DOUBTFUL CONFIRMATION AND CONDITIONAL CONFIRMATION

Bp. Michał Stobnicki

Dear faithful,

we hear in today's Epistle that if a law had been given that could give life, justice would truly be from the law. But we know very well that the Old Testament was merely a figure, a foreshadowing of the establishment of the New Testament. The Old Testament was, as it were, a shadow. It gave some notion, but it was not the fullness of revelation. It was only a partial revelation. Thus in the Old Testament God reveals Himself as the one and only Creator of heaven and earth. But the New Testament reveals to us the fullness of the truth about God: that God is one in the Holy Trinity. And so the Old Testament in itself could not be a source of justification. Through the Old Testament no one could be saved. It was necessary that a new and eternal testament be concluded, that the Lord Jesus shed His blood on the Cross and in this way open for us the gate of heaven. The Old Testament was solely and exclusively a preparation for the New Testament. Hence the Mosaic religion ceased to be the true religion at the moment of the death of our Lord Jesus Christ on the Cross. And the contemporary variation on Mosaism, Talmudism, is, my dear brethren, nothing other than a false religion. It has nothing in common with the Mosaic religion, nothing in common with the Old Testament, which has expired.

Dear faithful, our Lord Jesus Christ, the second Person of the Most Holy Trinity, who assumed human nature in the womb of the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, who became one of us, who united human and divine nature in one Person, who completed the work of redemption through His sorrowful Passion and death on the Cross, instituted seven sacraments of the New Covenant. Seven sacraments through which God's grace is given to us. Seven sacraments that we need in order to attain salvation.

THE INDELIBLE MARK

Dear faithful, each of the seven sacraments of the New Covenant gives the soul a different grace. Otherwise one single sacrament would be enough for us, but there are seven sacraments. And today a few words on the sacrament of confirmation.

A sacrament, as the Catholic Church teaches, is a visible sign of invisible grace of God. We human beings are composed of soul and body. We live, as it were, on the border of two worlds: the material and the spiritual. We are not merely animals, purely bodily beings. We are not angels, purely spiritual beings. We have a material body and an immaterial spiritual soul. We come to know the reality around us by means of the senses that God has implanted in our human nature. We have eyes for seeing, ears for hearing, and so on. Hence we need certain outward signs, accessible to our senses, through which God's grace is given to us. Otherwise we could never be certain whether God's grace has been given to us. We need something tangible, something accessible to our senses. And that is precisely a sacrament: a tangible, visible sign of invisible grace of God.

In an extraordinary situation God can give us His grace outside a sacrament. The best-known example is perfect contrition. If one day you see rockets falling from the sky, you will not be able to go to a priest to make use of sacramental confession. Then beat your breast, try to arouse contrition out of love for God. Ask pardon for all your sins, because through this contrition a soul deprived of the possibility of confession can obtain the forgiveness of sin. With this contrition there must of course be joined the resolution that, if I have the opportunity, I will go to confession. But, my dear brethren, there is exactly the problem with this contrition that I mentioned a moment ago: we would never have certainty whether it was aroused by us properly, deeply enough. That is why we need that outward sign: the priest in the confessional who pronounces over us the words of absolution, *Ego te absolvo*, I absolve you from your sins, and who traces over us the sign of the Cross. In this way we have certainty that the forgiveness of sins has been given to us.

Together with baptism and the priesthood, it belongs to those three sacraments that imprint an indelible mark on the soul. Baptism, confirmation and the priesthood. A mark that lasts forever, a mark that we will never be able to remove, although the souls in hell would probably prefer to wipe that mark from the soul. Why? Well, my dear brethren, because to whom more is given, of him more will be required. A confirmed Catholic enjoys in heaven greater happiness, greater joy than a Catholic who is merely baptised. Likewise a priest who manages to reach heaven will enjoy still greater glory and joy than a confirmed Catholic. But it works the other way too. If a confirmed soul falls into hell, it will suffer more than a baptised one. Likewise a priest who ends up in hell will suffer more than a Catholic who received the sacrament of confirmation.

This mark, my dear brethren, is imperceptible to us. There are no scanners, no QR codes that would let us determine whether someone is confirmed, baptised, or has received the valid sacrament of the priesthood. But it is visible to God, to the devil, to the angels, and in the life to come it will be visible to all of us, for this mark remains forever. You will forever be baptised, confirmed, or a priest. Marriage ends at the moment of a spouse's death. The priesthood lasts forever.

Dear faithful, but returning to the sacrament of confirmation. What does this sacrament effect, and why do we need it? The sacrament of confirmation gives the soul the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit. It strengthens the soul with the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit. The Latin name of this sacrament, *confirmatio*, if we translated it literally, would be "strengthening," because that is the effect, that is the purpose of giving this sacrament: the strengthening of the soul, arming it, preparing it for spiritual war. For all of us, whether we want it or not, whether we like it or not, are from the beginning of our existence participants in a spiritual war whose stake is our eternal life.

ARMED FOR SPIRITUAL WAR

And think: if you saw a lad walking through your town or village in sandals and shorts, with a stick in his hand, and you asked where he is headed and he told you, "I am going to the front, I am going to war," you would tap your forehead. What a madman, who, unprepared, unarmed, wants to fight! Whom? How? Unfortunately a great mass of contemporary Catholics resembles such a madman. We take up the fight against the devil without realising who our adversary is. Unarmed, unprepared.

Dear faithful, the sacrament of confirmation is extraordinarily important because through this sacrament we are armed by God, we receive the spiritual armour and sword that we need for the fight against the devil. And we all know very well how weak, how frail we are, how much we need help from heaven to defeat the devil, to win victory over temptations, to persevere in the Catholic faith, in sanctifying grace.

And the enormous misfortune that struck Catholic souls was what happened after the Second Vatican Council, that is, the whole doctrinal and liturgical revolution, for within the liturgical revolution not only the rites of the Holy Mass were destroyed, but also those of the other sacraments, including the sacrament of confirmation, which was devastated, which Archbishop Lefebvre described as very doubtful, or even invalid. And it seems that with the naked eye we are able to see that something happened to this sacrament. For where among Catholics today will we find, will we see the gifts of the Holy Spirit: wisdom, fortitude, knowledge, fear of the Lord? They are simply not among us. They are fading away. Here and there you still meet some old woman who, despite old age and illness, bends her knees and piously makes the sign of the Cross on entering the church, but the average Polish so-called Catholic enters the house of God as if it were a pigsty. What do once-Catholic churches look like today? Turned, my dear brethren, into a den of thieves. A complete lack of any fear of God. And Holy Scripture says plainly: *Initium sapientiae timor Domini*, "the beginning of wisdom is the fear of the Lord." Where there is no fear of the Lord, where there is no respect for what is divine, there folly reigns. And that, my dear brethren, is the explanation of why there are so many fools around us. Why so many foolish people around us, to whom no logical argument gets through?

The blind, who do not want to recognise reality as it is, who prefer to live in fairy tales. And Saint Paul already warned against this in his letter to Timothy: a time will come when men will turn away their hear-

ing from listening to the truth and will turn to fables.

THE MATTER: OLIVE OIL

Dear faithful, let us therefore look at what happened to the sacrament of confirmation after the Second Vatican Council, so that we may understand where the source of the problem lies, what the absence of God's grace comes from, what the absence of the fruits of the Holy Spirit's action among contemporary Catholics comes from.

Every sacrament, in order to be validly conferred, must fulfil four conditions. First, the sacramental matter, that is, the outward element that accompanies the conferral of the sacrament. In the case of baptism, it is the pouring of water over the head. In the case of extreme unction: the anointing with the oil of the sick. In the case of the Most Blessed Sacrament: bread and wine, which are transubstantiated into the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. In the case of the sacrament of confirmation, it is the laying on of the hand on the head and the anointing of the forehead with the oil of holy chrism.

Since apostolic times there was no doubt that holy chrism must be made, like the other oils that the bishop blesses on Holy Thursday, that is, the oil of catechumens and the oil of the sick, from olive oil. Such is the apostolic tradition, such is the will, the institution of God Himself: biblical oil, oil chosen in a special way by God, which became the instrument of His grace, which accompanies the conferral of the holy sacraments. For 2,000 years, my dear brethren, no one ever thought that olive oil could be replaced with something else, until Paul VI, who at the beginning of the 1970s, carrying out the destruction of the sacrament of confirmation, permitted, in an age in which we can without any problem reach another continent within a few hours, the replacement of olive oil with any other vegetable oil on the ground that it is supposedly hard to obtain in some regions of the world. Today, my dear brethren, you can find everything in a shop. You will find goods from all the continents, and it turns out that precisely today olive oil is suddenly unavailable. This is a pure lie, pure madness. For 2,000 years of the Church's existence it was no problem to transport olive oil to the whole world, wherever there were Catholics, so that bishops could bless it, could consecrate the holy oils, so that souls could be strengthened by the holy sacraments, so that grace could be given to souls. And suddenly, in the 1970s, it turns out that it is impossible, that it is not feasible, extremely difficult.

And so, my dear brethren, since the 1970s we have an enormous problem concerning the matter used in the post-conciliar church, for there is no doubt, theologians are agreed on this, that replacing olive oil with some other oil will mean that we are not dealing with holy chrism at all, that we do not have consecrated oil. One might just as well smear people with Kujawski oil. It will be worth just that, no matter what the bishop recites over that oil. The apostolic tradition, the divine institution is clear: the matter of the sacraments, the matter of the holy oils, is olive oil. Since the 1970s, my dear brethren, people everywhere in the world believe in something completely different, which is absolute nonsense. If you were anointed with "chrism" in quotation marks, made from some other oil, and the inventiveness of the post-conciliar hierarchy knows no bounds here, then your confirmation is simply, absolutely invalid. There is no room for any discussion.

THE FORM: "RECEIVE"

Next, my dear brethren, the second element necessary for the validity of a sacrament, that is, the sacramental form: the words that accompany the conferral of the sacrament. As Saint Thomas Aquinas teaches, the sacramental form effects what it signifies, and ought to signify what it effects. In other words, the words constituting the sacramental form are to express the effect of the sacrament. In the case of holy baptism: "I baptise you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit," so I wash you in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. In the case of holy confession: "And I absolve you from your sins in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." In the case of confirmation, the traditional form used for centuries by the Church is equally clear and concrete, that is, it expresses directly, beyond doubt, what the effect of this sacrament is: "I sign thee with the sign of the Cross and I

confirm thee with the chrism of salvation. In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen." I strengthen you, *confirmo te*. So that is the effect of the sacrament: the strengthening of the soul with the gifts of the Holy Spirit.

And again our favourite, Paul VI, at the beginning of the 1970s, declared that the Church had been using an improper, inadequate form and that it should be replaced with a form supposedly derived from the Eastern rites. Why, it is hard to say, would the Roman Church now reach for some other liturgical traditions? And it must also be stressed that this is by no means a copy, not a repetition of the Eastern form. It was modified. Translated into Polish it reads: "Receive the seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit." And here, my dear brethren, a few objections.

First, as far as the seal is concerned, it is imprinted by three sacraments: baptism, confirmation and the priesthood. All three imprint a seal. Through these three sacraments the Holy Spirit imprints a seal on the soul. So it is nothing specific, nothing peculiar, nothing that distinguishes the sacrament of confirmation. Second, my dear brethren, in this form we have the phrase "the seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit." But we all know from the catechism that there are seven gifts of the Holy Spirit. The singular is used. One cannot be confirmed in one seventh. Is it now supposed to be that the person being confirmed fills in some questionnaire and ticks which of the gifts of the Holy Spirit he wants to receive? Complete nonsense. Either one is confirmed, or one is not confirmed.

And a third remark, my dear brethren: this form begins with the word "receive." As though it were some kind of offer. Well, in the confessional the priest does not say, "If you want, I absolve you from your sins," but says, "By the power of Christ the Lord, I absolve you from your sins." Over the bread and wine he says, "This is My Body," and not, "If you wish, this is My Body." This word "receive" introduces here an idea, a concept deriving from Lutheran theology. And I will give you one small example. Martin Luther rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation, that is, he denied that bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and at the same time he created his own pseudo-theological concept, which is called consubstantiation. And it means that the Lord Jesus becomes present in the bread and wine, but together with them there is no change of substance; rather the Lord Jesus, as it were, sits down alongside the bread and wine, but is present only as long as the congregants are in the meeting-house and believe it. So it is the faith of the congregants that causes the Lord Jesus somehow to become present in the bread and wine. But when the congregants go home, when the Lutheran supper ends, the Lord Jesus vanishes. Nonsense, complete nonsense. But this is the making of these Lutheran pseudo-sacraments dependent on the faith of the people. Catholic theology does not teach so. Catholic theology does not teach so. So why this: "receive"? "I sign thee with the sign of the Cross and I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation. In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen." That is how the Church confirmed for centuries. We see therefore, my dear brethren, the doubt concerning this post-conciliar sacramental form introduced by Paul VI.

SACRAMENTAL INTENTION

Next, my dear brethren, the third condition for the validity of a sacrament is sacramental intention, that is, the outwardly expressed will to do what the Catholic Church does. We know very well that since the Second Vatican Council the building of a conciliar church has been under way, which the post-conciliar hierarchy does not especially hide. A new springtime of the Church, a new church with a new theology, a new liturgy, a new morality, a new canon law, a new Holy Scripture, a new rosary and so on. And we see, my dear brethren, once again extremely clearly, that there is a contradiction visible to the naked eye, a contradiction between what the Church did and taught up to the time of the Second Vatican Council and what she began to teach and do since the Second Vatican Council. There is no continuation here, no continuity, although some, with Benedict XVI at the head, tried somehow to rescue the council through the hermeneutic of continuity, by showing that there was no rupture, that we are dealing with a continuity of teaching. Well, we are not. Well, we are not. If for 2,000 years the Church taught that she is the only way to salvation, and today through ecumenism, through religious liberty she promotes the conviction that Jesus Christ is one of many ways leading to heaven, to salvation, then we are dealing with a

total contradiction. It cannot be joined together, reconciled in any way. Either Jesus Christ is necessary, faith in Jesus Christ is necessary for salvation, Catholic faith is absolutely necessary for salvation, or not, or there are other ways.

And so, my dear brethren, as I said, this sacrament makes, arms the man. The sacrament of confirmation makes of the baptised soul a warrior, a knight of our Lord Jesus Christ, called to spiritual combat, to the shedding of blood, to the shedding of one's own blood. And this sacrament gives the strength to wage this fight, to accept the grace of martyrdom, if that should be the will of God. And now we must ask ourselves: whom is the post-conciliar church to fight?

If all are brothers, if all religions are good, if all religions lead to salvation, if everyone is now a friend, then whom are we to fight? What spiritual fight? There is no fight any more for Christ the King, because Christ the King has been dethroned. They took His throne from Him, they deprived God of all rights. Today a little dog, a little cat has more rights than the Lord God, because if you pat the cat or kick the dog, you will go to jail, while God you can trample and spit on with impunity. And so, my dear brethren, today we are really dealing not with Catholics, but with a shapeless, Catholic, pseudo-Catholic mass. We are dealing not with knights, but with rags, with which one can do anything.

Dear faithful, and this shows us how much this sacrament is needed and why the devil hates it so much. Why was it demolished, destroyed by the servants of the devil? Because people deprived of the sacrament of confirmation become an easy prey for the devil. People deprived of the sacrament of confirmation, of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, become a shapeless, impersonal, mindless mass, susceptible to every lie, every propaganda. And we must ask ourselves what the intention of the conciliar church is. It does not need knights of Christ the King, because it no longer fights for Christ the King. So they call this sacrament the sacrament of Christian maturity. What does this maturity mean? They should rather call it, as is often said, the sacrament of parting with the church: just get the little piece of paper, because it will come in handy for the wedding. So we may have doubts concerning what the intentions of the post-conciliar hierarchy are. Do they still want to do what the Catholic Church does, or not? Do they have entirely different intentions and aims?

THE SACRAMENTAL MINISTER

And finally, my dear brethren, the fourth element necessary for the validity of every sacrament, that is, its minister, the one who confers the sacrament. In the Latin rite the ordinary minister of the sacrament of confirmation is the bishop. And here, my dear brethren, we must mention, if only briefly, another deformation of Paul VI, namely the destruction of the rites of ordination. In 1968, that is, a year before the introduction of the *Novus Ordo Missae*, the rites of ordination were the first victims of Archbishop Bugnini and company. Why, we may ask? Why did they set about the rites of ordination before they reformed the Mass? Because Freemasonry knows perfectly well where the heart of the Church beats. Without validly ordained bishops and priests the Church dies, because there is no one to give the sacraments apart from baptism and marriage. And so Freemasonry in 1968 attacked the rites of ordination. The rites of priestly ordination significantly changed, the rites of episcopal consecration written completely anew.

And we must note here, my dear brethren, that a mere 21 years earlier, in 1947, Pope Pius XI, in the apostolic constitution *Sacramentum Ordinis*, using his supreme authority as teacher and shepherd of the Church, defined what constitutes the matter and form of the sacrament of the priesthood in its three degrees: the diaconate, priestly ordination and episcopal consecration. And Pius XII invented nothing new, wrote nothing new, no new prayer, no new text. He merely indicated, from that rite, from the text which the Church had used for centuries, which sentence is the most important, which is the sacramental form, which brings about the effect of ordination, whether of a deacon, a priest or a bishop, and thereby settled once and for all all the disputes and doubts that various theologians had held over the centuries. So the matter was settled in 1947, and 21 years later Paul VI, heedless of this decision, approves the changed rites of ordination, in particular the rites of episcopal consecration, which were written, together with the sacramental form, completely anew. Completely anew.

And one need not be, my dear brethren, a doctor of theology to realise that those who stood behind these changes, who are the very same people who destroyed the rites of the Holy Mass, of confirmation, of the other sacraments, did not have good intentions. They were not friends of Christ the King, but His enemies. Their aim was to destroy the Catholic Church. Their aim was not to correct anything, to perfect it, but to destroy. And these rites, since they were changed, written anew, not expressing unambiguously, as in the case of confirmation, what the effect of the sacrament of the priesthood is, are doubtful. We are entitled to ask, to put to ourselves the question, whether these post-conciliar priests, bishops really are what they claim, or merely clothe themselves in chasubles. It is an extremely important, extremely difficult question, but such too was the aim that guided Archbishop Lefebvre in 1988, when he consecrated four bishops at Écône, to ensure the survival of an undoubtedly valid line of succession, without any doubt whatever. If the Church for centuries ordained bishops and priests in a certain defined way, why change it? Why change it? Did Archbishop Lefebvre not simply hand on what he had been given? He ordained bishops just as he himself was ordained, so that there would be no doubt here, for these doubts, my dear brethren, will one day most certainly be settled definitively.

CONDITIONAL CONFIRMATION

But our heads probably ache from all this by now, because the four elements necessary for the validity of a sacrament have been discussed. With each there is something wrong. And yet the bishop said that these three sacraments, baptism, confirmation and the priesthood, imprint an indelible mark, which means that it is received once in a lifetime. So what is all this about? What are we to do with all this now? What is the solution? How do we get out of this blind alley into which we were led by the post-conciliar revolution?

Here, my dear brethren, the solution is very simple and it is not the invention of Archbishop Lefebvre or any other bishop, namely the Church has always held that where there is a positive doubt (positive, that is, a serious, justified doubt, not on the principle of "it seems to me so" or "it occurs to me"), there a sacrament that imprints an indelible mark is to be repeated conditionally, so that there may be certainty that it was validly conferred. And hence you have probably heard more than once that Latin expression *sub conditione*, "under condition." What does it mean? My dear brethren, conferring a sacrament *sub conditione* is not conferring it again. There is no such thing as a second confirmation, there is no such thing as a repeated confirmation. It is a conditional confirmation. Namely, the bishop adds a condition to the sacramental form: "If you are not confirmed," *si non es confirmatus*, "I sign thee with the sign of the Cross and I confirm thee with the chrism of salvation."

What is the sense of it? If the first one, that sacrament conferred in the new rite, should prove to be valid, then nothing happens. Because if you are confirmed, that is the condition; if you are not confirmed, that is the condition. If that other sacrament was invalid, the soul receives the sacrament, receives the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit. The effect is very simple. From the day of confirmation or ordination *sub conditione* there is no doubt whatever about the validity of the sacrament received. And so that burden, the burden of doubt, is lifted from the soul. For a Catholic soul is a soul that longs for clarity. And the Lord Jesus says: "Let your speech be: yea, yea; nay, nay." A Catholic soul does not want to live in doubt, but strives for resolution. I want to know the truth, I want to know objective reality, and this is what the conferral of the sacrament *sub conditione* serves. It is not a declaration of invalidity, for that can ultimately be done only by the Apostolic See, but it serves to remove doubts, which for the soul can be very burdensome. I have had the opportunity to meet various souls, various faithful, priests, in my life, and truly these doubts can be very burdensome, they can torment greatly, and a Catholic soul, a soul honest with itself, with the Lord God, simply wants to remove these doubts.

And it is no sin, it is no sacrilege, as some claim. Even those who call themselves the spiritual heirs of Archbishop Lefebvre. Today they publish articles saying that it is something impermissible, sinful, sacrilegious. They absolutely pass over in silence what Archbishop Lefebvre did all his life. In the book *Letter to Lost Catholics* you will find a clear declaration: in every case where this sacrament of confirmation was conferred in the new rite, I confer it conditionally, *sub conditione*. Because this is not, my dear brethren, some

game, these are not jokes, this is an extremely important matter. Am I armed with the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit? Do I have the spiritual armour, the spiritual sword, to fight the devil? And we all desire, my dear brethren, to strive for and reach this certainty.

That, my dear brethren, is all the words of explanation concerning the sacrament of confirmation conferred conditionally, *sub conditione*, as it is called, words that have heated up more than one traditionalist discussion in our homeland and abroad. And it is nothing extraordinary. It is the practice of the Church, which serves the good of souls, the good of the faithful. So all those who wish to receive the sacrament, I remind you, in a state of sanctifying grace, should review from the catechism the chapter on confirmation, and on the last Sunday of October, on the Feast of Christ the King, such a ceremony is planned here in this church.

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Praised be Jesus Christ.