellay condemned this as a schismatic act, but now has the problem that the Vatican doesn't want to approve new bishops for them either without the SSPX agreeing to Vatican II.I personally side with the Resistance because I read the 2012 letters, but I still go to the SSPX for sacraments and there are also priests in the SSPX who occasionally keep contact to Williamson. The Resistance priests are notably more conservative than the SSPX, but they aren't sedevacantists. The Resistance is \*intentionally\* not one organization, because they fear they'd be subverted from within. So they keep separate groups (Hewko, Pfeiffer, Williamson, Chazal, Dominicans of Avrille, Bp. Aquinas in Brazil, etc.).

Even\_Appointment\_783 (1): Thanks, I've also heard that they had a newly ordained priest ordained by a certain Bishop Aquino in brazil

forbiddenq (3): I'm fairly certain that most actual SSPX priests would advise you against attending one of these fractured groups, they are simply completely separate from the Vatican.

Willsxyz (2): >Williamson was told to stop his "Eleison Comments" newsletter, which he didn't, and Fellay kicked him out because of "disobedience"And as superior general, Bishop Fellay had every right to tell Bishop Williamson (not superior general) to stop publicly doing or saying certain things which were not within his realm of competence as a Catholic bishop. As an example, whether it is a historical fact, or not, that approximately 6 million European Jews were murdered by the Nazi government of Germany is not an article of Catholic faith, and even though Bishop Williamson seems to be particularly interested in this question, he has no obligation to publicly expound upon it and can legitimately be enjoined from doing so by his lawful superior.

None (1): My priest knows I go to resistance group occasionally and he has never told me not to go. I go there for the first five Saturdays devotion, I'm not giving that up because they are "separate from the Vatican".

asimovsdog (1): > And as superior general, Bishop Fellay had every right to tell Bishop Williamson (not superior general) to stop publicly doing or saying certain things which were not within his realm of competence as a Catholic bishop. First, he did one interview. He didn't constantly publicly hammer on about the Holocaust. What should he have done, turn back time?Second, he defended himself in court against the German State, not against Fellay, to have the right to say his opinion (and to stay out of jail). He did even comply with Fellays order to exchange his attorney for a pro-Zionist one.Third, Williamsons expulsion had nothing to do with his holocaust interview (even priests in the Society today admit this). The interview happened in 2010, the expulsion was in 2012, over two years later, when the media frenzy had already died down. It had everything to do with Fellays "six preamble" letter, where he wanted to reconcile (aka sellout) the Society to modernist Rome and Williamson (and a few other priests) blocking that.The problem is, that the entire purpose of the SSPX is to NOT reconcile with Rome as long as Rome is modernist (now even more than in 1988). That is where the jurisdiction comes from, it doesn't come from the Pope, it comes from the fact that 99% of Catholics sign off on heresy. So, in other words, Fellays current direction to reconcile is against the original purpose of the SSPX.Anyway, I guess the people who understand why Williamson did what he did (he esp. feared Zionism infiltrating the Society), understand why the Society now is "nicer" to Rome (who are also under Zionist control). Certainly, the fact that Maximilian Krah, an Israeli-allied "Christian" was in charge of the finances at the time, also didn't help. Williamson did nothing wrong, neither morally (anyone should be able to speak about the holocaust) nor ecclesiastically (he was right to resist Fellays course because it would undermine the mission of the Society and its jurisdiction).

mineuserbane (1): Would you apply the same rational to an Orthodox church?

None (1): If you think that a group of Catholic priests such as SSPX-MC is the same as a schismatic sect then you are not a Catholic yourself.

mineuserbane (2): The SSPX-MC is a schismatic sect. They are not in communion with Rome and refuse to acknowledge their legal authorities. They are a lot closer to Orthodoxy than Catholicism.

None (1): Certainly not, they hold the same R&R position as the SSPX. You are brainwashed.

mattdamon992 (3): What's the definition of schism as taught by saint Thomas? How are the orthodox or the resistance not schismatic.

mineuserbane (1): See Canon 751 providing the definition of schism: "Can. 751 Heresy is the obstinate denial or obstinate doubt after the reception of baptism of some truth which is to be believed by divine and Catholic faith; apostasy is the total repudiation of the Christian faith; schism is the refusal of submission to the Supreme Pontiff or of communion with the members of the Church subject to him."The refusal of submission to the Supreme Pontiff places the SSPX-MC solidly in schism as defined by canon law. The refusal of communion with the larger Catholic Church also places the SSPX-MC in schism. You really need to re-evaluate your stance on these sects. Read your catechism. Read Canon Law. Read the letters from the Vatican regarding these issues. Read them with an open mind. You are walking a very fine line (if not over it already). https://www.vatican.va/archive/cod-iuris-canonici/eng/documents/cic\_lib3-cann747-755\_en.html

None (1): My SSPX priest says its fine to go to the resistance so I don't care what you say.

Outrageous-Law-5710 (1): The SSPX refuses “submission” to the Pope. That is why they are still in an irregular status. Both the society and the resistance lack jurisdiction. The only difference is, the SSPX communicates with Rome, which Archbishop Lefebvre said not to do till they restore Christ as King. The resistance does not have communications with Rome. But they do recognize that the Pope is the Pope.

# Post 361: Main Differences Between SSPX, FSSP, and ISCKP?
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1hx200g/main\_differences\_between\_sspx\_fssp\_and\_isckp/

I have only ever attended SSPX masses in my lifetime and even then, my knowledge for what makes it is limited in comparison to others. For those that have attended masses listed above, what is the main differences in the ways the Liturgy is conducted and from the SSPX's standpoint, are they an appropriate substitute for attendance if you cannot get to a SSPX mass?

None (13): I'm pasting here a commentary I made as an answer somewhere else.The main difference is, the SSPX officially, publically and actually claims that some parts of Vatican II cannot be reconciled with tradition and must be rejected by the Church. The SSPX claims as well that the NO is problematic in essence and that one shouldn't assist to it. The SSPX considers most of the new sacraments problematic.The ex Ecclesia Dei groups have ambiguous actual positions on the matter (depending on the priest you're talking to you will a get whole spectrum of answers), but their official position, according to their superior general, is that Vatican II doesn't contradict Tradition, and that the difference between the NO and the TLM is purely subjective and human, one isn't better than the other. The superior general of the FSSP even called the NO a "very fertile rite".Those are actually major differences, because they have for consequence different moral choices. The SSPX thinks the Vatican has to eventually switch back to the TLM, the ex ED communities officially don't, the SSPX says one can't participate to or celebrate the NO, the ex ED officially say one can, the SSPX only get confirmation and ordination by bishops ordained and consecrated in the traditional rite (or make a validity enquiry on the new rite consecration before accepting it as not doubtful), the ex ED don't, etc.

dbaughmen (14): The problem with the “Ecclesia Dei” groups that sprung from JP2 (FSSP, ICKSP, IBP) is that they have Novus Ordo orders and are ordained by bishops who have been ordained with the grotesque New Rite. The SSPX is the great middle way because its orders are 100% valid and recognised by all, (NO, sedes, etc)

Piklikl (3): This flowchart pinned in the subreddit might help:https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ety59p/a\_handy\_flowchart\_based\_on\_notes\_from\_an\_sspx/For the most part it would be difficult to distinguish a Mass celebrated by a priest of the SSPX vs the others, so if you think that Catholicism is simply a matter of the way the Mass is celebrated(you shouldn’t because it is so much more), then there’s no appreciable difference between them.However, Catholicism is indeed so much more than just the liturgy of the Mass, which is where you will find the differences between the SSPX and the Ecclesia Dei groups.Edit to actually answer your question: the SSPX has problems with Vatican 2, the groups you list do not. The SSPX upholds the teachings of the Church that the salvation of souls is the highest law, to the point that its leaders have disobeyed/displeased the Pope rather than contravene that highest law. This was most apparent in 1988 when the SSPX consecrated 4 Bishops so as to ensure the continuation of its mission of forming priests in the traditional methods as a way ensuring the access of the faithful to the sacraments confected in the traditional ways (Archbishop Lefebrve, realized that Rome was simply stalling and way for him to die, so he made the difficult decision of proceeding with the consecrations in light of the extraordinary circumstances). To put it simply, the SSPX would rather offend the men who happen to be installed in the Vatican rather than offend God. Obviously this is a strange and tenuous circumstance (imagine your mother tells you to do something that you think is wrong, it’s not right for a child to be put in that position but ultimately the child must follow their conscience even if it offends the parent), and several priests of the SSPX thought that the episcopal consecrations were a bridge too far (in spite of the fact that the SSPX had almost always been disobeying the men in the Vatican in one way or another) and left the SSPX and went to Rome asking for a way to celebrate the traditional liturgy while maintaining good relations with the Vatican. The Vatican formed a commission to oversee these priests called the Ecclesia Dei Commission, there’s a few difference organizations underneath this commission (FSSP and ICKSP are the two largest and most well known), but ultimately the groups were allowed to exist on the condition that they accept everything the Vatican has promulgated, including everything promulgated at the pastoral council of Vatican 2, explicitly as a way of getting the faithful who are “attached” to the traditional liturgy to become more open to the innovations of Vatican 2. Individual priests belonging to the groups might express criticisms of Vatican 2, but these are purely personal opinions (and certainly not values as they are unwilling to suffer for them), when push comes to shove the Ecclesia Dei priests cannot criticize the Council or the Vatican and have formally accepted the changes in the Church. A person who claims to be a Christian and who does everything that a Christian does, and only puts just one little grain of incense on the altar of a false god cannot be a Christian; so it is with these Ecclesia Dei priests.They want to have their cake and eat it too: they have an emotional attachment to the liturgy and are willing to sacrifice principles (accepting the innovations of V2) in order to not feel like they are breaking with the men who happen to be in positions of power in the Vatican at the present time.Ultimately only time will reveal the error of their ways, and it could very well take centuries.

No-Test6158 (4): As someone who was brought up in the NO and not tradition, when I came to tradition I was completely unaware of the differences. I just went wherever a Tridentine Mass was offered.It's only through time that I have started to see the major differences. In practice, and from experience, the biggest difference between the ED and Diocesan Latin Masses is to them it's all a matter of appearance \*\*not\*\* a rooted culture and faith. Since I have been attending the SSPX, I have found that it is much more cultural as well as the liturgy. In this respect, the SSPX is very much a continuation of the church, as it was, in 1962. Sure, I've sat through some bad liturgies at SSPX masses, but I've also sat through a 2 hour pre-1955 Palm Sunday liturgy at a Diocesan parish which was "performed" for the 2 old ladies in the parish who go to everything. There is never any social occasions around the ED/Diocesan masses. It's all rather business like. Come in, do mass, leave. Nobody talks, nobody knows what's going on in each other's lives etc.So in simple terms, I find the non-SSPX stuff to be much more performative than the SSPX, for whom it is a genuine faith and culture.

PleasantStorm4241 (2): I agree somewhat with your last sentence. I think it's a mix in the ex-ED communities - genuine trads, and trads who claim the moniker because it's fashionable, and in the case of one woman who, IMO, is using it to grow her IG following. There is an FSSP parish I've attended at times that I consider to be for Novus Ordos who think they're trads. The sermons are okay, but not "meaty" as are usually the SSPX sermons I hear. The ex-ED priests seem neutered because they can't/won't speak out about modernism; maybe there are exceptions. We need shepherds who will warn the sheep.

Jumpy\_Cardiologist61 (2): Yes, you can attend them. This video from the SSPX podcast addresses this:[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lgCv5Rohu24&t=186s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lgCv5Rohu24&t=186s)The liturgy and preaching would be pretty much the same on a weekly basis.The differences are in their official positions on Vatican II / the Novus Ordo and in what they are willing to publicly say. As others have said, the FSSP / ICKSP's official position is that everything in Vatican II is reconcilable with Tradition, and that the Novus Ordo vs. the Latin Mass is just a matter of personal taste. As long as you celebrate the Novus Ordo reverently, their position is that it's fine. The SSPX's position is that some parts of Vatican II are fine but other things are not reconcilable with Tradition (religious liberty, etc.) and that the Novus Ordo is objectively deficient in important ways.That's pretty much the dividing line. The SSPX could regularize its canonical status anytime they wanted if they were willing to endorse Vatican II and the Novus Ordo, and they refuse to do so because they think both of those things are at the heart of the crisis that is afflicting the Church.Privately, a lot of FSSP / ICKSP priests don't agree with the official position and do think there are issues with Vatican II and the Novus Ordo, but they're not going to say that publicly because they would get in trouble.Another difference is that the FSSP and ICKSP are not going to say anything publicly that could get them cancelled. So for example, when the gay blessings thing came out from the Vatican, a lot of religious orders and bishops publicly spoke out against it but the FSSP and ICKSP didn't because they didn't want to get cancelled.

madmonk323 (0): The mass is the mass. Only difference is what group is conducting it. FSSP and ISCKP are both in full communion with Rome. SSPX has a canonically irregular statues.

None (1): Thanks for the reply.Hmm, its definitely a matter of formalities. So if a priest ordained under the New Rite still does the Traditional Liturgy, is the Mass still valid or does the ordination under the New Rite automatically make it non valid in the eyes of the Society therefore creating an obligation to only attend SSPX masses?I can definitely see matters of formalities and why the SSPX priests advise against not attending others. I guess in a way our understanding that there is issues means we have a duty of care to religion so its best not to get involved otherwise. Always wondered with how modern it all is getting, at what point do you lose the means to get to heaven.

Araedya (2): >It’s all rather business like. Come in, do mass, leave. Nobody talks, nobody knows what’s going on in each other’s lives etc.Home Depot Catholicism is what my SSPX priest has named this phenomena. Very transactional. I think it heavily depends on the parish though. Our FSSP parish has a pretty active social community surrounding it.

None (7): If you ask any priest from those different groups they'll tell you they have major differences. I'm surprised one would answer that question this way with so much certitude.The main difference is, the SSPX officially, publically and actually claims that some parts of Vatican II cannot be reconciled with tradition and must be rejected by the Church. The SSPX claims as well that the NO is problematic in essence and that one shouldn't assist to it. The SSPX refuses all the new sacraments.The ex Ecclesia Dei groups have ambiguous actual positions on the matter (depending on the priest you're talking to you will a get whole spectrum of answers), but their official position, according to their superior general, is that Vatican II doesn't contradict Tradition, and that the difference between the NO and the TLM is purely subjective and human, one isn't better than the other. The superior general of the FSSP even called the NO a "very fertile rite".Those are actually major differences, because they have for consequence different moral choices. The SSPX thinks the Vatican has to eventually switch back to the TLM, the ex ED communities officially don't, the SSPX says one can't participate to or celebrate the NO, the ex ED officially say one can, the SSPX only get confirmation and ordination by bishops ordained and consecrated in the traditional rite (or make a validity enquiry on the new rite consecration before accepting it as not doubtful), the ex ED don't, etc.

Piklikl (3): The SSPX is also in full communion with Rome (you either are or not, the men in the Vatican want to imply that one can be in partial communion with Rome, but that’s simply impossible).The Faith is also so much more than just the liturgy of the Mass (also the Liturgy is so much more than just the Mass). To the lay person whose exposure to the Liturgy of the Catholic Church is only attending Mass, it would indeed be difficult to distinguish the difference between the SSPX and the Ecclesia Dei Groups, and consequently to care about the differences.However the Church has always taught that your faith and the way you pray are inextricably linked (lex orandi, lex credendi). Consequently what you believe will impact how you pray (and how you pray will impact what you believe). Catholicism is so much more than the liturgy of the Mass, and it’s a mistake to think that to live the Faith to its fullest is simply a matter of only attending Mass that is celebrated in a particular way. Catholicism is very much a lifestyle, and the Ecclesia Dei groups are in principle indistinguishable from the Novus Ordo.I’m not at all saying that outside the SSPX there is no salvation, but if you’re looking for a more logically consistent way to practice your Faith you can’t find a better source of the sacraments. The Ecclesia Dei groups are smells and bells Catholics, plain and simple, and are simply looking for an emotional, superficial experience.

None (1): Thanks, that is a good, simple answer. I was brought up in a very black and white way of thinking in which the ideal of attending something non SSPX was outlandish.

dbaughmen (6): The position of the SSPX certainly does not say it is invalid. Some would say its position says “dubious” and others would say “valid”. I don’t know much about the subject. Here’s an SSPX video explaining it all - https://youtu.be/u-OvhNwZE3w?si=XCo525gFGgUtgOmeI would personally not recommend those masses because they are under the auspices of the NO but the SSPX priests know better than me haha.God bless!Edit: here is another video I found for ya https://youtu.be/lgCv5Rohu24?si=15QhgGnOotLiCcHO

No-Test6158 (3): That's an excellent way of phrasing it. We don't have Home Depot here - we have "B&Q", so I'll say that instead!Yeah, the diocesan ones are very transactional. Like, they want to get us in and out as quickly as they can so they can continue doing \*normal things\* (like LGBT masses and saving the environment).

Araedya (4): It’s a simple answer because it’s incorrect. The TLM might be more or less the same across the groups but there are actual significant differences between the SSPX and the Ecclesia Dei groups in how they view V2, the NO, and the crisis in the Church. Some individual ED priests may privately hold opinions more in line with the SSPX but the party lines are quite different.

madmonk323 (1): Np, I wasn't brought up in SSPX nor the TLM as a whole so I don't really have a bias.

None (3): Thanks, will have a watch
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I used to agree with it too but I've learnt that it was almost the uniform consensus of theologians that canonizations were infallible as well as saints such as St Thomas who say: "Since the honour we pay the saints is in a certain sense a profession of faith, i.e., a belief in the glory of the Saints [quâ sanctorum gloriam credimus] we must piously believe that in this matter also the judgment of the Church is not liable to error."

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (5): From what I understand, there are two things mentioned when someone is canonized. One is that they're in Heaven, therefore a Saint. That part invokes authority in its declaration.The second part says the person is worth emulating. That statement doesn't have any sort of authoritative phrasing attached to it.Let's take a very obvious example. St. John Paul II. Supposedly, he was nominated for canonization for his personal piety and powerful prayer life. As an administrator of the Church? He mostly delegated to others and was known not to be a scholarly man. he was more of a sportsman who became a priest, from what I understand. He wasn't the intellectual other priests were, like Pope Benedict XVI.So, while he's a Saint and in Heaven, we can't rightly say he's a great example of what Popes should be. His dedication to the Rosary and love of Christ? Great examples. But he obviously didn't handle the SSPX case well, delegating it to clergy who were Modernists and aligned against the SSPX, specifically, and Tradition, more generally.

sssss\_we (4): >learnt that it was almost the uniform consensus of theologians that canonizations were infallibleWhat do you mean, almost uniform? I thought literally every pre-Vatican II theologian held that view

asimovsdog (5): The Conciliar Church doesn't want to be infallible anymore since they do not believe that the Church can be infallible. Paul VI did not "de-canonise" saints, but he did "demote" them and said they were only myths [abc news](https://abcnews.go.com/International/saint-saint-kind-demoted/story?id=23477573). Meaning, according to Paul VI, the Magisterium was not infallible when they canonized St. Ursula or St. Nicholas (and subsequently removed them from the calendar).So, anyone arguing that these new canonizations are infallible and have to be believed: ask them whether St. Ursula was infallibly canonized. If "yes", then Paul VIs view is wrong and post-conciliar canonizations can be rejected because the popes didn't believe in the infallibility of the Church, which is a requirement for promulgating an infallible statement. If "no", then Paul VI is right and canonizations in general don't carry infallibility because the Church apparently has the power to canonize mythical creatures without background checks.

SanctusFranciscus (2): I reject this view and side with the Catholic Church

None (1): The essence of the problem is what we mean with canonization. Historically, the Church meant by that "the recognition of the heroicity of one's virtues". Today, the reform gives evidence that this isn't the exact standard anymore. Therefore, the SSPX considers that those aren't proper canonizations, and that therefore we must doubt the validity of their infallibility (since we don't have the authority to do something more than doubting, since we don't have the authority to condemn)

kawaqcosta (1): Another similar issue is the opinion that the Roman See would not teach errors to the extent that we see now. As far as I have researched, theologians did not even conceive of the possibility of what is happening today.

MarcellusFaber (1): The Society is wrong about that.

RiskKeepsMeEmployed (1): my understanding is that it was NOT the unanimous consensus of theologians, and it certainly isnt dogmaticeven if I am wrong or you disagree, just look at the extent of the changes in the canonization process. no heroic virtue, no devils advocate, and no 2nd miracleDo you think for a second those theologians of antiquity could still believe a Pope like JP2 who condoned pagan worship in Catholic churches would even be a candidate for canonization. even if it remains murky, it isn't critical for our salvation to be sure of the status of post v2 canonizations. we dont have to have our opinion set in cement about it and many things.

None (2): I agree with you as much but I was asking specifically because the SSPX says there’s reasonable doubts that since the canonization method was change, there is no certainty people like John Paul II are saints.

None (2): I wasn’t completely sure so I didn’t want to be definitive lol

MarcellusFaber (1): They did. They believed that a Pope who did this sort of thing could not be Pope. See Gregory of Valencia.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): That may relate to the binding and loosing authority Christ gave St. Peter. Remember the cult of St. Simon of Trent was dismantled. So, who knows? A future council or Pope could dismantle his cult, too.

sssss\_we (2): oh, OK, I understand, just trying to know if you knew someone that held the opposite view.

None (1): I’ve known some SSPX/Resistance who tried to argue against it but their claims were usually pretty weak
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+JMJHello all,Let’s be cliche for a moment. Outside of those born into the SSPX is there a hope for being accepted into real community? Is there a hope of an insider being attracted to virtuous but late comer man? I’ve had likely the best conversations about faith and values with people from the Society and see my Catholic beliefs and passions aligning most closely with the mentality of these communities. But to get an “in” has proved impossible. Not ruling out I’ve done something wrong. But when a SSPX priest tells a woman she can’t legitimately meet a friend or potential romantic interest from an adopted member of the herd, well, that’s wrong once virtue has been tested (or at least given a chance to be tested). Not to mention at least seeing a friendly face at mass on Sunday. I adore the Society and am graced for the privilege to attend the sacraments. But never have I ever gotten shut out so coldly when it comes to community. Just saying. Praying for everyone. Pax.

Duibhlinn (10): Be careful that you don't generalise your personal experience and apply it to every SSPX community. My own experience with the SSPX has been vastly different from yours. I was raised nominally Novus Ordo but de facto in an atheist household. I was about 17 or 18 before I even found myself to the Novus Ordo, and older still before I first attended an SSPX Mass.The first time that I went to an SSPX Mass in my area everyone was extremely warm, welcoming and kind to me. They noticed that I was new and they invited me to pray the Rosary with them after Mass and come get food with them later on. They even paid for my tab which was beyond generous. The priest as well approached me in the parish hall when everyone was having tea after Mass to introduce himself, very kind French man, and welcome me to the parish. They basically treated me like I was their family despite most of them having only just met me. If you compare that to how welcoming the local diocesan Latin Mass is, by comparison they basically treat new people like contagious lepers.I really can't speak on what SSPX women think of going out with men who weren't raised in an SSPX community since I'm not a woman nor was I raised in an SSPX community. All I can say is that it has been my observation that they are probably going to be more interested in what your behaviour, virtue and beliefs are than necessarily whether you were raised in the Novus Ordo. If I had a daughter raised in a Latin Mass community I would certainly be cautious about her seeing someone who had literally just shown up 5 minutes ago. But you don't stay a new stranger forever. Keep absorbing the traditional faith and you will no longer be an outsider.One thing I will say is that while yes it's good that people pair up and get married, it is my experience that people who come across like they're simply hunting for a girlfriend aren't seen too favourably and that type of behaviour tends to be looked down upon. Just be a normal person, don't be too intense trying to hunt down a girlfriend, and everything will probably be fine. Arseholes are universal, just because someone attends an SSPX Mass doesn't make them immune from sin. You will always encounter people in life who aren't as nice to you as they should be. Don't let it get you down too much. Try to pray for these people to cool their jets as you Americans say.

Piklikl (10): I think you need to be a little more clear and a little less cryptic. The only members of the SSPX are priests. The priests administer the sacraments in the same the Church has administered them for centuries, the faithful/laypeople (us) can choose to receive them. It sounds like you're an older male who recently discovered the SSPX and also met a woman there that you might fancy. This woman was then advised by an SSPX priest to be cautious around you? BTW the SSPX always has and probably always will struggle with community (especially in the US). The SSPX is not equipped to manage parishes, and consistently fails to grow and maintain their communities. What's worse is the SSPX leadership will directly intervene and throttle any serious efforts by laypeople to self-organize and create these communities, so you're not alone in taking issue with how the SSPX deals with community.

No-Test6158 (6): So let me answer your questions in a fairly balanced way.Is there any chance of you being accepted into the community?Of course. But it will take time. We, as Catholics, are quite used to strangers dropping by. Perhaps they are travelling. We don't want to push them if they're just passing through. There is also the curiosity factor with the SSPX (and to an extent, any Traditional Catholic church) - let's be honest, this is a very different style of worship to what most Christians are used to. We don't know if a newcomer is testing the water or has been attending the Traditional Mass elsewhere for decades.So take your time.Now, I'll address the more sensitive part of the question.Is it possible that you will be accepted for a relationship with an existing member of the community?Of course. If new blood doesn't come in, these Traditional families will die out. Already, certainly in the relatively small country I live in, there is a lot of intermixing between a small set of Traditional Catholic families. \*\*\*BUT\*\*\* - be absolutely sure that this is not your intention.As someone who has been part of Roman Catholic Traditionalism for coming on for 11 years now, I can sniff out someone who is "hunting" from miles away. There are a certain \*type\* of man, who is attracted to the innocence of a woman and the trappings of her traditionalism with nefarious intentions. This can lead to a lot of pain for a lot of people.If the priest has warned someone about you, then someone else will have spoken to them about your behaviour. Be incredibly mindful of your actions and how they can be viewed. If they have spoken out, then they are concerned about the intentions towards someone. I would have a good think about what you might have done. It might be worth having a chat with the priest about how to approach this in a manner that will not lead to anyone getting hurt.Age gap relationships are scarily common in the traditional scene and they often bring other issues with them. The priest is likely acting with the best intentions of both you and the woman involved, looking to steer away from a possible scandal but also trying to make sure that nobody gets hurt.If you are new to the community, I would recommend \*\*NOT\*\* dating anyone until you are stable within the community. You still have a lot of distance to cover to fully understand how the Traditional scene works. I'm only just figuring it out, and I've been part of it for +10 years, and even then, I still don't fully feel like I know what's going on!

None (4): The Society is a fantastic yet strange place sometimes. I was born into it and spent 25 years attending to the last few years in which I haven't been practicing (Nothing to do with it, just the way I've been living)The SSPX community is different in every parish and even in the larger ones here in Australia , you get some really good people and some holier than thou's who have resulted in the loss of some new parishioners. Whilst I can't really grasp entirely at what your reaching out for, I can tell you that in the right parish, people are very welcoming to outsider and even more relaxed in their views (within the trad teachings that is).Over the years, the priests have changed their views on what the recommend for marriage for singles and even so, the varying ideals between priests of different parishes will be quite different sometimes. As for even becoming part of a community especially if your looking for a partner, it doesn't matter what age, if your part of the society or a new comer, its equally as hard as there is people of all ages which are quite liberal that attend the Society and you would't pick them as being a Trad.All in all, the Society is still a reserved way of life that makes people somewhat introverted away from it all due to the constant hate and attack from other Catholic churches but like everywhere you go, there are still welcoming and lovable people, its just a matter of finding where you belong and if marriage is goal, still believing and trusting God will make you find your home.

Jerailu (3): As a french rc, it's my experience that at any given parish the welcoming can change drastically. I went to normie NOM parish who took me like family just like I attended places where people are cold etc. SSPX here is the same, if you're lucky it's a good parish, if you're not it's not.

Huge-Explanation-358 (2): What do by you mean by "consistently fail to grow and maintain communities"? Could tou give one or two examples please?

NtGiL\_29 (5): So lucky that y'all down under have Fr. Themann as your district superior... he was a stud as my mission priest a while ago.

Piklikl (2): In the context of the SSPX, the most important metric to consider is vocations. St Marys, KS, the largest SSPX “parish” in the world sends far fewer young men to the seminary per capita than other, much smaller communities (there’s a case to be made this is a function of too few priests for too many parishioners -St Marys has 14 priests to minister to 4000+ parishioners).The oldest SSPX mission chapel in the US was in Norfolk, VA, but recently closed and never was any bigger than when it started.I’m sure there are other examples of SSPX communities failing to thrive I think it’s a combination of 3 factors that make this a common thread: the SSPX leadership is made up of old European men who run things in exactly the way you would expect a bunch of old European men to run things (“the faithful need to just stop asking questions and trying to get involved and give us their money”); the SSPX thinks the Prussian K-12 system is the only acceptable system of schooling and seems to be ignorant of the fact that it was intentionally designed to be resource intensive (making it hard to start schools, and then once they’re started incredibly difficult to continue running); and finally while this is more of a US problem (which is sadly rapidly being exported to other countries), the US is extremely car dependent which makes it difficult to form and maintain communities while also driving up the cost of living especially for large families.

None (3): He is a great person and offers very sound advice, loves the Aussie humor and a great chat. Haven't seen him for awhile even when I was attending Mass. Hopefully will run into him again in the future.

Huge-Explanation-358 (3): It seems to me that the goal is to open a school in the middle of nowhere to create a community around it. People would just buy land around it and form a new/inter city eventually. That's what I've heard from older parishioners, but they don't say this kind of thing in public, they said it to me probably because I have been going to mass one or two times a week for more than a year and I've been helping internally a bit. It seems impossible or at least highly impractical, to be honest. People cant just change careers, we need more than potatoes and eggs. Eveything takes an enormous amount of money, but no one is interested in actually solving a problem and selling the solution. The teenagers i've talked to want to open a virtual library or something like that. They want 0 contact with the world outside the context of religion. The same goes for young adults who still live with their parents. These guys have 0, and I mean 0, common sense outside the church. No one talking about becoming a pumbler, a welder, opening a repair shop. Nothing that really creates goods and services. I think one of the biggest problems with communities failling to thrive is that most guys are manchildren, at least where I go. They dont talk about money because "not everything is about money", but thats easy to say when you live with your parents. They cant talk to a woman even if it costed their lives, and i've even seen my wife's friends complaining about it. The priests also dont talk about it. Theres a gap betweeen the single and the married men. Two completely different types of people, and they dont even talk to each other other than basic small talk.
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Suppose that an SSPX priest committed a grave crime like sexual abuse and his Bishop laicized him/removed him from ministry/revoked his faculties etc. Would he still have supplied jurisdiction to celebrate the Sacraments since the salvation of souls is the highest good?

dbaughmen (9): No priest can celebrate the sacraments or show any sign of their former ministry when laicised. It wouldnt be “his bishop” it would be the Vatican directly as the SSPX makes direct recourse to Rome. (I personally do not like this)

No-Test6158 (4): Laicisation is almost always automatic. But most cases are heard in Rome. As the SSPX is subject to Rome, if Rome rules that a cleric is laicised, then they are laicised. They may appeal but if they decide to ignore Rome and continue to practice their ministry then they are doing so completely illicitly. Which also hands them over to secular authorities.They may only celebrate a sacrament \*"in extremis"\* - that is, if there is an immediate risk of death. And I believe this is limited to just hearing confession and giving last rites.

found-0717 (2): It’s a good question…what is an example of a priest that supplied jurisdiction would not apply to?

SanctusFranciscus (1): I think the idea of supplied jurisdiction is an example of an SSPX position I reject. This shouldn’t be shocking but we don’t need to affirm all of their views or claims (nor should we) for risk of taking them to be their own magisterium with their own keys. This idea of supplied jurisdiction introduces a totally subjective way of viewing elements of sacramental life that are totally objective.

PhilIntrate (1): Thank you. Would such a priest still be allowed to minster to someone in danger of death?

Jerailu (1): Why don't you like it?

PhilIntrate (1): Gotcha, but doesn’t this mean the society can only celebrate “in extremis” as well?

PhilIntrate (1): That’s what I’m wondering, since there are always souls to save

Willsxyz (1): yes

No-Test6158 (2): No, because, on paper, they are only \*"suspended a divinis"\* and not laicised. Laicisation is a different process.This means they retain the clerical state and its obligations but they have no position in the church. Hence they are working with permission of necessity.

found-0717 (1): Something that confuses me then is how does Baltimore catechism question # 1004 make sense in all this

PhilIntrate (1): So theoretically, if Rome were to laicize all priests of the society, they could only celebrate "in extremis" going forward?

No-Test6158 (2): Good question>Bishops, priests and other ministers of the Church cannot exercise the power they have received in Holy Orders unless authorized and sent to do so by their lawful superiors. The power can never be taken from them, but the right to use it may be withdrawn for causes laid down in the laws of the Church, or for reasons that seem good to those in authority over them.So the SSPX operates under a hierarchy formed of district superiors who answer to the superior general who effectively answers directly to the Pope. So, if the district superior asks something of the priests in his care, they must comply. This goes up across all levels. It also means that the bishops of the society are bound to the superior general, regardless of whether the superior general is a bishop or not.

No-Test6158 (1): As I said before, laicisation is most often automatic and is incurred when a priest does something that is against their priestly charge or, by their own free will, elects to leave the priesthood. I can't think of any reason why Rome would laicize all priests in the society, or on what charge. If that did happen, I would imagine they would appeal to Rome before they did anything else.The "in extremis" case would only apply to those sacraments that need to be administered in an emergency. So there would be no case where they could, for example, say Mass in an emergency - certainly not on the terms that the Society currently practices. It is envisaged purely for those situations where the only member of clergy near to someone who is dying is one that has been laicised. So emergency baptism (which can also be done by a lay person), emergency absolution and emergency last rites.I don't actually know what the penalty is for a priest who continues to minister after they have been laicised. I don't think there is any higher penalty, other than excommunication. I have met a priest who was laicised - he was ordained when he left school and then immediately realised that the clerical life was not for him. He plays the organ now at a Catholic church and has 2 sons.

found-0717 (1): Do they take vows of obedience to a person then?

found-0717 (1): I had no idea the district superior answered to the pope! I was always under the impression that they view him as a modernist / compromised.

found-0717 (1): I guess what I’m confused about is that you said they are suspended which is what that Baltimore catechism question seems to be covering. If they are suspended a divines then why can they say mass

PhilIntrate (1): Wait, so what if the district superior tells an SSPX priest to stop his priestly ministry, but isn’t formally laicized, could that priest still operate under supplied jurisdiction and open his own chapel?

rathdrummob (1): You’re really supposing a lot. Neither the bishops, priests, or the elected superiors of the SSPX hold any standing anywhere in the Catholic Church hierarchy. They only exercise or submit to authority that they assume upon themselves. And as much as they would say that they answer to the pope, it’s very clear that they only answer when it suits them. The honest answer to OP’s question is: that if one were to adopt the SSPX justification regarding supplied jurisdiction to administer the sacraments to the faithful within the jurisdiction or diocese of a lawful Catholic bishop, one would need only to have someone “ask” for the sacraments, thus demonstrating “emergency”. So the honest answer is he can do whatever he can justify to himself, since he is his own authority. If he is laicized by the Vatican, then he no longer has the ability to administer sacraments anymore anyway so then he would simply be cosplaying as a priest. There’s a few out there and they find dupes to follow them and give them money. Don’t be one of those…

mineuserbane (2): They are not supposed to without approval from the local ordinary. They claim supplied jurisdiction under several canon law codes. See here: https://sspx.org/en/supplied-jurisdiction-traditional-priests-30452#:~:text=The%20supplying%20of%20jurisdiction%20in%20times%20of%20crisis&text=This%20authority%20over%20a%20flock,the%20pastor%20over%20his%20flock.I'd highly recommend cross referencing those codes with the commentary on the code of canon law (available online as a PDF for free: https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&opi=89978449&url=https://isidore.co/CalibreLibrary/Beal,%2520John%2520P\_/New%2520Commentary%2520on%2520the%2520%255B1983%255D%2520Code%2520of%2520Canon%2520Law%2520(7252)/New%2520Commentary%2520on%2520the%2520%255B1983%255D%2520Code%2520of%2520Canon%2520-%2520Beal,%2520John%2520P\_.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwj66p-\_w-eKAxWALtAFHQpPJjgQFnoECCIQAQ&sqi=2&usg=AOvVaw1LIkvqWLI6\_GGkYhxAy2RV ) The only way I see the supplied jurisdiction claim behind valid is by accepting that there is no other suitable priest within about a four hour drive. Most people pass parishes that offer valid sacraments on their way to a society chapel. Where I live, the society chapel is right down the road from a Byzantine Catholic church. Most people would pass it on the way. Supplied jurisdiction would only apply if that church was not suitable to minister to the congregation.

# Post 365: One year later: the Fiducia Supplicans “flop” | FSSPX News

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 9

Comments: 0

URL: https://fsspx.news/en/news/one-year-later-fiducia-supplicans-flop-49698

# Post 366: Sanctification Method for when you don't have Mass

Author: adustsoul

Score: 1

Comments: 0

URL: https://mega.nz/file/xh1DlQRb#1YoJtPcUaltjCkG7KZGeXyG5PIUV7O0e8sOgeHUmQ8w

A couple of days ago I commented a post about what to do when you can't attend the TLM. I said that our family do a couple of prayers and I saw that this booklet we have has no version in english, so I decided to translate it and share it with you. Here it is.

# Post 367: Dubious Absolution

Author: KnightErrant83

Score: 5

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1htknv7/dubious\_absolution/

Hey y'all, made an account specifically to ask this question. I went to confession today and at the absolution, the priest said exactly, "I absolve you of your sins Name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit." I realize that it's vitally important that the absolution formula is said correctly for it to be valid. If he left out, "IN THE Name of," would this invalidate the absolution? And no, he didn't just mumble "in the," from my hearing it was left out entirely.I hope I'm not being scrupulous and just splitting hairs. This was the first time I've had a dubious absolution since converting, so even if I should have corrected Father, I was a little shell shocked and nervous to do so, especially as he wasn't my regular confessor. I'm going to my local SSPX chapel for Mass tomorrow as usual, but I don't know whether I need to re-confess to make up for today. I suppose it would be safe to do so anyway and just mention the circumstances. I've also already asked a priest from the same SSPX chapel, but I recognize he's spread thin, and I'm asking here in case he can't get back to me today.Thanks!Pax Christi

SanctusFranciscus (14): Aquinas argues that “I absolve you” is all that is needed!

None (9): No offense bro, I think you’re kind of overthinking this one lol ¯\\_(ツ)\_/¯

Duibhlinn (7): I have read that the most essential words necessary for valid absolution are "ego te absolvo", I absolve you. Of course the bare minimum of validity does not necessarily mean liceity.I got this information from this book: Theory and practice of the confessional; a guide in the administration of the sacrament of penance written in 1905[https://archive.org/details/TheoryPracticeOfTheConfessional](https://archive.org/details/TheoryPracticeOfTheConfessional)

ardaduck (3): Probably haistily said. While handing out communion Father speaks so quickly that he even recites the prayer while breathing in 😂

Pale-Roof9278 (2): Perhaps it was an oversight or misspeak? The formula is absolutely important but often NO priests will do the abbreviated form. Since the intention of the priest was to absolve you and you had remorse for your former sins, I would personally assume it was valid (assuming the validity of NO orders and faculties). As per any confession you may share sins at the next confession if there was a concern of not willfully omitting anything from the past.

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (2): You're grand. Even if it was not said properly to the point where there's a problem the intention was there and so as I understand the church supplies what was lacking.Feel free to ask the priest but yes you're being attacked by scruples.

Total-Wedding8871 (1): Crucial words are “I absolve you”

# Post 368: What if you Can’t attend the TLM?

Author: Adventurous\_Home\_559

Score: 8

Comments: 31

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1hs432s/what\_if\_you\_cant\_attend\_the\_tlm/

What do I do if I can’t attend the TLM. There is no FSSP and no SSPX chapel or church, near me at my current location.

dbaughmen (9): \*\*You can not miss mass if you do not have a mass to attend.\*\*I recommend listening to a sermon on Sundays, maybe watching a livestream and just prayer!God bless

adustsoul (9): Our family do some prayers along the Rosary, I just found out there is no booklet with the prayers like we have in English so I'll be making one and will post again here

merinw (3): When we moved five states away (a move we had been planning for years, but didn’t know until two months before we moved, WHERE in this big new state we would end up), our SSPX pastor advised us to go stealth to a NO parish. Where we now live is an eight hour round trip to the closest SSPX Mass. That is not reasonable except for a couple of times a year. Our pastor reminded us that SSPX has not rejected the Pope and it is not in schism. He said, go to the most reverent local parish you can find so you can receive the Eucharist. Regularly. He advised us to look on masstimes.com to find a parish with daily Masses and more than once a week Confession and Holy Hour (some, we’ve discovered, only have Confession by appointment). We have taken his advice. Six months ago, we traveled out of state to an SSPX chapel for Sunday Mass. we went over the day before and stayed in a hotel overnight. Even so, it was a long day driving home, after driving the day before. We did not feel comfortable eating at a restaurant after Mass. We could not eat the hotel “free” breakfast because there was not enough time between it and Mass. If we accept the validity of the current Pope, even if we are not comfortable and have concerns about the NO and all the changes it has brought to the church, then, we should be able to go take Communion (on the tongue) at a NO parish when we can’t go to an SSPX mission. I advise folks in similar situations to look for “reverent Catholic Masses” which tend to be hybrid with a lot of Latin, more silence, more traditional, and beautiful. There are none of those close to us either, but a couple are 2.5 hours away, which is more doable. Not for membership and full participation, but definitely more often than once or twice a year. We feel we were led by God Almighty to be where we are now. We have continued faith there is a reason for it and it will reveal itself its own season.

No-Test6158 (4): https://www.piusx.org.pl/scandinavia/Mass is offered infrequently in Randers. It might be worth emailing Fr Hakan Lindstrom who leads the apostolate in Scandinavia.If you can't attend Mass, there are a few things you can do. You \*could\* attend the new Mass. Not advisable unless absolutely necessary. Do some research and find the most liturgically Roman place near to you. If this isn't possible then:Recite the Rosary and the propers of the Mass devoutly. Make an spiritual act of Communion and ask for God to make Masses available to you. This is what many faithful Catholics have done when they were separated from the Mass (in Britain and Japan for example).If you haven't got a missal, thenhttps://www.divinumofficium.com/cgi-bin/missa/missa.plhas the Masses in both Latin and English. A translation into Danish isn't yet available. You could always offer this service up to the owners of the website!You could also watch one of the many livestreams available along with the above.You could even do all 3 if you wanted to. Then you are paying lipservice to the church and still attending a valid Mass and then getting your spiritual nourishment elsewhere. Again, something faithful Catholics have done in times of oppression.

Kogos\_Melo (2): You should try out convincing the closest parish to pray TLM

Duibhlinn (2): There are more Latin Masses in the world than those offered by either the FSSP or SSPX. The Latin Mass Directory is the most complete and accurate resource to locate Latin Masses.[https://www.latinmassdir.org/](https://www.latinmassdir.org/)Regardless of what Mass you go to, you need to keep in mind that as a catechumen you are not to receive the Holy Eucharist.[https://www.reddit.com/r/Catholicism/comments/1hkx31i/the\\_sacraments/](https://www.reddit.com/r/Catholicism/comments/1hkx31i/the\_sacraments/)

SanctusFranciscus (2): Go to the best Mass you can and ignore this terrible recommendation to commit grave sin because a liturgy is poorly done yet possesses Christ fully is to be rejected. This is horrible and a great argument against the SSPX generally

asimovsdog (1): You're supposed to "sanctify the Sunday", you don't have an obligation to attend Mass if you cannot attend a properly reverent, pleasing and valid Mass, celebrated by people who don't sign off on heresy. Watch it on YouTube and take spiritual communion. In doubt, call / write to an SSPX priest, he can advise you better (or even travel to your area).You'll probably need to change your location, work, etc. Trust me, the TLM is the most important thing in the world, since it helps your inner life. Try to make adjustments to that if you can.

Jumpy\_Cardiologist61 (1): This video addresses the topic: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sZpbnoyd1zg&t=10s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sZpbnoyd1zg&t=10s)Speaking for myself, I used to go to the Novus Ordo when I was on vacation or something and there was no local Latin Mass available because I was like "Well, I have an obligation to go to mass, so I'll go even if I know it's going to be bad."But then every time I went, I would encounter something irreverent, doctrinally incorrect, etc. So then I felt conflicted because I was like "Well, I have an obligation to go to mass in-person, but then when I go to the Novus Ordo it's always depressing or infuriating and I feel like I've been spiritually assaulted."We recently asked a priest about it, and he basically said you don't have to go to the Novus Ordo because it's dangerous to your faith and you can't be obliged to put your faith in danger. So we just watched a livestream Latin Mass instead that Sunday.If you live somewhere without a Latin Mass, I would strongly consider moving long-term. I think some things in life are worth uprooting yourself and moving for, and the Faith is one of them. I just think having a local Latin Mass church is so important.I would also double-check if there's a local Latin Mass here: [https://www.latinmass.com/find-latin-mass](https://www.latinmass.com/find-latin-mass)and here: [https://www.latinmassdir.org](https://www.latinmassdir.org)and here: [https://fsspx.news/en/mass-centers](https://fsspx.news/en/mass-centers)In the short-term, I would just watch a livestream Mass on YouTube, but I wouldn't plan on that being a permanent solution.

mineuserbane (1): You must attend Mass on Sundays and holy days of obligation. If the TLM is not available, it is better to attend the NO than miss Mass.

Naft\_814 (1): You're still required to attend Mass if you have one nearby, even if it's not a TLM. Whether it be Novus Ordo or an Eastern Divine Liturgy (Eastern Catholic, not the Eastern Orthodox)

asimovsdog (2): > we should be able to go take Communion (on the tongue) at a NO parish when we can’t go to an SSPX missionOverall correct, except for this. We're not supposed to be in communion with people of other faiths (and the NO essentially expresses a different faith).

None (8): This is not the official opinion of the SSPX

ardaduck (2): You don't have to take communion either, we're only mandated to commune once in Paschaltide.

SanctusFranciscus (2): Agreed, capitalize M and you have my endorsement

ourladyofcovadonga (1): Ironically worse than not going to any mass

merinw (2): I will just tell you that my SSPX pastor in WA told us when my husband got the job with no SSPX chapels closer than four hours away to go “stealth” to NO so we could take communion. SSPX is not sedevacantist. He said to us to try to go an SSPX chapel far away, as much as our work and finances allowed. I guess there are differing viewpoints but I will stick with what our SSPX priest advised us.

rathdrummob (1): This is a very problematic position. SSPX does not have the authority to dispense anyone from their Sunday obligation.

Naft\_814 (1): In what way? Fulfilling your Sunday Obligation at the Unbloody Renewal of the Sacrifice of the Cross is worse than committing a mortal sin of not attending Mass?

None (8): The SSPX isn't dispensing anyone; it's simply saying that NO is uncatholic, and the Catholic doctrine has always been that uncatholic sacraments cannot fulfill Sunday obligation. Even an Orthodox Mass, which is itself not a bad rite but that is said in schism, shouldn't be attended.

ourladyofcovadonga (2): NO is displeasing to God. In addition, the validity of NO priests is dubious at best. Therefore, it wouldn't be a mortal sin to refrain from mass if you didn't have a valid TLM near you.

Naft\_814 (2): "Even an Orthodox Mass, which is itself not a bad rite but that is said in schism, shouldn't be attended." Are you failing to see the irony here? The same thing can be applied to an sspx Mass. Secondly, how exactly is a NO Mass uncatholic? The Church has somehow officially promulgated an uncatholic Liturgy? The Church has uncatholic Sacraments? The Holy Eucharist at a Novus Ordo Mass is somehow not the Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity of Our Lord? How is that even remotely possible and how have the gates of hell not prevailed?

Naft\_814 (0): "NO is displeasing to God" when did the Church declare this? Are you just repeating sspx talking points? The SSPX is not of the authority to declare that. Just because they say that doesn't make it therefore true."The validity of NO priests is dubious at best" again, are you just repeating sspx talking points? The SSPX doesn't re-ordain NO priests, it's one of the issues sspv and other sedevacantist groups have with the sspx. My old sspx chapel I attended had a priest who was originally NO. Can the correct words be messed up? Sure, but you can't just automatically assume that's going to happen, or be in constant suspicion. There's a huge controversy over Father/Bishop Pfeiffer of the sspx resistance because the Latin words of Consecration were messed up. Should we therefore be suspicious of other Consecrations in the Old Form since there's video evidence of it being messed up?

None (2): There is no irony, the SSPX isn't schismatic. Nobody seriously claims that.Yes, it seems the Pope had promulgated an uncatholic liturgy, it's not the first time a Pope not infallibly does something uncatholic. The gates haven't prevailed.The NO is dangerous, it's not invalid, so it is indeed the blood etc. of Christ.The NO is uncatholic for the reasons explained in the Brief critical exam of the Novus Ordo, I can't explain it better, if there is one aspect you challenge I can talk about it with you!They are partially responsible for the huge religious relativism that is in the Church today.

asimovsdog (1): > The same thing can be applied to an sspx Mass. Yeah but with the difference that the Latin Mass is thousands of years old and definitely Catholic and the NO is 60 years old, already dying out and was signed off by heretics who denied that the Catholic Church is the one and only means of salvation, so it's doubtful whether it was even "validly" promulgated (by a council that wasn't a council, behind the back of Paul VI, designed by a bunch of modernist theologians).> Secondly, how exactly is a NO Mass uncatholic? [Here are 62 reasons, written by the priest of the Campos of Brazil](https://archive.is/SQ12D). Short form: It doesn't express the Catholic faith, not even ad orientem and in Latin. All "offensive" prayers that can't be prayed by Protestants were taken out and on top it was written by six Protestants. An attendance at a NO is basically a denial of the Catholic faith and a support of an ecumenist "all faiths are okay" one. He who doesn't profess the faith by staying silent will not enter heaven.Second, the NO is basically indistinguishable from an Anglican or Lutheran Mass, which, in some cases, have valid Eucharists. But we don't go there because we're Catholic, not Anglican. The NO priests all have to sign that "Vatican II is okay", which is a bold lie. We are not supposed to be "in communion" with them, support them or pray with them. Even if we are "excommunicated" by them, it does nothing for us, because you cannot mock God with legalese. It is only "Catholic" in name, but not in faith, it expresses nothing that is uniquely Catholic.[According to Fr. Gregory Hesse](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ur1OlGrTU7s), a renowned canon lawyer, the rite of the NO is not the "development" of the Latin Rite, it's such a substantial change that it's effectively a new, schismatic, rite. It leads people away from the faith, because what you practice becomes what you believe, not the other way around.> The Holy Eucharist at a Novus Ordo Mass is somehow not the Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity of Our Lord?The SSPX doesn't deny that the Eucharist is valid, but that doesn't mean that you can automatically go there. A valid Eucharist doesn't make a valid Catholic Mass. Orthodox have valid Eucharists too, we don't go there. > How is that even remotely possible and how have the gates of hell not prevailed?Mate, please read up on the difference between material and formal heresy. The current pope says that all religions lead to heaven yet we still say that he's the pope, even though that statement is objectively heretical. As long as the pope does not himself believe or know that he is acting agains the Catholic Church, it means he is in material error, but not formally outside the Church (doesn't mean we support what he's doing). The popes since VII did a massive oopsie. A massive one, but that doesn't mean he's not pope anymore, but also doesn't mean we can blindly follow him. I don't know why someone is on the SSPX subreddit but doesn't know the basics about the SSPX stance on Vatican II. Going to Mass is not a commandment, sanctifying the Sunday is. If you cannot go to an SSPX mass it would be better to not go to Mass at all rather than going to a Mass with people who accept the false teachings of VII but celebrate a valid Mass (ICKSP, FSSP, some Eastern Churches too) or be in communion with people who both in doctrine and practice deny the Catholic faith (NO). Because the goal of the Sacrifice of the Mass is to be pleasing to God and such a sacrifice, while "valid", cannot be pleasing to God.

Naft\_814 (2): I'd argue against the idea that the Novus Ordo is dying out. I've been to many NO parishes in my Diocese and the neighboring Archdiocese and have seen many people (yes, including young people and families) attend. There's also a large and active young adult group in my Diocese. In my time in the sspx I've seen maybe 6 or so adult conversions but have seen many Baptisms listed in various bulletins for the Easter Vigil. We also can't assume that VII or the NO is the reason for a fall in Faith when 1) Africa and Asia are growing despite lacking the TLM and 2) the sexual revolution and rise of atheism in the West. It's not just Catholicism that saw a decrease in the West, protestants had a decline as well, they wouldn't even have been impacted by VII or the NO.I skimmed through the article you linked, interesting how this is noted: "These 62 reasons have been written by the priests of Campos (Brazil) before they dangerously accepted a canonical recognition by the conciliar Church" so do these priests even still believe they originally wrote? (not gonna lie, "conciliar Church" is just flat out cringe. The "conciliar Church" is still the Catholic Church) it reminds me of Fr. Udressy, the former sspx district superior of Germany who left the sspx last year for reconciliation with the Church.The whole 6 protestants argument is a false belief, one that I held myself. The 6 protestants were obsevers and had no part in the composition of the New Missal. In fact Max Thurian converted in and became a priest. Here are some quotes from him prior to his conversion: “I have no difficulty in affirming that in the new Order of the Mass, nothing has been changed with respect to traditional Catholic doctrine concerning the Eucharistic Sacrifice.” and"Recently a Protestant liturgical commission was given the task of revising the prayers of the Last Supper. It was proposed that they adopt the second Catholic Eucharistic Prayer (inspired by Saint Hippolytus). That proposition was rejected, because the commission considered that the doctrine implied in that prayer did not correspond to the actual common faith of Protestants. . . .the invocation of the Spirit on the bread and wine presupposed Transubstantiation." Here's another quote related to the protestant liturgical commissionfrom Lutheran scholar Jean Pleyber in 1976: "As to the matter in question, I have often assisted at Masses celebrated according to the new canon, and each Sunday I have viewed a televised Mass. I have never seen evidence that such Masses deny the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. And when I hear said and when I read that “they have fabricated a Protestant Mass,” I know only too well that this is not true and that such persons are wide of the mark. I have even asked the priest in my village to forward the new liturgical texts to me, and I am convinced upon reading them that nothing has changed in Catholic Eucharistic doctrine. I believe it is useful to say that the Catholics who speak of a “Protestantized Mass” are quite ignorant of Protestantism and perhaps of a great deal of Catholicism.""We are not supposed to be "in communion" with them, support them or pray with them." My guy, that is literally schismatic according to the second part of the canonical definition of schism. You do this again later when talking about the fssp, institute, other Eastern Churches and accusing the NO of denying the Catholic Faith. Its baffling when i hear defenses that the sspx isnt schismatic yet this (as I was already aware of) is the sspx position. It's this kind of attitude that I once held that made me nervous about attending my local diocesan TLM when I left the sspx a little over a year ago and it's absolutely ridiculous.You either a) have never attended a Novus Ordo Mass b) have never paid attention when attending one or c) have unfortunately been exposed to an actual problematic parish (to which I have the utmost sympathy for you if that's the case) the Catholic Faith is literally expressed in the Mass, the True Presence is literally expressed in the Mass, "Sacrifice", "Offering", and "Victim" are explicitly said in the Mass, in fact the GIRM use Sacrifice/Sacrificial 19 times in the introduction alone, when receiving Communion you literally affirm that you believe in the True Presence (protestants accuse us of idol worship for that btw) Fr. Hesse is problematic, I wouldn't be looking towards him for advice on the subject. I find it funny you say that it leads people away from the Faith when ex sspx attendees have a newfound love and devotion to the Faith after leaving the sspx (and other groups) and primarily attend the NO. Meanwhile, the sspx (and other groups) lead people out of the structure of the Church that Christ established and receive illicit and in cases of marriage and confession (except for the sspx after the year of mercy though permissions are needed for marriages) invalid sacraments. But will appeal a false sense of supplied jurisdiction.The sspx position is that the Holy Eucharist is doubtful in the NO. And yes, Eastern Orthodox do have valid sacraments but they're illicit and not in Union with the Church. Same with the sspx, resistance, and other groups. And before you "the sspx says the Pope's name in the Canon" 1)Old Catholic groups do as well 2) the sspx priests are suspended from public ministry (besides confession and with permission marriages) they do not have the necessary permissions and supplied jurisdiction does not cover this.So quick correction the actual quote is "...every religion is a way to arrive at God", this is still certainly problematic and the Holy Father should clarify what he meant (i have a feeling i know what he was trying to imply but that's a whole different debate) Regardless there's a major difference between Pope Francis making an off the cuff remark and his authentic Magisterium. There's a difference between his off the cuff remark and an ecumenical council that your are required to assent through Faith as a Catholic and a Liturgy that was promulgated by the Church.Dude, I'm well aware of the sspx's position on Vatican II, I was a staunch supporter of the sspx for nearly 20 years. Note, I hate using that online since it just sounds like progressives who say "I went to Catholic school" and since you have no idea who i am (or maybe you do, I know a lot of people in the sspx) you can't really verify that. Regardless, I know the sspx's beliefs, I used to share them myself. Certainly, sanctifying Sundays/Holy Days is the Commandment to which the Church declares that to do so is to attend Mass. Otherwise, I could just take the Dimond Brothers position and stay home all the time. The Sacrifice being pleasing to God is also one that's in Communion with the Church, not ones that are parallel altars against the Union of the Church such as the sspx, resistance, old Catholics, Eastern Orthodox, sspv, cmri, and all the other independent groups who have taken it upon themselves to act as the authority of the Church and treat the Church as losing the Faith as every schismatic group has done throughout history

mattdamon992 (2): Going to mass on Sundays and holy days is a commandment! There is more than 10.

mattdamon992 (2): Judging the new order of mass as evil is inherently subjective. Best to be objective and just follow the actual Catholic church:)

None (2): NO is defintely not "dying out", but factually TLM communities are at worst stagnating while NO is collapsing in the West. In the rest of the world it has increased for demographic reasons, but this is hiding the fact that it is decreasing the proportion of presence in most countries, being replaced by evangelism (or even paganism and islam in Africa). Also, there is a global doctrinal collapse, self-considered Catholics believe less and less in Catholic dogmas both in the West and in the rest of the world. The fact that in the West protestantism declined in the same time as Catholicism is not proof that there is no crisis; the main thing trads accused Vatican 2 was to protestantize Catholicism, so it makes sense they'd follow the same trends. Islam is thriving here, and Muslims (in French opinion polls at least) are more and more believing in what islam teaches. Also, as Hillaire belloc explained, heresy is often about adapting to the current ideas, so Catholicism lost his purpose here. There are also many negative trends that were exacerbated after Vatican 2.regarding the "62 reasons", I prefer the brief critical exam, actual doctrinal arguments. Accusing someone of not having attended the NO because they disagree with you is very easy. From your arguments I could say you haven't talked to any SSPX priest about that specific issue. "Sacrifice" is used indeed, but in ambiguous terms that don't imply that this is the factual renewal of the sacrifice of Christ. Let's continue being specific, real presence is not enough (even Lutheran believe in it), transubstantiation is the full needed doctrine. regarding schism, you need evidence to claim that. However, the right of necessity authorizes priests to celebrate Mass without jurisdictions, so to settle this debate one needs to settle the previous one about the NO. Also you're pointing at the many different trad groups, but there is way more doctrinal divergence within the NO (from FSSP to gay German priests): the sad truth is, their religious relativism makes them not care about that.Finally the example of Fr. Udressy you gave... You seem to have information that hasn't been released because he hasn't given his reason (most papers say exactly that), my guess is that there isn't any doctrinal reason. But we lose a priest, we gain a bishop... Bishop Strickland has just released a communiqué praising archbishop Lefebvre... in the footsteps of bishop Huonder. Personal examples are nothing, my SSPX parish is thriving, the NO parishes in my area are catastrophic, but I'm not generalizing. Sorry if I sound a little bitter (maybe I should spend less time arguing on internet and touch grass haha), I'll compensate by doing my evening praying in you intention!

asimovsdog (2): First, I live in Germany. That should answer your question as to why I hate the NO so much. The NO is nothing but a leftist-green political festival at this point, where women lecture about how oppressed they are and how African "refugees" are the new Lazarus and we have to take them all in. Occasionally you have fun liturgical abuse like chicken dance mass in Passau. This is the NO here. You cannot convince me that this is "Catholic" just because of the label above the door. Yes, there are "better" ones, I do not care to hunt. This is the average NO here.Our bishops are so leftist, they're technically even formally in schism after they signed the "Königsteiner declaration" where they flat-out rejected the "no" on contraception by Paul VI (and also continued the German Synodal Way, even after multiple "no"s by Francis, where they discuss fun topics such as female priests, the definition of a woman and whether priests are even necessary). But, according to you, they still have the label "Catholic" and that's all that matters for heaven, yes? The bad evil SSPX is in schism for continuing the TLM, but Mrs. "extraordinary minister" handing out communion in the hand will go to heaven because she is "in communion" with the "proper" Church. > And when I hear said and when I read that “they have fabricated a Protestant Mass,” I know only too well that this is not true and that such persons are wide of the mark.I was Protestant myself. [Here's a random Lutheran Mass](https://youtu.be/xEWgi4K-Oq8?t=2699) and it's virtually indistinguishable from a regular NO (they're even more reverent since they line up properly at a communion rail which many NOs fail at).> I believe it is useful to say that the Catholics who speak of a “Protestantized Mass” are quite ignorant of Protestantism and perhaps of a great deal of Catholicism."There is no real difference between the NO and any Lutheran Mass. Protestants also speak of "sacrifice", but they mean something different. They mean "Sacrifice" as in "remembering Christs sacrifice on the Cross".> My guy, that is literally schismatic according to the second part of the canonical definition of schism. Schism from the modernist Church yes, but who schismed? To schism means to cut oneself off from tradition, now: is ecumenism and religious freedom Catholic teaching because it was promulgated by the "Catholic" church? I'll cite Dignitatis humanae §4: "Religious communities (note: especially including Islam) also have the right not to be hindered, either by legal measures or by administrative action on the part of government, in the selection, training, appointment, and transferral of their own ministers, in communicating with religious authorities and communities abroad, in erecting buildings for religious purposes, and in the acquisition and use of suitable funds or properties." - effectively this means, Islam now has the "right" to spread their false faith. I ask you: Would you sign this? Is this Catholic teaching, "validly" promulgated? If you answer "yes", I need a serious, serious explanation, if "no", then why do you attend a Mass held by a non-Catholic priest?We are in schism from the conciliar Church, yes, because they no longer teach the Catholic faith, but an ecumenist one. The conciliar Church is only Catholic in that they have a valid hierarchy, but they are all in material, even if not formal, heresy. Some priests even agree with the SSPX but don't have the guts to leave (they're just cowards). Especially under Francis, diocesan priests are a lot more SSPX-phile than you are.I do not want to be in communion with modernists, because in order to get into heaven, the label "Catholic" matters less than the faith "Catholic". THEY schismed from Tradition at Vatican II, they do not hold the eternal Catholic faith (or else please explain how the freedom to error is suddenly Catholic teaching). They are the ones who introduced never-before held doctrine on religious liberty, with their bastardized Mass (the NO is merely an expression of that faith, that all faiths are welcome and equal), the "development of doctrine" (doctrine does not develop as truth does not change), etc. Francis' remark was not "off the cuff", he even tripled down on it. It was an expression of that new faith. In any other earlier century he would've been threatened to be killed for being a heretic if he wasn't pope.> The 6 protestants were obsevers and had no part in the composition of the New Missal. They were officially only "observers" at the council, yes, but later actively assisted Bugnini and there were a lot of "talks" at the dinner tables after the meetings. Paul VI wanted the NO to be easy for Protestants to accept, and invited them to help. To say "they did nothing" is disingenuous - then why were they invited in the first place?> the Catholic Faith is literally expressed in the Mass, you literally affirm that you believe in the True Presence(a) No it isn't, only [30% of NO attendees believe in the Real Presence while 99% of TLM attendees do](https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2019/08/05/transubstantiation-eucharist-u-s-catholics/) and (b) I've been to quite a few NOs and don't remember hearing the word sacrifice (I did hear "offering of gifts" like in Protestant circles). The NO is so good at teaching transsubstantiation, that 70% lost the faith. Amazing.> In fact the GIRM use Sacrifice/Sacrificial 19 times in the introduction aloneGive me a NO that actually follows the GIRM like Paul VI intended. I'll wait. I, for one, have never even heard the word "sacrifice" in an NO. It's usually just a bunch of songs (literally in any order, there's no common structure to it like in the Latin Mass), then the priest does an "offering of gifts", the consecration and hands out the communion. I've been to NOs. I won't return.> I find it funny you say that it leads people away from the Faith when ex sspx attendees have a newfound love and devotion to the Faith after leaving the sspx (and other groups) and primarily attend the NO.Yes, it's called Stockholm syndrome. There are a few people like that and it's mostly redditors for some reason. Haven't met someone IRL like that. My guess is that they have to somehow gaslight themselves that the NO is perfectly fine and there's no problem with Vatican II, so then they double down on being a rabid popesplainer and St. Francis of Rome can do no wrong. They do feel that something is wrong, but they want to be right so they can ignore the problem of global apostasy and try to convince themselves that there's no problem with Vatican II and it can somehow be explained away. Also happens to "Anglo-Catholics" a lot who desperately try to reconcile Anglicanism and Catholicism. It's the same reason why hypocrites commit sins but then are driven towards doing more and more good works: because they want to silence their conscience with good works, which tells them that something is wrong, yet they somehow have to justify ignoring it.> (except for the sspx after the year of mercy though permissions are needed for marriages) invalid sacramentsWhile it doesn't matter (the SSPX has jurisdiction just by the fact that 99% of "Catholics" signed off on ecumenism and therefore lost the faith, the SSPX has to exist or else the Catholic Faith is lost), the year of mercy got extended indefinitely and hasn't been retracted so far. The SSPX has full jurisdiction from Pope Francis himself and even a popesplainer like you would have to admit that.> Fr. Hesse is problematic, I wouldn't be looking towards him for advice on the subject. Ah yes, just call someone "problematic", without addressing his arguments. Classic argumentation.> But will appeal a false sense of supplied jurisdiction.So, you would rather go to a church that teaches ecumenism, but has "proper jurisdiction", than go to a Church that does not teach it because it somehow doesn't have jurisdiction? Which one will get people into heaven?> It's this kind of attitude that I once held that made me nervous about attending my local diocesan TLM when I left the sspx a little over a year ago and it's absolutely ridiculous.Sorry to see you leave but I don't get why it's ridiculous to call the NO schismatic? Do you also support going to the newly approved Mayan rite just because the pope said it's okay now (it was "validly promulgated" after all)?> an ecumenical council that your are required to assentNo, an "ecumenical council" is only believed to be infallible if it: defines doctrine, excommunicates someone or anathematizes. VII didn't do any of that, it's perfectly fine to not accept it. As said by John XXIII himself, it was merely an "aggiornamento", an "updating" of the faith to the modern world. You are thouroughly confused on what the term "ecumenical council" actually means.

None (2): Too bad I can't upvote more than once. What a sad time of crisis... May God save the Church from the modernists!

# Post 369: North Korea: Christians are public enemy number one
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SanctusFranciscus (4): Always have been 👍

# Post 370: History of the SSPX in Ireland
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URL: https://fsspx.ie/en/history-sspx-ireland-32340

dbaughmen (6): Ireland, formerly such a Catholic country is dying and giving in to tremendous modernism

Pale-Roof9278 (2): We must pray for those living in the Diaspora. From a little encounter with individuals invested in the SSPX in Scotland and Ireland there seems to be a nucleus of faithful whom are vehemently committed to fidelity to God and His Church. While outside demonic forces and politics from within threaten the growth of the Society, perhaps more magnified than in other areas. Unfortunately this is not unique for the plight of the Society: often local ordinaries will spitefully block the growth and movement of the Holy Ghost through the fidelity of the faithful adhering to the Society’s values. Do we not share the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic faith? The actions of these self opposing forces engaged in fear, vitriol and envy say that they either A: have no confidence in their custom and are threatened; B: are demonically inclined to oppose a blossoming of the faith within the Trad circles suggesting they have zero confidence in the “ecumenism” they preach. Either way I refuse to pity them but I do pray for the conversion of souls to a true inclusion in the salvation warranted by Christ and His teachings through the Apostles and their successors into today.

jaqian (3): It's not dying, it's going through a rebirth.

Duibhlinn (1): It's quite sad to see. There are a few islands of relative normality but as soon as you step offshore you are met by a hellscape, one created by the total modernist victory that has taken place.One of the main concerns we currently face as a nation is the threat to the continued existence and preservation of our vast physical heritage such as churches. The Jesuits were trying to sell the church currently housing the Latin Mass in Limerick to developers who wanted to turn it into a leisure centre with a swimming pool. The only thing that saved it from that fate was the 2008 economic collapse. The ICKSP bought it when its value was reduced to being basically economically worthless. A lot more could be done, and should be being done, by all of the orders to preserve this rapidly disappearing treasure. Many dioceses are on the verge of large scale selloffs of Church property and demolitions began a few years ago in some dioceses such as Dublin.

# Post 371: I have a troubling question
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1hngzgu/i\_have\_a\_troubling\_question/

I’ve Been having trouble with this thought, there are so many people confident in there religion and they think that there right but there wrong, as a traditional Catholic I’m very confident but how do I know if I’m right, yes i have apologetic sources but atm everyone has a answer and they have there own apologetics

Piklikl (11): Ask yourself if you suddenly had amnesia and didn't know about any of the world's religions, how would you be able to figure out what religion is the One True Church? Just go back to your Catechism: the Roman Catholic Church is the only religion that can meet the four criteria that any religion claiming to be the One True Church would need to meet: \* \*\*One:\*\* there can be only one! You can't have multiple religions all claiming to be the one true religion (especially since most of them, the Catholic Church included, explicitly say that other religions are false, so not everyone can be right simultaneously). \* \*\*Holy\*\*: the entire point of religion is worshipping God, so you absolutely must judge a religion based on how well it does this (so mega churches with their ridiculous over the top theatrical "worship" displays are out, also religions that incorporate degenerate activities as part of their "worship" - this was more of a problem with paganism).\* \*\*Catholic\*\*: this word means universal. God should be worshipped by all people, so any religion that is designed for one demographic to the exclusion of others (eg a specific race or nationality, or a religion mainly for extroverts) can't be the one true religion as everyone should be able to belong to it. \* \*\*Apostolic\*\*: by now you will probably have concluded that a religion based on the Abrahamic traditions is the one true religion, and the Roman Catholic Church is the only religion that is based on the Old Testament and then has an unbroken chain of authority going all the way back to its founding by Jesus Christ Himself who fulfilled the prophecies of the Old Testament. Most religions these days are started by random people with no divine mandate that can be found in other texts. Jesus passed on his authority to Peter, the first Pope, who later passed it on to Linus, and so on. The Eastern Orthodox Church used to meet all of the above criteria, but in 1054 they formally split off from Rome and refuse to this day to acknowledge the authority of the Pope, which disqualifies them as being the One True Religion. From there it's pretty simply to realize that while the Roman Catholic Church is the One True Church, there's been a Crisis in the Church since the 60's if not earlier, and the SSPX is the only group within the RCC to acknowledge this openly and publicly and is basically "frozen in time" until competent discussion of the huge changes can happen. The men who happen to be in power in the Church refuse to allow any questioning of these huge changes, so until that happens, the SSPX is left in the awkward, lonely, position of remaining faithful to the traditions of the Church and the highest law of the Church which is the salvation of souls. All the other "trad" groups (FSSP, ICK, trad Diocesan) implicitly declare by their actions that obedience to the current administration is more important than the salvation of souls.

SnowWhiteFeather (6): God created a rational reality.Sentience is a quality that isn't indicated by the material world. Rocks aren't sentient. Atoms aren't sentient. The relationships between atoms aren't going to generate sentience. At no point should sentience rationally emerge according to natural law, which indicates a supernatural law.If you observe human nature with a belief in supernatural law you can learn about good and bad. You can identify the people who best represent good and bad and listen to what they have to say.

None (8): That's the fun part: you don't know!Indeed everyone claims to be right. It's hard to know the objective truth! However, truth does exist, so you can confront different opinions and chose the right one.It's good to investigate what others claim, because listening to their arguments will help you understanding your own faith better.Personally I think the debates that matter the most are:- does God exist? (and there are a lot of answers, almost all of the thinkers in history were in the pro side of the argument)- is Catholicism right compared to other religions? (Here the debate is easier in my opinion, other religions have big flaws when you investigate them)- is the SSPX right in the crisis of the Church? (This debate is the most niche of the 3, however after some research it appears obvious to anyone that there was a major quiet doctrinal change in the 60s, and one has to pick between before and after).The fact we're a tiny minority believing in what we believe doesn't matter; 95% of people don't care and do like the world tells them to, 4% follow what's the most convenient for them to believe.Every time I investigated the SSPX's position on a "controversial" aspect I ended up agreeing with what the SSPX says, so I have a tendency to trust them.But yes, we shouldn't be afraid of the truth, so don't be a skeptic, but sure try to ask questions and find answers!

seeking\_0333 (2): First, this is an incredibly well thought out and succinct comment. Very good job.As someone who has been discerning the SSPX for about a year (and been to confession at a chapel twice but nothing else), I just don’t understand the very last part of what you saidFSSP and ICK and diocesan TLM - how are they more concerned with the current administration than the salvation of souls? They seem very much so concerned with the salvation of souls. Though yes they are “playing ball” but it seems like if Rome brought the hammer down to eliminate the Latin mass, they could just join or re-join the SSPX.In fairness I believe the same argument could be used in reverse (especially after hearing E Michael Jones say he met with one of the SSPX bishops in England begging him to sign the document from Rome, in 2017 or so I believe, and that he wouldn’t do it) Fellay maybe. He admitted Lefebvre would have signed it! My guess is because of the requirement to be under a local ordinary.Think how many more Catholics would enthusiastically begin attending the SSPX if they were formally brought into the fold.I guess I’m still a bit apprehensive with the whole thing. Married with five children. Discerning…God love you

Tasty-Ad6800 (1): Those criteria are established by the church claiming to be the one true church. How can you make an argument that stands in its own merits without relying on the authority of the church? In other words, don’t rely on an argument where the authority is the final burden of proof. After all, the SSPX reject the authority of the church to justify their position, and you should be able to justify the Catholic Church as the one the church without appealing to authority.

Tasty-Ad6800 (0): A truth is eternal. The true church should be eternal as well. To say one must pick the older or newer is absurd and contradicts the true nature of the Church. I will expect you to caveat your response because you must in order to hold to the SSPX position.

None (2): I don't believe this was a comment regarding the personal attitude of the FSSP and ICK priests, many of them being holy priests; he simply meant that their community's official position is giving up in front of Rome (since they rather had obedience to Vatican than loyalty to tradition).Indeed, when they're at risk to lose recognition from Rome they're willing to compromise on anything: say the NO, praise it, say Vatican II has no problem, or not say anything about the current issues.Sadly, if Rome canceled them, there's no evidence all of them would join the SSPX, for the same reason they don't join it know.No matter all of the criticism one can do of the SSPX, it does have the best public doctrinal position, the other trad institutes have good things but they're lacking a few key doctrinal things.If an agreement with no doctrinal compromise was found with the Vatican it'd be justice, but it's not as important as traditional doctrine

ourladyofcovadonga (1): It was not Abp. Fellay. It was Williamson that EMJ was speaking with. They are friends. And Williamson was removed from the Society so he does not represent the Society.

Piklikl (1): What other criteria would be essential for a One True Church? I urge you and anyone else to share if you find something better, not to prove that I/the Church is right and you shouldn’t question things, but because we really don’t know if there’s other criteria out there.I get that it seems tautological/circular reasoning to use the catechism to “prove” that the Catholic Church is indeed the only true religion in the world, but not only is it a fool’s errand to try and prove such a thing beyond a shadow of a doubt (apologetics has never been the exercise of proving that the Faith is a fact, but simply to demonstrate that it is reasonable of belief), but also it wouldn’t be sustainable in the long run to expect to use resources “outside” the Church to prove the Church is real (as eventually everyone must join or perish).I do think the catechism needs better ways of being taught, and I really like the approach of a detective with historical amnesia waking up today and using reason and logic to conclude, without emotional arguments, that the Catholic Church is the one true Church. The 4 Marks of the Church, in my opinion, is just such an exercise, but from a different angle.To my knowledge, the Church has never used her authority to declare herself the one true Church based on the criteria she has set, the 4 Marks of the Church is just part of the Catechism.The SSPX also doesn’t reject the authority on its own authority, so to speak, but using the authority and teachings of previous Popes (ie “Rome isn’t wrong because the SSPX says it’s wrong, but because according to previous Popes Rome is wrong”).

None (1): What do you mean caveat?The true Church will last until Christ comes indeed. It doesn't mean Popes will always be right about everything. That's all the SSPX is saying. Pope Francis is the Pope, but when he says "I believe Hell is empty", it is not "the Church" saying it.We're not the ones calling the modernist ideas with the Church the "counciliar Church", Benedict XVI started it.

seeking\_0333 (1): Well…. That gives me much hope then!

ourladyofcovadonga (1): Emj is goated but his views on TLM and the novus ordo are terrible
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Check out the Church Review Podcast on Spotify for the latest SSPX episode.

# Post 373: Do unbaptized people have a low chance of staying out of mortal sin for long periods of time
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As an early teenager, trying to resist mortal sin feels like an impossible battle. I push myself to go weeks without falling, but eventually, it all combusts, and I fail again. Being unbaptized only makes it harder since I don’t have the grace of baptism yet to strengthen me. I’m waiting until Easter to be baptized, but until then, it feels like every effort I make isn’t enough. Even walking outside brings temptations I can’t fully escape. I’ve tried cutting out anything that causes me to fall, but no matter how much I limit, the temptations still come. I’m lost and don’t know what to do anymore; it feels like I’m fighting a battle I’m destined to lose.

rmlenz (7): Continue to be honest with God about your intentions, wait patiently for the day of baptism, maintain the virtue of hope.

AccordingPublic8152 (5): Try saying the “litany of humility” in the mornings 🙂 you’ll be fine until Easter! If you want some books to fill your spare time: GK Chesterton, Fulton J Sheen, Thomas Aquinas, Augustine 📚

SnowWhiteFeather (6): If you struggle with sins of the flesh fasting and praying the Rosary are the best thing you can do. I will see if I can find a good video for you.

None (3): I was like this into 20s, age can temper temptation as you mature and are desensitized to it, in a way. Of course to take advantage of this and feel you have progressed, you need to have a foundation of spiritual devotion and good habits, which it sounds like you are working hard on. Your own efforts won’t be enough though, you will need to pray often and trust that God will not abandon just because you fall and repent many times.

None (1): Pray the rosary everyday and watch this video [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kmzjiR2GyDk](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kmzjiR2GyDk)When you watch this video, listen to the priest, MAKE NOTES

No-Test6158 (1): Not to dissuade you but this battle may not "magically" get better when you've been baptised. Even baptised people sin - I know I have, many many times. Be gentle with yourself, pray as often as you can, trust in Our Lord and ask his Holy Mother to intercede for you. I would also recommend that you make an active effort to pursue more wholesome activities. For me, it's studying that helps a lot. My confessor recommended that I read about the church history as it's something I find very interesting and it really helped. For some people it's exercise, others it's music. Do what works for you - if you don't know, ask for it to be shown to you.Temptations will continue to arise but if you have a strategy to manage them and you trust in God and ask for the grace to overcome them, you will manage to do it. Don't beat yourself up when you fall, just pick yourself up and try again! \*Luke 15:7\*>I say to you, that even so there shall be joy in heaven upon one sinner that doth penance, more than upon ninety-nine just who need not penance.

Next-Antelope-5887 (0): Approximately 82% of the world's population is not baptized. There are a lot of really good loving, compassionate people out there that stay out of mortal sin. Suck it up, butter cup. Get some mental help and therapy. I wish you well, my friend!

Reverend2300Immortal (0): I'm going to make a telegram group for traditional Catholics, who wants to come in

Fravashi\_Yazatas (1): Yes, this one does hit. Takes a lot to embrace and understand, but it is so very meaningful.

# Post 374: Society of Saint Pius X Commitments, Ecône 2024: 1 Belgian, 1 Canadian, 3 Italians, 11 Frenchmen, 2 Kenyans & 2 Swiss
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Next-Antelope-5887 (4): And a partridge in a pear tree.

# Post 375: Bishop Strickland Lauds Archbishop Lefebvre
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None (4): He also believes in Medjugourje😬

Duibhlinn (6): We all have our flaws.

Timeless\_Traditions (-2): The initial apparitions are 100% true. Nothing wrong with them at all. Just exercise caution with a lot of the rest of it, yeah?

dbaughmen (6): Even our good Archbishop had his flaws

# Post 376: Footage of Dominican priest saying medieval Latin Mass for a 1990 Swedish educational documentary: Mass in the 12th century church of Endre, Gotland as it would have been said there on Sunday the 14th of October 1450 A.D.
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No-Test6158 (5): As someone who used to serve at Dominican Rite Mass, a lot of this is familiar to me. But I have always found the chant in this video to be very strange. I've sung Dominican and Roman rite chant for many years, and this is very unfamiliar to me. But maybe that's just me. If anyone knows anything more about the chant in this video, then that would be much appreciated.

Duibhlinn (3): This video is a historical reenactment of the medieval Latin Mass, filmed in the [12^(th) century parish church of Endre on the Swedish island of Gotland](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Endre\_Church), as it would have been said there on Sunday the 4^(th) of October 1450 A.D. which was the 18^(th) Sunday after the feast of the Trinity (\*Dominica XVIII post Trinitatis\*). It was filmed as part of [a 1990 documentary](https://smdb.kb.se/catalog/id/001369514) for [Sveriges Utbildningsradio, the Swedish Educational Broadcasting Company](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Swedish\_Educational\_Broadcasting\_Company).This documentary footage is far more than just a mere reenactment by actors. What you are witnessing is an actually valid, real Catholic Mass as it would have been said in that very same church in the mid 15^(th) century. The celebrant is [Dominican priest Father Anders Piltz O.P.](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anders\_Piltz), then professor of Latin at [Lund University](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lund\_University) and the cantor is Mattias Östborn who was the cantor of the [Catholic parish of Visby](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Body\_of\_Christ\_Church) at the time that this documentary was filmed.A rough English translation from the original Swedish of a part of Father Piltz's introduction to the footage of the Mass:>\*We have reconstructed a High Mass from 500 years ago in a regular Swedish parish church, in Endre church about about a mile east from Visby, Gotland. We imagine that we participate in this High Mass an autumn Sunday in the middle of the 1400s. It is the people of the village that participates in clothes typical to that time and we have to the best of our abilities tried to reconstruct how a Mass was carried out in the\* [\*Diocese of Linköping at that time. Gotland at that time was part of the Diocese of Linköping\*](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Diocese\_of\_Link%C3%B6ping)\*.\*There are two versions of this footage on YouTube. I have linked the version with the higher visual quality. The other one which is lower resolution but includes the introduction (in Swedish) by Father Piltz [can be seen here](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UTSJ7LqZLYQ).

dbaughmen (1): This is beautiful!! What a blessing. I didn’t know it was a valid mass too

Reverend2300Immortal (0): I'm going to make a telegram group for traditional Catholics, who wants to come in

Duibhlinn (2): I may be incorrect but as far as I know the Mass on display is in accordance with the Missal that would have been used by diocesan parish priests in Gotland rather than the Dominican Rite. There were Dominicans in Sweden in the mid 15^(th) century, such as at the [Svartbrödraklostret](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Black\_Friars%27\_Monastery\_of\_Stockholm) in Stockholm and even on Gotland at the Abbey of Saint Nicholas near Visby but I'm not knowledgeable about whether or not this church in particular has a connection to the Order.

Jattack33 (2): He is a Priest but iirc it wasn’t a valid Mass as he deliberately used a wax disk instead of a Host

No-Test6158 (1): Yes, I see your point! The Dominican Rite is part of a family of Northern European rites so it's not dissimilar to, but not the same as this. I find the pre-reformation rites to be fascinating. It's amazing how, despite all being ever so slightly different, their overall form is very much the same. Definitely gives validation to the term Use of the Roman Rite!But yeah, I'm just unfamiliar with the chant used here. I watched a recreation of a mass celebrated according to the English Sarum missal (recreation, because it was "celebrated" by Anglican priests) and the chant was much more familiar to me.

Duibhlinn (1): Another poster on r/TraditionalCatholics also said the same, that they had read as much. I thank you for bringing this up as I thanked them. Would you happen to have a source for the information? When the other poster brought this up I went back and examined the footage and it didn't look like wax to me. When the celebrant breaks the host during the consecration it looks quire real to me, and the priest also consumes the host as part of the priest's communion.

Jattack33 (2): I can’t find a source maybe I’m misremembering

# Post 377: Does dignitatis humanae suggest that this sort of atrocity is a human right and it would be wrong for the state to oppose it?
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sssss\_we (6): You can read it for yourself, Dignitatis Humanae is widely available online.

MacduffFifesNo1Thane (5): The document suggests it but there is one important cultural topic behind it and the Second Vatican Council that explain both in a nutshell.Pope John XXIII was insanely afraid of Communism and the atomic bomb. It’s why he summoned the Council.So believing in any god was better than no god. And giving that most Satanists are atheistic and deify the concept of rebellion, I’d argue it’s the only religion not covered by Dignitatis Humanae. Because it’s atheism with extra Redditor steps.

JoeDukeofKeller (1): Someone lights it on fire, says to the police: "What did I go wrong? It's a Phoenix, they're supposed to burn."

Rare\_Fill1801 (1): Unfortunately the document does seem to support people having the so called “right” to practice their religion, which is contrary to the teaching of the church, no religion has the “right” to exist except the Catholic Church, and no person has the “right” to follow a false religion. The church has always taught that rights come from God and that God does not impede our free will to follow false religion or to commit sin, just because God allows that to happen in his permissive will, doesn’t mean man has a “right” from God to do anything contrary to his will.

Fresh\_Fisherman\_3632 (5): > \*\*This right of the human person to religious freedom\*\* is to be \*\*recognized in the constitutional law\*\* whereby society is governed and thus it is to become a \*\*civil right.\*\*> It is in accordance with their dignity as persons-that is, beings endowed with reason and free will and therefore privileged to bear personal responsibility-that all men should be at once impelled by nature and also bound by a moral \*\*obligation to seek the truth\*\*, especially religious truth. They are also bound to adhere to the truth, once it is known, and to order their whole lives in accord with the demands of truth. However, men cannot discharge these obligations in a manner in keeping with their own nature unless they enjoy \*\*immunity from external coercion as well as psychological freedom.\*\* Therefore the right to religious freedom has its foundation not in the subjective disposition of the person, but in his very nature. In consequence, \*\*the right to this immunity continues to exist\*\* even in those who \*\*do not live up to their obligation\*\* of seeking the truth and adhering to it and \*\*the exercise of this right is not to be impeded\*\*, provided that just public order be observed.

Fresh\_Fisherman\_3632 (4): > Therefore the right to religious freedom has its foundation not in the subjective disposition of the person, but in his very nature. In consequence, \*\*the right to this immunity continues\*\* to exist even in \*\*those who do not live up to their obligation of seeking the truth and adhering to it\*\* and \*\*the exercise of this right is not to be impeded\*\*, provided that just public order be observed.

dbaughmen (2): Do you have a source as to that being the reason the Council was summoned?

sssss\_we (7): Yes, I agree with you, but it's always best for the person who has doubts to read the documents :)

MacduffFifesNo1Thane (2): Hey, John Locke allowed religious freedom to all, except Catholics and atheists. He espoused religious toleration, not religious freedom.There’s exceptions to religious toleration, not religious freedom. I’d argue the aforementioned Satanism is not one of religious freedom. Because no one likes Satanists. It hurts to see it, like how one tolerates pain.

MacduffFifesNo1Thane (1): “Today the Church is witnessing a crisis underway within society…the existence of a militant atheism operating all over the world….[and s]cientific progress itself, which has given man the ability to create catastrophic implements for his own destruction, has raised anxious questions…”John XXIII’s \*[Humanae Salutis](https://jakomonchak.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/humanae-salutis.pdf)\* a.k.a “It’s My Council and You Can Come if You Want To.”

Fresh\_Fisherman\_3632 (3): Search “Minnesota satanism” on here. go in some mainstream subreddits and read the comments about this. These people are overjoyed by it. I don’t think they realize, however, that if this sort of thing continues it is going to backfire tremendously. What quicker way to get Christians to wake up to just how erroneous “religious freedom” is than to demonstrate how it gives equal rights to truth and falsehood, good and evil, God and Satan?

# Post 378: "Father Nierembergh still further remarks, that the servants of the mother of Godnot only are more privileged and favored in this world, but also in heaven willbe more especially honored."
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"And he adds, that in heaven they will have a peculiarly rich device and livery, by which they will be known as servants of the Queen of Heaven and as the people of Her court, according to those words of Proverbs:“All her domestics are clothed with double garments.”Taken from the best book explaining Mariology: "Glories of Mary" by St. Alphonsus, Doctor of the Church (read for free):[https://www.saintsbooks.net/books/St.%20Alphonsus%20Maria%20de%20Ligouri%20-%20The%20Glories%20of%20Mary.pdf](https://www.saintsbooks.net/books/St.%20Alphonsus%20Maria%20de%20Ligouri%20-%20The%20Glories%20of%20Mary.pdf)

# Post 379: Was Bishop Tissier the Most Like Lefebvre? Testimonies from Asia
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dbaughmen (8): Most likely… as Bishop Tissier was with him from the very beginning

Murky\_Question\_9362 (2): I only know that both fought for the true Catholic faith and morals and preserved and handed down Church as it was given to them.

asimovsdog (2): Not really, [according to Fr. Chazal](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XIEUkx8imCQ), he had a good run but was silent towards the end of his life. However, he did motivate Lefevbre to go on when Lefevbre himself almost lost hope, so without him there wouldn't have been an SSPX. May he rest in peace.

# Post 380: Is it a sin to receive communion in the hand when this is the only option given by superiors?
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1hagerd/is\_it\_a\_sin\_to\_receive\_communion\_in\_the\_hand\_when/

Taking the example of a faithful who has no way of receiving it on tongue in his parish or a diocesan seminarian who is forced by his rector to receive communion in the hand, otherwise he will be dismissed from the seminary and will be unable to serve the Church as a priest.Would they be sinning by taking communion in the hand or the sin is of those who force them to take communion in this way?

Duibhlinn (6): It's important to take into account that we are mandated to receive Holy Communion only at least once per year. There is no mandated need to receive the Eucharist at every Mass. If I am unable to receive on the tongue I don't receive at all. That obligation to receive once per year is also within reason and subject to the possibility that there is a just and reasonable reason why someone cannot fulfil it.If someone is unable to receive on the tongue in their parish then there is no one forcing them to receive on the hand. They only \*need\* to receive the Eucharist once per year, and it's within the obligation's rules that as they can't do so in their home parish they can reasonably receive on the tongue elsewhere to fulfil the obligation.As for a seminarian example you give, why is that person in a Novus Ordo diocesan seminary to begin with? If someone doesn't want to receive Communion on the hand why in the world are they going through a seminary which will turn them into priests who the Bishop will force to give Communion on the hand to parishioners at every Mass? Even if someone in a Novus Ordo diocesan seminary makes it through without having to receive Communion on the hand they will still be expected to distribute it on the hand. There isn't a single diocese in the world, other than maybe Campos in Brazil which is a completely exceptional and special circumstance, where a diocesan priest won't be forced to give Communion on the hand. In such a hypothetical scenario of that seminarian it would make me question what in the world they are doing in that seminary to begin with, and why they didn't just go to a traditional seminary.I am aware of a small subset of delusional "traditionalists" who believe in "infiltrating" Novus Ordo seminaries and playing some sort of "long game" to get ordained then somehow at some point in the future turn around and if they become a Bishop implement good policies. Complete fantasy. You're there getting a theology lecture from the Novus Ordo trousers wearing cryptolesbian "nun" and other sorts of poison blasted at you 24/7 and at the end you will just be relegated to some arctic wasteland in Alaska when they find out that you aren't 150% on board with modernism. Yeah good luck trying to "subvert the subverters". Many men who would have made good priests completely throw away and waste their lives in this folly. Even though trad seminaries are always full their foolishness still deprives us of more needed priests.

mattdamon992 (2): Receiving Holy Communion in the hand is not sinful when done with the proper dispositions, especially if it is the only option provided by authority. Historically, this practice dates back to the early Church. St. Cyril of Jerusalem (4th century) instructed the faithful to "make your left hand a throne for the right, as for that which is to receive a King," emphasizing profound reverence in this practice. He also spoke of receiving both the Body and Blood of Christ, indicating that communion under both species was common in some early communities.The Eastern Catholic Churches have preserved the practice of receiving Holy Communion in both species for centuries, often using intinction (dipping the consecrated Host into the Precious Blood). While their practices differ slightly from those in the Latin Rite, they illustrate the diversity of legitimate traditions within the Church.In the modern context, the Church has affirmed that receiving in the hand is permissible if done reverently, as outlined in Memoriale Domini and subsequent permissions from the Holy See. These documents stress that reverence for the Eucharist is paramount, regardless of the manner of reception.For a seminarian or parishioner unable to receive on the tongue, their obedience and interior reverence take precedence. The moral responsibility lies with those enforcing the limitation, as long as the recipient approaches with the proper faith and devotion. The Catechism (CCC 1415) reminds us that the state of grace and proper disposition are what truly prepare us for receiving Christ.Thus, while the traditional reception on the tongue has significant value, receiving in the hand can also reflect a deep respect for the Eucharist when approached thoughtfully. It is not sinful when no alternative is available, provided one's heart is properly disposed.

Pale-Roof9278 (1): Agreed up to the point of being in a diocesan seminary. As a former diocesan seminarian from an area that had NO Indult Latin Mass exposure before four years ago, SSPX or otherwise, sometimes this is the avenue that God uses to get us to our true Trad home. Not all are born into it.

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): >If I am unable to receive on the tongue I don't receive at allBecause in your view would taking communion in the hand be a mistake/sin or "just" to refuse to take communion in a less reverent manner?Since, as indicated in a writing by Saint Cyril of Alexandria, there was Communion in the hand in the Ancient Church>In such a hypothetical scenario of that seminarian it would make me question what in the world they are doing in that seminary to begin with, and why they didn't just go to a traditional seminary.It's not that simple. I personally sought information about entering traditional seminaries and, at least for the reality where I live, being accepted into these seminaries is extremely unlikely, since they are not accepting "strangers", but only those boys who grew up in the traditional rite, were altar servers there and so on.The Institute of the Good Shepherd would be the most feasible of them (with the seminary in France and a monthly fee that is high for many Brazilians).In this situation, many young men are faced with the option of joining a Novus Ordo seminary or religious order or remaining in the lay state (attending Novus Ordo Masses, which are the only ones available to many).EDIT: Furthermore, for someone entering the diocesan seminary today, it will be almost a decade before he is ordained. By then this obligation to distribute Communion in the hand could be revoked, no?

ICT\_Catholic\_Dad (1): Have you seen the conservatism and love of tradition in the young priests being ordained today? In my 8 years as a Catholic living in two dioceses in that time, attending daily mass when life circumstances permit, I've yet to ever hear a heresy preached from the altar, and every priest I've met under 40 is thoroughly committed to the salvation of souls. Maybe you've had some bad experiences. Maybe Pope Francis says and writes things it'd be better if he didn't. But the "novus ordo" church is clearly at work reforming itself.My only caveat to this is I can only speak to the situation in the US. But thanks to the internet, theUS church is increasingly the global trendsetter.

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): >sometimes this is the avenue that God uses to get us to our true Trad homeDidn't got it, do you mean that the diocesan seminary is sometimes this avenue?

UntoTheAgesOfAges (3): Seems like you are mostly interested in Diocesan priesthood, but to the point about communion in the hand I would recommend that you take a look at St. Michael's Abbey. About as traditional as you will find and following in the steps of St. Norbert their patron, only distribute on the tongue.

Duibhlinn (1): >Because in your view would taking communion in the hand be a mistake/sin or "just" to refuse to take communion in a less reverent manner?What do you mean "just"? There is no obligation to receive Communion at every Mass. You don't need to justify it.>Since, as indicated in a writing by Saint Cyril of Alexandria, there was Communion in the hand in the Ancient ChurchThis is complete rubbish. No such thing happened in the ancient Church.>It's not that simple. I personally sought information about entering traditional seminaries and, at least for the reality where I live, being accepted into these seminaries is extremely unlikely, since they are not accepting "strangers", but only those boys who grew up in the traditional rite, were altar servers there and so on.You what? Who told you this? This isn't true. Why don't you go contact the actual seminaries instead of randomers who clearly don't know what they're talking about?Obviously they are going to prioritise people who have served the TLM weekly or daily since they were small children, that doesn't mean they are going to deny you. You will probably have to be on a waiting list, like everyone else, since there are waiting lists for every traditional seminary. You aren't special.>The Institute of the Good Shepherd would be the most feasible of them (with the seminary in France and a monthly fee that is high for many Brazilians).Have you contacted the Personal Apostolic Administration of Saint John Mary Vianney? They are based in the Diocese of Campos but are all over Brazil. I think they would be your best option. They are quite big as an order.>In this situation, many young men are faced with the option of joining a Novus Ordo seminary or religious order or remaining in the lay state (attending Novus Ordo Masses, which are the only ones available to many).You're not in any "situation", you got bad information and are allowing it to cloud your rational judgement.>EDIT: Furthermore, for someone entering the diocesan seminary today, it will be almost a decade before he is ordained. By then this obligation to distribute Communion in the hand could be revoked, no?I have no other way to say this than that I think you're delusional. There is no way that the crisis in the Church is going to be over in 2031.

Pale-Roof9278 (2): I attended a Novus Ordo diocesan seminary about 10 years ago and was ultimately dispensed about 8 years ago. About 3 years after that I found the TLM full time and thereafter the SSPX.

brazilian\_investor\_ (0): I didn't get it, what exactly do you say I should look into regarding St. Michael's Abbey?As for the diocesan priesthood, that's true.Objectively, I would indeed prefer to go to a traditional seminary.But things are not that simple.I personally sought information about entering traditional seminaries and, at least for the reality where I live, being accepted into these seminaries is extremely unlikely, since they are not accepting "strangers", but only those boys who grew up in the traditional rite, were altar servers there and so on.The Institute of the Good Shepherd would be the most feasible of them (with the seminary in France and a monthly fee that is high for many Brazilians).In addition, I feel a special urge to serve as a priest in my home diocese. By God's mercy, I have the grace of being extremely well-liked in the city and so many encourage me in various ways to pursue the priestly vocation. I also have a sister who is old enough to be my daughter and I will be the godfather of a child to be born, great opportunities to exercise spiritual fatherhood. In short, I see that this would be a great opportunity to grow in charity by loving God in these brothers with whom I already have great ties.Yes, I will need to be discreet on some topics in the diocesan seminary, but I think it can be opportunities for growth in humility. As for modernism, I think I can receive the teachings there with a presumption of heterodoxy and form myself in parallel.Furthermore, for someone entering the diocesan seminary today, it will be almost a decade before I be ordained. Who knows, by then we won't have Latin Masses in my diocese.What do you think about these thoughts?

mattdamon992 (0): Why is saint Cyril rubbish? How do you imagine the early church did the first masses for a couple of hundred years? How do you think the body of Christ was broken and shared around?

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): If I may ask, did they dispensed you because you were too traditional?

UntoTheAgesOfAges (2): My point is simply that there is a wide gradient of options when considering vocation. Just because you cannot go to a traditional seminary does not mean that you absolutely have to go to a diocesan one. I bring up St. Michael's as an example because they are a male community that does not distribute on the hand but are a "NO first, TLM second" kind of group.>Yes, I will need to be discreet on some topics in the diocesan seminary, but I think it can be opportunities for growth in humility. As for modernism, I think I can receive the teachings there with a presumption of heterodoxy and form myself in parallel.This may be a hot take to some, but I think this is a laudable endeavor. Some who enter traditional seminaries are scandalized by the NO priesthood and it would be a legitimate detriment to their interior lives and ministry to try and "stick it out" in their local diocese. If you feel that you want to "fight the good fight" in your own Diocese, then that might be exactly what you are being asked to do. If every trad guy discerning priesthood goes to traditional seminaries, the ordinary Diocesan priesthood will continue to liberalize.I can't speak to the issue of money but it seems some others on this thread have good advice vis-a-vis setting up a trust, retirement accounts, etc.

Duibhlinn (1): >Yes, I will need to be discreet on some topics in the diocesan seminary, but I think it can be opportunities for growth in humility.Well that's one word for it. The other word is cowardice. Scandal is another one I can think of. Pretending to be something you're not, basically deceiving your way through 7 years so as not to offend modernists. Not the qualities I would look for in a priest.History is not going to look kindly on men such as yourself who, despite knowing that there was a crisis in the Church and that there were serious issues, went along silently with what was going on in Diocesan seminaries and kept their head down so they didn't suffer any ill consequences. Spineless. You are going to sign up to sacrifice your entire life as a man and you're going to do it that way? You will regret it.>As for modernism, I think I can receive the teachings there with a presumption of heterodoxy and form myself in parallel.If God has given you a vocation to serve in His priesthood you will be wasting years of your life being bombarded by heresy. You are also deluding yourself if you think you are immune to the damaging effects of modernism. Even Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre himself said that saying the transitional Mass, the Mass between the TLM and the full Novus Ordo, was damaging to his faith. That man slept being rained on in Africa in a building without a roof so that the nuns could have somewhere to live and suffered persecution for tradition that many could not dream of. If he found not even the full Novus Ordo, but a precursor, to be damaging to his faith you are not going to be immune to it.

Duibhlinn (1): Saint Cyril is not rubbish. Modernist revisionism of Saint Cyril is rubbish.

Pale-Roof9278 (2): Not particularly. My attitude stunk.

brazilian\_investor\_ (0): >This may be a hot take to some, but I think this is a laudable endeavorCould you elaborate a little more on your point of view? I'd love to hear.>Some who enter traditional seminaries are scandalized by the NO priesthood and it would be a legitimate detriment to their interior lives and ministry to try and "stick it out" in their local dioceseYou say that because I live in NO (there is no TLM in my diocese), I wouldn't be scandalized?>If you feel that you want to "fight the good fight" in your own Diocese, then that might be exactly what you are being asked to doThis consoles me.>If every traditional guy discerning priesthood goes to traditional seminaries, the ordinary Diocesan priesthood will continue to liberalize.It's something I consider too. I look at my diocese (I live in the countryside). We have dozens of diocesan priests and no traditional priests. We have a population that, for the most part, doesn't even know what TLM is. And many of those who do know, have a great aversion to it, thanks to the negative propaganda that has been made about it. I don't see the possibility of SSPX/IBP/ICKSP being stabilized here in the near future.These souls need priests. Preferably good priests.And the most direct way I see to reach these people is through the diocesan priesthood.I see the problem with NO. But I also see the effectiveness of the Sacraments. I know people who demonstrate a high degree of virtue who have never attended TLM.The comments that were not very favorable to this endeavor highlighted the potential risks that I would have to face, among them: \- being ostracized by the modernists in the seminary \- being isolated, therefore more susceptible to being influenced, and thus falling into modernism \- exposure to heresies - difficulty in maintaining a non-belligerent stance towards the modernists in the seminary, considering the long period of training (8 years) \- impaired studies (even if I study on my own, many hours will be dedicated to the Nouvelle Theologie, for example) \- when ordained, the risk of being sent to a peripheral parish and being censored, thus reducing the scope of the good that could be doneI was, in considering the diocesan priesthood, looking at it as a kind of "mission". Yes, it has its dangers: threats, persecution, exposure to false doctrines. But the challenges faced by the missionaries were not very different from these. And they faced them for the salvation of souls.What do you think about it?

mattdamon992 (0): Source?https://churchlifejournal.nd.edu/articles/early-christian-communion-in-the-hand/

UntoTheAgesOfAges (1): > These souls need priests. Preferably good priests.This is exactly the point. The reality is that many people in rural areas need strong priests to lead them. Yes, you may be scandalized by some expressions of modernism in your own Diocese, but it seems like you could persevere in the good fight regardless. The call is to love your flock as Christ loves the Church.Make no mistake, I love that more young men are entering traditional seminaries. However, there is somewhat of a bubble effect - people who love the TLM join seminaries that love the TLM to minister to Catholics who love the TLM. There are many NO Catholics who have simply been raised in modernism and do not know any better. These people need to be evangelized by priests who are willing to enter imperfect Dioceses and fight the good fight, bringing reverent liturgy to people to help them \*desire\* tradition and the TLM.I'm not surprised that you have received comments not favorable to this endeavor, but those are the kind of opinions you'll find in some traditional corners of the internet. A very good priest friend of mine kept his head down in seminary, says the TLM privately when he is assigned to NO-only parishes - but through his preaching he is inspiring a generation of young men and women to desire tradition. If he had gone to a far-off traditional seminary, these parishioners might not have had such truths preached to them.Perhaps you will be ostracized. Perhaps you will be isolated, impaired in your studies, assigned to a parish in the middle of nowhere once you are ordained. The life of a priest is not meant to be a comfy one, it is meant to be a life of sacrifice - an \*Alter Chrisus\*. Many desire traditional seminaries because they would suffer in their ordinary Diocesan formation, but suffering is a core component of the Christian life. It can be fuel for the fire of your interior life, giving you inner strength to persevere through the tribulations that you will inevitably experience.If you have time, I would check out [this interview](https://youtu.be/o8ubCSJya-A?si=tp1ozosWIGnyXIgr) with Dr. Ed Feser. I think it presents a conservative yet hopeful view of the Church that would assist in your discernment.EDIT: Typos

Duibhlinn (1): I found it hard not to smile when I saw you post an nd.edu link lol

brazilian\_investor\_ (2): Thank you for these valuable reflections and for suggesting the interview.In the end, I think the criterion must be charity, where/how I love Our Lord the most.I think I will get to know the NO monastery in my diocese better. The environment there is much more favorable to Tradition than the diocesan seminary.God bless you!

mattdamon992 (0): Where there is joy there is Christ :)

Duibhlinn (1): Well done brave novus ordo mujahideen

Cathain78 (2): Look at the post history, he basically spends his spare time channeling the ghost of Bugnini and parrots every piece of modernist apologetics while claiming that it’s everyone else who is indoctrinated. The poster child of everything wrong with the Conciliar Church today.

mattdamon992 (0): No source to share? so you're just spreading your delusional belief that communion in the hand wasn't a part of the early church?

Duibhlinn (2): Many such cases.

# Post 381: Would it be a problem for a secular priest to keep a financial reserve for emergencies?
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I'm willing to pursue the priesthood. I've already known religious life a bit, but I think I'm more inclined to the diocesan priesthood. I also have a patrimony that I built up during my years of secular work. If I become religious, obviously I should leave it. But, in the case of the diocesan priesthood, would it be a problem for me to keep this patrimony? Could it be scandalous for the faithful? Not to squander a luxurious life, I already lead a simple one.. But to have more peace of mind about the future, when I get old and sick, and thus not have to worry about that, so I can focus better on serving God and the faithful. Even a security to be able to protect myself, financially and legally (lawyers), in case of persecution, slander, etc. For example, some time ago a priest, after having been the parish priest of a church for decades, when he reached the age of 75 and was forced to present his letter of resignation, had it accepted and was asked to leave the parish house. As far as I know, he is living in his sister's house.And, of course, he have the heart free to do charity with that money too.

None (7): Why are you asking here?You might be able to keep it indeed, but the diocesan Church will probably take care of you when you're old, so you won't need it even for security

asimovsdog (4): For a diocesan priest no, then again, I really wouldn't recommend going into a diocesan seminary. For an SSPX priest it might be okay because it can make you more independent from the fear of having to be silent on issues within the SSPX because of fear of getting kicked out.The whole "but I get X amount of return if I give the money on my deathbed, so it will help the poor more" is dangerous because the morality isn't by how much money you give to the poor but how many souls are saved because of your money (and how much it helps you to trust God). So, if you give $100 now and that money then immediately contributes to one more soul being saved it's worth more than investing the $100 and giving $10000 on your deathbed. I do struggle with this myself.See also: https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/12324a.htm

None (3): You can put this into a revocable/living trust, a qualified retirement account, and/or a standard brokerage account with designated beneficiaries in the case of your death. You will likely not need the money now, but it may very well be all you can rely on 30 years from now depending on the condition of your order, district, or diocese. The growth on any amount invested over that period of time could be substantial. Should you not need to draw that amount down in retirement, it could be a very meaningful amount to give to the poor or to the church. Should you require distribution of it as supplementary retirement income, you will have reduced your amount of “burden” on the church by potentially hundreds of thousands of dollars. God makes very clear we should not “bury” our talents, but multiply them - and a lifestyle of poverty and simplicity does not require you to go without any comfort in your later years!

No-Test6158 (2): I wouldn't see a problem per se, however, the SSPX has had a challenge with people leaving the Priesthood after being ordained - either returning to a secular life or moving into the SSPX resistance or more extreme circles so I could quite imagine that they may be concerned with the possibility of you changing allegiance after they made a significant investment into you. Remember that it takes 6 years minimum to be formed as a priest and the society will be footing the bill based on the assumption that you will be working for them.You might want to look into the Oratory of St Philip Neri - they tend to be fairly traditional leaning and they also allow their priests to keep their personal wealth upon entering into the community. Their process for ordination is a bit slower - you commit to the community first before being recommended onwards for training to the priesthood.As for the IBP - they are good but I know at least one former seminarian (now priest) from Brazil who had a really lousy time with them.

Duibhlinn (3): Why are you asking about the Novus Ordo diocesan priesthood on this subreddit?

SnowWhiteFeather (0): I don't know. The simple answer is to ask before you make commitments.If money concern is an insurmountable hurdle to your vocation to the priesthood you probably weren't meant to pursue it. Make sure you are properly discerning. Pray, think, and use good judgement. Don't be discouraged. Have faith.

None (2): That is by no means close to guaranteed given the financial condition of most dioceses.History is full of companies and states which have gone underwater on their pension plans, leaving their employees holding the bag. Only prudent to have a proprietary reserve to pay for emergency expenses in retirement.

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): >For a diocesan priest no, then again, I really wouldn't recommend going into a diocesan seminaryCould you share with me why exactly?Objectively, I would indeed prefer to go to a traditional seminary.But things are not that simple.I personally sought information about entering traditional seminaries and, at least for the reality where I live, being accepted into these seminaries is extremely unlikely, since they are not accepting "strangers", but only those boys who grew up in the traditional rite, were altar servers there and so on.The Institute of the Good Shepherd would be the most feasible of them (with the seminary in France and a monthly fee that is high for many Brazilians).In addition, I feel a special urge to serve as a priest in my home diocese. By God's mercy, I have the grace of being extremely well-liked in the city and so many encourage me in various ways to pursue the priestly vocation. I also have a sister who is old enough to be my daughter and I will be the godfather of a child to be born, great opportunities to exercise spiritual fatherhood. In short, I see that this would be a great opportunity to grow in charity by loving God in these brothers with whom I already have great ties.Yes, I will need to be discreet on some topics in the diocesan seminary, but I think it can be opportunities for growth in humility. As for modernism, I think I can receive the teachings there with a presumption of heterodoxy and form myself in parallel.Furthermore, for someone entering the diocesan seminary today, it will be almost a decade before I be ordained. Who knows, by then we won't have Latin Masses in my diocese.>the morality isn't by how much money you give to the poor but how many souls are saved because of your moneyInteresting...>So, if you give $100 now and that money then immediately contributes to one more soul being saved it's worth more than investing the $100 and giving $10000 on your deathbed. I do struggle with this myself.The \*\*immediately\*\* matters? Or could you save the money for now (and therefore have greater freedom in life to serve God and work for the salvation of souls) \*\*and\*\* giving all of it (to works in the service of God and salvation of souls) at deathbed, having the best of both?

brazilian\_investor\_ (2): >You might want to look into the Oratory of St Philip NeriThank you for the recommendation.>As for the IBP - they are good but I know at least one former seminarian (now priest) from Brazil who had a really lousy time with them.Lousy in what sense?

brazilian\_investor\_ (3): Because I would like to know the opinions of people on this subreddit (opinions that sound quite Catholic to me)

brazilian\_investor\_ (4): >If money concern is an insurmountable hurdle to your vocation to the priesthood It isn't, I was just wondering if it would be right for me to have this security when my parishioners possibility won't have it.

None (2): Well the Church hasn't declared bankruptcy yet 😂But again, why are you asking on the SSPX sub and not on the NO one, r/Catholicism?

asimovsdog (1): A bit of a longer answer, but I'm in the same situation (I have two houses that I can rent out and I want to join an SSPX seminary in my 30s, but I still have stuff to do before I can join).I'll explain:> The immediately matters?It depends on the situation, I just wanted to attack the thinking process: by the time you're old, times may be far worse (stock crash, inflation, war, etc. who knows what'll happen until then), the money might be worthless, get lost in the process, etc. And even if the value of the money is retained, maybe by that time, people will be so hardened in their hearts that your money won't reach them, even if you throw more money at the solution. I just wanted to drive home that it's not your money (a little or a lot) saving people, only Gods grace. Plus "doing charity" alone is not the end goal of charity (it can reduce suffering, but not eternal).Jesus prefers the 2 cents of the widow to the riches of surplus of a rich man. A $2 pamphlet that saves one soul can get more reward in heaven than rich man that founds an entire university, little money with Gods grace is more effective than a lot of money without grace. On the other hand, he tells us to \*be wise and use our money wisely\* (parable of the ten talents). Jesus also wanted the rich young man to trust him and immediately follow him (to make him a disciple), however, this was a direct command from God (which is not your case).I would not see it as a "either or", you can give some money away right now, some along the way and some later. So for me, I'll rent out the houses as long as possible, but not invest the generated money into stocks, but use it immediately for tasks at hand. That way I'm never really rich (which is tempting me to laziness), can save souls now AND later and have a security in case of unpredictable emergencies (let's say 20 years down the line the SSPX goes woke / modernist and I'll have to leave them behind, something like that). I guess that is a decent tradeoff on "invest now vs invest along the way vs invest on my deathbed".Priests in the SSPX do not take vows of poverty (as they're more or less missionary priests) and monks in the medieval era funded themselves with renting their property, as true poverty proved to be hindering to the actual goal of monks: saving souls and focusing on prayer. \*\*Poverty is not a virtue, but a removal of a spiritual obstacle\*\*, i.e. "not being attached to your money" is the first goal. But being rich is good for having your hands free for other stuff, it's not bad in itself. So take my example: it's basically the same way as monks funded themselves all throughout the ages.> I personally sought information about entering traditional seminaries and, at least for the reality where I live, being accepted into these seminaries is extremely unlikely, since they are not accepting "strangers", but only those boys who grew up in the traditional rite, were altar servers there and so on.Hm yeah, I'm not familiar with FSSP / IBP, etc. I didn't expect them to be this cliquey. I cannot recommend them obviously because as long as they're in the "official" Church, they're "fake traditional": sure, they have nice Masses, but have to obey a more-or-less modernist pope in order to keep the buildings and joining them doesn't do much for the long game (see the [FSSP Chartres pilgrimage being threatened to be shut down](https://www.catholicnewsagency.com/news/260875/vatican-could-reportedly-restrict-latin-mass-for-chartres-pilgrimage-french-media-claims)).> As for modernism, I think I can receive the teachings there with a presumption of heterodoxy and form myself in parallel.Maybe in a FSSP / ICKSP seminary, but not in a diocesan. Lots of people tell themselves that, lots of people fail. The "bishops" are pure leftists or silent weaklings, from what I've heard. I'd really warn you about this: it's more or less putting yourself into an occasion of sin (or in this case, occasion of modernism), you will probably get infected by it (even the SSPX isn't completely free), even if you don't: as soon as you attempt anything trad within a modernist seminary, you'll be not ordained, kicked out or transferred to the diocese of Antarctica and celebrate the Latin Mass for penguins (kidding, but you get the point). > Yes, I will need to be discreet on some topics in the diocesan seminary, but I think it can be opportunities for growth in humility. Well at least here in Germany, the "bishops", if they even deserve that title, are pure heretics. Can't speak for Brazil, but I highly doubt you'll learn anything about the actual Catholic faith in a diocesan seminary. Above all you need to save your own soul, so that's why I wouldn't want you to join a Novus Ordo seminary.The best case outcome in a diocesan seminary (if you even make it to ordination without being discovered as an undercover trad and manage to keep your faith) is being someone like Fr. Nix, a "diocesan hermit", i.e. monk-ish travel priest with a decent bishop that allows him to celebrate the TLM. Most people I've spoken to say, in Rome nothing will change until the boomers have died out (somewhere between 2040 and 2060, when the Novus Ordo will die from natural causes).> Who knows, by then we won't have Latin Masses in my diocese.Exactly (also why I consider them "controlled opposition", because while they do celebrate nice Masses, they do little to get Rome back on track in the long run and without the SSPX existing, they'd be shut down by the pope in a few years time). They basically exist to distract (parishioners and seminarians) from the SSPX and so it's not helping in the long game.

No-Test6158 (2): I'm not really sure, something about their charism just didn't suit him I think. They're solid but really rather small!

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): Because I would like to know the opinions of people on this subreddit (opinions that sound quite Catholic to me)

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): >Poverty is not a virtue, but a removal of a spiritual obstacle, i.e. "not being attached to your money" is the first goal. But being rich is good for having your hands free for other stuff, it's not bad in itself. So take my example: it's basically the same way as monks founded themselves all throughout the ages. That was quite enlightening, thank you!>Hmm yeahBy yeah you mean that is indeed very unlikely for me to be accepted in the SSPX seminary?>Maybe in a FSSP / ICKSP seminary, but not in a diocesan. Lots of people tell themselves that, lots of people failDo you personally know guys who tried to do this and became corrupted?I was thinking that way, until both a traditional friend of mine and my spiritual director thought that I could do this without getting carried away by false doctrines. (this friend of mine has other friends following this same path).Despite everything, I see good priests ordained by the diocese (maybe something like 10% of the total?)>as soon as you attempt anything trad within a modernist seminary, you'll be not ordained, kicked out or transferred to the diocese of Antarctica and celebrate the Latin Mass for penguins (kidding, but you get the point)Yeah, I got it. A newly ordained priest was doing an excellent job in one of the most important parishes of my diocese and was moved to a more peripheral one. But still, there are souls there to save, and I don't see the possibility of neither SSPX nor IBP/ICKSP arriving there in the near future.>Can't speak for BrazilThere are good ones, but many of them are from Liberation Theology. But from what I see, they are more Catholic than those in Germany.>is being someone like Fr. Nix, a "diocesan hermit", i.e. monk-ish travel priest with a decent bishop that allows him to celebrate the TLMAre you of the opinion that it would be in any case morally wrong for me to celebrate in the NO?

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): But were they mean to him or something like that?I see that there is a certain cultural difference in the relationship between the priest and the faithful in the case of the SSPX and the IBP when compared to how it usually is in Brazil.

None (3): This is to be taken as a compliment haha, but if the SSPX sounds quite Catholic to you, even more than the rest if you ask the question here only, why don't you simply join the priesthood there? It's the only seminary you won't hear contradictions from in the teachings

asimovsdog (2): > By yeah you mean that is indeed very unlikely for me to be accepted in the SSPX seminary?The SSPX constantly says they need more priests, not less. So the SSPX seminaries do have free slots, at least here in Germany. If you're not getting into an FSSP seminary, it's at least worth a try to apply at the SSPX. However, they obviously would like to keep their priests after ordination, because the SSPX funds the seminary and they have an anti-modernist oath, which would probably prevent you from switching later to a diocesan seminary. And they relocate their priests often, but maybe you can talk about starting a mission in your diocese (and not have to worry about getting your TLM restricted).>Do you personally know guys who tried to do this and became corrupted?I admit that I know too few diocesan priests to make a judgment, but an SSPX priest told me this: the Church is a hierarchy and there are cases where you have to obey. So, operating within a bad hierarchy to "subvert it from the inside" will fail because the people at the top very well know what's going on and are not well-meaning. Traditionally, all attempted subversions were knifed down by the pope, but in this case it sadly happened that they struck the head. So now it is better to take a step aside and let the corrupt hierarchy collapse. Maybe they will let you continue if you're not dangerous enough. But once you start causing trouble (or in the case of your priest, save "too many" souls), they will hinder you, censor you, etc. So your goal to save souls is limited from the start. Plus, you're getting a worse formation than at any trad seminary and have to learn to shut up about the scandals in the Church, have to popesplain things, etc.The biggest problem is what you're NOT learning, e.g. you're not learning that certain things are sins, like immodest clothing for example (it's just the first thing I notice in NO masses). So, how do you expect to give souls good advice if you haven't learned to distinguish good from bad? And if you dare to speak up, you'll be censored. You're not learning to be steadfast and have a backbone, you're learning to be a company man. Padre Pio was holy, but not always well liked, but he cared more about saving his flock than being popular. If I was you, I'd be trying to get the best education possible because after ordination you're going to be too busy to teach yourself on the side. Also, your means of communication in seminary will likely be restricted, so the "learning on the side" will likely fail.> Despite everything, I see good priests ordained by the diocese (maybe something like 10% of the total?)Yes, but remember: the first soul you need to save is your own and it can be easily lost: if you advise badly, you as the priest will be responsible for the mistakes of your flock. So, if you go into a seminary that has a 90% modernist priests, how high will the chance be that you won't get infected, spread modernism and go to hell for it? I think the advice from your spiritual director is naive.> Are you of the opinion that it would be in any case morally wrong for me to celebrate in the NO?Yes because of what the NO expresses, how it got introduced, the new theology that went alongside it, the prayers that were cut to please Protestants, Orthodox and Jews, etc. etc., even if celebrated reverently. I know these priests are "good guys", maybe they are popular (popularity doesn't mean anything, Protestantism is also popular) and certainly well-meaning, but the opposite of good is well-meaning and nice. Bishop Williamson once called it "the heresy of niceness" (versus the virtue of steadfastness). I could never do this, I'd see myself as a supporter of the biggest Church crisis today, I mean, why did these souls get lost in the first place: because of the introduction of the NO. It was a disaster and the more I learn about it, the more scandalous it gets, how the NO was pushed from a small group of Rhine theologians, against the will of most bishops at first (they thought Bugnini was nuts, but then later went along because they weren't well organized and didn't expect such massive changes). I just want the NO to die out naturally so that ultimately the TLM can take over and save more souls because one displays the actual Catholic faith and the other is a Lutheran-lite service and is misrepresenting the identity of the Church.TLDR: see if you can get into the SSPX seminary in Argentinia, from what I've heard the SSPX is not full. Lastly: it's better to NOT be a priest than to be a bad one. Better to be on a waiting list for a trad seminary and having to wait a couple years, than to risk being infected and spreading modernism. Ask them to open a mission near you (the SSPX only opens missions where it knows that Catholics are). If you are popular, the money will come automatically, but you won't have to put your own soul at risk. I can only advise you this far, you're going to have to make the choice yourself. God bless you.

No-Test6158 (1): I think it was more a matter of him struggling a bit with European culture - despite Brazil having a European language, there are sizeable cultural differences. I mean he still got ordained but I think he's now moving to the Diocesan priesthood with an allowance made to let him celebrate the old Mass.

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): Objectively, I would indeed prefer to go to a traditional seminary.But things are not that simple.I personally sought information about entering traditional seminaries and, at least for the reality where I live, being accepted into these seminaries is extremely unlikely, since they are not accepting "strangers", but only those boys who grew up in the traditional rite, were altar servers there and so on.The Institute of the Good Shepherd would be the most feasible of them (with the seminary in France and a monthly fee that is high for many Brazilians).In addition, I feel a special urge to serve as a priest in my home diocese. By God's mercy, I have the grace of being extremely well-liked in the city and so many encourage me in various ways to pursue the priestly vocation. I also have a sister who is old enough to be my daughter and I will be the godfather of a child to be born, great opportunities to exercise spiritual fatherhood. In short, I see that this would be a great opportunity to grow in charity by loving God in these brothers with whom I already have great ties.Yes, I will need to be discreet on some topics in the diocesan seminary, but I think it can be opportunities for growth in humility. As for modernism, I think I can receive the teachings there with a presumption of heterodoxy and form myself in parallel.Furthermore, for someone entering the diocesan seminary today, it will be almost a decade before I be ordained. Who knows, by then we won't have Latin Masses in my diocese.What do you think about these thoughts?

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): I agree with all the disadvantages of the diocesan seminary that you pointed out.Maybe I'm just a little more optimistic than you are about how much these issues can affect me. Like the exposure to modernism, the sin of immodesty in dress... Maybe I'm "less worried" because this is already the environment I live in, since I only have access to NO Masses here. It was in this environment that I resumed my faith journey, I've learned to love God, my vocation flourished..Does that make sense?>I just want the NO to die out naturally so that ultimately the TLM can take over and save more souls because one displays the actual Catholic faith and the other is a Lutheran-lite service and is misrepresenting the identity of the Church.About the Council and the liturgical reform, I'm familiar with these points you made. And, I agree, it was terrible.But I wonder: is the best solution for all good priests to prefer not to say any Mass at all rather than say a Mass in NO?I look at my diocese. We have dozens of diocesan priests and no traditional priests. We have a population that, for the most part, doesn't even know what TLM is. And many of those who do know, have a great aversion to it, thanks to the negative propaganda that has been made about it. In your opinion, would it be better if there were no Masses here than the many NO Masses that we have daily?I see the problem with NO. But I also see the effectiveness of the Sacraments. I know people who demonstrate a high degree of virtue who have never attended TLM.That is why I considered going to the diocesan seminary. Seeing it as a "mission". Yes, it has its dangers: threats, persecution, exposure to false doctrines. But the challenges faced by the missionaries were not very different from these. And they faced them for the salvation of souls.What do you think of this perspective?

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): >I think it was more a matter of him struggling a bit with European cultureCould you talk a little more about this? It is a considerable question in my discernment, in which I have among the options the diocesan seminary or a traditional seminary abroad.>but I think he's now moving to the Diocesan priesthoodIn Europe or Brazil?

None (2): Thanks for sharing me your thoughts!I happen to have a brother who was just ordained by the SSPX in Écône; and a great friend of mine is there as well. Regarding being a stranger not raised in the tradition, well my brother's best friend in his year in the seminary was Gabonese, and one priest we both like a lot (I just talked with him today) was not raised in a traditional Catholic family. There is not even a financial issue, since for example my friend who is still in seminary is from a poor family: in those cases, they have donors paying for everything. Finally, regarding the teachings of the diocesan seminary, first being isolated makes being badly influenced very likely, and also, forming yourself will be far from what a traditional seminary would offer you. Being discreet for almost a decade is an almost impossible challenge. I understand why you"d want to stay in your diocese, but in a time of crisis like now, although it's easy and presumptious to say from my layman perspective, it's important to sacrifice what we hold dear for the glory of God. My brother was sent to South Africa, he could have been useful in my family/city but I think having a right formation matters the most. Écône is far indeed, but unlike my brother's Gaboneese friend you have an SSPX seminary on your continent, in Argentina, where I believe you wouldn't be the only Portugese speaking seminarian. There also is an English language one in the USA. Here is the link to the seminary in Argentina : [https://lareja.fsspx.org/pt](https://lareja.fsspx.org/pt)I'll pray for you so you take the right decision now (I haven't finished my rosary)! Good luck and don't hesitate if I can help you!

No-Test6158 (2): I'm not so certain about the details here aside from the fact that there are a lot of things about life in Europe that are very different to life in the New World. I think a lot of people come here expecting it to be one way and then they find that it isn't. But I am European so I can't be certain.Regarding the second part of your question, I think your best option is to enter a Traditional Seminary - but I wouldn't be in this subreddit if I didn't think this! Bear in mind the current restrictions in place over the Diocesan clergy and their formation. I don't see things getting better in the immediate future. Bear in mind that if you were to enter the diocesan clergy you would be bound by a lot of these restrictions which means having to ask the Holy See for permission to offer the Mass of All Time. To me, this is an untenable position, but that's just myself. You will also have to swallow all the rot about ecumenism and respect for false religions that the post-conciliar church forces on their clergy. If that's something you can do, then I would urge you to think about this a lot.And he, hopefully, will be entering the diocesan priesthood in Europe, where the bishops are, seemingly at least here in my country, a little more sympathetic to the Old Rite. Or at least, they are privately.

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): Thank you so much for your help. I'll pray for you too.>Regarding being a stranger not raised in the tradition, well my brother's best friend in his year in the seminary was Gabonese, and one priest we both like a lot (I just talked with him today) was not raised in a traditional Catholic family.Awesome! Were your brother, this Gabonese seminarian and the great friend of yours raised in tradition? As for this priest you like a lot, would you know how long it has been since he entered the seminary and/or was ordained?>in those cases, they have donors paying for everythingIs it the SSPX itself that strives to find donors or is it the seminarian who goes after them?>being isolated makes being badly influenced very likelyIndeed, that's a risk. Although I feel I could be already "vaccinated". Both a traditional friend of mine and my spiritual director think that I could do this without getting carried away by false doctrines. Seems reasonable?>Being discreet for almost a decade is an almost impossible challenge.I'm talking to a few people to get a better understanding of what the situation is like there. One person told me that as long as I don't take a very belligerent and aggressive attitude, I'll be left in peace. If that's the case, do you think it would be possible to deal with it?>I understand why you"d want to stay in your diocese, but in a time of crisis like now, although it's easy and presumptious to say from my layman's perspective, it's important to sacrifice what we hold dear for the glory of God. My brother was sent to South Africa, he could have been useful in my family/city but I think having a right formation matters the most.I see your point. On the other hand, I see some other relevant factors.On the part of my personal salvation , well, of course it would be possible anywhere in the world. But I have always been very close to my family and I don't see that this relationship hinders my path to God, but rather that it gives me strength and support. Besides, going to another country (due to the seminary) is a considerable change, considering how well I will adapt to the local culture and so on. And, being ordained a traditional priest, I think these changes of location will be quite frequent (something I am not very inclined towards naturally). Most importantly, in the part of saving others, I am thinking, don't we also need traditional young men entering the diocesan clergy? Otherwise, the situation in the dioceses will only get worse. I live in the countryside and I don't see the possibility of a Traditional Mass institute being established here in the near future. What we have are the diocesan and religious priests, all NO. Could it be that God is asking me to "fight the good fight" here where I grew up and be an instrument of salvation for these people, even without studies as good as I would get in a traditional seminary?

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): >I'm not so certain about the details here aside from the fact that there are a lot of things about life in Europe that are very different to life in the New World.Ok, so for me trying some Traditional Seminary it would have this risk too.>If that's something you can do, then I would urge you to think about this a lot.Objectively, I would indeed prefer to go to a traditional seminary.But things are complex.I personally sought information about entering traditional seminaries and, at least for the reality where I live, being accepted into these seminaries is extremely unlikely, since they are not accepting "strangers", but only those boys who grew up in the traditional rite, were altar servers there and so on.The Institute of the Good Shepherd would be the most feasible of them (with the seminary in France and a monthly fee that is high for many Brazilians).In addition, I feel a special urgency to serve as a priest in my home diocese. By God's mercy, I have the grace of being extremely well-liked in the city and so many encourage me in various ways to pursue the priestly vocation. I also have a sister who is old enough to be my daughter and I will be the godfather of a child to be born, great opportunities to exercise spiritual fatherhood. In short, I see that this would be a great opportunity to grow in charity by loving God in these brothers with whom I already have great ties.I'm talking to a few people to get a better understanding of what the situation is like in the diocesan seminary. One person told me that as long as I don't take a very belligerent and aggressive attitude, I'll be left in peace. As for modernism, a traditional friend of mine and my spiritual director think that I could do this without getting carried away by false doctrines, receiving the teachings there with a presumption of heterodoxy and forming myself in parallel.That's true, currently the bishop does not allow TLM in my diocese. On the other hand, things may change in a decade.With that in mind, do you think it would be worth entering the diocesan seminary?I wonder, don't we also need traditional young men entering the diocesan clergy to "fight the good fight"? Otherwise, the situation in the dioceses will only get worse. I live in the countryside and I don't see the possibility of SSPX/IBP/ICKSP being established here in the near future. What we have are the diocesan and religious priests, all NO. And these souls need priests.>\> And he, hopefully, will be entering the diocesan priesthood in EuropeI didn't get it. If his struggle was adapting to European culture, what's the point of him leaving the IBP to enter a diocese in Europe?

None (2): Thanks for praying as well!My brother and my friend were raised in tradition, my priest friend wasn't, I'm not sure for the Gabonese friend, it's possible je wasn't; I know other examples who weren't either. The fact that most seminarians were raised in tradition isn't because the SSPX only accepts them, it's simply because traditional families are more prone to create children having a traditional vocation !Regarding donors, I think it's the SSPX who finds them, but the seminarians can help. For example, my friend who is in seminary doesn't have a rich family so SSPX donors are paying for him.Regarding being vaccinated against modernism, I don't think it's impossible you go through staying traditional, but I think it's not going to replace a good traditional formation you'd receive in a traditional seminary; also, the SSPX's position is against the New Mass, I personally agree with that, and you'd have to learn to celebrate the New Mass if you went to a NO seminary, I think this is actually the main issue.Regarding being discreet and left in peace, I think it depends what you're willing to say and how "tolerant" the seminary is, so it's difficult to give a definite answer; no matter what I don't think it's a very healthy way to spend a few years of formation.Seminary in my opinion is more than a mandatory step to get ordained, it's a complete life formation that should deeply influence the seminarian to make a good priest, so I don't think it's possible to go through it with a mindest going against the modernist teachings in NO seminary, without lacking what a priest would have after going to a trad seminary.Regarding your relationship with your family, the SSPX is not making people cut the bridges with their families! However it's certain that a priest, no matter where he's sent, will have a new state duty, and his parishioners will have to go above his own family. It's really easy to say for me as a layman who isn't entering the seminary, but we have to sacrifice everything for the purity of the faith we transmit to others!I have a grand-uncle who entered the NO seminary with a traditional mindest, but now he's like the average NO priest I know.There is a difference between being conservative and being traditional; being traditional is only accepting what doesn't contradict Tradition, meaning only the TLM and disagree with Vatican II on some issue, and those 2 things are definitely not publically believed in the diocese. Believing that, you won't ever be made bishop or more, meaning you'll always be dependent on people you disagree with on key doctrinal issues. Nobody is useless where he is, but the NO priests who become traditional are alone and persecuted, and man's not made to be alone, priests should have superiors and colleagues having the same traditional faith as them in order to spiritually survive.I have example of good diocesan priests who are doing good where they are, but no example of diocesan priests who are fully traditional and who didn't end up having to give up some of their traditional beliefs.Anyway, I'm sorry of what I say can sound easy to say, harsh and judgmental, this is not my intention, I just think you having the vocation is great, and I wouldn't want a fellow traditionalist ending up stuck without tradition!

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): >Anyway, I'm sorry for what I say can sound easy to say, harsh and judgmental, this is not my intentionBy no means! I appreciate your advice and generosity in helping me better narrow down my options, thank you!>My brother and my friend were raised in tradition, my priest friend wasn't, I'm not sure for the Gabonese friend, it's possible he wasn't; I know other examples who weren't either.Could you tell me when they entered the seminary and/or were ordained?I ask because this information that SSPX (and other traditional institutes) were being more cautious in admission was told to me by someone very familiar with this environment.>also, the SSPX's position is against the New Mass, I personally agree with that, and you'd have to learn to celebrate the New Mass if you went to a NO seminary, I think this is actually the main issue.This is a point where I disagree with what seems to be the SSPX's position. Yes, I am aware of how the New Mass came about, how the intention was to remove the sacrificial character of the rite, etc.But I do not think that a faithful person is sinning by going to the New Mass if it is the only option he has (for me, for example, it is the only option in the entire diocese). The faithful need the Sacraments and many of them would be scandalized to see Catholics not fulfilling the Sunday precept. I think that, if it is a sin, the greatest responsibility lies with Bugnini, with Paul VI, not with a faithful person who has little to do with the decisions of the Church.I look at my diocese (I live in the countryside). We have dozens of diocesan priests and no traditional priests. We have a population that, for the most part, doesn't even know what TLM is. And many of those who do know, have a great aversion to it, thanks to the negative propaganda that has been made about it. I don't see the possibility of SSPX/IBP/ICKSP being stabilized here in the near future. These souls need priests. Preferably good priests. And the most direct way I see to reach these people is through the diocesan priesthood.>I have a grand-uncle who entered the NO seminary with a traditional mindest, but now he's like the average NO priest I knowWhat do you mean by that exactly? That he thinks like John Paul II, Benedict XVI or Bishop Barron?>but no example of diocesan priests who are fully traditional and who didn't end up having to give up some of their traditional beliefs.What traditional beliefs are you specifically referring to?

None (2): >"Could you tell me when they entered the seminary and/or were ordained?"Well my brother entered 7 years ago and was ordained this summer. The same for his Gabonese friend. Regarding my friend, he entered 3 years later after my brother. Regarging the Italian priest we're friends with who didn't grow up in the Tradition, I think like 10 years ago.>I ask because this information that SSPX (and other traditional institutes) were being more cautious in admission was told to me by someone very familiar with this environment.Well it's kinda true, the SSPX is picky and most seminarians leave before the end (it's the same for most traditional seminaries). But this is not about people being from the tradition or not; I know only one person who was refused, and he was SSPX raised. I know many who left during the seminary, some of them being SSPX raised friends. Besides, you could just apply and see, if they refused you you'd know for sure>This is a point where I disagree with what seems to be the SSPX's position. Yes, I am aware of how the New Mass came about, how the intention was to remove the sacrificial character of the rite, etc.>\[...\]>I look at my diocese (I live in the countryside). We have dozens of diocesan priests and no traditional priests. We have a population that, for the most part, doesn't even know what TLM is. And many of those who do know, have a great aversion to it, thanks to the negative propaganda that has been made about it. I don't see the possibility of SSPX/IBP/ICKSP being stabilized here in the near future. These souls need priests. Preferably good priests. And the most direct way I see to reach these people is through the diocesan priesthood.If you had a doctrinal disagreement with the SSPX, I think it'd definitely be a good reason not to join their seminary hahaHowever I don't think the SSPX's position is that it's necessarily a sin; in fact, I think it's almost never a sin, most NO people have never been to TLM and many don't even know it exists, so it can't be a sin for them. Whether people would be scandalized or not is not the question I think, but it's how much they're aware of the alternative.IBP etc. couldn't be stabilized here indeed because they need diocese approval; the SSPX doesn't though (which doesn't mean they have bad relations, in some places like my parish in France they have really good relations, in fact the NO parish priest helped us getting our church.You could even been the re-introducer of Tradition in your diocese, which would be a great vocation indeed!>What do you mean by that exactly? That he thinks like John Paul II, Benedict XVI or Bishop Barron?Well tbh he's a little worse than that, he's probably between Benedict XVI and Pope Francis. But to me even Pope Benedict isn't good enough, despite all his good aspects he believed in religious freedom and applied its consequences, like ending Catholicism as the official faith in Catholic countries. >What traditional beliefs are you specifically referring to?Well I'd say believing the TLM should not have been replaced by the NO, that Vatican's religious freedom and œcumenism contradicted the dogma of Christ the king which implies that the state has to be Catholic, etc. You're probably already aware of it, but Quanta Cura by Piues IX is an example of traditional teaching that's not accepted by most NO people and that contradictis Vatican II.In the SSPX seminary they have a special course about those issues.You're still in my prayers!

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): >the SSPX is picky and most seminarians leave before the endWhy do they leave exactly?>I know only one person who was refusedDo you mean that you know only one person who has refused \*\*after\*\* being already in the seminary or also including vocations that seek the SSPX for entry into the seminary?>You could even be the re-introducer of Tradition in your diocese, which would be a great vocation indeed!You say as a diocesan priest?>But to me even Pope Benedict isn't good enough, despite all his good aspects he believed in religious freedom and applied its consequences, like ending Catholicism as the official faith in Catholic countries.I didn't know that, which country left Catholicism as its official faith during Benedict papacy?>Well I'd say believing the TLM should not have been replaced by the NO, that Vatican's religious freedom and œcumenism contradicted the dogma of Christ the king which implies that the state has to be Catholic, etc.Got it>You're still in my prayers!Thank you, praying for you too!

None (1): >Why do they leave exactly?Well depends but usually because they realize they come to the conclusion they don't have the vocation. I have many friends who left the seminary (Écône or US) for those reasons only. >Do you mean that you know only one person who has refused\*\*after\*\*being already in the seminary or also including vocations that seek the SSPX for entry into the seminary?No I mean I only know one person who was refused after applying to the SSPX seminary.>You say as a diocesan priest?Well I mean as an SSPX priest; sadly the diocese isn't forming traditional priests imo, regarding the TLM but also regarding religious freedom>I didn't know that, which country left Catholicism as its official faith during Benedict papacy?Well sadly this is not just that countries happened to leave Catholicism as their official faith, but it's that they did that in agreement with the Vatican. Most of them did that during John Paul II's pontificate though, sometimes with the help with Benedict XVI as a cardinal, but only a few lasted until 2005 when Benedict XVI became pope.There are "Freedom of religion in ..." wikipedia articles for most countries, they are interesting to check (although it's depressing to see how recent it all is and how easily it happened)The only ones that did it in agreement with Vatican during Benedict's pontificate were Italy ("In 1984, following a revised accord with the Vatican, Catholicism lost its status as the official religion of the Italian state\[3\] and Italy became a secular state.") and Nicaragua. But as a cardinal he participated in making countries remove Catholicism as their official faith in many countries during John Paul II's pontificate.Sadly, this is coherent from them, since Vatican II's religious freedom implies Catholicism being a state religion is contradictory to religious freedom.This is very sad because it played a big role in dechristianization. When my country, France, separated Church and State in 1905, saint Pius X reacted by publishing "Vehementer Nos", an encyclical condemning that... My country has been going downhill since that.

brazilian\_investor\_ (2): >Well depends but usually because they realize they come to the conclusion they don't have the vocation.Got it. I've heard of a Brazilian who went to IBP seminary but didn't adapt well to European culture (although I don't know exactly why).>sadly the diocese isn't forming traditional priests imo, regarding the TLM but also regarding religious freedomYeah, the majority of them, at least here in Brazil, aren't.>The only ones that did it in agreement with Vatican during Benedict's pontificate were Italy ("In 1984 \[...\] ")But in 1984 we were in John Paul II pontificate.>and NicaraguaI thought that Catholicism had stopped being the official religion of Nicaragua already in 1939.>But as a cardinal he participated in making countries remove Catholicism as their official faith in many countries during John Paul II's pontificate.I didn't know that. How exactly did he participate?>This is very sad because he played a big role in dechristianizationIndeed.

None (2): >Got it. I've heard of a Brazilian who went to IBP seminary but didn't adapt well to European culture (although I don't know exactly why).Well this can happen; it's sad necessity that Catholics faithful to tradition often have to travel to a different country to get to seminary. But it's an honor to have to face difficulties juste like first century Christians. Even in France, my brother had to go to Switzerland (Écône), which is a French language but international seminary. But I don't think many people leave the seminary for cultural reasons; most of my friends who left the seminary were French, I don't personay know anyone who left for cultural reasons but I understand.Maybe that would be easier with the Argentinian seminary though.>Yeah, the majority of them, at least here in Brazil, aren't.Well to be fair it's the majority of bishops and priests everywhere. It's worse than the Arian crisis where it's said that 80% of the bishops didn't stand for tradition...>But in 1984 we were in John Paul II pontificate.yes but the final concordat was signed in 2009. No matter what, Benedict XVI has never said he and previous popes had been wrong to make countries stop having Catholicism as their official faith. The difference between him and Pope Francis is simply a difference of degree and not of nature, they both gave up on the full meaning of the dogma of Christ the king. The fact is, the Vatican is not trying anymore to have Catholic countries having Catholicism in their constitution. >I didn't know that. How exactly did he participate?Well mostly, as a cardinal, by being part of the signing of new concordats with Catholic countries. Here is an example of how it happened with Spain, although Benedict XVI himself is not mentioned in the article.[https://fsspx.asia/en/news/catholic-spain-and-religious-freedom-42710](https://fsspx.asia/en/news/catholic-spain-and-religious-freedom-42710) If I can help you with anything let me know!

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): Got it.Thank you so much for all these valuable insights.I will talk to my spiritual director so he can help me see how these points apply to my concrete life.Perhaps I would consider a NO monastery in my diocese (where I would also be a priest) where the environment is more favorable to Tradition or to better inform myself about my truly traditional options.God bless you! You're in my prayers.

None (1): Thanks for the prayers! I'll continue mine too!Don't hesitate to keep me updated!

# Post 382: Job opportunities?

Author: Pale-Roof9278
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ha8rsi/job\_opportunities/

Hello brothers and sisters in Christ, As the title says I’m going to pull the lame duck move and ask if SSPX schools, etc are hiring? I’m soon to possess a double Master’s Degrees in both a M Div (dated and from a Noveau Theologique institution) and just completing a MTS in Thomistics (solid as I could find in an accredited lay Catholic institution). I’d be looking for teaching, advising and/ or counselling roles preferably in a SSPX or Trad private school situation (I have two years of pastoral internship experience prior to this). To start I only value getting the experience and finding an institution that will sign off on my Visa [I will do the leg work again and deal with fees etc] (non- US resident here on student visa ATM). Any suggestions are gratefully appreciated. Please keep it constructive and charitable- I’m aware of the long shot nature of my request.

ourladyofcovadonga (4): They pay peanuts and you're essentially a volunteer. I'm not saying don't do it but keep that in mind.

Piklikl (3): Your best bet is probably to reach out to the US District and check with them, they will be able to point you in the right direction as they’ll be able to answer your visa sponsorship questions as well as know what schools/communities would be able to make use of your talents.

feelinggravityspull (3): In addition to what u/Piklikl recommend, you might just look up SSPX schools in regions where you are willing to live and reach out to them directly. Good teachers are always in demand.Our Lady of Sorrows in Phoenix is a nice place--if you don't mind the desert, give them a try! :)

No-Test6158 (2): You'd be better off getting a teacher qualification before approaching the district, otherwise you will be a teaching assistant or volunteer counsellor. If you're a qualified teacher, they'll near enough bite your hand off to take you on. I would also add that, usually, the SSPX leaves spiritual and advice work to their clergy, who are formed especially to do this. Not to disparage you, but if you're looking for that kind of work, you may be up against quite a barrier here.So, in short - I'd say get qualified as a teacher first, then they will be fully willing to take you on as an employee teacher.

merinw (2): There are some states that allow teacher certification with a college degree, through apprenticeship programs. The pay is scale with the other teachers, but on the lowest level. I know NJ does it. They have had a program there since the mid 1980’s. You take and pass the National Teacher Exam. Apply in school districts that are hiring in a state with a program. You are provisionally certified. You would have to teach in a public school for a year while being mentored, then, if your reviews are food, after the year you are fully certified. Can teach anywhere in that state. Worth cross referencing with states that have programs and states with several SSPX missions and schools.

# Post 383: Another SSPX Superior says 'YES, New Bishops are Coming'

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 18

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lLfGsbIUrIY

dbaughmen (5): Deo Gratias!

Innocentivs (5): Great news.

Total-Wedding8871 (4): Been hearing that. What’s new?

# Post 384: Is it legitimate to consider that there is a risk to be taken into account when taking vows of obedience and poverty in a specific community?

Author: brazilian\_investor\_

Score: 2

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1h6gf7m/is\_it\_legitimate\_to\_consider\_that\_there\_is\_a\_risk/

Objectively, the religious state is superior to the secular state and better assures us of our sanctification and eternal salvation.Saint Thomas and Saint Alphonsus, for example, seem to make it quite clear that a long deliberation is not necessary to evaluate the decision to enter the religious state, since this desire comes from God and is advice that Christ himself gave.However, when we move from theory to practice, the situation does not seem so simple to me.I understand that the motivation for entering religious life, as it is currently structured, is to seek one's own sanctification through the observance of a rule/constitution (which theoretically would lead the individual to holiness more effectively than if he remained in the world) in a community/under the authority of a superior, conditions that would serve to encourage/oblige the observance of the rule/constitution (and, therefore, the pursuit of perfection).However, from what I can see, this is only true as long as the religious house lives by the observance of the rule/constitution. But what if the religious house becomes corrupt/the superior is deposed and another wicked one is put in his place/the religion is suppressed by the hierarchy of the Church or by the civil authorities?For example, even Saint Benedict entered a monastery where, later, they tried to poison him. He left. But, nowadays, a monk in that situation, without money, without communication with the outside world, without support from family and friends, without being able to act against the obedience of the superior and with a vow of stability to that community, he could not simply leave.In a certain sense, it seems similar to married life. One can do everything to choose the right spouse, but there will always be a risk.More specifically, the emergence of this doubt is linked to my vocational discernment.I identify to a certain extent with the monastic life, the silence, the contemplation, the retreat and the withdrawal from the world.However, when considering specific monasteries, I came across different realities.There would be the option of a monastery with a stricter observance, but probably I would go hungry and sleepy, conditions that I know wear me down and take away my desire to even pray. In addition, for example, to not having access to the internet, which for me is a great tool in studying.On the other hand, there would be another with a more relaxed observance (where I would also be ordained a priest), but the abbot is not as holy or competent as I taught, the community is old, not fervorous and selection criteria for entry are lax.Sometimes it seems that I do not really want to follow the Rule of St. Benedict to the letter (as it would be in the monastery with the strictest observance), having the impression of "I know what works best for me". In a less strict monastery, I would be able to exercise my spiritual life as I wish, but precisely because it is more lax, I am concerned about what the future of the observance of the rule / constitutions in this monastery will be.In addition, I have a certain amount of wealth that I have built up over the years that I have worked (I intended to get married) and sometimes the risk of giving it up through a vow of poverty does not seem to be worth the expected return. Likewise, I do not know if this is a question of disordered attachment, but I have always been very close to my family, and distancing myself from them in a stricter enclosure also seems to me to be a risk, in case, as mentioned, the monastery in question becomes corrupt.For these reasons, I have wondered whether the secular priesthood might not be a safer path, one in which I could serve God without the risk of vows of obedience, poverty, and stability (which, theoretically, would serve to free me from worldly concerns to turn more easily to God, but, in practice, they can actually cause more concerns).Is this way of thinking correct?

Piklikl (1): I think you might be overthinking the vows. As far as I can tell, you don’t have to immediately give all your worldly possessions up, there’s usually some period of postulancy for all religious orders. Once that period is over and the novice master thinks it prudent, you will then take a year long vow. I can only speak for the SSPX Brothers Novitiate, they usually take a series of one year vows, followed by a few 5 year vows, then a 10 year vow, then a perpetual vow; I imagine it must be similar in other religious communities.In any case, your question definitely seems more suited to a spiritual director, do you have one?I would also recommend spending time amongst the communities you’re interested in, as well as other ones you have access to (the Benedicitines in Silver City are always happy to host people).I think we all have a duty to exercise our God-given intellects in making these decisions, and I think your concerns are legitimate. I think it paramount to constantly interrogate your motivations and intentions, and make sure that you’re always optimizing for that which will give the greatest glory to God. Ultimately, once you do submit yourself to a superior, the responsibility falls entirely on them if there’s a misallocation of resources.If you’re a math wizard and your superior decides that you’ll be scrubbing pots and pans for the next five years. As much as that seems an obvious poor allocation of manpower, ultimately that’s not your problem, you just have to do what you’re told. I also think something like that is an obvious exercise in humility, and if there’s one thing I know it’s that we should all rejoice at opportunities to practice humility.

brazilian\_investor\_ (2): >I think you might be overthinking the vows. As far as I can tell, you don’t have to immediately give all your worldly possessions up, there’s usually some period of postulancy for all religious orders.You mean in the sense that this consideration would not be so relevant, since the decision of whether or not to take perpetual vows would come after a long period of experiencing what this life would be like?>In any case, your question definitely seems more suited to a spiritual director, do you have one?Yes, I'm waiting for the next meeting in the next month>I think we all have a duty to exercise our God-given intellects in making these decisions, and I think your concerns are legitimateThanks for your input>Ultimately, once you do submit yourself to a superior, the responsibility falls entirely on them if there’s a misallocation of resourcesStill, it is my responsibility to decide whether or not to submit to him by vow, making the orders made possible by that vow also having a degree of responsibility on my part, right?>I also think something like that is an obvious exercise in humilityIndeed

# Post 385: Can Priests Receive Communion on the Hand When They are not Celebrating or Concelebrating?

Author: \_username\_inv4lid
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1h6d426/can\_priests\_receive\_communion\_on\_the\_hand\_when/

I’ve always wondered whether they can. Since Priests’ hands are ordained to handle the Eucharist, can they therefore receive communion on the hand? I don’t think it would really make sense for them to do so, but could they technically do this?

asimovsdog (8): No, because the danger of crumbs falling to the earth and being trampled on are still the same.

dbaughmen (3): At the consecrations of 1988, the concelebrating new Bishops celebrated on the tongue whilst not kneeling.

lu\_ke\_44 (1): I think someone already answered but on the tongue, as particles can get on the hand and thus drop onto the floor. Safest bet it always tongue with a plate underneath

\_username\_inv4lid (1): That makes sense

\_username\_inv4lid (1): Thanks

# Post 386: Recommended Reading

Author: Fravashi\_Yazatas

Score: 3

Comments: 12

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1h5zz8t/recommended\_reading/

Just wondered if anyone could recommend some good reading for me (anybody really) in the vein of SSPX formation.I’m already a Douay-Rheims/Cat.Trent person, and recently saw Sheed’s ‘A Map Of Life’ and ‘Theology For Beginners’ recommended, respectively, and both of which I already own. I’ve got the study version of ‘Catholicism’ by McBrien, but oddly enough, I’ve seen criticisms from BOTH sides stating it’s too liberal and too conservative…what?‘The Story Of American Catholicism’ - Maynard?‘The Spiritual Exercises Of Loyola’ St Ignatius?‘Uniformity With God’s Will’ - St Liguori ?‘Apologetics And Catholic Doctrine’ - Sheehan?Many thanks in advance and apologies for my ignorance. Attended for the first time on 01 December and don’t think I want to go back, so to speak, to say the least. Edit #1: Any opinions on my current missal…Daily Missal Of The Mystical Body - 1957 Maryknoll Fathers (editors) - PJ Kenedy & SonsNihil Obstat : Frederick R McManusImprimatur : Richard J Cushing16 November 1956

dbaughmen (3): I reccomend strongly the Fr Lasance missal, his books are good too. As for books, “Liberalism is a sin.” Is a good book written by some lay Spaniards in the 20’s. “Lift up your hearts” by Fulton Sheen, some of his pre vatican-ii work which is good. Among others, let me know if you wish for more! As for Catechisms, if you want to understand it more you can read My Catholic Faith or the Baltimore Catechism.And of course, any book by Archbishop Lefebvre.

AtaturkIsAKaffir (2): In the Likeness of Christ by Fr Edward Leen is brilliant

alicceeee1922 (2): Archbishop Lefebvre's They Have Uncrowned Him, Archbishop Lefebvre's collection of speeches and letters, Popes against modern errors by TAN

Jumpy\_Cardiologist61 (2): A Brief Catechism for Adults by Fr. Cogan Credo by Bishop Schneider [mastercatechism.com](http://mastercatechism.com) Popes Against Modern Errors SSPX podcast, especially crisis in the church series, sacraments series, and vocations series. Just pick the episodes that seem good:[https://www.youtube.com/@SSPX/playlists](https://www.youtube.com/@SSPX/playlists)I'm not familiar with that missal but I really like my Angelus Press one.

dbaughmen (3): On a side note, nothing can be “too conservative” haha

Fravashi\_Yazatas (1): Thank you

Fravashi\_Yazatas (1): Thank you!

Fravashi\_Yazatas (1): Nice advice. I’m growing , baptized Catholic in 83/84, but parents didn’t care enough to educate us growing up and I was thrust into my 20’s thinking I could do anything I wanted without consequences and ended up in a poor way. Lots of false starts and stops again for 2 decades until I was blessed with a certain knowing. First rosary I ever recited was back in 2003ish, definitely 2004. Made a strong showing in 2005/06 but ran away from RCIA feeling unworthy of ever receiving Christ in the Eucharist. Not good, I know, but I’m back for good, by God’s Holy Will, not mine. May God bless and keep you always.

Fravashi\_Yazatas (2): 😂

dbaughmen (3): Another good one I reccomend is called (something) perfect by Cardinal Richelieu, I can’t remember the name…

Fravashi\_Yazatas (2): Gonna check my local public library soon, thanks.

# Post 387: Communion with Rome?🇻🇦

Author: Adventurous\_Home\_559
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1h51wca/communion\_with\_rome/

Are the SSPX in full communion with Rome? What is the difference between a Roman Catholic Church and a SSPX church?

SnowWhiteFeather (11): Yes, the SSPX is in communion. ( https://youtu.be/At96vbIpFmQ?si=t\_za5pR3EAehP8Dt )Roman Catholicism is someone who partakes of the Roman rite, which includes the SSPX.The SSPX is a priestly society, which means that the priests are members and not the layperson who may attend their Masses.

None (7): "Full communion" is a nonsense term. There is no "partial communion" in actuality; the concept of partial communion was an insufficient description of Orthodox priests/patriarchs who are validly ordained but do not exercise legitimate authority in the Church. This by no means applies to the SSPX.Either you are in communion with the Universal Church or you are not. There's no halfway pregnant, just as there is no halfway communion. The Church is one, meaning it is united.

dbaughmen (5): The SSPX, even if it were not visibly connected to the present Roman hierarchy (which it is) is inside the Church and practicing the Catholic Faith. And is ever in communion with “eternal rome and the Rome of all time.” And should avoid the Rome of neo-modernist and protestant tendencies.

# Post 388: Discerning God's Will In Life

Author: None
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Comments: 0

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1h4peax/discerning\_gods\_will\_in\_life/

Need some more advice from a based traditinal viewpoint in the Faith. So I posted a couple of days ago about friends and relationships but I need some help understanding if my current motives are personnaly emotional or spiritual based for others.Now I moved north earlier this year as I was in a bad place and had to leave. When I moved North, I lived with my sister who needed someone to help around the house with her 2 young nephews whilst her husband was away. I did a mixture of practical things whilst also being a firmer hand and father like figure when needed. For the first time in a long time, my nephews made me feel life nothing in life mattered more than the moment spent with them, essentially a feeling of wanting a family and something more.Whilst up there, I also had a break from a full time job and helped my brother in law's parents doing up their new house (I'm a tradie) in which over the 6 months gave it my best whilst making enough money to survive on. I heard that I was the answer to a novena to Saint Joseph for all I did for them and what they wanted done.Not only that, I made good friends with my brother in laws sister and her family in which I also helped them and they were very grateful for the help I gave the whole family and how much it meant.Now I moved south shortly after as I was looking for a career change which was tricky as it was hard to get a job up north for what I wanted. Not only that, but a priest from a parish south asked me to make a addition for the church to build on what I had done previously so it all seem to work in timing.Once completed, I moved in with another sister who had her partner away on work in which she also needed some support and appreciated me being here with my niece and nephew. Meanwhile I realised for work that I'm not meant to do what I wanted to and secured myself a good paying position in my current trade and things were looking up.However, my sister's partner is set to return home so I got myself a temporary place to stay. My job has gone downhill and I can't do anything to change it, I've had some financial difficulties arise and I feel like all the change that I've experienced this year may fade away as I return back to my life as it was before I moved up North (Trade is toxic and depressing and doing the right thing almost impossible).I decided a new move to sales for my next job and start again as alot of my problems stem from my previous life down here and in my original line on work.Yesterday, I facetimed my sister up north and I was so happy to see my beautiful nephews who are growing up fast. Made me realise I miss them and the friends I made up there and nothing down here is holding me back now I've decided that the reason for moving down here (employment) has changed anyway whilst my sister and her extended family north all are Catholics and have been a good influence on my life for the time I was up there. I feel like once again, I should head North but am just not sure if it's just me running/drifting from my problems here or if I'm meant to be part of a greater plan up North with them again.I'd appreciate any advice especially from anyone whose had a life journey as such. Thanks so much for reading this as long as it is as I just need a second opinion on this side of my life. God bless you all.
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URL: /r/CatholicDebates/comments/1h4mgk0/catholic\_reddit\_is\_a\_cesspool\_of\_heretics/

hardeho (4): That's very helpful, thanks.

# Post 390: Immaculate Conception - Dec 9???

Author: Total-Wedding8871
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1h4jfui/immaculate\_conception\_dec\_9/

Recently the Vatican decided after a dubia that in the N.O. Sundays in Advent outrank solemnities, so the Dec 8th Feast Day of the Immaculate Conception has been pushed over to Monday. However, for those who follow the 1962 (or earlier) calendar , we will be celebrating the I.C. Feast day and commemorating the 2nd Sunday in Advent on December 8th anyway. If our local bishop hasn't dispensed this Dec 9th obligation, are we technically "obligation filfilled" for I.C. Mass? I'm hearing back and forth on this and wanted your thoughts...some of us don't have access to a TLM on a weekday so this will be...tough.

asimovsdog (2): Sundays outranking solemnities, what garbage decision is this? If a solemnity falls on a Sunday, the solemnity takes precedence. This dubia doesn't make any sense.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (2): No matter what don't go to the NO

dbaughmen (2): My local SSPX priest stated that we are fulfilled if we attend mass on Sunday in the \*\*traditional\*\* rite. I’m assuming if you have to attend the NO you must go the following day too.

ExpertSalesCopy (1): The position of the SSPX is you are not obligated to attend the Novus Ordo. If you accept this teaching, then you will not go to a NO on Monday. If you do not accept this teaching, then you should find a Catholic liturgy (in any rite) to attend on Monday. Some people will go to a NO and attend without participating as a way to 'hedge' their bets. That way you can follow the letter of the law and obey your local bishop without participating in a liturgy you believe is defective. Of course, this gets complicated for a number of reasons, e.g., will you witness eucharistic abuses or hear heresy? Do you have children that will be exposed to this?

Araedya (1): Sort of a weird situation. Our local SSPX parish has stated that since the feast of the Immaculate Conception takes precedence over the second Sunday in the 1962 missal, our obligation is satisfied on Sunday 12/8 for those that attend the traditional mass. However, our FSSP parish has decided to push the feast of the Immaculate Conception to 12/9 and celebrate the second Sunday of Advent on 12/8.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (2): You cannot attend the NO no matter what

dbaughmen (2): True

# Post 391: What's the point of doing a vow of obedience to a unknown superior (as in religious orders nowadays)?

Author: brazilian\_investor\_
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1h471yp/whats\_the\_point\_of\_doing\_a\_vow\_of\_obedience\_to\_a/

I've understood the value from religious vows as an ascetic exercise in order to get rid of disordered attachments to the things, the pleasures of flesh and own will.Studying the early monastic life, I can also understand the idea of a group of men taking a vow of obedience to a holy man, so that he would guide them on the path of virtue and holiness.I also understand what Saint Alphonsus says about works done through obedience consecrated by vow having greater merit than works done by secular people, even if they are pious works, because our will is the most precious good we can offer to God.That said, I'm not getting the sense of obedience vow in religious orders nowadays.A vow of obedience is made, according to a constitution (which could be arbitrarily changed), to a superior who can (and probably will) be switched.When the superior's sanctity is not a premise, what guarantee do we have that the religious, by suspending his judgment to perfectly obey the superior's will, would in fact be guided on the path to sanctity or would he simply be placing obstacles in his journey and possibly putting himself in a vulnerable situation?Also, from what I see (in the Novus Ordo universe), many times the superior's focus is not on the sanctification of his subjects, but on "managing" the house in a way not much different from that which the head of a company does.Exaggerating a little to highlight my doubt: I could make a vow of obedience to a random person I met on the street. And I would be mortifying my will. But that doesn't seem like a good idea.Religious life is objectively more perfect (and therefore more meritorious) than secular life. But is it true regardless of the holiness of the superior? Would it be a good choice to make a vow of obedience to a superior/community you know are lax, just to have the merit of obedience consecrated by the vow?

None (1): First, the vow of obedience is primarily to the rule. Those constitutions are supposed to have been approved by the church, which is where they derive their authority, and also where the superior derives their authority to command. (thus the difference between obeying a random person on the street and a superior). The constitution/rule doesn't arbitrarily change, and it's rare any changes do happen. The idea is that obeying the RULE is your fastest way to perfection. Second, the superior isn't allowed to command anything contrary to the rule, or anything sinful. Given that your superior is not commanding contrary to the rule nor commanding sin, your ability to grow in holiness should not be dramatically hindered by an unholy mother superior. If they ARE commanding such things, no one should be entering that community: how on earth could that be a good thing to take a vow to obey a rule if you know you won't be able to obey it in that monastery? Secondly, prudence is a virtue that always needs to be practiced, even those in religious life though it will look different for them. For example, in the Carmelite nuns, before asking permission for some exception, they are supposed to pray and discern whether they really need that exemption. Of course, they could get permission and they would be able to do what they want in obedience, but constantly getting exemptions can negatively impact your own soul. You can't just pawn off all responsibility for your soul onto the superior (although they have a lot of that responsibility): you are still responsible for your own soul. The same goes for someone discerning religious life: the problem of unfaithful monasteries has existed for all time, and in the early church they had to be discerning about what monastery they went to. For someone discerning religious life, prudence would dictate you shouldn't enter a monastery that runs more like a company than a monastery. To your question: Religious life is objectively more perfect (and therefore more meritorious) than secular life. But is it true regardless of the holiness of the superior? I would say usually yes unless they are commanding against the rule or commanding sin. To your last question, no, it would not be a good choice to make that vow of obedience to a lax community. God will always maintain a faithful remnant of those in religious life, leaving us some faithful monasteries to which he wishes to call people, even if other monasteries choose to be unfaithful to their vocation. There will always be a good option.

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): >For someone discerning religious life, prudence would dictate you shouldn't enter a monastery that runs more like a company than a monasteryWhy exactly, because I won't be in a environment that encourages me to follow the Rule?>To your last question, no, it would not be a good choice to make that vow of obedience to a lax community.Between the priesthood in a lax monastery and the secular priesthood, which one would be better?

None (1): Ok, sorry, I deleted my last account because I only made an account to respond to your question. Making another one.For the first, because of a few reasons. One, there's a good chance they aren't living the rule, and there's a good chance the superior commands things against the rule. Two, because according to Alphonsus Rodriguez, an old writer about religious life, one of the chief benefits of religious life is the good example of the other brothers. St Jerome, along with probably hundreds of other saints, praise the value of religious life for the good example you receive. Being deprived of this is no small loss. Third, the whole purpose of religious life is the pursuit of perfection. To not pursue perfection in the religious life is a mortal sin. If they run like a company, they have probably fundamentally forgotten this aim, thus destroying the character of their religious life. That will affect you too, where you will forget the aim of your life. There are other reasons too.Choosing between the secular priesthood or being a priest in a lax monastery, that's a false dichotomy. If you were to force my hand to answer your question, I don't actually know the objectively correct answer, but it's not a decision you should have to make. If you want to be a secular priest, or feel called to that, do that. If not, don't. If you want to be a monk who is a priest, then find the best monastery that you can and go there. Maybe it won't be as fervent as it could be. Maybe there will be issues there. But then trust our Lord that since you sought out the most fervent monastery you could, that it will be fine and you'll be able to reach the highest degree of holiness you are capable of. And don't go trying to enter a lax monastery. Secular priesthood and monastic life are fundamentally different: your objective if you are a priest is to sanctify the church and you are supposed to have already reached a certain degree of perfection. Your objective if you are a religious is to become perfect. Here's some SSPX communities: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SSPX-affiliated\\_religious\\_orders](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SSPX-affiliated\_religious\_orders)Also, if you are interested in communities that are latin mass but not sspx, then there are the Carmelite Monks in Pennsylvania and Colorado, and there are Benedictine monks of Norcia in Italy. (Well, there's probably a ton abroad if you are willing to learn a new language. In my opinion Italian is one of the easier languages to learn, though. )

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): Thanks so much, you're helping me a lot.So the idea is that the rule/constitutions are safe ways to perfection, and by making a vow of following it and entering a Congregation, an environment that will both encourage and obligate you to follow the rule, you'll be following it and, therefore, on the path to perfection. Is it?>Not pursuing perfection in religious life is a mortal sinWhat exactly would "not pursuing perfection" consist of?If a religious follows the orders (according to the constitutions) that his superior gives and does not disobey any prescription of the constitutions, would that be enough to not be in sin?>There are other reasons too.Sometimes I fear that, by joining a religious congregation, especially a lax one, I could be putting myself unnecessarily in a vulnerable situation, in which the renunciation of my will, my possessions, the cloistering, the separation from family and friends could complicate rather than help me in my seeking for God. Is this concern legitimate?>If you want to be a secular priest, or feel called to that, do that. If not, don't.I realize that part of me doesn't want to follow a set rule and thinks I know what works best for me. But I don't know if it's my pride or my disordered attachments clouding my judgment or if I don't have the "fit" for religious life in the congregations I've known. At the same time, I want to know what the highest path is for me, in which I best serve God and leads me to perfection.To clarify the situation a little. I've always been very inclined to study and contemplation, while I have low physical energy. I see myself as having a phlegmatic-melancholic temperament.In the active life congregations I've known, the intensity of activities, the rigor of physical labor, the lack of moments of rest are things that drain my energy, impacting my commitment to activities (even prayer). Even recreation on Sundays (with games and conversations for long periods of time) tired me out (that's not how I rest, but in my cell studying or reflecting on something).In a monastery with stricter observance, let's say I would go hungry and sleepy, conditions that I know wear me down and take away my desire to even pray. In addition, for example, to not having access to the internet, which for me is a great tool in studying.On the one hand, religious life sometimes seems counterproductive to me, giving up vainly the resources that I have, and that I could be a secular priest and follow the way of life that seems more suitable to me.On the other hand, when I read some of Saint Alphonsus' writings on the merit of works done through obedience consecrated by the vow, I wonder if the most generous choice would not be to enter religious life and embrace these difficulties out of love. In some of these writings, he says that Dositheus (the the disciple of Dorotheos), for having lived under obedience, enjoys greater glory in Heaven than Anthony the Great; and that pious souls in the world sought shelter under the obedience of any religious congregation precisely because they knew that works done through obedience consecrated by vow yield merits of a greater caliber.How do I solve this puzzle, which one is the most generous choice?

None (1): To preface, I am a lay person, who has been discerning religious life and I'm just repeating my own observations, what I've read, what congregations have told me and what priests have told me. I'm not a real authority in any sense. So take what I say with a huge grain of salt. >What exactly would "not pursuing perfection" consist of?Honestly, I don't have an exact definition. I always took it to mean that you should be aiming for and aspiring to perfection in holiness, and backing that up in your actions. Basically don't say "I'm at x level, and I want to stay there" or "I'm at x level, I want to get to y level, and then stop there" or "I'm just here to coast and live my life, I'm not going to try to pursue holiness." But that might not be totally accurate, and you can probably find a religious priest that would give you a better description. It might be the case you're just not supposed to say "I'm just here to coast and live my life, I'm not going to try to pursue holiness." I don't know>If a religious follows the orders (according to the constitutions) that his superior gives and does not disobey any prescription of the constitutions, would that be enough to not be in sin?Yes. (I mean, there are a lot of obvious things that are not going to be treated in the constitutions, like don't go rob a bank. Assuming you're not sinning in things not treated in the constitutions.) In fact, what you're describing would bring you to perfection if done perfectly (following the rule)>Sometimes I fear that, by joining a religious congregation, especially a lax one, I could be putting myself unnecessarily in a vulnerable situation, in which the renunciation of my will, my possessions, the cloistering, the separation from family and friends could complicate rather than help me in my seeking for God. Is this concern legitimate?Entering a lax congregation is not just a vulnerable situation, it's a nearly impossible one. To add an additional note: from what I've seen if you go to a monastery that is lax, not only do you risk the things mentioned before, but you'll find yourself in an impoverished formation program. Sometimes in a deformation program, unfortunately. Back years ago they would at least teach you how to live the rule, but nowadays even that's often not happening. For example, you likely will find yourself not even realizing you're not practicing silence, because you've never see someone actually doing it. Plus there's a chance you'll get sent home anyways for trying to live the life differently than everyone else.In regards to entering a good monastery, giving up these things is not going to be harmful or complicate things. There are reasons why you give these things up, and ultimately it is for your own benefit, to grow in holiness. Unless the superior is asking you to renunciation your will to pursue God, these things aren't the things at stake here. > To clarify the situation a little. I've always been very inclined to study and contemplation, while I have low physical energy. I see myself as having a phlegmatic-melancholic temperament.I've been told by a religious mother superior before (not saying it's true or not) that a phlegmatic temperament is really good for monastic life. > In the active life congregations I've known, the intensity of activities, the rigor of physical labor, the lack of moments of rest are things that drain my energy, impacting my commitment to activities (even prayer). Even recreation on Sundays (with games and conversations for long periods of time) tired me out (that's not how I rest, but in my cell studying or reflecting on something).I mean, the issue isn't really these things: there are all types of people, including people that feel like this are in any religious congregation. This is my personal experience, which is very limited, but people that I've met who have been happy in active congregations are those who desire the active apostolate, with the exception of a couple who at the very least have a lack of desire for a heavily contemplative life like monastic life but still have a religious calling. While most who are happy in monastic life have a desire for a lot of prayer and separation from the world. But again, I haven't met a ton of people in either situation.

None (1): >In a monastery with stricter observance, let's say I would go hungry and sleepy, conditions that I know wear me down and take away my desire to even pray. In addition, for example, to not having access to the internet, which for me is a great tool in studying.For the former, you'll be surprised how your body adapts, and what grace will do. Say you enter a Benedictine Monastery, you might be physically exhausted and miserable for the first several months but it will get better as you get in better shape. For the latter, I had the same struggle. I love to study. Trust me, if you find an orthodox monastery that has a good library, you won't be missing out. Heck, you'll be grateful for getting 'the baby without the bathwater" or basically, all the spiritual benefits of the internet without the other things, like reddit. You could choose to avoid monasteries that have no intellectual life, if that would bother you.>On the one hand, religious life sometimes seems counterproductive to me, giving up vainly the resources that I have, and that I could be a secular priest and follow the way of life that seems more suitable to me.I promise you that it's not counterproductive. These rules of life were originally written by people who were very holy and very wise, who saw the numerous pitfalls and numerous ways people get sidetracked in their pursuit of God. It's like archery: we may be aiming at the target, but the devil only needs to divert our attention slightly off the course in order to get us to not hit the bullseye, and he'll usually do it by a excess, distortion, or absence of something spiritual. There are congregations that have time to study, but it may be less than you're used to. You'll sacrifice some means of pursuing holiness, but you'll be getting drastically more in return. It's like having a personal dietitian/chef plan and cook the perfect healthy and tasty diet for you, and you saying "yeah but they don't make very many salads, that's going to make me unhealthy." >On the other hand, when I read some of Saint Alphonsus' writings on the merit of works done through obedience consecrated by the vow, I wonder if the most generous choice would not be to enter religious life and embrace these difficulties out of love. In some of these writings, he says that Dositheus (the the disciple of Dorotheos), for having lived under obedience, enjoys greater glory in Heaven than Anthony the Great; and that pious souls in the world sought shelter under the obedience of any religious congregation precisely because they knew that works done through obedience consecrated by vow yield merits of a greater caliber.I think of this in terms of the hermits that I've met (some of whom actually do have a vow of obedience). Some are extremely holy, but some of them it's a sort of "holiness but only on my terms." They rather pray than work when work needs to be done, then recreate when they're supposed to pray, then practice penance but only the selective penances they like. Eventually they become people who are so used to doing everything their way without having to deny their will in even the normal everyday things that most laity have to, in their communal relations, that it kind of destroys the point of having become a hermit. The entire reality of religious life or eremitical life is that it's a holocaust offering: a whole burnt offering of yourself. Not having to conform your will to another's (be it a superior's or directly God's in the case of a good hermit) is antithetical to that. Now, when Thomas Aquinas talks about hermits, he brings up an objection about obedience. He replies that since you are supposed to already be perfect before entering upon the eremitical life, having already been tried in monastic life, that those hermits don't need an external practice of obedience to a superior but rather they already have the practice of obedience in readiness of mind. So I don't know what to make of Saint Alphonsus here. But if you go and meet 10 religious in good monasteries, and then 10 hermits, you'll see what he means. Here's the link in the Summa: [https://www.newadvent.org/summa/3188.htm#article8](https://www.newadvent.org/summa/3188.htm#article8)>How do I solve this puzzle, which one is the most generous choice?I think philosophically, entering monastic life in a zealous monastery. In practice, you'll have to figure that out for yourself. You could just go visit a monastery and see how you like it. I've been told you shouldn't get caught up too heavily on what the "most generous choice" or highest philosophicaly is in the theoretical, that God actively wills people to all sectors of life to reach the highest degree of perfection there and that you should do what God desires for you as a subject. (Ie think of both Thomas Aquinas and St Alphonsus). Maybe that's modernist, though, I don't know. I honestly don't know of my own accord what the right answer is. I'm not a spiritual director.

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): >To add an additional note: from what I've seen if you go to a monastery that is lax, not only do you risk the things mentioned before, but you'll find yourself in an impoverished formation programThat's what I see in this lax monastery. As for me, ok, I try to educate myself as I can. But my biggest concern is with the future of the community (if it's already lax now, imagine later). >In regards to entering a good monastery, giving up these things is not going to be harmful or complicate things.In the ideal scenario, I understand... But I can't help but see a risk associated with this decision.Let's take the Legionaries of Christ as an example. For many, it seemed like a great Congregation, but...Or a good community being dissolved, either by decision of the hierarchy or by the civil government, and the religious sent away.From this perspective, the secular clergy seems to me to have greater security.But I don't know if I'm misunderstanding how Providence works.

None (1): Also you should get a spiritual director.

None (1): Here's an example of a community that gives you daily times for study. There are many like them. The Carthusians have a ton of it, for example, though they are novus ordo. [https://www.ourladyofguadalupemonastery.com/who-we-are](https://www.ourladyofguadalupemonastery.com/who-we-are)

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): >For the former, you'll be surprised how your body adapts, and what grace will do.But if that is the premise, wouldn't it be more sensible to choose a mixed religious life (active and contemplative), which Saint Thomas claims to be the one that best leads to the perfection of charity?>These rules of life were originally written by people who were very holy and very wise, who saw the numerous pitfalls and numerous ways people get sidetracked in their pursuit of God.Indeed. My question is whether this still applies to the way the Rules are applied today.Let's take the Rule of Saint Benedict, for example. From what I see, in monastic history, much more than the "letter" of the Rule, what was applied was the "spirit" of the Rule. Thus, it is difficult to say how much weight the holiness of Saint Benedict has in this way of life.Even the literal application of the Rule seems to me to present some inconsistencies. I know of an austere monastery where they don't eat meat at meals, but they do eat candies at recreation.>I think of this in terms of the hermits that I've met (some of whom actually do have a vow of obedience)It makes sense. Still, St. Alphonsus is quite emphatic about the value of works done out of obedience. At the same time, in a letter to a young man, he recommends being celibate in one's own home rather than entering a lax monastery.>that you should do what God desires for you as a subjectSounds true. Besides the fact that St. Thomas claims that the mixed religious life is the most perfect, we are still within the natural realm, in a certain respect.But what about the secular priesthood?Although its primary purpose is the edification of the Church, St. Thomas teaches, as can be seen in the rite of the Sacrament itself, that Holy Orders confer sanctifying grace.\*"Now, just as sanctifying grace is necessary for us to receive the sacraments worthily, so it is necessary for them to be worthily dispensed. Hence, just as sanctifying grace is given through baptism, which makes us capable of receiving the other sacraments, so also through the sacrament of orders, which designates someone as a dispenser of the other sacraments."\*How can we compare, in terms of the sanctification of the individual himself, the contribution of the grace of the Holy Orders and that achieved by a monk who lives his Rule?

None (1): >In the ideal scenario, I understand... But I can't help but see a risk associated with this decision.Can you explain what is the risk of giving up things like your personal possessions, enclosure, etc that you mentioned before? Is your concern entering a community that you discerned was a good community, only for it to turn out disastrous?

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): I've got it. But the next session will only be in a few weeks

None (1): >But if that is the premise, wouldn't it be more sensible to choose a mixed religious life (active and contemplative), which Saint Thomas claims to be the one that best leads to the perfection of charity?I mean, in practice yes, it is better to illumine than to just shine. I honestly don't know how to respond to that besides sharing my own personal experience, which is limited, which I can if you want. >Thus, it is difficult to say how much weight the holiness of Saint Benedict has in this way of life.That is very true, you are completely right. Same with the Rule of St Albert. I am coming up with a guess for how to deal with this, but. I guess I would fall back on just visiting good reputable monasteries and getting a feel for the Benedictine Spirit, and then discern a community based off of how they live that spirit. (for the benedictine example) And focus more on their fervor and having the right priorities. That's my best guess, I don't know if that's a good answer. I probably shouldn't be giving advice considering that you have a spiritual director, so maybe just ignore that.>I know of an austere monastery where they don't eat meat at meals, but they do eat candies at recreation.Lol, as do I. Also a lot of rules, idk about the rule of St Benedict, forbid eating outside of meals, so that would ban something like that. Repeating my weak guess of a response from above, if I went with the spirit of Benedictines, and the spirit of what religious life is about, evaluating the basic things like the austerity, the silence, etc, I would guess that will guard against this. On the converse, there are sometimes things in a rule that you can break without it really being an issue. Like the Carmelite Nuns constitutions have something about keeping all the monastery money in a chest with 3 locks. >How can we compare, in terms of the sanctification of the individual himself, the contribution of the grace of the Holy Orders and that achieved by a monk who lives his Rule?As far as I understand it, the graces of Holy Orders are charismatic gifts, that is ordering towards the sanctification of someone else, though I am sure they sanctify the person. I have no idea, ask a theologian. But to answer your question, most monks are either choir monks who are also priests, or lay brothers who get drastically less time in prayer. So given you choose to be a choir monk, there isn't a real debate here between a monk and a secular priest.>At the same time, in a letter to a young man, he recommends being celibate in one's own home rather than entering a lax monastery.Can you send me that? That would make me feel a lot better at my current state in life. Lol.

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): >Is your concern entering a community that you discerned was a good community, only for it to turn out disastrous?That is one possibility.This lax monastery I speak of, I went to it because I had heard that the superior was a saint and it took me a few months to realize that something was wrong.I had no vows and, given the lax situation, I was able to seek outside guidance.I see that some monks are there because they have nowhere to go. They are old, without education, without money, without descendants to care for them.Even Saint Benedict entered a monastery where, later, they tried to poison him.He left.But, if I were a monk in that situation, without money, without communication with the outside world, without support from family and friends, without being able to act against the obedience of the superior, I could not simply leave.Even if I don't die of hunger or anything like that, it seems to me that there is a risk that I could be putting myself in a situation where, instead of being freer to serve God, I would be worried about my relationship with my superior, with my brothers, the future of the community, etc.

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): >I honestly don't know how to respond to that besides sharing my own personal experience, which is limited, which I can if you want. Yes, if you want and can, I do want to hear! I don't know if my spiritual director will have these answers either>I probably shouldn't be giving advice considering that you have a spiritual director, so maybe just ignore that. For my part, your advices are very welcome.>Can you send me that? That would make me feel a lot better at my current state in life. Lol. Sure. The book I have is in Portuguese, the translation would be like this:\*I cannot recommend the conjugal state, because Saint Paul does not recommend it to anyone except in cases of necessity due to habitual incontinence. I do not believe that he is in such a condition.\*\*As regards the secular priestly state, it should be well remembered that the secular priest has the obligations of a priest and the distractions and dangers of the laity; living in the midst of the world he cannot avoid the whirlwind of governing his own household and the complications that will inevitably come to him from relatives; and his soul will never be able to remain free from dangers. He will encounter temptation within his walls, because he cannot prevent women from entering his house, whether relatives, servants, or other strangers. The ideal would be to live in a secluded dwelling and to attend only to divine things. But this condition is very difficult to put into practice. And that is why few priests aspire to perfection in their homes.\*\*Whereas, by entering a monastery where observance reigns, he will be free from the worry of thinking about what to eat and what to wear, because his vocation will provide for all these needs. He will not have relatives there to continually bother him with quarrels and business dealings that will keep him in constant turmoil; there will be no women there who could make him lose his peace of mind; there will be no rumors of the world that would distract him from his prayer and recollection.\*\*I have said so much on purpose, "observant monastery," because if he wants to enter any other monastery where there is no fervor, it is better to stay at home and make every effort there to save his soul in the most perfect way he can. In a monastery where discipline is relaxed, he will be in danger of being lost. Even if he entered such an Institute with the resolution to devote himself to prayer and to think only of God, led astray by the bad examples of his companions, made an object of ridicule, persecuted by those for whom his example is a tacit rebuke, he will abandon all devotions and end up doing as the others do, as experience proves.\*But, for that matter, I would check this episode of the SSPX podcast of Vocation Series: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1Yo\\_Ep8V9rQ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1Yo\_Ep8V9rQ) I've liked this content too (in Portuguese): [https://www.salusincaritate.com/2021/02/consagrados-sobre-o-celibato-leigo.html](https://www.salusincaritate.com/2021/02/consagrados-sobre-o-celibato-leigo.html) And I was reading the book "Single for a Greater Purpose: A Hidden Joy in the Catholic Church".I was considering this option. But then I thought, why not become a secular priest?I am considering entering the seminary of my diocese. It is corrupt morally and doctrinally, but my spiritual director said that it would be possible to graduate in parallel and survive during the formation period. (From what I have been told, here in Brazil it is very difficult to be accepted a man into a traditional seminary who has not grown up in that environment since he was younger - which is not my case, I'm 27)

None (1): I am really sorry about how that monastery went. So discernment is basically just the use of the virtue of infused prudence (which resides in the intellect) with the aid of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, 4 of which are aimed at the intellect and one of which (counsel) is particular helpful for discernment. The point of these gifts is because we don't have angelic knowledge, we are still able to make foolish decisions even with perfect infused prudence. So God's counsel makes up for our lack in knowledge to help us make good decisions.It's kind of like discerning marriage in this modern era. You could do all the due diligence in the world, marry someone devout from your parish who grew up with your values, get advice from others, pray deeply for God to give you counsel. That woman could still divorce you in 5 years, leaving you with 3 small children. That's a disaster. You can't truly prevent that from happening, and that happened to someone I heard of at my parish. BUT that doesn't mean you choose to not court people ever. You do the best due diligence you can, use your best prudence, pray, etc. And then leave the remaining risk to God's divine providence.All you did in that situation is use your prudence to get out. Also, in those situations where a professed monk is in a monastery with serious issues, they transfer. Those monks who were older probably didn't leave because they're older and change is hard on them (also they might be lax themselves) but what you didn't see while you were there were the monks that transferred out. I entered and left a monastery like you are describing, and later found out about several of the professed having transferred to more fervent monasteries before I entered. I think it's probably easier if you're in a non-SSPX community.Also what I've experienced is that 99% of everyone surrounding any community will tell you that superior is a saint, regardless of that superior's holiness. I don't know why, it's weird.

None (1): Ok, first that letter by Saint Jerome might be one of the most genius things I have ever read in regards to vocation.My experience is that those who live in an active religious congregation, either they don't have the initial desires for contemplation and higher levels of virtue and pursue it weakly, or they struggle badly trying to balance the two, their pursuit of holiness and active apostolates, that they burn themselves out and eventually become lukewarm. Basically, it becomes a question not of shining vs illuminating, but shining brightly (contemplative) or illuminating weakly (contemplative/active). The second thing to consider is: the secular priest exists to sanctify the church, while the religious seeks to sanctify themselves, BUT in the process of pursuing holiness they strengthen the church.I've never seen secular priests struggle in the same way as contemplative/active religious, but that's probably because I've been surrounded by very holy priests. It's always something I wondered at, that God probably was giving them the grace to become particularly holy despite all their challenges. They seem to have a much healthier contemplative/active balance. Either way, you'd have to ask them about these things.To make things complicated: you could join the fssp seminary in the US? It's probably drastically better than a diocesan seminary, though not SSPX, and I've met FSSP priests who entered that seminary at an older age. You could also just give it a shot at your local traditional seminary: who knows? God might work a miracle. Religious visas are a bit of a mess here, though.It sounds like you just want to be a secular priest. Am I inaccurate in saying that?Also: what I've noticed about lay celibacy is that it tends to be a backup option for people who wanted something else but never managed to make it work. Case in point, there was recently a ceremony in my diocese where 5 women took vows as consecrated virgins. They all had white hair and were very old, which was an odd image considering they were all wearing wedding gowns. I haven't met anyone who actually felt a positive desire for that life. If I were your personal friend or spiritual director, I would advise you to try something else first. I admit to not having read th article or watched the video yet, just giving my fast opinion.

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): >It's kind of like discerning marriage in this modern eraIndeed>BUT that doesn't mean you choose to not court people everWell, looking at it from another perspective, it is a matter of faith that celibacy is superior to marriage, so perhaps we should consider whether it is worth the risk?On the other hand, the same cannot be said about religious life, which is objectively superior to secular life...>but what you didn't see while you were there were the monks that transferred outSomething that happened a few times there was that the person would come in, make the profession of vows, be ordained and then ask (and get) a dispensation from the vows to be incardinated in some diocese.

None (1): Maybe to add to that: I have met people who have been called to lay single life. I just personally think people shouldn't go to it too quickly. Perhaps other people who are drastically more qualified than me would say otherwise, I don't know.

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): >Ok, first that letter by Saint Jerome might be one of the most genius things I have ever read in regards to vocation.Oh, I didn't notice... But now I'm asking myself, maybe Saint Alphonsus here with "at home" (in Portuguese is actually used "in his house") is referring to the house of the secular priest (instead of entering the monastery), not the man's current house (probably with his parents).The paragraph before the excerpt I posted is:\*At the end of your letter you ask me to tell\* \*you my opinion, in case you don't have the will to enter religious life, about whether it would be better to get married, as your parents want, or to be ordained as a secular priest.\*Anyway, the single life can be an absolutely legitimate option>The second thing to consider is: the secular priest exists to sanctify the church, while the religious seeks to sanctify themselves, BUT in the process of pursuing holiness they strengthen the church.Couldn't we also say that the secular priests sanctify themselves in the process of sanctifying the Church?>They seem to have a much healthier contemplative/active balance. Either way, you'd have to ask them about these things.You mean in the sense that the life of a secular priest seems less hectic than that of an active life religious?>To make things complicated: could you join the FSSP seminary in the US?Yes, it would be an option. There's a priest from Institute Good Shepherd native from my state.I realize that changes are not the most comfortable situations for me personally.I fear that it would be a bit of a distant endeavor and, if it fails, I might end up getting discouraged from the vocation. Being a diocesan priest, one advantage is that I would be close to my family and the people I grew up with who encourage me on this vocational path. On the other hand, I don't really know what damage a corrupt seminary could cause to my faith.>It sounds like you just want to be a secular priest. Am I inaccurate in saying that?That was the calling that awakened in me last year. It was the most natural thing for me, the reference I had the most contact with, religious life didn't even cross my mind. I only started considering it after realizing that the diocesan seminary wasn't well. The vows of poverty and obedience scared me a little from the beginning. Studying about them, the situation improved. But, as discussed, I see a risk in them, a risk that doesn't seem so small to me. I have tried to base my choice, more than on my feelings, on what would be the highest/most generous state I could choose.This touches on the question, for example, of the merit of works done out of obedience, as Saint Alphonsus puts it. While he himself says that it is not a good idea to enter a lax monastery.Could the explanation be something like this: \*"objectively, works done out of obedience consecrated by vow have a higher merit, but taking a vow of obedience under these conditions is unwise"\* ?Thinking of an analogy, it would be something like: \*"giving alms is meritorious, but for a family man to donate all his wealth is unwise"\* or \*"fasting is meritorious, but if you are becoming malnourished, it makes no sense"\* ?

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): >Also: what I've noticed about lay celibacy is that it tends to be a backup option for people who wanted something else but never managed to make it workFor some, it is.It's the second case that the priest presents in the podcast, or that Luanne Zurlo (author of the book I commented on) calls Single by Default.>I have met people who have been called to lay single lifeIt's the third case that the priest presents in the podcast, or that Luanne Zurlo calls Single for a Greater PurposeIt's not something new in the history of the Church, the Consecrated Virgins have been present since the beginning of Christianity. And it is a state objectively superior to marriage, as defined in the Council of Trent. When Saint Paul recommends in his letters that it is better not to marry, religious orders like today did not exist.But for men, I personally have come to the conclusion that since the intention is to be celibate in the world, it is difficult not to consider the option of the secular priesthood.

None (1): >Couldn't we also say that the secular priests sanctify themselves in the process of sanctifying the Church?Yes, absolutely!!>You mean in the sense that the life of a secular priest seems less hectic than that of an active life religious?In reality, no, they seem to be busier than active religious and have less time for prayer. They just seem to handle it better and be holier. Maybe that's just my limited experience having been around wonderful priests all the time.Ok, to keep this a little shorter: if I were in your shoes, I would visit monasteries and religious institutes, until I found one that seemed really holy. Sometimes reputation doesn't line up with reality: sometimes there are hidden gems of excellent monasteries, and sometimes a monastery has a great reputation but is lax. I would keep visiting them until I found a good and fervent monastery, so that I'm not going to have this "what if" about religious life. (I mean, I wouldn't go on for years visiting these monasteries. But at least make a real effort to find a good one.) I promise you there are good communities out there. Then if I didn't want to go to that monastery, or feel any desire to go to any monastery at all in the theoretical, then I would go to a traditional seminary. I have no intent to contradict your spiritual director about going to the diocesan seminary: I'm just saying what I would do. I would be willing to look outside the country if need be. The second thing I would do in your shoes is I would make sure I was attending daily mass as often as possible, going to confession at least monthly, and praying at least 20-30 minutes a day. The reason for that is because I've met people that get "roadblocks" in their discernment due to some worry or hangup about something more human, sometimes even closing themselves off to discernment at all because of that. Having a deep prayer life will help you moderate those human desires and put them secondary to the "one thing necessary." I also would try to not get hung up too much on the merit of the vow of obedience, if you really feel called to be a priest: imagine if every priest on the planet did that! That's what I would do in your shoes. I'm also not you, just take all that with a huge grain of salt.

None (1): Basically your concern about the vow of obedience is a really good one, but I don't think it's sufficient basis for discerning no to religious life.

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): From what you have seen, why do the secular priests live a more busy life than the active religious?Thanks for your opinion.I'm actually already doing the part of daily Mass, confession and prayer.Why exactly you wouldn't go to the diocesan seminary? If not for the merit of the vow of obedience, for what reasons I would enter in religious life?I think I have some possible explanations, but need to clarify them a bit.

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): Could you explain more precisely why it wouldn't sufficient?

None (2): Sorry for the lack of response: I went on retreat. Here are the reasons I wouldn't go to the diocesan seminary: One: Aristotle says (I paraprase) that the first requirement for a teacher is that the student trusts/believes in them. (I can't find the actual quote, it's in "faith, hope and love" by Joseph Pieper.) This is because what teaching relies on is an act of "human faith." That is, outside of a spiritual context, believing some statement on the testimony of another, not because you have actually experienced it or rationally came to that conclusion. If you walk into a store with a blue wall and the shopkeeper says "hey, don't touch that wall, it was just painted and it's still wet." You probably wouldn't go and touch the wall to make sure: you believe him on his testimony, and that's what I'm talking about by an act of human faith. By deduction you can see how important this is in the case of education: every single thing you're taught in the classroom is initially accepted on the testimony of the teacher, although hopefully you eventually understand without having to rely on their testimony. It relies not on the actual truth of the statements being taught, but on your trust/belief in the teacher themselves.Imagine spending 7+ years in seminary, going to classes every day where you don't believe your teachers. Where you have to inbibe and remember information that you don't trust is true, and have to recall that information for essays and tests, study it, etc. I'm thinking especially of your biblical studies: you will possibly be taught a lot of things that are objectively false. Imagine being there for 7+ years in a place where you'll be given a spiritual director that you don't trust nor feel secure obeying, a formator you don't trust, etc. That sounds like hell.Two, at the same time you're enduring this environment, you're being deprived of a positive formation. Actual orthodox classes on doctrine, biblical studies, the spiritual life, etc. That is huge: from my experience it seems just not knowing a few basic facts about the spiritual life blocks some people from making progress. Oftentimes in our spiritual life, we'll read a book that didn't have much of an impact at the time, but is extremely helpful to us in 5, 10 years. Reading good books in a good seminary is a huge aid to this. You could respond saying "yeah but I can read these on my own." Ok, so you're going to take the time to read 7 years worth of traditional seminary education reading, in addition to your liberal seminary? On number two, it further impacts the quality of priest you'll be. People are spiritually starving. They are thirsting for truth, doctrinally and otherwise. Do you want to be in a position to feed them? Or do you want to be starving yourself? It could be the one writing from a church father that you read in the trad seminary, one word of advice in the seminary, that you put in a homily that changes someone's life. Both your sanctity and that of your flock depend on your formation. Plus there's the sheer fact of the example of good and holy priests in the seminary, which is huge. In my opinion, if you're going to be a priest you minus well be the best one you can be.Third, I don't know if this is a problem in Brazil, but in the USA we used to have problems with seminaries expelling seminarians for being too traditional.Fourth, think of what you'll be doing afterwards. You don't just go to seminary and then do whatever you want afterwards: you're assigned at a parish. It could be a very liberal parish. Even at the most traditional parishes, you'll have to give people communion on the hand. Then you have extraordinary eucharistic ministers, and don't even get me started on the laity bringing communion to the homebound. Of course as you know, at a diocesan parish this will all be in the novus ordo. Remember: Lex orandi lex credenti. If you go to a latin mass seminary, you will end up in a latin mass parish where these abuses are nonexistent.Can you get through seminary unscathed? Sure. Would I personally choose it? No!

# Post 392: SSPX community/relocating

Author: New\_Activity1115
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Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1h2weki/sspx\_communityrelocating/

Hi there! My family is considering a relocation. We want to homestead and are looking into areas around an SSPX because of the unknowns with other TLM getting shutdown. That being said, can anyone recommend an SSPX location that has a welcoming community of young families? We won't have family local, so community will be all we have (and each other of course.) Our children are all under the age of 7. We are looking at St. Mary's for obvious reasons but want to know what other options there are. A homeschool co-op would be awesome too. Thank you!

None (3): ST. Marys seems quite nice (been a few times) but you’d need to have an employment situation that allows for it. Not much of a thriving city within an hour of there

PleasantStorm4241 (2): Our Lady of Good Success in Louisiana, MO. Tight, growing community, with a school that keeps growing, too. School started as a homeschool group and took off.

Timeless\_Traditions (1): No less than 2 SSPX in St. Lawrence County, NY. Holy Face in Massena, NY with a school run by 17 Dominican Mothers and St. Thérèse Church and Priory in Nicholville, NY. Many families and the school in Massena has a fantastic reputation for world-class education. Other churches in vicinity offer a Sunday TLM every week.Edit: Massive Mennonite/Amish community in this county and neighboring counties.

NtGiL\_29 (1): Topeka and Manhattan are both decent towns about a half hour away. Plenty of homesteading land around St. Mary's, so I don't think employment situation would be the holdup.

New\_Activity1115 (2): Thank you so much! Is that the name of the school too?

PleasantStorm4241 (1): Yes. I've been there, too. Chapel packed with families. It's in a rural area, too. It does not have daily Mass, however. Mass on Sundays, 1st Fridays, Saturdays except for 1st Saturday, and Holy Days of Obligation. You'll have to call to confirm.

# Post 393: Lost In Life and in a Dilema Without Friends

Author: None

Score: 4

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1h2jmw5/lost\_in\_life\_and\_in\_a\_dilema\_without\_friends/

I'm in a current dilemma and need your prayers. Please delete if this is not allowed.I'm 27 years old and a lonely single male. I was born and raised part of the SSPX and was a reverent follower for the younger years of my life until I let myself become stray.I'm a great sinner and still attended church and the sacraments for over a decade until I left the church this year as I was doing greater harm to my soul and God attending than not. Through many great trials, moderate alcholism and mental health issues I constantly fall short of any desire to return.This all came undone when I offered a big financial and time devoted sacrifice to God for a change to bring someone special into my life to help save my soul in which I found someone who wasn't even close to the one. This made me make some big changes to the way I viewed life and made me set this year aside to get my personal life back on track.Tonight once again after a stressful and disappointing week of setbacks in life find myself wondering if I will ever find my way and faith again. I understand that only the Traditional Faith will lead us to God and refuse to let myself get involved in a relationship with anyone that doesn't want the Tradional Faith. I find myself never fitting in with the youth of the parishes as I have always had a more serious and mature outlook than them when younger and now alot of them my age who are single are successful and critical thinkers whilst I'm a very down to earth and simplistic person.It's become harder now I've moved and the only religious contact is long distance with my family who still practice. Now I know that to those in the Faith the answer is simple, just go to Church. For me though, my whole life has been seeing religion rift the family apart and when I struggled, fell and had no one there to help me on a personl/mental in the years I've been alive.I know it's long and all over the place but all I ask is for prayers (an add to your Rosary would be a great blessing) for a return to the faith, a good confession and also that I meet some friends and hopefully someone special that can help me find my way again as I am too weak to even live my life alone and having a future partner whose strong in the Faith will be the push and support I need to make it right and endure the current struggles

Piklikl (9): >to bring someone special into my life to help save my soulThis is problematic. Do not look for anyone else to help get you back on track and save your soul. You need to move from dependence to independence on your own, and only once you're there can you expect a fruitful and flourishing marriage when you establish interdependence with another independent person. It seems like you're trying to move from dependence on a bad lifestyle to distract you from the path you're going down to dependence on another person to drag you up the right path. That's not a recipe for success, and is frankly the wrong move to make as someone who is supposed to be the spiritual leader of your family. Take the list of things you're looking for in a potential spouse and use it instead as a list of things you need to master before you can start looking for a potential spouse. If you're looking for a holy woman, you must first be holy yourself so start taking your faith seriously. Get back to the sacraments, daily rosary, and spiritual reading. If you're looking for a woman who takes care of herself and is fit, attractive, etc, focus on becoming a peak physical specimen yourself. If you're looking for a woman who has her finances in order, work on getting yours cleaned up (use a budget so you can spend less than you earn and invest the difference in low cost, broad based index funds). You want to be the best that you can be for your future wife. You have to take radical responsibility for everything in your life, stop expecting everyone else to pick up your slack. Right now you probably feel like you're standing at the base of a gigantic mountain looking up to the summit that you want to to be at tomorrow, but you have to realize that that would simply be counterproductive. If an angel came and plopped you right at the peak in an instant you not only wouldn't fully appreciate the position, but you're much more likely to fall right off more or less immediately. Beware of unearned rewards/dopamine/money. Resist the urge to "get rich quick", both when it comes to money as well as relationships. You're not a good date away from turning everything around (just think about it from her perspective, why would you want your future wife to be saddled with the job of raising a man child?), you are signing up for a lifetime of slow, methodical change. Yes, from time to time it's good to raise your gaze the to the summit to remind yourself of where you're trying to go, but for the most part keep your head down and just focusing on getting through each day and pleasing God. Do not worry about having the strength to stay on the path for the rest of your earthly existence, you just need to get through today. "Sufficient to the day is the evil thereof", so you will never be given more than you handle (just be sure that you're always asking God for the graces He is more than happy to give you). Focus on making doing the right thing the easy thing, stop fighting your fallen human nature so much. You say you've moved but now you lack any local religious contact, well maybe it's time to move somewhere where you have more of a local group to immerse yourself in. You're the product of the 5 people you spend the most time around, so stack the deck and make sure they as high quality and holy as possible. You say that the youths you've interacted with just don't seem to be on the same wavelength as you; well, you can either try to find a group that you do vibe with, or you can change your attitude and try to fit in (or exert influence on the group and try to improve their attitudes). The only "shorcut" I would advise is develop an attitude of serving others. Stop expecting everyone else to serve you, to have everything taken care of so life is easy for you; instead do everything you can to do this for others. Not only will this help you immensely as a single person (IMO single people have a duty to help society as much as they can), but it will do so much to help prepare you for marriage, which requires daily sacrifice and putting the needs of your spouse and children before your own. Get rid of the alcohol, it does nothing for you, and there is no healthy amount of alcohol you can consume. It trashes your sleep, it hinders your social development, and is overall a terrible waste of money. Foster a habit of reading, as that is the most common habit among successful people. If you don't like reading books, try audiobooks (with the Libby app you can check out audiobooks from your local library for free). Make it non-negotiable, if you don't really like it with enough work you will learn to. For no just focus on making it easy. Start with the book Atomic Habits, as that applies to all parts of your life, especially the spiritual. When it comes to the spiritual, again for now focus on making it easy. Start with fulfilling the bare minimum: attendance at Mass on all Sundays and Holy Days of Obligation. You don't need to be in the state of grace, you just need to go. If you're feeling like you can add in a little more, then just say 3 hail marys right before you go to bed and right when you wake up. The important thing is to start small and only until you've established the habit can you consider adding more to it. I'll keep you in my prayers.

asimovsdog (4): In Europe the SSPX churches have larger youth meetups every year, where everyone from the country can meet, so you'll probably find someone with your personality. Can't speak for America, because American parishes are more spread out. They also organize WhatsApp and Telegram groups, but you need to ask for that. Finding a wife, well, good luck man, it's hard in these times not just for you. Don't fall for the "the one" meme, just find someone that's good enough. Work out, pray, socialize if you can. I'll pray for you 👍

SnowWhiteFeather (3): Piklikl had a great answer. The only thing I would add is that people who grow up Catholic –especially if they have had poor formation– tend to overlook the small things. It is worth revisiting your catechism if you are struggling.It is also easy to get into the habit of mindlessly reciting prayers. When we pray we are talking to someone. Your focus should be less on how much you are praying, but how well you are praying.

None (4): Thank you so much for insightful and thorough response. It's definitely hard to change one's ways especially after living a life of fear for change but the change has been slowly happening for the better. I appreciate your prayers as well.

None (2): Thank you for your thoughts and prayers

# Post 394: Rome

Author: AcceptableMaize8955

Score: 12

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1h1e05w/rome/

Here upon this day, i come to recognize the SSPX as in Communion with Rome. Lofton Deceived me, just because members of the SSPX have said wrong things doesnt mean the SSPX itself is wrong or bad.

None (6): Well that's honest of you to state that!

mattdamon992 (1): Anything specific as to why Lofton deceived you or are you happy to just leave it at that. Solid.

AcceptableMaize8955 (2): Well, the main Arguments used is Lefebvre was ExCommunicated. Correct, so was Saint Athanasius it didnt mean Saint Athanasius was wrong though? Lefebvre was regarded as the most important bishop of the 20th Century by Pope Benedict XVI and the early church didnt need Papal approval for Ordinations so its not like lefebvre was doing some terrible never seen before action. There's also the "the sspx doesnt have canonical status with Rome" but that can't be backed up, if Rome thought the SSPX wasnt within the Holy Sees communion why then dont they clarify that? The SSPX can also get a bad name for some of its members disrespecting the Holy Father or something along those lines which is some how used against the SSPX itself too. Also the SSPX doesn't absolutely hate the New Order of the Mass, They Hate irreverence in the Mass. The Early seminarians of the SSPX when Lefebvre wasnt present had celebrated the Novus Ordo in Latin. Lefebvre is a hero, and only wanted the Best for the Church. The SSPX accepts Rome, Accepts Pope Francis as the supreme pontiff. Case closed. (Its crazy I went from calling lefebvre heretic to Hero)

mattdamon992 (1): On the Athanasios point:So you've seen this video and you think he's manufacturing arguments and documents? do you think there is sufficient similarity with Lefebvre and Athanasios? https://youtu.be/gDPWpatgr7c?si=bslf0fewv-U68bfK

AcceptableMaize8955 (1): I didn't watch that video, Im saying both Athanasius and Lefebvre have a similarity in the sense both were ExCommunicated and both had a ExCommunication lifted, both were Holy Men who wanted to preserve the church, not do her harm.

# Post 395: Lay community near Our Lady of Guadalupe monastery?

Author: Beneficial-Tangelo85
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Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1gzyrjc/lay\_community\_near\_our\_lady\_of\_guadalupe\_monastery/

We currently live a couple hours away and are trying to get out of the city. Does anyone know if there is any sort of community of lay people/families in Silver City NM where the monastery is?

None (2): The best way to figure out would be to visit the monastery and meet all the different people there. I live in Las Cruces and the community at OLOG is extremely welcoming! I so want to visit again soon.

None (1): You may also want to look into the Our Lady of Mount Carmel Chapel in Las Cruces. It is very new and the priest will be arriving soon.

Beneficial-Tangelo85 (2): We’re in El Paso. Visited the FSSP a few times, but we really don’t want to be in EP long term. We were thinking of Las Cruces but didn’t know there was any SSPX there. Do people meet regularly out there?

None (1): I live in Cruces but I go to Jesus and Mary in El Paso. The Our Lady of Mount Carmel chapel in Las Cruces is barely getting a priest but we have been meeting there on Sundays for the rosary for a long time. When he arrives, I'll no longer have to make the drive every Sunday. I only visit the monastery in Silver City once in a while.

Beneficial-Tangelo85 (1): Are you referring to the Carmelite monastery in Cruces or a different chapel? I looked up Our Lady of Mount Carmel chapel but nothing came up. I am familiar with the Carmelite monastery a little bit, but are they going under the SSPX now?

None (2): No, it's not that one. I sent you a message to try and clear things up and get you more information!

# Post 396: Do SSPX priests have a few days a year to spend with their families in their homeland?

Author: brazilian\_investor\_
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1gzrzck/do\_sspx\_priests\_have\_a\_few\_days\_a\_year\_to\_spend/

And what about the other institutes of the old Ecclesia Dei, such as the Institute of the Good Shepherd?

ourladyofcovadonga (2): Society priests get vacations every year but to what extent I do not know. At my old chapel the priest took a few weeks off every year to see family.

None (1): This year my priest went back to his homeland for the whole of November.

Piancol (1): Here in the District of Mexico all priests get 1 month vacation every year and they usually go to their respective countries of origin.

brazilian\_investor\_ (1): Could you say approximately how many weeks?Did his family live far from his parish?

ourladyofcovadonga (1): From what I remember, 2+ weeks. Could be different for others. Yes, he has to fly within the States but fortunately for him not to a different country.

None (1): I think it's 3 weeks for the average priest, and one month for those in the missions

# Post 397: Join The Confraternity of the Most Holy Rosary & get big benefits!

Author: Away\_Report6974
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1gzf5mc/join\_the\_confraternity\_of\_the\_most\_holy\_rosary/

Joining The Confraternity of the Most Holy Rosary is very easy and simple, and the benefits of it are so big that you will be suprised.\*\*Info about enrollement will be at the bottom of the post.\*\*But what even is this confraternity?\*\*There is only one confraternity of the Rosary, and that is the Archconfraternity; it is that tree planted from St. Dominic himself, which has already borne abundant and miraculous fruit. History tells us that through the establishment of the Archconfraternity the Christian faith was revived, piety multiplied, virtues blossomed, sinners were converted, and God through the Blessed Virgin Mary blessed people who prayed the Rosary fervently. The Archconfraternity has preserved the same way of reciting the Rosary that the Blessed Virgin Mary revealed to St. Dominic and recommended to the people to recite; thus it has existed for more than 800 years, since 1213.\*\*Graces granted to the Confraternity of the Living Rosary:\*\*1. The members participate during life and after death in all the merits and indulgences of the Orders of St. Dominic, as well as all the members of the Archconfraternity.\*\*\*\*2. Members are assured of the special cause and assistance of the countless Saints who once belonged to this Archconfraternity.\*\*\*\*3. The Rosary Altar is privileged for eternity for all deceased members of the Archconfraternity, as well as for other souls.\*\*\*\*4. Countless indulgences both complete and partial are granted to the members, which can also be given to the souls in purgatory.\*\*But the most beatiful graces are indulgences that we can give to purgatory souls. As Jesus said to st. Gertrude:\*\*“Everytime you deliver a soul from\*\*\*\*purgatory, you do Me such a\*\*\*\*favor as if you had redeemed me from slavery\*\*\*\*and be assured that I will reward you generously”.\*\*\*\*Numerous indulgences given to the Archconfraternity:\*\*Partial Indulgences.(The condition for obtaining them is: to be in a state of Divine Grace and have the intention of obtaining these indulgences.)\*\*200 years and 200 quadragene indulgence have members when they carry the Holy Rosary (beads) with them in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mary with a contrite heart;\*\*\*\*Indulgence of 7 years and 7 quadragene on Sundays and feasts of the whole year, equally on all days of the whole Octave: Christmas, Resurrection, Ascension, Pentecost, Corpus Christi and on the Solemnity of the Nativity and Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary.\*\*For praying the Holy Rosary, the following indulgences:\*\*(a) each time 5 tens are celebrated one gains: 40 days (Pope Leo X); 100 days (Pope Innocent XI); 10 years and 10 quadragenes (Pope Sixtus IV);\*\*\*\*(b) 10 years for each Our Father and Hail Mary (Pope Innocent VIII); 10 years and 10 quadragenos at each Hail Mary when the Name “Jesus” is respectfully pronounced;\*\*\*\*(c) every day once only: 10 years and 10 quadragen when we pray together and 50 years when we pray in church (before the image of the Blessed Virgin Mary of the Rosary);\*\*\*\*(d) whoever prays the entire Psalter (15 tenths, gains still: 40 days (Pope Pius V); 100 days (Pope Leo X); 7 years (Pope Clement VIII); 7 years and 7 quadragenes (Pope Pius V);\*\*\*\*(e) 140 days when we cause others to pray the Holy Rosary;\*\*\*\*(f) 100 days for each visit to a Rosary chapel when one says any short prayer for the Holy Father's intention;\*\*\*\*(g) 100 days for each pious meditation of a quarter of an hour in duration and 7 years for ½ hour in duration;\*\*\*\*(h) 3 years and 3 quadragene for visiting a sick member and for burying a deceased member;\*\*\*\*(i) 60 days for every good deed and for attending Brotherhood services.\*\*\*\*And many, many plenary indulgences: as well as the feast days of Christmas, Easter, the Annunciation, the Assumption of Our Lady, the feast of Our Lady of the Rosary, the Immaculate Conception, and Our Lord’s Presentation in the Temple, and the day of the enrollement to archconfraternity)\*\*(Conditions for obtaining plenary indulgence them:1.sanctifying grace, 2.worthy Confession and Holy Communion 3. prayers for the intentions of the holy father (f. e. Our Father, Hail Mary), must be said out loud (or atleast with lips) as this is prayer of the church, no attachment to any sin)Prayers for the intentions of the holy father cannot be changed, and they are:i. The progress of the Faith and triumph of the Church.ii. Peace and union among Christian Princes and Rulers.iii. The conversion of sinners.iv. The uprooting of heresy\*\*Carry the Holy Rosary with you!\*\*Source: my God and everything: a devotional book for members of the Third Order of St. Francis of Assisi 1944rr.\*\*At the request of Fr. Cormier, General of the Dominicans, the Holy Father Pius X, renewed and recognized the former indulgence granted to members of the Holy Rosary, that is, 100 years(!) once a day to those who carry the Holy Rosary devoutly with them. (Pius X, July 31, 1906).\*\*\*\*In addition, the Holy Father Pius X, October 13, 1906, in an audience, granted this Grace to members of the Holy Rosary that they can gain the indulgences of the Rosary then even if they interrupt the chaplet - after each tenth - whenever. (Pius X, October 14, 1906).\*\*\*\*TO BECOME MEMBER OF ARCHCONFRATERNITY YOU MUST:\*\*\*\*1)\*\* be received by a priest who has the authority to do so (we can easily enroll online),\*\*2)\*\* be entered in the book of the brotherhood,\*\*3)\*\* have a rosary or a piece of it consecrated by an authorized priest.\*\*The members' only obligation is to pray the entire rosary (this obligation does not bind under pain of sin), all 15 Mysteries, once a week for the intentions of rosary confraternities around the world and the dominican order.\*\*The fifteen decades of the Rosary do not need to be said all at once - it's up to you, the obligation is only to pray 15 Mysteries with intentions written earlier.The rosary must be prayed correctly - so meditating on mysteries.\*\*HOW TO ENROLL ONLINE?\*\*\*\*If you are from U.S., simply go to:\*\* [\*\*https://rosaryconfraternity.org/the-confraternity/enroll-in-the-confraternity/\*\*](https://rosaryconfraternity.org/the-confraternity/enroll-in-the-confraternity/)\*\*and fill out the form.\*\*\*\*If you are not from U.S., you need to find a dominican website from your country that allows enrollement.\*\*\*\*I believe most of them allows enrollement online, but you need to look through the dominican websites in your country.\*\*\*\*F.e. type "archconfraternity of Rosary join" in your language\*\*

Sir\_K9206 (6): I enrolled over 3 years ago and it has been one of the best things I have ever done. It is of immense comfort to know that my family, friends and loved ones both alive and deceased are being prayed for by my Catholic brothers and sisters around the globe. Long live Christ the King and His beloved mother.

Away\_Report6974 (2): If you have any questions, write them down i'll try to answer :)

Secure-Run8431 (1): What if our state isn't an option?

Timeless\_Traditions (1): Hi…any advice for my comments section statement submission?

hobbit\_boppit (1): Do you need to recite the rosary with a physical rosary? Or, for example, can I pray the rosary while walking and listening to it through my headphones?

Away\_Report6974 (1): maybe try this:[https://www.therosarian.org/enrolling](https://www.therosarian.org/enrolling)

Away\_Report6974 (1): what do you mean?

Timeless\_Traditions (1): Sorry, I was beyond over-tired when I posted that. Can’t remember what I was driving at.

# Post 398: Old SSPX USA website

Author: kawaqcosta

Score: 3

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1gwe9fg/old\_sspx\_usa\_website/

I was looking for an old SSPX website that contained several texts and articles up until a certain date, at the beginning of the last decade if I'm not mistaken, when the SSPX changed its website.I searched in vain for this site and finally managed to find the address in my browser's favorites.The site is as follows: [archives.sspx.org](http://archives.sspx.org)Unfortunately it seems that it is no longer online. Does anyone know where the texts from this site are? I believe that they have not transferred all of them to the main site.

Piklikl (3): Do you remember any specific texts/article titles from the old website? You could try googling that to see what you can find. Otherwise there’s always the way back machine:https://web.archive.org/If anything has ever been put on the internet, it’s almost always never deleted.

kawaqcosta (2): Yes, I have saved a short article by Fr. Peter Scott SSPX, but it does not return any results on Google.I had forgotten about The Waback Machine, thank you very much for pointing it out! I was able to find the texts I was looking for.

# Post 399: SSPX bishop: Top Vatican cardinal told me the Novus Ordo Mass is defective

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 9

Comments: 10

URL: https://www.lifesitenews.com/blogs/sspx-bishop-top-vatican-cardinal-told-me-the-novus-ordo-mass-is-defective/

AcceptableMaize8955 (0): If Rome recognizes the Novus Ordo, then its valid. The end. In the words of Saint Augustine "Rome has spoken case is closed."

None (3): The SSPX is not questioning its validity: it questions its legitimacy; a Mass can be both valid and bad! Also as long as Rome has not spoken infallibly it can be wrong, thank God haha (otherwise we'd need to agree with Pope Francis on everything!

dbaughmen (2): “We refuse to follow the Rome of neo-Protestant and neo-Modernist tendencies.” Archbishop Lefebvre, 1974 declaration.

None (3): if the Vatican says the macarena is the new valid mass, guess what?

AcceptableMaize8955 (0): To each their own, I personally will be following Rome rather than any ones opinion. The Catholic Church can't be corrupted, if im not to follow Rome then Rome has been corrupted. Thus the Catholic Church is Wrong.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): You're not following Rome you are following modernist infiltrators in the temporal city of Rome

AcceptableMaize8955 (0): Pope Leo the GreatThe Lord . . . wanted His gifts to flow into the entire body from Peter himself, as if from the head, in such a way that anyone who had dared to separate himself from the solidarity of Peter would realize that he was himself no longer a sharer in the divine mystery . . . The Apostolic See . . . has on countless occasions been reported to in consultation by bishops . . . And through the appeal of various cases to this see, decisions already made have been either revoked or confirmed, as dictated by longstanding custom. (Letter to the Bishops of Vienne, JulyAlthough bishops have a common dignity, they are not all of the same rank. Even among the most blessed Apostles, though they were alike in honor, there was a certain distinction of power. All were equal in being chosen, but it was given to one to be preeminent over the others . . . the care of the universal Church would converge in the one See of Peter, and nothing should ever be at odds with this head. (Letter to Bishop Anastasius of Thessalonica, c. 446, 14:12; FEF\*,\* vol. 3, 270) \[link to[ ](http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/3604010.htm)[\*\*Schaff, NPNF2\*\*](http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/3604014.htm)\]

dbaughmen (2): OP you seem to have an obsession with the city of Rome. Our Lord did not promise that the city of Rome would not be corrupted, I believe that someone prophesied (I can’t remember who) that one day there will even be Catholic missionaries in Rome as it will lose the faith. As long as there are valid Bishops, clergy, faithful and people practicing the Catholic faith; it is not lost.“Rome will lose the Faith and become the seat of the antichrist.” - Our Lady of La Salette

AcceptableMaize8955 (1): Sure, Rome can lose faith as in the city but that doesn't mean the Churches Magisterium will be corrupt which it can't. Also thats private revelation not public revelation.

AcceptableMaize8955 (0): The See of Rome is the see of Peter, Peters authority is in the see of Rome. The Supreme Pontiff hold the Fullness of the Magisterium and the Magisterium goes without error.

# Post 400: Hi! Maybe, I have asked this question before, but I cannot find the answer...

Author: None

Score: 2

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1gulg9w/hi\_maybe\_i\_have\_asked\_this\_question\_before\_but\_i/

I am moving from an Islad to Lower Mainland here to Burnaby next year. Will be combining work and studies. I am converting to Catholicism, and, on top of attending the local parish in my hometown, I also make a monthly visit to FSSP parish here in Vancouver. I was always interested in the SSPX and wanted to check out one their masses and by doing this, perhaps, resolve some misconceptions abouy this group. Where is the nearest SSPX Parish/chapel in BC? Just wondering if you guys know.Thanks!

Piklikl (3): Looks like there's a priory located in Langley, [here's a link](https://sspx.ca/en/christ-king-priory-church-30141) to the home age where you can get Mass times (they have daily Mass it seems). For Sunday Mass times, click the link to be taken to the Bulletin. It's kind of hard to find, but the SSPX has a relatively okay Map that you can use to see where chapels are located, [here's a link to it](https://sspx.org/en/mass-centers).

Internal\_Ad1735 (2): https://maps.app.goo.gl/1zwrJjkZuD8wVAqXA22630 48 Ave, Langley Twp, BC, Canada V2Z 2T6It's a bit far from Burnaby though, but if you have the time for going back and forth on a Sunday you should.

None (1): Have you been there( if you are from those areas, of course)?

# Post 401: Is it wrong to participate in orthodox Christian prayers?

Author: None

Score: 5

Comments: 10

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1gub946/is\_it\_wrong\_to\_participate\_in\_orthodox\_christian/

I have a Russian Catholic convert friend who gave me an orthodox prayer book. From what I understand many orthodox prayers are shared with Byzantine Catholics which would make it acceptable to pray from my understanding, but I was wondering what is the SSPX thoughts on this if there are any

asimovsdog (11): Praying orthodox prayers by yourself isn't a problem (as long as they align with Catholic teaching), praying together with an Orthodox is (because it might encourage him that his heresy is a-okay).

Internal\_Ad1735 (4): Of course it's acceptable. The Byzantine rite is used by 14 sui iuris Eastern Catholic Churches, and they all have prayer books in common with the Eastern Orthodox. The liturgy is actually identical, except a few lines (Byzantine Catholics mention the Pope and all bishops in communion with Rome, while the Eastern Orthodox will mention their Patriarchs).

Total-Wedding8871 (4): You might get some “you’re a Westerner so stick with Western spirituality” but truth is truth and ancient Eastern Christian spirituality is excellent! Most if not all of those traditional eastern rite prayers will be pre-Schism so you’re generally good to go! I wish there was more of it in the West (for example: the Jesus prayer should be prayed by the East AND West as a normative thing)

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (2): Avoid the Post-Schism heretical prayers and prayers to their false Saints, most of it should be fine

None (1): I understand. My friend is Catholic either way. But what would do you think Catholic/Orthodox people that are married should do? I have a couple of friends in that situation

None (1): That is good to know. Thank you!

None (2): Iabsolutely agree. The Jesus prayer is powerful.

asimovsdog (4): I'll just give you my answer as an anonymous layman:1. They should talk about their differences, first and foremost. At the end, what is at stake is not only the salvation of their own souls but also that of their children. One part goes to Catholic Mass, the other one to a Divine Liturgy - will the children keep the Catholic faith? Likely no.2. Are the convinced Catholics or just Catholic-in-name? If it's the latter it probably doesn't matter, they'll both end up in hell.3. I know this is hard, but: Don't pray with your husband / wife, but pray for him/her (and tell him/her about that). Both the Orthodox and Catholics forbid praying with heretics, so even for the other side you're doing him/her a favor. You can still pray the rosary by yourself without praying with the other person. I know a convert who had a child with an agnostic woman who does this and it works, more or less. They don't pray together and it's not anyones fault, but it's not that much of a problem and they get through the day.If they're converts, then offer up the pain, but if they went into marriage knowingly: every single time it ends up like this, they don't put the faith first, just feelings - only to end up with more pain as the feelings fade. Marriage should not be treated lightly, because the goal of a marriage is to raise children. I myself broke up with someone because she was Protestant and it was clear to me she didn't share my vision of traditionalism. Yeah, she was hot and young and everything, but useless as a potential wife and useless to discuss religion with. It just doesn't work.

None (1): Thanks for the reply. Luckily my soon to be wife is Catholic as well.I just have many friends in this situation. One is already married with children with an orthodox woman the other is in a relationship with another orthodox woman. My friends are convinced Catholics and I believe they’re way more practicing than their orthodox wives so I think the children will be as well

asimovsdog (3): If they are just nominally / culturally Orthodox, they could take their wives to a Catholic Latin Mass and see how they react. But I would really not advise going into a marriage without conversion first.

# Post 402: Will the novus ordo ever get undone?

Author: Christ\_is\_\_risen

Score: 7

Comments: 33

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1gtus6l/will\_the\_novus\_ordo\_ever\_get\_undone/

I don't mean a reformed novus ordo. I mean the only form of the mass being the Tridentine mass. If the novus ordo isn't catholic, how is it the official catholic mass? How haven't the gates of hell prevailed? if the novus ordo never completely gets undone then the church will be protestant and not catholic. Do you think the Novus ordo will ever completely end? I hate the feeling of going to novus ordo churches. it is like a different religion. I try to go to my SSPX every Sunday but sometimes that is not possible. Why is God letting this happen?

dbaughmen (16): We must remember that St Paul prophesies the Great Apostasy. And not to sound apocalyptic, but we could be seeing stages of this.Vatican II was an atomic bomb on the Catholic Church, and yet we are still here. Yet we had Archbishop Lefebvre and the preservation of the Catholic Mass, sacraments and lineage is still alive. So the gates of hell have not prevailed against the church, and they wont be even if the Church is again reduced to Twelve.We must pray to God for the restoration of the Faith and of the Mass in the daily Rosary, only this way we will succeed. I myself have great hope that the one day the Church will restore herself, I can feel it. Give it a few more years, but it is not too late, it never will be as Christ promised.

Sir\_K9206 (11): I believe it will eventually be replaced by the TLM. It won’t happen overnight, but it will happen. We’ll need a God fearing Pope at the Vatican first, surrounded by good and decent bishops. Keep the faith.

asimovsdog (6): The NO will die out somewhere in 2060, because they have extremely few priests. Rome tries to "fix" this with permanent deacons, but they aren't priests or bishops. The average age of a NO priest is about 70 and there's barely anyone under 50 in my parish. The protestant-ish service they do simply doesn't draw anyone to sacrifice their life for it like the TLM does. Why would anyone take up a life of celibacy for this?In Rome, nothing will happen until boomers die out (in about 20 - 30 years). Then, all bets are off. The current pope is a massive boomer, we'll probably get another boomer after him. My guess is that the world will go back to "normal" because the economy and the social landscape isn't as good as it was even in the 90s, which makes young people more conservative. The Church will be heavily persecuted by Islamists in Europe, (in 2200, over 50% of Europe will be Islamic, if birthrates stay as they are), it is very much possible that it will go back to normal, but it won't be pretty when it does. Maybe we'll see it, maybe we won't.

None (5): God has allowed the Arian crisis, which lasted for centuries. Most bishops embraced that heresy, even some Popes defended it, and the political entities fell for it as well. As long as no pope infallibly says a formal heresy, as long as some brave bishops fight for traditional faith, the Church hasn't failed.Once a traditional Pope arrives in power, he'll probably either progressively cancel the NO, or reform it (fixing its issues), or enforce the TLM. We shouldn't worry about this though, the first step (getting a trad pope) will be hard enough!

Araedya (3): Not sure we will ever see this in our lifetime. If anything, it would more likely to be a reformed NO, best case scenario of this would be a vernacular TLM. I think it’s more likely (and to avoid really dealing with the problem) a future pope might just allow the NO and TLM to exist simultaneously (without restrictions) to avoid as much controversy as possible. As time goes on and those generations “attached” to the NO die off, there will be a more natural drift back towards the TLM (or parishes like St John Cantius in Chicago). But I do think mass in the vernacular (whatever form that takes) will be here to stay. A vernacular TLM would be an ideal compromise.

TooEdgy35201 (3): Well, looking at the unprecedented wickedness of the world now, does it seem to you like it is a temporary rough patch or more like the end times are coming upon us? I favour the latter option, and with that no there will not be a restoration (unless the Great Monarch prophecy has some merit)

None (2): Novus Ordo is not the official Mass, it’s an imposter Mass. It’s no different to an Anglican Mass. The church is perennial in her teachings and doesn’t change on the whim of a few corrupt bishops sitting comfortably in Rome, who want to shape and mold the church into their own warped visions.They have the audacity to claim we are the ones not in communion, but it is they who are not in communion. It is them who decided that the church founded by Christ and his disciples is no longer “good enough” and must be reformed. They are obsessed with legalism in Rome. Shame on them is all I have to say. I pray their hardened hearts change one day, but that isn’t likely, and the church in Rome seems to be drifting further and further into scandal and disrepair as time goes on. They are bleeding parishioners and closing churches and monasteries because they no longer hold the ancient traditions and integrity that Catholicism was founded on. Most of their priests don’t even wear the collar anymore. It’s all so narcissistic and sad to see. Maybe one day it will go back to how it should be, but probably not in my lifetime. They are also losing vocations at an exceedingly high rate.

mattdamon992 (-7): First, let’s take a step back and consider the big picture. If the Novus Ordo were invalid, heretical, or “not Catholic,” it would mean that Christ’s promises to protect His Church have failed. The Church teaches, and always has, that the gates of hell will not prevail (Matthew 16:18). But those promises apply to the visible Catholic Church—the Church united under the Pope (currently Francis) and the bishops in communion with him—not to small, breakaway groups like the SSPX, sedevacantist groups like the SSPV, or Bishop Williamson’s so-called “resistance.” Christ founded one visible Church, and it is through that Church that He safeguards the sacraments and the liturgy, including the Novus Ordo.The Novus Ordo, promulgated by Pope Paul VI, is the official Mass of the Catholic Church. It is celebrated globally, and while it may feel different from the Tridentine Mass, both forms are valid expressions of the same Catholic faith. To suggest otherwise is to risk undermining the authority of the Church and rejecting her God-given mission to guide the faithful.It’s important to understand that the Church has always had liturgical development. The Tridentine Mass itself wasn’t handed down as-is from the Apostles—it was codified only in the 16th century after the Council of Trent. Before that, there were a variety of rites in use. The Novus Ordo is part of this same tradition of organic development, guided by the authority Christ gave to the Church. Vatican II called for reform, and this is the result. It doesn’t mean the older form is invalid, but it does mean the Church is exercising her legitimate authority in reforming the liturgy.Now, about the feeling of “a different religion”—I understand where you’re coming from. The externals of the Novus Ordo can sometimes feel less traditional if it’s not celebrated with reverence or care, but that doesn’t change the reality of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist. The same sacrifice of the Mass is offered in both forms. What’s most important is focusing on Christ in the Eucharist, which is the heart of the Catholic faith, no matter the liturgical form.Finally, regarding why God is “letting this happen”: God permits challenges, even within the Church, to strengthen and purify us. The liturgical debates today call us to deepen our understanding of what it means to be truly Catholic—obedient to the Church, united with the Pope and bishops, and faithful to Christ. Instead of wishing for the Novus Ordo to disappear, why not work to ensure it’s celebrated as reverently as possible? That’s something you can have a real impact on.The Church isn’t a human invention. She’s guided by the Holy Spirit, and her liturgy, no matter its form, is always meant to draw us closer to God. Trust in that promise, and remember: the visible Catholic Church is where Christ’s promises reside.

mattdamon992 (-7): Let’s dissect your assertions step by step. First, regarding Vatican II as "an atomic bomb on the Catholic Church," even if you stop short of saying it “destroyed” the Church, you imply significant damage. Such rhetoric conflicts with Christ’s promises. As Pope Leo XIII reminds us in Satis Cognitum, "The Church is not something dead; it is the body of Christ endowed with supernatural life." By its nature and constitution, the Church is both visible and indefectible.Second, your reverence for Archbishop Lefebvre overlooks glaring issues with his actions and theology. He wasn’t a momentary dissenter; he remained in defiance of lawful authority for over a decade. Pope Leo XIII teaches that "bishops separated from Peter and his successors lose all jurisdiction." Lefebvre went further than just disobedience—he effectively attempted to redefine Catholicism. By setting up marriage tribunals outside the Church’s authority, claiming the SSPX now held the marks of the Church, and denying the validity of the Novus Ordo priesthood on the absurd grounds that a priest’s lack of belief in transubstantiation invalidates the Eucharist, he teetered into theological error and schism. Even more concerning, his view that authority derives from the people—a Protestant and Gallican notion—strikes at the heart of Catholic teaching. St. Cyprian’s warning is clear: "Heresies and schisms arise and are begotten from the fact that due obedience is refused to the supreme authority." Lefebvre exemplifies this, creating division rather than unity. He did incredible work for the church but after Vatican II he appeared to lose faith and seemed to think he needed to save the church even by repeated and significant acts of disobedience, (the end does not justify the means) rather than realising the Church saves us. Third, your fixation on a "restoration" of the Church presumes that the Church is not fulfilling her mission. St. Augustine refutes this thinking, declaring, "The Church will not disappear but shall remain as long as the sun rises and sets." The Church’s unity and authority remain in the communion with Peter’s successor, not with groups or individuals who set themselves up as arbiters of “true” Catholicism. Maximus the Abbot reminds us that "obedience to the Roman Pontiff is the proof of true faith and legitimate communion." The SSPX’s claim to “preserve tradition” while remaining outside this communion is incoherent.Lastly, disparaging the Novus Ordo undermines Catholic unity. The Church teaches that all forms of the liturgy promulgated by the Pope are valid and sanctifying. Denigrating it as inferior or damaging is not fidelity—it is division. The Mass, in any form approved by the Church, is the Holy Sacrifice of Christ. The restoration of the Church begins with fidelity to the Pope and the bishops in communion with him. Pray the Mass, Pray the Rosary, yes— pray also for the virtues of humility and obedience for us all which are essential to being truly Catholic.

dbaughmen (9): There is so much wrong with this. This is absolutely not an SSPX or a Catholic position. Some of these statements are ambiguous and untrue. I advise against this statement.

feelinggravityspull (4): Excellent bait

Problemtoo (-1): Your explanations are well thought out and beautifully explained. Thank you for taking time to respond clearly and without ire. May God bless all of us as we navigate through life and share God’s love with all humans no matter what they believe.

None (-3): This is a good, balanced approach.

None (3): "By its nature and constitution, the Church is both visible and indefectible." The SSPX doesn't deny that. "Bishops Separated from Peter and His Successors, Lose All Jurisdiction" this needs to be defined exactly (what does "separated mean; disagreeing with some doctrinal issue? Being formally excommunicated?) However, it has never been infallibly declared that the SSPX is separated from Peter. Finally, the SSPX bishops don't claim juridiction anyway. "By setting up marriage tribunals outside the Church’s authority, claiming the SSPX now held the marks of the Church, and denying the validity of the Novus Ordo priesthood on the absurd grounds that a priest’s lack of belief in transubstantiation invalidates the Eucharist, he teetered into theological error and schism."You need to prove the marriage tribunals are essentially a "theological error and schism". The other claims are false (the SSPX doesn't deny it "helds the marks of the Church" whatever that means, nor that the NO priesthood is invalid, nor that not believing in transubstantiation invalidates the Eucharist. Where the heck do you get these last 2 claims from?"his view that authority derives from the people" source?"Third, your fixation on a "restoration" of the Church presumes that the Church is not fulfilling her mission. \[...\]" then every time the Church has known a restoration, it contradicted Christ' promise?"The Church teaches that all forms of the liturgy promulgated by the Pope are valid and sanctifying." I know the document you're refering to, it was published before VII, and the Pope didn't say "this has been and will be true of every liturgy ever": he simply refered to the ones currently proclaimed.

mattdamon992 (-11): If you think there's 'so much wrong' with my statement, then let’s actually engage with Church teaching instead of dismissing it outright. The Novus Ordo is a valid, licit liturgy promulgated by the Church under her God-given authority. To deny that is to deny the promises of Christ to His Church. Let me explain why.Christ’s promises are directed toward the visible Church, not breakaway groups like the SSPX or sedevacantist movements. In Matthew 16:18, Jesus says: 'You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell will not prevail against it.' This Church is not an invisible, nebulous group—it’s the visible Church united under the Pope and bishops in communion with him.The First Vatican Council affirmed this clearly in Pastor Aeternus: 'The eternal Pastor and Bishop of our souls... willed that in his Church there should be shepherds and teachers until the end of time.' Christ established a tangible, hierarchical Church to safeguard His promises.Pope Pius XII reinforced this in Mystici Corporis Christi: 'They walk in the path of dangerous error who believe that they can accept Christ as the head of the Church, while not adhering loyally to His Vicar on earth.' This makes it clear that rejecting the visible Church or the Pope’s authority is a rejection of Christ’s plan for His Church.The Council of Trent also settled any doubts about the Church’s authority over the liturgy: 'If anyone says that the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church customarily used in the solemn administration of the sacraments may be despised... let him be anathema.' The Novus Ordo, promulgated by Pope Paul VI, is one such approved rite. To question its validity (or to despise it) is to challenge the very authority of the Church established by Christ.So, if you believe my statement is 'ambiguous' or 'untrue,' I challenge you to provide an actual argument, grounded in Church teaching, to support your claim. Engage with any authoritative source, and engage with the clear promises Christ made to His visible Church. Dismissing the Novus Ordo or the authority of the Pope without proper reasoning isn’t a Catholic position—it’s an emotional reaction. Let’s discuss this like Catholics who seek truth, not like factions that reject it.

mattdamon992 (0): Thank you

mattdamon992 (1): Test response.

mattdamon992 (1): Friend I do actually have real hope that the SSPX will be fully reconciled with holy mother Church next year. I am very hopeful that Pope Francis will allow a consecration and give them a personal prelature. There is so much good the SSPX do but they need to do it within the fullness of the Catholic church. 1. On Indefectibility and the SSPX’s ClaimsYou argue that the SSPX bishops do not claim jurisdiction and remain in communion with the Church ("not separated from Peter"), but this assertion doesn’t hold when weighed against authoritative declarations. St. John Paul II, in Ecclesia Dei Afflicta (1988), clearly stated that Archbishop Lefebvre’s act of consecrating bishops without papal mandate was a schismatic act that resulted in automatic excommunication. Benedict XVI also confirmed in 2009:> “Until the doctrinal questions are clarified, the Society has no canonical status in the Church, and its ministers – even though they have been freed of the ecclesiastical penalty – do not legitimately exercise any ministry in the Church.”Pope Francis was motivated by concerns regarding the lack of valid confessions and marriages within SSPX communities and so granted them faculties in these areas. This was another conciliatory gesture to try and bring the SSPX back into full communion.Supplied JurisdictionThe SSPX’s invocation of “supplied jurisdiction” is similarly problematic. Bishop Tissier de Mallerais himself stated:> “It is inasmuch as you do not refuse to receive from your priests the ministry which they have the right to exercise for your good... that the jurisdiction that you in a certain way give them will be able to be fruitfully exercised.”While Bishop Tissier qualifies this with “in a certain way,” indicating some level of doubt, this statement reveals a flawed theology of jurisdiction indicating that the people can, by their requests, provide jurisdiction. Lefebvre himself also asserted that SSPX clergy derive their authority from “the requests of the priests and the faithful to take care of their souls.” Such reasoning directly contradicts canon law and even the SSPX’s own patron saint, as the Catechism of St. Pius X states:> “The power possessed by the Hierarchy does not come from the people, and it would be heresy to say it did; it comes solely from God.”Lefebvre explicitly stated regarding the replacement to Bishop Mayer:> "This is not the case with the new bishop, who has no other basis for jurisdiction than that which comes from the requests of the priests and the faithful to take care of their souls and those of their children, and who have asked him to accept the episcopacy so as to give them true Catholic priests and the grace of the Sacrament of Confirmation. Thus it is clear that the jurisdiction of the new bishop is not territorial but personal, as becomes also the jurisdiction of the priests.......Since the jurisdiction of the bishop is not territorial but personal and has as its source the duty of the faithful to save their souls, if a group of faithful in the diocese calls upon the bishop to have a priest, this group gives by this very fact, authority to the bishop to watch over the transmission of the Faith and of grace in this group, by the intermediary of the priest that he sent."(Source: archbishoplefebvre.com)By claiming jurisdiction through the consent of the faithful, the SSPX undermines the Church’s divinely ordained hierarchical structure. The jurisdiction exercised by bishops and priests must be conferred through the proper channels established and maintained by the Church (the visible, hierarchical body that the world knows as the Catholic Church, headed by Pope Francis, and the bishops in communion with him), not derived from a perceived, and necessarily subjective, “necessity” or popular demand.Marriage Tribunals and JurisdictionHow can you not see the marriage tribunals as depriving the legitimate successors of the Apostles of their authority to a society of priests with no canonical mission? Lefebvre stated:> “Inasmuch as the present Roman authorities are imbued with ecumenism and modernism, and as their decisions and the new laws are in their ensemble influenced by these false principles, it will be necessary to establish substitute authorities to supply for these defects, which authorities will adhere to Catholic principles of Catholic Tradition and of Catholic law. This is the only way to remain faithful to Our Lord Jesus Christ...”Bishop Tissier also claimed "true jurisdiction" for this Canonical Commission, stating:> “The supplied jurisdiction of the Canonical Commission is not habitual, territorial, or permanent, but personal and dependent on the necessity of the faithful. It is a true jurisdiction, not an exemption from the obligation to receive a judgment from the Church and does not usurp any papal authority or divine right. The judgments and acts of supplied jurisdiction, including the episcopal consecrations of 1988, will eventually have to be confirmed by the Holy See.”---.

None (2): Thank you for your detailed answer! It does look chatGPTlike though haha. I'm gonna try to be as synthetic as I can because I don't have much time, but I'll try to answer on everything.I'm also hoping an agreement, not because I think the SSPX is wrong, but because it's not a normal situation indeed that people who openly proclaim non Catholic things (blessing gay couples, religious freedom, ... religious relativism) would be at high positions of the Church while orthodox Catholics are persecuted.Regarding "being in communion", this has to be defined first. If being in communion with the Pope means "agreeing with him doctrinaly", then the SSPX isn't in communion indeed. If that means "to be schismatic", then it need to be proven that the SSPX is in schism.John Paul II and Benedict XVI might have belived that the SSPX was schismatic and/or excommunicated; they have never formally declared it was that way, and more importantly, \*\*they have never done it infallibly\*\*. You keep using Popes as infallible authority; however, when speaking non infallibly, Popes have been wrong many times in history. Why should we not believe Pope Francis when he preaches religious relativism but we should believe him when he speaks against orthodox Catholics like the SSPX?Regarding jurisdiction, it seems to me you don't see the position of the SSPX as it actually is: they don't say the jurisdiction comes from the people (they would never say such thing), but by the Pope through the case of the necessity (which is brought by the need to give the sacraments to the faithful who are deprived of it, but that doesn't mean the jurisdiction "come" from them!Regarding the marriage tribunals it is true you can't trust people who are religious relativists on their judgment for that. The tribunal the SSPX has set up is not claiming jurisdiction or infallibility, but to guide people.Regarding the declaration of Archbishop Lefebvre, how else can you describe the Pope against Tradition in so many essential topics? Religious freedom against Quanta Cura?Archbishop Lefebvre's words here are ambiguous: you could even make them mean sedevacantism. This is not what he defended though. If you read the official SSPX's position, you'll see that indeed that he belived the Pope has materially given up the faith, but he's not saying that the Pope is a formal heretic, nor that he has infallibly declared a heresy. Therefore he didn't deny indefectibility.As a general rule, there is a difference between saying "I will do this even if you forbid me to do it because you're not fighting for Catholicism anymore but for religious relativism" and saying "I consider you don't have authority and I don't want to obey you". If my father orders me to do something bad, I'll disobey; if he forbids me to something good, I'll do it anyway. That doesn't mean I refuse that he has a right of authority over me nor that I substitue my authority to his."This claim aligns more with Protestant sectarianism than Catholic unity. Somewhat ironically, the SSPX has splintered into groups like the SSPV and The Resistance, whereas the Catholic Church, despite her suffering, remains the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church united to the Pope and bishops in communion with him."This is a human argument. Also, first the SSPX doesn't claim to be "the Church", and more importantly... The doctrinal divide within the NO Catholics is much bigger than between the SSPX and the resistance; the only difference is we actually care about doctrine, while the Pope doesn't care that he has got bishops publically proclaiming gay/LGBT marriages and religious relativism, and Institute of the Good Shepherd priests claiming Vatican II contradicts Catholic doctrine within the same groups. There is a huge divide within the ex Ecclesia Dei as well: they have to public positions on the NO and Vatican II, but many members basically believe the same thing as the SSPX. Nobody is spared by the crisis of the Church.

mattdamon992 (1): 2/22. Lefebvre’s Statements and claim the church is in apostasy For example, his infamous 1987 declaration:> "The proposal of Cardinal Ratzinger...even if you concede to us a bishop, even some autonomy from the bishops, even if you concede us the whole liturgy of 1962, even if you allow us to continue the seminary and the Fraternity as it is working now, we will not collaborate! It is impossible, impossible because we work in a diametrically opposite direction. You [Cardinal Ratzinger and those he represented] work to the de-Christianization of society and the Church and the human person. We work for Christianization. It is illogical. ROME HAS LOST THE FAITH, MY DEAR FRIENDS! ROME IS IN APOSTASY. I do not speak empty words, only that I tell you the truth! Rome is in apostasy. You cannot have confidence in them. ROME HAS LEFT THE CHURCH, THEY HAVE LEFT THE CHURCH, THEY HAVE LEFT THE CHURCH! It is sure, it is certain."This statement illustrates a complete break from Catholic ecclesiology. Lefebvre’s claim that “Rome” (the See of Peter) had abandoned the faith effectively positioned himself as the sole arbiter of Catholic tradition, rejecting the papacy and hierarchy.Pope St. Paul VI addressed this type of thinking directly in a 1976 letter to Lefebvre:> “You refuse to recognize, as must be done, these two ways in which supreme authority is exercised… In practice, you are claiming that you alone are the judge of what tradition embraces.”The Church’s indefectibility ensures that the faith will never be entirely lost within her visible structures, as Christ Himself promised in Matthew 16:18. Lefebvre’s rhetoric denies this indefectibility, implying that the Church’s marks (One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic) had “transferred” to the SSPX.Lefebvre stated:> “I ask you: where are the true marks of the Church? Are they more in the official Church (I am not talking about the ‘visible Church,’ I am talking about the ‘official Church’) or in us, in what we represent, what we are?”This claim aligns more with Protestant sectarianism than Catholic unity. Somewhat ironically, the SSPX has splintered into groups like the SSPV and The Resistance, whereas the Catholic Church, despite her suffering, remains the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church united to the Pope and bishops in communion with him.---3. Restoration and the Role of the PopeThe restoration of the Church is always ongoing—a process of renewal within her visible structures, led by the successors of Peter. Lefebvre’s assertion that the papacy had become the “seat of the Antichrist” is both theologically unsound and contrary to Christ’s promises. Pope Paul VI reminded Lefebvre:> “The mission of discerning and remedying abuses is first of all Ours; it is the mission of all the bishops who work together with Us… How can you claim to act contrary to the recent Council in opposition to your brethren in the episcopate?”The Pope is the guardian of tradition, not a single bishop or group acting independently. Lefebvre’s rejection of papal authority led not to restoration but to schism and division. It’s worth noting that figures like St. Athanasius, who opposed heresy during the Arian crisis, did so in defense of the Church (including the Council which Athanasius defended) and in communion with the papacy—not in opposition to it. Lefebvre’s actions lack such fidelity to the Church’s hierarchical unity.---ConclusionLefebvre’s actions, while motivated by genuine concern for the Church, ultimately resulted in disobedience, schism, and theological error. The restoration of the Church cannot be achieved through defiance of papal authority or the establishment of parallel structures. True restoration lies in fidelity to the Pope and bishops in communion with him. As Paul VI implored:> “You break with the Church’s legitimate pastors and scorn the legitimate exercise of their charge… You must take the only decision that befits a son of the Church.”The true path to restoration lies in humble submission to the Church’s hierarchy and trust in the Holy Spirit—not in setting oneself as the sole arbiter of Tradition

mattdamon992 (1): Thanks for the response, I do think this is helpful for all of us to better understand where everyone sees things.(Unfortunately, I think ChatGPT would hallucinate far too much to be of any real use here, so it’s good to have an actual conversation instead!)On Jurisdiction and the SSPXYou say the SSPX doesn’t believe jurisdiction comes from the people, but Archbishop Lefebvre’s own words tell a different story. In his 1991 letter about Bishop Mayer’s replacement, Lefebvre explicitly said:"This is not the case with the new bishop, who has no other basis for jurisdiction than that which comes from the requests of the priests and the faithful to take care of their souls and those of their children, and who have asked him to accept the episcopacy so as to give them true Catholic priests and the grace of the Sacrament of Confirmation. Thus it is clear that the jurisdiction of the new bishop is not territorial but personal, as becomes also the jurisdiction of the priests."...."Since the jurisdiction of the bishop is not territorial but personal and has as its source the duty of the faithful to save their souls, if a group of faithful in the diocese calls upon the bishop to have a priest, this group gives by this very fact, authority to the bishop to watch over the transmission of the Faith and of grace in this group, by the intermediary of the priest that he sent."This is not a one-off slip. It’s baked into SSPX’s operations. For example, Bishop Tissier talks about “real jurisdiction” as I previously pointed out , and Bishop Fellay went so far as to set up a convent in Wanganui NZ under what he called the “equivalent of diocesan right.” There is some info on that here, Our History – Dominican Sisters of Wanganui Incorporated – The Dominican Sisters of Wanganui Incorporated are separate from, and not associated with, the New Zealand Dominican Sisters Incorporated. That’s not something you do if you think your jurisdiction is supplied or provisional in nature. There is a sense of a real jurisdiction being imposed. And let’s not forget the SSPX Canonical Commission - where they require oaths on the Gospels and make people swear not to seek redress from a legitimate Catholic tribunal. A tribunal by its very nature presumes jurisdiction, no? If they didn’t think they had real jurisdiction, what’s the point of requiring those oaths? This isn't a small bit of jurisdiction here and there to save a soul in danger of death. The longer this separation goes on, the more it looks and smells like a substitute hierarchy! The SSPX need to come back into regular communion ASAP or it will never happen. On AmbiguityYou acknowledge ambiguity in Lefebvre’s words - his rhetoric often danced dangerously close to sedevacantism, even if he didn’t fully go there. Fair enough. But why doesn’t the SSPX apply the same generous reading to Vatican II or Pope Francis? If Lefebvre’s ambiguous words can be excused as a reflection of his frustrations with the crisis in the Church, why isn’t the same courtesy extended to Vatican II interpretation or papal comments today? (There is plenty to be said about Pope Francis and whether off the cuff comments should be considered teachings!)The SSPX seems quick to call out ambiguities in Church documents as evidence to disregard Vatican II or the authority of the Pope (and to refuse the profession of Faith). But when it comes to Lefebvre’s words - like calling Rome “apostate” or saying “Rome has left the Church”-it’s somehow not a problem. This double standard undermines their credibility. On Communion and SchismYou argue that being “in communion” doesn’t necessarily mean agreement with the Pope, but I’d counter that true communion involves more than just avoiding formal schism. You need actual submission to the legitimate authority of the Pope and bishops. The SSPX’s refusal to acknowledge this basic principle is what creates the ongoing tension. When you set up tribunals, chapels, schools, and seminaries outside canonical authority and churn out priests that are not sent by ecclesiastical or canonical authority, that looks and functions like a parallel Church, no matter what it’s called. Similarly when its telling its adherents that all other Latin Masses are bad or questionable (even when in communion with the local bishop), the mass celebrated by 95% of Catholics is 'evil' and that the SSPX has the only legitimate position... The Bigger PictureYou’re right—there’s a crisis in the Church, and it’s deeply frustrating to see doctrinal confusion and scandal. But does the solution lie in setting up your own tribunals, declaring the Pope’s jurisdiction null in practice, and (in effect) claiming a special role as the arbiters of tradition? That’s a slippery slope. The SSPX often says it’s not “the Church,” but its actions often look like a substitute for it, especially when it operates independently of the Pope’s authority. Like the archbishop, the SSPX seem to see itself as saving the Church, but the Church saves us, not the other way around. I think there's a lot more we could talk about with respect to authority and I'd like to look into your argument on the father scenario. I really don't understand the SSPX position on that myself. It seems they have a bit of a novel way of looking at Obedience - "If we think what the Church/Pope/Bishops are telling us will mean the destruction of the Faith, then we decline to do it, even if the action of itself is not sinful". I always understood the Traditional teaching on Obedience is that if you are questioning the prudence of directions, then that is not true obedience! Unless something is clearly sinful, then you should be deferring to Lawful Superiors. Let’s not forget that the Church has faced crises before. Is there any real evidence besides the tired argument of St. Athanasius and perhaps Liberius that we can really point to? All the saints I found always just Obey and quietly accept all their trials and injustices (Padre Pio as a recent one).I think there's more I could/should address in your comment, but like you, I am a bit light on time as well tonight.

None (1): Sorry, I'm answering late again, I'll try to be fast but still answer everything! JurisdictionTo be honest I'm quite surprised about this debate. I have seen the SSPX accused of many things, but never of believing the jurisdiction comes from the people. If you ask any SSPX priest, they'll tell you they don't believe that.However, it think it's a problem of definition. What does "coming from" means? Yes, it is because the faithful need sacraments that the right of necessity exists. It doesn't mean that the jurisdiction comes from the will of the people, and not through the Church, even if people (needing sacraments) is the reason behind jurisdiction. In the letter you're quoting, archbishop Lefebvre says this : "Since the jurisdictional authority of the bishop \[de Castro Mayer\] does not come from a Roman nomination, but from \*\*the necessity of the salvation of souls\*\*, he will have to exercise it with a special delicacy and taking special account of his presbyteral council." Indeed, the right of jurisdiction is supplied here by the right of necessity; it doesn't mean it's the people who can grant it. To answer the following paragraph, yes the SSPX imitated the structure of diocese because it's the normal Catholic structure: it doesn't mean they claim the absolute right (as opposed to the necessity right) to create everything, including new dioceses etc. "A tribunal by its very nature presumes jurisdiction, no?" It depends what authority is claimed by this tribunal. This tribunal was created because of the abuse in the diocesan tribunals; and the reason they make people swear not to use those is because those tribunals are inflitrated with religious relativism and can't be trusted. That doesn't mean we're claiming jurisdiction!Let's imagine an bad government that would give really unfair justice, condemning innocent people to death and releasing criminals. If a community decided to create its own tribunals, it doesn't mean they contest the right of their government to have tribunals; it means they temporarily need proper justice, and setting up things that could do the closest thing to what those tribunals are doing, without claiming their authority. You seem to be making an Appeal to motive: yes we believe we're compelled by necessity to do those things, it doesn't mean we're claiming this is something else than necessity. Necessity is enough to make us right and to give us the reason we need to do everything to protect the faith.It is not indeed a normal situation: but the modernists who break away from tradition are the ones who caused it, not the SSPX, because the SSPX was compelled by its Catholic duty.On AmbiguityLefebvre is dealing with very complex theological issues, so yes indeed on some quotes you can see ambiguities. But those are always solved by other parts of what he did or said. More importantly, he is never said things that are explicitly going against tradition. Vatican II on the other hand is very ambiguous on some issues indeed, but not only it's explicitly against tradition on some aspects (religious freedom), but also it has been systematically interpreted as such by the post VII Popes. The SSPX doesn't care about Vatican II as such: it's the ideas going against tradition whithin it or behind it that it is afraid of. The fact that all of those following popes and more and more Catholics are believing in these ideas going against tradition are proving us right: the fact people who agree with Archbishop Lefebvre are not infiltrated with those modernist ideas is proving him right as well. "There is plenty to be said about Pope Francis and whether off the cuff comments should be considered teachings!" This is the central point: Pope Francis nor Vatican 2 are using infailliblity to claim their contradictory to tradition beliefs: which is why we're not following them. However, some of the things Pope Francis are saying are definitely going against tradition. This doesn't disprove anything against the indefectibility of the Church because he's not saying them infallibly; however, it does mean that he souldn't be followed blindly on everything.

None (1): On Communion and Schism"you need actual submission to the legitimate authority of the Pope and bishops." You need to define what you mean by communion and submission. But if by that you mean that we have to agree with everything the Pope is saying infallibly, then of course we do. If you mean being obedient if he wants us to believe or say anything against tradition, then we shouldn't. Are you being obedient if you refuse to believe something Pope Francis says? Are you obedient if you refuse to participate at your bishop' celebration of LGBT "marriages" like they do in Germany? As Thomas Aquinas says, it is our duty to publically denounce religious authorities when they are going against the faith (and he's even using saint Paul vs saint Peter in his example) [https://www.newadvent.org/summa/3033.htm#article4](https://www.newadvent.org/summa/3033.htm#article4)"that looks and functions like a parallel Church"It can look like one, but it is not one: this is why Archbishop Levebvre has refused to give the new bishops "diocese", that's why he didn't create SSPX chapels: even if we use the needed jurisdiction out of necessity, we are not claiming we want to replace the Pope!"Similarly when its telling its adherents that all other Latin Masses are bad or questionable (even when in communion with the local bishop), the mass celebrated by 95% of Catholics is 'evil' and that the SSPX has the only legitimate position..."The SSPX is not saying the ex Ecclesia Dei TLM is "bad". It's exactly the same Mass! What's bad is to agree with some official positions of those institutes, and going to their parishes might lead someone to that.I understand why claiming to be right when you are 1% against 99% can seem arrogant. But all we're doing is clinging to the traditional teaching of the Church, which comes from Christ himself. During the Arian crisis, the majority of bishops were Arian: \*The whole world groaned, and was astonished to find itself Arian.\* That doesn't mean the bishops who stood up against arianism were wrong!Regarding the NO, most of my family goes to it, it pains me to say it's evil but when you look both at its essence and at its consequences, you can't say it's not evil. Here is the Brief Critical Exam if you havent read it yet (it's short and very informative!)[https://angeluspress.org/blogs/catholic-doctrine/a-brief-critical-study-of-the-novus-ordo-missae](https://angeluspress.org/blogs/catholic-doctrine/a-brief-critical-study-of-the-novus-ordo-missae)

mattdamon992 (1): Hi Jackle,\*\*On Jurisdiction\*\*I want to be more direct about the SSPX’s stance on jurisdiction. You mentioned that the SSPX isn’t claiming jurisdiction from the people, but only acts out of necessity. Can you cite cases from history where a bishop or group has ever taken such action and been vindicated? However, the statements from both Archbishop Lefebvre and Bishop Tissier de Mallerais tell a different story anyway if i think. Archbishop Lefebvre’s 1991 statement regarding Bishop Mayer’s replacement is very clear:>Additionally, Bishop Tissier explicitly said:>When Bishop Tissier says "it is a true jurisdiction," he isn’t just talking about some provisional arrangement. He is claiming real, binding authority, even if he tries to frame it as being supplied by necessity (when has this happened and been sanctioned by the Church?). This isn't about guiding people in an advisory capacity; it's about assuming the authority to make binding decisions in a way that directly mimics the canonical jurisdiction that only the Pope and bishops in communion with him legitimately exercise.It’s quite inconsistent for the SSPX to claim on one hand that they are simply guiding people, while at the same time requiring people to swear on the Gospels and submit to their tribunals in place of the diocesan ones. These actions are fundamentally about exercising authority—real jurisdiction—and not merely offering guidance. This isn't just semantics; it's a matter of how authority is legitimately conferred and exercised within the Church's divinely established hierarchy.The SSPX tribunal, for example, isn’t merely offering suggestions for dealing with marriage cases; they are making binding judgments that require the faithful to submit, while instructing them not to seek redress from legitimate Catholic tribunals. This isn’t something that can be done without proper jurisdiction. If they didn’t think they had legitimate authority, why the oaths? Why the instructions not to appeal to diocesan authorities - or simply just guidance without the rigamole of a 'canonical commission!'. The SSPX's argument that they have the right to do this out of necessity becomes difficult to accept when the language and actions are so clearly about claiming authority that properly belongs to the Church, through the Pope and those in communion with him. To put it bluntly, if it looks like jurisdiction, acts like jurisdiction, and binds like jurisdiction—then it \*is\* jurisdiction. And in this case, it is jurisdiction that hasn't been granted through the appropriate, canonical channels. You were obviously incorrect to state earlier that \*Regarding the marriage tribunals it is true you can't trust people who are religious relativists on their judgment for that. The tribunal the SSPX has set up is not claiming jurisdiction or infallibility, but to guide people.\*\*\*Not a Human Institution\*\*You brought up the analogy of setting up a tribunal in a corrupt government to ensure justice. I agree with the general sentiment that, in the face of corruption, there is a need for true justice. However, the Church isn't just a human institution. Christ Himself established the Church, with a visible hierarchy and a divinely guided structure. When we act outside of that structure, we risk undermining not just human authority, but divine authority.The SSPX’s actions in setting up tribunals, seminaries, and consecrating bishops—without canonical approval—are actions that mimic the hierarchical authority of the Church. Even if done with the best of intentions, it challenges the very structure that Christ established. The Church has processes for dealing with perceived corruption or error—those processes require obedience, patience, and sometimes suffering, as exemplified by saints like Padre Pio. Setting up parallel systems isn’t the way.

None (1): The Bigger PictureYes, this crisis is painful and way too long. I'm still hopeful though, change can be unexpected, and some things are going right!Regarding obedience, I think I answered with saint Thomas' quote (he also tackles the question at IIa IIae question 104 article 5) but ultimately for every new crisis there are new dilemnas and theologians haven't answered everything; however I thing that keeping the faith on everything is what matters the most. Reagarding Pope Liberius, he sadly isn't the only example (although it's the most similar one), there is also Pope Formosus, Pope John XXII etc., but more importantly, saint Paul against saint Peter. I think the general rule we need to remember is that being blindly obedient to the Pope is too comfortable to be true, and we need to stand up to evil no matter how much we love and respect the Pope. Padre Pio, who didn't like Vatican II either, was persecuted indeed and accepted that, but he never compromised on faith, and he never said the NO. Besides, he was not a bishop and wasn't a member of the teaching Church, he didn't have the same duties as Lefebvre (who appreciated him a lot).I think this crisis won't solve itself is great saints, as tools of God, don't stand up to it and proclaim Tradition, as they've always done, but it's true that so far we parishoners have been nothing more than sinners, unworthy of fighting for the Church of God. As a conclusion, a passage of saint Augustine that gives me hope: (Of True Religion, VI, 11) "Often, too, divine providence permits even good men to be driven from the congregation of Christ by the turbulent seditions of carnal men. When for the sake of the peace of the Church they patiently endure that insult or injury, and attempt no novelties in the way of heresy or schism, they will teach men how God is to be served with a true disposition and with great and sincere charity. The intention of such men is to return when the tumult has subsided. But if that is not permitted because the storm continues or because a fiercer one might be stirred up by their return, they hold fast to their purpose to look to the good even of those responsible for the tumults and commotions that drove them out. They form no separate conventicles of their own, but defend to the death and assist by their testimony the faith which they know is preached in the Catholic Church. These the Father who seeth in secret crowns secretly. It appears that this is a rare kind of Christian, but examples are not lacking. Indeed there are more than can be believed. So divine providence uses all kinds of men as examples for the oversight of souls and for the building up of his spiritual people."

mattdamon992 (1): You mentioned the need to define what is meant by "communion" and "submission." It involves an actual, lived submission to the Church’s governing authority, not just in teachings on faith and morals, but in matters of discipline and governance as well. The unity of the Church isn’t only about shared doctrine—it also involves visible, structural unity under the legitimate authority established by Christ. I think Communion could be looked into by both of us - how do you see the Church seeing it? I understand, without having a reference at hand, it to mean worshipping with all members of the Catholic Church (and obviously that doesn't mean attending a literal clown or surf mass, nor a LGBT wedding). Specifically, refusing to take communion when attending a NO mass, a FSSP mass etc appears to be a clear 'refusal of communion'. When St. Thomas Aquinas speaks of the duty to resist a prelate in cases where faith is in danger, it is about opposing a specific action that is directly sinful—not about a wholesale rejection of the prelate’s authority to govern a group of priests, or establishing parallel structures. I'm not sure about that new advent reference - did you look at the 'reply to objection 2'?# Obedience to Authority vs. Blind ObedienceYou argue that we should not obey the Pope if he asks us to do something against tradition. True, we must never obey a directive that requires us to sin. But what exactly in Vatican II or the Novus Ordo constitutes a command to sin? Disagreeing with certain prudential decisions of the Church—such as the reform of the liturgy—does not justify disobedience. Disobedience is a far cry from raising legitimate concerns in the proper way. The notion that every decision must be examined by each individual Catholic to determine if it aligns with their understanding of tradition places private judgment above Church authority, which is inherently Protestant. The SSPX & Co were not the first to say that the antichrist sits in Rome and had 'lost the faith'. The Church has faced crises in the past, and reform has always been achieved by remaining obedient and suffering in union with the Church, not by setting up independent structures. # "Parallel Church" ArgumentYou mentioned that the SSPX doesn’t want to replace the Pope or create a "parallel Church" because Lefebvre didn’t assign dioceses to his bishops. However, you can’t deny that the SSPX has, in effect, set up a parallel structure to fulfill roles that belong to the diocesan bishop and the Holy See. The existence of tribunals, seminaries, and the consecration of bishops, all outside of the Pope’s authority, effectively creates a substitute hierarchy. You may argue that it is out of necessity, but this still amounts to assuming an authority that has not been granted by the legitimate hierarchy.If the SSPX truly recognized the Pope's authority, they would not be establishing their own tribunals, consecrating bishops, seting up (and taking over!) convents etc, without papal mandate. The fact that Lefebvre didn't assign dioceses is irrelevant if, in practice, these clergy function independently of the Pope and establish their own governance structures.# Critique of the Novus OrdoRegarding your comments on the Novus Ordo, labeling it "evil" is a grave statement. This is a liturgy promulgated by the Pope and celebrated across the entire Church. To declare it "evil" is to assert that the Church has officially sanctioned something intrinsically harmful to souls, which contradicts Christ’s promise that the gates of hell would not prevail against His Church (as well as the Council of Trent anathema on this point). How can you really be comfortable stating something so grave when you have the ordinary magisterium and the entire Catholic Church celebrating this mass. If you look at the essence of the Novus Ordo, it is still the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, instituted by Christ. Its validity is not dependent on its perceived alignment with tradition but on the authority of the Church to promulgate liturgical forms. I state again, to claim that the Mass, which the Church has promulgated for the spiritual benefit of her faithful, is evil, is to question the very indefectibility of the Church.# Appealing to HistoryYou mention the Arian crisis and how the majority of bishops were in error at that time. We disagree on the historical facts about what that justified. There are at least two encyclicals from pre Vat II popes that pretty clearly state that Pope Liberious was falsely accused here, and that He \*\*sent\*\* Athanasious out (i.e. jurisdiction) - Principi Apostolorum Petro and Quartus Supra.

None (1): "Can you cite cases from history where a bishop or group has ever taken such action and been vindicated?" Depend what you call "such action"; but using the right of necessity is definitely something that's possible, it's explicitally part of the canon law for consecrating bishops."Archbishop Lefebvre’s 1991 statement regarding Bishop Mayer’s replacement is very clear:"You forgot the quote! However this exact document doesn't prove the SSPX believes jurisdiction comes from the people in the sense you're claiming, as is shown by the the quote I gave you earlier"He is claiming real, binding authority, even if he tries to frame it as being supplied by necessity"Well you have the burden of proof, and I don't find this convincing: no matter what you think about the right of necessity, the SSPX is not claiming anything else that it's using the right of necessity for jurisdiction. Ask any SSPX priest about it and he'll tell you that, I know many of them and they'd believe it'd be crazy from the SSPX to claim something else. "It’s quite inconsistent for the SSPX to claim on one hand that they are simply guiding people, while at the same time requiring people to swear on the Gospels and submit to their tribunals in place of the diocesan ones. These actions are fundamentally about exercising authority—real jurisdiction—and not merely offering guidance. This isn't just semantics; it's a matter of how authority is legitimately conferred and exercised within the Church's divinely established hierarchy."This is a new debate then, this is not about accusing the SSPX to believe that "jurisdiction comes from the people". What would be inconsistent from the SSPX would be to say "hey, we're the only non modernist institute left, but you can go to whatever, us or the others". Also, the main reason of the oath is that people take advantage of the fact the SSPX tribunal doesn't have official authority (which it doesn't have indeed) to try they luck in a different tribunal if they didn't get what they want. "To put it bluntly, if it looks like jurisdiction, acts like jurisdiction, and binds like jurisdiction—then it\*is\*jurisdiction."Yes when you're not following a bad authority you have to take decisions that make you look like you're considering yourself as the real authority, however that doesn't mean you don't recognize the authority in principle. You keep making an appeal to motive, but I assure you, if we belived that we'd say it, we're not sedevacantists though, we do believe there is still a Pope, no matter how not Catholic the things he (non infallibly) says are.Tbh this sentence from you seems to be proving my point, yes we act like we have jurisdiction, because we have it through the case of necessity, we're not claiming it comes from somewhere else though."You were obviously incorrect to state earlier that \[...\]"Well... What part of what I'm saying is "obviously incorrect"?"The SSPX’s actions in setting up tribunals, seminaries, and consecrating bishops—without canonical approval—are actions that mimic the hierarchical authority of the Church. "There seems to be a misunderstanding; I understand why you'd feel that way, but try to think from the SSPX's perspective: if you disobey orders from the Pope because you considered them bad, and decided to them anyway, how would you do it? The reason the SSPX is following as much as possible the canon law structure is because this is a fundamentally a good law, and because the right of necessity doesn't mean we shouldn't seek having the most normalized canonic status as possible. That's literally the perspective we have, if we believed something else we would say it. "The Church has processes for dealing with perceived corruption or error—those processes require obedience, patience, and sometimes suffering, as exemplified by saints like Padre Pio."I already answered about Padre Pio, you didn't answer what I said. Also, Archbishop Lefebvre obviously thought about it since he personaly met him and said Mass for his canonization after his death. Archbishop Lefebvre only waited for having no other option to act. But he did his duty as a bishop, which is to preserve tradition no matter how persecuted he was. The Church needs obedience, patience, but also the virtue of courage (I'm not sure how you call it, in French we call it strenghth). In the extract I gave you from saint Thomas Aquinas, he explains how correcting a superior is a duty and not an act of pride if the faith is at stake.

mattdamon992 (1): I completely agree that keeping the faith is important. But it's crucial to understand what that fully entails in the Catholic context. Remaining Catholic, in the fulsome sense of the word, isn't just about holding on to the teachings that we believe are true and what we believe is Tradition, and attending a beautiful TLM - it means being united to the Church in a holistic manner, through:1. \*\*The Profession of Faith-\*\*this includes adherence to all Catholic doctrines, including those taught by the Magisterium, even if non-infallibly which I think is the sticking point for the SSPX - but lets no go down that rabbit hole of the Profession of Faith and rejection by the SSPX. 2. \*\*Subordination to the Hierarchy-\*\*remaining obedient to the Pope and the bishops in communion with him. I suppose we have argued already about what it means to be 'obedient'. I think we fundamentally disagree. The SSPX say obedience in matters of discpline requires subjective judgement as to whether its a danger to the faith. We won't agree there. 3. \*\*Sacred Communion-\*\*sharing in the sacramental life of the Church, in union with the Church's visible structures. Again, we've discussed this. Without these three bonds, one can't have the fulness of the Catholic faith that Christ intended when He established His Church.# Archbishop Lefebvre and His SuspensionArchbishop Lefebvre’s actions, particularly after his suspension, present a major challenge in understanding true Catholic unity. Once he was suspended \*a divinis\*, he lost the ability to legitimately exercise his ministry within the Church. By that time, Lefebvre was already "retired" as a diocesan bishop (Remember, he was called out of retirement by a group of seminarians...) - he held no office that would allow him to act independently. Any authority he might have had to govern, ordain, or consecrate came from the Church, not from himself or from the perceived needs of the faithful.When Lefebvre continued to ordain priests and eventually consecrate bishops without papal mandate, he created a schism. We can go down the rabbit hole of the responsibility of bishops in times of crisis, but ultimately, I think it's better to simply look at what Pope St. Paul VI wrote to Archbishop Lefebvre in his 1976 letter. Paul VI appealed to him to remain united to the Church and to trust in the Church’s guidance. Ultimately, for what its worth (which is nothing), I think he lost faith in the visible Catholic Church, and thought he had to take a whole lot of action to save It (which saves Us). The Pope is not an enemy of Tradition - he is its guardian, and he has the responsibility to guide the Church, even if he does a poor job. # QuotesI appreciate the quote from St. Augustine. It’s powerful and reminds us that even when good men are unjustly driven out, and attempt no novelties in the way of heresy or schism,their response should not be to form "separate conventicles of their own." I'd close my own comment with a couple more. Pope Leo XIIIA\*mong the prelates, indeed, one or other there may be affording scope to criticism either in regard to personal conduct or in reference to opinions by him entertained about points of doctrine; but no private person may arrogate to himself the office of judge which Christ our Lord has bestowed on that one alone whom He placed in charge of His lambs and of His sheep. Let every one bear in mind that most wise teaching of Gregory the Great: "Subjects should be admonished not rashly to judge their prelates, even if they chance to see them acting in a blameworthy manner, lest, justly reproving what is wrong, they be led by pride into greater wrong. They are to be warned against the danger of setting themselves up in audacious opposition to the superiors whose shortcomings they may notice. Should, therefore, the superiors really have committed grievous sins, their inferiors, penetrated with the fear of God, ought not to refuse them respectful submission. The actions of superiors should not be smitten by the sword of the word, even when they are rightly judged to have deserved censure.” para 37 - Sapientiae Christianae (January 10, 1890) |\* Saint Pius X\*“Do not allow yourselves to be deceived by the cunning statements of those who persistently claim to wish to be with the Church, to love the Church, to fight so that people do not leave Her... But judge them by their works. If they despise the shepherds of the Church and even the Pope, if they attempt all means of evading their authority in order to elude their directives and judgments..., then about which Church do these men mean to speak? Certainly not about that establishedon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, withChrist Jesus Himself as the cornerstone.”May 10, 1909\* Padre Pio\*“God’s will be done…the Will of the superiors is the will of God.”\*#

None (1): "communion" and "submission."I'd define in communion as it's always been defined, meaning "not in schism"; and submission, Aquinas' explains how disobedience is required in some cases ; and the SSPX has an article that I encourage you to read explaining it: [https://sspx.org/en/can-obedience-oblige-us-disobey-30348](https://sspx.org/en/can-obedience-oblige-us-disobey-30348)The day a Pope infallibly condems the SSPX/infallibly says Vatican II is right on everything, or that the NO is good, or that the TLM is bad, I'll obey. But thanks to the Holy Ghost, it has been permited that all the recent Popes who broke away from tradition have stoped using their power of infallibility."I think Communion could be looked into by both of us - how do you see the Church seeing it? I understand, without having a reference at hand, it to mean worshipping with all members of the Catholic Church (and obviously that doesn't mean attending a literal clown or surf mass, nor a LGBT wedding). Specifically, refusing to take communion when attending a NO mass, a FSSP mass etc appears to be a clear 'refusal of communion'."The thing with "worshipping with all members of the Catholic Church" is that it would imply worship with members of the Catholic Church who are doing "literal clown or surf mass". An important question: would you say you're in communion with those priests/bishops celebrating clown Masses or gay marriages? Because nobody accuses them of not being in communion with the Pope, and the Pope is not saying they aren't. If being in communion means "worshiping with", and that you're in communion with Pope Francis, and that he's "in communion with" them, are you in communion with them as well? This is the reason I think communion cannot mean anything else than simply not being in schism. "When St. Thomas Aquinas speaks of the duty to resist a prelate in cases where faith is in danger, it is about opposing a specific action that is directly sinful"Where does he say that?"I'm not sure about that new advent reference - did you look at the 'reply to objection 2'?"Yes that's exactly the part I was talking about, what do you think about it? Because I think it's very relevant in our discussion (I'm always amazed at how saint Thomas thought about everything haha)? "It must be observed, however, that if the faith were endangered, a subject ought to rebuke his prelate even publicly. Hence Paul, who was Peter's subject, rebuked him in public, on account of the imminent danger of scandal concerning faith, and, as the gloss of Augustine says on Galatians 2:11, "Peter gave an example to superiors, that if at any time they should happen to stray from the straight path, they should not disdain to be reproved by their subjects.""Obedience to Authority vs. Blind Obedience"You argue that we should not obey the Pope if he asks us to do something against tradition."The SSPX argues for more than that; they're trying to do as Aquinas explains, "to rebuk him in public, on account of the imminent danger of scandal concerning faith". It's more than just staying in a corner and disobey anything bad, it's trying to humbly stop our superior the Pope "straying from the straight path". "The notion that every decision must be examined by each individual Catholic to determine if it aligns with their understanding of tradition places private judgment above Church authority, which is inherently Protestant."Private judgment is about the holy scriptures, not about tradition, protestants don't believe in tradition! But the SSPX is not claiming to be infallible on anything. And us Catholics believe, as Aquinas explains, that prudence should lead obedience. That means we should neither believe blindly everything the Pope says (especially in a time of crisis), nor scrutentize everything the Pope says and try to see heresy in it. Archbishop Lefebvre is everything but the latter.

mattdamon992 (1): The historical record does not provide a precedent for a bishop or group taking such actions—namely, consecrating bishops AGAINST papal wishes or setting up parallel tribunals—and being vindicated by the Church.1. Right of Necessity Misapplied: Canon law does reference supplied jurisdiction in cases of necessity, but this is narrowly tailored for extraordinary individual situations (e.g., absolution of a dying penitent by an otherwise unauthorized priest), which, by the way, was a novelty introduced by the 1917 code. It does not authorize systematic, ongoing actions that defy explicit papal directives, as seen with the SSPX consecrations. Canon 1013 explicitly states that no bishop may consecrate another without a papal mandate, and this is a matter of divine law, not merely ecclesiastical law. So invoking a state of necessity to disobey the divine law will not work, as Christ foresees all things. I do have some hope the next consecrations will be given a mandate and that'll be accompanied by a full acceptance by the sspx of the requirements.I've previously replied regarding the people supplying jurisdiction point, but it is still out there that Lefebvre thought the church supplied, through the needs of the faithful, full and personal jurisdiction to essentially wandering clergy, as opposed to following the actual church authority which Christ setup with Peter and the Bishops. 2. Jurisdiction Cannot Be Self-Declared: Archbishop Lefebvre’s assertion that necessity granted him the authority to act against the Pope's will undermines the Church’s divine constitution. By the way, doesn't every sede bishop invoke the same state of necessity? Pope Paul VI addressed this directly in his correspondence with Lefebvre, stating, “You are claiming that you alone are the judge of what tradition embraces.” The Church alone, through the Pope, determines whether a state of necessity exists. Rome repeatedly stated that no such necessity justified Lefebvre’s actions, rendering his claim invalid.

None (1): Regarding the 3 first points, I think I've answered in my 4 comments, If you think I haven't feel free to show me where and I'll do it when I can!# Archbishop Lefebvre and His Suspension"Archbishop Lefebvre’s actions, particularly after his suspension, present a major challenge in understanding true Catholic unity. Once he was suspended\*a divinis\*, he lost the ability to legitimately exercise his ministry within the Church. By that time, Lefebvre was already "retired" as a diocesan bishop (Remember, he was called out of retirement by a group of seminarians...) - he held no office that would allow him to act independently. Any authority he might have had to govern, ordain, or consecrate came from the Church, not from himself or from the perceived needs of the faithful."Being retired doesn't mean you're not part of the teaching church anymore! For the rest, it comes back to the question I already answered about right of necessity. "When Lefebvre continued to ordain priests and eventually consecrate bishops without papal mandate, he created a schism.We can go down the rabbit hole of the responsibility of bishops in times of crisis, but ultimately, I think it's better to simply look at what Pope St. Paul VI wrote to Archbishop Lefebvre in his 1976 letter. Paul VI appealed to him to remain united to the Church and to trust in the Church’s guidance. Ultimately, for what its worth (which is nothing), I think he lost faith in the visible Catholic Church, and thought he had to take a whole lot of action to save It (which saves Us). The Pope is not an enemy of Tradition - he is its guardian, and he has the responsibility to guide the Church, even if he does a poor job."If you accuse Lefebvre/the SSPX of schism, the burden of proof is on you, so I'm waiting for arguments. The Pope should not be an enemy of tradition indeed: but that's wishful thinking; what if he is? John XXII was wrong on private judgment, even saint Peter has been wrong on faith matter.An appeal to motive claiming that Archbishop Lefebvre "lost faith in the visible Catholic Church" would need more than "I think" as an argument!# Quotes"conventicles" is not defined by a question of number, but by if you're Catholic or notRegarding Pope Leo XIII's, it doesn't contradict what saint Paul, Aquinas and the SSPX have said.Regarding Pius X's, we don't hate the Pope, we pray for him every day, and we don't have judgments, everything we believe about the TLM and religious freedom is based on tradition (e.g. Trent and Quanta Cura)Regarding Padre Pio's... Either he contradicts Aquinas, or you need to be more precise and to define your terms before accusing of schism Catholics who didn't give up an inch of faith standing up to doctrine contradicting tradition and being persecuted for that reason.

None (1): "Parallel Church" ArgumentWe're coming back to the jurisdiction debate, I think I've answered it, if you think I haven't and that you're making a new point, feel free to point it to me! Critique of the Novus Ordo"Regarding your comments on the Novus Ordo, labeling it "evil" is a grave statement. " I agree with that, I'm not saying it lightly because I say this is the Mass where most Catholics (and most of my family) goes to; the SSPX is claiming that out of duty, not because we'd enjoy hurting people"To declare it "evil" is to assert that the Church has officially sanctioned something intrinsically harmful to souls"What do you define as "the Church"; is it the Church when Pope Francis preaches religious relativisms, promulgates an official document saying gay couples could be blessed? No, which is why I put so much emphasis on the concept of infallibility: if we had to obey everything a pope promulgates or says, what would be the purpose of infallibility? "If you look at the essence of the Novus Ordo, it is still the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, instituted by Christ. Its validity is not dependent on its perceived alignment with tradition but on the authority of the Church to promulgate liturgical forms."Again (for at least the 3rd time), we're NOT claiming the NO is not valid!! I'm fine debating the actual positions of the SSPX, but stop making appeals to motive please!Also, the brief critical exam answers exactly what you're saying, I could paraphrase it but it makes sense to just send it again. Could you read it and asnwer it before making your next answer? It's definely better written than anything I could say. [https://angeluspress.org/blogs/catholic-doctrine/a-brief-critical-study-of-the-novus-ordo-missae](https://angeluspress.org/blogs/catholic-doctrine/a-brief-critical-study-of-the-novus-ordo-missae)Appealing to History"We disagree on the historical facts about what that justified."I agree; tbh all I'm looking for is actual sources, wether they validate my point, because I'm tired of not being able to have clear knowledge of what happened haha. I've been through the 2 encyclicals and I haven't found where they said Athanasius was sent out by Liberius (he surely was at least at some point for sure, but was he even when Liberius condemned it, even if the Pope did it through weakness and not heretical belief). Athanasius though is a saint, and Liberius is the first "non saint" Pope in 300 years of Catholic history, and the only non saint in the first 500 hundred. And there are been for sure Popes who publically preached material heresy, like John XXII, and Catholics who resisted them? And according to wikipedia : "In this list \[of people excommunicated by the Catholic Church\] there are two popes (Honorius and Leo I) and five saints (Leo I, Athanasius, Columba, Joan of Arc, Mary Mackillop) who were issued an excommunication by a church authority."What's for sure though is that Saint Paul is here to show us that even for saint Peter in person, who was a great saint, arguably the best Pope and the higest authority, standing up to the Pope when the slightest bit of faith is in danger, no mater if we'll be perceived as pridefull or not

None (1): As I said they will never be a case that 100% similar to the current situation. When saint Paul acted against Peter, he had no example to use.But what is the difference between consecrating bishops against the Pope's wish or refusing to believe something going against tradition that he teaches? Disobedience is disobedience, either we have to blindly obey the Pope all the time or we don't.1. [https://sspx.org/en/theological-study-1988-consecrations-1-31444](https://sspx.org/en/theological-study-1988-consecrations-1-31444)Here is an article explaining why the right of necessity was well applied; it does seem your definition ("this is narrowly tailored for extraordinary individual situations (e.g., absolution of a dying penitent by an otherwise unauthorized priest)") is only a personal interpretation that's not based on canon law."which, by the way, was a novelty introduced by the 1917 code"Is this supposed to undermind its value? Also, of course it's a novelty, this code is the first canon law code! And anyway, "suprema lex salus animarum", as Canon Law states, the supreme law is the salvation of souls. Canon law is not infallible, even if justifies the SSPX's actions anyway."I do have some hope the next consecrations will be given a mandate and that'll be accompanied by a full acceptance by the sspx of the requirements."Well I agree with the first one, but regarding the requirements, if those go against tradition (like make it accept religious freedom), the SSPX won't accept them with the help of God. [https://fsspx.news/en/news/1988-consecrations-and-accusations-schism-27850](https://fsspx.news/en/news/1988-consecrations-and-accusations-schism-27850)"Canon 1013 explicitly states that no bishop may consecrate another without a papal mandate"Do you think the SSPX is not aware of that? Of course it is, but Canon 144 gives Supplied Jurisdiction and Canon 1323 and Canon 1324: give the Exemptions from Penalty (including the right of necessity). "'ve previously replied regarding the people supplying jurisdiction point, but it is still out there that Lefebvre thought the church supplied, through the needs of the faithful, full and personal jurisdiction to essentially wandering clergy, as opposed to following the actual church authority which Christ setup with Peter and the Bishops."You're basically repeating your point without considering my arguments nor even adding arguments. Of course Archbishop Lefebvre never said nor believed that, and no matter what the SSPX doesn't believe that."2. Jurisdiction Cannot Be Self-Declared: Archbishop Lefebvre’s assertion that necessity granted him the authority to act against the Pope's will undermines the Church’s divine constitution. By the way, doesn't every sede bishop invoke the same state of necessity?"Sedes all believe and claim different things, and I don't see why this implied \*ad personam\* argument would impact us. The sedes are wrong to believe the seat is vacant, it doesn't mean they are wrong to believe in transsubstantiation."Pope Paul VI addressed this directly in his correspondence with Lefebvre, stating, “You are claiming that you alone are the judge of what tradition embraces.” The Church alone, through the Pope, determines whether a state of necessity exists. Rome repeatedly stated that no such necessity justified Lefebvre’s actions, rendering his claim invalid."You keep doing what I already answered. Paul VI was not infallible about everything. Nor are all popes in history. Also, if you don't define "Rome/the Church/ infallible or not", generalisations have no value. Seems like you didn't even read me.
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I normally go to an SSPX church, but I used to attend a Novus Ordo church with my family every Sunday. Sometimes my family wants me to go with them to the Novus Ordo whenever I am over and I normally do. I also try to go to a Latin mass on the days I go to a Novus Ordo too. I also happen to know the priests at the Novus Ordo church and they are very good men. Is it okay to go to the Novus Ordo?

VinceStalks (14): It's on its acronym. NO

BrodyJerome (7): No

None (8): [deleted]

None (12): I don't understand this at all. There are so many people without the traditional Mass or those of us who have to travel for it all the time. You seemingly have easier access to it. Why would you still want to attend the novus ordo if you are blessed with the SSPX so much closer to you?

None (6): Just say NO

dbaughmen (18): It doesn’t matter whether these NO priests have the Faith or not. The problem is “The Novus Ordo is impregnated with the spirit of protestantism” (Archbishop Lefebvre). And would you attend a Protestant service??Additionally, even they admit that their rite is defective, as a top Vatican cardinal admitted to Bishop Fellay and he revealed the other day. God bless you!

DevilishAdvocate1587 (14): Even a reverent Novus Ordo is lipstick on a pig. No amount of Gregorian chant or incense will take away the fact that it is a defective rite infected with ecumenism and modernism. It quite literally has prayers from the false Talmudic religion of modern Jews. How could any sensible Catholic worship God with that?

Recprocate (4): The Novus Ordo is evil and not Catholic, so the easy answer is no.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (4): party line SSPX answer - no [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0Yfo63OiNeo](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0Yfo63OiNeo)

None (7): No.

None (1): I've been in your shoes since my family would bring me to NO as a kid, and I also know many good NO priests (including family members!)Depends if you're aware of what NO is exactly. Most people go there not knowing TLM even exists, or that the NO has doctrinal issues. Most of them probably have invincible ignorance, meaning they don't have the means to know the truth.If you read the brief critical exam of the NO, you'll know what those doctrinal issues are. One thing though, it is possible for a Catholic to go even to a non Catholic rite, but it's not ok to participate, and if doesn't replace sunday obligation. So when one has to go to the NO (marriages,...) one shouldn't sing or get communion.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): No. It is a mortal sin and a sacrilege to go to the Novus Ordo. Cease this immediately

Equivalent\_Let\_2173 (-2): Of course, it’s okay to attend a Novus Ordo Mass. It is a valid and licit Mass approved by the Church, celebrated in communion with the Pope and the bishops, and offers the same Eucharist as any other legitimate Catholic liturgy. If someone claims that the Novus Ordo is an insult to God, it’s worth considering this: Is it truly more fitting to attend a Mass said in disobedience to the Pope and the legitimate bishops of the Church by priests who are not incardinated in any diocese? A Mass celebrated without proper canonical mission risks undermining the very unity and authority that Christ established in His Church? The Novus Ordo, when celebrated reverently, is deeply enriching and faithful to the Catholic tradition. Let’s not forget that obedience and unity are integral to our faith.I think you know this answer if you consider the Novos ordo priests to be decent men. You know this mass is not an insult. Do not listen to sspx hyperbole about the ordinary form.

mattdamon992 (-6): Yes it's fine. Don't be offput by sspx extremists. The Latin mass is beautiful and I prefer it but the Novos ordo is not evil nor devoid of good.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (2): This is completely false, the SSPX teaches that attendance at the Novus Ordo is sacrilegious and sinful

keto\_catholic (1): Is this a bot?

None (5): I'd love to read more about that if you have a reference.

zzzxxc1 (3): Do you have a source for that? Sounds very interesting

Seethi110 (-2): Source: trust me bro

Christ\_is\_\_risen (9): What are the Talmudic prayers in the Novus Ordo?

Equivalent\_Let\_2173 (2): This take doesn’t really make sense to me. Do you realize the Tridentine Mass—and all Catholic liturgies, really—are full of lines straight from the Old Testament? The Psalms, for example, are everywhere in the prayers and chants, and a ton of the liturgy, like the Offertory or the Sanctus, is built on Jewish liturgical traditions.And about the “fruit of the vine” line—that’s not some random Talmudic thing. It’s literally the words of Jesus at the Last Supper (Matthew 26:29, Mark 14:25, Luke 22:18). Are we supposed to stop using Christ’s own words because they come from Jewish tradition? That doesn’t add up.If you’re saying Old Testament roots make the Novus Ordo “defective,” then the Tridentine Mass would have the same problem, since it’s filled with the same stuff. Both forms of the Mass come from the same sacred tradition that fulfills the Old Testament in Christ. Instead of being a problem, that’s part of what makes them so beautiful and rich. Why would we want to reject that?

Equivalent\_Let\_2173 (2): Claiming that the Novus Ordo is "not Catholic" or "evil" runs directly counter to Catholic teaching and tradition. The Council of Trent anathematized the idea that the validity of the Mass depends on a specific liturgical rite. Canon 7 on the Sacrifice of the Mass states:"If anyone says that the ceremonies, vestments, and outward signs, which the Catholic Church uses in the celebration of Mass, are incentives to impiety rather than offices of piety, let him be anathema."Calling the Novus ordo evil implies you believe it is an incentive to impiety, even when celebrated in accordance with the rules. Is that your position?The Novus Ordo was promulgated by the Church under Pope Paul VI with full authority, and as Catholics, we are bound to accept that it is a valid and licit form of the Roman Rite. To reject its Catholicity or validity is to step into schism, contradicting the authority Christ gave to His Church.While critiques of certain aspects of the Novus Ordo’s implementation are valid, as even Pope Benedict XVI acknowledged, calling it "evil" directly opposes the Church’s indefectibility and the promises of Christ that "the gates of hell will not prevail against it" (Matthew 16:18). The Church remains the source of salvation, and her sacraments and rites are protected by the Holy Spirit.

Equivalent\_Let\_2173 (1): Claiming that the Novus Ordo is "not Catholic" or "evil" misunderstands both the nature of schism and the authority of the Church. According to St. Thomas Aquinas (Summa Theologica, II-II, Q.39, Art. 1), schism occurs when someone "refuses to submit to the Supreme Pontiff or to be united with the members of the Church subject to him." Similarly, Canon 751 of the Code of Canon Law defines schism as "the refusal of submission to the Supreme Pontiff or of communion with the members of the Church subject to him."Refusing to attend the Novus Ordo, or refusing to participate in it even when fulfilling social obligations, can demonstrate a refusal of communion with the Church. This is especially true when such actions are based on personal or unauthorized critiques, as this places private judgment above the Church's authority. The Novus Ordo was promulgated by Pope Paul VI and affirmed as a valid expression of the Roman Rite by every pope since. To reject it categorically is to adopt a Protestant ecclesiology, where individual or minority group opinions are elevated over the universal teaching authority of the Church.Furthermore, appealing to a "Brief Critical Examination" written by an unauthorized body is not a substitute for forming one’s conscience in line with the Magisterium. The Catholic Church, founded by Christ, possesses the authority to regulate the liturgy, and it is through this authority that the Novus Ordo was promulgated. As Pope Benedict XVI stated, the Novus Ordo and the Tridentine Mass are "two forms of the same Roman Rite."To align yourself with the Church, one must submit to her authority and remain in communion with her, rather than fostering division or adopting a cafeteria Catholic mindset. Instead of rejecting the Novus Ordo, the focus should be on ensuring it is celebrated reverently and in line with the Church's teachings. Anything else risks falling into schism and stepping away from the unity Christ willed and mandated for His Church.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): It's a sacrilegious travesty. The Novus Ordo is evil

None (0): Good answer

None (7): Is it extreme to acknowledge the abuse?

mattdamon992 (2): I agree...that that's what they teach.

Araedya (4): https://www.lifesitenews.com/blogs/sspx-bishop-top-vatican-cardinal-told-me-the-novus-ordo-mass-is-defective/

None (3): Personal testimony is a form of evidence.

MacduffFifesNo1Thane (11): If my memory serves me correctly, I think OP refers to the prayers at the Offertory being “Fruit of the vine, work of human hands,” etc.

DevilishAdvocate1587 (4): The phrase "fruit of the vine" is said by Jesus, but the formula of the blessing comes from the Talmudic religion, which itself is a post-Second Temple tradition of Pharisaic teachings. As for the Tridentine mass, nothing in it comes from a foreign, satanic religion. The saints before the Law, the saints under the Law, and the saints under grace, all these are constituted members of the Church. - St. Gregory, Book 5, Epistle 18

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (2): you can't use the council of Trent and apply it to a rite no one anticipated or wanted 400 years in the future. there are anathemas as well like the one on the vernacular we could apply to the NOM. don't get me started on quo primum. nothing in v2/NOM has the auspices of infallibility.

None (2): We're getting from the "is the NO evil" to the "is the SSPX schismatic" debate. But anyway; can we disobey the Pope when he's not infallible and that he's going against tradition? If the answer is no, then saint Athanasius etc. were wrong. Saint Thomas Aquinas says that we have to submit the Pope; of course we do. He doesn't say "no matter what" though.The NO, even celebrated reverently, made millions lose the faith because of its half protestant doctrine. If Popes like Benedict XVI, John Paul II and Pope Francis, who consider all religions the same, kiss the Quran, name cardinal heretics who peed on the door of the Holy Office (de Lubac) etc. consider that I'm not a Catholic, I consider that as evidence I'm indeed a Catholic.[https://sspx.org/en/responding-false-accusations-31102](https://sspx.org/en/responding-false-accusations-31102)

mattdamon992 (1): Who died and made you pope? Declaring the Novus Ordo 'evil' is not only false but an insult to the Church's authority, which has declared it valid and licit.

mattdamon992 (1): No, abuses should be pointed out to bishop and priest.

None (2): Thank you!

Seethi110 (1): So who is the person that witnessed “a top Vatican Cardinal” saying this?

DevilishAdvocate1587 (8): Yup, that's the main one. The Good Friday prayers for the Jews are also pretty watered down compared to the ones found in the pre-55 missal. There's definitely an atmosphere of indifference and appeasement in the Novus Ordo.

Equivalent\_Let\_2173 (2): It’s important to clarify the role of the Talmud and its relationship to Christian theology for others reading this. The Talmud is not inspired by God. It is a post-Temple compilation of rabbinic debates and interpretations of the Law of Moses, written centuries after Christ. While it may preserve some elements of earlier Jewish traditions, it does not hold authority for Christians or reflect divine inspiration. Salvation is found solely in the Church, which is the body of Christ.Regarding the phrase "fruit of the vine," it is rooted in Scripture (e.g., Psalm 80:8, Isaiah 5:1-7) and was used by Jesus at the Last Supper, long before the Talmud was written. To suggest the offertory prayer stems from a post-Temple rabbinic tradition seems historically inaccurate unless you can provide actual evidence it came direct from the Talmud. Even then just because it appears there does not mean it is not actually derived from Christ. The Jewish people still hold to the old testament, and so we shouldn't be surprised post Christ Jewish prayers hearken back to the same Old Testament we use. Jesus often used language and imagery from Jewish liturgical and scriptural traditions, but He transformed and fulfilled them in the New Covenant.The Tridentine Mass, like the Novus Ordo, also draws from the Old Testament. This isn’t a problem but a testament to the Church’s understanding of salvation history as a unified whole. As St. Augustine beautifully put it, "The New Testament is hidden in the Old, and the Old is made manifest in the New." This continuity is part of the Church’s sacred tradition and its liturgy.The richness of the Mass, whether Novus Ordo or Tridentine, lies in how it manifests Christ’s sacrifice for our salvation. Both rites, when reverently celebrated, lead us to the same truth: the Cross and Resurrection. Instead of engaging in polemics, we should focus on fostering personal sanctification and unity within the Church. Let’s keep our eyes on Christ, the source of all salvation, who calls us to worship Him in spirit and truth.

Equivalent\_Let\_2173 (1): Your comment raises some interesting points, but it mixes up disciplinary decisions and doctrinal authority, and it seems to miss some key historical and theological context.1. Council of Trent and the Vernacular: The Council of Trent didn’t ban the vernacular outright. What it actually said (Canon 9 of Session 22) is that it’s wrong to say the Mass must be celebrated “only in the vernacular,” which is why Latin remained the standard. But it also allowed for the possibility of vernacular use in some cases, as long as it didn’t harm unity. The Novus Ordo’s use of the vernacular fits within the Church’s authority to make decisions about liturgical discipline and matches Trent’s emphasis on helping the faithful understand and participate.2. Quo Primum and Liturgical Binding: Saying Quo Primum permanently binds all future Popes is just not correct. Sure, it uses strong language about being "perpetual," but that only applied to its disciplinary rules at the time. Popes can’t bind their successors in matters of discipline, and history shows this clearly. For example, Pope Pius V used the same "perpetual" language in Quod a Vobis about the breviary, but Pope St. Pius X revised it centuries later. The same authority that establishes a liturgical rule can change it.3. Vatican II and the Novus Ordo: The reforms from Vatican II, including the Novus Ordo, were made under the Church’s legitimate authority. Pope Paul VI promulgated the Novus Ordo as a valid and licit form of the Roman Rite. While it’s fine to critique how it’s been implemented—things like irreverence or abuses have been acknowledged even by Popes—that’s different from saying the rite itself is invalid or “evil.” That kind of claim undermines the Church’s indefectibility and authority.4. Liturgical Continuity and Adaptation: The liturgy has always developed over time. The Tridentine Mass itself was a reform of older regional liturgies, not something handed down in its exact form by Christ. The Church has the authority to adapt the liturgy for pastoral needs while preserving its core truths. As Pope Benedict XVI said, the Novus Ordo and the Tridentine Mass are “two forms of the one Roman Rite.” Dismissing the Novus Ordo because of personal preferences or critiques from outside Church authority misses the point of liturgical development and risks rejecting the authority Christ gave His Church.In short, the Novus Ordo is valid and licit, just as the Tridentine Mass is. Trying to pit them against each other misunderstands how the liturgy has always worked and undermines the Church’s authority. Rejecting the Novus Ordo because of a misreading of history or authority sounds more like Protestant-style individualism than true Catholicism.

Equivalent\_Let\_2173 (1): Even if a Pope kissed the Quran, what does that actually prove about the Novus Ordo? Nothing. You’re conflating subjective interpretations of specific actions with objective evaluations of the Church’s teachings and liturgical rites. The Novus Ordo was promulgated with full papal authority and remains a valid and licit form of the Roman Rite. Isolated events, however controversial, don’t invalidate what the Church herself authoritatively upholds.Your reference to St. Athanasius is misplaced. Athanasius defended the Council of Nicaea in communion with the papacy, not in rebellion against it. His fight against Arianism wasn’t an act of rejecting the Church’s authority—it was an act of fidelity to it. By contrast, rejecting the Novus Ordo outright or undermining its validity isn’t fidelity to Tradition; it’s a rejection of the indefectibility of the Church, which Christ Himself promised.Ultimately, your stance is subjective. You interpret events like a papal gesture and impose your private conclusions on the entire Church and a form of the rite that has been accepted by the entire Roman Catholic church. In contrast, I’m simply relying on the unbroken tradition of the Church and the authority of the papacy, which Christ established, to demonstrate how Catholics are called to think and act. To reject the Novus Ordo as invalid or evil is to deny the Church’s authority and indefectibility—and that’s a position that no faithful Catholic can hold.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): No one made me Pope

None (3): Novus Ordo was an abuse from its inception.

None (3): Bishop Fellay, according to LifeSite.

Seethi110 (0): What’s wrong with those prayers though? Is there anything theological incorrect about them?

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): Quo Primum is not "disciplinary", it is dogmatic. Plain and simple. Vatican 2 and the Novus Ordo are not made under the Church's authority but by a heretical counter-churches "authority", which is why they are incentives to impiety.

None (2): What do you mean "even if"? The fact Pope John Paul II kissed the quran is not debated. And where did I say that it proved anything about the NO? I said what makes the NO dangerous is that it's half Protestant. The fact that it was made by religious relativistic Popes is indeed the reason though. Those are not "isolated events" btw, those are recurring events that all post VII Popes are doing, without expressing regret afterwards. The Church has unburried and trialled Pope Formosus's corpse for less than that.So, have you read the Brief Critical Exam? Because it really summarizes the issues with it. The fact the Pope promulgated the NO doesn't make it good. And the SSPX doesn't claim the NO is invalid.Athanasius was defending Nicea: we are defending Quanta Cura, Leo XIII, saint Pius X, Pius XI, and all of the Catholic popes in history who preached against religious freedom and the Protestant meaning of Mass.He wasn't rejecting the Church's authority indeed: we're not either. We are, as he did, repeating Traditional doctrine even when condemned by the Pope (as he was condemned by pope Liberius). Saint Paul had a doctrinal disagreement with Peter and he ended up being right, Catholics of all of history, when a Pope uninfallibly said something going against Tradition, stood up to them, just like they stood to all the Popes I mentioned, or to add an example again, to John XXII. It is those Popes who reject the Church's teaching, Christ's teaching.You're confusing subjective with uninfallible. Our stance isn't infallible, but it based on Tradition. Pope Francis's stance is not infallible either, but its not based on Tradition: it even goes against it. So yes, I prefer to be faithful to God than to men.

mattdamon992 (1): So says you, with no authority—and so says a splintered minority of bishops and priests who cannot even unite among themselves (sedevacantists, various SSPX splinters, etc.). Meanwhile, the Magisterium, the teaching authority of the Church established by Christ, has spoken definitively.'Rome has spoken; the case is closed' (Roma locuta est, causa finita est), as St. Augustine aptly said. The authority of the Pope in matters of faith and liturgy is clear: “If anyone says that the Roman Pontiff has only the office of inspection or direction, and not the full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church... let him be anathema” (First Vatican Council, Pastor Aeternus, Chapter III) To call the Novus Ordo an 'abuse' is to reject the authority Christ gave to Peter and his successors. This undermines Catholic unity and indefectibility.

Equivalent\_Let\_2173 (1): There's nothing wrong with these prayers. It is genuinely concerning how critica somel posters are of the Catholic church and its rites while professing to be Catholics...

mattdamon992 (1): You are misunderstanding about Quo Primum. It was a disciplinary decree, not dogma, and popes can change disciplinary laws—as history shows. Pope Benedict XVI confirmed in Summorum Pontificum that the Tridentine and Novus Ordo Masses are two valid forms of the one Roman Rite.Claiming the Novus Ordo is sacrilegious undermines the Church’s indefectibility and Christ’s promise that the gates of hell would not prevail. The Tridentine Mass itself was a reform; the Novus Ordo is another legitimate reform under the Church’s authority. To reject it is to reject the unity and teaching authority of the Church.

Equivalent\_Let\_2173 (-1): 1. "What do you mean 'even if'? The fact Pope John Paul II kissed the Quran is not debated."True, but the gesture doesn’t bear doctrinal weight or redefine Church teaching.2. "And where did I say that it proved anything about the NO? I said what makes the NO dangerous is that it's half Protestant."Your/sspx judgment that the Novus Ordo is “half Protestant” is necessarily subjective. Validity and licitness of the liturgy are determined by the magisterium, not personal opinion.3. "The fact that it was made by religious relativistic Popes is indeed the reason though."Again, this is a subjective interpretation. Regardless of personal views on individual Popes, their promulgation of the Mass carries the full weight of papal authority. Personal assessments do not negate the Church’s divine guarantees of guidance.4. "Those are not 'isolated events' btw, those are recurring events that all post VII Popes are doing, without expressing regret afterwards."Despite poor decisions by some Popes, Catholics are not free to judge them. We are called to respect and obey their authority in all legitimate areas as successors of Peter. 5. "The Church has unburried and trialled Pope Formosus's corpse for less than that."That action occurred under a subsequent Pope, after Formosus's death. A future Pope may evaluate and accuse a predecessor, but as faithful Catholics, we are not authorized to pass judgment on a reigning Pope.6. "So, have you read the Brief Critical Exam? Because it really summarizes the issues with it."Not for years, and again, the “Brief Critical Study” is entirely subjective. It does not carry magisterial weight and cannot override the Church’s official stance on the validity and licitness of the Novus Ordo Mass.7. "The fact the Pope promulgated the NO doesn't make it good. And the SSPX doesn't claim the NO is invalid."The SSPX may not claim invalidity, but they openly label the Novus Ordo as an “insult to God” and “evil.” They also claim it is a sin to attend and Catholics should not actively participate in it. Such actions and rhetoric are inherently schismatic (refusing communion with those subject to the Pope) dividing Catholics and rejecting the unity of the Church.8. "Athanasius was defending Nicea: we are defending Quanta Cura, Leo XIII, saint Pius X, Pius XI, and all of the Catholic popes in history who preached against religious freedom and the Protestant meaning of Mass."Athanasius did so in union with the Pope, not in rebellion. Our task is not to defend prior Popes against the current Pope but to save our own souls. That means remaining in the Church, united with our fellow Catholics, in submission to the lawful Pontiff, as Christ commanded.9. "He wasn't rejecting the Church's authority indeed: we're not either."Establishing tribunals, ordaining bishops explicitly against the order of the pope, ordaining priests and sending them into dioceses against the will of the actual shepherds, and rejecting lawful suppression of an order contradicts the claim of obedience. 10. "We are, as he did, repeating Traditional doctrine even when condemned by the Pope (as he was condemned by pope Liberius)."I recommend checking your sources. Pope Liberius confirmed the Nicene Faith in a council and died in exile for the Faith. Pope Liberius allegedly excommunicated Athanasios but this was undoubtedly forced from him, and Athanasios knew as much. Is your argument that Lefebvre and co believe that the Pope has been pressured into suppressing the sspx?11. "Saint Paul had a doctrinal disagreement with Peter and he ended up being right."Paul was also an infallible apostle with miracles and divine mission. The disagreement was about personal conduct, not doctrine or governance.12. "Catholics of all of history, when a Pope uninfalibbly said something going against Tradition, stood up to them, just like they stood to all the Popes I mentioned."Source?This and the other points—about infallibility, Tradition, and fidelity to God—seem to misunderstand the nature of the Church and our role within it. Tradition is not a weapon we wield to challenge the magisterium; it is safeguarded and authentically interpreted by the magisterium. Rejecting the magisterium or refusing communion with the lawful Pontiff (or those subject to him) on claims of “being faithful to God” risks repeating the errors of Protestantism: private interpretation over submission to Christ’s Church. We are not called to stand in judgment of Popes or the Church. Rather, we are called to work out our salvation in humility, within the Church Christ founded, which remains united under Peter and his successors. Obedience and unity—not rebellion—are marks of fidelity to Christ.

None (1): Your response is a perfect example of reaching; low-level claptrap that is not worth a response.

None (3): 1. "True, but the gesture doesn’t bear doctrinal weight or redefine Church teaching."I'm sorry but I don't understand how someone can, out good faith, claim that. The Quran is evil. Kissing an object is a sign of complete respect. How can you not make the link? There plenty scandalous acts that any Catholic in all of history would have reproved. Can you imagine how Catholics of all times in history would react to such a thing? Especially the martyrs of Islam or paganism who died rather that paying respect to those evil false religions. I'm honestly shocked Catholics who aren't religious relativists would still try to defend such a deed.There are so many wrong things he did though, like naming cardinal Yves Congar who was condemned by the Holy office (and who admited he peed twice on the door of the Holy Office after his condemnation).2. "Your/sspx judgment that the Novus Ordo is “half Protestant” is necessarily subjective. Validity and licitness of the liturgy are determined by the magisterium, not personal opinion."Again, we're not contesting its validity but its legitimacy. And when has the magisterium infallibly proclaimed the NO was not valid? A theological opinion that doesn't contradict tradition (=saying the NO has been protestantized) is not de facto uncatholic. However, a theological opinion contradicting tradition (=saying that the NO, even if it doesn't reflect the Catholic sense of Mass, which is the renewal of the sacrifice of Christ, as demonstrated by the Brief Critical Exam) is materially heretical, even if it's not formally heretical."You can tell a tree by its fruit". A Pope makes a new ordo which underminds the sense of sacrifice of Christ in Mass. Some Catholics say this will diminish the belief in the sense of sacrifice of Christ in Mass. Practicing Catholics start to massively lose faith in the sense of sacrifice in the Mass (as polls show). Maybe I would't have agreed with the SSPX if I hadn't been born late enough to see their doctrinal analysis proven right.3. Regardless of personal views on individual Popes, their promulgation of the Mass carries the full weight of papal authority.This promulgation is not infallible. Or maybe saint Peter's wrong opinion about Christian views on the Old Covenant was right, even if he ended up retracting it after saint Paul corrected him? "But even if we or an angel from heaven should preach a gospel other than the one we preached to you, let them be under God’s anathema!" as saint Paul said. \*Again, you seem to confuse "subjective" with not infallible.\*4. "Despite poor decisions by some Popes, Catholics are not free to judge them. We are called to respect and obey their authority in all legitimate areas as successors of Peter."Did saint Paul judge saint Peter? Did Athanasius judge Pope Liberius? St Thomas Aquinas explains it here: [https://www.newadvent.org/summa/3033.htm#article4](https://www.newadvent.org/summa/3033.htm#article4)It is a right, a duty and and an act of charity to publicaly correct a superior when it's a doctrinal issue, even if he's a Pope, or even saint Peter himself.5. That action occurred under a subsequent Pope, after Formosus's death. A future Pope may evaluate and accuse a predecessor, but as faithful Catholics, we are not authorized to pass judgment on a reigning Pope.I didn't say I had the authority to make a trial against a Pope: I said that when a Pope says things going against Tradition, it's our duty to say it.6. answered in 3. You should read the brief critical exam again! It's short and very factual. It's not only an SSPX thing btw, they also teach it in the FSSP seminary (and maybe in the other institutes as well)7. You didn't give proofs to your claim

mattdamon992 (1): It seems you prefer to remain in an echo chamber, dismissing ideas without engaging with them. If you're interested in discussion, address the arguments rather than resorting to empty retorts and insults.

None (3): 8. "Athanasius did so in union with the Pope, not in rebellion."He was condemned by Pope Liberius and excommunicated... But the example of saint Paul is better documented so we should focus on that. The Arian crisis is very similar to our time though.9. Establishing tribunals, \[...\] contradicts the claim of obedience.I'm not claiming we're obediant: as explained above (and as Aquinas explained it), it is wrong to be obediant to a bad order. We aren't rejecting the Church's authority: just like if I refuse to obey my father because he asks me to do something bad, that doesn't mean I reject his authority in principle: it's specific orders going against God's I'm indeed rejecting.10. There are conflicting sources on the subject, what are yours? But I don't really need this example anyway, Saint Paul is a better example.11. "The disagreement was about personal conduct, not doctrine or governance."It seems your theological opinion goes against Aquinas' : It must be observed, however, that \*\*if the faith were endangered\*\*, a subject ought to rebuke his prelate even publicly. Hence Paul, who was Peter's subject, rebuked him in public, \*\*on account of the imminent danger of scandal concerning faith\*\*, and, as the gloss of Augustine says on Gal. 2:11, "Peter gave an example to superiors, that if at any time they should happen to stray from the straight path, they should not disdain to be reproved by their subjects."12. "Catholics of all of history, when a Pope uninfalibbly said something going against Tradition, stood up to them, just like they stood to all the Popes I mentioned." Source? Well theologians stood up to John XXII. He retracted his material heresy to his deathbed. Are you on the side of the Catholics who said "this is against tradition, I can't accept it, Holy Father you should stop teaching this"? The same goes for the other Popes I gave the example of.13. "This and the other points \[...\] to Christ."I am not rejecting infallible magisterium. Show me how my understanding of infalliblity, tradition and fidelity to God are false? Regarding communion, how do you define if someone's in communion or not?I'm not rejecting infallible magisterium. Just like the theologians refused John XXII's formal heresy, we refuse it from any pope. I'm basing what I believe on Tradition that has been proclaimed by popes in history, for example condemning religious freedom. Regarding the question of humility, this is how Aquinas answers it: "Reply to Objection 3: To presume oneself to be simply better than one's prelate, would seem to savor of presumptuous pride; but there is no presumption in thinking oneself better in some respect, because, in this life, no man is without some fault. We must also remember that when a man reproves his prelate charitably, it does not follow that he thinks himself any better, but merely that he offers his help to one who, "being in the higher position among you, is therefore in greater danger," as Augustine observes in his Rule quoted above. "14. When you see all of those bishops preaching against the Catholic faith made cardinals, when you see the faithfull losing faith \*en masse\* in basic doctrinal points and embracing religious relativism, you have to realize that this is a crisis at least as bad as the Arian crisis. Hiding the doctrinal controversies plays the Enemy's game

None (1): No, I'll be dealing with you differently. Get well soon.

# Post 404: 77 Fruits or Benefits received from participating in the Holy Mass
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1gtgc7e/77\_fruits\_or\_benefits\_received\_from\_participating/

Taken from "The Incredible Catholic Mass: An Explanation of the Catholic Mass" by fr. Martin Von Cochem, a great German Capuchin Theologian that lived in 17th century1. For your salvation, God the Father sends His beloved Son down from Heaven. This is the biblical story. 2. For your salvation, the Holy Spirit changes bread and wine into the true Body and Blood of Christ. 3. For your sake, the Son of God comes down from Heaven and conceals Himself under the form of the sacred Host. 4. He even humbles Himself to such an extent as to be present in the minutest particle of the sacred Host. 5. For your salvation, He renews the saving mystery of the Incarnation. 6. For your salvation, He is born anew into the world in a mystical manner whenever Holy Mass is celebrated. 7. For your salvation He performs upon the altar the same acts of worship that He performed when on earth. 8. For your salvation, He renews his bitter Passion, in order that you may participate in it. 9. For your salvation, He mystically renews His death and sacrifices for you His precious life. 10. For your salvation, He sheds his Blood in a mystical manner and offers it up for you to the Divine Majesty. 11. With this Precious Blood He sprinkles your soul and purifies it from every stain. 12. For you, Christ offers Himself as a true burnt offering and renders to the Godhead the supreme honour which is its due. 13. By offering this act of worship to God, you make amends for the glory which you have failed to give Him. 14. For you Christ offers himself to God as a sacrifice of praise, thus atoning for your omissions in praising His Holy Name. 15. By offering to God this oblation (something offered to God) which Christ offers, you give Him greater praise than do the holy Angels. 16. For you Christ offers Himself as a perfect sacrifice of thanksgiving, making compensation for all failures on your part to give thanks. 17. By offering to God Christ’s act of thanksgiving you make a generous acknowledgment of all the benefits He has bestowed upon you. 18. For you Christ offers Himself as the All-powerful Victim, reconciling you to the God whom you have offended. 19. He pardons you all your venial sins, provided you are firmly resolved to forsake them. 20. He also makes reparation for many of your sins of omission, when you left undone the good you might have done. 21. He removes many of the imperfections attaching to your good deeds. 22. He forgives you the sins, unknown or forgotten, which you have never mentioned in Confession. 23. He offers Himself as a victim to make satisfaction for a part, at least, of your debts and transgressions. 24. Each time you come to Mass, you can do more to pay the penalty due to your sins than by the severest work of penance. 25. Christ places to your credit a portion of His merits, which you may offer to God the Father in expiation of your offenses. 26. For you Christ offers Himself as the most efficacious peace-offering, interceding for you as earnestly as He interceded for His enemies on the Cross. 27. His Precious Blood pleads for you in words as countless as the drops which issued from His sacred veins. 28. Each of the adorable wounds His Sacred Body bore is a voice calling aloud for mercy for you. 29. For the sake of this propitiatory (appeasing) Victim, the petitions offered during Mass will be granted far sooner than those that are offered at other times. 30. Never can you pray so well as while present at Mass. 31. This is so because Christ unites His prayers to yours and offers them to His heavenly Father. 32. He acquaints Him with your needs and the dangers to which you are exposed and makes your eternal salvation His particular concern. 33. The Angels also who are present plead for and present your prayers before the throne of God. 34. On your behalf the priest says Mass, by virtue of which the evil enemy will not be suffered to approach you. 35. For you and for your everlasting salvation he says Mass and offers that Holy Sacrifice to God Almighty. 36. When you participate in Mass, you are yourself in spirit a priest, empowered by Christ to offer the Mass both for yourself and others. 37. By offering this Holy Sacrifice you present to the Blessed Trinity the most acceptable of all oblations. 38. You offer an oblation precious indeed, of greater value than all things in Heaven and earth. 39. You offer an oblation precious indeed, for it is none other than God Himself. 40. By this Sacrifice you honour God as He alone is worthy to be honoured. 41. By this Sacrifice you give infinite satisfaction to the Most Holy Trinity. 42. You may present this glorious oblation as your own gift, for Christ Himself gave it to you. 43. When you participate in Mass correctly, you perform an act of highest worship. 44. By coming to Mass you pay the most profound reverence, the most loyal homage, to the sacred humanity of Our Lord. 45. It is the best means whereby to venerate the Passion of Christ and obtain a share in its fruits. 46. It is also the best means of venerating the Blessed Mother of God and increasing her joy. 47. By participating in Mass you can give greater honour to the Angels and Saints than by reciting many prayers. 48. By coming to Mass devoutly, you can also enrich your soul more than by anything else in the world. 49. For in this act you perform a good work of the highest value. 50. It is an exercise of pure faith, which will receive a great reward. 51. When you bow down before the Sacred Host and the sacred chalice, you perform a supreme act of adoration. 52. For each time that you gaze reverently upon the Sacred Host, you will receive a recompense in Heaven. 53. Each time you strike your breast with remorse, some of your sins are remitted to you. 54. If you come to Mass in the state of mortal sin, God offers you the grace of conversion, which can be fulfilled in confession. 55. If you come to Mass in the state of grace, God gives you an enlargement of grace. 56. In Holy Mass you sacramentally eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood. 57. You are privileged to behold with your eyes Christ hidden under the sacramental veil, and to be beheld by Him. 58. You receive the priest’s blessing, which is confirmed by Christ in Heaven. 59. Through your diligence in hearing Mass, you will also obtain physical and earthly blessings. 60. Furthermore, you will be preserved from many misfortunes that would otherwise befall you. 61. You will also be strengthened against temptations which would otherwise have vanquished you. 62. Holy Mass will also be to you a means of obtaining the grace of a holy death. 63. The love you have shown for Holy Mass will secure for you the special assistance of Angels and Saints in your last moments. 64. The remembrance of the Masses heard in your lifetime will be a sweet consolation to you in the hour of death and inspire you with confidence in the divine mercy. 65. They will not be forgotten when you stand before the Judge and will incline Him to show you favour. 66. You need not fear a long and terrible Purgatory if you already, to a great extent, atoned for your sins by frequently assisting at Holy Mass. 67. One Mass devoutly heard will do more to mitigate the pains of Purgatory than any act of penance, however difficult of performance. 68. One Mass in your lifetime will be of greater service to you than many said for you after death. 69. You will attain a high place in Heaven, which will be yours for all eternity. 70. Your happiness in Heaven will be increased by every Mass you hear on earth. 71. No prayers offered for your friends will be as useful as a single Mass offered on their behalf. 72. You can amply recompense all who have been kind to you by coming to Mass for their intention. 73. The best help, the greatest consolation, you can afford the afflicted, the sick, the dying, is to hear Mass for them. 74. By this same means you can even obtain for sinners the grace of conversion. 75. You can also earn for all faithful Christians saving and helpful graces. 76. For the Suffering Souls in Purgatory you can obtain much help. 77. And if it is not within your power to have Mass said for your departed friends, you can by devout assistance at the Holy Sacrifice release them from many torments. A priest once said: “If Christians only knew how to profit by Holy Mass, they might acquire greater riches than are to be found in all the things God has created.”
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HiMy wife and I are considering moving back to Mexico with our young family; where we are now there isn't a large community so we'd like somewhere our children can grow up around fellow catholics.Which chapels in Mexico have the largest communities with decent work prospects as well? (background in IT with native English, but happy to try a new field)Thanks!

Piancol (8): Mexico City is where the main Headquarters of the SSPX in Mexico are located (District House, Priory, two main chapels with daily masses, a small school, a convent) but it's a massive, chaotic, cosmopolitan, progressive city with all the pros and cons that come with it. Also, the community as such is not that strong or united – basically, the faithful are divided into two almost unmixable worlds (northern and southern) according to which of the two chapels they attend to and then subdivided into different big families. Your experience as a newcomer might depend on how sociable you are and how close you live to either of the two chapels. The other cities with their own priories and somewhat big established communities are:Guadalajara, in the state of Jalisco.Orizaba, in the state of Veracruz.Gómez Palacio, in the state of Durango.León, in the state of Guanajuato.Sadly, I can't tell you much about their communities because I've never lived in any of those cities or even visited their churches. But here's a link where you can find more info and maybe contact them:https://fsspx.mx/es/distrito-mexico-31203There are other cities in Mexico with SSPX chapels or mass centers but their schedules vary from weekly to sometimes bimonthly, so I would advise to check the main ones first.I am originally from Mexico City (or CDMX as we call it here) although I currently reside in the state of Puebla, where we have the most beautiful SSPX chapel of the whole country (not exaggerating) but sadly not a priory, so we don't have daily mass, just on the weekends.Feel free to PM me if you have any other questions!

ourladyofcovadonga (6): Sorry not related to your question but I was so bummed when I went to Morelia and the only SSPX mass was held like once a month in a small chapel. Such a shame for a once glorious country.

None (1): [deleted]

Practical\_Beyond\_910 (1): Kinda late response, but I have to promote our chapel and city hahaI've been an SSPX parishioner for 10 years in my native Monterrey. When I first arrived, our community was composed of a big family and a few "outsiders", totaling 70-80 faithful; now, after many marriages and the arrival of waves of NO refugees, our numbers rose to 200+ faithful so we had to change our location to a bigger and better-equipped chapel. Monterrey is a great place to live!Pros: \-The District Superior told us that our chapel is becoming a Priory in the near future; we have the infrastructure to house priests, but vocations are lacking. \-We're a medium-sized community: not too few for us to feel cloistered, not too big for the faithful to get lost in the crowd. We all know each other and we are fairly united. \-We have many young families with kids (mine included.) \-Our city is the industrial hub of Mexico. In Monterrey jobs are plenty, and I'm sure you'll find an IT vacancy, especially with native English as a differential skill. \-Thank God, our state is still very conservative, and we have not succumbed to the approval of homosexual "marriages" or legal abortion (yet.)Cons: \-We don't have weekly Mass. We receive the priests from the District House almost all weekends (excluding every second weekend of the month.) \-We don't have a school like the other two big cities of the country, Guadalajara and Mexico, but this may change with the establishment of a Priory. A growing number of young families are opting for homeschooling in the meantime. \-Our chapel is to the West of the city, in the periphery, which, depending on where you live, means a long drive. \-Our apostolates and groups that promote an active parish life are still in the launching phase. Since our relocation, a year ago, many things had to be reset. \-Monterrey is one of the most expensive cities to live in the country (if not THE most), but it compensates with higher-than-average salaries than the rest of Mexico.Feel free to PM me for more info! You can also find us on Facebook at NLTradicional and Instagram at tradnoreste.

maciasfrancojesus (2): I am from Torreón, Coahuila and I used to attend one of the SSPX places in Gómez. It was beautiful and was my first exposure to the true mass.However, my community would not be the best for OP's career. If I were making that move and still wanted to be around the north of the country, I would probably try Monterrey. I'd assume they have a decent SSPX community given the larger population. Also, definitely more career opportunities than La Comarca Lagunera (Torreón, Gómez, Lerdo).

Piancol (5): Mexico's faith has been very attacked from the beginning of the crisis and even way before that. All the V2 modernist changes were swiftly and forcefully applied almost overnight here. Thanks to that and a combination of factors such as a Freemason political class, superstitious and pagan sincretism, the invasion of American heretical sects, and a strong influence of neo-communist ideologies (especially the infamous Theology of Liberation) our once strong Catholicism has dwindled greatly, to the point where the vast majority of people that still call themselves Catholic are only nominal types.

None (3): I live in the most catholic (supposedly) city in the UK and we are a pretty small chapel with mass once a week here - it's really a shame in comparison to our Irish history.

None (1): May have mistaken me for someone else haha

ourladyofcovadonga (2): Any good books or videos on the topic? My limited knowledge knows about the American and masonic influence on Mexico but I'd like to learn more.

# Post 406: Looking for a chant/Recherche d'un chant de messe de la Toussaint

Author: None

Score: 2

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1gjs1z6/looking\_for\_a\_chantrecherche\_dun\_chant\_de\_messe/

Bonjour,Quelqu'un pourrait-il me dire comment s'intitule ce magnifique chant grégorien que je recherche ? écouté à la messe de 10H30 le 01/11/2024 en l'Eglise de Saint-Nicolas du Chardonnet, passage de 16:00 à 18:50.[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ivfjmCDR1kI](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ivfjmCDR1kI)Merci d'avance de votre aide.https://reddit.com/link/1gjs1z6/video/rxsvu0j8uyyd1/player\--- Looking for a chant:Could someone tell me the title of this magnificent Gregorian chant, heard at the 10:30 a.m. mass on 01/11/2024 in the Church of Saint-Nicolas du Chardonnet? Passage from 16:00 to 18:50.

None (2): Timete Domine Gradual for the Feast of All Saints

# Post 407: What can we answer to people that say that assisting at an SSPX Mass doesn’t Fulfill One’s Sunday Obligation

Author: RegiaeRandom

Score: 6

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1gjk9q9/what\_can\_we\_answer\_to\_people\_that\_say\_that/

They keep sending me this link https://www.trueorfalsepope.com/p/does-assisting-at-sspx-mass-fulfill.html

HMX5000 (7): Pray for them and move on.

CatholicFuturist (3): This channel has some good videos specifically on John Salza's arguments against the SSPX: [Christpilled - YouTube](https://www.youtube.com/@OrdinemIntegro)

Kogos\_Melo (3): Make an irony about clown masses with guitars and drums lol

None (2): They’re prideful and confuse the legalism in Rome with the intention of the heart, which is what matters most to God. Also the Vatican II church is riddled with inconsistencies and hypocrisy. To claim those of us who attend SSPX don’t fulfill our Sunday obligation while in the same breath claiming it’s ok to be a Protestant in the name of Ecumenism is laughable. They wonder why their pews are empty…

mattdamon992 (2): I understand where they’re coming from, and technically, they’re correct according to Church law, which prioritizes attending Masses in full communion if available—whether that’s a Latin Mass or a reverently celebrated Novus Ordo. John Salza is pretty lethal. Engaging in a back-and-forth might not lead to mutual understanding, so sometimes it’s best to acknowledge their perspective and respectfully stick to your own convictions. Praying for unity in the Church can go a long way, too

asimovsdog (1): If they want you to go to the Novus Ordo, send them this: https://dominicansavrille.us/62-reasons-to-reject-the-new-mass-novus-ordo-missae/Then ask them whether they would consider going to a Lutheran Mass okay, because that's effectively what they're doing right now.For other TLM groups, it's mostly just politics, the SSPX is the only group that is somewhat fighting to get Rome back, the other TLM groups are just controlled opposition, they wouldn't exist without the SSPX.

RegiaeRandom (1): I know those reason ! But I wanted to be sure that i fullfill my sunday obligation

# Post 408: The 15 Promises of the Rosary

Author: Away\_Report6974

Score: 7

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1giiqgf/the\_15\_promises\_of\_the\_rosary/

https://preview.redd.it/p0ntfmhiinyd1.jpg?width=565&format=pjpg&auto=webp&s=62e379243ea2b8c0e5cb0b020add72029ce30a85\*\*Given to bl. Alan de la Roche:\*\*\*\*1. Those who faithfully serve me by the recitation of the Rosary shall receive signal graces.\*\*\*\*2. I promise my special protection and the greatest graces to all those who shall recite the Rosary.\*\*\*\*3. The Rosary shall be a powerful armor against hell. It will destroy vice, decrease sin, and defeat heresies.\*\*\*\*4. The recitation of the Rosary will cause virtue and good works to flourish. It will obtain for souls the abundant mercy of God. It will withdraw the hearts of men from the love of the world and its vanities, and will lift them to the desire of eternal things. Oh, that souls would sanctify themselves by this means.\*\*\*\*5. The soul which recommends itself to me by the recitation of the Rosary shall not perish.\*\*\*\*6. Those who recite my Rosary devoutly, applying themselves to the consideration of its sacred mysteries, shall never be conquered by misfortune. In His justice, God will not chastise them; nor shall they perish by an unprovided death, i.e., be unprepared for heaven. Sinners shall convert. The just shall persevere in grace and become worthy of eternal life.\*\*\*\*7. Those who have a true devotion to the Rosary shall not die without the sacraments of the Church.\*\*\*\*8. Those who faithfully recite the Rosary shall have, during their life and at their death, the light of God and the plenitude of His graces. At the moment of death, they shall participate in the merits of the saints in paradise.\*\*\*\*9. I shall deliver from purgatory those who have been devoted to the Rosary.\*\*\*\*10. The faithful children of the Rosary shall merit a high degree of glory in heaven.\*\*\*\*11. By the recitation of the Rosary you shall obtain all that you ask of me.\*\*\*\*12. Those who propagate the holy Rosary shall be aided by me in their necessities.\*\*\*\*13. I have obtained from my Divine Son that all the advocates of the Rosary shall have for intercessors the entire celestial court during their life and at the hour of their death.\*\*\*\*14. All who recite the Rosary are my beloved children and the brothers and sisters of my only Son, Jesus Christ.\*\*\*\*15. Devotion for my Rosary is a great sign of predestination.\*\*Read the best book about Rosary: [https://thavmapub.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/secret-of-the-rosary.pdf](https://thavmapub.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/secret-of-the-rosary.pdf)

Kogos\_Melo (0): 15 promises of the rosary... 15 misteries... 150 hail mariesEverything was perfect until the worst pope of post-cv2 crisis came in and ruined it

# Post 409: Question about singing during High Mass

Author: obiwankenobistan

Score: 8

Comments: 8

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1gibj7c/question\_about\_singing\_during\_high\_mass/

Preface: I usually attend Mass at either a Diocesan TLM or an FSSP Parish. There’s also an SSPX mission about 45 minutes from me; I’m equidistant from all three. That said, I haven’t been to the FSSP church in a while, but went yesterday for All Saints’ Day. It was a High Mass. I hope you all don’t mind my post here; I’m just looking for a more traditional perspective.At the Diocesan TLM High Mass, the Faithful are generally nice and loud and sing the responses, Gloria, Credo, Agnus Dei, and Salve Regina.Yesterday, at the FSSP church, it felt like the Faithful either weren’t singing at all, or barely were. The Priest definitely sang the Credo by himself. In fact, I had two people in front of me turn their heads when I sang the first response, and (I could be imagining it) one person actually shook their head in disapproval at me.My guess is either that this Church just really doesn’t get into the singing part, or traditionally, only the Priest and Schola are supposed to sing. I definitely don’t want people staring at me haha.So, did I do something wrong? any advice? Thanks everyone!

None (6): Well in some parishes people don't sing much: so one person singing will definitely stand alone.However it is definitely a good thing to sing during high Mass (outside of the canon), as it helps us being less passive. So I'd keep singing, but keeping down the tone.

BertBlyleven (5): The faithful at the SSPX chapel I go sing. The priest is an extreme liturgist and encourages everyone to sing. Hope this helps.

dbaughmen (6): The truth is, the faithful should not sing at High Mass at all. The choir is an extension of the Altar Boys in theory, traditionally. And singing or responding to the responses during High Mass is technically a product of the Dialogue Mass.God bless you!

obiwankenobistan (6): Thank you for the reply! I had a feeling it was something I just wasn’t aware of. The Diocesan Parish has good, holy men as Priests but I could definitely see them being required to make certain concessions that I didn’t realize were actually not normal. Definitely good to know for next time.Is the Dialogue Mass part of the 1962 missal? Or is that a V2 development prior to the Novus Ordo?God Bless you too!

Piklikl (6): Do you have a source for your assertion that the faithful shouldn’t sing at a High Mass? In 8 years at an SSPX school and 2 at the SSPX’s only English speaking college and I’ve never heard anything like it.

None (6): Do you have an SSPX source against the practice of singing at high Mass or answering Mass?Dialogue Mass has nothing wrong: it's in fact saint Pius X, who can't be suspected of modernism, who started it.

dbaughmen (6): Of course, if you have any other questions please ask me! The Dialogue Mass is a modern practice that developed pre-Vatican II where every prayer was said out loud by the priest and the faithful sung or said every response in the Mass. It is definitely frowned upon, at least in the United States. This developed when modernism was already deep in the church and prior to when the Church was about to implode at Vatican II.

ardaduck (5): At the SSPX priory in Antwerp Rev. de Bruyn was complaining about nobody singing the Kyriale before starting his preaching lol. It was not Missa XI or IX and you have less people in the summer so parishioners were quieter.

# Post 410: How evil is the new mass?

Author: Christ\_is\_\_risen

Score: 8

Comments: 18

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ggqq5u/how\_evil\_is\_the\_new\_mass/

is the novus ordo evil or just bad or an inferior liturgy? also, is it ever okay to attend it and if it is, if there is no latin mass around you do you have to go to a novus ordo?

dbaughmen (12): The Novus Ordo is, as quoted by Archbishop Lefebvre: “impregnated with the spirit of protestantism”. It is a water down, protestant style excuse for a mass. (Excuse my directness).

None (6): I have some friends who have no TLM options I'd watch this and consider your particular circumstances, hope you can have one to go to soonhttps://youtu.be/sZpbnoyd1zg?si=ogcCvkYeX7J9vFLT

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (5): The big problem is the intent behind the new sacraments: watered down doctrine in the Liturgy, hoping to attract Protestants by avoiding Catholic doctrine they might find off putting.It throws "Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi" out the window.

HMX5000 (9): Some Novus Ordo Masses are quite bad and others are only inferior because they are not solemn. I do not have the opportunity to attend a traditional Latin Mass and I have to change churches frequently.

ourladyofcovadonga (4): The society has numerous free videos on this. A simple YouTube search would suffice.

feelinggravityspull (4): The Society's official position, I think, is that the Novus Ordo is not a Catholic liturgy, and therefore you should not attend and cannot licitly be compelled to do so.This is obviously controversial, and not all lay people attached to the SSPX fully agree.

Murky\_Question\_9362 (3): They are spiritually empty and not reverend in the slightest. Even the most "reverend" NO is 10000000× less reverend than the least reverend TLM

RiskKeepsMeEmployed (2): [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ftzfRi5TZrY](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ftzfRi5TZrY)

None (1): If you're asking for the SSPX's position, it considers the NO as uncatholic (meaning "not expressing the Catholic faith about Mass"), which means it's never good to go to the NO, even the most reverend. So for someone who's fully aware of that, it is bad to go to the NO.This position is based on the brief critical exam, I advise you strongly to read it if you haven't yet!https://angeluspress.org/blogs/catholic-doctrine/a-brief-critical-study-of-the-novus-ordo-missae?srsltid=AfmBOooAgzxfbujUt3F\_gGZvphK9yRJzUj1gCuvQgnpOTvbysvxkFZyC

mattdamon992 (1): That ‘short critical exam’ has zero magisterial authority behind it, so treating it as some authoritative text that should guide the faithful in discerning whether they "should go" to the new mass is misguided at best. The Church alone, through the Pope and bishops in communion with him, has the authority to regulate the liturgy and determine what constitutes valid and reverent worship. If the Novus Ordo were truly ‘evil’ or sinful, it would mean the Church is capable of leading the faithful astray, which goes against Christ’s promise to protect His Church.And as for coherence, let’s consider this: why listen to a group that hasn’t been sent by any ecclesiastical or canonical authority, nor has the backing of miracles or signs? The SSPX lacks both legitimate mission and divine endorsement, so maybe it’s worth questioning why their perspective should carry more weight than the Church’s own guidance. If we’re truly serious about obedience and tradition, it might be time to look to the Church, not unsanctioned critics.

Seethi110 (1): Spiritually empty?

Seethi110 (1): I don’t understand how a Novus Ordo where the Roman Canon is reciting can be described as “not expressing the Catholic faith about the Mass”

mattdamon992 (0): I think it's pretty clear that the sspx position is that the Novus ordo is evil and it is a sin to go to it. You can see that from sspx videos and from their blue book/Christian warfare examination of conscience. Nuts.

None (2): Nobody said it has magisterial authority and that it is an authoritative text. All we claim is that it is theologically right, and that we agree with its claims. Also, you bring no proof of your following claim regarding undefectability. Finally, one doesn't need miracles to know if a position is right or not. Plenty of Popes have been wrong about doctrinal subjects in history (Honorius, Liberius, John XXII,...), and the solution has never been to say "well the Church has spoken, let's blindly agree with this even if this contradicts Tradition".

None (1): Have you read the Brief Critical Exam? This should explain it to you pretty well

None (2): That's pretty much what I said yes. One has to be coherent about he believes of the NO Mass. Either it's no problem, then we shouldn't stubbornly defend the TLM. Or we refuse to go to it, then we shouldn't pretend it's not evil.

# Post 411: the pictures in the 1962 missal are so beautiful

Author: None

Score: 60

Comments: 1

URL: https://i.redd.it/fdq1jjjr1bxd1.jpeg

I was just taking a moment today to appreciate these beautiful images

obiwankenobistan (3): The borderline iconoclasm is some of the churches with “modern” architecture blow my mind compared to things like this just in a little book and things like the Milan Cathedral.

# Post 412: Holy Working Moms?

Author: Agitated-Agent1612

Score: 9

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1gd9o4l/holy\_working\_moms/

I am discussing with my boyfriend what our future family dynamics would look like, specifically the role of a mother. My mother was somewhat a stay-at-home mom, sometimes leaving me with my grandparents when she needed to help with the family business. His mother has always been a working mom which led him to being raised mostly by his nannies; he has mentioned that he disliked being raised by nannies and would not want such a dynamic with our future children. I am very keen to be more active in the early childhood of our children as I have experience with teaching young children and have seen how good and holy education benefits children. However, seems like being a stay-at-home mom might not be feasible for us. My boyfriend's career trajectory is in academia, meaning if we would only rely on his income alone, it won't be enough (or we will be rice-and-beans poor). Academia is known to pay peanuts in the early days, with a potential to secure and well-paying job once he gets tenure. He is extremely good at what he does, getting recommendations right and left, but it'll still take him years to earn enough to support a family on one income. Likely, when that time comes, the children would probably already be in school. All this means that I would need to work to supplement his income. My career trajectory can make me decent money with the possibility of hybrid work. But I'm aware that even with that, I would need to rely on daycare or other services to manage raising children. I don't have any good role models of moms who have done it well. Apart from St Zelie Martin (St Therese of the Child Jesus' Mom), I don't know anyone else! We are planning to start marriage prep soon before engagement so we will be able to consult our priests regarding this, but would really appreciate 1. Testimonies of moms who managed to work and raise a family2. The realistic challenges, and 3. Some advice on how to increase our success in thatTL;DR: How to be a working mom who is also fully dedicated to the raising of children especially in early childhood days?

minimcnabb (2): Have you read "story of a family"? The story of Saint Thérèse's family?I was honestly shocked how much of the childhood care was outsourced to nannies and family members. If it didn't prevent her parents from Sainthood, then I am sure you can seek some inspiration from them.

operakitti (2): Saint Gianna Molla was a pediatrician and mother of four. Speaking as the daughter of a single working mother, I think you can be a good mother and work. My mom was always there when I needed her. I had friends with stay at home moms who couldn’t not say the same. It is the quality, not necessarily the quantity. God bless you and your boyfriend.

# Post 413: Looking for American Catholic friends

Author: kawaqcosta

Score: 8

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1g6dzq8/looking\_for\_american\_catholic\_friends/

Hello! I am a Brazilian Catholic, a member of the SSPX, and I would like to meet some other members of the Society to interact and talk about faith and other related things.I think it would be an interesting way to practice my English. I would like to know if anyone is interested in this.

None (2): Not American but English, happy to help you practice

badger-dagger (2): Send me a message if you come to Orlando, FL. St Thomas Moore is the priory there (Sanford). Wonderful parish!

Balbvin\_IV (2): I'm also Brazilian, which chapel do you go to? I go to Mass in Ribeirão Preto

dbaughmen (1): I’m happy to help as well! Also English

None (3): [deleted]

LucasLoboFerr (2): I'm Brazilian and'll save your profile when I visit there.

kawaqcosta (1): Eu vou na de Parnaíba - PI.

None (1): Wonderful, have you started catechism?

# Post 414: Let's convert sinners with The Golden Arrow prayer! - New prayer "Crusade"

Author: Away\_Report6974

Score: 13

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1g6cgt3/lets\_convert\_sinners\_with\_the\_golden\_arrow\_prayer/

What even is “\*\*Golden Arrow\*\*”?In approved by Catholic Church revelation, Jesus Christ dictates to Sister Mary of Saint Peter “\*\*Golden Arrow\*\*” which would have the power of wounding Him delightfully, and which would also heal those other wounds inflicted by the malice of sinners.\*\*It would also send torrent of graces and convert many sinners.\*\*I have an idea for an prayer crusade in which our community could get involved.The idea is to make a resolution to say the so-called "Golden Arrow" once a day for the rest of your life (of course, I recommend doing it more times, e.g. 3, but the resolution is to do it at least once a day).You can easily calculate that if e.g. 100 people from our community get involved in this, it would be 100 Golden Arrows per day. After 10 years, this act would have been recited 365,000 times! (and if we said it 3 times a day, it would be over a million such acts in 10 years).We see that throughout our lives, many millions of such beautiful prayers will be said, and many sinners will be saved from damnation.Therefore, I wholeheartedly invite you to this action. If anyone is interested, please leave a comment or like so that we know how many people are in our group :)Prayer:\*\*May the most holy, most sacred, most adorable, most incomprehensible and unutterable Name of God be always praised, blessed, loved, adored, and glorified in heaven, on earth, and in the hells, by all the creatures of God and by the Sacred Heart of our Lord Jesus Christ in the Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar. Amen\*\*\*\*(if you are not english-speaker try to find translated version of this prayer online.)\*\*You can read more about this revelation:[https://tandirection.com/tradition-restored/prayer-of-the-golden-arrow/](https://tandirection.com/tradition-restored/prayer-of-the-golden-arrow/)

None (2): The Holy Face devotion is what we need right now. Thank you for spreading it. If anyone wants more information about the Holy Face devotion and its roots, please visit [Martinians.org](http://Martinians.org)

# Post 415: Lives of the Saints

Author: Pale-Roof9278

Score: 2

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1g3nvfu/lives\_of\_the\_saints/

Hello,Is anyone aware of a pre conciliar compilation of the lives of the saints that’s relatable to lay persons? TIA.

dbaughmen (3): The best ones are Butler’s Lives of the Saints and Dom Gueranger’s Liturgical Year. The one by Dom Gueranger also includes readings from the mass, it is more complete whilst Butler’s is similar to martyrology.

None (1): Not a fan of all the divine mercy stuff, but the iPieta app has the full 1904 butlers lives of the saints

Pale-Roof9278 (1): Thanks for the suggestions, gentlemen. I’m grateful for the clarification that there is an earlier version of Butler’s because I was unaware that it was pre conciliar edition. Because my friend will not trust anything post 1962. Additionally, I use the iPieta daily just for the trad readings and old calendar. I too am skeptical of Faustina and DM because of the presumption they seemingly contain of salvation.

tradmark (1): I use Butler daily. I recommend out also as informing our daily prayers and preparation for confession and Communion.

dbaughmen (2): Dear OP, I highly recommend the Santifica app which is purely traditional and has daily Dom Gueranger and Butler’s. It has many devotions, litanies, rosaries and daily traditional mass propers.

# Post 416: Wanting to convert. Need some help

Author: Ugapintail

Score: 9

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1g2z71j/wanting\_to\_convert\_need\_some\_help/

Without getting too deep into this. I spent the first four decades of my life as a Protestant. I know that uniting with Rome is where I need to be. But I’ve seen the issues with Norvus Ordo and the TLM is what I want to unite with. I’ve studied the church for almost 8 years now. It’s time that I make the formal move. I think RCIA isn’t really going to give me what I need. I’ve reached out to a local SSPX priest who did not return my emails. What should k do here? Just do RCIA and never attend norvus ordo? Can I join the Church by uniting with SSPX? Color me Confused at this point. 🤷🏼♂️

None (6): I converted from being an atheist, had a bad experience with RCIA then was eventually catechised and baptised by an SSPX priest, shoot me a message if you want and I can answer any questions :)P.s SSPX priests tend to be quite busy, serving multiple chapels across significant distances: I can give you advice on how to pin one down haha

ArtannsVoid (8): Is it possible you can go to mass at an SSPX chapel? Typically the priest may stay after and talk to people. You can always try and ask them then.

None (5): The Catholic Church is going through a crisis, not the first in its history nor the last. You should still join the most "orthodox" group within it, namely the SSPX! I was this saturday at an SSPX wedding in a diocesan church, with the bishop's authorisation of course. My point is, yes we are within the Church, if Pope Francis didn't believe so he wouldn't have granted our priests the right to confess outside of jurisdiction!

bigdawg640 (-1): Go to the FSSP, ICKSP, or other traditional orders with full canonical authority. SSPX has no canonical authority and should not he your first taste of tradition due to there uncharitable view of the church.

Ugapintail (1): Not helpful

bigdawg640 (1): If you want to stay in full regular communion and go to a traditional mass, don't go to the SSPX, theres much more other traditional orders. Also there's more to the faith then aesthetics.

Ugapintail (1): Again. Not helpful

# Post 417: Struggling

Author: PastMarvel900

Score: 5

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1g085sh/struggling/

Hello. My parents have a deal that I have to go to OCIA and a monthly Novus Ordo mass with them if i want to continue going to my diocesan TLM (we don’t have a SSPX near us). During todays lesson my priest commented on a question that I asked anonymously about why is the Latin Mass getting banned and why we are throwing away two thousand years of tradition. He responded by saying that around 200, the church language had shifted to Latin from Greek and at the Council of Trent they had changed the order of the mass to be said in Latin and other things. I thought it was just codified during that council but I could be wrong. He also had said that many of the people that think they are praying in latin or going to the latin mass believe that they are cooler (he used a different word that i can’t remember). I was trying to explain to my parents on the car ride home that just because I go to the Latin Mass doesn’t mean that the prayers we make during the mass somehow take precedence over a novus ordo participant. I also brought up the fact that my priest had said for the external solemnity of Our Lady of the Rosary, “Maybe if Pope Francis had been saying the rosary he never would’ve said all religions lead to God. And maybe there wouldn’t be so many problems/heresy in the church.” When i told my parents that, they said that he is disobeying the pope and that he is supposed to be subject to him and to be careful of who i expose myself to. And i was trying to explain that you can disagree with the pope no matter if you are a cardinal, archbishop, or a priest etc. I also explained that everyone including me there pretty much believes that the statement our priest made was true. They responded to say that if everyone believes a certain set of rules, it is a cult but then i soon went on to say that every denomination including Catholic are a cult based off of their explanation. I really need some guidance right now. If y’all would provide some guidance, that would be greatly appreciated.

dbaughmen (8): Dear OP, my situation was very very similar to yours. To start off - an SSPX bishop said to me - “Take this misfortune, wavering parents as a gift-trials of Providence.As for your parents, peck (PEC) them to death (figuratively !).P — Prayer. Pray the Rosary for them and their conversion.E — Example. If they sees their son profoundly happy with Tradition, you will be a constant argument for Tradition under their eyes. They know you well. They love you well. They only want you to be happy....C — Charity. If you’re a good son, respectful, obedient, loving them as your parents more than ever, again you will be an argument for Tradition, stronger than words. Generally speaking, women listen less to men’s words than to their actions. Persevere in action of Tradition, and you will normally have more chance of winning over your mother than your father.Watch and pray, watch and pray, your Mysteries every day.”That said, “obedience” is a virtue intended toward good, not evil. It isn’t even among the most important virtues. And the false prophets in the Conciliar Church are not ones we pay homage too. My parents had the same “cult” objection, and I truly do not blame this view as their view of Novus Ordo “Catholicism” is what they grew up with, and they will defend what they grew up with. And you must defend what your ancestors grew up with, every ancestor leading up to Christ and his apostles. You have 1958 years of Church history, and the saints on your side, and they have 66. I also do not recommend that you receive communion when you must attend the Novus Ordo.Dear OP, I will pray for you and the conversion of your parents, may the Holy Ghost touch their heart. Always remember, you will be persecuted for your faith, it is expected. Never compromise!

dbaughmen (4): If you need anymore help, please DM me and I can even find you an SSPX priest who can be your spiritual advisor.

# Post 418: Bishop Tissier de Mallerais has died at 79

Author: CatholicFuturist

Score: 44

Comments: 8

URL: https://sspx.org/en/news/death-bishop-bernard-tissier-mallerais-47993

HMX5000 (25): V. Réquiem æternam dona eis, Dómine. R. Et lux perpetua luceat eis. V. Requiescant in pace R. Amen.🙏🙏🙏

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (18): RIP. Now the SSPX have only 2 bishops, everybody needs to start praying because the pot is going to be stirring again

Highwayman90 (13): May his memory be eternal, and if he is in the process of being purified, may his soul be healed of its wounds that he may enter the Beatific Vision.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (12): Requiescat in Pace

CV-CR-CI (9): requiescat in pace 🙏

dbaughmen (9): May His Lordship be forever in eternal glory. We thank him for all he has done for the Church, he has sustained it in troubled times. Requiescat in pace!

LiliumInterSpinasXV (6): In paradisum deducant te angeli; in tuo adventu suscipiant te martyres, et perducant te in civitatem sanctam Jerusalem. Chorus angelorum te suscipiat, et cum Lazaro quondam paupere æternam habeas requiem. 🙏

rmlenz (4): We need trust

# Post 419: One of the best christian books for free!

Author: Away\_Report6974

Score: 9

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1fyuhs7/one\_of\_the\_best\_christian\_books\_for\_free/

This was the book that changed my life couple years ago, please have look it also!"The Secret of the Rosary" by St. Louis De Montfort for free:[https://thavmapub.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/secret-of-the-rosary.pdf](https://thavmapub.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/secret-of-the-rosary.pdf)

trent\_88 (1): Thank you!

# Post 420: What the Real Third Secret of Fatima Said Witness Account

Author: savethetroops2024

Score: 0

Comments: 0

URL: https://youtu.be/nO-8UhGOagg?si=6zTEatjqYH5iKdl6

# Post 421: A quote which we must remember in confusing times… by their fruits we shall know them

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 22

Comments: 9

URL: https://i.redd.it/unstzk9mp8td1.jpeg

peppers\_yeppers (4): The sede grift in sspx communities is getting wild rn

None (2): Just in case... [Contra Sedevacantism](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1QyilJ9oBjUsXtjS0e-HsUakO8Sgw5bP1salPZUWYJzA/edit?usp=sharing)

RegiaeRandom (3): He said that 38 years ago, wdym «today»?

RegiaeRandom (6): Mgr Lefebvre wasn’t Sedevacantist.

None (2): Yes or course, but the people who keep carefully selectionning specific quotes from him in order to make him sound like one probably are...

dbaughmen (1): What he is saying its true, it has nothing to do with sedevacantism.

None (1): He didn't say that, he said the archbishop wasn't sedevacantist, not that you weren't trying to cherry pick quotes from him that make him look like a sede.

dbaughmen (1): I personally believe the Archbishop would NOT have been a sedevacantist today. But what the quote says is true, I am personally not a sedevacantist

None (0): Well of course he wouldn't be a sedevacantist "today", since he criticized it even back then!

# Post 422: SSPX and Islam

Author: e-eye-pi

Score: 3

Comments: 15

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1fxd2u0/sspx\_and\_islam/

Has anyone come across the criticism that traditional Catholicism is getting close in some ways to conservative expressions of Islam - modesty dress codes and veiling; restrictions on education and employment for women; a rather militaristic approach to faith? These are views I'm picking up. I mean, what on earth can one say to this? I'm in the UK and this is coming from the USA so if any of our American friends could explain what's going on, I'd be grateful. It's baffling to me.

rmlenz (9): Some neocons have already tried to promote this narrative here in Brazil, but then stopped. I don't know what to say about this, but it's obviously a joke.

asimovsdog (3): Well, the modesty, restrictions and militarism is shared between the two religions, yes. But that's just social conservative rules (who were instituted for good reason), you could say the same thing about the Anabaptists and Islam. I've not heard that traditional Catholic are allowed to marry more than one wife or needlessly wage war against other countries.

None (3): I am leaving Reddit because it has become an obstacle to my duty of state as a Catholic Father. It has become a distraction, a temptation, and ultimately an idol. I would fraternally encourage all reading this message to consider whether their own use of the platform is edifying and healthy, or whether it is a superficial lesser good that only serves as an obstacle to your personal and spiritual growth.

ourladyofcovadonga (2): Real faith requires real adherence. I think a better question to ask is whether one is really following the will of God or not, instead of making comparisons to a false religion. If you're following the truth, then anything else is irrelevant. I think it's pretty clear that traditional Catholicism is incompatible with modern western civilization (post French revolution, modernist thinking, etc) and the advancement of Jewry in politics has made it abundantly clear that we are the enemy of the world. I say this because its usually compromised Protestant heretics and lukewarm Novus Ordo Catholics who say things like that.Edit: Also ignorant secular people say things like that, i.e., "trad Catholics are oppressive to women."

None (1): Islam is straight up Luciferian

Huge-Explanation-358 (2): Seriously? Who? I'm brazillian too.

None (1): A que ponto a sociedade está forte no Brasil?Pergunto porque nasci no Brasil, mas moro desde muito pequeno fora do país. Não sei muito sobre como o catolicismo tradicional está por aí.Fico feliz em ver outros brasileiros aqui.

e-eye-pi (2): I've seen traditionalists referred to very disrespectfully in this context of comparing traditional Catholics to a Christian version of the Taliban because of the things I mention. It really is that extreme. I mean, yes, there are women who veil in church and there are standards regarding modesty, but none of this is enforced. Plus, women and girls are allowed an education, even up to very high levels. There are incredibly learned nuns and female saints for instance, which is completely not present in Islam. And - the kingdom of God is not of this world. So, there really can't be any militaristic theocratic ambition in our faith. Not like Islam at all. I don't get where this is coming from.

e-eye-pi (3): This is a really lucid perspective, thank you.

e-eye-pi (2): Yes, it's very much the NO Catholics who are saying this in my experience, and Protestants too but I don't listen to them anyway. I think you're absolutely right. It's a false equivalence that is designed to obscure the truth. What do you mean by the advancement of Jewry, though? I had thought of it as more the advancement of postmodern secular thinking, and really demonic influences (transgender, lgbt and feminist ideology etc). Do you mean atheist Jewry - as in Marxist influences?

kawaqcosta (2): Ítalo Marsili disse certa fez que a proibição das missas tridentinas efetuadas por Francisco contribuiriam para evitar conversões ao Islã,[219775008\\_4711211932241538\\_537477926371423726\\_n.jpg (442×960) (fbcdn.net)](https://scontent.fthe13-1.fna.fbcdn.net/v/t39.30808-6/219775008\_4711211932241538\_537477926371423726\_n.jpg?\_nc\_cat=108&ccb=1-7&\_nc\_sid=127cfc&\_nc\_ohc=VCLoNkKJrjEQ7kNvgHK-EtL&\_nc\_zt=23&\_nc\_ht=scontent.fthe13-1.fna&\_nc\_gid=ACrFXCLDZ7p1JQHVOQBQ4We&oh=00\_AYB6pnnv1ofyjJANdSwZ4OL3nPAtcp5R145StYgntu6Ikw&oe=6717E5E3)

rmlenz (2): Há 2 priorados e muitas Capelas, no momento está sendo construído o terceiro Priorado, que será aqui em Fortaleza, graças a Deus, mas levará tempo

ourladyofcovadonga (2): I mean the advancement of their kind to high-power positions, the kowtowing of politicians (especially "conservative" Republicans to the modern Israel, their influence on politics, etc. They are very much related to the demonic influences in the parenthesis you listed. One can easily find that they have heavily influenced LGBT, pornography, ethnic cleansing, and other obscene ideologies that are contrary to the Catholic faith. The masonic stuff is closely intertwined with these people and I wouldn't say they are mutually exclusive. Masons are typically secular, Jewish, or quasi-Protestant, and have been dulled by the French Revolution and modernism. I'm going off an a tangent but I guess the point I'm saying is that Protestants and Jews love masonry and Zionism which results in an ugly culture that hates anything traditional + Catholic.

Lucas\_AlCab (2): Doutor calça cagada kkkkkkkkk

None (1): Que bom saber! Sou de originário de Recife. Espero que a SSPX e o catolicismo tradicional continue crescendo no nordeste e no Brasil inteiro

# Post 423: What specific parts of v2 do SSPX reject

Author: Smooth\_Ad\_5775

Score: 7

Comments: 20

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1fw0qc6/what\_specific\_parts\_of\_v2\_do\_sspx\_reject/

Just wondering, not trying to debate. I want to research each document to see what the problem is. Is it entire documents you disagree with? Or just parts? Thanks

debigas (6): Would you drink water with a drop of deadly venom? Even if some parts are pious and respect doctrine, the whole thing must be rejected, since it’s hard for laymen to discern what’s ok and what’s not.For the official position, that would be better answered by a SSPX priest, you can hit them through email, most of the time. I recommend the Catechism of the crisis.

None (6): I'm putting below a site from the SSPX explaining it in detail.You should ask a priest if you want the official SSPX pov but basically, what the SSPX considers as doctrinally dangerous is the idea for religious freedom and ecumenism.The most problematic texts are Dignitatis Humanae (which opposes, for example, the encyclical Quanta Cura) and Unitatis Redintegratio (which opposes, for example, the encyclical mortalium animos)Collegiality is also considered problematic.If you've questions don't hesitate!https://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/SiSiNoNo/2003\_March/errors\_of\_vatican\_II.htm#:~:text=%3EVatican%20II%20teaches%20a%20false,Christ%20as%20was%20always%20taught.

None (1): [https://www.ewtn.com/catholicism/library/protocol-agreement-of-the-vatican-and-archbishop-lefebvre-2096](https://www.ewtn.com/catholicism/library/protocol-agreement-of-the-vatican-and-archbishop-lefebvre-2096)

None (1): [The Errors of Vatican II](https://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/SiSiNoNo/2003\_January/errors\_of\_vatican\_II.htm) (8 Parts)

MarcellusFaber (0): The heretical and erroneous parts. The CMRI has a good compilation of the most dodgy statements, as does John Daly:https://isidore.co/misc/Res%20pro%20Deo/J.%20S.%20Daly/The%20Principal%20Heresies%20and%20Other%20Errors%20of%20Vatican%20II%20by%20John%20Daly.pdfhttps://cmri.org/articles-on-the-traditional-catholic-faith/the-doctrinal-errors-of-the-second-vatican-council/

AquinasDestiny (2): Archbishop Lefebvre signed off on the council

None (3): He's asking the SSPX pov not the sedeprivationist one... That's not honest from you not to specify it!

MarcellusFaber (1): Neither the organisation nor the man are Sedeprivationist, and neither are they addressing the heretical Pope question in those articles, but rather listing the errors/heresies and comparing them to the traditional teaching. The SSPX position on this is in agreement with those two articles, and in my opinion those two articles present the errors most thoroughly, therefore I recommended them.

None (1): Well indeed my bad they aren't sedeprivationists since they are... sedevacantists. Which is even farther from the SSPX's position. So it is still dishonest from you to present this at the SSPX's position if it's from a sedevacantist site.Also this listing doesn't represent the SSPX's position from the simple fact it calls them "heresies", which isn't what the SSPX says (the SSPX would at the most call it a material heresy, not a formal one, but never straight up "heresy").

MarcellusFaber (0): You’ll find it to be different in their podcast.

None (0): Material heresy is still heresy. It seems you are making a category error here.

None (1): What?

None (1): Then saint Thomas Aquinas was a heretic, since he materially didn't believe in the immaculate conception... The point of the distinction between material heresy and formal heresy as always been very much an important one in Catholic theology, and only a formal heretic can formally be called so. But that's not even the issue here, OP was asking for the SSPX pov not for the sedevacantist one, so it's dishonest to tell him the sedevacantist one without saying what it is.

None (1): Aquinas died almost 600 years before the Immaculate Conception was a defined dogma. He was not in obstinate denial of this dogma, and so, was neither engaging in material heresy nor formal heresy. To say material \*heresy\* is not \*formal heresy\* and therefore it cannot be called \*heresy\* is a category error. It's like saying dogs are different from wolves and therefore cannot be called canids.However, I agree that answering the OP with a CMRI breakdown is misleading. CMRI is obviously going to have a different way of covering the topic.

asimovsdog (1): Thomas Aquinas never denied the Immaculate Conception, that's a myth from people who don't read Aquinas. At the time, people didn't know what biological "conception" was, therefore he "denied" the sanctification at the point of conception because he didn't have the biological knowledge for how conception works. However:"We cannot suppose that the favor granted to the precursor of Christ and to the prophet was denied to Christ’s own mother. Therefore, we believe that she was sanctified in her mother’s womb, that is, before she was born." - Thomas Aquinas, Compendium Theologicae, Chapter 224, "Sanctification of Christs Mother"https://www.christianbwagner.com/post/st-thomas-doctor-of-the-immaculate-conception

None (1): Thanks for being honest about the misleading part! So we agree we're debating between SSPX and sedevacantist, not among SSPX ;)Regarding material heresy, well still Aquinas is a material heretic. I'm of course aware that the dogma hadn't been defined yet, that was my point; the distinction between material heresy and formal heresy is very important one. In order to be a formal (aka proper) heretic, you need to formally deny a dogma. But that's not what the Pope nor VII are doing, of course they are saying things that contradict implications of the dogma, but they've never formally declined any dogma, that's the point.I agree that this could sound like a weird and unnecessary distinction to make; however this is a theological distinction that exists for a reason, we need to know when something's can be formally called a heresy or not.Now I do think that whatever Pope Francis is saying is materially heretic, but I don't think he believes he doesn't believe anymore in any dogma, or at least he hasn't said so publicly.That's actually what I like about the SSPX, they keep a very balanced position even if in the crisis of the Church it is very tempting not to be so, and they don't go farther that's what's needed.We should actually rejoice that the Pope, despite all he has done that keeps taking people away from the faith, is not a formal heretic; if he said "I don't believe anymore in the transsubstantiation dogma", sure things would be more "clear", but also it would be a great blow to Church.I keep hoping the liberal tendency within the Church can be replaced by a conservative one, which on the long run could become with God's help a traditionalist one, that's what's happening in my country (France) at least

None (1): Well if you want to get technical (even if there are other examples of saints not believing in dogmas before they were published, that's just one example, and even if this example isn't necessary to my point) biological knowledge of that time did believe that the soul would be created in the body after conception, he believed Mary had the stain of the original sin anyway, which is still contrary to the dogma. But if you have arguments against that I'd have no problem withdrawing my claim, Saint Thomas is one of the greatest saints ever and one hour ago I was at an abby where he has been for years, so any more proof he was right about everything is welcome!

None (1): In order for a catholic to engage in heresy, he or she must have obstinate denial or doubt, which implies that it involves an act or thought which is made with sufficient knowledge and will to be ‘obstinate’. This cannot be retroactively applied to St. Thomas nearly 600 years after his death. It seems to me you have a fundamental misunderstanding of what qualifies one to be a heretic, be it material or formal.I agree that the SSPX position is properly tempered to this crisis in the Church. Due to the confusion, stemming from the leadership in the Church, in which so many catholics are inundated, I have great sympathy for those who make the conclusion of sede vacante, even though I am not prepared to make such a conclusion.It seems quite odd to me that you would conclude that Bergoglio is not a formal heretic when he has repeatedly made heretical pronouncements, doubled and tripled down, refused filial correction from bishops and is now making up new sins and allying with other pertinacious heretics—even to go so far as to co-author one of their books. I think you have to ignore heaps of evidence to think he is merely a material heretic who would self-correct if he was merely given the proper guidance in Church teaching.Whether or not this means he loses office, I think is a matter of subjective inference in Canon Law, but as an informed catholic, I can acknowledge errors from him, caution others to not engage in them and not follow them myself."The scribes and the Pharisees have sitten on the chair of Moses. All things therefore whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do: but according to their works do ye not; for they say, and do not." [Matthew 23:2-3]

asimovsdog (2): Apart from MarcellusFaber shilling sedevacantism again, it is only formal heresy if the person in question knows it to be against Catholic teaching. The definition of formal heresy is "\*\*conscious\*\* knowledge that it is contradictory to the teachings of the Church". If you put yourself into the mind of a modernist, the pope probably does think that what he is doing is helping the Church, although he is absolutely mistaken. He is a material heretic, no doubt, but for it to be formal, he'd have to be condemned by the Catholic Church, and since he is the head, that's going to be difficult.Even if the pope publicly professes heresy (as Francis did a couple days ago), no matter how public it is, he is not a formal heretic, only a material one.https://dominicansavrille.us/little-catechism-on-sedevacantism-part-i/https://dominicansavrille.us/little-catechism-on-sedevacantism-part-2/https://dominicansavrille.us/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Refutation-of-Sedevacantism.pdfhttps://catholiccandle.org/2024/09/26/cc-in-brief-sedevacantist-questions/The CMRI article is okay, but sedevacantism is not.

None (1): "It seems quite odd to me that you would conclude that Bergoglio is not a formal heretic when he has repeatedly made heretical pronouncements, doubled and tripled down, refused filial correction from bishops and is now making up new sins and allying with other pertinacious heretics—even to go so far as to co-author one of their books. I think you have to ignore heaps of evidence to think he is merely a material heretic who would self-correct if he was merely given the proper guidance in Church teaching."I'm obviously not defending Pope Francis, what he says is grave and materially heretic and leads many people to lose the faith as I said above. However, has he said anything about refusing a single dogma? Because that's what we would need to qualify him as a formal heretic. Even if a lot of the things he says are obviously be one day condemned as heretical by the Church, this is not the case. In order to be a formal heretic you have to formally refuse a dogma, Pope Francis has done a lot of bad things but he hasn't done that yet. Being obstinate is not necessarily even a doctrinal issue, and even in doctrine just because you keep disagreeing with a doctrinal point, as long as you don't deny an infallibly defined truth, you're not a formal heretic. My point was of course not to say "Saint Thomas Aquinas = Pope Francis", but rather to show that the definition of heresy can be tricky, and that accusing someone of formal heresy isn't something we can do from our personal judgment without prudence. Saint Thomas is one of the greatest saints ever, Pope Francis arguably one of the worst popes ever. The big difference with their material heresies is indeed that the dogma hadn't been proclaimed yet. Material heresy just means someone says something that objectively goes against the faith, wether the person saying it is culpable or not. So yes, technically, Saint Thomas Aquinas was a material heretic (since what he belive on one subject was against the faith), but of course that doesn't mean he should be held accountable because the dogma he argued against hadn't been proclaimed yet. Pope Francis on the other hand has the possibility to know that what he preaches goes against tradition, and also as a pope he has a much greater responsability. However, he doesn't have yet, thank God, negated publically any dogma.This might sound like a useless distinction, and also might sound like trying to diminsh the gravity Pope Francis' actions and words; it really isn't. The whole point of the SSPX in using that distinction is simply to try to have a balanced and precise judgment of the crisis. Also if the Church really didn't have a Pope, or if this pope was a formal heretic, this would be a great blow to the indefectibility of the Church, we don't want that.Take care!

# Post 424: If you used to be against the SSPX, what made you change your mind?

Author: DevilishAdvocate1587

Score: 22

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1fveozl/if\_you\_used\_to\_be\_against\_the\_sspx\_what\_made\_you/

For me it was a couple of different things, but reading Kennedy Hall's book defending the society has been a real eye opener so far. Kennedy makes the point that one act of disobedience doesn't automatically put one into schism, so even if Archbishop Lefebvre committed disobedience, it doesn't make him a schismatic. He also mentions how Pope John Paul II committed similar actions while behind the Iron Curtain and during Ostpolotik. In general, I like the arguments that he makes in that book.The SSPX also seems to have the most balanced and reasonable view on the crisis in the Church. It doesn't go so far into sedevacantism, which really does seem to cause despair, but it also doesn't compromise on the Catholic faith instituted by our Lord, Jesus Christ.I'm also convinced that the SSPX is the reason why the Latin Mass has been preserved in the face of so much suppression. I believe that the SSPX is key to restoring the traditional Roman Rite.

CatholicFuturist (11): I, like many, just believed what was told to me about the SSPX and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, that they were a bunch of fringe schismatics who thought they were better than everyone else and that Lefebvre was a radical.One of my first impressions of the SSPX after I decided to look into them was this [podcast](https://podcasters.spotify.com/pod/show/militantthomist/episodes/Saturday-Morning-Stream-SSPX-Edition-w-Jerome-and-Dende-e2g6o8s), and it was quite good.I watched the documentary on Lefebvre's life and was sold. He was no doubt a saintly man who loved God and wanted the world to know Him. His work in preserving the Latin Mass and tradition serves to vindicate his legacy everyday.Even people who dislike the SSPX and Lefebvre have to admit that he was, by all accounts, a very holy man, who, even though they disagree with his actions in defying Rome, completely understand where he was coming from in the consecrations.

None (8): I actually have never read any books about the SSPX. I never needed any convincing. It was through prayer that I was lead to them. The first time I walked into the chapel, I knew I was safe. I knew God had prepared the SSPX to be a refuge of souls. To this day I've never read any books about them.

Jattack33 (6): I still don’t attend the SSPX but I used to be 100% against them, I have attended once when I was abroad. What changed my mind was more clearly seeing the Crisis in the Church and realising that Archbishop Lefebvre wasn’t some nutter who loved Latin and hated the Pope, but a genuinely Catholic Bishop who wanted to hand down the faith as it was handed down to him.

Fresh\_Fisherman\_3632 (3): Visiting a chapelI had never experienced a Catholic Church like that before. I knew that this was the real deal. Pure unadulterated Catholicism, the faith of my forefathers. > Lord grant us priests > Lord grant us holy priests > Lord grant us many holy priests> Lord grant us many holy religious vocations> Lord grant us many holy catholic familiesI said to myself “there is no way that this can be a bad thing” - the thought was laughable

Key-Entrepreneur3475 (1): Il est possible de sacrer un évêque avec un accord implicite du pape, mais jamais contre l'accord du pape. Il y a des définitions infaillibles sur ce sujet dans le concile de Trente. Il est de droit divin que seul le pape peut accepter un évêque dans l'Église. Ne pas respecter cela, comme l'a dit Pie XII, est un sacrilège qui entraîne l'excommunication. Dans Jean 10:1, il est écrit que seul celui qui passe par la porte est un pasteur légitime.De plus, pour exercer, ils inventent une juridiction de suppléance universelle qui n'existe pas dans le droit canon.La FSSPX a de bons prêtres, mais elle ne peut pas être le chemin car, comme tous les schismatiques, elle s'envoie elle-même. C'est extrêmement grave (depuis 2000 ans, c'est condamné par l'Église). Je peux vous apporter des textes précis qui condamnent cela fermement.La FSSPX doit rentrer dans l'Église, sinon elle ne peut pas devenir une œuvre de Dieu.

Key-Entrepreneur3475 (1): Il est possible de sacrer un évêque avec un accord implicite du pape, mais jamais contre l'accord du pape. Il y a des définitions infaillibles sur ce sujet dans le concile de Trente. Il est de droit divin que seul le pape peut accepter un évêque dans l'Église. Ne pas respecter cela, comme l'a dit Pie XII, est un sacrilège qui entraîne l'excommunication. Dans Jean 10:1, il est écrit que seul celui qui passe par la porte est un pasteur légitime.De plus, pour exercer, ils inventent une juridiction de suppléance universelle qui n'existe pas dans le droit canon.La FSSPX a de bons prêtres, mais elle ne peut pas être le chemin car, comme tous les schismatiques, elle s'envoie elle-même. C'est extrêmement grave (depuis 2000 ans, c'est condamné par l'Église). Je peux vous apporter des textes précis qui condamnent cela fermement.La FSSPX doit rentrer dans l'Église, sinon elle ne peut pas devenir une œuvre de Dieu.

# Post 425: A book about Padre Pio

Author: XaviGamer144

Score: 3

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1frn6wc/a\_book\_about\_padre\_pio/

Hello, I would like to ask for any reccomended books about Padre Pio

Glittering\_Dingo\_943 (2): Last mass/final mass of Padre Pio - Angelus press

# Post 426: Inquiring about the SSPX

Author: Crusaderhope

Score: 22

Comments: 47

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1fk9c1n/inquiring\_about\_the\_sspx/

I am a seminarian in my first year of theology, I want to understand the SSPX because I see it as a resistance movement against modernism.My reasons: after the recent Pope Francis statements I realized the Church Crises is way more deep than I first saw, seeing the list of sins against sinodality made me shocked, as a seminarian attending College I know a lot of good men who love latin and wish to be more traditional priests, but publicly they hide this fact because you can quite litterraly be kicked out of the vocacional because of love for the latin language.So I want to support the SSPX as a resitance movement because I cant support this blatant hijacking of the church, so I ask you, how does this sub views the SSPX movement and what does it get right in your opnions?

dbaughmen (11): The SSPX is a blessing from Almighty God. As mentioned before in this sub, in the crisis of the church - the official positions of the SSPX are true, moderate and balanced. The SSPX has the blessing of having such holy priests among its ranks who have truly upheld the Catholic faith. It has spread throughout the world and brought the traditional sacraments to people. Although ‘controversial’ we have the protection and guidance of our dear Abp Lefebvre who no one, not even his now atheist ex seminarians, or those who split with him deny that he is a saint, he has given us the groundwork for the mission of the SSPX today. I encourage you to inquire about an SSPX seminary for formation, you’d receive such an amazing experience at St Thomas Aquinas Seminary, free of all persecution! I pray for your vocation, dear brother, Laudetur Jesus Christus!

None (3): I am from an SSPX family and one of my brothers just got ordained by it! I see the SSPX as having the best doctrinal position in the current crisis in the Church. Refusing to compromise on any inch of Catholic doctrine, no matter the consequences. You can summarize it in 2 points:- since Vatican II Catholic doctrine (especially on the question of the dogma of Christ the king) is in danger in the hierarchy of the Church - the NO Mass is ambiguous on the nature of Mass (doesn't portray it anymore as the sacrifice of Christ, leading to many people not realizing that anymore) and therefore we should say the traditional Mass.You should consider talking directly to an sspx priest, they'd love to tell you about it! Many positions of the SSPX are caricatured by everyone (including the SSPX faithful haha) so it's better to speak directly to the priests, it's their job. I'll pray for you!

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (4): The SSPX believes the new mass is intrinsically evil which is usually one of the hardest things to get behind for certain people. I think that’s what you should look into and also look into to see the manner in which Lefebvre was suspended and then excommunicated. Also look at anti SSPX arguments. I really think you should join some sort of TLM society

craft00n (1): Hi. This sub is by faithfuls for faithfuls. Many people here, including me, disagree with SSPX on numerous points, and some pretend that their view is the one of the SSPX. This subReddit isn't trustworthy in term of "getting closer to SSPX.If you want to get in touch with SSPX where you are, don't hesitate to contact the local SSPX priests. I would also recommend "Open letter to confused catholics" from Absp Lefebvre, it was his starting move, tbh.

LeNonFrenchie (1): Read Archbishop Lefebvre's "Open Letter to Confused Catholics." It opened my eyes to the issues. You can listen to it for free as well on Apple Podcasts or Spotify as the SSPX podcast has made it available. Also listen to/read "They Have Uncrowned Him" by the Archbishop. Both of these will summarize Lefebvre's stance and that of the Society for you.

minimcnabb (1): As a seminarian, the best thing you can do is stick with it and become a diocesan Priest.I do say this as someone who loves and was converted in the TLM and would be described as a traditionalist.I thank God that the SSPX came about because I really believe the TLM (and tradition) would be largely dead without Archbishop Lefebvre. Certainly the FSSP which I attend only exists because of the SSPX.That said the FSSP, SSPX and other groups are basically sidelined and neutralized; right where the modernists want them. They aren't want for numbers but all the institutional power, and most of the souls reside within the regular parishes and diocese. This is why TC and other restrictions target the diocesan latin mass while the other groups are untouched.The hierarchy doesn't care if people are "playing Traditional" in isolated churches in parallel to the power structure based around the diocese.We need traditionalist churches in the regular parishes to clean up and celebrate Mass to the best of their abilities with the rubrics available, teach tradition, make confession, and the other sacraments available again. Eventually, these traditional diocesan Priests will become Bishops and Cardinals with real influence. The SSPX is overflowing with Priests, but the diocesan parishes are really struggling and dying off. In my area, they're importing priests from abroad because they have no organic vocation.God bless you.

feelinggravityspull (1): Hi OP. I suggest you discuss your questions with the SSPX directly. I don't know what country you're in, but I'm sure they would be more than happy to field questions from a seminarian.The primary mission of the SSPX is to preserve and nourish the Catholic priesthood. They do this not only by forming their own members, but also by reaching out and supporting priests outside the Society, to whatever extent they are able. You can find contact information for them on their website.

Crusaderhope (3): How do I contact the St Thomas Aquinas seminary ?

dbaughmen (1): As to what it gets right - it gets right the problems in the Papacy, and the Council and its numerous errors. And it gets right the hypocrisy of current church leaders, it is such a sad thing to see!

Crusaderhope (3): The SSPX positions are interesting, because honestly NO was weaponized to become bad liturgy, and especially in some countries the bishops try to remove part of the sacrificial nature of mass to be a happy go, and even tho they cant do this, a lot of disobedient priests intentionally ommit from the mass, thanks for the prayers

Crusaderhope (3): I would've agreed if I havent watched a reverend novus ordo (by the heralds of the Gospel group), I swear theres some priests that make rite so incredible, and I have been to TLM too, but I will see some arguments, but I can agree that are some people who turns NO in a evil mass.Regardless I understand what SSPX means by this position and i do understand the necessity of not making concessions to a argument like, "oh we can allow this much", because progressively its bit by bit you can get into liberalism

Crusaderhope (1): Thanks.

Crusaderhope (6): Gonna be honest this is a stance I agree with 100%, the problem is the possibility of being hunted down, like the liberals when in power tend to be incredibly strict, the neighboor diocese forbids latin, explicitly, and its dying because of it, fortunaly im am in a better position, and I have a good mentor to help me with, he wrote books against sinodality and I am one of the first to see it, he also speaks hebrew fluently, im just going SSPX if the diocese just depose him as head of the community he leads

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (2): cleaning up the church from its temporary rotting core is not what the Saints did or taught. You can't fix cancer from within the cancer. you have to nuke it out of existence. SSPX does not have enough priests to serve all the hopeful parishoners requesting sacraments. though yes their seminary is at capacity as I understand it.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): "Get an awful Formation from Modernists in Seminaries filled with homosexuals and compromise on our beliefs to get Ordained in the New Rite so we can infiltrate the Modernists" No.

Crusaderhope (3): Thanks, I cant guarantee I will ever hold their positions if I am not in their society, but I obviously can help them because in my city they do good work, and are beloved by small communities, honestly the SSPX are nicer personally than their online reputation tends to paint them.

dbaughmen (4): I can send you contacts via DM and I can also give you some emails

Crusaderhope (2): Honestly I barely mind the council, because from my studies I can conclude it could have been used for traditional purposes as much (kinda) as it has been for liberals.But the language it uses is abominable and clearly intended for hijacking by leftists, im in favor of applying corrections.What I mind is the insane wave of liberals entering the ranks of the Catholic church, its like all bishops you see are promoting some sort of political propaganda, specially in my country, the national bishop association is awful, and showed its hate to the conservative politicians we had, and its blatant support of the leftist "dictator" we have elected.I cannot see all of this and assume they arent trying to destroy the church. I heard about priests that are against privatly praying the Magnificant, priests (my teacher) in favor of abortion, another one only joins my class with political party shirts (liberal), honestly all its missing is Pro LGBT, defense, which the franciscan friars would be prone to do.

Nycticorax1017 (1): What does it get wrong?

None (1): I agree that a lot of the abuse with the NO is local only and isn't from the Vatican, however the very fact that the NO opens the the possibility to make these changes (while the traditional rite is very coded and doesn't let a margin for personal choices) is not a good thing.But more importantly, the NO has problems that existed from its start, even before it was adapted into different languages and many abuses started to spawn. Maybe you've already read it, but in the traditionalist world there is a short but very important document that summarizes the issues of the NO. It was written by 2 famous cardinals right when the NO was published, and it's interesting how they saw the declined of faith coming just through the text of the NO, even before the local abuses.I'm putting below a link to this text, it's short and pretty factual so I strongly encourage you to read it!Btw I'm wondering, have you talked yet with an SSPX priest?I'll finish my rosary today at the intention of your vocation! God bless!https://angeluspress.org/blogs/catholic-doctrine/a-brief-critical-study-of-the-novus-ordo-missae?srsltid=AfmBOorClu5dTfFL376NkT5TAB1Z9i4px7bM4lLWlOQEVG5VRH41im-W

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (4): Well the reason why they believe it’s evil has to do with the v2 theology behind it and everything butchered and made ambiguous. So look into those things and THEN make a decision. The SSPX say aesthetics aren’t the question here.I guess one thing to think about that I thought of is that reverent novus ordos are really just TLM copy cats within the bounds of the NO missal. Isn’t it strange that the more reverent a NO is, the more it’s trying to imitate the TLM? The more “reverent” a NO is, the more similar it is to a TLM. I think this just leads me to believe that the TLM is objectively better and IS the standard, but idk about the new mass being sinful to go to… I’m still researching all of this lol.

LeNonFrenchie (1): Even when offered "reverently," the prayers of the new mass have been largely gutted of the sacrificial language. It must be ntoed that the new mass lies within the aesthetic choices of the priest and many conservative priests take pride in the fact that "their mass" is offered reverently. This is why Fr. Cekada called it the "work of human hands." The reverent NO mass is just as much the work of the priest as a clown mass, rather than being the work of God. This boils the holy sacrifice down to the result of choices of the priest

minimcnabb (2): We see all around the world that the liberals slowly infiltrated nearly every institution on the planet for decades.I feel like we will have to do the same thing to wrestle back institutional power.I hope I am wrong.God bless you for your vocation, and I pray he protects you.

Crusaderhope (2): Depends, we cant also risk being marginalized, the analogy is better if you substitute cancer with a virus, and traditional groups as defense cells, we need a lot more than a group that attacks head in a situation they can t decisevely win, it will just make the "cancer" alerted, and attack us, and because they are the majority of the church, we will be seen as the one in the wrong, like we have been for a while, like I said even latin is seem as schismatic behavior in a lot of seminaries

minimcnabb (1): What did the saints teach us to do? Do you think that the Vatican will eventually absorb the SSPX and ecclisia dei communities into the various diocese?I fear that the SSPX is setting up a parallel church that is at risk of straying ever further from Rome with no clear path to reconciliation. I truly am struggling with even attending even the FSSP because I know my "voice" is not really heard. The FSSP mission here is literally bursting at the seams in every metric while the majority of diocesan parishes appear to be on the path to die out (literally) within 5-10 years. Yet the success of the trad parishes is basically ignored as the millions of diocesan parishioners and the hierarchy move on as if we existed as a mere nuisance.Please don't take anything I said as an attack against rhe SSPX, it is really not, I am just trying to be realistic while I observe what is really going on in the Church.

feelinggravityspull (2): Yeah, online trads can sometimes act as nasty as online anti-trads. I was shocked by how warm and welcoming and, well, \*normal\* the SSPX chapel was when I first visited it. It's probably not like that everywhere, but I'm grateful for what I have.I know the priests at my chapel have friendly relationships with non-SSPX priests throughout the diocese, including diocesan, FSSP, and "independent" priests. They really just see their role as supporting and nurturing other priests, no matter whether they're in the Society or not.They'd be good for you to talk to, even if you aren't a member.

Crusaderhope (5): Alr I accept

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): The SSPX is founded on the reality that V2 and NOM were not of God. The issues you see with Pope Francis are just a more obvious manifestation of the Popes actual or implied heretical leaning beliefs since vatican 2 began teaching religious liberty, ecumenism, and collegiality, all of which abrogate what the Church did and taught the previous 1900 years Have you read anything by Lefebvre, or seen his documentary on youtube? Have you started the SSPX podcast yet? - [https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL8xNB7FRtiDNlCx6RSBEaIxd9S\\_SHSJKJ](https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL8xNB7FRtiDNlCx6RSBEaIxd9S\_SHSJKJ)

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Depends on who’s answering the question. Conservs might say the new mass being evil, sedes would say seeevacantism.

Crusaderhope (3): Its not sinful, i can agree that its evil in the sense of how people intended to use v2 plus not every church has the structure for a TLM, per maximum reverency, what I think its wrong is the possibility of no latin at all, and reverend NO even if not ad orientem dont feel like TLM copy cats, they just have Latin, lets look at it this way, can you imagine when latin mass first began people would freak out by it not being aramaic? TLM organically developed, and it should last forever, but we always had multiple rites and if we invalidate one because of it only being good when equal to TLM, is kinda far, theres always a delicate balance we can keep beetween whats reasonably changable per organic development, and what we can never allow.For example we should never allow for massive rock concerts at mass with light shows.(obvious example)But I Grant you this its evil how people hijacked the church with liberal agenda and V2 certaingly allowed for that, we are obviously a divided church and I would stand with SSPX 100% than, a modern theologianNote: Yes NO is not perfect and needs changes to the rite regardless of any stance, but not to be used for replacing TLM ever

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): if you read work of human hands (its by a sede but the book does not deal with that topic) or Michael Davies books, you will never look back on the NOM with fondness. It is not of God.

Crusaderhope (1): Obviously your right, if they didnt changed the missal language again, it might be because im from brazil, but the mass I attend has sacrificial language, especially on the consecration of the eucarist, its unfair to say this makes the mass invalid when there are other rites in the church never had said language, or are simmilar to what today we have, obviously mass simbolism is important, but given how many simbology we have in the new testmant, to restrain mass to one, is a error.dont get me wrong I dont approve irreverency in mass, but to slander mass done by other traditional groups because they dont fit your criteria, isnt something you have the right to do.

Crusaderhope (2): That means eventually trads are gonna be the Catholic majority, that is good, you cant ignore that forever, we will prob have some trad bishops in a few years, its obviously God is choosing traditional groups to survive thats his hand in action, its how he operates in old testament.Be brave and corageous, its good if the Fssp made themselves known, but with great providence comes great responsability and some wolves will infiltrate, and dw we had worst periods before, like waaaay worst, this is nothing compared to protestant reformationA good move is to see if there are any local Catholic seminaries receiving that traditional flow it would be good to have trad teachers on seminaries

Crusaderhope (1): I thank you for your approach, I understand your objections to v2 and I m not here to contest it, I too am shocked by them, infact I can appreciate lefebvre s take on it, and I know that he met with Dr plinio Corrêa, a personal hero of mine, but ofc Plineo took a different approach distinct from Lefebvre's but i can see simmilar method of thinking as Plineo writes in his books, I just see the starting point both took as non negotiable, and see lefebvre disagreed in one of these takes, that Plineo knew how to take advantage of, but I think both views are necessary, as we need to dialogue in both of those perspectives so we form a counter revolutionary movement on multiple fronts.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): The NO is sinful

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): I guess that’s another thing Im uncomfortable about, sedevacantism. It seems pretty common in SSPX communities. Hopefully the SSPX will get a bishop that was consecrated in the new rite and it will scare them away lol.Is this book pretty statistical? I bought the problem ofLiturgical reform but it feels like it’s performing eisegesis on Vatican 2… a study that says the amount of times the word sacrifice is said may help. What else do you have to say about Ottavani changing his mind even though his arguments are frequently used? Thanks!

LeNonFrenchie (1): The traditional offertory has been completely removed from the new mass which contains much of the sacrifical language. If the Eucharistic Prayer One is used (a modified version of the Roman canon) for the consecration, it still has some, but the offertory is still missing. Additionally, many of the prayers for most of the feasts were changed. Only approximately 13% of the old missal remains in the new, making them, effectively, two different rites. This isn't just in translations but in the official latin texts. Don't just believe me and the SSPX. Here's a good source on it from a non-SSPX writer: [https://www.newliturgicalmovement.org/2021/10/all-elements-of-roman-rite-mythbusting.html](https://www.newliturgicalmovement.org/2021/10/all-elements-of-roman-rite-mythbusting.html)

Crusaderhope (1): Than the church can defect, and Christ's promise failed us, what rhe church permits is what it permits, if it defect its because it was never the Church

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (2): Sedevecantism is not common in SSPX communities. If you haven't been in one, how would you know? listening to internet keyboard warriors?No its not statistical, but if you want to get to the bottom of these things you are going to have to man up and do the deep work to get clarity. I still say Ottaviani simply quieted down out of obedience to the Pope. It doesnt matter, anyway, the book and its claims stand on its own. Besides Ottaviani didn't even write it, he just guided it and communicated it. Des Lauries and Lefebvre wrote most of it.

Crusaderhope (1): Well thats weird if im not mistaken, my priest refers to the offertory as sacrifices, like now offer your sacrifices, it even uses old testmant language, I think the change is because we dont have the obligation to pay monthly to our parish anymore, and the sacrifice of the eucarist is sufficient because is a infinite sacrifice shed "pro multis", so probably was taken out to avoid doctrinal confusion on our salvation being works related, which is not fides formattas. I still hold TLM very preciously, but this is not sufficient evidence for mass invalidty, for that all sacrificial meanings would have to be removed from the rite

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (0): >Than the church can defect No because the Church did not promulgate the Novus Ordo, it was just forced on the Church by Modernist Hierarchs. Pope Paul VI even said that it was not infallibly promulgated

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Ok ok

LeNonFrenchie (1): The new "offertory" in English goes as follows. The Portugues should be the same but not in english obviously: "Blessed are you, Lord God of all creation, for through your goodness we have received the bread we offer you: fruit of the earth and work of human hands, it will become for us the bread of lifeBlessed are you, Lord God of all creation, for through your goodness we have received the wine we offer you: fruit of the vine and work of human hands, it will become for us our spiritual drink" If what your priest is saying is different than this, he may be using the old offertory. In that case, he should just be offering the old mass

Crusaderhope (0): The councils are not contigent to the will of ther participants so even if they wanted to ruin the church with it, the Holy spirit is not contigent on them and would make the council without error, thats the problem, im not saying I like v2, but I have to hope the most traditional interpretation possible is the true interpretation, and thats what many priests today seem to hold. Its unfortunate but is the truth, we can obviously just retract some ambiguities if the church becomes more traditional

Crusaderhope (0): Its like this, but the word Offer, is sinonimous in portuguese would be oferenda, which is a sinonimous with sacrificio (sacrifice), in the old testament the sacrifices would be called , sacrificios, oferendas and holocaustos, they have the same liturgical meaning. Hence it doesnt lose any meaning, and always struck as a sacrificial, so it would have this meaning for us: >"Blessed are you, Lord God of all creation, for through your goodness we have received the bread we give " as sacrifice" (oferenda) for you fruit of the earth and work of human hands, it will become for us the bread of lifeSince we have neolatin language I guess the meaning doesnt change, its probably a different issue in english

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): You are presupposing that V2 is an Ecumenical Council, it's not, it's a heretical robber council and its fruits prove such. No Pope has ever said that it was an infallible Ecumenical Council with Pope Paul VI saying the opposite, not to mention there's no Canons present in the Documents which were Traditionally considered to be the infallible parts of Ecumenical Councils

Fresh\_Fisherman\_3632 (1): Compare that to the old offertory:> P: Receive, O Holy Father, almighty and eternal God, this spotless host, which I, Thine unworthy servant, offer unto Thee, my living and true God, for my countless sins, trespasses, and omissions; likewise for all here present, and for all faithful Christians, whether living or dead, that it may avail both me and them to salvation, unto life everlasting. Amen.> : O God, Who in creating man didst exalt his nature very wonderfully and yet more wonderfully didst establish it anew: by the mystery signified in the mingling of this water and wine, grant us to have part in the Godhead of Him Who hath vouchsafed to share our manhood, Jesus Christ, Thy Son, Our Lord, Who liveth and reigneth with Thee in the unity of the Holy Ghost, God; world without end. Amen.> P: We offer unto Thee, O Lord, the chalice of salvation, beseeching Thy clemency that it may ascend as a sweet odor before Thy divine majesty, for our own salvation, and for that of the whole world. Amen.the new offertory comes from a Talmudic table blessing. It is a Jewish prayer over a meal - not an offering of an expiratory sacrifice for sin

# Post 427: The Arlington Carmelites.... I'm a little disturbed.

Author: Breifne21
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Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1fh2qrt/the\_arlington\_carmelites\_im\_a\_little\_disturbed/

So, I'm not an American, and my knowledge of the American Church and the SSPX in America is largely anecdotal and experienced online, rather than irl, so please forgive my ignorance. I have just read that the Arlington Carmel has come under the pastoral care and governance of the SSPX. Usually, I would be overjoyed by such news, but I've done some reading on this convent and I'm quite disturbed in what I've read about the numerous scandals that have emanated from it. I will not comment further in respect of the sisters of Carmel therein. Suffice to say, there appears to be significant difficulty with the Prioress and rather scandalous accusations, and admissions from the Prioress, not to mention some questions over the legitimacy of their seeking the care of the Society (in that it would appear, at first glance, to be less about preserving the traditional faith and more about retaining the position of the prioress). I have to say, I'm really disturbed by this development. It seems like a very questionable house and for the Society to agree to its pastoral governance, without seeking the removal of the Prioress, and seems to me to be a grave mistake and highly.... disturbing. There is legitimate resistance in preserving the faith, but in as much as can be, obedience and respect is due to the bishop and the Pope. There are some questions here over the soundness of the faith of these sisters, some credible accusations of Sedevacantism and dalliance with Vigano remain currently over the reputation of this monastery. Could someone with greater knowledge on the subject please correct my, hopefully mistaken, understanding of the situation?

dbaughmen (3): In my opinion as I have inside knowledge on the SSPX in America - I believe this was most definitely a step in the right direction. This sent a message saying that the SSPX does not compromise with ultra-modernists like those in Rome. The official position of the SSPX is to “recognise and resist” the Novus Ordo bishops and Pope, they are heretics, remember that. They are genuine modernists. We must always try to reunite with them but Abp Lefebvre tried before the consecrations and so did Bp Fellay in more recent times, and both were one sided games that they were playing with the society. So therefore, this shows them that the SSPX does pose a threat to modernism, which is what we want.

Impossible-Mind9143 (1): I was concerned in them as well, especially considering my parish is quite literally right next to them, but it’s a step in the right direction if anything else.

Breifne21 (5): \*In my opinion as I have inside knowledge on the SSPX in America - I believe this was most definitely a step in the right direction.\*Can you explain please?As far as I can see, the Prioress of this community has an extremely shady, and compromised, position. Likewise, the manner in which they withdrew from the care of their bishop raises a great many questions as to the virtue and soundness of this house. \*they are heretics, remember that.\*We have no authority to judge on the matter and vain speculation on the part of laity and ordinary clergy on the orthodoxy of the Holy Father is dangerous at best. So long as we can find nourishment in the spiritual life to our salvation, we should not spout accusations against the Holy Father or the hierarchy, we should merely continue on with our spiritual life as Catholics, just as we always have. \*So therefore, this shows them that the SSPX does pose a threat to modernism, which is what we want.\*Please explain? All I can see is that the SSPX has publicly recruited an extremely questionable prioress and an extremely questionable convent. Is this yet another Avrille, or Williamson?

MarcellusFaber (2): We are commanded in scripture to avoid heretics. How could we do this if we cannot or are not permitted to identify them? St Alphonsus in his \*Theologia Moralis\* also writes of the obligation to denounce heretical family members to the Inquisition. We also see in history that the laity have identified heretics before a judgement of the Church and rejected them,the case of Nestorius, who was patriarch of Constantinople, being one example. The strongest argument is likely that the Church is a visible institution and is one in Faith, meaning that it must be visibly united in Faith. If the laity cannot identify who are Her members and who are not, then this unity has been destroyed and what the Church teaches about Herself as a matter of Faith untrue. To the objection that there are some fringe cases in which it is difficult to tell whether a particular person is a Catholic or not, requiring an investigation and a judgement by authority, one should refer to the error of the beard; simply because it can be difficult to tell exactly when stubble becomes a beard does not prove that cleanshaven-ness or beards do not exist. None of this fits with the idea that we are not permitted or able to identify heretics.

# Post 428: Official view on Ordinariate mass?

Author: Objective\_Ad6378
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ff6pgu/official\_view\_on\_ordinariate\_mass/

Whilst I am well aware as to what the SSPX teaches in regard to the Norvus Ordo, do these teachings extend to the ordinariate liturgy or no? Thanks in advance.

dbaughmen (2): Same rules apply to the ordinariate as the Novus Ordo. I am personally not a fan of it

Nycticorax1017 (1): You are not a fan, as in you are subjectively opposed? You simply don't like that Mass?

dbaughmen (2): Their orders derive from the Novus Ordo and I don’t really want to go there. And the whole idea of the ordinariate isn’t that good, they must assimilate!

# Post 429: Buffalo diocese is rapidly closing, will the SSPX take one of the churches?

Author: Smooth\_Ad\_5775
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1fdxm2w/buffalo\_diocese\_is\_rapidly\_closing\_will\_the\_sspx/

So many beautiful churches are closing, I’m wondering if the SSPX community would consider purchasing one of them? literally any traditional Catholic community, just NOT a Muslim one.

dbaughmen (19): Some Novus Ordo Bishops are REALLY ignorant and will refuse to sell to “schismatics” but prefer to sell to the Mohammedans (muslims)

obiwankenobistan (6): Something tells me once the NO Fanatics kill a diocese, it probably isn’t coming back.

BrodyJerome (2): We are already overstretched in many ways. The main issue is that there is not enough priests.

NtGiL\_29 (1): They already have Our Lady of the Rosary in Buffalo, although it looks like a smaller building. Could happen but not likely. Heck, I've even heard of diocesan TLM communities getting barred by the diocese from purchasing new properties for their growing parishes.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (3): Let’s pray for a change of heart

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (3): It may have been sex abuse but nevertheless, pray and spread the news to the society

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): I guess I’m thinking the community that’s there could move to a bigger church

obiwankenobistan (2): Actually, good point. I'd be really interested to see what the statistics look like on sex abuse from SSPX/FFSP/ICKSP clergy versus Novus Ordo clergy.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (7): Sadly the sspx has its own stories. One of the victims killed himself I believe. I praying a rosary on Friday for sec abuse victims and for the decrease in cases across the church. Please pray with me and also pray for these buffalo churches to be bought 👍

jaqian (4): Most of the sex abuse was by priests who were ordained before Vatican II, so tradition isn't a good argument.

obiwankenobistan (3): Will do. I've been working on improving my prayer life lately - trying to build the habit of praying the Rosary daily. I will add that to my intentions.

obiwankenobistan (1): I wouldn't say that simply being ordained a long time ago is the same as being a traditionally-minded Priest or even a Priest who received a traditional-minded formation. For example, Theodore McCarrick was ordained in 1958 and I think we'd all agree he is \*not\* a traditional Catholic.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Great

# Post 430: Question on online ordering & parcel deliveries on Sundays

Author: None

Score: 3

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1fa0jvg/question\_on\_online\_ordering\_parcel\_deliveries\_on/

Hi. I would just like to ask if one sins against keeping Sundays holy if let's say, one orders online an item before a Sunday but its delivery ends up happening on a Sunday (where one pays it in cash)? I apologize in advance if this question may sound too scrupulous or has already been asked before here on this subreddit.

dbaughmen (2): It is definitely not a sin as you are not working, just walking to the door snd signing for something. A sin would be working 8 hours nonstop on a Sunday!

Piancol (2): It's not like you control the schedules of the delivery company and even if you did that would not be a sin... such a non-event is barely a thing at all.

jaqian (1): It isn't a sin to work on Sunday if that is your job.

None (1): Thank you!

None (1): Thank you!

# Post 431: Why isn't Good Friday a Holy Day of Obligation?

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 14

Comments: 5

URL: https://i.redd.it/5tzk4poyuvmd1.jpeg

Its the Lords Passion! Its just as important as Christmas I think, if not more. Is it not considered a Holy Day somewhere? If not, why?

Piklikl (8): How can it be a Holy Day of Obligation if there’s no Mass to attend? Also Easter is more important that Good Friday, and if I’m not mistaken Christmas also “outranks” Good Friday.

Glittering\_Dingo\_943 (3): Because it’s not a sacrifice of the Mass

Piancol (2): That's a good question that I've asked myself too but for some reason I never asked a priest or researched more about it. I'm pretty sure there's a very good reason behind it so I'll stick around to read what others come to share...

liamsgirl (2): They do have Good Friday services with pre consecrated hosts...what better way to commemorate the sacrifice of Our Lord, FOR US, than going to His house and praying? I've gone all my life.

Jerailu (1): The order of the life of Christ are as follow: the Resurrection, the Incarnation (ie. Christmas) and then the Passion.But it should be noted that Triduum basically means Three days in one because the whole thing from the last moments of Our Lord to his Resurrection are the literal same moment in time, it's a whole united movement that's why in every account you generally "He died and came back from the deads for us", it's the same action. When you look at the Nicene creed it's the same action: “For us men and for our salvation he came down from heaven; by the power of the Holy Spirit he became incarnate of the Virgin Mary, and was made man. For our sake he was crucified under Pontius Pilate; he suffered death and was buried; on the third day he rose again; in accordance with the Scriptures.”

# Post 432: “Discrepancy” in GIRM concerning kneeling for communion?

Author: None

Score: 3

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1f8664o/discrepancy\_in\_girm\_concerning\_kneeling\_for/

My Priest who is the sole canon lawyer for the Diocese said that a \*Pastor\* can deny communion to those who kneel because of the last sentence in paragraph 160, Chapter 4, section 1 of the GIRM (Holy See’s version only, curiously). I’ve \*highlighted\* it below.“The faithful are not permitted to take the consecrated bread or the sacred chalice by themselves and, still less, to hand them from one to another. The norm for reception of Holy Communion in the dioceses of the United States is standing. Communicants should not be denied Holy Communion because they kneel. \*Rather, such instances should be addressed PASTORALLY, by providing the faithful with proper catechesis on the reasons for this norm.”\*He said that this was a “mysterious addition of unknown origin”, no one knows how it ended up there, and that it’s also not written in Latin (don’t remember what language he said it was in). But, now since it’s there, essentially he can non-initially enforce it (which he says he does not necessarily want or need to do, but he still has that authority).Concerning the “discrepancy”, I noticed in the GIRM on the USCCB website, that peculiar last sentence “of unknown origin” is missing, it’s \*only\* in the GIRM on the Holy See’s website. I feel this is sort of a crucial difference because it can make or break someone’s argument depending on which version they’re reading from concerning the faithful’s right to kneel for communion.Would appreciate anyone’s sincere input on this, please fill in the blanks if I’m missing something here.

Cathain78 (6): I wouldn’t waste your time, they will basically do what they want in my experience. And so long as they aren’t saying a TLM then chances of the bishop or anyone else causing a fuss are minimal. My old parish priest refused to give my wife or I Communion on the tongue (we were standing) and arranged to meet us after Mass one week after he denied reception on the tongue for the third time. His “pastoral “ catechises consisted of telling us it’s better to recieve on the hand because you are actually “asking for Jesus”. He then mumbled some stuff about priests not being special, the Church getting things wrong in the past (he was clearly going down the whole Protestant idea of the Priesthood of Believers) and finished with an ultimatum that we had to receive Communion there and then…but only on the hand.During this conversation, I told him neighbouring parishes allowed reception on the tongue - he said he didn’t care. And when I brought up the GIRM, he sneered and said “That will all be changing soon”.Due to this we left and never returned. A couple of weeks later we ended up at the SSPX and have never looked back. And what an absolute blessing that has been for me and my family.God truly works in mysterious ways.

None (1): How was the Mass like at that priest’s parish?

Cathain78 (2): I mean, nothing too outrageous by Novus Ordo standards. Largely elderly congregation, young man playing the usual modern hymn list on a piano, lay readers, children sent to another room for 20 mins for the “Children’s Liturgy” (ie. Drawing pictures of doves or rainbows), the ubiquitous extraordinary Eucharistic ministers slapping Christ into people’s hands, , the “risen Jesus” rather than a proper crucifix, etc. I mean we aren’t talking about 20 min speed reading express masses, or priest walking around the altar playing the guitar and speaking in tongues, like some Masses I’ve attended or been aware of over the decades.That said his attitudes are still certainly questionable. We saw the host being dropped several times (once involving my wife). A parishioner had to run up, pick Our Lord up, and consume it, while the priest looked on uninterested. That suggested to me either he despised Our Lord, or else had no belief in the Real Presence. This is what prompted my wife to try revert back to reception on the tongue (which had been suspended during Covid). Her third and final attempt led the priest to trying to force the host into her hands, leading to her jumping aside to avoid him.After we left that parish soon afterwards, we travelled to a parish where the priests were Jesuits. A beautiful old church (albeit the altar was not completely free of VII vandalism). However the sermon was focused around the Synod on Synodality, which made us uneasy. As we left we met a woman who had travelled from another far away parish. When I asked what brought her there, she looked sad and sheepishly explained that she remembered it from when she was studying in teacher college. She felt she couldn’t attend her own parish anymore. She said they had completely removed the tabernacle and it felt more like a Protestant prayer group. We shared our own experience as the reason as to why we were there. As we walked out, I told my wife that I knew of somewhere a few streets away that offered the TLM. She said she was willing to have a look. Unfortunately we had missed Mass but lifted a few leaflets and left. I explained about the SSPX to my wife at home later and she agreed to go back and try it the next Sunday. What an experience. A High Mass. The smell of incense pervading, the silence, the rood screen, the Asperges, the Gregorian chant from the Schola, the homily, the demeanour of the people, the bows and genuflections and constant signs of reverence, the people kneeling at the altar rail waiting to recieve Our Lord. When Mass was ended we were positively beaming. I think my first word was “Wow!”It felt like I had spent an hour in Heaven, been granted a foretaste. If that was Heaven, I’d take it in a heartbeat. My wife was in full agreement. She said she actually felt angry later that our generation had been robbed of that experience. We spoke to the priests and told him our story, and how we had met a woman in a similar sad situation. He said it was sad but increasingly common that Roman Catholics were becoming Roaming Catholics, trying to find a parish which still preserved some modicum of Catholicism.As we left and walked downstairs of the chapel, my young son said “Dad, I love the Latin Mass. I want to be an altar boy”.That never happened after the Children’s Liturgy, that’s for sure.

None (0): How utterly depressing. Our Roman tradition has been nearly completely suppressed by priests who seemingly lost the faith. If the Novus Ordo were to be performed in a manner similarly to the TLM, with incense, chants, and rails, we would be in a much better position; not to say that it would be better than a TLM, though.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): No... Quote on quote "Revererent Novus Ordos" are just a stop on the road for the destruction of the Catholic Faith. Keep in mind NO's at their start were just as you described...

Cathain78 (1): Just the same as Cranmer’s Transitional Mass for the Anglican Church. A stepping stone on the wrong road.

# Post 433: Unfortunately this SSPX chapel looks neglected.

Author: colekken

Score: 5

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1f56ezx/unfortunately\_this\_sspx\_chapel\_looks\_neglected/

I’m writing this with good intentions, hoping that someone affiliated with the church might see it and take steps to improve its appearance. The church in question is the "Queen of the Miraculous Medal" SSPX Chapel in Bryant, AR.Unfortunately, the chapel currently looks neglected. I drove by today and noticed that the parking lot is overgrown with weeds, the exterior paint is peeling, and there’s a deteriorating mobile home next door that detracts from the overall appearance. Given the chapel's modest size, I’m curious why it hasn’t been maintained better.I also noticed that Mass is only held twice a month. Does the priest not reside in Arkansas? Thank you for your attention to these concerns.

Piklikl (8): “If not me, then who; if not now, then when.”I totally agree that the attendees of this chapel would do well to make sure the chapel grounds are well maintained, as well as help put the neighbors of the property. Unfortunately the only way I’ve found to influence people in that regard is to lead by example. If I see something that needs to be done, instead of trying to figure out who to tell, I simply do it myself.

dbaughmen (6): SSPX priests are in gravely in scarce, there even is a Priest who flies from Colorado to Alaska sometimes just for sacraments. With only twice a month and no one maintaining it full time, it is really hard for these dear Priests

NtGiL\_29 (2): The closest priory looks like it might be St. Louis? Honestly I would be shocked if a priest lives there when Mass is only said twice a month. Probably one of those deals where they fly in for the weekend.

BothPhilosophy1839 (1): Would any of y’all like to get together sometime and address the needs of repairing or doing maintenance to the outside?

colekken (2): Ah, well I don't live there. Just passed through 👍

BothPhilosophy1839 (1): I also feel terrible about this, but I was going to go to the NO mass today but missed it due to sleeping too much. Was going to go to the SSPX mass at 4:30 but noticed mass wasn’t available during this Sunday. But I’m willing to help out in anyway possible to make this parish better whether cutting grass or painting something.

# Post 434: Where can I find a response to John Salzas claims against supplied jurisdiction?

Author: Smooth\_Ad\_5775

Score: 3

Comments: 29

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1f4cjee/where\_can\_i\_find\_a\_response\_to\_john\_salzas\_claims/

https://www.youtube.com/live/gd0OhVy1JtM?si=IrgT1PjD\_kShtVGIThe part of the video that talks about it is titled “Canon legal Errors of SSPX.”

No\_Construction5455 (2): Pope Benedict XVI removed the bogus excommunications, Francis gave them faculties, what more need be said?

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): A lot. The reason why he lifted the excommunications was so they could be reunited and the reason Francis gave them faculties is because he thought all their marriages and confessions were invalid which would be terrible. Even the orthodox have faculties and they’re in schism. None of this indicates that they have supplied jurisdiction for the other sacraments. Do you have a response to Salzas argument?

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (3): No the orthodox do not have Faculties whatsoever, Faculties can only be given to members of the Church. ""Faculties can only be used in favour of members of the Church who are not disqualified by ecclesiastical penalties or censures." [https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05748a.htm](https://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05748a.htm) Secondly Canon Law clearly proves the SSPX has supplied jurisdiction, Canon 1335 § 2. "If a censure prohibits the celebraion of sacraments or sacramentals or the placing of an act of governance, the prohibition is suspended whenever it is necessary to care for the faithful in danger of death. If a latae sententiae censure has not been declared, \\*\\*the prohibition is also suspended whenever a member of the faithful requests a sacrament or sacramental or an act of governance; a person is permitted to request this for any just cause.\\*\\*"

No\_Construction5455 (1): Yes, as he states, the Cannon prevents the consecration if it leads to the ruination of souls. He does not specify what souls have been, nor will be. To say it was independent of the Roman Pontiff is erroneous, ABL felt that his time was nearing end, and Rome said he could, just had not given the full authority to, but kept stonewalling him. He did what he, in the interest of SAVING souls, was necessary, I am over simplifying it, but his examples use just as many contextual errors as have been thrown out since 1988.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Thanks for your response!Are you saying that the orthodox confessions are invalid because they don’t have faculties? How does the Eastern Orthodox being under a different rite fit into all of this? And what does the church say about how one can request a sacrament from a suspended priest? How does one make such a request? If I ask my bishop to go to an SSPX priest he’ll say no I bet considering there are diocesan TLMs. I am very confused right now

None (1): [deleted]

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): I respect your response but just because ABL in his mind thought he was doing the right thing, doesn’t make it the right thing. We can argue if it was or not, but as much as the SSPX intentions go, their situation is still extremely complicated. The SSPX really have no ties with the conciliar church judicially and operate separately. This is just a blunt summary of my thoughts over the time in between our responses. I really think the most prudent thing to do in this situation is go to a diocesan TLM. The SSPX justify everything they do under crisis mode, but it’s not a crisis if we have a diocesan TLM near us. Hope through prayer and research we reach the same point. God bless you and your Holy Week.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): >Are you saying that the orthodox confessions are invalid Yes, if they received Faculties they would be valid, unfortunately they are both heretics and schismatics, thus cannot receive such. >How does the Eastern Orthodox being under a different rite fit into all of this? The Canon Law of the Eastern Catholic Churches states the same >And what does the church say about how one can request a sacrament from a suspended priest? See the relevant Canon, for any Just Cause >How does one make such a request? Attending such. >If I ask my bishop to go to an SSPX priest he’ll say no I bet Much like the Arian Bishops during the Crisis would say no to people attending those few Priests and Bishops (i.e St Athanasius and the Bishop of Cagliari) who stood firm with the Faith

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): Could you summarize the core points? I can't stand reading that ex freemason. Lots of jargon and legalism.

No\_Construction5455 (1): I would love to go to a diocesan TLM, if one were being offered. But none are, and my only choice is the SSPX, where we pray for the Pope and the local bishop during the mass.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): How is attending a chapel a request? Where can I find this definition of a request found somewhere

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): I just did some research, the orthodox don’t need to receiver faculties from the pope because they are incardinated in a diocese and have jurisdiction. Their confessions are valid.Either way, the orthodox were not given faculties as John salza claimed, to my knowledge at this point…I’m not sure though

None (1): [deleted]

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Dang that’s terrible that there’s none. Easier said than done but could you ever try getting a Latin Mass in your diocese? There’s probably others that want the same and your bishop might be moved if he realizes he’s keeping people from the SSPX. Also easier said than done, I think you should just go to the Novus Ordo as awful as it is. I used to think it was intrinsically Protestant and thus offensive to God, but even if the motives were Protestant, nothing about the NO is in it of itself Protestant. It’s just a mutilated Catholic liturgy, but still Catholic. Finding out that Ottavani later said he didn’t have a problem with the Novus Ordo and taking back his “intervention” also gave me a different perspective. I read The Problem of the liturgical reform too, and it expresses valid concerns, definitely some deficiencies compared to the Tridentine mass, but even after reading it I found that the NO is not intrinsically Protestant since it technically doesn’t express Protestant belief, to my view at least. I bet your diocese needs you way more than that SSPX parish lol. But I know that you’re in a situation that’s really tricky so may God help you do what’s best.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): Common sense, if you're attending with the SSPX you are requesting and desiring for the "Sacrament or Sacramental or an act of governance" provided by them

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): >because they are incardinated in a diocese and have jurisdiction No they are not incardinated in a Diocese and do not have Jurisdiction. Their Bishops are valid but do not have any jurisdiction whatsoever to provide that due to them being outside of the Church. What are you on about? Heretics and schismatics are not members of the Church, of course they cannot govern the Church!

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): I'll slog through it eventually hopefully. Just tired now

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): They govern on their own since they are under a different rite and canon law.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Did you read it

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): - They govern on their own And this is binding, how? They have no authority. They are outside the Church. They are heretics and schismatics well along the road to Hellfire unless they repent. What's difficult to understand? - since they are under a different rite and canon law Yep. And they reject the appropriate Eastern Authorities and the Eastern Canon Law showcases they do not have that authority.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): Not yet, probably when I get back home

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): I wouldn’t say along the road to hellfire…most are oblivious. Nevertheless,they are in schism. . I searched it up though and The Church said that they are apostolic churches so they have valid sacraments.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Whay about now.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus. Outside of the Church there is no salvation. If you deny this you are a heretic. Orthodoxy is sinful, sacrilege, schism, heresy. They don't have valid Sacraments for those which require jurisdiction however. Such as Confession.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): You down for tomorrow?

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Yea but I doubt most of them are culpable to the schism. If someone is validly baptized, are they not baptized loosely into the Church? Are they not apart of the Church in a certain way?

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): -Yea but I doubt most of them are culpable to the schism If you follow a schism, you are a schismatic. If you follow a heresy, you are a heretic. -If someone is validly baptized, are they not baptized loosely into the Church? Are they not apart of the Church in a certain way? What? Are Baptized Atheists apart of the Church?

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Good point. But following a heresy or a schism when you have no knowledge that it is such I would argue is not a mortal sin since people do not know they are wrong and they do not know how they are wrong. I doubt the average oriental orthodox knows how miaphysitism is heretical

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): Orthos have no knowledge of Catholicism? Have you ever spoken with an Ortho ever?

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Thats not what I said

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): That's what you're implying. Unless you're speaking heresy, thus I chose the most charitable interpretation.

# Post 435: Attending two daily low masses in a row?

Author: Smooth\_Ad\_5775

Score: 1

Comments: 17

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1f4bs6v/attending\_two\_daily\_low\_masses\_in\_a\_row/

Does anybody do this considering how short some low masses are?

dbaughmen (2): I don’t think priests do two low masses in a row daily, not consecutive, at chapels there only one daily mass. The private low mass has a beauty to it

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): On one day there is two in a row. Can one attend both and take communion at both?

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (4): No, you can attend Mass as much as is practical but out of respect you can only receive communion once per day

dbaughmen (1): Of course!!! One can take communion every minute if one wishes

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): I thought I could receive twice? Where could I find teaching on this

jaqian (1): Canonically you are allowed to receive twice in one day > Yes, you may receive twice in one day, although the Church provides guidelines that need to be followed. The Code of Canon Law provides that a person may receive Holy Communion a second time, provided he does so during a celebration of the Eucharist in which he participates (canon 917). The stipulation that one receive the second Communion at a Mass “in which he participates” doesn’t apply in the case of those in danger of death (canon 921).https://www.catholic.com/qa/holy-communion-twice-in-one-day

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (3): On the contrary we're actually limited to once per day outside of a few specified extreme scenarios. https://fsspx.news/en/news/eucharist-14-obligation-receive-communion-21498

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): 👍

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (1): ID say as always asking your priest when you have a question is best. Here's a link tho https://fsspx.news/en/news/eucharist-14-obligation-receive-communion-21498

jaqian (1): [Catholic.com](https://www.catholic.com/qa/holy-communion-twice-in-one-day)

dbaughmen (0): The article he says literally says twice

Old\_Detroiter (0): Novus Ordo allows it. Traditional chapels follow the traditional ways on this, once a day if one is in a state of grace. edit, saw the post about viaticum when one is sick but to be honest I would ask your priest.

dbaughmen (1): Oh sorry youre right, it says twice per day

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Yeah I read it

jaqian (2): You mean the Catholic Church allows it

Old\_Detroiter (1): No, I mean the Novus Ordo.

jaqian (2): The Novus Ordo is a liturgy and doesn't have a Canon, unlike the Catholic Church which has a Canon and a Pope. Who is your Pope? Lefevre?

# Post 436: Thoughts on 24/7 adoration chapels

Author: Smooth\_Ad\_5775

Score: 2

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1f3h56t/thoughts\_on\_247\_adoration\_chapels/

Title

obiwankenobistan (3): I don’t think we go far enough. We should have Masses 24/7 too

dbaughmen (1): Most SSPX chapels have 24 hour adoration sometimes, but since most are small there isnt daily mass, their should be

colekken (1): As long as there is always atleast one person with the Blessed Sacrament or the Blessed Sacrament is covered when no one is around, it sounds great.

jaqian (2): The priests have other duties they need to attend to. The Palmarians have 24/7 mass but no one receives Communion.

# Post 437: Thoughts on prom and homecoming

Author: Smooth\_Ad\_5775

Score: 4

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1f2u8kb/thoughts\_on\_prom\_and\_homecoming/

Are children permitted to go these events by the Church? If not, why do some Catholic schools have these events?

dbaughmen (3): Of course with the exemption of conventional music, I see no problem with this, let them have fun! Novus Ordo High schools do have dances

madmonk323 (3): I didn't go to my HS prom, but I feel the prom itself is fairly innocent. It's usually the debauchery afterwards that's not

Minute\_Television262 (2): Proms, homecomings, and similar dances and events need to be dumped, once and for all. Of course, there is nothing inherently sinful in the concept of a promenade dinner and dance. It's just the backdrop of decades of debauchery surrounding these and similar events. I remember going to some 7th and 8th grade dances and parties in the late 1980s, and it was horrible back then. These events were not at all innocent. I also was shocked when I saw what went on at "hotel parties" after the high school prom over 30 years ago. But it was parents who rented the hotel rooms and allowed it to occur. I can't even imagine what must go on now.

BrodyJerome (2): Yes!Can we stop being weird about these things and letting kids grow up normal?

Piancol (1): The Church doesn't go around sanctioning specific social events like that. What the Church does it's to teach us the doctrine and morals that then we would use to determine if this or that event is a danger to our souls.Proms, homecoming, graduations, birthdays, weddings, etc. are simply social gatherings that can be as benign or malignant as the people organising and attending make them to be. Of course, if there's alcohol in excess, indecent music and dancing, unsupervised teenagers of both sexes, it goes on after midnight, etc. Then your natural reason can tell you that it's not a place for a true Catholic to be.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): SSPX frowns on proms to say the least and doesnt' host them at any of their schools. the Church itself doesn't comment specifically on this to my knowledge.

# Post 438: SSPX and the Legion of Mary

Author: BlueLightning09

Score: 3

Comments: 11

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1f1t6nm/sspx\_and\_the\_legion\_of\_mary/

I saw that the SSPX promotes apostolates of the Legion of Mary. What is the situation? Is there an autonomous branch of the Legion of Mary from the SSPX or they simply collaborate with eachother?

dbaughmen (3): I’ve never seen the SSPX promoting the Legion at chapels, but they do have the Millitia Immaculata

jaqian (1): What do you mean by autonomous? The Legion of Mary is one organisation worldwide with it's HQ in Ireland (I'm a member of the Legion of Mary).

BlueLightning09 (2): Here are some examples:[Legion of Mary Congress a Fountain of Grace | District of Canada (fsspx.ca)](https://fsspx.ca/en/news/legion-mary-congress-fountain-grace-7770)[SSPX Legion of Mary | District of Australia and New Zealand](https://sspx.au/en/sspx-legion-mary-33837)[Legion of Mary | District of Asia (fsspx.asia)](https://fsspx.asia/en/news/legion-mary-5410)

BlueLightning09 (2): Like a "separate" Legion of Mary. I'm asking because I don't know how the SSPX collaborates with the Legion.

dbaughmen (2): Like the Militia of the Immaculata, it must be a subgroup of the Legion, as they do a traditional version of the group most likely

jaqian (1): If a Presiidium isn't part of the official Legion of Mary, then it isn't Legion of Mary.

BlueLightning09 (1): Are these subgroups in the same "irregular" canonical situation as the SSPX? I mean, for example is there any issue if a lay person that assist to the SSPX to help in a diocesan Legion of Mary group?

dbaughmen (3): The diocesan groups are definitely more modern, the SSPX subgroups have nothing to do with the more Modern dioceasan ones, as the SSPX practically mimics the life of a diocesan priest/diocese if the church was at a regular time. Another example of this is the Archconfraternity of St Stephen, the traditional alternative to the Guild of St Stephen, which are the Altar boys’ group. I personally wouldn’t assist at a diocesan one due to their Modern and very Novus Ordoy qualities but if you wish too there is nothing wrong with doing that.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): How is there nothing wrong with assisting modernists?

dbaughmen (1): I am absolutely not okay with it, but thats what the Society’s position is

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): Do you have a resource on this?

# Post 439: Hello guys, question about miraculous medal

Author: storman\_sten

Score: 3

Comments: 15

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1f03dli/hello\_guys\_question\_about\_miraculous\_medal/

Not part of SSPX but at a icrsp the priest tolf me I should wear the medal and that it was something outlandish not to do so. I mean, feels like a hard stretch? Please share your thoughts

lupenguin (3): I mean I wear one, not because I was told to, but because of what it means to me. You don’t have to, it’s not like Jesus is going to stop you from going to heaven because of it, if you don’t like to wear things yeah I get it. But I don’t see a reason why not to read it

craft00n (3): My brother is an SSPX priest and doesn't care about these things. So no, you can perfectly be catholic and not wearing medals, saying the contrary could even be superstitious.BUT, you should definitely have some private devotion and prayer habits . For me, I'm wearing the Scapular of our Lady of Mount Carmel.

feelinggravityspull (2): There are so many medals and scapulars and things that someone, somewhere, thinks are absolutely essential.Figure out what makes sense for your spiritual life, perhaps in discussion with your spiritual director, and go with that.If it brings you closer to Christ, use it. If it doesn't, don't worry about it.

No\_Construction5455 (1): I wear one, my Crucifix, and a St. Benedict medal, along with my Army dog tags.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): what in the world guys the Blessed Virgin Mary told the world to wear it. Ignore her at your peril'A Stretch'? get educated"Mary told her to strike a medal in this form, and that all who wore it after having it blessed would receive graces."[https://www.fisheaters.com/miraculousmedal.html](https://www.fisheaters.com/miraculousmedal.html)

dbaughmen (1): The miraculous medal is amazing, its outrageous that a Priest would say such a thing

storman\_sten (1): Agree , i wear a scapular, have an icon corner and orthodox prayer book

storman\_sten (3): Right?

feelinggravityspull (2): The miraculous medal is great! No one should ever disparage it or Our Lady's promise of grace to those who wear it. It's a marvelous sacramental and has been responsible for many, many conversions.BUT, no one should criticize their fellow Catholics who choose not to wear it. The miraculous medal is not the only way God draws souls to him.

storman\_sten (1): So essentially what you are saying is that all Christians should wear a medal? A cross would not suffice? Yes, that sounds like a stretch

craft00n (1): If it's good for you, it's good for God. The real moral obligations are sacraments. Frequent confession and communion.

craft00n (2): Same as him

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): yes, agreed. I'd never criticize that way - I will simply criticize those that criticize which seems to be happening here, unfortunately :D.Also the least I can do is educate about the benefits and promises of the Medal. Just like the scapulars and St Benedict medalMy wife and I would not go a day without wearing the brown scapular, Miraculous medal and St Benedict's medal.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): I am not sure what more I can possibly say beyond what my other comment said. Do you pray the rosary daily or do you find that a 'stretch' as well?

storman\_sten (1): No, I think the rosary is great. The desert fathers used prayer ropes as well, so it is clearly in line with Christianity, the historical and the present church.

# Post 440: Padre Pio and the New Mass

Author: Glittering\_Dingo\_943

Score: 6

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ey3eyc/padre\_pio\_and\_the\_new\_mass/

Is it true that Padre Pio was opposed to the post conciliar liturgical changes and was given an insult to continue saying the traditional mass?I’ve also heard that his sister was a traditionalist and she left the convent after the council because of the changes. Is this also accurate?

dbaughmen (10): Contrary to public belief. Padre Pio never celebrated the New Mass. His last mass was using the old Missal but facing the Congregation, he was forced to do this, Paul VI granted him permission to say the Traditional mass instead of the interim missal. He most likely did not like the changes being brought about by the council, he also probably didn’t say the new missal because he was too old to learn a new mass.

None (3): His most famous biographer has collected a few quotes from Padre Pio explicitly against Vatican II (he didn't specifically refer to what doctrinal issues bothered him though)

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (3): IIRC he was also blind at the time

# Post 441: Are there any Bible apps you recommend?

Author: None

Score: 4

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ey0n89/are\_there\_any\_bible\_apps\_you\_recommend/

If possible, I would like one made by Traditional Catholics. Or are there any other apps you recommend other than the Bible app?

feelinggravityspull (5): I highly recommend Verbum. It's got tons of fantastic features: Latin Vulgate, DR, RSVCE, Haydock Commentary, other traditional commentaries, etc. etc.

HMX5000 (3): I use iPieta. Several languages and extras.

HMX5000 (1): I recommend iPieta

Kody127 (1): Catena

HMX5000 (1): I use iPieta. Several languages and extras.

# Post 442: Today is the 110th anniversary of the passing of the greatest Pope in modern history. St Pius X

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 38

Comments: 17

URL: https://i.redd.it/j7gw21sowujd1.jpeg

The last sovereign pontiff to be canonised. Sancte Pie Decime, gloriose patrone, ora pro nobis!

None (6): \*I was born poor. I have lived poor. I will die poor.\*Astronomically based

Light\_92 (4): Sspx isnt sedevacantist my man

feelinggravityspull (6): Greatest pope in modern history, yes. Last pope to be canonized, no.

dbaughmen (4): Post-V2 canonisations arent infallible

BrodyJerome (3): Archbishop Lefebvre going to heaven like "Y'all sure John XXIII and Paul VI are dead? They ain't up here"

dbaughmen (4): Infallibly canonised

Vintomik (0): Sspx fidels when they realize that JP2 is a Saint 😱😱😱😱😱😱

Light\_92 (3): do you really belive that Pope Benedictus XVI wasnt Pope? I dont like the today "pope" he is missguiden the Church of Christ but it doesn't mean that he isn't pope. And btw "pope" is just the Bishop of rome not Christ by himself, he is just infallible when talks excathedra. And Fortunately he hasn't done it yet. We all need pray to have a good one that talks wuth the true and the tradition of thousands of years.

feelinggravityspull (7): Obviously the SSPX has expressed reservations about some post-conciliar canonizations. But one thing the Society doesn't do is engage in thinly veiled sede-baiting, which is what OP is doing (or so it seems).

None (3): Modernists unfaithful when they realize JP2 has betrayed Catholic Tradition 😍😍😍😍😍😍

dbaughmen (1): It doesn’t matter at all whether he is Pope or not, the fact is that post-v2 canonisations have taken so much out of the process compared to how they used to be, the process is unrecognisable so theyve taken out key elements therefore making it fallible

None (3): I agree most of his posts are sede-baiting, this one doesn't seem problematic to me though

Light\_92 (1): Why? due vatican II isn't a legit council?

feelinggravityspull (3): Maybe I'm being too sensitive. At least we can all agree that St. Pius X was the greatest pope in the last 400 years!

dbaughmen (2): It doesnt have to do with the council itself, but the reforms that came after it, V2 allowed them to change the process and they changed it so much that it removes all the binding of it

Light\_92 (2): Im agree with that

dbaughmen (1): God bless you!

# Post 443: Opinion on Post Conciliar Saints?

Author: Original-Layer-6447

Score: 5

Comments: 9

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ewt03c/opinion\_on\_post\_conciliar\_saints/

What is the Society's opinion on the infallibility of the canonization of post-conciliar saints such as Cardinal Newman, JPII, Carlo Acuris, Teresa of Calcutta, etc?

None (6): After the Council a reform was made on the process of canonization. To sum it up the change made it faster but less serious. For example, they reduced the number of necessary miracles for a canonization. More importantly, they changed the definition of what's considered being a saint (it used to be someone who practices virtue to a heroic level).The previous process was considered by most theologians as infallible, the SSPX's position is that there is doubt on the infallibility of the new one. The reason the SSPX "only" had doubts, and doesn't straight up condemn it, is that it doesn't have the authority to do so (only a Pope could), but the mew canonization is definitely considered problematicSo it doesn't mean all those people aren't saints, it just means we aren't infallibly sure thay they are. For example Archbishop Lefebvre was a big fan of Padre Pio, he even said Mass so that he would be canonized, but we still don't call him saint Padre Pio (even if most people, like myself, personally believe he's a saint)

dbaughmen (4): Canonisations post v2 are definitely not infallible, some of the people being canonised are purely political moves. Carlo Acutis was a way to appeal to the “youth” who play “video games”. JPII is most definitely not a saint, he was canonised due to his extreme charisma and popularity with the Novus Ordites. Mother Teresa had been rumoured to be a horrible person. Until the church goes back to normal we can’t define who’s a saint and who’s not.

Piancol (4): As with mostly everything post-conciliar, the safest bet is just to ignore it. We don't really need all these new saints, having such a long and rich history of infallible canonizations.

KaleidoscopeLumpy842 (5): Paul VI and John XXIII seem really political. Especially when they have not said Paul VI's miracle.

None (2): Politically motivated canonization should be disregarded.

Original-Layer-6447 (0): I completely disagree canonizations of saints in the 21st century is prudent for the sake of spiritual inspiration of the faithful. Canonizing Carlo Acuris was objectively a great decision on part of Francis.

None (2): It does seem to be a good decision (Carlo Acutis seemed like a very devoted Catholic)... That's not the question though, as I said in a comment. What matters isn't if we personally believe those canonized people are saints or not (our opinion ultimately doesn't matter), but if they are infallibly canonized or not. It would be stupid from us to pretend that any person canonized by Pope Francis has to be a horrible person.

Piancol (2): Well, that is your personal opinion. You asked for the SSPX stance on the matter, but clearly you're just looking for echo on your own thoughts, good luck with that!

Original-Layer-6447 (1): No I was curious for the society’s opinion on the inability of canonizations my particular opinion on Carlo Acuris is a different question

# Post 444: Who are your favorite English Catholic Saints?

Author: None

Score: 3

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ewpjz2/who\_are\_your\_favorite\_english\_catholic\_saints/

Btw, should Saint Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, be classified as an English Saint or not?

CatholicFuturist (3): St. Thomas More, Utopia is a great read.

TooEdgy35201 (1): Saint Boniface since he converted my country.

GoneFishin56 (1): All of them. Every last one.

# Post 445: Could Reginald Cardinal Pole be Canonized one day?

Author: None

Score: 1

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ewnu8t/could\_reginald\_cardinal\_pole\_be\_canonized\_one\_day/

He worked to rebuild the Catholic Church of England, but now seems to have been forgotten. Or maybe I'm just overestimating him?

# Post 446: Does anyone know where to find a list of all the offices and vestments and everything Paul VI abolished?

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 2

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ew6sve/does\_anyone\_know\_where\_to\_find\_a\_list\_of\_all\_the/

Piklikl (4): It's hard to find a comprehensive list online for something like this, so I asked ChatGPT:Pope Paul VI, during his papacy (1963–1978), implemented significant reforms within the Catholic Church, particularly in the wake of the Second Vatican Council (1962–1965). These reforms led to the abolition or modification of various offices, vestments, and practices. Below is a list summarizing some of the key changes made by Paul VI:# Liturgical and Ceremonial Changes:1. \*\*Triregnum (Papal Tiara):\*\* \* \*\*Abolished Use:\*\* Pope Paul VI was the last pope to wear the papal tiara during his coronation in 1963. He subsequently abandoned its use and symbolically laid it on the altar of St. Peter's Basilica. The tiara has not been worn by any pope since.2. \*\*Galero (Cardinal's Hat):\*\* \* \*\*Abolished Use:\*\* The red galero, traditionally given to cardinals during consistory, was discontinued. Cardinals now receive a red biretta instead.3. \*\*Pontifical Court:\*\* \* \*\*Reorganization and Abolition:\*\* The elaborate papal court, including titles like "Prince Assistant to the Papal Throne," was significantly simplified. Many ceremonial positions and titles were either abolished or transformed into honorifics without ceremonial functions.4. \*\*Liturgical Vestments:\*\* \* \*\*Abolished or Simplified:\*\* Several traditional vestments such as the \*\*papal slippers, stockings, and buskins\*\* were discontinued. The use of ornate vestments, such as the \*\*fanon\*\* (a striped papal shoulder cape), was also significantly reduced.5. \*\*Sedia Gestatoria:\*\* \* \*\*Abolished Use:\*\* This ceremonial throne, used to carry the pope in processions, fell out of regular use under Paul VI. It was later replaced by the popemobile.6. \*\*Simplification of the Papal Mass:\*\* \* \*\*Reforms:\*\* The elaborate papal Mass was simplified. Many traditional elements, such as the use of the subdeacon, tunicle, and certain intricate liturgical vestments, were abolished.# Abolished Ecclesiastical Offices:1. \*\*Abolition of Minor Orders:\*\* \* \*\*Subdeacon and Other Minor Orders:\*\* The minor orders, including the subdiaconate, were abolished in 1972 through the motu proprio \*Ministeria Quaedam\*. These were replaced with the instituted ministries of lector and acolyte.2. \*\*Master of the Sacred Palace:\*\* \* \*\*Reformed Role:\*\* This office, traditionally held by a Dominican friar and functioning as the pope's theological adviser, was transformed into the Theologian of the Pontifical Household, with a more academic and less ceremonial function.3. \*\*Abolition of Certain Honorific Titles:\*\* \* \*\*Examples:\*\* Titles such as "Patriarch of the West" were abandoned, reflecting the ecumenical and simplified approach of Paul VI's papacy.# Liturgical Reforms (Post-Vatican II):# Missal of 1969 (Paul VI Missal):Abolition of the Tridentine Mass (1962 Missal): Although not completely abolished, the widespread use of the Tridentine Mass was replaced by the new Mass of Paul VI, which introduced significant changes, including the use of the vernacular, a simplified liturgy, and a revised calendar.Suppression of Certain Feasts and Prayers:Liturgical Calendar Reform: The liturgical calendar was revised, leading to the abolition or downgrading of certain feast days and the simplification of the sanctoral cycle. Some traditional prayers, like the Last Gospel at the end of Mass, were also removed.Sacrament of Tonsure:Abolished: The tonsure, a clerical rite of initiation that marked the entrance into the clerical state, was abolished in favor of a simpler process of admission to candidacy for ordination.Other Reforms:Papal Coronation:Abolished: Pope Paul VI was the last pope to have a coronation ceremony with the papal tiara. He later decided that future popes would not have a coronation but would be inaugurated with a simpler ceremony.Reduction of Ceremonial Protocols:General Simplification: Paul VI initiated the reduction of numerous ceremonial and courtly protocols associated with the papacy, opting for a simpler, more pastoral approach.Abolished Practices:Kissing of the Pope's Foot:Discontinued: This medieval practice, symbolizing the pope's supreme authority, was quietly discontinued during Paul VI's papacy.Conclusion:Paul VI’s papacy was marked by a decisive move towards modernization, reflecting the spirit of the Second Vatican Council. His reforms aimed to make the Church's liturgy, governance, and practices more accessible and understandable to the modern world, often by simplifying or abolishing older, more complex traditions.

Glittering\_Dingo\_943 (5): Heartbreaking

# Post 447: Protect our sacred vessels!

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 44

Comments: 0

URL: https://i.redd.it/3q40qdjeanjd1.jpeg

# Post 448: A tribute to our namesake, St Pius X

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 16

Comments: 0

URL: https://i.redd.it/fjpskwviyjjd1.jpeg

# Post 449: Attending non-Catholic weddings

Author: StelIaMaris

Score: 3

Comments: 15

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1evr9rs/attending\_noncatholic\_weddings/

Good evening all,My sister in law is getting married this February. She is a lapsed Catholic, and has already been divorced once, and her fiancée is not Catholic. I understand that the Church teaches that we are not to attend non-Catholic weddings, but prudence could potentially say otherwise. My wife’s family is openly hostile to our Catholic faith, and as a result there will potentially be a good deal of backlash for not attending. I wanted to get your opinions on this, so anything you have to say would be greatly appreciated. Thank you all and God bless you!

dbaughmen (7): I personally wouldnt attend a ceremony of another denomination, if is not in a church just arrive after the ceremony. It is really fundamental that you show them that your faith is not a game and that it is really important to you by not attending their ceremony, then again we must be ready to die for it, we can not hide our faith and we must openly show them what it is to be a Catholic

HMX5000 (6): If I were you I wouldn't attend. Especially if there is open hostility towards Catholicism.

Piancol (3): Leaving all doctrinal teachings aside (and we really really should not), you might be thinking that by attending you would be giving an example of "tolerance" and your apostate/infidel relatives would be moved to reflexion and feel friendlier towards the Catholic faith. Truth is, they will lose even more respect for you and "your religion" seeing that you're ready to give up your principles for a personal human event that contradicts everything you supposedly stand for.

None (2): I am leaving Reddit because it has become an obstacle to my duty of state as a Catholic Father. It has become a distraction, a temptation, and ultimately an idol. I would fraternally encourage all reading this message to consider whether their own use of the platform is edifying and healthy, or whether it is a superficial lesser good that only serves as an obstacle to your personal and spiritual growth.

Next-Antelope-5887 (2): Please do not shun your family! Go and be a beacon for your faith. Do not use your belief in Jesus and God as an excuse for not attending. Do not use your belief in Jesus and God as a form of punishment. Instead, use your faith as an example and go and represent the Catholic Church. Love and inclusion always triumphs over shunning and exclusion. Go and turn their water into wine and show them your love!!!

Recprocate (1): I wouldn't attend personally. May Our Lord and Our Lady guide you, God bless.

TransitionPutrid8476 (1): Martyrs died for the Faith. We need to have their faith and courage and not attend weddings like these.

StelIaMaris (2): This is a fantastic answer, and I thank you very much for it! Without getting into too much detail, my wife and my nephews are basically being held…hostage (maybe not the right word.) The implication is that if we do not go we will not be allowed to see them again. The Good Lord knows those kids need good role-models, so I believe we have decided to attend. But I will certainly keep in mind your suggestions. God bless you!

None (1): I am leaving Reddit because it has become an obstacle to my duty of state as a Catholic Father. It has become a distraction, a temptation, and ultimately an idol. I would fraternally encourage all reading this message to consider whether their own use of the platform is edifying and healthy, or whether it is a superficial lesser good that only serves as an obstacle to your personal and spiritual growth.

TransitionPutrid8476 (1): This is an SSPX subreddit, is it not? Do you attend Mass at an SSPX Chapel? Then speak to an SSPX priest about this matter and follow his guidance.

Next-Antelope-5887 (0): Do not shun your family. Be the example, love your family. Be inclusive, not exclusive. Go turn their water into wine.

None (1): I am leaving Reddit because it has become an obstacle to my duty of state as a Catholic Father. It has become a distraction, a temptation, and ultimately an idol. I would fraternally encourage all reading this message to consider whether their own use of the platform is edifying and healthy, or whether it is a superficial lesser good that only serves as an obstacle to your personal and spiritual growth.

Next-Antelope-5887 (1): Question: Going to their family's wedding is a sin?

None (1): I am leaving Reddit because it has become an obstacle to my duty of state as a Catholic Father. It has become a distraction, a temptation, and ultimately an idol. I would fraternally encourage all reading this message to consider whether their own use of the platform is edifying and healthy, or whether it is a superficial lesser good that only serves as an obstacle to your personal and spiritual growth.

TransitionPutrid8476 (1): Yes

# Post 450: Did i screw up by not recognizing Black robe, cross around neck, Zuchetto on head -- attending priest?

Author: dookiemaster420

Score: 5

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1evg21c/did\_i\_screw\_up\_by\_not\_recognizing\_black\_robe/

New to the Church and attended a Mass where a presumably important person was wearing an all black robe, large silver cross around neck, and black zuchetto?/small black hat -- he was not participating in the Mass but was attending it. I cannot remember if he had white collar or not. Is this another priest? Did i screw up by not acknowledging him as Father or something else? I said "hi, how are you doing?" and he said "good morning" I was short on sleep/brain fog and it didn't hit me until shortly thereafter that I may have disrespected him unintentionally.Who is he/what role is likely? and what is the proper respectful greeting in the future?Thank you!

dbaughmen (6): It was a Benedictine abbot, he is the head of a monastery. it’s absolutely fine, he definitely gets it a lot! All priests of all ranks get called “father” usually.

Piancol (4): I don't think you screwed up by using a generic polite greeting with him. If he's not clearly dressed as a priest, performing functions clearly reserved for a cleric, or he was not introduced to you as one or did it himself, then you are right in just playing it safe. Furthermore, it's not a sin or even wrong to greet a priest using a polite and respectful general greeting. You had no ill intentions about it and the biggest proof is that you're worried you messed up.Ask around to figure out who he is, and if he turns out to be a priest and you see him again then go greet him appropriately and mention how last time you would've done the same if you knew. That's it.

hardeho (1): You're gonna have to flog yourself in his presence to atone. Continue until he tells you to stop.

dookiemaster420 (2): Thank you 🙏 now on to learn about these Benedictine abbots

dookiemaster420 (1): Thank you 🙏

dbaughmen (2): Abbots dress like bishops and have very similar powers and jurisdictions within their own Abbey. There are also nuns named Abbesses, who also hold the same powers within their convent, they even wear a ring a, a cross and carry a crozier. I saw someone posted a picture of both Abbots and Abbesses in r/CatholicClericalDress

sneakpeekbot (1): Here's a sneak peek of /r/CatholicClericalDress using the [top posts](https://np.reddit.com/r/CatholicClericalDress/top/?sort=top&t=all) of all time!\#1: [A classic that must be in the first posts - the papal tiara and falda (train, makes the Pope look taller too)](https://i.redd.it/lbm62vo6fajd1.jpeg) | [0 comments](https://np.reddit.com/r/CatholicClericalDress/comments/1eurqtu/a\_classic\_that\_must\_be\_in\_the\_first\_posts\_the/) \#2: [The prelatial dress of the Franciscans, grey traditionally](https://i.redd.it/zd5wp6640ajd1.jpeg) | [0 comments](https://np.reddit.com/r/CatholicClericalDress/comments/1eupuzu/the\_prelatial\_dress\_of\_the\_franciscans\_grey/) \#3: [St Pius X in the red Capello Romano, also worn by Cardinals. First Post](https://www.reddit.com/gallery/1eupu0y) | [4 comments](https://np.reddit.com/r/CatholicClericalDress/comments/1eupu0y/st\_pius\_x\_in\_the\_red\_capello\_romano\_also\_worn\_by/)----^^I'm ^^a ^^bot, ^^beep ^^boop ^^| ^^Downvote ^^to ^^remove ^^| ^^[Contact](https://www.reddit.com/message/compose/?to=sneakpeekbot) ^^| ^^[Info](https://np.reddit.com/r/sneakpeekbot/) ^^| ^^[Opt-out](https://np.reddit.com/r/sneakpeekbot/comments/o8wk1r/blacklist\_ix/) ^^| ^^[GitHub](https://github.com/ghnr/sneakpeekbot)

# Post 451: What do you think of Cardinal Manning?

Author: None

Score: 1

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ev1jgv/what\_do\_you\_think\_of\_cardinal\_manning/

I personally honor him along with Cardinal Newman. Could he also be Canonized one day?

Melbtest04 (1): I personally view him as a heretic but that’s on a doctrinal matter

jocyUk (1): When Pastor Aeternus was voted on, lightning struck the basilica. The liberals commented that it was "the anger of God". Cardinal Manning thundered back that "they had forgotten the thunder of Mount Sinai."He allegedly had visions of the anti-Christ, was ultramontane. What's not to love here? Incidentally, i've heard it said that the worst thing that ever happened to English Catholics in nineteenth century England was the death of Mrs Manning.

jocyUk (1): Why?

# Post 452: Check out our new sub r/ catholicclericaldress

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 5

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1eupkz2/check\_out\_our\_new\_sub\_r\_catholicclericaldress/

I see people on here sometimes discussing why the Catholic clergy dresses like they do, so l made a sub dedicated to that so you can find answers to those questions, if you ask me, clerical dress is REAL fashion. Please feel free to join and grow this sub, r/catholicclericaldress!God bless you all!

Light\_92 (2): interesting! thank you.

# Post 453: Does anyone know of any Traditional Catholics who have written autobiographies that are worth reading?

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 4

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1eu37m0/does\_anyone\_know\_of\_any\_traditional\_catholics\_who/

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (2): [https://angeluspress.org/products/little-story-long-life](https://angeluspress.org/products/little-story-long-life)

None (2): [deleted]

Piancol (1): There is one by a Chinese woman called Rose Hu. 'Joy in suffering' is the title. You can find it in the Angelus Press website. It's the autobiography of a Chinese Catholic convert that suffered persecution from the Communist government with all her family and later in life found the SSPX (Fr. Daniel Couture, SSPX was her spiritual director). Now, the style might not be the most polished and the narrative is a little bit rough, but it's the only example I know of a contemporary Trad biography that I can recommend.

Huge-Explanation-358 (1): Why is it controversial?

None (1): Voris is a notorious grifter and anti-sspx pundit.

# Post 454: Are there any places to find the Novus Ordo and the Traditional rite of Ordinations side by side?

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 0

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1eu1av4/are\_there\_any\_places\_to\_find\_the\_novus\_ordo\_and/

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): You may find this appropriate [https://sspxpodcast.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Podcast-Consecrations-and-Ordinations.pdf](https://sspxpodcast.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/Podcast-Consecrations-and-Ordinations.pdf)

# Post 455: A Handy Flowchart Based on Notes from an SSPX Priest

Author: Piklikl

Score: 45

Comments: 16

URL: https://i.redd.it/rm4dt5riy2jd1.png

None (8): Weird. V2 didn't cause the crisis. It served more as the culmination of modernism that was lurking long before. V2 certainly expedited the transmission of modernism to the world at large but it did not cause it.

None (3): That's great!It'd be nice to make a more neutral version and to post it on r/traditionalcatholics. Also the other Ecclesia dei communities are missing.I'd be glad to help if you wanna!

None (3): I am leaving Reddit because it has become an obstacle to my duty of state as a Catholic Father. It has become a distraction, a temptation, and ultimately an idol. I would fraternally encourage all reading this message to consider whether their own use of the platform is edifying and healthy, or whether it is a superficial lesser good that only serves as an obstacle to your personal and spiritual growth.

luke-jr (3): It's inaccurate. As a "sedevacantist", I would answer "no" to #1, because heretics are by definition \*outside\* the Church.

None (12): We can say Vatican II was both a cause and a consequence of the crisis I'd say.Also it is definitely the most official symbol of the crisis of the Church so it's fair it'd portrayed as such

Piklikl (4): Eh, semantics. It’s a blob on a flowchart, the whole thing is a simplification.V2 might not have caused the crisis, but it certainly touched it off; the point of the flowchart is to show that crisis in the Church came about as a result of the changes post-V2, helping to show some of the logic behind the SSPX’s position.

Piklikl (6): You're more than welcome to take a crack at it, I don't think I would be able to because I already think it's neutral enough.I strongly believe that the SSPX is the best group out there. Not saying that extra SSPX nulla salus, but every other group that supports the traditional rites has some compromising factor, the SSPX is willing to suffer the image of disobedience and discord in pursuit of the highest law which is the salvation of souls.

Piklikl (2): thatsnothowanyofthisworks.gif

None (5): I am leaving Reddit because it has become an obstacle to my duty of state as a Catholic Father. It has become a distraction, a temptation, and ultimately an idol. I would fraternally encourage all reading this message to consider whether their own use of the platform is edifying and healthy, or whether it is a superficial lesser good that only serves as an obstacle to your personal and spiritual growth.

None (1): I agree V2 caused \*a lot\* of problems but not all of them. Therefore, I can't agree with the statement that V2 caused the crisis. Though I don't want to argue over semantics!

None (5): I just think it's a little disingenuous. It takes a large problem with a lot of nuance and sort of scapegoats V2 as the primary problem. Of course it's a huge problem but I also think it's deeper than just V2 itself. A neo-conservative Catholic or Novus Ordo Catholic could use this infograph against us due to this small detail. I digress. I get what you're saying and I don't want to split hairs.

None (2): Hello again!I think you should try to crosspost it to r/Traditionalcatholics, it'd probably be appreciated by many people there!

None (1): Don't get me wrong, I strongly support the SSPX as well, I just think some of the phrasing sounds a little pejorative even if it's true, like the commentary in number 4 could simply be "... opposition in private", and the resistance one isn't perfect either.

None (1): I agree with you; Vatican's is a central problem not because it caused all the problems of the crisis, but because ot contains the core of the current doctrinal errors (religious freedom, collegiality, ...) but your depiction of a simple culmination is appropriate in my opinion. People caricature the SSPX by saying that VII is the essence of all evil for us, and we shouldn't prove them right.So yeah I think it's a matter of precision but we are basically saying the same thing

Piklikl (3): Eh I dont know how well received that would be, especially since I started this subreddit so it might look too antagonistic. Of course if you want to you’re welcome to, I just think the tone does come across as a bit cocky.

None (1): I agree, unfortunately I don't think I'd know how to edit this haha, but it'd be an interesting post though!

# Post 456: Crisis?

Author: SaintDunstan1

Score: 2

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1etwt54/crisis/

What is the "crisis" that the author is speaking of in this article?https://sspx.org/en/news/don-davide-pagliarani-meets-pope-francis-27614#:~:text=On%20this%20occasion%20there%20was,meeting%20for%20the%20first%20time.

Piklikl (3): The Crisis in the Church that the Church has been in since Vatican II was convened. The changes in the Church brought about “in the spirit of Vatican II” directly resulted in religious vocations plummeting (both in quality and quantity), the faithful ceasing the practice of the Faith in droves, and all manner of dangerous if not downright heretical teachings promulgated by those who are supposed to safeguard the teachings and traditions of the Church.

dbaughmen (2): In a nutshell, Vatican II practically destroyed the church and it is in shambles and has been shaken down to its core. That is the church’s crisis

None (1): I'm not sure how this could be a serious question.

None (0): On the off chance this is a serious question, [here](https://youtu.be/bJ6AhxvUeRQ?si=\_VO65CHDq56iF0oU) is a video for your consideration.

SaintDunstan1 (2): Thank you for your response.

# Post 457: Who are your favorite Counter Reformation Saints?

Author: None

Score: 5

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1etuvcv/who\_are\_your\_favorite\_counter\_reformation\_saints/

And why?

Cathain78 (3): St John Ogilvie - bucked the prevailing trend in his time and place by converting from Protestantism to Catholicism, and died a martyr for the Faith.

None (1): St John Fisher. Meticulously explained the reality of the body and blood of Our Lord in the Eucharist to the heretics and received his heavenly award for it.

jocyUk (1): Ignatius of Loyola - O God, Who, to spread abroad the greater glory of Your name through St. Ignatius, strengthened the Church militant with new power;

jocyUk (1): Not the reason John Fisher was martyred...

None (1): Correct. He was martyred for denying the king as the head of the church. I was speaking figuratively since he wrote that work a few years before his death.

jocyUk (1): which work are you referring to?

None (1): The Reality of the Body and Blood in the Eucharist, or \*De Veritate Corporis et Sanguinis Christi in Eucharistia, adversus Johannem Oecolampadium\* (1527).

# Post 458: Who do you think will be the next Doctor of the Church?

Author: None

Score: 2

Comments: 12

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1etsi1d/who\_do\_you\_think\_will\_be\_the\_next\_doctor\_of\_the/

Or who do you think it should be?

None (5): Hopefully Archbishop Lefebvre haha

zaradeptus (4): Newman seems the most obvious candidate.

Piancol (2): At this rate and considering everything that's happened, one of the post-conciliar popes.

MacduffFifesNo1Thane (2): Idk maybe Patrick Stewart if they want name brand, or perhaps Maggie Aderin-Pocock if they want to do space-accurate Sci-Fi…Oh…of the CHURCH.No one in current hierarchy, sans Cardinal Burke or Sarah or Ranjith, seem Doctor-worthy.

Melbtest04 (1): Possibly Francis. It would’ve been Pell had he not sadly passed

Minute\_Television262 (1): My answer probly won't be popular and I might even potentially get banned for it 😂 BUT......and let me add he's NOT perfect but ...."PD". Love him or hate him, the guy knows the ancient papal.teachimgs inside and out, and he did make videos explaining why the papacy is necessary. Some of his videos are the ultimate refutations of Protestantism!!! I realize he's not everyone's favorite person or cup of tea but, there is value there.

PatriciusIlle (1): Taylor Marshall thinks it will be Taylor Marshall.

MacduffFifesNo1Thane (4): When he entered Heaven, I like to think St. Jerome greeted him personally by saying “Hello, \*Newman.\*”

dbaughmen (3): LOL thats a nice joke

Minute\_Television262 (2): You are joking, right ?

PatriciusIlle (2): Puff Daddy?? but he's novus ordo

zaradeptus (1): This is my headcannon now.

# Post 459: If Lefebvre stopped saying Jp2s name in the mass wouldn’t that indicate schism?

Author: Smooth\_Ad\_5775

Score: 2

Comments: 19

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1etnf4f/if\_lefebvre\_stopped\_saying\_jp2s\_name\_in\_the\_mass/

I mean sedevacantism not schism. But possibly both now that I think about it

Minute\_Television262 (6): Archbishop Lefebvre (and others) sometimes went back and forth in trying to figure out what was going on, and about how to respond to it. This is understandable, because it was and is a unique and unprecedented crisis. Msgr Lefebvre even basically admitted the possibility of the sedevacantist position, but said it was more likely that we are dealing with "liberal popes", in his book They Have Uncrowned Him.

dbaughmen (5): OP I literally gave you a priest to talk too. At this point your really just trying to discredit us

None (2): Obvious troll is obvious.

None (2): Stop spamming and go to a priest or two

11BtoDC (1): All the significant manualists, including Suarez, have referred to sedevacantism as 'common error' and NOT schism. Not defending the sedes. In fact, I dismiss their assertions.

colekken (0): Yes and no.Yes, because if Lefebvre stopped mentioning John Paul II's name during the Mass, it could suggest a belief that John Paul II was not the legitimate pope. This action might be seen as a step toward Sedevacantism, which holds that the current pope is not valid.No, because not mentioning a pope's name in the Mass doesn't necessarily mean one subscribes to Sedevacantism. Lefebvre hypothetically could have other reasons for omitting the name, such as protesting certain actions or policies of the pope without rejecting his papal legitimacy. This action could be interpreted as a statement of resistance rather than a declaration of the seat being vacant.But this is all hypothetical since I have very little knowledge in the area of Lefebrve omitting JP2's name from the Mass.

MarcellusFaber (-1): Sedevacantists are not per se schismatic. If we were, then you would be too, since it is pertinacious refusal of submission that is schismatic, not refusal of recognition. Those who refuse submission to a Pope because they reasonably believe his election or person to be suspect are not schismatic even if they are wrong. See Wernz-Vidal 7:398.

colekken (2): I was raised in the Novus Ordo and now attend a parish served by the Priestly Fraternity of St. Peter (FSSP). I am fully committed to the teachings of the Catholic Church and remain in full submission to the Holy See. I want to clarify that I am neither schismatic nor Sedevacantist.My participation in this subreddit is occasional, primarily to stay informed and to pray for the Society of St. Pius X (SSPX). I sincerely hope that the SSPX will one day achieve full canonical regularity, akin to the FSSP, the Institute of Christ the King Sovereign Priest (ICKSP), the Institute of the Good Shepherd (IBP), and other traditional communities in full communion with Rome.

None (2): There is no such thing as partial communion.

MarcellusFaber (2): If you are a Catholic, you do not submit to the laws and teachings of Francis; it is simply impossible to do so without losing the Faith. This man has stated that Luther was “was not wrong about justification” on his flight returning from Armenia in 2016), that the death penalty is ‘inadmissible’, and has made it clear that he is a latitudinarian (religious indifferentist). You may try to escape this by saying that he did not teach any of these positions authoritatively, but this is very clearly untenable in the case of the death penalty for:1. He changed the catechism to reflect this change in doctrine, and not only changed it, but admitted that the Church had formerly taught the opposite, as if She can err in her teaching: https://www.vatican.va/roman\_curia/congregations/cfaith/documents/rc\_con\_cfaith\_doc\_20180801\_lettera-vescovi-penadimorte\_en.html2. He taught in Amoris Laetitia, paragraph 83, that ‘the Church firmly rejects the death penalty’. He also does this in the context of rejecting abortion and euthanasia in the same paragraph, putting it in the same category as murder of the innocent, which is quite clearly intrinsically wrong. Some people have tried to escape this by claiming that this is simply a change in discipline, a prudential matter. However. The problem with this is that the Church has no discipline concerning the death penalty, for she has never used it (Ecclesia non sitit sanguinem; all executions of heretics were carried out by the State); the State has the right, and even the obligation in certain circumstances, to impose the death penalty \*through the natural law\*, and the Church cannot take that away. See the following: https://www.vatican.va/content/dam/francesco/pdf/apost\_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco\_esortazione-ap\_20160319\_amoris-laetitia\_en.pdfYour next thought after this may be simply that the legitimacy of the death penalty is not de fide. This is an untenable position for the following reasons:1. St Robert Bellarmine stated in chapter II of De Laicis that one of the heresies of the Anabaptists is their rejection of the death penalty. See an English translation here: https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.260111/page/n11/mode/1up?view=theater2. Cardinal Juan de Lugo states also in his Disputationes Morales et Scholasticae (Disp. X, Sectio II, pg. 57), that the heretical Waldensians held the same position. He then goes on to affirm its legitimacy, stating that all Catholic theologians do so also. See the following: https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=0rQOAAAAQAAJ&pg=GBS.PA56&hl=en\_US (No English translation this time, I’m afraid, but you could run it through ChatGPT).3. Innocent III included the legitimacy of the death penalty in his profession of Faith against the Waldensians. See Denzinger 425 (1948 edition).4. Leo X condemned Luther’s proposition that “it is against the will of the Spirit’ that heretics be burned. See Denzinger 773.4. The significance of the fact that all Catholic theologians agree is that a moral consensus of the theologians, due to the intimate connexion of their teaching and the Church’s, is infallible. This is because, if they erred as a whole, then the Church would necessarily be led into error, which is impossible.5. The ordinary magisterium of the Church is just as infallible as the extraordinary magisterium, and the ordinary magisterium has taught consistently (in catechisms, sermons, etc.) for centuries that the death penalty is legitimate. If we say that the death penalty is ‘inadmissible’, then we also have to say that the Church has changed Her teaching, Her teaching which has been taught by the ordinary magisterium. You may retort that the bishops together with the Pope now teach the immorality of the death penalty, which you would believe to be infallible. But this doesn’t solve our problem, as we now have an infallible Church contradicting Herself. The solution is that infallibility flows from the Pope, and when there is no Pope, the bishops’ teaching is not infallible, for the ordinary magisterium is the teaching of the bishops \*together with the Pope\*. It is simply more proof that the Holy See is currently vacant.So you are stuck; you must submit to the man whom you believe to be Pope, but you are also bound to publicly profess the legitimacy of the death penalty, otherwise you become a heretic and fall out of the Church. Of course, you can simply cling to tradition as taught by St Paul in Galatians 1:8 (and rightly so) and suspend judgement as to the current state of the Papacy, but the fact remains that you do not submit to Francis (presuming you remain a Catholic), and simply recognising him as Pope does not change that, for recognition is not submission to laws and teaching.

colekken (1): My research shows that Bishop Fellay & Fr. Alain-Marc Nely (SSPX) met with Pope Francis April 2, 2016. Then, Superior General Don Davide Pagliarani (SSPX) met with Pope Francis on February 8, 2022. We've got to have another meeting. Because at this rate we won't have another meeting until 2028.

None (2): I am in the "suspend judgment" camp. I don't think the virtue of obedience can ever require a catholic to submit to error.

None (1): [deleted]

colekken (0): There is nothing you could tell me or say to me that would make me stop praying for and supporting the SSPX, both physically and financially. And there is nothing you can do or say that would ever make me leave the Chair of St. Peter and its current occupant, Pope Francis.Now good day to you, sir.

None (2): The meetings won't change the fact that SSPX is catholic and has been in communion with the Church since its inception.

MarcellusFaber (1): You have clearly not read Francis’ documents which I cited:>83. Here I feel it urgent to state that, if the family is the sanctuary of life, the place where life is conceived and cared for, it is a horrendous contradiction when it becomes a place where life is rejected and destroyed. So great is the value of a human life, and so inalienable the right to life of an innocent child growing in the mother’s womb, that no alleged right to one’s own body can justify a decision to terminate that life, which is an end in itself and which can never be considered the “property” of another human being. The family protects human life in all its stages, including its last. Consequently, “those who work in healthcare facilities are reminded of the moral duty of conscientious objection. Similarly, the Church not only feels the urgency to assert the right to a natural death, without aggressive treatment and euthanasia”, but likewise \*“firmly rejects the death penalty”.\*See page 65 here: https://www.vatican.va/content/dam/francesco/pdf/apost\_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco\_esortazione-ap\_20160319\_amoris-laetitia\_en.pdfTo say that one ‘firmly rejects the death penalty’ in the context of condemning abortion and euthanasia, for the same reason (infringement on human dignity), is to say that it is intrinsically wrong. It is not a prudential judgement, and to make that statement is brain dead.

MarcellusFaber (0): I would not wish you to stop praying for or financially supporting the SSPX! I attend their Masses and have given them substantial contributions in the past!Neither do I wish you to abandon the Holy See. I simply point out to you that you do not submit to Jorge Bergoglio’s teaching, because, if you did, you would be a heretic.

colekken (1): True. But it is important that they continue the meetings.

None (1): [deleted]

None (2): No doubt.

MarcellusFaber (1): I have recently collected the evidence of the legitimacy of the death penalty being \*de fide\*. I place it below:1.St Robert Bellarmine stated in chapter II of \*De Laicis\* that one of the heresies of the Anabaptists is their rejection of the death penalty. See an English translation here: https://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.260111/page/n11/mode/1up?view=theater2.Cardinal Juan de Lugo states also in his \*Disputationes Morales et Scholasticae\* (Disp. X, Sectio II, pg. 57), that the heretical Waldensians held the same position. He then goes on to affirm its legitimacy, stating that all Catholic theologians do so also. See the following: https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=0rQOAAAAQAAJ&pg=GBS.PA56&hl=en\_US (No English translation this time, I’m afraid, but you could run it through ChatGPT).3.Innocent III included the legitimacy of the death penalty in his profession of Faith against the Waldensians. See Denzinger 425 (1948 edition).4.Leo X condemned Luther’s proposition that “it is against the will of the Spirit’ that heretics be burned. See Denzinger 773.5.The significance of the fact that all Catholic theologians agree is that a moral consensus of the theologians, due to the intimate connexion of their teaching and the Church’s, is infallible. This is because, if they erred as a whole, then the Church would necessarily be led into error, which is impossible.6.The ordinary magisterium of the Church is just as infallible as the extraordinary magisterium, and the ordinary magisterium has taught consistently (in catechisms, sermons, etc.) for centuries that the death penalty is legitimate. If we say that the death penalty is ‘inadmissible’, then we also have to say that the Church has changed Her teaching, Her teaching which has been taught by the ordinary magisterium. You may retort that the bishops together with the Pope now teach the immorality of the death penalty, which you would believe to be infallible. But this doesn’t solve our problem, as we now have an infallible Church contradicting Herself. The solution is that infallibility flows from the Pope, and when there is no Pope, the bishops’ teaching is not infallible, for the ordinary magisterium is the teaching of the bishops together with the Pope. It is simply more proof that the Holy See is currently vacant.To be a Catholic, you must publicly profess all her \*de fide\* teachings. This includes the legitimacy of the death penalty. If you pertinaciously reject the Church’s teaching on this matter, then you are a heretic, not a Catholic.

# Post 460: Good books about the history of the Church

Author: WannabeCatholic1

Score: 3

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1esq1cl/good\_books\_about\_the\_history\_of\_the\_church/

Hello, I've been reading the book "A history of Christianity: the first three thousand years" by Diarmaid Macculloch in order to get a good overview of the history of the Church, and I was quite disappointed by it, due to the extreme secular bias of the author. I wonder if anyone has a book recommendation of the history of the Church from a more sound perspective? Some books I've been looking up is:James Hitchcock's " History of the Catholic Church"Paul Johnson's "A history of Christianity"Thomas Bokenkotters "A concise history of the Catholic Church"I have also looked into Warren Carroll's "A history of Christendom" series (although I'm interested in it, it's quite long and somewhat expensive to ship to my country from the US).Are any of these books sound from a traditional Catholic position? And does anyone have any other good recommendations of ecclesiastical history?

None (3): L'Église au Risque de l'Histoire by Jean Dumont is the best ever if you can read French!

jocyUk (1): Alzog. Manual of Universal Church History. Guggenberger A., S.J., A General History of the Christian Era. Church History by Rev Fr John Laux, A History Of The Catholic Church by Rev Fr Fernand Mourret-Thompson, A General History Of The Catholic Church From The Commencement Of The Christian Era Until The Present Time, Volume 1 by Darras, J. E. (Joseph Epiphane). Hope these help, let me know if you need further suggestions. These all have pre-V2 imprimaturs so are safe to read.

# Post 461: Fasting tomorrow?

Author: None

Score: 6

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1es3lhu/fasting\_tomorrow/

Hi everyone. I can't seem to find an answer on this online. Are we required to abstain from meat on holy days of obligation such as tomorrow on the Feast of the Assumption? Sorry if this has been asked before. I started attending Latin Mass months ago at a diocesan church and I'm still finding my way. Edit: Thanks for the help everyone. God bless!

scrime- (11): No, fasting would usually be for the vigil of a major feast. On the actual feast day it would actually be somewhat discouraged to fast/abstain (although you should still fast before Communion of course).

Piancol (5): No fasting or abstinence required on FEAST days of the Church. It's a feast, we're supposed to be celebrating it. A family gathering with a special meal to commemorate the occasion would be ideal – it teaches the kids and maybe even your lapsed/heathen relatives or friends (would you choose to include them) about the importance of these dates. We do it for our own mundane things like birthdays, anyway, right?

None (4): Thanks everyone for the informative answers. The whole "feast" part of the day makes perfect sense lol. Appreciate all the help!

Highwayman90 (7): To build on this, it's worth remembering that this is the "FEAST" of the Assumption, not the "Assumption Fast" (interestingly, most if not all Eastern Churches practice the Dormition Fast before this feast, but they feast on the day, as does the Latin Church).

# Post 462: Archbishop Lefebvre appreciation post

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 24

Comments: 6

URL: https://v.redd.it/bupv6k7f9gid1

Piancol (6): Archbishop Lefebvre, pray for us!

None (3): My wife and I are naming our 4th child, Marcel. He absolutely is a saint in our hearts. Saint Marcel Lefebvre ora pro nobis.

hardeho (2): Nothing to add, but I appreciate the appreciation. I am 100% sure he is a Saint in heaven, and I pray he is recognized by Rome someday.

dbaughmen (3): St Marcel 🙏🏻

dbaughmen (2): How amazing, Deo gratias! May St Marcel watch over your family, we pray for his canonisation

dbaughmen (3): Our dear Archbishop saved the church, its the least Modernist Rome could do. We need a St Pius X in that dirty institution, may he come soon to fix our church

# Post 463: What are your opinions on the statement that the SSPX has gone too soft on Modernist Rome?

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 4

Comments: 15

URL: https://i.redd.it/gh5w05b24did1.jpeg

Should the society take a harder stance to the issues in the church and in the world?

None (16): I think the SSPX has a very balanced position; it's respectful towards the Roman authorities as any Catholic should be (which is also a duty of charity), but it publicly denounces every dangerous teaching they publish.In times where we the 1% are right against the 99%, it's important to stay humble about it if we ever want the crisis of the Church to find and end. Don't get me wrong, I'm not saying we should "put aside our differences", but that "taking a harsh stance" doesn't have the right connotation. We should take the truth and the charity stances and that's it!Regarding the question of an agreement, it's the duty of the SSPX to seek one (since our situation isn't normal), but it's also our duty to not compromise, which realistically speaking means we probably won't get an agreement any time soon.

kawaqcosta (4): Their position is balanced. I recommend that you read these two articles by Fr. Paul Robinson FSSPX:[The SSPX and the Conversion of Rome to Tradition | FSSPX News](https://fsspx.news/en/news/sspx-and-conversion-rome-tradition-17117)[Unity of Faith with Pope Francis & Canonical Recognition of the SSPX | FSSPX News](https://fsspx.news/en/news/unity-faith-pope-francis-canonical-recognition-sspx-16715)They are quite instructive as to the need for an agreement.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (2): Not too soft. I would guess only sedes would say such a thing. And maybe the mc sspx

None (1): I think the SSPX has had great levity in the situation with Rome. They have engaged when they needed to and stepped back when the situation began unacceptable. I feel like the relationship they have with Rome is ongoing, and they will be willing to revisit the situation when Rome decides it wants to be reasonable.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (0): It appears since the Election of Fr. Davide Pagliarani as Superior General they have taken a more critical position on Pope Francis' Pontificate, condemning various things such as Fiduicia Supplicans and the Pachamama incident. I pray that the SSPX may reunite with the SSPX Resistance

colekken (-7): I think that is a ridiculous statement. Eccumenism needs to continue.

dbaughmen (-4): One thing that worries me are the conditional reordinations/consecrations, the society should start making them mandatory

Piklikl (2): I think you meant to say that you hope that Resistance repents of their (ridiculous and prideful) errors and return to the SSPX. The so-called resistance has demonstrated that it's either a bunch of kooks or arrogant men who think they are right about everything and anyone who disagrees is a secret modernist/mason. We continue to pray for they, but they are clearly the ones in error, not the SSPX.

dbaughmen (1): Let us hope

GYEvanID (5): ...and then threw everything Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre fought for? Meh...!

None (4): This is not what either the Church or what the SSPX have been doing towards doubtful rites; when someone comes from a Protestant church where they perform a doubtful baptism, the Catholic church has always asked to make an inquiry first, and to do an under condition-baptism only if it wasn't proven the baptism wasn't valid.I once asked a priest why this has always been the Church's teaching (after all, why not systematically doing an under-condition sacrament no matter what, just in case?), but he told me that it because sacraments are such an important matter that it wouldn't be respectful to do that.That's why we should trust the SSPX and stop seeking to find "changes", when they simply do what archbishop Lefebvre did before them, and what the Church did before him

Jerailu (0): It was never the SSPX practice. I might in the near future (10 years) be ordained through Paul VI's book, if I have the vocation, and I thus researched the matter. There's no argument against the validity of said orders generally.Only case on case basis, wich can sadly happen.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): I agree the SSPX Resistance is heavily flawed, guilty of disobedience and was filled with people it definitely should not be filled with. Indeed, the SSPX Resistance today actually embraces things that Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre would condemn, there are Priests in the SSPX Resistance who are Sedevacantists (With the prevailing SSPX Resistance view seeming to be that its a valid theological opinion to hold) and even reject the usage of the 1962 Missal, I have also heard the SSPX Resistance accepts the Thuc Line. they had a legitimate concern (SSPX regularizing) but jumped the gun too fast and now basically spend their days talking about how any day now the SSPX is going to regularize and reject what Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre fought for while slowly rejecting Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre's teaching. It's a sad situation and I know there are good people in the SSPX Resistance, I wish the SSPX and the SSPX Resistance may reunite strengthening Tradition. "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell in unity." - Psalms 132, verse 1, Douay-Rheims 1899 Bible

colekken (-1): No

None (2): I agree that this was never the SSPX's practice, however they also consider the NO rites for some sacraments as inherently doubtful, which I think is a balanced and true opinion (many theological studies have been made on the subject).Even when valid, sacraments can be problematic, for example the NO Mass is valid (even if the doubt of the intention is way bigger than in the TLM), but it's not completely Catholic either because of all of its Protestant tendencies, which is why a Catholic aware of its problems shouldn't participate to it.Valid doesn't mean good, otherwise a clown Mass and a black Mass would be good.10 years isn't exactly what I would call the near future haha, but you're right to look at time through God's lenses 😂 I assume you're thinking about joining the seminary in the next few years?I have a brother who was ordained in june 😇

# Post 464: New York Church to be Converted into a mosque

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 14

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1eqo96k/new\_york\_church\_to\_be\_converted\_into\_a\_mosque/

What an abomination, what is happening to the church and why is the hierarchy of the Novus Ordo doing nothing about this kind of thinghttps://www.newsweek.com/new-york-church-mosque-buffalo-1937906

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (11): Very sad. St Pius X pray for us all

colekken (6): Agreed. This was a good, traditional church. I hope the Muslims don't use this to mock us.

dbaughmen (11): All ye saints, hammers of heretics pray for us.

dbaughmen (8): Just like Hagia Sophia, thats such a beautiful church too

GYEvanID (2): I predict they would demolish it to properly align it with the qibla.

# Post 465: Lefebvre not validly consecrated?

Author: Smooth\_Ad\_5775

Score: 0

Comments: 10

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1eqo02x/lefebvre\_not\_validly\_consecrated/

This seems to be an argument posed by https://www.betrayedcatholics.com/necessary-intention-in-traditionalist-orders-lacking-2/How does one respond to this

Vintomik (11): Catholic do not believe in donatism ty

dbaughmen (7): Makes absolutely no sense. I didn’t read the article but from what Ive heard is that the argument is that because his consecrator was a freemason he wasnt validly consecrated. This has absolutely nothing to do with validity as even if he was a mason his orders are valid

Piancol (5): Fake news, and quite old as well. These attacks are very boring and uninspired, tbh.

None (2): [deleted]

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre's Consecration is almost certainly valid, assuming Lienart was a Mason, he is forgetting the Apostolic Tradition of having 3 Consecrators. To believe all 3 Bishops that Consecrated Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre were all witholding their intention of Conferring the Sacrament is lunacy. Secondly the woman in the article commits a grave smear by claiming that Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre was a Mason, this of course is completely baseless and has been refuted prior time and time again.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): It's lunacy. I was reading his autobiography, not only were the 2 co-consecrators present but 6 other bishops. If there was any concern it would have been noticed. that is one of the points of co-consecrating. Also a reason the pre 62 sacraments should never have been modified. they all had safeguards so the words could not be fuddled to muddy the waters.

forbiddenq (2): I think she's a Sedevacantist: [https://www.betrayedcatholics.com/free-content/4-a-catholic-course-of-study-new/f-primary-proofs-the-see-is-vacant/](https://www.betrayedcatholics.com/free-content/4-a-catholic-course-of-study-new/f-primary-proofs-the-see-is-vacant/) She also calls Paul VI an antipope, she's got some interesting ideas that's for sure. She also quotes Lefebvre positively in other articles, while she claims here that he has connections with Freemasons here and questions his ordination.I hope no Catholic is actually using her as a valid source to attack the SSPX lol.

forbiddenq (1): OP, I strongly advise you not to use her work, she is a terrible source.

Piancol (2): You had me at Sedevacantist. Nothing that a schismatic or heretic has to say would ever catch my attention for more than a couple of seconds if at all. The great problem of our times: the internet and social media gave everyone a chance to vomit the nonsense that lingers in their minds to an unsuspecting audience that rarely takes the time to fact-check anything. Everyone is a self-appointed expert on everything and no one cares about the truth anymore but just about clashing opinions and superficial information. Not talking about you but in general.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (3): Her confidence just caught me off guard and I had never heard such a claim lol

Antoninus\_Ferrer (1): Sedeprivationist here, homealoners are not good representatives of sedevacantism and Abp. Lefebvre is regarded as valid by all major sedevacantist groups.

# Post 466: Why SSPX over other canonical societies even though the SSPX are suspended?

Author: Smooth\_Ad\_5775

Score: 5

Comments: 21

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ep8u3n/why\_sspx\_over\_other\_canonical\_societies\_even/

I’m looking into the SSPX still.

dbaughmen (13): Dear OP, ik you have a lot of questions about the SSPX so Ive sent you the contact info of a priest of the society who can actually answer them correctly

craft00n (5): What do you mean by "suspended" ?

None (3): I am leaving Reddit because it has become an obstacle to my duty of state as a Catholic Father. It has become a distraction, a temptation, and ultimately an idol. I would fraternally encourage all reading this message to consider whether their own use of the platform is edifying and healthy, or whether it is a superficial lesser good that only serves as an obstacle to your personal and spiritual growth.

Cathain78 (3): I think it’s important to understand the situation within the Church during the early 20th century when Pope St Pius X saw clear dangers within the Church and attempted to brace it against them, then in the middle of that century during the time of the Second Vatican Council, and after that the formation of the SSPX in order to preserve what was in danger of being lost. If you haven’t already then read the Archbishop’s “Open Letter to Confused Catholics” which explains some of this and also gives more detail on the changes which swept through the Church even before the Council had concluded. Add to that some research on what people like Bugnini were openly admitting they were trying to do, and how much of what we see in the Church today is a continuation of those aims.Finally, look at the legalities of the society’s position with all of this in mind. I’m not saying Canon Law is not important - albeit even Canon Law itself was changed and “updated” in the early 80’s. Ironically, sometimes these changes even lent themselves to the SSPXs situation (eg. The section on fulfilling one’s Sunday obligation). But I think the legal status is perhaps the least important of all these considerations although they can’t be simply dismissed, of course. Why do I say that?Well a couple of things spring to mind. And this is only my personal opinion. We hear Saint Paul write to the Corinthians regarding the Law - the letter of which kills but the spirit of which gives life. Perhaps this is what is in the mind of Pope Francis when he frequently rails against legalism, clericalism and “rigidity”? Odd then that the opponents of the SSPX, so often liberal in other ways, suddenly switch to being very rigid in their legalism when the status of the society comes up in discussion. We should remember that the highest law in the Church is, and always has been, the salvation of souls. And if the society is saving souls in a time when souls are deserting the faith in record numbers, then who could reasonably argue that it isn’t carrying out the highest law of the Church while its detractors point fingers and refer to the letter of the law? Finally, the SSPX refer to the law itself stating that they are acting even in accordance, not only in spirit but by the very letter in that they are permitted to legally carry out their ministry and the sacraments without the Ordinary’s sanction in a time of great need and crisis (re Supplied Jurisdiction). And here it hinges on one’s opinion - is the Church in crisis at this time? Well, that depends on who you ask. The SSPX clearly believe that since the changes to the liturgy and the theology at VII, the changes in the faith of laity and clergy alike following this, the closing of churches, the dwindling of clerical and religious vocations since the Council, etc then yes, there is a crisis in the Church that validates the mandates within Canon Law to allow them to carry out their priestly ministries. The same reason that St Athanasius was justified in persevering in administering to the faithful even when the heretical bishops opposed him, even as he was exiled for the umpteenth time by the ecclesiastical authorities of his age. As the Saint remarked- “They have the buildings, we have the faith” I hope you research, and pray for guidance, and find the truth in these times of confusion. Be assured of one thing and that is Christ’s promise - the gates of Hell will not prevail against His Church.To end with another quote by that great saint and Church Father ….“Even if Catholics faithful to tradition are reduced to a handful, they are the ones who are the true Church of Jesus Christ.” -St Athanasius

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (2): In brief - The other Canonical Societies accept Vatican 2, the Novus Ordo and many other heretical novelties. (Slight exception here for the IBP) - The other Canonical Societies are entirely beholden to the Modernist Bureaucrats in Rome, and as they have no Bishop of their own, they depend on them for Ordaining their Priests and approving their development. The SSPX does not have this problem and this is why they are consistently expanding and why the Canonical Societies are consistently being rejected from Diocese after Diocese. - The other Canonical Societies seem to reject the fact that there even is a Crisis in the Church (Exception here for the IBP)

None (2): I don't know what exactly you mean by "suspended", but the general rule that convinced me is that faith goes over human legality; the SSPX is the only mean to not compromise on traditional faith, if they have to break canon law (which I don't think they have) in order to keep the faith so be it. Supra lex, salus animarum: above the law, the salvation of souls. It has already happened in the history of the church that not following a Pope has been a moral duty, I think it's the case right now.

ptexcellenceteacher (1): Look into John Salza content. These guys are misleading

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (3): Thank you

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): The priests are suspended

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): I meant suspended as having to do with not being allowed to say mass, as Benedict said they are . I continue looking into SSPX though. Please pray God reveals to me everything.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (2): Amazing

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (2): Second, the SSPX receives Supplied Jurisdiction from the Church as per Canon 1335 § 2 If a censure prohibits the celebration of the sacraments or sacramentals or the performing of acts of the power of governance, the prohibition is suspended whenever this is necessary to provide for the faithful who are in danger of death. If a\*latae sententiae\*censure has not been declared, \*\*\\*\\*the prohibition is also suspended whenever one of the faithful requests a sacrament or sacramental or an act of the power of governance; for any just reason it is lawful to make such a request.\\*\\*\*\*

obiwankenobistan (3): Suspension is generally a punishment for clergy. Where did you hear that?Because, in fact, they have faculties from the Pope to hear confessions. They would not have that if they were suspended.They are “canonically irregular”.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Thanks you

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Why wouldn’t their masses be suspended? He never gave them faculties for the Eucharist.

dbaughmen (3): A suspension requires a pope actually saying they are Suspended a divinis, Benedict did the exact opposite by rescinding the excommunication of the 4 Bishops and then Francis gave them “permission” to hear confessions and do matrimonies

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): But didn’t Benedict say they were suspended?

dbaughmen (4): What he did was explain that the SSPX had no canonical status inside the church, but proving they are inside the church irregularly

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): He did say they were suspended though (“ The priests of the Society of St. Pius X are validly ordained, but suspended, that is prohibited from exercising their priestly functions because they are not properly incardinated in a diocese or religious institute in full communion with the Holy See “). So are you saying they became unsuspended when Francis gave them faculties?

dbaughmen (7): You tire us OP, instead of asking us contact the priest, who knows best

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Ok

# Post 467: Public school

Author: None

Score: 6

Comments: 10

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ep7h1p/public\_school/

What's everyone's thoughts on public school?We obviously will always be involved in are children's faith formation. I'm mainly worried about modernism and heretical ideas entering into my children's heads whether they go to public school or "Catholic" school.

None (11): I went to public school so definitely no. I wasn’t raised Christian but there were many things that rubbed me the wrong way, mainly how boys and girls interacted. It’s truly a godless environment and many of my peers came from single mom and divorced households who had no respect for their classmates or teachers.

dbaughmen (9): Both the public schools and the Novus Ordo schools are horrible places, they will teach children nothing but how horrible “the streets” are and bad manners. (Coming from someone who went to a “catholic” school) I strongly recomend a Traditional Catholic school near you or homeschooling. (If youre interested, the Sisters of St Thomas Aquinas do online zoom classes from their school/convent in Florida, great education!)

SnowWhiteFeather (5): If I had the choice between sending my kids into the workforce or public school at five years old I would choose the workforce.The Prussian Educational Model is meant to indoctrinate compliance to the state and form factory workers or soldiers. It does not serve the wellbeing or interests of the citizens and it is harmful to the children who are put through it.

MarcellusFaber (6): See Divini Illius Magistri. Sending your children to a non-Catholic school is grave matter.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (5): Public schools teach worldly values and are obviously secularized. But it may be fine as long as they have some sort of Catholic community

Cathain78 (5): My children still attend their local “Catholic” school. We have written to the school to exclude them from going to the local parish for Masses and also from making their sacraments there. Our oldest made his First Confession and First Communion at the SSPX chapel we attend instead, and the youngest will do likewise. We allow them to participate in prayers, etc. otherwise we count on instructing them and instilling our values from home and from attending Mass at the Society. We hope it is enough in a world where they are bombarded by harmful messages and ideas continually, but it’s certainly better than what most kids have to work with today.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (2): As someone who has spent years in Public School and "Catholic" School, do not send your kid to such. They will most likely be corrupted and be swayed into sinful teachings and practice. In Traditional Examinations of Conscience this is explicitly mentioned as a thing for Parents to avoid. Do not leave your kids into the arms of Satan and his agents, homeschool or send to an SSPX Church. If you would like resources on such please feel free to ask

rmlenz (3): I don't know how to help you, maybe our realities are very different, probably we dont live in same country, however in my place too there's this discussion.But I can say you always believe in a good home education, children imitates your parents better than anyone out house

Minute\_Television262 (2): Public schools were garbage 35 years ago, and Vatican II sect schools were actually even much worse. I went to Vatican II sect schools back then and, maybe it would not have been quite so horrible if I could have at least been spared their "religion" and "health education" classes. Of course now, I can only imagine what it must be like. I'm sure many Novus Ordo schools are happy to present "Drag Time Story Hour" etc. In any event, I would not send my kids anywhere near a public school aka "DPRK Indoctrination Center", but some people may have no choice but to do so.

None (1): To be honest, "modernism and heretical ideas" seem to be the least of the problems in public schools. If it’s possible, I would strongly try to avoid such "education" and consider homeschooling instead. In the country where I live, we have only one Catholic school (in the entire country), and it’s located in the capital. There are many schools that call themselves Catholic, but they have practically nothing to do with Catholicism. It's really a disaster how things look.

# Post 468: What do we make of Robert Barron? Is he an orthodox Bishop?

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 5

Comments: 12

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1enk4b2/what\_do\_we\_make\_of\_robert\_barron\_is\_he\_an/

I’ve seen him be very hostile towards tradition, and the Novus Ordites like him, but is he someone we should listen too?

Odd\_Glove7043 (11): He does not hold the SSPX position. However, he does have an understanding of many of the issues the Church faces. To me, he comes off like a very pious and God-fearing Bishop.

Araedya (5): He’s been surprisingly friendly towards the sspx if [the rumors](https://wdtprs.com/2023/02/bp-barron-cancelled-the-tlm-at-a-parish-and-moved-it-to-a-college-chapel/)were true, giving them permission to use a diocesan chapel in his diocese.

Relative-Elevator-34 (3): Doesn’t Bishop Barron teach that Catholics can reasonably hope that Hell is empty?

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (3): He is a Modernist who accepts Vatican 2, the Novus Ordo, rejects Adam and Eve as being literal and believes that Hell is empty. He is to be avoided.

Minute\_Television262 (4): I can't judge his heart. He seems in some ways "better" than a lot of these "bishops" when it comes to certain teachings However, in the end he's unfortunately leading people right back to The Beast and The Whore aka the counterchurch.

KaleidoscopeLumpy842 (3): He's not orthodox. He doesn't cease to promote Vatican II . Most of his videos reflect his modernization of mass and tradition through the post conciliar lens.

None (-3): Troll

Glittering\_Dingo\_943 (9): Agree

dbaughmen (5): I think he’s conservative, but he really likes the NO

dbaughmen (3): That is protestant teaching, Francis has practically said that Hell doesn’t even exist. This is a trend among the Novus Ordites

None (3): Yup at the end of the day he's been questionably ordained (as a priest and as a bishop,) has had a faulty formation, and has taught and pushed numerous V2 heresies like false ecumenism.

dbaughmen (2): He loves sidestepping questions about the Latin mass too

# Post 469: Are there any short quotes or prayers related to Jesus or Our Lady in Latin?

Author: None

Score: 4

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1em4773/are\_there\_any\_short\_quotes\_or\_prayers\_related\_to/

Ave Maria, Ave Christus Rex, and Ad Jesum per Mariam come to mind to me, but I'm not sure if there are more.

dbaughmen (2): Christus Vincit is a short nice one. And for Our Lady, Salve Regina

# Post 470: Can laypeople use thuribles in the home?

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 3

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1eloo2v/can\_laypeople\_use\_thuribles\_in\_the\_home/

Is it permissible to incense the house with a thurible and own one?

Piklikl (2): Sure there’s nothing wrong with that, but it wouldn’t really be doing anything and kind of weird. Incense is only blessed as part of the liturgy, I don’t think you could get some blessed for home use. It’s not used to cleanse, you would use holy water for that.

jocyUk (1): Yes certainly! Early Christians used incense privately. This is akin to asking if you can use candles at home. Have them all blessed according to the ritual.

# Post 471: Who was Malachi Martin?

Author: None

Score: 1

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ekmn75/who\_was\_malachi\_martin/

What kind of person was he?

# Post 472: What do you think about the SSPX Resistance and Bishop Williamson?

Author: None

Score: 4

Comments: 52

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ekjru6/what\_do\_you\_think\_about\_the\_sspx\_resistance\_and/

What are the detailed differences between SSPX and SSPX Resistance? I don't know much about the difference between the SSPX and the SSPX Resistance, other than that the SSPX was founded by Archbishop Lefebvre himself, and the SSPX Resistance is supported by Bishop Williamson.

None (10): The "resistance" (they often don't like this word) started in the 2010s when the rumor started that SSPX was preparing an agreement with Rome, an agreement in which the SSPX would do doctrinal compromissions. While it is true that dome of the heads of the SSPX had talks about it and considered it, it ended up not doing it and never signing any compromising documents.I once talked about it with an SSPX priests who had a very balanced opinion on the matter I think; he basically told me that the mistake of the resistance wasn't to refuse any doctrinal compromission (they're right to say so), but that they lacked prudence: they started openly and publicly attacking the SSPX, often violently, instead of waiting for the SSPX to actually make a compromise before leaving it.Regarding bishop Williamson, the resistance is only part of the issue, he's mostly a problem because he took public positions on subjects that shouldn't be concern a bishop, like the Holocaust.Also, from personal experience, people in the resistance usually have ties with sedevacantism, but most of them disagree with that

Piancol (8): Imprudent, prideful, rebellious, disobedient, and ultimately nonsensical.

Brendanjfinnegan (3): My parents were married by an SSPX priest in 1998. Bishop Williamson was visiting the parish that week and heard my father's confession.My dad tells me that it was the greatest confession he ever had in his life, His Excellency was a great listener and gave him very practical, heartfelt advice. Before giving him his penance and absolving him. Another time, he was visiting the Seminary in Winona, Minnesota of which Bishop Williamson was the Rector...and a seminarian came up to Dad and said that "His Excellancy Bishop Williamson would like you to be his guests at dinner this evening,"He was humble, gracious and even carved and served the meat for them during dinner (Roast Beef) . He regailed my Mom and Dad with numerous stories about his years as The Rector...using his dry British wit to enchant them... Mom said that It was a memorable evening. This is the Bishop Richatd Williamson that my Mom and Dad temember. And I pray that the priests and Bishop Williamson may help heal this rupture soon.

VanSensei (2): The Resistance is one of the most disjointed things I have ever seen. They can barely keep a Mass center open for very long and it feels like every man is his own bishop over there

dbaughmen (1): I personally believe the SSPX is a big tent type of organisation, in its ranks are priests who wish to reconcile with rome to even sedevacantists. I personally believe all traditionalists can live under the SSPX tent, and that to keep the balance, we should keep the society exactly where it is right now. It is in a prudent position

None (-1): The SSPX has compromised with the Conciliar church that brought The Resistance.

dbaughmen (4): Bishop Williamson sometimes gives some excessive commentary, he has strong opinions

squib19438 (4): Why do you feel that Williamson can't express his opinion on the "Holocaust"? Are Catholics required to believe it? He doesn't deny any article of faith that I'm aware of. What violent attacks did the "resistance" make on the SSPX? I've not heard of this.

None (2): That's like saying a bishop shouldn't talk about politics or governmental issues. These shouldn't be the bulk of his pontificate but sometimes they are necessary and edifying, as in the knowledge that monarchy is the preferred style of Catholic governance. The holocaust narrative pertains to all people, Catholic or not. He has every right as a bishop to talk about a matter that affects people's lives, albeit inadvertently.

None (4): You forgot "ridiculous".

hambeejee (4): Add "stupid". Yes they are, seriously. 1st hand experience with them.

None (2): How?

None (3): Of course we aren't required to believe it haha, but it's not appropriate for a bishop to have public positions on controversial historical topics that aren't about the faith.Regarding the violent attacks, I'm only talking about verbal attacks! Like, accusing the SSPX of being traitors etc., not physical attacks. They still today continue to violently accuse the SSPX, at least the ones I know in France

None (1): Yeah I'm not pro Williamson but he has every right, and in fact is rather courageous, in discussing the holocaust narrative.

None (1): Political and governmental issues can be very related to the faith, especially in the current context of the Church crisis, when most people give away the dogma of Christ the king.While judging if the Holocaust happened isn't really, in my opinion, something that touches the faith; it's not like of Catholics are the ones accused of commiting it, and I don't think the fact it happened or not had any impact on how a Catholic should live his life

Piancol (2): The list can go on and on lol

None (0): 1) lukewarm on modesty and the jab2) friendlier to Rome than previous generations3) tolerant of the FSSP4) staunchly anti-sede5) evolutionistsSummary of the neo-SSPX

squib19438 (1): You keep saying violent and yet it is not actually Violence. You could choose a more accurate description like viscious verbal attacks. Using Violent to describe a verbal attack is inaccurate.

squib19438 (3): fun fact in case anyone cares to research. The 1967 Encyclopedia Brittanica fails to mention a single mention of the Holocaust even though it was supposed to have happened over 20 years prior. Yet it covers thoroughly the JFK assasination which was only 4 years prior. I am speaking of direct knowledge as I own the full set.

None (2): I do agree it's courageous, but still I don't think it's really appropriate for a bishop, this is a historical controversy that has nothing to do with the crisis of the Church and with Catholicism; the SSPX already has a complex public image, I don't think it's prudent to try to fight all wars from the heads of the SSPX

None (1): No but it affects church politics such as Nostra Aetate and the false ecumenism of V2 such as the Jewish relations and counsel that was sought for many V2 documents.

None (3): 1. Proof of a change?2. Proof of a change? And being friendly isn't supposed to be a problem for a Christian.3. Proof of a change?4. Proof of a change? The SSPX has always been rightfully against dogmatic sedevacantism, just like many sedevacantist groups are against the SSPX5. Proof of a change? And mico evolution isn't condemned by the Church nor contradictory to Tradition of you're not a Protestant

hambeejee (2): Ah, stupid Resistance statements and accusations.

Huge-Explanation-358 (1): I've never met a fsspx priest that supports evolutionism

None (3): Ok sorry in my language we call it "verbal violence", I thought this was a thing in English, my bad!

PopPunkLeftist (1): 1. I don’t believe you 2. Okay and? That’s your proof of the Holocaust not happening? Embarrassing

None (1): It is appropriate because "holocaust" guilt and misinformation plagued V2 and Ratzinger's pontificate.

None (0): And why are they stupid?

squib19438 (3): I just said it was a fun fact, something interesting. I didn't say it was proof the "Shoah" didn't happen. Here's another fun fact. the word "holocaust" true meaning before WWII was a burnt offering to God.Here's a question, why does everyone still claim 6 million died When they've now admitted it was less than half of that? between 1.1 million and 2.7 million? 🤔Your name is very fitting by the way.

None (1): It's true, but knowing if the "Holocaust" was real or not has no reason to change anything about our faith; Ratzinger was wrong Catholics should have guilt about the Holocaust even if it's true.I think we don't have much to earn, and a lot to lose by taking a public stance on those issues, especially for a bishop

BusinessUniversity44 (1): Because they’re literally false on all accounts.

PopPunkLeftist (1): Yes words can have different meanings, your point being?And where the fuck did anybody admit that estimation you gave you dumbfuck lmao

None (1): I agree it has little to do with our actual faith but it's important to know these things especially as a Catholic in this age. Necessary? No. Williamson talking about the holocaust is simply not a big deal, as if he was talking about something vicious or bad. A bishop can opine. Just like priests talked about the vaccine or the disgusting practices that occurred during the lockdowns, it's topical information that's useful for laity to meditate on.

squib19438 (2): ok, why do you not believe me when I say there is no mention of the holocaust in the 1967 encyclopedia? If I am lying you can prove it right? why not prove it? Why is it not in there if it happened? Are they antisemetic?

None (1): I do agree it's important to know these things, but through historians, not through bishops, that's all I meant; I also agree it shouldn't be a big deal, but unfortunately it is, it's pretty much the most controversial topic in history for people of our time, meaning it's not very prudent for a bishop to take a public stance on it.I'd argue pretty much the same thing about the vaccines to some degree, but it depends if you're talking about the health perspective (which shouldn't be a topic for a bishop, especially if it's very controversial) or about the moral perspective (vaccines made using embryos etc.). And regarding the lockdowns it's also related to morals because the state usurped the right to force churches to close etc.; and it was also very unnecessary.However this is not really the main issue I think there is with bishop Williamson/the resistance, again I think this shouldn't be that big of a deal

PopPunkLeftist (1): <“iwasnt trying to use this random bullshit about the britantica to discredit the Holocaust I was using this random bullshit about britanic to discredit the Holocaust!”LmaoAnd you still haven’t even proved that lmao, are Catholics this fucking stupid?

Samui\_life (1): Why are you such a liar squib? The 1976 edition of the Encyclopedia Britannica does mention the Holocaust.It is covered in the "History of the Jews" section and also in the entry for "World War II".The coverage includes details about the systematic persecution and murder of Jews by the Nazi regime during World War II.

squib19438 (1): Is this what you're here for? Because you hate Catholics? That's fine a true Catholic embraces that. So onward we go, So 6 million huh? No bodies though right?

squib19438 (1): I did not say the 1976 edition. I said the 1967 edition.Reread my original post. I have no reason to lie. The point is even 20+ years afterward it was not considered a historical fact. You also prove my point. In 1976 or sometime between 167 and 1979, it was moved from what some consider propaganda to fact that cannot be questioned, so much that you can be charged as a criminal if you do.

PopPunkLeftist (1): If you’re argument that the Holocaust didn’t happen because there isn’t one big grave yard for the estimated 6 million that died (when a good amount of them were straight up cremated and buried in mass graves that we still don’t know where they are to this day) that is truly embracing but Catholics are a piggish and stupid people so what did I expect

squib19438 (1): How many were cremated? Best guess? Do you know how many they could cremate at one time? By the way I'm honored you chose me.

PopPunkLeftist (1): We don’t know the exact amount but it was a pretty good ass chunkAlso according to the people who made the cremators they could handle about 4-6 bodies “The bodies were “. . . sorted according to their combustibility: for the bodies of the well-nourished were to help burn the emaciated. Under the direction of the Kapos, the bearers began sorting the dead into four stacks. The largest consisted mainly of strong men, the next in size of women, then came children, and lastly a stack of dead Mussulmans, emaciated and nothing but skin and bones. This technique was called ‘express work,’ a designation thought up by the Kommandoführers and originating from experiments carried out in crematorium 5 in the autumn of 1943. The purpose of these experiments was to find a way of saving coke. . . . Thus the bodies of two Mussulmans were cremated together with those of two children or the bodies of two well-nourished men together with that of an emaciated woman, each load consisting of three, or sometimes, four bodies.” Filip Müller, Sonderkommando - Filip MüllerCatholic AND a Holocaust denier? Man you’re double stupid

squib19438 (1): You must be jewish yourself. How exactly does this prove that 6 million were killed? It is on you to prove it happened sir, not on me to prove it didn't. Thus far your only "proof" is from someone who is partisan, and in fact gained from his testimony and therefore is not credible. This is standard practice in a court of law sir.

squib19438 (1): "a pretty good ass chunk" How exacting and scientific!!!😂

PopPunkLeftist (1): “It is on you to prove that it happend”Okay, read up pig https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\_HolocaustAlso this is a dude who literally worked with the crematorium at the camps so he absolute not partisan source and he actually knows what he’s talking about lmaoYou obviously don’t know anything about the court of law but your entire religion is just a juficatoon to rape kids and swindle money out of people

PopPunkLeftist (1): We literally have no way of knowing truly lmao I know Catholicism is the pro child rape religion but you guys can’t get this fucking stupid

squib19438 (1): You honestly provided that as proof? The Wikipedia of the Holocaust??😂😂Com'on man this is not a serious conversation. Your hatred for the truth has you in a fog. You have spent zero time researching any of this.

squib19438 (1): That's all you got? Those people are not Catholic although they claim to be, and they are deservedly on the road to hell. So here's the people you're defending... https://abcnews.go.com/Health/baby-dies-herpes-virus-ritual-circumcision-nyc-orthodox/story?id=15888618

PopPunkLeftist (1): are you stuck up high school teache lmaoWikipedia isn’t really a bad source at all and maybe you should actually read up on any history book ever instead of listening to some antisemetic child rapist priest And you haven’t done any research at all, you’ve just been spouting shit that I easily debunked, are catholics this fucking stupid lmao

PopPunkLeftist (1): Nope, they’re Catholics through and through, don’t even try and pull that no true Scotsman’s excuse lmaoAnd yeah that’s evil, but metzitzah b’peh is incredibly rare and virtually not practiced in any Jewish groups bare from like 0.0000001%While Catholics are still raping kids to this day and their church will actively protect them and assist them

squib19438 (1): Ok you got me. you win, I gotta go now.

PopPunkLeftist (1): Bye

# Post 473: Is it possible to do a Pontifical Solemn High Mass without ceremonials?

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 7

Comments: 4

URL: https://i.redd.it/0qyqyu5rwqgd1.jpeg

I mean without the tunics, crosier, mitre etc. My contirmation was done this way as a Sung Mass. Is this in the rubrics? Ive seen SSPX Bishops exclusively do this, is it considered liturgical abuse? As you can see in the picture above, Bp Tissier isnt using any of the prescribed vestments

hambeejee (2): I am by no means a rubrician, in my opinion it would be treated as a regular Solemn High Mass, just no other Pontificals used like Tunic and Dalmatic under the Chasuble, Gloves, etc. and the servers/Acolytes would be bound to use rubrics that would prescribe for a Bishop when celebrating Mass (like kneeling while the MC and Thurifer give the Boat and open the Thurible for incensation respectively, AC1 and AC2 kneels while giving the Wine and Water, Kissing the ring for the solita osculas).It might be that a Parish lacks another 3 Clergymen/Ministers to celebrate a Pontifical Solemn High Mass. in this scenario at OLVC, they lack 2 Assisant Deacons and 1 Assistant Priest. Pardon me as this is what I usually see with regular Solemn High Masses celebrated by Bishops of the SSPX. And I think it would not be a Liturgical abuse.Feel free to correct me on this matter.

dbaughmen (2): Apparently this was a post-conciliar relaxation on this liturgical norm (prior to the promulgation of the NO) that allowed bishops to dispense with the pontificalia when necessary. I’m sorry that I don’t have the citation at hand. I’ve heard that Abp Lefebvre made use of the allowance often in Africa and afterwards. Abp Lefebvre has always had some rather wonky liturgical practices, and his successors love to copy every single one of them

hambeejee (2): Given that he went to Africa for missions and lacking clergymen, it would be a good reason enough he did that.Rubrics wise, I searched on the Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described by Fortescue, no indications of a regular Solemn High Mass celebrated by a Bishop was there. But given that he can always celebrate a Pontifical Low Mass and Sung Mass, he can do this as well.

PatriciusIlle (1): Not even a hat-tip? smh

dbaughmen (1): Wdym

# Post 474: Who are your favorite Saints and why?

Author: None

Score: 5

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ejyts2/who\_are\_your\_favorite\_saints\_and\_why/

Except Our Lady, of course.

# Post 475: Saint John Vianney, pray for us.

Author: None

Score: 16

Comments: 2

URL: https://i.redd.it/0k8mbs04vngd1.jpeg

jaqian (1): He was a Third Order Franciscan or Secular Franciscan as we're called now.

Brendanjfinnegan (1): A demon once said to him during an exorcism. "priest if there were 2 more of you in the world, my kingdom would be over"Cure of Ars, Ora Pro Nobis.

# Post 476: Why did Jesus entrust Mary to John?

Author: None

Score: 3

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ejv56s/why\_did\_jesus\_entrust\_mary\_to\_john/

Is there any special reason why Jesus chose St. John over others?

MacduffFifesNo1Thane (2): St. John was there for Him at the cross. St. John was the only one of the 12 Apostles to be there. The women at the cross couldn’t support a widow. Just like the widow of Naim, the Blessed Mother needed a son in ancient Israel to survive.St. John was there for His Mother. Presuming the Blessed Virgin was perpetually Virgin and her only Son was gone, the dedication of St. John is something Christ would have considered.

Minute\_Television262 (1): There is also the aspect of John being a representation of all of us. John often referred to himself as "the disciple Jesus loved". But John also was in a sense including every believer in Jesus until the end of time in the phrase "the disciple Jesus loved". (This is much like how Luke wrote his gospel to Theophilus. Theophilus may have been a real individual man but, his name means "friend of God" or "beloved of God" [or "the disciple Jesus loves" if you will]. So Luke was writing that gospel to all of us). When Jesus entrusted Mary to John/the disciple Jesus loved, Jesus was also entrusting her to us, and us to her. "Son, behold thy mother."

jocyUk (1): that He might commend a Virgin to a Virgin. “The pure is entrusted to the pure,” says Theophylact. To show that Joseph was not His father.See Lapide SJ if ever in doubt as to the meaning of scripture! [https://www.ecatholic2000.com/lapide/untitled-114.shtml#\\_Toc385609057](https://www.ecatholic2000.com/lapide/untitled-114.shtml#\_Toc385609057)

# Post 477: Interesting….

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 12

Comments: 4

URL: https://i.redd.it/w230v3xszigd1.jpeg

Do you guys think John XXIII truly was a freemason and had bad intentions?

colekken (2): Pope St. John XXIII was a huge supporter of the Latin Mass, he founded the 1962 Missal.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (0): I think he really reallly liked Latin.

dbaughmen (2): Its not that he was a big supporter, he hadn’t thought of the Novus Ordo yet.

dbaughmen (2): Roncalli loved the pomp and grandeur of the papacy. I wonder why he convoked Vatican II

# Post 478: Who do you think are the Greatest and Worst Popes?

Author: None

Score: 2

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ejbmff/who\_do\_you\_think\_are\_the\_greatest\_and\_worst\_popes/

Except for St. Peter, of course.

parsonpilgrim (4): Greatest, St Peter, not fair… second greatest, Gregory the Great or Pius V. Worst, Alexander VI or Francis I

craft00n (2): Best : Pie V.Worst : Liberius, who fought in favor of the arians.

dbaughmen (2): Among the best, St Pius X, St Pius VThe worst, Paul VI

HMX5000 (3): There have been many great Popes, it is difficult to choose one. I think that after Saint Peter I would choose Pius V. And as for the worst, I think you just need to see the newspaper regularly to know which one it is.

colekken (1): Best= Pope Pius IX ; Worst= Pope Benedict IX

goyayoshiro (2): Is he the one who's pretending to be humble, has been removing clergy who are orthodox, and has been twisting Church teachings to appeal to the secular world though unnecessary "innovations"?

HMX5000 (0): Unfortunately yes.

# Post 479: What do you think about Franco, Salazar and Moreno?

Author: None

Score: 3

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ej0f91/what\_do\_you\_think\_about\_franco\_salazar\_and\_moreno/

To be honest, I don't know much about them, but what I do know is that most people call them Dictators, but many Catholics call them Great Men. Some even go further and seem to think of them as Saints already. What is your opinion about them?

dayakcowboy (5): I don't know if they are saints, but they definitely did a lot of good for Church and State relations. They tried to integrate Catholic principles into their governance and steered their respective countries from bad influence, despite facing criticisms about their methods (which may seem brutal, but keep in mind most great men in history do have to employ stern actions to counter the crisis that they are facing). Whatever they may have done, they were more committed in preserving Catholic ideals of governance than most leaders of Western nations now. Which is why they do deserve a certain amount of reverence and honour.

None (2): Franco is the only one I know well, but in those cases what I usually do is that I say "no matter what they did wrong, they are still better than the alternative" (in Franco's case, communists). We shouldn't be fanboys of political leaders just because they fought our enemies, but we shouldn't completely disavow them just because they did some bad things or they are considered dictators by modern people

dbaughmen (2): Franco practically saved Spain from atheism and republicanism. He was a great man, could have been a saint he had great ethics set in place in Spain and united it to Holy Mother Church.

Inevitable\_Bison\_867 (1): Franco was awarded the Supreme Order of Christ by Pope Pius XII, which is the highest order of chivalry that can be awarded by the Pope.

# Post 480: Justify Disobedience

Author: Glittering\_Dingo\_943

Score: 5

Comments: 63

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1eiy9jt/justify\_disobedience/

I agree with most of the Society’s positions but I don’t believe this justifies disobedience. Please prove me wrong.I am slightly interested in pursuing the priesthood with the society but worried about the morality as actually being a priest with the SSPX is different than just attending.

Piklikl (17): The Church has made it clear throughout the centuries of the importance of the Liturgy and the Tridentine Rite. What the Church teaches 500 years ago, is still true today.Post Vatican II, the Church has stopped defining any dogma (the last time being establishing the doctrine of the Assumption of Our Lady in 1950). This makes sense as there’s overwhelming evidence that Vatican II (not a dogmatic council) has problems with some of the documents (the Church cannot teach error).Essentially, the only justification for the radical changes is an appeal to authority, ie “because I said so” (actually it’s more like “because the Pope said I could speak for him, and this is what I know he would want”, looking at you Bugnini), instead of a well reasoned expansion on existing teachings. While the men who happen to be alive today and are in positions of authority in the Church would never outright ban the Tridentine Rite (look at the backlash that happens every time they attempt to suppress it), they know that if they can cut off the “supply” of the Mass, ie well formed priests using the methods handed down through the centuries, it would only be a matter of time before there was no one left to celebrate it. They intended to do this by controlling all the bishops and not allowing them to ordain men set on celebrating the TLM.The SSPX did everything it could to “play ball” with Rome. Rome even approved the candidates and all that remained was for Rome to approve a date of the episcopal consecrations. Archbishop Lefebvre soon realized that Rome was just giving him the run around and waiting for him to die. If he did not consecrate the 4 Bishops, the SSPX would have been unable to continue with its mission which is the formation of priests in the traditional methods.The Tridentine Mass would not be at the level it is today if the 4 Bishops were not ordained (it’s an open secret that Rome only tolerates the Ecclesiastical Dei organizations as a way of drawing faithful away from the SSPX in an attempt to eliminate it). If you love the Latin Mass in 2024, you owe a debt of gratitude to Archbishop Lefebvre because he closely followed the dictates of his conscience, recognized the crisis in the Church, and chose to disobey men instead of offending God.

None (8): What justifies disobedience?Disobedience is justified when asked to do something bad. The Novus Ordo is dangerous for the faith (since it's made to be half protestant), therefore it's bad for priests not to be able to say the TLM."Supra lex, salus animarum" : "above the law is the salvation of souls"; it's more important to do good than to obey.The whole point of infallibility is for Catholics to know when exactly they HAVE to obey no matter what, even if they don't understand; everything else is subject to personal interpretation unless there is theological evidence against it. The NO and Vatican II's ideas are definitely not infallible, therefore if they are evil (which is the case) it's necessary for us not to submit to them.In my opinion, it's not only that we can disobey, it's that we have to!I have a brother who was ordained in the SSPX last month, happiest day of my life!Anyway, I'll pray for you!

None (3): If the choice is to obey and promote scandal or disobey, then it becomes a duty to disobey.

kmith0709 (6): Hi! I agonized over this for a really long time, and lost a lot of sleep over it, and eventually concluded that I had to choose between blind obedience and adherence to the Truth. Which one of those did I think was more important as a Christian. I also concluded that, by choosing obedience at all costs, I was following the letter of the law (obey Rome) but forsaking its spirit (be a good Catholic). And, if the SSPX was really "not in communion with Rome," then why are their priests validly ordained and some of their Sacraments considered licit? That's kind of absurd if you think about it. They obviously are Catholic.Above all, it was just very obvious to me which priests (NO vs SSPX) were really concerned about my soul. I'm gonna go where they want to help me get to heaven. SSPX priests are amazing! Their formation is the real deal.Best of luck!

SaintJohnApostle (2): What are the Society's positions that you agree with? Which ones do you disagree with?

Brendanjfinnegan (2): Obedience is an important virture but it is subservient to the virtue of faith, and indeed is part of it...faith is greater than obedience!!! If obedience of any superior is in conflict with faith, you not only have a right to disobey a superior, you have a DUTY to disobey a superior. Peter was the first Pope and when he was incorrect in what he taught regarding circumcision as being necessary in order to become Catholic, Paul publicly rebuked Peter. Countless examples like St. Joan of Arc, St. Robert Bellarmine and St. Athanasius did the same thing.

craft00n (2): Disobedience has rightfully happened multiple times during Church's history. As an example, Saint Athanasius was excommunicated, and Saint Lucifer even started a schism that got along for a hundred years.If you think SSPX is right and the crisis is as serious as they say, desobeying can be legitimate. But if you're not sure enough, find the right community : ICKSP, FSSP, IGS, are some of the several Latin mass and traditional theology oriented communities. You'll see soon enough that they can't speak freely about theological problems (I have a cousin in ICKSP), that they're theologicaly divided and incoherent (Wach, superior of ICKSP, think the Bshp Lefebvre was a saint, but my cousin think he was a schismatic and truly excommunicated) and that Rome could force them to celebrate NOM wherever they want (one of my parents friends, priest in ICKSP, told us that being in SSPX would be preferable for security reasons), but I really think you shouldn't do things that you don't find rightful.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (2): FSSP is the way to go

goyayoshiro (1): If the pope already thinks he is God and has been removing clergy who admire tradition, there's obviously something wrong.Pray hard for your vocation. I was in the same situation as you are. I was aspiring priesthood in the Catholic church. But given where the Church is going, I never imagined it would become this bad. Who knows if the next Pontiff is as bad as the current one or even worse. I had priest friends confide with me that they are 'not pleased' where it's going. I could not help but feel they are 'handcuffed' and are puppets by the secular Vatican. Truly heartbreaking.I don't think God cares if SSPX is separated from the Vatican. The Vatican is not God to really separate it from the Church's body. If the formula of the mass (that has worked for centuries and has proven to produce good fruit) appeals to you, it shows your love for reverence and respect to spending time with God compared to the Protestant-like NO format. In my book, SSPX is upholding a tradition that the faithful should NOT be deprived from.I'm quite sure God appreciates the highest form of prayer more when it demands pure reverence, solemnity and respect compared to a worship that appeals to a secular world. The church nowadays prioritizes what's appealing and conforming to the secular world over what's proper to God. I, myself, would rather disobey a man, than disobey God. The pope is and never will be God.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (2): Can I ask how the novus ordo is ALWAYS dangerous to the salvation of souls? Less reverent is one thing but dangerous is another. I get it reflects ecumenism but how does Protestant influence intrinsically make the entire form of the liturgy sinful and unpleasant to God NO MATTER WHAT? I have it in all caps not to argue but just to stress what I’m most confused about.

Glittering\_Dingo\_943 (1): I’m just worried that since SSPX priests are suspended (besides during confessions) that by carrying out priestly ministry in disobedience as a suspended priest could be endangering to one’s soul.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (2): The FSSP accept the heresies of Vatican 2 and the Sacrilege of the Novus Ordo

Glittering\_Dingo\_943 (1): I’ve been discerning ICKSP and FSSP as well, I’m just worried about thier being allowed to continue which leads me to consider the society

None (2): It's a fair question! I hesitated for a while because as a kid I'd go to NO on some occasions, so at some point as an adult I had to chose if I had to follow the SSPX on this question or not.Have you read the short critical exam of the NO? Because the consequence of it is to believe that there is something doctrinally wrong with the NO, not only because of the dangerous freedoms it leaves to the priests, not only because of the language translations (since this study was made right after the NO was published, so when it was still in latin), but because of its very essence.Indeed, the NO in general doesn't reflect the Catholic sense of Mass (sacrifice of Christ), but the Protestant one (a meal in memory of the last supper). Which had the consequence of making millions of Catholics around the world, including priests, losing the faith in the Catholic sense of the Mass.So the NO is still valid (it's still the body of Christ in the Host), but the rite isn't properly Catholic, and it makes people lose the faith.I wouldn't say it's necessarily sinful though, I'd argue it's not most of the time, because for something to be sinful people need to be fully conscious of what's wrong with it; and the difference between the NO and the TLM is very subtle for most people, even if it's very deep. So it'd only be a sin for someone who perfectly knows how the NO is in essence dangerous for the faith and protestant.Something that stroke me was how similar the NO was to the Protestant reformation; deleting the offertory, translating everything,... At the beginning most protestants believed in the real presence (strict Lutherans still do), but progressively they lost the faith in more and more aspects of the Mass

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): also read: [https://unavocecanada.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/ottaviani-intervention.pdf](https://unavocecanada.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/ottaviani-intervention.pdf)

None (3): I also worry about this, as a married man and father of five who is considering attending the local SSPX chapel. So it seems like the SSPX has legitimate jurisdiction supplied from Rome, but not the local ordinary, is that an accurate understanding?

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (2): St Athanasius was exiled censured and suspended and yet he continued to say public mass give confirmations and even ordain deacons.Faith is a theological virtue and as such it holds higher precedence then the moral virtue of obedience.What is more endangering to your soul? modernism and liturgical abuses that are incardinated by Rome and your local bishop, or your local priest who simply gives you sacraments and sermons and maybe educates your children, disobeying the mandate of Rome and Diocese to do the work of satan (liturgical abuse and the heresy of religious indifferentism is worse then murder and abortion).

None (2): SSPX also have some other authorisations (marriages in some districts, ...), but I think this is beside the point.If you're want to know if the status of the SSPX is definitely licit in the eye of Rome, it probably isn't.The question is, as you said, is disobedience always bad.You could read saint Thomas Aquinas on obedience; it's never mandatory to obey something evil, in fact it's always mandatory to disobey in that case.The point of the law is to push people towards the good; as soon as it stops doing that, it ceases being a law.If you need proof of why it's necessary to disobey, meaning proof of why what is asked to us (accepting Vatican II's errors/accepting the NO Mass) is evil, I will happily provide them for you!

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (2): Canon 1335 showcases the Supplied Jurisdiction the SSPX Priests receive. \*\*Can. 1335\*\*—§ 1. If the competent authority imposes or declares a censure in a judicial process or by an extra-judicial decree, it can also impose the expiatory penalties it considers necessary to restore justice or repair scandal.§ 2. If a censure prohibits the celebration of the sacraments or sacramentals or the performing of acts of the power of governance, the prohibition is suspended whenever this is necessary to provide for the faithful who are in danger of death. \*\*If a\*\*\*\*\*latae sententiae\*\*\*\*\*censure has not been declared, the prohibition is also suspended whenever one of the faithful requests a sacrament or sacramental or an act of the power of governance; for any just reason it is lawful to make such a request.\*\*

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): IBP then. I just saw your response to my post lol

Piklikl (2): Ecclesia Dei groups are just “smells and bells” Catholics. They don’t care about the actual faith underlying the prayer, but just what the prayer looks like. However the two are always linked and their priests almost always become extremely liberal or extremely conservative. They’re trying to have their cake and eat it too.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Oh you think Francis will take away your TLM privileges? I doubt that will happen since the sole reason those societies exist are for TLM. Taking the TLM away from them would cause a massive uproar and I don’t think he would do that. If he does do that you could probably join the SSPX after. The thing is that the SSPX is only going to be more disobedient to the Pope unless they actually become a canonical society. Their bishops are old so they will need to (illicitly) consecrate bishops again which would constitute as a second schismatic act. They already operate as a completely separate church and with two schismatic acts without remorse, they eventually could be considered as schismatics. The SSPX is a very extreme path to go on since the justification for being able to celebrate Mass as SSPX (suspended priests) is mostly based on the idea that the novus Ordo is sinful and unpleasant to God which causes a crisis and that crisis allows people to go to SSPX. I really think the FSSP is the way to go. I don’t think Francis would take away their TLM.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (3): Doesn’t the SSPX say it’s sinful to go to the NO? And that the NO is unpleasant to God?

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Ottavani changed his mind about the mass.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (3): see my answer above.You can find plenty on supplied jurisdiction on [sspx.org](http://sspx.org) and in Fr Hesse talks on youtube.in most cases (one exception is Kansas) the local ordinary hates SSPX, hates TLM and loves liturgical abuse so of course does not support SSPX.SSPX incardination was as a fraternal society of priests in Switzerland from 1970 through 1975 which is where their permission to give sacraments stemmed from (it was never operating under a specific diocese similar to religious orders) and if you believe as I do their suspension was never valid according to canon law for various reasons including they were never granted an appeal .I am a father of more then 5 and there is no reason for you not to visit and study much more to consider this as it may be the best thing you could do to fortify the souls of your family and raise future saints. Put the time in. Fr Hesse, Michael Davies and the works of Archbishop Lefebvre will steer you straight.

None (2): Yes I think it's the right way to see it! The SSPX has some authorisations, which proves it's not schismatic because Rome would never make schismatic sacraments licit

Glittering\_Dingo\_943 (1): I definitely agree

None (2): SSPX priests do say that, but as always it's never sinful when people aren't aware it's bad, that's what every SSPX priest I talked with about those questions told me!Saying that it is unpleasant to God is the same thing as saying it's bad, and yes the NO is bad since it makes people lose the faith and is essentially non Catholic

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (0): unlikely, the Pope simply told him to be quiet. Show me where he stated he disavowed a single thing in the Intervention.

None (3): Thank you Mitth

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (2): Great. FSSP it is

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (2): Your saying it’s bad. What exactly do you mean by that? Apparently it’s a sin for an sspx parishioner to attend a NO if they take communion

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): “I have rejoiced profoundly to read the Discourse by the Holy Father on the question of the new Ordo Missae, and especially the doctrinal precisions contained in his discourses at the public Audiences of November 19 and 26[a] after which I believe, no one can any longer be genuinely scandalized. As for the rest, a prudent and intelligent catechesis must be undertaken to solve some legitimate perplexities which the text is capable of arousing. In this sense I wish your “Doctrinal Note” [on the Pauline Rite Mass] and the activity of the Militia Sanctae Mariae wide diffusion and success.[6]”https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ottaviani\_Intervention

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (3): The assumption is a SSPX parishioner is well educated and is aware of the issues of NO, and obviously we reject communion in the hand unequivocally but not sure we want to muddy the water that way. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0Yfo63OiNeo](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0Yfo63OiNeo)

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (3): But how bad? It is a Catholic mass and many NO add Latin and chants and ad orientem and altar rails, receiving on the tongue and many Catholic things to it. The same sacrifice on Calvary is there. It is way more similar to the tlm than the average Protestant service. You’re saying that just because there’s some Protestant influence in the promulgation means that the whole mass is intrinsically non Catholic and displeasing to God NO MATTER HOW REVERENT? IYou also gotta explain how it’s no longer pleasing to God. Did God tell you? Why would the same sacrifice on Calvary be displeasing to God even if offered up reverently? The No mass still contains many Catholic prayers. It’s still a Catholic mass. It has the same sacrifice as the TLM. It can be done reverently.

None (1): It is, only if the parishioner perfectly knows the NO is bad. As an SSPX parishioner I went to NO for a while without knowing.It is bad because it's not Catholic, it has a Protestant sense of the meaning of the Mass

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): "believe, no one can any longer be genuinely scandalized"do you believe that? Would Ottaviani continue to believe that today with the results and further study and testimonials?he didnt disavow anything. The Intervention stands on its own. He as so many others tried to assuage the issues with trust in the Popes. The modernist Popes today actively participate in pagan worship. Back to your original question, how does the modernist performances of the Pope and Rome not demand disobedience?

None (1): Yes exactly

Araedya (1): It’s more than just the aesthetics and reverence though, it’s the change in prayers, the reduction or elimination of things protestants find uncomfortable such as sin, hell, saints, sacrifice, etc. The focus of the mass was completely changed, downplaying the sacrificial nature and replacing it with a sharing of a communal meal. You only need to read the protestant reactions after the new mass was promulgated to understand how different the mass is at its very core. If protestants can now worship without objection at the catholic mass, that speaks volumes imo. It goes along with the new theology that came out of V2.Is God pleased with this? I don’t know. I have a hard time believing he would be ok with the watering down of the mass and theology to appease protestants. I used to have hang ups about the SSPX position on the NO and I still don’t agree with it being sinful to attend but looking at the big picture, I understand why they take the position(s) they do. Attend the TLM exclusively for awhile and then try to switch back to the NO. I think you will understand more.

None (1): I am leaving Reddit because it has become an obstacle to my duty of state as a Catholic Father. It has become a distraction, a temptation, and ultimately an idol. I would fraternally encourage all reading this message to consider whether their own use of the platform is edifying and healthy, or whether it is a superficial lesser good that only serves as an obstacle to your personal and spiritual growth.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): He was talking about the missal of the Mass regarding scandalization. It’s the idea that the missal in it of itself is not scandalizing which is being implied in that section. He wasn’t talking about the popes behaviors. To answer your question, I would say it depends on which performances require obedience in the first place.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): The sspx position is that God is displeased though and that if you know the mass has Protestant influence then you are sinning by going to it. I. Don’t think I can accept that. NO come in a variety.I don’t attend many NO: the one near me though is one I dislike attending. It’s undeniably with Protestant influence but I would never go so far to say me attending that is a sin or that it’s displeasing to God.

None (1): I am leaving Reddit because it has become an obstacle to my duty of state as a Catholic Father. It has become a distraction, a temptation, and ultimately an idol. I would fraternally encourage all reading this message to consider whether their own use of the platform is edifying and healthy, or whether it is a superficial lesser good that only serves as an obstacle to your personal and spiritual growth.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): Bp Schneider's conclusions on SSPX may be interesting to you[https://theoldroman.com/2022/01/19/schneider-it-is-licit-for-men-to-enter-piusx-seminaries-gloria-tv/](https://theoldroman.com/2022/01/19/schneider-it-is-licit-for-men-to-enter-piusx-seminaries-gloria-tv/)[https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/bp-schneider-sspx-who-have-integrity-of-the-faith-should-be-granted-faculties-to-say-mass/](https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/bp-schneider-sspx-who-have-integrity-of-the-faith-should-be-granted-faculties-to-say-mass/)I suggest you read Lefebvres books and begin a dialogue with a SSPX parish and their priest to determine if it could be a good fit for you.

Araedya (1): Is the TLM merely a preference? Are both the NO and the TLM equally fine as long as they are done reverently or is the TLM an objectively superior liturgy that communicates the fullness of the catholic faith? Ifit’s the latter, how could God be pleased at the promulgation of a liturgy that compromised the faith in order to appeal to heretics.How you answer this question really determines if you will ever believe the SSPX are justified in what they say and how they act.PS: the only reason the unicorn NO is exceptional is because it typically tries to adhere to the TLM as much as possible.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (3): Not everybody prefers to TLM…. I can agree with the TLM being objectively better but I can’t agree with saying that it’s a sin to attend a watered down mass knowing it’s watered down. Just like there’s nothing wrong with drinking a watered down coffee.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Ok thanks. Its just really tricky relying on a bishop since bishops are differing on this matter with most being against the SSPX position. From the SSPX position, idk if one can even rely on the pope regarding this. The SSPX parish near me would definitely be a great fit. I just don’t know if their stance is objective truth and I have to believe all of it in order to believe their masses are licit. If I bring my friends and family into this and it’s wrong, it will blow up in our faces and do great harm later. It’s really just I don’t know who to believe. Catholic creators I’ve been following for a while are standing against the SSPX, and they seem pretty genuine. While there are some genuine sspxers, some can be quite vulgar and intense and it seems like they never are charitable with the Pope. Idk if I’ve seen a trad say they love Pope Francis. I think we can love the Pope, even if we dislike what he does. I get why there is a lot of hate behind this, since the church has lost so much since Vatican 2. Everyone just acts like it’s all clear cut when it’s not. People are definitely being uncharitable from both sides, can you agree with me on that at least? I don’t know if I’ll talk to a priest because he’ll probably just tell me to read a book or something which I’m already doing. Unless priests usually have a bunch of evidence on hand, idk if a conversation will help. Online conversations seem to work best for me. If you have a priest that is willing to answer A TON of questions, I would be glad to have contact info.Please pray for me on this matter. I want the truth for real

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): I haven’t been to many NOs so Idk if it’s a preference. I would rather go to a TLM though than NO. Maybe it is objectively better. But I still think that God could be pleased with a sacrifice offered reverently even if the liturgy as a whole was compromised. By your logic, why should God be pleased with the Byzantine liturgy leaving out the filioque to accommodate the traditions of heretics so that they may be open to being Catholic? I wouldn’t go so far to saying it’s a sin to attend NO with knowledge of its ecumenical purpose as long as your intention is worship.

None (1): I am leaving Reddit because it has become an obstacle to my duty of state as a Catholic Father. It has become a distraction, a temptation, and ultimately an idol. I would fraternally encourage all reading this message to consider whether their own use of the platform is edifying and healthy, or whether it is a superficial lesser good that only serves as an obstacle to your personal and spiritual growth.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): ^(It’s really just I don’t know who to believe. Catholic creators I’ve been following for a while are standing against the SSPX, and they seem pretty genuine. While there are some genuine sspxers, some can be quite vulgar and intense and it seems like they never are charitable with the Pope) \*I suggest you consider how to remove yourself of seeking human respect and feelings. Who cares how genuine Michael Lofton, Matt Fradd, or Alex Jones for that matter appear to be. It is meaningless and their charisma has nothing to do with their opinions, wisdom, or what they offer your salvation.\* ^(Everyone just acts like it’s all clear cut when it’s not.) \*No one I know believes that. I think the crisis hardly makes sense and we have to rely on Faith quite a bit. But no one has a safer position then the Society. They are uncompromising on the tenets of the Deposit of Faith yet they still retain a dialogue with the Pope and Rome, say the 1962 mass, and disavow sedevecantists.\* ^(People are definitely being uncharitable from both sides, can you agree with me on that at least?) \*Yes, and? Your soul is at stake don't worry about other people so much.\* ^(I don’t know if I’ll talk to a priest because he’ll probably just tell me to read a book or something which I’m already doing. Unless priests usually have a bunch of evidence on hand, idk if a conversation will help.)\*Sounds defeatist. these priests spent 6 years in seminary and many since answering other similar peoples questions. Many of them converted to SSPX themselves, only the minority grew up traditional. They won't just have facts and understanding they will often have the ability to meet you where you are and give relevant examples to help convince you\* back to the beginning: just don’t know if their stance is objective truth and I have to believe all of it in order to believe their masses are licit.\*what do you mean by this? Have you noticed that Pope Francis, Bishop Schneider and the PCED have all given you permission to use SSPX for sacraments? SSPX is not orthodox there is no way a Catholic institution can give some sacraments and not others. Bp Fellay claims Pope Francis gave him written permission to ordain priests, do you really think you should avoid them for mass when the rest of the parishes are a danger to your soul?\* [\*https://onepeterfive.com/sspx-mass-shelter/\*](https://onepeterfive.com/sspx-mass-shelter/)

Araedya (1): I mean, with that logic you might as well attend protestant services. You’re just there to worship after all.The goal of ecumenism shouldn’t be to water down the faith to make it more appealing to protestants but to help them understand why the catholic position is correct. All false ecumenism does is turn catholics into protestants.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (2): Ok you present good points. I also attend TLM but attend diocesan confession!I guess again I just can’t condemn every single novus ordo as sinful to attend. I can count the different NOs I’ve been to on one hand and there are denitiely more reverent ones out there, and I feel like I have no right to condemn them. The debate isnt “well why don’t we just attend the TLM?” The concern is about condemning all NOs (which make up the majority of masses) on the face of the earth as intrinsically evil just because it’s watered down. That’s something I can’t get behind even though I strongly prefer the TLM. And because I can’t get behind that, I also can’t get behind the sspx line of reasoning for why it’s ok to attend their chapels. There are other TLMs in better standing than I can attend.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): How is that the same logic? You’re missing my point. Ecumenism isn’t the point of the mass, correct. But I’m saying that just because the NO was promulgated with ecumenism as one of the goals, doesn’t mean every NO is unpleasant to God and sinful to go to if you are aware of its origins. That’s my point.

None (1): I am leaving Reddit because it has become an obstacle to my duty of state as a Catholic Father. It has become a distraction, a temptation, and ultimately an idol. I would fraternally encourage all reading this message to consider whether their own use of the platform is edifying and healthy, or whether it is a superficial lesser good that only serves as an obstacle to your personal and spiritual growth.

Araedya (1): If God is pleased by a “compromised” liturgy just because it’s celebrated reverently, where do we draw this line? There are reverent protestant services. The orthodox liturgies are reverent. Is God pleased with all of them? Reverence can’t be the sole determining factor. If you follow this line of thinking it ends up leading to religious relativism.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Ok I’m very sorry you don’t have a non SSPX Latin mass near you. If I was in your position then I’d be way more likely to attend since I abstain from the NO as much as I can. I would probably attend the SSPX masses if the priests were not suspended, regardless of their opinions about the NO. It’s just that they are suspended so it makes sense for me to go to a different TLM with non suspended priests. Let’s pray for a regular communion so that all who want to go to TlM but can’t because of controversy maybe can someday. I am a Protestant convert too so I see where you’re coming from. Thanks for taking the time to type back. Could you go into more about why you are indifferent about the disobedience of the SSPX?

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): It’s the same sacrifice though. It’s the same sacrifice on Calvary. That’s what we offer up to God as worship. The sacrifice doesn’t change. And there are NOs where the sacrifice is offered up reverently.

None (1): I am leaving Reddit because it has become an obstacle to my duty of state as a Catholic Father. It has become a distraction, a temptation, and ultimately an idol. I would fraternally encourage all reading this message to consider whether their own use of the platform is edifying and healthy, or whether it is a superficial lesser good that only serves as an obstacle to your personal and spiritual growth.

Araedya (1): Even with validity and reverence, the theology behind the NO is still flawed. That’s the problem.But regardless, as I said earlier, I don’t think it’s sinful to attend, especially if the priest is well formed and orthodox. Even with me being mostly on board with SSPX positions, I will (and do) still attend the NO if I have no other choice because I just can’t get comfortable with the idea of just staying home. But that perhaps shows the inconsistency of my own thinking.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Ok That makes sense. What do you have to make of this scenario: I want to take my Protestant friend to mass cause they’re interested. TLM wise there is a Sunday low mass at 7 am about the same distance as a Sunday high mass at 8:30 am SSPX. I really think my friend is more likely to be evangelized by a high mass. Would going to the SSPX for the reason that my friend would like it more be a just cause for attending. Or I guess my question would be, how does the priority of the salvation of souls come into this scenario?

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Ok so you believe God can be pleased by a novus ordo and that someone with knowledge of the flawed theology behind it can attend and that attending wouldn’t be a sin?

None (1): I am leaving Reddit because it has become an obstacle to my duty of state as a Catholic Father. It has become a distraction, a temptation, and ultimately an idol. I would fraternally encourage all reading this message to consider whether their own use of the platform is edifying and healthy, or whether it is a superficial lesser good that only serves as an obstacle to your personal and spiritual growth.

Araedya (1): I’m hesitant to say it’s sinful to attend, deficient as it may be, and inconsistent as it may make me. The sacraments are tremendously important and since this question usually is a matter of attending the NO or just staying home, I’m more inclined to say its better to attend the NO rather than nothing at all as long as it’s not outright heterodox.Whether or not the NO is pleasing to God is another question. I can’t imagine he would be pleased by most of what came out of V2. Maybe the better word would be tolerated.

# Post 481: Sedevacantist mass attendance

Author: None

Score: 6

Comments: 28

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1eifxp5/sedevacantist\_mass\_attendance/

I wanted to run this by everyone and see what y'all think. I've been working 6 or 7 days a week for months now and haven't been able to attend mass(luckily my wife and kids attend sspx chapel weekly). I'm hoping on getting Sundays off soon at work. I miss attending mass. It really is killing me being a way from the blessed sacrament. I have an opportunity to attend a mass this coming Tuesday. Only problem is that it's a sedevacantist mass. I wouldn't take the sacrament, but only be there to pray. What is everyone's thoughts on attending this coming Tuesday?

MarcellusFaber (6): Strange that you should ask this; I’ve just commented on it in another thread. In short, the reasons for not going would be 1) You do not believe that the priest is a Catholic 2) The priest is a vitandus or declared tolerated excommunicate (impossible in my opinion, but also extremely unlikely and easily verifiable if it is possible) 3) There would be a danger to your Faith or scandal to others.As to one, the only possibilities are that he is a heretic or a schismatic. As to heresy, I would ask the grounds for the accusation (I believe it to be nonsense). As to schism, those who refuse submission to the Roman Pontiff due to reasonably doubting the validity of his election are not schismatic. See Wernz-Vidal 7:398 (I can provide other references if necessary). To say that our contention that Francis is not Pope due to his blatant heresy is unreasonable is ridiculous; perhaps you may disagree, but the major premise of our syllogism is the common teaching of the theologians and canonists, even if there is a small number that disagree.As to 2), as an SSPX attendee, I doubt you are terribly bothered by the prospect of excommunication by the supposed authorities. That said, I find it extremely unlikely that a ‘Sede’ priest has been excommunicated by name, which is what is necessary for us to be forbidden to attend his Mass or request the Sacraments from him.As to 3), how would he be a danger to your Faith? First, I doubt that he would preach at a week-day Mass, and second, their preaching is in general good and not dissimilar from the preaching of SSPX priests. Perhaps you would be afraid that he would bring up the question of the vacancy, which perhaps you think might tempt you to believe that the gates of hell have prevailed (a nonsensical idea)? Would a Catholic have been justified in avoiding the Mass of a Molinist Catholic priest in the past simply because he believed that Molinism is blasphemous and leads to atheism (despite it never having been censured), worrying that he may mention it in a sermon and endanger his Faith? He would have very weak Faith if that were the case. In the case of scandal, it must be remembered that there must actually be a person to be scandalised. Who could that be? Also, the answer would be to simply not tell them. The giving up of spiritual benefits due to pharisaical scandal is also only obliged in limited circumstances.I have one last thing: not receiving Holy Communion at the Mass makes no difference; if you cannot receive Holy Communion due to who is saying the Mass, you also cannot participate (cannot have communicatio in sacris), and it would be a sin to go at all except in the circumstance that you are going to simply be passively present for the sake of civil honour (which you are not). If you are going to participate in the Mass for spiritual benefit, then it makes no sense at all not to receive Holy Communion if you are in a state of grace.The justification in law for this is canons 2261 and 2284 of the 1917 code, which allow the laity to approach suspended priests or even undeclared tolerated excommunicates, for the Sacraments for any just reason (wishing to attend daily Mass certainly qualifies according to the commentaries on the canon). The equivalent canon in the ‘83 code is canon 1335, if you believe that one to be in force (which it is not).

Minute\_Television262 (3): Sedes and SSPX are basically doing the same thing. One just thinks Francis is a pope and the other thinks Francis is an antipope. The great St Vincent Ferrer (who performed miracles and converted large numbers of people to the Faith) mistakenly thought an antipope was the pope, so this demonstrates that Catholics, even the greatest of the saints, can potentially err in good faith about such a matter.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (2): Not all sedes are cut from the same clothIMO SSPV is pretty close to SSPX and there is no doubt about their episcopal lineage so you could receive sacraments there without much concern. But it really comes down to the individual priest. Some are off their rocker and deny sacraments to people that attend FSSP like parishes over this or that. CMRI is pretty middle road but they and all the other groups are Thuc line. Sanborn and Dolan's organizations refuse to hear confessions of SSPX parishioners nor give other sacraments...

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (2): Sedevacantists are schismatics, and additionally heretics depending on which type. Their Episcopal Lineages (The main ones being the Mendez and Thuc Line) are invalid. As Catholics, we do not attend the ceremonies and meetings of Non-Catholics, such is Scandalous and Evil. Praying with such has been condemned since the early years of the Church.

None (3): the problem is that many sedes are actually heretics, since they believe in ultramonatism, whereby the pope has no limitations to his authority. This would violate Vatican I which clearly defines the boundaries of papal supremacy. Lefebvre also didn't believe in any form of hyperpapalism and defended Vatican I. So I would say on those grounds, communing with known heretics should be avoided.

dbaughmen (3): I personally believe it is fine to attend a sedevacantist mass as they are also our Catholic brethern, they are amazing at upholding the faith. Although we do not agree with their act and what they do, it is fine. Some people paint sedevacntism as “protestantism” but its the same valid Catholic faith. Some people don’t like to say it, but Archbishop Lefebvre said it was fine if some priests took the name out of the Pope in the prayers. There are some sedevacantist priests within the ranks of the SSPX

None (2): Thank you for your thoughtful and well detailed reply.

MarcellusFaber (2): Heresy is the pertinacious and direct denial or positive doubt of a revealed truth to be believed with divine and Catholic Faith (something de fide). To say that ultramontanism is heretical is unbelievably retarded; what de fide truth does it directly contradict? Not only this, but respected Catholics such as Joseph Fessler and Josef Hergenröther, both prominent Cardinals and theologians of the 19th century, were undoubtedly ultramontanist. Were they heretics? Also, the Catholic Encyclopaedia article on ultramontanism states that the enemies of ultramontanism are the enemies of the Catholic Church.

Odd\_Glove7043 (4): This isn't an SSPX position or a Catholic position

None (2): I really feel that the sedevacantist are truly catholic also. These are very confusing times to be living in post Vatican II. I just don't ever see myself believing that there couldn't be a pope. I don't despise Pope Francis. He just saddens me. I do pray for this man and have love for our Pope. He just often frustrates me.

MarcellusFaber (3): You’re welcome.

TooEdgy35201 (3): Allow me to point something out: Your brand of ultramontanism is a tiny relic of less than 0.001%, just as High Toryism has been usurped by the "true blue Tory" brand, so was ultramontanism, but in the latter case it just picked up where Lamennais left off. Ultramontanism always had two sides to it as a political philosophy: Joseph de Maistre's view in his book "On the Pope" vs Lamennais who was a liberal, believed in separation of church and state, democracy etc.When someone used to define Toryism, he would refer to it as a political philosophy centred around God, King and Country. Socially conservative, fundamentally Christian in spirit, and economically leaning towards protectionism and paternalism. Today the insulting parody version is secularist, very socially liberal and treats the country like an economic zone rather than as an ancient nation with its own customs, language and culture. They support gay marriage, gender ideology, late-term abortion, multiculturalism, euthanasia, criminalizing prayer etc.I can cite Mary Whitehouse's books against libertine permissive society, Samuel Johnson's books, Richard Hooker's The laws of ecclesiastical polity, Quintin Hogg's book on conservatism, Keith G. Feiling's books on the history of the Tory Party and Samuel Coleridge Taylor's works to give the sense of actual Tory beliefs. The other interlocutor will not care however and continue to insist on the parody version because it's the one with power and authority. Your citation of an outdated article from the time of Pope St. Pius X and two 19th Century theologians has the same power as me trying to argue in favour of High Toryism.When you look at Rome, reality collides with fancy imagination. The ultramontanist is not a man who believes in state religion, the Kingship of Christ, defending God's morality and uncompromising hostility to the ideas of the encyclopedists and the philosophes. The ultramontanist at the Court of Rome is still a follower of absolute monarchy, true enough, but he takes it to such a level where The Lord Pope turns into a Vice-God on earth and the Church is a slave to the Vice-God Supreme Roman Pontiff.The ultramontanist is otherwise very socially liberal, more likely than not a Jesuit or sympathetic to them, supports radical development of doctrine theology, rules the Roman Court like any other secular Court by having a bank which is embroiled in countless financial scandals, has an affinity for Masonic ideology by emphasizing false ecumenism and equality of all religions and believes with sincere heart that The Lord Pope has the right to alter the deposit of faith through the authority of Christ.Ultramontanists such as Cardinal Ghirlanda SJ believe that The Lord Pope has unlimited power and may even alter the text of sacred scripture itself, and that he is infallible in everything he says and does. Other Jesuits like Cardinals Hollerich SJ and Martini SJ are also stern ultramontanists and incredibly socially liberal. Francis in fact has Cardinal Martini SJ as his role model.As much as I like Cardinal Billot and Pope Pius IX, I simply do not live in the 19th Century. The Roman Curia is the source of endless abuse, scandals and heresy. It caused greater damage than Napoleon ever did. Being a mindless flatterer of the Court of Rome has severe negative impacts on one's spirituality and may lead to losing one's faith entirely, plenty of such cases exist. To be a traditionalist in this era wicked era means categorical opposition to the infernal Court of Rome which has the gall to corrupt the faith of Christ.[https://www.lifesitenews.com/blogs/cdl-muller-theory-of-popes-unlimited-power-contradicts-the-entire-catholic-tradition/](https://www.lifesitenews.com/blogs/cdl-muller-theory-of-popes-unlimited-power-contradicts-the-entire-catholic-tradition/)

dbaughmen (2): Did you see “I personally believe”

dbaughmen (4): I know it is a really saddening thing, sedevacantists say some truths. They are truly holy Catholics who are confused and saddened just like us, people overlook them and treat them too harshly sometimes.

MarcellusFaber (1): It is no refutation of ultramontanism to point out that people who follow an anti-Pope are unsound and that an illegitimate Curia causes scandal. None of that disproves the powers of a true Pope nor the obedience and respect owed to him. It is completely absurd to characterise a Catholic position as heretical, which is a question of objective principles, based on its mischaracterisation and superficial similarity to the ideas of heretics. The existence of a fake diamond does not disprove the existence of genuine diamonds.

alicceeee1922 (0): >Cardinal Gianfranco Ghirlanda, S.J., a canon lawyer who helped the Pope with hiscurial reform, presented the “theory of the papacy as an unlimited power of divine right over the whole Church, as if the Pope were a\*Deus in terris\*\[God on earth\].”Sounds like a genuine ultramontanist to me. We should help him out by introducing another pragmatic sanction of Bourges and by helping the Jesuits to return to the Roman Court. Why do they have to be in our lands when they can adore the "God on earth" in the Vatican face to face?

TooEdgy35201 (1): You will claim that the Novus Ordo Church is not a refutation since it is a sect, fine. The refutation of that ecclesiological model (e.g. one where the King/State can do literally nothing whatsoever to alter the situation) is contained in the hundreds or maybe even thousands of ultra-richerist groups who have no unity amongst each other. Every autonomous unit holds whatever the local Priest or Bishop claims, whose doubtful orders may sometimes come from an Old Catholic line. One group will teach that Jews go to heaven, the other group will permit meat on Fridays, yet another one will have altar girls. This is the Achilles heel of sedevacantism, we are facing a Protestantization of the Catholic faith with no central authority which can regulate seminaries, discipline, ordinations, catechisms etc. I am a not a sede out of principle, that is someone who believes that we have to endlessly pray for reprieve from the Cromwellian tyrants and that the spiritual sphere has total supremacy over the secular sphere (as shown in Joseph de Maistre's book), thereby excluding all defensive action by a Catholic State and/or Catholic prince. My sedevacantism is by coincidence, I am forced to endure this regretful situation, at heart I am a regalist whose thought is rooted in the honourable faculty of the Sorbonne and history. If we had a Catholic prince, I'd be the first to demand the immediate appointment of another pope when the momentum is great enough. But until something like that becomes viable the Catholic state has to defend itself by banning all communication, withdrawing funding, enacting radical regium placet, cleansing the local national church from abuse, heresy, fill the dioceses with Catholic Bishops etc. Ultra-richerism is fundamentally insulting to one's intelligence and historically illiterate.The Catholic prince can and must defend his national church. >illegitimate Curia causes scandalThe Curia and the Jesuits have caused the greatest crisis of ecclesiology and faith in history. They have forfeited their right to continued existence and need to fade into history. The infernal Roman Court did not exist before 1088, the apostate Jesuit Order did not exist before 1540. The Pope as well as the church can do very well without them.

alicceeee1922 (1): Do you recognize that the principle of epikeia is in effect, and that insisting on ultramontanism is akin to wearing cement shoes while doing a triathlon? You have no pope, and before you mention it, no all the trailer park popes elected via conclavism are not fit for purpose.Look up what the Catholic Kings did during the great schism. Did they blindly stick to one claimant? No, they deposed them all and the Catholic states acted as if no pope existed.The other guy already cited the 1398 Council in Paris by King Charles VI - that is a realistic way to proceed. Not 19th Century ultramontanism. You have no pope to make an infallible ex cathedra statement.

TooEdgy35201 (2): The old and most honoured theological faculty of the Sorbonne has left a very valuable study to posterity. In 1398 King Charles VI of France called a national council in order to determine what to do in case of schism and doubtful papal claimants. The royal decree of the council is reproduced in the work of Pithou, and the acts of the council may be found in Coleti Collection, 15th volume p. 1003. By 247 to 300 votes it was decided that in the absence of a genuine papal claimant, that EVERYTHING that may have had to do with the Roman Pontiff (dispensations etc.) would automatically descend on the local Bishop (e.g. episcopalism). Furthermore, they discontinued funding, forbade all appeals, as well as communication in temporal as well as spiritual matters with the Papal pretenders. Suffragan Bishops would be invested by the Metropolitan Bishop, and the Metropolitan one would in turn also appoint his successor beforehand without any need of confirmation by the Pope given that he was absent.The church continued to exist without the silliness of the ultra-richerist sede groups. One group, the apologists for the Court of Rome, claim that the Church defects when there is a heretical papal claimant, but it can continue to exist perfectly well in fact, another (ultra-richerists) - claim that you must just continue to run your autonomous unit ad infinitum without any chance of restoration except by a miracle. History proves otherwise.

alicceeee1922 (1): The ultra-richerist groups are not interested in evangelization and having a Catholic state. They seem to be just fine with Dignitatis Humanae which grants total power to the Roman Curia to issue total drivel like Fiducia supplicans without much opposition. You ought to add that Pius IX placed excommunication upon those who would ban communication with the Court of Rome, or enact exequatur to ban the publication of Fiducia supplicans. Ultramontanism robs you of every single way to defend the national church when Rome goes barmy.

MarcellusFaber (1): Ultramontanist principles concern the faculties of a reigning Pope and our obligations towards him. At the moment, there is no Pope, so in a practical sense it is not relevant. The theoretical principles remain, however, and to call them heretical is utterly absurd.

TooEdgy35201 (1): He doesn't want to recognize 99.99% of ultramontanists today and says that they are fake.The ultra-richerists are however something he cannot wish out of existence, and they are all of the ultramontane school. The ultraricherists will call you "Gallican" when you suggest that the Catholic state is part of the solution, ironic isn't it? From the ones who act like radical protestants with Catholic aesthetics. The ultra-richerists just want to maintain their protestantized autonomous unit.

TooEdgy35201 (1): >You ought to add that Pius IX placed excommunication upon those who would ban communication with the Court of Rome, or enact exequatur to ban the publication of Fiducia supplicans.There is no one to excommunicate me, I am not in communion with the Novus Ordo Church. Man made rules are not divinely revealed truths. Epikeia applies when the Catholic Church is in total crisis.But it is good of you to point this out, this is another reason why ultramontanism contributed to the crisis. Franco and Salazar could do nothing to protect their local churches since they were blinded by alleged rights of the Court of Rome, which in truth are usurpations. You cannot take the right away to defend against heresy.

TooEdgy35201 (1): >Ultramontanist principles concern the faculties of a reigning Pope and our obligations towards him.Not quite. Ultramontanism extends to the Court of Rome, in the absence of a Pope the said Court continues to dictate from Rome. The nature of the Papal Office and ecclesiology were radically altered after 1088. Whereas the Bishop of Rome was once the only notable figure in his diocese, he is now surrounded by hundreds of henchmen who may even act contrary to his will by withholding information and what not.>The theoretical principles remainAs an ultramontanist you believe in the total supremacy of the spiritual sphere over the secular sphere and that the papal claimant has the right to depose Kings etc. - The political doctrine of Joseph de Maistre.

alicceeee1922 (1): >The theoretical principles remainYou want to continue where Pope Pius XII left off and without major rectification? This isn't just a bit of mischief.>to call them heretical is utterly absurd.My friend and me have never contended that the followers of the ultramontane school are heretical per se, instead we call it a failed political doctrine which was abused and co-opted by insufferable liberals who unleashed an apocalyptic crisis after heavy centralization made it possible in the first place. They did not have to take each national church, capturing Rome sufficed. The political doctrine you defend did not stand the test of time, I am afraid.

alicceeee1922 (1): The choice the traditionalist Catholic faces is between ultramontanism and the much older regalist model, which dates back to the time of the Roman Emperors. I know which one I'll pick. Ultra-richerism is a genuine insult to reason.

MarcellusFaber (1): The first chap in this thread to whom I replied did call it heretical. If you are going to attack ultramontanism for having been co-opted, you might as well attack the concept of authority in the Church in general; the fact that a group of men masqueraded as authorities and caused damage by that does not refute the fact that the legitimate pastors do have authority.I also do not concede that it is a political doctrine.

alicceeee1922 (2): We do not have to attack authority when we know how legitimate authority looks like: The popes of ages past had to swear an oath in which they promised to observe the canons and General Councils, It's in the book that the Jesuit John Garnier published in 1680. Therein you will find the Roman Ritual, with lots of interesting additional information. When they observe the ancient canons, we have no reason to deny authority. What happens today when you suggest that the papal office is bound by the ancient canons? It is in direct opposition to the ultramontane creed as seen in the condemnation of the 3rd article of the 1682 Declaration, whose authors were applying 1st Millennium standards to the papal office. Today, the papal claimant is above everyone, and delusional Jesuits like Ghirlanda, SJ (whom you will not recognize as part of the ultramontane school I know) will make it sure to let you know that he is a Deus in terris.

# Post 482: Will SSPX Establish a Mission in NW Texas?
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I heard a rumor that SSPX was considering establishing an SSPX mission in NW Texas (which is now devoid of any TLM for at least 250 miles, with none that close in the state of Texas). I have also heard the current bishop up here is anti-tradition (heard he even discouraged women from wearing veils awhile back) but he is due to be replaced next year. My spouse and I are recent transplants from the West Coast where we were able to not only worship at an SSPX mission in our former community, but there are two NO churches there that are hybrid (listed on reverentcatholicmass.com). I don’t want to be negative but, I have been shocked at what is permitted at local NO masses (female servers, non Catholic music, bands, lyrics projected on the wall next to the crucifix, tabernacle not displayed, immodest clothing for Mass, candy distribution to children by the pastor right before communion, women offering communion, majority taking communion in the hand, and more).Anyone know or heard anything?

eowynstan (1): if you are near Amarillo, the answer is probably not. I know several people who lived there for years and couldnt get an official mass going and have moved to other mission parishes :/ you can try reaching out to Mary & Jesus in El Paso but the Dickinson priory is very overwhelmed since they serve most of Texas and Louisiana.

MarcellusFaber (1): The CMRI has a Mass in Amarillo on the 1st and 3rd Sundays according to the Lux Vera directory, said by Fr Augustine Walz: http://www.ecclesia.luxvera.org/Directory-USA.html#TXTo those who will object to recommending Sede Masses, I reply:1) Catholics are allowed by the law of the Church (in canons 2261 and 2284 of CIC 1917), to request the Sacraments from suspended priests and even undeclared tolerated excommunicates for any just reason (which has a very low bar according to the commentaries on the law). The equivalent canon in the ‘83 code is canon 1335.2) Those who refuse submission to the Roman Pontiff because they reasonably doubt the validity of his election are not schismatic. There are various authorities for this, the most commonly cited being Wernz-Vidal 7:398, who gives the particular example of those who initially refused submission to Urban VI, recently cited by Viganò. The key element in schism is pertinacious refusal to submit, not refusal to recognise on its own (though I concede that in most cases, it would be unlikely to find the one without the other).The only justification, other than stating that one would rather not take advantage of the Church’s generosity in this regard, for refusing to attend ‘Sede’ Masses (as if Catholic Masses should be placed in different categories according to the theological opinions of the Catholic priest saying them; it is like speaking of a ‘Molinist’ Mass), is that they are not Catholic. Perhaps true in particular cases, but not true in the vast majority. On what grounds? They are not heretics, and I have already answered the question of schism.I add the caveat that one should be cautious of the Independent chapels on the directory. One is usually safe with the CMRI, however.

None (1): What do you watch out for when checking out independent priests?

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): The Thuc Line is invalid, riddled with Scandal and Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre told us to completely avoid them

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): In addition I must reject to your notion that Sedevacantists are not schismatics, this is inherently false as per Quartus Supra "For the Catholic Church has always regarded as schismatic those who obstinately oppose the lawful prelates of the Church and in particular, the chief shepherd of all. Schismatics avoid carrying out their orders and even deny their very rank. Since the faction from Armenia is like this, they are schismatics even if they had not yet been condemned as such by Apostolic authority. For the Church consists of the people in union with the priest, and the flock following its shepherd." And Infallibly at the 4th Council of Constantinople, Canon 10 "As divine scripture clearly proclaims, Do not find fault before you investigate, and understand first and then find fault, and does our law judge a person without first giving him a hearing and learning what he does?. Consequently this holy and universal synod justly and fittingly declares and lays down that no lay person or monk or cleric should separate himself from communion with his own patriarch before a careful enquiry and judgment in synod, even if he alleges that he knows of some crime perpetrated by his patriarch, and he must not refuse to include his patriarch’s name during the divine mysteries or offices.In the same way we command that bishops and priests who are in distant dioceses and regions should behave similarly towards their own metropolitans, and metropolitans should do the same with regard to their own patriarchs. If anyone shall be found defying this holy synod, he is to be debarred from all priestly functions and status if he is a bishop or cleric; if a monk or lay person, he must be excluded from all communion and meetings of the church until he is converted by repentance and reconciled."

MarcellusFaber (2): Whether they try to force their position on the laity, behave as if they have authority as a parish priest would, behave or are known to have behaved scandalously, or teach error dangerous to Faith.

MarcellusFaber (1): Please provide a citation. As to invalidity, this has been hotly debated, mainly with the SSPV arguing for it. The arguments of Bp. Kelly have been widely accepted as having been refuted in Mario Derksen’s study: http://www.thucbishops.com/

MarcellusFaber (1): Those ecclesiastical laws of Constantinople IV which you cite are no longer in force. Schism also requires the pertinacious intention to rend the unity of the Church, which we do not have.

None (1): Thanks. What do you mean by behaving as a parish priest? Sorry to grill you with questions. I'm friends with an independent priest and I'm discerning whether or not to maintain close relations with him.

TooEdgy35201 (1): Plenty of ultra-richerist sede groups already hold the opinion that Mary being "co-redemptrix" is a matter of dogma whose denial begets lose of salvation.Ultra-richerism is the achilles heel of the sedevacantist position. The only sources you can genuinely trust on the faith are patristic works, councils and papal encyclicals/bulls/decretals"id teneamus, quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est"

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): This thread has a significant amount of citations. [https://thecatacombs.org/showthread.php?tid=470](https://thecatacombs.org/showthread.php?tid=470) On validity, I have read many of these studies and they usually jump around the very clear and obvious facts of Archbishop Thuc being very visibly mentally insane, in fact the man who brought him back to the Church admitted such himself. How does this study differ or address such an argument?

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): >Those ecclesiastical laws of Constantinople IV which you cite are no longer in force May you provide evidence of such? >Schism also requires the pertinacious intention to rend the unity of the Church, which we do not have. I doubt the average Copt or Heterodox has a pertinacious intention to rend the unity of the Church, yet they are still in schism

MarcellusFaber (2): They claim to have authority over the laity. Perhaps they refuse the Sacraments unreasonably. The SSPX priests whose Mass I attend does the former but not the latter. I have no concerns about continuing to request the Sacraments from him.

MarcellusFaber (1): All laws were abolished with the promulgation of the 1917 code unless they were explicitly contained within it. I strongly suspect that these laws had long ceased to be in force before that (can you really see an ecclesiastical law staying in force unchanged for 1100 years?), but 1917 is a clear and definite point at which they would have been abolished, were they to still bind.I will get back to you about the schism question.

None (2): I see. Thanks for your responses. 🙏

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): >All laws were abolished with the promulgation of the 1917 codeThis is not a matter of mere Canon Law, this is from an Ecumenical Council and is Divine Law

MarcellusFaber (1): You need to demonstrate that. Simply being promulgated by an oecumenical council does not make it divine law; councils have promulgated plenty of ecclesiastical laws that are no longer in force.I would also say that the law relates to superiors who were at least at one point legitimate. It does not relate to those who were invalidly appointed or elected and hence never held office.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): Simply look at the language and its citation of Holy Scripture. It's definitively not a simple Ecclesiastical Discipline.

MarcellusFaber (1): The citation of scripture is an explanation of why they decided to promulgate the law; there was a problem in the East at the time of clerics rashly rejecting their patriarchs. If it were a matter of divine law (which we hear repeated and asserted as such nowhere else), then St Hypatius would not be a saint, since he removed Nestorius’ name from the liturgy and refused to be in communion with him without a judgement, and in fact defied the rebuke of his bishop: https://web.archive.org/web/20210416223813/https://romeward.com/articles/239752903/an-extract-from-the-life-of-saint-hypatiusSomething also to be mentioned is that you would fall foul of this canon just as much as I would, were Francis legitimately elected and it still in force, for what is required of Catholics is not just verbal recognition and acceptance of the true Pope’s claim, but also true submission to him. It is no good to say that a man is Pope but refuse to obey him. However, we both recognise that submission to this man would cause the loss of the Catholic Faith, which we are naturally obliged to publicly profess. Hence, it makes very little sense to accuse us of schism, for our actions are substantially the same as yours, as a supporter of the SSPX Resistance. Were we schismatic, which I of course deny, you would be equally schismatic, and your verbal recognition of Francis’ claim would not change that, since you refuse him submission.

# Post 483: What do you think of these two Crosses?
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I'm considering using one of these two Crosses as a necklace, but would it be better to go with the second one, which has more medals, or would it be okay to choose any of the two?

scrime- (5): I’m a big fan of the Pardon Crucifix. I prefer it without the medals attached but to each their own.

None (1): https://ruggedrosaries.com/blogs/news/indulgences-of-our-pardon-crucifixes-and-triple-threat-crucifixeshttps://ruggedrosaries.com/products/8-way-devotional-medal

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): I like the one with the metals out tot the side

Medon1 (1): I wish the 8 way cross were bigger, it seems from the pictures the details of the St Benedict cross may not be clear

Piancol (1): I love it! I have one identical to that one attached to my rosary <3

None (2): I have often heard of the Medal of St. Benedict and the Miraculous Medal, but I don't know much about the Pardon Crucifix. What does Pardon Crucifix mean?And the St. Benedict Medal and the Miraculous Medal next to the first Cross seem to look a little different from the commonly known medals, but does this have no problem? To be honest, I personally like the first Cross a little more, but I'm not sure if it's a good choice.Btw, this is a different story, but I have never seen people around me wearing Crosses that look like these. Moreover, I am not a Catholic yet, but is there any problem if I wear these Crosses as a necklace?

scrime- (2): It’s a style of crucifix that St. Pius X had a particular devotion to. He approved several indulgences specifically related to the Pardon Crucifix, although they are now technically void in light of the new Manual of Indulgences that “wiped” and simplified all of the previous indulgences. I like the different symbols it incorporates and appreciate the history. There’s not a lot of information online about the origin of the crucifix with medals attached. It’s never been officially approved by the Church, although I’ve seen vintage listings that would suggest it’s been around a while. I’ve questioned whether or not the medals would “count” as individual sacramentals since they are attached, but you would have to consult a priest to get a better answer.
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Some Catholics seem to think that pre-Vatican II Popes like Pius IX, Leo XIII, Benedict XV, Pius XI, Pius XII are Saints, but what do you think about them?And what do you think of the post-Vatican II Popes like John XXIII, Paul VI, John Paul I, John Paul II, Benedict XVI, and Francis?Btw, I don't understand why most of the Popes from Pius IX until Vatican II were not Canonized, but most of the Popes after Vatican II were Canonized.As far as I know, there are some Catholics who say that while Canonizing the Popes after Vatican 2, they are trying to Canonize Vatican 2 itself. It may be because I don't know much, but I think they may be right.Do you think John Paul I, Benedict XVI and Francis will also be Canonized? Moreover, John Paul I has already been Beatified.Edit: And as far as I know, Pope Benedict XV tried for peace and there was an Apparition of Our Lady of Fatima during his reign, but do you think this meant something or was just a coincidence?

dbaughmen (8): The need to canonise Vatican II is to confuse the faithful that if these people are “saints”, why would they be heretics and teach false things? They have really made canonising anyone easier and faster, they even removed the “Devil’s advocate” which balanced the process. Pius XII was a good pastor, could be a saint. But he introduced some liturgical practices that were wonky but he was good. We should not treat Vatican II canonisations as infallible!

feelinggravityspull (4): Once upon a time, the only canonized Popes were martyrs. I wish that had remained the case.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Aren’t all canonizations infallible? Isnt the magisteriums infallibility used when a saint is canonized?

Piklikl (3): Canonizations are not infallible, and even if prior to Vatican II they were, the process has been modified so much (some might say explicitly to allow the post V2 popes to be canonized), that we can reasonably hold that it would no longer be the case.The post V2 popes being canonized is very much a political move.Here’s a great video from an SSPX priest explaining the matter:https://youtu.be/UI9FVR2Dfbc?si=Bdz7mrsOpSJzwqPH

dbaughmen (3): Well said

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Ok hopefully your right because some saints make me uncomfortable with Catholicism as a whole
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St. Andrew Kim Taegon, St. Augustine Zhao Rong, St. Francis Xavier, St. Paul Miki, St. Andrew Dung Lac, Pray for us.
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Of course, there will be countless saints, but for now, St. John the Baptist, St. Athanasius, St. John Chrysostom, St. Maximus, St. Thomas More, and St. John Fisher come to mind for me. Who comes to mind for you?
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I know they are famous, but I don't know the details of what makes them so great. Why are they more important than other Church Fathers and Doctors of the Church, such as St. Ambrose, St. Maximus, St. Bernard, St. Bonaventure, etc.?

jrichpyramid (3): They both wrote extensively

Piklikl (1): St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas are pivotal figures in Christian thought due to their comprehensive theological and philosophical contributions. Augustine's writings on original sin, grace, and the Trinity, along with his integration of Platonism and his autobiographical "Confessions," have profoundly shaped Western Christianity. Aquinas's "Summa Theologica," synthesis of Aristotelian philosophy with Christian doctrine, and development of natural law have laid the foundation for Scholasticism and influenced Western legal and moral philosophy. Their extensive writings, broad influence, and ability to integrate classical philosophy with Christian theology set them apart, ensuring their enduring legacy in both theological and intellectual traditions.

None (1): In the medieval period, St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas offered distinct Christian perspectives on politics. St. Augustine argued that human nature was driven by original sin, making politics a morally compromised activity driven by self-interest and lust for power. He viewed politics as a necessary evil, in order to maintain order in a fallen world, where true justice was unattainable. For St Augustine, the purpose of politics was limited to securing peace, a relative good shared by both the sinful city of man and the virtuous city of god. Both are essential for the political phylosophy and the idea of state, equality, fairness, etc. As well as Religion. St. Augustine was important figure during Baroque era after 30y. war (1618-1648), which was this brutal, messy fight in Europe, religion and politics- Catholics vs. Protestants.
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Are they apart of the SSPX? Are they a break off? Are they sedes? I’m confused

Jattack33 (7): They’re SSPX resistance, a break off group that thinks the SSPX is going to give in to Rome

Piancol (3): They're getting close to having more bishops than priests lol

dbaughmen (1): Theyre not sedes but just radical Recognise and Resist, they were founded by Bp Williamson and now have a few bishops too. Fr Hewko SSPX-MC (Marian Corps) is their man in the US. It is fine to receive sacraments from them, they say great truths.

craft00n (7): They have been saying so for the best of 20 years, they're not very good at predicting things.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): The SSPX-MC under Fr. Hewko has no Bishop

Piklikl (5): It’s probably not fine to receive sacraments from them, and they are not known for saying “great truths”, so I’m not sure why you’re spreading such misinformation.They’re a bunch of proud men who refuse to submit to authority. They’ve made it clear they will do whatever they want, and then make up their reading after the fact (instead of using their principles to guide them).It’s a sad state of affairs, and we must pray for them; but they absolutely do not deserve any praise.

hambeejee (4): They make a lot of calumny against the SSPX, especially that Fr. Chazal and his faithful. Worst, they are so prideful. Our SSPX Priests advised to stay away from them.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): What’s does in mean by giving into Rome? I thought regular communion was wanted.

Piklikl (1): They’ve actually been around a lot longer than 20 years; Archbishop Lefebrve actually had to deal with priests and faithful who protested and left whenever he would attempt some sort of reconciliation with Rome.

Piancol (1): Good.

craft00n (2): Accepting Vatican 2 and becoming similar to Ecclesia Dei communities.

craft00n (1): I know that some guys stole half of the SSPX assets a few decades ago, but I don't know if they were already calling themselves "resistance".

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Do you want to become a canonical society eventually

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (2): the resistance was born in 2012 when Williamson left. Now there are at least 3 different organizations calling them some version of it and they all bad-mouth each other as well.

craft00n (8): I'm not an SSPX member, SSPX is a community of priests, and I don't think there's any SSPX priests here. Nonetheless, every SSPX priest that I spoke to is obviously willing to have a normal canonical situation once the crisis that started all this is resolved. Lefebvre didn't ordain without a reason, he thought the current modernist crisis in Rome was dangerous for the faithful's salvation, and every SSPX priest agrees with it in theory. If you don't think that Lefebvre was right when he ordained priests in 77 and then bishops in 88, why would you get ordained in SSPX, or be a parishioner there ?Anyway, I'll never "become a canonical society", I'm a catholic faithful, only member of the Church, the one with Pope Francis and Father David Pagliarani, of which Paul VI and Lefebvre were members, and before them Pope Liberius and Saint Athanasius.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): So is the only way the crisis would be resolved is if the liturgical reforms were revoked?

craft00n (1): I don't know, I'm not a canonist nor an ecclesiologist. God will find a way, as he already did in the Arian crisis and the three Pope's schism. Btw, any canonist would tell you that the great schism resolution was canonically illegal (they used Conciliarism, a heretic theological position which was already disqualified at the time), so you can see that God can really use absolutely anything in order to guide his Church.

Araedya (1): The SSPX were almost regularized back in 2017 but Rome did a complete about-face at the last moment and the entire thing fell through. They (the SSPX) were willing to agree to a personal prelature allowing them to continue as they are while still being allowed to question certain aspects of the council and the liturgical reform. This was their [doctrinal preamble](http://www.archbishoplefebvre.com/uploads/1/0/3/2/10321570/\_bishop\_fellays\_doctrinal\_preamble.pdf)that they submitted to Rome back in 2012 if you want an idea of what they’re looking for. It’s pretty reasonable imo.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (2): Dang. Thank you for the preamble.

craft00n (1): To my knowledge, it's the SSPX who turned the offer down because a few old and really wise priests said "Well, personal prelature, the Pope can wipe us from the surface of the earth in one stroke of pen". It's my uncle, SSPX priest, who told me so. For what I'm able to understand, SSPX wouldn't go back under direct papal institutional authority without strong theological evolutions on Rome's side.

Araedya (1): I’ve heard the talks w/ Rome generated some internal strife but from what I understand they were all set to be regularized until cardinal muller changed the terms of the (doctrinal) agreement at the last minute which caused the sspx to walk. There’s probably better sources but this [interview](https://fsspx.news/en/news/bishop-fellay-interview-are-disturbing-factor-church-19871)with Bishop Fellay touches on some of it towards the end there.
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I don't trust his finger guns...

dbaughmen (7): People always try to paint traditionalist Catholicism as a cult, if we were all of us wouldn’t be here on reddit. Try looking at the Palmarians

Huge-Explanation-358 (5): Lmao then go worship pachamama, that's what catholicism is all about isn't it

Piklikl (5): Waste of time. “I went to a parish and here’s what some of the weird laypeople said, so let’s assume that the priests (the only actual members of the SSPX) have the same opinions too.”If the podcast host was interested in the truth he would have one of the SSPX priests on, but of course he wouldn’t because then he would have to move closer to an SSPX location and start attending.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (3): I’m sad he said that.

None (4): Popesplainers and V2 apologists are far more culty than reverent trads 😂 I'm not even going to watch this video after this guy said that the sspx claims to be more Catholic than Pope Francis (never happened.)

Brendanjfinnegan (3): Pope Francis is not Catholic in the slightest

sharon\_maria (1): You guys are a cult
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Hello all,I recently joined the church(confirmed and first communion about a 1.5 years ago @ the age of 15) without any of my family or friends. I have known about the theological issues with V2 and the New Mass and desired to find a SSPX church, but because it is my only option I go to my local NO Parish to fulfill my obligation and receive the sacraments. I was lucky to have excellent preists, who are mostly orthodox. There is no TLM anywhere nearby, and going into adulthood I'd like to actively be more traditional in my faith rather than mostly going along with the people around me. Do you guys have any ideas for what I can do to build a more 'traditional faith' at least until I get to a point in my life where I can move to an area with an SSPX chapel or at the very least a Diocesan TLM? God Bless

dbaughmen (9): Read Traditional Catholic books, classics, and listen to podcasts. I also recommend buying a Traditional Catholic calendar to keep up with what Holy Mother Church is prescribing on that day. If you ever travel anywhere with a TLM, ask or try to go! I recommend also making friends and corresponding with a SSPX priest or any traditional Priest so he can help you along the way, I could put you in contact with one. God bless you! Be careful in the NO

craft00n (3): If you have the brains for it, read Saint Thomas (Summa Theologica). That's a great philosopher and theologian, and THE traditional catholic reference.

Brendanjfinnegan (1): These are all great suggestions. I would like to say that when we say the prayer "oh Lord Grant us Priests"; It needs to be taken literally...The SSPX is being stretched pretty thin at this point in terms of being able to say all the masses that are requested of them... My uncle is an SSPX priest and his normal Sunday Mass circuit consists of 4 masses at 3 different chapels!!

feelinggravityspull (1): Check out the "[Being Catholic](https://fisheaters.com/beingcatholic.html)" section on the [Fisheaters](https://fisheaters.com/) website. This was a hugely important resource for me when I was coming into the Church.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): Stop attending the NO first, and Sanctify the Day via other means (Prayer, Spiritual Reading perhaps even a Missa Sicca.) Attending the NO is sinful and sacriligeous.

dbaughmen (6): Also, do not forget to pray before and after every meal, the angelus and 6am/pm and 12 pm. And your daily rosary to help with this situation, the rosary helps a lot!

Medical-Prompt-2278 (2): Me and My(Protestant) best friend are super into theology, and weve both been reading his works. His works largely helped bring me into the church. God Bless

Medical-Prompt-2278 (2): This is an amazing resource. Thank you so much!

Medical-Prompt-2278 (5): Ive been praying the 1961 Little Office of the Blessed Virgin. I do need to pray the rosary more however. Ive also been trying to get to daily mass(for the sacrament, rather than the NO Mass). I would totally appreciate it if you could get me into contact with someone.

dbaughmen (2): Thomism is the antidote to modernism

dbaughmen (1): Of course! I will send you a few emails via DM

# Post 491: Why is it that the Novus Ordo in Latin America has been affected the most?

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 17

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1eduf0k/why\_is\_it\_that\_the\_novus\_ordo\_in\_latin\_america/

If you go to any Mexican or Central American mass, you will see no reverence! I have never seen an Altar Server in any of these countries, just adults in suits serving. The priest has a random chair behind the altar to sit on whenever he pleases. Of course, there has to be a guitar or the few boomers that go won’t like it. Priests are very informal and I have never seen a one in a cassock in these countries. Why is it that these particular regions were affected the most by Vatican II?

Duibhlinn (16): Liberation theology and, especially in the case of Mexico, extremely deeply entrenched Freemasonry on a societal level.

feelinggravityspull (6): Regarding cassocks, after the Mexican revolution, priests were forbidden from wearing clerical garb in public. Although that is no longer the law, decades of legal persecution changed their habits (pun intended). It is unusual to find priests wearing a collar outside of church, or so I've been told.

dbaughmen (3): Goodness. But seriously, an American NO is a breath of fresh air compared to their masses.

dbaughmen (3): Yeah, the faithful are used to recognising them solely by their white short sleeve dress shirt. How sad. But I know the SSPX has a strong presence in Mexico so that is great, plus numerous sedevacanist movements

# Post 492: Erie SSPX no longer exists?

Author: SunnyHelianthus

Score: 2

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ecztgv/erie\_sspx\_no\_longer\_exists/

Hi guys, anyone know when the Erie SSPX disappeared. I saw it on a map of TLM churches and apparently now it is no longer there? Did they move elsewhere? Kind of crappy, considering the only other option is a diocesan church.

dbaughmen (2): Idk of this is it. https://www.latinmasserie.org

Brendanjfinnegan (2): That appears to be a diocesan Mass

SunnyHelianthus (1): That's the diocesan one I was referring to that was the only alternative. There was an SSPX mission in Erie since 1988. I see an address going to an old church in Erie, but the SSPX website seems to not identify it anymore. I was just wondering if a local Erie resident may know what happened?

dbaughmen (1): You could visit fsspx.today. Some churches are there

SunnyHelianthus (1): Thanks, but I just did just say above that the SSPX website no longer has the mission listed. Do you know what happened to close it?

# Post 493: Do all SSPX priests take the Anti-Modernist oath?

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 7

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1eaqhjg/do\_all\_sspx\_priests\_take\_the\_antimodernist\_oath/

I know the Superior General does when swearing in, but do Priests take it in seminary?

jrichpyramid (6): Commenting for visibility I would love to hear a discussion on this

Brendanjfinnegan (7): If they were ordained by an sspx bishop then yes they do.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (4): yes they take it twice both at ordination, and I believe at the sub-deaconate or when they actually sign in as a SSPX member. I believe they may renew it every 10 years after ordination.

Duibhlinn (3): I believe they do. Is anyone aware of whether any of the Ecclesia Dei groups take the Oath? I haven't heard anything about it regarding the ICKSP, FSSP, IBP etc.

Jattack33 (3): I know the ICKSP do, not sure at which stage of the seminary process but they do.I know the IBP seminary professors do so I’d imagine their seminarians do at some pointI presume the FSSP do

dbaughmen (2): I’d actually like to know this too.

# Post 494: Are sspx priests suspended?

Author: Smooth\_Ad\_5775

Score: 2

Comments: 22

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ea9a24/are\_sspx\_priests\_suspended/

I know pope Benedict said they were suspended but then pope Francis granted bishop fellay permission to ordain without permission from ordinary as long as he communicates the names of the ordinates to the bishop of place. and a guy on this sub said that the priests were only suspended because of lack of dimissorial letters but now there isn’t a lack because Francis gave permission if the names of the ordinates are communicated to the ordinary. So wouldn’t that mean that the priests aren’t suspended as long as their names are contacted to the ordinary? And if this is the case, how should I find out if their names are communicated to the ordinary? Once I get this figured out I will probably stop bothering you all with my questions. Thank you for your help so far. https://wdtprs.com/2017/05/sspx-claims-about-permission-from-rome-to-ordain-priests/

Araedya (3): It’s worth mentioning that Fr Z no longer believes SSPX priests are suspended and believes you can attend in good consciencehttps://wdtprs.com/2020/04/ask-father-whats-the-truth-about-the-sspx/

dbaughmen (1): As you have many questions OP, it would be good contacting an SSPX priest and chatting with him about this. I can connect you with one if you want.

Naft\_814 (1): I'm probably going to get down voted into oblivion for this but yes, the priests are still technically suspended. They've been given faculties for Confession and (after receiving permission from their bishop) matrimony. It should be noted that faculties are needed for those two sacraments in order to be valid. The other sacraments are done illicitly due to them not having an actual Canonical status. Your best bet is to contact your local bishop on the matter. Obviously, talking to someone who attends the sspx or an sspx priest is going to have bias towards their position(I was raised in the sspx but left a year ago after realizing there were issues)

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (2): His idea that the SSPX aren’t suspended is based on the idea that a suspended priest cannot have facilities. Where can I find this idea in canon law or Vatican sources?

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Ok you can message me his contact information thank you so much

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Ok thanks for your response: I have two articles though that I want you to read. This is the first articlehttps://wdtprs.com/2017/05/sspx-claims-about-permission-from-rome-to-ordain-priests/This one came after the first https://wdtprs.com/2020/04/ask-father-whats-the-truth-about-the-sspx/What are your thoughts?

Cathain78 (1): As someone with the opposite experience, raised in the Novus Ordo and started attending SSPX masses a year ago, I feel you are being rather uncharitable. And talking to an SSPX priest will mean they will give a biased answer? Well they will hold a certain opinion of course. Talking to your Novus Ordo parish priest will also likely reveal his own bias. And if it was anything like mine, worse than just that. At least talking to my SSPX priest I don’t have to worry about listening to roaring heresy nor his complete disregard for “the rules”. In truth, he seemed far more errant than any society priest I’ve encountered.

Araedya (2): I think for the specific questions you are asking you might want to have an actual conversation with an SSPX priest. In my (limited) experience, they are used to questions and happy to answer them. My logic would be that if Pope Francis has given the SSPX permission to freely ordain priests without the local ordinary’s permission then the ordinations would be licit and not subject to the automatic suspension. I would assume they would follow the usual protocols regarding paperwork. Furthermore the fact he extended the additional faculties for confession/marriage puts them in an even more “regular” situation. I think that if you want to attend the SSPX you’ll have to get used to the fact their situation is unusual and complicated.

Huge-Explanation-358 (1): Well just go to Mass and talk to them afterwards

Naft\_814 (2): I would have to disagree with Fr. Z on some of his points. I think an important thing to note about the SSPX is that while they will cooperate with some things with Rome, they will only be obedient to what they see as reasonable. For example, if the local bishop does not give permission to the sspx to ordain or build a chapel in his diocese they will do it anyway. (As far as I can see the only source regarding the sspx being able to ordain without permission is from Bishop Fellay. I'm going to have to see actual proof to actually believe thats the case) Those who promote the sspx will use the excommunications being lifted or faculties being granted as a way to act as if the sspx is totally fine, but they seem to ignore Pope Benedict XVI saying they had no Canonical status and that Pope Francis stated he's given faculties for the pastoral benefit of those who attend the sspx chapels. But here's the thing, the sspx bishops are getting older. They will be consecrating bishops sometime in the future, even if they have to do so without permission from Rome. Doing this it can be predicted that they will once again be excommunicated and the faculties of their priests revoked. It's better to stay away instead of try and get involved with the sspx.I should mention some stuff that you're probably never going to hear about or read in a blog because many people outside of the sspx probably don't know these things. Many of these things were my own opinions as well until recently. Those who attend the sspx view the sspx as holding the truth. The sspx views the Novus Ordo as, although valid, a spiritual poison and an offense against God. In their spiritual Warfare book, participating in the Novus Ordo is listed as a sin. If for some reason you are to attend a Novus Ordo Mass for a wedding or funeral you are not to participate and not to receive Communion. In the sspx we really have no actual connection with the Pope or our local bishop, sure we pray for them, but we really just see them as modernists and we don't really abide by their authority unless we think it's reasonable. We pretty much view the sspx bishops as our bishops (they're not, your local bishop is your bishop). Other Latin Mass communities like the fssp and institute are to be avoided, the sspx does not consider them Traditional Catholics. If someone were to leave the sspx to attend a Diocesan chapel or FSSP/institute (and you're no longer at least a friend of the sspx) you will be viewed as putting your soul in grave danger (yes, I was told this by a family member after I told them I left) this is common as many people have gone through similar things with their families if they leave the sspx

Naft\_814 (1): With all due respect I'm not sure how you thought my comment was uncharitable. Please also note that I advised him to talk to his local bishop on the matter since he is trying to find information on this, his local bishop will be the best reference. I'm well aware of the issues that are going on in the Church and I'm well aware of modernist takes coming from various laymen and clergy. Please dont think that because I left the sspx it means I therefore think Novus Ordo clergy can do no wrong, heresy should be purged out of the Church and corrections should be made. However, this doesn't therefore mean that talking to a sspx priest and taking the sspx position is justifiable as the sspx promotes schismatic views. I'm not sure if you've read my other comments on this post but myself as well as others face scrutiny if we no longer attend the sspx, our family and friends act as if we've pretty much left the Faith. It's also pretty well known that you'll receive scrutiny if you leave. Many people either leave quietly or they have a hard time leaving out of fear. Though it's not said, it's believed that the sspx is the holder of the true Faith and the trustworthy authority, or at least is the correct path to take. In fact, the first time I stopped attending the sspx and went to the local TLM for my Holy Day of Obligation, I was a nervous wreck because we're told that you shouldn't be going to other TLM groups either. There are serious issues of schism that are ignored because you may be less likely to hear heresy. But the thing is, schism is a lot easier to fall into.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Ok

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): I am very scrupulous so I’m not going to an SSPX mass until I’m absolutely sure it’s licit within the church. After a few questions then I’ll know whether I can go or not.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Thank you for your response

None (1): Don't forget that the situation of necessity allows to pass through laws anyway! This is a very Catholic principle : "supra lex, salus animarum" ; above the law, is the salvation of souls

Naft\_814 (1): No problem! Regardless, I do want to still say that all in all I just want the sspx to be similar to the fssp and have a true Canonical status. My family is all still in the sspx, many people I care about are in the sspx, and I have a lot of respect for many of the sspx priests. I understand the confusion people have and I know those who adhere to the sspx think they are doing the right thing (after all I was an adherent for nearly 20 years myself and used to share many of those opinions myself) However, my loyalty is to Christ, His Church, and His Vicar and because of that I can no longer defend the sspx as they are in their current situation. I hope and pray that things change for the better in the future.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (2): The state of necessity does not apply to me since I have several TLMs near me.

Naft\_814 (1): That's not a good argument to use. Every group will use the state of necessity argument to do what they please. Here's the thing, the sspx do not have a state of necessity

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): What do you think about the argument that the priests aren’t suspended as long as their names are communicated to the bishop (since pope Francis gave permission to ordain priests to the bishop without talking to the ordinary first and the only reason why the priests are suspended was because of a lack of dimissorial letters)? I think it was presented in the first link but I want to go into that argument a little bit more:. Thank you

None (3): I see what you mean, but TLM from ex Ecclesia Dei communities doesn't solve the state of necessity issue, since they don't have a good/clear position over some modern doctrinal issues; either they avoid doctrinal problems like religious freedom of Vatican II by not addressing it, or they even go as far as supporting it; it's not only a Mass issue, modernism is also about views on the modernist crisis, on religious freedom etc; I know the ex Ecclesia Dei communities pretty well (I'm a scout chief at a FSSP parish) and I think if one goes to their Masses too often, he risks being influenced by their standpoints

Naft\_814 (1): I don't know of any documents allowing the sspx to do that. Bishop Fellay said he received a letter from Pope Francis but as far as I know there is no actual documentation of that. If there is actual documentation stating that they are indeed given permission then id be more than happy to see it. Otherwise, the suspension comes from session 23 chapter 8 of the Council of Trent stating: "Ordinations of sacred orders shall be celebrated publicly, at the time appointed by law, and in the cathedral churches, in the presence of the canons of that church, who are to be invited for that purpose; but, if they are celebrated in some other place of the diocese, in the presence of the clergy of the place; the principal church being always, as far as possible, made use of. But each one shall be ordained by his own bishop. And if any one ask to be promoted by another bishop, this shall by no means be allowed him, even under the pretext of any general or special rescript or privilege whatsoever, even at the appointed times; unless his probity and morals be recommended by the testimony of his own Ordinary; otherwise, he who ordains him shall be suspended from conferring orders during a year, and he who has been ordained shall be suspended from exercising the orders which he has received, for as long a period as shall seem expedient to his own Ordinary." The sspx seminary in Germany was explicitly denied permission to ordain yet they did it anyway. https://catholicradar.com/2024/06/28/bishop-voderholzer-prohibits-ordinations-of-pius-brothers-in-zaitzkofen/

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): The Holy See – the Secretary of Ecclesia Dei explained – permits and tolerates the priestly ordinations of the Fraternity of St. Pius X, even while continuing to consider them valid but not licit, subject to communication of the names of the ordinands to the bishop of the place. - this is what the first article said and it’s from ecclesia Dei. So ecclesia Dei does confirm what Francis said.

# Post 495: What is the chant in the last part of the video?

Author: Smooth\_Ad\_5775

Score: 2

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ea85y1/what\_is\_the\_chant\_in\_the\_last\_part\_of\_the\_video/

What is the chant at the very end where it shows the outside of the church?Consecration of the immaculata:https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=9gJsfD3lmes

Piklikl (1): It's the Antiphon that is sung while the Bishop inscribes the Greek and Latin Alphabets in the Ashes on the floor of the Church during the Consecration Ceremony. It starts [here](https://www.youtube.com/live/c3HnXJQ7LII?si=osSv2mT16XUhUI2r&t=5550) on the livestream with an explanation from the narrator, and then here you can hear the antiphon being sung again [here](https://www.youtube.com/live/c3HnXJQ7LII?si=2UOU6UF-twrB\_sa3&t=5750). [Here](https://i.imgur.com/MCVv5Wr.png) is a screenshot from the pdf of the dedication booklet with the words and music for the antiphon ([here's](https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5ac3a9969772ae70692f95e6/t/644eaf8f8c5c6e5b7668f5b1/1682878352208/\_The+Immaculata+Consecration+Booklet%2C+May+3+2023\_web.pdf) a link to the pdf).>O quam metuéndus est locus iste! vere non est hic áliud, nisi domus Dei et porta cæli.>What a fearsome place! This can be nothing other than the house of God; this is the gate of heaven.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Thanks. Is there any other audios of this chant?

Piklikl (1): Hmm it’s hard to say; I highly doubt it’s recorded in studio quality anywhere. Your best bet is probably to look around at other SSPX church consecrations and see if they recorded higher quality audio.Alternatively you might be able to make a donation to the Benedictines in Silver City or to an SSPX seminary and maybe the seminarians would be able to record a higher quality version for you.

# Post 496: What constitutes as a “just cause” for attending masses by suspended priests?

Author: Smooth\_Ad\_5775

Score: 1

Comments: 25

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1e8z7gd/what\_constitutes\_as\_a\_just\_cause\_for\_attending/

Canon law states you can go to mass by suspended priests for any just cause, what is the definition provided by canon law of “just cause”?

dbaughmen (3): …..Here we go again with this OP.

Jerailu (2): It's literally in the name. A just cause is a cause deemed...just. Like for instance in times of persecutions or if you cannot reasonably deny a wedding/funeral invitation (wich is frankly everytime. If the guys are not that importants to you what are you doing at their wedding anyway?)

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (2): I am more or less 'party line' SSPX.Ultimately if you think the Novus Ordo Mass or problem areas of Vatican 2 (Collegiality, Religious LIberty, Ecumenism) are defensible, then I will be the first to tell you that the SSPX argument fails. Go to Diocesan TLM or NO. they are both of the same beliefs.the individuals that believe Jp2 was worthy of canonization, and that reverent NOMs are pleasing to God, have no business going to SSPX. yet many do because they haven't studied hard enough, or they take to heart and their ultimate conclusions what the new conciliar church teaches about new religious liberty.It is kind of hilarious when you see Orthodox, protestants and Muslims treated with more respect then the SSPX.Anyway, our battle is not about preference (smells and bells) it is because we clearly see the things in the NOM and V2 are not of the faith. I resist because I must and Faith demands it.If you want to learn more listen to Fr Hesse. Not going to say he is always 100% right, but he was wise, spot on and is very easy to listen to: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y28501DJ3Mk](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y28501DJ3Mk)

Brendanjfinnegan (1): It generally has to do witha person:who wishes to attend said mass not having a mass nearby (more than 15 miles away) or having any moral apprehension against attending (scandalous behavior by a priest minister or congregant).

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Please be patient with me 😂 I’m really interested in the SSPX but I want to be absolutely clear that I can licitly attend the masses. The novus ordo was all I knew until a few months ago…

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): I don’t think attending SSPX for the TLM is a just cause though when there’s other diocesan TLMs about the same distance

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Does that link answer my question?

dbaughmen (4): Okay if you really want to learn, I’m sorry

Jerailu (3): I don't think it's illicit per se as the status of SSPX priests is not that of suspended but rather of technical vagus belonging all to the same private club and you can be a vagus without being suspended so you could attend their mass still if you wanted to.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): if you click on it it would be pretty obvious it directly addresses your question.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (2): Im sorry too if I came off as too demanding or doubtful but I really am interested. But I want to make sure it’s morally ok that I attend. So could you provide me with the definition of just cause in canon law?

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): “The priests of the Society of St. Pius X are validly ordained, but suspended, “- st Benedict

rathdrummob (3): Good luck with that. It’s a word salad. You can find enough to believe them if you really want to or you could decide that they’re full of it if that’s what you’re trying to find out. They’ve had 50 years of smart people spilling ink justifying their ambiguous position in the church. If you’re looking for surety you won’t find it from them. You could look elsewhere but I’d doubt that you’ll find an objective source.

Jerailu (2): What do you mean saint Benedict ? If you're talking about Benedict the XVIth, since his papacy, pope Francis gave bishop Fellay a licence to ordain without dimissorial letters from the Ordinary and thus possibly incardinate priests in the name of the SSPX.Bernard Fellay made it public in an interview awhile ago. So canonically speaking you either believe he's lying or you have to admits they're licit.I don't agree with the SSPX and usually don't go there to church because I do not agree with them but when I'm invited and stuff I do take communion here for these reasons.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Sorry I meant pope Benedict 😂 the point is that they’re suspended

Jerailu (2): Yeah but they aren't anymore if they can be ordained and incardinated in the SSPX because the whole being suspended bit was because they weren't licitly ordained.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): If they can? are you saying the Vatican is ok with its SSPX ordaining priests? Can you cite me something that proves that licitly SSPX ordained priests aren’t suspended?

Jerailu (1): I told it in the above post, bishop Bernard Fellay says pope Francis gave him verbally a licence to ordain priest without dimissorials letters.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): So how does that mean licitly ordained priests are not suspended? And are there still illicitly ordained priests who are suspended?

Jerailu (3): Well it's just logic.1: The SSPX priests were suspended because their ordinations weren't done with dimissorials letters2: The pope give verbally an indult so that they are not concerned with the need to conduct ordinations while providing dimissorials letters3: The cause for the suspension a divinis of said priests does not exists4: Therefore the suspension is not in effect anymoreDoesn't it seems logical to you? If your doctor says you should stay in bed because you're sick, once you're healthy who would claim you still need to be bedridden? The cause disappeared thus you are not obliged by your previous state.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): That does seem logical! What do you have to say about this article?https://wdtprs.com/2017/05/sspx-claims-about-permission-from-rome-to-ordain-priests/It seems there are already good objections to the article but I want to know what you think

Jerailu (1): Well I say that either Fellay or either the cardinal is right. In the absence of an official letter I choose to take the most charitable opinion in favour of the subjects but any catholic must act according to their conscience.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Ok so does the priests names have to be given to whoever in order for their ordination to be licit?

Jerailu (1): They probably gave them after or right before the fact.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): The names do have to be communicated I believe. I cannot find out though whether the priests near me have their names communicated to the ordinary. I don’t think I will attend SSPX 😢

# Post 497: SSPX vs FSSP liturgical

Author: dookiemaster420

Score: 5

Comments: 9

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1e8mkr3/sspx\_vs\_fssp\_liturgical/

Where/what are the differences in the way FSSP delivers Mass vs. SSPX? I understand their history and that they “play a bit closer” to Rome but what are the fundamental liturgical differences re: Mass? Thank you 🙏

dbaughmen (6): The SSPX sometimes adds unofficial things to the mass like a second Confiteor like in the pre-55 missal. The SSPX also refuses to use the pre-55 Holy Week while the FSSP use it. The SSPX also removes some things in Pontifical Masses, like using two Mitres and wearing pontifical sandals. But other than that, the Latin mass is practically universal.

dookiemaster420 (4): Why SSPX make those changes/adjustments?

feelinggravityspull (3): The FSSP uses the second confiteor. In fact, I've never attended a TLM that didn't include one- SSPX, FSSP, diocesan, ICKSP.

dbaughmen (8): They follow the example of Archbishop Lefebvre. He did all these things and it stuck, the SSPX bishops love to model their choices of clothing and vestments exactly after his. In my opinion the SSPX should go back to the pre-55 holy week.

dbaughmen (3): I also failed to mention the use of birettas, the Archbishop didn’t require them, there are very few SSPX priests that use them.

dbaughmen (3): Diocesans don’t ever use it, the ICKSP uses it as they are also accustomed to the pre-55 missal, and I’ve never seen the FSSP use it but youre right they probably do

hardeho (5): My current SSPX chapel, all the SSPX priests I've seen (4 or 5 over the past few years) wear Biretta's, and my previous Church was FSSP, and they did the 2nd Confiteor.

Cathain78 (2): The biretta is used at my chapel.

dbaughmen (2): It was either the pre-55 missal or they adapted that custom from the SSPX and the Archbishop. The majority of SSPX priests don’t wear birettas.

# Post 498: The best and worst things your parents did for your fauth.

Author: Smooth\_Ad\_5775

Score: 6

Comments: 31

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1e7gv68/the\_best\_and\_worst\_things\_your\_parents\_did\_for/

What were some things your parents did that helped you become strong in your Catholic faith?What were some things your parents did that negatively affected your Catholic faith?

None (6): Sent me to a catholic school that malformed me against piety and faithfulness and made me participate in sacrilege.

None (7): My mom is Protestant and against Catholicism. I am very grateful to have not picked up her mentality on that. She married a Novus Ordo Catholic when I was a teenager and that is when I was first exposed to Catholicism. I immediately wanted to convert but religion was never EVER talked about in the home. No prayers, no religious items, nothing. My family stopped going to church a few years ago and it is impossible to bring it up because they get very angry about it. Since I started going to the SSPX mass it got worse. They think I’m part of some schismatic cult but they refuse to talk about it because of their aversion to talking about anything that has to do with religion. The best thing they did: Not teaching me to hate Catholicism. The worst thing: Not teaching me to love God or His Church.

dookiemaster420 (5): Best - My Father has always praised and given thanks to Our Lord. Led our family with strong values and fear of God. Worst - Novos Ordo Catholic school that led me to reject the faith for 15+ years until randomly attending a Traditional Latin Mass by SSPX.

None (3): [deleted]

None (2): [deleted]

jrichpyramid (2): Best: My dad was a Protestant who raised us on Sunday school, Bible stories. When I converted years later he was very understanding, and we would pray the Our Father together as he got closer to the end. As he was passing I would pray a rosary in the room and my family never once complained about it.Worst: the looks I got when I gave the eulogy at my fathers funeral when I said the line “I will pray for you until I die.” My Protestant family all just walked around saying things like “he’s in Heaven now.”

SummerKisses094 (2): The best thing- my dad was consistent when I got older and kept praying for me. The worst thing- nobody really talked to me about tough topics when I was a kid so I was very cynical and lost my faith for a long time

Odd\_Glove7043 (1): The best thing they did was let me Baptised at 14, but that's it. They are accommodating to the fact I am religious to an extent, it's been a process of them understanding but I'm grateful

Odd\_Glove7043 (1): The best thing they did was let me Baptised at 14, but that's it. They are accommodating to the fact I am religious to an extent, it's been a process of them understanding but I'm grateful

None (1): The best thing they did was send me to Catholic school when we weren't even Catholic. The worst was when my mom belittled and try to guilt me after I became a Catholic as an adult.

None (1): I am leaving Reddit because it has become an obstacle to my duty of state as a Catholic Father. It has become a distraction, a temptation, and ultimately an idol. I would fraternally encourage all reading this message to consider whether their own use of the platform is edifying and healthy, or whether it is a superficial lesser good that only serves as an obstacle to your personal and spiritual growth.

None (2): How did a Catholic school do this? I know most modern Catholic schools are hardly different from public schools

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (2): What led you to attend the TLM

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Is that how you became so devout

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): What led you to convert

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): How did you get into Catholicism

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Was it a novus ordo school? What was it about it that helped you grow into the faith?

None (1): It WAS a NO school. I had a Dominican sister who taught me science and government and a Jesuit and former Franciscan who taught me religion. The other teachers were lay people. I had amazing teachers who were just great examples. The stories about the saints just blew me away. I had never had that example before or heard about anyone who did those things. The realization that that were people in heaven who talked to God about you and were able to help you such a foreign concept. It was crazy to me that Jesus was actually physically present in the Church and that a little piece of bread had the potential to become the body and blood of z Jesus Christ. I went to Mass for the very first time when I was 8, and it stuck. By the time I was 10, going to protestant church with my parents just seemed pointless. There was nothing about it that I was drawn to. Why go, Jesus isn't there. So much was missing. I didn't even know the Latin Mass existed. I was 25 before I was able to convert, and that was only after we moved to St. Marys, Kansas, because my husband got a job here. That literally landed right in our laps. I had no I idea it was the epi center of the TLM. Zero knowledge of what that meant or even implied.Life is crazy.

None (4): I don't know what your question means. How did it get this bad? Modernism. In what ways did they scandalize me? It's difficult to know where to begin.

dookiemaster420 (3): I had re-started my journey with Faith while living in Northeast USA and had trouble finding a reverent church and I tried near every “denomination” too. Even Catholic churches up here were having gay mass…literally. So I was eager to find something that was reverent, peaceful, and specifically focused on both old and new testament during the masses and strong homilies but I couldn’t find anything. Visited family in the South and we were culturally (NO) Catholic growing up so they wanted to go to a Christmas Mass when I was in town last year. They all woke up late and only one mass was happening that we could make — so we piled in the car and drove there, showed up to this small church, walked in and were INTENSELY confused — Usher was incredibly kind and welcomed us in — been going ever since. Thank you Lord for guiding me there 🙏

jrichpyramid (1): Getting coffee and chatting with a Catholic friend. I was going through a tough time. Once I read the early Church fathers and attended the Latin Mass I was moved.

None (3): Ah so you went to a modern Catholic school then? That was pretty much my question.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (3): What an amazing story!

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): What did the Catholic say that helped you?

None (2): Yes. Which ones aren't? I'm not aware of any.

jrichpyramid (1): He listened a lot. Talked about Aquinas. Talked about Justice. Talked about moral objectivism. Didn’t happen overnight.

None (5): The SSPX run Catholic schools.

None (2): Oh. I didn't know they had schools. How different my life would have been if I had one of those.

None (5): Yeah. They are amazing. I taught at one a couple of years ago because they desperately needed someone to teach a class and the experience was absolutely amazing. Those kids are beyond expectations. Pius, respectful, happy, kind, loving, etc. I couldn’t believe it. I taught a boys and a girls high school class.

None (2): I would love to know more about these. Very encouraging.

None (3): There are only a handful of them around. Ours has grown considerably that we had to purchase another building. Haha. Here ya go. https://sspx.org/en/schools

None (2): That's really cool! Thanks for the info.

None (2): My pleasure.

# Post 499: Thoughts on Protestants

Author: Smooth\_Ad\_5775

Score: 1

Comments: 8

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1e79q0o/thoughts\_on\_protestants/

Do SSPX have a lower view of protestants than other Catholics?

None (10): The SSPX holds the same position that the Church has always held, until recent years. Protestantism was founded as a heresy. It is a false religion. There is no salvation outside of the Catholic Church; however, this does not mean that a person cannot have salvation if they are not physically a part of the Church. St Thomas teaches us, in his articles on heresy within the Summa Theologica, that a heretic is someone who starts or follows false or new opinions. By being followers of a heresy, known to them or not, they are defined as heretics, which St Thomas says is a form of unbelief. Knowledge of truth must come before belief, and belief before faith. Protestants do not know or accept the truths that the Catholic Church has known and teaches; therefore, they cannot have belief or cultivate true faith. We do not have a “lower view”, we have a reasonable view.

LabRepresentative885 (5): They’re material heretics.

StelIaMaris (3): They’re heretics, not much else to say. I have good friends that are Protestants, but they’re wrong lol

dbaughmen (3): Just schismatic heretics. Although the Novus Ordites do have a way of eliminating these kinds of words. More like - “brothers and sisters in Christ” pfft… interfaith dialogue

None (1): "But there were also false prophets among the people, even as there shall be among you lying teachers, who shall bring in sects of perdition, and deny the Lord who bought them: bringing upon themselves swift destruction." [2 Peter 2:1]

ApprehensiveDust12 (1): They're the new Samaritans

scrime- (1): I consider them Christ followers, but not Christians in the fullest sense of the word. I would say the same of any “Catholic” who thinks dogma is optional.

Odd\_Glove7043 (0): No one should have a "lower" view of them, but our thoughts on protestantism is low, but there's a distinct difference between protestant and protestantism.

# Post 500: Any opinion on Alex Jones and InfoWar ?

Author: craft00n

Score: 1

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1e70x8z/any\_opinion\_on\_alex\_jones\_and\_infowar/

Hi, I'm a french monarchist, my brother and my uncle are priests in SSPX and I'm going to SSPX mass each Sundat. I'm also quite critic of alternative information sources (of journalism in general, tbh), because I'm a psychology student interested in misinformation and belief in conspiracy theories (I use the agnostic definition : an opinion can be a conspiracy theory without being "false" or "delusional"). I've seen many things coming from Jones and InfoWars, including the Sandy Hook denial thing, and recently his bankruptcy. Could some american SSPX parishioners share their opinion about this guy in order to me to understand what he's worth and how you consider this kind of person pls ?

Piklikl (8): He's a charlatan, playing an act to make money. That doesn't mean he's wrong about everything, but it certainly means you have to expend so much energy vetting everything he says that it's no longer worth using him as source of information. From what little I know about him it does seem like he had a good start trying to uncover the truth and report things that the establishment news wouldn't, but over the long term I think he just slipped into being a grifter. Humans respond to incentives, and it's especially hard to fund media in a way that doesn't create perverse incentives (eg state funded media will be less critical of the state that funds it, Alex Jones panders to the crazy people that make up most of his audience and buys the products he advertises).

SnowWhiteFeather (5): There isn't much for me to say.He isn't as insane as the mainstream media makes him out to be, but his values are different than mine and some of his conclusions and predictions are questionable.If he shared more information instead of conclusions or held similar values and beliefs to me I would find his commentary more valuable.I spend most of my time listening to well-formed and traditional Catholics.

VanSensei (5): Actions have consequences. You can't go after parents who've lost a child like that and make up blatant falsehoods about their deaths.

Odd\_Glove7043 (4): Alex Jones WANTS there to be conspiracy theories because it means he can make money, he's been proven to lie or distort things, he is completely uncharitable with him bothering the families of people who died in a school shooting, he isn't someone Catholics should watch.

colekken (4): I have been listening to him before and he said some very anti-Catholic stuff. Your basic "Catholics aren't Christians" b.s. that kind of pissed me off. But he does say a lot of smart non-religious things.

craft00n (1): Are there many Sandy Hook denialists ?

# Post 501: TLM for Feast of Assumption in Santa Clara / San Jose (CA) area

Author: elsro

Score: 4

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1e6n758/tlm\_for\_feast\_of\_assumption\_in\_santa\_clara\_san/

Going on a business trip and want to ensure I have a Mass for the Assumption to attend. Please advise & TIA!

None (6): St. Thomas More Chapel (SSPX) is in San Jose. Not sure of others nearby at the moment.

dbaughmen (3): Immaculate Heart of Mary Oratory - ICKSP is also there

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): los gatos is small, quiet and South of you. [https://fsspx.today/chapel/ca-los-gatos/](https://fsspx.today/chapel/ca-los-gatos/) The San Jose chapel is just on the periphery of the hustle and bustle of downtown. Its probably closer. [https://fsspx.today/chapel/ca-san-jose/info/](https://fsspx.today/chapel/ca-san-jose/info/)

# Post 502: The Chosen TV show?

Author: dookiemaster420

Score: 3

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1e5ymef/the\_chosen\_tv\_show/

Thoughts on this? Is it worth watching or too protestantized?

Huge-Explanation-358 (12): If it's on Netflix that's a clue on how bad this is.

None (6): I watched the first 3 seasons to critique it. It certainly has its dramatic tv show parts but it is not a terrible show. Would I recommend it? Probably not, but it really depends on who I would be talking to. Is it worth watching? I don’t think it gives anything of value so no. It is neat to see the stories from the Bible played out though.

Piancol (2): It's been reviewed and critiqued by several Trad-oriented vloggers and commentators, including some priests, and the general consensus is that the production values are high but the doctrinal ambiguity (or plain errors in some instances), and the dramatic licenses it takes make it a no go. Especially for new converts or poorly catechised Catholics (i.e. almost everyone nowadays lol).

dbaughmen (0): Some people won’t like this, but here’s a good take on it : https://youtu.be/DB6EgKJxoIw?si=PULKcIsg\_hTaHaMl

# Post 503: Does the SSPX reject Vatican 2

Author: Smooth\_Ad\_5775

Score: 0

Comments: 68

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1e5h1k9/does\_the\_sspx\_reject\_vatican\_2/

None (6): They reject a couple of the documents put out at Vatican 2, such as on ecumenism and religious liberty.

feelinggravityspull (5): The simple answer is No, it does not. You can find a good summary of their position [here](https://sspx.org/en/news/recognizing-sspx-questioning-vatican-ii-4742), as well as elsewhere online.Significant quote:>[Liberals hold] that certain doctrines of the Catholic Church are not true. They reject Catholic teaching, full stop. The SSPX, on the other hand, does not claim that the teaching of the Catholic Church is false. Instead, it claims that some of the assertions of Vatican II contradict other magisterial teachings that have greater authority, and hence that accepting the doctrines of the Catholic Church requires accepting these more authoritative teachings and rejecting the small proportion of errors in Vatican II. It asserts that the actual teaching of the Catholic Church is to be found in the earlier and more authoritative statements.

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (6): Vatican 2 taught nothing infallibly. Iirc the sspx position is all but 2 documents are good, 1 is ambiguous but good if understood correctly and one contradicts church teaching. It does however reject the "spirit" of Vatican 2 which has opened the door to other abuses

dbaughmen (2): Yes, the changes brought about by Vatican II (the novus ordo) and the documents, as they clearly contradict Catholic teaching.

None (1): [https://www.ewtn.com/catholicism/library/protocol-agreement-of-the-vatican-and-archbishop-lefebvre-2096](https://www.ewtn.com/catholicism/library/protocol-agreement-of-the-vatican-and-archbishop-lefebvre-2096)

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Why

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (2): Thanks

Huge-Explanation-358 (1): Which one is the completely wrong document?

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (-3): Which Catholic doctrines does it specifically contradict? If you reject an ecumenical council, doesn’t that mean you reject the authority of the church? And if you do that, doesn’t that mean you’re schismatic? Just trying to understand

None (9): Because ecumenism and religious liberty are wrong. Previous Popes have strictly condemned these things for good reason. (I’m not going to explain why they are wrong here. You will need to do your own research.)

None (1): [deleted]

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (2): I think it was the one on religious liberty, Dignitatis Humanae

dbaughmen (3): You just keep thinking you’re better than everyone else with these questions and trying to discredit the society.

None (2): Sspx has good videos on YouTube giving the summary of what's wrong with V2 and the conciliar church. Just search it, it's not hard to find. They also have many good books if you wanna get more detailed answers, such as Catechism of the Crisis (one of my favorites, and an easy read.) It's a complicated problem and probing redditors with a cold instrument isn't gonna help you greatly.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (-3): The burden of proof is on you to prove to me that Vatican 2 is wrong on these things. Otherwise it makes sense that I would just accept the authority of the church.

MarcellusFaber (1): Deary me. You only had to Google it! Dr Peters’ translation is found here: https://cdn.restorethe54.com/media/pdf/1917-code-of-canon-law-english.pdf

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Not true. I am getting different answers from people. Some saying yes, others saying no. Just wanting clarification.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (5): Fr Hesse, Archbishop Lefebvre, and Michael Davies collectively wrote 10s of 1000s of pages on thisSSPX has hours of youtube podcasts as well.they are easy enough to find and make a ironclad case. Look up the 5 minute video on Collegiality as well, its pretty irrefutable and makes the case in short amount of time then the other more complex topics IMO. rando's on reddit shouldn't be your go to on some theologically consequential topics.

None (5): No. The burden of education is on you. If you refuse to learn then that’s on you. I don’t want to tell you here because that would require me to type out way too many words on my phone, and I’m not interested in doing that. Otherwise, I would be happy to share information with you. There are plenty of popes who have good explanations against ecumenism and religious liberty and modernism in general. Look up encyclicals of St Pius X and Pope Leo XIII. There are many others too.

MarcellusFaber (1): Popes Gregory XVI, Pius IX, and Leo XIII all condemned religious liberty, Gregory XVI calling it ‘insanity’. See the Syllabus of Errors, errors 15-17.

craft00n (1): The burden of proof is dialectically distributed. Your question didn't seem to be doubtful at the beginning, so there was no burden of proof at all. To understand more about the burden of proof, here's a video from an agnostic colleague:https://youtu.be/1w6MRwyEsjQ?si=-ex4vQfIhXdULnPK

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (-4): You’re using the burden of proof fallacy. Anyways,have those popes condemned those things using infallible authority? If not then I’m not sure what the problem is

None (8): The answers to all of your questions are going to by on the SSPX website.

None (3): Decrees are only infallible when they are defining doctrines concerning faith and morals.

None (6): The answers are not simple and require a vast amount of knowledge to comprehend the complexity of the crisis and why the SSPX exists. The SSPX gives decent explanations on their website. It would be better for you to go there yourself, otherwise I would just be copying and pasting from there.

dbaughmen (6): Mate, you’re just in this reddit to try to discredit the Society, instead of calling us schismatics try and learn.

MarcellusFaber (2): We are still bound to believe what a Pope teaches even if it is taught fallibly. That said, Pius IX’s condemnations in the Syllabus of Errors were considered by many theologians to be infallible.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (-2): I didn’t call you schismatics.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): “’Until the doctrinal questions are clarified, the Society has no canonical status in the Church, and its ministers — even though they have been freed of the ecclesiastical penalty — do not legitimately exercise any ministry in the Church.’“The priests of the Society of St. Pius X are validly ordained, but suspended, that is prohibited from exercising their priestly functions because they are not properly incardinated in a diocese or religious institute in full communion with the Holy See (cf. Code of Canon Law, canon 265) and also because those ordained after the schismatic Episcopal ordinations were ordained by an excommunicated bishop.Concretely, this means that the Masses offered by the priests of the Society of St. Pius X are valid, but illicit, i.e., contrary to Canon Law.”Pope Benedict said this about the SSPX though. So by your logic you should believe that the priests are illliclty performing sacraments and that they have no actual ministry in the church. Help me make sense of this

dbaughmen (1): “And if you do that, doesnt that mean you’re schismatic?”

MarcellusFaber (1): See canons 2261 and 2284 of the 1917 code. This answers this objection, presuming the worst case scenario of the bishops genuinely having been excommunicated and the priests suspended. Though I do not accept the legitimacy of the ‘83 code (for it is my opinion that John Paul II and Ratzinger were heretics, who are barred from the papacy by the divine law), this provision is also found in the ‘83 code, albeit more vaguely and apparently less generously. See Edward Peters’ translation of the 1917 code for the canons I mentioned and their equivalent in the ‘83 code.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): It’s a question. I’m saying, would doing that make you schismatic? And hoping for an explanation. I’m interested in SSPX and just putting forth some claims made against them so I can see what you have to say about them.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Your saying jp and ratzinger were antipopes? How accessible are these canons you’re referring to? AI summarized them and I’m not sure how they have to do with SSPX. Can you summarize the counter objection to do the objection I proposed?

MarcellusFaber (1): Canon 2261 states that the laity can approach undeclared tolerated excommunicates for the Sacraments for any just cause (the commentaries, such as of Hyland & Dom Augustine, state the bar is very low for this; wishing to communicate more frequently is given as an example of just cause). Canon 2284 extends this provision to suspended priests. From your point of view, SSPX priests are suspended, hence canon 2284 applies to them and they can be approached for the Sacraments. These canons are easily accessible in the English translation of Edward Peters, Dom Augustine’s commentary (on archive.org), and in Hyland’s dissertation on excommunication (also on archive.org).Yes, I do believe that the putative Popes from Paul VI onwards have been anti-Popes. Some examples of their publicly professed heresies are religious liberty, teaching that the Jews are not a cursed people, which is the common teaching of the Fathers, collegiality, and latitudinarism (or religious indifferentism), which leads to their enthusiastic promotion of false oecumenism and communicatio in sacris with non-Catholics.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): So aren’t you a sede? And the 1917 code isn’t the current version of canon law so I don’t think that would still apply to now…

MarcellusFaber (1): Yes, I am. I also don’t believe that the ‘83 code is legitimate, since I am Sede’. I have also referred you to the equivalent canons in the ‘83 code, which are canons 1331 and 1335.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Where could I find the 83 code?

MarcellusFaber (1): On the Vatican website, by googling it…

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Has a laetae sententiae been declared on the priests of the SSPX?

MarcellusFaber (1): Not on each individually.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (2): So what “just” reason do the parishioners have to go to suspended priests? And don’t the SSPX accept Francis as the pope?

MarcellusFaber (1): I have explained this already and directed you to two sources which explain it. As to the SSPX thinking that Francis is the Pope, indeed they do, but the correct understanding of the current crisis is not necessary in order to be Catholic.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Is there a YouTube video that explains all of this?

MarcellusFaber (1): Not for this, I’m afraid. You’ll have to do the reading for this argument. The argument about which there are YouTube videos is the usual SSPX argument from necessity.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (2): I read up on necessity. I can see where you’re coming from a lot better now.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): How does necessity come into play when there’s another TLM chapel in better standing with the pope closer? How would I be permitted to go to SSPX in that case? Not an attack, but this is just my situation currently.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Where can I find the commentaries about the bar being low for the “just reason”

MarcellusFaber (1): I don’t tend to use their argument from necessity, at least not from a ‘Sedeplenist’ point of view. My next argument would be to invoke cessation of law concerning the laws that require dismissorial letters, papal mandate, jurisdiction given in writing, etc. since the laity need the Sacraments and laws that would prevent our having the Sacraments due to the situation would have become harmful. This is from the idea that western orders conferred through the new rites are doubtful, however. As to the argument from canons 2261 and 2284, it doesn’t matter whether there is a priest in good standing more readily available; the law still allows one to go to the suspended or excommunicated priest.

MarcellusFaber (1): On archive.org:https://archive.org/details/1917CodeOfCanonLawCommentary/page/179/mode/1up?view=theater (Volume 8, Book V)https://archive.org/details/ExcommunicationItsNature/page/n99/mode/1up?view=theater (Pg. 88)Edward Peters also lists prominent canonists and their commentaries on his website, which you can search for on archive.org, Google Books, Hathi, or in libraries. WorldCat and JSIC are useful for finding both physical and electronic copies. You might also check AbeBooks for copies. I warn you though that many of these commentaries are not in English (typically they are in Latin or German). See the below link: http://www.canonlaw.info/canonlaw\_cites17.htm

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Another guy on here said that the priests aren’t even suspended anymore since pope Francis gave dismissorials to bishop fellay. What do you make of that?

MarcellusFaber (1): I was not aware of that. I do not know the implications. Perhaps common error could be mentioned from my point of view, but I’m not certain.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Ok well thanks for your help. I am seriously considering attending an SSPX chapel. Please pray that God makes everything clear to me about this.

MarcellusFaber (1): I would strongly encourage you to do so, but to check in which rites the priests saying Mass there were ordained. Sometimes new rite priests who join are not conditionally ordained.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Oh. How are novus ordo ordinations invalid may I ask?

MarcellusFaber (1): I wouldn’t say that they certainly are, but doubtful Sacraments have to be avoided. The problem is that the rites were changed by Paul VI. My simple line of thought is that, while technically possible, it is not likely that a Modernist anti-Pope would promulgate valid rites. The rather more complicated arguments, which I’ll admit I don’t understand that well, involve the lack of a moral union between the matter and form of episcopal consecration. Comparisons to the controversy concerning Anglican orders have also been made.It is worth noting that it is utterly impossible for a true Pope to promulgate invalid or harmful rites or disciplines due to the Church’s disciplinary infallibility.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): I am not a sede so I will believe that the ordinations are valid but thank you for telling me. Does the SSPX do conditional baptism and confirmations? I was converted at a NO church and they didn’t have me do a conditional baptism. After the confirmation I found out that the possibility of my Protestant baptism being invalid was higher than I thought. Chances are I’m fine but I still wanna be sure.

MarcellusFaber (1): Yes, they will baptise and confirm you conditionally if there is a good reason, which in your case there is. Make sure you get confirmed by one of the bishops though; sometimes SSPX priests do confirmations themselves, which is certainly invalid in my understanding.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): I’m pretty sure the SSPX get the temporal authority to confirm from their bishops. That’s what it’s like in the Novus ordo and it’s how I was confirmed.

MarcellusFaber (1): It doesn’t work like that because their bishops do not have authority over the priests as diocesan bishops do. Besides, Pius XII only allowed parish priests to confirm in certain circumstances; SSPX priests do not claim such an office.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): So wouldn’t their confirmations just be illicit?

MarcellusFaber (1): No, not in the case of confirmation.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Hm. How do their bishops not have authority over the priests?

MarcellusFaber (1): Because they are not diocesan bishops. The authority of a bishop does not come from his orders, but rather from his ordinary jurisdiction, which the SSPX bishops do not have, nor make any claim of having.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Ok that makes sense. The SSPX I would attend does not do confirmation by priests 👍

MarcellusFaber (1): Good, good. I wouldn’t discouraged you from receiving any of the other Sacraments from a priest who made such a mistake; just don’t be confirmed by one of those.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Would you know if the sspx gives records of their ordinations to the Vatican?

MarcellusFaber (1): I have no idea. I doubt it.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): Sorry I mean the bishop of place, not the Vatican.

MarcellusFaber (1): I doubt that too.

# Post 504: Is it heresy if someone likes St. Bonaventure more than St. Thomas Aquinas?

Author: None

Score: 2

Comments: 8

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1e37atd/is\_it\_heresy\_if\_someone\_likes\_st\_bonaventure\_more/

As far as I know, Pope Benedict XVI liked Bonaventure more than Aquinas, but is that heresy?

None (5): No, it is not heresy. Although, being a Thomist, I might take offense. 😝

None (4): Heresy is a corruption of dogma. A preference to another saint doesn't affect any dogmatic principle, unless there's some missing context here.

colekken (1): No.

kawaqcosta (1): Obviamente não, uma vez que uma heresia é a negação pertinaz de um dogma católico. A preferência por um teólogo ou outro é permitida, entretanto deve ser fundamentada para ser razoável.

dbaughmen (1): Mosts are Thomists, but that definitely isn’t a heresy. A heresy is a belief that goes against the teachings of the Church.

craft00n (1): St Thomas himself was condemned for a time. I'm a full thomist, and I really stick to Pascendi, but if you prefer someone else, just be sure not to go in heretical paths.

None (1): So, if someone claims that Bonaventure's theology is superior to Aquinas', is that heresy?

None (4): That, I don't know. I hope someone else can answer you. Benedict XVI was a liberal modernist so I'm inclined to think there's some strange logic behind his statement.

# Post 505: For someone who just started going to the Latin Mass, what is a great resource for them to learn it whilst know absolutely nothing about it?

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 5

Comments: 10

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1e2rsew/for\_someone\_who\_just\_started\_going\_to\_the\_latin/

merinw (3): Loved subscribing to Benedictus. $5/ month with every weekly Mass (Latin on left, English on right) plus daily readings, prayers, and music. Worth every penny.

None (3): There should be a little red pamphlet somewhere in your church that walks you through the mass. You can also purchase a 1962 missal. (You should do this either way, the missal is one of the most important things to have). There are some catechisms that walk you through the Tridentine mass as well. You’re best off just asking your parish priest and don’t forget to check out the book store if they have one. There will likely be various resources available at the book store if they have one. Otherwise, Angelus Press sells some resources on this.

None (2): I would highly suggest a book called [The Latin Mass Explained](https://tanbooks.com/products/books/the-latin-mass-explained/)

None (2): The Mass of All Time by ++Lefebvre

kawaqcosta (1): Eu recomendaria o livro \*Explanation of The Holy Mass\* de Dom Prósper Guéranger OSB. Li ele e achei muito bom.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (2): I second this!!!

dbaughmen (2): Muito obrigado, Dom Gueranger é um verdadeiro santo

Huge-Explanation-358 (1): Why don't you reply in English?

kawaqcosta (1): Porque eu falo português.

Huge-Explanation-358 (2): Sim, mas é um sub de língua inglesa. Também sou brasileiro.

# Post 506: Update on this

Author: None

Score: 9

Comments: 9

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/s/yYb9aj6cG1

I was the original poster of this a long time ago. Shortly after this, I began attending the SSPX chapel in El Paso. However, I am overjoyed to say a chapel will be opened in Las Cruces in August 2024. Blessed be God 🙏🏼

merinw (3): I pray that an SSPX mission would be opened in the TX panhandle. It is four hours to Albuquerque, the closest SSPX chapel. We are in a very Christian community with many Catholic Churches but they are all N.O. Several have altar girls. One had country western songs during Mass. A couple of weeks ago, there was a couple of baby baptisms in one parish. The priest made a face and joked about the exorcism in the sacrament of baptism. In N.O., there is only one exorcism. Traditionally, there are three. But this priest acted like the one was something to be embarrassed about and apologize for. Apparently does not understand why there are exorcisms in the sacrament of baptism. People come to Mass dressed very casually. Sleeveless, strappy tops, slacks, are common for women. Men don’t wear ties. It has been a shock after attending at the SSPX mission where we used to live. I pray for an SSPX mission up here in NW TX.

No\_Construction5455 (2): That is absolutely the best news to hear. Right now we are trying to find a either the land to build or a property with a suitable building. Non nobis Domine...............

None (1): What area of Texas are you in? I have a full list of TLM's and maybe I can help direct you to one.

merinw (2): As I said, Texas panhandle. That is NW TX. There are no close TLM in TX to us. The closest is Albuquerque. I have already done the looking and crying. Until one is built here, we are stuck. I heard the Bishop threatened folks awhile back with excommunication if they went to TLM. He will be moved next year. Hoping for a replacement who is not threatened by TLM, as opposed to threatening those who find peace in the TLM.

Piklikl (2): Why not move closer to an SSPX priory? I understand that uprooting your entire life and finding new jobs etc is an enormous undertaking and it’s not a simple endeavor at all; but at a certain point if you’re going to spend a significant chunk of your life in one place wouldn’t you rather it be in close proximity to the sacraments? Sure the SSPX needs to grow and spread much more, but until then we all have agency and the capacity to take actions in our own lives to remedy the issues we see around us.

None (0): How do you feel about sede/independent TLMs? Because that would be your only option if you're willing to drive the 2-3 hours instead of 4

merinw (2): We just moved across the country. Have planned this for the past seven years, we on,y got involved in SSPX in the last year and by then, this move was in the works. It is sad but it is what it is. Everything else worked out so perfectly, I believe we are here for a reason.

merinw (1): Not going to go to a schism church unless SSPX is declared by this Pope as in schism. That said, I would go to a reverent Catholic Mass (see reverent Catholic Mass.com). Was baptized in one in Washington state and it was very respectful and reverent. About half in Latin, including choir.

Piklikl (1): Of course that's how the timing would work out. And yes, I'm sure Divine Providence has something to do with it.

# Post 507: Opposing views?

Author: ttpf222

Score: 3

Comments: 10

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1e08o3m/opposing\_views/

Hi, all!I am passionate about religion and have begun researching your Society. I admire you all for preaching several key truths: that beliefs shouldn’t change solely because of the passage of time or of how popular they are; that some beliefs are more true than others; and that God allows people to send themselves to Hell if they choose. Further, I admire your confidence in your faith: you believe not only that it can withstand all criticisms, but also that once fully explained it will attract every person to its light.But in order to be converted to your faith, I would first have to understand it; and in order to understand it, I would first have to understand why its opponents are wrong. Your Society seems reluctant to let people explore opposing views… and is especially suspicious of American-style freedom of speech…. Perhaps this is because you fear that, on the way to converting to your faith, people will first espouse an erroneous intermediate position. But if the process is leading to what you would consider a fuller, stronger faith in the long run, then why are honest mistakes a bad thing? And what has censorship done except confer a tantalizing victim-status on the censored (“come see what they don’t want you to”)?Thanks for your time and thoughts,T.

None (5): You are wrong in assuming that you have to understand why others are wrong first to understand the Faith. You can’t understand why others are wrong until you understand what is right, otherwise there is no truth to compare what is wrong to.

None (5): >Your Society seems reluctant to let people explore opposing views…An example would be nice. I don't know what you mean here without getting into specific subject matter. Certainly, being led astray from the path to salvation is not good.>But if the process is leading to what you would consider a fuller, stronger faith in the long run, then why are honest mistakes a bad thing?Who is saying honest mistakes are a bad thing? Specificity is key.>And what has censorship done except confer a tantalizing victim-status on the censoredI'm struggling to see how this is related to a Society position.

merinw (3): I suggest you start reading the Catechism of Trent. Stop worrying about what others think and find out what you think when you read the Catechism.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (3): you wrote a bunch of text but I dont see how any of this has to do with Catholicism or the SSPX specifically. the Catholic Church never taught that men have the right to damaging free speech btw. Specifically heresy. No one has a right from God to spread heresy. And that is nothing to do with SSPX or Vatican 2, that just Catholic teaching as stood for centuries. You could research that individually and find it to be a fact. So there is one key truth for you :D.

craft00n (3): Hi, french SSPX parishioner here. SSPX isn't "our" society, it's important to keep that in mind if we don't want to become just another cult. SSPX is a society of catholic priests inside the Church, and, as catholics, we rely on what the Church gives us in order to go to heaven.I maybe able to help if you want, but you don't find the truth by looking at the error. Have a look at Summa Theologica : Saint Thomas refutes the false opinions on the base of the truth, not the other way around.Anyway, as the SSPX legitimacy is a disputed question, it's perfectly valid to ask for answers to the various objections that are given against it.The thing about freedom of speech and freedom of press is that it's liberal freedom. You should read Libertas (Leo XIII). Liberal freedom is the right to do anything, true freedom is the right to do what is good and say what is true.

None (2): Freedom of speech and press is what helped blow up the protestant revolution. Freedom of press also breeds secret societies like commies and masons. Having total freedom to say what one likes leads many people astray. It also fosters laissez-faire capitalist religions that are so dominant in American culture. American capitalism and protestantism flourished on the "free market" church system. Oh you don't like your church? You can shop around and just go to ol' pastor Bob next town over who has more X or Y. You can walk down a populated metro area and see 50 different churches, religions, sects, and heresies. This is horrible for people. How confusing and alienating is this? It fosters a divided society. Neighbors have nothing in common with neighbor. Your town is now full of anonymous, fluid nomadic-like individuals who don't see eye to eye on basic things. Also the sspx isn't afraid of dialogue. Sspx priests have mentioned that it's okay to ask questions about the faith. In the apologetic series on YouTube, a priest says it's absolutely rational and \*normal\* to question the faith. People are sense-oriented rational animals. No one is going to believe a Catholic apologist if the Catholic can't answer real questions like, "Why is Jesus God?" Catholics aren't just blind faith believers. Catholicism at its roots is extremely rational and rewards the inquisitive thinker. That's because the truth is rooted in God, (reality is God who is Being itself) who ultimately is simple and can be known by anyone who desires (to an extent, of course, God is incapable of being known fully for He is infinite in measure.)

dookiemaster420 (1): i think some people are defensive/stubborn in general, that’s not a society issue necessarily, but for the most part i’ve been asking questions in this subreddit all year and except for maybe 1 post, i’ve been met with grace, kindness, & genuine efforts to educate / inform. If you are specific with your questions it seems most faithful here will lend a hand and a comment or 2. 🙏

ttpf222 (1): Thank you for all these thoughtful responses! I think you all have already answered my question…. Let me offer a couple of clarifications, and then state what I think is your position, and then please jump in and correct me where I still misunderstand.u/dookiemaster420, I did not intend to make an \*ad hominem\* attack against SSPX or Catholics. I apologize if that’s what it sounded like. I try to talk about ideas, not people.u/ryan\_unalux, u/MitthrawnuruodoVCR, the reason this has to do with SSPX is the following. My neighbor has suggested that I convert to Catholicism. (My current views don’t fit within one denomination, but are closest to high-church Anglicanism.) But SSPX has accused most of the Catholic Church of compromising with at least 3 falsehoods:1. the idea that it’s ok for newer teachings/beliefs to directly contradict older ones,2. the idea that every proposed belief/religion is equally true, and3. the idea that everyone will automatically go to Heaven no matter what.If the SSPX is right – if the Catholic Church really has compromised with those 3 falsehoods – then if and when I convert, I better make sure to join the SSPX rather than the rest of the Catholic Church.I perceive the SSPX position to be the following:- Each person has a duty to seek God with both his intellect and his will.- As u/Brother\_Irenaeus seems to state, it is preferable for a person to be convinced of Catholicism’s truth first by an act of the will, so that he first believes. Then, his ongoing process of learning will help bring to light in his intellect the doctrines he already knows by an act of the will.- It is understandable that some individuals will need more intellectual exploration first, so that they know what they would be assenting to. However, such intellectual exploration must be subordinated to the good of society. Seeking God with one’s intellect necessarily involves, at some point, considering ideas opposing Catholicism. But considering anti-Catholic ideas publicly will inevitably result in at least one person believing them. And that damages society.- So, intellectual exploration must occur only within intimate private settings, such as a small discussion group at one’s parish or coffee shop. And care must be taken that an anti-Catholic idea never be uttered in the hearing of those who haven’t already heard it. And if it is, then it must be followed with a simple quick explanation of why it’s wrong and Catholicism is right.- Since public intellectual discussion results in people hearing and possibly believing anti-Catholic ideas, public intellectual discussion is morally wrong in practice.- Such is true even if all participants are sincerely seeking the truth. So, any person who asserts an anti-Catholic idea should be censored.- Therefore, the notion that civil governments must not restrict speech (especially religious speech) is false and harmful. Censorship is a positive good.Is this an accurate portrayal of the SSPX position?

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): you need to get away from 'what is the sspx position'On something like this that has nothing to do with Vatican 2 and the new mass, there is no SSPX position. if you come across it in their materials they are simply re-iterating what the Catholic Church taught for centures or millienia. Everything discussed in this follow up summary post HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH SSPX. SSPX is a fraternity of priests made to give Catholic sacraments. If they preach on such subjects to the faithful, or in their seminaries, they are never making up new doctrine of conclusions. They are passing along the teachings of the Church Herself. You can find support for all this in various encyclicals and other doctrine. I am not an actual expert on this specific topic, but it seems what you stated is what the Catholic Church said and taught consistently. I doubt most the current Roman seminaries teach anything like this now but they would if they were intellectually honest. however put another way, if you agree with this particular logic train, are looking for proper Catholic groups and schools of education that still teach it, no one would be a better candidate then SSPX to seek out for more such spiritual nourishment.

ttpf222 (1): That sounds like the answer is “yes”. But Benedict/Ratzinger called himself Catholic and argued that censorship was an application of Catholicism, not a principle; and that such applications could change in different pastoral / historical circumstances. Why should one assume that Ratzinger’s argument is wrong and Lefebvre’s is the only “Catholic” one? It’s not good enough to say “because my parents told me so”: one must have a \*\*reason\*\* for one’s beliefs. I’m looking for that reason. The SSPX webpages don’t seem to explain that reason, and there is no SSPX church geographically close to me, so that’s why I decided to ask here. But if this subreddit is not an appropriate forum, I want to be respectful of that, so will find somewhere else.

# Post 508: Who are the Saints who especially loved and revered the Blessed Virgin Mary?

Author: None

Score: 3

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1dz1idi/who\_are\_the\_saints\_who\_especially\_loved\_and/

Well, I asked a similar question in another post last time, but this time I'm asking a bit more broadly.

MarcellusFaber (4): All of them.

None (4): St. Alphonsus Liguori - wrote the Glories of Mary, one of the ultimate compositions of MariologySt. Louis de Montfort - wrote Secret of the Rosary and True Devotion to Mary

Highwayman90 (3): St. Mary of Egypt entrusted her path of repentance to the guidance of the Blessed Mother.[https://www.stmaryofegypt.com/maryofegypt](https://www.stmaryofegypt.com/maryofegypt)

l--mydraal--l (2): St Maximilian Kolbe

Piancol (3): Alphonsus Maria de Liguori, Louis Marie de Montfort, Bernard of Clairvaux, Bonaventure, Therese de Lisieux, John Vianney, Maximilian Kolbe, Pio da Pietrelcina. And of course, the visionaries of the different apparitions of Our Lady like Guadalupe, Lourdes, Fatima, La Salette, etc.

# Post 509: "so called" priests / conditional ordinations, etc.

Author: dookiemaster420

Score: 1

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1dxzr5c/so\_called\_priests\_conditional\_ordinations\_etc/

[https://novusordowatch.org/2023/06/sspx-priest-novus-ordo-ordinations-invalid/](https://novusordowatch.org/2023/06/sspx-priest-novus-ordo-ordinations-invalid/)What is the general position of the congregation/lay persons regarding this topic? I have attended some Masses with a few of these NO Priests that have "not been conditionally re-ordained".

Piklikl (6): First off, this is reddit; the SSPX Faithful active on here represent maybe 0.01%, so you’re not getting an accurate sample of “the general position” (also, not accusing you of anything, but most people adopting this line of questioning never seem to be genuinely interested in what they state but rather simply want confirmation that their opinion is the generally accepted opinion).I do think the SSPX leadership need to be more transparent about their processes and positions, unfortunately the leadership is still stuck in an age when the faithful are expected to not ask questions but simply shut up, do as their told, and give their tithe. In a generation or two these men will be dead and hopefully their replacements will umpire things.That being said, if you’re trusting the SSPX to provide the sacraments, then you should fully commit to that trust. The SSPX does put a lot of effort into training priests, and for the most part they wouldn’t allow someone to administer the sacraments if there was genuine cause for doubt. Ultimately we are still living through a Crisis in the Church, and as lay people we can’t be reasonably expected to perform canonical investigations into every member of the clergy we come across. We won’t find ourselves in Hell because we failed to discover a defect of matter in the ordination of the priest who was eventually consecrated as a Bishop.I wouldn’t be surprised if after the Crisis is over the Vatican starts investigations into all of these issues and does what it can to rectify the problem (similar to how once a monastery discover they had been celebrating Mass for 10 years using apple wine, the Vatican stepped in and had every single one of the masses “recelebrated” and enlisted the rest of the clergy throughout the world to assist), but that’s pretty much the only entity with the capacity to do so. Keyboard warriors on the internet do not have the authority or capacity to conduct canonical investigations, so we shouldn’t be looking to them for their opinion.

None (2): The concept is similar to those who receive baptism outside of the Catholic Church, as is my case. If the baptism meets the requirements to be valid then that’s the end of it but if there is any possible doubt that the requirements were not met then it is usually up to the individual, under the guidance of the SSPX priest, to undergo a conditional baptism. The society priests will not force you to do so. As for priests, there are some doubts to the validity of Novus Ordo ordinations (I won’t go into detail here), so when a Novus Ordo priest comes to the SSPX, the Society will offer them a conditional ordination if the individual wants it. It is my opinion, if you can call this an opinion, that it is safer to just go with the conditional sacraments so you can be absolutely certain that they were done correctly. I underwent a conditional baptism and a conditional confirmation for this reason. So there can be no doubt.

rathdrummob (-2): 🤣🤣I know him. He’s batty. They don’t allow his sermons to be live streamed because of this. He’s saying the quiet part out loud but he’s old and not all there so they just try to keep a lid on it. The linked article is from a group even more removed from the Catholic Church than the SSPX. Fr Michael Johnson, and the rest of the SSPX priests in the house he lives in, do not exercise any licit ministry in the diocese of Los Angeles. It’s really a scandal for the dwindling number of people that get sucked into the rad trad world from a diocese that, while it’s still recovering from the Mahoney era, is still allowing legitimate TLM in several parishes. So there are places they could go and receive legitimate/ licit sacraments. Abp Gomez is not antagonistic to conservatives. But the local SSPX group (they’re not a parish but they call themselves that) makes no effort toward integration into the actual Catholic community. 🤷🏻♂️

dookiemaster420 (2): Thank you for the detailed answer. I am learning as much as I can given my current circumstances.

None (3): Sspx is not out of communion with Rome and their priests have been given the okay for the sacraments by the Vatican. Your post reeks of misinformation and your involvement in apostate subreddits vindicates my observation.

rathdrummob (1): You can drink whatever Koolaid you want- and you don't need to take my word for it. Ask your local Catholic bishop. He actually has the authority to speak for the church, unlike you or I (or the SSPX). FWIW\_ I was raised on the SSPX koolaid- I drank it for ~5 decades. Thankfully for myself and my family we have found our way into the Catholic church and while there are obvious problems, it has been an immense relief. And to address your statement that the SSPX "has bee given the ok for the sacraments (?) by the Vatican..." The SSPX doesn't even make that claim, except for witnessing marriages (with the approval of the local ordinary) and absolution, and THAT privilege was granted only recently by Pope Francis. When pressed, they just go into their word salad about their interpretation around supplied jurisdiction. I've heard it all, and understand it, it's just not logical. It, their claim of supplied jurisdiction, relies on their own judgement that ordinary jurisdiction doesn't apply to them because they said so. Then by extension of that logic, ALL independent "catholic" groups have that same jurisdiction, that's chaos. And it's protestant. I have seen so many things over the course my life, but especially over the last 10 years or so, that would strongly suggest that the SSPX has no will to ever enter into full communion with the Catholic Church. The mere suggestion back in 2012 caused a huge split. Any real movement toward legitimacy would cause a massive- and possibly fatal- fracture. I have had this opinion privately expressed to me by older priests of the Society. Furthermore- you know nothing about me, nor I about you, keep it civil.

None (2): For someone who was with the sspx for 5 decades, you don't know a lot of basic facts. I don't blame you, though. As a recent convert I've found that many born and raised trads are pretty unaware of basic Catholic truths. >The sspx doesn't even make that claimYes they do. It's in the Catechism of the Crisis in the Church book by Angelus Press as well as heavily discussed in their podcasts and videos ad nauseum. A quick Google search would show you this. Multiple Vatican officials have publicly said that the sspx fulfills one's Sunday obligation and that they are not in schism. Also, if the sspx were really outside of the church then they would not even be considered in "irregular communion." Pope Francis would have crushed their legitimacy by now. The whole crisis in the church today is complex and unfortunately, to the detriment of souls, extremely difficult. At the end of the day, there's an obvious rupture of orthodoxy within the church. If it's not clear to you, I have nothing to say. There are oceans of ink already spilled detailing the errors of V2 and its fruits. You can claim your relaxation at being "within the church" at your Paul VI mass, great, good for you. Being blind to the problem is a convenient way out.

# Post 510: Position on Catechism

Author: l--mydraal--l

Score: 7

Comments: 27

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1dxzetf/position\_on\_catechism/

Thank you for your advice on my previous questions. One that I've not found much on is what the SSPX position is on the most recent Catechism.Thank you in advance for your direction on where to look and read.

Piancol (10): As with most post-conciliar stuff, the SSPX just ignores it and uses the traditional and safest one available in every region. They don't hold the proper authority to sanction or ban any doctrinal documents but instead they just stick to the traditional teachings – in this case, mostly the Catechisms of Trent and S. Pius X.

None (5): The post conciliar catechism references V2 more than any other material besides scripture. Because of that, it is necessary to avoid it and refer to classic versions such as Baltimore, Pius X, Trent, etc.

user4567822 (3): Interesting that many people in SSPX don’t follow the [Catechism of Saint Pope Pius X](https://www.ewtn.com/catholicism/library/catechism-of-st-pius-x-1286) 203:> Every Catholic must acknowledge the Pope as Father, Pastor, and Universal Teacher, and be united with him in mind and heart.

None (2): I recall Father Palko, SSPX, in a recent SSPX podcast mention that the Catechism has doctrinal issues regarding religious freedom and ecumenism as it teachings these things. As a Catechist at an SSPX Church I find issues with its wording as well but that is probably a more subjective opinion. We will not use the Catechism of The Catholic Church mainly for promoting the errors of religious freedom and ecumenism.

merinw (1): You can read the Baltimore Catechism or the Catechism of Trent. I was recommended the later early on by a congregant in my SSPX mission. The former was required reading in the SSPX Adult Catechism class.

l--mydraal--l (1): Sounds like the safe and consistent way to go.

l--mydraal--l (1): Thank you 🙏

kawaqcosta (1): Na verdade seguimos sim. Entretanto se o papa ensina cosias erradas não temos obrigação de acatar seus ensinamentos errôneos, pela própria natureza deles.

None (1): After 5 years of teaching converts my recommendations on what Catechism to use are as follows: The Council of Trent (this requires a well educated teacher), Baltimore Catechism #3 (for adults), My Catholic Faith Catechism (this one covers many areas that the other two do not.)After all of that it is very important for the individual undergoing lessons to develop a firm grasp on the spiritual life. This is probably the most important thing of all. If the Catechist is not comfortable with this then the Catechumen should seek out someone who is. There are many book recommendations that I have for this if anyone is interested.

l--mydraal--l (1): Thank you. Good advice.

Piancol (1): Definitely! Ignoring anything post V2 has been my safe route to avoid modernism and Protestantholic nonsense for all my adult life. And, honestly, there's no need for new content when we have 1950ish years of resources to consult – anything of trascendental importance has been already defined by the Traditional Magisterium.

None (2): Sorry I forgot to mention that I read this in an Angelus Press book. Here's also a good primer written by the sspx about the modern CCC.https://sspx.org/en/new-catechism-catholic-30407

user4567822 (2): 1. Se o Papa ensina algo de forma autoritária, devemos submeter-nos \*(Canôn. 750 e 752 do Código de Direito Canónico)\*2. Se um Papa ensina algo de forma não oficial \*(como opinião pessoal, etc.)\* podemos discordar.Posso estar errado, mas pela forma como escreveste esse comentário, parece que acreditas que recentes Papas ensinaram heresias. Ora, isso não é submeter-nos à Igreja. É apenas acreditarmos no que nos soa bem e rejeitar o resto.

None (1): [deleted]

kawaqcosta (1): Existem diversos graus de certeza em teologia (baseados em graus diversos de autoridade magisterial ou argumentação racional) e os correspondentes graus de erro. Em inglês é chamado de "theological notes" e o Pe. Ludwig Ott, no seu livro "Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma", comenta um pouco sobre isso. Você também pode consultar isso em outras fontes online.A heresia propriamente dita é contrária a doutrinas propostas infalivelmente pelo magistério eclesiástico, seja em definições conciliares, papais ou do magistério ordinário universal. Eu não acho que o magistério do Concílio Vaticano II e dos papas recentes tenham proposto heresias nos seus documentos, mas sim erros teológicos mais ou menos graves, pois, na minha avaliação, possuem colocações contraditórias com o magistério precedente. Para mim isso é um dado verificável ao analisar os argumentos tradicionalistas, textos conciliares, pós conciliares e do magistério anterior (é necessário muito estudo, reflexão e ponderação nessa matéria, dada a dificuldade inerente a ela e muitos erros existentes em avaliá-la). Além de ser teoricamente possível, dado que não houve nenhum engajamento de autoridade infalível.A possibilidade de erro no magistério não infalível do Papa é algo avaliado pelos teólogos como possível, embora altamente improvável. Nessa situação a suspenção do assentimento ou mesmo dissensão é algo permitido. O Pe. Daniel Pinheiro IBP, um sacerdote brasileiro do Instituto do Bom Pastor, possui um estudo interessante sobre os diversos graus de magistério e os correspondentes graus de assentimento. Ele baseia suas colocações na própria natureza do assentimento devido às proposições mais ou menos certas e também em teólogos católicos. Link do estudo: [Assentimento ao Magistério – Estudo Completo | Scutum Fidei](https://scutumfidei.org/assentimento-ao-magisterio-estudo-completo/)

Huge-Explanation-358 (0): As coisas não são tão simples assim. O \*\*\*GAUDIUM ET SPES\*\*\* do CVII é tão contrário à doutrina de sempre que o próprio Bento XVI o chamou de Antisyllabus. Ambos os documentos supostamente fazem parte do Magistério Ordinário. Sendo um a contradição do outro, o que te leva a crer que devemos seguir o mais recente e não o mais antigo? O Magistério não pode se contradizar, logo, o que contradiz não é Magistério. >parece que acreditas que recentes Papas ensinaram heresias. Ora, isso não é submeter-nos à IgrejaEntão vá adorar a Pachamama.

None (1): The Spiritual Combat is where I would begin with anyone. It is by Father Scupoli. The Spiritual Life by Father Tanquerey. The Three Ages of the Interior Life by Father Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, OP. It is hard to find these and can be very expensive but there is an online pdf of both volumes.

user4567822 (1): Uau. Não estava à espera de uma posição até que ponderada.- Então reconheces o Concílio Vaticano II como um válido Concílio Ecuménico? Reconheces todos os Papas desde ele como verdadeiros Papas.Mas poderias mostrar-me todos os erros teológicos graves que encontras do CV II para cá? \*(é que não pareces ser dos que vêm com a “Missa de Sempre” ou “Salvação sem a Igreja”)\*

user4567822 (1): Teoricamente, o \*Guadium Et Spes\* (que nem sequer é uma constituição dogmática) poderia ter imperfeições, é verdade. Mas desafio-te a apontar o que achas errado nele, \*\*apontando citações\*\*.Quanto ao Pachamama, isso mostra como muitos falam mal contra o Papa sem mínimo de pesquisa.Em primeiro lugar, causar escândalo/permitir idolatria no Vaticano não mostra que um Papa é falso/cometeu o crime de heresia. \*O Papa Honório foi culpado pela expansão de uma heresia por não a ter combatido\*Pachamama era \*(apesar de feia, na minha opinião)\* uma representação da Virgem Maria,([neste vídeo](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1wioisaIU2I&t=804s) até se ouve uma mulher a chamá-la de “Nuestra Senora de la Amazonia”). De qualquer forma, o Papa Francisco esclareceu que [\*”as estátuas da pachamama (…) estavam lá sem intenções idólatras”\*](https://www.vaticannews.va/pt/papa/news/2019-10/francisco-fala-das-estatuas-jogadas-no-tibre.html).

kawaqcosta (1): Eu sou fiel da FSSPX. Ela reconhece o Concílio Vaticano II como um Concílio Ecumênico e os papas desde então como verdadeiros papas, afinal não somos sedevacantistas como muitos dizem.O que há é uma discordância de pontos particulares do Concílio e do Magistério recente derivado dele. Os tópicos principais são a Liberdade Religiosa, Ecumenismo e tudo que decorreu disso nos últimos 50 anos. Seria algo muito extenso para tratar aqui e não tenho perícia suficiente para tal, no entanto você pode consultar esses assuntos nos livros e sites da FSSPX.Eu aderi à posição dela em 2019, mas venho estudando melhor e me parece que esse assunto é extremamente complexo. Existem pontos relevantes levantados por ambos os lados e não são problemas simples para lidar.

Huge-Explanation-358 (1): Nem a "Constituição Dogmática" do Concílio é uma constituição dogmática, basta ver as notas do Secretário do Concílio no final do Lumen Gentium. O Papa permitir idolatria no Vaticano não é heresia. Entendi rs. E não me venha com "Oh, mas não é heresia formal, porque precisa ser notificado por uma autoridade!". Você sabe que estou falando de heresia material. João Paulo II, ao beijar o alcorão, pode não ter cometido heresia formal, mas materialmente é idolatria, além de um tremendo escândalo cujos frutos são obviamente a perdição das almas que se enganam sobre a nocividade de falsas religiões criadas por demônios. Sobre o Gaudium, minha opinião é irrelevante, prefiro citar membros competentes para isso. “Se se deseja emitir um diagnóstico global sobre este texto [daGaudium et Spes] poder-se-ia dizer que significa (junto com os textos sobre a liberdade religiosa e sobre as religiões mundiais)uma revisão do Syllabus de Pio IX, uma espécie de Antisyllabus” (Cardeal Joseph Ratzinger.Teoria dos Princípios Teológicos. Barcelona: Editorial Herder, 1985, pág. 457.).E o Cardeal disse ainda:“Contentemo-nos aqui com a comprovação de que o documentodesempenha o papel de um Anti Syllabus, e, em conseqüência,expressa a intenção de uma reconciliação oficial da Igreja coma nova época estabelecida a partir do ano de 1789“ (Cardeal Ratzinger.Teoria dos Princípios Teológicos. Barcelona: Editorial Herder, 1985, p. 458).Sem rodeios, essa digníssima autoridade do Vaticano acusou o documentoGaudium et Spes– do Vaticano II – de desempenhar um papel de Anti Syllabus. Enquanto o Syllabus é caracterizado por sua oposição aos princípios do mundo moderno, o documento do Vaticano II expressa a intenção de reconciliação oficial da Igreja com a civilização moderna, nascida a partir da Revolução Francesa. Portanto, segundo o Cardeal Ratzinger, o Vaticano II ensinou o contrário do Magistério precedente, mais especificamente, contra o Syllabus do Papa Pio IX.

user4567822 (1): A excomunhão de Lefebvre nunca foi retirada. Eu sei que eles não são protestantes, mas estão em estado canónico irregular. Bento XVI [escreveu](http://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/pt/letters/2009/documents/hf\_ben-xvi\_let\_20090310\_remissione-scomunica.html) em 2019:> O facto de a Fraternidade São Pio X \*\*não possuir uma posição canónica na Igreja\*\* não se baseia, ao fim e ao cabo, em razões disciplinares \*\*mas doutrinais\*\*. Enquanto a Fraternidade não tiver uma posição canónica na Igreja, também \*\*os seus ministros não exercem ministérios legítimos na Igreja\*\*. Por conseguinte, é necessário distinguir o nível disciplinar, que diz respeito às pessoas enquanto tais, do nível doutrinal em que estão em questão o ministério e a instituição. Especificando uma vez mais: \*\*enquanto as questões relativas à doutrina não forem esclarecidas, a Fraternidade não possui qualquer estado canónico na Igreja\*\*, e os seus ministros – embora tenham sido libertos da punição eclesiástica – não exercem de modo legítimo qualquer ministério na Igreja.Eles não estão em comunhão perfeita com Roma. Poderias procurar uma [Missa na forma extraordinária perto de ti, mas numa Igreja Diocesana](https://www.latinmassdir.org/countries/)? A FSSPX é perigosa - por exemplo:> [This serious shortcoming prevents us from regarding this new rite as \*\*legitimate\*\* and even allows us to \*\*doubt the validity\*\* of the celebrations in more than one instance.](https://fsspx.org/en/new-liturgy-30947) > [The correct definition of evil—lack of a due good—clearly shows that the \*\*New Mass is evil in and of itself regardless of the circumstances\*\*.](https://sspx.org/en/new-mass-legit-30283)

user4567822 (1): Eu concordo contigo que o que JPII não pareceu lá muito certo, mas negar Papas por heresias materiais é uma coisa mesmo muitoo, mas muitoo burra. E causar escândalo também não mostra a ilegitimidade de um Papa. Quanto ao Pachamama, já mostrei que era uma representação de Maria e o Papa disse que não estava lá por idolatria.Uma coisa interessante que vejo sedevacantistas/grandes críticos do CV II: é que a mesma coisa pode ser feita com Papas/documentos/Concilios antes do CV II. Escândalos, más disciplinas, más decisões, etc.. Mas a Igreja não prevalecerá como diz Mateus 16:18- Reconheces o CV II como um válido Concílio Ecuménico? \*(podes, à vontade, julgar que houve uma má implementação de algumas coisas)\*- Reconheces Novus Ordo como um tipo válido, legítimo e não errado de Missa?- Reconheces todos os Papas desde o Vaticano II como legítimos Papas?

kawaqcosta (1): Estou bem inteirado desses assuntos. Eu conheço estas informações e concordo substancialmente com elas, no momento. Tanto é assim que frequento a FSSPX durante os últimos 6 anos e não vou mais à nova missa desde então. Para mim a posição dela é a mais razoável, no momento. É possível que eu mude de opinião, mas ainda terei de estudar muito para fazer isso.

Huge-Explanation-358 (1): >não pareceu lá muito certoPra que tanto eufemismo? Dói maldizer um papa, mas só estamos descrevendo as ações dele. A Fraternidade São Pio X não é sedevacantista, inclusive na sacristia da capela da Vila Mariana tem um quadro do Papa Francisco e um do Dom Odilo. Eu também não sou sedevacantista. O Concílio Vaticano II, sendo inteiramente pastoral, por definição não é infalível (pode ver as notas do Cardeal Felice no final do Lumen Gentium). Se um Concílio Ecumênico pode ser falível eu não sei, não estou dizendo que não pode, só que eu não sei. O Novus Ordo definitivamente é válido, agora não sei o que quer dizer com "não errado". Sim, todos são papas, que inclusive fizeram algumas coisas boas, como o Humanae Vitae de Paulo VI. Sobre a Pachamama, bom, palavras são palavras, as ações mostram uma coisa completamente diferente.

user4567822 (1): Dizer que Novus Ordus é mal está contra a Igreja meu caro.Uma coisa é preferir forma extraordinária, achar que Novus Ordo não é perfeito ou até mesmo querer uma mudança dela. Mas dizer que é errada? A Missa muda ao longo dos tempos.

user4567822 (1): A excomunhão de Lefebvre nunca foi levantada. Eu sei que o Papa Francisco tem relaxado algumas restrições, mas eles continuam em estado canónico irregular. O Papa Bento XVI [escreveu](http://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/pt/letters/2009/documents/hf\_ben-xvi\_let\_20090310\_remissione-scomunica.html):> O facto de a Fraternidade São Pio X \*\*não possuir uma posição canónica na Igreja\*\* não se baseia, ao fim e ao cabo, em razões disciplinares \*\*mas doutrinais\*\*. Enquanto a Fraternidade não tiver uma posição canónica na Igreja, também \*\*os seus ministros não exercem ministérios legítimos na Igreja\*\*. Por conseguinte, é necessário distinguir o nível disciplinar, que diz respeito às pessoas enquanto tais, do nível doutrinal em que estão em questão o ministério e a instituição. Especificando uma vez mais: enquanto as questões relativas à doutrina não forem esclarecidas, a Fraternidade não possui qualquer estado canónico na Igreja, e os seus ministros – embora tenham sido libertos da punição eclesiástica – não exercem de modo legítimo qualquer ministério na Igreja.O CV II não estabeleceu nenhum dogma é verdade. Mas mesmo assim nós temos de acreditar em muitas coisas que lá foram definidas \*[(Canon 752 do Código de Direito Canónico)](https://www.vatican.va/archive/cod-iuris-canonici/eng/documents/cic\_lib3-cann747-755\_en.html)\*.Poderias procurar [neste site](https://www.latinmassdir.org/countries/) se tens missas na forma extraordinária perto de ti, mas numa igreja diocesana? Não te recomendo nada a FSSPX. Olha o que eles dizem:> [This serious shortcoming prevents us from regarding this new rite as \*\*legitimate\*\* and even allows us to \*\*doubt the validity\*\* of the celebrations in more than one instance.](https://fsspx.org/en/new-liturgy-30947) > [The correct definition of evil—lack of a due good—clearly shows that the \*\*New Mass is evil in and of itself regardless of the circumstances\*\*.](https://sspx.org/en/new-mass-legit-30283)

kawaqcosta (1): O surgimento do \*Novus Ordo\* não pode ser comparado com a evolução orgânica da liturgia católica, uma vez que ele foi um rito inteiramente fabricado e mudou radicalmente a liturgia anterior. Nunca houve nada semelhante na história da Igreja, pois todos os ritos evoluíram orgânica e gradualmente. A própria possibilidade de tal coisa ocorrer nunca foi concebida anteriormente. O Cardeal Ratzinger, no prefácio da obra \*A Reforma da Liturgia Romana\* de Mons. Klaus Gamber, afirmou o seguinte:> O que ocorreu após o Concílio é algo completamente distinto: no lugar de uma liturgia fruto de um desenvolvimento contínuo, introduziu-se uma liturgia fabricada. Escapou-se de um processo de crescimento e de devir para entrar em outro de fabricação. Não se quis continuar o devir e o amadurecimento orgânico do que existiu durante séculos. Foi substituído, como se fosse uma produção industrial, por uma fabricação que é um produto banal do momento. \[...\]Noutros tempos, qualquer afirmação relativa a uma verdade de fé que fosse imprecisa e que desse margem para compreensões heterodoxas seria condenada como errônea e perigosa (não necessariamente herética), especialmente em contextos onde falta de clareza pode minar o dogma da fé.A nova missa está numa situação análoga a essa. As deficiências e ambiguidades da nova liturgia, não expressando precisamente a fé católica na presença real e no sacrifício, são falhas graves. Noutros tempos algo semelhante a isso na liturgia seria condenado pela Santa Sé, que já condenou coisas muito menos graves que isso. São razões suficientes para justificar a malícia inerente do \*Novus\* \*Ordo\*, independente de ser bem ou mal celebrado.Me restrinjo a dizer isso sobre o \*Novus Ordo\*, não tenho interesse em prosseguir essa discussão. Se você quer buscar a verdade quanto a esse assunto, estude. Discussões online são geralmente inúteis e infrutuosas. Mas perceba que as razões pelas quais os tradicionalistas sustentam suas posições não são infundadas e levianas, são razões sérias, embora um ou outro argumento possa estar errado. Eu mesmo não concordo com tudo que vejo em relação a isso.

# Post 511: SSPX livestream liturgical issue/handling Eucharist or is this normal?

Author: dookiemaster420

Score: 3

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1dxi3s1/sspx\_livestream\_liturgical\_issuehandling/

Just watched a livestream and Father washed his hands, then wiped his face & chin several times over the next few minutes, then handled the Eucharist. Is this acceptable/normal/etc.?Thank you

Piklikl (4): I think it's acceptable/normal; Father was probably hot and sweaty and forgot to stash a handkerchief in his sleeve. The washing of the hands is largely symbolic anyway, if it needed to be a literal cleansing then we would see something closer to what surgeons do before going into the operating theatre. Priests wash their hands with soap and water in the sacristy before vesting, wiping away sweat isn't an issue.

aguysomewhere (3): It was probably hot

dookiemaster420 (1): Thank you!

# Post 512: What do you think about the death penalty?

Author: None

Score: 5

Comments: 12

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1du6t4f/what\_do\_you\_think\_about\_the\_death\_penalty/

Pope Francis opposes the death penalty, but it seems that some Catholics have different opinions.Edit: If the death penalty is justified, what do you think about John 8:7?Edit 2: And what do you think about if someone is falsely accused and could be put to death?

NextAd8013 (11): Support it 100%

Legacy\_Forging (8): Death sentence for corrupt politicians yesterday

asimovsdog (3): John 8:7 were Pharisees who were trying to stone a woman over prostitution. Mosaic law forbids prostitution, but doesn't put a death penalty on it. Romans 13:3 pretty much clears it. Jesus himself said that, for some people, it would be better for them to be thrown into a lake than to mislead other people into heresy. The value of the soul is infinitely larger than the value of a body. Even through death, some people could be saved - and the death could be used by God as penance for the sins, in case the soul is saved via contrition. Others will be condemned to hell, but if we let them live longer, they aren't going to repent and accumulate more and more sins and drag other people into hell.I approve of the death penalty, but only if it's done by Catholic morals and with severe prudence. The Inquisition did it right, they did burn heretics at the stake, but only after severe prudence, which was a lot better than medieval mobs burning people for "witchcraft".

Piancol (7): Up until 2018, the Catholic Church taught that it was allowed as a punishment of last resort, and only in cases where the greater good was in true danger. That being said, in this day and age of corrupt and godless governments it doesn't sound like the greatest idea...

MacduffFifesNo1Thane (3): I am against the death penalty as it currently is done, at least in the USA. Even though Catholic dogma and tradition allows it, there are issues of innocent men being killed and possible inhumane deaths. I cannot trust the government who mistypes my address two different ways on a license renewal notice. Only then to go down to the DMV and then have to correct it to a third wrong way on the license itself. And yet I can trust them suddenly to be able to kill a human humanely?Pope Francis is right to oppose it in my personal view BUT is wrong to have “changed” dogma on it.I also prefer unusual punishments, like having prisoners on death row do [The Salt and Pepper Diner Challenge.](https://youtu.be/KFgNx5tI7S4?si=ADJkNmowYNKVU1yz)

None (1): I support it but with the current way society is, you could be put to death if you say something bad about the rainbow group.

GoneFishin56 (-8): As a general statement, true Catholics oppose the death penalty. There are rare circumstances where it is warranted.

craft00n (-1): You should take a look at Ed Feser on this issue. Pope Francis seems to say that death penalty is not justified anymore because we have better solutions. I wouldn't agree but he's certainly right for certain countries, and opposing him on a political scale (if we were in power) would need us to have very very strong arguments and have at least his nihil obstat.

scrime- (2): I am neither agreeing nor disagreeing with your post, but the teaching on the death penalty is not and was never dogma.

MarcellusFaber (8): That is a heretical statement. It is de fide that the death penalty can be legitimately used by the state.

craft00n (6): Many Popes, some of whom were saints, advocated in favor of the death penalty for certain crimes. In Horrendum Illud Scellus, Saint Pius V gave the order to kill any priest convicted of homosexual acts.

craft00n (1): The fact that it can sometimes be good for sure is ordinary magisterium.

# Post 513: Eagle pulpit?

Author: dookiemaster420

Score: 2

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1dt45zp/eagle\_pulpit/

Why is the Eagle commonly found on the pulpit? Can someone share the history and meaning? Thank you 🙏

Cathain78 (3): I haven’t noticed this, but I would hazard a guess perhaps it is to do with the tetramorph - animals which represent the four Evangelists? If so, the eagle would represent St John.

Duibhlinn (2): I first noticed the eagle motif when I began attending the TLM. My presumption was that it was something to do with Romanitas but having looked into it I don't think there is any one answer, but there are various ideas for what it may represent. For a real answer you're have to go back in time and speak to the stonemasons who first started carving them, I believe in medieval Italy.

pjj68 (3): This is what came to my mind, too; but there's more, cf. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eagle\_lectern#Symbolism

Cathain78 (2): Interesting, so there a couple of theories on the subject.

# Post 514: What are the liturgical abuses in NO that you know?

Author: None

Score: 6

Comments: 10

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1dsfyrw/what\_are\_the\_liturgical\_abuses\_in\_no\_that\_you\_know/

Well, the NO Chapel I've been to before used Protestant songs at Mass, but that's just the beginning. Although I haven't been there myself, in my country, at Mass, sometimes people wear mascot costumes, or a priest plays a guitar solo, or something like that happens. Oh, btw, the Mass where he played the guitar solo was the Easter Vigil Mass.And slightly off topic, but it smees that Catholics who hate TLM, perhaps not all, seem to have a high probability of being silent about the liturgical abuses in NO, or rather actively participating in them. Just like Cardinal Gregory celebrating Martin Luther King “Mass.” Or is it just me who thinks that way?

MacduffFifesNo1Thane (8): I’ve eschewed the NO 85-90% of the time now: going for weddings, funerals, and if I need to meet the obligation and I can’t find a TLM/Eastern Rite/Ordinariate liturgy.This was my college’s priest 9 years ago, [right](https://www.reddit.com/r/Catholicism/s/AtHMiBVazf) before he left for sexually assaulting a male student.I’ve been to NO Masses where the Christmas Eve sermon was 3 dad jokes, where lay women gave sermons, and where Protestants openly gotten the Eucharist. I’ve been to Masses held around spaghetti dinner tables and the Host was leavened wheat bread from the grocery store. It’s not until literally right now that I realized I’ve eaten the same bread at that table for dinner and not sure if that was consecrated as well, because it was on the table for dinner. But does the Sacrament confect on all valid matter in the vicinity or just what’s intended to be consecrated?Bringing kids and the laity up around the table altar for the Our Father, teaching heresy and error from the pulpit, guitar Masses…I’ve seen it all. Yoga with the priest outside of Mass, endorsing actual factual contraception, giving Communion to the unrepentant sinners in public scandal (thank you, Father College once again).The only thing I’ve haven’t seen with my own eyes is liturgical dance, although I know it exists around here, or did, because my cousin keeps saying I should watch her routine that brought people to tears.Edit: People who love the NO love it because it can be catered to them. Which is, by definition, ripe for abuse. They want to feel involved. The parishioners want to feel loved and hugged. They don’t see how robotic it is to, in the name of transparency, turn all the missalette pages in unison to the point page-turning becomes audible, despite the fact the same reading is in the vernacular. They don’t care about following the rubrics because it would make the Mass less about their needs and more about God. You can’t serve both. This is also why people who hate the TLM think it’s purely about the language (“I don’t speak Latin”). The reformers did a damn good jobmaking people forget —or never learn— that the NO is not the vernacular TLM. The NO is to the TLM what a Whopper is to a fine dark chocolate truffle.

None (6): I got you beat. I belong to a Dominican Priory for my home church. It’s considered conservative-Latin Mass (Dominican rite) on Sundays as well as NO Masses. They give good homilies BUUUUT the hymnal in the pews for the NO masses on Sunday (lots of masses because lots of people) has “a mighty fortress is our God” by Martin Luther!!! I was in total disbelief when it was selected as a hymn during one of the NO masses. I just sat there stunned while everyone sang it without noticing. I was a protty at one point so I recognized it right away.

GYEvanID (2): The worst in Indonesia for every NO Mass in Indonesian: \*\*"For all" instead of "For many" during the wine consecration, and persists as of now.\*\*Explanation: Be deceived not. Indonesia is infamous for twisting the translations as whatever the Protestants (mainly Calvinists and Non-Denominationals) want, not just Muslims, and there are many within Catholic Church's documents and Holy Bible. I tell you the most fatal: during the wine consecration part, they used the word "for all (bagi semua orang)" instead of "for many (bagi banyak orang)," and their justification is logically flawed (false generalization).

SummerKisses094 (1): At the parish I sometimes go to, one of the children’s liturgy teachers dresses as a witch and has a coven she goes to community events with. While that isn’t a liturgical abuse, I think it says a lot about her thought process. The priests treat their time in front of Jesus as a comedy show, always making jokes during the mass. Lastly, the Christmas Eve vigil, they brought Santa Claus in for a special blessing.

jocyUk (1): see this [https://crisismagazine.com/opinion/why-do-mass-going-catholics-resent-god](https://crisismagazine.com/opinion/why-do-mass-going-catholics-resent-god)

None (0): One time a young woman/teen lector was wearing leggings and a cropped sweater, it was unbelievable on the amount of immodest women there were. And of course, it feels gynocentric, the NO in general.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (2): Don't attend the NO at all

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): Do not attend the NO whatsoever

merinw (1): The curved altar and no communion rail. Round sanctuaries. Very female. Noticed that right off and I am a convert via TLM but we recently moved and there are no TLM close by, only if one drives four hours one way. It is suffering to go to NO but it is the only means of receiving the Eucharist.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (2): Don't attend the NO whatsoever

# Post 515: A few questions about the Church Fathers

Author: None

Score: 3

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ds6wkl/a\_few\_questions\_about\_the\_church\_fathers/

Well, these might be a bit difficult questions, but anyway.1. Are there any Saints among the Greek Fathers who have an influence comparable to that of St. Augustine?2. If there are no such Saints among them, why is St. Augustine so much more important than other Church Fathers?3. Are there any Church Fathers who especially revered Mary and wrote important writings about her?4. Are there any Church Fathers who explicitly described Eucharist as not just bread and wine, but as the real Body and Blood of Christ?5. Who are your favorite Latin Fathers and Greek Fathers and why?Edit: I thought I wrote question 3 unclearly, so I edited it a bit.

None (5): 1. St. Athanasius is probably the most important Father there is. His works influenced Nicaea and his refutation towards the Arians was seminal. 2. St. Augustine is a very important Father because his works are so extensive, touching base on nearly every subject, religious and secular. His works have been confirmed in various councils, such as at the Council of Ephesus and Orange. 3. We know St. Jerome revered the Blessed Mother dearly, being an explicit advocate of her perpetual virginity, though I don't know what you mean by "described her in depth." St. Maximus the Confessor wrote a biography of the Blessed Mother, if that's what you mean. 4. Jesus Christ Himself. 5. Latin - Pope St. Leo, Greek - St. Basil

None (3): If you google “ante-nicene fathers on the real presence or body and blood of Christ” (they’re the pre 325 AD hence “ante” meaning before Nicea-first ecumenical council, church fathers) you’ll see it was THE VIEW that the bread and wine becomes the body and blood of Christ. Justin Martyr comes to mind specifically he uses “transmutation” to describe it.

TooEdgy35201 (2): >Are there any Saints among the Greek Fathers who have an influence comparable to that of St. Augustine?The Cappadocian fathers have a very huge influence in the East.

jocyUk (1): 3. Ephrem5. Damascene for his lucidity

# Post 516: New to TLM

Author: trent\_88

Score: 9

Comments: 13

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1drhef2/new\_to\_tlm/

I converted to Catholicism when I got married. I have been hearing a lot about the TLM and would like to attend a service. How do I dress and prepare myself? All I have ever known is the Novus Ordo. Any links would be helpful.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (5): [https://www.fisheaters.com/TLMintroduction.html](https://www.fisheaters.com/TLMintroduction.html)[https://www.fisheaters.com/TLMetiquette.html](https://www.fisheaters.com/TLMetiquette.html)

None (6): Honestly just go to an sspx parish and talk with the priest afterwards. He'd be more than happy to give you the time and resources to help you, whether questions, concerns, etc. The society promotes that people wear their Sunday best but a button down with slacks and dress shoes will be more than sufficient. As for a woman, a dress past the knees, shoulders covered, and a veil (they have veils if you don't have one.) When I was new I just sat in the back pews to avoid sticking out like a sore thumb.

jrichpyramid (3): No need to wear a three piece suit, but please try and wear something nice. This varies across cultures. Most of the mass is silent.

None (2): Wear what you would want to wear in the presence of God. Hopefully one would reason to dress as best as they could. In the mass, God really is present.

SnowWhiteFeather (2): I am from the Rocky Mountain House mission (Our Lady of Sorrows) that is served by the priests at St. Dennis.The standard most people hold is to dress as though you are attending a wedding. They should have a poster that outlines the standards of modest dress for men and women somewhere near the entryway. (Someone already covered womens dress in their post) If you do your best, no one will be too concerned. Having you there is more important than worrying about your clothes.I should be able to put you in touch with parishioners or priests from St. Dennis, if I am correct in assuming that is where you intend to go?If you want to understand what Mass you are attending, you can check the Church Calendar here:https://1962ordo.today/calendar/If you want to follow along with the prayers during mass you can get a missal from the book store. It should be open after mass.Otherwise, make sure to introduce yourself and let people know that you are new. With so many new faces and people traveling for the summer it is difficult to keep track of who is who.

SnooMacarons713 (1): [https://latinmasshelper.com/readings/](https://latinmasshelper.com/readings/)Have you got a latin mass missal? This website provides a few, and also the link I give you has a page reference regarding on readings on different missals, quite handy. I use the Fr Lasance Missal.

trent\_88 (1): Thank you

trent\_88 (1): Thank you, I will do that

Cathain78 (3): “Most of the Mass is silent “In the case of a Low Mass, yes.I’d recommend starting with a Sung Mass if possible, however.

trent\_88 (1): Thank you

trent\_88 (1): Thank you

trent\_88 (2): Good advice, thank you for your answer!

trent\_88 (3): Thank you

# Post 517: Why do some Catholics think that the Traditional Latin Mass is just a Tradition from the Middle Ages?

Author: None

Score: 14

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1dpf9e5/why\_do\_some\_catholics\_think\_that\_the\_traditional/

As far as I know, Cardinal Newman remarked, “The Traditional Latin Mass is virtually unchanged since the third century.” However, these days, some Catholics seem to be claiming that TLM is just Tradition from the Middle Ages and rather that New Mass is a restoration of the Traditions of the early Church. Why do they make that claim? How on earth can they say that the “New” Mass is a Tradition from the early Church?

None (9): Antiquarianism. A very serious error of modernism that was denounced by Pope Pius XII

Cathain78 (10): First of all, you can assume with a high degree of probability that they haven’t actually done any serious research themselves to reach this conclusion. They are just repeating it as read from someone else.The motivation, I would guess, is basically an attempt to push back against the fact that the New Mass is an innovation dating back 60 years. So they will try to put the TLM on a similar footing by saying it only goes back to the Middle Ages, or to the Council of Trent, or even that it was constantly being changed right up until Pope Pius XII. The inference is there that it’s not that old itself, or at one point it was an innovation just like the NOM. Anything to try and make the NOM seem less like the jarring novelty that it is.Their arguments are not even coherent.For example, they talk about rigidity of the old and the need to move with the times. Then they claim their mass is actually somehow closer to an older form of the mass than the TLM and thus are using antiquity as a pejorative trait for the TLM but somehow a (false) positive selling point for the NOM.In a similar vein, Modernism at its core believes in the need for things to evolve and change over time to better suit the current environment (unfortunately, for them this also applies to radical departures from core beliefs), but when it’s explained that the TLM gradually and organically evolved over the centuries to become what it is today, they use this as a point of accusation to somehow state that it has been corrupted from its original form.There is no consistency to their arguments because they are arguing in bad faith. Their underlying reason is simply to score points, try to assuage their own underlying doubt, and win the argument at any cost. Things like accuracy and facts all take a very distant second to just appearing to win the argument and silencing their critics.

MarcellusFaber (8): Due to ignorance and lies that the reformers told.

colekken (5): Ignorance runs deep. By ignorance I simply mean the lack of knowledge. I was raised in the Novus Ordo. I used to think that the Novus Ordo was the same Mass that has been occurring the last 2,000 years. I went to Catholic school and no one taught me about the Eastern Catholic Churches or the Traditional Latin Mass. I didn't learn about those until my early 20s.

GYEvanID (3): >Brutal mode: onlack of knowledge, and \*\*propaganda of lies\*\*.>Brutal mode: off

# Post 518: What on earth is this? A Mass celebrating Martin Luther King?

Author: None

Score: 5

Comments: 20

URL: https://www.youtube.com/live/fJXD8CLHfJg?feature=shared

The name of this channel says Roman Catholic, but is it really the Catholic Church, not the Anglican Church? Or maybe I just misunderstood something? Also, why on earth is music like that? Are they filming some kind of sister act or something?

None (5): He's a communist, a r&%+st, and he denies the Trinity of our lord. He was a very bad man.

None (2): He encouraged looting and rioting. His modern day portrayal is completely fake.

craft00n (3): Modernism 101. Fighting segregation is based, but being based isn't enough to be a saint.

dbaughmen (1): Its a real diocese alright, run by the first “black-american” cardinal Gregory, he’s been on Face the Nation alongside a women episcopal “bishop”. This modernist hates all traditions and loves inclusivity.

None (1): [deleted]

None (0): Segregation is a good thing. People naturally want to be with their own kind and now they are forced to mix.

craft00n (2): Well in France hardcore racists like that nearly don't exist. I know that SSPX has a hard time figuring out what they should do in the US, seeing how smoothbrain some Americans are.

craft00n (3): "Your own kind" isn't "Anyone you don't know but is the same colour as you". There's a parable for that (Lc 10:25-37). Like it's literally what Christ explains: the importance isn't common points but relations.

None (1): I never said you shouldn't help them if they've been half beaten to death. A black person is 30x more likely to attack a white person than vice versa. Why should whites have to live with that? They shouldn't and only an insane or demoralized person would think otherwise when they know the statistics.

None (0): During WW2 when the US occupied Rome Pope Pius XII requested that no black troops be stationed in the Vatican because of all of the raping they were doing. Thousands of French women were raped by American soldiers (mostly blacks).https://web.archive.org/web/20230520232020/https://codoh.com/library/document/e-michael-jones-takes-holocaust-part-two/en/

craft00n (2): And you think that there's something genetically intrinsic to black skin that makes black people more eager to attack white people ?

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (2): I'm betting the assaults by white soldiers weren't being reported as much.This IS a nation founded by and for the white Anglo-Saxon Protestant.Not to mention all of the affairs that could be written off as assault when women get caught cheating. That's not to say it didn't happen, but it's a known that framing a second class citizen isn't exactly a rare thing in any culture.I'd be more likely to see this as an endemic worry in the years following the Civil Rights movement, when the government subsidized single motherhood and black children were far less likely to be without a father.I remember an elderly Hungarian immigrant telling me her sister was able to travel in and out of black neighborhoods in the late 1960s without any issue. Her job was to make sure the women getting assistance weren't secretly keeping a man in the house and double dipping with income.

craft00n (1): Well, because it's well known that Russians and nazis weren't raping anyone. Certainly a skin color thing.

None (0): [removed]

None (-1): Or maybe blacks just rape more as the statistics show they do in every country in the world.

craft00n (2): Well first I will be absolutely keen on your scientific sources.And then... Are you implying that black people are not able to follow the moral teaching of the Catholic Church ?

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): And yet you don't see any of the gangsterism or general lawlessness before the subsidization of single motherhood.It's also fairly common in Muslim nations where men can have 4 wives, and that's not counting women they keep in servitude that don't get the "wife" title. Men are left without women and its not that different from societies without fathers.If you think it's a black problem, the next few decades of white kids with single mothers are going to be quite a shock to people who think "black bad".

None (2): I'm not saying they can't follow church teaching but they will have a more difficult time following various aspects of it compared to other groups of people. https://web.archive.org/web/20230520232020/https://codoh.com/library/document/e-michael-jones-takes-holocaust-part-two/en/

craft00n (2): So you would advocate for segregating the weakest to have them live amongst them ? You really think that would help saving their souls ?That, and the fact that I would like to know of any scientific source proving that black people have less ability to act in conformity to God's will, because of certain brain characteristics.

None (2): I meant to post a different link in my last post. Nobody would ever be able to publish a study that would offend blacks but when you look at their behavior throughout history wherever they are the answer becomes obvious. Human behavior is heavily influenced by genetics. Certain groups of people have certain traits inherent to them. https://www.ctvnews.ca/mobile/genes-can-predict-criminal-tendencies-study-1.760182?referrer=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.google.com%2F

craft00n (2): Your claim wasn't precisely about criminality but about brain functioning, so this kind of studies can exist."Human behavior is heavily influenced by genetics", well if that was so true behavioural genetics would be a flourishing science and not a steaming pile of bs (Aaron Panofsky, "Misbehaving science"). We don't know at all the impact of genetics on behaviour, because heritability statistics and twin studies are far too shallow as an experimental paradigm.Genetics in humans are correlated with lots of things, but correlation isn't causation, so looking through history or doing demographic stats can't prove much.Sadly, your link is broken.And there's still this problem about the fact that doing some minority report type of segregation won't help with the sanctification of anyone.

# Post 519: Calling someone who recognizes Pope Francis "basically a sede (-vacantist)" is calumny.

Author: None

Score: 5

Comments: 2

URL: /r/CatholicDebates/comments/1dp1bxo/calling\_someone\_who\_recognizes\_pope\_francis/

HMX5000 (8): Unfortunately we live in such a gray world that calling white what is certainly white and calling black what is certainly black is considered a social sin.

GYEvanID (1): Art of Satan.

# Post 520: Why doesn't Michael Lofton go to Novus Ordo?

Author: None

Score: 6

Comments: 11

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1dopu67/why\_doesnt\_michael\_lofton\_go\_to\_novus\_ordo/

I haven't watched many of his videos, but as far as I know he defends the Novus Ordo, but he doesn't go there, he goes to the Byzantine liturgy. If there's no problem with NO, why doesn't he go there? Or maybe I'm misunderstanding something about him?

Bolivar687 (7): He claims he goes to both although his main is Byzantine.

None (12): Wouldn’t it be hilarious to see his bishop take away his little Byzantine chapel

None (3): Demonichttps://youtu.be/b0Xj72x6NVE?si=Ze2HUHlzQjtgH-JQ

None (3): Micheal Lofton is a total clown

Araedya (6): The irony is even if the hammer fell on the Byzantine liturgy he’s built a private chapel in his own house so he can avoid going to the NO at all costs

jaqian (1): Nonsense

None (2): Good argument. I've totally changed my mind

jaqian (0): Throwing mud at someone and calling them a heretic doesn't make them one.

None (2): Literally not a single argument. You fools are all the same

craft00n (2): I'll help you. Dimond himself is a heretic (Feeneyism), so his theological opinion doesn't count.

None (2): That's not how it works. I'm neither a sede or a feeneyite and this video has nothing to do with those topics. This video illustrates how this neophyte goon pretending to be an authority of church matters is an amalgamation of errors and should not be listened to.

# Post 521: Do you think that there are still Saints like Padre Pio or Maximilian Kolbe in our world today?

Author: None

Score: 7

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1do5ikr/do\_you\_think\_that\_there\_are\_still\_saints\_like/

I'm not sure if there really are Saints like them in our world today. Am I just thinking too negatively?

craft00n (9): Certainly, God's grace is overabundant.

Educational-Emu5132 (7): Without question

jaqian (6): Padre Pio is a special case, not many receive the stigmata. And Maximilian Kolbe had special circumstances to stand out. But there are many saintly people out there, there just aren't those circumstances to make them come to our attention.

Piklikl (2): "Sufficient to the day is the evil thereof." Everyone is called to be a saint. We should all ask ourselves what are we doing wrong, and how are we not responding to God's grace to become great witnesses of the Faith like these two saints.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): Supposedly, in the Chicago area there was a priest who would not do the Novus Ordo and worked miracles. One of his last was to do his own funeral Mass just before he died. I forget the details, but supposedly he did it the same day. I don't know his name, though.

# Post 522: Paul VI and Agatha Christie

Author: None

Score: 12

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1dmnr3a/paul\_vi\_and\_agatha\_christie/

As Pope of the Catholic Church, Paul VI instituted the Liturgical Reform, making the Catholic Mass more similar to Anglican services and limiting the Traditional Latin Mass.As an Anglican, Agatha Christie wrote in a letter to Paul VI, "The rite in question, in its magnificent Latin text, has also inspired a host of priceless achievements in the arts – not only mystical works but works by poets, philosophers, musicians, architects, painters, and sculptors in all countries and epochs.” and appealed to him to preserve the Latin Mass, an outstanding treasure of Western culture.Hold on, was it just me who felt that way, or did these two people's roles switch? What on earth is happening to the Catholic Church in Our Time?

craft00n (6): As an anglican non theologian, Agatha Christie's opinion about mass isn't worth anything, even if it goes our way. Fun to read that anyway.

Jattack33 (2): The letter she signed was also signed by two Anglican “Bishops”

# Post 523: Rejoicing Viganò Excommunication is Anti-catholic

Author: None

Score: 4

Comments: 13

URL: /r/CatholicDebates/comments/1dm2nhp/rejoicing\_viganò\_excommunication\_is\_anticatholic/

craft00n (4): His reaction manifests that he is indeed in a schism. Bishop Lefebvre was never proud of the condemnation, always sad about the crisis.I won't rejoice, anyway, because all of this is sad.

obiwankenobistan (2): But he hasn’t been excommunicated, right? Just accused of schism and recalled to the Vatican? I assume excommunication is the punishment if he’s found guilty?

None (1): Is he in schism or is Rome in schism?

None (5): Excommunication is the implicit sentence for the charge of "schism" and the hearing being "extrajudicial" suggests the sentence has already been decided but will not be finalized until June 28.

craft00n (3): I don't know, ask the Pope... Ah yes, Rome can't be in schism. Remember what Bishop Lefebvre thought about sedeprivationism : it's cool on paper, but it isn't efficient at all in reality.

obiwankenobistan (2): Thanks

None (1): What leads you to conclude that Rome can't be in schism?

craft00n (2): Well schism is rejecting the Pope's authority (Cathechism of Christian Doctrine). Rome in schism isn't something sound in catholic theology.

None (1): Is the non-vicar (as he himself rejected the title) Pope Francis not rejecting countless infallible pronouncements of Popes immemorial? If he and his ilk in Rome are clearly parting with the Magisterium preceding them, what would you call that?

craft00n (3): He can be wrong about things, it doesn't stops him from being Pope. Worst case, like during the Arian crisis, the Pope is still Pope, but we're must disobey when he give wrong orders. Saint Athanasius never affirmed that the Pope wasn't really Pope.Dude that's Pope's Infallibility 101 there, you should look at SSPX cathechism classes.For the vicar thing, the Pope has used many different official titles in history, the fact that he stops using one doesn't create any problem about his election.

None (1): I agree with what you said above, but you did not answer my questions. It seems you are arguing with what you think I'm saying rather than what I am actually saying.

craft00n (1): I answered. You can't determine that Pope Francis is a heretic, because you don't have the authority to condemn him. Even if that was true, nobody could say it with certainty. And in fact, it's useless, because Saint Athanasius never called Pope Liberius an heretic, and still he resisted arianism even through excommunication.

None (1): No, you didn't. I can recognize heresy; this does not mean I "condemn" him: this is a red herring.

# Post 524: French SSPX superior acknowledges plans to consecrate new bishops

Author: CautiousCatholicity

Score: 14

Comments: 29

URL: https://rorate-caeli.blogspot.com/2024/06/first-public-acknowledgement-of.html

Piklikl (4): Eh, sounds way too generic to be considered an announcement. Of course they've always had a plan for another episcopal consecration, but it just seems like the District Superior for his June Letter was reflecting on the 1988 Consecrations which also took place in June. 20% of the faithful dropped off then, maybe he thought that reminding people of the practical necessities would mitigate the dropoff that will likely come if another is performed.

Status\_City4236 (1): 🤭 If I had a dime for every time I hear something like this, I'd be a rich man.

jaqian (0): Hopefully it will be done with permission

dbaughmen (2): Considering the state that the Vatican is now, it seems really hard.

jaqian (0): Then it shouldn't happen

dbaughmen (2): It most definitely should, many souls depend on the SSPX, and the SSPX depends on its Bishops.

jaqian (-3): That would be disobedience and a schismatic act.

LiftandDisruption (6): Can. 1323, 4°: "No one is liable to a penalty who, when violating a law or precept... acted under the compulsion of grave fear, even if only relative, or by reason of necessity or grave inconvenience, unless, however, the act is intrinsically evil or tends to be harmful to souls..."—Code of Canon Law, Book VI, Part I, Title III

dbaughmen (1): So you’d rather the society that has practically saved tradition die off with our great and holy Bishops.

craft00n (1): Well, only a bishop can know if he should consecrate without authorisation. In 1988, Lefebvre thought so. Apparently, today, the three remaining bishops of SSPX think the same.

Francisco\_\_Javier (1): what act?ordaining someone is not intrinsically evildisobedience to a superior is evil, but allowable in some circumstances (ie not intrinsically evil)usurping church authority - schism - would be 'evil'idk how you categorize the act

jaqian (-1): We should take our example from St Padre Pio and be obedient.

LiftandDisruption (1): I am genuinely not sure what you're asking about. The subject is Lefebvre's consecration of Bishops. I posted Canon 1323, which supports this action.

None (2): Clearly you do not see the state of necessity that obliged Archbishop Lefebvre to do what he did. That same state of necessity exists today. If you do not believe it does then that is your prerogative; however, the SSPX believes that it exists and they prove that it does over and over again. The act of consecrating new bishops, due to the state of necessity, was protected under Canon Law. Obviously not everyone is going to acknowledge the existence of the necessity. The CCC on this matter wouldn’t exist if everyone would already agree that the state of things necessitates the act of consecrating new bishops without proper authority.

jaqian (1): It's strange how the FSSP, ICKSP and Good Shepard don't have these worries.

None (2): It isn’t strange at all if you know the reasons. That is because, on paper, these groups (I’m not familiar with Good Shepherd) have to accept the teachings of Vatican II, including the acknowledgment that the Novus Ordo mass is good. The SSPX refuses to do this, due to the heretical nature of many of those teachings, which is why they do not have a canonically regular status. This is the simplest and quickest way I can explain this but there is a lot to learn on this topic.

jaqian (2): So they put their trust in Jesus that the Church is protected by His Holy Spirit and nothing shall stand against it? Curious.I'm always confused as to whether or not the SSPX is in communion with Rome, aren't they supposed to accept the teachings of Vatican II?

None (1): Nothing can stand against His Church, yes. That does not mean that nothing can stand against the people in that Church. It also does not prevent the introduction and continuation of error. Some of the things that were discussed and decided during Vatican II and afterwards directly contradict much of what was previously put out by the Church. If these things are truly inspired then why would divine inspiration contradict itself? It can’t. The SSPX safeguards the traditional teachings of the Church and provides a safe place for Catholics who want to avoid the possibility being taught error.

jaqian (1): If you aren't in the Church, you are outside it. Ex ecclesiam nulla salus

None (1): Not sure how this statement applies to the conversation but it is clear that if you are not in the Church then you are outside it. Yes.

craft00n (1): You should go explain to the Pope that he should cancel the canonizations of Saint Athanasius and Saint Lucifer, because they in fact should have obeyed to Pope Liberius when he ordered them to bow to the arians.

jaqian (2): If the SSPX disobeys the Pope and ordains its own bishops, is it not then in schism?

None (1): The act itself is not done so out of disobedience, but out of necessity for the salvation of souls. Can Rome call it schismatic? Sure. Only because they do not believe in the state of necessity that requires the ordination of bishops in the case of the SSPX. The SSPX does well to prove this state of necessity. I would recommend doing research into that.

jaqian (2): State of necessity? If the ICKSP and others can be obedient and by their obedience have priests ordained then so can the SSPX. The Catholic Church will continue with or without the SSPX. IMO I think the canonical status of the SSPX puts more Catholics off; I was in London last year and would have loved to have attended an SSPX near Islington but their status put me off and I went to a Nous Ordo instead as I know where I stand with them. If there had been an ICKSP I would have attended that.

None (1): I’m not going to try and explain the state of necessity and the reasons why the SSPX is different than the other traditional groups, other than what I have already said. Btw, attending an SSPX mass doesn’t make you SSPX. Only the priests and bishops of the SSPX are SSPX. You are also allowed to attend the SSPX mass. You can fulfill your Sunday obligation by doing so.

jaqian (2): I'd rather attend one that is in communion with Rome in good standing. I think a lot of Catholics are put off by the controversy around you. It's a pity as I would love to see the SSPX thrive but only if they fully resolve their canonical standing. If in good standing I and plenty of others would donate to the SSPX.

None (1): Around me? I’m not SSPX. I do attend an SSPX mass though. The SSPX isn’t responsible for resolving their canonical status. They will not accept heretical teachings and this is why Roma won’t give them a canonically regular status.

jaqian (2): And that is why most regular Catholics won't have anything to do with them.

None (1): Not sure what a “regular Catholic” is but yeah. Most Catholics are not educated well enough to see the doctrinal issues promoted in Vatican II and after and most Catholics, due to that, will likely stay away from the SSPX, since it doesn’t make sense. Those of us that do understand are very thankful to have the SSPX. The number of parishioners at SSPX chapels are growing every week. I see new people at Mass monthly. Thankfully people are learning and many realize the importance of the SSPX.

# Post 525: What does SSPX think of Tolkien?

Author: None

Score: 9

Comments: 9

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1dl4e5h/what\_does\_sspx\_think\_of\_tolkien/

Many Catholics love him and some even think he should be canonized.He did not like the liturgical reforms after Vatican II, but he did not openly resist them like Archbishop Lefebvre.What do you think about him?Saint? Or Modernist? Or just a Catholic writer?

paca-milito (13): Catholic writer.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (21): Let's put it this way: When the Novus Ordo Missae was released, Tolkien would very loudly give the TLM responses. Edit: Tolkien never expressed Modernist heresy. At no point did he agree with the Modernist stance that dogma's nature can change to contradict previous understanding of it.

JohnFoxFlash (9): I'm from England, when I was in uni I went to his childhood parish (Birmingham five ways Oratory). I go to mass at an SSPX church some times. I'm not a Middle Earth adorer but he was indisputably a cool guy

craft00n (2): Tolkien is a fantasy writer, it has very little to do with modernism. But I could say two things : First, Tolkien was very traditional because of its mother conversion. Second, my uncle, priest in the SSPX, once heard a well known SSPX priest saying the LOTR was "gnostic" ; he gave me this example to explain to me that SSPX doesn't have an opinion about everything, and especially about things that have nothing to do with faith or morals.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): He actually did openly resist them by loudly stating the original TLM responses out of dislike for the NO

kawaqcosta (1): Foi um escritor católico. Os padres daqui o recomendam como um autor de boa literatura, tanto no seu conteúdo como no seu estilo. Alguns grupos católicos acusam de haver gnose nas suas obras, mas vejo isso como um excesso deles. Não vi nenhum padre criticando ele em algum aspecto.

scrime- (0): I like his work, but I think the glorification of LOTR is overrated. Despite the Christian allegory his books are filled with pagan influence. Condemning Harry Potter and calling Rowling a witch while praising Tolkien like a saint is hypocritical in my opinion.

craft00n (1): The problem with Rowling isn't magic, it's the fact that the children are lying, stealing, using "unforgivable sortileges", it's the fact that it's promoting a utilitarian worldview. Tolkien has a more traditional virtue ethics world, so it's fine.

scrime- (1): That’s fair criticism, and I would agree that those are respectable reasons not to read or promote Harry Potter. But I still hear traditional Catholics condemn Harry Potter specifically for the magic and spells, so my point still stands in those cases.

# Post 526: Is Vatican II Heretical?

Author: None

Score: 13

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1deymja/is\_vatican\_ii\_heretical/

Is Vatican II Heretical or just ambiguous and vague?

asimovsdog (17): Parts of it are objectively heretical, particularly the idea of religious freedom, i.e. that there is salvation outside the Catholic Church ("This Vatican Synod declares that the human person has a right to religious liberty… the right to religious liberty is based on the very dignity of the human person", Dignitatis Humanae). [Here's a list of V2 heresies if you like to read.](https://www.superflumina.org/heresies-taught-by-vatican-2.html)Also, [watch this on the creation of it](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8y1cABhLc2o) and judge for yourself. Is a rite created by Protestants, Jews and Freemasons pleasant to God? One day, there heresies of Vatican II will be formally condemned alongside all the people who created and supported them. One day, Paul VI will - likely - be condemned for promulgating these writings, but until that happens we cannot judge him or dispose of him.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (6): Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, founder of the SSPX, was willing to sign all of the documents of Vatican II... except for the two documents:"Did you not sign and agree to the resolutions of this council?""No. First of all, I have not signed all the documents of Vatican II because of the last two acts. The first, concerned with "Religion and Freedom," I have not signed. The other one, that of “The Church in the Modern World”, I also have not signed. This latter is in my opinion the most oriented toward modernism and liberalism."The two documents he refused to sign ended up getting signed by him when they told him he was signing an attendance sheet. So, they lied to him to get him to sign the two he objected to, and many years later the lie persists that he signed them all.As for the other documents, even if they are vague enough to be interpreted in a manner that contradicts previous understanding of doctrine, the fact that they \*can\* be interpreted correctly follows the old rule that one SHOULD choose the interpretation that's closer to the traditional understanding of doctrine, and for that reason he did sign the rest of the documents. But it seems no everyone stuck to that rule like they were supposed to and have gone out of their way to interpret the rest of the documents in whatever manner they saw fit for the agenda of the Modernist heretics.

Minute\_Television262 (6): Yes, there are some heresies contained in the documents. Among those heresies are: (1) Catholics can in some circumstances pray/worship with non-Catholics. (2). Some non-Catholics can receive Holy Communion from Catholic priests under certain conditions. (3). The human person (including people who do not live up to their obligation of seeking out the truth) has an inherent right from God not to be disturbed in the public expression of any (false) religion (so long as public order is not disturbed). (4) The Church of Christ \*subsists\* in the Catholic Church. (5). The Jews are not to be considered reprobati, aka not to be presented as rejected by God. (6). Muslims are included in the plan of salvation. Also that Muslims worship the one God, the same God whom Catholics worship, who will judge mankind on the last day (This is false because it is Jesus who will judge mankind on the last day). (7). "All, however, though in different ways, long for the one visible Church of God, a Church truly universal and set forth into the world"... As if the Catholic Church isn't already this Church. (8). Non-Catholics can be saved. (9). Atheists can be in good faith. (10). The college of bishops (when acting in union with the pope) possesses the charism of infallibility, rather than the pope alone.(11+) There are also other heresies, and/or statements implying heresy, such as about the purpose of marriage, conscience, birth control, an emerging NWO world authority, etc

None (3): There is material and formal heresy; material means "anything that contradicts Tradition". Formal means "something infallibly declared heretical, or explicitly and openly negating a proclaimed dogma. VII is materially against Tradition (for example it contradicts Christ the king) but not formally. (it doesn't say "I don't believe in this dogma" and it hasn't been condemned... yet)

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (2): It is objectively heretical. Read Nostra Aetate and Dignitatis Humanae

No-Try7513 (2): Simple answer....YES
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None (17): It’s not. The SSPX doesn’t say that it is sinful.

asimovsdog (6): Because it's not about the reverence or rite, it's about the theology behind it. If the Novus Ordo priests accept Vatican II heresies as truth, then they are heretics and not part of the Church anymore. An Eastern Catholic rite is indistinguishable from an Orthodox Divine Liturgy, but one is sinful to attend, the other one is not, why? It's the same rite, both are reverent, but one is celebrated by heretics, that's why.The sinfulness also depends on whether the person is aware of what the Novus Ordo represents, how it was created. The Novus Ordo was created by Protestants and leads to Protestantism, it should be boycotted at all costs. We should not communicate there, but it is still okay to passively attend out of charity, i.e. for weddings, funerals or baptisms.

None (3): It's only sinful is you know the NO Mass is dangerous for the faith. It's dangerous for the faith because the faith in the sacrifical aspect of the Mass, which is the essence of the Mass, is (intentionally) missing. The Short Critical Study of the Novus Ordo Missae, which I strongly encourage you to read (and is in my opinion a must-read for a Traditional Catholic) was written before all of the abuses of the New Mass, and it already considers it this way: "the Novus Ordo represents, both as a whole and in its details, a striking departure from the Catholic theology of the Mass as it was formulated in Session XXII of the Council of Trent". Juste because something feels reverent doesn't been it's fully Catholic. Being not reverent enough is only one of the issues of the NO![https://angeluspress.org/blogs/catholic-doctrine/a-brief-critical-study-of-the-novus-ordo-missae](https://angeluspress.org/blogs/catholic-doctrine/a-brief-critical-study-of-the-novus-ordo-missae)

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (3): we believe the new liturgy is rotten at the core. Michael Davies successfully argued in "Cranmer's new mass" that is is a clone of a protestant service, and it will cause to the RCC what Cranmers mass did to prots. No matter how reverent the NO is, it distracts and abuses away from the fact that every Mass is the bloodless sacrifice of the Cross, it removes 90+% of references to prayer, sin, reparation, hell and purgatory. As such it is offensive to Our Lord every time and doesn't give proper respect to his Death and what He left for us at the Last Supper. Read [https://www.fisheaters.com/frsomerville.html](https://www.fisheaters.com/frsomerville.html)and[https://sspx.org/en/ottaviani-intervention-30257](https://sspx.org/en/ottaviani-intervention-30257)and various books by Michael Davies and Fr Hesse youtube videos.

None (8): A Novus Ordo mass is obviously less reverent over all. We, as humans, being sensible creatures, look to provide the most visible signs of sacrifice as we can possibly give. The Novus Ordo mass took away a lot of those visible things and the resulting spirit of the new mass can mislead people. It can’t be sinful to attend because the Church authorizes it as a valid rite but the danger that it can present to one’s soul is enough to make me not want to go. Also, there’s no such thing as a reverent Novus Ordo mass. Maybe more so than another but even the most tame one is less pleasing to God than any Tridentine mass.

elsro (2): Michael Davies writes, "Lex orandi, lex credendi," that which we pray, is what we believe, and ultimately how we live. I grew up attending the NOM and I was at best a cultural Catholic. It is still taking a lot to understand the faith, but with the SSPX, I believe there is a better shot at salvation...and really isn't that the goal in life? 😅

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (2): It is sinful. - It is a non-Catholic Protestantanized rite, talmudic berekah table prayers in Latin are still talmudic berekah table prayers - It objectively is sacrilegious with Communion on the Hand and other Liturgical abuses - It is harmful for the Faith with the teachings of V2 believed by all Priests who celebrate it

Status\_City4236 (2): I think you all are missing the point: why would someone go to a mass that is deliberately less beautiful and less reverent?

None (1): It’s usually reverent because of maybe the priest there at the time but what happens when he has to leave and a liberal one replaces him? Also, a reverent NO is like putting lipstick on a pig.

dbaughmen (1): The Novus Ordo is a watered down, touched by man version of the true Catholic liturgy. Its not sinful but its not good either.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (7): "The Novus Ordo Missae, even when said with piety and respect for the liturgical rules, is impregnated with the spirit of Protestantism ... it bears within it a poison harmful to the Faith." - Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre[](https://x.com/WhiteAusGroyper/status/1797593189249081776/photo/1)

Jerailu (1): The SSPX does discourage to go to the NOM but you can disagree with them as they aren't an authority but a priestly fraternity and I do think they're wrong on this.

Fearless\_Medicine\_23 (1): As a Protestant who has attended Anglican services and Novus Ordo services, I can confirm that it is pretty much the same service except the Novus Ordo includes prayers to Saints and Hail Mary's.It's funny that you say that it "leads to Protestantism" because Protestants believe that moving away from the BCP 1662 lead to Romanism.I believe, although I may be wrong, that people once had integrity and although we stood on different sides, we could admire people's desire for truth and loyalty to their cause and belief. Ecumenism gives people a sense of their own importance and a false sense of virtue and superiority.Honestly, I have far more civilised and beneficial conversations with traditional Catholics who believe I am going to hell compared to Protestants and Catholics who are wishy-washy on the whole ecumenical thing.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (-1): The novus ordo was not created by Protestants though. It was made by Vatican 2.

Thaladan (1): I'm sympathetic to the SSPX, but these assertions that the NO is "less pleasing to God" are very off-putting. It seems like the epitome of pride, assuming - without any divine revelation - that you know the mind of God.

Smooth\_Ad\_5775 (1): May I ask why it is sacrilegious to receive on the hand even if you are reverently receiving? People probably hugged Jesus and kissed Him, and your saying touching him with your hands is sacrilegious? Just trying to see where you’re coming from.

dbaughmen (1): Real.

Jerailu (-2): The TLM is touched by man too.

None (6): Believe me, I 100% agree with everything the Archbishop says here, but these words do not equate to saying that it is a sin to go to the new mass. What can be sinful; however, is intentionally having a spirit of rebellion against the true Church of Christ by promoting a mass while knowing it is created to be more consistent with the beliefs of false religions.

None (3): You are right. You can think that they are wrong. I do not think they are.

asimovsdog (5): It was assisted in creation by 6 Protestant ministers, then promulgated by "Catholics" who believe in religious freedom, aka heretics. You might as well call them "Protestants with a Catholic flair" at that point.

None (4): There were a number of Protestant pastors involved in the creation of the new mass. They wanted to create something more Protestant to help people feel more like they are in a familiar environment when visiting a Catholic Church, instead of something entirely alien to them. If you didn’t know that the new mass was aided by Protestants then I can imagine your shock in learning this. When I first learned of the creation of the new mass and the intentions behind it everything that the SSPX does made sense.

None (3): The reasonable conclusion would be to assume that it is less pleasing to God. I believe there is scriptural evidence to support this conclusion (I need to dig to find it) but it is unreasonable to think that the Novus Ordo mass and the Tridentine mass are equal when they are clearly not. God doesn’t even love all people equally. Why would he love a mass that was created by the approval of Protestants and modernists as much as a mass that is the full embodiment of sacrificial nature dedicated only to the Sacrifice and the salvation of souls.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (2): He explicitly says it is a poisonous, harmful and Protestant Liturgy even when said reverently. You may not attend poisonous, harmful and Protestant Liturgies. Catholics do not pray with heretics.

Jerailu (1): Yes I do not deny this. Yall remains catholics despised our disagreements we are brother in the faith.

LocationFeisty2847 (1): There were Protestants on the panel of attendees at Vat.II who very definitely influenced the N.O. Mass.

Jerailu (0): That is false, the council of Trent also indeed invited protestants (though they didn't came as the separation was recent) but you would not say it was protestants.The Novus Orso can be critiqued WITHOUT saying it's intrinsically evil. The TLM also has serious problems but you still go to it and that is fine for the human part in our ceremonies could never totally satisfy God.That's also why we use God's word or paraphrase him!

Thaladan (1): If you want to make a more modest claim - like I'm concerned that this is less pleasing to God because of XYZ - that's fine.But just asserting that something is less pleasing to God? We can't comprehend the mind of God, beyond the limits of what has been divinely revealed. I think that when someone assumes that they know the mind of God, they're implicitly putting themselves on a comparable level to God. And that's the essence of pride.

Jerailu (0): Well you can say it's lesser than the NOM but it does not follow one should always refrain to attend nor does it bind the whole catholic Church as saint Augustine said: "Union in what's necessary to hold, liberty in what is not. Charity above both."The Church asks its members to adhere to its dogmas, not to your conclusions.

None (3): I agree that the liturgy is as you say but you still can’t say it is sinful to attend. I am of the thought to never go under any circumstances; however, you cannot fault someone else for going if they have no other option. The sacraments are still valid and sacraments are necessary for salvation. Also, people that attend the Novus Ordo and priests that celebrate the Mass are not all heretics. Overall, the New Mass is still valid and the SSPX even recognizes this. No one, ever, has said that it is sinful to go. They said that one should not go because of the harm that it presents and because it is less pleasing to God.

None (1): Sorry, I should be specific: no one in a position of authority and in a manner that represents the entire SSPX has said that going to a Novus Ordo mass is sinful.

None (4): I am interested in hearing what “problems” exist within the Tridentine Mass. Also, what about what was said is false? Are you denying that the new mass was invented using the input and approval of Protestant pastors? Because that is a known fact.

None (2): I understand your concern about that; however, it has nothing to do with pride. We can say that it is displeasing to God to practice a false religion or to commit a sin, etc. Why wouldn’t a rite that was manifested to look more like a false religion, with approval of pastors of a false religion, be less pleasing to God?

None (2): Your point is accurate; however, which Dogmas are you referring to?

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): >but you still can’t say it is sinful to attend Yes, I can say that sacrilege is sinful to attend. That much is obvious. >you cannot fault someone else for going if they have no other option Yes, I can. If someone chooses to go to a sacrilegious Black Mass because they have no other option then I can fault them for such >Also, people that attend the Novus Ordo and priests that celebrate the Mass are not all heretics. Every Priest who celebrates the NO embraces Vatican 2, i.e heretic. The people yes, I know there are good men who are trapped behind the NO and don't know of its errors. >No one, ever, has said that it is sinful to go Yes, the SSPX has, many times.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): There are so many different examples of this from the SSPX including that Spiritual Warfare handbook it which it included going to the NO Mass as a sin to examine, the SSPX has always had the position that attending NO is sacrilegious and against the Faith, of course those Catholics who are ignorant of its dangers and the issues of it cannot be considered culpable, but in cases other than that it is sinful. Sacrilege is sinful, I am sorry to say, and Novus Ordo is a sacrilege.

Jerailu (1): All of them. To be a catholic is to be baptised and believe what she says.

None (3): I am sorry but every one of your responses is not consistent with the teachings of the SSPX. Your opinions here are erroneous and flawed. Your opinions can certainly be applied to some but not all. There is some truth in your words but you take them to an extreme that does not follow reason or any official teachings. I’m sure there are the occasional priests who make the error to suggest that these kinds of opinions are absolute but again, these are errors. You cannot say that it is sinful to attend a Novus Ordo Mass. You also cannot assume that every Novus Ordo priest supports heresy because this is not true and very presumptuous. Presumption is an error as well.

None (1): The Spiritual Warfare book is made for the SSPX and the Third Order of the SSPX. The obligation to never attend a Novus Ordo Mass is specific to the SSPX and the SSPX Third Order (I was a postulant for a couple of years before deciding to become Dominican). Not regular lay persons. It is a sin to commit sacrilege and to promote error is of course wrong but you do not necessarily do either of these things by attending a Novus Ordo Mass. Attending the new mass with the intent to follow the Church of Christ is not a sin. I am a very strict traditional Catholic but telling people they are committing sin by attending a Novus Ordo Mass is just wrong. Ask any SSPX priest this.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): I can say it is sinful. Novus Ordo is Protestant and Sacrilege. This is explicit SSPX Teaching from the start. Vatican 2 is heretical, Priest's who teach it are heretical. This is explicit SSPX Teaching from the start.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): >but you do not necessarily do either of these things by attending a Novus Ordo Mass Attending a Novus Ordo Mass, in which the Eucharist is inherently Sacrileged, is Sacrilege. There is not a single SSPX Priest who would say that the Novus Ordo Mass is not a Sacrilege and thus sinful, something cannot be sinful for an SSPX Member and then fine for every body else. Sin is sin

None (1): Right. I agree with what you are saying. The Mass itself is sinful, but the SSPX does not teach that it is a sin to attend a Novus Ordo mass. They have never said this. It’s a similar concept to Catholics being allowed to attend a service of a false religion. You can go, it doesn’t mean that you should, but do not participate. Do you not have a statement where the SSPX said that it is a sin to attend?

None (1): I’m not arguing that. What I’m saying, and what SSPX priests will say, is that it is not a sin to attend the Mass. Bishop Fellay even said it is a valid Mass. I think the only thing that will shut me up is if you can provide me a statement where it is said that attending the new Mass is sinful. Your arguments so far do not prove sin on the part of those attending.

None (1): Also, what you say about sin at the end is very wrong. Something CAN be sinful for one person and not another. This is very obvious. Consider vows. If someone makes vows and breaks them, they commit sin; however, is you do something that would be sinful to someone who made a vow to not do that something then you do not commit sin. (Unless the act in itself is an evil act of course). It is not an evil act to attend a Novus Ordo Mass. The SSPX does not teach this whatsoever.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): >that it is a sin to attend a Novus Ordo mass Is it not a sin to participate in Sacrilege? >It’s a similar concept to Catholics being allowed to attend a service of a false religion. You can go, it doesn’t mean that you should You are not allowed to attend the ceremonies of heretics, this has been condemned since the start of the Church, here is a more recent quote from Pope Pius XI in Mortalium Animos "It is clear why this Apostolic See has never allowed its subjects to take part in the assemblies of non-Catholics: for the union of Christians can only be promoted by promoting the return to the one true Church of Christ of those who are separated from it, for in the past they have unhappily left it" or from the SSPX "You also know that it is precisely for this reason that the Church has always forbidden Catholics to participate in non-Catholic Masses, even if they are valid. That is why if a Catholic finds himself in an Orthodox schismatic country and he is unable to find a place of Catholic worship, not only is he dispensed from the obligation to hear Mass, but if he participates in the Mass of the schismatics (valid, once again) he is not excused from committing a sin against the faith. And this is so in virtue of divine natural law, that is to say, even if the ecclesiastical laws have changed for “ecumenical” reasons" https://sspx.org/en/must-catholics-attend-new-mass-30441#:\~:text=The%20SSPX's%20position%20on%20the,puts%20the%20faith%20in%20danger. >Do you not have a statement where the SSPX said that it is a sin to attend? "The Church imposes the obligation to hear Mass “\*in the Catholic rite\*,”\[3\] but a protestantized rite cannot at the same time be characterized as Catholic. Moreover, a “\*protestantizing\*” rite exposes the faithful to “\*considerable spiritual harm\*,” which is one of the strongest reasons exempting from the Sunday obligation of assistance at Mass. And as it involves danger for our own faith and for that of our dependents, for whom we are responsible before God, we must say that whoever is conscious of this danger, insofar as he is conscious of it, far from satisfying the Church’s precept, rather commits a sin against faith \[by attending the N.O.M.\]." https://sspx.org/en/must-catholics-attend-new-mass-30441#:\~:text=The%20SSPX's%20position%20on%20the,puts%20the%20faith%20in%20danger.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): >is that it is not a sin to attend the Mass Sacrilege is a mortal sin and grave offense against Christ. >Bishop Fellay even said it is a valid Mass Yes. It is a valid Mass. So are Orthodox Masses. So are Satanic Black Masses. What is the point of this argument. >I think the only thing that will shut me up is if you can provide me a statement where it is said that attending the new Mass is sinful "Now, even if one wanted to contest the heretical elements of the New Mass, the sole refusal to profess Catholic dogmas quintessential to the Mass renders the new liturgy deficient ... The correct definition of evil—lack of a due good—clearly shows that the New Mass is evil in and of itself regardless of the circumstances." [https://sspx.org/en/new-mass-legit-30283](https://sspx.org/en/new-mass-legit-30283)

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): >If someone makes vows and breaks them, they commit sin; however, is you do something that would be sinful to someone who made a vow to not do that something then you do not commit sin That falls under the sin of Oath Breaking, breaking your bond is a sin for all people >It is not an evil act to attend a Novus Ordo Mass The SSPX explicitly teaches the NO is evil and sinful to attend "The Church imposes the obligation to hear Mass “\*in the Catholic rite\*,”\[3\] but a protestantized rite cannot at the same time be characterized as Catholic. Moreover, a “\*protestantizing\*” rite exposes the faithful to “\*considerable spiritual harm\*,” which is one of the strongest reasons exempting from the Sunday obligation of assistance at Mass. And as it involves danger for our own faith and for that of our dependents, for whom we are responsible before God, we must say that whoever is conscious of this danger, insofar as he is conscious of it, far from satisfying the Church’s precept, rather commits a sin against faith \[by attending the N.O.M.\]." https://sspx.org/en/must-catholics-attend-new-mass-30441#:\~:text=The%20SSPX's%20position%20on%20the,puts%20the%20faith%20in%20danger.

None (1): Where in this article does it say that it is a sin to attend a Novus Ordo Mass?What you quoted does not imply this.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): Explicitly states it is evil, here is a more clear quote "The Church imposes the obligation to hear Mass “\*in the Catholic rite\*,”\[3\] but a protestantized rite cannot at the same time be characterized as Catholic. Moreover, a “\*protestantizing\*” rite exposes the faithful to “\*considerable spiritual harm\*,” which is one of the strongest reasons exempting from the Sunday obligation of assistance at Mass. And as it involves danger for our own faith and for that of our dependents, for whom we are responsible before God, we must say that whoever is conscious of this danger, insofar as he is conscious of it, far from satisfying the Church’s precept, rather commits a sin against faith \[by attending the N.O.M.\]." https://sspx.org/en/must-catholics-attend-new-mass-30441#:\~:text=The%20SSPX's%20position%20on%20the,puts%20the%20faith%20in%20danger.
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[DISCLAIMER: I am not sedevacantist; I have specific arguments against the position, but perhaps those might be best for another post.]It appears to me that catholics are quite open and willing to discuss any and all topics with protestants, to appear on their shows and have open disagreements for the purpose of edification, but when it comes to sedevacantists, it seems to be quite the opposite. It seems that anyone even suspected of being a sedevacantist is banished from polite conversation among catholics at large, and this does not seem to exemplify christian charity, especially when contrasted with the exceeding charity demonstrated toward protestants. I think the lack of discussion creates echo chambers on both sides of this subject and overall harms souls that are hungry for understanding of the True Faith.I think informed discussions with protestants often lead to protestants becoming catholic, so I don't see why the same approach is not used with sedevacantists to bring them into the fold of the Church.It is possible that this is just my experience and not as widespread as I think it is. What do you think?

hardeho (11): I think because the Sedes are perceived as more "dangerous" to people's faith. So much of protestantism is just theologically absurd, it can just be dismissed out of hand.People are (rightly) more afraid that they will lose family, friends, loved ones, to a "conversion" to the Sedes.Just my thoughts.

Indigo-Meadow (10): I've also noticed how trads fawn over Eastern Orthodoxy, but like you said, become hostile over any discussion of feeneyism, sedeprivationism, or hard sedevacantism. I think for some of the older clergy, the wounds are still fresh, so things can get a bit heated. I don't pretend to understand what is happening with the laity. Honestly, I think its gotten harder and harder to speak to sedevacantists given how bad the crisis in the church has become.

TooEdgy35201 (8): In a country like Germany, you turn into a sede as soon as you leave the Synodal Sect of Frankurt. I am not paying church tax to anticlerical radlibs who destroy the faith.

None (6): I sympathise with the sede position. I think they just don’t want to face the truth that the Pope might not be the Pope including the ones after V2. If that’s the case, the whole NO religion gets thrown out the window for them. Whereas with EO and Prot., they are not within Catholicism so don’t influence them personally.

None (4): Sedes have great arguments, are fervent about learning the truth, and typically have more knowledge about the faith than most Catholics. Many if not most Catholic pundits are grifters who seek glory, money, or fame within their circle jerk of lukewarm vomit. Without naming names, many NO apologists cower from intelligent debate on the grounds of not wanting errors to spread. (Even "trads.") The irony being that they love dialogues with Protestants and atheists. It's all a part of the V2 spirit of false ecumenism and garbage theology. I'm not a sede, btw. I find the sspx position the strongest.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (5): I agree. People often treat sedevecantists like the monsters living under your bed. its absurd and they are mis-understood.Lefebvre, Castro de Mayer and Fr Hesse all said multiple times we could or even probably face a situation where a Pope is anathematized by a future pope. They all just said that no one except a future pope could declare it and I agree with that.I sympathize with the position however I believe most adopt it out of pride or convenience. I also agree with Bishop Schneider when he said SV is a error, it is not inherently heretical or schismatic.

MarcellusFaber (6): Because there is a stupid and unthinking taboo against the position. It’s also because the leading ‘Sede’ voices tend to cause people to think that they might have to stop going to Mass and receiving the Sacraments regularly if they become ‘Sede’, which is sectarian rubbish.

JohnFoxFlash (3): It is a funny one. Like surely sedeprivationists and sedevacantists are closer to us than prots or orthodox are, but they're treated as something radically more dangerous that we must charge at with clubs and pitchforks. Ultimately there is the true Church and the Truth, both are objective even if the latter isn't always clear to us, but how us subjective and flawed humans view and experience things is, I hate to say this phrase, a spectrum. I guess sedes are seen as more dangerous because they're incrementally different to us on the spectrum of how humans express Christianity, compared to baptists or whoever - so they're more dangerous in the sense that they may confuse people as to what is or isn't Catholicism in a way that Prots can't.

asimovsdog (3): There are sedes who say that the pope MAY not be the pope, but lack the authority to dispose of him (early SSPV priests like Fr. Jenkins). Effectively it's close to the R&R position, but without the "pope-sifting" that the SSPX has to do on what to accept and what to reject, they just reject everything that comes out of Rome as dangerous.Then there are sedes who say that the pope definitely IS not the pope, putting their own judgement above the papacy and quoting various saints out of context to support their position (like Fr. Cekada). Then they develop various theories on how this could've happened while preserving their definition of the indefectability of the Church, whether they should elect their own pope (Palmarian Church with "Pope" Michael, Conclavism), develop theories on who is and isn't a heretic, theories on whether we should pray "una cum Papa Francesco" during Mass and whether it's mortal sin to pray for the pope. It's basically Catholic fundamentalism, all while painting sedevacantism as an "easy" alternative to R&R while ignoring the glaring holes in the theory.Sedevacantist priests (from the SSPV) weren't banned from the SSPX in the early years as long as they didn't preach with \*\*certainty\*\* that the pope is not the pope (also the SSPV priests didn't get kicked out because of sedevacantism, but that's another story). It's perfectly fine to have doubts whether the pope is not the pope or to expect that he will be disposed of in the future. It is however wrong to dispose him yourself, because that is effectively conciliarism.The modern SSPX (post 2012) is sliding towards Rome again (see Bp. Williamsons rhetoric on the "neo-SSPX") and the SSPX also has taken in a large influx of liberal-ish Novus Ordo Catholics who are already scared of being labeled schismatic. Most people are also not informed on sedevacantist theory.> I think informed discussions with protestants often lead to protestants becoming catholic, so I don't see why the same approach is not used with sedevacantists to bring them into the fold of the Church.Because sedevacantists see the R&R position as stupid. Sedevacantists are fully aware of the SSPX. They think that if you have a pope, you have to obey him in everything he says in order to fulfil the "submission to the Roman pontiff" requirement. And that a true pope can never preach heresy because in order to be pope you have to be a Catholic and not a heretic, yada yada. And they might even be right and we are following a fake pope, but until a future pope declares the current one null and void, the sedevacantist theory stays a THEORY, period. Yes, they might be correct that the pope is not the pope, but what should we do in the meantime, while he hasn't been disposed of? In the words of Fr. Gregory Hesse: "In the Last Judgement, if I did my best to follow the rules in a time of confusion, can God condemn me to hell? No. But if I say that the pope is not the pope, and in the end it turns out that somehow he is the pope? Then I'll have a problem."

apisDei (2): In my experience all Sedes I've ever met where uncharitable, dishonest and manipulative, without exception. Of course, exceptions must surely exist somewhere, but I never met one. Hence why I struggle with being patient towards them.

None (2): Sedevacantists can be a real mixed bag, much like any other religious group. They have perhaps a higher concentration of people who would be considered strong-willed, accusatory, and demanding. It goes with the territory, because sedevacantism is in itself "a very daring theory" to quote Fr. Hesse. It takes a daring sort of a person to hold that position unwaveringly.I sympathize with them sincerely and I'm just as fed up and disgusted with modernism as they are. I don't know if I would call myself a sede, but what I do know is that Rome has been playing fast and loose with doctrine and moral theology for nigh-on 70 years now and I am steering clear of it.

lupenguin (2): I’ve talked to sedes, they have no charity whatsoever

None (1): How to speak heretic: 'Sedevacantist': Protestant you should treat like crap.

None (4): That makes sense, as far as the mentality they have, but I think it lacks perspective. I have close family that either never seriously practiced the Faith, stopped seriously practicing the Faith or left to protestantism, so I think that it could be equally dangerous. I understand you are not putting forward your argument but rather your best understanding of the general perception, and I appreciate the discussion.For me, I think sedevecantist material I viewed a number of years ago caused me to take the Faith much more seriously and to be informed much more than I otherwise would, but I will admit that it caused despair, which is not good. I just think that if there were more solid defenders of the Faith against sedevacantism coming to the table to have a discussion, then I would not have fallen away for over 12 years.Moreover, I think it is consistent with christian charity to not shut the door on them. I think we should do what we can to invite them back into the fold of the Church, just as we would for fallen away catholics who have gone protestant. At least we would have many more points of agreement with sedes.

None (2): Thank you for your coment! I share these same thoughts. I want to help to foster unity, not division, regardless of the pain/discomfort that may come with it.

None (3): I have great sympathy for germans enduring the schismatic, if not apostate, sects masquerading as catholic.

None (1): I see what you're saying. I think you are basically correct.

None (1): I 100% concur with your assessment. Thank you for your thoughtful comment.

None (1): SV?

None (3): I think you about nailed it.

None (2): It seems patently absurd to accept anyone from protestants to satanists into polite discussion but to treat sedes with such distain as I've seen.

None (2): It seems to me R&R is closer to reality than the hyperpapalist sedevecantists (and modernists).

None (1): This makes the most sense. I still think we shouldn't confuse the position with those who may identify as sedevacantist. I tend to think that the desire to think oneself as juridically qualified to singularly announce the Pope has lost office due to some spurious quotes comes fron a place of pride. I'm always open to information, but I don't see myself as some kind of authority on the matter.

None (1): Well said! I'm with you.

JohnFoxFlash (6): I've never met a charitable Orthodox either but I'm sure that both exist

MarcellusFaber (4): That is a sweeping generalisation.

None (1): Are you meaning to characterize all sedes or just the ones with whom you've talked? I don't think it's charitable to generalize all when there is a wide variance.

None (1): What?

hardeho (9): I am not a Sede, but I don't have a huge problem with them either. I have a few IRL Sede friends, and a lot more fake internet friends. These are confusing times, and we are all just trying to get through it as best we can.

MarcellusFaber (3): You seem to think that believing the Holy See to be vacant entails loss of Faith, that such an idea is opposed to the Faith, since the Faith must be defended against it, (i.e. you believe it is heretical), and also that we are outside of the Church.This is nonsense. The definition of heresy is the pertinacious denial or positive doubt of something to be believed with divine and Catholic Faith (something de fide). The denial or doubt must also be direct, meaning that there can be no intermediate steps of reasoning between a proposition and its contradiction with something de fide, so even if you believe that the Sedevacantist position logically leads to the denial of de fide dogma, it cannot be heretical unless it directly contradicts it with no intermediate steps. This is especially true if the person holding the position refuses to accept that their position logically leads to a contradiction. It is worth noting that so-called ‘ecclesia-vacantism’ (the idea that there are currently no diocesan bishops or a current hierarchy) which is often conflated with Sedevacantism by Sedes and non-Sedes alike, likely is heretical, if not seriously erroneous. However, this erroneous idea is not inherent to believing the Holy See to be vacant, contrary to what people like Don Tranquillo assert. The response in short is the appointment of Catholic bishops through common error as to the identity of the Pope. Laymann (Confessor to Ferdinand III) also strongly supports this position. I would also ask what your accusation of heresy would be; Ss Robert Bellarmine, Antoninus, Alphonsus de Ligouri, Francis de Sales, Cardinal Newman, Wernz-Vidal, Ballerini, Marato, etc. all say what we do concerning heresy and Papal Office. Of course, there is a minority (composed of John of St Thomas, Cajetan, Suarez, Bouix, Billuart, Lagrange etc.) that opposes the majority position based on bad ecclesiology, and you can hold to their position if you like, but it would be ridiculous to accuse doctors of the Church of heresy for holding the much more straightforward position. The rethinking and blatant twisting of the meaning of the texts we cite by people like Siscoe & Salza is also ridiculous.As to the accusation of schism, those who refuse to submit to a Pope because they reasonably doubt the validity of his election cannot be considered schismatic. This is taught clearly by Wernz-Vidal giving the example of the situation with Urban VI. I also have quotes from other theologians and canonists teaching the same thing. If this were not true, the Great Western Schism (not properly speaking a schism) would have to be considered a lot messier. I would also point out that nobody who professes the Catholic Faith now submits to Francis, so non-Sede Catholics would also be schismatic if we were due to their refusal to submit to Francis, which is now necessary to refuse to practice the Catholic Faith. This is why Schneider slyly changed the cause of schism from the refusal to submit to the Roman Pontiff to the refusal to recognise him in his catechism, which is a novelty not found in the sources. All that said, that is not to say that some Sedes, who might be called sectarian, might be schismatic due to a different reason than their refusal to submit to the man whom you consider Pope. It is possible to become schismatic through refusing communion with other Catholics, and De Lugo states explicitly that this can happen during a period of sede vacante. Sedes like +Sanborn are on very thin ice in this regard.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (2): sedevecantism

MarcellusFaber (3): Thanks. Apologies if my other reply seems a bit blunt.

None (3): \~Novus Ordite: 'Protestants aren't heretics.'Also: 'Sedevacantists are Protestants.'Also: 'Sedevacantists are heretics.'

None (2): Indeed! My goal is to foster unity, and I couldn't imagine treating them as harshly as I've seen some allegedly catholic subs do (ehhem, r/Catholicism).

None (7): No, I don't think that the position of sedevacante entails a loss of Faith, and I don't think it is necessarily heretical, especially since interregnum is a basic function between popes (the possibility of extended interregnum logically follows). I agree that ecclesia-vacante would be a heretical position because it implies that the gates of hell prevailed against the Church, but Christ will be with us "all days, even to the consummation of the world." \[Matthew 28:20\]I'm sorry if I communicated ambiguously and gave a false impression of what I think because we agree on these points; I was not accusing anyone of heresy in my comment, nor meaning to imply this. I also agree that shismatic would not be a correct accusation on the basis that someone holds the position of sedevacante.I think sedevacantists have a reasonable basis to conclude that Francis is not the Pope, but I am not prepared to make such a conclusion, as I don't think I am in a position to adjudicate this matter. I would liken this to having reason to think someone has committed murder while having not been convicted; I can acknowledge the facts that point to murder and, at the same time, acknowledge that I am in no position to adjudicate the matter. Any conclusion I draw would be tentative and subject to change based on new developments or decisions from those who are poised to adjudicate the matter.I refuse to see myself as not in communion with other catholics and the Church at large, and this is why I give due charity to those holding the sedevacante position, but I think that you are correct that Sanborn is walking a thin line that could possibly be considered schismatic. When I talk about sedes returning into the fold of the Church, I am talking about those who refuse communion with other catholics or the Church at large, not every single sede.Thank you for your thoughtful comment, and I wholeheartedly appreciate this conversation.

None (1): I agree with you.

None (1): No worries, brother. I appreciate blunt truth (with charity).

None (3): Ah. Yeah, it makes no sense. They treat satanists better than sedevacantists.

MarcellusFaber (3): I‘m glad to hear it. It would be edifying if more non-Sedes would take such a position.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (3): I've met other SSPX and FSSP folk who say they would not pray the rosary with sedes or let their kids play with sedes..... Really upset me. Dont get me wrong, some sedes are physcho and I wouldn't want to be around them but a majority are very devout, prayerful and responsible Catholics and parents.

None (3): Satanists are just \*really\* separated brethren. All the kewl kids know that. Sedevacantists r meen! No Heaven for you, love haters!SMH

None (1): So, are these people otherwise living catholic lives but see the Chair as presently vacant?

None (3): Your sarcasm is appreciated. I'm made to feel crazy for observing how wayward this novelty of "ecumenism" has gone.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (2): many are. but you get every flavor under the rainbow from the home aloners to the ones that aren't afraid to go to SSPX when traveling.

None (1): I could see how people would not be fond of the position, but I am in no place to judge.

# Post 530: Does SSPX mass meet the requirements of the Sunday Obligation?

Author: l--mydraal--l

Score: 5

Comments: 16

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1dd72e4/does\_sspx\_mass\_meet\_the\_requirements\_of\_the/

There are varying answers to this depending on who you ask, and I'd love to hear what you think.I've been invited to an SSPX mass this weekend. I usually go to a diocesan vigil mass or the Ordinariate mass which happens monthly.I assume you believe that SSPX mass does meet the obligation, of course, but I'd like to know how and why.Blessings,M

Cathain78 (14): “According to the New Code of Canon Law, “The obligation of assisting at Mass is satisfied wherever Mass is celebrated in a Catholic rite....” I hope that settles your doubts." - Cardinal Silvio OddiPresident for the Sacred Congregation for the ClergyMarch 17, 1984“In the strict sense you may fulfill your Sunday obligation by attending a Mass celebrated by a priest of the Society of Saint Pius X. ...If your intention is simply to participate in Mass according to the 1962 Missal for the sake of devotion, this would not be a sin. It would seem that a modest contribution to the collection at Mass could be justified.”Msgr. Camille PerlSecretary of the Pontifical Commission Ecclesia DeiIn a May 28, 1996 letter and repeated in Protocol No. 236/98 of March 6, 1998:https://sspx.org/en/what-canonical-status-sspx-30842

kmith0709 (2): My diocese official website has a whole long FAQ page addressing the SSPX (because they have a very large presence here), and it says that their Mass does not fulfill our Sunday obligation, and that the faithful are not to receive Communion there. It says we may attend Mass there in a pinch, like, if it's an emergency and they are all that's available, but that we may not receive Communion. It cites that Pope Benedict XVI quote from 2009 saying that Society priests "do not exercise any legitimate ministry" in the Church.This saddens me because I love going to SSPX, love what they teach, and prefer their Mass to my neighborhood NO -- but I don't see how I can attend or join without outright disobeying my Bishop.I am curious if anyone here is in a similar situation and what your thoughts would be.

VanSensei (2): Yes

Araedya (2): In addition to what was already said, on a logical level, it makes no sense to me that Rome would extend faculties for SSPX priests to hear confessions and to witness marriages but it would somehow be sinful or not count for the Sunday obligation to stay for their mass.I think [this post by Fr. Z](https://wdtprs.com/2020/04/ask-father-whats-the-truth-about-the-sspx/) has always summed things up pretty well but if you find him too biased of a source, here is a recent, [more neutral source](https://youtu.be/JsJuuSK-FqI?si=zMHwKJcfNhiWaofj)with Fr. Gerald Murray, who has a doctorate in canon law and appears all over mainstream conservative catholic media. I thought his analysis was relatively balanced and his conclusions are more or less the same as Fr. Z although he had more reservations in general and I certainly wouldn't consider him to be overly sympathetic to the SSPX. Although somehow it was still too sympathetic for the main sub, but that says more about them than anything else.

apisDei (1): Check out these three vids by Christpilled on YouTube:\* [https://youtu.be/K\\_qmQy2n2vM](https://youtu.be/K\_qmQy2n2vM)\* [https://youtu.be/e96Oe7et\\_P4](https://youtu.be/e96Oe7et\_P4)\* [https://youtu.be/zv\\_FOamD5rc](https://youtu.be/zv\_FOamD5rc)

l--mydraal--l (5): Thank you. So it seems that it comes down to a mix of love, Grace and if we're going to get into it, the definition of Catholic rite.My understanding is that so long as we attend mass with an SSPX priest out of love for the Mass, while not denying the validity of Vatican II, we commit no sin and fulfil our Sunday Obligation.

l--mydraal--l (2): May I please read it?

l--mydraal--l (2): Thank you! That was really helpful.

l--mydraal--l (1): Thank you.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (2): "not denying the validity of Vatican II"literally no one claims the Pope didnt call all the bishops together during vatican 2.What vatican 2 actually requires of a Catholic is TBD, even the Vatican itself says it is up for debate and the whole thing certainly isn't infallible, neither are the pieces SSPX rejects:[https://www.lifesitenews.com/blogs/this-dissertation-on-vatican-ii-influenced-romes-decision-to-lift-the-excommunications-of-the-sspx-bishops/](https://www.lifesitenews.com/blogs/this-dissertation-on-vatican-ii-influenced-romes-decision-to-lift-the-excommunications-of-the-sspx-bishops/)"Not accepting what is said in the three conciliar documents (\*Nostra Aetate,\*\*Unitatis Redintegratio\*, and\*Dignitatis Humanae\*) is not a reason to be considered disobedient or even heretical. Therefore, there is nothing to be asked of the SSPX because of the Second Vatican Council."

Cathain78 (2): That would depend on who you ask, I think 😊Provided above are comments on the topic from authorities in Rome, and also reference to the New Code of Canon Law. Canon Law itself simply states that if it’s a Catholic rite then it satisfies your obligation. We have one post-conciliar authority quoted above stating that the intention for attending may or may not have some bearing on the matter in his personal opinion, whereas the other doesn’t even mention that as a consideration. Regardless - according to the letter of the law there is no issue at all with attending an SSPX mass.As for agreeing with everything that came out of Vatican II, well that’s another topic. Certainly if would think for the SSPX, not only the changes to the Mass but also certain changes to the Church’s traditional views on “Religious Liberty” and Ecumenicism are hugely problematic. But in terms of your question regarding whether it’s ok or not to attend an SSPX mass, Rome itself seems to have stated that in itself it’s not an issue. Of course, you may get individuals who disagree but that’s their personal opinion and I don’t think they can convincingly argue against the above nor Canon Law itself, whatever their personal opinions may be.

Cathain78 (0): Also the definition of “Catholic rite” seems quite clear to me. Nobody but the most vociferous opponents of the SSPX contend that they are anything but Catholic priests. Their ordinations are valid, their masses are valid. The liturgy they use is the Catholic Mass approved by Popes and is still used and approved by bishops and the Ecclesia Dei communities today. I don’t think anyone could reasonably claim that they are not celebrating a Catholic rite mass.Since Canon Law makes no mention of licitness (and the SSPX have an answer to that anyway with an appeal to Canon Law), then it seems quite clear cut that , as Cardinal Oddi stated, it is a Catholic Mass that satisfies your Sunday Obligation and that should suffice to settle any doubts.

kmith0709 (2): It's a pdf so I'm having a hard time figuring out how to link it via Reddit -- sorry! If you search for "catholic diocese of richmond sspx" it should come up; it's entitled "Frequently Asked Questions," and it's a 5 page (525 kb) pdf download. Hope this works.

l--mydraal--l (2): [Got it](https://richmonddiocese.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Frequently-asked-Questions-12\_7\_16.pdf)

l--mydraal--l (2): In my further research, I found [this podcast episode](https://youtu.be/FVJcGhmxmuw) which could be helpful for you.

kmith0709 (2): Listening to it now, thank you for sharing!

# Post 531: Why is the SSPX criticised so heavily from all sides? (Meaning everyone criticises it)

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 4

Comments: 13

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1dc23ym/why\_is\_the\_sspx\_criticised\_so\_heavily\_from\_all/

apisDei (4): Because the SSPX is \*true\* and \*moderate\*. The truth is \*bitter\* though, it requires you to leave your comfort zone, deny yourself, pick up and carry the cross and suffer persecution. Most people are not ready for that and would rather live a comfortable lie, hence why whenever they are confronted with the truth, they start hissing.The SSPX also holds a moderate, realistic, reasonable and prudent position, which is not extreme enough for exremists. It holds the middle ground between sedevacantists (there is no pope) and so-called conservatives (the pope's infallibility has no limits), hence why the SSPX is being attacked from both extremes.Out Lord said: "If the world hates you, know that it has hated me before it hated you." (John 15:18) "If they persecuted me,they will also persecute you." (John 15:20)

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (2): same reason St. Athanasius was exiled.

Cathain78 (2): Partaking in the abuse and persecution of Our Lord. Carry that cross, it only vindicates us.

None (1): Does The Resistance count as a side? In that case, the SSPX is criticized as being too lax (neo-SSPX) and I think based on something that happened in 2012.

dookiemaster420 (1): i don’t have enough understanding but do feel like even in this forum i’ve tried to gather information and perspectives and i definitely feel judged and like people don’t want to walk me through the questions and concerns — both good and bad. I imagine other people feel this way (in person and online) and maybe that contributes to even more criticism.

Key-Entrepreneur3475 (0): Hello, It is possible to consecrate a bishop with an implicit agreement of the pope, but never against the agreement of the pope. There are insufficient definitions on this subject in the Council of Trent. It is by divine right that only the pope can accept a bishop into the Church. Not respecting this, as Pius XII said, is a sacrilege that results in excommunication. In John 10:1, it is written that only he who passes through the door is a legitimate pastor. In addition, to exercise, they invent a universal substitute jurisdiction that does not exist in canon law. The FSSPX has good priests, but it cannot be the way because, like all schismatics, it sends itself. This is extremely serious (for 2000 years, it has been condemned by the Church). I can bring you specific texts that strongly condemn this. The FSSPX must return to the Church, otherwise it cannot become a work of God.

SaintGus77 (3): Well said.

dbaughmen (3): Great way to explain it

Blackbeeyellowbee (2): what do you mean?

dbaughmen (2): Yes that definitely counts, Bishop Williamson would be a great addition to the SSPX again

Key-Entrepreneur3475 (1): Hello, It is possible to consecrate a bishop with an implicit agreement of the pope, but never against the agreement of the pope. There are insufficient definitions on this subject in the Council of Trent. It is by divine right that only the pope can accept a bishop into the Church. Not respecting this, as Pius XII said, is a sacrilege that results in excommunication. In John 10:1, it is written that only he who passes through the door is a legitimate pastor. In addition, to exercise, they invent a universal substitute jurisdiction that does not exist in canon law. The FSSPX has good priests, but it cannot be the way because, like all schismatics, it sends itself. This is extremely serious (for 2000 years, it has been condemned by the Church). I can bring you specific texts that strongly condemn this. The FSSPX must return to the Church, otherwise it cannot become a work of God.

Cathain78 (4): Jesus was slandered and persecuted.His followers should expect the same.The world hated Christ, his followers can expect the same.“Blessed are you when others insult you, persecute you, and falsely say all kinds of evil against you because of me” Mat 5:11“Then Jesus told his disciples, “If anyone would come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me” Mat 16:24

Francisco\_\_Javier (2): He was so right in denying the blasphemous religion of modernity - ie the si6 million perfect victims offered up that man might overcome his primitive racism

# Post 532: Incredibly troubling stories

Author: dookiemaster420

Score: 7

Comments: 39

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1dbvmsi/incredibly\_troubling\_stories/

I find the mass to be fulfilling but these are very unsettling stories… how can we continue to support the SSPX when they seem to bully and silence victims of abuse within the church? It seems like 4 years later and really no advancement or improvement. I know several of these priests are still actively working in SSPX churches and giving sacraments. https://onepeterfive.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/SSPX-Sympathetic-to-Perverts.pdf

Piklikl (9): Unfortunately these kinds of situations are not easily objectively discussed or understood. Kennedy Hall [gave a pretty good writeup](https://meretradition.substack.com/p/father-rostand-abuse-case-the-full) on a case of an accused SSPX priest that I think is very balanced in light of the delicate subject that can be applied to similar situations. The reality is there is no human organization that can be free from the scourges of fallen human nature, but that certainly doesn't excuse it when it happens, especially when those men who commit these grievous sins are supposed to be moral authorities. It also does not absolve us from striving to rid every oragnization we can of the scourge. Sure sexual abuse cases happen at far lower rates in the Catholic Church compared to other organizations, but that again does not excuse the evils committed nor remove any obligation from the leadership to attempt to eradicate it. Every problem is a leadership problem, and this is certainly one of them. That being said, it's important to remember that allegations are allegations, and many times the people who make them are not of sound mind. The whole Church Militant debacle that you're referring to was clearly a half baked attempt to round up every single person with an axe to grind against the SSPX and roll it all into one article. I spoke with the SSPX District Superior of Asia, Fr. Summers, and he said what he does if there's ever any sort of accusation made against a priest he immediately removes the priest from public ministry and conducts an investigation. If the investigation finds the priest guilty he is dealt with accordingly (I don't recall if this includes handing him over to civil authorities, which I would hope so), but if the investigation exonerates the priest then Fr Summers accompanies the priest and publicly clears him of any wrongdoing and reinstates the priest with a big celebration. I think this is a good strategy that could be used. If you zoom out and look at the issue from a 50,000 ft view, we are still as a society figuring how to best deal with this issue, and as imperfect as it is, the Catholic Church (and by extension the SSPX) is on the forefront of fixing it. While it's saddening the clergy have been forced to do so (instead of being proactive and voluntarily putting into place the best practices before there ever was even an issue), it's better than nothing I suppose.

None (15): Church Militant 😂😂 That phony's been exposed time and time again. His weird vendetta against the sspx is founded on slander and misinformation. Are you on his payroll or something?

craft00n (9): Multiple of my family members were victims of abuses. Is SSPX correctly dealing with these issues ? In my opinion no. Is it exclusive to SSPX ? Sadly not at all (I'm a psy student). Is SSPX still the best community of priests to get catechism and mass ? Absolutely yes.SSPX isn't a cult. If you don't trust them with something, you still can trust them for something else. I don't get my political views there, nore my opinion about mental health. But for doctrinal problems, they're (in my opinion) the best.

asimovsdog (3): Okay, let's go through all the "cases" in detail:- Fr. Ramon Angles: Kurt Chione, a teacher at St. Marys, reported him to the police as soon as he was aware. The police failed to do their job to investigate. How is the SSPX at fault if the police doesn't do their job?- Fr. Pierre Duverger: isn't even charged with a rape allegation, just charged with imprudent words in the confessional. Not even a police report was filed, and the "20 victims" of him also haven't filed any report. Church Militant then cites a document specifying how the PR should deal with Church Militant, insinuating that it describes how to "cover up", but that's not what the document said.- Laudenschlager: Was a deacon, fired from a seminary after wanting sexual favors. Is still fired, is now gay and works for Microsoft. He doesn't even associate with the SSPX.- Peter Palmeri: Three priests didn't report his abuse of his children to the police, because they cannot break their confessional seal. Well, it is what it is, but they cannot break their seal.- Fr. Novak: didn't do anything sexual, just a very uncharitable person towards some parishioners- Fr. Philippe Peignot: Allegedly molested a boy and was banned from being around children. Ban was lifted again years later. Only case where I could see a "coverup".- James Simmerman: Millionaire who was charged with a rape allegation by a woman. The SSPX priests that knew him vouched for his character during his lawsuit. Given how quickly and easily rape allegations happen against men with money in the US, I can see why the SSPX would defend him. His case was dropped after a settlement. Doesn't mean he's guilty.- Fr. Christophe Roisnel: abused children, was reported to police and in the meantime put into a monastery while the case was going on. Church Militant claims that the SSPX "hid" him and the police "found" him, which is idiotic, the SSPX does cooperate with the police. Again, there was no "coverup", he was sent to a monastery while the investigation was going on.- Kevin Sloniker: was only know for circumcizing himself and was removed from his position as a teacher due to mental instability. He wasn't kept away from children because he wasn't known to molest children. Reported to police and is serving life now.- Fr. Uribe Silviano Bernabe: raped women, now serving life. Again, not the SSPXs fault. - Fr. Frédéric Abbet: accused of molesting boys, acquitted because of lack of evidence. He was accompanied by his attorney to make sure it doesn't happen again, sadly, it did happen again, now he is serving life in prison. Again, no fault of the SSPX, they did investigate his case but allowed him to be a teacher because the claims couldn't be verified.- Fr. Stephen Abraham: accused of molesting a boy and then another one 10 years later. Was sent to a monastery after the second case. The PDF you linked is literally grasping at straws regarding "widespread pedophilia support". With the exception of Peignot, the entire document is a massive nothingburger. You can read most of these stories in a pro-SSPX or anti-SSPX light and given the reputation of the Church Militant after their lost defamation case, I'll still give the SSPX the benefit of the doubt. Meanwhile, in the mainstream Catholic Church, the priests and bishops aren't disciplined at all.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (4): The Church Militant folks jumped aboard the anti-SSPX bandwagon after they received funding from a wealthy FSSP parishioner whose priest was angry with the SSPX for saying people shouldn't go to the FSSP or any diocesan or otherwise Vatican approved (on the condition that the clergy stay quiet about the Modernist crisis) TLM location, because the Modernist bishops have such locations at their mercy.... looks like the SSPX was right. The Modernist bishops are closing TLM locations everywhere.Church Militant made the wealthy donor a producer, so...I had a Facebook conversation about the abuse cases where I was genuinely just asking questions. Not trying to argue or anything. The alleged victim somehow summoned Christine Niles into the conversation, eho proceeded to accuse me of being a collaborator of the SSPX's "cover up" and I was kicked out of the discussion, banned from that person's Facebook page before i could respond. Odd.Asfar as credible cases of SSPX clergy carrying out sexual abuse go, I did hear of a priest from Soth America who was already a priest before joining the SSPX. He claimed he was falsely accused of being a sexual predator for being a traditionalist, which happens more than you think.Apparently, it turned out to be true. The SSPX didn't know because there are too many of these cases where Modernist clergy persecute traditionalist leaning priests in a sort of "boy who cried wolf" manner. Unless that was another Church Militant invention. Some of the more credible accusations involve sex offender lay people being hired by the SSPX without the SSPX knowing they were sex offenders. It seems that sort of thing happens everywhere in today's society, so it's not surprising it happened to the SSPX. I think it was a janitor at one of their schools, or a lay person abusing his daughters.Not something directly under the SSPX's control when it is endemic throughout society.

pottyflower (2): I CANNOT STATE MORE VEHEMENTLY, that having all but lost my faith attending the Australian NO Masses and having Emailed my considerable grief to the Archbishop about the state of the "Anything goes" NO masses here in Brisbane, after Much consideration. I started attending The SSPX Masses and was floored by the Humility, Profundity, Spiritual Integrity, and the Efficacy of Supernaturally Empowered Work Ethics in The Spiritual Warfare Battlegrounds that these Priests , intrepid Soldiers of The Society of St. Pius X, so genuinely, generously, self sacrificially faithful follow Christ Jesus, Their Lord and King, Pontiff, Teacher and God. These Lovers of God and souls, Seek out the lost; Bind up the wounded; Strengthen the wavering; Admonish in love the wayward; Set Afire hearts cold and frosty! Most Truly, The Beloved Holy Spirit IS Ablaze there where His tireless Spouses are!

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): "several of these priests are still actively working in SSPX churches and giving sacraments."oh? which ones were proven abusers and remain active in SSPX?

OpenStay2580 (1): you have all been hoodwinked! you all failed God miserabley! come back to The Church and stand your ground in faithSSPX was funded by The Rothchilds!during Vatican 2, they knew people would scatter and they knew people would stand for the true massSo they gave them a dramatised alternativeaHolding yard if you will?filtering the true faithful out of the way of the Vatican allowing the evil Masonic Jesuits To fulfil the evil mission that was started by Ignatius 500 years ago when they introduced the extremely pagan Helio centric model.My name is Darcy Corboy! I am a traditional Catholic (to the best of my ability)I’m loyal to Romeand in the name of God and holy mother church I command you all to repent and come back with humility and help us heal the one true holy Catholic church(you can contact me via Instagram @darcy\_corboy)God bless

dookiemaster420 (1): I understand what you’re saying and it does seem like a leadership issue. However, I personally find the sentiment of “obey the superiors no matter what” to be problematic and one of the most “cult-like” realities within SSPX ESPECIALLY when there’s seemingly evidence of at least several priests co-conspiring in abuse. And also victims who have been silenced/shamed and then leading the clergy to demonize the victim because “the superiors said the priest is clear”. I’m also not terribly thrilled with reading about Laudenschlager and his direct relationship with Lefevbre.The more you dig It’s hard not to see these issues present from the BEGINNING of the SSPX in general… Thank you for taking the time to respond. I think preserving the Mass is absolutely critical but I am struggling with the above mentioned.

Piklikl (13): For those out of the loop, Church Militant dissolved in April 2024 after it lost a defamation lawsuit. [Source](https://onepeterfive.com/the-demise-of-church-militant/).

AquinasDestiny (3): Wait a minute. It is in far more places than Church Militant. It's even in the national news

dookiemaster420 (3): No, just trying to learn. Do you mind helping to educate me instead of accusing me of being on someone’s payroll?

dookiemaster420 (1): How are these men’s incarcerations and convictions phony/ slanderous/misinformation? Are you suggesting the criminal records, mugshots, etc. are fabricated?

dookiemaster420 (2): That is horribly sad but thank you so much for your honest response. God bless you and your family.Is there anything the parishioners can do to help bring about change in the leadership and how these issues are addressed?

dookiemaster420 (5): I really appreciate your time and perspective. Truly. Thank you so much 🙏

Legal\_Fact\_3681 (1): Novak is a known groomer of children and seducer of wives and has also covered up horrific abuse by other priests. All shall be revealed.

Healthy\_Remote\_6472 (1): I'm not clear on the dates relating to the accusations against Fr Abraham, but he was the priest put solely in charge of a 10-day SSPX girls' summer camp in the UK in around 1995.

dookiemaster420 (2): Thank you for your response. Fascinating "politics" even within the faith.

dookiemaster420 (1): Rothschilds, eh? can you provide some sources etc.?

craft00n (4): We don't have any proof that Laudenschlager had any relations at all with Lefebvre. We only know that Lefebvre travelled to the US to ordain him... And in fact he did so for all SSPX priest, as he was the only SSPX bishop at the time. Churchmilitant and affiliated are specialists in this kind of suppositions.

godzylla (2): That's crazy

craft00n (6): Don't worry, people tend to be defensive because Churchmilitant has an history of non ethic journalistic practices. And their now independent journalists still do questionable things today (like doxxing people).

None (5): Your username and the way you worded your post is proof that this was done in bad faith. Do your research before trolling

dookiemaster420 (1): is Laudenschlager not gay? Not married to a man? Is it untrue that he is no longer a priest with SSPX despite being “hand selected” by Lefevbre?

craft00n (4): Systematically go on trial against abusers, being entirely supportive of the plaintiffs, show show no hostility against the leadership.As of today, I still don't know of any organisation correctly dealing with sexual abuses, I don't even know what this would mean, so I wouldn't be capable of finding a solution to influence the leadership on these issues.Ow and churchmilitant is a bad joke. There are two scandals that I know very well, being very close to the victims, and the churchmilitant version of the story is systematically full of lies or defamatory suppositions.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): While there are "politics", it comes down to doctrine and its interpretation. in this sense, it's dismissive to just label it "politics" because there are very real concerns pertaining to the Faith, but the different groups do form political factions. So, yes there are politics, but one mustn't fall into the fallacy of saying they're merely that. In hindsight, St. Athanasius fighting the Arian heresy, where he was the only bishop effectively left to combat it and he eventually restored the Church, there were likely some people who dismissed it as mere politics.Not saying you're doing that. But it is something to look out for. I've seen too many Catholics outright dismiss the Modernist crisis as mere politics, and it's concerning to know that it won't be seen as more than merely that by some. This is a very real threat to the faith of Catholics everywhere.As things slide downhill and the Novus Ordo sees its eventual extinction, we have to keep in mind that even though the Gates of Hell won't defeat the Church, they WILL cause alot of damage in their attempt. They did before in the time of St. Athanasius. They've already caused damage in today's crisis. It's just hard for people to see until it arrives at their own parish.I take comfort in Christ's promise that He would not leave us orphans, in the spiritual sense.

dookiemaster420 (2): You’re judging me and You’re pushing me away from this church when all I am seeking is information. You are also accusing someone you don’t know anything about.I’ve been researching. I continue to research. You are adding to it right now.If you want to actually help, share some information instead of your sad earthly judgement.You also failed or refused to answer any of my questions… and that is the most interesting thing to me out of this thread.

craft00n (1): He wasn't "hand selected" by Lefebvre. He was ordained by him, like any other SSPX priest.

dookiemaster420 (1): Thank you very kind human for responding to my questions. The faith is so beautiful and I know we are all sinners. Just trying to find my way 🙏

dookiemaster420 (1): I intend on being conscientious of not dismissing anything as merely politics and I’ve learned a lot just reading some of the thorough responses and perspectives shared here. Thank you for taking the time to explain.

None (2): Sorry dookiemaster420. The sspx is not a separate church btw, it's part of the Holy Catholic Church.

Lax\_Ecstatic (1): This is objectively not true. They are only very recently recognized by Rome as valid, but absolutely irregular, not in full communication with Rome.

dookiemaster420 (1): I just want to be clear here— so you’re refusing to answer my questions?

dookiemaster420 (-1): Are most/all SSPX followers as judgemental and arrogant as you are? You’re really not doing the society a favor by acting this way.

None (5): The other poster already did a good job of answering you. In every organization there are going to be instances of grave sin. Being Catholic doesn't exempt someone from committing sin. Be aware of the differences between allegations and actual charges. Here are words from the society itself concerning a recent \*confirmed\* affair:https://sspx.org/en/news/communique-society-saint-pius-x-44179

craft00n (2): Absolutely not. It's hard to understand each other on the internet, and people can be defensive. Don't worry.

dookiemaster420 (0): I would really like to hear followers of the SSPX’s perspective on the questions I asked instead of “reading between the lines” of various related articles that answer some, but not all, questions i’ve asked here.

dookiemaster420 (-1): they don’t even name the superior in the article you’ve posted??

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): why do you expect to find quality answers on reddit? it will be skewed toward the immature and silly.if you walk away with a different opinion of any organization based on what randos on discord or reddit or twitter say then I think you have a poor approach to life and reasoning. I attend SSPX and I think its fair to say the SSPX struggles with perfect governing, none of them signed up for it really, though obviously God gives grace to fulfill every mission of a cleric. That being said I think its virtually impossible to know beyond a doubt when and where the SSPX specifically failed in curtailing weakness or abuses. We don't know what they knew and when they knew it and the media is often or always looking to lambast those of good heart, and the reporting on it all was largely led into fantasy land by Church Militant.

# Post 533: Best response for the oft-repeated claim that SSPX is in schism?

Author: None

Score: 12

Comments: 48

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1dbftbt/best\_response\_for\_the\_oftrepeated\_claim\_that\_sspx/

I have never considered SSPX to be in schism, and I have no doubt that the this claim is misinformed (or sometimes malicious), but I just want to pose the question here: how would you respond to the claim that the SSPX is in schism?I was recently told that they were schismatic by a friend from an ICK Mass I regularly attend. He said he got this from Fr. Ripperger. I wanted to share some information with him so that he could reconsider this position, but I want to see what others here have to share before doing so.I am hoping to compare notes and arrive at a more concise, evidence-based answer (hopefully with sources) to elucidate this matter for those who have been misinformed.Thank you in advance for any information you can provide!

eowynstan (13): if they’re really in schism, why does the Vatican say its ok to receive sacraments from the society and that attending mass there fulfills the sunday obligation?

None (8): Schism means disobeying the legitimate authority or setting up a rival Church. The SSPX is doing neither. They are just doing Catholic things the way Catholics have always done. There is no novelty or going against tradition with the SSPX. There is no 'rebellion' against the authority because no one has the duty to follow a bishop or pope if they are contradicting the faith. Since V2, modernism, and its related theology go against tradition, we have the obligation to reject it and stick to what was always taught by the Church. That's a simplified version of the situation. People write entire books on this subject so it's not always convincing nor edifying to rely on cliff notes.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (4): Schism has two requirements:1. Separation from the Church's hierarchy. Which the SSPX never did.2. Establishment of a hierarchy parallel to the Church's hierarchy. Which the SSPX also never did.You know who DOES fit those two requirements? The Eastern Orthodox.

Piklikl (3): OnePeterFive has [a pretty thorough defense](https://onepeterfive.com/sspx-mass-shelter/) of attending Mass at the SSPX, which would indirectly answer your question (there is no case to be made that one can attend the Masses of a truly schismatic organization). The article contains lots of citations, and OnePeterFive is not a supporter of the SSPX (though they seem to always give the SSPX a fair shake). Most people make the claim that the SSPX acts in ways that are schismatic (which is certainly true, the SSPX has made it clear that it will deviate from Rome in order not to offend God), and therefore they are schismatic (also this or that Bishop has said something bad about the SSPX, therefore somehow that particular man speaks for the entire Church - when the authorities who actually matter in Rome have never said anything quite as negative). The SSPX is Catholic, and on speaking terms with Rome, that is good enough for us lay people.

craft00n (3): I never could have a look at the original text, I just have a cut from it. Basically, in 1194, Card Cassidy (at the time head of the directory for oecumenism) sent a letter in response to a question from an English parishioner who asked if he was authorised to go to SSPX mass in an oecumenical spirit. In this letter, Card Cassidy said that SSPX isn't falling under the scope of oecumenism, because it is not in schism, but only in a complex position in terms of jurisdiction.Another good argument is the fact that the pope gave jurisdiction to all SSPX priests to give the absolution, all around the world, in 2015, meaning that SSPX is indeed under the authority of Rome.

apisDei (2): Check out these three vids by Christpilled on YouTube:\* [https://youtu.be/K\\_qmQy2n2vM](https://youtu.be/K\_qmQy2n2vM)\* [https://youtu.be/e96Oe7et\\_P4](https://youtu.be/e96Oe7et\_P4)\* [https://youtu.be/zv\\_FOamD5rc](https://youtu.be/zv\_FOamD5rc)

jaqian (-5): The SSPX were in schism at one point but no longer. But many SSPX make heretical statements that the Novus Ordo isn't valid and to get confession from SSPX only. These people don't help you.

Cathain78 (6): Right, Pope Francis extended faculties to the Society to hear confessions. He doesn’t do this for Orthodox or Protestants or independent Sedevacantist groups because it makes no sense to do so. He did it because the SSPX are a society of Catholic priests, who are “canonically irregular” meaning they operate outwith the normal structure of the bishop or a personal prelature, but nonetheless are Catholics and non-schismatic.

None (5): Solid point! And I understand in certain dioceses, they work directly with bishops. Would schismatics do this?

jpsdubau (2): Where can this be found in the Vatican documents?

eowynstan (2): a rebuttal^ not a question!

AquinasDestiny (1): The Vatican doesn't say that. The Vatican says that if it is impossible to get to a mainstream Mass, then it is possible to go to the SSPX. So if the journey to a mainstream Mass was more than an hour away, and the SSPX were next door then you could go to the SSPX Mass.

None (3): Well said! Do you happen to have a source (say, from an encyclical, catechism, doctor of the Church, etc.) concerning there being no duty to follow bishops/popes who are contradicting the faith? I get that this position just makes sense, but I think it would mean more from an authoritative source. It seems that modernism has brought with it some false ideas on the virtue of obedience and when it doesn't apply.

AquinasDestiny (1): Actually the SSPX only refute five paragraphs of Vatican II.

None (3): Indeed!

Numbainne47 (5): That's not schismatic, it's always been the case in catholicism that your obligated to serve God before the church, and hypothetically if serving the church would mean not serving God then you are obligated to serve God. That's not schismatic it's church teaching. Besides the sspx has made it very clear they have no intention of deviating from Rome, lefebvre was horrified by the idea.

None (1): Thank you for the reference and thoughtful response!I will certainly read that article and probably send it to my friend to hopefully resolve the matter.Please correct me if I'm mistaken; allow me to reiterate your comment in the interest of mutual understanding:Although it is often claimed that the SSPX is schismatic due to their willingness to deviate from Rome in order to not offend God, they are catholic (submitting to papal primacy) and on speaking terms with Rome, demonstrating that they are not in fact schismatic and attending their Masses is permissible.Am I correctly characterizing your comment?

AquinasDestiny (0): One Peter Five got it wrong, and the The Vatican doesn't say that. The Vatican says that if it is impossible to get to a mainstream Mass, then it is possible to go to the SSPX. So if the journey to a mainstream Mass was more than an hour away, and the SSPX were next door then you could go to the SSPX Mass. 1P5 read into it what they wanted to read into it, which is not reality.

None (2): Thank you for sharing! I found Salza's attack on the SSPX to be nonrigorous and lacking honest representation of SSPX positions. I think it is quite revealing that he has thus far not engaged in any public discussion/debate with those who disagree with his conclusions, to my knowledge (please correct me if I'm mistaken); it reminds me of protestants that have so many false ideas about Catholicism but do not engage with catholics to put their erroneous notions to the test.

None (4): No sspx priest says that the mass is invalid. Stop spreading lies. They say it's valid but you shouldn't go because it's a jeopardized, inferior form of worship; which is true. Yes, they do say to avoid NO priests because they've been compromised in some way, shape, or form by the conciliar seminaries.

None (2): You make a claim that is unsupported by the evidence. You carry the burden of proof to demonstrate that what you say is true, otherwise you are making yourself a source of scandal. Disunity is from satan; calumny is a sin.

AquinasDestiny (-2): Actually, he only wrote this in a communication. It was never put into Canon Law, so no faculties were ever actually officially given.

obiwankenobistan (6): There is a letter from the CDF that affirms that as long as you attend SSPX “out of love for the traditional Mass and not out of disobedience” it satisfies your obligation. I think it will show up if you Google around

Piklikl (5): # Confession:\*\*Pope Francis' Letter for the Year of Mercy:\*\* In the letter "Misericordia et Misera," issued at the conclusion of the Jubilee Year of Mercy on November 20, 2016, Pope Francis extended the faculty for SSPX priests to hear confessions validly and licitly indefinitely.Source: [Vatican Website - Misericordia et Misera](https://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost\_letters/documents/papa-francesco-lettera-ap\_20161120\_misericordia-et-misera.html)# Marriage:\*\*Letter from the Pontifical Commission Ecclesia Dei\*\*: On April 4, 2017, the Pontifical Commission Ecclesia Dei issued a letter providing guidelines on the celebration of marriages involving SSPX priests. The letter states that local bishops can grant faculties to SSPX priests to witness marriages, or they may appoint a diocesan priest to oversee the marriage while allowing the SSPX priest to celebrate the Mass.\* Source: [Letter of the Pontifical Commission Ecclesia Dei](http://www.vatican.va/roman\_curia/pont\_commissions/ecclsdei/documents/rc\_pc\_ecclsdei\_doc\_20170327\_lezione-matrimonio\_en.html)These sources confirm the specific pastoral provisions made by the Vatican to ensure the validity and licity of confessions and marriages involving SSPX priests. I'm not sure if there have been developments since then, but the validity of SSPX Marriages and Confessions have always been questioned, and no one has ever cogently answered the SSPX's justifications.OnePeterFive also has [a pretty thorough write up](https://onepeterfive.com/sspx-mass-shelter/) with extensive citations, and it's definitely not a publication supporting the SSPX.

obiwankenobistan (3): A rebuttal is appropriate here. They are the one asserting the point, and therefore they must prove it. You can’t prove a negative.

None (5): Angelus Press has a great book I can't recommend enough called The Catechism of the Crisis in the Church. It's laid out in question-answer format with authoritative sources ranging from encyclicals, theologians, doctors of the church, etc. The whole book isn't about the question you're asking but it's central to a large portion of it and you will be satisfied.

None (2): The sspx doesn't argue that the entirety of V2 is bad.

Piklikl (2): Yes, and moreover Rome itself has said it is permissible to attend their Masses.

apisDei (2): Not sure if he doesn't want to debate but regardless of that, his positions are simply not tenable. The SSPX is entirely Catholic, in communion with Rome. They only have an irregular gray-zone situation and they will stay that way until Rome says okay let's clean up this mess.

jaqian (-4): Do you hear yourself?

Piklikl (5): How do we know that something must be in Canon Law in order for it to be true?

Cathain78 (4): Is that how it works? I would think the onus would be on you to demonstrate that is the case, since you are the only person I’ve ever heard make this claim and I’m not sure what authority you have to do so.

AquinasDestiny (-1): The Vatican doesn't say that. The Vatican says that if it is impossible to get to a mainstream Mass, then it is possible to go to the SSPX. So if the journey to a mainstream Mass was more than an hour away, and the SSPX were next door then you could go to the SSPX Mass.

AquinasDestiny (-2): This teaching re marriages never entered Canon Law, but was only in a communication, so SSPX priests do not always have faculties for wedding ceremonies.

None (2): Thank you! I will keep that one in mind. I am just hoping that there might be a link with quotes/references I can share with my friend. Not so easy to get someone to read a book.

None (4): Nothing I said is irrational

None (3): "Whenever an abuse is committed in the celebration of the sacred liturgy, it is to be seen as a real falsification of Catholic liturgy.” —Redemptionis Sacramentum(2004) of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments

AquinasDestiny (0): Your comment contravenes St. Thomas' philosophy of Critical Reality

obiwankenobistan (2): Unless you have a source you can provide that supersedes mine, no, the Vatican does not say that.> In a May 28, 1996 letter and repeated in Protocol No. 236/98 of March 6, 1998: In the strict sense you may fulfill your Sunday obligation by attending a Mass celebrated by a priest of the Society of Saint Pius X. ...If your intention is simply to participate in Mass according to the 1962 Missal for the sake of devotion, this would not be a sin. It would seem that a modest contribution to the collection at Mass could be justified.Link: https://sspx.org/en/what-canonical-status-sspx-30842#:~:text=and%20repeated%20in-,protocol%20no.%20236%2F98 "Protocol No. 236/98"

Piklikl (2): Canon Law is not the end all be all (and this line of thinking is actually a relatively recent development in the Church's history). And per the SSPX's justifications, they always do have jurisdiction for marriages because ultimately the couple acknowledge that they believe there is a crisis in the Church and therefore even if the SSPX's initial justification for operating without sanction of the local Ordinary is somehow wrong (no competent authority that I know of has ever commented on it, and no some random canon lawyer you found on the internet doesn't count as a competent authority) there's still supplied jurisdiction.

None (3): When I'm home later I'll quote the exact parts.

jaqian (1): And that applies to both TLM and Novus Ordo

AquinasDestiny (0): This text is missing information.

None (2): Much appreciated!

None (2): It applies to all Masses. However, Novus Ordo is notoriously fraught with abuses (e.g. Communion on the hand, decades of erroneously changing the words of Consecration, clown masses, etc.), so this quote is particularly relevant to Novus Ordo.

jaqian (-1): Most of those are extreme examples. There were plenty of abuses in the TLM prior to Vatican II and don't forget that most of the abuse scandals came from priests ordained before Vatican II (and the SSPX isn't exempt from those scandals either).

Piklikl (4): >most of the abuse scandals came from priests ordained before Vatican IIYou got a source for that? If I recall correctly the changes made after Vatican II made it whole lot easier for pedophiles to become priests, to the point that many of them intentionally became priests because it was so easy.

None (3): When we see them, we should call them out and not follow error so as to not magnify scandal by our participation in it.And I'm not sure what you mean by "extreme examples". Communion on the hand is still being practiced in the vast majority of Novus Ordo Masses. It started out as an abuse and was allowed in a limited sense so as to guard the faithful who had been miseducated; how did an abuse become almost entirely ubiquitous?

# Post 534: What are your thoughts on Leo XIII?

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 6

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1daukei/what\_are\_your\_thoughts\_on\_leo\_xiii/

Bolivar687 (6): Unfortunately, it seems his Ralliement policy was imprudent. It set off decades of faithful French Catholics not knowing what they're supposed to do as papal policy alternated between contradictory instructions every few years. It seems this is the reason why he was remembered as a liberal and never accrued a larger cult.I say this was unfortunate because everything I've ever read by him is a banger. It's sometimes hard to believe just how clear and coherent it is. In They Have Uncrowned Him, Archbishop Lefebvre demonstrated that Leo XIII is probably the Pope who, more than any other, most convincingly proved in his teaching that liberal democracy and Christianity are utterly incompatible.

craft00n (3): Based af. I'm a monarchist so I'm not found of the Ralliement, but it was worth trying, I would say.

rathdrummob (1): Hmm.🦗

None (1): His encyclicals are really good. Especially the one against modernism.

# Post 535: Is this okay to say as the Act of Contrition in the confessional?

Author: None

Score: 5

Comments: 14

URL: https://i.redd.it/b35gdgq1xv4d1.jpeg

O my God, I am heartily sorry and beg pardon for all my sins, NOT SO MUCH because these sins bring suffering and Hell to me, but because they have crucified my loving Saviour Jesus Christ and offended Thy Infinite Goodness. I firmly resolve, with the help of Thy grace, to confess my sins, to do penance and to amend my life. Amen.

None (2): From a lay perspective:It seems okay to say. Just because we say things in a prayer doesn’t me we have to “feel” them. Ideally, we are sorry for our sins not because of fear of hell, but for love of God. In reality, this is not always true unless we are very holy. Therefore we pray this way as if it were true. So long as we have a desire to mean everything that is said in this prayer (even though it may not presently be the case), God will give us grace according to what we seek in the prayer.In conclusion, the “NOT SO MUCH” part may not be true for most of us. So long as we desire it to be true, I see nothing wrong.Again, I’m just a lay person so take this all with a grain of salt.

Chemistry103 (2): Look up the standard act of contrition, and ask yourself what the biggest difference is and why it is important.

jrichpyramid (3): This sub enables the worst in the laity sometimes. 🫠

None (1): I didn't know this prayer existed until recently, but it's what I've genuinely felt since returning to the Faith, and I was amazed to have my thoughts contained so succinctly in this prayer. I did know about imperfect contrition and perfect contrition as concepts before and unsuccessfully tried to describe it to others, but I think it came across as scrupulosity or rejecting mercy when what I meant was this prayer. It's somewhat consoling to pray it now because it's a genuine feeling I have deep down.

None (1): I think the key difference, denoting "perfect" (as distinguished from "imperfect") contrition is "NOT SO MUCH because these sins bring suffering and Hell to me". I think this is important because we should be sorry for our transgressions regardless of the unfavorable consequences we may face. We should ask ourselves, why must He suffer?

None (-1): Do you have anything of substance to add to the discussion?

Chemistry103 (0): Not sure what you mean when you say " why must he suffer". Am at work, no time to think. But when I read this version and then recite the normal version the suffering and he'll part stands out. It lacks something the normal prayer has, so yes.

jrichpyramid (1): Do you think in our 2,000 years of History illiterate brother and sisters in Christ had time to argue over a word or two? I own a prayer book from 1893, a Lasance Missal from 1938, and a Maryknol Missal from 1961. They’re all different. We offer ourselves with full and true contrition to Christ.

None (1): When I don't understand something, I ask a question.To what are you saying "yes"? I find your comment perplexing.

None (-1): So, are you able to answer the question I posed, or are you only here to step on a soapbox?

jrichpyramid (2): No soapbox intended, I’ll move on. The point isn’t being made or understood. Peace be with you.

None (-1): Do you think you have anything to do with "the point" not being "made or understood"?"And why seest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye; and seest not the beam that is in thy own eye?" [Matthew 7:3]

jrichpyramid (3): The Act of Contrition is perfectly acceptable to say in the Confessional. I would be curious to hear what a priest would say (in person) having you showing them Reddit, this sub, and the responses thus far.

None (-2): Why are you so evasive to direct questions?

# Post 536: Is it licit to make Private Vows of Poverty Chastity and Obedience

Author: LoudEffort

Score: 3

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1d8zn8o/is\_it\_licit\_to\_make\_private\_vows\_of\_poverty/

The title says it all. Would it be licit to make a private vow and live life as a monk, separate from an established community. Obviously this would be done under the spiritual guidance of a confessor. Would the vows be binding under pain of Mortal Sin. Also if you took a vow of poverty could you hold some form of employment to make ends meet or would your vows bar you from such activates. I'm Interested in finding out after reading about various Saints, specifically Carmelites who took private vows.

jaqian (6): There are strict canon laws around living as a religious, (which I forget) but you need to get permission from your bishop. However you could look into Third Orders like the Domicans, Carmelites and Franciscan's (now know as the Secular Franciscans of which I am one). There are also Lay Associations like the Legion of Mary (also a member) etc. What these all have in common is that you live in the world but you are a member of a religious community that meet maybe once a week (LoM) or monthly (Franciscans), follow certain rules and try and conform your life to the Gospels.

Previous-Plan-3876 (1): Seek out a spiritual director because you will need one either way.

None (1): To live as a monk you couldn’t live separate from an established community, whether that is physical or in spirit. You would need a religious rule to follow. Nothing is stopping you from developing private practices, such as poverty, chastity, and obedience. In fact, these are good to practice and we should be practicing them anyways without making vows. (Depending on your state in life)Your vows are only held under pain of sin if officially done in the Church. (There’s a way better way of explaining that) So, your private practices are not bound. Also, you have a very strict obligation to fulfill your duties within your state in life. Those duties are just as important as your Catholic duties because they work hand-in-hand. I believe a vow of poverty would prevent you from obtaining income. Here’s another point to make. Making a vow is not going to convince you to develop yourself fundamentally. You’re not going to “all of a sudden” come to a spiritual realization or whatever. You need to develop yourself on a fundamental level, building up these virtues that you wish to make vows for and make them a part of your life first. This is why religious have years living as such before making vows. As a layperson, all you need is what I described above. You do not need vows to validate yourself and by not making vows in no way takes away from the merits gained by observing those practices.

jocyUk (1): on poverty, no. only solemn vows make ownership of goods invalid. this is all terribly complicated and you should talk to a canonist. to live as a monk requires a lawful superior who could receive these vows.

# Post 537: Is there a full video of the 1988 consecration?

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 8

Comments: 9

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1d8z9mg/is\_there\_a\_full\_video\_of\_the\_1988\_consecration/

I’ve always wanted to watch the full thing and I’m wondering if they recorded the whole thing, does anyone know the whereabouts of a full video?

Piancol (4): I'm interested too lol

Piklikl (4): It looks like the 35ish min version floating around on YouTube is probably all the footage that exists today:https://youtu.be/Ebz2L7ALPhw?si=9aJahZONomZsVsMh

dbaughmen (1): I wonder what happened to all the people that attended it lol, I’ve never heard anyone say they were there yet There were thousands of people there

craft00n (3): My parents were there. It was rad.

Piancol (1): Maybe it was all a hoax and we're uncovering the deepest trad conspiracy ever! 😂

dbaughmen (3): Thats so cool, seeing the salvation of tradition before your eyes

craft00n (2): Well, I wouldn't say so. Ordaining bishops without pontifical authorisation is a very grave thing to do, they were very preoccupied. It was far more perceived by a defeat by many, including Bishop Lefebvre, because it meant that Rome would not change its mind for decades more. In fact, the parents decided to trust Bshp Lefebvre, but, still today, they are saying that they can't be sure about the fact that it was good or bad, because this decision can only be taken by a Bishop, so only a Bishop can judge the fact that it's good or not.

Piklikl (4): The fact that 2 Bishops participated (Lefebvre and de Castro Mayer) seems to indicate that at least they thought it was a good thing. Archbishop Lefebrve made it quite clear that it pained him to take any action that distanced the SSPX from Rome, but ultimately his loyalty lay to the timeless teachings of the Church (not just to those who happen to be alive), and his primary obligation was the salvation of souls ensured by the solid formation of good Catholic priests.If there was any bad thing about the episcopal consecrations, the fault seems to me to lie in Rome. Attempting to thwart Archbishop Lefebrve’s mission of forming priests and ensuring that mission continues long after his death is a mark against the men in Rome, not the SSPX.

Previous-Plan-3876 (3): It’s actually not that grave at all. Or at least it wasn’t. Up until 1983 you did not need the popes permission to ordain bishops like Archbishop Lefevbre did. It was changed simply to prevent communists from ordaining their own people or forcing the ordination of their own people. In all reality what Archbishop Lefevbre did was completely normal for most of church history. JPII could have quit lying to Lefevbre. Lefevbre was dying and needed bishops for the SSPX. The pope lied for years to the Archbishop saying he would give him bishops. You want to talk about grave issues let’s talk about the Assisi incident that forced the Archbishop to ensure the survival of the SSPX beyond his own life.

# Post 538: Does the SSPX still do conditional reordinations?

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 5

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1d86dzm/does\_the\_sspx\_still\_do\_conditional\_reordinations/

Do they still conditionally reordain the NO priests that join the society?

feelinggravityspull (15): AFAIK, they only do this if there is a serious reason to believe that the priest was not validly ordained to begin with. (E.g., I've heard of one instance where there was videotape of an "ordination," but the bishop's hands came nowhere near the ordinand's head.)I think you're more likely to find a certain strand of SSPX faithful who are scandalized that the Society \*does not\* do conditional reordinations.

None (6): I researched this and found that it is by no means a requirement, but if a priest seriously doubts the validity of his ordination, they will offer conditional reordination.EDIT: conditional ordination\* (there's really no "re"ordination)

colekken (10): I know this will probably get a lot of down votes but, I hope not.

asimovsdog (1): Why? Is there anything wrong with conditional ordination? If the ordination didn't happen (which does seem to happen sometimes), then the priest gets properly ordinated. If the ordination already happened, nothing happens. If the SSPX doesn't do it, there is a chance that all the sacraments that that priest dispenses, are invalid. So, seems like a win either way. Ordination is not like baptism, where the form can be quite lacking for it to be valid.It's just like having to check because some NO bishops are doing a garbage job since they lost their faith. Not sure for what reason someone would be against conditional ordination.

jocyUk (1): we shouldnt get in the habit of "just in case" conditional ordinations/confirmations/baptisms. it robs us of certainty and causes more harm than good

# Post 539: ?

Author: None

Score: 5

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1d3uhwm/\_/

Do you think god removes certain people from your life?

Araedya (5): I think he puts certain people in our life for various reasons so I don’t see why the opposite couldn’t be true as well. Ultimately it would be for some greater good even if we may not see it at the time.

Cathain78 (5): I think there is an element of Divine Providence running through my own life, so I would say yes.

# Post 540: Conspiracies or real?

Author: exotic\_beak

Score: 0

Comments: 15

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1d1nnrj/conspiracies\_or\_real/

Do you believe in the NWO and the Great Reset? Also, do you think that vaccines (from a future pandemic) are the Mark of the beast spoke of in revelation?

None (19): [deleted]

Duibhlinn (13): I remember [your last post](https://www.reddit.com/r/Catholicism/comments/1cmguyw/the\_sspx/) about the SSPX

Ugapintail (5): Can we block him?

None (5): These are trigger words/phrases/idealogies that take things to an extreme in order to suppress the actual hidden truths contained therein. The underlying sentiments are valid/ potentially (& in some cases very likely) true.

None (4): H O W D O Y O U D O F E L L O W T R A D S

Thaladan (9): No, no, and no.People only profess these dumb conspiracies to make themselves feel special.

Previous-Plan-3876 (5): The mark of the beast spoken of in revelation referred to actions the Roman Empire were taking at the time. 666 itself refers to Nero and in order to trade in Roman markets you had to receive a literal stamp saying you venerated the emperor.

RadTradTref (2): The Great Reset is a real thing but I don't believe it is an organized conspiracy. It is individually actors looking out for their best interest that often allign with each other.As far as the vaccine it is not the mark of the beast. That is for sure.

Indigo-Meadow (1): No, no and no, even though I'm not vaccinated. In my opinion, there are more crazies in Ecclesia Dei than the sspx.

arcticphoenix2020 (1): There are real conspiracies, but this definitely seems like a bait post. It leads with a straw man and false paradigm, either you believe in the wildest interpretation of every conspiracy theory, or you denounce all conspiracy theories as fringe/lunatic ideas and accept ALL status-quo narratives wholesale since only a kook would do otherwise.

craft00n (1): Nop, nop, and nop.

exotic\_beak (-8): I don’t believe in these. Just wondering if all trad catholics are into this

None (5): OP is a pot stirrer

None (-1): And they attempted something very similar with worthless masks and vaccines

None (3): Evidence > conjecture

CautiousCatholicity (4): > Just wondering if all trad catholics are into thisThe answer is no. Obviously. Any other questions?

# Post 541: Fr Ailbhe O’Reilly: Early Celtic Liturgical Practices

Author: Duibhlinn

Score: 7

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ROXVr1TktYc

Soggy-Isopod-905 (2): Wait, did father O'Reilly joined SSPX?

Odd\_Glove7043 (2): Thankful to attend an Irish SSPX chapel

LoudEffort (2): Was Fr O’Reilly ordained by a traditional Bishop?

Duibhlinn (1): No, I don't believe so. Father O'Reilly was invited to speak at the SSPX's Knock conference in 2022 which is where that talk took place.

Duibhlinn (2): Maith an fear tusa féin

Duibhlinn (1): I don't know who ordained him but I don't think so. He went to Maynooth, then to somewhere in Brazil and then to Rome. He is a member of the Canons Regular of the Order of the Holy Cross.

No-Test6158 (1): He's joined the SSPX as of this year. I had lunch with him yesterday and he said our mass this morning!

# Post 542: Servants of the Holy Family

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 7

Comments: 10

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1cww23d/servants\_of\_the\_holy\_family/

Does anyone know this group in Colorado? They just consecrated a Bishop who split from the Society a while ago I know. What are their views?

colekken (2): They are in trouble with the Church for saying some negitive things and not apologizing. I think they are in broken communion with the Holy See and the local Bishop has warned Catholics against attending their Masses.

Jattack33 (2): They are very cagey on where they get their Holy Orders from which is a bad sign. Their founder was ordained by Archbishop Lefebvre but they don’t name the Bishops they use now they just say things like “retired ordinary”. I’ve seen it suggested that they have used the following Bishops[Bishop Jesus J. Sison](https://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/bishop/bsisonjj.html)[Bishop Pascal S. Hardjasoemarta, M.S.C.](https://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/bishop/bhard.html)[Bishop Antonino Nepomuceno, O. M. I.](https://www.catholic-hierarchy.org/bishop/bnep.html)But I’ve never seen real proof of this and these men have been dead for decades.

No\_Intern\_4110 (1): Yes, Bishop Ward. He was originally ordained by Archbishop Lefevre. The Archbishop then chose him to be the first district superior for the SSPX for the United States. You can hear a young Bishop Ward talk all about his origins and why he left (with. Archbishop Lefevre’s permission, by the way) many many years ago: https://servi.org/adw-address-to-catholics-1986/

RadTradTref (1): One of my wife's friends has attended Mass there since she was born. Her and her husband are great people who have the true faith. Their new Bishop was the priest that baptized her and married her and her husband. Other then that all I know is they are independent.

No\_Intern\_4110 (1): In reality, the former bishop of the diocese just didn’t like them for accusing him of some things that it seems he was guilty of: https://youtu.be/MoVwH0Di94M?feature=shared

No\_Intern\_4110 (1): Actually they name a bishop who consecrated their priests here: https://www.instagram.com/reel/CvuzBaYLfTB/?igsh=cnFvbmNsaDhsZHd3

dbaughmen (1): I see. Any idea who Bishop Ward was consecrated by? I’ve heard them say “Archbishop”. Could be a NO Bishop because they’ve used them before, or it could be Vigano.

No\_Intern\_4110 (1): Do I have any idea? Yes.

dbaughmen (1): Vigano?

# Post 543: Questions About Catholicism

Author: Fearless\_Medicine\_23

Score: 3

Comments: 14

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1cu8exj/questions\_about\_catholicism/

Hi all,I am a Presbyterian and I am very reformed in my faith, worship and practice; however, I appreciate tradition and liturgy of "high churches" eg. Anglicans, RC and EOI have read a lot of Catholic literature, especially John Henry Newman, St Therese of Liseaux, St John of the Cross. And I have listened to a good few Catholic commentators eg. Trent Horn, Kennedy Hall, Fr Jenkins (SSPV), Tim Gordon etc. But I still struggle with a lot of Catholic doctrine and how it has developed, and a lot of YouTube commentators, both Protestant and Catholic, usually have bad faith arguments, or maybe just don't fully understand what the other believes - like the time Taylor Marshall said Martin Luther taught that sinning didn't matter, which isn't true.Anyway, I am rambling. I have a few questions which I'd appreciate any guidance on 🙂1. Mary as Co-Redemptrix - I really don't understand this. It is a beautiful idea of Mary being the Mother of Christians, but the example texts in scripture such as John caring for Mary after Jesus' death and Mary telling the servants at the wedding to do what Jesus tells them; it just seems like a leap to go from that to Co-Redemptrix.2. Baptismal Regeneration - Henry Manning left the CoE and joined the RC over this matter. Again, I understand that baptism and salvation in scripture are closely linked but the thief on the cross did not have to be baptised. I understand the argument as to why Confession is not necessary for those in certain circumstances to be saved, but as people believe the infants will go to limbo if they are not baptised then it seems like adults also would not be able to enter heaven without it.3. The Church - One of Newman's arguments that the RC Church was the true Church was that it was unchanged, unlike the Anglicans, Lutherans, Presbyterians (which I wholly agree with) but after Vatican 2, doesn't this become an argument against the RC Church?Anyway, thank you for your time for reading and, if you do, answering 🙂

MarcellusFaber (11): Martin Luther did in fact say that we must “sin boldly” to use the mercy of God more. He was a wicked man.

None (5): Hi! 1. "the example texts in scripture" I see your point, don't forget us Caholics recognize 2 complementary sources of Revelation: Holy Scriptures, and Tradition (this theological word is to be understood as in "customs", but in the etymological sense of transmission: what was transmitted to us from Christ by the Church he instituted). While most protestants adhere to \*sola scriptura\*, Scriptures only, no Tradition. Even scriptures were transmited to us through Tradition (from mouth to mouth first, then written, then unified in a single Bible putt together by the Church). Unlike Muslims who believe all truth is contained in the Quran, we believe that Tradition was transmitted partially orally, partially throught liturgy etc., AND with scriptures. ;) 2. "as people believe the infants will go to limbo if they are not baptised then it seems like adults also would not be able to enter heaven without it." Well this is what Catholics do believe! Except for baptism of desire (a catechumen who dies willing to get baptism and in certain dispositions) and blood baptism (martyrdom of a cathecumen). Also Catholic theologians believe it's not impossible for an non Catholic baptized person to go to Heaven when he's in state of pure ignorance (for example a guy living in the Amazon forest and could never have heard of the Catholic church.) 3. Depends what you define as "the Church". Whatever the Pope says doesn't change what faith is. An important concept to use here is infallibility; a Pope is infallible only in very specific conditions; those conditions weren't met during Vatican II! There are examples in history of Popes preaching material heresy (like pope Liberius, Pope John XXII,...) but never when speaking infallibly. Have a good day, I won't be able to answer this weekend because I'll be doing the Chartres pilgrimage! 🙂

Numbainne47 (3): 1. Mary as co redemptrix is getting at the fact that Mary played a role in the greater plan of our salvation through her cooperation as the new eve alongside the new Adam. Through the disobedience of Adam and eve sin came into the world, Through the obedience of the new Adam and eve sin was destroyed. It's important to know that co DOES NOT mean equal to, it means along with, so mary of course is not God and did not save us from our sins in the same way Jesus does. Jesus telling John behold thy mother and telling Mary woman behold thy son is Jesus making Mary the mother of the church and he is referring to her as woman to connect her to the woman in the prophesy from genises 3. This goes extremely in depth I recommend you check out William albrecht on anything regarding maryology. 2. Baptismal regeneration is extremely abundant in the early church, and the thief on the cross is an examples of Baptism by desire. Water baptism is the ORDINARY means of Baptism, but there are EXTRAORDINARY means like Baptism of desire or Baptism of martyrdom. 3. The church did not change in its dogmatic binding teachings, just because there is heresy in the church doesnt mean it fell, Jesus said it will never happen. look at the arian crisis, heresy spreads but it doesnt mean the gates of hell will prevail, evil attacking the church is nothing new, Jesus said it would happen and it has happened but it won't prevail.

Any\_Coach6428 (2): We Catholics believe that we participate in Christ's redeeming work as co-redeemers as Paul did as we see in scripture however Mary does it in a far superior way than any other Christian (quoting Jimmy Akin at the end there). Catholic answers has a few good articles on this. Here's one [https://www.catholic.com/magazine/print-edition/mary-mother-of-salvation](https://www.catholic.com/magazine/print-edition/mary-mother-of-salvation) Mary is also the mediatrix of all graces [https://www.catholic.com/qa/isnt-calling-mary-the-mediatrix-of-all-graces-contrary-to-the-doctrine-that-jesus-is-the-sole](https://www.catholic.com/qa/isnt-calling-mary-the-mediatrix-of-all-graces-contrary-to-the-doctrine-that-jesus-is-the-sole)Mary is co-redemptrix and mediatrx of all graces because she co-operates with God's plan by saying yes to be the mother of the Redeemer and because of the unique way in which she participates in his suffering and death on the cross.

MarcellusFaber (2): The first thing I would say is that one shouldn’t treat these questions separately as matters of opinion, but rather go to the root of things. We know that the Catholic Church is the true Church because God has revealed that to us. We know from philosophy that God can neither deceive nor be deceived, so if we receive a message from him, it must be true. We know that we as a race have received public revelation from God since he signed his messages with his signature, which consists of miracles and prophecies. This is what Faith is based on; Faith is the virtue by which we believe those things which God has revealed (so Faith is not some sort of blind trust as moderns say; it is based on evidence). This is the reason that Our Lord worked miracles, to prove that he came from God and that his teaching was true. The pagans and Jews of the early centuries even accepted this since they did not try to dispute that miracles were worked, but rather accused Our Lord of being a magician (there is evidence for this in the Talmud and Origen’s work ‘Contra Celsum’ in which he quotes Celsus). This cannot be true though since Our Lord both rose from the dead and raised others from the dead, which is something not possible by witchcraft. This relates to Catholicism not only because their is a continuity of doctrine and governance with the Church of the early centuries (for it is the same Church), but also because miracles have been worked as motives of credibility of the Catholic religion up until the present. Ss Francis Xavier and Anthony raised people from the dead, for example, and very many miracles have been recorded at Lourdes and examined in terms of natural science. St Pius X had miracles associated with him also, and all that is not to mention all the Eucharistic miracles and the miracle of the sun at Fatima. If you accept that argument, then you must submit to what the Catholic Church teaches, for God, who is omniscient and omnipotent, preserves Her from error.As to your specific questions:1. Christ is the source of all graces, and since Christ was brought into the world by Mary, there is a sense in which She is the Mediatrix of all graces. It seems also that the idea is quite old with the Fathers of the Church calling Our Lady a ‘go-between’. The Catholic teaching on this is discussed in Ludwig Ott’s Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma: https://archive.org/details/fundamentalsofca0000ottl/page/209/mode/1up?view=theater (You will need to make an account, but it doesn’t cost anything).2. It is Catholic dogma (it is divinely revealed) that baptism, or the desire of it when baptism is impossible, is mediately necessary for salvation (meaning you’re stuffed if you do not have one of those). See the Council of Trent’s teaching on baptism. However, one cannot desire something that one does not know, so I cannot see that applying to people who have not come into contact with Catholicism or have no intention of being baptised. The doctrine itself is clear, but exactly how the doctrine applies is disputed. St Thomas teaches that God will send either an angel or a missionary to a person who truly seeks the truth to instruct him in the truths of the Faith, and there were cases of this happening in the New World, and that is also what I hold. Some theologians after the discovery of the New World began speculating that someone could implicitly desire baptism, but I can only see this as rubbish for the reason already stated.3. Following the Second Vatican Council, the Catholic Church, prima facie, no longer appeared to fulfil Her own doctrine about Herself (unity of Faith, infallibility of Oecumenical Councils, dogma can never change, harmful laws or rites impossible for Her to promulgate due to Her disciplinary infallibility, infallible canonisations, etc.). However, it is hardly plausible, considering the Church’s bold claims about Herself, that the Church could fulfil Her claims about Herself for ~1,960 years and then cease to do so; that is preposterous from the point of view of human probability. These apparent contradictions also do not strike a death blow to the previous proofs mentioned using miracles and prophecies as motives of credibility. For some people, it is enough to end there, however, after much thinking and research, I have concluded that a vacancy of the Holy See is the solution to these difficulties; the apparent contradictions with the doctrines I listed above melt away if one concludes that these changes were not made by Catholic Popes, but rather by men who managed to give the impression to the world of belonging to and being leaders of the Catholic Church when they had in fact abandoned Her and could not therefore represent Her or act on Her behalf. There is superfluous evidence for the Popes from Paul VI onwards (from about 1964 at least) being heretics, and since heretics are not members of the Church, and one cannot be the head of a society without being a member of it, then they cannot be or have been visible heads of the Catholic Church. That is the short explanation, and there are difficulties that arise, but these can be explained if need be.

asimovsdog (1): 1. Mary as Co-Redemptrix is not a dogma. It is a dogma that she is the Mother of God, as in, both the human and divine nature of God. So, she did have a free will to not birth Jesus, but God also knew that she was going to agree to give birth to Jesus, because God knows all possible futures. Which is why she can be seen as a co-redemptrix because without her will ("I am the Lord's servant" aka "I will serve"), Jesus would not have happened. She did however, not redeem the world on Cavalry as Jesus did. The word "co-redemptrix" did not appear in the magisterium until the pontificate of Pius XII, and it's not a dogma to not believe in it. 2. Infants in limbo is a theological debate. There are theories and visions that they are in hell but do not suffer any pain, they just cannot see God. Other theories say that God will give them perfect knowledge and then let their free will decide. It's up to God, really, trusting that he is all-just. Jesus is not bound by the sacraments himself and the thief on the cross had the baptism of desire (he couldn't physically get down from the cross to get baptized). We also celebrate the feast of the Holy Innocents, the first babies who were "baptized by blood", since they died for Jesus when Herodes killed them. Everyone SHOULD get baptized as soon as possible. But if it isn't physically possible, the desire would suffice. God not only knows what will happen, but he also knows what would happen if the circumstances were different. He knew that if the thief wasn't nailed to the cross, he would obey Jesus and get baptized.

Fearless\_Medicine\_23 (3): Thank you for your reply. I have heard that, although I was told that he meant it as "be honest about your sin and do not hide it or deny it".I don't know which he meant, but I believe Taylor Marshall was saying that Protestants believe that sinning doesn't matter - which isn't true. Grace alone does not mean we have liberty to sin.If he did mean it the way you say, then I would definitely say he was wrong and that abusing the grave of God is a grevious sin.

Fearless\_Medicine\_23 (1): Thank you so much for your reply and for such a detailed answer.1. Yes, most Protestants subscribe to Sola Scriptura. Another user who has commented provided a link to a book, so I will read that and see I get on. I will keep in mind Catholic belief in revelation, tradition and scriptures. I suppose it does then raise the question: where do we get the doctrine to follow tradition and revelation?From what I understand, Anglicans believe in scripture and they interpret scripture through the lens of the Church Fathers. As Reformed protestants, we believe that it is a gathering of information and theology through the years and from there we understand what scripture says - I suppose this means that we didn't really know what scripture was saying for 1600 years though 😂2. Haha! Well, yes I suppose it is what Catholics believe but it doesn't sit well with me but that is my own issue, nothing much can be done about that. Thank you for explaining regarding the baptism of desire and martyrdom. I have heard Fr Jenkins of the SSPV speak about this, but I suppose I didn't quite get what was really meant about it.3. That is interesting. Is the Newman saying that the Church is unchanged because, even when outwardly it changes eg. Ad orientum, Latin, what the definition of sin is etc, as long as people keep the faith and tradition it will remain?Thank you again! I hope you have a lovely time!

MarcellusFaber (2): The miracles are worked by Catholics or occur in a Catholic context because God stamps Catholicism, and often certain doctrines of Catholicism, with his approval using them. If he did the same for Protestants, then he would appear to give approval to a false religion. So the fact that Catholics have miracles and Protestants don’t is proof that Catholicism is true and Protestantism is false. The miracles are still public knowledge and can be investigated by Protestants; that is the point of them, to serve as motives of credibility for everyone. I would also say that miracles do sometimes happen to non-Catholics (the examples I can currently think of are of Jews), but their nature was such that these people felt compelled to convert to Catholicism by them.2. The reason is in the very foundation of Christianity. We are all fallen because we have inherited original sin from our first parents. Original sin brought all sorts of evils into the world, but it also prevents us from spending eternity with God. I haven’t done the reading to understand the complexities of this, but I think we both know that this is undisputed by the Fathers of the Church etc. The easiest way to look at it is that the son of an alcoholic suffers from his father spending all his wages on drink rather than on food, clothing, and shelter for his son. The son does not deserve the consequences, but they are the natural result of the wickedness of his father.3. No, it does not. To be a Catholic, one must be baptised, publicly profess the Catholic Faith, be subject to the legitimate pastors, especially the Pope, and not have been excluded by legitimate authority. Those Anglo-Catholics do not publicly profess the Catholic Faith, nor would they submit to the Pope if they were convinced he were in fact the Pope as Sedevacantists would (even if we are wrong, we lack pertinacity from the fact that we would submit were we convinced that the current claimant actually held the office).You’re very welcome for the answer!

Fearless\_Medicine\_23 (1): Thank you for your detailed reply, much appreciated!This is very interesting as we believe as Protestants that miracles were assigned only to the Apostolic era and ceased with the death of John.I understand your argument for the miracles and why they must be of God, and not any form of witchcraft etc, and I wouldn't be so presumptuous to say that they were; however, I struggle with the miracles too as they seem to appear to Roman Catholics and never to Protestants. Would that not defeat the point in proving to folk that the RC Church is the true Church if apparitions and miracles only appear to believing Catholics?1. Thank you for the link! I will give it a read - I must admit, even though I'm not a Catholic I do enjoy a good Catholic book haha.2. That makes sense. But why then would infants be excluded from salvation as they can't know. Sorry, I understand that this may be more of an emotive point, but I struggle with God sending babies to limbo and burying children outside of a cemetery, but adults are sinners but want to be Catholic and be baptised, but can't, are saved?3. Yes, I see your point. If sedevacantist then it removes the barriers. But does that mean, for example, some Anglo-catholics could also be considered Catholics? For example, The Society of St Charles the Martyr?Thank you again 🙂

feelinggravityspull (1): Anti-Protestant polemics can be just as bad as anti-Catholic polemics. "Sin boldly" is often taken out of context, and it doesn't mean we should keep sinning so that God's grace may abound still more. Your understanding is more accurate.Still, even in context, the quote is doctrinally objectionable, as Luther used it in support of his \*sola fide\* position. Here's the quote in context (in a letter to Melanchthon):>If you are a preacher of mercy, do not preach an imaginary but the true mercy. If the mercy is true, you must therefore bear the true, not an imaginary sin. God does not save those who are only imaginary sinners. Be a sinner, and let your sins be strong (or “Sin boldly”),but let your trust in Christ be stronger, and rejoice in Christ who is the victor over sin, death, and the world. We will commit sins while we are here, for this life is not a place where justice resides. We, however, says Peter (2 Peter 3:13) are looking forward to a new heaven and a new earth where justice will reign. \*\*It suffices that through God’s glory we have recognized the Lamb who takes away the sin of the world. No sin can separate us from Him, even if we were to kill or commit adultery thousands of times each day.\*\* Do you think such an exalted Lamb paid merely a small price with a meager sacrifice for our sins? Pray hard for you are quite a sinner.The bolded portion of the above quote is where I see the doctrinal problem. Mortal sin does, in fact, separate us from God's sanctifying grace, because it is a knowing, deliberate rejection of that grace.

Seriouscat\_ (2): Tradition starts with metaphysics. It's not a revelation of an arbitrary decree of God or man, but an understanding of and a description of the very nature of being, truth, love and all creation. It's like someone asked: Where did we get the doctrine to follow gravity so that things could start falling?The difference between Catholicism and Protestantism is that Catholicism sees God as the foundation and source of everything, including the nature of everything, that exists. Protestantism sees God mainly as a lawgiver. Catholicism holds that the intellect of man, like that of angels, is created to behold spiritual things, up to and including God Himself, though not exhaustively. But according to Protestantism, man is only able to grasp God the same way one grasps the laws of his nation and his personal freedoms.Tradition is self-authenticating by nature. When a Protestant reads for example about the Beatitudes, he can only grasp what is said as a phenomenon or an appearance, whereas a Catholic advanced enough is able to grasp the nature or the essence of what's being said. These are the real issues to be grappled with. Things such as papal infallibility or the Immaculate Conception will only begin to make sense in light of the correct foundation.

None (1): Hi! I'm back from the pilgrimage! Your point 1 and 2 have already been answered, but regarding the point 3, I don't know what exactly is meant by "the Church hasn't changed", but for sure its traditional teaching hasn't changed indeed, as in the Pope hasn't infallibly published something contradictory to Tradition.Have a good week!

Seriouscat\_ (2): Heaven is not, by definition, a physical place. Neither is it a kind of political asylum granted by God. Heaven is defined by one's knowledge of and love for God. Knowledge means Catholic tradition, of which the Bible is a subset or a cross section. Loving God means obeying that knowledge, which at the same time literally means partaking of the Holy Ghost.In a sense, people who love God above all will be at home in the universe, and secondarily possess a body and exist in a physical place. This is salvation or Heaven. Presence of God, not to the eyes or the senses but to the intellect. People who either dislike or hate or simply preferred to ignore God will be stuck with their choice, face to face with the knowledge that God is most important and most lovable and most true of all there is. And they will hate themselves and everything for this, which is the essence of Hell, which only secondarily means physical existence in a dark, fiery place with others that have chosen the same fate.An unbaptized child can not enter Heaven. Not because someone decrees or ordains it so, but because of the very definition of what Heaven is. But neither will there be Hell for the child, because Hell is the punishing knowledge of having rejected God either directly or through something that represents God. So logically there will be neither glory nor suffering for such children.If you really want to gain deep insight into the nature of these things, study Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange's writings. Then Summa Theologica. Then The Catholic Encyclopedia. Get the definitions straight, get the metaphysical foundation. Ignore "issues" and "commentators".Born and raised Lutheran and having spent a few decades trying to understand Lutheran doctrine and theology I've concluded that there is no such thing. It's all rhetorical diarrhea with the appearance of profundity here and there.

# Post 544: Do you only go to SSPX Churches for Confession?

Author: MaterMisericordiae23
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1cs9acq/do\_you\_only\_go\_to\_sspx\_churches\_for\_confession/

So I go to an SSPX Church and I go to Confession and confess my sins to an SSPX priest. Unfortunately, the Church is a bit far and Confessions are generally before or after Masses, which take place at 7 am. If you commit a mortal sin and you want to go to Confession, do you go to a Church near you or do you wait until the SSPX priest is available?

Breifne21 (11): I will go to any orthodox priest, SSPX or not.

TooEdgy35201 (9): German based - Only SSPX because there is nothing else worthwhile around me.I am not paying money to fund the destruction of the faith. In Germany you must pay church tax to be a member of the Novus Ordo. The ones who control the bureaucracy are anticlerical radlibs.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (7): out of all the NO sacraments, Confession is the least doubtful, if you find a good priest somewhere else. Though I have personal and anecdotal experience of NO priests that know no better have a tendency to say and do their own thing.Alas, the last two times I went to confession at a Diocesan TLM, my confessions were scandalous. One was heard by an 80 year old priest I wanted to assume would be more trad. basically acted like my sins weren't sins and I was wasting their time. I would never go back unless I was traveling for months at a time or in danger.

dbaughmen (7): Any independent traditionalist, SSPX, or even in serious cases the FSSP, ICKSP, etc is fine. As long as its traditional absolution. The NO confession is a no-no though.

Traditional-Lock-863 (3): My SSPX chapel only has Mass on a Sunday and Holy Days of Obligation, it is over an hours car journey away.If I commit a mortal sin during the week, then I will go to a church in the diocese for confession from a N.O priest. There is a monastery not far from me that houses a community of priests of the Syro Malabar rite that will hear confessions at call. I've not had an issue with them.You can always re confess past sins that have been previously absolved when you next go to confession with the SSPX priest.

None (2): I think it's better to go to SSPX, but if I had no choice I'd go to any actually traditional priest, so diocesean TLM priest should work

None (2): In a pickle I do go to a local NO run by Norbertines who are pretty reverent and orthodox. Some priests refuse to celebrate the NO, they have 24/7 adoration, tlm, etc.Edit: some priests have been spectacular confessors while some have not. Although the latter is rarer, it shows the wildcard of going to a conciliar church, even if it's reverent.

Cathain78 (2): I’ve been to a local NO confession on a couple occasions in the past year. It’s not ideal - for starters there doesn’t appear to be any regular times for confession, even when advertised as such. So you have to catch the priest after Mass and ask him to hear your confession. And as others have mentioned, there is almost an incredulous and condescending manner to them as if it’s bizarre anyone thinks it’s worth actually confessing sins. On both occasions I was given the impression that I had wasted their time (mortal sins I may add), but I recieved absolution and done my penance. I didn’t dwell much on whether it was valid or not. I had an earnest desire to confess, went to a priest and asked for such, and to the best of my knowledge recieved absolution. If you are concerned or scrupulous then certainly speak to your SSPX priest about it.

Aggressive-Charge-54 (2): Reconciliation is one of the only sacraments that can validly be provided through the Church, not a validly ordained SSPX priest. Pope Francis has extended the authority of absolution to SSPX priests out of concern that many SSPX faithful were confessing their sins to a SSPX priest without really having any faculty to provide the Church’s forgiveness.I would go to any priest within the Church for absolution rather than remain in the state of sin. However, SSPX priests frequently tend to be better confessors than most (in my experience).

No-Try7513 (2): I only go to sspx for ......EVERYTHING

jocyUk (1): if you die in a state of mortal sin, what happens? get to confession asap no matter the priest

MaterMisericordiae23 (3): The thing is, I only have diocesan TLM Masses (besides the NO) near me and I do not know the priests there too well. Unfortunately, there's no nearby FSSP, ICKSP, or traditional priests that I know of. If I commit a mortal sin and I need to go to Confession, should I wait until the next time my SSPX priest is available?

PleasantStorm4241 (3): Agree as well. If I need Confession, I will go to Confession to a NO priest. My preference is for an SSPX or other traditional priest, but when I need to go, I don't wait.

feelinggravityspull (3): > Confession is the least doubtfulCompletely agree. There's a NO parish near me that has several hours of confession times almost every day, so I go there pretty often. I prefer going to my regular confessor(s) at my SSPX church, because their counsel is often extremely helpful. But I'll definitely go to a diocesan priest (NO or TLM) for confession when needed.There have been a couple times at NO confession where I've had to ask the priest for a different penance, because the one he assigned was so vague. But that's rare, and I have no problem asking for a more concrete penance. Never had a priest bungle the words of absolution.

None (6): why is NO confession a no no?

jaqian (4): The only reason the SSPX can even offer a licit confession is because Pope Francis granted them faculties. The SSPX are supposed to accept all Catholic sacraments as valid. All NO parishes have valid sacraments.

MaterMisericordiae23 (1): So I only have diocesan TLM Masses (besides the NO) near me and I do not know the priests there too well. Sadly, there's no nearby FSSP, ICKSP, or traditional priests that I know of. If I commit a mortal sin and I need to go to Confession, should I wait until the next time my SSPX priest is available then?

PleasantStorm4241 (2): Love the Norbertines! They are my favorite non-SSPX confessors. I've received good counsel from them so far.

Breifne21 (7): I would go to Confession, regardless. Priests who say the TLM are generally orthodox, just be slightly aware that what you may receive counsel which may not be as strong or solid as we might like.

dbaughmen (6): The NO priest have a tendency to change words. And invalidating it, and its in the vernacular. Also, One time I went to a NO confession and they said “Your penance is to love Jesus more.” Which is not a penance I can do in a few minutes. Its a lifelong thing

dbaughmen (2): If you truly truly cant carry the burden of the sin, just go to the NO, but make sure they say the words of absolution right. “I absolve you of your sins in the name of, etc.”

None (2): is the SSPX confession done in Latin??

dbaughmen (3): The absolution is, the Priest usually says it while you’re saying the Act of Contrition. Its way longer than what the NO uses though

# Post 545: Cross necklace...
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>Communicants of the[Oriental Orthodox](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oriental\_Orthodox\_Churches)and[Eastern Orthodox Churches](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eastern\_Orthodox\_Church)are expected to wear their baptismal cross necklaces at all times,[^(\[7\])](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cross\_necklace#cite\_note-Samaan2010-7)[^(\[8\])](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cross\_necklace#cite\_note-Konstantopoulos2017-8)a practice derived from Canon 73 and Canon 82 of the[Sixth Ecumenical Council (Synod) of Constantinople](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Third\_Council\_of\_Constantinople).[^(\[9\])](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cross\_necklace#cite\_note-Konstantopoulos-9) I found this on Wikipedia, and was wondering if its true, as I cannot find the aforementioned Cannons anywhere else.Also in general, what is everyone's thoughts on wearing cross necklaces? Is there any western tradition which involves the laity wearing them? Thanks in advance :)

# Post 546: Rocky Mountain Chapels

Author: Middle\_Vermicelli478
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1cr6h2k/rocky\_mountain\_chapels/

I'm looking to move to Montana or Idaho. Is anyone from that area and has attended the chapels/missions in those states? How are their communities?

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (3): well I hear there is quite a large SSPX priory in North Idaho..... and they serve a mission chapel in Kalispel. the kalispel chapel has maybe 80 parishioners but as far as I know only get mass on Sundays.

# Post 547: NO Mass question

Author: Cathain78
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1cpdipi/no\_mass\_question/

One thing that I haven’t been able to fully get my head around is the fact that while the Society acknowledges the validity of NOM, the general consensus is that it’s displeasing to God. I’m struggling a little bit because I would assume that if it is ultimately the eternal sacrifice made by Christ on the cross then it must be infinitely pleasing to God. Are we saying that the core of it is in fact pleasing and it’s just the rest of the rubrics around it which displeases him?

None (5): I wondered a long time about validity vs legimacy of the rite; an example helped me understaning it better. If a priest was to celebrate a black/satanic Mass where he would perform the valid rite (the consecration formula on bread), the Mass would be valid, but it's obviously be bad, and wouldn't please God. Even if it is the eternal sacrifice made by Christ on the cross.Valid simply means that the sacrament has been actually performed, not that it was licit or good. So for the NO we say it's valid (since the matter, form and minister are here) but that it leads to heresy, making it bad and dangerous for us, and displeasing to God. I actually wondered at how balanced this position is when I fully understood it!

TooEdgy35201 (7): 1. Look at how the mass was created. Bugnini (Freemason) along with several protestants were the main authors of it. You may find comments published by these Protestants who will claim that the NO is a success in ecumenism and that Protestants won't find anything objectionable in it. 2. In certain regions like Germany, the rite is associated with rampant liturgical abuse and heterodoxy. If you are from there the mass is automatically an absolute no-go since it is directly under the heretical diocesan Bishops who follow the "Synodal Way". Giving money to them is a sin against the faith.

None (3): The Catechism of the Crisis sold by Angelus Press is an awesome, clear, straightforward, and relatively short book pertaining to these questions. I highly recommend any Catholic to read it. Its layout is Question - Response and it's an overall easy read.

None (2): Please read this article. Bishop Fellay explains all of this in an interview. https://sspx.org/en/news/interview-bishop-bernard-fellay-sspx-mass-traditionis-custodes-part-2-27435

None (1): The Catechism of the Crisis sold by Angelus Press is an awesome, clear, straightforward, and relatively short book pertaining to these questions. I highly recommend any Catholic to read it. Its layout is Question - Response and it's an overall easy read.

Any\_Coach6428 (1): The setting of the NO is displeasing to God even if the actual sacrifice is pleasing to Him. I wonder how God felt about all the people who were involved in the torture and death of Jesus even though He was pleased with the sacrifice. And of course though the sacrifice itself was pleasing to God, it still was painful to Him was it not? We get graces through the mass and as Bishop Williamson has stated, the graces in the NO are strangled. Therefore, even if God is pleased by the sacrifice in the NO, the graces He gives are less.

Cathain78 (1): Thanks for the example. In all honesty I’m not sure it helps me because now it leads me to wonder if a Black Mass itself does haven’t intrinsic worth. I mean clearly we know the intent behind it is abhorrent and sinful. But that core part where transubstantiation takes place, if done validly, must still be pleasing to God surely due to the inherent nature of what it is? Regardless of the context in which it is done, Christ’s sacrifice on Calvary cannot be anything other than pleasing to God. Yes everything else surrounding it - the blasphemy, the wicked intent, etc are going to be especially sinful. But the sacrifice should still be meriltuous because how could there be any possibility that it would ever be displeasing to God? The actual temporal event was actually similar to a Satanic Mass - Christ mocked, blasphemed, humiliated, tortured and put to death. Is this a way in which even in the midst of the most reprehensible intent, God still gloriously produces good from an evil situation?I guess what I am trying to say is that regardless of the circumstances surrounding any valid Mass, is the core part is in itself always pleasing to God because it is the sacrifice of Christ irrespective of any nonsense or sinful business we surround it with?

Cathain78 (2): Yes, I’m aware of the history and issues with the New Mass.

Cathain78 (1): Thank you. So, from the bishop’s responses, I guess he is confirming that the New Mass is an insult to God in the way it’s been stripped out and Protestantised. It’s an offence that a less pleasing Mass has been used instead of a more pleasing one. It’s still a valid Mass however. And the sacrifice itself is still pleasing as it must be. But everything else about it is negative.In other words, he seems to back up what I thought - the actions of Christ and his one eternal sacrifice taking place within the Mass are infinitely pleasing to God. The liturgy of the New Mass surrounding it, which is very much “work of human hands”, not so much.

Cathain78 (1): Thank you, I will look out for it.

None (3): I understand the distinction you're trying to make, but I think you can't separate the 2; if I offer a great present to someone, but I cover it with wrap paper with horrible insults written all over it at the intention of making you feel horrible, it's gonna be insulting no matter how good the present it. Sure the present is great, but it's not a question of balance between the good done by the present vs the bad done by the insults, since the insults is a proof that the present is nothing but a mockery, which means the present becomes a source of displeasence toward the person who offered it, even if it's itself a source of pleasing for the new owner.

None (1): Sounds right to me.

Cathain78 (3): I appreciate the time and effort in trying to give me a new perspective. Not sure I’m convinced but I’ll certainly mull this over, thank you 👍

None (2): Make sure to come back here if objections come to mind! I think this topic is central in the Church crisis. Believing the NO Mass is valid is important because otherwise we spiral down to sedevacantism, and the Church has basically failed Believing it is also a danger to the faith is important, because the NO is partially responsible for the decline of Catholicism, and having a "weak" position on the matter means we're not attacking the crisis to the root, which is necessary if we want a revival of Catholicism ;)

# Post 548: Experience working in the schools?
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1cnifzq/experience\_working\_in\_the\_schools/

I just moved to a new state and was offered a job teaching 6th grade for next year in a fairly large academy nearby. It all sounded fine, but they did mention the teaching seminar I have to go through in Kansas. Has anyone here done this before? What should I expect? Do they fly you out? Where do you stay? Thanks.

None (4): I have some experience teaching at the SSPX academy in Kansas City. First off, the kids there make the job worth every single penny and then some more. I have never seen a group of better mannered children all the way through the high schoolers. The teaching seminar is ideally required, but they would never ask for the impossible. I was not able to attend myself due to working another full time job. Is there not a virtual option? If not, I would recommend going for your sake, even if it is inconvenient. If you are unable to go due to travel, expenses, or both, then definitely reach out to the school and see what you can work out. I have been through one of their seminars a couple of years ago but not the big one in St Mary’s. Not sure where it’s at this year.

4dvocata (2): Is there any halfway decent pay?

# Post 549: I found my faith again

Author: None

Score: 16

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1cmxidr/i\_found\_my\_faith\_again/

Through talking to SSPX priests and friends I managed find my faith again before engaging in this endeavor 2 months ago I was strongly considering converting to EO but I just could not do it

None (4): [deleted]

philomenatheprincess (2): Thank God 🙏🏻

philomenatheprincess (2): I’m happy you’re staying. What were the theological differences you were struggling with if you don’t mind me asking?

None (3): [deleted]

philomenatheprincess (1): Aah I understand! Happy to have you back in the fold. I’m sure it’s still hard and you’re struggling but that you decided to stay also shows how strong your faith is in those dogmas. 🙏🏻

# Post 550: Valid Confirmation

Author: RadTradTref
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Comments: 9

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1cms1fi/valid\_confirmation/

I was confirmed in the NO but not by a Bishop. Our Priest did the Confirmation because our Bishop died 2 days before my Confirmation. Was that valid. And if it is why doesn't the SSPX allow Priest to do Confirmation so they don't have to wait every 2 years to do Confirmation.

feelinggravityspull (4): The ordinary minister of confirmation is the bishop. An ordinary (e.g. a diocesan bishop) can delegate authority for confirmations to a priest in his diocese. As long as the priest has permission to do this, it is canonically regular and sacramentally valid. If a priest attempted to confer confirmation without permission from his ordinary, it would be invalid.SSPX bishops don't have jurisdiction, and therefore they can't authorize their priests to administer confirmation. Instead, their bishops travel the globe to confer the sacraments. Canonically irregular, but unquestionably valid.

dbaughmen (4): It is “valid” if done right. If it is truly a time of necessity, a Priest is allowed to confirm in emergencies. I’d still recommend conditional confirmation in the Latin Mass. God bless!

None (4): It’s likely valid. I was confirmed in a NO church and it wasn’t done by a bishop. The Bishop has the authority to delegate if needed. We ended up discovering a doubt regarding my baptism (done in a Protestant church) so I chose to have a conditional baptism, which meant I had to receive a conditional confirmation as well. I don’t think the SSPX has a rule about priests not doing confirmation. I think they just try to stick to having the Bishop doing it because that’s how it’s supposed to be done. If your dispositions are correct then waiting the extra time shouldn’t be a problem. It’s not ideal but the SSPX is making an effort to confirm more frequently due to the massive amount of people being confirmed. (I think there were around 120 confirmed at my church last year. )

colekken (2): I imagine because that was a rare situation.

craft00n (2): NO in general is valid. If your bishop is a known heretic who doesn't believe in confirmation, then it may be invalid.

dbaughmen (2): And, the SSPX says confirmations every year in the US around March-May-ish.

SuperGrapeSoda (1): 👆 This

RadTradTref (1): Oh really? I have attend the FSSP for the last 6 years and only recently moved to an area near the SSPX. I was told they do confirmation every other year.

None (3): Depends on the parish. They are trying to do it every year but it’s hard with so little bishops. They just started doing every year this year at my Parish but we’ll see how long it lasts.

# Post 551: Boyfriend Wants to Attend Diocesan Mass

Author: Significant\_Bag\_7211
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1cl52et/boyfriend\_wants\_to\_attend\_diocesan\_mass/

Hello Everyone,I am new to this sub. I currently am in a relationship with a man who used to attend the NO and about 1 year ago started attending diocesan TLM. His whole family, including a Priest who is a cousin, are NO Catholics. (Priest is a diocesan Priest who prefers to say the TLM, but still occasionally says NO.) When I met my boyfriend, he told me he was only attending a TLM, not NO. I currently attend an independent TLM, and also like and have attended SSPX in the past. Over the past two weeks he was invited by an acquaintance who goes to his Church to attend a NO confirmation Mass on a Sunday. He ended up going to the wrong Church and ended up missing over half of the NO confirmation Mass by the time he arrived at the right Church. I found out later the same acquaintance gave him a NO missal. Last Sunday he went to a NO Mass because it was more convenient for him to see an old friend over an hour's drive away. I was not happy about this at all, and nor was my Priest and family.Once a week my Priest will call him and give him lessons after weekly readings of the My Catholic Faith book. My boyfriend appreciated the lessons at first, and after I told my Priest about the recent attendance of NO, my Priest has been discussing with him the heresies of the NO. My boyfriend thinks he is Traditional Catholic and defends his decision to go to NO the past two weeks. My priest told him that if he does not start attending the TLM and admit the heresies of the NO and submit to being a Traditional Catholic, then I will not marry him, as it is not what I want. I have had several discussions with my boyfriend about why I agreed with my Priest. He then consulted his Priest cousin, as well as a cousin who attends a diocesan TLM exclusively. Boyfriend has told me he only wants to go to diocesan TLM in the future. He told me that he wants the "Church" (conciliar) and thinks that by not attending diocesan TLM, he is stepping away from the Church. He thinks NO is still reverent and valid. I asked him about attending SSPX, and he said he does not know anything about them. I told him that diocesan TLMs will eventually be wiped out, and if he loves the TLM so much, he will need to consider another option. I told him I would consider what he has told me before making a final decision.My questions are as follows: Is it worth continuing the relationship? Or are we too incompatible? Should I not attend a diocesan TLM due to heresy, no Sacraments said in Latin Rite, etc.?

craft00n (5): NO is valid. SSPX is clear about that. Just listen to the old Bshp Lefebvre recordings. Anyway, one shouldn't attend to NO, valid or not.You have to speak with him about these issues, about NO being good or not, about the crisis, about Vatican II texts, about what you want for your children.It's not your priest that will choose who you will marry, only you can, because only you know how you want to raise your children.Personally, I would not marry a girl who frequently goes to NO. I could agree with her on passively attending for weddings or baptisms amongst our few NO friends. Diocesan TLM is a bad idea, because homilies may contain grave errors, and this problem extends, in a smaller scale, to all non-SSPX TLM, imho. My positions on the crisis implies that the SSPX is legit, so I would need her to agree with me on that (on 1988, and on the extraordinary jurisdiction). For the rest, whether she likes ICKSP, FSSP, or any other TLM organization, I don't care.My fiance is currently agreeing with me about these important issues, and she doesn't like non-SSPX TLM communities (for me, I like ICKSP because I have a cousin and multiple friends there).

feelinggravityspull (3): It sounds like these are deep and sincere disagreements. Regardless of who is right, your differences may be too deep on these issues.Here's a question that may be clarifying: Do you respect your boyfriend enough to follow his lead, willingly and lovingly, even when you don't agree with his decisions?If the answer is no, then you definitely shouldn't marry him.

alicceeee1922 (5): Unless your boyfriend has read dozens of books covering medieval and tridentine theology, ecclesiological history, council acts, canon law, the church fathers, various liturgical rites, the entirety of Summa Theologiae, moral theology and other areas I suggest that you give him a chance at learning new things. If he is at the Novus Ordo he can hardly be described as a learned man who makes a conscious and deliberate choice.

dbaughmen (2): Leaning towards independent traditionalism and the SSPX is by far superior to the Bergoglian diocesan mass. If you really love this guy I suggest a midway point instead of convincing him directly, as this may stress him out and cause him to go to the heretical NO. Try to keep him away from NO events such as this confirmation. The midway point in this situation seems the SSPX. Teach him about it, and the good things it teaches. God bless you both

Blackbeeyellowbee (2): The man you marry is the man you choose to be your and your children’s leader. Courtship is the period during which you discern whether he is fit for that role and if you guys agree on fundamental things, such as, in this case, the Mass and your stances on the current crisis in the Church. Judging by how you described the situation, it seems most prudent that you guys break off the relationship. Also (an advice I read in a book for catholic young ladies), don’t convince yourself that you will convert him (to the correct position in regards to the Mass and crisis in the Church). If he will ever change his mind, you can’t know when that will happen and how solid that conviction will be and waiting until the would probably dangerously prolong the period of courtship.God bless you sister for your courage and determination in this situation!

dashdum (2): Personally I won’t attend a diocesan NO or diocesan TLM Mass. Knowing my stance: He doesn’t sound committed to his diocesan TLM as he will bag out for a gathering of friends? Doesn’t look good for your future. If he told you that the NO is still “reverent and valid” then he will likely still go when it is more convenient for him. If he thinks that going to a non-diocesan Mass is wrong and he’s outside the “church” in doing so then it sounds like he and you have a fundamental difference. Sounds like you both have declared what you want and they are fundamentally different. I would move on.

TooEdgy35201 (3): What sort of doctrinal views does he hold ? The average religious education at the Novus Ordo parish has been in severe decline over the past decade, and one may expect numerous gaps of knowledge from their attendees. In a country like Germany it has reached the point where a radically new religion is being embraced. The heresies are in fact so numerous that one would have to restart from the basics. Has he ever studied past Councils like Trent, Florence, the Laterans...? Someone who willingly embraces traditionalist theology (and with that TLM) usually has a background of personal study.

None (2): I would say that if he doesn't change you're incompatible; I think couples need to go to the same Mass on sunday and to agree on where the send their kids to school and cathechism. I think you shouldn't attend a diocesan (or even Ecclesia Dei) TLM on a regular basis, because they usually don't have a Traditional Catholic position on the NO, on VII and on the importance of the TLM. So if you think he's still looking for the truth and could be convinced you could stay with him and make him talk to an SSPX priest!

eowynstan (2): attending a diocesan tlm is not a realistic compromise. Fr Pallegrini just mentioned that a priest should be able to say mass in peace, without fear of his reverence or homilies disrupting the norm and having it taken away. i would leave your independent chapel, and attend the society exclusively as well. those NO catholic relatives will just never understand and will always pressure him, and you need to be a united front on this, especially for future children. perhaps asking him to listen to the sspx’s crisis in the church series or Fr Sherry’s “Why the Society is Right” would help him understand, if not, i’d leave him. hoping the best for you!

Breifne21 (2): Attend the SSPX and be done with it. Be aware though, I will never advocate attending Mass with an "independent" priest. If he refuses to attend with you, you have your answer.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): The SSPX stance on the Novus Ordo is that it has had much doctrine removed. Not that it's outright heretical or contains heresy. Your independent chapel may eventually have to join the SSPX once they find themselves unable to find replacement clergy.I remember a place south of Indianapolis that had this happen. Oddly enough, the modesty for clothing was less strict with the independent chapel, as far as how laypeople should dress when they're just out in the world and not attending any liturgical activities. But they had a more hostile stance to the Novus Ordo than the SSPX.The SSPX was more strict about clothing styles recommended to laypeople in their everyday lives, but acknowledges the validity of the Novus Ordo. The SSPX is opposed to diocesan/Vatican approved TLM locations because they don't acknowledge that Latin/Roman rite priests can do the TLM as a right of their priesthood in their rite.So, attending the SSPX with this fiancé of yours means each of you will have to come to certain understandings of doctrine and the crisis in the Church. While the new rite is more prone to heresy, it is not itself actually heretical.Maybe it won't be such a big jump for you, but don't think some of the positions held at your independent chapel will hold up against SSPX understanding of doctrine and the crisis. The SSPX is the biggest TLM group for good reason. They've held their ground and avoided going over the edge like some independent groups have.That being said, I hope it goes well for you. The SSPX stands as a bastion of traditional understanding of Catholic teaching. Just as St. Athanasius did in his own time, the whole hierarchy having been infected by the heresy of Arianism.

VanSensei (-1): The diocesan clergy are solid, too. I attended a diocesan Latin Mass for Christmas morning one year and it was great.

Significant\_Bag\_7211 (1): I agree that I do not want to attend NO as it does have many issues, including all of what you mentioned. I am making the decision, and my Priest was speaking to him on my behalf during a conversation about the issues with NO and that he needs to talk to me about it. I agree with you about diocesan TLMs in that I would prefer not to attend. Is your fiance a convert?

craft00n (3): Same. She should speak with him and have him read a few things.

Blackbeeyellowbee (1): I think him attend a NO confirmation Mass wouldn’t really be a problem as he would do it out of charity.

Significant\_Bag\_7211 (1): I do think if we can be on the same page about SSPX I think I will feel much more comfortable moving forward. I however am not sure about his views on the NO and if that is something he is willing to let go of.

Significant\_Bag\_7211 (2): Thank you for your advice and kind words. I feel much more confident now in how I want to move forward. God bless you!

Significant\_Bag\_7211 (1): These are great questions I will ask him. Thank you!

Significant\_Bag\_7211 (2): You made some great points. Thank you!

Significant\_Bag\_7211 (2): I agree with you and Fr. Pallegrini in that we have a right to receive the Mass and Sacraments in the Latin Rite, in peace. I agree that we need to be on the same page about the faith and I will encourage him to give those talks about SSPX a listen. If he agrees to go to a SSPX chapel, should I worry about the other elements of the Traditional Catholic faith and life, including teaching against the heresy of Vatican II, in that he will learn over time? Or is that something I need to discern now through him listening to SSPX crisis of the Church, etc.? Thank you!

Significant\_Bag\_7211 (2): Thank you, I appreciate your input.

Significant\_Bag\_7211 (1): My question is not debating SSPX or independent; it is about whether or not we are compatible regarding our differences in the crisis of the Church and whether he would accept SSPX. As I said in my initial post, I went to an SSPX chapel and an SSPX high school, where I received religion lessons, and I am fully aware of the differences held by both.

dashdum (2): They (diocesan clergy) teach Vatican II, which many find heretical so “solid” is the whole question here.

craft00n (1): Nop, TLM since birth.

dbaughmen (1): Ill include you both in my prayers. God bless!

eowynstan (3): i think you may have to worry about seasons of doubt, especially when these novus relatives come around! it may be difficult and come at tough points in your life (ie moving to a city for work that has a diocesan closer or “reverent NO” and the society is an hour or so). it isnt a dealbreaker, but know realistically you may have to dig into it! i would pray that youre near a priory so the priests can be around more or a good mission chapel with a good community life. i would see how it goes and have an honest check in later in your relationship about being sspx only… where are you and he most comfortable with in regards to drawing the NO line? passively attending funerals? weddings too? its gonna be a tough boundary to draw.

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (1): Compatible. Hmm. Do you think he'll come around and draw conclusions like yours? How long will you wait if so? Can you still care and love for each other if this difference in opinion isn't resolved?We are, as Catholics, missionaries. We aren't perfect, though, God does encourage us to try. I hope things go well for you. Ask for St. Raphael and St. Valentine to pray for your relationship. Convince him of what's going on in the Church. Think about what Jesus would do. The crisis in the Church is getting more obvious, so maybe he'll come around. Either way, the Lord loves you both.

Significant\_Bag\_7211 (1): Thank you. These are all things I plan to discuss. My biggest concern is the influence of his family. I actually am considering asking him to move an hour away from his family and closer to a SSPX chapel where I think he will embrace the community of that chapel and help strengthen his views on tradition.

eowynstan (2): are you there too? i’m not sure he will take to a move where you arent! good luck though. i hope it will be a clear decision for you either way it goes

# Post 552: Words of Consecration changed from "for many" to "for all"?

Author: None

Score: 3

Comments: 0

URL: /r/CatholicDebates/comments/1ci800s/words\_of\_consecration\_changed\_from\_for\_many\_to/

# Post 553: Godparents

Author: RadTradTref

Score: 7

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1cbdtq9/godparents/

Can my 10 year old son be the godfather to my baby due in September? We recently moved across the country and don't know many people. Our pool for godparents is very small.

None (2): In my family that's what we did, I think it's great! But you can always ask your priest ;)The oldest daughter in my family is \~23 and she's the godmother of my brother who is \~25... And he is the godfather of the youngest daughter who is \~14!

None (2): For some reason I always thought that you have to be 18 year old to be a godfather. However, I think it'd be best for you to ask an SSPX priest.

dashdum (2): There is a booklet which I got from my church’s bookstore which discusses the responsibilities of a god parent. It is not an honorary role. It is entitled “Attention, Godparents!” Published in 1951 by The Queen’s Work, written by Daniel A. Lord, S.J. Here is a quote which is taken from the churches teaching on the Roman ritual: “It is the obligation of sponsors (godparents), from the very fact that they have undertaken this responsibility, to regard the child as a spiritual son or daughter entrusted to them. They must carefully watch over those things which relate to the instruction of the child in correct Christian living, so that the child may show forth in his entire life the obligations which godparents in the solemn ceremony have vowed he would keep.”In my opinion a ten year old can not understand nor fully consent at such an age to ensure his sibling will be instructed fully in the Catholic faith. What if you and your husband died tomorrow leaving your children orphans? Could he do such a thing at 10 or 12?Best to ask your priest for a recommendation of a parishioner who would be willing to befriend your family and oversee the Catholic upbringing of your infant if you cannot.

RadTradTref (2): As far as I know you just need to be confirmed. I was a Godfather at 16

# Post 554: Garabandal

Author: NextAd8013

Score: 1

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1c9dsp0/garabandal/

What's your opinion about aparitions in Garabandal?

dbaughmen (3): It's never been endorsed by the Catholic Church. I remain indifferent about this event.

asimovsdog (1): Williamson believed it and said it was a cover-up because the authorities didn't want to get any messages against Vatican II out (as the message of Garabandal was clearly warning against VII). It would make sense that the "new" Church wouldn't endorse any messages against VII. I haven't heard any reason not to believe it so far.

NextAd8013 (2): As far as I know Akita also mentiond apostasy and it's officialy approved

asimovsdog (4): Alright, seems there there are reasons to condemn it:https://introiboadaltaredei2.blogspot.com/2019/11/garabandal.htmlAlso, it wasn't even against VII, since all seers accept VII.

# Post 555: First meeting for marriage prep

Author: None

Score: 8

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1c93kn9/first\_meeting\_for\_marriage\_prep/

I am getting ready to meet with the priest for marriage prep. I heard at the first meeting you have to each go to the priest one at a time and go over some stuff with him and make an oath. What is gone over in this private meeting, just trying to be prepared!

mynameisnotBOBO (7): We were asked similar things as other commenter mentioned.Also how long have we been courting, all of the parishes I’ve ever attended, if I’ve been married before or received marriage prep. Very simple and clear questions.

ArtannsVoid (3): We were both asked a series of questions. Questions like if we’re doing this from our own free will and such. Very simple questions!

None (1): Do you remember what all documents you had to sign?

None (3): Someone told me that they ask if you're hiding anything from your fiancee. Is this true, should I do an examination or something before I go

ArtannsVoid (2): No they’re very simple questions, it’s not an interrogation. I personally don’t recall being asked that and neither does my husband. Another question I remember being asked is if he was a part of any condemned organizations (freemasonry or communist group).

# Post 556: Can Priests be Confirmation Sponsors?

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 3

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1c8cha8/can\_priests\_be\_confirmation\_sponsors/

Can my parish priest be my confirmation sponsor because I hold him in such high regard? Or must it be a layperson

None (3): Can they? Sure. But more likely than not they will be too busy helping the Bishop conduct the ceremony and won’t be able to. May as well ask I guess? No harm in it.

# Post 557: Altar Boys

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 4

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1c81slg/altar\_boys/

Does anybody know a good place to get a good cassock and surplice for serving?

None (3): [deleted]

dbaughmen (1): Thanks Mate, and yes that’d be really nice

# Post 558: What's your thoughts about Divine mercy devotion? Does any of you pray the Divine mercy chaplet?

Author: NextAd8013

Score: 12

Comments: 8

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1c5ibue/whats\_your\_thoughts\_about\_divine\_mercy\_devotion/

asimovsdog (11): Dimond is a sede, but he has still very good research on this topic: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=quQb-vyM9CwIn short:- Divine Mercy chaplet is shorter than the rosary. While there is nothing wrong with the prayer theologically, it should NEVER be a replacement for a real rosary (which a lot of people apparently do to "save time"). That in itself is the deception.- Faustinas diary was on the list of banned (i.e prohibited) books for 50 years. That should make people question her relatively quick approval to sainthood. There are a lot of doubts around Sister Faustinas sainthood and general post-V2 beatifications. These issues are not due to translation errors as JPII claimed.- While the prayers are about Jesus' heart, the first Divine Mercy image does not show Jesus' wounds nor his heart, which is very, very unusual. The wounds were added in a later edition of the image. The image was banned in 1959, because of doubts about the theology of Divine Mercy.- Sister Faustinas visions theologically do not line up with what Jesus would say (such as claiming that Jesus would not judge her or that you could save people at the hour of their death through the chaplet, even though that includes people outside the Church)- I am sceptical towards the Divine Mercy Sunday due to the above reasons, since it reeks of protestant-ish "Jesus will forgive me anyways". I cannot judge whether the indulgence is valid or not, if in doubt I'd lean towards "yes".I would pick another classical devotion, such as the Brown Scapular, the St. Michael Chaplet, the St. Bridget chaplet the full rosary (all mysteries) before I'd pray the Divine Mercy chaplet.

None (7): The diary is off and creepy. I also watched the Diamonds’ video and I agree.

LoudEffort (3): My local chapel promotes it, I find it uncomfortable. On the second Sunday after Easter they prayed the chaplet after the Rosary. There’s even a divine mercy image in the chapel right beside the Altar. It’s sad because it seems a lot of priests have been duped by this particular devotion and have not properly researched Faustina’s troublesome writings.

PleasantStorm4241 (4): I used to pray it until I heard about the part where the Eucharist flew out of the tabernacle two or three times into Sr Faustina's hands. I think I actually heard this from one of the Marian Fathers on the Divine Mercy YT channel. Also, there are sections of her diary where it sounded as though Jesus was putting Sr Faustina above His Mother. Just NO. Also, the portrait is off - where are Jesus' wounds? There are other things that seem off. It seems like a typical Modernist attempt to replace traditional devotions such as the Rosary and the Sacred Heart novena.My SSPX pastor has spoken against it; he's said the prayers are fine, but the source and other things are questionable and that He will no longer bless DM items. I'd actually be disappointed if I saw a DM image in an SSPX chapel or another traditional church.

NextAd8013 (2): Does any sspx chaple promotes this devotion?

None (2): Comments are exactly what I expected on an sspx subreddit post 💀

None (1): Half of what you said is blatantly wrong. Do better.

None (2): https://thecatacombs.org/showthread.php?tid=1310

# Post 559: Missal

Author: None

Score: 3

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1c13h7e/missal/

Is the genuine leather missal worth the 20 dollars extra than the faux leather missal? Which should I buy?

PeterSSPX (3): Yes it’s worth it to me, I have both but the genuine leather feels much nicer. It also smells good as an added bonus.

4dvocata (3): Whichever one you buy, you will get your moneys worth using it every Sunday

None (2): Yes, it is and I speak as someone who actually owns one it holds up a lot better overtime

None (2): I've only owned the genuine leather edition. Three years later and it's held up well but the front and back leather flaps have detached from the paper within. Big deal? Not really. But I can't say definitively if the extra money was worth it.

jocyUk (1): yes, they keep their value. get an old one off ebay

# Post 560: Can a Pope be a Heretic?

Author: None

Score: 6

Comments: 16

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1bzd2wb/can\_a\_pope\_be\_a\_heretic/

I've been questioning this recently, especially with wrong actions of some of the past few Popes. Like Assisi Prayer Day, or Pachamama. So can a Pope be a Heretic?

TooEdgy35201 (4): Yes, a papal claimant can fall into a damnable heresy. It is taught by Frances de Sales, Alphonse Liguori, Robert Bellarmine, Cardinal Torquemada, Cardinal Cajetan, Francisco Suarez, Bishop Tostat, Bishop Bossuet and numerous others.The opinion is divided between automatic loss of office and condemnation and deposition by a council.

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (2): Yes. There have been several previous popes declared heretics after their death by church councils. For example pope honorius the first

luke-jr (2): No. The Vatican 1 fathers concluded no pope had ever been a heretic. The Church formally defined that a heretic cannot become pope even if he has universal acceptance. The only theological opinion compatible with Catholic teaching is that a heretic loses office ipso facto (though V1 didn't get to formally defining that case)

asimovsdog (2): Yes, but that doesn't mean that he automatically loses office, which is the sedevacantist position (their position that a heretic pope automatically loses office relies only on a quote of a medieval pope, which was an opinion because it was seen as ridiculous at the time, but it's not infallible dogma). Nobody can formally declare the pope a heretic and excommunicate him because there is no higher authority on earth, except for a later pope. So popes can be declared heretics in retrospective, but not while they are in office (that would also undermine the office because the pope could've been declared heretic for many different minor reasons). They can practice and preach heresy (as long as it's not ex cathedra, which the Holy Spirit would prevent), but that doesn't mean we should blindly follow that heresy. We should still use our brains. There were too-nationalistic popes, there were popes tempted by Arianism, there were lots of times in history when popes didn't act like they should and caused a scandal. However, you also have to take into account that the pope doesn't act alone and that Popes can change. There are massive lobbies and groups within the Church that would like to control the pope and prayer can change those people.

craft00n (1): Quaesio disputata. There are lots of good theologians who agree with it, but Pastor Aeternus (Vatican 1) says contrary. I don't know.

apisDei (1): John XXII preched heresy but repented on his deathbed. He didn't lose his papacy during his public heresy. Sedevacantism is a dead-end.

arentageisha (1): ALOHA, good morning I am Kandace Chinn-Carbajal and I would like to be a traditional catholic in La la land, yet it is pretty much impossible thanks to the current Pope! he is not my Pope that is for sure, and I am reaching out to share that I think like many other of tens of thousands of Catholics that he is indeed a Heretic, and each day he continue to divide and weaken Our Mother church! True many other Popes have been heretics too, yet the current one I believe may absolutely ranks amongst the worst Popes ! It is very dangerous that he has a vendetta against the traditional, the beautiful Latin mass! He is a very hypocritical leader too! He is killing the church especially in America, it is heartbreaking, yet he cannot live forever! And the Catholic church will eventually heal itself and carry on despite corrupt and ignorant church leaders! I love the Catholic faith and our Wise Saints and Venerables yet despise the current corrupt so- called leader! Our Holy Mother is not happy with his performance and many loyal Catholics leaving under his FAILING papacy!

None (0): What's for sure is that a Pope can at least be materially heretic: meaning he doesn't contradict a Catholic dogma, but he says things that are contrary to scriptures/tradition. As opposed to someones who is a formal heretic, who would say "I disagree with that dogma". Pope Francis seems to be materially heretic, since he pretends not to contradict Catholic dogma, but not formal heretic.

None (2): I know of Honorius but what are the other ones? Also if you do know, to what extent can their heresies effect the church.

None (3): Could you quote the part of the council where they say that please?

Trengingigan (0): So, is Bergoglio the Pope?

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (1): Obviously as they are head of the church their heresies can have a major affect. Also obviously no ,after how the church is shaken or attacked it will always stand

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (0): Saint Peter acted heretically for a while before being corrected by Saint Paul. He acted against the council of Jerusalem in treating Jew and gentile converts to Catholicism differently.There was also a John (the 22nd?) who iirc was declared to have acted hermetically tho it was more implicit. This was around the teaching that souls can enter heaven before the end of time rather than having to wait until the final judgement. This was in the 16th century I think

luke-jr (1): The question was also raised by a Cardinal, “What is to be done with the Pope if he becomes a heretic?” It was answered that there has never been such a case; the Council of Bishops could depose him for heresy, for from the moment he becomes a heretic he is not the head or even a member of the Church. The Church would not be, for a moment, obliged to listen to him when he begins to teach a doctrine the Church knows to be a false doctrine, and he would cease to be Pope, being deposed by God Himself.If the Pope, for instance, were to say that the belief in God is false, you would not be obliged to believe him, or if he were to deny the rest of the creed, “I believe in Christ,” etc. The supposition is injurious to the Holy Father in the very idea, but serves to show you the fullness with which the subject has been considered and the ample thought given to every possibility. If he denies any dogma of the Church held by every true believer, he is no more Pope than either you or I; and so in this respect the dogma of infallibility amounts to nothing as an article of temporal government or cover for heresy.(Abp. John B. Purcell, quoted in Rev. James J. McGovern, Life and Life Work of Pope Leo XIII [Chicago, IL: Allied Printing, 1903], p. 241; imprimatur by Abp. James Quigley of Chicago)

luke-jr (1): If he is a heretic, then Catholic teaching obliges us to reject him as pope; he can't be both

None (2): It was answered by whom?So you don't have a quote from Vatican 1?

# Post 561: Help on Confirmation/Advice

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 1

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1bz82yg/help\_on\_confirmationadvice/

For a little back story, my nephew is getting confirmed and had originally signed up for this at a Novus Ordo parish ages ago, but they recently became SSPX parishioners under my guidance, my nephew has fallen in love with tradition and now hates the NO but since he originally picked a female sponsor who is very dear to the family, his mother doesn’t wanna go through on SSPX confirmation as they don’t want to let her down, but he really is dying to do it with the SSPX, what do you reccomend we do? He is still in time to finish the preparation for confirmation, and to get the paperwork done and all.

MarcellusFaber (6): He’s just going to have to accept that he will have to have a man as his sponsor if he is confirmed by an SSPX bishop. It’s a difficult situation, but you should definitely encourage him to do this, cautiously.

dbaughmen (3): Well he is definitely open to anything as long as its an SSPX confirmation, its his mother, my sister that really wont let him and is really pushing for NO confirmation because of this relative

None (1): Sounds like the person to convince is your mother! I'd say there are 2 solutions, first try to tell her that the sacrament itself is much more important than whoever is the godfather, that your brother should pick the rite he loves the most, especially since the new rite is often invalid (just a few weeks I talked to a father who had to receive his confirmation again since he realized the bishop made a "general confirmation" instead of giving it individualy). You can also try to tell her that a sacrament is something one cannot receive against his will, he should be the one making the decision. And btw, for confirmation, the confirmed one is the one who choses his godfather anyway.If that doesn't work, I'd say that this is a case where disobedience is necessary, but it'd be sad to have to go through this; try to convince her as much as you can. But no matter what don't let him go to NO sacrament, he'd probably regret it all his life; when I was younger my Mother forced me to serve NO Mass, now I wish I had been strong enough to say no (but I didn't know enough about it)Good luck for you and him! I'll say my rosary for you!

dbaughmen (1): Wow! This is amazing advice, just what we needed. Thank you so much, and I’ll definitely also pray my rosary for you and all your intentions as well. Well, worst case scenario if he went to both and we compromised, since the SSPX one is scheduled 2 days before the NO one, would it be ok to go to both and receive it twice? (Even if one may be invalid)

MarcellusFaber (1): To receive a Sacrament which imparts an indelible character twice is sacrilegious. To receive a doubtful Sacrament is also grave matter.

None (0): Thanks for the prayers! I don't think it's a good solution for a few reasons, mostly because: - if you're against the NO for doctrinal reasons (which is my case and the SSPX's), meaning if you think NO is ambiguous about Catholic doctrine, then it would never be ok to participate to it. - You should talk to an SSPX priest about it but I think receiving a sacrament twice is considered very bad by the church; for example when a Protestant converts, the Church does a whole trial to make sure the baptism wasn't valid before doing an "under condition baptism". If receiving a sacrament twice wasn't a problem, the Church wouldn't go through such a complicated process. - maybe human reasons too ; it's let them believe that you are ready to compromise with your beliefs; which means that if any situation of this type happens again, they'll be able to show you this example to try to make you do the same thing again. Good luck again, stay brave and charitable and everything should end well!

# Post 562: Why don’t any SSPX or other traditionalist Bishops wear the Cappa Magna or any other ancient vestments?

Author: dbaughmen

Score: 6

Comments: 5

URL: https://i.redd.it/llclyjp2h5tc1.jpeg

Beside during the holy mass, mostly all trad bishops usually stick to a simple cassock and pectoral cross or the mozzetta instead of the mantelleta and they dont even wear ferraiolos. Why could this be? As these vestments are considered a humble uniform

PatriciusIlle (6): The cappa magna exists precisely so that it can be stripped away before a liturgical event in order to symbolize the humbling of a prelate. Our bishops don't have ordinary jurisdiction or geographic territories. They don't need to symbolize this humbling because they don't have the external trappings that bishops of yore had.

nejc135 (7): Because the FSSPX bishops have no territorial juristiction. They are mere auxiliaries. Diocesan bishops are only allowed to wear the cappa magna in their respective dioceses. The only exception to this rule are the cardinals, who can wear it wherever they want, because they are the princes of the church. That's why Cardinal Burke wears one all the time.

Jattack33 (2): The SSPX do not have Bishops with jurisdiction, the Cappa magna is worn by those with jurisdiction (Cardinals, Diocesan Bishops and Papal Legates). Although the SSPX Bishops celebrate Masses at the Throne which is something that they really shouldn’t do as that is also a sign of jurisdiction.The SSPX have also inherited a missionary spirit from Archbishop Lefebvre (himself one of the great 20th century Missionary prelates), a spirit that has simpler ecclesial dress as was common in colonial nations, SSPX Priests often don’t wear Birettas and their Bishops wear their Rochets and Mozzetta over abito piano rather than over a choir cassock, as missionary Bishops often did. However I know Archbishop Lefebvre wore the Cappa Magna in his younger days, perhaps when he was Bishop of Tulle.

hardeho (2): Because someone will always bitch about something no matter what. Exhibit A is this post.

feelinggravityspull (1): Interesting, do you have a source for that?

# Post 563: Who’s heard of trad recovery?

Author: didgeridoodlypoodle

Score: 8

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1bx0bwe/whos\_heard\_of\_trad\_recovery/

I believe this woman is the founder. She goes on and on and on about traditional Catholics, mainly the SSPX. She hosts guests to tell stories of their former life within the SSPX communities and their stories sound extremely suspicious to me. I didn’t start goin to the SSPX until I was 26, but I was raised traditional Catholic at a diocesan parish and then attended and got married at the FSSP. I just cannot relate to those stories and I feel as if this is diabolical in a way. One of her videos for reference: https://youtu.be/yNZSBejOty0?si=hfbi37pjmh2lOJs4

asimovsdog (7): It's just some woman who suddenly had concerns about SSPX being invalid because "it's not in communion!!1!" and some bad experiences with priests, now generalizes and slanders the whole trad scene. It's a meme "movement", but the [memes](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t-qJfg48Xfs) are great tbh. Just don't give it any attention.

Breifne21 (5): It is diabolical. Thats not to say that some people are not sometimes badly treated or face spiritual abuse at the hands of traditionalist priests. It does happen in the SSPX (I know this on a personal level, still attend the SSPX though), just as it happens in FSSP, ICKSP, Diocesan, NO, Byzantine or the local football team. People are frail and weak and liable to sin. Tradition doesn't stop that. But lets call out these cretins for attempting to create this idea that its inherent to tradition, or almost unique to tradition. A quick perusal of r/excatholic would disabuse them of that.

# Post 564: SSPX use of pre-1955 missal?

Author: Objective\_Ad6378

Score: 8

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1bwvli6/sspx\_use\_of\_pre1955\_missal/

Hello all! Whilst I know that the society uses the 1962 missal typically, could a priest of the society uses the pre-1955 missal as well as Holy Week if he wanted to?

None (8): The superiors are not very strict, because many priests make a few changes (regarding the prayer for Jews) but the position of the SSPX is very simple. Archbishop Lefebvre agreed that 1962 was not as good as 1955. But on the other hand, for refusing a change, we need very serious reasons, more specifically we need reasons that would be a matter of faith; otherwise disobedience wouldn't be justified. It is justified for the NO change, not for the 1962!This is why he chose to stop after 1962, but not to go back to 1955; because it's important for us to remember that even if we live in a time of crisis we have to always put ourselves in a spirit of obediance.I'm always impressed at how balanced Archbishop Lefebvre was, even in a time of crisis when everything was falling appart, and when it's very tempting to always embrace the most radical position!

None (5): I know that some society priests do this; however, I am not too familiar with how strict their superiors are in regard to enforcing the 1962 liturgy. I know that the society agreed that certain liturgical changes needed to happen, leading to accepting the 1962 version. I believe there is an SSPX podcast on this topic.

hambeejee (3): Our Priest said that the ideal should be Pre-1955.But during last Good Friday during the Great Intercessions, for that part we used the Pre-1955 Missal for the Good Friday Prayer for the Jews (no Flectamus and Oremus) exclusively

# Post 565: We regret who we chose for baby's godfather

Author: morehorchata

Score: 5

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1bwh8f6/we\_regret\_who\_we\_chose\_for\_babys\_godfather/

At the time we chose him, the godfather was going to become a priest. Every encounter with him seemed that he was living a very traditional Catholic life. We admired him.He has since left the seminary and is living a life that we wouldn't want our child around. I feel so guilty. My parents chose "bad" Catholic godparents for all of my siblings and I so I wanted to break that cycle. “there, but for the grace of God, go I.” I just wanted to do better for my first child.

hardeho (8): Don't start with feeling like a failure so early into parenthood. There are so many more failures still to go, you got to save some mental anguish for the future.

colekken (4): I don't think it will matter in the long run. I mean, my godmother was my aunt and my dumb uncle told her one day that 'he doesn't love her anymore' and left her. So she not really in the family anymore. Plus, Catholics believe in the great cloud of witnesses so someone in heaven will look after them.

None (2): it doesn't matter. we haven't seen our kids godparents since the baptism. not sure if she's even still alive or not.

notanexpert\_askapro (2): You can't even be 100% sure of the character who we're going to marry, let alone who you choose as a godparent. Plus sometimes people change...for the worse.I think if you regret anything it should probably be of judging your parents a little harshly for not picking better godparents. I used to think a bit negatively of my mom for picking a Lutheran and a non practicing Christian, formerly Catholic brother. But now I get it. She knew them long enough she felt confident about them being good people even if not Catholic.

dashdum (2): Our son’s godparents didn’t turn out to be a good choice so we asked another man who became a close friend of ours later if he could be our son’s honorary godfather at the time of our son’s first communion. Essentially he has promised to do all the things the Roman ritual requires of a godparent. If we would be unable to educate him as a Catholic (we died or couldn’t for some reason), he promised to make sure our son would be properly catechized. He was thrilled and bought my son his first missal, etc. We send him Christmas cards addressed to Godfather ……. and he love it. It’s a win win!

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): You chose a godfather based on good spiritual reasons; that puts you above more than half of couples, who think it's nothing but a mondaine status.

PleasantStorm4241 (0): You are baptized only once.

# Post 566: love the SSPX mass, but confused by all the sex scandals??

Author: None

Score: 8

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1buq5oq/love\_the\_sspx\_mass\_but\_confused\_by\_all\_the\_sex/

Have things changed with how they handle accused priests? Everything i’ve read alludes to the fact that they just relocate these priests or send them to the “golden cage”.Why so many sex abuse (especially children) in SSPX? Patrick Groche was accused as well and he was “close to Lefevbre”?Please help me understand!https://international.la-croix.com/news/religion/lefevbrist-priest-in-france-charged-with-raping-27-pre-teens/17849https://www.bishop-accountability.org/2024/01/new-sexual-abuse-allegations-resurface-old-pain-for-victims-of-fundamentalist-church-priest/

None (12): Sexual abuse is unfortunately a very common thing in every industry or organization. For years, i had a bad taste in my mouth because i heard a popular podcaster state that around 5% of Catholic priests are accused of sexual misconduct. He went on to say that if any other organization had those numbers, they'd be banned. It wasn't until years later that i decided to do some research. It turns out that out of all the major companies or organizations i looked up (schools, hospitals, NFL, hollywood, walmart, etc), the Catholic Church has one of the lowest rates of accusations yet gets the most (only?) publicity. I dont know the specifics of SSPX, but everything these days should be researched as well as given the consideration of a pros and cons list to weed out all the propaganda.

asimovsdog (8): Stuff happens, the question is whether the SSPX takes better disciplinary measures than the Vatican. Bad people don't change the faith, allegations need to be taken seriously and the people in question removed - but always with due process. The Vatican has barely disciplined priest for abuse, even in admitted cases. The key here is that it will not be solved by allowing priests to marry or women to read Mass. >Fegan had unveiled what he called a “golden cage” or “gilded prison”: Notre Dame de Montgardin, a secluded monastery in the Western Alps. “This is the place where they hide priests who had been molesting children,” Fegan tells Stuff. > >Jake says the clergy’s handling of the Carlile case will reflect badly on the SSPX leadership. Sending Carlile to Notre-Dame de Montgardin instead of complaining to police, “that’s just letting him off very easily”.The priest molested a child and was sent to a monastery as a disciplinary measure. In this case, it happened in the sacristy, so nobody can prove what happened unless the priest himself admits to it and turns himself in. So, best thing they can do is send him away. Then the press attacks the SSPX for "not doing enough", like okay what should they do, execute him on the spot over an allegation?>The Rev. Laurent Ramé, the superior of the SSPX priory of Saint-Germain-de-Prinçay in which Maillard resided, alerted the police in early summer 2020 after receiving reports of several rapes and sexual assaults. Shortly after the revelations in 2020, the Lefevbrists "excluded" Maillard from the priestly fraternity, according to Jorna. >The superior said the institute also filed a civil suit against Maillard. After the accusations, the priest was sent to the Maison Notre-Dame. Located in the Hautes-Alpes, near Gap, where they welcome priests from the SSPX, some of whom are accused of sexual assault. Shortly after his arrival, Maillard was indicted and then imprisoned.Okay, so he was detained, reported to the police and imprisoned as soon as SSPX authorities knew about rape accusations (the prior cases were reports of minor misdemeanors). Doesn't really sound like a "cover-up" to me. In the other cases, the families knew about the abuse, but didn't alert any SSPX authorities, so why blame the SSPX leadership then? > Kneeling on the wooden prie-dieu, they believe their future lies in how strongly they hold onto their rosary beads. Again, hyperbole like this is why I'm weary of such allegations. Because if you have an axe to grind people are going to just make stuff up. It just reveals that they want to smear the SSPX and make it seem as if the society does nothing.

Piklikl (11): Unfortunately this is the stark reality of the situation. It may seem like "what-aboutism" (eg. sure there's sex scandals in the SSPX, but what about public school teachers/day care/etc?), but I think it's just keeping things in context. Demonstrating the problem of sexual abuse in the SSPX/Catholic Church being smaller relative to other organization should absolutely not be used to excuse us from working as hard as we can to eradicate it. I think as faithful we need to continue to demand accountability from the Church/SSPX and demand that they keep us informed on the policies and procedures they put into place to protect the vulnerable (as well as to protect the priests themselves from unnecessary scandal). The SSPX is a human organization, there will be human failings.

None (4): Wow this was fascinating to read — thank you

None (4): Thanks for your response. I think I understand what you are saying. I suppose most people wouldbe expecting the local (or federal) law enforcement to get involved and charge and incarcerate the priests? and for the SSPX or whichever organization to cooperate with said law enforcement? You mentioned the Vatican what do they do with these types of incidents typically?

None (4): Thank you, that makes a lot of sense

asimovsdog (5): > You mentioned the Vatican what do they do with these types of incidents typically?> In 2011, Pope Benedict told bishops, in new guidelines, that they had to report any suspected cases to local police promptly. Previously, all cases were supposed to be referred to Rome.I can only go from what I hear from the media (which is obviously biased), but my view is that a lot of people in high positions do not care or care too little about the abuses. That's my personal bias and I might be wrong. My assumption is that the SSPX is very aware of not ruining their reputation as they are already a minority, therefore they probably care more about avoiding such cases than the official Church. I also don't want to smear the RCC as "doing nothing", of course.

# Post 567: Is there any way to contact someone about maybe opening a chapel closer to where you live?

Author: Coinboiiii

Score: 7

Comments: 20

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1btvnf1/is\_there\_any\_way\_to\_contact\_someone\_about\_maybe/

The closest SSPX church to me is about an hour away, and I was wondering if there’s anyway to see if it’s possible to even get a small chapel/community going or something? Anyone in particular I could contact?

None (7): As stated above, there is a shortage of SSPX priests. The priests that have to travel to a mission chapel are barely able to fulfill their minimal duties and they are not allowed to increase their number of visits because they have other duties to preform, such as teaching. An hour away is actually pretty good. It might seem like a lot but I know many people who have to travel 2+ hours every Sunday to get to the true mass. The SSPX is growing though. Hopefully they can get some more priests soon. The best we can do is pray for vocations to Holy Orders.

toketheo (6): I would love to know, too. But I think the main issue is lack of priests, unfortunately. Closest SSPX I have is far away too. Around 1h30 away by car.Regardless if possible, I think we need to contact an SSPX priest for that. He'll give us more info on that.

Piklikl (4): The SSPX is still quite short on priests. The only way that I'm aware of getting the SSPX to start saying Mass closer to you is for you to put in the work of organizing the faithful in your local area to make it worth the SSPX's time to have a priest visit closer to you. You can certainly reach out to the closest SSPX priory and ask if they have any specific tips (maybe there's already a group of faithful in your area and they can let you know that).What would probably make the most sense is to move closer to an existing SSPX location. Obviously that's a difficult and multi-year process, but God is not outdone in generosity so you can be assured of recompense for your sacrifices. I think it's good to keep in mind that a value we haven't or at least aren't willing to suffer for is just an opinion. It's not enough to just say that the Faith and the Sacraments are important to us, we must be able to point to concrete actions we have taken to demonstrate that the Faith and Sacraments are important to us. Personally, if I ran the SSPX for a day, I would give a 5 year notice to any location with less than a hundred people (maybe even higher than that), and then close them down. Our priests are spread way too thin and are burning out at an alarming rate.

None (3): Closest chapels are 3 hr (rural) and 3.5 hr (city) from me. There's occassionally a mission that happens in the summer that's a bit more than 2hr. That one was recently created in 2017 by a woman i believe and i think it was because they were able to rally up enough people (demand). You also need a place for the priest to board so like someone's house. I'd love a closer chapel because we have kids but I don't think that's really possible these days since there are very few priests and they're driving hours and hours to get to the mission chapels. More missions have opened up over the years which is good but I wasn't able to get in a confession since they seemed rushed.

Previous-Plan-3876 (3): Most of us would love to be an hour from a Chapel. The closest one to me is over 3 hours away.

None (2): Just contact the prior, in Ireland, Fr. Abbey.Then you got two solutions: - convert all your friends and get some to go to the seminary, to increase the amount of Masses ;)- gather a big community in your area who'd appreciate a TLMOr both!

2629357 (2): I’m 15mins away from mine

SuperGrapeSoda (1): You can contact the SSPX office in Platte City, MO. And make the request, they will tell you ‘ no new locations ‘ - but you can request an intake survey form so they know of the demand when / if they have priests.

Coinboiiii (3): I am constantly praying for the growth of the TLM.

Coinboiiii (3): Yeah, I’d like to contact a priest and find out if it’s possible, even to just have a service once a week where I live, or maybe half an hour away; just don’t know if it’d be possible :/ I live in Ireland and we have very few SSPX churches

Coinboiiii (2): I see. I’m very new to the SSPX, so I don’t know much about the situation with the priests.

None (2): We are so blessed to have a SSPX church near from us and I appreciate what out priest is doing every week, He has to travel 1 hr to reach the port to ride a Ferry for 2 hrs just to Host the Mass. He is a German and was assigned here in asia where temperature reaches 43 C. I love the way he preached and the way he took care of the parishioners here in our city our community is getting bigger and bigger thanks to him. I thank SSPX for bringing me back to the herd. Will include OP in my prayers.

Coinboiiii (2): Interesting. Irelands fairly small, so I may be able to rally up some people interested in the TLM.

Coinboiiii (2): Haha, I think the chances of me converting my friends to Christianity, let alone Catholicism, are extremely slim. I could probably try gather some people together though; that’s certainly possible.

Coinboiiii (1): I wish 😔

Piklikl (2): Feel free to ask any other questions you might have, either here or make a new post if you like. In general though, your life tends to get better when you move closer to a priory.

craft00n (2): As anywhere else in the Church, there's not enough priests.

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (4): Afaik in Ireland there's a lot of Sunday's every priest is already saying 2 Masses so it's not very likely tbh (2 in Dublin Athlone cork Newry Belfast and every second week or so Monaghan and Kilkenny

craft00n (1): Oh you're in Ireland ? Where so ? A member of my family is priest there but I won't give more info because I'm under a pseudonym.

None (2): Well converting "everyone" is not easy for sure, but helping bring a few friends to the faith in a lifetime is manageable ;)

# Post 568: Chartres Pilgrimage 2024

Author: UKChartres

Score: 10

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1btun17/chartres\_pilgrimage\_2024/

Happy Easter!Registration is open for the Chartres to Paris pilgrimage with the SSPX 18th to 20th May 2024.Sign up for the UK Chapter with this form: [https://forms.gle/MkcK1kNfVEfJ2rNp6](https://forms.gle/MkcK1kNfVEfJ2rNp6?fbclid=IwAR16\_wF4OZjnJysiv9lJkF51O2Ql2vEcqUn8ujoeBT3vf1B4iAgF1pD107U\_aem\_AeqbcskRDbaa\_DGIDIqJj3twU5OrfkYuGjVxCwAt8F8b0DVoSRTI\_YsRC1Jpe9Hw\_4GXQnPm9HyviiR60iF6Mcgz)And pay here: [https://inscription.pelerinagesdetradition.com/](https://inscription.pelerinagesdetradition.com/?fbclid=IwAR2Sd6LfQvxHgq3lfyXDjFLqwXb6mUFEbyCdHItyajUXjHs9vNuJDADFQF8\_aem\_AerPn0erEcTVmTcenJOVT-fy2PoYVMUugc7kup6JBIcGhSRH52dqLAeZSKcoBOrNXodFS565zwhs0-JRsdqnACiy)Please e-mail [ukchartres@gmail.com](mailto:ukchartres@gmail.com) with any questions.The UK Chapter traditionally welcomes other English-speaking pilgrims from countries without their own chapter (USA, Australia, New Zealand)[https://fsspx.uk/en/news/chartres-pilgrimage-registration-now-open-43920](https://fsspx.uk/en/news/chartres-pilgrimage-registration-now-open-43920)[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rLLiOqkixHg](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rLLiOqkixHg)https://preview.redd.it/macgfxaqe1sc1.jpg?width=1241&format=pjpg&auto=webp&s=0a89c8839f2ac61c5e9d73148bb710458e72da3e

Piklikl (4): I've been on this pilgrimage with the American chapter and it's a wonderful experience!

None (2): You should post it on r/TraditionalCatholics as well! Would be a good apostolate!

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (1): I'm not English but maybe you know what time it starts Saturday morning?

UKChartres (2): We have Holy Mass at 07.45 in the morning outside the Cathedral on Saturday morning.

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (1): Thanks

# Post 569: Does former use of cannabis disqualify you from the priesthood?

Author: None

Score: 6

Comments: 25

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1brjug3/does\_former\_use\_of\_cannabis\_disqualify\_you\_from/

I was exploring the question of vocation with a Society priest, and he suggested this is a disqualifier. Is this absolutely true (no exceptions) or is there more to be considered?

colekken (5): Do you currently smoke it or do you intend to smoke it in your future? If the answer is "yes" then that could be a disqualifier. But, if it is something that you've put behind you I don't think it will be a problem.

PatriciusIlle (5): Of course it isn't a disqualifier. I know priests who smoked pot (before ordination). Not a big deal. Tattoos are technically a disqualifier (i.e., according to Canon Law bec it falls under self-mutilation) - and even those are passed over today. Past drug use has never been an actual disqualifier to holy orders. Don't get hung-up on this. Continue your discernment. God bless!

ExpertSalesCopy (2): It would depend on how recent, how long and how much. Same as with any other habitual or mortal sin.

Piklikl (2): From what I can tell, absolutely not. If you want to be sure, reach out to the SSPX Seminary you would most likely be going to given your geographic location and they will be more than happy to let you know. [Canon Law very clearly states](https://www.vatican.va/archive/cod-iuris-canonici/eng/documents/cic\_lib4-cann998-1165\_en.html#:~:text=Can.%C2%A01041%20The%20following%20are%20irregular%20for%20receiving%20orders%3A) the impediments to the priesthood, and smoking pot isn't one of them.

None (2): I very recently put it behind me. I have come to the conclusion that it should only be used in special cases (and likely not by smoking in most cases) as the SSPX podcast on this subject suggested.

None (1): Thank you for the thoughtful response! Would you mind elaborating a bit on the priests smoking pot before ordination? Even as someone who accepts certain valid uses, that seems like it would be scandalous.

None (1): Thank you for the thoughtful response. Would you be able to elaborate as to the specifics, or were you merely giving a general response?

None (1): Thank you for the info. I may be contacting the seminary soon.Do you happen to know what exactly is meant by apostasy? I rejected/wrestled with the idea of faith for 12 years before returning. Would this qualify as apostasy as pertaining to Canon Law?

colekken (3): I would probably seek out a priest about this question. My knowledge on Marijuana and the Church is very limited. 😅

BrodyJerome (3): Very recently? And you are already considering the priesthood?

None (2): [deleted]

ExpertSalesCopy (2): Sorry for the delay. I'm not sure what additional details I could provide without additional information. Just like if the abuse involved alcohol, porn, gambling or self-abuse.

Piklikl (2): I'm fairly certain in that context they mean notorious apostasy, eg you're a prominent public figure who has apostosized. Also I think it means you're still in a state of apostasy, which is a formal, public rejection of the faith. Do reach out to the Seminary though, you're probably the 40th person this month with questions like this and they most likely already have all the answers!

None (3): I did exactly that. I consulted the Society priest with whom I made my general confession. We've had a couple conversations about it. He suggested I watch the SSPX podcast on it, which was my initial impetus to stop, and it is in part why I have come to this conclusion.

None (0): It seems you think that's a problem. Care to explain?

Cathain78 (2): Absolutely, St Augustine openly confessed his chequered past.If saints had to be perfect then we would have almost none.

None (1): I thought you meant on the day of ordination. Did I misunderstand?

None (2): I really appreciate you sharing your thoughts! This has helped ease my concerns.

colekken (4): Well I'll be praying that you make an excellent priest then 🙏

4dvocata (1): Pendulum swing effect. He’s worried you may be swinging to extremes with your life too quickly.

None (2): [deleted]

None (2): 😂 wait a minute, that's not incense!

None (2): Thank you for the encouraging words, but I suspect that I have disqualified myself.

None (1): I could see that perspective, and it's reasonable to be concerned about that, but this inspiration did not come to me only recently. I don't think that this is a case of swinging to extremes but rather struggling to know what I am called to do.

None (1): Thank you for clarifying. Sorry for misinterpreting.

colekken (3): There's still time. The Church needs priests. You just gotta set your mind to kicking the habit.

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): Much appreciated!

# Post 570: Some advice please…

Author: Objective\_Ad6378

Score: 11

Comments: 15

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1bpdjn5/some\_advice\_please/

Hello all, for some context to my situation, I am 16 years of age living in the UK, I’ve been born and raised into a Norvus Ordo parish, however has recently grown a love for the TLM and tradition. However my parents do not approve, they extremely dislike the TLM and me living out my faith. With Holy week approaching they want me to attend the NO, which among the issues in the average NO, on Good Friday they do a “inter-church walk of faith” which involve praying publicly with Protestants. Not only do my parents want me to attend these but also to be an altar server at the NO and this Inter-church thing. I’ve mentioned my opposition before but my parents started a fight where a lot of harsh stuff was said towards me. Any advice would be greatly appreciated. Thank you and God bless.

4dvocata (5): Feel free not to go to the ecumenical service. Good Friday is NOT a holy day of obligation

Piklikl (5): It might be worth it to reach out to a priest at the NO parish and ask for help. Even if he is not supportive of the TLM, he most likely would not want you serving in a ceremony you do not want to be a part of (and hopefully will counsel your parents to be more accepting of your choices). You don't have any control over your parents (or any other people for that matter), you only have control over yourself and the responses you give. Make sure you remain as respectful as possible towards your parents and don't give them any ammunition to use against to (it really helps just to remember to breathe during a heated discussion).

Piancol (4): Your instinct to reject that travesty is clearly right, but being still a minor, I would advise that you don't go against your parents' will in an aggressive manner. If you have to go to the NO to avoid a violent falling out just go but you can compromise with them that you won't participate or serve in any of the ceremonies. And if they try to force you somehow then you can talk to the priest or layperson in charge to tell them that you don't want to do it but you're being forced to. They would certainly not want you to do that Consider that, if you push this too hard on them, you might be burning an otherwise precious bridge that in the future - perhaps not so distant - will serve to also lead your parents to the True Latin Mass. Also, they probably think that you are just being teenage rebellious or that you have been brainwashed by this "Trad cult", and your handling of the situation might encourage this false notion in their minds.Try to be meek and humble at heart, like Our Lord Himself told us to be. You don't want this immense treasure to be a wedge betwen you and your parents but instead to be able to lead them to it and to share it with them. They most probably are only trying to protect you from what they perceive as a danger to your soul.You can always offer up this humiliation and submission of your will in reparation for all the sacrileges and abuses that will be committed in this disgraceful ceremonies.

Skwarex\_98 (2): Pray to Holy Mother. She will help you make good and holy decisions. When it comes to this strange ceremony... you shouldn't participate in it. How far away from you is the nearest TLM chapel?

None (1): Hi! It's heartwarming to see how us young people are devouted to the TLM! It's especially brave from you, who is a minor!Everything has been said here I think, but I'd say, no matter what, do not participate (meaning don't serve Mass etc.), but talking to the NO priest about it might work; if you object your right of conscience I think he would't have choice, especially if he sees that you're determined, he probably won't want to start a scandal.However at it has been said, careful not to break the precious bridge you have with your parents, which might help them one day end up to the TLM.Think of Christ's bravery and patience during his passion, stating the truth but with charity, to find the prudence to do what is right!I had to dealt a few times with "family dilemna" over NO Mass, the way I deal with it is showing them that it hurts me not to be able to participate with them, but that I'm doing it out principle and not against them. It makes them much more understanding, especially if you get the chance to explain the rational and morally imperative reasons behind your decision.You'll be in my prayers today!

dashdum (1): If you have a TLM missal, read the Mass each Holy Day and everyday if you can. I hope your parents wouldn’t take that away from you! If we are sick or for some reason can’t go to Mass we “pray the missal” (read the ordinary and all the parts of the Mass). It will be your underground church. When you are old enough to make those decisions for yourself then you will have kept the faith and the TLM in your heart for all those years.

Objective\_Ad6378 (5): The problem is I might be brought to it against my wishes.

rathdrummob (-2): Submission to your parents’ wishes is a tenet of the church. If you truly wish to live a life as an authentic catholic in a traditional way it starts with the basics. Your parents are not demanding that you commit sin. Praying with Protestants is not inherently sinful and doesn’t deny the faith. It might be distasteful to you but it isn’t sinful. Humility is the antidote to pride, and if you’re going to truly embrace a traditional Catholic culture then beware of the prevailing sin of the “trad” community, pride. I know from lifelong experience in myself and many others. Embrace charity and humility as Christ taught. Talk to the priest and then LISTEN to the priest. And pray and be humble. Then it will be possible to experience the joy of a catholic life.

Objective\_Ad6378 (3): I’ve considered talking to the NO priest and I think I will but such an opportunity for said discussion would likely not occur until after Holy Week.

Objective\_Ad6378 (3): Well thankfully I have multiple choices for TLM, and they are quite easy to get to. The main issue is actually being allowed to leave the house to go to them on Holy Days of obligation.

dashdum (1): I once saw a very old man sitting in the back of a NO Mass reading from his traditional missal. I think he was too old to drive to a TLM Mass so he went to the NO Mass and sat in the back and prayed from his traditional missal.

4dvocata (5): It would be sinful to willingly participate in the ecumenical service, and therefore your parents commanding you to attend is unjust. I would try to compromise with them to avoid the “walk” or Good Friday in general. I certainly would firmly refuse to assist in an active role as a server. If it’s any consolation, Just a few short years left and you’ll be on your own as an adult! Mr. Rathdrum means well but his response isn’t exactly 100% correct or relevant, imo.

Piklikl (3): Put yourself in his shoes: would you want one of the servers in your ceremony to have deep reservations about participating? This is a situation he needs to be aware of sooner rather than later, so you're just going to have to summon the courage to be assertive both with him and your parents (and of course remaining respectful all the while).

Skwarex\_98 (1): I think you should tell them WHY you want to go to TLM: because you find it most appropriate to give glory to God in this particular way. You could have a talk with them concerning your love for Church and Pope, that you want to be part of Catholic Church - in my case, it did the work

Objective\_Ad6378 (2): I have attempted to do that but my parents standpoint seem to be less theological and more ideological. Additionally my mother is fiercely loyal to the NO parish because of how long she has been going their.

# Post 571: SSPX and SSPX resistance

Author: NextAd8013

Score: 6

Comments: 20

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1bj5vzk/sspx\_and\_sspx\_resistance/

Has someone been to both main sspx and sspx resistance masses how do they compare? What you think of 2012 split did sspx realy changed ( became softer on Vatican II? Went against founders direction?or vice versa?)

None (12): Hi!I'm an SSPX parishoner, but I know the resistance pretty well since one of my closest friends advocates for it.Also I know Avrillé very well, which is in between the 2.2 years ago (when I didn't know the topic well) I talked with an SSPX priest who told me everything and I thought that his position was very balanced, now I still agree with this position. So basically in 2012 Bishop Fellay (who was superior general of the SSPX) sent a letter to the Vatican asking them if they would accept an agreement based on the letter he sent, where he proclaimed a few things that the SSPX advocates against. Maybe this was just a test, but as soon as the letter became public there was a lot of debates within the SSPX against this letter. Some priest openly criticized the SSPX and were expelled, some left by themselves, saying the SSPX was about to sign a compromising agreement with Rome. After all this turmoil the SSPX ended up not signing the agreement, but the evil was done. However, after seeing the SSPX backed down (and rightly so), "resistance" (most of them refuse the word) priests kept saying that the SSPX would sign the agreement, even if it still hasn't more than 10 years, and they started scrutinizing the SSPX and blaming it for any tiny thing, to justify their departure from the SSPX. So what the SSPX priest I talked with a few years ago was basically "resistance people were right to disagree with the letter (the priest told me he himself was very scared when he saw the letter); however, by condemning the SSPX before it actually signed any agreement, they lacked prudence. Also, we have to trust our superiors as much as we can because they know things we don't, so of course we shouldn't have blind obediance, but we shouldn't condemn them for something they haven't even done yet." To answer the example of Vatican II, that's what the resistance says, but as I said I think it's just a way to justify the separation since the SSPX ended up not signing anything compromising.As someone who reads Archbishop Lefebvre a lot, I can tell that the SSPX has kept his very prudence and balanced position, consisting in criticizing the problematic parts of Vatican II whithout calling it formally heretic. My Ecclesia Dei friends keep saying that the SSPX just talks about Vatican II, my resistance friends say the SSPX never talk about it... The common point between them is that they never go to the SSPX and just repeat what they've heard from their priests trying to justify their position!So my conclusion is that when I have to chose between resistance and SSPX I always chose the SSPX, for a few other reasons too; also, I hate the spirit of "war" that we have, because it's a big scandal for people outside the Tradition; and I noticed the SSPX barely talks about the resistance, while the resistance keeps talking about the SSPX all the time.

NextAd8013 (6): As far I see by exploring world of traditionalism online I find ressistance priests (most of them ) very radical preaching conspiracy theories ( especialy Pfeipfers group) bishop Williamson himself was always very different from other sspx bishops.

colekken (4): I've never heard of the SSPX Resistance. Are you speaking of the SSPV (Society of Pope Pius V)?

Antoninus\_Ferrer (1): The Resistance is good insofar as they call out modernizing happenings in the SSPX, and when they fight against modernism. They are a hinderance when getting involved with invalid clergy, and spiraling into clerical warfare.

Glad-Sweet9526 (1): Is the SSPX Marian Corps "the resistance"? And is Father Paul Kramer a part of the SSPX Marian Corps?

VanSensei (1): The Resistance is very spotty and disorganized. It feels as if they go through Mass centers like drunks go through whiskey. Its annoying

None (1): Abp. Lefebvre signed the Second Vatican Council documents.

None (1): I agree with you, those are just the human arguments against it though.

NextAd8013 (3): No I'm speaking about Williamson's group

None (1): same what is this? can someone help us understand?

NextAd8013 (1): What kind of modernization is happening inside SSPX?

NextAd8013 (2): Originaly it was but they split up

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): Lying is sinful

colekken (2): The Williamson's Group...? I'll have to look them up.

colekken (2): I looked up. There was apparently a Bishop in the SSPX with the last name Williamson and he didn't believe that the Holocaust actually happened and he hated the Catholic church. Long story short they kicked him out of the SSPX.

Glad-Sweet9526 (1): Roger that, thanks

None (1): What's your point

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (1): He did not sign the documents of Vatican 2

None (1): I was told directly by a priest of the SSPX that he did, and [Catholic News Agency](https://www.catholicnewsagency.com/news/14756/archbishop-lefebvre-signed-every-one-of-vatican-iis-documents), according to Ignazio Ingrao, claims he did. [Second Vatican Council documents in full](https://archive.org/details/second-vatican-council?tab=collection)Your claim is directly contradicted by the evidence. Why do you claim he did not sign the documents of Vatican 2? Lying is sinful.

CAAZEH\_THE\_COMMISSAR (2): \>I was told directly by a priest of the SSPX that he did Most likely a modernist infiltrating the Society, report him to the Superior for an investigation. Abp. Marcel Lefebvre vehemently denied ever signing the documents of Vatican 2, rejecting it even during the Council and his signatures are not found on them. The "signatures" that are found, were for attendance sheets for the council, which modernists then spin as the documents

# Post 572: Should I go to a NO baptism?

Author: RadTradTref

Score: 5

Comments: 24

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1bgow90/should\_i\_go\_to\_a\_no\_baptism/

So my sister just had her 4th baby. She is a nominal Catholic at best. She sends her kids to NO Catholic school but doesn't even take them to Mass on Sunday. She has chosen my younger brother to be the Godfather of her newest baby. My younger brother is gay married to another man and doesn't practice the faith at all. I don't even understand why she chose him and how her church is even allowing him to be the Godfather. Should I go to the baptism and should I notify the NO priest that my brother (the future Godfather) is a non practicing homosexual? I have some time to decide because the NO refuses to do baptism during lent and the Easter season so the baby is scheduled to be baptized some time after Pentecost.

colekken (13): The Novus Ordo is a valid Mass in the Catholic Church, just like the Traditional Latin Mass. Homosexuality aside, you are very fortunate to have a sister who is having her baby baptized in the Catholic Church. My brother refuses to have my nephew baptized at all. When your nephew grows up, all he will know is that he is validly baptized in the Catholic Church. He won't know about any of the other drama, so I encourage you to support him and attend as he enters into the Holy Catholic Church.

None (3): You could notify them and see what the response is.

Alternative\_Law8496 (2): He needs to know he’s not practicing.

Signal-Confection-32 (2): Ok so unrelated questionDoes your gay brother have children?

None (2): Many people here say "it's valid, therfore no problem". I'm sorry, but this is not the SSPX's position, have y'all ever asked an SSPX priest about it?The SSPX's position is that NO is valid but not legitimate (saying a sacrement is valid doesn't mean it's good, for example sacrements at the orthodox are valid but it's bad to have an active participation at any orthodox Mass/sacrament.So the SSPX's position is that we shouldn't participate to NO sacraments/Mass, although we can go assist to them (for example for a NO Mass I go there when I'm invited to a wedding, but I don't sing and I don't get communion; no need to be ostentatious about it though). So I think you should show up to the baptism, but not participate in any way (and if they notice, make sure to tell them it's not against them!)Regarding the baptism, the traditional doctrine of the Church was that it is better for a baby to not be baptized than to be baptized but not raised as a Catholic; if they won't take him to Mass every sunday, that'd be a good enough reason to refuse the baptism, for the child's sake. This sounsd cruel, but it's the right thing to do.Regarding your brother, I didn't get if he was practicing it or not?

elsro (3): I would be very worried to have the child baptismed, if the child is not going to be raised Catholic. It would cause a lot more responsibility...but maybe this is something to ask your priest.

Huge-Explanation-358 (1): The Godfather cannot be involved in a public scandal. I baptized my son a month ago and this was explicitly explained.

PeterSSPX (1): I will pray for your family.

BrodyJerome (1): Even according to the 1984 code of canon law, Canons 872-874, if the brother is both not practicing the Catholic faith and is in a same-sex "marriage", he would not meet the Church's requirements to be a godfather, since he would be required to be an example of the living Faith of the Church. This is the main problem. The second problem, is that for the church to officiate this baptism there should be a well-founded hope that the child would be brought up in the Catholic religion, and this does not seem to be the case. Under these circumstances, in any other time in history, the priest would refuse the baptism.My reccomendation would be to inform the priest where the baptism is going to take place before it happens, so this can be corrected. Knowing NO priests, it is likely that he will not care, or he will find a way around it. If this is the case, I would recommend not attending.

Piancol (1): There are two different issues here (or more). First of all, the actual question in the title: yes you can and should go because it's a valid sacrament in a Catholic church, but furthermore you could be there witnessing that everything is actually done properly so the sacrament IS valid and complete. But this first point could depend a lot on the next point...Second, about your brother and his living situation. Currently he's living in mortal sin and in public scandal and he would certainly not be allowed to be a Godfather by any means, doctrinally, canonically, or even common sense-wise. I know of several relatives and friends that were refused as Godparents in NO parishes because they were living in concubinage, adultery, etc. and your brother's situation, sadly, is even worse than that. Which makes me think that this NO parish is probably one of the worst kind (yeah, there are some worse than others), unless they somehow have been lied to or given incomplete information about the prospective Godfather. In any case, please do report it to the proper authority, anonymously if possible, and if they still go through with him after having all the facts then I would advise you to abstain from participating in that, clearly shameful and most probably sacrilegious travesty.In any case, try to ask your local SSPX priest's advice on this giving him all the necessary information; that's always the best course of action.And pray a lot for your siblings (which I know you most certainly do already), I will remember all of you in my prayers.

SEELE01TEXTONLY (0): Your sister as "nominal \[...\] at best" and brother "non practicing" is just, like, your opinion, man. So long as they didn't misrepresent anything, I think you're being really presumptuous. maybe defer to the priest's judgement on this.

rathdrummob (0): My godfather is/ was (deceased) gay. It’s not contagious.

RadTradTref (3): I agree it's valid and we are very glad she is getting him baptized. Her middle 2 child were baptized at ages 4 and 2 after I kept asking her for years to baptize them. But my nephew will grow up and know his Godfather is gay and non practicing.

RadTradTref (1): No he says he want them but will never have them.

asimovsdog (1): > This sounsd cruel, but it's the right thing to do.Why? If the baby dies before reaching the age of reason, it goes straight to heaven.

BrodyJerome (1): So what if it's not the SSPX's position. There is no unified "SSPX position" and the SSPX doesn't dictate magisterium. We do what we can as Catholics, and search what the Church's teachings are. The SSPX is not some Petite Église we have joined ourselves to, but simply the fraternity of priests that says Mass at the church we go to, as Traditional Catholics.

RadTradTref (2): Thank you

Huge-Explanation-358 (1): Lmao, you know what OP meant, but you can't help but to try to create a fuss can you?

RadTradTref (1): I know it's not but it is scandalous.

colekken (8): Well, if he grows up to love the Faith he'll be able to put that fact aside and love the fact that he is a baptized Catholic no matter the circumstances.

PeterSSPX (1): Thank goodness

None (1): Well yes, but (that's the actual theological reason, I'm not making it up) it is not a sin for a non baptized person to not go to Mass on sunday, but it's a grave sin for a baptized person; so if you baptize a child and don't teach him to go to Mass, he probably won't go to Mass as an adult.

None (1): Well the SSPX's position and the Catholic church are the same thing.Sadly though, the Vatican sometimes expresses views which contradict the doctrine of the Church (like recently for the blessing of gay couples). In that case, knowing the position of institutes that didn't give up any of the Catholic doctrine can be useful.That's all I meant ;)

SEELE01TEXTONLY (1): um, no? Sister didn't have to invite OP at all. She’s presumably married, under husband’s authority, so OP is out of his lane interjecting himself based on only his personal opinion

# Post 573: A sticky situation

Author: anonymous5534

Score: 6

Comments: 11

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1b982ee/a\_sticky\_situation/

I’m someone who is considering becoming Catholic and has been for a little while now. I come from a non religious family Ever since I came back to campus for this spring semester I have been attending Mass every single week. My family currently doesn’t know I’ve been doing this It’s been easy for me to attend Mass at the Chapel here on my college campus where I can just go on my own. I don’t need a car or anything like thatHowever I’m really worried about what I’m going to do over spring break when I’m gonna be away from campus for the first time since the start of the semester and I don’t know what I’m going to do about going to MassThe only thing I could really do is tell my parents that I’ve been attending Mass and to see if my Dad would be willing to take me to Mass somewhere near me. It’s gonna be a really tough conversation for me, especially since bringing up topics of faith is really difficult in my family and it can be kinda tense and scary to do soI know that I should probably just get over myself and tell him which I might but I’m scared I’m not going to be able to get past my nerves and tell himI get that I’m not technically Catholic yet and I think I’m technically not bound to the Sunday obligation, but I would still feel really guilty about missing Mass for a week or to and I don’t know what I’m going to do and I’m really worried Sometimes I wish I was a cradle Catholic from a Catholic family and that I didn’t have to deal with this in this way Any advice you guys have about how to navigate this difficult situation would be much appreciated God bless you and thank you

parsonpilgrim (7): If you’re not ready, you’re not ready. Don’t feel obligated to narrate your whole life. I get the impulse to share, but if you’re not ready to field questions and defend the Faith, then be a catechumen and a good student for the time being and focus on learning, reading and praying. The Sunday obligation is Divine Law, not ecclesiastical—it is that too, but Divine Law trumps Canon Law, as everyone in SSPX knows. You should try to keep the Lords Day holy in the way you can. Maybe that means sneaking off to Mass, if possible, or doing what you can and what a reasonable person would do when that’s not an option. Don’t get overly scrupulous. Referencing the canon, the requirement to “hear Mass” may be reasonably suspended if the Mass is unCatholic, illicit, or if you’re sick or it’s practically impossible to attend. The language allows for a well formed conscience to judge prudently. Nevertheless, keep in mind the Divine Commandment to keep the day holy. I’m glad you’re converting. It’s hard work and extraordinary— you cause much joy in Heaven. Sometimes you have to follow the example of Mary and ponder these things in your heart for a while before taking off to see family.

None (2): Hi!It's great to hear about you're conversion, you'll be in my prayers!I assume the reason your father might get a bad reaction is that there are reasons for you to think he'd have reasons to be against it; I don't think you have the duty to tell him right away, but obviously you can't hide it forever, so I think you should try to tell him in the way that would make him the most understanding. Not a way that would convince you, but him. Try to get the reasons why he'd oppose it and be diplomatic about it!As long as you're charitable and faithful, you could even end up being the tool of his conversion, that'd be the most beautiful ending! It's possible, I have met a few families converting through the child. Faith just gives a family such a stronger and deeper sense of unity!So yeah although I don't think it's a moral imperative, it's definitely important for you to continue having Mass every week, you should definitely try to eventualy let them know about, and hopefuly even convert them! If you have reasons to think your father would refuse to drive you there (but btw bringing him to Mass would be a great way for him to discover it!), see if a friend could, or contact the closest parish and ask them if someone could drive you!Good luck!

Piklikl (2): It might be helpful to write out what you want to say (and phrase it in a way that doesn't sound judgemental about your parent's choices), and just read it off to your dad. Start the conversation with "There's something I want to talk to you about, but it's really difficult for me so I've written down what I want to say." Also roleplay the conversation with a friend, that way the first time you're actually saying the words "would you be able to give me a ride to Mass a couple times during spring break" isn't in front of your dad. I wouldn't be surprised if your parents, while not interested in Catholicism themselves, wouldn't mind helping you at all and would much rather be the ones giving you a ride than someone from a parish near your home.

Piancol (2): Hey, nice to see you around again, my friend! If having a talk with your parents about it seems too overwhelming and problematic to you, maybe it's better not to. See if you can find a way to hitch a ride to the local parish for Sunday Mass - maybe there's a group for that specific parish or church and you can ask there. Do you know any neighbours or friends that might be going to church on Sunday or might be willing to give you a ride?Anyway, if everything else fails then don't forget to sanctify the Sunday with the Holy Rosary and, if possible, read the prayers of the Mass for that day.Now, I have a question for you though: How come you're constantly posting in this specific SSPX group but don't seem to be planning on becoming a faithful of the SSPX, as far as I understand from your comments? I'm just genuinely curious as to why would you come for advice or guidance precisely here and how is it that you got here in the first place?

anonymous5534 (2): I might have options but Idk for certain

anonymous5534 (2): It’s a possibility that there might be other ways but we’ll have to seeMy Dad knows I have been interested in the faith and the discussions we’ve had have been kinda rough so that’s why I have my doubts that he’ll take me It’s hard for me to believe that he’d be willing to change his mind, Idk if I could do it or notI feel like a coward

anonymous5534 (3): My dad, although pretty anti Catholic, can be very loving and generous with how he treats me. If I express that it’s something I’m really willing to do, he might be willing to do it, but it’s just a really tough conversation to have

anonymous5534 (2): 1. I did end up taking with my Dad yesterday and it went worse than I had hoped, it was pretty bad and left me really upset. I only know of one friend who goes to the same college as me who just so happens to live near me and goes to Mass at a place not incredibly far from when I am, but they have Mass really early in the morning and she might have to factor in a lot of time to come and get me so I didn’t feel comfortable asking her, especially since it would’ve been fairly last minute. Same goes for getting someone from a parish. I did sorta consider calling an Uber, but with how rough things were yesterday I didn’t feel too comfortable with that option either. That and it would’ve been like $50 there and back which is a bit ridiculous 2. I did end up watching 2 different Masses that were streamed live, prayed a Rosary, and did the readings separately3. I wouldn’t say I’m opposed to attending SSPX Masses or becoming a more traditionalist Catholic, I just feel a bit confused as to how exactly I should feel about it and if it’s the best place for me to start. A big part of why I’m here is because I was introduced to Catholicism through someone who is very much a supporter of the SSPX and that more rad trad route, so it still sticks with me even during moments when I feel myself drifting away from it a bit. I do like getting advice here because I can get what is close to even the most traditionalist opinion on any matter than I can consider that whenever I’m discerning something

None (1): Without God's grace we all are!You shoud stop blaming yourself for things you haven't even done yet (and, whith God's grace, that you won't do!), and try to get the situation right to get the solution right! ;)What is it that you fear? That you won't know how to defend your faith? Then anticipate the questions and prepare for them by asking a priest and friends! That he'll get mad at you? Then make sure to tell him in a way that will affect him the least. That he'll not love you as much/reject you? Then it's for sure a hard decision (and you should wait you're more firm in your faith to confront him), but if you love him you love his good, and converting would be his ultimate good! Simply that he'll say no to do drive you to Mass? Big deal, just get someone from you parish to drive you! All of those? Then apply all the solutions!Don't forget though that not anything can be fixed in one second, all of those things will need to take their time. But God never asks us something that's above our capacity.If objections on the faith are things that are worrying you, feel free to tell them here! The most beautiful thing about our faith is that it's true, not only it's the good thing to believe in, but also it's the rational thing to believe too!Also I strongly encourage you to ask for advice in your community, to your Catholic friends, to any parishoner you trust, or to you priest, he'd be glad to support you!And as always, prayers and charity are they key!

anonymous5534 (3): I ended up talking with my Dad on Saturday. It didn’t go very well, it actually went worse than I thought. I could tell it wasn’t quite the time to ask him to take me to Mass, it was probably too late to get someone from the parish to come, and idk how I felt about having anyone else come to our place to take me. It was all a very messy situation and I was pretty upset Saturday night Idk exactly what I was afraid of per se, but I just know that it’s a divisive topic and kind of a taboo for us and I knew that it was gonna be a sorta sore subject. I wasn’t even the one that brought it up, he was. I guess I wasn’t as ready to defend the faith as I would like. I ended up just watching a couple of Mass live streams, praying a Rosary, and did the daily readings on my own separately and that’s what it was I’m worried about how things will go moving forward but I’m not really looking forward to it

None (1): I'm really sad to hear that... But do not lose hope! What is done is done, you did what you could! One day you'll be independent and you won't need anyone to drive you somewhere. Also, the more you'll learn and read about the faith, the more you'll know how to defend it. And hopefuly one day your parents will even convert! After all, non of us would be Catholics if the apostles (and so many others) had persisted despite their own weaknesses, and despite being persecuted. Just live your life, do what is right and don't overthink things, "He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in that which is greater"! Hardships are just opportunities for us to get better!

# Post 574: Question Regarding Dissolution of Marriage Process

Author: Trashbag\_Alien\_Queen

Score: 6

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1b8dxqe/question\_regarding\_dissolution\_of\_marriage\_process/

Hi friends,I am going to try to keep a LONG story super short, feel free to ask for clarification if needed.My husband was previously civilly married. Neither he nor his ex-wife are baptized, so had a valid natural marriage. I am also unbaptized. Because of all this, the dissolution of his previous marriage has to go to the Vatican. We are catechumens who recently had the bomb dropped on us that the dissolution will not be completed in time for us to receive Sacraments at Easter, despite being assured since September that it would be done in time and everything was on track.At this point we have given up hope that there is any way we will be receiving Sacraments this Easter, we are \\*extremely\\* frustrated and disheartened. We did faith formation several years ago at an FSSP church and were made to believe the process would be fairly simple and straightforward, the exact opposite of what we are going through at our current diocesan parish. I know SSPX is in irregular communion with Rome, so I am curious how the dissolution of marriage process might work. Would it still need to go through the diocesan tribunal process and to the Vatican? Or is there a different process entirely?Thank you in advance for any information you can give!

None (3): Hello!First I wanna say I'm sad to hear all of that, I can't believe how hard it must be to hear you have to wait one more year! It's a shame the system is so slow.That being said, although I'm an SSPX parishoner and supporter, I wouldn't get baptism at the SSPX if I thought they were actually Catholic, so I can't encourage you to something do you would consider bad. I don't think it's true that we are in "partial communion" though, whatever this means; either we're outside of the Church or we're not, we can't be half in half out! And I don't think it's possible to argue we're out, otherwise it'd mean Pope Francis allowed schismatics to give confession and marriage!Now to answer your question, except in France where an agreement has been made, the SSPX doesn't want to follow the current canon law regarding marriage (because of its views that are against Tradition) and so it has set up its a community tribunal, which doesn't go through diocesan. Anyway, if you have other questions let me know, if you want I'm in touch with SSPX priests so I can them directly, you both will be in my prayers!

Piklikl (2): The SSPX's tribunals do work closely the Vatican (some things have to be done by the Pope/Vatican, so things get referred up the chain, at least that's my understanding) , they're not just out doing their own things. There's a chance they might have a shorter line to wait in at the Vatican, so to speak. However, I wouldn't be surprised if the SSPX ends up telling you the same thing your diocesan parish (at least in the timeline). In any case, this is a very technical issue with a lot of moving parts, your best bet is to either contact the SSPX US District Office or get in touch with your local SSPX priest. You also might be able to get some sort of workaround if you're dead set on getting sacraments at Easter, it would probably involve the two of you taking a public vow to live as brother and sister until the two of you can be validly married in the Church. That way the two of you can get Baptized and receive the Eucharist (and possibly Confirmation), and once the marriage stuff is sorted out, you two can get that taken care of at a later date.

joao464 (1): First: dissolution of marriage does not exist. A valid marriage cannot be dissolved. What exists is the declaration that the marriage has always been null and void. If your fiancé and you were previously married to someone else just civilly, you probably wouldn't even need a long process, as generally a civil (state) marriage is null in itself, you would just need to talk to a valid priest. If you want, call me privately, I have very contacts within the clergy and I can help you.

joao464 (1): It is worth mentioning that, according to several moral theologians, life in concubinage, or cohabitation between a man and a woman who are not married, even if there is the intention to marry, is an impediment to a future true marriage between the two who live together. This issue must be resolved URGENTLY with a serious and traditional priest. Cohabitation as it is is the occasion for a very serious sin.

Highwayman90 (1): Dissolution of a natural marriage does exist, though, per the Pauline Privilege.

joao464 (1): It is not a dissolution of the marriage contract, but only a "per accidens" dissolution, where the marriage contract continues (as it cannot be dissolved), but the spouses are exempt from cohabitation.

# Post 575: Marriage Prep

Author: None

Score: 5

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1b89jyi/marriage\_prep/

Hello, I was wondering why marriage prep consists of if you do it through the SSPX

None (1): Hello! I just went through this a year ago. My wife and I got married in June and we are expecting a baby girl this week! Typically you will meet regularly with your priest, usually I’ve seen at least once a month leading up to the wedding. They usually have a standardized packet of information that they need to cover, including what marriage is as a vocation/sacrament, expectations in marriage, how to overcome specific conflicts, what is ok in marriage and what is not ok in marriage, including topics on intercourse. There’s more too it than that but that’s the gist. It’s all standard information but very necessary, especially because society today is working to destroy what marriage should be. Let me know if I can answer any other questions!

None (1): What kind of questions do they ask? Do they ask questions about your past? I have some stuff in my past that I'm ashamed of

None (1): They will ask the general questions to make sure that you’re eligible for marriage within the Catholic Church. (Age, relation to the potential spouse, consent to marriage, no previous valid marriage, etc. As long as there’s no impediments you’re fine. Past sins are never talked about outside of the confessional unless you are specifically seeking guidance about them.

None (1): Both parties need to be baptized Catholics and Confirmed as well but the confirmation isn’t an absolute requirement but it should take place prior to marriage if possible.

# Post 576: Holy week question

Author: RadTradTref

Score: 8

Comments: 9

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1b5y3i1/holy\_week\_question/

I'm new to the SSPX. I've been attending the FSSP for 6 years. I just moved and now we attend the SSPX. The last 6 years we have done the pre 1955 Holy week. Does the SSPX do pre 1955 or 1962 Holy week or is it different for each chaple? Thanks fmin advance for you answers.

Piancol (8): Officially, the SSPX follows the 1962 Missal, since Archbishop Lefebvre accepted it after careful analysis and consideration. You might find a chapel or priest here and there that does something different but those are rare exceptions.

4dvocata (3): Most of them do the ‘62 but it can vary.

mynameisnotBOBO (4): To my knowledge it is the 1962 Liturgy

RadTradTref (3): Thanks

RadTradTref (2): Thanks

RadTradTref (1): Thanks

4dvocata (2): No problem man! How are you liking the new location & new chapel?

RadTradTref (6): I love it! There is a certain peace of mind knowing that the Mass can never be taken away. When I was at the FSSP there was always a worry in the back of my mind that at any moment this could all end.

4dvocata (3): That’s true. Stability is nice to have and important especially when you’re raising kids. Glad you found a good community there.

# Post 577: I'm so tried of being called a schismatic and a Rad Trad

Author: None

Score: 19

Comments: 18

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1b56ebr/im\_so\_tried\_of\_being\_called\_a\_schismatic\_and\_a/

Some context I go to a big University in Texas and our local church is super conservative and people when ever I mention the fact that I grew up going to society masses and still sometimes go but not as often as did when I was younger I just start getting bashed and called a schismatic and Rad Trad for even going or defending the SSPX or the TLM. Advice? and yes I do Pray for the people in question

craft00n (12): I'm in a very progressist university in France (Paris 8 - Saint Denis), don't open with religion. Start by speaking about other things, create links and friendship, THEN go into serious topics. People won't insult you if they think you're cool, and they will be eager to think differently about the whole SSPX if you show to them that you are measured and comprehensive.

None (7): Try as much as you can to be occasionaly (if possible) with people having the same ideas as you. Being always with people who disagree with us is enriching and interesting, plus it's necessary for apostolate, but it can be too destablizing.Also, try not to engage on the matter with people who are of bad faith, since it can be very frustrating while having no use!Personaly at some point I got tired too be always on the defensive, and when people were annoying I went more on the offensive (without being agressive obviously); for example if I woul simply tell them "what do you believe about religious freedom, do you think it's coherent with the Traditional doctrine of the Church?". Then either they say yes, then I tell them to read Quanta Cura, if they say no I tell them that they agree with the SSPX and not with any public position from an Ecclesia Dei.This worked pretty well and tended to made those people less agressive!No matter what, never forget that just because we're a tiny minority means we're wrong, if we're just charitable and faithful with everyone without caring about what they think of us, we'll make the difference in the Church! ;)

4dvocata (4): These don’t sound like very nice people. Bashing someone isn’t very Christian. If you’re a rad trad, their behavior makes them a bunch of crazy “mad-trads” or at least a mad-neoconservative. lol I don’t see rad trad as a pejorative or an insult. I would wear that as a badge of honor…. but the schismatic allegations are just silly. You could go toe to toe with them, but there’s probably a difference in principles going on here -mainly their acknowledgment of the crisis in the church. In an argument, a different principles like that is likely an unbreachable abyss.My best recommendation is to kill them with kindness, and be as charitable as you can be. I have friends in the diocesan latin mass community and I maintain those friendships, even though I attend the SSPX just being a kind person. It’s definitely not a bad idea to read up as much as you can on the position of the society so you can defend yourself and for your own education . For example, it’s impossible for the church to give ordinary faculties to hear confession to schismatic clergy yet Francis has done so with the society universally… go figure.

None (11): Sspx sacraments are valid and fulfill your Sunday obligation. Sspx is incredibly anti-sede and anti -schismatic. Plus, their sole purpose of existing is to get Rome back on track. Sspx is not setting up rival churches. They literally just want Catholicism as it has always been taught before rampant modernism. We pray for the Pope and the church every Sunday and on first Fridays. I'd wager that most haters have never even been to an sspx mass. Rad trads? It's a bunch of families trying to save their souls.

rathdrummob (0): Your new friends might not be very charitable, but they aren’t wrong. I recently left my SSPX church - 53M, confirmed by Abp Lefebvre, SSPX since mid 1970s- when I realized that they have lost their way. I now see very clearly that the SSPX has no way back to full communion. It wasn’t always like this, but now, at least in the US, it operates as a separate church. There is little to no collaboration with the various dioceses in which they operate, the openly tell their supporters that they aren’t required to attend Mass if there isn’t an SSPX Mass available on Sundays and holy days. If it walks like a duck (cult) and talks like a duck(cult)…. Well ? I’ve been a very involved follower and defender of the SSPX, I coordinated a mission for several years, I’ve raised my family in this group, moved around the country to be close to “mass center”, sent my kids to their inferior schools…but we couldn’t take the double speak anymore. They aren’t in communion with Rome and don’t want to be. It wasn’t always like that, but it is now. Find a conservative priest who is actually inside the Catholic Church and talk to him. Those are your people if you’re a catholic. There are many multitudes of very devout people living their faith in the diocesan Catholic Church. Find them. It’s refreshing.

Antoninus\_Ferrer (0): Are you attending a conciliar church?

None (5): I do that and i think it is more they have been lied to about the society and some society priests don't do the society right with how they talk about the Novus Ordo it really doesn't sit well with them but i see your point

None (4): Yes, I guess it just i am just really tried of dealing with these sorts of people as it is the officially approved catholic space on campus and in bit of good news a bunch of Faithful who go SSPX and FSSP are forming our own space and praying to get it approved so we can speak on these things freely but not like a new church or anything like that

craft00n (6): Hi, I'm a french student and while I fully disapprove your take about "full communion" I have to agree about cult problems. In France, the problem is less present, but still some dynamics are really dangerous.My brother once heard a priest teaching in a sermon that we shouldn't have friends outside of SSPX church attendees, and that is absolutely cult-like. But you know what ? My father works with Don David Pagliarani, and when Don David heard about that, he was really angered and the priest was lectured and is not head of priory anymore.Sincerely, US SSPX churches are really one of a kind, don't judge SSPX only by them, they don't lead SSPX, and their modus operandi is not at all majoritary in SSPX.For the full communion and cooperation with diocese thing... Do you know any diocese who wants to cooperate with SSPX ? In France, that never existed. Bishops just put FSSP or ICKSP churches in 100 meters perimeter around any city SSPX church.

jrichpyramid (1): Thank you for sharing.

None (1): Although your candor and experience is appreciated, it seems you do not have a strong grasp on the basics. Refraining from NO masses is not cult-like due to the sundry reasons given by the sspx based on the facts regarding its inception, its purpose, its content, and its fruits. In addition, it is not cult-like since the sspx only does what the church has always done; that which is not harmful to the faith. They do not innovate nor deviate from tradition or orthodoxy. You claim that one should seek a conservative NO priest which is already almost a contradiction. I've met good NO priests but they are the distant minority in what should almost never be the case. The fact you have to qualify a "conservative" priest is telling of the dangers of NO parishes. Going to mass and seeking counsel should not be a gamble, hence the disapprobation of NO masses. And anyways, the sspx is not in schism nor have they ceased in their mission to return fully to Rome and correct her errors.

None (1): Do you include diocesan Latin mass that also has a Novus Ordo mass in your definition of Conciliar church

None (1): I'm sorry to hear. I hope you guys get approved. I think you should find solace in the fact that you're doing the best for your salvation. In addition, try to avoid things that lose your peace of soul. If reading too much online or watching certain topics makes you despair, drop them; even if they're from Catholic sources. Increase spiritual works and pray for perseverance. Ask Our Lady for assistance, who will never fail to help us

rathdrummob (1): Well, your condescension is not really appreciated in turn. I certainly get the basics, and I even know some of the big words. I’ve been living inside SSPX culture for close to 50 years, SSPX schools in the 70’s, 80’s- moving around the country to “mass centers”, arranging my life and career around places where there are SSPX schools… the blinders just came off and I’m finally understanding what it means to actually be a Catholic. I’ve seen the society ebb and flow, good years and less good. I have family members who are religious in the SSPX. But I had to leave because my children were losing their faith. There’s too much bitterness, the faith is too legalistic- way too much ink is spilled justifying themselves, too much doublespeak. “We’re in full communion but…” only theoretical communion. Many priests and many faithful would rather criticize what clothes people are wearing or if a woman has a veil than to rejoice that she is a new visitor to the mass. It’s a bunch of Pollyannas clutching their pearls over cultural stuff that is simply made up. We live today. We have the church that God has given us for this day. There was a Eucharistic procession in downtown Spokane last year with thousands of people attending- not a single word from the priests in Post Falls encouraging the faithful to take part! That demonstrated their commitment to communion with the Catholic Church. They have no intention of regularization. And I do understand that I’m mainly talking about the US. I was in Europe last summer and they seemed to have a less puritanical sentiment. And I did speak to Fr Pagliarani- not at length or about this topic. I know that they had a superiors meeting after ordinations addressing some of the issues I’m talking about. If things change for the better maybe I’d go back, but I got kids to raise, I can’t jeopardize their faith anymore.

Antoninus\_Ferrer (1): The diocesan latin mass accepts Vatican II, or at least accepts the licitness of the new mass. Do you not remember what the Archbishop said about the indult?

4dvocata (1): Safe to assume yes to this question bud.

None (2): do u think children’s faith (or lack thereof), in general, has more to do with influence from the church or influence from their parents…? It does seem a bit odd to blame the church for your kids “jeopardization of faith” and not your self, your family dynamics, other influences, and/or modern society. Is that just me?

rathdrummob (2): I’m aware of how it sounds, and at the end of the day you’re absolutely correct. But the effect of the environment and community in which children interact with the faith is hugely important. I’m basing my decisions on my experience. I’ve been doing what I thought was the right thing all along- deferring to the priests as I was raised, now seeing the effects of those decisions, the insistence on attending their mediocre schools, allowing my family to be indoctrinated into their Calvinistic attitudes about culture and “the world”, the lack of contact with and judgement of the actual Catholic Church and the many, many amazing families that are living their faith and who’s only sin is not ascribing to the SSPX version of Catholicism… etc, etc. My adult children finally seeing through all of that and associating all of that negativity and prideful doublespeak with their faith has become an undeniable hurdle that they are having to work through. While I’m sure that my younger children will have their struggles and doubts, they will at least be different ones, and by working through this for myself, I’m able to hopefully be of some assistance to all of them in building an internal faith based on joy, charity and peaceful love of God rather than the pharisaical fantasy that they are the among the “remainders of True Catholicism” from some older age that never really existed. They feel cheated, as do I. So if I can spare the younger ones at least that much it would be irresponsible not to try.

# Post 578: Self MORTIFICATION

Author: AlternativeMuted4912

Score: 4

Comments: 6

URL: https://i.redd.it/ho8dvdfo0nlc1.jpeg

Are there any available rite of blessing for a discipline whip at the Rituale Romanum? Or should I just let the priest bless it using the Ad Omnia blessing?What is the view of the society in regards to self mortification?

None (5): Great question. My priest said we shouldn't self-flagellate

Piklikl (2): Virtually every single time I've ever heard anyone mention self-flagellation, they ALWAYS say you should only do it with close guidance from your spiritual director. Whoever blesses your whip is likely going to refuse if you can't articulate your spiritual guidance and reasons for wanting to self-flagellate.

dashdum (1): It depends on what. If you decided to not wear short pants or short sleeves in summer heat and offer the discomfort up for souls in purgatory, to do extra fasting (within reason), or to eat foods that you don’t particularly like but are good for you as a penance that might be commendable if done for the right intentions. Extreme forms for self-mortification should be discussed with your confessor so you are not doing them with a less than humble piety or the wrong motivation.There are some Catholic organizations , who as a group, all fast and abstain from meat an extra day each week (e.g, Tuesday’s) with a common prayer intention linked to the fasting.

tradmark (0): But mine said we should under certain conditions. It depends on the individual I think.

None (1): Interesting. Do you remember those conditions? Maybe it's time to bring back the hair shirts.

feelinggravityspull (5): Condition #1: consult your spiritual director, not Reddit.

# Post 579: How to revamp my prayer life

Author: anonymous5534

Score: 6

Comments: 13

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1b0nahv/how\_to\_revamp\_my\_prayer\_life/

My prayer life has been getting worse as of lateFor two nights in a row I’ve decided to put off my nightly prayers until the next morning and I haven’t been praying prayers like the Rosary or the Divine Mercy Chaplet the way I have been in the pastI feel exhausted with prayer and like it just goes on and on, it can take me upwards of 1-2 hours to get through my nightly prayer and feeling like I have to redo them several times if they weren’t just right. I’ve also had an intensified fear of being caught in prayer for some reason and I feel like that’s wrong and sinful of me. Overall the thought of prayer just brings me feelings of great fear and dread. Especially when I am doing “make up” prayers that I know I should’ve done earlier. I feel like I have to sort of “punish” myself when doing these make up prayers as well, like forcing myself to be in an uncomfortable kneeling position as opposed to just sitting like I normally would. I feel guilty saying that prayer makes me feel this way but it’s hard for me to not feel like God is upset with me about all of this but, but I also don’t to fall down the dark path of acedia I think if I could find a way to sort of summarize my prayers for others that might help as well as not making the prayers I do so monotonous, but that feels negligent and selfish at this point I really need some kind of help and guidance to rejuvenate my prayer life that I don’t fall further down this dark holeGod bless you all, and thank you

None (4): Judging by your previous posts, I would recommend developing a relationship or obtaining spiritual direction with a traditional priest. I will pray for you

Piklikl (2): >it can take me upwards of 1-2 hours to get through my nightly prayerI think you might be struggling with scrupulosity. &#x200B;>feeling like I have to redo them several times if they weren’t just rightYou definitely are struggling with scrupulosity. Morning and night prayers shouldn't take you more than a few minutes each. If you want to spend hours in prayer (a very laudable desire to be sure), then you should drop out of school and join a religious order. You must fulfill your duties of state, which as a student means focusing on your studies. Perhaps your education is a little different from mine but I don't see how someone could do well in school while also spending hours a day in prayer (which again in isolation is not a bad thing, but when it impedes your ability to fulfill your duties of state then it does become a bad thing). A remedy I've heard for scrupulosity when it comes to prayer is to resolve never to repeat a prayer. Say your rosary, and if it's not perfect so be it, offer up the imperfection to God. Most of the time scrupulosity is simply just our pride telling us that we can actually save our souls on our own, it's not the Grace of God that saves us. I recommend you read through the very short book (practically a pamphlet) [Can We Be Saints?](https://www.arlingtonregia.com/legionsaints/cwbs.html) by Frank Duffey. An excellent quote from the book:>Perhaps the following words of Cardinal Newman will tempt us to take a step forward on the road: "If you ask me what you are to do in order to be perfect, I say, first do not lie in bed beyond the time of rising; give your first thoughts to God; make a good visit to the Blessed Sacrament; say the Angelus devoutly; eat and drink to God's glory; say the Rosary well; be recollected; keep out bad thoughts; make your evening meditation well; examine yourself daily; go to bed in good time, and you are already perfect."Also as u/Allstars94 mentioned, getting spiritual direction from a traditional priest is going to be your best bet as well. An in person meeting is better, but I'm sure if you get in touch with your local SSPX chapel they should be able to get an email address of a priest you can chat with.

jocyUk (1): you shouldn't try to make up for missed prayers. your post is full of tell tale signs of the work of the devil

anonymous5534 (1): I talk with a priest about once a week (I don’t think he’s a traditionalist) but it never goes as well as I would like

anonymous5534 (1): I haven’t been doing as well as I possibly could, that might be as a result of a couple different factors For 3 nights in a row I’ve neglected to do my nightly prayers in the way that I feel I should and I would be willing to find ways to summarize the prayers in the future but I feel that in penance I should do them the way I intended to for the time (if that makes sense). I’ve just been so burnt out when it comes to prayer and it’s hard to feel motivated to do it beyond some general prayers where I just talk to God about whatever is on my mind I get tired very easily at night and I feel so burdened by feeling like I need to make up 2-3 hours of basically the same prayer 2-3 times just beats me down, yet I feel like it’s the sin of acedia if I don’t. As mentioned I feel guilty and negligent about reducing the prayers I do in thanksgiving to God as well as for others, especially if I feel like I have to make up for prayers that I’ve missed What you mentioned is a common rebuttal I hear to scrupulosity and I have an issue with it personally. I have never said that perfect prayer is what saves me, I don’t believe that, I don’t believe that people that don’t do what I do aren’t saved or anything like that, but I can find it hard to believe that it is wrong to settle with prayer that you know could be better. I find it hard to feel that it’s okay to give imperfection to God and just expect everything to be fine and dandy. It’s almost like scrupulosity can’t necessarily be helpful but might be harmful but Idk that doesn’t necessarily feel right either It’s like scrupulosity puts me in this checkmate of I don’t know what to do, I can see the arguments for why it’s right, I can see the arguments for why it’s wrong, but I can’t really see wither of them being completely wrong. Even the priest I have been speaking to has said that he doesn’t necessarily think it’s wrong but that it’s exhausting and he’s rightThat quote from Cardinal Newman kinda makes me concerned because I really struggle to do a lot of even those things. I’m really worried about how things are gonna end up for me

None (2): Well that's probably why. Do you have sspx nearby? It would be well worth it to travel if possible. You can talk to a priest and exchange information. If he's too far for regular meetings I'm sure he'll be able to help you through phone calls, messages, zoom, etc.

Piklikl (1): >I’ve just been so burnt out when it comes to prayerThis is exactly why scrupulosity is bad. Prayer is a good thing, and your unreasonable (personal, subjective) standards are turning it into a bad thing for you. You definitely should talk to a priest about this. Even if he's not the best priest in the world, it's an exercise in humility and obedience to follow his direction. Every virtue is a middle point between two extremes (an excess and a defect). Life is about aiming for that middle point (which is actually closer to one of the extremes, so it's not exactly in the middle); sometimes you find yourself on the defective side of things, sometimes you're on the excessive side. You're clearly on the excessive side of things.I'm not advocating that you give up religion entirely and lapse into being a mediocre Catholic, just that you take 10-15% off the top and steer towards the defective side of things. It might help to think of this as you're trying to walk on the ridgeline of the roof of a good prayer life (walking perfectly on the ridgeline is having a perfect prayer life) . On the excessive side of the ridgeline, you fall off the roof by praying too much. On the defective side of things, you fall off the roof by praying too litte. I'm not encouraging you to pray too little, I'm encouraging you to take a step towards the defective side of things because you're clearly on the excessive side the ridgeline and in danger of falling off the roof entirely. I think you should go for a week or two of saying the most basic and simple prayers (no more than 5 min) for your morning and evening prayers. Nobody went to hell (or purgatory) for spending less than an hour on their night prayers, and you're not some special super sinner who needs to do tons of penance. Swallow your pride, and acknowledge that you're being excessive.

anonymous5534 (1): Neat my college? I don’t really know and I don’t have a car on campus I know of one not too far from my home but my family isn’t very religious so idk how that would end up working out for me

anonymous5534 (1): I will say that I’m not a Catholic yet, just aspiring and it can be really hard. Tbh I’m bot even baptized yet so it kinda makes me feel like there’s a little more that I have to do to make my prayers heard, specifically some prayers of intercession at the start of a lot of prayerIt’s hard for me to convince myself that scrupulosity is wrong and I find myself fighting any argument I hear or try to think of against it but I can definitely see what it does to my prayer life. It’s gonna be a tough rebuilding process

None (3): Sspx has a mass locator on their website. It's very easy to use. I would use public transportation if possible even to go just once and get in contact with a priest. I think that's your best bet because asking online to a bunch of random people isn't going to do your scrupulosity any good. Sspx priests are awesome. Very friendly and wise. They will help you save your soul.

anonymous5534 (1): I’m aware of the finder, that’s how I know about the one near me and the name of the Father but I don’t really live anywhere near public transportation but we’ll see

None (1): Walk if you have to lol

anonymous5534 (1): I might email him

# Post 580: Looking to join an SSPX

Author: RadTradTref

Score: 12

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1axrmdb/looking\_to\_join\_an\_sspx/

Hello, forgive my ignorance. I was NO for most of my life before finding tradition. I have attended a FSSP parish the last 8 years. We recently moved and now we are close to a SSPX Priory. We have gone to Mass a few times now and love the Church. We want to join but it's it like any other parish? Do we register as parishioners. I know they are not considered parishes but rather chapels so are the people called parishioners?Just not sure how that works.

PeterSSPX (10): It might be different from place to place but most chapels have a registration form near the entrance. If you can’t find it I’d pick up a bulletin and send someone a text. Worst case scenario you can just email Father and he’ll help you.

None (8): You don't "join" the sspx. They're part of the Catholic Church. Only the priests "join" the sspx. At my chapel, the parishioners register at the beginning of every year to be accounted for. You don't have to register. That's only if you're making it your home church, i.e., you're a regular parishioner, you want to receive your tithe information at the end of the year, etc.

Piancol (8): Just go and find the priest there and introduce yourself. Little chat to explain your background and intentions and he'll be able to guide you better than anyone. That's the easiest most natural way to do it.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (5): for all intents and purposes your exprience will likely be the same as in FSSPwhile you'll see online especially facebook that we are technically 'oratories', in everdyay life we and even the priests use the normal language of church, chapel, parish, parishoners etc. one thing I think you'll find out is the vast majority of parishoners have no idea or any care at all about this stuff and the polemics so often seen online. we just want to get good sacraments, good sermons, and raise good kids. you can find your corner in the larger parishes that want to badger sedevecantists and resistance and argue for pre55 missal but that stuff is magnified online and its really healthy in our parishes to just shut up, forget what rome is doing, and get the sacraments continually and read lives of the saints rather than more than is needed about the crisis in the church.

Mandapanda82 (2): At ours there are cards you fill out and just place in the offering baskets when they come around, or if you have a chapel coordinator, you might contact them and ask. I go to a little mission chapel who sends a priest over every Sunday and Holy Day from a priory in a different state.And yes, they are to be referred to as chapels and priories. My understanding is “parish” is to only be used for diocesan churches. But someone can correct me on that if I am wrong. And there is still deference for what a local ordinary (bishop) in the diocese for which your church is within says for matters they have the right to change (sorry if that was a weird sentence-I am really tired). For example, in the US if a Holy Day falls on a Saturday or Monday, the you are usually exempt from the obligation under pain of sin (except Christmas-that never transfers). However, your chapel will likely highly encourage the faithful to still attend. Same for Ember Days and vigils that are traditional days of fasting that are no longer observed in Novus Ordo churches. But again, not under pain of sin. I was confused about that for a bit, which is why I bring it up. They recognize there are disciplines which the bishops and the pope have the authority to change, but whether or not it’s spiritually fruitful is another matter.

# Post 581: Donate to the propagation of the devotion to the Holy Face in England
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1awja6p/donate\_to\_the\_propagation\_of\_the\_devotion\_to\_the/

As the title says, kindly donate to this cause as part of your Lenten penance, and don't stop when Lent is over because blasphemies towards Our Lord never stop. [https://donate.stripe.com/8wMcOx08kalh8rSbII](https://donate.stripe.com/8wMcOx08kalh8rSbII)

None (2): Lenten almsgiving\\* sorry

# Post 582: In Search of. Vintage Catholic artwork or paintings.

Author: LegitimateMaybe9995
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1asxrz6/in\_search\_of\_vintage\_catholic\_artwork\_or\_paintings/

Hello everybody, I am a traditional Catholic from Southern California. And I am looking for vintage artwork or paintings of Saint Pope Pius the Xth or photos or artwork of Archbishop Lefebvre that are framed. PM if you have any for sale. :)

Jure\_Francetic777 (3): Hello, I’m not really aware on any reputable sellers whom sell vintage Catholic Art. The best bet is honestly to buy replicas. They’re basically 1:1.

None (3): There wont be much "vintage" art of ABL as we only started making prints and stuff of him after he founded the SSPXHowever, for St. Pius X, check ebay?

elsro (2): https://www.etsy.com/listing/1387502278/archbishop-marcel-lefebvre-framed

LegitimateMaybe9995 (3): Thank you :)

elsro (2): https://www.etsy.com/listing/1473585152/marcel-lefebvre-the-great-holy-cardAlso saw this one after looking in Etsy just now!

LegitimateMaybe9995 (3): I ordered 5 of those. For all of my friends I love it so much :)

elsro (2): Oh nice! I was surprised to see him so young. I guess I've gotten to seeing him older. Glad to be of service and hope you have a good one!

# Post 583: Have I committed mortal sin?

Author: anonymous5534

Score: 2

Comments: 26

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1aq9feh/have\_i\_committed\_mortal\_sin/

As I have been posting a lot recently, my prayer life has been getting more and more difficult as of late and a lot of the prayers I used to be able to do very easily have gotten a lot harder for meI used to be able to pray a Rosary and/or Divine Mercy Chaplet every day, now I only get through a Divine Mercy Chaplet every few days a week and aw for the Rosary, it got to a point where I was only able to pray one decade a day and even then I rarely do that anymoreAs of late the only real effective prayer I can do is basically just talking to God like He is a friend, like a Father, and even then it doesn’t feel the same to me now as it was even a week ago. Still I have been doing my general prayers every night. I try to make a point of spending at least 15 minutes in prayer every day. My general prayers usually consist of three parts: my general prayers where I just kind of talk to God as I mentioned, one part where I pray thanksgiving as well as for other around the world, and some other more structured prayers that I pray on behalf of myself and others Usually I’ll pray the last two together and sometimes I’ll just talk to God a bit earlier which I was able to do last nightHowever last night I spent a lot more time doing some work than I had thought, didn’t eat until around 3:00-4:00 in the morning and as I was trying to prayer before eating it was taking me a lot longer than usual to get through it because of OCD and scrupulosity, and even after I ate I didn’t feel too great. It can take me a long time to get through the other parts of my general prayers as well, especially if I’m really tired and I just ended up feeling like I should just get some sleep since 8 hours is very rare for these days and just went to sleep There’s only been one other time where I’ve ended up skipping my nightly prayers was a week or two ago when I ended up taking some anxiety medication that I assume kinda ended up knocking me out pretty good. I ended up making up those prayers the next day which I plan on doing today, I already did the first part and might get to the second part later todayStill I woke up this morning feeling guilty because I decided to just not do the prayers I do every night kinda just because I didn’t feel like it, even if a couple of reasons may have been valid to an extent. Maybe I’m being scrupulous again but I feel like I committed mortal sin by neglecting to do what I know to be the right thing do in regards to prayer. Especially with prayer I do othersJames 4:17TLDR: I’ve been ving a lot of trouble with prayer recently and I neglected to do some of the prayers I do every night because I didn’t feel to great, is this mortal sin or not?

hardeho (5): Are any of the prayers you say obligations that bind under pain of sin? Unless you are part of an order, probably not. Not that it's not something to address, but what you described doesn't sound anywhere near mortal sin. Also, find a good traditional sermon or talk on scrupulosity. That sounds like a bigger danger to you than missing some prayers.

None (2): “The wish to pray is a prayer in itself. God can ask no more than that of us." - Diary of a Country Priest (George Bernanos)Although neglect of prayer is a sin against the first commandment, it sounds more venial than mortal. Remember sin becomes mortal if it checks these three boxes. (1) grave matter (2) full knowledge, and (3) deliberate consent. It doesn't sound like you're purposefully avoiding prayer. It sounds like you're not in the best place right now. Highly recommend talking to your priest. Discipline is required for prayer and often times demons pull us away. I just heard a sermon that recommended a strict prayer schedule (mortification) for people who live hectic lifestyles or who are lazy (weird how that works)

dashdum (1): I recommend that you get a dozen of the same booklet of prayers (small booklet of basic prayers) or various prayer cards (memorare, angelus, guardian angel prayer, st. Joseph prayer, st. Michael prayer, etc.) and put one everywhere (bedside, kitchen table, work desk drawer, wallet, car dashboard, bathroom counter, laminated card duct-taped to shower wall, tape a prayer card to the bathroom mirror where you brush your teeth, etc.). Then as you go about your day you’ll be reminded and can pray a short prayer. When you shower, you pray the morning offering prayer taped in the shower. When you are sitting on the toilet you pick up the card on the counter and pray that prayer. When you go to bed you have a card to read a prayer to your guardian angel. It may not always be the most reverent but your trying and accomplishing small prayers throughout the day. You will gain graces to help you expand and continue the short prayers. Work your way back up to the rosary.I have to admit that when my children were little, and as a stay at home mom, I said a lot of prayers when I had to go to the bathroom. It was the some of the only times I had relative quiet without someone tugging on my skirt (even if only a minute or two). I’m sure God heard me because some of those less than ideal toilet prayers were answered!Keep it simple and in your face so you can’t forget or neglect the short simple prayers each day.

craft00n (1): Obviously not. Mortal sin is grave matter, not doing your night prayer once is not grave matter.

Piancol (1): It seems to me that the real issue to address here is that of scruples and perfectionism. It's a very common thing among us and we all have it one way or another but if left unattended it can quickly evolve into a serious matter that can damage or distort your spirituslity in very vicious ways. Most scholars agree that the root of Martin Luther's evil was precisely that of scruples topped with a bad case of impurity. And we all know the incredible damage that his distorted conscience ended up doing for the whole world.Talk to a priest about it, ask them to guide you out of this vice and recommend good readings that help you address this issue.

None (1): [deleted]

Status\_City4236 (1): In order for a sin to be mortal, 3 factors must be present: It must be serious, you had to have given thought to It's seriousness and knowing that it's serious. You do it anyway.You caught yourself after you gave it some thought, so it's not mortally sinful

anonymous5534 (1): No, these prayers are pretty personal. They have established prayers within them (basically all of what the 3rd part is) but other than that they are all original to meYeah scrupulosity definitely is but Idk how to work my way out of it

anonymous5534 (1): Where do you think the line is drawn between neglecting prayer in a sinful way as opposed to it just being a light matter? That’s where I get confused

anonymous5534 (2): Yeah I know I get afraid that the troubles of scrupulosity translate into acedia and I don’t know how to work myself out of it

anonymous5534 (1): The Rosary is a lot harder for me to pray than the Divine Mercy Chaplet

anonymous5534 (1): I’ve fallen back into this habit, 3 nights in a row last week I didn’t end up doing some nightly prayers that I would usually spend an hour on. I feel the need to make them up sometime as penance for not doing them when I should have. I feel like it’s sin if I don’t.I’ve also been trying to do prayers of penance recently and it makes me all stressed out and nervous Overall prayer has become really difficult for me and I’ve been really anxious as of late and feel like I’m committing more sin than usual which leads me to condemn myself and makes me feel like I need to do more prayers of penance for it all. I’ve just been really stressed and anxious as of late

None (1): I think that's a matter only a priest can settle for you. I was in a similar quandary and it seems that there are multiple factors. For example, it depends on where you are in your spiritual life. Someone far in their journey will pray much more than most neophytes. It's not like there's a rule for praying like "you must do 60 minutes a day." I'm not sure if willful neglect is the same thing as acedia, which is what I think you're experiencing. If you can't reach a priest, I recommend just youtubing traditional sermons on prayer life. If you're a reader, an absolute classic I recommend is St Frances de Sales "introduction to the devout life."

LoudEffort (1): Have you tried breaking up the decades throughout the day, or praying alongside a video? I found that helped me when I was in a drought.

anonymous5534 (1): Tbh I’m not confirmed or even baptized but I’ve been considering converting and so I try to live as Catholic as I possibly can (if that makes sense)

anonymous5534 (1): Yeah, it can still take me up to 3 hours to get through a single decade

None (1): Bruh at least get baptized. Please! Your prayers are not as effective since you're not in a state of grace.

None (1): And who knows, baptism may merit you graces like you'd never expect.

LoudEffort (1): Is it your OCD that is preventing you? If it is that’s a real shame, try not to worry too much about it, you are trying your best.

anonymous5534 (1): God hears my prayers though right? What is the difference between the prayers of those who are baptized and those who are not?

anonymous5534 (1): I’m a bit scared of it all for various reasons but I hope that I get there

anonymous5534 (2): It’s hard to pinpoint exactly what it is but I presume soThe recent discovery I made in terms of trying to overcome OCD and scrupulosity is that it’s hard to convince myself that there’s anything wrong with what it does to my prayers. Like if I feel like a prayer is anything less that absolutely perfect for whatever reason, I shouldn’t go with it and I don’t see an issue with that. Yet it wreaks havoc on my prayer life and leads me to places of acedia and that’s something I don’t want It’s like I’m divided against myself and don’t know what to do, it’s kind of scary and concerning

None (1): Yes but he wants you to be with him. Unbaptized are separated from God. I'm not forcing you to go to church but please try to go to a traditional priest and get baptized.

LoudEffort (1): So sorry to hear that. I hope you find your way out of it eventually.

anonymous5534 (1): Is there anything I need to do prior to that though? Like going through catechism or something of that nature?

None (1): Right now you are dead to Him. Have you read any basic catechism? (Not saying that in a rude way.) If not, there's a free Pius X Catechism online that is simple and amazing if you wanna read up on baptism. Tbh I'm not sure. Highly recommend just going to the nearest sspx chapel and asking a priest before or after mass.

None (1): As far as I know, first communion is where you need catechism. I mean babies get baptized.

# Post 584: What Should I Do?

Author: anonymous5534

Score: 2

Comments: 31

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1anol9m/what\_should\_i\_do/

As you all know the Super Bowl is tomorrow I’ve been thinking about this for about a month now and it has really been gnawing at me and I feel really confused and overwhelmed Mass on my campus takes place at 6:00, the game will be starting at 6:30. If I go I will certainly be missing a part of the game but probably one of the parts I don’t want to missAs a fairly new aspiring Catholic and someone who just started going to Mass every week, it’s really forced me to question what I would end up doing In the past couple weeks I’ve been meeting some other Catholics around campus and they have offered to to take me to Mass off campus earlier in the morning so the rest of my afternoon would be freeIt seems like a good option, but then I kind of have to ask myself “what am I prioritizing here?” A week or two ago this was not something I was even considering and I felt like I had to make a choice, not find some way to weasel out of it, even if going to Mass off campus is technically a viable optionI just feel like if I go to Mass off campus and don’t force myself to make the tough decision of going to Mass on campus instead of watching the game that I’m committing some kind of sin against God, idolatry I suppose, and that really bothers me Idk am I just being too scrupulous? What do you guys think I should do?Thank you all, God bless you

None (12): Go to Mass.

PeterSSPX (10): As long as you go up mass you’ll be fine. We have multiple mass times for a reason, if you fulfill your Sunday obligation you are doing what’s right.

SummerKisses094 (8): Mass, then the game🤷🏻♀️

Piancol (1): If you were going to miss Mass for the game that would definitely be a sin, but if you find the way to do both then feeling guilty about it is just falling in the trap of scruples, thinking that God wants you to be miserable for Him, which is not the case. Now, if you willingly decide to offer up not watching the game as a personal penance or sacrifice, then that's a different story and would certainly be valuable spiritually, but it's not mandatory.The commandment is to sanctify the Sunday, and after going to Mass at any time and place you can, then you can relax and watch your game which is innocuous fun and God will not hold it against you. The mere fact that you are having a dilemma about this shows already that your priorities are straight and God knows it.

MaevainwenAdaniel (0): See the game. At least it will bring you joy which is something the SSPX cannot

MaterMisericordiae23 (1): Can't you go to Mass at an earlier time?? I've never heard of a TLM church does not have mass times before 12 pm.If you miss any of the morning Mass, then attend the evening Mass.And no, going to Mass as to not miss the game is not a sin

Status\_City4236 (1): I don't mean to be uncharitable, but it's kind of a stupid question:Of course, God should take precedence over any sporting event. The thought that you wouldn't simply just go to an earlier mass andAvail yourself of the charity your friend is showing is really over-thinking it.

anonymous5534 (1): Do you think it would be wrong of me to go off campus for Mass and be able to watch the game if it is an option?

anonymous5534 (1): I hope you’re right, it just feels wrong for some reason. I guess it’s because I wasn’t even considering it as an option only a few weeks ago and I’ve been wrestling with this in my mind for about a month

anonymous5534 (1): I ended up going to Mass that morning and watching the game in the evening

anonymous5534 (1): In all honesty I don’t think it’s gonna be a TLM but I just wanted some more traditionalist opinion on the matter itself

anonymous5534 (1): In retrospect I see that now, especially since that’s what I did. Scrupulosity really sucks sometimes

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (5): Going out of your way to get a different Mass so you can get the game is prioritising Mass. Go off campus and enjoy the game. I understand what you're saying but it's completely fine. If you get Mass on Sunday that's your obligation fulfilled. There's no weaseling your way out going on here. Feel free to ask any priest about it.

SummerKisses094 (1): Im not sure if its “wrong” per se but I’d make going to mass the priority.

Piancol (1): Ultimately, you should do what makes you feel at peace with God in conscience, but asking for a priest's advice about dilemmas like this one always helps with fine-tuning our spirituality so we avoid falling into excesses of all kinds. Cheer up, being Catholic is not and should not be a burden!

hardeho (3): How is going to Mass at 6PM making it the priority? Go in the morning like 95% of Mass going Catholics do anyway, you aren't doing anything wrong.

anonymous5534 (1): That’s what I kinda feel too, how many times can I go to Mass in a day?

anonymous5534 (1): I’m not a confirmed Catholic, I’m not even baptized, but I’m very much considering the process and trying to do the best I can but it can be very hard for me and it can be sorta scary sometimes. Scrupulosity and anxiety hits me really hard a lot of the time and I’ve been in a really bad place as of late

Spiritual-Coat2347 (-3): You can receive Eucharist twice in one day. I don’t think there is a limitation on mass attendance.

Piancol (1): I think you're kind of skipping some fundamental steps here then. You should definitely start talking to an SSPX priest, it will help you tremendously on your pathway to Catholicism. Also, you could start studying the Cathechism on your own - you will need to do that anyway before you can get baptised and all. I offer my help and guidance as a lifetime Traditional Catholic if it's of any use.

None (6): I'm pretty confident it is the opposite actually. You can go to Mass as many times as you want, but only one communion a day

anonymous5534 (1): The thing is I’m not a confirmed Catholic anyways, just kind of working towards it and can’t receive the Eucharist in any event anyways. But I still want to get to Mass as much as I can

anonymous5534 (1): I understand all this but I still want to do what I can

Jerailu (-2): It's two communions but shouldn't be an habit.

None (3): You're sure about that? Is it a priest who told you?

Jerailu (1): It's in the current code of canon law:CIC83 Can. 917: «One who has received the blessed Eucharist may receive it again on the same day only within a eucharistic celebration in which that person participates, without prejudice to the provision of can. 921§2.»

None (1): Oh ok I didn't know that!However the SSPX follows the 1917 code of canon law, which says the opposite : Nemini liceat sanctissimam Eucharistiam recipere, qui eam aedem die iam receperit, nisi in casibus de quibus in can. 858, § 1.No one is permitted to receive the most holy Eucharist who has already received it on the same day, except in the cases mentioned in can. 858, §1.

Jerailu (1): Yeah it's more complicated. I have a St Pius the Xth catechism with me (french edition I'm french) and they quote the new code as normative WHILE giving the advice to follow the old one on things such as fasts etc.It should also be noted that the CIC83 says that more for things such as altar servers serving multiple masses or people going to mass then a funeral and stuff like that.Ofc as the supreme law is the Salvation of all humans souls one always bypass the norm in danger of death or persecution! You see someone trying to break in a tabernacle? Even in mortal sin (ofc with an act of real contrition first) you should try to save the eucharist even if it means consuming all the hosts. A priest died after consecration and one cannot be obtained to finish the mass? A faithful should step in and finish it then distribute holy eucharist etc.That's one of the reasons I'm catholic we can break the shabath when it's needed. Or chose to follow a harsher law when we can.

None (1): Je suis pas un légaliste, je suis d'accord avec les exceptions que tu donnes ;)Mais par contre justement je ne pense pas que l'occasion d'aller à la Messe 2 fois dans la même journée constitue une raison suffisante de ne pas respecter le code de 1917.Tu utilises une édition de la FSSPX j'imagine ?

Jerailu (1): Yeah the edition of st Pius the Xth catechism I have is edited by the SSPX's french district mate.And I agree that it's wise in most cases to only take communion once a day! The CIC83 only state one is free to commune twice a day not that it's always recommendable.
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None (13): I got banned from r/Catholicism for saying the SSPX has premium priests.

None (3): Protestants are the biggest judaizers on the planet. That being said, the sspx condemns anti-semitism.

Piklikl (2): What’d you say?

aguysomewhere (4): I just joined this subreddit after seeing that they had banned promotion of the SSPX

PeterSSPX (3): Nothing untrue

None (5): They talk so much smack there! It drives me nuts because it still comes up in my feed, but I can't respond lol.

None (1): What was the nature of the beef?

PeterSSPX (8): Pretty sure it was something about disproportionate Jewish control over the pornography industry or something like that

Huge-Explanation-358 (3): oy vey delet dis

PeterSSPX (1): exactly lol

# Post 586: Untrue Teachings of Vatican II?

Author: Thaladan

Score: 11

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1ah97n0/untrue\_teachings\_of\_vatican\_ii/

I've explained my situation regarding the SSPX in previous posts.I've been reading/listening to what the SSPX says about Vatican II and its teachings. The three key teachings which it rejects seem to be (in descending order of significance) ecumenism, religious liberty, and collegiality.The SSPX's objections to those teachings (especially ecumenism) seem to usually revolve around them being ambiguous, misleading, open to misinterpretation, and/or having bad consequences. The objections are rarely that the teachings are untrue \*per se\*.Is that accurate, more or less? Or are there examples of Vatican II's teachings which are (from the SSPX's perspective) unambiguously and intrinsically untrue (i.e. with no room for an orthodox interpretation)?

None (8): To my understanding, the issue for them is mostly to be \*\*purposely\*\* "ambiguous, misleading, open to misinterpretation" is dangerous enough for Vatican II to be problematic. Anything can ambiguous, but being ambiguous in purpose is really bad when the goal is to infliltrate modernist ideas. Taking religious freedom as an example, by enforcing "religous freedom" into Catholic countries in the name of Vatican II, recents Popes have proved that this Council is dangerous.However, I think some teachings are untrue \*per se\* ; I encourage you to read for youself, first \*Quanta Cura\* (the most famous papal encyclical condemning religious freedom), and then \*Dignitatis Humanae\* (the Vatican II controversial text about religious freedom) and to see how they contradict each other.Here are the 2 texts:[https://sspx.org/en/quanta-cura](https://sspx.org/en/quanta-cura)[https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\\_councils/ii\\_vatican\\_council/documents/vat-ii\\_decl\\_19651207\\_dignitatis-humanae\\_en.html](https://www.vatican.va/archive/hist\_councils/ii\_vatican\_council/documents/vat-ii\_decl\_19651207\_dignitatis-humanae\_en.html)

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (3): of the 3 areas in v2, the actually teaching on collegiality seems to be entirely contradictory to the past, with zero room to argue for poor interpretation. the SSPX Podcast by don tranquillo absolute DISMANTLES the new teaching. in 1983 code of canon law and catechisms since, the teaching on death penalty and giving sacraments to protestants is completely oppositive of pre 1962 teachings. The latter is what convinced Lefebvre to consecrate bishops just as much or more so as assisi 1986 did. https://www.sspxasia.com/Documents/Archbishop-Lefebvre/Conferance-in-Turin.htm

# Post 587: Confession without absolution?

Author: None
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1afehm6/confession\_without\_absolution/

I went to confession very recently. The priest cut me off midway; he said to call a priest and schedule a general confession because there were many people in line behind me. I heard no words of absolution and no prescribed penance. I asked him, "So, I cannot receive absolution now?" He said, "I gave you absolution." I thanked him and left, but upon further research and reflection, it seems that this was a highly dubious way to administer the sacrament.What should I do if I have reason to suspect that the words of absolution were not said?Does anyone have any references pertaining to Catholic teaching on what to do about dubious absolution?

Piklikl (5): That seems odd. He can’t give you absolution until you’ve finished confessing all your sins. Then again if you think you got absolution then you can proceed as though you did.Your safest bet is to do as he says: schedule an appointment and then mention the circumstances. There’s no limit to how many times we can confess the same sin; some spiritual fathers suggest it as an exercise in humility when we can’t think of any other sins, and a general confession is a confession of all your sins since your last general confession.

hardeho (6): If he was telling you you had too many sins to confess for the time allotted, and you needed to make a general confession by appointment, then it wouldn't make sense to absolve the sins you were there to confess. If he gave absolution there, you wouldn't strictly "need" to come back for a general confession. Sounds to me like he intended to withhold absolution and have you come back to a more appropriate time. I bet you flustered him with your question and he either misspoke or said something he should not have.

Status\_City4236 (2): In order to validly absolve you of your sins. A priest must say words to the effect of " I forgive you of your sins" Or "I absolve you of your sins." if he doesn't then it's not a valid confession.

BrodyJerome (1): Was this an SSPX priest?

None (2): Thank you for the insightful comment. I highly suspect I did not receive absolution. I am still looking to schedule a general confession.

MaevainwenAdaniel (0): Well obviously those "spiritual fathers" are getting off on it. If you are truly confessing to your god, there's no need to overconfess just so that you have something to feel guilty about. It has nothing to do with humility, it has everything to do with the culture of fear and shame that the SSPX cultivates. They're not true men of God which is why the confessions they conduct are ineffective ¯\\_(ツ)\_/¯

None (2): I think he said something he should not have. Thank you for your insight!

None (1): No, the local diocesan TLM priest.

None (1): I had questioned whether it was damaging to me to go to this Mass before, in this very sub, and I was rebuked for thinking that there was a problem. I am a recent revert trying to find my path, and I feel quite isolated and without answers. The closest SSPX Mass only occurs on the 1st and 3rd Sunday each month.

Piklikl (3): >those "spiritual fathers" are getting off on itOne shouldn't be using explicit language and descriptors in the confessional anyway, and this isn't advice coming from SSPX priests explicitly, just about any decent literature on the sacrament will remind the penitent to not get carried away with their confession.&#x200B;>the confessions they conduct are ineffectiveTell me you know nothing about how confession works without telling me you know nothing about how confession works.Also, this wasn't an SSPX priest, it was a diocesan priest.

None (2): Wasn't SSPX. Get off your soapbox.

None (4): Hey i'm sorry you're having spiritual trouble. Sspx masses are valid and you should have no qualms regarding attending them. It's very hard to be a real Catholic. In some cases it's lonelier and dimmer than wherever we were before God's grace led us to the Church. Have faith that you're on the good path and remember that God rewards those who try their hardest to find the truth, to worship Him correctly. Remember that the path to Heaven is narrow - very, very narrow. Although, there's no reason to despair. We have the saints, angels, Mary, and Christ on our side. IMO, it's better to go to the sspx priest for your spiritual problems instead of the internet. They are typically very responsive and incredibly helpful. Ask for his number and develop a relationship with him. Also, diocesan priests, even the traditional ones, can vary wildly from one priest to another, whereas most if not all sspx priests are orthodox, just, wise, and charitable in their offerings. God bless brotha

None (1): I appreciate what you are saying. I have no qualms about attending SSPX Masses, as I stated above, but where I am, we only have Mass with the SSPX priest on 1st and 3rd Sunday. I have an SSPX priest in my contacts, and I have been in regular contact with him, but I realize that he is spread very thin and try to respect his time rather than contact him every time a thought pops into my head. I am currently working on moving closer to him because where I am is dire straits for traditional Catholicism.

# Post 588: Is this prayer book in accordance with traditional Catholic teaching?
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1aeu20e/is\_this\_prayer\_book\_in\_accordance\_with/

Bit worried it might be impregnated with the errors of VII so just making sure its alright because its back in stock for the first time in forever.[https://store.melkite.org/product/publicans-prayer-book/](https://store.melkite.org/product/publicans-prayer-book/)

craft00n (3): If you have a clean doctrinal background, a prayer book should not be able to do bad. The problem with modernism is ambiguity: you will be able to understand things correctly, and reject what isn't normal.

BrodyJerome (2): It's not part of the Latin tradition, ie it is of a different spiritual tradition, a different rite. I would not recommend it if you are a Latin, even if it does not contain errors, because it may lead to confusion.

None (2): I have an 'orthodox' friend who I am trying to convert so I was looking for a decent prayer book for him

BrodyJerome (1): If you converts, I think that the ideal thing for him to do would be to switch to the Roman rite.

None (2): Okay, but he has been brainwashed by 'orthodox' so it'd be easier to do it in baby steps

# Post 589: St. Christopher's Mission

Author: Principal-Moo
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/19cwp8m/st\_christophers\_mission/

I am a former Roman Catholic that joined the Eastern Orthodox Church a few years ago when I moved to Hanoi, Vietnam. I am still in Hanoi, Vietnam and there is a local parish with an English-speaking priest. I want to return to the Church, but I just don't know where to go. I have concerns about today's Church, so I'm hesitant to go to my local diocese. Prior to moving to Hanoi, I did attend Mass at a couple of independent parishes (one in northern Virginia and the SSPX in Richmond, VA) because I had concerns about the state of the Church. I never took the Sacraments at these churches and I always attended "regular" Mass before or after to fulfill my Sunday obligation. Now, I think that I am comfortable with rejoining the Church through the SSPX, but I was wondering the following:\* If I go to Confession with an SSPX priest, when I return to Hanoi, should I attend Mass at the local diocesan parish? It's pretty modern (it's an international community, so lot's of singing, holding hands etc.). \* I have a passing knowledge of the justifications for attending the SSPX, but any help in finding resources to read would be appreciated.Also, I will be staying in Times Square for an upcoming business trip (February 8-11). I see that I am one block away from St. Christopher's Mission. But, due to my work and travel schedule, I will not be able to attend Mass Sunday evening: I can only go to Confession. Since I am returning to the Church after a few years, and I have a lot to confess (some things that I am very afraid of confession), should I contact the priest ahead of time to schedule Confession outside of normal hours? Lastly, does anyone know if the priest has an email address? Calling is difficult because of the time differences. Thank you in advance for your help and please pray for me.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (3): just to set expectations, while I am not a priest you may not be ready to come full bore back into the RCC and receive sacraments, etc. but lay out your predicament as quickly as possible in confession. Fr Sulzen is incredibly experience so you should not pass this up. If you are eligible for confession, thank God. but he may lay out stipulations for returning to the RCC since you were in schism or apostasy. I've heard things that a period of time and whatnot is needed to 'abjure' your schism, etc. but only a well-formed priest can get to the bottom of this for you and Fr Sulzen is fantastic even for SSPX. "should I attend Mass at the local diocesan parish? It's pretty modern (it's an international community, so lot's of singing, holding hands etc.)." personally that would scandalize the hell out of me, I would stay home though I would consider attending confession there as needed. "does anyone know if the priest has an email address? Calling is difficult because of the time differences." find an email for the ridgefield CT Priory. Here are the NYC phone numbers listed on sspx.org: 347-610-6381 (Coordinator's) 203-431-0201 (Ridgefield, CT priory) I believe Fr Sulzen is the one saying mass there now. "I have a passing knowledge of the justifications for attending the SSPX, but any help in finding resources to read would be appreciated." there is so much online friend. Fr Hesse, Fr Gruner, Fatima Center, Fr Mawdsley, Fr Michael Rodriguez, Kennedy Hall, etc. etc. etc. I like this article: https://onepeterfive.com/sspx-mass-shelter/

Principal-Moo (2): Thank you very much for your response. I'm prepared to wait it out, but can you confirm that I would be able to make my Confession? I obviously miss Holy Communion, but I really hope I can make a Confession.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (3): no I can't confirm I don't know but Fr Sulzen will let you know. You don't need to talk to him before confession or anything just go straight in with all your sins, your purpose of amendment and explain quickly your situation, how long you were gone, why you are back and Christ through the priest will take care of the rest.

# Post 590: How should we treat those who abandon their parents?

Author: AntiqueGovernment528

Score: 7

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/19c5wyx/how\_should\_we\_treat\_those\_who\_abandon\_their/

I have great empathy for those born to abusive parents, I had a toxic fatherNow I never thought about leaving my responsibilities to my father, taking care of him in his old age, helping him if he needs it, today he is a better person with me!But I know there are horrible parents who have done horrible things to their children.Saturday last week, we were in a Bible class that we do weekly, the priest was teaching about the 10 commandments, when he was teaching about the 4th commandment, my girlfriend (recently converted), humbly, asked if parents who abandoned their children if they need help, they must be helpedOur priest calmly explained why, but in the middle of the explanation a 50-year-old colleague started talking loudly about things like you have to honor, you have to pay the debt of the life they gave you, etc., so she told the story of a friend of hers who took care of the mother she abandoned,Recently I also saw the story of a woman who did not take care of her father, her relatives cursed her, but none of them gave emotional financial support, etc., and I was thinking how these people do not receive support, there are many cases like this and many Christian brothers do not give a little support, as the Bible itself says to visit and help those who suffer in tribulation!Now don't get me wrong, caring for and honoring your parents is a non-negotiable commandment, I just think we should have more charity towards those who suffer from their parents!give emotional support, visit, because preaching with your mouth is easy now being charitable towards your brother few people doSorry if I said something heresy or wrote something wrong, I don't live in the USA!

None (7): My mother was a real nightmare when I was younger for reasons I wont get into here, both to myself and to my wife Having now converted and having a child of my own this subject has been playing on my mind.I discussed with our society priest and he said obviously we must honour them in as best a way that we can, but if doing so would put undue stress and suffering upon my wife and children - they should be the priority.Ultimately have to pray for her, but she needs to change to an extent, and children can't be expected to neglect their spouses and children in an effort to chase that change.

None (1): I have the same feelings and struggle to maintain a good relationship with mine.

AntiqueGovernment528 (1): I'm so sorry for what you went through alone and what your family went through!I'm glad your priest supported you!

AntiqueGovernment528 (2): I wish you the best and I will pray for you

# Post 591: please read this

Author: Expensive-Curve9470

Score: 5

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/196kjw3/please\_read\_this/

That's a rant I wanted a Catholic perspective on thisI have a friend who helps his mother and grandmother financially and even lives with them to be able to helphowever he lives being disrespected and not valuedyesterday there was a party at his house and his cousin married a single mother and got her pregnantmy friend's mother said he was more of a man than his son for doing thismy god please pray for him

None (2): how did he get her pregnant that quick?

apisDei (2): There is no question in your post.

asimovsdog (1): If he supports her and can live alone, then he needs to cut them off. Dating single mothers and being a provider for another mans child isn't really an "achievement", single mothers are easy mode when it comes to dating, because usually nobody wants them.His mother sounds like awful for disrespecting him, gets money off her son and then doesn't respect it. He should get her to apologize or cut her off if he can, we should honor our parents but it's not our responsibility to support abusive boomers indefinitely if they have their own financial means.

JoelBuysWatches (2): >Dating single mothers and being a provider for another mans child isn't really an "achievement", single mothers are easy mode when it comes to dating, because usually nobody wants them.What a vile, repulsive sentiment.

# Post 592: "Not in full communion"?

Author: None

Score: 2

Comments: 7

URL: https://i.redd.it/x6bddxia73cc1.jpeg

Thos accusation makes as much sense to me as saying a dog's wagging tail is "not in full communion" with the dog.

Numbainne47 (9): I have yet to ever hear someone explain exactly what not being in "full communion" is

None (6): I never fully understood why people get so upset about the fact the SSPX exists. I think it comes down to the fact that they don't like us because we chose to defy and continue the original ways pre Vatican so they distort and confuse the issue so the wider popularion becomes scared of what the SSPX is because all they hear is "defiance"!The politics belong to the people who study Theology. We understand what is wrong or right based on the traditional ways. Full communion with Rome? Did Jesus really care about the politics of who was who and what was what. No, he taught in a way that people would understand in that time and provided them the means to salvation.The only reason these politics are there is to provide the means to teach people as the generations continue the ways of God and the laws he has shown. The Holy Mother Church has provided religious leaders to look after the structure and if they fault and fail to retain the traditional system, God is still the higher power. No man on earth has the authority to overwrite what God has shown men.All this Communion and apparent defiance of Rome in previous years is just garbage and the only reason you read those sort of things is because the modernists and enlightened want to destroy one of the only true traditional society's left. They can't stand to live their lives knowing that we want Tradition and a way of Religion that God has provided and they haven't had a say in. Similar to history and the division of Church from State.God loves us as children, we get told the ways and understand the consequences of our actions for not obeying him. Faith, Hope, Charity, love of God and our Neighbour, respect for the religion and its ways. That is the heart of the matter which no politics should ever tear away and which no man on earth can tear away.

None (0): [ For ease of access to the links, here is the original comment from "Kilimakos", posted in r/TraditionalCatholics (https://www.reddit.com/r/TraditionalCatholics/s/whjnrsWvkh) : ]So, calumny because I said the SSPX is not in full communion with the Church?>Another body using the Latin ritual books but not in full communion with Rome is the Society of St. Pius X.: [https://richmonddiocese.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Frequently-asked-Questions-12\\_7\\_16.pdf](https://richmonddiocese.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Frequently-asked-Questions-12\_7\_16.pdf) > >“We notify the people of God that the Priestly Fraternity of St. Pius X founded in 1970 by Archbishop Marcel Lefevbre is not in full communion with the Catholic Church, so the Catholic faithful must refrain from attending its services.” [https://www.catholicnewsagency.com/news/255405/bishops-of-panama-catholics-must-not-attend-sspx-masses](https://www.catholicnewsagency.com/news/255405/bishops-of-panama-catholics-must-not-attend-sspx-masses) > >Since 1975 this Society has not been in full communion with the Holy See.[https://www.aod.org/announcements-newsroom/newsroom/2011/december/regarding-the-society-of-st-pius-x](https://www.aod.org/announcements-newsroom/newsroom/2011/december/regarding-the-society-of-st-pius-x) > >It is hoped that this step will be followed by the prompt attainment of full communion with the Church on the part of the whole Society of St Pius X... [https://www.vatican.va/roman\\_curia/congregations/cbishops/documents/rc\\_con\\_cbishops\\_doc\\_20090121\\_remissione-scomunica\\_en.html](https://www.vatican.va/roman\_curia/congregations/cbishops/documents/rc\_con\_cbishops\_doc\_20090121\_remissione-scomunica\_en.html) > >At that time he was in full communion with the Church; they were just concerned. [https://www.catholic.com/video/is-an-sspx-mass-valid-for-our-sunday-obligation](https://www.catholic.com/video/is-an-sspx-mass-valid-for-our-sunday-obligation)Some examples showing you that they are not in full communion with Rome, that partial communion exists. SSPX apologists usually deny this and say "there's no such thing as partial communion or not being i full communion", and often make silly jokes or post counter arguments from people who admire the SSPX. I know I made no baseless acusation, and no calumny was made... again, when I dare saying some things about this group, some I experieced myself, apologists often call me names for doing so, and that's a sad reality, to be called a liar for simply telling the truth.Brother, I used to be on your shoes and know how you must be condemning me, calling me names and saying I'm wrong while believing Lefebvre is a saint and the SSPX is fine, and how unhappy you will be while reading this, but know I'm praying for you to get out of this mess with your faith and sanity intact.

None (5): Me neither, but when challenged, they repeat the claim so as to present a false confidence in the oft-repeated assertion. The anonymity of the internet seems to encourage sociopathic deception techniques.

JoelBuysWatches (3): Catholicism + being a keyboard warrior

Cathain78 (7): The salvation of souls is the highest law, and the primary mission of the Church. Let’s not let rigidity and legalism get in the way of the primary mission of the Church. The SSPX is fine

None (3): Well said.

# Post 593: SSPX community life?

Author: TheKingsPeace

Score: 12

Comments: 10

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/192jhnv/sspx\_community\_life/

I understand there are whole communities of people associated with SSPX parishes. They almsot live as a catholic Amish, insulated from “ the world” and dedicated to building a Catholic culture. Any sense of that ? Is this true ? what is it like?

NtGiL\_29 (10): Strictly speaking, this does not exist. Many people who have never been to St. Mary's get this idea that it's just this enclave of a perfect Catholic society where everybody goes to the Immaculata on every Sunday and this and that and the other thing. While the Immaculata parishioners may represent a slight majority of town residents, it is by no means an insulated community. Post Falls is even less so, as it's a bigger city and while it has a big SSPX contingent, there are also big FSSP and SSPV communities there too. It's more so about choosing to spend your time with other traditional Catholics and patronizing Catholic-owned businesses, which you can do pretty much anywhere with a decently-sized parish.

Piklikl (7): At least in the US, there is no such place. Even the largest SSPX “parish” (the SSPX doesn’t really have parishes) in Saint Marys, KS, has pretty much no structure to it (this is a bad thing IMO). I strongly believe that Catholicism would be remarkable in a tight knit community like an Amish community, but the crisis in the Church makes it difficult to attempt to evangelize them.

craft00n (3): That's a bit true (just a bit true) in the USA, for what I know. Not at all in France. The USA way of acting is very special and is not optimal.

apisDei (2): Absolutely not. Firstly the SSPX has no parishes but priories, churches and chaples. Secondly, 99.9% of these don't have communities attached to them. Places like St. Mary's, KS are a rare exception with having a school attached and a large portion of the town being part of the community. Even in other places with schools, SSPX faithful make up a tiny minority percentage of the population of the town they're in.

Neither-Seesaw-8453 (1): I’m late to the game here, but I think you’re pretty accurate in the sense that yes, the only people you know are society people and the only community you know is the society. It’s not like a physical community tho where you all live next to each other, but your life is: Sspx school, sspx church, sspx people. There’s little connection to the world outside of that. I got out at 18, and 4 years later I’m still adjusting to the normal world. Wouldn’t recommend raising your kids like that.

JoelBuysWatches (1): It’s a great place to subjugate women. 10/10, they have no power here.

MaevainwenAdaniel (1): You've obviously never been to Australia. There are full parishes of that cult that take up entire towns. I was lucky enough to be able to escape the one in Tynong

Effective\_Traffic346 (1): What is a great place to subjugate women?

Huge-Explanation-358 (1): lmao

apisDei (1): You're right in assuming that I've never been to Australia - I haven't! Still, there are no SSPX parishes, like I already said, there are only priories, churches and chapels. If there is an Australian version of St. Mary's, KS, I haven't heard of it. But you didn't present any evidence, you just said "they take up entire towns". I doubt that.

# Post 594: The Society of St. Pius X. (FSSPX) - schismatic or Catholic? - Bishop Athanasius Schneider - Part 5

Author: apisDei

Score: 11

Comments: 4

URL: https://youtu.be/cpVgVNJzFBc

BasedEurope (1): I always forget H.E is very multilingual

apisDei (2): He is German. German is his mother tongue.

BasedEurope (1): he was also raised in the USSR so he is also a native Russian speaker

apisDei (1): I know, but he is ethnically German, not Russian. Check this out: https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Volga\_Germans

# Post 595: Prayer request

Author: None

Score: 9

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/18xu2pw/prayer\_request/

This is very important, please pray for me everyday until I give news on the outcome. There is a man willing to give me a lift to the SSPX every Sunday but there are many complications and reasons why it might not be possible. Please pray that it all works out and I can attend. This is one of the most important intentions I have ever asked for, do pray for me please. BTW I am a minor, that is why there are complications to me getting a lift, and many problems with anti-Catholic foster carers and all sorts

Huge-Explanation-358 (1): Any news?

None (1): Thanks for the prayers everyone

dashdum (1): If you cannot go to the TLM Mass all the time (or at all) because your guardians won’t allow it or won’t provide it then read your missal every Sunday and holy day. Read all the ordinary, gospel, epistle etc. the whole Mass as if you were at church. They have the 1962 and earlier versions of the missal online if you don’t have one. It’s called “praying the missal” and it will suffice for your Sunday obligation if you cannot get to a TLM Mass.

None (1): Yes, I am attending the SSPX every Sunday and I have joined the choir

None (1): Also, I moved out of my foster parents house

None (1): I have been going every Sunday since January 14th and I got a missal Thanks for the advice though

# Post 596: Saints who Disobeyed the Pope

Author: Thaladan

Score: 2

Comments: 25

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/18w3moz/saints\_who\_disobeyed\_the\_pope/

Hi all, I posted a few weeks ago about looking into the SSPX.Are there any notable examples of canonised saints who disobeyed the Pope, in a similar public manner to how Archbishop Lefebvre did?St Catherine of Sienna comes to mind, for confronting the Pope and persuading him to return to Rome. Although I think that's still quite different, she didn't outright disobey him (as far as I'm aware). Are there any better examples?

apisDei (5): I think you're asking the wrong question. What you actually want to know is whether resistance to a pope can be justified or what the limits of obedience are. I recommend you study the writings of Dr Peter Kwasniewski and of Dr John Joy (especially his articles at OnePeterFive).To put it shortly, obedience to the pope is obviously not absolute. The pope is not above God (and His law), nor above Tradition.To still answer your question though, I would say that such saints are rare as popes have mostly been orthodox (albeit sinful and ar times even corrupt, sometimes even scandalously so) and their supremacy was not questioned as people were used to absolute monarchs and the topic of the limits of obedience to the pope was simply not relevant (unlike today!).Of course there are examples of resistance to the pope, even in Holy Scripture with St. Paul resisting St. Peter to his face. You already mentioned St. Catherine of Siena. There are also canonised saints who backed anti-popes like St. Vincent Ferrer. I would say that Marcel Lefebvre should (and will) be canonised, also as patron saint of just resistance to superiors. Also, keep in mind that Cardinal Slipyj consecrated bishops against the will of the pope just like Lefebvre. He is not a canonised saint, but unlike the SSPX, he was undisputedly in good standing with the Church.

craft00n (5): Saint Lucifer of Cagliari, who started a 100 years long schism, and Saint Athanasius, who was excommunicated by Pope Liberius.

None (-5): [deleted]

None (1): [deleted]

Thaladan (1): Yes, I want to know about resistance to the Pope and limits of obedience. I asked for examples of saints who have been disobedient, because I think - at least for me - that would be a helpful, practical illustration of legitimate, righteous disobedience. Make it less abstract and theoretical.I'll have a look at those examples you mentioned.

craft00n (2): Looks like a smart boy here. Maybe a specialist in psychology of religions or pragmatic logic ?On an other level : "SSPX members" are all priests. You may want to say "SSPX followers", but hey, if you had any idea of what you're talking about...

None (1): Disrespectful to mention a commie Jew

apisDei (1): I completely forgot to mention the most obvious one: St Athanasius.

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): Mentioning that someone is a Jew is pejorative? The fruits of antisemitism!

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): The Jews of then are not the same as the Jews of today. Christ came to fulfill the messianic prophecies and to institute Catholicism as the one, true religion. When I say commie I refer to one who adheres to Marxist ideologies. Marx came much later than Christ btw. And Jews are the enemy of mankind (1 Thessalonians 2:15) and belong to the synagogue of Satan (Revelations 2:9). So is Scripture antisemitic or am I missing something here? 🤔

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): Not an argument 👎 go troll another sub before commenting on serious matters

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): You came unprepared and have no recourse but to squeal "ooh you're just a bigot full of hate" just like the countless NPCs out there with no arguments. You just want to hear yourself talk. Matthew 10:34 "Do not think that I came to send peace upon earth: I came not to send peace, but the sword."

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): You're right I should join the masses because that entails that they are correct. Stop replying, you're embarrassing

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): Until you show me that I twisted Scripture, I'll be right here, waiting with open arms to hear if I was incorrect. Will you, though? I'm afraid there's only one coward here and it's become quite obvious who.

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): "'Thou art blasphemed' by those false teachers, who call themselves Jews and Israelites, and the chosen people of God, waiting for the coming of the Messias, but are not to be looked upon as such; having refused to own their true Messias, Jesus Christ, they are the 'Synagogue of Satan,' the greatest enemies of the true faith."- Haydock Douay Rheims Commentary Hence any Jew who rejects the Messiah is part of the synagogue of Satan. Yes the early Christians were Jews. That's not a finishing blow like you think. Jesus came initially to preach to the lost sheep (Jews) and then extended his reach to all ends of the earth. They were Jews that became Christian. Don't conflate the terms. A Jew who becomes Christian is no longer Jewish. Just like a Buddhist who becomes a Christian is no longer the former.

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): It's the Haydock commentary which he also takes from sacred tradition and Patristic writings 🤷 If you think your baseless opinions are better than those of approved church men, then you're just a protestant who thinks he can surmise the meaning of Scripture by himself.

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): So who's right about this line of Scripture? Joelbuyswatches or the church fathers and learned men who devoted their lives to studying it? The onus is now on you to refute Haydock's commentary, to which you only replied with "no that's wrong because i personally read that line differently and my opinion is the right one."

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): Okay show me... 🙄

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): Not really. You made a troll post that a commie Jew (which is literally true) is a saint. I replied that you made a disrespectful comment since Jews are enemies of mankind. Why? They rejected and killed Christ and continue to this day to suppress Him and His Holy Church. No religion other than Catholicism is true, therefore any other religion should be vehemently rejected. You being a judaizing troll (and probably a zionist of some sort) just further cements my original comments. That you refuse to list your sources shows me who the coward is here.

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): Nothing I said was irrational. In fact, it was all rather simple and easy to follow. You resort to ad hominem name calling because you have nothing else to say. You've lost the argument. And yes, I hate all other religions, insofar as they all reject Christ and His Church. Do I hate them as individuals? No. I pray for their conversion often. And I don't know where "christofacist" came into play. It seems you have a bone to pick. I've correctly determined that you are a baiting troll, perhaps even a zionist Jew or Protestant.

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): Am I correct, though? 😁

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): No you're a liberal Catholic with a weak catechism. I suggest relearning the basics and going to a traditional mass. I assume you're a novus ordo attendee. I'd be surprised if you weren't.

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): The church I go to is not in schism 😂 Keep going though, schizo, I'm having a laugh over here. Your modernist tears have replaced my morning coffee

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): Go a little further down to lines 21-24. That's you

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): That has nothing to do with this conversation 😂 bro just flinging Scripture and thinks he's doing something. Go to catechism

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): "We cannot give approval to this movement. We cannot prevent Jews from going to Jerusalem, but we can never sanction it. Jews have not recognized Our Lord, therefore we cannot recognize the Jewish people. They had ample time to acknowledge Christ's divinity without pressure, but they didn't. Should the Jews manage to set foot on the once promised old-new land, the missionaries of the Church would stand prepared to baptize them. Jerusalem cannot be placed in Jewish hands.” - Pope Pius X

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): Biblical instances of Jewish hatred for Christ and his Church. Not limited to these btw... John 19:6, 1 Thessalonians 2:15, Revelations 2:9, Revelations 3:9, Acts 3:15, Acts 14:2, Acts 23:12, John 9:22, Matthew 27:21If Scripture is not enough, you're doomed goy. Keep your pseudo "Catholicism" to yourself next time

# Post 597: Bishop Williamson

Author: None

Score: 6

Comments: 11

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/18voone/bishop\_williamson/

What is the deal with him like i get he said some things that where way out of line but where does the SSPX stand on him now?&#x200B;

Numbainne47 (4): I'm pretty sure he was kicked out of the sspx. Not because of his views but because he wanted to consecrate more bishops but the other bishops didn't want him to.

craft00n (6): He was disobedient so he was kicked out. He's theologically weird (very into appearances), wouldn't agree to get corrected by Menzingen when writing things (to which the others bishops, including Felley when he was superior, agreed to). He started to deny some elements of the holocaust and consecrated numerous new bishops for no sufficient reasons.

apisDei (2): He was disobedient so he was kicked out. That is all.

Allawihabibgalbi (1): Just like Lefevbre…

Numbainne47 (3): Except the context of lefebvre and Williamson consecrating bishops are different. I'm pretty sure the sspx didn't want him to consecrate bishops without permission because it wasn't necessary like it was for lefebvre.

Allawihabibgalbi (-1): It wasn’t necessary for Lefebvre to consecrate bishops. They were done illicitly, and now Williamson is getting booted for the same thing. The lack of self-awareness is astounding.

Sneedevacantist (1): It is necessary for Bishop Williamson to consecrate more bishops. There is a shortage of undoubtedly valid traditional bishops, as the new rite of episcopal consecration is positively doubtful.

Numbainne47 (3): Yes it was necessary in order to retain tradition in the church, yea they were done illicitly in a time of crisis. Even if you want to say there isn't a crisis in the Church right now there certainly was at the time.

Allawihabibgalbi (-1): Brother, Lefebvre did a sacrilegious thing even after Pope Saint John Paul II tried to work with him. Crisis is not an excuse for schism or illicit ordination. It is not moral for a man to run over a pedestrian to get his child to a hospital, and it was not moral nor necessary for Lefevbre to break communion with the Roman Catholic Church.

Numbainne47 (7): Except they weren't working with him rome was going to give him one bishop except they kept pushing it back and Lefevre was going to die. Lefebvre didn't cause a schism because he never set up competing jurisdictions or rejected the pope, and yes it is an excuse for illicit consecrations when Lefebvre had genuine concerns that people's faith were in danger, which according to canon law you cannot be excommunicated for. I agree it is never necessary to break communion with the church, I think we're we disagree is that I don't think he did. He made it very clear he is not creating a schism, the sspx still make it clear to this day which is why they don't give bishops jurisdiction. What he did was disobedient but not schismatic.I agree it created some sort of tension between the society and rome which is unfortunate but consecration of bishops is not a schismatic act, it just simply isn't.

None (1): Actually…there’s a popular argument, one used by the members of the official Apostolic Visitation, that according to the old Code of Canon Law (prior to the update put forth by JPII), the consecrations had been done in communion with Rome. Many bishops into the 1900s were consecrated without prior papal mandate, because of the difficulty of communication between Rome and certain overseas countries, the USA being one. In those days in order for a consecration to be in communion with Rome, the pontiff’s name would simply need to be mentioned in the Canon of the Mass. The consecration would eventually be recognized by papal authority sometime after the actual ceremony. Also hence the absurd amount of auxiliary bishops in the US and elsewhere.Yes, Rome was “working” with ML…but to hear both sides of the account, it seems very understandable that ML and the rest of the SSPX were skeptical. This process of waiting took nearly a decade and Rome refused to move on the subject. ML knew his death was coming, so made the decision to move forward with the consecration, which legitimately saved the work of the SSPX and by extension saved the traditional liturgy all around the world. Even the FSSP owes its existence to this act.If you want validation that Rome wasn’t going to move, find me a member of the FSSP who has been consecrated a bishop to provide for the needs of that community, even after years of requests, Rome has refused to allow such a consecration.It’s worthy of note, that just like in centuries past, after the initial excommunication was lifted, all four bishops were recognized by Rome. Williamson is a different issue who has since gone rogue from the SSPX.

# Post 598: Avoiding Mass which presents scandal

Author: None

Score: 3

Comments: 37

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/18v5ef8/avoiding\_mass\_which\_presents\_scandal/

I am a recent revert of barely 2 months. I have been attending a Traditional Mass offered by my local diocese as well as an SSPX Mass when I can attend. SSPX only offers Mass in this diocese on the 1st and 3rd Sunday of each month, which I have been told by a local priest not to attend because it is "illegal". I have resolve to not only disregard his directive because I know we are in crisis, but I don't have any clear answers on what to do in my situation.Through discernment, I think I am being scandalized by attending the Mass offered by the diocese and think it will be best for me not to attend. I understand that SSPX priests cannot give a final yes or no on whether or not to attend such a Mass, but it seems to me that I am in a damned if I do and damned if I don't situation. The confusion among the clergy and faithful seems to be brimming everywhere I turn.Spiritual direction is almost nowhere to be found, hence why I am on reddit (the last place I thought I would be for this purpose). Is there anyone with whom I can speak to find an answer in this time of deep confusion?

NtGiL\_29 (5): If the local priest tells you that attending an SSPX Mass is "illegal", then he is straight up disregarding multiple Vatican directives from the past 30 years. Ultimately, regarding the sermons and scandals therein, it is not a large enough issue to not go to Mass unless it is manifest heresy. Every priest is going to have sermons that miss from time to time, and especially if you can't recall anything that's seared in your mind as being awful, you can simply choose not to heed the sermon. The biggest thing is that the diocesan TLM represents the same form of Eucharistic sacrifice that the SSPX TLM does.

None (5): From my understanding as a SSPX attender, it's not strictly forbidden if you go to a (non SSPX)Latin mass that still follows the old ways but they prefer you not too due to the risks associated with change if it happens and the danger of being complacent with such matters.The SSPX has relaxed over the years but they have shown they will not faulter to the modern teachings.If you are aware of what is the right way and wrong way in the Latin mass, you should be fine to attend as you can make the attendance with the knowledge that it's being conducted correctly and in the proper way. If you see changes happening in other Church's that are inline more with Rome today, I suggest you stay clear if you want to keep traditional.

None (1): Attending a novus ordo mass is not necessarily wrong; however, you are under no obligation to attend a mass where possible harm can be done. It’s all a means to attaining our end and is our progression towards that end can be hindered by poor or incorrect teaching then you can’t be obligated. An SSPX priest can say not to attend and that it might be best to not attend even if there is no other option because of these reasons. There’s a reason why the SSPX third order members are not allowed to attend the new mass per their rule but it would also be wrong to say that every single new mass said could be harmful even if they are all sad in comparison. If you can find a traditional Dominican priest that does mass according to the Dominican rite then you can witness a mass even more ancient than the Roman rite but those are hard to come by.

None (0): [removed]

apisDei (1): Why are you scandalised by the diocesan TLM?

None (2): Thank you for the charitable response. I'll give your words consideration.

None (3): Thank you for your thoughtful response. It seems that according to everyone in my life, I would be committing mortal sin by not attending, but I feel I am jeopardized by attending. It seems like I can't avoid being a persistent disappointment to God.

None (1): You are incorrect.

None (1): To say the least, the priest has indicated bad formation in his sermons.

None (3): It's hard I know especially when everyone Priest themselves has a different level of strictness (within keeping the SSPX way in mind). Also alot of the Faithful are not good at giving such advice because they tend to feel comfortable in their position in life.If you do it with the intention to please God and you stay true to what you know is right from what you've been taught in Traditional ways, God will guide you and be merciful if you slip up from not knowing any better.God bless and pray my friend

Allawihabibgalbi (0): You are a schismatic. Repent and rejoin Rome and the Holy Father, Pope Francis.

apisDei (1): Okay, but this is not sufficient reason to dispense you from your Sunday obligation. Does he preach heresy in his sermons? Or does he just have sermons of lower quality or sermons you simply don't enjoy?

None (1): Calumny is a sin.

None (2): It's difficult to recall all of the issues, but you might be able to describe them as lower quality. One particular sermon stands out in my mind where he diverted into talking about a hot button war conflict, seeming to take a side on it. And I don't think the pulpit is the place for this.

Allawihabibgalbi (0): So is schism. Repent.

apisDei (1): I understand and I agree with you but this is not sufficient reason not to attend Mass at all two Sundays per month. You should attend the SSPX whenever it is available and be thankful to God that you have a TLM (albeit not SSPX) for the other two Sundays each month.

None (1): On what basis do you accuse me of this?

None (0): I want you to be right, but I can't shake the thought that there is something seriously lacking there.

Allawihabibgalbi (0): You call the Ordinary Form illicit and spirituality harmful. That’s just one thing so I don’t gish-gallop you. I’m also trying to be charitable so if you can deny that claim, I’ll take your word for it. Don’t use technicalities or deception either, it’s something I see far too often in Sede/Conclavist communities.

apisDei (1): It is a valid Mass in the Church where no heresy is preached and the rite itself has no protestant spirit (unlike the NO), so you're obliged to go. "Thinking" or "feeling" like something might be off is not enough and very subjective. But I would ask for an appointment with an SSPX priest and ask him this, then follow his guidance.

None (1): You are misrepresenting my words. That's not charitable.

None (1): That's not as easy as you might think, but I will hope to do that next Sunday.

Allawihabibgalbi (0): Can you clarify then? Without using vague terms, please. Is the Novus Ordo Mass licit, of the same benefit to the soul as the Extraordinary Form? Is V2 free from serious error and heresy? And is NFP gravely sinful?

None (5): You are being pedantic Ryan. Thank God that you can even get to TLM every Sunday and attend.

None (1): You made the claim. It is not my burden to make you see that your claim is contrary to what I've said above. I'd be glad to talk further about these orthogonal points you bring up if you would show good faith and recognize your error.

None (1): I can't say you are wrong. I will give your words consideration.

Allawihabibgalbi (1): You gave me good reason to believe this after claiming a priest could claim that the Novus Ordo is immoral to attend and be in good standing with the Catholic Church. I have nothing to recant, you’re avoiding the points so as not to convict yourself of the charge of schism. If you wish not to answer, I will continue to assume you are not in communion with the Holy Father and the Roman Catholic Church.

None (1): Thank you for demonstrating bad faith and extreme lack of charity. Take your own advice and repent.

None (1): "Or how canst thou say to thy brother: Brother, let me pull the mote out of thy eye, when thou thyself seest not the beam in thy own eye? Hypocrite, cast first the beam out of thy own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to take out the mote from thy brother's eye." [Luke 6:42]

Allawihabibgalbi (0): It’s a very easy clarification for you to make. Reason won’t be set aside for charity when you are heavily suggesting evil teachings. You can clear this up and choose not to. Schism be damned.

Allawihabibgalbi (1): 2 Peter 2:1-3

None (1): The claimant holds the burden of proof. You have yet to demonstrate any basis for your false accusations against me.

None (1): How does that verse apply to this conversation, exactly?

Allawihabibgalbi (0): You made a suggestive claim and are now being vague and refusing to clarify it. How the father of lies is working…

Allawihabibgalbi (0): The current state of the SSPX and those who follow it. A group founded by a man who was deceived by Satan has continued to show its poisonous fruits.

None (1): I am asking you to demonstrate why you made your false accusation against me, and you have thus far refused to demonstrate any basis. Try self-reflection instead of bad faith. God bless you!

None (1): The SSPX is not in schism. Please stop sowing division among the clergy.

# Post 599: Women working outside the home?

Author: TheKingsPeace

Score: 6

Comments: 39

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/18ul77s/women\_working\_outside\_the\_home/

What is your view of wives, mothers and even single women working outside the home? Is it good or bad?Is SSPXs view on it different from Catholic in general? Why or why not?

apisDei (9): This is not a black and white issue, it depends on the circumstances. But I believe it is generally preferred that the mother is a homemaker.

craft00n (6): The only goal is saving the souls. If you need her to work in order to feed the children, let it be so. It would be better the other way.

elsro (10): I am a traditional Catholic women. I am a millennial. In this current economical climate, I, a female, am the breadwinner in the family. Albeit, my husband does work, it will not be sufficient for our family. To me, I am disgusted by the implicit misogyny. I do what I can for my family.

Lizgirl93 (3): Why does the way men talk about women in SSPX make me think it's a cult?

Usual-Speaker7279 (2): I am due to be married and my fiancé and I have agreed that once the children are old enough I can take on a small part time job at a coffee shop, florist, etc. The money isn't necessary will most likely just be used as extra pocket money or savings but it means I get to interact with more people who I wouldn't usually interact with.

MarcellusFaber (5): Married women should not ordinarily work outside of the home, for it is the man's responsibility to provide the basic necessities of life (food, clothing, shelter, etc.); to be the provider. The wife's responsibility/prerogative is in the domestic sphere. She looks after the children, cooks, cleans, does various other household chores, and makes the house a pleasant place to be. She acts as the heart of the home. Practically speaking, it is also not possible for a woman to have a full-time job outside of the home since, in a Catholic family in which everything is functioning as it should, the wife will often be pregnant and will be having to care for small children. It is not at all acceptable for other people to be regularly paid to look after the children so that the wife can go to work. Sending children to nurseries from a young age distresses the child and is also against the motherly instinct, and that for good reason.Pius XI teaches in \*Quadragesimo Anno\* that it is immoral for women and children to be required to work. See paragraph 71:>71. In the first place, the worker must be paid a wage sufficient to support him and his family.\[46\] That the rest of the family should also contribute to the common support, according to the capacity of each, is certainly right, as can be observed especially in the families of farmers, but also in the families of many craftsmen and small shopkeepers. But to abuse the years of childhood and the limited strength of women is grossly wrong. Mothers, concentrating on household duties, should work primarily in the home or in its immediate vicinity. It is an intolerable abuse, and to be abolished at all cost, for mothers on account of the father's low wage to be forced to engage in gainful occupations outside the home to the neglect of their proper cares and duties, especially the training of children. Every effort must therefore be made that fathers of families receive a wage large enough to meet ordinary family needs adequately. But if this cannot always be done under existing circumstances, social justice demands that changes be introduced as soon as possible whereby such a wage will be assured to every adult workingman. It will not be out of place here to render merited praise to all, who with a wise and useful purpose, have tried and tested various ways of adjusting the pay for work to family burdens in such a way that, as these increase, the former may be raised and indeed, if the contingency arises, there may be enough to meet extraordinary needs.This is not to say that there are not exceptions to this, for example, if the husband has died or is not fulfilling his responsibilities. However, this is not at all the ideal and there is a reason that charity to widows and orphans is regarded as of particular importance. It also does not mean that it is wrong for a wife to make a little money on the side, for example, with a small sewing business, and this sort of practice is praised in the wisdom literature of the Bible.As to a single woman, there is nothing wrong with her working outside of the home so long as it is in accordance with her femininity. However, I do believe that it should be viewed as a temporary arrangement until she is either married or has entered the religious life, and I also believe that part-time work should be preferred following the same kind of thinking. A woman looking for a 'career' is misguided, for the point of a job is to either support only oneself (hopefully a temporary condition) or one's family. Since it is the man's responsibility to provide for the basic necessities of life, it naturally falls to him to have jobs/'careers'. However, I will add that 'careers' seem to be viewed nowadays through the lens of self-aggrandisement rather than that of raising a family, and as such I dislike the word.

RegencyEngland1817 (1): Hi, elsro, you do a good job. The reason that it is better for families to put the family first is because the wife is the handmaid of the husband and together they raise their own children but the lady of the house is the one to educate the children in the house while the gentleman is tending the family farm or family business.If the adults work for other families, they become obliged to another family before their own family during that time.Traditionally, a Catholic husband has lots of money coming in from his farm and his businesses. This means that they don't need the parents to go to work for someone else.It's all in the holy Name of God and it's how God puts leading families together.This is the ideal.Today, 2024, the Socialist politics everywhere encourages each person to go out of the house every day to work for the gov or for another family. Even children are encouraged to be educated by strangers. Schools are now politically run in Socialist ways.You obviously must work as you must. I am just describing what God expects of husbands and wives for the Catholic family within the Church. Please don't think I'm offending you here, ma'am. God bless you. 😊🙏Bess. In UK

Chadwick457 (1): Love this!

MarcellusFaber (1): Pius XI must have been a misogynist then...

Huge-Explanation-358 (1): ^(22)Wives, submit yourselves to your own husbandsas you do to the Lord.^(23)For the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the church,his body, of which he is the Savior.^(24)Now as the church submits to Christ, so also wives should submit to their husbandsin everything.

craft00n (2): Because you're on the internet and text conversations are always unclear.

Neither-Seesaw-8453 (1): Because you’re getting the accurate vibe that the sspx attracts insecure men who want somebody to hand them authority and respect on a silver platter, and this gives you a bad feeling about the organization.

craft00n (3): You said it all.

None (0): [deleted]

Huge-Explanation-358 (1): I couldn't explain it any better. I will literally translate and save this.

elsro (0): Nope. But I believe he would have the charity to understand how Modernism changed the world...

Lizgirl93 (2): Mysogeny is clear no matter how you communicate it.

MarcellusFaber (1): You can sneer, but I have various friends who have large families and whose wives do not work. At least one of them is not particularly well-off and at one point, when they fell on hard times, his wife had a budget of £20 a week to feed a family of eight and managed it.>Maybe that’s the case in the late 1800s where you got your sense of morality.This is also a disgusting comment. You are implying that morals change and also that we have superior morals at present, which is obvious rubbish. Have you looked at the moral calibre of the West?

MarcellusFaber (1): I'm glad it was of use.

MarcellusFaber (1): What you are saying is not remotely traditional; morals do not change based on the times.

craft00n (2): Well langage pragmatics exists in every language and topics, for what I've red.

None (-1): [deleted]

craft00n (2): Morals doesn't change, what should be done yes. If you need to work outside of home as a woman to feed your children, let it be so, as the end goal is saving their souls.

MarcellusFaber (1): What are you doing here?

None (0): [deleted]

Booty\_Warrior\_bot (1): \*I came looking for booty.\*

MarcellusFaber (1): Trolling, as I thought. Bugger off.

None (-1): [deleted]

MarcellusFaber (1): Sneer sneer sneer. No arguments at all, simply ignorance and stupidity.

None (-1): [deleted]

MarcellusFaber (1): If you're not trying to convince me, shut up and bugger off!>Your definition of ignorance is the claim that women are not your property.Simply a bold-faced lie and slander. Catholicism did away with the treatment of wives as property, as was common in the ancient pagan world. Pope Leo XIII strongly condemned the pagan treatment of women in \*Arcanum Divinis,\* paragraph 7:>When the licentiousness of a husband thus showed itself, nothing could be more piteous than the wife, sunk so low as to be all but reckoned as a means for the gratification of passion, or for the production of offspring. Without any feeling of shame, marriageable girls were bought and sold, like so much merchandise,(5) and power was sometimes given to the father and to the husband to inflict capital punishment on the wife. Of necessity, the offspring of such marriages as these were either reckoned among the stock in trade of the common-wealth or held to be the property of the father of the family;(6) and the law permitted him to make and unmake the marriages of his children at his mere will, and even to exercise against them the monstrous power of life and death.[https://www.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_l-xiii\\_enc\\_10021880\\_arcanum.html](https://www.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\_l-xiii\_enc\_10021880\_arcanum.html)As did Pius XI in \*Casti Connubii,\* paragraph 75:>75. This, however, is not the true emancipation of woman, nor that rational and exalted liberty which belongs to the noble office of a Christian woman and wife; it is rather the debasing of the womanly character and the dignity of motherhood, and indeed of the whole family, as a result of which the husband suffers the loss of his wife, the children of their mother, and the home and the whole family of an ever watchful guardian. More than this, this false liberty and unnatural equality with the husband is to the detriment of the woman herself, \*\*for if the woman descends from her truly regal throne to which she has been raised within the walls of the home by means of the Gospel, she will soon be reduced to the old state of slavery (if not in appearance, certainly in reality) and become as amongst the pagans the mere instrument of man.\*\*[https://www.vatican.va/content/pius-xi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\\_p-xi\\_enc\\_19301231\\_casti-connubii.html](https://www.vatican.va/content/pius-xi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf\_p-xi\_enc\_19301231\_casti-connubii.html) But, of course, I doubt you're interested in this. You're only interested in being a lying pest.

None (0): [deleted]

MarcellusFaber (1): So being proven wrong, you move swiftly on with your emotional rhetoric. I see.If you're going to speak like that, claiming that wives are 'subjugated', you might as well say that children are subjugated by their parents, soldiers by their officers, or employees by their employers. That doesn't really work now, does it? As to my being \*\*an\*\* inferior, I certainly am, as we all are to someone unless we get to the top. It is simply required in an ordered society, otherwise there would be chaos. There cannot be two captains of the same ship.No doubt, this is the point where you reveal that you are a Socialist or an Anarchist, or something equally retarded.

None (0): [deleted]

MarcellusFaber (1): Answer the question and stop it with your emotional rubbish: Are soldiers, children, or employees subjugated? If they are, your use of the word is meaningless and everyone is subjugated, but it's unavoidable.As to being fairly compensated, you ignore that a wife who stays at home to look after her children is provided by her husband with all the necessities of life and, certainly in the Western world, some of the luxuries too, as well as the support, protection, and love of her husband. It is not slavery or servitude, you plonker.>Just so you know, pulling out more quotes from dead popes “proves” nothing but your own ignorance and cultishness.I quoted them to demonstrate your monumental ignorance/malice. You claimed that we think that women should be treated as property, yet I quoted two Popes teaching the opposite. Now you have been refuted, you attempt to move the goal-posts and obscure why I quoted them in the first place. You disgrace of a human being.

None (1): [deleted]

MarcellusFaber (1): >Alright, quick round-up. Women aren’t property, they’re just employees who aren’t paid, but are given comfortable lifestyles in exchange for their deference.No, they're not employees either; I mentioned employees to demonstrate that your use of the word 'subjugation' is not fitting. Marriage is a contract/partnership by which a man and a woman agree to share their life and raise children together; it is an unequal friendship. It is a friendship because the two parties have the common goal of getting to heaven, raising children, and living happily together. It is unequal because someone must have the final say in the family; it is not possible to have a majority in a democracy of two, and God has ordained through the natural law that it is the man who will be the head of the family. This was recognised by every human society until ours.There is a sense in which men and women are equal, in that God created them for the same purpose of loving him and in that they have similar rights that come along with their common obligations. They are not equal in physical strength, inclinations, abilities (a man cannot give birth, obviously), or in the majority of their responsibilities which are determined by their differing strengths and weaknesses, nor are they equal in authority when speaking in terms of a particular married couple.Your comparison with slavery falls apart at the first hurdle as slaves are property which can be bought and sold, yet we have already determined that wives are not property.

None (1): [deleted]

MarcellusFaber (1): >So it’s slavery minus the slave trade, then.No. This is again, infuriatingly, an argument that attempts to appeal to emotion rather than reason. As I said earlier, slavery is the ownership of a person. Wives cannot be bought or sold, husbands are commanded to love their wives "as Christ loved the Church" (in case you didn't know, he was crucified for the Church), and the right of a husband to command his wife is not absolute as in chattel slavery. There are so many ways in which the noble institution of marriage differs from slavery that it is absurd that you even suggested this.>Hey, here’s a novel idea. How about marriages as an actual partnership based around compromise and genuine equality?That is not what God has ordained, not in the absolute sense that you propose (of course there is compromise in marriage, but not in everything), nor does it work in practice most of the time. Many men nowadays allow themselves to become subject to their wives in their marriages; lacking a common rule concerning who makes the final decisions, it comes down to force of personality. Not to mention that the inequality is built into our nature.>Your arguments are no different than those made by antebellum slavers, who also claimed that God created a natural order where black people were subservient to whites.I simply answer that it is not part of the natural law that Africans be subject to Europeans as it is that, in a marriage, a wife owes obedience to her husband. This owed obedience was recognised in every human society that I know of throughout history, which is obviously not the case with regard to Africans and Europeans. I can also simply reply that, if you are correct concerning the arguments of these slavers, they were mistaken concerning the state of the natural order. It is not taught by the Catholic Church, preserved from error by God and marked by him as the true religion with miracles and prophecies, that obedience is indiscriminately owed by Africans to Europeans. However, it is taught by the Catholic Church that wives must obey their husbands.>It’s awfully convenient how much God wanted white men to stay in positions of power and authority, isn’t it?Now this is just a stupid thing to say, and another attempt to turn the argument back to emotional and rhetorical devices. An African man with a European wife, or a Chinaman with a Mayan wife, or a Mongol with a Mauritian wife, would have just as much authority over his wife as a European man over his European wife would. Try harder next time please.

None (1): [deleted]

MarcellusFaber (1): >See, this is the problem with arguing with someone who thinks they have infallibility on their side. Every conversation devolves into “well I’m right because God says so”. No circular logic, not here!Perhaps it would be circular if I had no evidence for the truth of the Catholic religion (honestly I don't really see how it is; how would I be proving God's existence or the infallibility of the Church's teaching by stating that wives must obey their husbands?) . But I do, as I said, in the physical and moral miracles and in the prophecies (which are simply miracles on the intellectual plane). If you really want to get anywhere with people like me, attempt to disprove the starting point, which is the miracles and prophecies. We have claimed vastly more of these throughout history than any other religion and they are well documented. For example, the miracle of the Christians who had their tongues cut out in what is now Northern Algeria in 484 yet continued to be able to speak is attested to by the Emperor Justinian I himself, Aeneas of Gaza, Marcellinus, Count of Illyria, and Procopius of Caesarea. That is simple one example among thousands.>However you sleep at night, man. Personally, I’d be a little perturbed if I were parroting the same EXACT talking points that were used to justify the subjugation of an entire race.I've already explained this. You are simply ignoring my answer.>Especially if “every society in history” (that you’re aware of) has done it (which is a laughable statement on its own, but I digress).Go on then, refute what I said. You may find one nation (similar to the German tribe whom Caesar/Tacitus report not to understand the immorality of stealing), but I reckon you'll struggle, and there will not be enough to refute my argument.

None (1): [deleted]

MarcellusFaber (1): >Wow, that is not how the burden of proof works AT ALL. If you’d like to cite infallibility as your argument, YOU have to prove that. YOU have to prove that any miracle you claim happened actually did. It is not up to me to disprove anything.I've just given an example with several credible witnesses. If credible witnesses attest to an event, then it is reasonable to accept that it happened. Would you doubt the Emperor Justinian's testimony concerning other historical events? I am in the process of providing the texts in which these writers described the miracle.>The vast majority of societies throughout history engaged in warfare. You would be hard pressed to find any entirely peaceful societies, and any fringe examples that you do find are exceptions to the general rule. Therefore, by your own logic, warfare is just and the natural order of things.All that proves is that warfare is not in itself immoral, which I agree with.

None (1): [deleted]

MarcellusFaber (1): >I have no sense of Emperor Justinian’s credibility on ANY matter. I don’t know why his testimony would make a claimed miracle any more likely. Especially considering how limited any ancient Emperor’s scientific understand of the world would have been.Does one have to be at all educated in science to realise that a man who has had his tongue ripped out from the roots should not be able to speak? A five-year-old could work it out. Don't be ridiculous. There are at least five sources corroborating each other, which I listed.>It doesn’t even prove THAT! Saying that “most societies did something” is proof of nothing in terms of morality. Most societies created money. That doesn’t make money “the natural order”. It doesn’t make money moral or immoral. Why are you willing to extrapolate further on the placement of women in society historically and claim that it is somehow relevant today, yet you balk at applying the same logic to the existence of warfare and currency?The argument is simply that, if all human societies throughout history regard something as moral, then it is not possible, or at least exceedingly improbable, for them to have all been wrong. We all have a sense of what is right and wrong and everyone is agreed on the fundamentals (every human society recognises that murder is evil, for example), and therefore it is very unlikely for everyone to be wrong about a moral question in the same way.>On the contrary, women were subjugated by most societies BECAUSE of money and warfare. If women are still meant to be subjugated, then men should still be running at each other with spears, full stop. Technology has rendered both of these outdated customs irrelevant. And we're back to talking about 'subjugation'...I thought we'd got past this... This argument has an huge \*non sequitur\* in it. What has warfare got to do with treating women as property, or indeed, modern technology? I'm afraid you're infected with progressivism and will need to demonstrate why progressivism is correct for any of what you have just said to make sense.

None (1): [deleted]

MarcellusFaber (1): >Most societies throughout history have allowed adult men to marry female children. Please tell me how this applies to morality today.You're going to have to give me specifics and evidence for me to answer that. What exactly are you thinking of?>I have no reason to believe these people were telling the truth,So do you typically assume that people are lying rather than telling the truth? Procopius of Caesarea, for example, reports the same thing as the other witnesses. Would you reject the other historical details of his chronical?:>“And Honoric shewed himself the most cruel and unjust of all men toward the Christians in Libya. For he forced them to change over to the Arian faith, and as many as he found not readily yielding to him he burned, or destroyed by other forms of death; and he also cut off the tongues of many from the very throat, who even up to my time were going about in Byzantium having their speech uninjured, and perceiving not the least effect from this punishment; but two of these, since they saw fit to go in to harlots, were thenceforth no longer able to speak.” (\*De Bello Vandalico,\* Book I, Chapter 8)[https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Procopius/Wars/3C\\*.html](https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Procopius/Wars/home.html#BG) >I have no reason to believe that what they witnessed was miraculous. An absence of a contemporaneous scientific explanation does not make something a miracle, especially when it happened to people without the benefit of modern science. In short, eyewitness accounts are worth jack shit in determining what is miraculous.So you believe that 'science' in the future will explain how a group of men who had had their tongues ripped out could carry on speaking? Not only that, but why two of them lost their power of speech after visiting a brothel? Isn't that something like an act of Faith? An act of Faith in what though?>Columbus used an eclipse to trick native Jamaicans by claiming it was a display of God’s anger.Just as a fake diamond does not disprove the existence of a genuine dimond, a fraudulent 'miracle' does not disprove the existence of real miracles.

None (1): [deleted]

MarcellusFaber (1): >Okay, that’s not proof of infallibility whatsoever, but beyond that, an eyewitness account of an event is not even proof of a miracle. It doesn’t matter whether I assume everybody to be a liar or truth-teller at face value.This is simply false. I actually have eight witnesses from the time to the fact. How likely is it that all these men were wrong at the same time? Not to mention that the miracle of these men being able to speak was continuous and not restricted to a particular moment, which reduces the possibility of error further. How likely is it for a group of men numbering in the tens to all develop the ability to speak without a tongue at the same time? One source even states that two of these men lost their ability to speak after a particular action? How likely is that? There is no natural explanation for any of this and to say so is absurd and based on scepticism; it's an \*a priori\* argument. This is also not the only example I have. We have the examples of St Bernard of Clairvaux's miracles, St Francis Xavier's, Lourdes (a prominent case being that of Peter de Rudder, whose leg in 1875 was miraculous healed after having being broken for eight years and was examined by physicians), Eucharistic miracles, and very many others. Those of Lourdes are in modern history and as such there has been more scientific scrutiny. The same goes for Eucharistic miracles. But I have no doubt that your scepticism will prevent you from accepting the truth of any of them.>even if you do, that won’t matter, considering the church has never claimed as part of an infallible assertion that women should not be allowed to work outside the home.It was not taught using the extraordinary magisterium (by an \*ex cathedra\* proclamation of the Pope), but it was undoubtedly taught by the ordinary magisterium of the Catholic Church (the constant teaching of the bishops), which is also infallible. It is also in scripture, which is inerrant.

None (1): [deleted]

MarcellusFaber (1): >Citing eyewitness testimony is also hearsay; it’s not enough to convict a person in a courtIf it were as simple as that, they wouldn't bother taking witness statements. From a quick look on Wikipedia, it seems hearsay refers to second-hand statements. For example, a witness repeats something which they heard from someone else. The statements of Justinian I and various of the others would therefore would not be classed as hearsay since they state that they witnessed these men with no tongues speaking with their own eyes. For example, Justinian says "\*Vidimus venerabiles viros , qui abscissis radicitus linguis suas pœnas miserabiliter loquebantur",\* which translates as "\*\*We saw\*\* venerable men, who, their tongues torn out from the root, were miserably relating their punishments". The sources can be found here, though they are given in Latin and Greek: [https://play.google.com/books/readerid=wnREAQAAMAAJ&pg=GBS.PA172&hl=en](https://play.google.com/books/readerid=wnREAQAAMAAJ&pg=GBS.PA172&hl=en)>And I have very much not moved on from the question of whether you consider child marriages to be morally acceptable, given the majority of human societies throughout history did. By your own logic, you should. Though I await your loophole anxiously.As to the age of marriage morally allowable, I direct you to canons 1067 and 1034 of the 1917 Code of Canon Law. If you object to these, then you must also object to the law in Colombia and the law as it was in Scotland until 1929, less than a century ago. The age of consent in very many European countries also remains between 14 and 16.

None (1): [deleted]

MarcellusFaber (1): >Stated differently, just because men forced women into a role of domestic subservience for the majority of history, does not make that any less morally reprehensible. You cannot defend something as morally justifiable just because a lot of people have done it.The point is that, if almost everyone throughout all of history has believed a practice to be moral, then the burden of proof is on you to disprove it since the probability of them all being wrong is astronomically small whilst the probability of you being wrong in comparison is huge.

None (1): [deleted]

MarcellusFaber (1): > just as I can prove that it’s plainly wrong to force a child to marry you.Naturally it is, Did I ever say otherwise?>Ad populum logical fallacy This isn't always a fallacy, just as an appeal to authority isn't always a fallacy (for example, if one appealed to a doctor on a medical question).

None (1): [deleted]

MarcellusFaber (1): >Child marriage was believed to be a moral practice by almost every society all throughout historyI disagree. I think the problem lies in your definition of what a child is.>Claiming that something is morally just because the majority finds it to be that way is a textbook ad populum fallacy, however.Let me give an example: presumably you believe that torturing puppies is wrong. I also think that you couldn't give a logical argument for this, yet you still have a sense that it is wrong. Every person has this sense.When there are difficult moral questions, there tends to be a lot of disagreement and differing opinions. However, with more fundamental questions (such as whether murder is wrong, for example), there is a consensus. If there is a consensus throughout most of history and most societies, to the point that they hold exactly the same position, then it must be concluded that mankind has reached the truth. This is because there are very many ways of being wrong, but only one way of being correct. It seems incredibly unlikely that everyone would independently come to a consensus which were wrong, for probability is against every society following the same error, there being so many errors.So, you see, it is not an appeal to the people, but rather an appeal to the fact that it would be very unlikely for everyone to be wrong in the same way independently.

# Post 600: Please Pray for the Estonian Chapel

Author: BasedEurope

Score: 8

Comments: 0

URL: https://youtu.be/gFteji9UlZg

# Post 601: Immediate Missions?

Author: Timely-Measurement

Score: 3

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/18hsi9i/immediate\_missions/

Is anyone aware of theologians or saints reflecting on "\*\*immediate missions\*\*" in the Church. This is the mission conferred directly by God with the mediation of the Church, as with the biblical prophets, St. Paul, St. Bernadette and the children of Fatima.St. Francis de Sales says,>"Immediate mission is when God Himself commands and gives a charge, without the interposition of the ordinary authority which He has placed in the prelates and pastors of the Church (On the mission of the Church, Ch. 1)I know St. Thomas reflects on the prophecy in III of the Summa, but he does not speak there on the concept of the \*immediate mission\*.Here is the full quote>Now you cannot be ignorant that they neither had, nor have, in any way at all, this mission. For if Our Lord had sent them, it would have been either mediately or immediately. We say mission is given mediately when we are sent by one who has from God the power of sending, according to the order which He has appointed in His Church; and such was the mission of S. Dennis into France by Clement and of Timothy by S. Paul. \*\*Immediate mission is when God Himself commands and gives a charge, without the interposition of the ordinary authority which He has placed in the prelates and pastors of the Church:\*\* as S. Peter and the Apostles were sent, receiving from Our Lord’s own mouth this commandment: \\*Go ye into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to every creature\\* (Mark xvi. 15); and as Moses received his mission to Pharaoh and to the people of Israel. But neither in the one nor in the other way have your ministers any mission. How then have they undertaken to preach? \\*How shall they preach,\\* says the Apostle, \\*unless they be sent?\\*(Rom. x. 15)Ratzinger>the place of prophecy is eminently the place God reserves for Himself to intervene personally and anew each time, taking the initiative. > >"Ratzinger, "Das Problem der Christlichen Prophetie," 181. Cited in: Hvidt, Niels Christian. \\_\\_Christian Prophecy: The Post-Biblical Tradition\\_\\_. 1st edition. Oxford University Press, USA, 2007. Pg 80.

# Post 602: Help in New Mexico

Author: None

Score: 6

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/18gpurs/help\_in\_new\_mexico/

Does anyone know of any SSPX or similar traditional groups that have a presence in New Mexico, specifically around Las Cruces? Thank you and God bless.

NtGiL\_29 (7): There are SSPX and FSSP locations in El Paso. The other closest thing to Las Cruces would me the Benedictine (but SSPX-affiliated) monastery in Silver City. The monastery is a bit of a legend in SSPX circles as seemingly every priest seems to have a great story from a retreat there.

elsro (5): Fr Michael Rodriguez offers the TLM in Socorro, near El Paso.

# Post 603: I do not know what to do

Author: Ok\_Director9646

Score: 2

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/18gepi6/i\_do\_not\_know\_what\_to\_do/

I need helpI feel alone without helpok, first I know that divorce is not good! but in my case it was necessaryI am a son and when my parents started to separate it was a relief for me because my father was emotionally abusive!their marriage has a high chance of being null and void!my mother suffered from my father and yet some people criticized her for asking for a divorce, and yet my father was never criticized!I can't find support anywhere, when Catholics comment on this subject they only talk about how bad divorce is, etc., I've seen some people say to people in a situation similar to mine, this phrase "get over it, because it's in the health and illness"Hi, I'm just the op from the previous post, unfortunately my account has been deleted!I asked for help on a forum and the answer worried mebasically he said that the critics were right because my mother committed marital abandonment and every Catholic has the duty to condemn a public scandal!I don't know what to do, there are no traditional priests nearby! I feel lost!

notanexpert\_askapro (3): It sounds to me like your mom did the right thing. Don't pay attention to people who don't get it. My condolences.

elsro (3): Hope you find the support and love you need to heal. You and your family will be in our prayers!

None (1): For a start, I'm sorry to hear of your circumstances. The descions your parent(s) made are theirs alone; a formality of the church but the ultimate judge is God himself.The opinions of the general public are irrelevant as they have no right to condemn or state what and how someone should live their life.If sins have been committed only those responsible and involved can make it right with God and the judgement and "gossip" of others is a sin on others behalf.Stay strong, keep your morals and faith, seek guidance through pray and a priest if you feel so and just remember, that we are here to be charitable and help each other not prop ourselves up by making ourselves feel holier by condemning others.Hope this has helped. Pm if you need to chat if your feeling down.

apisDei (1): Didn't you post this same post some time ago here? I feel like I've read this already and some people have offered their suggestions in the comments. Was that you, or am I mistaken?

# Post 604: SSJK prayer book

Author: None

Score: 5

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/18g2vux/ssjk\_prayer\_book/

What prayer book do Eastern Catholics who hold the SSPX position (SSJK) usually use?

USAFrenchMexRadTrad (3): Don't know, but there's a red pocket book the Orthodox use that a number of Eastern Catholics approved for use.There are Melkite Catholics that use it, so it may be a good idea to ask them about it.https://www.ebay.com/sch/i.html?\_nkw=red+Orthodox+pocket+prayer+book&\_trksid=p4432023.m4084.l1313

Indigo-Meadow (2): Don't know about any prayer books, but the SSPX were supposed to prepare a translation of Fr. Kovpak's book years ago and I don't think anyone has heard anything about it since.

None (1): Interesting

# Post 605: I need help, someone please read

Author: anonymous5534

Score: 5

Comments: 8

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/18fpkwz/i\_need\_help\_someone\_please\_read/

This might seem like a crazy question, but how would I know if I am possessed or undergoing some kind of demonic oppression?I’m someone who has recently been taking an interest in and considering the Catholic faith for a few months now. I was sorta religious in a private sense as a kid and was an atheist for a few years after that. I’m now realizing that the atheist position isn’t as good as I thought and I’ve been considering returning Yet, my journey to commit to the faith has been rocky at best. I keep falling back into sin and recently I’ve been feeling a bit rebellious against it. I keep falling into mortal sin and I’m afraid that I can’t be forgiven I keep sinning more times than I can count and I’m afraid that I’ll never be able to properly convert or ever be in a proper state of grace. I’m afraid that I can never be forgiven and that it’s too late for me (Hebrews 10:26-31)Well tonight I gave into sin again and since then I’ve been feeling overwhelmingly anxious and I can’t sleep. My mental health has been really bad recently but I’ve also been noticing that I’ve been feeling a bit physically off recently, like there’s something wrong with me. I kind of get these shortness of breath moments and it can be difficult to fall asleep without having moments where it feels like my heart isn’t How does one know of they’re possessed, what does that look like, and what do you you guys think I should do?Thank you all

apisDei (6): Definitely do not seek out advice from strangers on the internet. For the spiritual stuff, find a good traditional Catholic priest in your area, ask for an appointment and talk to him. He will know how to help you spiritually. In regards to your mental health, psycho therapy can help. Perhaps those two are connected, perhaps they are not, perhaps fixing one of those two will automatically also fix the other. You cannot know until you do something about it and find out.

craft00n (5): Hi, first, no spiritual advice from the internet, go to you local priest.I'm a french tradcath since my birth, and psychology student. One of my brothers is an SSPX priest. I myself struggle with that, so the solution seems to be :- Weekly confession with your local trad priest.- Maybe engage in therapy, for problematic cravings (if I get your problem). I'm currently doing cognitive behavioural therapy.Satan has very few to do with our problems, original sin is enough to drive us all the way down.Exorcism isn't for addictions or psychiatric problems, and the Church doesn't want to give it to people who may just have psychological issues, as it would just aggravate their struggle.Keep Faith and Hope, I'll be praying for you.

Positive\_Girl2909 (2): Read the books by Father Gabriele Amorth, he has a wealth of knowledge about this and shares some practical ways of discerning if one is suffering from psychological issues or demonic interference.

None (1): Hey Anon. Good that your reaching out. As others have stated best advice from a priest.Don't think that there is no hope or forgiveness for your sins. I struggle to remain in the faith and keep away from grave sin. The biggest part of it I find is the fear of repentance and someone else (even a priest) knowing the sins I have committed. The worst part about It is I am raised a Catholic so I know right from wrong therefore the punishment for sin will outweigh that of an atheist who has had limited access to the truth.If you need to chat just pm me but meanwhile just pray for a full conversion and have faith in God

None (1): What I can tell you for sure is that you are not alone and I feel I can relate to everything you've said here.

anonymous5534 (2): Not trying to use this as spiritual counsel or as a substitution of speaking to a priest, just looking for some general insight

anonymous5534 (2): I’m afraid that I have done things that are unforgivable or just make me unworthy of life

None (1): It's good to be aware of the sins and feel shame but you should never givet up hope of salvation. Even the worse sins are forgivable through Confession you just have to be sorry and make Penance for them.Never think that there is no hope. Even Jesus forgave great sinners that showed Faith and remorse for their sins.I understand it would be hard for me to grasp what your going through, but even if you think your doomed to fail then what's the harm in trying again for the path of salvation.

# Post 606: Looking for a Persuasive Book

Author: Thaladan

Score: 11

Comments: 8

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/18ejgax/looking\_for\_a\_persuasive\_book/

Hi all, I recently started dating an SSPX girl. She's asked me to consider the SSPX more seriously.I'm from a devout Catholic background, relatively trad-orientated. My main issue with the SSPX is the disobedience, which seems to me to be a very risky slippery slope that leads to personal interpretation and authority, not dissimilar from Protestantism.I've spoken with an SSPX priest, only for an hour or so. My main takeaway from that discussion was that the TLM is not \*merely\* a liturgical preference for the SSPX, it's much more crucial. And so I think that understanding \*why\* the SSPX believe that is another key issue for me.If anyone could recommend a persuasive SSPX book which addresses those two issues in particular, that would be great. I did read Archbishop Lefebvre's \*A Letter to Confused Catholics\* already, which I'm afraid that I didn't find terribly helpful.

elsro (5): Michael Davies -Cranmer's Godly Order: The Destruction of Catholicism Through Liturgical ChangeMichael Davies - Pope John's CouncilMichael Davies - Pope Paul's New MassThese were books I first read when I started going to the TLM. It gives a good history of how and why things happened. Afterwards, maybe give Michael Davies - Apologia Pro Marcel Lefebvre: 1905-1976. 1977-1979. Pt 1. Pt 2 a chance.Lmk how it goes! May the Holy Ghost inspire your study and discernment!

SnowWhiteFeather (5): https://youtu.be/XcG733oDZ58?si=70hvsuTpVodfBdsgEdit: the channel has a lot of good resources.To explain it most simply we aren't only bound by the authority of the current Pope. We are bound by the authority and teaching of all Popes. The difference obviously being that the current Pope has a duty and obligation to clarify and teach here and now.We also have a duty and obligation to reject heresy and sin. The Pope like all men has free will and he can err and sin like any of us. Papal infallibility refers to the infallibility of the Pope when he is speaking as the Pope. A Papal decree is different than simply addressing the general public or publishing a document for that reason.The recent confusion and error largely arises from misunderstanding what level of authority given documents and teachings hold. Teachings that are not binding, but also ambigious have been used to introduce confusion into what is being practiced and taught.Vatican II was pastoral it was not dogmatic. It is not infallible or binding. The Council of Trent by contrast was an ecumenical council and so any teachings on faith or morals are binding. The following is from the Council of Trent:CANON XIII.-If any one saith, that the received and approved rites of the Catholic Church, wont to be used in the solemn administration of the sacraments, may be contemned, or without sin be omitted at pleasure by the ministers, or be changed, by every pastor of the churches, into other new ones; let him be anathema.This teaching tells us that it is anethema to compel ministers from practicing approved rites. Archbishop Lefebvre was improperly excommunicated for continuing to practice the Tridentine Rite, which was protected by the Council of Trent as I just quoted.Second edit: I am a recent convert so anyone who sees a mistake with what I said please correct me.

apisDei (3): Check out Dr Peter Kwasniewskis writings on obedience to the pope as well as Kennedy Hall's book "SSPX: The Defence".

Piklikl (4): I think it might be helpful to consider what constitutes true obedience (most people seem to forget the caveat "in all that is not sinful"). If you are obeying man but offending God in the process, this is not true obedience. I do think that in this current crisis in the Church the laity will be given a wide berth in terms of culpability, as we have all been severely let down by the clerics in the Church (and conversely their judgement will be all the more harsh). I agree with you that disobeying a man while making the claim that it is to avoid displeasing God is a slippery slope (and I venture to guess that the SSPX would agree with you as well), which is why it's important to examine the fruits of such claims. The SSPX is not without its failures over its relatively short life, however its members have done a remarkable job in staying on the path Archbishop Lefebvre set them on. The SSPX's disobedience \*\*could\*\* be the thin edge of a protestant wedge, but so far they have done nothing in the past 53 years to indicate that it is so (why haven't they engaged in more extreme behavior?). Personally, I do wish they did a better job at emphasizing how they are deviating from (contemporary) Rome, and just being more transparent in general, but compared to the rest of the Church they are doing quite well.

MarcellusFaber (2): The books which I'd recommend about the new Mass are 'Work of Human Hands' by Fr Anthony Cekada and 'Two Timely Issues' by Arnaldo Xavier da Silveira. They're not strictly speaking SSPX works (especially not Fr Cekada's, though he was a member of the SSPX for a time), but they do explain very well the doctrinal problems with the new Mass.

Fast-Ad-340 (1): SSPX podcast is organized by series and topics. Not book, but great resource for information, explanation, and questions.

Piklikl (3): >We are bound by the authority and teaching of all Popes.Having traveled around Europe a bit over the past 10 years or so, most Catholics seem to forget this and there is a heavy recency bias in what various churches choose to promote. To a new Catholic it would seem like the only saints in the Church are JP2 and Mother Teresa, and as long as a man is validly installed in his position in the Church it somehow enables him to deviate from the millennia of Church teaching as he pleases.

# Post 607: I need help

Author: Proper\_Condition4960

Score: 5

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1836evr/i\_need\_help/

I feel alone without helpok first I know that divorce is not good! but in my case it was necessaryI am a son and when my parents started to separate it was a relief for me because my father was emotionally abusive!their marriage has a high chance of being null and void!my mother suffered from my father and yet some people criticized her for asking for a divorce, and yet my father was never criticized!I can't find support anywhere, when Catholics comment on this subject they only talk about how bad divorce is, etc., I've seen some people say to people in a similar situation to mine, this phrase "get over it, because it's in health and illness"Sorry if I said the wrong thing!

elsro (6): Per the catechism, the Church allows for a separation when there is abuse in a marriage, and from the brief description you provided, it seems that would be the case.I hope you find someone to confide to help you through this cross. Praying for you and yours!

rmlenz (5): Hi, I hope you overcome this situation. Don't guilty yourself so many. Find a Priest to care you.

SnowWhiteFeather (3): Asking questions and asking for support is always welcome. The Church is where we belong and everyone should feel welcome.I would like to try to clarify what we are talking about though.Divorce does not exist in the Catholic Church.There is seperation, which can be justified in the case of abuse. Sometimes during seperation a civil divorce is necessary (I believe it is necessary to seek approval first), but a civil divorce is only a divorce on paper. The marriage still remains intact.There is annulment, which is the recognition that the marriage wasn't completed properly and for that reason it is invalid. (Annulments are given out in some diocese like secular "divorces" and this is an abuse of authority. There is a high standard that should be met to prove that the marriage didn't happen.)In terms of dealing with judgement though that is another matter. It is going to be difficult, but as Catholics we try not to shy away from that which is hard. I would ask God for grace and try to forgive those who have wounded you. Try not to presume that everyone is walking around thinking about you –because they aren't. Focus on the people who are open to friendship and in time you will be so concerned with things that matter that you won't be concerned about it anymore.

MarcellusFaber (2): The Council of Treat anathematised those who said that there could not be a period of separation in difficult situations such as these. However, the Church also never despairs of a reconciliation and always advocates for one.It seems that permanent separation (or incomplete divorce, as McHugh and Callan call it), is generally allowed in cases of adultery.See 2831 of McHugh and Callan's Moral Theology:[https://archive.org/details/moraltheology0002john/page/756/mode/2up?view=theater](https://archive.org/details/moraltheology0002john/page/756/mode/2up?view=theater)"With permission one may even seek a civil divorce, if it is a separation only, in order to be free as regards civil effects of marriage."

# Post 608: Pre communion confeitor

Author: Western-Arm7862

Score: 6

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/17jbvrz/pre\_communion\_confeitor/

So I just went to my first sspx mass today (I usually go to fssp) and it was a very beautiful solemn high mass. One thing that confused me was that the priest said a third confeitor right before communion. I know sspx and fssp both use the 1962 missal and I’ve never seen this at my fssp church I usually attend. I thought this was removed from the mass in the 1950s when other things like Holy Week were changed. Do any of y’all know why or how they say the pre communion confeitor?

apisDei (5): Third? You mean second? Both FSSP and SSPX use the 1962 missal but the servers (or deacon+subdeacon) pray a 2nd Confiteor while the priest drinks from the chalice (this 2nd Confiteor is actually not contained in the 1962 missal). Not sure what you mean that the \*priest\* is saying a 3rd Confiteor as he only says one at the start of the Mass?

Piklikl (3): The Pre-Communion Confiteor is a custom, like women veiling in church or kneeling at the Sanctus or after (I'm team kneel after the Sanctus). In fact, the [Angelus Press Daily Missal](https://angeluspress.org/products/1962-roman-catholic-daily-missal) doesn't even mention the Pre-Communion Confiteor (AP is the official publishing arm of the SSPX in the english speaking world). I'm confused when you say that the priest said it, because I've never heard of the celebrant saying the Confiteor, if a priest said it it's only because he was in the role of deacon for a Solemn High Mass.

ExpertSalesCopy (1): The priest says one confiteor, the servers say two.

Piklikl (6): I think OP is counting this way: 1st - priests Confiteor, 2nd - servers Confiteor, 3rd - Pre-Communion Confiteor. However, he says that the priest said the Confiteor so now I'm not so sure.

Western-Arm7862 (1): Sorry for the confusion here, I may just be ignorant but I heard the priest say mea culpa mea culpa. I don’t know if that is just the normal rubric of the mass but it sounded like the confeitor to me.

apisDei (3): Ah yes, that would make sense but I agree OP mentioning that the \*priest\* says the 3rd one is confusing indeed.

apisDei (2): Maybe you have confused \*mea culpa\* with \*Domine non sum dignus\*?

# Post 609: St Ann's in Livonia MI

Author: RadTradTref

Score: 2

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/17b368t/st\_anns\_in\_livonia\_mi/

1 in a million chances but I thought I'd play the odds. Anyone on here go to St Ann's in Livonia MI?

# Post 610: BIG NEWS: Florida Bishop Permits SSPX Confirmation Mass in Diocesan Church

Author: apisDei

Score: 19

Comments: 2

URL: https://liturgyguy.com/2023/10/14/big-news-florida-bishop-permits-sspx-confirmation-mass-in-diocesan-church/

None (13): Yes that was so awesome! I was there Saturday and was confirmed!

apisDei (8): Congrats!

# Post 611: Is there any online PDF missal I can follow to this video?

Author: cityaugu

Score: 2

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/178gfgt/is\_there\_any\_online\_pdf\_missal\_i\_can\_follow\_to/

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JVu\\_PcFVg2Y&t=703s&ab\\_channel=rosariumpio](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JVu\_PcFVg2Y&t=703s&ab\_channel=rosariumpio)I was trying to use one of the old missal (19th century) from Google Books, but it seemed like some parts were missing. [https://www.google.com/search?q=missal+roman&sca\\_esv=573602636&tbm=bks&source=lnt&tbs=bkv:f&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjzj4PTn\\_iBAxWZrYkEHcloB9IQpwV6BAgBEAg&biw=1306&bih=855&dpr=1.5](https://www.google.com/search?q=missal+roman&sca\_esv=573602636&tbm=bks&source=lnt&tbs=bkv:f&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwjzj4PTn\_iBAxWZrYkEHcloB9IQpwV6BAgBEAg&biw=1306&bih=855&dpr=1.5)&#x200B;&#x200B;

# Post 612: Solemn high mass

Author: Western-Arm7862

Score: 5

Comments: 12

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/177h1jk/solemn\_high\_mass/

I was just wondering if any of you know why some large parishes don’t offer solemn high masses each Sunday or at least more frequently? I’ve looked around a little bit and found that some of the larger icksp apostolates have a solemn high mass each Sunday, but even the Immaculata in St. Mary’s with 12 priest as well as all the Fssp apostolates I could find don’t offer solemn high mass very often. Does anyone know why this is? Any response is appreciated!Deo gratias

apisDei (7): SSPX = Reaching the most amount of souls with the True Faith is the most important. Therefore many mass locations but less frequent masses (and even less frequent solemn high masses).FSSP/ICKSP = Will not go the extra mile but only go where they're "allowed/invited" to, therefore fewer mass locations and countries but more frequent mass schedule, fewer solo missionary priests and more frequent solemn high masses.

NtGiL\_29 (4): My parish is reasonably large (\~500 parishoners), but our choir is not a big priority for whatever reason. We don't have a High Mass all summer to give the choir a break. Perhaps that's just internal politics but it is one reason.

Piklikl (3): The SSPX simply doesn't have enough priests. Solemn High Mass is celebrated with a Deacon and Subdeacon. Since the SSPX doesn't typically circulate the actual ordained Deacons and Subdeacons around the mass centers/"parishes" (they typically stay at the Seminary when not on vacation or some sort of sabbatical), those positions at a SHM must be filled by priests. So for a Sunday Mass to be Solemn High you would need to tie up 3 priests for the entire Mass (and don't forget those priests also wouldn't be able to assist with distributing Communion, so you'd have to get more priests to assist with distribution).People seem to think that St. Marys has 11 priests lounging about while the 12th says Mass on Sunday, but most of them are gone on the weekends supporting mission chapels. The ones that aren't aren't have more than their fair share of work to do as they're likely teachers at the Academy and professors at the College, not to mention they are Spiritual Directors and also must tend to their diriges. Don't forget there's lots of Confessions to be heard! If there's 4,000 faithful in SM, that's 1 priest for every 333 faithful. Most other SSPX Priories have much smaller priest:faithful ratios, personally I think the ideal would be no more than 1:150.

None (3): many reasons but i would guess that it is just the logistics of the whole thing would just be a lot on the parish staff and priests but if you want a better answer ask the liturgy Director or whom ever may be in charge of that at your local parish

ExpertSalesCopy (1): It requires a Deacon, schola and a lot of preparation by the singers. This is the reason you don't see them more.

None (1): I don't know. Reading the replies leaves me extremely grateful that our small SSPX parish does a sung mass every Sunday. Our priest is just super based, I assume.My honest opinion, and it's totally conjecture, is that our priest decided to do sung mass only because the diocesan parish in town was doing sung mass every week and receiving a moderately large audience, possibly siphoning future parishioners.

Piklikl (3): Plus ICKSP goes hard in the paint when it comes to the smell and bells. Their livery and chapels are far more ornate than most other priestly societies, for better or worse.

Piklikl (3): That's kind of sad, Catholics should sing, especially during Mass as singing is twice praying. Sadly most of the faithful let their pride get the best of them and refuse sing out of some misguided sense of charity to others (its extremely rare for someone to actually sing that poorly to justify not singing at all).

RoseB2077 (3): That sounds a lot like what St. Isidore's in Watkins does. Do you go to St. Isidore?

Western-Arm7862 (1): My fssp parish I currently attend does the same.

NtGiL\_29 (2): Nope! Looks like a beautiful church though and of course I hear Fr. Robinson on the podcast a lot. I'm in Wisconsin!

RoseB2077 (3): Fr. Robinson is great! That's interesting though, I didn't know other churches also took the summer off from doing high Masses.

# Post 613: Military service and Catholic dating

Author: DatGuyKilo

Score: 10

Comments: 12

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/16w03xr/military\_service\_and\_catholic\_dating/

Hey everyoneGiven the recent trend of "Would you ever be willing to..." posts, I figured it was time to add one of my own.So here goes: \*Ladies and gentlemen of\* r/SSPX, \*would you date/court/marry someone who is in the Military? Why or why not?\*Here's why I ask - I'm in the United States Air Force currently and it is basically a fact of life that we move every 4 or years (granted, the base and career field I am in does mitigate that chance significantly). That being said, i am trying to do a full 20 years of service.....so, my question is, do y'all think this is a dealbreaker for ever finding a real relationship? Or do you think it can work out? If so, any advice?From my end, I would feel guilty about even trying to start a relationship knowing that I'd have to either break it off or ask them to leave their life behind in 4-5 years (which again, low chance due my FDS and AFSC) which is a rather short amount of time to decide if you want to spend the rest of your lives together. Not to mention that this requires you to find someone in the first place, which isn't easy considering the Catholic POV on the Armed Forces (which is a shame, but that's a whole other topic...)Thoughts?&#x200B;(P.S. Can we try and keep any patronizing "you're so young don't worry about it you'll totally find someone once you decide to settle down and give up on the military" comments to a minimum? I've heard that before and it really isn't helpful...I'm trying to make a career of the military, so what would be much more helpful is just honest feedback)

elsro (8): I think the biggest hurdle in moving every 4-5 years is finding a TLM to attend regularly and ensure you and your family have access to the sacraments. I know whenever I plan a family vacation, my father always makes sure we have a good Mass easily accessible.My aunt is with a Marine and they are doing well. They've lived in Florida, Japan, Australia, and now Hawaii. It's a fun experience for the kids, but they also homeschool.Thanks for your service! And God bless!

mynameisnotBOBO (4): Thank you for your service. To answer your question: absolutely! My sister is married to a marine, 3 kids, more on the way, and they’re happy. It does take a toll on my sister with loneliness and overwhelming kids lolShe has mentioned about uprooting themselves and being stationed somewhere else, but she accepts it. Her and the children are well taken care of and that eliminates so much anxiety. My other sister is also dating a guy in the Air Force! She’s very busy with work and also has 3 kids from a previous relationship. With both of their lifestyles, it just happens to work out. She does say to me how he’s gone for months at a time and of course they miss each other; but the future for both of them and the children is what’s important. Sacrificing and compromising here and there is what relationships are all about haha!! As for me, my fiancé is a long haul truck driver. Maybe it’s in our DNA to fall for men who aren’t always home 🤔 (joke)I hope what I’m about to say (type?) doesn’t fall under the patronizing umbrella but the right woman will understand. It’s beautiful how you consider the affects military life will have on her. That’s definitely a top discussion when dating/courting, I’m sure you know. To summarize, the answers is yes, 100x yes!!

Piklikl (4): My thought's haven't changed since your post over in r/CatholicDating ;) That being said I think you'll find more receptivity to military service among trads, we tend to understand the concept of sacrificing one's own wants for the good of others more so than the average Catholic.

ExpertSalesCopy (2): You should be looking for a way out of the military instead of further complicating your situation by dating (which is oriented to marriage).Get out of the Air Force, move to a Priory and find a woman there. God will not let you down.

None (2): [deleted]

DatGuyKilo (1): My duty is to The Republic, and the Faith

mynameisnotBOBO (1): Our relationship started off long distance for months before getting engaged and me finally moving closer to him. He’s been long hauling during this entire time, so it’s been sporadic home time and us seeing each other for 10 months. Just recently he’s been home consecutively because of time off he’s taking from winter driving. So now I’m getting used to him actually being home! lolWhen we finally lived closer, initially every single time he’d leave, I’d be a mess! I didn’t know anyone here and I was lonely, ugh. As long as you have someone to talk to and you’re not completely physically alone, it gets so much easier! You will definitely miss him every single time, but you’ll adapt. I hope it works out for you guys. It’s a secure job for a family, especially for mothers staying home.

ExpertSalesCopy (3): No your duty is to God, then yourself, then the Church, then your family, then your friends. Duty to your country is WAY down the list.Find a career that doesn't risk violating Catholic doctrine on Just War, doesn't promote sodomy and immorality and doesn't keep you from the sacraments.

DatGuyKilo (2): I attend Mass every Sunday, and confession dailyIf it wasn't for Republic troops, there wouldn't be a church on American soil to attend

ExpertSalesCopy (3): I am familiar with the propaganda. I served in the early 90s, in Panama, Korea and elsewhere. Look to the Church for wisdom rather than the neo-cons.

SnowWhiteFeather (3): You seem to be elevating the Republic to the level of God in this comment. It is by Gods grace that there is a Church on American soil, the Republic is the tool by which he does it.

DatGuyKilo (1): I'm Air Force sir, we are the family friendly branch

ExpertSalesCopy (2): I served in the Air Force when it actually WAS family friendly. Stop fooling yourself. https://www.afgsc.af.mil/News/Article-Display/Article/3099876/pride-month-inspires-lgbtq-initiative-team/

# Post 614: Catholic man in need of a wife! SSPX= Solution?

Author: TheKingsPeace

Score: 0

Comments: 27

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/16vuj3z/catholic\_man\_in\_need\_of\_a\_wife\_sspx\_solution/

Hello. I am a young catholic man who is most certainly nly called to marriage.The difficulty is, I am having trouble getting married or finding a young lady, one who is the “ right sort”.I am pleased as punch to read about the various growing SSPX communities and the many decent young ladies who are now dutiful wives and mothers.I am looking for a gorgeous, stunning daughter of God, one who1. Is an excellent and prompt cook. Devoted to making exquisite meals and desserts for her husband ( me!). Chicken a la king, beef Bourgogne, and T bone steaks are acceptable dishes. Bananas Foster and Black Forest cake are acceptable desserts. Of course, beyond the basics Mrs. can feel free to experiment in the kitchen.2. A dutiful housekeeper. You heard me! When I come home from a long days work I want the house looking spick and span. I may permit a maid being hired on occasion but she needs to make keeping things clean a priority.3. One who is Knowledgable about history and catholic culture. One who cares about being part of Christ’s church on earth and is familiar with catholic literature and music. Being familiar with both Gregorian and Byzantine chant are ideal, as well as the songs of the troubadours. Beowulf, Dante’s inferno, and the Canterbury tales are a must in terms of literary knowledge.4. A pleasing disposition! I need a wife who offers her petty inconveniences to the lord, and doesn’t waste time grumbling, muttering or criticizing the king of the castle ( me again!) I need her to have a godly disposition and never utter and unkind word.5. One who is spiritually curious. Who loves reading the old , new testaments and the catechism ( Baltimore and St Pius X most preferable.)So I have my lists of “ musts.” I’ve been fishing around on CatholicMatch.com and novus ordo parishes. Dissapointingly, I’ve returned empty handed.Is SSPX filled with such women? Please let me know!

notanexpert\_askapro (19): Please tell me this is a joke post. Exquisite meals and spick and span the first and second things you posted? You're first of all marrying someone to be the mother to your kids. Organized and knowing how to cook is good but if you're not okay with that and with having a good woman maybe look at another vocation....cause you're there to support the mum and kids in raising kids together. And no criticizing at all wow. No you don't want a grumbler but at the same time you want to be able to be frank and kind and nobody is gonna get both those right 100% of the time. King of your castle good grief. Your King gave have his example. By being crucified for His Bride. By washing feet. Becoming a servant. Just hire a maid service if it's all about a woman who will be just devoted to serving you. It'll be cheaper.

elsro (10): Seems like you have a list of what you want, but I think you should mention what you have to offer... otherwise I can understand why you are "empty-handed".

None (8): this has to be a joke lmao

None (8): has a habitual adulterer in his profile pic.

None (7): King of the castle lmao

amurtha (6): So…the Virgin Mary? Best of luck with your search, this doesn’t seem like a real person and I fear your expectations are too high, you’ll set yourself and any future spouse up for failure with that. Try seeking the advice of a holy spiritual director, you need some adjustments here, this isn’t reality.

None (5): This post almost made me physically ill.

apisDei (3): When did you convert? Yesterday?

HappyEffort8000 (5): Great in theory. I attend an FSSP parish. There are single woman who probably match this, but it’s like anything else in that unless you’re 6’ and buff with a nice car, good luck.

None (5): This is a poor attempt to be funny. Just seems like you’re trying to mock the SSPX more than anything else

None (2): Before I learned that this was satire, I actually agreed with a lot of it, lol. I’m a Sspx trad wife and I do all of those things for my husband. I seriously enjoy it. Married him at 21 and now I’m 22 with our first son. Saved my virginity for marriage. I never learned how to cook (because I was poor) until I married him and he did not mind at all. He loves what I cook and if I fail, he loves the effort anyway. He’s a real man and takes care of me and is very sweet. His duties are equal if not more than my own. I love living out God's perfect design. These things listed should probably not be said to a potential wife unless you want to scare her off (LOL), but, if she chose you and is willing to live out biblical womanhood, these duties are implied. You also have to be a very Christlike husband to motivate her to do her duties. I serve him even when he doesn’t deserve it and vice versa. Love is a choice. I chose him. He is my best friend and I'd never treat him badly. And because I try to keep a forgiving and supportive spirit (instead of belittling him), he has beaten his corn addiction that he's had since 13. I've never been happier for him. Men will change for God with a determined helpmate/helpmeet and a lot of prayer. This is the list in which I recommend any traditional Catholic woman to look for in a man that is ready for marriage.1. Loves God with all his heart, defends His honor, prays, and lives by His commandments.2. Is 100% pro-life.3. Does not have a porn, nicotine, or alcohol addiction (you need to ask BEFORE deciding to court him).4. Honors his mother and father.5. Respectful, patient, humble, and assertive when needed.6. Hardworking, sacrificial, and is willing to provide for a family.7. Receives the sacraments.8. Chaste and protects your virginity until marriage.9. Confident in his masculinity.10. Desires fatherhood.These are only some of the points that are important to look for early on; otherwise, you will be in for a difficult time trying to navigate healing during your marriage. Catholicism is not for the weak, which is why this world encourages a self-serving lifestyle. Those deceived by it may never see the face of Jesus. A good, Catholic marriage invites graces that will help you and your spouse make it to heaven together, with little distraction from the outside world. Choose wisely who you will love.

ExpertSalesCopy (1): Seems like a hoax, but anyway, go to Catholic Match, search for the keyword "TLM" and see what you find. This is how several of my sons have found suitable candidates. They will obviously want to know whether you're "all hat, no cattle".

None (0): UHHH BASED?

MaevainwenAdaniel (1): Hail to the king you heretic

elsro (7): You know I wondered if this was a joke too! But I wouldn't mind to do any of those things IF he "allowed" a few thousand weekly spending $. Like if he is using me for cooking and cleaning, then at least pay me. Oh wait, that's not Catholic marriage....😬

notanexpert\_askapro (2): I'm not so sure. I know people actually like this IRL minus is maybe wanting fancy food. Like, even most misogynists are fine with a simple meal and cookies lol.

TheKingsPeace (-6): Ok. What I wrote is satire. I am actually a filthy, heretical NO mass attending catholic who thinks Pope Francis is basically fine.I’d like a Catholic wife who is religious but a bit less… trad than I described.That being said, there are many young catholic men who think they are reasonably entitled to the above because… reasons 🤷♂️????

notanexpert\_askapro (1): Same.

elsro (2): And with money!

Dry-Ad8580 (1): I have some news for you: you’re not even remotely funny. I’ll be praying for you.

notanexpert\_askapro (2): Why are you even helping him out??

notanexpert\_askapro (5): Lol right. And Liking to do that stuff isn't at all uncommon. But wait until you have a hard pregnancy or kids back to back and he starts demanding you keep up your same level of services, or even cutting some slack but still way too high expectations.

None (6): >That being said, there are many young catholic men who think they are reasonably entitled to the above because… reasons 🤷♂️????I believe that the comment was not satirical but you now claim it is after reading the comments

SnowWhiteFeather (3): You don't seem to understand what the SSPX teaches or believes.The difference between trads and NO is primarily one of belief. The lifestyle differences are downstream from what we believe respectively. The lifestyle of trads is congruent with pre-Vatican II Catholics, which isn't particulairly I think you could clear a lot of misconceptions up by going back to the historical delineation and give a listen to Archbishop Lefebvre's "Open letter to confused Catholics" you can find it on YouTube.

None (1): Did you mean to respond to me?

elsro (5): Oh yeah, add baby carrying machine to the list of duties. Like I can understand someone wanting conservative values, but we have still have to treat others with respect and the dignity of having the image and likeness of God.I really hope OP reconsiders perspective going forward.

Dry-Ad8580 (3): No, sorry- this was meant for the OP. My apologies. You and I are in agreement that this post is in exceedingly poor taste.

# Post 615: My wife’s heart isn’t in the mass

Author: Dry-Brief7477

Score: 9

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/16rw8xi/my\_wifes\_heart\_isnt\_in\_the\_mass/

My spouse went to public school until graduation. I was homeschooled until graduation. We both grew up in tradition, went (and go) to mass every Sunday at our SSPX chapel, and yet unfortunately for her, she states her parents failed in catechizing her properly( why I mentioned homeschooling vs public schooling). As she always mentions “it’s like living a double life when you don’t have guidance, go to public school, but then you’re still traditional.” With all of that being said, my spouse does not understand the beauty of the mass. She has said to me, “I don’t understand the mass and my heart is not in it.” it’s very frustrating for me, as I try to go every chance I get at our mission chapel. I have tried suggesting books, I have tried videos to teach where each part of the mass is and where to follow, etc.,. She made the revelation to me a couple months after our wedding that she didn’t even know that the priest says the epistle and gospel during the mass, she thought it was just during the sermon. I had no idea of this as I didn’t start sitting with her at mass until after we were married as I do multiple things at our chapel. The conversation always is, I don’t know how to follow it well enough, I don’t know where everything is. I know I cannot demand perfection, but I can’t help but to worry for her soul, including the future for our 2 month old son. Any suggestions? In addition please offer a prayer for us if you can.

NtGiL\_29 (8): I really feel for you - definitely not an enviable situation to be in. One of the main attributes of the Latin Mass is that it is mystical. It sounds like you have done more than a reasonable amount to try and inform your wife about the merits of the Mass. I think that at this point the most effective route to go would just be to petition God to grow her devotion to the Mass. God does things every day that are so far beyond human power that it is unbelievable.One material question - can you consistently hear the priest during the Mass? I have found that it is a much better experience for those who are not diehard Latin Mass attenders if they can hear the priest saying the different parts of the Mass such as the confiteor, pax Domini, and preface.

Piklikl (9): We don't necessarily need to fully understand what's happening at Mass (and ultimately we never will be able to), and we also don't need to get anything out of attending Mass. We don't primarily attend Mass because of what we get out of it, but mostly because God has demanded that we do so. It is enough for her to tell God that she simply doesn't understand what's going on, but she is remaining faithful to His wishes by attending the sacrifice at which Catholics are all bound to attend on all Sundays and Holy Days of Obligation. Her heart doesn't necessarily need to be in the Mass (by which I mean she doesn't need to feel like her heart is in the Mass), for her to fulfill her obligations. Of course, it helps a whole lot if we do attempt to gain a greater understanding of the Mass and at least have an idea of what's going on (eg the significance of the primary parts of the Mass: Offertory, Sacrifice, Communion, the origin of the various prayers, the significance of the Vestments and Sacred Linens, etc). It's important that you be aware that it can be very easy for someone to get overwhelmed by the density of information present in the Mass, and that translates to discouragement and detachment. \*\*It's extremely important that you meet her where she is at\*\*, and help her take tiny steps towards learning more about the Mass. This starts first and foremost with a good missal (the [AP Daily Missal](https://angeluspress.org/products/genuine-leather-1962-roman-catholic-daily-missal) is a universal favorite), but also don't just buy her a missal and chuck it at her and expect all your problems to be resolved. Sadly there isn't a good resource that I'm aware of that teaches people how to use a missal properly, but if you know how to use one then you should do your best to teach her. If you don't have a missal and can't afford one, then a decent compromise might be to load [this website](https://www.divinumofficium.com/cgi-bin/missa/missa.pl)on your phone and discreetly read from your phone during Mass. Heck with a baby it might even be a lot easier to read from the phone during mass than trying to wrangle and infant and a missal at the same time.The important thing to realize is that your wife missed out on a lot of crucial formation as a child (not her fault), so for a time her learning path will closely resemble that of a child, and there is no shame in that. This is also a very good opportunity for the both of you to actively engage in preparing for the education you both will give your son about the Faith. Many times we only really learn about important things because we think it's important for our kids to learn about those things.

ChristRespector (4): I went through something similar so I feel your struggle. There’s no silver bullet but doing the daily readings together and praying together definitely helped me. If she is a faithful Catholic and regularly attends mass with you, you are very lucky and shouldn’t worry too much about her sharing your passion for the traditional mass.My wife has never read a book, watched video or listened to a podcast I’ve recommended to her. But she always has an open ear to listen to me talk. And as long as I dont sound like I’m taking down to her or trying to sway her, she has an open mind. So try to put things in your own words, be patient with her, and have faith. You dont need to worry about the little one as long as you are doing your job as a dad to properly catechize and love your children. You got this.

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (3): If she's trying her best to improve and keeps trying that's all good asks for. She can't do more

amurtha (1): As a mom of two small children myself, I just also want to say, she might have a desire to learn more or pay closer attention but the needs of the small baby during mass come first. I’ve only heard a handful of sermons in their entirety since becoming a mother myself. God knows our vocation though. One thing my spiritual director has suggested is that I contemplate the four means of prayer prior to mass so I can refer back to those four things every mass. Each mass I have different intentions and prayers and they help to keep me refocused between the feedings and corrections of the children. Perhaps try suggesting something like this? Take the pressure off her to be fully 100% in the mass, due to her station in life that isn’t realistic. But four simple yet honest prayers offered to Our Lord is realistic, and can grow a devotion to the mass. Also, The Weight of a Mass is a great children’s picture book you should look into for your little one and it might even help your wife. I will keep your family in prayer.

None (1): I will certainly pray for your family

Dry-Brief7477 (3): Thanks for your comment. Our priest says everything audibly(minus canon of course) and there is no issue for anyone to hear what he is saying. Thankfully she did confess to me that it is much easier to follow the high mass rather than low. Unfortunately due to our child being 2 months old, she doesn’t go to the high often and we get it only twice a month.

# Post 616: Angelus Press Conference

Author: NtGiL\_29

Score: 3

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/16q7ow3/angelus\_press\_conference/

I keep seeing posts on Instagram about it. It's a little late in the process for me to plan a trip to it this year, but it does potentially look intriguing for the future. Has anyone ever gone or gotten firsthand accounts from people who went? How is it?

RedditG2023 (2): I went with my wife in 2021 to find out more about the SSPX for myself. There is so much negativity about them in online articles so wanted to go there and make my own judgment. My wife and I had a great time over the three days and we met so many nice, intelligent and normal people. After the conference we went to St Marys town to see what it was like and observe the foundation of the Immaculata Church. We were very impressed with the community, their devotion, their commitment to having large families and their happiness.

NtGiL\_29 (1): Thank you!

# Post 617: Make Time to Pray - SSPX Sermons

Author: apisDei

Score: 6

Comments: 0

URL: https://youtu.be/gDRh2LiUEg0

# Post 618: Religious Societies Associated with the SSPX

Author: OGFreelanceBodyguard

Score: 3

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/169bzxj/religious\_societies\_associated\_with\_the\_sspx/

Is there a list of all the different religious societies or congregation and their locations that are associated with the society?

JohnFoxFlash (3): This list is old, for example the Transalpine Redemptorsts reconciled with Rome and are now in a similar situration to ICKSP, FSSP etc, yet they are still on this list https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SSPX-affiliated\_religious\_orders

OGFreelanceBodyguard (1): Thank you!

# Post 619: What do you Feed your Soul? - SSPX Sermons

Author: apisDei

Score: 1

Comments: 0

URL: https://youtu.be/2QIhv7pBHuw

# Post 620: The Importance of Humility - SSPX Sermons

Author: apisDei

Score: 3

Comments: 0

URL: https://youtu.be/tx7W3sMGlfs

# Post 621: We’re the 1950s an ideal time?

Author: TheKingsPeace

Score: 0

Comments: 14

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/164wtxj/were\_the\_1950s\_an\_ideal\_time/

Many traddys I’ve known seem to glorify the 1950s. Apparently it was a time when all real catholic men wore ties and fedoras to work and were real “ go getters.” It also was a time when all catholic housewives were physically stunning, did the cooking and cleaning in heels and make up, were excellent and prompt cooks and seldom spoke when their husband didn’t care to hear from them.This whole picture seems rosy at best. Thoughts?

JohnFoxFlash (14): I don't know any trads that believe any of that. It's more a caricature made by people who dislike trads

Piklikl (7): Clearly it wasn't, because the 1950's led to the sexual revolution of the 1960's. Most of the stereotypes of the "average" person during the 1950's wasn't actually average, just a small, wealthy demographic. It's like air travel during the 50's and 60's: everyone loves to talk about how luxurious air travel was back in the "good old days", but fail to do the math and realize that a round trip, cross country ticket would cost [the equivalent of $4,000](https://brilliantio.com/how-much-were-plane-tickets-in-the-1960s/). Even if most households looked like the one you described, it's far from ideal and extremely chauvinistic (which is not at all Catholic). Also heels and makeup are bad for one's health, so I find it disturbing when men expect women to undergo these things in order to please them. Add to that the disgusting attitude of " seldom spoke when their husband didn’t care to hear from them" and it's no surprise that once divorce was broadly legalized in 1969 the flood of female initiated divorces. "Sufficient to the day is there evil thereof". There is no time in history that is objectively better than any other (from a Catholic perspective), because God makes available top each and every person the graces necessary for salvation.

None (5): it was a great time for white men.

None (5): Really, I'm more of a 1850s gal. If not 1650s.

elsro (5): I would say for women not the best time. I like having the option to pursue a career and be a mother. I am horribly offended by OP perspective of a wife. I would never want my husband to see me like that or would I see him as some cooking/washing make up'd robot. Where is the human dignity? Where is the human value?

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (5): i think the 50s were when the wheels fell off the wagon. no there was never an ideal time to live and be a Catholic.

None (3): No time was an ideal time. Stop this RETVRN nonsense everybody.

maddyc13 (3): lol. women submit to men. great time! no. please don’t think this was a great time for women. definitely not a time where they were “allowed” to speak up when they felt abused.

RationalCatholicJoey (1): Well in the US the top marginal tax rate was 91% so this helped spread out the income to more of society to allow a single income to raise a family. Now with an increasing concentration of wealth, this makes it much more difficult for a single income to be able to provide for a family. This 'rosy' picture also assumes that you are white. Black citizens in some areas would be lynched for trying to exercise their democratic right to vote.

TheKingsPeace (1): Plenty of right wing Catholics, even novus ordo ones wish for a spouse who would fill the criteria described!

elsro (2): Totally agree!

JohnFoxFlash (4): Maybe where you're from it's different. But from where I'm from, the only Catholics that idolise a specific decade are Novus Ordo boomers with the 1970s. I haven't noticed non-boomer NO attendees idolise any decade, nor any decade for trads

Piklikl (2): aaaaand those right wing Catholics are typically single, because what woman wants to marry a pig who expects things like that?

elsro (1): This!!!! Thank you!

# Post 622: In an sspx parish are the catechumens still required to leave after the mass of the catechumens?

Author: swingwellthiccboi88

Score: 2

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/161ic42/in\_an\_sspx\_parish\_are\_the\_catechumens\_still/

I’m an orthodox catechumen, in the Orthodox Church MOST parishes do not require the catechumens to depart, but some (typically monasteries) still do ask the catechumens to leave after the first part of the liturgy, so I became curious if this is still a practice in the Catholic world, I asked this on r/Catholicism but the answers were kind of unclear so I thought I’d ask it here as well.!

Piklikl (5): Nope, I don’t think any western rite has required catechumens to depart for several centuries at least.

StudentofAquinas (2): When I was a catechumen, I was encouraged to stay for the whole Mass. All of the catechumens in my "batch" of converts were, so I guess the answer is no!

NtGiL\_29 (1): I have never seen nor heard of this happening in an SSPX parish - or any other traditional parish, for that matter.

Jerailu (1): It's not required but I know some NOM parishes in south France who does it.

# Post 623: Eucharist adoration

Author: None

Score: 2

Comments: 9

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/16133ws/eucharist\_adoration/

What's everyone's opinion on going to eucharist adoration at a NO parish? The only way I can get to adoration is at a NO church that has perpetual adoration.

Jerailu (4): It's okay.

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (4): I drop into the local cathedral on my way home from work most days. If the hosts are validly consecrated I'm visiting our Lord. If they aren't I'm praying for a while in a place conducive to prayer (it's a nice cathedral in Ireland, quite conservative set up in the sanctuary etc) with an intention to be doing something more. It's a win win situation.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (5): if you believe the NOM is a sacrilege, whether in general or in that particular parish in the manner its performed, and if you believe Communion in hand is sacrilegious and the particles are being spread throughout that chapel as a result of hardly-Catholic eucharistic ministers putting it in everyone's hand (most who probably don't believe in the real presence or know the Faith) then I don't think you have any business stepping foot in such a parish.

MacduffFifesNo1Thane (2): It’s cromulent.

Seethi110 (1): Why would that be a problem?

Seethi110 (1): The Church cannot permit sacrilege. Therefore, Communion in the Hand is not sacrilege.Though admit, it is a very imprudent practice

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): try to source that. Nothing says what you are claiming and priests/popes have committed sacrilege before. you may not know fully what the Church teaches about the limits of infallibility.

Seethi110 (1): The Church is indefectible, which means it cannot permit something that is heretical, dangerous, or sacreligious.It can promote things that are imprudent, which is what I believe Communion in the Hand falls under.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): I'm afraid that is not how indefectibility works. We know the Church will last for all time but nothing outside of Ex Cathedra is guaranteed infallibility or to avoid error, scandal or sacrilege sorry to burst your bubble. go look these terms up on new advent.

# Post 624: sung vs high mass

Author: teenyfairy

Score: 3

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/15wkwma/sung\_vs\_high\_mass/

is there a difference between sung mass and high mass? i see both listed on the calendar.i see sung mass, high mass and then just mass.

johnny63339 (3): In our Chapel there are three masses: a Low Mass, a sung Low Mass, and a High Mass. A Low Mass has no musical accompaniment, no incense, different rubrics and generally only two Altar Boys. The sung Low Mass will have songs at the beginning of mass, the Offertory, the Communion and the end of mass, but the rubrics and number of Altar Boys are the same as a Low Mass. The High Mass (sometimes referred to as a Missa Cantata) has a priest who chants in Latin throughout mass. It also has an MC (or Master of Ceremonies), a Thurifer, a Crucifer and Acolytes bearing candles (a Torch Bearer)It's been my experience that most parishes don't have sung low masses. It's either high or low.

elsro (1): That's how it is at our missionary. We have an early Low Mass and a later High Mass. I don't know if it is the High Mass being sung or the the fact that it is the later Mass, but it's definitely fuller than the early Low Mass.

Jerailu (1): An high mass is a mass with the fullness of the ministers: a subdeacon and deacon, at least 2 acolytes with their torches, a thuriferer. This is AT LEAST of course.It should be sung.A sung mass is this but without the deacon and subdeacon.

# Post 625: Does Anyone Know What Happened to Bryce Laliberte?

Author: ChristianMuslimNGO

Score: 3

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/15v13qv/does\_anyone\_know\_what\_happened\_to\_bryce\_laliberte/

Does anyone have any information on Bryce Laliberte? I'm shocked how little there is out there. For such an influential and such a controversial figure with so much mysterious stuff surrounding his death, you'd think there'd be more?

apisDei (1): Never heard of him. After looking him up online I don't understand how he is related to the SSPX or this subreddit.

# Post 626: Beaches and pools

Author: Winter-Explanation62

Score: 2

Comments: 8

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/15s2kdo/beaches\_and\_pools/

Greetings all! I was interested in this topic to see the opinions. Firstly, what is your opinion on beaches and pools as occassions of sin and avoidance/non-avoidance of them. Secondly, did any priests give you advice regarding it, what was it? Thirdly, did Catholic schools and organizations hold beach events and swimming classes with both men and women in the past?

None (4): We avoid them, most people we know do as well. Sometimes we go to lesser known or private beaches, later in the day, and they're usually empty. Unfortunately living at a tourist destination, our drive to the chapel is pretty racey lol. Women in nothing walking down the streets to the beaches and hotels. Very trying for our teenage son. I used to think it was fine to go to the beach anywhere anytime, but it's like, you know there will be the nudity. And you can't really be like, well everyone else does it, or I can't be expected to give up going to the beach. Because yeah, we can definitely give it up for Christ. And we really shouldn't numb ourselves to obscene dress.

apisDei (2): The Church has condemned mixed beaches. Beaches used to be separated between men and women. For me, as a man, a beach/pool is definitely an occasion of sin. Sadly the same is true for gyms. If you need to cool off in the summer or take a vacation, going to the mountains is bettern than to the beach. Unless you can afford a private/remote beach where you can be alone with your family, I would avoid them alltogether.

None (1): I think they're an occasion of sin. Swimsuits are underwear essentially. I don't live near the ocean or lake so I don't have that problem of being near immodestly dressed people. I did grow up swimming in public pools and I would never go to one or take my kids to one. The only mixed-gender swimming should just be between a husband and wife.

TheKingsPeace (1): Should mixed gender beaches be illegal?

TheKingsPeace (1): Why not just say “ she’s pretty and that’s that?”You could encourage women to wear burkas when they swim ! It

Winter-Explanation62 (0): Do you think those are sinning who do go and take their family also? Because I know so many good, holy people and priests who aren't against it. Like, so many. Also, my opinion is that one should discern. For example, I am a 20yo, and I regularly go to the beach. In the around 50 times that I went, never once did I intentionally commit a sin of thought or look, or even feel a passion stirred up. Not only me, so many people don't have a problem with it, but some do, of course. So, I think one should decide through prayer and a spiritual director. P.S., I am a Novus Ordo Catholic as it is called, haha.

None (3): Yes, immodesty is unacceptable. According to our Lady as well.

Winter-Explanation62 (0): And, also one could ask for additional advice from other holy men. And doing your homework also regarding theology.

# Post 627: Beaches and pools

Author: Winter-Explanation62

Score: 3

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/15s2kd1/beaches\_and\_pools/

Greetings all! I was interested in this topic to see the opinions. Firstly, what is your opinion on beaches and pools as occassions of sin and avoidance/non-avoidance of them. Secondly, did any priests give you advice regarding it, what was it? Thirdly, did Catholic schools and organizations hold beach events and swimming classes with both men and women in the past?

Piklikl (2): Swimming continues to be a contentious topic among traditional Catholics. Generally speaking, I think most priests would advise against any sort of mixed swimming. I think it’s contentious because the world tells us mixed swimming is perfectly fine and normal, and anyone who thinks otherwise is just a weirdo; so lots of Catholics end up going along with it because it’s considered normal. Given what is considered normal for a woman these days to wear while swimming, one can easily make the argument that it’s an occasion of sin, especially for young men/boys who have not learned custody of the eyes. To answer your third question, I’ve never heard of any SSPX related organizations holding any sort of event that involved mixed swimming. In Saint Marys, KS, parishioners would regularly rent out the public pool and have boys only or girls only swim. The public pool actually ended up closing down simply because so few people used it (likely because of the principled stance against mixed swimming among the majority of people in the town). I would be interested to hear discussion about mixed swimming when it comes to families, whether immediate or extended. My inclination is that it’s not a good idea but perhaps I’m too strict.

Fast-Ad-340 (1): Go. How else can we connect to the enormity of creation without spending time in the mountains or at the beach. The only way I can avoid immodesty would be to become a hermit and have groceries delivered by Instacart. I see more immodesty in the stores, on my commute, etc.. than I ever see at the beach or pool. No way to avoid it except through self sufficient communal living. My 2 cents. And teenagers will struggle with or without seeing immodest behavior. It’s a part of puberty. We grow up and leave the things of childhood behind.

MaevainwenAdaniel (1): Well I wouldn't recommend sinning there so...

# Post 628: Latin Instruction in SSPX Seminaries and Schools

Author: kambachc

Score: 4

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/15r4jij/latin\_instruction\_in\_sspx\_seminaries\_and\_schools/

Does anyone have any knowledge what the above is like? Do they speak in Latin at their seminaries? Thank you for any and all answers!

johnny63339 (7): I can speak to the topic as I lived a number of years in St Mary's kansas, taught at a fairly large SSPX Sschool have a brother-in-law who is an SSPX Priest and have two of my younger children attending an sspx School currently. It depends entirely on the institution and who runs it. .In St Mary's Kansas for instance the students get a strong grounding in the Latin language although the majority are certainly not fluent in it. In seminary, quite a bit more Latin is expected and after 5 years an SSPX Priest can certainly converse adequately in Latin in addition to the prayers he learns for saying the Mass and the other institutions are just a hodgepodge of different Latin fluencies depending on who the Rector is.

johnny63339 (6): As far as the seminaries go, the only one I have any personal experience with is when the society had its main seminary in Winona Minnesota and Bishop Williamson was the Rector. There although he would occasionally speak short sentences in Latin to the seminarians, the majority of give and take was in English. Richard Williamson by the way is quite fluent in Latin and is somewhat of a word nerd.. lol.. please pray for him as I fear his time on this Earth is not a great deal longer. Perhaps someone can comment concerning the Econe,, South America France, Germany and the other seminaries around the world

kambachc (3): Amazing! How would you say the Rector fosters that? Does he invest more time for the seminarians in studying it? Do they use a certain material! Thank you for telling me this!

mjayh7 (2): A great Bishop. If his time comes to an end soon, I pray God’s mercy.

None (1): [deleted]

# Post 629: SSPX newbie question- sorry if this is stupid

Author: teenyfairy

Score: 6

Comments: 18

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/15qgnld/sspx\_newbie\_question\_sorry\_if\_this\_is\_stupid/

so I am currently trying to discern between eastern orthodoxy and catholicism. my knowledge on both is quite slim. today, I heard of SSPX for the first time. I am trying to learn more about it, but from what I can tell... it's super traditional catholics who aren't in communion with rome? have SSPX people considered being orthodox then? and- for SSPX people, why not just go to a TLM or eastern catholic church? I am very intrigued and hope to learn more. the closest SSPX parish to me is St. Thomas More Priory in Sanford, Florida. It's about an hour away though.

afogleson (11): I'm not sure why this is always the assumption, that the sspx is not in communion with Rome. Everytime Rome has called them the sspx has responded. Francis recognized the sspx ability to hear confessions and perform weddings (and thus say mass) that all sounds like in communion with Rome.

Piklikl (6): Probably the easiest way to think about the SSPX is they’re Roman Catholic priests who are waiting for a better explanation of the changes to the Roman Rite after 1962. Anytime explanations are asked for, the Vatican refuses to elaborate, which is suspicious. Switching Rites is a big deal for the faithful, and even bigger for priests. You can’t just go to a Marian Rite one Sunday and then go to an Eastern Rite the next. Orthodox are schismatic, so it’s wrong to attend their liturgy just because they have a good track recording of consistency (because they’re consistently wrong). The Othodox Church cannot be the same Church Christ founded since they deny the primacy of Peter and thus forfeit their Apostolicity, which is one of the 4 marks of the True Church. The TLM, whether offered by FSSP, Diocesan, or any other priest is only possible thanks to the SSPX and its founder, Archbishop Lefebvre. The naysayers of the SSPX love to pretend as though the TLM would still be around if the Archbishop had not resisted the changes, but if you know the history and sequence of events of the past 60 years you know that the TLM is still around thanks to the SSPX. Those who think that one can endorse all the changes since V2 and expect the Church to thrive in the long run as long as they still have a TLM to attend are at best just “smells and bells Catholics”, and their Faith is quite superficial.

None (2): >it's super traditional catholics who aren't in communion with rome?By the Vatican's own words that the SSPX aren't in "regular" communion with Rome, but both sides are working to achieve that. Which essentially means that they have an "irregular canonical status". However, let's be 100% clear here, they are certainly not outside the church. They are fully considered fully Roman Catholic with valid holy orders and you can fulfill your Sunday obligation there unless your bishop gives you explicit instructions to the contrary. You can also receive valid confession and holy matrimony with the SSPX.&#x200B;>have SSPX people considered being orthodox then?No. This is not typical of SSPX attendees. Orthodoxy lacks a few Catholic dogma which came about after the great schism in 1054. SSPX is fully Catholic and accepts all the same dogma of the faith that Pope Francis and the current magisterium believes in. The defining characteristic of the SSPX is the belief that the Church is in a crisis that arose after Vatican II and the Novus Ordo Mass. To make the leap to Orthodoxy, the typical process would likely be getting convinced that the roots of the crisis come from Vatican I and not Vatican II, at that point it could be possible they would explore Orthodoxy. This subject is very dense so i'll leave it there.&#x200B;>why not just go to a TLM or eastern catholic church?Well, TLM diocesan churches are being suppressed and outright banned. If anyone can find a diocesan TLM they are welcome to go. However, I think it's worth noting that Diocesan TLM likely wouldn't even have ever existed without Archbishop Lefebvre and the SSPX preserving it. For example, my diocesan TLM Pastor was trained by the SSPX to say the TLM and this is very common.Eastern Catholic church is a completely different tradition. The typical SSPX attendee probably has respect for the Eastern Divine Liturgy and traditions and may even attend a divine liturgy from time to time. However, the SSPX and it's attendees seek to preserve the traditional Latin-Rite. The primary purpose of the SSPX is to save souls, and the secondary purpose is to preserve the liturgy, tradition, customs, as the church goes through the current crisis.&#x200B;Let me know if you have questions.

MaevainwenAdaniel (1): Orthodox is the proper method of Christianity, SSPX don't require their priests to take vowels, so they are Godless and heretical men that blaspheme by standing between God and the people as an obstical. Much like a Sheppard that R\*pes his sheep.

teenyfairy (2): for sure sounds like it! I've just heard over and over again that they're not (this was before I even knew was sspx was)

teenyfairy (1): thank you for taking the time to reply! that definitely clears some things up for me. it doesn't seem like there are too many SSPX parishes around (at least not near me) so is it common for people to drive a good distance to get to church?

teenyfairy (1): this helps a lot! thank you so much. do you have any good book recommendations on sspx or just the catholic faith in general? I am inquiring orthodoxy and catholicism but have a strong leaning towards catholicism. I am going to try an sspx parish this coming sunday. I see online that they offer both sung and high mass. which would you recommend for someone who has never been to a tlm or sspx parish before?

teenyfairy (1): this helps a lot! thank you so much. do you have any good book recommendations on sspx or just the catholic faith in general? I am inquiring orthodoxy and catholicism but have a strong leaning towards catholicism. I am going to try an sspx parish this coming sunday. I see online that they offer both sung and high mass. which would you recommend for someone who has never been to a tlm or sspx parish before?

teenyfairy (1): I inquired into Eastern Orthodoxy first but ended up at Catholicism. I am still in the conversion process and open to being proved wrong. you went from the sspx to EO?

afogleson (4): Ohh I get it. It's a vastly misunderstood thing. And a lot of catholics even my age are still of the "just say no to sspx" sect 😀. If you are interested I'd suggest watching the Dr Taylor Marshall, Return to tradition, and the Kennedy report you tube channels.

Piklikl (1): It’s super common, growing up my parents would regularly drive 1+ hrs each way with 6 kids to get to Mass on Sunday; their ultimate goal (which they eventually achieved) was to live within walking distance of an SSPX school. Also if you’re looking for some good literature on the subject of the SSPX, I can’t recommend enough reading the small book “An Open Letter to Confused Catholics” and also watching the documentary on Archbishop Lefebvre produced by the SSPX: https://youtu.be/Cf9oy7wDkms

None (1): Great! I love the SSPX. I would certainly recommend the High Mass for the full experience. However, just a word of advice. The SSPX is spread out all across the world with missions. Resources are scarce. Its a global body. They seek to preserve the latin mass, not spend all their money making the most grandiose ornate latin masses possible. So, while all TLMs are beautiful in their own right, just be aware that if you really want to experience an extraordinarily ornate TLM liturgy, it may be outside the SSPX.Book recommendations on SSPX:1. Open Letter to Confused Catholics by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre. Its available on audiobook on youtube. If you listen on 2x speed i believe its only a few hours.2. Infiltration by Dr. Taylor MarshallI would probably leave it at that for just SSPX book topics. If you're discerning between orthdoxy and roman catholicism, there are more mainstream theological books that you should be reading. Youtube is a great resource for this. So much Catholic vs Orthdoxy content out there.

Elegant-computer3179 (2): Same here. I ended up in the Latin mass.

No\_Investigator\_2494 (1): what made u stop inquiring orthodoxy if u dont mind saying

teenyfairy (1): awesome, thank you! I'll check them out. I was just browsing Dr Taylors instagram feed actually.

teenyfairy (1): Perfect, I’ll give that a watch tomorrow. Another question if you don’t mind… so technically I’m lutheran so my reception into a novus ordo church would be RCIA then I wouldn’t be baptized since they recognize my lutheran baptism. How does reception into an SSPX church differ (do you still do RCIA and do they also recognize a protestant baptism)?

teenyfairy (2): thank you very much! I will look into those books. the sspx parish nearest me is st thomas more in sanford florida. from what i can see online, it seems like a very beautiful parish. they have 7+ priests who all live there and travel around florida during the week bringing the tlm to people. they also have an academy there for kids prek-8th grade. it seems like a great community of devout catholics (I've stalked all their social medias haha) I am very excited to go. thank you for all your help!

Piklikl (2): Ask all the questions you would like. The method of receiving a convert differs from location to location (though I hear the SSPX is standardizing as best it can to something similar to RCIA). You’ll want to get in touch with your nearest SSPX location. You’ll likely be questioned about your baptism to determine validity and if there is any doubt you’ll likely get a conditional baptism after about a year of classes.

# Post 630: Does SSPX make a difference?

Author: TheKingsPeace

Score: 5

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/15nmcuq/does\_sspx\_make\_a\_difference/

I’ve wanted to go deeper into my faith. In your view is SSPX meaningfully different from the regular Novus Ordo?I would think if one is a sincere catholic and tries with it all, the difference between standard catholic and SSPX is minor at best.What do you think?

Piklikl (5): This is purely anecdotal, but from what I've seen, it's much more likely for someone to progress in holiness with the SSPX. The NO tries too hard to compromise with the world, which is a futile endeavor. If you read Open Letter To Confused Catholics, a tidy book by the founder of the SSPX, I think you will understand better how the men in the hierarchy of the Church in the 60's and 70's robbed us and billions of souls of a great theological and liturgical tradition. The Church is supposed to stand in stark contrast to the world, the members of the SSPX (side note, only priests are members of the SSPX) have no problem doing that yet most NO priests seem to almost be apologetic to the world for the Faith.

apisDei (3): The difference is huge my friend. Not sure how familiar you are with the differences in liturgy alone. You can have a strong faith but in a NO environment everything is working against you and trying to undermine it, while attending the TLM (and the SSPX in particular due to their non-compromising stance on doctrine etc.) soothes your soul. Yes of course you can climb a mountain while pushing a shopping cart through gravel, but it will be much easier using an off road truck or even a mountain cable car.

SnowWhiteFeather (1): Try giving this a listen. It should cover most questions you have about what we believe and why we believe it.https://youtu.be/XcG733oDZ58

Real\_Ad6596 (1): It is a world of difference, many priests in novus ordo are modernist and didnt have the best seminary education sadly. Join the sspx and you will see it eventually.

MaevainwenAdaniel (1): If meaningfully different means they have a penchant for harbouring pedofiles and preaching heresy then yes

# Post 631: Did SSPX close its doors in Czech Republic?

Author: None

Score: 4

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/15h66fj/did\_sspx\_close\_its\_doors\_in\_czech\_republic/

I looked for the mass schedule in the country, but couldn’t find any. Did they close their doors there?

Piklikl (3): Looks like there's plenty of SSPX locations in Czechia: http://www.fsspx.cz/mass/

# Post 632: No TLM near me, what to do

Author: None

Score: 2

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/15g9ug8/no\_tlm\_near\_me\_what\_to\_do/

I live in a country with absolutely no TLMs. What should I do? I've already asked my NO priests and they don't seem like they will budge.

Sleepy\_Man90 (6): I mean It's not for everyone but I do know people who have chosen to move to a country that \*does\* have a Latin Mass, so if that's an option you can consider then do that. Personally I wouldn't attend a NO mass at this point no matter what because its just so wrong and far away from what the mass is supposed to be. Me and my wife and children do live in Northern Ireland but we have to travel 2 hours on a Sunday morning to attend Mass.Edit: ok nvm they deleted their account 🤔

None (4): Just me personally, for anyone reading, I will always choose to attend a TLM over NO. I believe the NO is deficient. I won't give my money to the Novus Ordo parish or receive communion there unless they offer kneeling on the tongue and its from a priest. But I still struggle with the idea of doing a dry mass instead of a novus ordo if I am traveling. I wish the NO didnt exist and we just had TLM. But it just feels wrong to not go to any mass. If I am not mistaken, the SSPX leave it up to personal choice.

Sleepy\_Man90 (1): We've been told by our priest that the NO mass isn't a proper mass, they don't do it correctly so it's functionally the same as not attending mass in terms of enriching your soul. You also can't be sure that the priest is properly ordained in the old rites or that they will give you proper penance nor even take into account certain sins being as serious as they should be.The only thing we've been told we can attend NO wise is a wedding or a funeral, but that is for social reasons rather than religious ones. Again just no communion or participation in the services themselves. My wife went to a family funeral a few years ago and just sat at the back and prayed to our Lady with the rosary for the whole service.

None (2): I won’t argue with any of that. That’s all true. We all just have to do what is best to safeguard our faith. That is the most important thing in our lives.

# Post 633: Thoughts on Novus Ordo Confessions

Author: StudentofAquinas

Score: 2

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/15eg896/thoughts\_on\_novus\_ordo\_confessions/

What does everyone here think of confessing to a Novus Ordo priest? I have heard a few different opinions on the matter from fellow SSPX attendees. Some will do it if they have no other option and feel that they can be assured of the bare minimum doctrinal Orthodoxy of the priest (a "reverent Novus Ordo" priest for example), while some say it should only be done in the most extreme cases, like if the penitent is in danger of death. I have read from an SSPX source that a Novus Ordo confession can be valid, provided that the priest says the correct formula of absolution and does not downplay the gravity of sin, but it is not advised because one may encounter bad council, or even an incorrectly said formula, thereby rendering the confession invalid. Thoughts?

None (3): I had to get a confession in in a pinch and went to my local NO. I kneeled behind the partition and the priest was like, "Are you kneeling?? Come sit over here!" He wanted me to face him! \*Visible disgust\*

mynameisnotBOBO (3): I attend an SSPX parish but my confessor is a NO priest. Thankfully I know my faith enough to know when a priest is wrong\* whether he’s NO or traditional.

StudentofAquinas (3): Eeeww. I'm a bit lucky, I had to go to my local Novus Ordo once in a pinch, and despite some of the priests being quite liberal, the confessionals are very traditional. Full partition connected to the wall (so you couldn't do face-to-face even if you wanted to), a kneeler, traditional act of contrition hung on the wall, the whole nine yards. The priest hearing confessions at that time was new to that church and surprisingly wasn't that bad. He did recommend some Catholic podcasts to listen to before giving me my penance which made me cringe.

# Post 634: Using orthodox prayerbook

Author: storman\_sten

Score: 2

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/15dksdk/using\_orthodox\_prayerbook/

Maybe this is a question for a priest, but I’ve started using an orthodox prayer book as I find the prayers there to be more compelling. Should this be a problem? I figured not since they stayed the same in their teachings the last 1400 years or so. Glad to hear your input.

BertBlyleven (2): I have a small Antiochian Orthodox prayer book printed in the US in the 1940s or 50s, and I'm amazed at how "western" it is. Lots of great stuff on virtues (3 theological + 4 cardinal), 7 sacraments, etc - things I'd expect from a Catholic catechism from the same era. I would still verify there isn't anything contrary to the faith in it, otherwise I see no issue. FWIW the anti-Catholic orthodox polemics from the laity is a relatively modern thing, so the older the book is the less likely you'll find problematic things.

Trengingigan (1): Why would it be a problem? The only problem is if the text contains heresies, for example against the papacy or explitly refers to the orthodox church as the true church.

Agent0486\_deltaTANGO (1): It's not a modern thing, it's an historical thing since arguably the 800s. In fact, I'd argue it's a modern thing for Orthodox to be ecumenistic towards Catholics

storman\_sten (1): Idk would I ask if I had the answer?

# Post 635: What to do if I don’t have any SSPX Diocese in my area?

Author: None

Score: 5

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/15aydur/what\_to\_do\_if\_i\_dont\_have\_any\_sspx\_diocese\_in\_my/

I don’t have any SSPX Churches in my Area and all Churches are doing Novus Ordo. Traditional Latin Mass is totally zero in the country I’m at.I will be here for a very, very long period of time.Any advice on how I can receive my Communion and where can I do my reconciliation?I cannot disclose my area for privacy reasons but totally non here. I have done all my research and checked the sspx websites as well. Thanks guys 🙏

Piklikl (7): To clarify, a diocese is a geographic region over which a bishop has jurisdiction. The SSPX is a missionary society, so the SSPX Bishops have no jurisdiction. The SSPX has chapels all over the world, in places you wouldn't expect. It's always a good idea to send an email to whichever [SSPX District](https://fsspx.org/en/content/5925) you're in (there's a few countries that the SSPX has missions in but for political reasons they have to maintain secrecy) to see if you truly have no options; they will also be able to provide you with contact information of any independent traditional priests who live in the area. Also there's places (such as Dubai) where the SSPX visits every few months but they don't typically advertise it because it's so infrequent.The SSPX advises the laypeople to steer clear of the Novus Ordo Mass, but when it comes to confession while you might get some unorthodox advice, the SSPX doesn't question the validity of a "N.O. Confession". If you need to go to confession, then I don't see any issue with you going to a NO Priest. Also don't be afraid to ask a NO priest about the Latin Mass (it really helps if you know how to serve). You never know who among them would like to say a Latin Mass privately so it's always something worth mentioning. A friend of mine asked the military chaplain in basic training about the Latin Mass options and the priest ended up saying a private Latin Mass once a week that he could serve at. You might consider having a "Sunday Routine" where you spend an hour or so in prayer as well as making a special effort to sanctify the day. We are blessed to have at our disposal quite a range of Masses live streamed from SSPX Chapels on YouTube, so you could even tune in and attend Mass virtually. Also something to consider is if you're able to take trips every few months to places that do have the sacraments.

Total-Wedding8871 (2): Are there any Eastern Catholic churches available? Melkite? They have beautiful liturgies as well if you want to avoid the N.O.

None (2): In a similar situation, maybe try to contact the SSPX district near you although they may not be in your country if for example it is in Arabia.

MaevainwenAdaniel (1): Rejoice and be orthodox

None (2): Sorry my bad about the diocese, I’m in a Islamic Country. A very strict one. I want to receive the Eucharist but as you have said, it’s slim to none.Though thanks for informing me about the confession part. Now I know that I can go for confession but not the communion. That’s some progress.

Piklikl (1): No worries! There’s a lot of technical terms when it comes the way the Church is organized and we shouldn’t feel bad about not knowing all of them. It’s still worth it to reach out to the District you’re in to see if it’s possible for you to attend a Mass nearby, the places where there is a strict state religion is typically where the SSPX has to operate in secret.

# Post 636: What is the current state of SSPX in France and Germany?

Author: None

Score: 5

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/15ajqu6/what\_is\_the\_current\_state\_of\_sspx\_in\_france\_and/

Is it growing? What are the rate of converts?

# Post 637: Fr Franks is riding 500 miles to Santiago de Compostela to raise money to finish restoring his mission chapel in Wichita!

Author: Piklikl

Score: 8

Comments: 0

URL: https://youtu.be/WsRsPIsrxGQ

# Post 638: A piece of advice

Author: Traditional\_Track234

Score: 7

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/151v2gx/a\_piece\_of\_advice/

Hello, me and my brother wants to convert to Catholicism, however our parents (we are teenagers) are quite secular and regard religion and Catholicism as irational superstition which was used to control people historically. They probably know about our faith and desire to become Catholics or at least Christians (they know that we have read the holy Bible and that we have attended mass a few times). If anyone have any good piece of advice of how to convince them that converting is the right choice, it would be very appreciated.P.S: We live in Sweden which is a very secular country.

None (8): [deleted]

Sleepy\_Man90 (4): This is excellent advice, lead by example and others will follow!

Traditional\_Track234 (3): Thank you very much for this helpful advice. God bless you too!

# Post 639: Has mass attendance been growing in SSPX’s chapels?

Author: None

Score: 4

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/150qc1i/has\_mass\_attendance\_been\_growing\_in\_sspxs\_chapels/

Piklikl (3): Hard to say. The SSPX doesn't really collect data, and SSPX families generally are large to it would be hard to tease out whether or not more people are starting to attend SSPX chapels or the SSPX Faithful are just having more kids. Anecdotally, I’ve heard a lot of chapels surged in attendance due to COVID (the SSPX was one of the few organizations who actively resisted lockdown orders to provide the Sacraments, even going as far as winning a case against the Governor of California); but like I said no data is collected or published.

rathdrummob (3): We had a huge swell post COVID. But it has pretty much dwindled away and even declined below pre COVID levels over the last year or so.

afogleson (5): We count souls at mass every mass in our chapel. We are growing quite significantly but it's more over the last 4-5 years.

None (1): Have you seen an increase in your chapel?

None (2): I see. What about physical structure? Has there been any major development lately, after the Immaculata?

# Post 640: Id cordis nostri

Author: Aggressive\_Gate\_9224

Score: 3

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/14h80gb/id\_cordis\_nostri/

Hi! How shoukd we think about pope Innocent VIII's bull calling for the extermination of Waldensians? I am a bit horrified by It. Thank you

siriusreddit (4): How should we think of God calling for the extermination of the people who inhabited Israel before the Hebrews?Why did God make lions, tigers, and bears? Carnivores?Stop thinking about the little details like papal bulls and try and understand the big picture. Sin. It makes things grey. The Pope was a man. The times he lived in weren't perfect. Were the Waldensians good? I don't know, I'm no history major. But I do know that situations are complex and both sides always think their side is on the moral side of history.

None (1): Could you post the source for it?

# Post 641: Should I stop helping my friend out?Do I commit sin by helping him this way?

Author: Rude-Farm9639

Score: 2

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/14gdn64/should\_i\_stop\_helping\_my\_friend\_outdo\_i\_commit/

So I have a friend who was Catholic but now is a Hare Krishna believer, who usually shave their had and leave a lock or ponytail on the back of their head (I think this is called shikha) and he usually asks me to cut his hair like that. This haircut is to symbolise that they are committed to Krishna. But it got me thinking that maybe I should not cut his hair right? Because the way I cut his hair, that hairstyle I might be encouraging or part taking in his false belief. What do you think? Should I stop cutting his hair?

Cato2011 (5): Don’t cut his hair. It’s part of pagan worship; even worse because your friend is a heretic. You wouldn’t help a “friend” paint a Satanic temple, would you?

Piklikl (3): There are 9 ways of being accessory to another's sin ([source](https://www.beautysoancient.com/nine-ways-of-being-accessory-to-anothers-sin/)): 1. By counsel.2. By command.3. By consent.4. By provocation.5. By praise or flattery.6. By concealment.7. By partaking.8. By silence.9. By defense of the ill done.I'd say you're likely partaking in their sin. Definitely ask a priest next time you're in confession.

AmericanPatriot85 (3): Not a heretic, he's an apostate. Slight difference.

# Post 642: Wow, so schismatic (sarcasm)

Author: David\_Knight339

Score: 5

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/14cm58s/wow\_so\_schismatic\_sarcasm/

https://www.tiktok.com/t/ZT8JNMQby/

TwoWeimsAZ (1): The Tiktok music is 😣 awful.

David\_Knight339 (2): Well they chose it 😂

# Post 643: “Obedience is a virtue intended to direct us toward good, not toward evil. To pretend not to see evil in order not to appear disobedient, is a betrayal of truth and a betrayal of our own selves.” — Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre

Author: SanctusFranciscus

Score: 37

Comments: 0

URL: https://i.redd.it/2p6f62vifo6b1.jpg

# Post 644: SSPX women a different breed?

Author: Agathonbanitohen

Score: 4

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/13t5rpj/sspx\_women\_a\_different\_breed/

I’ve been discussing things on the FSSPX discord I’m a member of and the topic of SSPX wives came up. A woman there says that women who grew up SSPX are a different breed. As a traditional man, I’d like to meet a good traditional woman and I’m curious how those women who grew up SSPX are different. That, and how do I approach them.

NtGiL\_29 (10): That is a very crude way of describing it. From my experience (as a male), there are variations even within parishes on what types of young women grow up there. I'm not in whatever Discord server this is but I think the attempted point is that they are less worldly and more grounded in religion than other women. It's by no means a blanket statement.Taken from Fr. Lovasik in the book \*\*Clean Love in Courtship\*\*, the best way to approach a young Catholic woman is to develop a platonic friendship with her first (and several others as well), and then after a while, when you have determined that the personalities/interests/worldviews match, then you ask for courtship. That method prevents short flameouts and flings by developing a rapport and 'vetting' candidates first. (For any females reading, this method works for you too!)

Cato2011 (6): I’m not sure what you mean by a “different breed.” Do you mean they are wonderfully attractive? I will say women who grew up in the SSPX come from strong families who often marry men who also come from other strong SSPX families.

elsro (1): I wouldn't say "different breed," but more like raised differently. My sister is more SSPX than the rest of us (raised Novus Ordo) and she is more modest, and definitely more inclined to Catholicism than the rest of us.

LingonberryOk7009 (1): Nah, they're just very classy religious women. What you see on TV, the medieval ones, they are like them.Some were also preferred to have a vocation. specially, who are religiously devoted to the faith.

AmericanPatriot85 (5): I'm pretty sure it's a complement. I'm pretty sure he means something akin to "made of stronger stuff"

# Post 645: I'm happy to say that I will get to visit an SSPX parish over memorial weekend! But mainly to people who attend very small chapels, are guests welcomed? It's a tiny little church in Crookston.

Author: None

Score: 14

Comments: 9

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/13ltzzl/im\_happy\_to\_say\_that\_i\_will\_get\_to\_visit\_an\_sspx/

Previous post history indicates I am not in support of the SSPX, this is no longer true.Pax Christi

SuperGrapeSoda (4): That’s outstanding, guests are always welcome ! We’re trying to establish an SSPX community in our area, but their head office said they are not expanding, sadly.

LizzyJayne (2): I also attend a small SSPX church, folks there love to hang out after mass and chat,you will be most welcome!

Informal-Big1910 (2): You will always be welcome at chapel. I assume you are familiar with the TLM? If not just ask some and they can lend you a hand missal so your not completely lost. Be sure you introduce yourself to the priest after mass.Before I went to an SSPX for the first time, I had this preconceived notion that everyone was going to be super pious or odd or whatever. Not saying those people don’t exist, but most everyone are normal people living normal lives just trying to raise a good Catholic family. Only thing I would recommend is just be appropriately dressed. If some comes in shorts or a tee shirt, we don’t say anything usually, but you’ll tend to stick out.

NtGiL\_29 (1): To answer your question - yes, guests are always welcome. Never going to turn someone away who wants to attend Mass.To answer the question about 'random' chapels - the Society is maxed on what they can do with their priests right now. That is the limiting factor. Most of the more scattered, smaller-town SSPX locations are from when there were not a ton of locations clamoring to join. Some of them only get Mass once or twice a month. Moral of the story, pray for more priests, because that is hopefully what can allow them to start expanding again.

None (2): I have to drive 40-50 minutes to this one. What seems weird is that there's SSPX chapels scattered in rural areas, but in the most densely populated of them, Fargo, there is none.

None (1): I’ve been to about 10 Tridentine Masses now, and realizing that the only reason I still have it is the SSPX, i feel I should visit. Also, my priest only does low masses, I would like to see a sing mass.

No-Consideration2616 (1): Guest are always welcome

SuperGrapeSoda (0): That’s an interesting point. Isn’t there quite a few chapel locations in the western Minnesota area too?

Aggressive-Charge-54 (1): Fargo does have a regular Sunday TLM though if you’re looking for another option.

# Post 646: Mortal sin and prayers

Author: None

Score: 4

Comments: 8

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/132pxqw/mortal\_sin\_and\_prayers/

What is the Traditional Catholic teaching on prayer in a state of mortal sin? Are our prayers efficacious? Do the saints still intercede for us? It seems (note: seems) that God has answered a great deal of prayers from Protestant friends, even completely reversing serious terminal illness. God heard their prayers and they’re straight-up damned. So I’m wondering if he listens to us when we’re in a state of mortal sin, as well. If not, what’s the point in praying until after confession?

Blackbeeyellowbee (10): I’m no theologian, but I’m pretty sure Our Lord hears the prayers of those who want to be reunited with Him. If one has committed a mortal sin and wants to repent of it, Our Lord will hear his prayers. Actually, if anything, someone in mortal sin must pray a lot.

SnooMacarons713 (3): I would share the following verse here, because I always feel dear with it.But as for me, when they were troublesome to me, I was clothed with haircloth. I humbled my soul with fasting; and my prayer shall be turned into my bosom. \[Psalm 34:13\]When St Augustine gave the sermon on the verse, he admitted he can't find the proof in NT, or during the time of persecution, our lord himself was not put on haircloth or fasting. But still it was the teaching in this psalm. He did not mention repent or confession in haircloth too. I am not sure the catholic practice at fouth centure.But I think haircloth is a way of repent, feel sorry for wrong doing and repent. And a contrit of heart is an acceptable sacrifice. Fasting is refrain from food, or any form of sense pleasure. You can't miss either of the two, in order to achieve the 3rd, into my bosom my prayer shall be turned. By put on haircloth, you let the mortal sins die, and released your own stress, or in another verse "burn my reins and my heart" \[Psalm 25.2\]. To sum up, by means of confession and fasting you will have a better prayer life.

tradmark (3): I try to pray more, not less, when I have fallen into mortal sin. I try in addition to whatever else I need to pray about, to acknowledge my sin before God, to say the act of contrition, to make a serious promise to go to confession as soon as I can, however inconvenient it may be, and to offer up some voluntary mortification.

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (2): They're not straight up damned, its hard for a prod to get into heaven but not impossible. Like if they mean well but are misled

LingonberryOk7009 (1): Holy Rosay, Act of Contrition.,

None (3): Thanks for the advice. I’d like to think He heats us in these instances, as well.

None (3): Excellent psalm and sermon. I think literally wearing a sackcloth is a beautiful practice. But even if not literally, that’s good advice. Thanks

SaintBobOfTennessee (1): I agree; it's not the authentic Catholic understanding of salvation. We know the established way of salvation that our Lord gives us, but He is not bound by specific methods, and we don't know anyone's heart. He can act beyond the normal means. We should never count on extraordinary means, but they are possible. We commend everyone to God's care.

# Post 647: Hallow app question

Author: None

Score: 9

Comments: 16

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/12xe412/hallow\_app\_question/

So, I got the Hallow app because someone told me Taylor Marshall uses it. After listening to two episodes of Bible in a Year with Father Mike Schmitz, he revealed that the creation story isn’t “literal.” Many Catholics apparently agree. The church fathers and popes did not agree. This was clear in Lateran IV and Vatican I.https://catholicorigins.com/lateran-iv-–-the-church’s-key-dogmatic-teaching-on-creation/Do you guys know of a good app we can use for daily mediations and scripture ?

ChristRespector (3): Hallow has a lot of content. I’ve never actually used it for prayer but I downloaded it and explored it quite a bit. They do have a lot of modernists on their like Fr. Schmitz and Bishop Robert Barron, but they also have sections like “Pray in Latin”. I don’t see a reason to discount the app as a whole just because there is some non-orthodox content on it.Laudate from what I can tell seems to be more directed at traditionalists. It doesn’t have the audio or the nice UI that Hallow does but it has the full Douay Rheims Bible on it and I think the Lectio Divina passages are from that translation, as well as a virtual missal for the extraordinary form of the mass.

yangster33 (2): Hi! Not an app but there is this fairly new YouTube channel called [Aurea Insights](https://youtube.com/@aureainsights) created by faithful of the SSPX. Their mission is to explain every verse of the Bible (in less than a minute short!) according to the works of the Church Fathers and biblical scholars - specifically St Thomas Aquinas and Cornelius a Lapide. Hope this helps :)

None (1): [deleted]

None (4): I second this and use Laudate.

None (3): Thank you! I’ll look into Laudate. And I won’t write off Hallow because of a few modernists, l’ll just be careful.

Common-Inspector-358 (3): i don't think it's really fair to call Fr Schmitz or Bishop Barron "modernists". I get it, and I understand that they arent perfect, but they are probably better than like 90% of priests out there. and i definitely wouldnt lump them under the same "modernist" label that one may put on open heretics like james martin.

None (2): Hey there! Thanks for that link. Their page looks promising and they have a long way to go! I subscribed.

None (1): Believe it or not, no. I’m not.

ChristRespector (2): I’d disagree especially regarding Bishop Barron but would agree neither are near the level the James Martin is at. Both push the idea of “Judaeo-Christianity”, that Muslims and Jews are in partial communion with the church, etc. I don’t have the time right now to dig up the Catholic definition of “modernist” but I think they would fit the definition.

None (2): Yeah that’s rough. I’m just trying to find a trad catholic Bible study with readings and commentary and none of the three qualify

ChristRespector (2): I just finished Douay Rheims and the footnotes are phenomenal. Not quite the same as having someone go over each reading in detail for but example in first Kings where the Israelites ask for a king to rule them, the translator explains that up to that point Israel was a theocracy meaning that God was the literal sovereign over the people, and by asking for a king they were rejecting God as their sovereign.You won’t get anything like that from Bible in a Year unfortunately. I still listen to it every day, it definitely has some good commentary, but there is a lot that is lacking.

None (2): I love the Douay Rheims. Did you read it in Laudate or did you read the physical book?

ChristRespector (1): Physical. I love it too. I was reading the RSV-CE at first and was having trouble connecting with it for some reason. The beauty of the DR translation just sucked me in. The fact that the language is a bit more difficult too forced me to pay more attention whereas sometimes I would zone out reading RSV. Don’t even get me started on the NAB lol.

None (1): Good. I may just end up reading it for myself instead of the Mike Schmitz readings. He just bounces around between Genesis and Job and that’s not even in order. Plus he stutters. I have a nice leather-bound copy of Douay Rheims with Christ’s letters in red, which I think is pretty cool

ChristRespector (1): Yep my copy is the same way! I think it’s ambitious that Ascension put together a reading plan that goes back and forth between new and Old Testament but I find it hard to follow when I’m just getting a chapter or two of a book at a time. After reading Genesis through Deuteronomy I read the New Testament and then went back and finished the old which worked well for me.I keep thinking about doing a Bible study podcast and reading the Douay Rheims, but I’m definitely not equipped as far as theology goes to do something like that with commentary. Maybe SSPX will put someone up to the job some day.

None (1): I haven’t come across the part where it goes back and forth between the old and new testaments. So far it’s just Genesis and Job. Once he starts bouncing around the New Testament and Old I might just read the Bible on my own. You definitely should do a podcast. I’d listen to it!

ChristRespector (1): I think it’s day 90 where he does the first “messianic checkpoint” and reads the holy gospel according to John. If I ever get around to it (the podcast) I’ll let you know!

# Post 648: Our Lady of Fatima Church in lacombe Louisiana

Author: None

Score: 6

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/12wxpmo/our\_lady\_of\_fatima\_church\_in\_lacombe\_louisiana/

Hello everyone. I just moved to Gulfport Mississippi and the closest SSPX church to us is in lacombe Louisiana which is a little over an hour away. I was curious if anyone has ever been there or goes there currently would know if there is a cryroom?

Informal-Big1910 (3): I don’t know the answer, but I used to live in New Orleans (before I became a Traditional Catholic… actually while I was living there, I was very much a lapsed Novus Ordo Catholic…). It’s a shame the Society can’t purchase and save a church in the city. There are soo many magnificent churches in New Orleans that are closed and just rotting… some due to Katrina, but most just due to closed parishes. It’s such a large Catholic area… I pray one day the Society can get a large following in New Orleans and restore beauty and tradition in the Big Easy.

# Post 649: What’s the summary of SSPX position?

Author: Agathonbanitohen

Score: 6

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/12w7blf/whats\_the\_summary\_of\_sspx\_position/

I’ve been watching podcasts from the SSPX \*Crisis in the Church\* series and listening to audiobooks of Msgr Lefebvre’s \*They Have Uncrowned Him\* and \*Open Letter to Confused Catholics\*. Interesting material. Would these sources constitute a good summary of the Society’s position regarding Vatican II and what’s been going since then?

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (5): between that and [SSPX.org](https://SSPX.org) you'll already have a better perspective than most. I always suggest reading the Ottaviani intervention (about 40 pages) and ABL's Letters to Confused Catholics (about 90 to 150 depending on version). Both online in PDF format.

Chemistry103 (7): All you need to do is look at the world around you to understand the fruits of Vatican 2. The world has been in a steady state of moral decay for the last 60 years. It is what happens when there are not enough Catholics is a state of grace to pray for others. Without them God's wrath is unleashed, read about Lot.

Cato2011 (3): SSPX doesn’t have an “official” position on Vatican II. It simply subscribes to the teachings of the Church. Opinions vary quite a lot among its priests and leadership on Vatican II. The Society’s apostolate is to offer valid Tridentine masses. Everything else - schools, marriages, taking stances on social, theological, and political issues is not a main focus. To avoid controversy and stay true to its mission of offering masses, the Society avoids commenting officially on Vatican II.

ernieray1786 (2): Valid but illicit. If you want to be a obedient Catholic, you have to be in communion with your local Bishop. According to ancient Catholic laws, that means at bear-minimum, going to Mass at Easter within your diocese.

Agathonbanitohen (3): I’ve read the Ottaviani Intervention already. Eye opening.

Agathonbanitohen (2): The Ecclesia Dei Commission, Msgr Perl in 1996, said that Catholics can attend SSPX Masses and attending a SSPX Mass fulfills your Sunday obligation and can contribute to the collection during the Offertory. If I can fulfill my Sunday obligation at a SSPX Mass, that means I’m being an obedient Catholic.

# Post 650: trad moment

Author: goldplates95

Score: 17

Comments: 5

URL: https://i.redd.it/v9qy0xclugva1.jpg

Cato2011 (3): buttons > zippers

goldplates95 (2): It is the same artist who made this!:https://www.reddit.com/r/Catholicism/comments/z8slus/the\_tridentine\_liturgical\_calendar\_illustrated/?utm\_source=share&utm\_medium=ios\_app&utm\_name=ioscss&utm\_content=1&utm\_term=1

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (1): ?

None (6): He zips it up they button.

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (2): Haha thanks

# Post 651: To ex-Novus Ordo: what’s your faith life like now?

Author: ChristRespector

Score: 13

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/12tp6va/to\_exnovus\_ordo\_whats\_your\_faith\_life\_like\_now/

Hey there, I’ve known about SSPX for longer than I’ve been Catholic. I’ve attended a couple of FSSP Tridentine masses which I love and wish I could attend the TLM exclusively, but I have to do a bit of traveling to get to one so it’s not easy to make it every time I go to mass.Anyways I had always sort of looked down on the SSPX since becoming Catholic. It seemed like they were trying to have their cake and eat it too, essentially to hold the position of sedevacantism but still have the good graces of the church.I realize now that was a bad faith point of view, and that if you guys wanted to be sedes, you would just become sedes. Not like you face much less criticism being SSPX. I’ve been listening to Abp. Lefebvre’s “Open Letter to Confused Catholics” and so much of it rings true. When he started one of the chapters by saying “Vatican II was the French Revolution in the Catholic Church” my mouth dropped. You couldn’t say it any more succinctly than that.Being Catholic in this day and age is already somewhat difficult due to the ostracism that we all face, and I can only imagine that being a “SSPX Catholic” adds another level of ostracism that you face from people who are supposed to be your brothers and sisters in Christ. I mean even for me it’s painful to hear people talk about how great V2 was and how were so much better off because of it. Were there some positives? Sure but overall it seems like it was designed to weaken the church and protestantize it.So my questions to you all who either do only SSPX or those who do SSPX and NO/FSSP/ICKSP/etc (if there are any): is life harder now? Easier? Did it take a while for it to feel right? Do you ever have second thoughts? Are there any specific things you do not like about being part of SSPX?Cheers and May God bless you all.

Sleepy\_Man90 (9): Me, my wife and children used to be part of the Novus Ordo for years but we very rarely attended Mass or had much to do with our faith and we could never really work out why, it just never really felt right.We found the SSPX 3 years ago and it immediately clicked and felt right for us. We attend Mass almost every week, we go to confession and receive communication (on the tongue not the hand!), we are on first name basis with most of the congregation at this point and have made friends for life.I find that people will argue against me more if religion comes into question, moreover because we're traditionalist and people think that we're behind the times and want women to suffer and kids to suffer etc, but that's really not the case. I try to explain but you'll know yourself, people are set in their ways and just want an argument.But overall we feel so at home in the SSPX and we have absolutely no regrets, it's changed our faith and made it so strong.

elsro (5): I was raised in the Novus Ordo and it is easier for me to go to Mass at my local Novus Ordo parish - I mean, walking distance three minutes!However, I have a my one year old daughter and I really want to raise her as Catholic as I can. Thankfully, I can carpool with my parents and sisters to the SSPX TLM... it's only an hour with Sunday morning traffic. But I think it's worth it for the salvation of her soul... it's taked me a long time to come to this decision because before my daughter, religion was only done at my convenience...now I realize with the help of the SSPX priests, the Faith has to be more.

Agathonbanitohen (2): I’m at home in the TLM and it’s an atmosphere that I can breathe. No nonsense and no heresy. I don’t have to be a critic while I’m trying to pray the Mass. My faith and my identity as a Catholic is immensely strengthened and my devotion sky rocketed. My sons’ faith is strengthened and deepened and they \*want\* to go to Mass.

ChristRespector (2): That’s awesome to hear! I hope that something similar can happen for my own family. When I took my wife to our first TLM, it knocked my socks off, and I thought “wow, she’s gonna be blown away by the sheer beauty of it.” Nope. As a cradle Catholic it was so different than what she had been used to all her life. She didn’t like not being able understand the liturgy, didn’t like how long it was, etc.She will go with me when I ask her too but it didn’t do much for her. She’s somewhat sympathetic to the traditionalist criticisms of NO and V2 but only to the extent that she sees the contradictions and how the church has reversed its positions on many things that were supposed to be unchangeable.Really cool to hear you all having gotten to become close with your fellow parishioners too. I’ve never really had that and it seems like that would be even more powerful when you’re sort of going against the grain like that.

ChristRespector (1): That’s awesome and very encouraging to hear about your son!

# Post 652: If it happens….

Author: Agathonbanitohen

Score: 11

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/12relg9/if\_it\_happens/

Given what’s going on with the rumored apostolic constitution restricting the TLM, possibly happening in May, and this Synod on Synodality nonsense, I’m wondering if the SSPX is expecting a huge influx of folks heading their way?

Erasmus9 (4): Haven't heard the rumor, can you expand on this please?

AmericanPatriot85 (4): Likely

Sneedevacantist (2): The massive influx has already been happening at the chapel I attend. When I started attending at the end of last year, there was about 150 people attending every Sunday and it was packed to the brim. Now there's regularly 240-260 people attending, and we desperately need a bigger chapel.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (2): all the expected changes this summer including Traditiones 2.0 are simply going to maintain the upward trajectory caused by McCarrick/Vigano/Covid/Pachamama etc. etc. etc. Its been explosive growth for 5+ years now.

Agathonbanitohen (4): From what I remember, the rumor includes altering the 1962 Missal, forcing subdiaconate ordinations to be celebrated according to the New Rite. ( There are no subdiaconate in the New Rite )

# Post 653: URGENT: lady passing away

Author: Blackbeeyellowbee

Score: 4

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/12pgooc/urgent\_lady\_passing\_away/

My friend's grandma is passing, non practicing, i believe. The priest from the hospital will be there. He's NO, so i hope he is orthodox enough.Please pray for her.

None (2): Prayers 🙏🏻🙏🏻

financebro91 (2): Pax tecum!!

# Post 654: CMRI wedding

Author: Scania4075

Score: 7

Comments: 12

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/12j443o/cmri\_wedding/

A friend of mine is getting married this summer at a CMRI chapel. I’ve done some internet sleuthing about who they are their apostolic succession etc and it’s interesting but makes me feel uneasy. I’m not a sedevecantist. Does the society consider their marriages valid? I plan to ask my local priest soon

Mission-Twist5478 (1): Cmri weddings are not valid as in a valid CATHOLIC WEDDING because cmri priests are not valid priests

Mission-Twist5478 (1): I got an annulment from a real bishop because this was not a real catholic wedding

MarcellusFaber (-2): None of the traditional bishops have apostolic succession, not even the SSPX ones. Ordinary jurisdiction is required to be a successor of the Apostles. There is controversy surrounding the beginnings of the CMRI (they were exceedingly messy) and the validity of their orders due to the peculiar behaviour of Archbishop Thuc. Mario Derksen wrote a study of the Thuc consecrations which argues strongly that we are not permitted to doubt their validity of the Thuc consecrations by the laws of the Church, though that does not mean that they were all licit.The Society relied for a very long time on supplied jurisdiction for the validity of its marriages (I do not know exactly if they do still; the situation has become more complex). I don't see how they could possibly argue that CMRI weddings are invalid without admitting that their own were for thirty years.I would be quite happy to go as I would convinced of the validity of the marriage reading canon 1098 of the old code, which does not require a priest with delegated jurisdiction (the parish priest) if the ordinary or his delegate is not available. This only convinces me because I am in fact a 'Sede', however. You would have to be convinced that the orders of the priest saying the Nuptial Mass were valid to participate, however.

Prorsus (1): It's amazing the disinformation that is posted with confidence! You will find within Catholicism that matrimony is the easiest Sacrament to perform validly. With this Sacrament, it's the couple themselves that perform the Sacrament! Get this; in an extraordinary circumstance where a couple doesn't have access to a priest for about 6 months, the Church allows such a couple to simply live together as husband and wife and consider themselves both licitly and validly married, because they would be.

Scania4075 (4): Thank you for the replies. I really enjoy researching about these topics. I used to be what most people would consider a ‘conservative NO’ catholic but within the last couple years found tradition. I will certainly ask my local priest at my sspx chapel

hard\_2\_ask (3): >Ordinary jurisdiction is required to be a successor of the Apostles. &#x200B;>These Churches, \*\*although separated from us\*\*, possess true sacraments, \*\*above all by apostolic succession\*\*, the priesthood and the Eucharist, whereby they are linked with us in closest intimacy. Therefore some worship in common (communicatio in sacris), given suitable circumstances and the approval of Church authority, is not only possible but to be encouraged.UNITATIS REDINTEGRATIO 15 on Eastern Schismatics

MarcellusFaber (2): Are you really quoting Vatican II as an authority on an SSPX sub', or are you demonstrating that it taught error?

hard\_2\_ask (3): I realize the irony, but it's a legitimate teaching. Apostolic succession is communicated and held even without jurisdiction. Does a bishop cease to have Apostolic succession if he becomes a titular bishop?

Common-Inspector-358 (0): vatican 2 is an authority in the sspx as much as it is an authority anywhere else in the church.

MarcellusFaber (1): This is not correct. Orders can be held without jurisdiction, but orders are only one required aspect of Apostolic Succession. Ordinary jurisdiction is the other. Fr Sylvester Berry, writing in the 1920s, addresses this question starting on page 138 of his book 'The Church of Christ': [https://ia803001.us.archive.org/0/items/TheChurchOfChristAnApologeticAndDogmaticTreatiseBerryRev.E.Sylvester5729.o/The%20Church%20of%20Christ\\_%20An%20Apologetic%20and%20Dogmatic%20Treatise%20-%20Berry%2C%20Rev.%20E.%20Sylvester\\_5729.o.pdf](https://ia803001.us.archive.org/0/items/TheChurchOfChristAnApologeticAndDogmaticTreatiseBerryRev.E.Sylvester5729.o/The%20Church%20of%20Christ\_%20An%20Apologetic%20and%20Dogmatic%20Treatise%20-%20Berry%2C%20Rev.%20E.%20Sylvester\_5729.o.pdf)“Jurisdiction is authority to govern and must be transmitted in the Church as in any other society; it can be conferred only by a lawful superior, according to the constitution and laws of the society, and may be revoked at any time. Consequently jurisdiction in the Church can neither be obtained nor held against the will of her supreme authority; its transmission depends entirely upon legitimate succession. \*\*It is not sufficient, therefore, that a church have valid Orders; it must also have a legitimate succession of ministers, reaching back in an unbroken line to the Apostles, upon whom our Lord conferred all authority to rule His Church.\*\*” – Pgs. 140-141 (my emphasis)

hard\_2\_ask (1): OK, just to clarify, does a titular bishop have apostolic succession?Note: Titular bishops dont have jurisdiction.

MarcellusFaber (1): If that information is correct, then no.

# Post 655: At what age is it appropriate to watch The Passion of The Christ?

Author: RadTradTref

Score: 5

Comments: 11

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/12c7d9d/at\_what\_age\_is\_it\_appropriate\_to\_watch\_the/

At what age do you think it is appropriate to have your children watch Mel Gibson's The Passion of The Christ?My oldest is almost 10 years old. He received his first holy communion and confirmation this year. I think he is old enough to watch The Passion as it is a tradition of my wife and I to watch it every year on Good Friday. She thinks he is still to young. What do you think?

Rare\_Fill1801 (4): Honestly I think any age is appropriate to watch the movie, yes there are scenes of very graphic violence but children need to be exposed to the sacrifice of Christ at an early age. Children are naturally much more sympathetic and the impact of the movie in my option will help them to love and understand Jesus sacrifice much greater than if they are older. All Catholic Churches have crucifixes in them and art of the passion so I don’t think it’s inappropriate to show them. After all our lady of Fatima game the three children a vision of hell itself which is arguably much more traumatizing than the movie. We need to be exposed to the reality of our sin very early, so that we can avoid it when we are older.

None (3): I think if you are of the age of reason and are receiving the Holy Eucharist, then you should see exactly what our Lord’s sacrifice truly was. Obviously with guidance and depending on the child, but I wish I had seen something like The Passion of The Christ when I was young, I think I would’ve been much more reverent. God Bless.

GYEvanID (2): Considering the historical violence as well as blood and gore, I think you - as the parents - should not let him watch alone.That movie is rated Teen in my country, Indonesia.

mtrainlover (-1): Ummm never

Financial-Anything47 (1): At the same age that it is appropriate for your child to watch real-world beheadings.

RadTradTref (2): If never let him watch it alone. My wife and I watch it once a year and he'd watch it with us.

RadTradTref (3): Why never?

mtrainlover (1): I'm a TERF too!

RadTradTref (2): What is a TERF? I'm asking honestly and in good faith why never watch the passion. I'm interested in your perspective. I posted the question in several groups and you are the only one that said never. People on NOM groups said wait until they are much older even an adult. While people in more traditional groups said start watching it young.

mtrainlover (2): Oh sorry I misread your username. I thought it said TERF. A TERF or trans exclusionary radical feminist is a person with the belief that only biological women are real women and are known in their altruistic protest in protecting women and children

RadTradTref (2): Oh I knew that. I thought there was another meaning related to religion. but why should you never watch the Passion.

# Post 656: Prayers

Author: None

Score: 8

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/12acrod/prayers/

Please pray for me, I have never been to TLM before, I might be able to go on Maundy Thursday. Pray that I can get there and all goes well and my anti-Catholic parents don't find out.

Optimal\_Fan2421 (2): Please DM me if you need help getting to Holy Mass. If I am in your area or if someone is in your area we can help you out. If not please know my prayers are with you during this Holy week. Also I will pray a special intention that your parents may see the truth and come to the one true religion, outside of which there is no salvation. -Mr. K

None (3): God bless you, but I am in the middle of the UK lolThanks for the prayers.There is an old lady at my Novus Ordo church and she remembers the Latin Mass and Communion on the tongue, veiling and all the good stuff and she said she will take me on Thursday. So, as long as my parents let me go, it will work. The Latin Mass time coincides with the time for Mass at my local NO so that is quite handy.

# Post 657: Headcovering

Author: Mandapanda82

Score: 6

Comments: 14

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/125tmpq/headcovering/

I am genuinely curious as to the reason for veiling at mass: is it simply that we (women) veil because we are in the presence of Jesus in the tabernacle? Is it at least in part due to 1 Corinthians 11? If the latter, then why are we not supposed to cover our heads outside of mass as well? (Since we pray throughout the day and are in fact advised to “pray without ceasing”). Especially since we are to practice modesty at all times in all forms outside of mass, but certainly with our clothing. I’ve seen some stuff about a movement for Christian headcovering…and there is certainly precedent throughout Christian history. But the current movements are protestant (although I know some Catholic women have privately discerned to headcover outside of mass).My position here isn’t to say that we necessarily should be. Just curious as to an authentically (traditional) Catholic reasoning for why we only headcover at mass and not all the time.

MarcellusFaber (5): There's a particular passage from St Paul in which he teaches that women should cover their heads at Mass "because of the angels" (I've no idea what that means; I suppose I should check Cornelius a Lapide's commentary), but also to show that the head of woman is man. Another argument I've heard is that we veil things that are sacred, and since women bring life into the world, there's a certain sense in which they could be considered sacred. I don't know how traditional this argument is, however. A brilliant series of articles was published by Tradition in Action which explains the reasons for veiling, though I must warn you that it is very long: [https://www.traditioninaction.org/religious/d005rpVeil\\_1\\_Goodman.htm](https://www.traditioninaction.org/religious/d005rpVeil\_1\_Goodman.htm)I do support women going back to veiling all the time (though not like the Muhammadans), but that usually gets me labelled a nutter! (Never mind that various fathers and doctors were very sever in their treatment of the question, they must have been nutters too!).

None (3): I do not have knowledge about the historical reasons for women covering their heads during Holy Mass, but as a Catholic of tradition, I can say that I greatly appreciate this attitude and am very grateful to women for doing so. It helps me focus on the Holy Mass. Thanks to this, I do not get distracted.

GoneFishin56 (2): Another reason is that femininity is sacred. In our Church, the most sacred things are veiled, such as the tabernacle, the chalice, etc

rathdrummob (1): Wear a veil if you want to. I can’t tell from your comment if you’re looking for a reason to wear one or looking for some reason not to. You don’t need the church to tell you to, they obviously don’t. Unless it’s just a search for something to be scrupulous about, just wear it if it helps you or you just like the way it looks.

Highwayman90 (1): My understanding is that it's because a woman can bring life into the world, thus she should be veiled as sacred.

Cato2011 (5): I also support women veiling outside of the home. The Virgin Mary is the peak of womanhood, and I have never seen a sacred image if Her bareheaded.

Mandapanda82 (1): No it’s just genuinecuriosity

Mandapanda82 (1): My question isn’t just why we veil-my question is why is veiling ONLY expected at mass and headcovering not required all the time. If a woman is sacred, she doesn’t cease to be sacred outside of mass. If it’s general modesty, it should extend outside of mass. And sure, an individual woman could discern to headcover full time, I’m just curious for traditional Catholic reasoning for only veiling during mass.

Mandapanda82 (2): This is also another consideration I have been mulling over. Women ideally are called to Marian standards of dress even outside of mass, (though obviously not in the totally literal sense of ancient Jewish custom), but I don’t know why that would exclude headcovering of some sort (and like the above commenter, I don’t mean a hijab). In apparitions her head is almost always covered. In fact, I believe there was an uproar over the depiction of her apparition in Akita because it depicted her with her head uncovered.

Cato2011 (2): Until about the 1960s I believe all women in the Western world wore a hat or head covering. Men wore hats, too for that matter. It’s probably a custom that just died out or was abandoned.

Mandapanda82 (1): This is kind of what I am thinking. Vatican II didn’t address veiling, though my understanding is it was erroneously reported in American that it was abrogated. Previous to VII, most women at least wore hats when going out and it probably never occurred to the pre-VII Church that there was a need to address it because for the most part, there wasn’t at the time. But for me that still begs the question-what does God want women to do? The SSPX addresses feminine modesty and dress even outside of mass, except when it comes to headcovering. And of course, the mainstream Church thinks anything goes-even if you’re wearing a mini skirt to mass. There seems to be a gap in guidance here but I also don’t want to go making up my own rules or interpreting the Bible myself.

Cato2011 (1): Well, we do have to look to what modesty means in our own culture and that of Christianity. God didn’t provide any dress code in scripture. How you dress sends out a message. In my SSPX chapel, we have a dress code and for women it says dresses should be past the knee and sleeves should cover the elbows. No form fitting clothes. Veils in church. I think everyone would agree that’s modest.

None (1): I am in RCIA at a standard NO parish... very nice... but the amount of mini skirts drives me nuts... all I can look is at the alter... and sometimes we have lay people go up to read with their booty-tight dresses... mind you I am not an old fart... 20 years old with an awesome GF... but i don't wana be seeing these things during mass of all things...

None (2): my no parish could use that... in fact my NO parish at my mom... a lady wiped out her full bare boob out like clint eastwood during mass...mind blown...

# Post 658: What is SSPX current situation in Germany? Is it growing? If so, how fast?

Author: None

Score: 13

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/11pu9z0/what\_is\_sspx\_current\_situation\_in\_germany\_is\_it/

CartanAnnullator (7): I was recently baptized by two SSPX patres and now I go to their church.

None (3): [deleted]

None (2): Great to hear it. What was your religious background?

None (1): Thanks a lot for the answer. Have there been any plan to expand the number of Mass centers lately?

CartanAnnullator (3): Agnostic

None (2): Cool. How is your chapel? I mean, what Is the mean age of attenders, are new attenders coming at a fast pace?

CartanAnnullator (2): I have no statistics. Not very old, not very young although at the last mass, I saw some youngsters receiving communion. I can't tell if it is growing. My sister also joined, in a different city. She knew the two patres who baptized me.

# Post 659: [Opinions] St. Marys, KS

Author: siriusreddit

Score: 8

Comments: 24

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/11nwmis/opinions\_st\_marys\_ks/

Anyone visited or live in St. Marys? From a quick google search, there are apparently a lot of sex scandals and investigations going on? Baseless?

boesno (11): I live in St Marys and my wife grew up here. The scandals are real but it’s complicated and you have to look at each case individually. I’ve seen stories reported that are true, half true and laughably wrong. People move to St Marys for many different reasons but a lot of times it’s because they are trying find a better situation for their families and think that St Marys will fix things. Sometimes a familys situation is just really hard to fix and a large family has large problems. People here say that years ago St Marys was in “survival mode.” People were upset with what was happening in the church and moved to St Marys looking for help and answers from the SSPX. There were no jobs in rural Kansas and people were trying desperately to find a good situation for their families. In the last 15 years a lot of that has changed. A lot of tough, intelligent and moral people moved here. They started good businesses and now there is money being made and people move here for jobs and not just the church. The SSPX has grown and matured as an organization. There is now good staff, policies and financing in place to make the school and church the best it can be.It’s easy to sensationalize St Marys because the whole places sounds crazy on the surface buts it’s just the larger version of your typical SSPX chapel. I think the town is dynamic and there are great people here.

None (6): I lived in Saint Marys for about 10 years and moved about 3 years ago.Overall, its a great town, with an amazing Catholic spirit and some great people. I attended the college there and that was the best two years of my life.Pros: Extremely easy access to the sacraments, a large number of liturgy offered (Divine office, vespers, etc), a very diverse population (in the true sense), surrounded by large families and clergy, and a new beautiful church that they are 95% completed with and consecrating on May 3rd.Cons: Small town (depending on if you like that or not), economically monolithic (theres really only 1-2 places to work to earn a living unless you plan on working in Topeka and Manhattan and even those are limited depending on what you do for a living), and a general lack of things to do (its a small town in rural kansas after all).The other thing ill call out as the biggest con is: an extremely large parish. Cannot tell you how many people I spoke to when I left Saint Marys of how they felt unwelcome coming in, and it felt very closed off from the rest of the world. Some of that is by design, but alot of it is frankly how many people there are there. Im not sure where current numbers stand now but its a parish of about 3-4K (including children). That being said its difficult to make friends or immerse yourself in one of the many sub communities unless you know someone, its just kinda how it works. I remember i came back to visit and sparked up a conversation with someone who I had never met, and mentioned "Ive never met you before, did you just move here? and he said "no ive lived here for 25 years". Gives you an idea of how massive the place is.Now, regarding your sex scandal questions: I definitely would not say there are "alot". Of course, where there is smoke, there is fire, and I do believe there have been some accusations from a couple of individuals regarding this. I have not peered into the news of these lately but I do not think anyone has been convicted yet. So are there some that are true? Maybe. But there are also many that are 100% false, and people who have a bone to pick with a certain priest or the system or what have you and just trying to bring things down to their level. Pure malice in my opinion. But like I said, im sure sadly that some are true, but I wouldnt base that on the town per se, the abuse happens everywhere sadly.Overall: I recommend the college and its professors 1000%, truly one of the gifts of the SSPX is that college. Now, Living there as a parishioner long term? for me I decided to move because I wanted to a) be at a parish that actually needs more resources versus Saint Marys where they have literally everything from a parish perspective, b) live in a more populated area for better access to jobs and fun things to do with the kids, and c) wasnt a fan of being 1 of 4000, wanted more of a medium sized parish vibe where I can actually know my parish and the people who attend it.

Cato2011 (5): “A lot of sex scandals” I follow things pretty closely and I don’t think there’s more than any other institution. I would just keep in mind that the society isn’t immune from the illls of the world.

KpopKia (3): People do bad things all the time all over the place. St. Marys isn't different just because it's the largest traditional Catholic parish in the world. I've lived here since 1994. There are some things about it that bother me, but there are more things about it that I love. I wish I could tell you that it is some kind of great Catholic eutopia paradise. It isn't. Sometimes, religion seems to bring out the worst in people, and I don't know why. That is not the Church's fault. But it is a great place to live and be a part of. Crazy people? Yes, a few. We tend to roll our eyes and keep moving. Great people that you want to be friends with and have a community with? Absolutely. These are the people we embrace and open our arms to. You are going to find bad people and bad situations wherever you choose to live.I love living here, and I'm so grateful to be a part of the community that is here. I'm pretty sure this is where I'm going to stay.

Count\_Erfit (3): Google is liberal baloney. Drove by the new cathedral last week though. Looks very promising!

Piklikl (2): Remember, anytime there's any sort of accusation, no matter how baseless, both the SSPX and the civil authorities must do their due diligence and perform an investigation. While the SSPX does not need to publicize its internal investigations (although I think there's a case to be made that it would be in their best interests to have at least something approaching it), the civil authorities sometimes will publicize their investigations. Also those who are in the habit of making frivolous or baseless accusations are also the ones most likely to run to the media to get their private little crusade won. It's extremely unfortunate, but there have been a few sexual scandals that actually did occur, and the reality is it's better to err on the side of "over reporting" them, instead of trying to cover them up. The downside of this approach is that the reputation of the SSPX ultimately has to take a hit, but it's much easier to recover from a false accusation reputation loss vs a covered up scandal that was found out reputation loss.

GoneFishin56 (2): I’ve wanted to move my family there for years.

SuperGrapeSoda (1): Morning, are you aware of many homes for sale 4 bedroom or larger ? I saw one recently on Wildrose but now it looks ‘ pending ‘. Thank you

siriusreddit (1): Thank you thank you thank you for your feedback.

siriusreddit (3): Google probably isn't helping their case out either.

Lonely\_egg\_McMuffin (1): I live here and a lot of things are really well covered up sadly

None (0): [deleted]

boesno (1): I don’t know of anything on the market that you can’t find online. There is a housing development opening up just north of town this year if you have the money to build.

None (2): [deleted]

Count\_Erfit (4): This would be accurate if Google were the only game in town. However most ignorant reddit commenters fail to realize other search engines exist.

siriusreddit (2): If you don't think that Google is influencing things one way or the other then you've got some introspection to do.

siriusreddit (2): Not on purpose (as far as I know) but Google just naturally puts mainstream news stories at the top. Generally, mainstream news is against the Church. Different agendas.And actually, after doing research on this very briefly, I can say that my Google search results at least were very \*unbiased\* on this whole matter.

None (0): [deleted]

None (0): [deleted]

None (2): [deleted]

Count\_Erfit (7): Troll harder little sister. Maybe go to an muslim thread and rant about gender fluidity.

siriusreddit (2): What is your deal haha?

siriusreddit (4): Then we agree? You're confusing me my dude.

siriusreddit (1): Just on my usage of Google. I work in IT.When I'm signed in on my profile vs. a new computer most of my top search results will be Wikipedia, mainstream news outlets, etc.You seem to be on the defensive so let me just say this: that's not necessarily a bad thing. It's a fresh profile. Also, in this specific matter regarding SSPX abuse cases, I didn't notice any Google bias. But when it comes to the Catholic Church as a whole there tends to be more harshness/coverage than for other institutions, such as schools where child abuse is at a higher percentage than in religious organizations.

whoreallygives (1): it's obvious for anyone who uses the internet.

None (2): [deleted]

siriusreddit (2): Correct.Yes, I'm going off of my "groups" interpretation of it's own handpicked data and not doing the research myself. Like 95% of people nowadays. People like to appear the victim/minority.You might like this [vid](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nYYkRaU0xh8). Pretty cool channel.Just live your life man.

Common-Inspector-358 (2): have you ever used google before?

None (2): [deleted]

Common-Inspector-358 (2): Talking authoritatively about a product you've never used. Nice.

None (2): [deleted]

Common-Inspector-358 (2): google it

# Post 660: Suggestions please

Author: None

Score: 4

Comments: 8

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/11bqlub/suggestions\_please/

I’m looking for film and novel suggestions. They don’t need to be Catholic per se, but should conform to our moral standards. Something that is both entertaining and edifying. While spiritual nonfiction definitely has a place in my life, that’s not what I’m looking for.

Aggressive-Charge-54 (2): A Hidden Life (Beautiful movie about Blessed Franz Jaggenstatter)Arrival (Sci-if)Patterson (cheeky oddball movie)The Map of Tiny Perfect Things (YA movie with a decent message)About Time (some minor sexual content, but fairly brief). This list is based in movies that my wife and I both enjoyed. She normally will only watch black and whites due to content. I can’t stand them.

Piklikl (2): I never watched the TV adaptation, but Brideshead Revisited book as well as the audiobook narrated by Jeremy Irons was sublime. &#x200B;Anything by Dickens or Dostoevsky. P.G. Wodehouse is quite an entertaining author if you're looking for something humorous.

CartanAnnullator (2): The Passion of Augustine seems interesting.

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): Thank you… I think I’ll watch A Hidden Life this evening

siriusreddit (1): The Map of Tiny Perfect Things was pretty good. Thank you.

None (1): I have seen it and after that it’s very good but not quite what I was looking for this evening

None (1): I’ve started the high fantasy series The Wheel of Time. I recently finished listening to the audio book version of the first novel The Eye of the World and just began the second book. I find them to be quite good.

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): I did watch the tv show as well and while that was enjoyable I found/find the novels better so far and with enough differences that I find both equally enjoyable without spoiling the experience of the other

# Post 661: Ages for fast and abstinence

Author: Agathonbanitohen

Score: 1

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1193lc0/ages\_for\_fast\_and\_abstinence/

In the 1962 discipline, what are the ages for fast and abstinence?Thank you.

Agathonbanitohen (1): Like what u/rothlou0 said, but only in America is the fasting age at 18. In the rest of the Church, the age is 21.

rothlou0 (1): It dépends on your country, because as bishops are able to set this on their diocese. I search on sspx website and I found this: The law of abstinence binds all Catholics, beginning on the day after their 14th birthday.Thelaw of fasting binds all adults (beginning on their 18th birthday) until the midnight which completes their 59th birthday.Source:https://sspx.org/en/fast-abstinence-rules#:~:text=In%20the%20USA&text=Fasting%20and%20abstinence%20are%20obligatory,%2C%20is%20%E2%80%9Cstrongly%20recommended.%E2%80%9D

# Post 662: South Wales Baptism

Author: robertprice9

Score: 3

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/115ug08/south\_wales\_baptism/

I am looking for someone in South Wales to help me be baptized. I have tried the local novus ordo church but attending their RCIA was soul destroying. Is there anyone who could help me with this??

Cato2011 (4): N.O. RCIA is awful - good choice leaving it. There’s plenty of SSPX chapels in England. Look it up online. I’m sure the fathers would be happy to accommodate you. Maybe you can do your formation/instruction online and make a trip to get baptized come Easter.

MarcellusFaber (2): Your closest SSPX chapels are in Bristol and the far north of Wales.

None (1): [deleted]

robertprice9 (2): Hmm okay, thank you

robertprice9 (1): Interesting, thank you, I will look into it

# Post 663: South Wales Baptism

Author: robertprice9

Score: 0

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/115uecl/south\_wales\_baptism/

# Post 664: Homeschooling Curriculum Suggestions

Author: ManuvSteel007

Score: 6

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/10tjw25/homeschooling\_curriculum\_suggestions/

I'm looking for a homeschooling curriculum that would be appropriate for a traditional Catholic family. I've been diving in to the plethora of options over the last few days and decided it was time to just ask.Anyone here been through this decision making process and come to any conclusions? Any advice in general?

hardeho (3): Our lady of victory is associated with the SSPX I believe, or at least they are lay followers.[https://www.olvs.org/](https://www.olvs.org/)&#x200B;We use a lot of Seton materials. They are Catholic, and orthodox in their teaching. They use a classical style curriculum. They are not specifically traditional though. I'd say they are like 1980's/90's Steubenville Catholic. Which by comparison to modern era Catholicism, seems really good by ontrast.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (3): our lady of victory is phenemonal and most my wifes homeschool circle has used them without complaint

None (2): Catholic Heritage Curriculum https://www.chcweb.com/catalog/catalog\_request.htmlSetonhttps://www.setonhome.org/St. Jerome Schoolhttps://www.stjeromeschool.org/Kolbe Academyhttps://www.kolbe.org/

notanexpert\_askapro (2): First of all, hardly anyone uses a curriculum exactly as is. So not all of these will be perfect for you. Most people end up mixing and matching but starting with one is helpful. Here are a few I find quality:-- Catholic Heritage Curriculum (they teach long ages in a few random places but easy to edit out, otherwise very traditional)-- Catholic School House-- Tapestry of Grace-- not Catholic but it's close enough to mention nice-- adapt the end of the curriculum to have more Catholic figures. -- RC HistoryThere are MANY others, but these are my favorite so far. They do not all cover all subjects. Everyone has to find a math one that works for them for example. Many approaches exist.

# Post 665: SSPX Forum

Author: throwawaysspxer

Score: 3

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/10hutvy/sspx\_forum/

[https://sspxtalk.com/](https://sspxtalk.com/public/)It's a bit inactive since it was just created. Recently I've been trying to make a web forum independent of any particular platform that's sort of like Suscipe Domine or Fish Eaters, but specifically for SSPX. Obviously, this is unofficial and unaffiliated with the Society.There's some features that I've been experimenting with adding like live feeds/discussions, which will be added once it's migrated to its own server. Once I get some block storage for it we can add the ability to upload files too.Moderation is semi-strict, until you're given a particular role called "trusted user", all posts have to be manually approved, though this shouldn't take long. Currently the main neat features are private discussions and the ability to login using your Facebook or Discord account via OAuth2. You can also just create your own account with an email and password, and we may add the ability to log in via Google soon. Google has special requirements for using their API for production purposes so it is more tricky.

# Post 666: creating a Trad Catholic scholarly group!

Author: LabRepresentative885

Score: 3

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/10evjhz/creating\_a\_trad\_catholic\_scholarly\_group/

On FB. Called Trad Catholic Aspirants. If you have skills in Theology, history. Foreign languages, etc. Please come join.

LegitimateMaybe9995 (1): I am down. Send me the link.

# Post 667: Two Popes

Author: fordrodney84

Score: 0

Comments: 0

URL: https://parkbenchreader.wordpress.com/2023/01/09/two-popes/

# Post 668: Would you agree that SSPX shall be given a Personal Prelature?

Author: None

Score: 5

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/1048ao1/would\_you\_agree\_that\_sspx\_shall\_be\_given\_a/

Piancol (2): Not in the current state of affairs. Rome is farther away than ever from even acknowledging the errors and damage of modernism and V2, and with the clear antagonism of Francis against the Tridentine Mass and Tradition, it could only bring trouble.

NtGiL\_29 (2): I don't think it's an ideal scenario. While it would bring a sense of normalization with Rome, it would basically mean that the Vatican is giving the trads their little corner and then that would be their "concession" for a long, long time.

# Post 669: False religions

Author: None

Score: 16

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/103xy31/false\_religions/

I see that the group r/ Catholicism banns you if you say the truth about islam, or any other false religion, but especially islam is high estimed. Catholics should be taught to not hate obviously the muslims, but to hate islam and the demonic ideas of it and of his false prophet, Muhammad.

mtrainlover (3): You get banned for saying many things in that group.

None (2): I was banned from there for "obviously know\[ing\] nothing about Catholicism." I just have a theology degree from Fordham, lol. Yes, I learned modernism there, but something tells me I'm better qualified than their average poster where regards Novus Ordo Catholicism.

None (2): Yeah, the truth included.

# Post 670: I’m so tired

Author: erick2020x

Score: 4

Comments: 10

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/103qgof/im\_so\_tired/

I’m writing this post, because I would like to talk with like-minded Catholics who are traditional in thought.This year has been the most difficult year ever in my life. I lost my dad, who was looking after the whole family, I lost the woman in my life, and I thought I would marry who left me when things got tough, all my friends desserted me, I inherited my dad‘s business that is falling apart, I have so many responsibilities as the first son to the family etc. The list goes on, and I have prayed unceasingly to the Lord to assist me and so far, he hasn’t answered my prayers. I’m at the point of giving up on everything I’m doing. I’m not sure if the Lord wants me to continue or to stop. I have through to the Everloving Virgin Mary and Jesus to assist me with my prayers have not been answered and I don’t know what to do. I have rising debt costs, I have barely income coming in, but I have the potential to unlock wealth that I could use to help many people around the world, but I have not managed to do it. Should I just give up or should I continue going? The reason I ask is because many of my family members are against me and want me to just live with a normal job which is fine but why should I settle when I have so much to Potential. What am I doing wrong? Is it that the Lord wants me to do something else or he doesn’t want me to do this at all? Am I destined to keep trying and failing?Please help me I don’t know what to do. I am just so tired physically , spirtually and mentally.

None (4): I'm sorry that you've had such a hard year. In reading your post the first thing that popped in my mind was the story of Job from the Bible. Also, how about Jesus carrying the cross? The weight of the world was on our Lords shoulders as he walked to Calvary. Try to relate your suffering with what Christ went through. Doing this will be such a powerful way to help you get through hard times as well as grow closer to Jesus.(if you need someone to talk with about life feel free to message me. I can definitely relate to stress I'm about to have 3 children under 2.5 years lol)

NtGiL\_29 (2): I would settle. While a lot of people have grand plans for their potential wealth, the avarice gets to them. As Our Lord says, it is harder for a rich man to get into heaven than it is for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle. Focus on supporting yourself, then go enter courtship. You'll be in a better state of mind that way.

erick2020x (3): thanks so much

erick2020x (1): Ok so you believe that is better to not work hard and use whatever Potential you have to not create wealth and just settle. But why do that if you know deep down that you will not be happy?

NtGiL\_29 (1): You're putting words in my mouth. If "settling" is getting a normal job and paying off your debt, that's still working hard. In fact, I think that it would be a good idea to pay off your current debt and have the financial wherewithal to potentially support a marriage.Your comment here is a little off-putting. When you start chasing wealth, I don't care what it's for, it's avarice. Look at how bad the Vatican Bank is. Perhaps Our Lord is showing you by these failures that it is not your duty of state. But I cannot truly judge as you don't say what your "potential" is.

erick2020x (1): Ok, Since my dad's passing I have engaged his business partners in order to continue the projects that my dad left behind. Now there is "potential" in the sense that these men are also God-fearing men. Yes a few protestants but never the less our goal is the same, To promote Christendom and donate some of the proceeds to charitable causes. For me all Charitiable causes need to be Catholic but they think in general a Christian cause is enough. The debt that is left behind is such that I would not be able to pay it off and would work endlessly to pay it all. So I thought to myself why not work at what he was doing instead of doing menial jobs or jobs which wouldn't make me happy. So I would spend the rest of my life unhappy because I never at least tried to reach my potential and make a good business. Now in order to be happy in a marriage requires a degree of financial status espeically in todays world. at my age (38) and with hardly any money, where do i even begin to date someone?havent you heard the parable of the talents?

NtGiL\_29 (1): Look, if you’re dead set on doing this, I’m not going to fight you. All I’m saying is that if you’re having doubts (especially since you say that the debt is directly related to these business dealings), I think that you should take a sincere look at them.

erick2020x (2): perhaps i didn't explain. the debt my dad left is his personal debt and tax debt. In Spain when a significant other passes there is an inheritance tax which has become debt which we haven't been able to even afford a lawyer to help with. So I am paying his personal debts off to clear his name. Those aren't corportate debts.

NtGiL\_29 (1): at this point, I would recommend speaking to a trusted priest about the situation - talk about the choice, but also ask them for tips to combat the discouragement you’ve been dealing with.

erick2020x (1): i definetely will look for a good priest. the easy option is what you proposed which is not wrong but isn't life about pushing through a challenge? this is what i thought about christianity/catholicism. the easier thing to is settle but the harder more rewarding thing is to keep pushing.

# Post 671: SSPX Q&A:

Author: Researcher\_1129

Score: 2

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/101nq6r/sspx\_qa/

\*\*What is SSPX?\*\* The Society of Saint Pius X (SSPX) is an international fraternity of traditionalist Catholic priests founded in 1970 by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, a leading traditionalist voice at the Second Vatican Council with the Coetus Internationalis Patrum, and Superior General of the Holy Ghost Fathers until 1968. \*\*Why was it founded?\*\* SSPX was founded as any regular convent for priests to study and pray \*\*in solidity.\*\* How were all of the churchs established then? \*\*When churchs stopped saying TLM (Traditional Latin Mass) they had to step in to help out. When more and more FSSPX church start to grow and appear more saying the TLM they most likely will stop and go back to there original way of life.\*\* How is the SSPX different from FSSP?> The Priestly Fraternity of Saint Peter (Latin: Fraternitas Sacerdotalis Sancti Petri; FSSP) is a \*\*traditionalist Catholic\*\* society of apostolic life for priests and seminarians which is in communion with the Holy See. &#x200B;>The Society of Saint Pius X (SSPX) is an international fraternity of traditionalist Catholic priests founded in 1970 by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, a leading traditionalist voice at the Second Vatican Council with the Coetus Internationalis Patrum, and Superior General of the Holy Ghost Fathers until 1968. See the difference? \-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------Where is one in my area? [https://sspx.org/en/community/priories](https://sspx.org/en/community/priories)Follow this link to find any in your area.

None (2): >See the difference?Nope.

FloristsDaughter (1): Me either. Can someone ELIA5? Thanks!

# Post 672: SSPX in Wisconsin

Author: FloristsDaughter

Score: 6

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/100qge3/sspx\_in\_wisconsin/

Hi all -I know there is a group in Waunakee - I've attended just once. I'm curious if they have an online community? I'd like to become involved, but I don't know anyone and feel really awkward just...showing up. It doesn't help that the one time I did, people saw my tattoos and straight up ignored me. I'd like to get to know folks prior to popping in again, to form some connections first. Thanks!

NtGiL\_29 (3): I’ve been to Waunakee on occasion when I’ve been in the Madison area. I’d say that the probably do not have an online community, although I can’t say I’ve ever asked anybody. If you find Waunakee to be too cliquey (which is fine, people have said that about my home parish too for good reason), Necedah isn’t too too far up the road.

Piklikl (2): I can sympathize with the IRL awkwardness, while I know fellowship is not a bad thing, I usually just leave right after mass & thanksgiving instead of hang around and chat with strangers. I think you might have some luck if you find some way to reach out to the priest via email (or even text). The vast majority of the priests have a good sense of their parishes and if you explain your situation (and don't be afraid to mention your perception of the cold shoulder at your tattoos) the priest will likely be able to put you in touch with key people that will help you get involved. A shortcut to getting involved in the parish is to volunteer to help out with stuff, that's not online, but it's definitely a fast track to integration.

FloristsDaughter (2): Thanks for that.

# Post 673: Benedict will be forever in my heart. Here is a picture of him in my wallet.

Author: mtrainlover

Score: 17

Comments: 1

URL: https://i.redd.it/itwvcowvze9a1.jpg

Aggressive-Charge-54 (1): requiescat in pace

# Post 674: Where to buy tassel cords for Senior Acolytes/MC?

Author: hambeejee

Score: 1

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/100eouz/where\_to\_buy\_tassel\_cords\_for\_senior\_acolytesmc/

Hello,As title. I have inquired from [acss.sspxusa.org](https://acss.sspxusa.org) through email, however, no replies from them.Thank you!

# Post 675: Extra ecclesium nulla salus - what's the sspx position?

Author: bug4ff

Score: 9

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/zouf5t/extra\_ecclesium\_nulla\_salus\_whats\_the\_sspx/

Can we hold out hope that those who aren't Catholics through no fault of their own, so long as they earnestly seek truth and pursue righteousness to the best of their ability, can find salvation through God's mercy, as the current CCC teaches? Or does the SSPX see this as modernist ecumenist nonsense too?I like this teaching, and hope it's true, but the church has gotten so much wrong with its ecumenism efforts it's hard to know what to believe anymore.

distouille (9): in the catechism of st pie x, it is written : "celui qui est hors de l'Église par sa propre faute et meurt sans la contrition parfaite ne se sauve pas. mais celui qui se trouve hors de l'Église sans sa propre faute et mène une vie bonne peut se sauver par l'amour de charité qui l'unit à Dieu et à l'âme de l'Église"trying my best to translate : "the one who is out of the Church by his own fault and doesn't die with perfect contrition (don't know how to translate this..) is not saved. but the one who is out of the Church without his own fault and live a good life can be saved by the love of charity that unite (?) him with God and the soul of the Church " 🙏

JackStone2112 (3): There's so much drama and the spilling of ink over what should be a straightforward answer. The best I have found is here: [http://archives.sspx.org/miscellaneous/feeneyism/three\\_baptisms.htm](http://archives.sspx.org/miscellaneous/feeneyism/three\_baptisms.htm)Answer found there: There is no salvation outside the Catholic Church. If God decides, in a dying person's last moments, to make that \*Catholic\* truth known to him, and he sincerely desires \*Catholic\* baptism, then yes, that person could be saved. But how \*narrow\* is that gate?! It would be easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle.

# Post 676: NSFW

Author: tnu0055

Score: 2

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/zogqno/nsfw/

Circumsision Is this ok to do?

HalfheartedHart (3): \*\*No.\*\*I'm approaching this with the assumption that we're talking about the circumcision of an infant. A lot of people (young Catholic parents included) seem to be obliviously following the “mainstream” practice in the USA of allowing their sons to be circumcised without even questioning it.But it seems pretty straight forward that it is not permissible for Catholics.Catholic medical ethics forbids amputation of a healthy part of the body without medical necessity. I implore you to respect his bodily integrity and refuse to have any son of yours circumcised. It is a risky and unnecessary surgery that has lasting negative effects and no medical justification.And yes, "...While Jesus was circumcized in obedience to the Law and as a shadow of His shedding His Blood at Calvary, He did \*\*not\*\* undergo the procedure that is used by modern, post-Temple Jews and by doctors in Western hospitals today." https://www.fisheaters.com/circumcision.html [emphasis added]www.catholicsagainstcircumcision.org has lots of helpful information on the subject, especially the articles linked here: https://www.catholicsagainstcircumcision.org/articles/Other resources include www.yourwholebaby.org and www.nocirc.org

Trengingigan (1): From a religious point of view, it’s neither forbidden nor obligatory.

MarcellusFaber (10): This is not correct. If it is done for a religious reason, it is a mortal sin as, by following the old law, one is implicitly stating that Our Lord has not yet come and denying the truth of the Catholic religion. If circumcision is done for a justifiable medical reason, then it is allowed.EDIT. Looking at the comment by HalfheartedHart, I realise that I did not recall the practice in the United States of general circumcision. This is not the case in England. I believe HalfheartedHart explains the medical side of things well.

# Post 677: Going where they’re called

Author: Agathonbanitohen

Score: 3

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/zn8lad/going\_where\_theyre\_called/

I’ve been doing some research on the SSPX and I have been watching some podcasts from the \*Crisis in the Church\* series. Interesting stuff. I remember one priest talking about \*going where we’re called\*. My understanding is that the SSPX set up chapels in dioceses because their position is that they minister the Sacraments to the faithful in the traditional rites because they doubt the validity of the new rites. I’ve heard that they often will set up chapels in liberal dioceses and I was wondering: Do faithful request the SSPX to come into a diocese and set up a chapel? Like for example: I have heard that a Scottish SSPX priest left Scotland to go to Chicago because of the TLM crackdown by Cardinal Cupich.

Piklikl (5): The SSPX doesn’t really have a blueprint for opening a new chapel, but typically if there’s at least a small group of faithful wanting the TLM and sacraments, the SSPX will do it’s best to service them. As far as I know there’s no consideration of whether or not a location is in a liberal diocese or not. The SSPX also assigns it’s priests all over the world, usually for at least a few years at a time. Typically a priest can’t just leave his assignment and go to one that he wants; that would be abandoning his post.

None (2): I remember a priest saying, multiple times actually, that a small group of people was asking for a chapel in a specific part of the country, yet they needed more priests in order to set a chapel there, money to build it... So yes, it does seem they arrange missions, and eventually chapels, in areas where there's enough laity interested in them.

Cato2011 (1): Right now the Society is everywhere - either there’s a church, mission, or a traveling priest who visits. The pastor of a church keeps track of mass attendance. Once it reaches a certain point, the area gets “up graded.” Meaning an occasional mass center might become a mission or there might be enough faithful to add a mass here or there. The reverse is also true. It an area dwindles, masses are canceled or chapels closed.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): it just depends on interest and donated properties so convenience factors. several chapels have been donated in wills to SSPX, the big hubs all have a story to them. St Marys, Armada, Winona and Post Falls were all bought for pennies on the dollar for the existing needs. and lots and lots of novenas being said by future parishioners to get a church and priest have been answered.

# Post 678: Praying in Latin

Author: tnu0055

Score: 5

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/zlh6pa/praying\_in\_latin/

When praying in Latin (not often) are my prayers still efficacious if I don’t know exactly what I’m saying? Although I know the overall message of the prayer ie. Hail Mary, Our father etc. It is essentially memorization for me at this point as I’m very new. Is this ok?

Highwayman90 (3): Traditional liturgical languages are worthy of study imo. I’m Byzantine (but have enough background in Latin to enjoy praying in Latin in some cases) and can say additionally that for me, understanding even a bit of Koiné Greek has enriched my experience of the liturgy.I’d highly recommend trying to learn the Lord’s Prayer, Hail Mary, Gloria Patri, and a few others in Latin. If you throw in the Apostles’ Creed, Salve Regina, and the Oremus cujus unigenitus, you have the Rosary.

Cato2011 (3): I would say no. You might as well use prayer wheels like the pagans. How about you use prayer card or missal with the translation next to it so you know what you are saying. Latin is a sacred language and is worth it.

None (1): [deleted]

tnu0055 (3): Yes I feel the same way

tnu0055 (1): Oh yes I thought I made that clear in the post sorry.

None (1): [deleted]

tnu0055 (3): It would be practice via recordings of other people I’ll repeat it enough to remember how the words sound then when I see them on paper I remember the sounds.

None (2): [deleted]

tnu0055 (1): Oh yes I mean I wouldn’t know it literal translation like word for word but yes I would know I’m saying the Ava Maria as an example.

# Post 679: FSSP and the SSPX

Author: Agathonbanitohen

Score: 8

Comments: 19

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/zl8921/fssp\_and\_the\_sspx/

I’m aware that the FSSP was founded by 11 clergy and a seminarian who broke away from the SSPX in 1988 and sought papal recognition because of the Econe consecrations. I was trying to find online what the current state of relations are between them and I’m hoping that you all would tell me. Btw, I’m a TLM Catholic.

Piklikl (11): I don’t think you’ll find much online, and there never has been any sort of formal relationship between the two organizations. My understanding is that the SSPX leadership are tolerant and willing to let bygones be bygones, but likely will never be able to publicly have this position because of the harm the FSSP has done to many families (the FSSP likes to set up shop near SSPX centers, and then push lots of anti-SSPX propaganda and tell SSPX attendees they’re all going to hell). It would be seen as an insult to many families who had to put up with the hate and vitriol from the FSSP parishioners for the SSPX leadership to formally pronounce that everything between the FSSP and SSPX is alright. The reality is the FSSP is a dying organization and probably won’t exist in a decade or two, much sooner if the relationship between Rome and the SSPX is fully repaired. The reason the FSSP was founded was so those priests could have the “smells and bells” while compromising on principles; if the SSPX is granted personal prelature then the SSPX will have the “smells and bells” without needing to compromise on their principles. It also seems plausible that in that case Rome would also pull a lot of support for the FSSP and other TLM groups and basically tell all their priests they can join the SSPX or be a normal diocesan priest. However it’s highly unlikely that the SSPX will ever get personal prelature, but that still doesn’t bode well for the FSSP. The FSSP exists at the whim of the current administration of the Vatican, and they will run into the same problem that the SSPX ran into in the 80’s: unable to find a Bishop who will ordain the priests. The priests of the FSSP don’t want to be disobedient to Rome, but the reality is there’s no duty to obey an authority that commands something that is offensive to God, which is the position of the SSPX.

None (4): I've seen priests of both congregations attending events and similar things, treating each other in a cordial manner. That said, usually they don't get together, with both clergy saying the laity shouldn't attend the other, with both laity being quite vitriolic towards each other. In real life things ain't that great but are ok, but online... things often become quite uncharitable.

RadTradTref (2): I think it dependson the area. I also think it is changing for the better, at least in my area. I attend a FSSP parish. There are 2 SSPX chapels about an hour away. One to the north and one to the south. The laity intermix all the time. I'd say about 20% of our parish live half way between the FSSP and one of the SSPX and alternate between the two. We have several family's who have very large backyard get together every year and attendance is about 40% FSSP, 40% SSPX 15% Melkite 5% NO. Usually there are close to 200 families at these parties. The priests come sometimes, mostly the FSSP and Melkite priests as well as some diocesan priests. The SSPX priory is about 3 hours south of the general area where the parties take place. And our kids have started to inter marry. I'd say 99% of my FSSP parish would not hesitate a second to go to the SSPX if our FSSP parish were to close. We have an unspoken don't ask don't tell policy with the priest. We don't ask if it's okay to attend the others mass so they won't tell us the official position of their respective societies.

fridericvs (3): Does the FSSP have any sort of distinctive charism that makes it different from the Society? I can see what you mean about how SSPX regularisation would rob it if it’s USP. I’ve often wondered if the FSSP should merge with the ICKSP as they seem to be quite similar.

notanexpert\_askapro (1): What's the position of SSPX on how we know what is offensive to God or not? Other than, obviously, 10 commandments kind of stuff.

Jerailu (0): The SSPX literally can't get a personal prelature because they are a worldwide priestly fraternity and I know only one worldwide group that got a bishop to rule them personally. It's called the catholic Church.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (1): yah the priests generally seem to get along much better between themselves than the laity. generally the priests dont bad mouth the other groups but there are several fssp priests that attack the sspx at every turn.

Piklikl (5): Not really. It’s essentially the SSPX (traditional formation of priests) with the explicit acceptance of all of Vatican II. Lots of FSSP priests will claim to be critical of Vatican II, but if their local bishop comes around all of a sudden they won’t say a bad thing about it. It’s really frustrating to hear the FSSP criticize the SSPX for being disrespectful to Rome when the FSSP engages in all sorts of two faced behavior (telling Rome one thing and their faithful the complete opposite).

Piklikl (8): Basic theology. The SSPX has always taken issue with Vatican II’s ambiguous statements regarding collegiality, religious equality, and ecumenism. Additionally, the SSPX takes issue with the seemingly deliberate changes made to the liturgy that run contrary to everything the Church taught up until the 1960’s (making the Mass a meal instead of a sacrifice, the protestantizing of the liturgy, implicit denial of the True Presence). The SSPX has never claimed to be doing “its own thing”, only reverting to the last know good configuration. This is why the SSPX is different from other TLM-centric organizations: despite getting a lot of pushback from informed traditional Catholics the SSPX celebrates the 1962 rubrics instead earlier rubrics because that was the last change made before the sweeping liturgical changes made in the spirit of Vatican II. The founder of the SSPX (one of the fathers of Vatican II, a man formerly entrusted with the religious development of most of Africa) saw most of the members of the Church jump off a cliff after Vatican II, and the SSPX is basically just camping out on the cliff edge waiting for the rest of the Church to climb back up to where things were before the changes. The SSPX was founded in 1970, 5 years after the close of Vatican II when it was clear that the fruits of Vatican II were plummeting Mass attendance, religious vocations, and in general a decline in the health of the Church. It isn’t a stretch to say if those are the fruits of the Council, then clearly some of those changes are offensive to God.

Piklikl (2): I don’t know all the ins and outs of canonical hierarchy, but those who do (both in the SSPX and at the Vatican) seem to agree that a personal prelature is the most likely solution to resolve the issues between them.

Piklikl (1): I don’t know all the ins and outs of canonical hierarchy, but those who do (both in the SSPX and at the Vatican) seem to agree that a personal prelature is the most likely solution to resolve the issues between them.

Piklikl (1): I don’t know all the ins and outs of canonical hierarchy, but those who do (both in the SSPX and at the Vatican) seem to agree that a personal prelature is the most likely solution to resolve the issues between them.

RadTradTref (2): I think that is changing, at least in my area. I attend a FSSP parish. There are 2 SSPX chapels about an hour away. One to the north and one to the south. The laity intermix all the time. I'd say about 20% of our parish live half way between the FSSP and one of the SSPX and alternate between the two. We have several family's who have very large backyard get together every year and it's about 40% FSSP, 40% SSPX and 20% Melkite. Usually there are close to 200 families at these parties. The priests come sometimes. And our kids have started to inter marry.

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (2): fssp seminary is nothing like sspx formation. they arent allowed to have good teachers and the priests really fend for themselves to learn tradition.

notanexpert\_askapro (1): Interesting, thanks. So is offensive to God in this case basically limited to heresy or anything that might imply heresy?

Piklikl (2): I’m using the phrase “offensive to God” in a very broad sense to highlight the fact that at its core the SSPX is doing its very best to fulfill the basic tenets of religion by worshipping God the way He has told us He wants to be worshipped. Obedience to God will always trump obedience to any man. By offensive to God I don’t intend to accuse heresy, but simply point out that something is suboptimal and able to be criticized and improved. Vatican II clearly has resulted in a lot of negatives for the Church, and I think can broadly be considered offensive to God in some respects. However the hierarchy of the Church since Vatican II has effectively demonstrated that criticism of the council is intolerable and will not be considered (in fact this is always the sticking point of the current talks between the SSPX and Rome, Rome refuses to discuss the Council or elaborate on any of the problematic points). There are legitimate ways of promulgating dogma, but the current administration refuses to use those means and instead demands obedience to its contemporary whims; effectively making Vatican II dogma without actually submitting it to the scrutiny that such a declaration would demand. As it happens the SSPX was rarely attacked prior to the episcopal consecrations for its position against Vatican II, but for its adherence to the TLM and the traditional formation of priests. The episcopal consecrations were not performed in defiance of Rome, in fact Archbishop Lefebrve did everything he could to remain on good terms with Rome. Rome approved the consecrations, approved the candidates, but started giving him the run around on approving a date for the consecrations. It became clear to the Archbishop that Rome was stalling and waiting for him to die. The entire point of the Society was to form priests in the traditional manner; and this would not be possible without a traditionally minded bishop to ordain them; which is why the Archbishop made the decision to please God and offend the men in Rome and go ahead with the episcopal consecrations. The SSPX has always attempted to remain respectful to the legitimate authorities, which is why pronouncements of heresy are never given because they are not competent to judge someone as a formal heretic. The SSPX doesn’t want to steer the Church in a different direction, only put on the brakes and reverse back to the critical junction where a hard left turn was made in the 60’s to discuss the changes made by Vatican II, so in effect the SSPX is sitting back at that juncture waiting for a reasonable explanation for the changes.

notanexpert\_askapro (1): Thanks for this comment. I'm confused about this:"There are legitimate ways of promulgating dogma, but the current administration refuses to use those means and instead demands obedience to its contemporary whims; effectively making Vatican II dogma without actually submitting it to the scrutiny that such a declaration would demand."What are the legitimate ways of promulgating dogma in the context of an ecumenical council or outside that context, according to SSPX? Why was VII not a legitimate way?Btw I have issues with VII myself just been trying to wrap my head around the SSPX position.

Piklikl (1): I’m by no means an expert, but it’s always seemed strange to me how Vatican II was convened explicitly as a pastoral council (the first and only), not as a dogmatic council. The Council explicitly did not produce anything binding, it’s stated purpose was simply to discuss matters in the Church. However, the revealed preference of the hierarchy since the council has been that it is dogmatic because no one is allowed to question the Council, even to the point of heavily modifying the canonization provides specifically to get the Popes who convened the council and upheld it canonized, thus making it harder to criticize the Council. If Vatican II is effectively dogmatic, why was it not convened as such? Another example of this unwillingness to use existing methods for proclaiming the teachings of the Church was JP 2’s statement on female priests. He made the pronouncement using an almost identical formula for an ex cathedra statement (so it seemed like he was invoking the infallibility of the office); but later clarified that he didn’t intend it to be an infallible statement. In fact the last time an infallible statement was made by a Pope was the proclamation of the dogma of the Assumption in 1950 by Pius XII. So basically the Church has specific ways of demanding assent to teachings by all her members, yet the only method that the Post V2 Church seems to use is obedience (“I said you have to follow it so you have to”). Please keep in mind that I’m a lay person, with only a cursory knowledge of the subject so I could be very wrong about all of this but it just seems strange to me that Vatican II is simply not allowed to be seriously criticized by anyone.

Agathonbanitohen (1): My understanding of why Pope Saint John XXIII convened the Council was to foster unity, within and without the Church and to find ways to evangelize the postwar world while keeping the same doctrine and same sense with a different way of saying it. The problem was that Msgr Bugnini and his allies hijacked the Council to lay the groundwork for their liturgical reforms. One aim of their reforms in the new Order of Mass was to deliberately remove obstacles to Protestant converts and make the Mass ecumenical. We can see the fruits of that. in addition, the reformers changed the theology and doctrine of the Mass with assembly theology and this repackaging the Mass as a meal. The 1969 General Instruction of the Roman Missal was a theological and doctrinal document. When the furor erupted when criticism of the General Instruction arose, the reformers slightly altered the General Instruction in the 1970 edition to make it more acceptable. One theologian said that the “ cleverness of the revisers “ “ saved “ the reforms from the “ Post Tridentine theory of sacrifice. “

# Post 680: I am so proud of our Pope. For anyone who has ever questioned his intentions, take a look at this outpouring of emotion.

Author: mtrainlover

Score: 3

Comments: 12

URL: https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/pope-breaks-down-cries-while-mentioning-ukraine-public-prayer-2022-12-08/?utm\_source=reddit.com

hardeho (3): ok, he feels terrible for the suffering if the Ukrainian people. I don't know of anyone who has questioned that.

MarcellusFaber (8): Why do you think that crying in public makes good all the evil he has done and his rejection of Catholic doctrine?

Cato2011 (2): Yes, it’s unfortunate the Ukrainian people are suffering in the middle of this conflict. But, the Ukraine’s government is a corrupt puppet of the West which is the source of human trafficking, money laundering, biological weapons research and production. He’s probably just sad the spread of the globalist agenda has stalled.

NtGiL\_29 (1): His intentions vis-a-vis the Ukraine question have no bearing on his intentions vis-a-vis, say, the Latin Mass question, the Vatican Bank question, the transhumanism question, the climate change question, the divorce question, the Pachamama question, etc. The list goes on, and we are plenty allowed to doubt the Holy Father’s intentions.

Minute-Contest4745 (1): That man support abortion. He also remove father pavone a anti abortion priest movement from being a priest.

Seriouscat\_ (1): I gather that 90 % of the time when people say that, referring to Catholic doctrine, they think of Bergoglio's relationship with marriage and sexuality. Less than 1 % understand that every single one of them beginning with Roncalli has praised Teilhard de Chardin's ideas, effectively denying the divinity of Christ.In 1917 Canon Law, when it comes to doctrine, the clergy is guilty until proven innocent, because it's their job, even the purpose of their life, to know.

mtrainlover (1): He's just being progressive

MarcellusFaber (1): Oh, I completely agree. All the Popes since 1958, including John XXIII, have been Modernists. Francis is simply carrying on in the same vein as Paul VI, John Paul II, and Benedict XVI. Benedict XVI is a Teilhardian and argued for ad orientem worship not for traditional reasons, but because it is more 'cosmic' (a Teilhardian idea).

HyperboreanExplorian (1): Progressing where, pray tell, Mr. Grindr?

Seriouscat\_ (0): Is it possible to have a pope who is not Christian or not a member of the Church he is seemingly leading?Or is this allowed to continue as long as nobody will think things through?Or is it just an individual choice to pretend to not know what one knows?

MarcellusFaber (1): That is the question. It does seem from common sense that an heretic cannot be the visible head of the Catholic Church, but we do not know the details for certain, for theologians speculated on the matter but did not come to a firm agreement, and certain elements of Sedevacantism can cause difficulties. It my opinion that we will not know what happens when the Pope becomes an heretic until the Church defines its teaching concerning the matter, which will not happen until the crisis has ended. For now, I do not hold a definite position on the matter, for I cannot know the right answer.

Seriouscat\_ (1): Those are actually two different questions that, formulated that way, sound like the same but really aren't. One is that can it ever happen that a heretic gets elected. Possible answers are that no, the Church is by definition preserved from that, ergo a pope may only seem like a heretic when he in fact is not. Or yes, a heretic can manage to get elected. But then the second question is that can a heretic validly be and remain a pope. Then the possible options are yes, the faithful are just supposed to put up with it. Or no, he is automatically excommunicated and the only thing required is his physical removal by force. Or no, but the hierarchy must come to its senses and then proceed to remove the man. What if someone did not just become a heretic after the election but always was one? Roncalli was a suspected Modernist long before 1958, which would by definition make his election illegal and invalid. Also, Pius XII intentionally did not make Montini a cardinal.If the Church was hijacked by and for a different system of belief beginning in 1958 and finalized in 1969, one that it fought against for at least a century before it happened, then the question is, who or what is going to hijack it back? And are those people saved or damned who hold this alternative system of belief that the Church always strictly condemned before it took over?Then the final question is that to believe in the old way, do you only need the TLM and the old sacraments or do you need something more? According to the Catholic Encyclopedia, Traditionalism is a condemned heresy. Put in everyman's terms it means that people are saved by participating in the right kind of appearances.Then, Sedevacantism is an idea. Sedevacantists are a bunch of people running a very messy shadow hierarchy. Sedevacantism the idea does not necessarily make Sedevacantists the people valid in any way. This is the interesting thing with their so-called Thesis. It is a stratagem to "steal" validity for episcopal consecrations from (according to them) a licit but invalid pope. Who, they say, possess the title but not the power. As far as I know, the SSPX thinks the recent popes are illicit but valid. They possess the power but not the title.I think the most important question is if you can save your soul in Novus Ordo? FSSP? SSPX? Or any of the myriad Sede shops?Another way to put this is if in the Church the human element exists for the spiritual, or the spiritual element for the human? If the spiritual element is not there, then what's the point in the human element? Or is the human element the really important one and the spiritual in a way optional?

# Post 681: When does your family put up the Christmas Tree?

Author: JackStone2112

Score: 3

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/zcjsny/when\_does\_your\_family\_put\_up\_the\_christmas\_tree/

And do you use a real or fake one?

None (3): Ours goes up day after thanksgiving and comes down sometime after the Epiphany. We do not forget to celebrate Advent. It's a job setting it all up and we like to enjoy it as long as possible.

# Post 682: My catholic Dilemna

Author: erick2020x

Score: 7

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/z3xlk8/my\_catholic\_dilemna/

I was raised as a catholic because of my dads side of the family, my mothers side was mainly evangelical christians. Growing up I sampled many different religions. I tried buddahism because of my martial arts training, I tried many different Christian denominations and each time I leave I seem to keep being pulled back to Catholicism. I even abandoned eastern martial arts in place of good old fashoned boxing instead of kung fu because there is too much mysticism. I prefer Catholic mysticism. I try my best to research as much real Catholicism as I can because I have read much about how the Church has been muddled up. . I was brought up in California and most of the churches I have seen, even the ones here in Spain have become watered down and is not like the real catholicism that existed in my fathers time. I was baptized in 1990 under a Catholic priest whom I am not sure was initiated under the old rite. He was a fairly young man when I knew him. Do I need to be baptized again? I have done confession many times but I am not sure how vaild it was. Do I need to do that and communion again? What do I need to do to make sure I have properly been initiated into the Catholic faith?

NtGiL\_29 (9): The great thing about Baptism is that it doesn’t have to be conferred by a priest. The Catholic Church accepts all baptisms that have form, matter, and intent. So as long as the priest a) said “I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost”, b) poured water on you, and c) intended to baptize you, you’re good!

Piklikl (5): You should probably contact your local SSPX priest and schedule a meeting with him to go over everything you’ll need to do to get back on the straight and narrow. He’ll probably help track down a baptismal certificate and then see about getting you into classes to receive the sacrament of Confirmation. As it stands at the moment, all you would need to do is go to confession, confess all the mortal sins you have committed since your last confession (find a good examination of conscience to help with this), and then you would once again be in the state of Grace and able to receive Communion.

JohnFoxFlash (3): Sounds like your baptism was fine

distouille (2): hello! baptism, if given correctly is a mark that you neep for life. but the state of friendship with God that it gives you is not there anymore when you stop worshipping God, you are not a catholic anymore and therefore commiting deadly sins.however you have it back when you confess to a priest, but there are conditions..it would be long and useless to explain everything here, because the Lord is good and we have the st pie x catechism that explains all our faith, and everything about sacramentals!the furst step for you is reading it, and going to catechism if you can in a traditional church, to be sure you get a good educationmay God help you, have a nice day! i am sorry for this message being messy, i struggle a bit with english 😓

erick2020x (2): Excellent

erick2020x (2): Thanks my fellow brother in christ

MitthrawnuruodoVCR (0): are you able to attend SSPX in san jose or Los Angeles/OC? you are going to have some of the best priests in the US IMO - Fr Burfitt and Fr Asher run amazing parishes. all their assistant priests are great too.

# Post 683: What is the SSPX position on trans men (aka female to male transgender) joining the Priesthood? I would have thought that is not allowed but would like to hear some informed opinions on the issue. Asking for a friend who says their local Anglican parish now has a trans priest. Thoughts?

Author: mtrainlover

Score: 0

Comments: 13

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/z3i210/what\_is\_the\_sspx\_position\_on\_trans\_men\_aka\_female/

NtGiL\_29 (16): The view of the Catholic Church, not just the SSPX, is that it is ontologically impossible. Even if the rite of ordination is conferred upon a female that is pretending to be a male, the mark of ordination would not appear on the person’s soul. Here is an [article from the SSPX](https://fsspx.news/en/news-events/news/united-states-transgender-individuals-infiltrate-seminaries-69072) with a recent anecdote from Milwaukee.

None (5): 1. Only men can be ordained to the priesthood.2. A “trans man” is a woman.3. Why would you even need to ask this?

ExpertSalesCopy (4): Only biological men.

distouille (3): the last comment is absolutely right, but i want to add something to it. first, let me apologize if some words aren't right, i am french and I will even write some of them in french, don't have time rn to translate but i will do it later if you can't either/ don't find what it meansyou can only receive a sacramental while in "état de grâce", state of grace maybe? wich comes with baptism and end when you commit a deadly sin, like killing someone. this state of friendship with God is given back when you receive "le sacrement de pénitence", that the priest accord you in the name of God after you confess. however, it is only efficient when you truly repent from your bad behavior, and a trans who keep being trans, keep refusing the body, the role and the rules (like impossibility to be a priest) that God gave them at their birth don't have the "ferme propos" to stop that behavior, and can't be admitted back in this state that they losta deadly sin (péché mortel) is a "grave" in french, so a really serious and bad sin : being trans is probably a deadly sin, so according to the command of being "prudent" (careful?), we can't say that trans people can be in l'état de grâce and therefore receive the "ordination" (not sure it is the same word in english but maybe)have a great day, hope it helps you!

bug4ff (2): There's no such thing. A female can mutilate herself, and be very confused, but that doesn't make her a man.I noticed some answers referenced "biological men only." I don't think we should even allow ourselves to use this ridiculous phrase, because it grants the entire premise that there could ever conceivably be some \*other\* type of man, hence the qualifier "biological." There's not. There is no other type of man.

peace-and-love-333 (1): Not a priest, not a scholar or anything, just a member of the SSPX, but I think that a transgender man would not be allowed to become a priest because he is biologically female. SSPX Catholics as a whole don't acknowledge/believe that trans men are men, that is still a woman to them.

mtrainlover (1): I shall read this with great interest. Thanks

Brilliant\_Check2073 (1): Why there are some trans shows in a Catholic church? Who accepts these things to happen?

mtrainlover (1): I think we can safely say biological men only. Thanks for clarification

RadTradTref (1): That begs the question can a trans woman become a priest? They are a man after all. I wouldn't put it past a NO priests to transition. Back when I was in the NO or priest married a man and tried to stay a priest.

mtrainlover (2): That was what I suspected. Thank you!

mtrainlover (1): Thank you Sir. This makes a lot of sense to me. The translation works well.

distouille (1): i am a woman, but thank you very much! happy to help, have a great day /night! God bless you ☺️🙏

# Post 684: When is name calling grave matter?

Author: None

Score: 4

Comments: 1

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/yzgrdb/when\_is\_name\_calling\_grave\_matter/

Hello, I would like to know when name calling is grave matter. Thanks, in advance! Ave Maria.

johnny63339 (1): Grave matter is when something is a serious sin. Saint Francis de Sales, A Doctor Of the Church, teaches us that if there is any doubt that something is great matter, it's probably not grave matter.

# Post 685: Why be SSPX? Why Latin mass?

Author: TheKingsPeace

Score: 4

Comments: 9

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/yxuxbm/why\_be\_sspx\_why\_latin\_mass/

I guess my question is why not just be a regular vernacular mass catholic? Why he more Catholic than the Pope?Are SSPXers better or more holy in your view?

Piklikl (19): Nobody in the SSPX or who attend the SSPX chapels for the sacraments seriously claims to be more Catholic than the Pope. It’s very bad form for you to be begging the question like that, but I’ll attempt to answer your other questions. The reason most of the faithful attend the SSPX masses probably comes down to the Catholic principle of “lex orandi, lex credendi”, which is the integral relationship between the manner of worship and the quality of ones faith: a poor manner of praying will undoubtedly result in a poor faith. The Traditional Latin Mass is a rite that has developed from the Last Supper through nearly 2000 years, \*\*slowly\*\* codified and developed into the form we know today; it is the rite that the vast majority of saints would recognize. And then men who happened to be alive decided that they knew much better than the centuries of other men (many of them saints) who came before them, tossed it all out the window and (even deliberately one might suspect) decided a bastardized version was much better and would usher in a new springtime of the Church. The SSPX was founded by one of the fathers of the Second Vatican Council, Archbishop Marcel Lefebrve. He was the former Superior General of the Holy Ghost Fathers at the time when it was one of the largest missionary orders and effectively made him the spiritual father of the entire continent of Africa. During his tenure the continent saw record numbers of baptisms, and also ordinations as he established several seminaries. Pope John XXIII moved him from Apostolic Delegate in Africa to Rome as a member of the Central Preparatory Commission for Vatican II. All that is to say the founder of the SSPX was himself a fruit of the traditional way of preparing priests, and had a literal front row seat at the table when this way was completely overturned and could see the terrible fruits of the Novus Ordo and how they stem directly from the poor, haphazard way of forming priests. He founded the SSPX in order to transmit what he had received, which was the traditional formation of a priest as it had been done for centuries (the phrase “I have transmitted what I have received” is on his gravestone) up until the men moved by the spirit of Vatican II saw fit to toss it all out. The SSPX is not doing anything new or unprompted, heck the SSPX gets tons of flack from diocesan traditional Catholics for not being “traditional enough” because they celebrate the TLM with the 1962 rubrics to make it clear they will obey Rome in all that is not dangerous to the faith. The steep drop off in practicing Catholics post NO implementation is a clear indicator of how dangerous the NO is to ones faith. There is nothing wrong with celebrating and having a preference for the TLM, the SSPX is the only organization that has made it even possible (every single priest who celebrates it today will trace their training back to the SSPX, the founders of all the TLM organizations in the Church today are all former SSPX). I strongly recommend you devote 1:44 of your time to watch this documentary and learn about the founder of the SSPX. https://youtu.be/Cf9oy7wDkms

Sneedevacantist (4): The choice is either the Mass of the ages or the Protestant worship service trying to imitate a Catholic Mass. Gee, I wonder why Catholics want the Latin Mass...

AndrzejGieralt (3): I would like to ask how much research or inquiry you did about the topic to begin with, because the "be more Catholic than the Pope" comment feels kind of in bad faith? If you didn't intend it that way I apologize but the question comes off as though you already think you have an answer in mind. 1. Why Latin Mass - the New Mass was designed to appeal to Protestants, the architect of this Mass was not hiding about this, citations are plentiful about this. The texts and actions are diminished in the New Mass and at times entirely replaced and invented. The offertory of the New Mass is a meal prayer from I believe the Talmud, whereas the original offertory speaks of offering this Spotless Host, offered by an Unworthy Servant, the priest, for the salvation of sinners. In the New Mass, the Eucharist is often spoken of as bread, and Christ's arrival is alluded to in future tense as though he wasn't here with us - trained Catholics understand these as metaphors, but many uninformed Catholics don't, and think the Eucharist is not Christ. 2. Why the SSPX and not any other Latin Mass? Because they pull no punches. They don't agree to dangerous ambiguity, they don't agree to obey a legitimate and true authority that tells them to do something that is demonstrably against Church teaching or damaging to the faithful, and therefore against the will of God. Most other groups seem to be willing to compromise and, although they do so in good faith, and I'm sure most/all/many of them are blameless in this, it's not something I can agree to for myself.

Cato2011 (2): The Latin mass (the Tridentine) is more likely to be valid and certainly has more graces than the vernacular. SSPX is easier to find than independent Latin Masses.

hardeho (4): Why limit myself in how Catholic to be? Besides, as we've seen, as Catholic as the Pope can be a pretty low bar sometimes.

MarcellusFaber (5): I have to disagree about SSPXers being more Catholic than the Pope; they are. However, that really isn't very difficult, the bar being so low. All Catholics throughout history have been more Catholic than Francis and it isn't any particular reflection on them that they were.

PontificeMaximos (1): >tons of flack“Flak” is WW II airman's slang for shells being fired at you in the air, so to catch a lot of flak is to feel in danger of being shot down.https://brians.wsu.edu/2016/05/22/flak-flack/#:\~:text=%E2%80%9CFlak%E2%80%9D%20is%20WW%20II%20airman's,danger%20of%20being%20shot%20down.

TheKingsPeace (1): The mass of the ages only dates to 1520 or so correct?

Sneedevacantist (3): The TLM was officially codified at Trent, but it was not a new Mass. It was basically Pope St Pius V wanting to have precise rubrics for the Latin rite Mass in order to ensure orthodoxy and eliminate Protestant influences from seeping into the Mass (which is why he also banned any rite that could not prove itself to be more than 200 years old). Suffice to say, I think he would be appalled to see the Novus Ordo and how Protestants were allowed input on it. Anyways, the core of the Latin Mass has been the same since at least the time of Pope St Gregory the Great, with minor alterations happening over the centuries.

# Post 686: The New Immaculata in St Marys needs to be furnished, here are some of the items that can be sponsored.

Author: Piklikl

Score: 3

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.anewimmaculata.org/sponsorship-items

None (1): Quite... expensive.As a side note, their St. Cyril of Alexandria looks terribly, and inaccurately, Latin.

No-Try7513 (1): You know what else needs to be finished ? OLOS in Phoenix . I'm just wondering why the completion of that church has been abandoned

# Post 687: Marriage Help

Author: challengederped

Score: 10

Comments: 12

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/yov3ye/marriage\_help/

Good morning!I've been going to an SSPX chapel for about a year, and I met my fiancée there. We are beginning to plan our marriage. Unfortunately our mission chapel could be described as a small decaying shack. We'd like something more beautiful to be married in, as you only get married once.We can get married in our local priory, which is a beautiful Catholic church that was given to the SSPX through a third party. The only problem is that it's a 3 1/2 hour drive away from us.There are plenty of historic beautiful Catholic churches around us. Has anyone had any experience asking the local diocese if an SSPX priest can celebrate a Nuptial Mass in one of their churches? We also have a gorgeous ordinariate church nearby.Side note, the bishop here is pretty liberal and has forced the only diocesan TLM into an ugly 1960s church in a seedy area. Idk how slim our chances are.

None (11): Make the drive. You said it yourself it’s beautiful and you only get married once. 3.5 hours isn’t a difficult drive to do weekly, let alone once for a wedding.

NtGiL\_29 (5): Chances are slim to none and slim is on the way out of town with each passing day that Francis lets Burke’s dubia on TC sit. Get married at the priory, you can always hold the reception somewhere closer to home.Congratulations, and may our Lord shower down His favor upon your union!

feelinggravityspull (7): Has your bishop delegated faculties to the SSPX to witness marriages? If so, that may make things easier. It may still be an uphill battle to get them to approve you using a diocesan church. Would that be up to the pastor of that church? You might ask him directly.If you’re worried about their reception of the SSPX, just tell them you’re Muslims or Hindus or something. Liberals have no problem letting non-Catholics use their churches. /s

Piklikl (1): Have a chat with your SSPX priest on what your options might be. They have a lot of experience navigating situations like this as, as well as keeping things nice for this once in a lifetime occasion.

craft00n (1): Try and talk to the local priests of the chapels that you like. Talk about "church unity", "working together to reconcile", "learn from each other respecting people and questioning opinions". That's how we do in France, it can work.

RiskKeepsMeEmployed (1): it depends on how kindly that bishop and diocese look upon SSPX. you simply need to ask the priest. i know its happened a couple times but honestly it isn't very likely maybe 10% chance. is there any historical churches near you that do not have sunday mass? there is a mission chapel for the indians from 150 years ago and they let SSPX say mass their numerous times a year. afaik SSPX is the only priests that ever go there to say mass actually. there has been at least one wedding there as well.

Sneedevacantist (3): Yeah, 3.5 hours for a one time thing isn't that bad. I drive three hours monthly just to attend a valid TLM.

challengederped (1): Yes, but that's 7 hours total of driving (close to 8-9 depending on traffic). I don't mind, but I don't want to inconvenience friends and family. I'll have to sit on it some more. Thank you!

challengederped (1): Thank you!

parsonpilgrim (2): Lol. Sadly true. Pretend to be a pagan, get the red carpet. Just wait for the fire works when a catholic priest arrives.

challengederped (1): I don't know, but I will ask. Thank you!

Piklikl (3): Look at it as a sneaky way of paring down the guest list in a way that won't offend anybody, so the cost of your wedding can remain reasonable.

# Post 688: Dialogue with SSPX

Author: Smoldeus

Score: 11

Comments: 31

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/yo1f97/dialogue\_with\_sspx/

I am a fairly recent convert to Catholicism, and I would like to experience a TLM for the first time. There is only one jurisdiction in my city that offers it, and I just discovered that it is in fact an SSPX Chapel. I posted to r/Catholicism asking for advice about decorum for my attendance there before I knew it was an SSPX Chapel. SSPX is strongly condemned on the subreddit, and I've thoroughly read why, according to them, the condemnation is justified. Attendance would be thoroughly discouraged if they were aware. I think it is only fair that I hear from those who support SSPX about whether this degree of condemnation is justified. What are your thoughts on your sacraments being considered illicit, and that I would be advised not to accept Communion?

feelinggravityspull (23): There’s a lot of gaslighting that goes on with regard to the SSPX. The fact is, they are Catholic and in communion with Rome (there is no such thing as “partial communion”: that’s like saying “partially pregnant”).I suggest you visit and make an appointment to talk with one of their priests. He will be happy to answer your questions. The SSPX is not shy about explaining their positions, and I have found most of their priests to be pastorally sensitive while doing so.

MarcellusFaber (9): The human element of the Church has been infected with Modernism, and hence we are in a crisis. Since priests are obliged to provide the Faithful with the Sacraments (which are necessary for salvation), and since the Faithful cannot receive the Sacraments from priests who do not believe in the Catholic religion (who are Modernists) unless in danger of death, and since the highest law of the Church is the salvation of souls, it would not make sense for the Faithful to be deprived of the Sacraments for the sake of bureaucracy. Canon law concerning the Sacraments exists in order to ensure that the Sacraments are administered properly, by a properly trained priest, and who is under a Catholic bishop in normal times. However, we are not in normal times, and it would be turning the law on its head to use it to prevent the Faithful from receiving the Sacraments at all, which would be the result. It is a principle of canon law that a law ceases to apply when it becomes harmful, which it would in this circumstance. Supplied jurisdiction applies considering the situation that we are in, which is the Society's main justification.If one compares mainstream 'Catholicism' with Catholicism as it was in the past, one finds that the recent Popes have been teaching things greatly contradictory to tradition. Since Catholicism is based on tradition, this is something of a problem. For example, throughout the ages the Church has been against the proposition that "Every man is free to embrace and profess that religion which, guided by the light of reason, he shall consider true" (from Pius IX's Syllabus of Errors; errors 77 and 78 are also good examples). This is not what is taught any longer. Oecumenism is practiced very publicly by the Popes and encouraged, but this was forbidden throughout the Church's history as communicatio in sacris with heretics and schismatics is indifferentist (it implicitly teaches that all religions are just as good as one another), offensive to God (for God has decreed that he should be worshipped using Catholic rites), and a mortal sin. This quote from the Oath Against Modernism is useful in showing the problem: "I accept sincerely the doctrine of faith transmitted from the apostles through the orthodox fathers, always in the same sense and interpretation, even to us; and so I reject the heretical invention of the evolution of dogmas, passing from one meaning to another, different from that which the Church first had". The whole oath is here: [traditionalcatholic.net/Tradition/Prayer/Modernism\\_Oath.html](https://traditionalcatholic.net/Tradition/Prayer/Modernism\_Oath.html)I recommend that you read through the Syllabus of Errors, the decrees of the Pontifical Biblical Commission of 1909, and any teaching prior to the 1960's. You will find that it is very different in these important areas to that of to-day. I also recommend the SSPX podcast, which goes over these problems in detail.

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (4): Probably the best approach here is for you to post their objections and then we can refute them?

None (8): r/Catholicism is really squirrely about SSPX. I understand why, and I personally have not received the Holy Eucharist at an SSPX parish as a Latin who normally practices in the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, but SSPX parishes beautifully honor the liturgy, their Masses are very much valid, and it's truly a breathtaking experience of the source and summit of the Christian life to be present at the sung Latin Mass at an SSPX, FSSP, or ICKSP parish.

RiskKeepsMeEmployed (2): some great articles that can set you straight. The PCED itself said SSPX could be attended and that one could tithe:[https://onepeterfive.com/sspx-mass-shelter/](https://onepeterfive.com/sspx-mass-shelter/)"1. In the strict sense you may fulfill your Sunday obligation by attending a Mass celebrated by a priest of the Society of St. Pius X.”His second question was “Is it a sin for me to attend a Pius X Mass” and we responded stating:“2. We have already told you that we cannot recommend your attendance at such a Mass and have explained the reason why. If your primary reason for attending were to manifest your desire to separate yourself from communion with the Roman Pontiff and those in communion with him, it would be a sin. If your intention is simply to participate in a Mass according to the 1962 Missal for the sake of devotion, this would not be a sin.”His third question was: “Is it a sin for me to contribute to the Sunday collection at a Pius X Mass,” to which we responded:“3. It would seem that a modest contribution to the collection at Mass could be justified.”"Bishop Schneider says anyone can and should attend SSPX AND ATTEND THEIR SEMINARIES. [https://gloria.tv/post/GSFtsoPc1UiN3dtT4qAKGwuK8](https://gloria.tv/post/GSFtsoPc1UiN3dtT4qAKGwuK8) Further he said Archbishop Lefebvre will likely be canonized one day.BishopeFellay has stated he has written permission from Pope Francis to ordain priests.What more could one want to be persuaded further?this is a great practical read as well.[https://onepeterfive.com/confessions-of-an-sspx-sympathizer-living-in-novus-ordo-land/?fbclid=IwAR0uEPThViQgsKzczbUX-WO5SqBE7Uc2MEnQO9qHcNe4CsC3NsfA\\_36EfyI](https://onepeterfive.com/confessions-of-an-sspx-sympathizer-living-in-novus-ordo-land/?fbclid=IwAR0uEPThViQgsKzczbUX-WO5SqBE7Uc2MEnQO9qHcNe4CsC3NsfA\_36EfyI)

Blackbeeyellowbee (2): The SSPX is in communion with Rome. The society was, in fact, never separated from it, given that what led to the excomunication or suspention \*a divinis\* (someone please correct me if I'm using wrong terminology) had no valid reason at its basis, and thus were invalid. Indeed, the Society never did anything heretical, but kept practicing Holy Tradition without conforming to the wordly spirit of Vatican II and the protestant spirit of the NO mass. Furthermore, you must know that the Society never rejected Vatican II as a whole, but only the parts of it that were clearly in contraddiction with the faith, tradition or previous teachings (such as St. Pope Pious V's \*Quo Primum\*, according to which the Mass cannot be radically changed). As a matter of fact, Archbishop Lefebvre implemented the pastoral indications on education that came from the council in his seminaries.In any case, if you want to better understand the situation from the SSPX's perspective, I advice you read \*An Open Letter to Confused Catholics\* by Archbishop Lefebvre, where he explains he decisions he had to take.

Sneedevacantist (2): SSPX has valid priests, Masses, and sacraments. Despite that, most users on r/Catholicism would rather you attend an irreverent Novus Ordo because "it's licit".

None (-3): I'm no longer an SSPXer, so maybe people won't like what I'm about to say or quote, but...The validity question was explained by Cdl. Ratzinger in a 1998 letter to a former SSPXer:"While the priests of the Society of St Pius X are validly ordained, they are also suspended a divinis, that is they are forbidden by the Church from celebrating the Mass and the sacraments because of their illicit (or illegal) ordination to the diaconate and to the priesthood without proper incardination (cf. canon 265)."He also mentions schismatic mentality, something that troubled me when I attended their masses and eventually was one of the reasons that made me leave them for good, for I've heard time after time in homilies that one shouldn't receive their sacraments from non-traditional priests, that they should avoid all non-TLM masses, that saint A or B ain't a real saint, that the 1988 excommunications weren't valid, the frequent comparisons between Abp. Lefebvre and saints such as Athanasius or Augustine, some of the laity attached to them calling him a saint... some might see no problem in this, or maybe defend them, but that's too much for me.Sure, much changed since Benedict lifted the excommunications and Francis gave them some jurisdictions, yet there's a long road ahead.

user4567822 (1): Pope Benedict XVI [clarified](https://www.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/letters/2009/documents/hf\_ben-xvi\_let\_20090310\_remissione-scomunica.html) that Lefebvre’s excommunication was just, FSSPX is in an irregular canonical status and has \*\*doctrinal problems\*\*.> The excommunication affects individuals, not institutions. \*\*An episcopal ordination lacking a pontifical mandate raises the danger of a schism, since it jeopardizes the unity of the College of Bishops with the Pope. Consequently the Church must react by employing her most severe punishment – excommunication\*\* – with the aim of calling those thus punished to repent and to return to unity. \*(…)\* The fact that the Society of Saint Pius X \*\*does not possess a canonical status\*\* in the Church is not, in the end, based on disciplinary \*\*but on doctrinal reasons\*\*. As long as the Society does not have a canonical status in the Church, \*\*its ministers do not exercise legitimate ministries\*\* in the Church. There needs to be a distinction, then, between the disciplinary level, which deals with individuals as such, and the doctrinal level, at which ministry and institution are involved. In order to make this clear once again: until the doctrinal questions are clarified, the Society has no canonical status in the Church, and its ministers – even though they have been freed of the ecclesiastical penalty – do not legitimately exercise any ministry in the Church.The liturgy of the Mass is not a dogma. It can change and it can change radically /u/Blackbeeyellowbee! Jesus rezou-a deitado em almofadas virado para os discípulos e em aramaico. A chamada Missa Tridentina veio muito tempo depois disto. Os Papas podem mudar a liturgia da Missa à vontade (se bem que nós podemos preferir uma a outra). O Papa Pio V queria dizer que ninguém podia alterar a Missa… até um Papa o fazer (já que ele próprio permitiu a existência de outros ritos sem ser o Latino). Depois deste Papa, o Santo Papa Pio X (Papa antes do Vaticano II) mudou a liturgia. O Papa Pio XII também disse que a liturgia da Missa pode ser mudada.If you want to participate in the so called “Tridentine Mass” search in [this site](https://www.latinmassdir.org/countries/) churches next to you (they will not be in an irregular canonical state with doctrinal problems and priests celebrating Mass illicitly)

feelinggravityspull (5): I appreciate this comment. I don’t agree with it all, but I can definitely appreciate where you’re coming from. There are certainly some SSPX positions I don’t think are fully accurate. But, for me, the pros far outweigh the cons. I’ve been happily attending an SSPX parish for about 5 years now, and I can honestly say I haven’t found such a robust Catholic spirituality anywhere else. The priests are consistently well-formed, the preaching is generally terrific, and there is a lively and warm sense of community.The priests are \*priests\*, first and foremost. They aren’t activists or rad-trad warriors. They are men who are striving to live holy lives and shepherd their flock to the same end.Are there problems? Sure. But there are problems everywhere in the Church. And when I compare my current parish with the alternatives and think about what would be best for my family, it’s really a no-brainer to stick with the Society—even if I keep certain things at arm’s length.

AndrzejGieralt (2): Hello. I was wondering, did you determine that those positions troubled you after you inquired further with your priests about their deeper reasoning, and determined that reasoning was false, or did it simply rub you the wrong way?I had similar concerns, but I discussed my many questions and possible objections with multiple priests, and found the logic to be airtight. I mean, of course we should avoid the Novus Ordo, since they were designed to work against the will of God by admission of the architects (i.e. remove all stumbling blocks for the Protestants, aka make the Catholic truth less clear, aka create scandal). The 1988 excommunications couldn't have been valid due to the detailed legal requirements of a laetae sententiae excommunication on the grounds used as claim against the Archbishop. The comparisons are indeed quite similar to those saints you mentioned, however I am concerned about calling the Archbishop a saint while simultaneously doubting other official canonizations. I think that position needs to be consistent, and you can maintain his heroism and inquire for his intercession while not making any theological claims about his objective sainthood. Unless I misunderstand, and a saint here refers to any holy soul in heaven or purgatory, and it is more so saying "we believe this is the case" rather than "we make the objective claim that this is in fact the case, and declare a mock canonization" - I believe the prior is quite consistent.

None (-2): Ratzinger isn't even Catholic. Who cares what he thinks?

Sneedevacantist (3): I also don't agree with the SSPX on everything, but they have valid priests offering valid Masses and sacraments, so I don't mind attending at their chapels for my Sunday obligation. I'm just glad that the chapel that I've been attending at is very traditional, welcoming, and has a wonderful, devout priest. The future of Catholicism is traditionalism.

JackStone2112 (2): I second this post, especially the point that at an SSPX chapel, the pros outweigh the cons. If a Bishop is yammering on about improper incardination of SSPX priests while allowing communion in the hand, encouraging the participation of yoga pants-wearing extraordinary ministers, and dropping the word "sinners" from the Hail Mary, I'll entrust my and my family's souls with the good priests of the SSPX. (All these examples are my first-hand experiences with the diocesean church.)

None (1): These positions actually troubled me for years, and after listening to homilies, reading some of their books and chatting here and there with SSPX priests, they became "stronger". The moment I realized something was deeply wrong happened during a first communion, when the local prior, while talking about John Paul II, said that "a man like that cannot be a saint", and the first thing that came to my mind was a strong urge to leave that place right away. If you are asking if I sat with them one day and brought forth my concerns, the answer is yes, many times actually, and for different reasons and questions.BTW, just looked into your game on Steam, and might have a look on it after a couple of rounds of HOI4 as emperor Haile Selassie.

JackStone2112 (1): Isn't praying for a non-saint's intercession a necessary condition for that soul to be declared a saint? So why not pray for Archbishop LeFebvre's intercessions to resolve, say, the current crisis in the Church?

None (4): This is a grave, disgusting and false accusation.

feelinggravityspull (2): OP, \*\*this comment does not reflect the position of the SSPX\*\*. At all.

AndrzejGieralt (2): Thanks for explaining :) And thanks a lot I really appreciate that! Not sure which game but I suspect you mean Heir Obscure :)Would you be able to elaborate about your objections to why the SSPX hold in doubt that Pope John Paul II is a legitimately canonized saint? I understand taking issue with that as a reaction, however I'm not clear what the actual dispute about the reasons are. Because I think the arguments are very strong, which is that the process of canonization was dumbed down, putting things into doubt to begin with, emphasizing that doubt by holding Pope John Paul up as an example of Catholic heroic virtue, while having done some extremely troubling scandalous things, particularly the Assisi meetings, and the various encouragements of false religions. Similar examples include Mother Theresa seemingly having claimed to encourage those in false faiths to remain in their false faiths. These individuals, although having done naturally heroic things, many of their significant public actions cause this kind of scandal, and can't be considered an example to follow. People might downplay those acts and focus on the heroic acts, or they might be so bothered by the scandalous acts that they really don't like the individuals (myself being Polish I highly value the heroic acts of the Pope while being fully convinced of the error of the mentioned scandals), the objective deeds and judgment of the actions of the individuals can't be accepted as an example of heroic virtue. Because canonizations don't just declare "this individual is in heaven," and the way it was explained to me is that the SSPX doesn't make any claims whether they are or not, but they hold the canonizations in doubt, and reject that these individuals should be venerated as heroic ideal examples of the Christian life.

AndrzejGieralt (1): If that's the case then, yeah that makes sense. I think you're right because I've heard about it having to be a localized veneration first? So yeah that's a good point in case anybody was going to say they're hypocritical or something.

None (2): He's a classic example of a modernist, sorry if you disagree but you're wrong.

MarcellusFaber (3): He was a peritus at the Council, very much a Modernist, and engaged in false oecumenism extensively during his pontificate, and probably before that. The last point alone would be enough to make him suspect of heresy in normal times. He praised and studied the work of Teilhard de Chardin, an arch-Modernist. Now, if Modernism isn't Catholic, which we know it not to be (read Lamentabili Sane, Pascendi Domini Gregis), then it seems to follow that Modernists aren't Catholic either. I'm afraid the conclusion follows common sense.

None (3): OP, \*\*this comment reflects common sense\*\*, to say Ratzinger is anything other than a modernist is gaslighting yourself and pure cope. Also Abp. Lefebvre literally said JP2's conciliar church wasn't even Catholic (logically by extension neither would JP2 be Catholic), why would Benedict be anything different?“To whatever extent pope, bishops, priests or faithful adhere to this new Church, they separate themselves from the Catholic Church.” (July 29, 1976, Reflections on the Suspension a divinis)“I should be very happy to be excommunicated from this Conciliar Church… It is a Church that I do not recognize. I belong to the Catholic Church.” (Interview July 30 1976, published in Minute, no. 747)“It is impossible for Rome to remain indefinitely outside Tradition. It’s impossible… For the moment they are in rupture with their predecessors. This is impossible. They are no longer in the Catholic Church.” (Retreat Conference, September 4, 1987, Ecône)

None (1): My main objection is the questioning of a canonization itself, something I understand to be infalible. Sure, many will bring up countless articles explaining how supposedly it ain't infalible, or how the process became falible after being watered down, but I find this questioning of the sancity of others, or, what seems to happen with the SSPX, accepting saint A while criticising the whole process and denying saint B, problematic. If the post-1983 saints are questionable because the old process was abandoned, what about the saints of the first centuries of the Church, such as George or Cosmas and Damian, should we question them too?I remeber when I translated an article of the SSPX's version of St. Maximilian Kolbe's Militiae, and gave to a priest to review, just to have it back with the title \*Saint\* being changed to mere \*Father.\*Again I might be stoned by many here, but if John Paul or Theresa ain't saints because of these scandals, which I do recognize as sad and grave, why stand for the sanctity of Abp. Lefebvre, who also caused scandle in 1988 and in other opportunities by attacking the popes and the Church?

AndrzejGieralt (1): So it's a very good point for sure, however it missed a few major significant distinctions. I don't know if the canonization process is meant to be infallible or not but it definitely makes sense that it would have been. However, if that process is then reduced, changed, treated with much less gravity, and seemingly used to justify and raise up people who would support some poor positions made in the Church, and we can observe objectively that people who did not display heroic virtue getting canonized, one simply cannot look at that and say 2+2=5 - it is clear that SOMETHING is wrong, and one doesn't have to make any claims definitely there other than simply acknowledging that fact. Something is wrong with the new process.Can you "accept" Saint A vs Saint B - well, no. However, you CAN venerate and ask for the intercession of holy men who happened to be canonized despite doubting the process, for example Padre Pio. Archbishop Lefebvre is included in this as well, because I mean, if you follow an order you better believe the founder of your order was a man of strong, heroic faith. And you hope for the canonization of these people while praying for their intercession, piously believing they are in Heaven despite not being given that certainty. That's fine. And it doesn't change the fact that you can't venerate anywhere near the same level individuals who supported and enacted ecumenical movements, for example.Why are Archbishop Lefebvre's actions different from Pope John Paul II and Mother Theresa? Well, I know more about the Pope so I will focus on that, but it has to do with what a scandal is. A Pope cannot in any capacity pray with non-believers, pagans, heretics, and schismatics, and cannot affirm their false faith. THIS is a scandal, because it causes people to believe that this is OK to do, and it is even more grave because it is the Pope who is doing it. Scandal means leading people into sin, and allowing false worship, encouraging it, approving it, is by definition enabling and encouraging sin, and at that, in a most public way.Whether the Archbishop caused a scandal is up for debate, you might believe it is a scandal, but if you had initially been in the SSPX than I am surprised that you would. The Archbishop wouldn't lead anyone into sin if his position is true, that is, that one cannot obey a command to do evil, and that the commands given to him were in fact to do evil. This disobedience would in fact be heroic and a good example worthy of admiration. In any case, no one is claiming Archbishop Lefebvre as having been somehow canonized independently of the due process, while still exercising their legitimate veneration of the admirable founder of their order.

None (1): Sure, recently some individuals have being admited to the calendar of the saints, and while their personal sanctity might have being verified, one wonder what heroic virtue they displayed. But this could also be used against trads, specially those who want to see people such as Chesterton or Columbus raised to the glory of our altars. But, at least to me, this is far beyond our, or the society's paygrade.But this dualism is often seeing within the SSPX, with the veneration of holy men such as Padre Pio, St. Charbel or the Martin, not questioning their canonization, while ignoring others, and questioning their canonization and the whole process, that they dislike. I recall a prior's homily, the same one who said John Paul II wasn't a saint, saying that the Vatican became a "saint factory".And don't be surprised, for actually I tried to ignore these facts whenever they came up, following the usual SSPX mentality: check what the priests, Lefebvre, websites and books say, accept these arguments and ignore whatever is said against us, for they are all modernists and members of a new church. With time I began to listen and see the validity, the reality of the claims and arguments against the society, Abp. Lefebvre, the positions they hold.

AndrzejGieralt (1): "But, at least to me, this is far beyond our, or the society's paygrade." - but don't you yourself at least see the distinction between the veneration of holy men (claiming no official/certain canonized status for them) while doubting the innovations of the new process? You seem to have said nothing to address my points about all the distinctions I presented." I recall a prior's homily, the same one who said John Paul II wasn't a saint, saying that the Vatican became a "saint factory"." - I would ask, what is ultimately wrong with this claim, besides you personally not liking it? What arguments convinced you that the SSPX is wrong besides a gut feeling?"I tried to ignore these facts whenever they came up" I suppose that's on you I'm afraid, but I think we've quite arrived at the point where these "facts" would prove most useful to unpacking the actual reasons for your change of mind. Hopefully you can explain to me the reasoning that led you to change your mind.

None (1): The process ain't flawed because somethings were changed here and there, to question a canonization is because one considers that they are being treated as a "badge of honor" for those who supported whatever changes that happened after Vatican II is a weak and feable position... what's wrong with admitting the personal sanctity of the recent popes, or non TLM clergy?First, to say that the Vatican, the See of Peter, became a "saint factory", sound terribly protestant to many, not just me. Second, if we lived in a parallel universe, and Rome began canonizing countless SSPX'ers, would they make the same critic? Maybe this "gut feeling" was my sensus fidei reacting towards clear signs of schismatic mentality.Actually this quite common within the laity attached to the SSPX, to ignore whatever criticism while accepting everything that comes from the clergy, without complaining or questioning. And, to make matters worst, whosoever don't follow their arguments are dismissed as mere "legalists".

AndrzejGieralt (1): "Actually this quite common within the laity attached to the SSPX, to ignore whatever criticism while accepting everything that comes from the clergy" - to be frank, this is insulting, especially since you have seemed not to attempt to offer any criticism beyond your "gut feeling". "The process ain't flawed because somethings were changed here and there \[...\] what's wrong with admitting the personal sanctity of the recent popes, or non TLM clergy?" - this is a bad faith strawman - you sound as though you don't even know the specific changes made to the canonization process, which, I'm assuming you do know what the changes are since you stated you've done your due diligence. And, no one says "admitting the personal sanctity" etc is "wrong" lol - you're completely ignoring the cases made against these individual's heroic virtue worthy of canonization.This would be more fruitful if you would respond to my recounting of the distinctions i.e. the actual issues with the character of the individuals being canonized not being compatible with the definition of a canonized saint, veneration of holy men despite not needing to claim they are in fact canonized or pseudo-canonized, etc.

None (1): Let's be honest here, you won't convince me that the SSPX is right and Abp. Lefebvre was correct, nor am I going to convince you of the contrary. Maybe we should just depart in good spirits.

AndrzejGieralt (1): I wasn't trying to convince you, I wanted to begin to understand your actual reasoning... to see what thought process led you to conclude the SSPX is wrong... I didn't think you were trying to convince me either. It's up to you if you want to continue the discussion or not.

# Post 689: Chaldean Catholic Liturgy word of institution to be removed

Author: MichaelTheHermit

Score: 2

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/ycx1al/chaldean\_catholic\_liturgy\_word\_of\_institution\_to/

Hey fellow Caths, I've read that francis has asked the Chaldean catholic church to return to its old rite which is without the Word of Institution, is it wrong? Given that the liturgy has never had a woi in it from the beginning, Does this make the Eucharist invalid? Link : https://www.ncronline.org/spirituality/just-catholic/pope-francis-mass-iraq-could-have-followed-older-rite

Highwayman90 (1): No: the Catholic Church has recognized the validity of consecration done with the ancient Anaphora of Addai and Mari, which is what would remain without the Words of Institution.http://www.christianunity.va/content/unitacristiani/fr/dialoghi/sezione-orientale/chiesa-assira-dell-oriente/altri-documenti/2001---orientamenti-per-lammissione-alleucaristia-fra-la-chiesa-/testo-in-inglese.html

None (1): It's antiquarian nonsense. The form required for consecration is laid out at Trent, if this form isn't fulfilled--no consecration. In the manuscripts we have for these liturgies, in the time they are from, these churches were not even Catholic, non-Catholics tend to do weird things, like remove the words of consecration from their liturgies.Regardless, the Catholic Church required them to add the words of consecration when they united.

MichaelTheHermit (2): If it was valid in the first place they wouldn't have had added the word of institution in the first place. The modernists seem to want to destroy other rights as well, besides i would never commune in the Nestorian cherch of the east if there is no catholic church present. Also won't attend a NO mass cos it's made up and sacrilegious

None (-1): Wrong. The words of consecration are required, see Trent. This "recognition of validity" from Ratzinger is in the same category as Vatican II and the Novus Ordo: Anti-Catholic filth that should be wiped off the face of the earth.

MichaelTheHermit (1): It's seems that Pope francis now asked our hierarchs to remove it

Highwayman90 (1): That’s simply not true. My understanding is that uniformity was the goal and further that even before this, in many cases in the Middle East Chaldeans and Assyrians could intercommune and Assyrians were invited, but NOT required, to add the Words of Institution when Chaldeans were present.+Francis is right to do this.

MichaelTheHermit (0): Is it even possible to be attend a mass anymore with this mess in vatican? They are destroying all rites and traditions, i might consider Eastern Orthodoxy

# Post 690: What is the Mark of the Beast?

Author: WillDurant1935
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# Post 691: Enthronement of Satan in the Vatican
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/ya75r6/busiest\_sspx\_church\_or\_chapel/

I want to see the full liturgical life of a traditional Catholic church or chapel; weddings, funerals, Benedictions as well as Masses. I have free time coming up so I can drive to the busiest SSPX church or chapel where they frequently (weekly even) have weddings and funerals as well as Benedictions, Masses and devotions. Where is that church or chapel in the US? Thanks.

NtGiL\_29 (7): St. Marys, Kansas. Hands down. Thriving traditional community and they’re building a massive new church there right now.Honorable mentions go to Post Falls, Idaho and Walton, Kentucky.

peace-and-love-333 (2): if youre looking to interact with more members of the sspx, defnitely hit up walton, kentucky. not sure how many sspx churches are in that area, i've only been to one there, i believe it was called our Lady of the assumption? i cant remember.

Most\_Consequence872 (1): St Michael’s in Atlanta, Ga. Father Danel is doing an incredible job!

nivalcmot (1): I’ve only been to one and it’s Our Lady of Sorrow in Phoenix Arizona. I was mesmerized. I’m in upstate NY and don’t have anything like it.

Piklikl (3): Yep, second St Marys (please don’t move there). The Divine Office is celebrated in public, rosary and benediction every evening for the month of October. Check out the latest bulletin, the last page contains all the regularly scheduled liturgical/devotional events. https://smac.edu/sites/sspx/files/media/bulletin\_10\_16\_2022\_v2.pdfSome dates to keep in mind to plan a visit around: Feast of Christ the King on October 31 and Christkindlmarkt last weekend of November.

vwayoor (1): Thanks. Kansas is closer to me.

vwayoor (1): If I ever go that far east, I'll check it out. Thanks

vwayoor (1): Thanks. Even closer to me!

Piklikl (1): What about the parish in Warners?

None (1): [deleted]

Most\_Consequence872 (1): You’re welcome! Also Queens of Angel in Houston, TX (Dickenson) seems to be having a lot of activities to.

nivalcmot (1): And to clarify. I’ve only been for Sunday High Mass. not sure about weddings, funerals, etc. but it’s a huge congregation and lots of families.

nivalcmot (1): Where’s that?

Piklikl (3): I’m being slightly facetious, but the parish IMO is way too big and most people who move there expecting a community end up feeling lost and ignored. There’s little organization, and it’s all due to the size of the parish (4k+ parishioners), so moving there would just make things worse. It’s okay to visit, but ultimately the other SSPX parishes need to grow to a size to be able to do the same things SM does, so move to one of those parishes.

vwayoor (2): I checked their website. They have a wedding every weekend for the next 3 weeks. Just to give you an idea how busy they are.

nivalcmot (2): Oh I see it’s in NY. That’s over 3 hours from me. I haven’t been.

Piklikl (2): It’s the parish that used to be in Syracuse, the school and parish moved over to Warners, NY. Really great community from what I hear, lots of young adults that are very welcoming.BVM, Church & Priory+1 315-320-4085https://maps.google.com?g\_st=ic

KpopKia (4): I agree with you. I live there and it's where I attend Mass. It's absolutely huge. It's quite overwhelming at times. I stopped attending processions ( and other public religious events) because it's so crowded you can't move. But we really, really need that Church we are building. We have 5 Sunday Masses just to accommodate everyone. We attend Mass inside a gymnasium and it's become a circus. There's two masses that are still said inside the chapel You'll need to make an appointment to go to confession. Which is nice because only a few people at a time go where before it was a 3 hour wait when everyone would just show up. If you want a social life, it is definitely there, but you'll have to assert yourself if you want to get to know people.

# Post 693: Fr. Hesse, Vatican II New Religion
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URL: https://youtu.be/WCkYQqu4LjA

parsonpilgrim (0): Good stuff. Dr Rao on Francis was spot on!

WillDurant1935 (0): Francis is a demon. Apostasy is obvious as he promotes worship of earth goddess.(Pachamama) Catholics need to see the truth and open theirs eyes; blinded by an obedience to a systematic acceptance of freemasonry and satanic teachings. The heresy of Francis can be seen as obstinate to the dogma of the Catholic Church. He has been corrected by Cardinals, and he persists in propagating error. This man is a formal, manifest heretic.There is evidence to support Pope Benedict XVI as a legitimate successor to the papacy even though he has made some erroneous pronouncements which show him to be also in heresy, but only material heresy. You could also include the other councilor’Popes’ in this category; because they all were modernist heretics who committed grave errors against ‘de fide’ dogma of the Church. Especially the sin of religious indifference. These ‘Popes’ were all modernists: John XXIII, Paul VI, John Paul I, John Paul II, and Benedict XVI. They all committed the sin of false ecumenism. These shameful false teachers have lead many astray, to twist the faith into a freemasonic and satanic sect of Catholicism which breaks completely with Sacred Tradition:“It firmly believes, professes and preaches that all those who are outside the catholic church, not only pagans but also Jews or heretics and schismatics, cannot share in eternal life and will go into the everlasting fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels, unless they are joined to the catholic church before the end of their lives;”{Pope Eugene IV, Council of Florence, Cantate Domino, 1441, ex cathedra}We must do more than recognize and resist. For by following in obedience to these errors, we are in complicity with falsehood and evil. By submitting to Francis as a legitimate Pope, we are giving him authority which he has ipso facto relinquished by his obstinate heresy. Francis has put himself outside the very Church he claims to lead. He is an apostate, and while sad, painful, and heartbreaking—we are called to pray for his conversion.

None (1): Pope Francis is the one and only Roman Pontiff, not a demon or ilegitimate pope. Please, don't promote these errors here or elsewhere, for with these false and serious accusations you are the one leading many astray.

WillDurant1935 (0): What about Benedict XVI who tried to bifurcate the papacy when he resigned? Take you head out of the sand, Catholicism is in full apostasy!

None (2): Yeah, right...Now that you changed your profile pic I can recognize you are the owner of that website sharing sedevacantism, stuff from the remnant and conspiracy theories. There's no point in saying anything else, for you won't convince me of any sede nonsense or wild theories, nor will I be able to make you see the errors you support.God bless you!

WillDurant1935 (0): Sede Vacantism is just a theological opinion. If you read more of Saint Robert Bellarmine, who was a doctor of the Church, you would understand more fully the opinion of the papacy being vacant because of heresy. Canon law also supports the sin of heresy which puts one outside the Church. You don’t have to accept my interpretation, do your own homework. The Church has had other anti-popes throughout history.

None (2): Oh yes, the usual Bellarmine argument... but again, no point in continuing this conversation.God bless you!

# Post 696: Chaldean Catholic Church's Sacraments

Author: MichaelTheHermit
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/xwx8b8/chaldean\_catholic\_churchs\_sacraments/

Hey guys l, i wanted to know if i can participate in the mass of the Chaldean catholic church and receive sacraments? I am going to Iraqi Kurdistan and there are only chaldean churches there. They seem to have an ancient liturgy but they consecrate the body and blood towards the people. Is it okay for me to go to their church?

None (5): They are Catholics, so... why not?

Piklikl (1): You should probably reach out to your local SSPX priest/priory and ask; I seem to recall there being something against switching rites (ie you can’t attend both simultaneously), but I imagine since you are traveling the requirements aren’t as stringent.

MichaelTheHermit (1): Because i read an article on sspx sitw which said that even eastern rites that are tainted by modern missal and reformations should be avoided

None (1): Attending other churches (Melkite, Chaldean, Maronite, Ukrainian...) for seeing how liturgy is celebrated or because there's no Latin parish nearby ain't switching rites, for the whole process actually, and sadly, involves tons of bureaucracy.

Highwayman90 (1): Hey, u/MichaelTheHermit ! I have a good friend who is Chaldean here in the US, and he said that the Chaldeans did indeed have their own liturgical reform. I’m not sure how fully it has been implemented in the Chaldean/Assyrian homeland, though. In any case, I’ve been to one of their liturgies in America and it seemed reverent enough, though I went to an Arabic one and don’t speak Arabic, so I probably should share that…

None (0): Well... even the Latin rite they (SSPX) use suffered several reformations over the centuries, the last one happened in 1962. But this recomendation shares the same principle as the one they have for the ordinary form, that it endangers the soul and so on? One priest once advised me not to attend the local Melkite parish due to sadly Latinizations(charismatism), yet I avoided this practice, kept going, became spiritually yet not canonically Eastern, and improved my spiritual life.

MichaelTheHermit (1): Thanks for your informative response

MichaelTheHermit (1): Very interesting. But 1962 missal is still traditional

Highwayman90 (2): Also, for more general Eastern information, I know that most Byzantine Churches were at least latinized (not necessarily modernized), but a lot of that has been undone.One exception is that the Ruthenian Church had a proper liturgical reform, so I know that more traditional Byzantines might prefer the Melkite or Romanian Churches here in the US.As for other non-Byzantine Easterners, we don’t have too many Coptic or Ethiopian Catholics in the US, but the Copts are mildly latinized yet pretty traditional here where I live in Nashville.Syro-Malabars are heavily latinized and until recently were fully versus populum, but ironically Pope Francis and the Major Archbishop of the Syro-Malabar Church George Alencherry pushed through a reform to make (I think) the Liturgy of the Eucharist ad orientem.I don’t know enough about the other Churches to comment, as I haven’t been to their liturgies.

MichaelTheHermit (2): Wow thanks. That's very informative

# Post 697: Third Order

Author: Effective\_Traffic346
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/xoz3k7/third\_order/

I've heard good things about the sspx third order. I was reading over the rule recently and am confused about the "no television" aspect. Does not television mean no DVD movie nights with family, no youtube videos that aren't a sermon or something etc? Or is that just no Netflix, no cable, and no wasting unnecessary amounts on time on watching videos? Thanks!

None (3): No TV means no TV at all, even if you are going to use it only for watching good movies... I remember how the laity, even non tertiaries, where encouraged to remove their TVs from home, for even owning one might be a "near occasion of sin", or you might give ways to corrupt your children. Though, here's what I've found in a website against the "new" SSPX:Regina Coeli Report: Does this mean the occasional film violates the spirit of the Tertiaries? Fr. Adam Purdy (Chaplain of tertiaries): I would simply answer no! This is particularly the case if the film is a good presentation of some virtue, nobility or character, or religious theme. Purely mundane or vulgar themes would definitely violate the spirit of the founder. They are deconstructive in nature. Someone will surely question what is meant by occasional. If it is more than once a week, I believe it is too much.

Piklikl (2): The SSPX moves fairly slowly with its updates on terminology, I think it's best to understand the spirit of the law (which is a typical Catholic strategy). My understanding is the Third Order is more of a local community thing, so it would make sense to see what your local Third Order members do. For better or worse, few priests make a distinction between passive viewing and channel surfing when it comes to TV (essentially time wasting) or intentional viewing of content on a device that happens to be referred to as a TV. This is largely because the priests themselves have little time to even think about doing these kinds of things, sort of like how the priest's advice on social media can be a bit out of touch because so few of them actually use it. I think a case can be made that cable TV has no place in the Catholic home due to the lack of control over what is played over it (especially when it comes to ads), but also I think Catholics need to remember that the list of things that absolutely must happen in order to get to heaven is pretty short.

craft00n (2): For what I know, TV is TV. Cinema is an art, SSPX isn't anti art. The problem is with mass media and loss of time trough entertainment.

None (1): Have to determine the spirit of the law. As social media isn’t allowed either yet there are thousands of traditional sermons, including those from Society priests on YouTube. Surely you aren’t forbidden from listening to them.Point being speak to your priest not Reddit.

GiuseppeMSarto (1): Watch Fr. Karl Stehlin on YouTube. You can't go wrong.

Effective\_Traffic346 (2): How does that work if you the only third order in the home? Or at least the only one that is sspx. Also I have heard that the new rule took internet usage into account as well. Is this true?

None (1): I don't know, for usually those who join this third order already have family members who follow and support the SSPX, at least that's what I always believed. Maybe those "alone" in this discard their own tv's and avoid the ones owned by others in the house... no idea.As for the new rule, I can't say much, for I don't know it and I'm no longer an SSPXer, but I remember homilies where we were called to leave facebook, twitter, whatever, and quit the internet, only using it out of necessity. Also, the local priory published an article written by a French SSPX priest, calling for people to remove all screens from their bedrooms.

# Post 698: Spot on Sermon of fr Burffit - SSPX NOT IN SCHISM
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/xm5fkj/spot\_on\_sermon\_of\_fr\_burffit\_sspx\_not\_in\_schism/

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q8URaumDzbETaken from Our Lady of the Angels (Arcadia, CA)Fr. Burfitt Discusses-Schism-Disgust with a Novus Ordo Clown Funeral-How the SSPX is not in Schism-Prelates of the mainstream Church that state the SSPX is not in Schism (including Archbishop Cordileone)

None (2): Who cares if the Novus Ordo thinks that the SSPX is in schism, it is the Novus Ordo which is in schism.See what was written in an open letter in 1988, signed by all the Superiors of the SSPX:> On the other hand, we have never wished to belong to this system which calls itself the Conciliar Church, anddefines itself with the Novus Ordo Missæ, an ecumenism which leads to indifferentism and the laicization of allsociety. Yes, we have no part, nullam partem habemus, with the pantheon of the religions of Assisi; our ownexcommunication by a decree of Your Eminence or of another Roman Congregation would only be theirrefutable proof of this. We ask for nothing better than to be declared out of communion with this adulterousspirit which has been blowing in the Church for the last 25 years; we ask for nothing better than to be declaredoutside of this impious communion of the ungodly. We believe in the One God, Our Lord Jesus Christ, with theFather and the Holy Ghost, and we will always remain faithful to His unique Spouse, the One Holy Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church.

# Post 699: I’m thinking of going to an SSPX mass and I have a question about veils. Are veils a requirement / highly encouraged? Asking for my wife. Currently we are attending an extraordinary form within our diocese and it’s about 50/50 for reference. Within your church is it a higher percentage than that? Ty

Author: tnu0055
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None (7): It is a custom to wear them and it is highly encouraged! From my experience going through different chapels I have not seen any women not wearing them. I can’t speak for all chapels but they have baskets with extra veils available for any women to use in the vestibule area if they forgot it at home :) highly encourage your wife to do it! It’s one of the fruits in these chapels compared to diocesan Latin mass that some don’t see the significance of wearing it!Edit: in my chapel there’s no women who don’t wear the veil. And it ranges from younger girls to elderly women

None (4): When I used to attend the local SSPX chapel, I remember seeing scenes where non-veiled women were approached by some of the faithful and receive a veil... truth be told, I've only seen this scene twice in all the time I spent there. It's also worthy of mention that the priests responsible for the chapel placed a wooden box right at the entrance with all sorts of black and white veils for those that had none.That said, I've also seen very few women not wearing veils, or wearing pants, and they weren't disturbed by those attending Mass, and one or two were actually talking to the priests. In the end, I believe it would make a good impression to go with a veil.

Cato2011 (6): It’s “almost” a requirement. Ushers will bring your wife a clean loaner - we have a basket of them in the narthex. I have NEVER seen a woman bareheaded in my church. I’ve been at my SSPX parish for over a decade. Sometimes female visitors show up in pants, but even that looks disrespectful to God and our norms. But, I think we recognize visitors and overlook it. Those who return seem to catch on and try to fit in. Our dress code is in the bulletin, on the announcement board, and online. Women cover their hair wear dresses below the knee and sleeves below the elbows. Men wear ties, dress shirts and a jacket. No flip flops or shorts. We really try to be welcoming. Our dress code is not to be vain or snooty, but to be respectful to the Sacrament and the house of God.

tnu0055 (2): Thank you very much!

tnu0055 (1): As a follow up question. At what age would it be appropriate to veil your (my) daughter?

tnu0055 (3): Thank you very much!

tnu0055 (3): Thank you. Appreciate your thorough response.

Cato2011 (6): In my parish it’s school age. But most little girls wear a bonnet or veil.

None (5): I'm not sspx, but my thought (after that of Tertulian) is that girls are still female and therefore should have a headcovering.But of course, baby bonnets, hats, scarves, and doilies all count.

Most\_Consequence872 (4): It’s not required until the “age of reason” but everyone that attends the SSPX in Atlanta starts veiling around 3, but as babies wear bonnets.

ArtannsVoid (4): I think pretty much from birth your daughter would wear a veil or hat of some sort. I see baby girls wearing them all the time

None (3): You’re welcome! I’m sure you and your wife will feel welcomed like family at the chapel! God bless!

# Post 700: We Must Maintain Tradition
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# Post 701: The sabbath and leisure
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My examination of conscience for confession is very serious about the sabbath and keeping it holy. I understand we shouldn’t profane it with gambling, etc or buying unnecessary things. We should also avoid servile work, if possible. What do y’all think about leisure such as the gym, assuming we’ve already been to Mass and will have family activities after?

Pitiful-Sample-7400 (6): Our Lord said the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath. Nothing wrong in going to the gym, for a jog, having a game of football etc.

Piklikl (5): On the one hand it is a day of rest, but also on the other working out is part of a healthy lifestyle so I don’t think there’s anything wrong with it, it certainly isn’t sinful. It’s certainly good to question the reasoning behind decisions, but ultimately there’s nothing wrong with working out at the gym on Sundays, before or after other activities.

None (3): I cut wood to heat my home. During the week I cut until the end of the day. I enjoy this work, on Sundays, I’ll cut wood until it isn’t fun anymore, then I quit because it becomes servile after that. I enjoy working in my shop, if on a Sunday whatever I’m doing stops being enjoyable, I stop. If you enjoy going to the gym I think that’s ok to do. If it’s a chore, then no. I hope that made sense.

None (3): Thanks! I find it enjoyable and healthy

None (3): Thanks. That does make sense.

None (1): [deleted]

None (1): mood, we're not bound to the extreme rules of the sabbath like the Jews.

# Post 702: Traditional Catholicism Telegram channel
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# Post 703: What’s the society of St. Josaphat?
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/wm09aw/whats\_the\_society\_of\_st\_josaphat/

I heard about them and am curious. Are they the eastern version of the sspx? Why were they formed? Thanks for any insights y’all can offer.

None (3): I'll just copy/paste what I posted a few months ago when someone asked about an Eastern SSPX in r/EasternCatholic:Many say the Society of St. Josaphat, but I see it like this: St. Josaphat's only seek to maintain Latinizations brought or enforced to the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church after the Union of Brest, while the SSPX wishes to restore and maintain Latin traditions as they existed for centuries and centuries in the Roman Catholic Church, before Vatican II and later reforms. Not to mention that SSPX leaders often meet and are in contact with Roman authorities, from Bishops to Popes, meanwhile St. Josaphat's have no link or whatsoever with his Beatitude Sviatoslav Shevchuk and the UGCC.I know several SSPX'ers admire and support them, seeing them as equals in the East, yet... things ain't that simple.

PESH28 (3): The [Wikipedia article](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Priestly\_Society\_of\_Saint\_Josaphat) on the [Society of St Josaphat](https://www.saintjosaphat.org/) is actually a quite decent summary. The Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church (UGCC) seems to be quite hostile to them, more than so than some random Latin diocesan bishops saying the SSPX are in schism, with talk of eradicating Lefebrvrists and multiple excommunications of SSJK superior [Fr Basil Kovpak](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Basil\_Kovpak) confirmed by Rome. The article suggests the UGCC is utterly Ukrainian turning away Russian or Russian speaking Orthodox priests discerning conversion (although there can be no doubting of their patriotism while UA faces Russian invasion). The SSJK anyhow follow the same SSPX line of professed loyalty to Rome but rejecting Modernism and Indifferentism. However, unlike SG Dom Pagliarini, I don't see Fr Kovpak dropping into Pope Francis for a chat (the Pope was Ordinary of Buenos Aires while Fr Pagliarini was the local SSPX seminary rector) as happened with the SSPX SG. There is a clearer recognition of the SSPX vis á vis Rome compared to SSJK and either Rome or Ukrainian UGCC authorities.

osteo5511 (3): Are the technically in schism? Why would they want to maintain latinizations? I always thought most Eastern Catholics were opposed to being latinized?

None (2): I don't know if they are in schism, but their founder was excommunicated by the Ukrainian Church in 2007, with this action later confirmed by the Congregation for the doctrine of the Faith, not to mention that his society has no official ties to the Church. If not in official schism, pretty close.These Latinizations, particularly stations of the cross in parishes, Eucharistic adoration, kneeling and group rosarys were added after the Union of Brest in 1596, so you can imagine some Ukrainians are fond of these Latin traditions. When, after Vatican II, the Eastern churches were encouraged to go after their own traditions, you had some unhappy with this decision. Some sources also mention the change of the usage of Church Slavonic to vernacular in Divine Liturgy as one of the causes for the creation of this priestly society.And yes, I believe the vast majority oppose Latinizations, but you also have a minority quite fond of them... in my Melkite parish they pray the rosary before DL.

No-Try7513 (2): It's not just that it's not just the latinizations the same people who destroyed the Latin Mass also destroyed the old church slovonic and enforced the same rules of using the vernacular in eastern churches

osteo5511 (2): I want to visit a Melkite parish so, these insights are interesting

# Post 704: Conditional confirmation
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/w8faye/conditional\_confirmation/

I was confirmed in the NO - is it possible for me to have a conditional confirmation in the SSPX?

Piklikl (2): You’d have to have a chat with your local SSPX priest, they don’t just hand them out like candy. You’ll describe the ceremony that you went through in the NO and the priest will try to ascertain if a conditional confirmation would be appropriate.

AveMaria17 (1): Yes speak to the priest, I had conditional confirmation. The doubt being sometimes dioceses don’t use 100% olive oil for the chrism which invalidates the sacrament so there is sufficient doubt for any NO Catholic

RiskKeepsMeEmployed (1): generally yes. i was just reading about this and the Confirmation rite was altered the most of any sacrament by the conciliar church. but you need to ask a sspx priest.

cloudsaway2 (1): Please don’t. You can only be confirmed once

Scania4075 (1): I am researching and inquiring myself about a possible conditional confirmation. I started attending SSPX masses about 2 years ago. Is using non olive oil really that common?

lu\_ke\_44 (1): you dont understand sacraments ig

# Post 705: Prayers for Savannah
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We need an SSPX chapel in southern GA. I attend in northern GA, which is great. But the Vatican has now banned the diocese of Savannah from celebrating the EF starting next year, and the cathedral will stop celebrating it this August. It’s very sad and now Catholics in southern GA will have no access to the true Mass

AbFideFidelis (1): Novus Ordo Missae is also the true Mass. It is better for salvation to go to Pauline Masses than SSPX Masses, since priests celebrating them doesn't have a mission, they weren't sent, so their minister is illegitimate (Latran IV, chap. 3 & Trent, Sess. XXIII, can. 7).

DubbersDaddy (1): Prayers, indeed.I suspect there will be calls for SSPX chapels in many places in the coming days. We live in interesting times. God, have mercy on us!

rf9661 (1): I’m in the Florida panhandle. There are two FSSPX chapels in this general area (I believe Pensacola and Jacksonville) that may work for you.

Informal-Big1910 (1): I’m a little late to this thread, but Charleston (I believe!) still has a few TLMs you can go to. My parents live there and in the past I’ve gone to Stela Maris, which is a beautiful parish. I know the Bishop in Charleston has placed restrictions on the TLM, but hasn’t outright banned it. Charleston Isn’t exactly close to Savannah, but closer than Roswell!

RiskKeepsMeEmployed (5): Michael Davies, Archbishop Lefebvre and Fr Gregory Hesse have 1,000s of pages and dozens of hours available to educate you all on why Novus Ordo should be avoided at all costs. It is a valid but deficient liturgy.

AbFideFidelis (1): I am saddened by this decision from your bishop, but you need to obey to him, Tridentine Rite is only a mean to attain salvation, not an end in itself. And if it is celebrated by priests who weren't sent by the Church, these Masses are illegitimate, and they cannot fulfill Sunday obligations, meaning that people commit mortal sins by attending them Sundays and Feast days, and by taking Communion here.

None (1): Indeed. Deus providat.

Particular-Royal8786 (2): Oh, Its not for me necessarily. I attend an SSPX chapel in Roswell, GA. North of Atlanta. But I wanted to go to a TLM in Savannah for years and now it’s suddenly not an option-for anyone. It is such a beautiful cathedral, too 😞 and their choir does an awesome job. The Savannah archdiocese Latin Mass society is talking about maybe petitioning the SSPX for a mission or something but it’s still a shame they robbed them (and we future visitors) of the cathedral and all other dicocesan churches. I’ll look into the panhandle churches next time in in the area! Thanks

Particular-Royal8786 (1): That’s great news! I’m glad people down there will have a place to go. I bet Charleston does have some nice TLMs, the churches there are beautiful. Thank you for the update

AbFideFidelis (1): But all these pages are nothing against the Magisterium, which condemns as an heresy, to say that despising the rites in use in the Church isn't a sin (see sess. VII, can. 13). So if this rite has been promulgated by the Church, it isn't a sin. Obeying to the Pope in such matters isn't a sin and can never be a sin, because it is assisted by the Holy Ghost. The Church is indeed protected by God so it cannot promulgate nefarious disciplines (cf. Auctorem Fidei, n. 78). "Roma locuta, causa finita est".

RiskKeepsMeEmployed (4): "they cannot fulfill Sunday obligations," this is a lie. the PCED, various Bishops and canon lawyers in communion with RCC contradict you. https://onepeterfive.com/sspx-mass-shelter/

Particular-Royal8786 (3): Ultimately, I suppose, if something seems unholy, it probably is. The SSPX doesn’t fit the “unholy” bill.Technically, no SSPX chapel or mission has ever been sent by the official church because of the society’s canonical status, nor has any diocese ever invited them, because they do not receive jurisdiction through the normal means of the hierarchy https://sspx.org/en/news-events/news/do-sspx-priests-have-jurisdiction-9198But that hasn’t stopped them from spreading the Gospel against the mainline Church’s heresies. Having said that, the church recognizes their Eucharist as valid, as well as their confessions and (recently) marriages. They aren’t even “officially” considered in schism, in fact. It’s a scary world we live in, where modernists disregard “extra ecclesiam nulla salus” and recommend praying with Protestants and attending clown masses but say a TLM will endanger souls. SmhMy soul will certainly be fineAlso, you’re a Protestant looking into sedvacantism so odds are you’re just off your meds

AbFideFidelis (1): Hello, the problem is, as you said, that : " SSPX chapel or mission has ever been sent by the official church". The status of the SSPX are abrogated since the 70s, and even these statues were limited in the Diocese of Fribourg and for six years.The Church can't teach heresy. SSPX has no mission in the Church, and it spreads many errors and even heresies. As I said, it is a catholic dogma that canonical mission is required for the legitimate ministry (Council of Trent, sess. 23, can. 7), and as said all theologians, bishops, etc : it is the meaning of the dogma. So the Universal Ordinary Magisterium also taught this dogma as I said, and you can't say that "you don't understand the meaning of the dogma", because the Church understands it as I said.I am not a modernist, and I believe in all dogmas of the Church. You believe that TLM is so good that no external circumstances can render this Mass bad ; but first I never said that all TLM Masses endanger souls ; second, yes, Masses (either TLM, Novus Ordo or Oriental) said by not canonically sent priests are bad for souls, not because of the rite itself, but precisely because it is said by an illegitimate priest, so it is an illegitimate Mass.You commit the sin of slander towards me when you say that I'm a protestant. Also, I don't understand your last sentence. If you believe that I'm interested into converting to sedevacantism, that's false (btw it denies the same dogma as I said above), but if I'm interested by it, it is because it is a schism and a corpus of heretical doctrines that needs to be refuted.

# Post 706: Question on how to go up for communion with a baby

Author: Kind-Philosophy3265

Score: 9

Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/w0v3cw/question\_on\_how\_to\_go\_up\_for\_communion\_with\_a\_baby/

The wife and I have a 1 year old and we wanted to know how to bring a baby up for communion. We are new to SSPX, does one of us simply go up there and kneel with the baby in our arms? Or should one of us receive the host and then pass the baby off to the other parent so they can receive the host? We are lucky to have Reddit so that we can ask questions. It’s hard being new to the faith and not having anyone in our family to ask questions. Thanks all and God bless.

Piklikl (9): It’s pretty common for parents to receive with a baby, just make sure they can’t inadvertently touch the paten or the host (I’ve seen some people just grab the baby’s hands With their free hand for the second or two while they receive). It’s also not uncommon for one parent to receive, go back and hold the baby while the other parent goes up, particularly if the baby tends to get really fussy in line. It’s a shame, but the SSPX is so strapped for resources that they rarely have any sort of welcoming structure in place for new parishioners, so please don’t take the lack of it the wrong way. And also please try to not let a fussy baby make you feel bad, babies cry and make noises, so it’s nothing to be embarrassed about.

RiskKeepsMeEmployed (4): husband or wife brings up baby, we just kind of lean them to one side and receive. priests usually smile if they give any reaction at all. If baby starts crying, which is rare since you're moving quick and there is stuff to see for them on the altar, just let them cry and don't skip the Eucharist.

Kind-Philosophy3265 (8): Thank you for the information. Well, i truly felt as if Jesus welcomed me when my wife and I went last week and that’s more than enough for us lol. On a side note, I’ve never knelt so much in my life. I had tears in my eyes during the mass, it was truly like seeing heaven on earth. Thank God for SSPX.

Piklikl (6): Thank God for the grace to be able see and know what is really important! So many people are discouraged by the lack of nice things like a welcoming parish, an organized parish, etc, and leave because they weren’t treated as nicely as they expected. Don’t hesitate to ask anymore questions! The SSPX exists primarily to form priests in keeping with the timeless methods the Church has used for centuries and were discarded post Vatican II; so many people think the SSPX makes normal parish priests, that they’re a teaching order, or that they’re a contemplative order. The SSPX is just keeping the lighthouse running while the Church is weathering the storm, we can’t expect them to also rebuild the entire town.

JackStone2112 (5): Yes. Thank God for the SSPX.

# Post 707: How to dispose of a broken rosary or crucifix

Author: erick2020x

Score: 3

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/vwcjng/how\_to\_dispose\_of\_a\_broken\_rosary\_or\_crucifix/

I remember this many years ago when I was learning about Catholicism in Africa. I was told that you have to bury them but I can’t remember exactly what you’re supposed to do. Can anyone tell me how to dispose of broken crucifixes and rosaries? I have this crucifix that I want to bury I think and I want to know if there’s something I need to do.https://i.imgur.com/xn6Ruui.jpg

Piklikl (2): You only need to worry about it if it's blessed, but it's still a good practice to treat any religious item with respect. "If you cannot fix the item, or you have no use for it, you may discard the item by incineration, burial or pious disposal."If it can burn, I'll usually do my best to burn in and bury the ashes; but for your crucifix simply find a good place and bury it.

erick2020x (1): Thanks

# Post 708: Video on Christ's Kingdom Come

Author: WillDurant1935

Score: 2

Comments: 0

URL: https://parkbenchreader.wordpress.com/2022/07/03/2752/

# Post 709: Masses near Savanna, Ga

Author: rathdrummob

Score: 7

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/vp80ly/masses\_near\_savanna\_ga/

I'm working near Savanna, Ga for a couple of months. Are there any latin masses near by?

BertBlyleven (2): The closest SSPX chapel is in Jacksonville, FL, and there are several families who drive to it from south GA. I highly recommend going there, but I understand how that can be difficult with lord brandon's policies. The cathedral in Savannah does have one, but it's honestly closer to what you would have seen in 1964 or 1965 - they've been doing stuff like vernacular readings for years. Beautiful cathedral though. I believe there's a diocesan parish in Richmond Hill that has a TLM one day during the week - no idea how much that's changed, it's been years since I spent any time out that way. Outside of Savannah it is very much mission territory until you get to Florida, South Carolina, or closer to Atlanta. Great people though.

rathdrummob (1): Thanks!

BotW\_Fishermen24 (1): I go to the chapel in Jacksonville florida and know the people who go there they still go there and I thought you might like to know they are moving into a new, much bigger church and debating whether to turn that one into a school.

BertBlyleven (1): Great to hear!

# Post 710: So has attendance at SSPX chapels increased since Francis has become pope?

Author: None

Score: 12

Comments: 12

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/vootql/so\_has\_attendance\_at\_sspx\_chapels\_increased\_since/

So I'm a regular Catholic who almost exclusively attends the NO (my city only has a Latin Mass early on Sunday and I unfortunately as of now work early on Sundays and either attend mass on Saturday or Sunday Night.) Anyways, has attendance at SSPX chapels increased since Francis has become Pope? Also, has the political climate contributed to more attendance? I'm curious because of how many people are (rightly, to be honest) critical of the Pope, and I'm wondering if this has been a factor in SSPX growth. I myself do not personally know anyone who attends an SSPX mass as there are no chapels close to where I live (from what I've found the closest are in Waterloo IA, a few in Minnesota, and Rapid City SD, and there are none in Nebraska where I grew up) so I don't have a chance to really find out much about attendance at such chapels.

Piklikl (9): The SSPX doesn’t collect the data needed to be able to accurately see if Francis had an impact on attendance. Even if they did, they likely wouldn’t grant access to a competent data scientist who could parse the data and show one way or another. Attendance at SSPX parishes in general has always been on the rise, but that’s due to a number of factors: people moving from other areas, families growing, leaving the NO. Also in recent times, the Covid restrictions probably led to an increase in attendance. All these things would need to be controlled for in order to understand the causes. I’m sure the declarations made by the Holy Father confirming the validity of the SSPX sacraments has also led to an increase in attendance, so it’s not all bad.

Nuke508 (6): St Michaels in Jacksonville Florida has grown tremendously over the past few years. But so has Latin mass popularity in Jacksonville as a whole

Absurdharry (7): I attend a SSPX Chapel in England near my parents' house when I'm not at university, and anecdotally I can say yes. A few years ago it would maybe get 10-20 attendees every Sunday, now regularly gets around 50 (it's not a big Chapel and it's in a rural area).

SuperGrapeSoda (7): All traditional Latin in mass communities have grown while the NO is in decline.

Kind-Philosophy3265 (2): I’m curious to know the answer to this.

None (2): In that sense its good. I am glad he did that. Unity does seem to be a big priority of his, even if its not a perfect way of going about it. So, have you personally known anyone who's left the NO or even FSSP communities to go to an SSPX chapel for reasons that are more political or due to the Francis papacy?

None (2): Has anyone specifically chosen the SSPX over say the FSSP or any other Latin Mass group that is closer to Rome?

None (3): Obviously, but I'm wondering if some of this might be due to church or even national politics in the United States or other nations. Are more people joining because they see the Francis papacy as problematic or feel that while he's the legitimate Pope, it isn't worth listening to him?

Piklikl (2): I personally don’t know anyone who has.

Nuke508 (3): The Bishop didn’t allow FSSP to operate in Jacksonville so there is no option in the area. Only sspx for a Latin mass only church

SuperGrapeSoda (5): The TLM has been growing since JPII. And I’m sure you’re right. Many factors have influenced the growth, but I believe the reverence in giving all glory to God has been the biggest reason.

None (2): Thanks.

# Post 711: Consecration to Saint Michael

Author: WillDurant1935
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Comments: 0

URL: https://parkbenchreader.wordpress.com/2022/06/20/consecration-to-saint-michael/

# Post 712: How to address issues with past papacies

Author: None
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Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/vawlmy/how\_to\_address\_issues\_with\_past\_papacies/

Hello brothers and sisters ,I was wondering how to address this matter with my Protestant friends and also, to be honest, with myself. In the history of our glorious church, historically speaking, we’ve had popes that well…fell short of holiness. Waaaay short. And even if it were alleged, I suppose we’ll never know because that was a long time ago, but the bottom line is this: is it a sin to say a pope was bad, per se? Or to say a pope is blasphemous etc, as long as we aren’t attacking an ex cathedra proclamation

parsonpilgrim (2): Protestants are about to have their own reckoning with failed leadership, sex abuse scandals and coverups going back decades. It’s ongoing right now. If their faith is based on the personal holiness of individual Christians, then they’re probably going to completely lose their faith soon and they’re just throwing shade on Catholics. Answering your question specifically, the infallibility of the Pope does not mean they are without fault, only that his specific ministry in the Church provides a negative guarantee that he will not teach error as Truth formally and in his role as Pope. We’ve had some notoriously bad popes. I say the present Pope is pretty bad. Not necessarily because of his moral life, but because of his theological confusion, yet we see the charism playing out even here, when Francis says things confusing or puts forward a heretical teaching as a personal opinion or off-hand remark, its doesn’t cross that important line. Even in the Encyclicals, the verbiage is confusing, odd, and mostly unclear, or problems appear in footnotes rather than the main text. It is no small miracle that while we probably have a personally heretical pope, yet he hasn’t made himself a Material Heretic by formally proclaiming a theologically unsound teaching. It’s almost as if something [or someone] is stopping him. The Holy Spirit is at work with what we give the Church to work with — which is sadly lacking.

please\_take\_one (1): https://youtube.com/watch?v=iHEz3tytWTo

None (1): That makes sense. I have a hard time explaining Francis tbh, and also some of the medieval popes. I did explain the Holy Spirit on protects infallible teachings when it comes to the papacy. I agree, Protestants will have their own reckoning

None (1): Thanks! I watch him all the time

# Post 713: Many masses in a tent of the SSPX pilgrimage from Chartres to Paris, France. The pilgrimage has been cancelled due to flooding.

Author: Ehicem

Score: 29

Comments: 1

URL: https://i.redd.it/q7pysii76t391.jpg

skalenius (5): I was on the pilgrimage. I went from Paris to Chartres though. The weather was the worst I've experienced. They decides not to cancel, but it was close.I'm sorry you got hit so hard by the storm. Better luck next year.Chartres sonne!

# Post 714: Feelings regarding this banner hanging during mass?

Author: Kind-Philosophy3265

Score: 12

Comments: 17

URL: https://i.redd.it/kswuec3mop391.jpg

No\_Drop3107 (10): Wait, this lecture hall is supposed to be a Church?

JackStone2112 (6): Let's play find the tabernacle.

Piklikl (6): I think you might be slightly overreacting. Are the decorations tasteless? Yes. However I think they’re meant to represent the feast today, Pentecost (the banner of the Holy Ghost on the back wall, the “flame” descending from the ceiling in the middle). You will undoubtedly have a better experience at the SSPX Mass simply because you aren’t subject to the terrible design choices that the Spirit of V2 inspires.

Kind-Philosophy3265 (3): I know I said I planned on going to a SSPX parish, but sadly I haven’t made it yet. I did however continue going to the NO mass that is closest to my house. Tonight at mass I look up and see this hanging from the ceiling. My heart drops instantly, anger and sorrow feel my heart at the same time. Then I glance over at the picture of Jesus and the divine mercy and there is blue and pink ribbons hanging around the picture.(not like what’s hanging in the picture shown.). How do you guys feel about this? One thing I can say now is that I will be attending a SSPX mass next Sunday. Also, should I contact the local Bishop?Edit: The blue and pink ribbons hanging around the picture of the divine mercy is acceptable. I was just using this to show that the color scheme is obviously different. The banner is hanging are pride LGBTQ colors.

johnny63339 (2): Is this a Catholic Church or a local library?

sasquatch\_pants (-1): Talk to priest first and ask straight forward what that banner is suppose to represent. Once you have your answer, report it to the Bishop. I'll be very honest, I left the Catholic Church for the Orthodox Church because western Christianity is clearly becoming more about the world than salvation.

Kind-Philosophy3265 (6): Yes, I might be overreacting. I also snuck a video during mass because I got sick of the boomer guitar playing. I play guitar and I love the instrument I just don’t want to hear a guitar at mass.

parsonpilgrim (7): You gotta make your way out. You will lose your faith in most NO parishes. I cannot believe they would celebrate pride month inside the parish. It’s not just the Mass, it’s the Faith and everything that goes with it that is disfigured.

SaintBobOfTennessee (11): Western Christians are more interested in the world than salvation, to a large degree, however, western Christianity (true Christianity which is Catholicism) has not changed; and it still has faithful members.The Orthodox have a lot of beautiful tradition, but there are theological errors in Orthodox Christianity, which Eastern rite Catholics have rejected while still retaining non-Latin traditions that are just as ancient and legitimate as the Roman rite.

None (5): If eastern schismatic churches would be interested more about salvation than it would not be separated into Russian one and Ukrainian one. Right?

JackStone2112 (3): The Bishop probably has the same banner hanging in his Cathedral.

None (3): There is no salvation outside the Catholic Church, and that is binding dogma guided by the Holy Spirit. Once you’ve become aware of what the Catholic Church holds to be true and that the Church contains all the means for your soul to be saved, but you reject it, you have damned yourself, and this is keeping in line with both tradition and Vatican 2. I’m sorry you let individual liberal churches and this modern phase our Church is going through right now steal your soul from Christ. Their are Traditional Catholic Churches as well as Eastern Rite Catholic Churches that aren’t riddled with liberalism. They were a mere google search away 🙄

Kind-Philosophy3265 (3): I made my departure tonight. No more NO unless it’s all I can find.

None (2): Exactly! There are so many things lost in the N.O. world. It is like ruins of a castle - there are some elements but the whole picture is much different than the once glorious castle.

None (1): And Romanian, and Bulgarian, and Ethiopian, and dozens of other heretical schismatic “orthodox” sects

mehmehmehwaa (6): SSPX priest advised that I should not take my children even if NO is all I can find.

None (3): I will never go to the NO. If it's all I have, my family and I will stay home, read the missal, and pray. It is not Catholic and it will make you lose your faith.

# Post 715: Behind the Scenes: June 2022 Update — The Immaculata Church Project
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URL: https://www.anewimmaculata.org/blog/2022/6/1-behind-the-scenes-june-2022-update

# Post 716: Study Bible suggestions

Author: None

Score: 3

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/v1evo7/study\_bible\_suggestions/

I was hoping to get some opinions on what the best study Bible is. Many of the suggestions I’ve seen in compiled lists seem to be modernist, and frankly I don’t want to read a study Bible that repeatedly informs me that what I’m reading in the scripture is wrong. Any advice would be much appreciated.

SancteMaria (3): Read the Catena Aurea for sections you're interested in.

None (1): The Douay Rheims has great footnotes

ArbusPrecatorius987 (1): https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=9ULVNNcviao&list=PLMjuJFil0JtRl7KhfbZovgCX8qUwbHCUU&index=4I have found Fr Dave Nix to be an excellent source.

ArbusPrecatorius987 (1): I have found Fr Dave Nix to be an excellent source. [https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=9ULVNNcviao&list=PLMjuJFil0JtRl7KhfbZovgCX8qUwbHCUU&index=4](https://m.youtube.com/watch?v=9ULVNNcviao&list=PLMjuJFil0JtRl7KhfbZovgCX8qUwbHCUU&index=4)

# Post 717: Shocking Agenda of the UN

Author: WillDurant1935
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Comments: 0

URL: https://parkbenchreader.wordpress.com/2022/05/29/shocking-agenda-of-the-un/

# Post 718: What are the best states to live in the US that are close to an SSPX parish??

Author: thussayethqoheleth
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Comments: 13

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/uwj2xx/what\_are\_the\_best\_states\_to\_live\_in\_the\_us\_that/

Edit: chapel not parish. I can literally move anywhere right now. I’d like to move to a community where mass is offered daily if possible.

RoseB2077 (6): Walton, Kentucky! I am a former parishioner of Our Lady of the Assumption chapel and only have good things to say about it! They have three masses on Sunday, daily mass, & frequent confession times. They also have a k-12 school, holy name men's society, women's group, a yearly festival, & more. There are so many amazing people there! Walton is an average small town and there isn't a lot there, but there are bigger surrounding towns like Florence & Independence. Hope this helps!

None (5): [deleted]

Piklikl (4): Arizona and Kentucky are probably your best bets.

boesno (3): I would check out some of the chapels in Minnesota and Wisconsin.Edit: I heard from a good source that Sanford, Florida is the best chapel in the country.

TradResistance (2): Michigan has several as well.

RiskKeepsMeEmployed (2): Post Falls, Idaho is the 2nd largest parish. Moderate amount of jobs, housing is expensive relative to other options. I also recommend Walton, KY and Sanford, Fl. Sanford is probably the most financially advantageous choice, plentiful jobs (right next to Orlando) and relatively cheap housing.

thussayethqoheleth (2): Sounds the same about all the big SSPX chapels!! I hope to move close to one soon!!

Piklikl (3): I wouldn't move to St. Marys unless you either already know people there or you want fight a giant uphill battle of socializing. The new Church, despite being the largest SSPX built church in the world, is still too small to fit the parish inside it; and there will be a lot of growing pains because for the first time in the history of the place, the administration of the parish is going to be separated from the school administration.

thussayethqoheleth (1): Thanks!!

DevonPigeon (1): I know that a very good Priest will be heading to Sanford Florida soon. (And we are certainly going to miss him)

KpopKia (1): I've been to that Church. It's nice. Not too big, not too small. The people are great.

None (1): Also heard jobs are scarce there. I haven’t been to an sspx parish in awhile because the one by me moved an hour away from me, but we had a st Mary’s priest visit and he kind of didn’t have kind things to say about the community during his (very rambling)) sermon

Piklikl (2): The job prospects are fine out there, and I think it isn’t fair to paint the actions of the community as somehow deliberate or intentional. But people do need to realize that there is no heaven on earth, and moving to St Marys isn’t going to somehow solve all their problems. IMO the biggest problem with St Marys is the lack of structure in the parish, and this is largely the result of everyone running in survival mode and the focus being put on the school. Hopefully the new church will represent a new chapter where the community can get some deliberate attention and structure (similar to how other very large Catholic parishes operate).

KpopKia (1): There are many people who attend that parish who would agree with you.

# Post 719: Questions about SSPX mass

Author: Kind-Philosophy3265
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URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/uwe4em/questions\_about\_sspx\_mass/

My wife and I are considering going to a SSPX mass this Sunday. Both of us are rather new to Catholicism and are kind of nervous to attend. Is there any advice y’all could give us. I have a st. Joseph missal, would this work for the mass? Or would I need the 1962 missal? Any tips and advice would be of much help.

ArtannsVoid (4): For your first Latin mass my advice is to not worry about a missal your first time. Just go, pray, and soak it in. I was baptized in 2019 at an SSPX chapel and it took me a very long time follow along with the missal. There’s a particular missal you’ll find a lot of people have and that’s the 1962 Roman Catholic Daily Missal.

Chemistry103 (2): Is this your first TLM?

DavisFreely (2): I agree with the user who said to not worry about a missal your first couple of times. Just soak in the mystery and glory of it all. That's what I did my first few times and I think it's the right move. I've only recently began to use a missal and have been learning how to follow along

RiskKeepsMeEmployed (2): pre 55 ST Joseph Missal will work for about 48/52 Sundays out of the year, if not more. Besides holy week there are a lot less changes than you've been led to believe.I'd be aware of the dress code, and at my parish I feel out of place on Sundays if I am not in a suit or vest. I'd wear slacks and tie at a minimum on Sunday. Wife should be in skirt below the knees covered shoulders at a minimum and a veil.

EugeniusPacelli (2): Don't doubt to ask other veteran churchgoers or the priests for help to follow the Mass or anything which can improve your devotion. They are usually very happy to welcome new members of the community.

Kind-Philosophy3265 (2): We will do just that then. I feel like Sunday we will be home.

Kind-Philosophy3265 (2): Yes, this will be our first TLM.

Kind-Philosophy3265 (1): Noted. We both are the oddballs every Sunday at the NO being dressed up.

Chemistry103 (2): Should be a Sunday Missal in the pew. I would use this to help learn the Mass. Took me a year to learn to follow the 62 Missal. Is your wife open to wearing a mantila.

Chemistry103 (2): What Chapel

Kind-Philosophy3265 (3): Corpus Christi Church in Washington. My wife already wears a mantila at the NO. We just moved back to Washington from Florida and the NO mass we attended here in WA was difficult to sit through. The music sounded like a Simon and Garfunkel concert. I could go on and on about some other things I’ve experienced at masses here in WA. I’m sure once we start attending a TLM, we will find ourselves truly home with Christ.

Chemistry103 (2): Start slow with the Missal. The rest will fall into place.

# Post 720: Question on 6 day creationism
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Comments: 5

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/ursoe1/question\_on\_6\_day\_creationism/

I actually do believe in literal creationism, and am wanting to read a book called I Have Spoken to You from heaven: A Catholic Defense of Creation in Six Days. Apparently it’s written from a Catholic perspective using biblical and magisterial texts as it’s source. However, I’ve heard that even pre-Vatican II popes were “ok” with a symbolic interpretation of the creation story? And open to God’s role in evolution? And dinosaurs? Anyone have any thoughts on these subjects?

Piklikl (9): Creationism is very much a Protestant concept, and there’s very little about a literal interpretation of Genesis to be found in Pre-Vatican II seminary formation books. Fr Paul Robinson, SSPX, covers this all in his excellent book, The Realist Guide to Religion and Science. I highly recommend at least reading through the Q&A section on the book’s website: https://therealistguide.com/q%26a

Pleasant-Industry328 (2): I personally have grown to believe that the 6 day creationism is untrue and that six days to God are similar to billions of years to us considering that heaven lies outside of time and space as well as this happening before the world was fully settled and formed basically not even having a 24 hour cycle yet

nejc135 (1): My priest is very passionate about YEC and geocentrism. He used to preach about it quite often. While it is necessary to point out the obvious errors of atheistic evolution, it is entirely within the bounds of orthodoxy to either embrace or reject evolution.

MargauxMontague (1): I recently heard a quote from a Fr. and he said we can’t have had days before we had the sun 🤷🏻♀️ so the week concept clearly isn’t our human earth concept of a 24 hour day. It’s just like a next level/segment of x amount of time

None (1): Oh wow. I had no idea! The author in this book claims “Pope Pius XII joined all of the Fathers, Doctors, Popes, and Council Fathers in defining that all of the statements in Sacred Scripture intended as historical must be accepted as statements of historical fact.” But I’ve also read that he issued an encyclical to address the issue specifically. I do believe you’re right about Protestants, though. I’ll look into that link. Thank you

# Post 721: Blessing of a new cornerstone of a church in Estonia

Author: None

Score: 14

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/uq3pxi/blessing\_of\_a\_new\_cornerstone\_of\_a\_church\_in/

In april 2022 was blessed a cornerstone of a new church of SSPX in Estonia. This will be the first SSPX church in Estonia, build next to existing chappel. Already SSPX represents around 5 % of catholic mass centres and also 5 % of sunday masses in Estonia. See [https://www.fsspx.ee/blog/2022/05/09/uuele-katoliku-kirikule-tallinnas-asetati-nurgakivi/](https://www.fsspx.ee/blog/2022/05/09/uuele-katoliku-kirikule-tallinnas-asetati-nurgakivi/)[https://fsspx.news/en/news-events/news/sspx-laying-cornerstone-new-church-estonia-73393](https://fsspx.news/en/news-events/news/sspx-laying-cornerstone-new-church-estonia-73393)

# Post 722: Can a NO mass or FSSP mass fulfill Sunday Obligation?

Author: thussayethqoheleth

Score: 5

Comments: 25

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/upn3fj/can\_a\_no\_mass\_or\_fssp\_mass\_fulfill\_sunday/

What if one can’t make it to an SSPX mass because of work or something?

None (3): Find an eastern rite. Maronite for example.

None (7): [removed]

Familiar-Regular5502 (5): Yes

None (2): If the Novus Ordo did not fulfill the Sunday obligation, then that would mean that every bishop in the world has failed to fulfill their Sunday obligation for the past half century. The Novus Ordo is certainly an inferior form of the Mass, but it is a Catholic Mass nonetheless.

None (2): [removed]

None (2): There are great episodes of SSPX podcast about thisShould Catholics Attend Novus Ordo Mass?: [https://youtu.be/sZpbnoyd1zg](https://youtu.be/sZpbnoyd1zg)Can I go to Any Latin Mass I Want?: https://youtu.be/lgCv5Rohu24

None (3): [deleted]

Antoninus\_Ferrer (1): No if one goes off of the old position of the society.

Highwayman90 (1): I know people have mentioned Eastern liturgies, and as someone moving toward Byzantine Catholicism, I have some thoughts here:1. Remember that the slightly different wording of the Creed is a more ancient one and it DOES NOT deny the essential doctrine of the Filioque but rather excludes it from the Creed, which even early Popes supported doing until the Frankish Kings pushed for its inclusion.2. The Divine Liturgy is beautiful; savor it!3. All of this said, I'd recommend that you ensure that certain traditional practices are followed to prevent yourself from being scandalized: 1. Make sure there's an iconostasis (even if it's not much... some Eastern parishes are dirt poor). 2. Make sure the Eucharist is dispensed in the traditional means (by intinction, from a communion chalice with a spoon); I saw something in this comment section about Dixie cups and was quite disappointed. 3. I'd pick Melkite, Ukrainian, or Romanian over Ruthenian if possible; the new Ruthenian liturgical books use gender-neutral language when describing mankind, and while I believe some of their priests may still use the old books, it's rather disappointing. 4. As for non-Byzantine Eastern Churches, know that they tend to be more modernized/Latinized. Syro-Malabar, Chaldean, and Maronite Catholics are especially so. I believe that Syriacs, Syro-Malankaras, and some of the smaller ones (a few Russian parishes and an Italo-Greek parish under other particular Churches' jurisdictions) are probably less latinized or modernized.Anyway, thanks for coming to my Eastern TED Talk ;)

None (1): No, I do not think that a NO mass can fulfill Sunday obligation. The standard position of the SSPX is that the NO is a schismatic rite, and it has long been the teaching of the Church that a Catholic may not attend the mass of a schismatic rite. In recent years, the Popes have softened this position with respect to the Orthodox, and I am not sure what to make of this.Attending an FSSP mass should be fine.

thussayethqoheleth (2): I go to Byzantine rite sometimes but I can’t get over not using the filioque

BertBlyleven (2): Proceed with caution here. Byzantine rite Catholic Churches are generally a lot better, but I've been to a Ruthenian Divine Liturgy where Holy Communion was distributed with dixi cups. And the modern Maronite rite is heavily inspired by the Novus Ordo and I've only seen it versus populum.

Highwayman90 (2): I'd take Bishop Williamson's advice: it is best to remain going to a TLM as a member of the Latin Church, but the Novus Ordo is acceptable. That said, I go pretty much exclusively to the TLM unless I'm traveling and can't find one within a reasonable distance.

None (1): > that would mean that every bishop in the world has failed to fulfill their Sunday obligation for the past half century.Why is that so implausible?>The Novus Ordo is certainly an inferior form of the Mass, but it is a Catholic Mass nonetheless.It is not a "Catholic mass," and the SSPX has always held that it is not a Catholic mass. If the Novus Ordo is a Catholic mass, then there would be no problem with it, except some disagreeable aesthetics. The problem with the Novus Ordo is that it constitutes, in origin and content, a substantial break with the Catholic faith. It was introduced in an illicit way, in order to express an essentially Protestant theology. This is why the SSPX holds that the Novus Ordo is a schismatic rite.

thussayethqoheleth (1): This is helpful! Thanks!!

NtGiL\_29 (1): I'm a little bit less of a hardliner on this issue than the second podcast viewpoint, but I still find these two episodes to be some of the best resources out there about the topic. Especially if you have been in Tradition for a while (not just the Tridentine Mass but the whole culture), sorting the wheat from the chafe in a FSSP/ICKSP/Good Shepherd sermon shouldn't be too strenuous. I live in an area with multiple trad organizations and people bounce between the different parishes with some regularity.

thussayethqoheleth (3): Yeah. I don’t know if I could ever go to NO mass again

thussayethqoheleth (1): There is a new position??

None (7): Keep in mind that they don’t deny the theology of the Filioque, they’re just using an older version of the creed. Still in communion with Holy Mother Church.

BertBlyleven (2): They also don't use the "God from God" portion of the Creed - the addition the Orthodox don't seem to care at all about (strange).

None (2): I agree, but I think the Maronite clergy are not compromised by modernism / heresy

None (2): [removed]

MacduffFifesNo1Thane (4): It's right in the abbreviation. NO.

thussayethqoheleth (2): Oh!!

Highwayman90 (1): I'd agree. I am very fortunate to have three regular Sunday TLMs in my area (two diocesan and one SSPX), so I really have very little reason to attend an NO unless I'm traveling. Even then, we are blessed to have many TLMs across the country, so I often find one.

# Post 723: Music recommendations

Author: None

Score: 5

Comments: 6

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/uoqrd2/music\_recommendations/

Would anyone be so kind as to recommend me some nice music albums? I'm still very new to Tradition and I'm struggling with finding "safe" music to listen to. I'm interesting in everything that can be considered at least "neutral". I'm looking for both traditional and modern sounds, including soundtracks or even electronic music (in case if there is anything safe for Catholics)

cm\_yoder (1): I personally like Cries of the Crusader by Struggle Jennings. Please note that this is a recommendation of that particular song, not of Struggle as a whole.

cm\_yoder (1): Matt Fradd has a Catholic LoFi Channel on youtube

Antun1999 (1): I like Hank Williams Sr. (Jr. is a bit problematic and Hank III. is talented, but lyrics are very bad).

MarcellusFaber (1): The Ex Cathedra YouTube channel, folk music produced by Maddie Prior, the Watersons, Eliza Carthy (though some of this has to be treated with a pinch of salt), John Edmond for Rhodesian music, Jerry Bryant's Roast Beef of Old England album, the 2nd Carolina String Band, the City Waites (my favourite is 'Hey Jolly Broom Man'), and Boccherini, Corelli, Mozart etc. for the Classical stuff. I rather like the Chamber music myself, such as in the 'Musical Evenings with the Captain' albums. Will Walking's YouTube channel also has some good music.

None (1): Any styles of music you are particularly fond of?

None (1): Maybe give Josh Garrels a tryhttps://open.spotify.com/album/3jrVFS6lW7HvxOKN7QPQC8?si=yY0zdAwGReubyTSWjVRCZA

# Post 724: What is the traditional method of forming priests?

Author: thussayethqoheleth

Score: 2

Comments: 8

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/un7co8/what\_is\_the\_traditional\_method\_of\_forming\_priests/

I hear all the time that we have to return to traditional formation. What was it? What are the differences between the old way and the new way?

Piklikl (6): The “old way” typically refers to 8 years or so of formation in the seminary, with minor and major orders conferred. The changes of seminary formation brought on by Vatican II resulted in a much lower quality of priests, pedophiles intentionally becoming priests because of how easy it became, and overall a crisis of priests not really knowing what they were doing. Thankfully it seems as though the quality of priests in the NO are improving, but the SSPX has always had high caliber results because that was Archbishop Lefebrve’s specialty (running seminaries).

None (3): Theologically, the confusion of Vatican II brought about a line of thought that we no longer needed to ground our thought in St. Thomas, but in in the "New Theology" which could include whatever the professor wanted. Thus, biblical professors taught protestant interpretations of scripture. Seminarians were told to not trust St. Thomas. Rahner was prevalent in seminary formation.To be fair, much of this way of training seminarians is fading away in diocesan seminaries. Professors are again turning to Thomas and the fathers, but there is still a long way to go. Right now, Ratzinger and Von Balthasar are in vogue, which are lesser evils, but still do not have the accuracy or consistency of St. Thomas. I predict that in 20 years, Thomas will have his rightful place in seminaries, at least in the U.S. (where I'm from).&#x200B;tl;dr The new method is more vague; Thomas and the old way are clear; diocesan seminaries are slowly returning to Thomas.

None (2): The detail that Mons. Lefev insisted on was sound doctrine and morals on the grounds of seminary. The sana doctrina of doctor angelicus, books of good authors combined with life of prayer was something essential to his vision. Also from the practical point of view Mons. Lefev was shocked to hear, that in other seminaries no one cares for the morals of seminarians, leaving them to leave and enter at every hour of day and night.&#x200B;To sum up, for Mons. Lefev had seminary those pillars: doctrine, order and prayer.

thussayethqoheleth (2): Yeah and as many great seminarians and priests there are, everyone seems to be experimenting constantly when we have the fullness of faith already. Vatican II obfuscated that and that alone is enough to reject Vatican II

thussayethqoheleth (2): Yeah and I was in a seminary where the moral theology professor suggested that fornication could be not sinful yet affirmed Catholic teaching. This stuff boggles my mind. I don’t understand what the point of having a starting point of ambiguity and learning Church teaching along the way when we have the fullness of truth already and just need to learn and meditate on it constantly. Vatican II isn’t even pastoral, it scattered the sheep

thussayethqoheleth (1): Sounds better than any seminary nowadays!

BertBlyleven (3): As it turns out people who want to sin in that matter generally find ways to justify it - modernists just insist on imposing it onto the whole church.

None (2): It is, and it is quite easy. Of course nothing is perfect, but Mons. Lefev has kept high standard.It is not hard to be better than local archdiocese seminary, first of all if professor (priest) of moral theology would not sexually live with other women, than the student might take him seriously. :DOr if the seminarians would not be mixed with female students of theology, that could also help those young men to focus on studies. Right?

# Post 725: What led you guys to SSPX?

Author: thussayethqoheleth

Score: 9

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/ujdpn3/what\_led\_you\_guys\_to\_sspx/

So the past two years I’ve delved deep into the scandals of Vatican II and I’m convinced this is a Satanic attack on the Church.I think part of what will help me understand SSPX is if I hear some peoples stories about how they arrived to SSPX and for those that were raised in it what was that like for you?

None (8): [deleted]

None (3): To make the story short: I was raised like classical Novus Ordo catholic, then I started going from time to time to Traditional mass, but mostly on the Novus Ordo. As the modernism progressed in the parish, everyone stopped kneeling when walking around the tabernacle, but I kept kneeling. Then I had dispute with the local priest, where he insisted that I should only bow and not kneel anymore. In the parish was also stationed one old very old pious priest from good old Slovakia, who also kept kneeling, even though it had caused him immense pain. So I knew that the young priest was just pushing against catholic practice. After having basically the same dispute with local bishop, I decided to go for TLM only since, and I never had to regret.While the NO world is just disassembling itself, tradition keeps growing. SSPX is the only public TLM in the diocese.

EugeniusPacelli (1): In my case, the cue of holliness and courage of some friends who come to our local chapel. I went for first time in September 2020. Previously, I had been attending the ICKSP, where I still frequently go, combining both congregations thanks to their excellence in liturgy and doctrine.

thussayethqoheleth (3): That is amazing! Thanks for sharing!

thussayethqoheleth (3): Honestly this is where I am. After scandal after scandal I’m so done with NO and the post-conciliar practices. I love my faith and I want it’s fullness.

# Post 726: The Cupola Art and its Meanings - Building the Immaculata - Update Video

Author: Piklikl

Score: 11

Comments: 1

URL: https://youtu.be/wYkPzpBPA1c

GYEvanID (2): Call me naughty, but my hands are itching to write the Greek letters over or beside Our Lady's halo (Μρ Θγ), as well as beside the Child Jesus (IC XC) and both His and His Father's halos (Ω ΟΝ). 🙃

# Post 727: Communion in the Hand

Author: WillDurant1935

Score: 2

Comments: 0

URL: https://parkbenchreader.wordpress.com/2022/04/29/communion-in-the-hand/

# Post 728: Is SSPX in communion with Rome?

Author: None

Score: 6

Comments: 7

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/u8x8b8/is\_sspx\_in\_communion\_with\_rome/

Piklikl (12): Yes, the SSPX is in communion with Rome. The SSPX regularly communicates with Rome, prays for the Pontiff and all Ordinaries, and Rome has in recent years made “positive indicators” towards the SSPX such as the reaffirming of the validity of SSPX marriages and confessions. The SSPX does have a tenuous relationship with Rome, but that’s to be expected from the only organized body of priests in the Church that dares to question the pastoral recommendations of Vatican II.

JackStone2112 (7): Let's put the question another way: is post-conciliar Rome in full continuity with Her Tradition? The Society of St. Pius X is.

WillDurant1935 (1): Yes, the SSPX is in communion with Rome, and this is their one weakness. For modernist Rome has such poison to spread by its heresy that we need to resist allowing ourselves to be drawn into their ecumenical dialogue.

None (1): Yesn’t

TradResistance (1): I have a friend who was married in NO, divorced due to abuse, and the NO then annulled the marriage. My friend then went on to re-marry in the church. Are they able to attend the SSPX? They have been reading about the SSPX and understand what and how things happened. They want to join the SSPX but are afraid that due to the divorce and remarriage, they would not be allowed. Does anyone know the answer to this question?

Piklikl (1): hey 2014 called, they want their failed resistance back. The SSPX must always remain in communion with Rome to the best of its ability, otherwise they deny one of the 4 marks of the True Church: Apostolicity. If you're wondering what that would look like, look no further than said failed resistance: they've splintered into a million sedevacantist groups and are no better than protestants who have made a law unto themselves.

johnny63339 (1): The SSPX has a very unofficial marriage tribunal in the United States. Contact their district superior headquarters in Platte City, Missouri.

# Post 729: Video on Christ's Kingdom Come

Author: WillDurant1935

Score: 0

Comments: 0

URL: https://parkbenchreader.wordpress.com/2022/04/19/2615/

# Post 730: Advices on travel to OLOG

Author: None

Score: 3

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/u5j5ge/advices\_on\_travel\_to\_olog/

Hi everyone,I would like to travel to OLOG monastery this sumer, do you have any tips & trics? How do people get there from El Paso or Phoenix airport? I have found only FlixBus to Deming once a day (15 USD). Uber is insanely expensive, as expected - like half of the flight price around globe. I see on the map railway near by, but I have not found any information about any trains there.There is also airfield near Silver City, that costs around 100 USD per flight to Phoenix or Albuquerque. So I might use that...

Piklikl (5): Have you reached out to the monastery and asked? They might be able to pick you up from EP or Silver City.

None (1): Yes, that will probably be the solution. I was just looking for alternatives.

# Post 731: Holy Saturday and Lord of the Rings

Author: WillDurant1935

Score: 0

Comments: 0

URL: https://dwightlongenecker.com/holy-saturday-and-lord-of-the-rings-2/

# Post 732: Listening to "They Have Uncrowned Him" makes me even more grateful for being Catholic now.

Author: holeofthemoon

Score: 4

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/u4kp9w/listening\_to\_they\_have\_uncrowned\_him\_makes\_me/

The Catholic Church always had intelligent men who could accurately see realities of the world to protect Her children from the wolves who seek to devour our souls. And just like we had Pope Leo XIII and Pope St. Pius X to warn us about the dangers of freemasonry and modernism, we also have Abp. Lefebvre to guide us in a time where the Body of the Catholic Church seems almost dead. The contrast between his words and the lukewarmness of the current Church men makes me see how beautiful is it to be a true Catholic in these times.Bless the SSPX for providing such this gem for everyone to listen.Blessed be Abp. Lefebvre!

# Post 733: Question of near occasion of sin

Author: Rude-Farm9639

Score: 1

Comments: 3

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/u44f9t/question\_of\_near\_occasion\_of\_sin/

So I don’t have problems with pornographyI don’t watch series nor read books of impurity, I don’t follow bikini models or girls who constantly or on a regular basis post “suggestive” content on social media I prepared for my confession and I didn’t have much time I had to leave for the actual confession(I’ve already written down my sins and prepared) but then I thought I might have near occasion of sin on instagram and I was in a hurry and I unfollowed like 10 people for example even accquaintances who might not post or rarely anything but because I’ve realized they have a bikini photo on their feed from months ago I unfollowed them Maybe I should have unfollowed also other girls who usually post content related to travelling language learning, or other topics but occasionally they post a story in a not completely modest clothing?Also before entering the church I wrote down some small prayers into my notes on my phone like an act of contrition, an act of hope and a prayer to Jesus that He may help me avoid occasions of sin and also that I will be working on itDid I have the first purpose of amendement?Are these near occasions?

Antun1999 (2): These are not near occassions in themselves, so if you are not likely to be tempted by it, I wouldn't say you have to unfollow the person with language learning posts. But please understand that reddit is not safe place to ask these questions. SSPX has great priests and You can trust them. You have serious issues with scrupulosity and priestly guidence is necessary.This work by Fr Doyle might also help:https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&url=https://fatherdoyle.files.wordpress.com/2010/06/scruples-and-their-treatment.pdf&ved=2ahUKEwig3vPF95X3AhWwwQIHHZmYC8sQFnoECAMQAQ&usg=AOvVaw2c62qIuS5Jln4Eu47SAQDc

Sleepy\_Man90 (2): As the other person said, near occasions of sin themselves aren't inherently bad, it's whether or not you fall to that temptation and allow it to happen that makes it a sin.In this day and age it's almost impossible not to see things like women in swimwear underwear, adverts on the TV, music videos, even adverts on youthe etc etc, temptation is everywhere now. So you just have to not linger on any images or thoughts that you may come across, and if you're in any doubt then confess it anyway.

None (1): If we are talking about instagram, I do not see any reason to use it, other than waste of time. Internet is addictive like alcohol or smoking, especially the social networks...

# Post 734: Was my Easter confession valid?

Author: Rude-Farm9639

Score: 3

Comments: 4

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/u3fxe7/was\_my\_easter\_confession\_valid/

I have a question today I went to confess and did a kind of general confessionI think I was well-preparedI confessed all kinds of sins from my past, from years ago because I felt like I wasnt specific enough with the kind and number of serious sinsSo today I went to church and saw there are two priests hearing confessions both of them I have confessed to and both of them were oldOne of them I knew he would make some special comments on different types my sins and once he gave me a harder penamceThe other one seemed to be older and when I confessed to him earlier last year he just made some general statement that my sins will be forgiven and gave a penance but he seemed to be meek but also really old and seems to be a bit “disconnected” (last year and earlier this year I also had gone to him to confess) and I went to him today to confessHe seemed to be a bit disconnected, the only comment from him on my sins was they will be forgiven. also I was having hard time to say well formed sentences although I was reading out my sins from a paper, some of them I have read out even 2-3x so I was making sure I confessed them properly (peobably my OCD and scrupulousity also played a role here) even after the absolution other sins came to my mind so I asked for another act of contrition and another absolutionBut now I’m afraid mabye my confession is invalid because have a pamphlet about confession and there are listed some reasons why a confession can be invalid. One of them was that if someone intentionally goes to a confessor who will listen to him in hurry or goes to confess to a priest who has hearing problems so that this priest won’t understand his sins-the confession will be invalidAnd I have read this part and I have known about this for some years alreadyAnd now I’m afraid mabye this could be why I chose the older priest today so my confession from today might be invalid?

None (5): I think you need to bring this to a priest. I personally don't think your confession was invalid because you were actually trying to confess everything, weren't holding anything back, repeated some things several times to make sure you were heard, and truly want to please God. I don't think choosing the older priest was an issue.Im a layperson, just like you, and any other advice on this is not going to be what you need because you are going to try to reason your way into the confession being invalid and will probably go back to confession. If you're scrupulous and have OCD you need a regular confessor who knows about this issue that you can confess to so that your mind will be at ease and he can give you appropriate advice and penances that will help you overcome this. I'm saying this with charity; you really need some help. You're torturing yourself. Talk to your priest and let him know about this and he will be more than happy to help you.EDIT I checked your post history. You need a regular confessor and therapy. Seek out a Cognitave Behavioral Therapist (I see a Catholic one for my ADHD) and he will help you develop real strategies for overcoming these issues (this is different than talk therapy because CBT utilizes the whole body). Your brain is literally addicted to thinking these thoughts and your priest and therapist will help you break this cycle. You don't have to live like this. Peace.

SaintBobOfTennessee (4): The priest does not have to understand every word you say for it to be valid. All he has to hear is that you are confessing your sins, and that you say an act of contrition. If you desired to confess all mortal sins and made a reasonable effort to do so, your confession is valid. Scrupulosity is a spiritual disease promoted by the devil. He wants you to agonize over whether you confessed properly or whether some sin might be mortal or not.

None (3): Do you know what saint Joanne from Arc said, when they asked her, if she is in the state of grace? You should meditate her reply.Your comment seems scrupulous. There are always old priests and church never asked them to test if they hear well enough. It seems more probable to me that this was minor sin, next time go to the other priest, so your conscience would be clear. E. g. at the end of easter octave.To make a mortal sin is harder than scrupulous souls think and is easier than think the lax ones.To make it a grave sin, the choose of the confessor must be more than average significant. For example the bad priest would "give" you absolution even if he would know, you do not want to change your sinful life - e. g. manager of abortion house. That would be a grave sin, because he would not normally receive the absolution from other priest.You can look at your case and ask, if the other priest would probably refuse to gave you a confession or not. Do not invent anything special, just look on what is the most probable.

Rude-Farm9639 (1): Thank you, I appreciate all answers!

# Post 735: New OLOG newsletter for spring 2022 with many nice pics

Author: None

Score: 3

Comments: 0

URL: https://www.ourladyofguadalupemonastery.com/news-letters

# Post 736: Video on Christ's Kingdom Come

Author: WillDurant1935

Score: 1

Comments: 0

URL: https://parkbenchreader.wordpress.com/2022/04/11/2590/

# Post 737: The Dark Knight: Transubstantiation & Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus

Author: WillDurant1935

Score: 1

Comments: 0

URL: https://parkbenchreader.wordpress.com/2021/12/19/dark-knight-of-the-soul/

# Post 738: SSPX: Conciliar Catechism is “teaching of the Church”

Author: WillDurant1935

Score: 2

Comments: 4

URL: https://akacatholic.com/sspx-conciliar-catechism-is-teaching-of-the-church/#respond

WillDurant1935 (3): The SSPX seems a little inconsistent when they recently condemned the teachings of Vatican II, and now approve of a Catechism filled with errors from the documents ofVatican II.

None (5): [deleted]

RedditIsReallyRigged (1): So scary that the sspx seems to have sold out

RemarkablePie (2): akacatholic is also sedevacantist, which is an agenda contrary to sspx

RedditIsReallyRigged (1): What did they actually say? Is it the Truth?

# Post 739: Entering diocesan churches

Author: Scania4075

Score: 2

Comments: 2

URL: https://www.reddit.com/r/sspx/comments/tyw4lm/entering\_diocesan\_churches/

This is something that has weighed a lot on my mind recently. I’ve read many different articles online and seen YouTube videos etc about the Eucharist and communion in the hand dropping pieces all over the floor and all around a church. I’ve also read opinions debating about the size of a fragment or particle and when the real presence ends. Is this a reason to never enter into a diocesan church or anywhere that has communion in the hand? The idea of stepping on our Lord due to the carelessness of others is distressing.

JackStone2112 (2): The fact that Catholics are still receiving in the hand is distressing. When will the trials end! This problem is absolutely part of the crisis of the Church and needs to be addressed. We should keep in mind where our arguments, even valid ones, take us. Not to enter a Catholic Church on the basis that there may be errant species- lost particles- may be a valid concern, but it leads to counter-productive acts and arguments. After all, there may be errant species at a chapel where the TLM is said. I think about the children’s story \*Outlaws of Ravenhurst\* where the stain of the spilled Precious Blood is still evident on the Chapel floor- a dramatic consequence of unintended spillage. Catholics- even some NO Catholics despite the statistics to the contrary- still believe in the Real Presence and would agree that dropping the Eucharist is an unintentionally sacrilegious accident. Those good Catholics might on that basis be open to an argument that Our Lord should be safely received on the tongue. But how would I tell them that, or encourage proper reception, if I refuse to even step inside a \*Catholic Church\*? I would seem to be erecting a steep wall that really is not necessary. But I understand the motivation, and depth of concern for Our Lord. -JMJ-

None (1): I have never heard about anyone thinking that way. I can understand it, but from big picture it does not seem fitting to reality.1) In every church there was always a chance, that you might step on our Lord, but people were going into them. So they did not seen it as problematic. Even in TLM can accidentally be dropped eucharist on the ground, it is less likely, but accidents do happen. There is greater good of you praying in the temple than the risk that there might be some particle. 2) The problem of modern churches is mostly their interior and what happens inside them. If there are some new statues, images etc, they are usually ugly or of low quality. Random pieces of junk or kids art are placed on random places. In 90 % there is the Calvin's table. Often images of people that should have never been canonised - like JPII.