



## DOES ORTHODOXY EXIST? (Esiste Ancora L'Ortodossia?)

By: Joseph Cardinal Siri

originally published in RENOVIATIO XII (1977), fasc. 3, pp. 275-278

*Red bold print added for emphasis.*

---

The discussion is born at a distance and concludes at a distance. It is clear that our discussion resides in the theological sphere: it obviously no longer goes there. The gravest problem that presents itself today to the observer of theological literature is the following question: does orthodoxy still exist? We will consider this question, certainly not because we in any way participate in this expressed doubt, but rather in order to place ourselves at the same level as those who discuss it. It is not impossible, in fact it is so real that, a Spanish Theologian has in fact written a book on the subject of "the impossibility of orthodoxy". Is it not strange, because the word itself "orthodoxy" indicates a well defined straight line, faithfully anchored to divine revelation and because of this to the truth contained therein, as inalterable as God is immutable, from whom it has its origin. Today, it seems that all that is straight, defined, anchored to an irreversible divine fact, is no longer to one's liking. In the midst of this crisis of rejection, this question paradoxically emerges, does it not seem strange.

It is enough for us to list a brief summary, and here it is.

In the sixties it began (he that has, at hand, a schedule of days and wishes to grow old [in the pursuit of this research] can study this well.) the separation of Theology from tradition, which certainly is like saying that you separate the lama from its line. Next metaphysics was discarded, that is the same theological tradition solidly and extensively traveled, and it would be the same, as if were, to separate "vision" from "eyes". Then one arrives at the placing in crisis of dogmatic formula, all of which anchored unequivocally, and faithfully, in our language, the truth of revelation. Shortly thereafter was initiated the language dance, totally unnecessary, for which they substituted the plurality of languages (security gates for those who wish to evade (break loose) from the unity of the language, commanded by the unity of meaning. The first formulas to succumb to this agile treatment were the Trinitarian and those Christology. In the end they began to criticize the concept of infallibility and it is not difficult to understand that this criticism is aimed directly at closing the mouth of whatever authority, even that of Peter, it is a hard lesson to believe but nonetheless it is a fact!

With this historical premise, if it had even an iota of truth, nothing would remain to us, other than the impracticability of dogma and the impossibility of orthodoxy.

**Therefore: no more orthodoxy. No more heretics, no more condemnations of heresy and no more heretics. The birth of a new heresy, possibly one hitherto never thought of before: heresy that denies the existence of that self-same orthodoxy.**

**For he that wishes to be the innovator rather than Christian, not bad: you have outdone even the strangest of all previous times.**

**Well, here it is, the sense of our discussion. And so with this? We are in the fullness of applied relativism: the ordinary all but dead.**

But if Christ rose from the dead, if he is the Son of God, if Revelation is true, then Orthodoxy is also true. The opposite also exists: heresy. The affirmation of orthodoxy carries with it the condemnation of heresy. Without this opposite the system of the Faith could become lame. Silence does not work, if the circumstances that it provokes or undoes not also work.

Is heresy a cultural fact?

Yes, so much so that it has to do with the story of thought and human actions. Careful: heresy enters into culture like a pathogen enters into medicine. Put into focus it completes, isolates and poisons. For this reason you cannot push heresy to enter into the culture because you will create risks to the Faith. It is true that many in fact are much more with the culture than with the Faith, it cannot be other so that you do not break yourself away from the crowd. **In fact heresy loves regrouping, collectives, it is so; it tends to become a strange social fact. Even if it is unstable and ascribes to an evolutionary right. Truth does not evolve. Error must evolve, because it has within itself the germ of its own invincible weariness.**

**Actually heresy is in fact not an abstract concept, without subject; it exists in, as much as heretics exist, that is people.**

**The source of heresy is always personal; even if the garnished favors it and even if it tends to extend itself like a stain of oil in many subjects.**

Often heresy exists in an unconscious state, in use and customs received from subjects who practice these usages, but do not understand their origins. This is what is happening in many abuses of every type, presented under the guise of openings and creativity. In said cases, first you create the instinctive conviction and only later do you arrive at the formulation of the heresy.

**The proof of this is that we have arrived at the new heresy: negating the existence itself of orthodoxy.**

**The truth of God requires defense, with your blood if need be!**

**We can do it on a theological plane. When we arrive at the magisterial plane, the word, obviously, is no longer up to us.**

[Back to Cardinal Siri Page](#)

**Fair Use Notice:**

This web site may contain copyrighted material the use of which may not always have been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available in our efforts to advance understanding of political, human, religious,

and social issues. We believe this constitutes a 'fair use' of any such copyrighted material as provided for in section 107 of the US Copyright Law. For more information go to: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.shtml>. If you wish to use copyrighted material from this site for purposes of your own that go beyond 'fair use', you must obtain permission from the copyright owner.