

Adventures in Blogland

R. Sungenis: Just for posterity's sake, I recently took a gander at some of the Blog spots of the NeoCons and Catholic Zionists. You know, the usual suspects: Mark Shea, Jacob Michael, Michael Forrest, Ben Yackov, Sandra Miesel and a few other such ideologues. I get a good chuckle at all the hand-wringing that occurs whenever CAI puts up something negative about the Zionist agenda. The Henny Penny's in Blog World are so fearful of bad news. In the proportion to the material I post is what I can expect of their gnashing of teeth and foaming at the mouth at me. Mark Shea is especially reactive. Below are some of the items that should make you chuckle, too.

By the way, we have some late-breaking news: Mark Shea has been officially endorsed by the Catholic NeoCon and Zionist publication known as *First Things*. If you didn't get a chance to read my article *Politics, Religion, Israel and the Seduction of the Catholic Voter*, the magazine *First Things* was started and is heavily endowed by NeoCon and Zionists. As I wrote in the article:

From confidential sources, it is now known that Norman Podhoretz, his wife Midge Decter, and other wealthy Jewish Zionists, financed the start of *First Things* and saw in Richard Neuhaus the premier "ecumenist" to head the magazine. Various Jewish Zionist writers are employed on the staff of *First Things* to see that the agenda of the financial backers is carried out.

My educated guess is that Mark Shea is also being funneled money from these or similar NeoCon and Zionist groups.

I took a stroll over to the "SungenisandtheJews" blog. I guess someone over there forgot to click all the buttons before they tried to blow the whistle on me. Check this out.

Friday, April 20, 2007

Catholic Culture Assesses Sungenis Website

Catholic Culture (formerly Petersnet) has the following relevant comments to offer about Robert Sungenis and Catholic Apologetics International:

Weaknesses:

- A tendency to rush to judgement and condemn others.
(Fidelity) (Examples)

- Some material is blatantly anti-semitic. (Fidelity)
(Examples)

Sungenis has elected to go beyond legitimate arguments about why the conversion of the Jews is a theologically legitimate objective. Instead, Sungenis has chosen to recycle the worst slurs and slanders in the anti-Semitic repertoire. (End Quote from Catholic Culture)

Posted by RSATJ at 5:54 PM Get the Discussion Going |
Trackback

R. Sungenis: Poor RSATJ (whoever that is). Notice how this busybody says he now wants to “Get the Discussion Going,” which is Blog euphemism for “Let’s start gossiping about this person so we can tear them to shreds.” It wouldn’t be so bad except when one clicks on the button at PetersNet for CAI, you get Jacob Michael as being one of the persons with whom PetersNet is against. Here’s what’s on the Petersnet’s reference about CAI:

- [Constant criticism of the New Mass which promotes a disrespect for papal authority over the liturgy.](#) (Fidelity)

[Example\(s\)](#)

Now if you click on the PetersNet link, what you’ll find is that it takes you to an article written by Jacob Michael when he worked at CAI. Here it is:

Further Information in Support of Example:

[“Constant criticism of the New Mass which promotes a disrespect for papal authority over the liturgy.”](#)

Here are a few examples we have found on the site at different times:

- The description of *The New Mass: Inalienable Right or Inferior Rite?*, by Jacob Michael states,

Jacob Michael analyzes the changes of the New Mass, and explains how the New Mass is *objectively inferior* to other approved, legitimate rites.[*emphasis added*]

R. Sungenis: PetersNet has this on their site because it is from when Jacob Michael worked for me at CAI, which is close to three years ago I believe. But Jacob Michael now works for the “Sungenis and the Jews” blogspot. So, imagine that. The very site J. Michael cites in order to condemn me, is the very site that condemns him!

In fact, previous to Ben Douglass' departure from CAI, he told me that we should expose Jacob Michael by mentioning the fact that Mr. Michael put on his website that the Novus Ordo Mass was satanic or had satanic origins. But, of course, now that Mr. Douglass is a compatriot of Mr. Michael, those kinds of tit-for-tats go unmentioned, I'm sure. The fact remains, however, that PetersNet would condemn Jacob Michael and his stand on the Novus Ordo, but PetersNet would agree with my stand. So much for PetersNet and Mr. Michael.

Here's another item on the blogspot:

Thursday, April 19, 2007

Additionally, Ben Douglass has recently divulged the following information:

"At the second conference of Catholics Defending Biblical Inerrancy, one of Sungenis' speeches consisted essentially in him reading, without attribution, Damien Mackey's article 'The Toledoths of Genesis.' This speech was recorded on DVD. So, I recently asked Sungenis a few times whether he had ever sold this DVD for profit. Lo and behold, he refused to give a straight answer to my simple yes or no question." Article

R. Sungenis: Poor Mr. Douglass. He's been so brainwashed and pressured by these Jewish ideologues that he doesn't hesitate to wash me down the tubes in a second to make himself look good. It's really sad to see Ben resort to such calumny to give himself a boost in the eyes of his newfound peers.

The even sadder thing about this accusation is that I explained it to Mr. Douglass three times in three separate emails, but leave it to him to leave that vital information out of the equation.

Here are the facts. The reason Damien Mackey wasn't cited is that Damien Mackey was neither the first nor the only one who has taught the "Toledoths of Genesis" concept. I learned that theory 25 years ago in a Protestant seminary. Mr. Mackey took it from the Protestants and without attribution, so I had no reason to mention Mackey's rendition of the theory. Mr. Mackey will not be cited as the source simply because he is not the originator of it! I told this to Mr. Douglass, but he ignores it, and instead, he chooses to make me look like a plagiarist and exonerate Mr. Mackey! As you can see, Mr. Douglass can't be trusted. He is too overcome with a vendetta by his uncontrolled emotions.

Here's more from the blogspot:

Sungenis has recently complained that “There was one instance, five years ago, in which I copied and pasted material for an article I wrote. I rearranged the wording so that I did not quote directly from the source, but Mr. Cork (who admits his family is Jewish) accused me of plagiarism”, and “This was a private article which I had no intentions of publishing on the open market. Had I plans to publish it on the open market, every statement would have been properly footnoted and with a bibliography, as is the case with every book I have ever written.” (Sungenis, Jacob Michael: Still Confused and Calumniating, p. 6) But as we can see, there are at least four verifiable examples of plagiarism, at least three of which are still being sold “on the open market” at CAI’s web site today - Bob charges \$18 for this three-tape set, in which he plagiarizes Fahey, Dilling, and Mohr. Of course, this is to say nothing of the book reviews and News Alerts taken from other sources that so regularly appear without any attribution at CAI. Bottom line: according to accepted definitions of the word, Bob Sungenis has plagiarized numerous times over the past five years.

R. Sungenis: Here we go again – trying to make me into a plagiarist. It makes good press for them, I guess. Here are the facts: If there is information that is unique to one author which he did not get from other sources, then I make it my duty to footnote him. But if the material has already been circulated and was quoted again by some other author or authors, there is no obligation for me to footnote the authors who copy the original source, because it is already in the public domain and has been used and reused by many people.

So the Blogspot gossip-mongers can stick their charges up their noses. They are obsessed with pinning some crime on me because their intention is to discredit me for their own Zionist agenda that I keep upsetting. The fact is, my published books and articles are meticulously footnoted and no one has ever charged me with plagiarizing their material. It is only the Jewish racists and Israel-first ideologues at these particular Blogs that create such lies.

Here’s more from the blogspot:

Monday, April 16, 2007
The Ginsberg “Quote”

To make matters worse, Jews often, secretly or not so secretly, conceive themselves to be morally and intellectually superior to their neighbors...Indeed, Jews are extremely successful outsiders who sometimes have the temerity to rub it in (The Fatal Embrace, p. ix, as cited in Piper’s The New Jerusalem). (Sungenis, Neo-Cons and the Jewish Connection, September, 2005, source)

To make matters worse, Jews often, secretly or not so secretly, conceive themselves to be morally and intellectually superior to their neighbors...Indeed, Jews are extremely successful outsiders who sometimes have the temerity to rub it in (The Fatal Embrace, p. ix, as cited in Piper's The New Jerusalem). (Sungenis, Politics, Religion, Israel and the Seduction of the Catholic Voter, p. 38, source)

Speaking of quotes falsely attributed to men named Benjamin, the quote from Benjamin Ginsberg might be fraudulent as well. I haven't read the whole book The Fatal Embrace, so the quote might be in there somewhere. But it certainly is not on p. ix. I told Bob this a long time ago, when I did all the digging to give him the primary sources he needed for his essays, thus obviating his reliance on Hoffman, Piper, et al. He agreed to remove the quote, and it no longer appears in the updated version of his essay:

<http://www.catholicintl.com/noncatholicissues/JNC.pdf>

Though apparently he left it in another version:
<http://www.catholicintl.com/epologetics/articles/pastoral/priscv.pdf>
(see p. 38)

And it would appear that he is back to his old tricks again. (Ben Douglass, comment left on Sungenis's Views on Display at Republic Broadcasting Network)

Here is page ix of Ginsberg's book. The reader is invited to attempt to locate the quote anywhere on this page.

When the reader has given up on this hopeless task, he is invited to read this excerpt from pages seven and eight of Ginsberg's book. The portion Bob quoted is in bold, while the rather enlightening contextual bits he left out are in bold red.

Certainly, everywhere that Jews have lived, their social or economic marginality - their position, "outside society," as Hannah Arendt put it - sooner or later exposed Jews to suspicion, hostility, and discrimination. Even in multiethnic societies, Jews have usually been the most successful and visible - and, hence, the most exposed - outsiders. In America, Jews currently appear to be accepted by the larger community. Nevertheless, at least in part by their own choosing, American Jews continue to maintain a significant and visible measure of communal identity and distinctiveness in religious, cultural, and political matters. At the

same time, most gentiles continue to perceive Jews to be a peculiar and distinctive group. Though Jews have learned to look, talk, and dress like other Americans, they are not fully assimilated either in their own minds or in the eyes of their neighbors. Even in America, the marginality of the Jews makes them at least potentially vulnerable to attack.

In America as elsewhere, moreover, Jews are outsiders who are often more successful than their hosts. Because of their historic and, in part, religiously grounded emphasis on education and literacy, when given an opportunity Jews have tended to prosper. And, to make matters worse, Jews often, secretly or not so secretly, conceive themselves to be morally and intellectually superior to their neighbors. Jews, to be sure, by no means have a monopoly on group or national snobbery. In contemporary America every group is encouraged to take pride in its special heritage and achievements. The problem is that Jews as a group are more successful than virtually all the others. Indeed, Jews are extremely successful outsiders who sometimes have the temerity to rub it in. As one outraged right-wing columnist noted recently, a Yiddish synonym for dullard or dope is “goyischer kopf,” that is, someone who thinks like a non-Jew.

The question with which this book is concerned, however, is not so much the roots of anti-Jewish sentiment as the conditions under which such sentiment is likely to be politically mobilized. As we shall see, where an anti-Semitic politics becomes important, usually more is involved than simple malice toward the Jews. In politics, principles - even as unprincipled a principle as anti-Semitism - are seldom completely divorced from some set of political interests. In the case of anti-Semitism, major organized campaigns against the Jews usually reflect not only ethnic hatred, they also represent efforts by the political opponents of regimes or movements with which Jews are allied to destroy or supplant them. Anti-Semitism has an instrumental as well as an emotive character. Thus, to understand the cycle of Jewish success and anti-Semitic attack - and to understand why the United States is not exceptional - it is necessary to consider the place of Jews in politics particularly, as Hannah Arendt noted long ago, their peculiar relationship to the state. (Benjamin Ginsberg, *The Fatal Embrace* [Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1993], pp. 7-8)

And so yet again, Bob is caught quoting secondary sources as though they were primary sources, giving bad reference information, and leaving out rather important contextual statements

- and all of this, even after he was informed by Ben Douglass back in 2006 that his source information was incorrect.

R. Sungenis: Oh, so the big crime is that I said that both quotes were on “page ix” when only the major quote was on “page ix” and the smaller quote was on “page 8.” Then these idiots wonder why I don’t take them seriously! Instead of listening to Ginsburg’s warning about what Jews do that incite people to anti-semitism, Mr. Douglass and crew would rather concentrate on the fact that I copied down the wrong page number in my quote!

I think this explains it all, ladies and gentlemen. Nevermind what the Jewish author Ginsburg says about his own Jewish people. Let’s just tar and feather Sungenis and no one will listen to Ginsburg. Yes, I hope you’re seeing how the game is played

Here’s more from the Blogspot:

But what did Mark Wyatt say, once upon a time, when Bob was caught using a bogus quote in his *Galileo Was Wrong* manuscript?

Seeing that the quote appeared not accurate, I asked Robert about it, and upon investigation he admits that in fact the quote is incorrect. He has checked out practically every quote in the book for accuracy, unfortunately, that one he did not. He says he has purchased thousands of dollars worth of books and articles during the research phase, and carefully checked (and in some cases rejected / corrected) the quotes. The person who made the advertisement also liked the quote, so he used it in the ad.

He personally thanks you, since in fact he has not sent out the first CD’s yet, and will expunge the quote (or correct it as makes sense) from both the ad and the book. He is a stickler for literary accuracy, and in fact it is a good thing you pointed this out. (Mark Wyatt, in defense of Bob Sungenis, source)

A “stickler for literary accuracy”? That statement is, at this point, just plain laughable.

R. Sungenis: What is “laughable” is that, several months ago, after he made a bogus accusation about a quote in my book concerning the University of Florida, Mr. Michael was challenged to find any other quotes in *Galileo Was Wrong* that were inaccurate. He hasn’t found any yet, and there are over 1600 quotes and footnotes from which he can prove his case. Until he does, he is a slanderer, which is par for the course for Mr. Michael.

More from the Blogspot:

And so, we turn again, with a new perspective, to Bob's claims about his own research:

The Jews are the best sources of information to talk about the Jews, it's amazing. That's what I found in doing my research. (Sungenis, on the radio program Mark Dankhof's America, February 23, 2007)

No, that is not what Bob has found in his research, because he hasn't done the primary research that would lead him to actually read the works of Jewish authors. What he meant to say above is that other anti-Jewish authors who quote Jews out of context are "the best sources of information to talk about the Jews." That is what he has "found" in doing his "research."

Posted by RSATJ at 10:07 PM Join the Fray! (6) | Trackback

R. Sungenis: Actually, it was Ben Douglass above who admitted that he hadn't read Ginsburg's book. He wrote:

Speaking of quotes falsely attributed to men named Benjamin, the quote from Benjamin Ginsberg might be fraudulent as well. I haven't read the whole book The Fatal Embrace, so the quote might be in there somewhere.

R. Sungenis: Check this laugh out about National Vanguard:

Sungenis Source Shut Down By Commonwealth of Virginia
National Vanguard Website

National Vanguard

We regret to inform you that National Vanguard (the organization) has been shut down by the Commonwealth of Virginia.

We thank you for your loyal patronage over the years and hope our hard work has kept you informed and entertained while making a positive difference for our people.

+++++

National Vanguard is an organization previously used by Robert Sungenis as a source of information about Jews. Only after sustained public pressure, an article published by Matthew Anger and heavy criticism from his own VP (Ben Douglass) did Sungenis

eventually (and quietly) remove the material after writing that he didn't care whether NV was a racist organization or not.

To date, the most critical thing Sungenis has said about National Vanguard is that it is considered by some to be extreme. (Page 10, MFATJ)

As of this date, Sungenis has a link to a video (The World As Seen Through Jewish Eyes) that includes a segment on National Vanguard.

R. Sungenis: This just shows how desperate these Zionist ideologues are. The video "The World As Seen Through Jewish Eyes" is a film made by a Jewish producer that shows how the Jew is trying to defend himself against false charges. I put the video on our site purposefully to show the Jewish side of the story!! Leave it to these idiots to say that I want to quote from National Vanguard simply because a Jewish producer included National Vanguard as one source that registers false charges! Yes, ladies and gentlemen, you can see the game that is being played. The smear campaign is in high gear. Here's more from their blog:

Here is a statement of purpose made by National Vanguard:

"We can have a clean, orderly, progressive, safe, and incomparably richer and more beautiful nation if it becomes a proud White nation again. To do that we must begin by restoring White community and White racial consciousness among our people. We at National Vanguard are doing that by building world-beating new media for Whites and by getting out on the street and meeting our neighbors and showing them what we're all about. We're going to help our people. We're going to educate our people. We're going to come up with creative ways to awaken our people. We're going to create publications that will be like nothing ever seen before in the cause of White awakening. We're going to do what it takes."

Posted by RSATJ at 9:56 PM Join the Fray! (31)| Trackback

R. Sungenis: I have stated repeatedly that I did not know the philosophy of National Vanguard up until Ben Douglass did the research and verified it for CAI when he worked here. When Mr. Douglass alerted me to National Vanguard's white supremacy, I told our webmaster to take off their material from our website, and it was only one or two items, if I remember correctly. That is all there is to it. But leave it to the gossip-mongering racists to make it sound as if I endorse National Vanguard!

Michael Forrest did something very similar recently. A few months ago I had made a quote about Michael Hoffman (Jewish critic) stating that, at this point, after I have experienced all the lies, distortions and exaggerations of Michael Forrest for the last two

years, I would trust Michael Hoffman a lot more than I trust Michael Forrest, even though I admitted Mr. Hoffman has his own faults.

What did Mr. Forrest do with that opinion? He referenced me on his Blog and then he quoted about ten pages from Mr. Hoffman's website! Of course, his intention was to imply to his audience that I supported Hoffman's views, and this despite that fact that I have distanced myself from Mr. Hoffman and don't have any of his material on my website! My point was only to show how distrustful Mr. Forrest has been to me. Lo and behold, Mr. Forrest proved my point once again by his present underhanded juxtaposition of my name and Mr. Hoffman's ten pages of material. Obviously, Mr. Forrest is a conniving slanderer, just like Jacob Michael and Benjamin Douglass.

Here's more on the Blogspot:

[Bob] continues to evidence a propensity to uncritically seek out and accept unsavory, dubious and/or negatively biased information in regard to Jews and has drawn others with similar proclivities to his website. (emphasis added)

R. Sungenis: Sorry, I am merely doing the same thing Jesus did when he confronted the sins of the Jews. If my Catholic brethren are going to call me an anti-semite for pointing out the sins and godlessness of the Jews, then they might as well call Jesus one, too. In fact, what Jesus said about the Jews was much worse than what I've said. Unfortunately, the Jews haven't changed in our day. They are still the same godless racists they were in Jesus' day. Few of them have repented of their sins.

Jesus Charges against the Jews:

1. Adversaries to all men: 1 Thessalonians 2:14-15
2. Agents of the devil: John 8:44
3. Blind: Matthew 23:26
4. Blind guides: Matthew 23:16; 23:17; 23:19; 23:24
5. Children of Hell: Matthew 23:15
6. Children of the devil: John 8:44
7. Crucifiers: Matthew 23:34
8. Defectors: Matthew 15:6; Mark 7:9, 13; John 5:45, 46, 47
9. Deicide: I Thessalonians 2:14-15

10. Dogs: Matthew 7:6; Apocalypse 22:16
11. Foolish: Matthew 23:17
12. Full of dead men's bones: Matthew 23:27
13. Hypocrites: Matthew 23:13-15, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29
14. Idolators: Apocalypse 22:16
15. Iniquitous: Matthew 23:28
16. Killers of the just: Matthew 23:35
17. Killers of the prophets: Matthew 23:37; I Thessalonians 2:14-15
18. Liars: John 8:44, 55; Apocalypse 22:16
19. Murderer(s): Matthew 23:31; Apocalypse 22:16
20. Offspring of vipers: Luke 3:7;
21. Serpents: Matthew 23:33
22. Sorcerers: Apocalypse 22:16
23. Swine: Matthew 7:6
24. Synagogue of Satan: Apocalypse 2:9; 3:9
25. Unchaste: Apocalypse 22:16
26. Unclean: Matthew 23:25
27. Vipers: Matthew 3:7; 12:34; 23:33
28. Whited sepulchers: Matthew 23:27

Jesus' Judgment Against Them:

1. "axe laid to the root": Matthew 3:10
2. "cast into the fire": Matthew 3:10; 7:19; Luke 3:9
3. "condemned": Mark 16:16

4. “cut down”: Matthew 3:10
5. “In vain do they worship me”: Matthew 15:9; Mark 7:7
6. “judgment of Hell”: Matthew 23:33
7. “Woe”: Matthew 23:13-16; Matthew 23:23-27; Luke 11:42-52
8. “wrath”: Matthew 3:7; Luke 3:7; 21:23
9. “you do not enter the kingdom of Heaven”: Matthew 23:13

(all quotes courtesy of Dr. Edgar Suter)

R. Sungenis: The Fathers of the Church had the same things to say about the Jews as Jesus did. In fact, so did the popes and councils of the Catholic Church! Why doesn't Mr. Michael, Mr. Forrest or Mr. Douglass call them “anti-semites”? Most of these Fathers are the same ones that Mr. Michael quotes to support his idea that there will be a mass conversion of Jews at the end of time. The duplicity is readily apparent.

Courtesy of Wikipedia, here we have a list of the Fathers' and Popes' views on the Jews. Note well: They were in consensus about these views.

Wikipedia: The following statements have been used to justify persecution of Jews. Many of the following people were recognized as saints by the Church; none of them advocated physical violence or murder, sometimes arguing, like Augustine, that the Jews should be left alive and suffering as a perpetual reminder of their murder of Christ.

Eusebius of Caesarea, in 325, blames the calamities which befell the Jewish nation on the Jews' role in the death of Jesus: “that from that time seditions and wars and mischievous plots followed each other in quick succession, and never ceased in the city and in all Judea until finally the siege of Vespasian overwhelmed them. Thus the divine vengeance overtook the Jews for the crimes which they dared to commit against Christ.”[2]

Saint Ambrose, Bishop of Milan (340-397) - A bishop was accused of instigating the burning of a synagogue by an anti-Semitic mob, and Emperor Theodosius was preparing to order the bishop to rebuild it. Ambrose discouraged the Emperor from taking this step because it would appear to show special favoritism to the Jews: (1) no action was taken against those responsible for burning the houses of various wealthy individuals in Rome; (2) no action was taken against those responsible for the recent burning of the house of the Bishop of Constantinople; (3) Jews had caused several Christian basilicas to be burnt during the reign of Julian, yet had never been asked to make reparation, and some of those basilicas were still not rebuilt. Ambrose asked that Christian monies not be used to build a place of worship for unbelievers, heretics or Jews, and reminded Ambrose that

some Christian laity had said of Emperor Maximus, “he has become a Jew” because of the edict Maximus issued regarding the burning of a Roman synagogue. Ambrose did not oppose punishing those directly responsible for burning the synagogue. He halted the celebration of the Eucharist until Theodosius agreed to end the investigation without requiring reparations to be made by the bishop.[3]

Augustine of Hippo in Book 18, Chapter 46, of *The City of God* wrote “The Jews who slew Him [Jesus], and would not believe in Him, because it behoved Him to die and rise again, were yet more miserably wasted by the Romans, and utterly rooted out from their kingdom, where aliens had already ruled over them, and were dispersed through the lands (so that indeed there is no place where they are not), and are thus by their own Scriptures a testimony to us that we have not forged the prophecies about Christ.”[4]

Augustine deems the survival and the scattering of the Jews as willed by God for them to give testimony everywhere that the prophecies that Christians interpret as proving that Jesus is the Messiah are no Christian invention, being preserved also by what he calls the Church’s enemies, the Jews. Thus, he says, the survival and scattering of the Jews fulfils the prophecy: “My God hath shown me concerning mine enemies, that Thou shalt not slay them, lest they should at last forget Thy law: disperse them in Thy might.”

Ephraim the Syrian wrote polemics against Jews in the fourth century, including the repeated accusation that Satan dwells among them as a partner. These writings were directed at Christians who were being proselytized by Jews and who Ephraim feared were slipping back into the religion of Judaism; thus he portrayed the Jews as enemies of Christianity, like Satan, to emphasize the contrast between the two religions, namely, that Christianity was Godly and true and Judaism was Satanic and false.

Like **John Chrysostom**, his objective was to dissuade Christians from reverting to Judaism by emphasizing what he saw as the wickedness of the Jews and their religion.[5][6]

In his *Dialog of Justin, Philosopher and Martyr, with Trypho, a Jew*, the Christian scholar **Justin Martyr** advanced arguments for the truth of Christianity and wrote to his imaginary Jewish opponent: “You think that these words refer to the stranger and the proselytes, but in fact they refer to us who have been illumined by Jesus. For Christ would have borne witness even to them; but now you are become twofold more the children of Hell, as He said Himself.”[7]

Saint Jerome (374-419) - He denounced Jews as “Judaic serpents of whom Judas was the model”. In his *The Jews in the Roman Empire (Les Juifs dan L’Empire Romain)* [Is this really a work by Jerome, or a modern history?] he wrote: “The Jews seek nothing but to have children, possess riches and be healthy. They seek all earthly things, but think nothing of heavenly things; for this reason they are mercenaries.”

Saint John Chrysostom (c. 344 - 407) - wrote of the Jews and of Judaizers in eight homilies *Adversus Judaeos, Against The Jews (or Against the Judaizers)*. [8]

“Shall I tell you of their plundering, their covetousness, their abandonment of the poor, their thefts, their cheating in trade? the whole day long will not be enough to give you an account of these things. But do their festivals have something solemn and great about them? They have shown that these, too, are impure.” (Homily I, VII, 1)

“But before I draw up my battle line against the Jews, I will be glad to talk to those who are members of our own body, those who seem to belong to our ranks although they observe the Jewish rites and make every effort to defend them. Because they do this, as I see it, they deserve a stronger condemnation than any Jew.” (HOMILY IV, II, 4)

“Are you Jews still disputing the question? Do you not see that you are condemned by the testimony of what Christ and the prophets predicted and which the facts have proved? But why should this surprise me? That is the kind of people you are. From the beginning you have been shameless and obstinate, ready to fight at all times against obvious facts.” (HOMILY V, XII, 1)

Saint Fulgentius of Ruspe (467-533) - In his “Writings”, written about 510 CE, he states “Hold most firmly and doubt not that not all the pagans, but also all the Jews, heretic and schismatics who depart from the present life outside the Catholic Church, are about to go into eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels.” (See also: *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus.*)

The Emperor Constantine the Great:

Constantine the Great, who is considered a Saint by the Greek Orthodox Church, instituted several legislative measures concerning the Jews and all other religions excepting Christianity: Non-Christians were forbidden to own Christian slaves or to circumcise their slaves. Conversion of Christians to Judaism or other religions was outlawed. Congregations for Jewish religious services were restricted but had elevated status over pagan religions. Constantine also supported the separation of the date of Easter from the Jewish Passover (see also Quartodecimanism), stating in his letter after the First Council of Nicaea:

“... it appeared an unworthy thing that in the celebration of this most holy feast we should follow the practice of the Jews, who have impiously defiled their hands with enormous sin, and are, therefore, deservedly afflicted with blindness of soul. ... Let us then have nothing in common with the detestable Jewish crowd; for we have received from our Saviour a different way.”[9]

Theodoret's Ecclesiastical History records The Epistle of the Emperor Constantine, concerning the matters transacted at the Council, addressed to those Bishops who were not present:

“It was, in the first place, declared improper to follow the custom of the Jews in the celebration of this holy festival, because, their hands having been stained with crime, the minds of these wretched men are necessarily blinded. ... Let us, then, have nothing in

common with the Jews, who are our adversaries. ... Let us ... studiously avoiding all contact with that evil way. ... For how can they entertain right views on any point who, after having compassed the death of the Lord, being out of their minds, are guided not by sound reason, but by an unrestrained passion, wherever their innate madness carries them. ... lest your pure minds should appear to share in the customs of a people so utterly depraved. ... Therefore, this irregularity must be corrected, in order that we may no more have any thing in common with those parricides and the murderers of our Lord. ... no single point in common with the perjury of the Jews.”[10]

The Emperor Leo I:

The Byzantine Emperor Leo I compiled a code of law, called the New Constitutions of Leo, Constitution LV: “Jews shall live in accordance with the rites of Christianity. Those who formerly were invested with Imperial authority promulgated various laws with reference to the Hebrew people, who, once nourished by Divine protection, became renowned, but are now remarkable for the calamities inflicted upon them because of their contumacy towards Christ and God; and these laws, while regulating their mode of life, compelled them to read the Holy Scriptures, and ordered them not to depart from the ceremonies of their worship. They also provided that their children should adhere to their religion, being obliged to do so as well by the ties of blood, as on account of the institution of circumcision. These are the laws which I have already stated were formerly enforced throughout the Empire. But the Most Holy Sovereign from whom We are descended, more concerned than his predecessors for the salvation of the Jews, instead of allowing them (as they did) to obey only their ancient laws, attempted, by the interpretation of prophecies and the conclusions which he drew from them, to convert them to the Christian religion, by means of the vivifying water of baptism. He fully succeeded in his attempts to transform them into new men, according to the doctrine of Christ, and induced them to denounce their ancient doctrines and abandon their religious ceremonies, such as circumcision, the observance of the Sabbath, and all their other rites. But although he, to a certain extent, overcame the obstinacy of the Jews, he was unable to force them to abolish the laws which permitted them to live in accordance with their ancient customs. Therefore We, desiring to accomplish what Our Father failed to effect, do hereby annul all the old laws enacted with reference to the Hebrews, and We order that they shall not dare to live in any other manner than in accordance with the rules established by the pure and salutary Christian Faith. And if anyone of them should be proved to have neglected to observe the ceremonies of the Christian religion, and to have returned to his former practices, he shall pay the penalty prescribed by the law for apostates.”[11]

Pope Gregory I

“For it is necessary to gather those who are at odds with the Christian religion the unity of faith by meekness, by kindness, by admonishing, by persuading, lest these...should be repelled by threats and terrors. They ought, therefore, to come together to hear from you the Word of God in a kindly frame of mind, rather than stricken with dread, result of a

harshness that goes beyond due limits.” (Synan, *The Popes and the Jews in the Middle Ages*, p.45)

June 591 “Censure of Virgil, bishop of Arles, and Theodore, bishop of Marseilles, for having baptized Jews by force. They are to desist. (Simonsohn, Shlomo, p.4)

November 602 “Admonition to Paschasius, bishop of Naples, to ensure that the Jews are not disturbed in the celebration of their religious festivals.” (The Apostolic See and the Jews, Documents: 492-1404; Simonsohn, Shlomo, p.23)

“TO PASCASIUS, BISHOP OF NAPLES: Those who, with sincere intent, desire to lead people outside the Christian religion to the correct faith, ought to make the effort by means of what is pleasant, not with what is harsh, lest opposition drive afar the mind of men whom reasoning...could have attracted. Those who act otherwise...demonstrate that they are concerned with their own enterprises, rather than with those of God!

Now, the Jews dwelling in Naples have registered a complaint with Us, asserting that certain people are attempting, in an unreasonable fashion, to restrain them from some of the solemnities connected with their own feast days, as it has been lawful for them to observe or celebrate these up to now, and for their forefathers from long ages past...For of what use is this, when...it avails nothing toward their faith and conversion?...One must act, therefore, in such a way that...they might desire to follow us rather than to fly from us...Rather let them enjoy their lawful liberty to observe and to celebrate their festivities, as they have enjoyed this up until now.” (Synan, 217).

Sicut Judaeis Non

The “Constitution for the Jews” was the official position of the papacy regarding the Jews throughout the Middle Ages and later. Pope Alexander III is the author of the oldest existing version of the bull. The bull was reaffirmed by many popes, even hundreds of years after Alexander III. Excerpts from the translation of the bull follows:

“[The Jews] ought to suffer no prejudice. We, out of the meekness of Christian piety, and in keeping in the footprints of Our predecessors of happy memory, the Roman Pontiffs Calixtus, Eugene, Alexander, Clement, admit their petition, and We grant them the buckler of Our protection. For We make the law that no Christian compel them, unwilling or refusing, by violence to come to baptism. But, if any one of them should spontaneously, and for the sake of the faith, fly to the Christians, once his choice has become evident, let him be made a Christian without any calumny. Indeed, he is not considered to possess the true faith of Christianity who is not recognized to have come to Christian baptism, not spontaneously, but unwillingly. Too, no Christian ought to presume...to injure their persons, or with violence to take their property, or to change the good customs which they have had until now in whatever region they inhabit. Besides, in the celebration of their own festivities, no one ought disturb them in any way, with clubs or stones, nor ought any one try to require from them or to extort from them services they do not owe, except for those they have been accustomed from times past to perform. ...We decree... that no one ought to dare mutilate or diminish a Jewish cemetery, nor, in

order to get money, to exhume bodies once they have been buried. If anyone, however, shall attempt, the tenor of this decree once known, to go against it...let him be punished by the vengeance of excommunication, unless he correct his presumption by making equivalent satisfaction.” (from: Synan, Edward. *The Popes and the Jews in the Middle Ages*. 231-232.)

This bull was reaffirmed by many popes including Celestine III (1191-1198), Gregory IX (1235), Innocent IV (1246), Alexander IV (1255), Urban IV (1262), Gregory X (1272 & 1274), Nicholas III, Martin IV (1281), Honorius IV (1285-1287), Nicholas IV (1288-92), Clement VI (1348), Urban V (1365), and Boniface IX (1389-1404). (*The Apostolic See and the Jews, Documents: 492-1404; Simonsohn, Shlomo, p.68,143,?,211,242,245-246,249,254,260,265,396,430,507*)

Later Christian writers:

Saint Bernard of Clairvaux (letter to Archbishop Henry of Mainz, 1146) “Is it not a far better triumph for the Church to convince and convert the Jews than to put them all to the sword? Has that prayer which the Church offers for the Jews...been instituted in vain?” (Carroll, Warren; *The Glory of Christendom*, 62).

Thomas of Monmouth, a monk in the Norwich Benedictine monastery, wrote in 1173 a detailed anti-Semitic tractate, called *The Life and Miracles of St. William of Norwich*, holding that Jews tortured to death a Christian child during Passover.[12]

Pope Innocent III 1198-1216

1199 Constitution for the Jews

1199 Letter on the Jews

Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), not imposing, he said, his own judgment but rather urging the judgment of the experts, declared that, “as the laws say, the Jews by reason of their fault are sentenced to perpetual servitude and thus the lords of the lands in which they dwell may take things from them as though they were their own — with, nonetheless, this restraint observed that the necessary subsidies of life in no way be taken from them.”[13]

Pope Gregory X: Letter on Jews, (1271-76) - Against the Blood Libel “And most falsely do these Christians claim that the Jews have secretly and furtively carried away these children and killed them, and that the Jews offer sacrifice from the heart and blood of these children, since their law in this matter precisely and expressly forbids Jews to sacrifice, eat, or drink the blood, or to eat the flesh of animals having claws. This has been demonstrated many times at our court by Jews converted to the Christian faith: nevertheless very many Jews are often seized and detained unjustly because of this. We decree, therefore, that Christians need not be obeyed against Jews in a case or situation of this type, and we order that Jews seized under such a silly pretext be freed from imprisonment, and that they shall not be arrested henceforth on such a miserable pretext, unless-which we do not believe-they be caught in the commission of the crime. We

decree that no Christian shall stir up anything new against them, but that they should be maintained in that status and position in which they were in the time of our predecessors, from antiquity till now.”

Geoffrey Chaucer (1343?-1400) wrote in “The Prioress’s Tale” of his Canterbury Tales of a devout little Christian child who was murdered by Jews affronted at his singing a hymn as he passed through the Jewry, or Jewish quarter, of a city in Asia:

Our primal foe, the serpent Sathanas,
Who has in Jewish heart his hornets’ nest,
Swelled arrogantly: “O Jewish folk, alas!
Is it to you a good thing, and the best,
That such a boy walks here, without protest,
In your despite and doing such offense
Against the teachings that you reverence?”
From that time forth the Jewish folk conspired
Out of the world this innocent to chase;
A murderer they found, and thereto hired, Who in an alley had a hiding-place;
And as the child went by at sober pace,
This cursed Jew did seize and hold him fast,
And cut his throat, and in a pit him cast.
I say, that in a cesspool him they threw,
Wherein these Jews did empty their entrails.
O cursed folk of Herod, born anew,
How can you think your ill intent avails?
Murder will out, ‘tis sure, nor ever fails,
And chiefly when God’s honour vengeance needs.[14]

Pope Martin V: He declared in 1419: “Whereas the Jews are made in the image of God and a remnant of them will one day be saved, and whereas they have besought our protection: following in the footsteps of our predecessors we command that they be not molested in their synagogues; that their laws, rights, and customs be not assailed; that they be not baptized by force, constrained to observe Christian festivals, nor to wear new badges, and they be not hindered in their business relations with Christians”
<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/08386a.htm>

After the Austrian and German Jews appealed to him, he spoke in their favor in 1420 and “in 1422, confirmed the ancient privileges of their race” (Ibid.)

Pope Clement VIII (1536-1605). “All the world suffers from the usury of the Jews, their monopolies and deceit. They have brought many unfortunate people into a state of poverty, especially the farmers, working class people and the very poor. Then, as now, Jews have to be reminded intermittently that they were enjoying rights in any country since they left Palestine and the Arabian desert, and subsequently their ethical and moral doctrines as well as their deeds rightly deserve to be exposed to criticism in whatever country they happen to live.”

R. Sungenis: Do I need to say more? I have the whole history of Catholicism behind me, and these Fathers, Doctors, Saints and the God-Man himself said much worse things about the Jews than I ever have. What is really happening today folks is that we have been taken over by Jewish propaganda, and there are a few Catholic/Jewish ideologues, like those on the above Blogspot who continue with their verbal diarrhea to hide the truth from you. Many of them are paid handsomely by Zionist groups to say whatever they can to silence people like me. They are bent on promoting the godless state of Israel for some pie-in-the-sky dream they have, even against their own Catholic religion (at least that's the religion they *claim* to have), and they will smear anyone who gets in their way. The Jews have done this for centuries against good people, and it continues today.

Here's more from the blogs. **Mark Shea** preaches his fallacious sermon on the covenant:

Wednesday, March 28, 2007

Rites of the Old Covenant

Through a series of unfortunate events mostly having to do with Bob Sungenis' loony vendetta against a faithful brother in Christ named Roy Schoeman, I've been made aware of yet another cadre of self-appointed lay bishops out there who have somehow come under the spell of believing that they have the power to define who is and is not a heretic and excommunicate the fallen forthwith.

The itch to define dogma on behalf of the Church is a strong one, and there seems to be something about Jews, Judaism and even Jewish converts that constitutes a sort of trigger mechanism for not a few Rad Trads. Lately, particularly since the abortive publication of the quickly-retracted "Reflections on Covenant and Mission" document, not a few on the Right feel a terrible sense of fear about all things Jewish, because they lack confidence in the Church's Magisterium and so feel a strange compulsion to "defend the Faith" from alleged "Judaizing tendencies". The Reflections document did not **create** this odd paranoia about Jews among the Trad wing. It's an unfortunately common feature of Tradism (though, as guys like David Palm, Michael Forrest, Ben Douglass, and Jacob Michael show, it is no **necessary** part of Tradism).

The Reflections document (which carries absolutely no doctrinal weight) sparked such a panic among the Jew-obsessed on the Right because it tiptoed right up to saying, essentially, the Christians are saved by Jesus and Jews are saved by Judaism and not Jesus. It didn't **quite** say that, but it came so close that many Trads panicked. The worst of the panickers was Sungenis himself, who became convinced that God had raised him up for this very

hour and then set about rooting out the Jewish Menace by means of plagiarism from Nazi sources, fraudulent quotes, and unbelievably specious arguments. Unfortunately, he managed to select for his special and focused hostility one Roy Schoeman and, in the course of blasting, slandering, calumniating and generally raging at him, has almost never missed an opportunity to miss an opportunity. For the gigantic irony is that Schoeman, a Jewish convert to the faith, is every bit as critical of the Reflections document as Sungenis. The difference is, Schoeman is capable of rational thought and has done rather a lot of it with respect to the relationship of Jews and Christians and the evangelization of the Jewish people.

Among the many screwy indictments that Sungenis brings against Schoeman is the claim that he wants to reinstitute Levitical sacrifices and rites in the public liturgical life of the Church. This is, in fact, just the opposite of what Schoeman thinks. Apparently, Schoeman has, privately, participated in instructional Seders in which the point is to show how the rites of the old covenant anticipate the fulfillment in the New. Sungenis (and not a few other Rad Trads swiftly damn him for this, citing their favorite text from the Council of Florence:

[The Holy Roman Church] firmly believes, professes and teaches that the legal prescriptions of the Old Testament or the Mosaic law, which are divided into ceremonies, holy sacrifices and sacraments, because they were instituted to signify something in the future, although they were adequate for the divine cult of that age, once our Lord Jesus Christ who was signified by them had come, came to an end and the sacraments of the new Testament had their beginning. Whoever, after the Passion, places his hope in the legal prescriptions and submits himself to them as necessary for salvation and as if faith in Christ without them could not save, sins mortally. It does not deny that from Christ's passion until the promulgation of the Gospel they could have been retained, provided they were in no way believed to be necessary for salvation. But it asserts that after the promulgation of the gospel they cannot be observed without loss of eternal salvation. Therefore it denounces all who after that time observe circumcision, the [Jewish] sabbath and other legal prescriptions as strangers to the faith of Christ and unable to share in eternal salvation, unless they recoil at some time from these errors. Therefore it strictly orders all who glory in the name of Christian, not to practise circumcision either before or after baptism, since whether or not they place their hope in it, it cannot possibly be observed without loss of eternal salvation.

The problem with this is that this is not all the Church has to say on the subject. But for those who primarily view the Gospel as a reducing valve designed to keep as many people from salvation as possible, that a tough sell. They don't want the whole story.

Nonetheless, there is more to the story. A careful reading of Paul reveals that he did not teach that Jewish converts had to abandon their Jewish culture. Rather, he insisted a) that the rites of the law of Moses were not salvific and b) Jewish converts had no right to insist that Gentile converts must observe their rites in order to obtain salvation. He specifically refused to demand that Jews reject their rites completely, just as he refused to demand that Gentiles adopt them. In Romans 14 (please do read it), he makes the basic principle clear: whatever you do, do it unto the Lord. And indeed, in deference to tender Jewish conscience, he even had one of his Gentile disciples circumcised so as not to give unnecessary offense to Jews. He is the original practitioner of the principle, "In doubtful things, liberty. In essential things, unity. In all things, charity." This is why, in the first century Church, there is a "church of the circumcision" in Jerusalem as well as a church of the uncircumcised. Jewish converts are free to practice their customs, just so long as they do not imagine such customs are salvific and just so long as they do not try to impose them on Gentile converts with the threat that "unless you are circumcised, you cannot be saved."

As time goes on, however, the Church becomes overwhelmingly Gentile, and increasingly the assumption becomes, therefore, that a choice to observe the Mosaic rites *is* a choice to attempt salvation by the rites of the Old Covenant, much as the assumption was, for a long time, that if wanted to be cremated, you were making a statement denying the Resurrection. It is this assumption that Florence and Cantate Domino reflect.

R. Sungenis: Sorry, Mr. Shea, you are no theologian. We've already covered this territory, so either you are not privy to it or you are just ignoring it. The Council of Florence already dealt with your slithery proposition, and they condemned it. Jews were not free to practice their customs "as long as they do not imagine such customs are salvific," as you claim. Look at the exact words of the Council:

Therefore, it commands all who glory in the name of Christian, at whatever time, before or after baptism, to cease entirely from circumcision, since, whether or not one places hope in it, it cannot be observed at all without the loss of eternal salvation.

Do you see those important words “whether or not one place hope in it”? Well that destroys your attempt to resurrect Jewish rituals, even if it is for no salvific value. Mr. Shea, you are leading people astray. You can't see Roy Schoeman's error because you are making the same error. The blind lead the blind, as Jesus said.

Mr. Shea has more:

But that's not all.** Here is that damned modernist Pope Benedict XIV (that *fourteen* not *sixteen*) explicitly teaching (Ex Quo, 74) that it is lawful to observe certain Old Testament ceremonial rites, so long as they are observed not as obligations of the old Law, but solely as a matter of custom or personal decision:

But others remarked wisely that some, surely, of the ceremonial rites of the old Law could be observed under the new Law if only they were not done as obligations of the old Law, which was abrogated, but as a custom, or lawful tradition, or as a new precept issued by one enjoying the recognized and competent authority to make laws and to enforce them, as Vasquez observes (vol. 3, in the 3rd part of the Summa, disp. 210, quest. 80, art. 7).

Pope Benedict XIV even repudiates, quite precisely, Sungenis' charge that Schoeman is judaizing with his celebration of "teaching Seders". He favorably quotes Leo Allatius as follows (Ibid., 67):

If a man should perform acts for a different end and purpose (even with the intention of worship and as religious ceremonies), not in the spirit of that Law nor on the basis of it, but either from personal decision, from human custom, or on the instruction of the Church, he would not sin, nor could he be said to judaize. So when a man does something in the Church which resembles the ceremonies of the old Law, he must not always be said to judaize.

R. Sungenis: No, because one pope is not going to contradict another on a matter of doctrine. But we've already covered this, Mr. Shea. Let it be known that Mr. Michael (who is the originator of this quote from Benedict XIV) didn't do a thorough study of it. He merely took out-of-context material from it to make his erroneous conclusion. I suggest you turn to our analysis of it so that you can counter his false conclusions. You can find it here: <http://www.catholicintl.com/qa/qa.htm>

But you can read it here:

R. Sungenis: And this is typical of the way Mr. Michael does shoddy work. He takes things totally out of context and makes false conclusions. He's just showing once again that he is incompetent to handle these issues, not only because of his lack of theological training, but because he has such a strong desire to exonerate

Roy Schoeman and the other Jewish converts who are pushing for the re-introduction of Jewish festivals.

Let's look at this in context and the reasons this came up, shall we?

72. Whatever be the case with women during menstruation entering the church and being allowed to receive the Lord's body, We turn back now to women after childbirth. As has been said, in the Latin Church observance of a period following birth is simply advised but not prescribed, while the Greek Church obliges women not to enter the church for a specified number of days. As Goarius says (p. 269): "The Greeks demand this behavior as a duty, the Latins only as a demonstration of reverence". But the Euchologion contains prayers to be said by the priest on this occasion as part of the whole ritual of the ceremony surrounding childbirth.

73. Accordingly this matter was carefully examined and discussed in the Congregations which met for the revision of the Euchologion both under Urban VIII and during Our pontificate. No one proposed the entire elimination from the Euchologion of the rites surrounding childbirth, but the suggestion was made that the prescribed period of forty days should be changed, and that different prayers should be substituted for the prayer in the Euchology which seemed to refer excessively to the legal uncleanness which caused the Jews to prevent their wives from doing any business for forty days after birth and from entering the temple. It seemed especially unfitting to beseech God to "cleanse etc. the defilement of her body from all the defilement of sin and wash away the stains of the soul in the course of forty days".

74. But others remarked wisely that some, surely, of the ceremonial rites of the old Law could be observed under the new Law if only they were not done as obligations of the old Law, which was abrogated, but as a custom, or lawful tradition, or as a new precept issued by one enjoying the recognized and competent authority to make laws and to enforce them, as Vasquez observes (vol. 3, in the 3rd part of the Summa, disp. 210, quest. 80, art. 7). It was decided that there was no real ground for surprise that the observance of a period after childbirth should be simply a counsel for Latin women, but obligatory law for the Greeks. Moreover, since the Greeks perform the rite in a different way than the Jews of old in not making an offering to the priest in the Jewish way, and since they sanctify the rite with suitable prayers, beseeching God to forgive any sins the woman has committed, and since the patronage of the Virgin Mother of God is invoked for this very purpose, it was decided on January 8, 1747, by those whom We had placed in charge of the revision of the Euchologion, to make no changes in this section. We subsequently approved their decision.

1) First notice that it was the Vatican who approved the decision, not some layman who decides that he thinks it might be good to re-institute Old Testament rituals.

2) the Vatican was very precise as to how and why she would implement a change in the Euchologion. There is no provision made for any other changes to current Church practice, as opposed to what we see today among our Jewish converts who want to institute whatever suits their fancy.

3) the issue of re-instituting the seder meal, or any other Jewish festival has never even been discussed by the Vatican, much less has there been any official statement telling us it would be permissible.

4) the above situation with the Euchologion and child birth is similar to the matter of circumcision. Although the Council of Florence forbids the practice of circumcision and other practices of the Law, that prohibition is only in respect of someone who regards circumcision as having a religious tie in to the Old Testament practice, so that it can be used to make a religious mark of some kind that will set someone apart religiously from someone who is not circumcised. But neither the Council, nor subsequent Church teaching, disallowed circumcision for non-religious reasons, that is, for reasons of health and safety. Thus we can practice circumcision today.

If anything, the above passages from *Ex Quo* show that Catholics should not be taking these things into their own hands. Without explicit approval from the Vatican, those who advocate seder meals and other Jewish festivals have completely over-stepped their bounds, especially in light of the fact that they desire to use Jewish festivals precisely for Jewish religious reasons, which was explicitly condemned by the Council of Florence.

B. Douglass: Pope Benedict XIV even repudiates, by name, Sungenis' charge that Schoeman is judaizing. He favorably quotes Leo Allatius as follows (Ibid., 67):

If a man should perform acts for a different end and purpose (even with the intention of worship and as religious ceremonies), not in the spirit of that Law nor on the basis of it, but either from personal decision, from human custom, or on the instruction of the Church, he would not sin, nor could he be said to judaize. So when a man does something in the Church which resembles the ceremonies of the old Law, he must not always be said to judaize.

R. Sungenis: Let's look at the context again:

Certain schismatics have tried to calumniate the Latin church by saying that it judaizes by consecrating unleavened bread, observing the Sabbath, and retaining the anointing of kings among the sacred rites. But Leo Allatius counters their rash claim in his splendid work *de perpetua consensione Ecclesiae Occidentalis et Orientalis*, bk. 3, chap. 4. He refutes them particularly by arguing as follows: "Since Jews observe Sabbaths, a man who observes Sabbaths acts in Jewish fashion: therefore the man who does not eat the flesh of strangled animals acts in Jewish fashion since the Jews are

forbidden by the Law to eat such food: but the Greeks do not eat such food: therefore, the Greek judaize" (loc. cit. n. 4). Then to Our purpose he concludes (n. 9) that it cannot be absolutely asserted that that man judaizes who does something in the Church which corresponds to the ceremonies of the old Law. "If a man should perform acts for a different end and purpose (even with the intention of worship and as religious ceremonies), not in the spirit of that Law nor on the basis of it, but either from personal decision, from human custom, or on the instruction of the Church, he would not sin, nor could he be said to judaize. So when a man does something in the Church which resembles the ceremonies of the old Law, he must not always be said to judaize".

The issue regarded using: (a) unleavened bread in the Mass, (b) observing the Sabbath and (c) the anointing of kings. It did not regard seder meals, Jewish festivals, the return of circumcision for religious reasons, nor any other Jewish ritual. Even the matter of "observing the sabbath" is not in that genre, because we still obey the rudiments of the Third commandment today by not working on Sunday, yet we have dispensed with the Mosaic legal requirement that it be done on Saturday from 6pm to 6am.

More importantly, even in the cases above in which the matters are referring to innocuous things such as whether the priest should use unleavened bread, the pope says above that "it cannot be absolutely asserted that the man judaizes." Note the word "absolutely." That word is used because it may certainly be the case that even in these small things one may give the impression of Judaizing, and the pope is admitting that this might actually be the case but that we cannot be absolutely sure.

If anything, it shows how SENSITIVE the Church is to the issue of Judaizing, not that it is seeking to relax the prohibitions from the Council of Florence. Why would the pope be so sensitive to the act of Judaizing? Because the Council of Florence was crystal clear that whoever practices Jewish rituals puts their salvation in jeopardy.

All, therefore, who after that time observe circumcision and the Sabbath and the other requirements of the law, it declares alien to the Christian faith and not in the least fit to participate in eternal salvation, unless someday they recover from these errors. Denzinger 712.

Only in very small and innocuous cases could the Council's declaration be superseded, as we see above. There certainly isn't any room for layman to arbitrarily decide that they are now going to re-institute Jewish festivals and ritual at their own whim. Any such notions are to be first passed by the Vatican, especially in light of the seriousness of the issue as brought out by the above texts. If anything, this should make our Jewish converts even more cautious about what they prescribe for Catholicism, not more lax.

END

Mr. Shea continues:

There are, of course, pastoral issues to take into account. A few years back, my parish did one of these teaching Seders. It was a valuable way to experience the connection of the Old Testament and the New. However, the local synagogue got wind of it and pointed out that we would probably not much appreciate it if they celebrated a faux Mass in order to try to educate Jews on what Catholics believe. Our pastors saw their point and so the teaching Seder came to an end. But it came to an end, not because we were bringing down the curses of Cantate Domino on our heads, but because, like Paul, we thought it better to avoid giving offense unnecessarily.

R. Sungenis: Sure, let's keep our pride and think that we are the ones making the decisions, and the hell with the Council of Florence. The truth is, Mr. Shea wouldn't know what the truth of the matter is if it weren't for the Council of Florence telling him so.

All this matters because not a few Catholics are wont to speak with a sort of contempt about the rites of the old covenant. Sungenis's vicious and intemperate attacks on Schoeman for, among other things, using Jewish rites to teach the gospel's connection with the Old Testament are only the most extreme form of a misguided attitude found among many Catholics. Statements like "Wild horses couldn't drag me to the reenactment of a dead rite that Christ himself ended" or "The Judaizing heresy strikes again" reveal a false understanding of the issue. The Church teaches that Christians (whether Jewish or Christian) are not bound by the ceremonial rites of the law of Moses. It teaches that such rites are not salvific. It teaches that Jewish Christians have no right to demand that Gentile Christians observe them. But it does not teach that Jewish Christians have no right to privately observe them as mere non-salvific customs. It does not teach that a Gentile cannot participate in such rites as a means of understanding their Christian faith more deeply. On the contrary, Pope Benedict XIV says that's just fine.

R. Sungenis: And we just saw from the parts of the Council of Florence I quoted that the Church has condemned Mr. Shea's position as false. The Church has said it doesn't make any difference whether you use the Jewish rituals for salvation or not. The rituals are forbidden, period. Who are you going to follow: the Catholic Church at the Council of Florence or Mark Shea who doesn't have a theological degree to his name?

The pastoral effect of contemptuous words directed at the rites of the old law is quite simple, quite unjust and quite un-Catholic. Many

Jews believe that Jesus did indeed come to abolish the law, not fulfil it, despite his words to the exact contrary. Speaking of Jewish customs with contempt and talking as though any fondness in the Jewish soul for their ancestral rites is contemptible is an excellent way for Catholics to confirm this misperception.

R. Sungenis: Jesus fulfilled the Law (Matt 5:18-19) and he abolished it also (2Cor 3:6-14; Heb 7:18; 10:9). The two are not mutually exclusive. It is only those who want to confuse the issue who try to make a separation between these two truths.

Mr. Shea continues:

Shane:

It would appear that Florence thinks that observance of Jewish rites, even by those who do not place their hope in them, is a big enough cause of scandal that it is too dangerous to do it. That's a pastoral judgement, not a dogmatic one. Apparently Benedict XIV views the pastoral situation as sufficiently different that he is not longer concerned about it.

Mark P. Shea

R. Sungenis: Ah, no, Mr. Shea. You don't make these kinds of decisions for the rest of us. If you want to practice a seder meal, go ask the Vatican, especially in light of the seriousness of the issue that the Council of Florence raised. Your interpretation of both Scripture and Benedict XIV aren't worth a hill of beans unless you get approval from the Vatican to teach people that they can now engage in another form of worship.

David Moss writes:

I think our current Pope Benedict XVI is of a similar mindset. As Cardinal Ratzinger, he wrote the following in a meditation on Holy Thursday, in "Behold the Pierced One" (Ignatius, 1986):

"Israel had to make a pilgrimage, as it were, to [Jerusalem] every year at Passover in order to return to its origins, to be recreated and to experience once again its rescue, liberation and foundation."
(pg 104)

Further on in his meditation, the Cardinal writes:

"... it seems to me, this Passover celebration which has come down to us from the nomads, via Israel and through Christ, also has (in the deepest sense) an eminently political significance. We as a nation, we in Europe, need to go back to our spiritual roots, lest we become lost in self-destruction.

"This feast needs to become a family celebration once again ... under the banner of the Lamb." (pg 106).

R. Sungenis: Mr. Moss, until if and when Pope Benedict XVI says it's ok for Catholics to practice the Passover, then you shouldn't be teaching it. Stop trying to put words in the pope's mouth. All he said above is that, analogous to the Passover, the people of Europe need to go back to their roots. He was not suggesting that the people of Europe start practicing the Passover but only that they go back to their roots, whatever they are. As one astute person named Sean said on the blog:

And maybe it would help this discussion to add the words of Pope Benedict XVI (*sixteenth*). He says in paragraph 11 of the recently released *Sacramentum Caritatis*:

Figura transit in veritatem

11. Jesus thus brings his own radical novum to the ancient Hebrew sacrificial meal. For us Christians, that meal no longer need be repeated. As the Church Fathers rightly say, *figura transit in veritatem*: the foreshadowing has given way to the truth itself. The ancient rite has been brought to fulfilment and definitively surpassed by the loving gift of the incarnate Son of God. The food of truth, Christ sacrificed for our sake, *dat figuris terminum*. (20) By his command to "do this in remembrance of me" (Lk 22:19; 1 Cor 11:25), he asks us to respond to his gift and to make it sacramentally present. In these words the Lord expresses, as it were, his expectation that the Church, born of his sacrifice, will receive this gift, developing under the guidance of the Holy Spirit the liturgical form of the sacrament. The remembrance of his perfect gift consists not in the mere repetition of the Last Supper, but in the Eucharist itself, that is, in the radical newness of Christian worship. In this way, Jesus left us the task of entering into his "hour." "The Eucharist draws us into Jesus' act of self-oblation. More than just statically receiving the incarnate Logos, we enter into the very dynamic of his self-giving."(21) Jesus "draws us into himself." (22) The substantial conversion of bread and wine into his body and blood introduces within creation the principle of a radical change, a sort of "nuclear fission," to use an image familiar to us today, which penetrates to the heart of all being, a change meant to set off a process which transforms reality, a process leading ultimately to the transfiguration of the entire world, to the point where God will be all in all (cf. 1 Cor 15:28).

Sean P. Dailey | [Homepage](#) | 03.28.07 - 6:02 pm | <#>

R. Sungenis: Thank you, Sean. I'm glad you were able to rescue Pope Benedict XVI from these Jewish ideologues. And a very astute priest named Fr. Stephanos said something similar:

[I'll modify and post here a portion of something I posted earlier over at Amy Welborn's concerning the "Seder".]

As both the Gospel and the Mass proclaim it, the first Eucharist was NOT a celebration of the Jewish Seder.

Rather, DURING the Passover meal, Jesus took bread ... and said what he said. His words about eating his body were a strange echo of the Exodus directives about eating the flesh of the Passover lamb.

THEN the Gospel and the Mass tell us that AFTER, AFTER, AFTER (NOT during) the Passover meal, Jesus took wine and said, "This is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant...." With those words he echoed NOT the Passover but the Sinai Covenant rite recorded in the Book of Exodus.

Fr. Stephanos, O.S.B. | [Homepage](#) | 03.29.07 - 1:29 am | <#>

R. Sungenis: Mark Shea adds another one of his gems, this time about **Steve Ray**:

posted April 4, 2007

Anyway, my strategy backfired and my friend (Signum Crucis) felt that I had called her a Rad Trad anti-semite. I say here publicly that I think no such thing and had no intention of implying as much. For the matter of that, I want also to make clear (just in case anybody should think so) that I had no intention of suggesting that Steve's board is a fansite for the crazy ravings of Sungenis, nor for anti-semitism. Indeed, Steve is about the most philo-semitic Catholic I've ever met. He actually has a cell phone account with an Israeli provider because he spends so much time in Israel what with shooting videos, leading tours, and just generally soaking up Israeli life and culture. I think the man even knows Hebrew. He is just about the most Judeo-friendly Catholic in the world.

I ask pardon of any I have offended. Mea culpa.

posted by Mark at [12:45 PM](#)

R. Sungenis: So Steve Ray is a good guy because he is “the most philo-semitic Catholic” and even has “a cell phone account with an Israeli provider”?! Wow, Steve, I didn’t know one had to reach such standards to be accepted as a good Catholic in your circles.

But Steve, I bet you didn’t know that the nation of Israel has control of AMDOCS, the central telephone operation in the United States. It’s one way the Mossad spies on American citizens, including you and those you talk to. Here’s an excerpt from my article, *Politics, Religion, Israel and the Seduction of the Catholic Voter*:

Amdocs Limited, and Israel-based, government-subsidized telecommunications company which contracts with the 25 biggest phone companies in America...is in the unique position of having legal real-time access to nearly every telephone in the country. ‘It is virtually impossible to make a call on normal phones without generating an Amdocs record of it’ [quoting Carl Cameron, Fox News correspondent]. The system also has the potential to generate personal information from every household and customer with a phone – in short, virtually every person in the country...Sources told Fox that in 1999, the NSA issued a ‘Top Secret Sensitive Compartmentalized Information report’ warning that Israel was acquiring the call records (“Little Brother is Watching,” *Culture Wars*, Marlene Maloney, 2-04, p. 30).

Of course, Mr. Ray would never suspect the Israelis of engaging in such clandestine activity, and that’s because he is “the most Judeo-friendly Catholic in the world.” Wow, what a wonderful guy Steve Ray is! I guess that’s also why I found out the other day that Steve Ray is telling people to boycott the CAI website just because we dare to critique and provide negative information about his nation of choice.

The Protestants do the same thing. They measure people’s fidelity to Christ by determining how much allegiance one gives to the Jewish people and the state of Israel (e.g., John Hagee, Pat Robertson, Jerry Falwell, et al). Unfortunately, a good crop of our Catholic converts in recent years have come from Protestant Dispensationalism and Fundamentalism where allegiance to the state of Israel was just as promoted as allegiance to Christ. In fact, they were one and the same. How sad. Of course, these Catholic and Protestant Zionists are too blind to realize that Jesus said that his kingdom was not of this world, and there is no special favor for the state of Israel anymore than there is for any other nation. But blind fools like Steve Ray and Mark Shea are requiring Catholics to give Israel favor and allegiance before they will be accepted as true Catholics. Today you have to be the same “philo-semitic Catholic” that Steve Ray is in order to be accepted as a true Catholic and not have him boycott your website.

There’s more. **Ben Yakov** adds his two cents about the seder meal:

“For us Christians, that meal no longer need be repeated. As the Church Fathers rightly say, *figura transit in veritatem*: the foreshadowing has given way to the truth itself. The ancient rite has

been brought to fulfilment and definitively surpassed by the loving gift of the incarnate Son of God.“

I reply: Yep! Of course this is in the context of the Old Testament Rites being the Sacraments of the Old Covenant that has given way to the New. The OT Sacraments have passed away & a strict unmodified observance of them is forbidden.

Modified OT rituals (which the Church has been doing for 2,000 years) are mere NT sacramentals! Read the CCC the Church has the power to create new sacramentals at will for the benefit of her children.

In ancient (see the writings of St Melito) & later Christian Traditions(the Knanayha Nazrini Malabar Christians) the Seder has moved from being an OT Sacrement to a NT sacramental meal that merely comemorates the Exodus & links it to the final Exodus from sin in the Mass.

BenYachov (Jim Scott 4th) | 03.28.07 – 11:09 pm | <#>

R. Sungenis: Jim, go read the Council of Florence. The Council did away with all those possibilities. You live in the 21st century after that Council, not in the first millennium.

Michael Forrest chimes in:

Thank you for the information, Fr. Stephanos.

I think this is a fascinating issue. As I wrote in reaction to Ben Douglass' critique of Roy Schoeman's book Salvation is from the Jews:

As Pope Benedict XVI indicated in the preface to his book, Many Religions, One Covenant, the topic of the relationships between God, Israel and the Church is one that calls for further exploration and discussion. The Church has not yet spoken with absolute clarity and finality about the full nature of these relationships. As such, and as is so often the case in such situations, there are two extremes of which we should be careful.

As we have witnessed in the aftermath of Vatican II, there is a danger that those with certain personal leanings or agendas may take undue liberties in their quest for compassion and openness by effectively usurping the role of the Magisterium: prematurely declaring and forcing new quasi-dogmas and quasi-doctrines upon

the rest of the Catholic faithful and condemning all of those who resist or question them as mean-spirited, reactionary dinosaurs. In the context of this discussion, a prime candidate for this first error would seem to be the promulgation of the “dual covenant” theory that proposes two separate pathways to God, one for Jews, one for Christians.

Conversely, there is an opposing, reactionary extreme that ought to be resisted as well, an extreme perhaps rooted in fear. While one may easily sympathize with the desire for absolute stability in light of some of the upheaval Catholics have endured over the past 40 years, the proper response still cannot be to effectively usurp the role of the Magisterium: prematurely stifling legitimate discussion and exploration by recklessly branding others with whom one disagrees as nefarious heretics and the like.

The Magisterium does not operate as the Urim and Thummim of old, in something of a vacuum, with truths being revealed suddenly, fully formed. The truth is generally arrived at through a complex process involving a thorough examination and sifting of many sources of information under the guidance of the Holy Spirit: from the Scriptures, to the Councils of the Church to the *sensus fidelium*...the sense of the faithful.

I believe that Roy Schoeman has helped to further that legitimate, important discussion. I also believe that Ben Douglass has added his own positive contribution now and I welcome it.

R. Sungenis: Mr. Forrest’s opinion boils down to saying: let’s forget about the Council of Florence, despite the fact that it says that these Jewish rituals cannot be practiced even if we don’t consider them salvific. Mr. Forrest would rather pay attention to Roy Schoeman and Ben Douglass, two people who have absolutely no teaching authority or even theologically academic credentials, to lead the way for us. Mr. Schoeman has proven himself to be a Jewish racist who is so confused about the Bible and the covenants that he contradicts himself in his book numerous times (as even admitted by Ben Douglass), and Mr. Douglass himself thinks that the Council of Florence can be overturned with a few well-placed but out-of-context quotes from Benedict XIV’s *Ex Quo*. All I can say to you Mr. Forrest is: if you want to ignore the Council of Florence and follow Schoeman and Douglass, then you all deserve each other. The blind lead the blind, and you will all be deceived by the devil masquerading as an angel of light.

Sandra Miesel adds this gem:

A rabbi performs a seder only in his own home. It's a family ritual.

Who has a problem with a Catholic family doing a seder at home,

explaining that this is the root of our Mass?
Sandra Miesel | 03.28.07 - 1:45 pm | <#>

R. Sungenis: No, Sandra. The seder meal is not the “root of our Mass.” There is not one word at the Last Supper about the seder, much less it being elevated to be “the root of the Mass,” nor does St. Paul venture into such notions when he reiterates the Mass in 1 Cor 11:16-33. No Father of the Church, no medieval, and certainly no official Catholic teaching says that the seder meal is the root of the Catholic Mass. If you don’t believe so, then show it to us, Sandra, as opposed to just making assertions about practicing Jewish rituals because you, being Jewish, have some kind of affinity toward them that you haven’t quite relinquished yet.

By the way, Sandra, I thought your interview about witches on Catholic Answers with Jimmy Akin was quite interesting. I’ll be writing about that soon. Interested minds want to know why you seem so positive about things about which you should be so negative.

The End