

Fr. Perozich comments —

Fr. Gerald Murray is a canon lawyer, better educated than a simple parish priest like myself in theology, canon law, and rhetoric. Thank you, Fr. Murray!

He points out the planned errors in What Is Man? An Itinerary of Biblical Anthropology, a book from the Pontifical Biblical Commission.

The same errors, along with others such as euphemisms, sophistries, slogans unfortunately are now organized in the Catholic Church's leadership from bishops through theologians, the congregations in Rome, the national bishops' conferences, diocesan structures which are now developed to force into the parishes these ideas in order to change the church and impose these ideas on the trusting faithful.

Such ideas mislead us faithful who, even though we know we are being manipulated, may not have a response to those in power.

*I have put into **bold** the highlights for me in Murray's article below.*

The errors listed in the teachings of these men whose teachings have departed from God, from Scripture and from Tradition are:

- Disrespect of the Hildebrand statement: "With a religion the only question that can matter is whether or not it is true. The question of whether or not it fits into the mentality of an epoch cannot play any role in the acceptance or the rejection of a religion without betraying the very essence of religion."*
- truth is eternal. It is discoverable by man in the natural order, and is revealed by God in the supernatural order. To know the truth is man's vocation. To preach the truth is the Church's mission.*
- The Church's understanding and exposition of truth will, by God's grace, be deepened and faithfully developed over time. But that truth can never be cast aside and replaced by new "truths" that contradict the truth as taught by the Church.*
- The push by some in the Church to update the Faith, meaning to change the teachings of the Faith, is a disastrous fruit of a relativistic mentality.*
- the current era, in which these claims are being made, is a better era because it happily prompts us to see how the "former" teaching was wrong and in need of revision.*

- *they ask only whether it is up-to-date, suitable to ‘modern man’ and the technological age, whether it is challenging, dynamic, audacious, progressive.”*
- *a corrosive way that is destructive of the truths taught by the Church concerning the inherent immorality of homosexual acts. The harm springs from the one-sided discussion of modern theories and opinions that reject the biblical teachings on homosexuality.*
- *the: anthropological approach of scripture, as understood and conveyed by the church in its normative aspects. . .is judged to be a reflection of an archaic, historically conditioned mentality.*
- *various biblical affirmations, in the cosmological, biological and sociological spheres, have been gradually considered outdated with the progressive affirmation of the natural and human sciences [I add to this that then the church’s leaders now subject her to worldly opinions rather than divine revelation because it makes them feel better about the condition of their own souls. There is always a personal gain in these departures from the truth.]*
- *list of criteria of judgment used against the Church’s traditional understanding of the Biblical teaching on homosexual activity: it is “archaic”, “historically conditioned”, “outdated”, lacking a “new and more adequate understanding of the human person.”*
- *modern justifications get considerable space; the traditional teachings only perfunctory mention. In effect, despite disclaimers, the text invites us to consider whether the truths taught by the Bible can change over time. Why? Because ecclesiastics honor modern errors conferring on them a patina of legitimacy, labeling these errors as current “science”. [This is another technique to confuse the faithful to accepting the claims of bishops, theologians, synods, bishops’ conferences, diocesan commissions.]*
- *Should not such offensive impostures be refuted and anathematized?*
- *It is a cause for scandal and furthers the climate of confusion and doctrinal uncertainty in the Church.*

- *In the face of this grave harm to the mission of the Church, we need to reaffirm our belief in the changeless truths of the Faith, rejecting all attempts to weaken and destroy what God has revealed and the Church has always taught.*

[End of Fr. Perozich comments with citations from Fr. Murray.
Murray's article begins now.]

A TROJAN HORSE IN THE PONTIFICAL BIBLICAL COMMISSION

Fr. Gerald E. Murray
Thursday, December 26, 2019

In his 1967 classic defense of the Catholic Faith against modern errors, *Trojan Horse in the City of God*, Dietrich von Hildebrand wrote: **“With a religion the only question that can matter is whether or not it is true. The question of whether or not it fits into the mentality of an epoch cannot play any role in the acceptance or the rejection of a religion without betraying the very essence of religion.”** He continues: “Even the earnest atheist recognizes this. He will not say that today we can no longer believe in God; he will say that God is and always was a mere illusion.”

Von Hildebrand reminds us that **truth is eternal. It is discoverable by man in the natural order, and is revealed by God in the supernatural order. To know the truth is man's vocation. To preach the truth is the Church's mission.**

This truth admits of no change. **The Church's understanding and exposition of truth will, by God's grace, be deepened and faithfully developed over time. But that truth can never be cast aside and replaced by new “truths” that contradict the truth as taught by the**

Church. Von Hildebrand writes: “It is of the very nature of Catholic Christian faith to adhere to an unchanging divine revelation, to acknowledge that there is something in the Church that is above the ups and downs of cultures and the rhythm of history.”

The push by some in the Church to update the Faith, meaning to change the teachings of the Faith, is a disastrous fruit of a relativistic mentality. It is said that truth is not eternal, but rather subject to change. What was true once is no longer so in a new historical era. And, of course, **the current era, in which these claims are being made, is a better era because it happily prompts us to see how the “former” teaching was wrong and in need of revision.**

Von Hildebrand writes: “Enamored of our present epoch, blind to all its characteristic dangers, intoxicated with everything modern, there are many Catholics who no longer ask whether something is true, or whether it is good and beautiful, or whether it has intrinsic value: **they ask only whether it is up-to-date, suitable to ‘modern man’ and the technological age, whether it is challenging, dynamic, audacious, progressive.**”

This prophetic critique comes readily to mind when we consider the latest outrage by misguided churchmen that plainly is aimed at giving sanction to homosexual activity. The Pontifical Biblical Commission has published a book entitled *What Is Man? An Itinerary of Biblical Anthropology* [2].

In this volume the topic of the Bible and homosexuality is treated, but in **a corrosive way that is destructive of the truths taught by the Church concerning the inherent immorality of homosexual acts.** The harm springs from **the one-sided discussion of modern theories and opinions that reject the biblical teachings on homosexuality.**



**Image: Sodom and Gomorrah Afire by Jacob de Wet II, c. 1680 [Hessisches Landesmuseum, Darmstadt, Germany]*

As reported at *Life Site News* [3], the book states that **the: anthropological approach of scripture, as understood and conveyed by the church in its normative aspects. . .is judged to be a reflection of an archaic, historically conditioned mentality.** We know that **various biblical affirmations, in the cosmological, biological and sociological spheres, have been gradually considered outdated with the progressive affirmation of the natural and human sciences;** similarly – it is deduced by some – a new and more adequate understanding of the human person imposes a radical reservation on the exclusive value of heterosexual unions, in favor of a similar acceptance of homosexuality and homosexual unions as a legitimate and worthy expression of the human being. What is more – it is sometimes argued – the Bible says little or nothing about this type of erotic relationship, which should

therefore not be condemned, also because it is often unduly confused with other aberrant sexual behavior. It therefore seems necessary to examine the passages of Sacred Scripture in which the homosexual problem is the subject of homosexuality, in particular those in which it is denounced and criticized.

Notice the long **list of criteria of judgment used against the Church's traditional understanding of the Biblical teaching on homosexual activity: it is "archaic", "historically conditioned", "outdated", lacking a "new and more adequate understanding of the human person."**

Officials of the Pontifical Biblical Commission have claimed that the text offers no opening for homosexual activity. But the **modern justifications get considerable space; the traditional teachings only perfunctory mention. In effect, despite disclaimers, the text invites us to consider whether the truths taught by the Bible can change over time. Why? Because ecclesiastics honor modern errors conferring on them a patina of legitimacy, labeling these errors as current "science".**

We need to ask why is there no citation of schools of thought, grounded in scientific knowledge and serious philosophical reflection, that contradict the affirmations here cited, and defend the Church's traditional understanding of the Biblical teaching as the most "adequate understanding of the human person."

Since when is it the practice of the institution, founded by Pope Leo XIII to promote knowledge of the true meaning of the Sacred Scriptures, to cite widespread and grave errors without clearly condemning them? Should erroneous notions that would attempt to use the Bible to justify "homosexuality and homosexual unions as a legitimate and worthy expression of the human being" be offered to the faithful for a thoughtful consideration of their possible legitimacy? **Should not such offensive impostures be refuted and anathematized?**

To concede, as possibly legitimate, claims that God intends man to commit sodomy by citing those claims as being the respectable fruits of scientific progress is a repudiation of the Commission's purpose. **It is a cause for scandal and furthers the climate of confusion and doctrinal uncertainty in the Church.**

In the face of this grave harm to the mission of the Church, we need to reaffirm our belief in the changeless truths of the Faith, rejecting all attempts to weaken and destroy what God has revealed and the Church has always taught.

[4]

The Rev. Gerald E. Murray, J.C.D. is a canon lawyer and the pastor of Holy Family Church in New York City.

*Article printed from The Catholic Thing: <https://www.thecatholicthing.org>
URL to article: <https://www.thecatholicthing.org/2019/12/26/a-trojan-horse-in-the-pontifical-biblical-commission/>*