

Lumen Gentium Annotated

*an examination of the hundreds of errors contained
in this momentous document which turned the tide
of the modernist revolution in the Catholic Church*

By the editors of *Quanta Cura Press*™

This book is dedicated to St. Thomas Aquinas, who is the Common Doctor of the Catholic Church, and whose writings are the vaccine (as well as antidote) against the pandemic modernism which has infected the Church, including Her hierarchy at the highest levels.

“[C]ertain it is that the passion for novelty is always united in [the modernists] with hatred of scholasticism [*i.e.*, the philosophy and theology of St. Thomas Aquinas], and **there is no surer sign that a man is on the way to Modernism than when he begins to show his dislike for [the scholastic] system.**”

Pope St. Pius X, *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*, 1907, ¶42 (emphasis added).

“Thomas refutes the theories propounded by Modernists in every sphere Modernists are so amply justified in fearing no Doctor of the Church so much as Thomas Aquinas.”

Pope Pius XI, *Studiorum Ducem*, ¶27.

Quanta Cura Press[™] grants to the public a non-exclusive license to disseminate this book for the greater honor and glory of God, provided that it is disseminated exactly “as is”, and free of charge.

Cover art: © 2013 Pascendi Photo Services[™], a division of Quanta Cura Press[™]

No claim to original works quoted in this book.

Preface

The Purpose of this Book

Pope Benedict XVI stated that there were two ways to interpret the teachings of Vatican II. In his Christmas Address to the Roman Curia, on December 22, 2005, the pope asked:

Why has the implementation of the Council, in large parts of the Church, thus far been so difficult? Well, it all depends on the correct interpretation of the Council or – as we would say today – on its proper hermeneutics, the correct key to its interpretation and application. The problems in its implementation arose from the fact that two contrary hermeneutics came face to face and quarreled with each other. One caused confusion, the other, silently but more and more visibly, bore and is bearing fruit. On the one hand, there is an interpretation that I would call ‘a hermeneutic of discontinuity and rupture’; it has frequently availed itself of the sympathies of the mass media, and also one trend of modern theology. On the other, there is the ‘hermeneutic of reform’, of renewal in the continuity of the one subject-Church which the Lord has given to us.

Pope Benedict XVI asserts that the correct “hermeneutic” is one of reform and continuity with the teachings of the Church before Vatican II.

The modest goal of the annotations which compose this book, is simply to place side-by-side the teachings of *Lumen Gentium*, with the traditional teachings of the Catholic Church starting from the time of the apostles. Then, the reader can judge for himself whether *Lumen Gentium* is a rupture with the Catholic Church's traditional teachings, or not.

A Preliminary Objection to the Purpose of this Book

However, before beginning this comparison, let us consider a superficial *a priori* argument: *viz.*, that Vatican II's teachings are infallible and therefore, that it cannot teach anything which is opposed to the truths of the Catholic Faith, however much *Lumen Gentium*'s teachings might appear to be the opposite. According to this argument, no (apparent) opposition between *Lumen Gentium* and the Catholic Church's traditional teachings should ever weaken our resolve to simply and continually insist that *Lumen Gentium* must be consistent with the traditional teachings of the Catholic Church, no matter how great an opposition appears.

Examination of an Argument Based on *Lumen Gentium*'s Designation as a 'Dogmatic Constitution'

A person might be led to this (errant) view because the council labeled *Lumen Gentium* as a (so-called) "dogmatic constitution". Does this label mean that this document infallibly defines dogma? In other words, is any part of this

“dogmatic constitution” infallible by the very fact of the council teaching it? Or, on the other hand, does the label “dogmatic constitution” refer to something else, such as the fact that it discusses certain particular dogmatic subjects, although the document itself does not infallibly define any dogma?

A prominent Protestant observer at Vatican II, Dr. Robert McAfee Brown, gave his eye-witness impression regarding the labels which the council placed on its documents:

In those early days of the Council there was much discussion about the relative degree of binding authority between, say, a ‘constitution’ and a ‘decree.’ It seemed fairly clear that a ‘constitution’ was of higher authority, and it would be a wise rule of interpretation to say that the ‘constitution’ *On the Church*, for example, was the context in which to understand the ‘decree’ *On Ecumenism*, rather than vice versa. As it actually worked out, however, there seemed little reason by the end of the Council why *The Church in the World Today* should be a ‘constitution’ (albeit a ‘pastoral constitution’) while the document on *Missionary Activity* should be a ‘decree’ or the statement on *Religious Freedom* a ‘declaration’.

Robert McAfee Brown, *Ecumenical Revolution*, Doubleday, Garden City, 1967 (2nd ed., 1969), p.176 (emphasis in original).

Our own research supports McAfee Brown, *viz.*, that there was not, and still is not, any authoritative clarity or any consistent and comprehensive rationale regarding the

respective weight of the documents, based on their designated labels (“constitution”, “decree” or “declaration”). This lack of clarity is exemplified in Pope Paul VI himself calling the *Declaration on Religious Liberty* “one of the greatest documents of the Council” even though it has what seems to be the lower status of “declaration”.

<http://www.asianews.it/news-en/Dignitatis-Humanae,-the-dignity-of-man-in-the-encounter-between-Truth-and-conscience-26172.html>.

This uncertainty fits with the revolutionary character of the council (and of the conciliar church since then), *viz.*, that just like in other revolutions, much that occurs is unclear and in flux. However, for purposes of addressing the objection that *Lumen Gentium* is in itself infallible, it is not necessary to determine exactly what authority a conciliar document has based on it being designated as a “dogmatic constitution”, as long as the contents of such a document are not thereby made infallible, *i.e.*, infallible by the very fact that the council teaches them in a document called a “dogmatic constitution”.

Examination of Other Arguments That *Lumen Gentium* is Infallible

Because there is no reason to think that *Lumen Gentium* is infallible because of its designation as a “dogmatic constitution”, we will next examine other arguments regarding whether any statements of *Lumen Gentium* are infallible in themselves, *i.e.*, solely from the very fact that the council teaches them. If *Lumen Gentium* is not in itself infallible, then it cannot be vain (or wrong) to entertain the possibility that its contents might contradict the Catholic Church’s traditional teachings.

How we Plan to Proceed in this Inquiry Whether *Lumen Gentium* is in itself Infallible

We propose to proceed by giving two arguments, based on two different types of evidence, in order to determine whether any teaching of the council is infallible in itself.

In the first argument, we will examine whether it is possible for Vatican II to teach infallibly if (or to the extent that) its teachings are new.

This argument will have three parts:

1. Whether new doctrine can be taught infallibly;
2. Whether Vatican II's teachings are new; and
3. The conclusion (of this first argument).

In the second argument, we will look at the declarations of the popes during and after the council, as well as those bishops whose opinions we could find, to see whether they consider any teachings of Vatican II to be infallible in themselves, *i.e.*, from the very fact that the council teaches them.

First Argument – Whether it is Possible for Vatican II to Teach Infallibly if (or to the Extent that) its Teachings are New

Part 1: Whether new doctrine can be taught infallibly

The First Vatican Council infallibly teaches that new teachings are not the proper subject matter for the guidance of the Holy Ghost:

For the Holy Ghost was promised to the successors of Peter **not so that they might, by His revelation, make known some new doctrine**, but that, by His assistance, they might **religiously guard and faithfully expound the revelation or Deposit of Faith transmitted by the Apostles.**

Vatican I, *Pastor Aeternus*, Sess. 4, ch.4, #6 (emphasis added).

The *Council of Trent Catechism* teaches:

The Catholic Church's "doctrines are **neither novel nor of recent origin**, but were delivered, of old, by the Apostles, and disseminated throughout the world. Hence, **no one can, for a moment, doubt that the impious opinions which heresy invents, opposed, as they are, to the doctrines taught by the Church from the days of the Apostles to the present time, are very**

**different from the faith of the true
Church.**

Council of Trent Catechism, under *Creed; Apostolicity* (emphasis added).

New doctrines are so foreign to Catholicism that St. Thomas Aquinas describes heretics as follows: “A heretic is someone who devises or follows false or **new** opinions.” *Summa Theologica*, IIa IIae, Q.11, a.1 *Sed contra* (emphasis added). Notice St. Thomas does not say “false **and** new opinions”. The newness of a doctrine is already sufficient reason to reject it.

The Second Council of Nicea, in 787 A.D, condemned doctrinal innovators and rejected all innovations, with these words:

[W]e declare that **we defend free from any innovations** all the written and unwritten ecclesiastical traditions that have been entrusted to us. ... Therefore, **all those who ... devise innovations** or who spurn anything entrusted to the Church ..., **we order that they be suspended** if they are bishops or clerics, and **excommunicated** if they are monks or lay people.

Emphasis added.

Pope St. Pius X describes modernists in terms of their break with tradition and their embrace of novel doctrines:

[T]hey pervert the eternal concept of truth and the true meaning of religion; in introducing a

new system in which “they are seen to be under the sway of a blind and unchecked **passion for novelty**, thinking not at all of finding some solid foundation of truth, but despising the Holy and Apostolic Traditions.”

Pope St. Pius X, *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*, ¶13, quoting from the encyclical *Singulari nos* of Pope Gregory XVI, June 25, 1834 (emphasis added).

Summary

This section shows that the Holy Ghost is not promised for the teaching of new doctrines. Further, the Catholic Church has always taught that Her doctrines are not new. Rather, the Catholic Church condemns new doctrines and considers them heresy. Thus, if Vatican II’s doctrines are new, they cannot be infallible and we should not embrace those doctrines but rather we should completely reject them.

Part 2 (of the first argument):

Whether Vatican II’s Teachings Are New

Having seen above that the Catholic Church rejects new doctrines and certainly does not teach them infallibly, we next look at whether Vatican II’s teachings are new. If they are, then they cannot be infallible. Below, we set forth the testimony of the hierarchy that the teachings of Vatican II are new.

The testimony of Pope John Paul II:

[W]hat constitutes the **substantial “novelty” of the Second Vatican Council**, in line with the legislative tradition of the Church, especially in regard to ecclesiology, constitutes likewise the “novelty” of the new Code [of canon law].

Among the elements which characterize the true and genuine image of the Church, we should emphasize especially the following: the doctrine in which the **Church is presented as the People of God (cf. *Lumen Gentium*, no. 2), and authority as a service (cf. *ibid.*, no. 3); the doctrine in which the Church is seen as a “communion”, and which, therefore, determines the relations which should exist between the **particular Churches and the universal Church, and between collegiality and the primacy**; the doctrine, moreover, according to which **all the members of the People of God, in the way suited to each of them, participate in the threefold office of Christ: priestly, prophetic and kingly**. With this teaching there is also linked that which concerns the duties and rights of the faithful, and particularly of the laity; and finally, the Church's commitment to ecumenism. ...**

[T]he Second Vatican Council has ... elements both old and new, and **the new consists precisely in the elements which we have enumerated**

Pope John Paul II, *Sacrae Disciplinae Leges*, January 25, 1983 (emphasis added).

As quoted above, Pope John Paul II specifically identified the main doctrines of *Lumen Gentium* as novelties. Among the chief novel teachings of Vatican II (and which are contained in the 1983 code of canon law), he lists: “the Church, [1.] the universal sacrament of salvation, [2.] is shown to be the People of God and [3.] its hierarchical constitution to be founded on the College of Bishops together with its head”. Pope John Paul II, *Sacrae Disciplinae Leges*, January 25, 1983.

We have other warnings that the conciliar doctrines are novelties, (for which the Holy Ghost was not promised). Pope John Paul II admitted the council’s novelties in these words:

Indeed, the extent and depth of the teaching of the Second Vatican Council call for a renewed commitment to deeper study in order to reveal clearly the Council's continuity with Tradition, especially in points of **doctrine** which, **perhaps because they are new**, have not yet been well understood by some sections of the Church.

Ecclesia Dei, (1988), ¶5.b.

The pope is calling for deeper study because 23 years after the council, he acknowledges that Vatican II’s continuity with Sacred Tradition is still not shown!

The testimony of Pope Benedict XVI:

In the first year of his pontificate, Pope Benedict XVI said:

[W]ith the Second Vatican Council, the time came when broad **new thinking** was required.

December 22, 2005 Christmas address (emphasis added).

Before he became pope, Cardinal Ratzinger taught:

If it is desirable to offer a diagnosis of the text [of the Vatican II document, *Gaudium et Spes*] as a whole, we might say that (in conjunction with the texts on religious liberty and world religions) it is a revision of the Syllabus of Pius IX, a kind of **countersyllabus**. ... Let us be content to say that the text serves as a **countersyllabus** and, as such, represents, on the part of the Church, an attempt at an official reconciliation with the new era inaugurated in 1789 [by the Masonic French Revolution].

Principles of Catholic Theology: Building Stones for a Fundamental Theology, translator, Sr. Mary Frances McCarthy (San Francisco: Ignatius Press 1987), pp. 381-382; French edition: *Les Principes de la Theologie Catholique - Esquisse et Materiaux*, Paris: Tequi, 1982, pp. 426-427 (emphasis added; bracketed words added).

Note: Obviously, whatever is the opposite (that is, the “counter”) of the Catholic Church’s prior teaching, must be a novel teaching which the Church did not previously teach. Yet this is how Pope Benedict XVI described some of the

main teachings of Vatican II! Thus, clearly, Vatican II's teachings contain novelties which are plainly not infallible.

The testimony of Pope Paul VI:

The new position adopted by the Church with regard to the realities of this earth is henceforth well known by everyone [T]he Church agrees to recognize the new principal to be put into practice [T]he Church agrees to recognize the world as 'self-sufficient'; she does not seek to make the world an instrument for her religious ends

August 24, 1969 *Declaration of Pope Paul VI, L'Osservatore Romano*; (emphasis added).

Further, Pope Paul VI also referred to the “newness” of the doctrine of the Second Vatican Council, in a general audience on January 12, 1966. *See*, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/audiences/1966/documents/hf_p-vi_aud_19660112_it.html

Statements Made by other Members of the Hierarchy

But there's more. Other members of the hierarchy have made clear statements concerning the novelty and rupture of the teachings of Vatican II.

Near the close of the council, Cardinal Congar stated:

What is new in this teaching [regarding religious liberty] in relation to the doctrine of

Leo XIII and even of Pius XII, although the movement was already beginning to make itself felt, is the determination of the basis peculiar to this liberty, which is sought not in the objective truth of moral or religious good, but in the ontological quality of the human person.

Congar, in the Bulletin *Etudes et Documents* of June 15, 1965, as quoted in *I Accuse the Council*, Archbishop Lefebvre, p. 27, Angelus Press, 2009 (emphasis added; bracketed words added).

Yves Cardinal Congar was made a Cardinal by Pope John Paul II in recognition for Cardinal Congar's lifelong dedication to the conciliar revolution. Cardinal Congar likened Vatican II to the triumph of the communists in Russia, calling Vatican II the "October Revolution" in the Church. Yves Congar, *The Council Day by Day: Second Session* p. 215, (1964). By this parallel, Cardinal Congar is telling us that Vatican II was an overthrow of the established order in the Catholic Church. Further, by making this particular parallel, Cardinal Congar saw fit to compare Vatican II to the triumph of the anti-God communists in Russia!

Cardinal Suenens compared Vatican II to a different anti-God revolution. He made the same parallel as Pope Benedict XVI did (quoted above), between Vatican II and the anti-God, Masonic French Revolution, saying that Vatican II was 1789 in the Church. Quoted in the *Catechism of the Crisis in the Church*, Pt., 5, by Fr. M. Gaudron, SSPX, posted here:

www.angelusonline.org/index.php?section=articles&subsection=show_article&article_id=2640.

In all three of the cardinals' comparisons of Vatican II with a communist or Masonic revolution, it is clear that they are stating that Vatican II's teaching is revolutionary, and thus it is new.

Conclusion Regarding the Non-Infallibility of Vatican II's Teachings based on their Newness

We have seen that the Holy Ghost is not promised for the teaching of new doctrines. Further, the Catholic Church has always taught that Her doctrines are not new. Rather, the Catholic Church condemns new doctrines and considers them heresy.

We have also seen that Pope Benedict XVI, Pope John Paul II and Pope Paul VI (as well as some cardinals), have all stated that Vatican II's doctrines are new. Therefore, Vatican II's teachings cannot be infallible (and further, they must be rejected because they are new).

Lastly, in addition to the declarations of these three popes and of the cardinals (regarding the newness of the teachings of Vatican II), as we read the annotations below, we will see for ourselves that the council teaches novelties "at every turn".

Second Argument – The Church Hierarchy Denies That Vatican II Defined Any Dogma

This second argument is based on the declarations of the popes and other members of the hierarchy, concerning their ultimate conclusion that the teachings of Vatican II were not made infallible by the very fact that Vatican II taught them.

The Testimony of the Council itself

Attempting to clarify the confusion concerning the status of *Lumen Gentium*, there was attached to this document the Theological Commission's March 6, 1964 declaration, which was then repeated by the Council's General Secretary on Nov. 16, 1964:

In view of conciliar practice and the pastoral purpose of the present Council, this sacred Synod defines matters of faith or morals as binding on the Church only when the Synod itself openly declares so.

The council never did “openly declare” any of its teachings to be infallible, as a reading of *Lumen Gentium* (below) will plainly show with regard to that particular document.

The Testimony of Pope Paul VI

Pope Paul VI was the pope who presided over three of the council's four sessions. He has been clear on repeated occasions that the teachings of Vatican II are not of themselves infallible.

For example, Pope Paul VI stated shortly after the close of Vatican II, that: “In view of the pastoral nature of the Council, it avoided any extraordinary statement of dogmas that would be endowed with the note of infallibility.” Pope Paul VI, “After the Council: New Tasks”, *The Pope Speaks*, vol. 11 (Winter, 1966), p.154.

When concluding the council, Pope Paul VI plainly stated that no teachings of Vatican II were themselves infallible:

Today we are concluding the Second Vatican Council. ... But one thing must be noted here, namely, that the teaching authority of the Church, even though not wishing to issue extraordinary dogmatic pronouncements, has made thoroughly known its authoritative teaching on a number of questions which today weigh upon man's conscience and activity, descending, so to speak, into a dialogue with him, but ever preserving its own authority and force; it has spoken with the accommodating friendly voice of pastoral charity; its desire has been to be heard and understood by everyone; it has not merely concentrated on intellectual understanding but has also sought to express itself in simple, up-to-date, conversational style, derived from actual experience and a cordial approach which make it more vital, attractive and persuasive; it has spoken to modern man as he is.

Address during the last general meeting of the Second Vatican Council, December 7, 1965; Acts of the Apostolic See, #58;

http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/speeches/1965/documents/hf_p-vi_spe_19651207_epilogo-concilio_en.html (emphasis added).

Pope Paul VI again highlighted the non-infallible, non-definitive character of Vatican II in a general audience in 1966:

There are those who ask what authority, what theological qualification, the Council intended to give to its teachings, knowing that it avoided issuing solemn dogmatic definitions backed by the Church's infallible teaching authority. The answer is known by those who remember the conciliar declaration of March 6, 1964, repeated on November 16, 1964. In view of the pastoral nature of the Council, it avoided proclaiming in an extraordinary manner any dogmas carrying the mark of infallibility but it still provided its teaching with the authority of the Ordinary Magisterium which must be accepted with docility according to the mind of the Council concerning the nature and aims of each document.

Pope Paul VI, General Audience, 12 January 1966,
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/audiences/1966/documents/hf_p-vi_aud_19660112_it.html (emphasis added).

The Testimony of Pope Benedict XVI

Pope Benedict XVI, when he was Cardinal Ratzinger, also stated that Vatican II was not infallible:

[T]here is a mentality of narrow views that isolates Vatican II There are many accounts of it, which give the impression that from Vatican II onward, everything has been changed, and what preceded it has no value or, at best, has value only in the light of Vatican II. ... The truth is that this particular Council defined no dogma at all, and deliberately chose

to remain on a modest level, as a merely pastoral council; and yet many treat it as though it had made itself into a sort of superdogma which takes away the importance of all the rest.

Address to the Chilean Episcopal Conference, Santiago, Chile, July 13, 1988,
<http://sagradatradicion.blogspot.com/2009/03/alocucion-los-obispos-en-chile-1988.html> (Spanish).

The Testimony of Pope John XXIII

Pope John XXIII explained:

The salient point of this Council is not, therefore, a discussion of one article or another of the fundamental doctrine of the Church, [but to study and expound doctrine] through methods of research and through the literary forms of modern thought.

Pope John XXIII's Opening Speech to the Council, *The Documents of Vatican II*, Abbott (general editor), p.715 (bracketed words in the original).

The Testimony of Various Cardinals and Bishops

Below, is the testimony of all council fathers whose testimony we were able to locate, regarding whether the teachings of Vatican II are of themselves infallible. They unanimously conclude that Vatican II was not in itself infallible in any of its teachings.

The Testimony of John Cardinal Heenan of England

[The Second Vatican Council] deliberately limited its own objectives. There were to be no specific definitions. Its purpose from the first was pastoral renewal within the Church and a fresh approach to the outside.

Council and Clergy, John Cardinal Heenan, London, 1966, p.7 (emphasis added; bracketed words added).

The Testimony of Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, on Sept. 9, 1964:

We must also restate that this ecumenical Council, as the sovereign pontiff John XXIII has stated many times, has no intention to pronounce itself on ... doctrinal issues; but its specific goal consists in giving to the pastoral zeal of the Church a new boost, so that it becomes more active and more fruitful in the dioceses, in parishes and in all mission territories, and also among all religious families and lay associations.

The Testimony of Cardinal Biffi

In his recent autobiographical work, Cardinal Biffi stated that:

John XXIII aspired after a council that ... avoided formulating definitive teachings that

would be obligatory for all. And in fact, this original indication was continually followed.

Giacomo Biffi, *Memorie e digressioni di un Italiano Cardinale* (Sienna, 2007).

The Testimony of Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre

[A]t the end of the [council] sessions, we asked Cardinal Felici [the Council's General Secretary], "Can you not give us what the theologians call the "theological note of the Council?" He replied, "We have to distinguish according to the schemas and the chapters those which have already been the subject of dogmatic definitions in the past; as for the declarations which have a novel character, we have to make reservations.

An Open Letter to Confused Catholics, Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, Ch. 14, entitled "Vatican II is the French Revolution in the Church", p. 107 (bracketed words in the original).

The Testimony of Bishop B.C. Butler of England

Not all teachings emanating from a pope or Ecumenical Council are infallible. There is no single proposition of Vatican II – except where it is citing previous infallible definitions – which is in itself infallible.

The *Tablet*, (England) Nov. 25, 1967, p.1220 (emphasis added).

Here is Bishop Butler again: “Vatican II gave us no new dogmatic definitions...” The *Tablet*, March 2, 1968, p.199.

The Testimony of Bishop Rudolf Graber

Since the Council was aiming primarily at a pastoral orientation and hence refrained from making dogmatically binding statements or disassociating itself, as previous Church assemblies have done, from errors and false doctrines by means of clear anathemas, many questions took on an opalescent ambivalence which provided a certain amount of justification for those who speak of the spirit of the Council.

Athanasius and the Church of Our Times, Rudolf Graber, Van Duren (publisher), London, 1974, p.66 (emphasis added).

The Testimony of Bishop Thomas Morris

I was relieved when we were told that this Council was not aiming at defining or giving final statements on doctrine, because a statement of doctrine has to be very carefully formulated and I would have regarded the Council documents as tentative and likely to be reformed.

Catholic World News, as quoted in its January 22, 1997 edition online.

Conclusion

The council itself, three popes and various cardinals and bishops tell us that the teachings of Vatican II are not infallible in themselves, *i.e.*, not infallible by the very fact that those statements were made by the council.

One Final Objection before we begin Examining the Text of *Lumen Gentium*

One might think, either through ignorance or false humility, that because we are not the pope (or at least a bishop), we should not “set ourselves up in judgment” whether the conciliar hierarchy is teaching the truth or not, or whether the conciliar hierarchy’s teachings are consistent with the traditional teaching of the Church. One might (wrongly) think that, to do so, shows a “Protestant mentality”. However, this view could not be further from the truth!

This ignorance or false humility is contrary to the consistent teaching of the Church. This could be shown by citing many Catholic authorities. Here is one:

When the shepherd turns into a wolf, the first duty of the flock is to defend itself.

As a general rule, doctrine comes from the bishops to the faithful, and it is not for the faithful, who are subjects in the order of Faith, to pass judgment on their superiors. But every Christian, by virtue of his title to the name

Christian, has not only the necessary knowledge of the essentials of the treasure of Revelation, but also the duty of safeguarding them. The principle is the same, whether it is a matter of belief or conduct, that is, of dogma or morals. Treachery such as that of Nestorius is rare in the Church; but it can happen that, for one reason or another, pastors remain silent on essential matters of faith. The true children of Holy Church at such times are those who walk by the light of their baptism, **not the cowardly souls who, under the specious pretext of submission to the powers that be, delay their opposition to the enemy in the hope of receiving instructions which are neither necessary nor desirable.**

The Liturgical Year, Vol. IV, Dom Guéranger; see the entry for the Feast of St. Cyril of Alexandria, February 9th (emphasis added).

Here is another authority: St. Vincent Lerins, in his *Commonitorium*:

What then should a **Catholic** do if some part of the Church were to separate itself from communion with the universal Faith? What other choice can he make but to prefer to the gangrenous and corrupted member, the whole of the body that is sound. And if some **new** contagion were to try to poison no longer a small part of the Church, but all of the Church at the same time, then **he will take the greatest care to attach himself to**

**antiquity which, obviously, can no longer
be seduced by any lying novelty.**

Emphasis added. Note that St. Vincent gives this rule to all Catholics, not only to the bishops or doctors of theology. We do not give more quotes from authority here because the type of person who suffers under this ignorance or false humility is a prisoner unable to free himself by reference to the consistent teaching of Church authority, because his very error is that his mind is too lowly to discern what those authorities say. Therefore, we present the following argument of reason instead.

The Catholics Faith is intelligible, even though it cannot be fully comprehended in all of its aspects, in the very manner that God understands everything. Our Faith is presented as a series of intelligible propositions (*i.e.*, statements) in each of which a predicate is said of a subject. Even though the faithful Catholic cannot prove by natural reason, this link (*i.e.*, connection) between the subject and predicate, he knows by Faith that the link exists and thus, that the opposite proposition must be false.

If one were to (wrongly) say that a Catholic is forbidden to compare current teachings of the hierarchy, with the consistent teaching of the Church of all time, this position would forbid a Catholic from understanding what he is saying (and believing) when he is professing his Faith. This position would instead substitute a blind obedience which accepts a mere formula of sounds – devoid of meaning – when professing the Faith. The Catholic Church has never professed such nominalism. Instead, the Church wants (and requires) Her children to understand the Faith, not merely memorize sounds or words by rote.

Thus, whereas the Protestants set their own private judgment as the measure and rule of all faith, the true Catholic sets the revealed truth of the Church of all time, as the measure and rule of Faith. This is infallible Catholic Tradition. Because the Catholic is allowed (and required) to understand his Faith, the current post-conciliar problem exists because an understanding of the Faith shows plainly that the modern conciliar teachings are the opposite of what Catholics have been required to understand and believe since the earliest times. That is, a Catholic who knows his Faith today is merely understanding what the Church has always taught. By knowing what the Church has always taught and knowing what the post-Vatican II hierarchy teaches, he notices that they are often opposites. To say that a Catholic is forbidden to notice this opposition is simply to say that Catholics are forbidden to understand, and must simply memorize the sounds of words without understanding that they have any meaning. In other words, the Church of the past (*i.e.*, the Church of all time), judges the present conciliar hierarchy's teachings. Faithful Catholics merely notice this fact.

Further, the very fact that Catholics are taught the distinction between infallible and non-infallible magisterial teachings, is because Catholics are taught that the infallible ones cannot conflict with the Catholic Faith but are part of it, whereas non-infallible magisterial teachings might conflict with the Catholic Faith. This distinction is a warning to Catholics to accept all of the infallible teachings without possibility of error, but to accept the non-infallible ones only provided that they do not conflict with the consistent teachings of the Catholic Church through the ages. This distinction also shows that Catholics are required not only to understand their Faith but also to

understand when current churchmen contradict infallible Catholic tradition.

Conclusion

Thus, our task in this book is merely to notice whether *Lumen Gentium* is harmonious with the consistent teachings of the Catholic Church through the ages.

Note Regarding the Authorities Cited in this Book

Besides citing many previous popes and Church councils, this book also quotes many Fathers and Doctors of the Church. The authority of the Church's Fathers and Doctors does not "automatically trump" Vatican II's teaching – even though the council's teaching is non-infallible. We cite the Church's Fathers and Doctors for these three reasons:

1. Because the Church authoritatively gives us the Fathers and Doctors as sources of Catholic Truth.
2. Because these Fathers and Doctors lived before the contagion of modernism and cannot be infected by that plague. (*See*, the quote above from St. Vincent Lerins.)
3. Because the Fathers and Doctors give Church-sanctioned testimony to the belief and teachings of the infallible Church herself, down through the ages, uninfected with modernism.

Lastly, we especially quote and follow the mind of St. Thomas Aquinas, because he is the Common Doctor who the

Church gives us above all others, for questions of theology and philosophy. He has a uniquely penetrating analysis which compels assent by the cogency of his arguments (even apart from his authority). Also, as Pope St. Pius X and Pope Pius XI have declared (quoted above), the doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas is the best defense against the modernism infecting the Church right now.

Some Practical Notes

This book uses the official Vatican translation of *Lumen Gentium*, found on the Vatican's website. Our own annotations are footnotes, at the bottom of a page and which use a superscript number. All endnotes use a full-size number, are in parentheses, and are contained in the document's official version contained on the Vatican website. There is a second set of endnotes, which contain both a full-size number and an asterisk in parentheses. These were added by the Vatican, after the original edition of *Lumen Gentium* was published.

This *Lumen Gentium* text and most original works cited in this book are free and freely available on the internet. To make the annotations of this book more readable, we have left out most internet links. However, the reader can easily find most of the original works quoted in this book, without our including those links. If, after making a reasonable attempt, a reader still has trouble finding an original work he wishes to consult, contact *Quanta Cura Press*™ at: quantacurapress@gmail.com.

Because many annotations in this book are very long, extending for pages, we have used two different type fonts.

We use a sans-serif font, Calibri, for *Lumen Gentium* itself. This is the font chosen by the Vatican for this document. We use a serif font, Century Schoolbook, for the annotations, making it easier to see at a glance, when opening the book to a random page, whether the text one reads there is an annotation or part of *Lumen Gentium* itself.

All of our annotations are below a line inserted onto the page. So if the reader opens this book to a random page and sees text below a line, he knows this is the text of an annotation.

Lastly, our annotations honor the traditional Catholic practice of capitalizing pronouns referring to God. We did not capitalize such pronouns in those post-conciliar texts which fail to do so.

In Jesus Christ the King of all Nations,
Whose Mystical Body is solely the Catholic Church,

The editors of *Quanta Cura Press*™

On the Traditional Feast of St. Thomas Aquinas
March 7, 2013

DOGMATIC CONSTITUTION ON THE CHURCH
LUMEN GENTIUM
SOLEMNLY PROMULGATED BY HIS HOLINESS
POPE PAUL VI
ON NOVEMBER 21, 1964
CHAPTER I
THE MYSTERY OF THE CHURCH

1. Christ is the Light of nations. Because this is so, this Sacred Synod gathered together in the Holy Spirit eagerly desires, by proclaiming the Gospel to every creature,⁽¹⁾ to bring the light of Christ to all men, a light brightly visible on the countenance of the Church. Since the Church is in Christ like a sacrament¹ or as a sign and instrument both

¹ Although the Catholic Faith was taught in its entirety since the beginning of the Church, the terms used to describe the Faith became more precise with the passage of time, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost. There are countless examples of this in the history of the Church, where the true doctrine was always clear, but the terms used in the early Church were not as precise as the terms later developed. St. Thomas Aquinas explains this principle in the context of the naming of priests and bishops:

We may speak of priest and bishop in two ways. First, with regard to the name: and thus formerly bishops and priests were not distinct. For bishops are so called “because they watch over others”, as Augustine observes (*De Civ. Dei* xix, 19); while the priests according to the Greek are “elders”. [*Referring to the Greek “episkopos” and “presbyteros” from which the English “bishop” and “priest” are derived.] Hence the Apostle employs

the term “priests” in reference to both, when he says (1 *Tim.* 5:17): “Let the priests that rule well be esteemed worthy of double honor”; and again he uses the term “bishops” in the same way, wherefore addressing the priests of the Church of Ephesus he says (Acts 20:28): “Take heed to yourselves” and “to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops, to rule the church of God.”

But as regards the thing signified by these terms, there was always a difference between them, even at the time of the apostles. This is clear on the authority of Dionysius (*Eccl. Hier.* v), and of a gloss {*i.e.*, an authoritative commentary} on Luke 10:1, “After these things the Lord appointed”, *etc.* which says: “Just as the apostles were made bishops, so the seventy-two disciples were made priests of the second order.”

Subsequently, however, in order to avoid schism, it became necessary to distinguish even the terms, by calling the higher ones bishops and the lower ones priests. But to assert that priests nowise differ from bishops is reckoned by Augustine among heretical doctrines (*De Heres.* liii), where he says that the Arians maintained that “no distinction existed between a priest and a bishop.”

Summa Theologica, IIa IIae, Q.184, a.6, ad 1 (bold emphasis and words in fancy brackets were added; parenthetical and square-bracketed comments were included by the editors to the English language edition from which this quotation was taken).

This same principle applies to the Catholic Church's use of the word "sacrament". As the 1913 Catholic Encyclopedia explains:

Just as many doctrines were believed, but not always accurately expressed, until the condemnation of heresies or the development of religious knowledge called forth a neat and precise formula, so also the sacraments were accepted and used by the Church for centuries before Aristotelian philosophy, applied to the systematic explanation of Christian doctrine, furnished the accurate definition and enumeration of Peter Lombard [in Book IV of his work, *The Sentences*]. ... Thus, time was required, not for the development of the sacraments – except insofar as the Church may have determined what was left under her control by Jesus Christ – but for the growth and knowledge of the sacraments. For many centuries all signs of sacred things were called sacraments, and the enumeration of these signs was somewhat arbitrary. Our seven sacraments were all mentioned in the Sacred Scriptures, and we find them all mentioned here and there by the Fathers (see THEOLOGY; and articles on each sacrament). After the ninth century, writers began to draw a distinction between sacraments in a general sense and sacraments properly so called.

1913 Catholic Encyclopedia, Topic: *Sacraments*, vol. 13, p. 597 (bracketed citation added; parenthetical citation in the original).

“[T]he word *Sacramentum* has various senses, and till its sense had been definitely fixed, or some other word found as a substitute, the enumeration of seven sacraments was

impossible.” This had been fully accomplished by the 1100s. *A Catholic Dictionary*, William E. Addis, Third Edition, Catholic Publication Society, Co., New York, 1884, entry: *Sacraments of the Gospel*.

This clarification, which was finished with virtually universal acceptance of the explanation of Peter Lombard (Sentences IV) in the 1100s, resulted in only the Seven Sacraments of the New Law being called “Sacraments” after that. For this reason, the Council of Trent infallibly condemned the error that “the sacraments of the New Law ... are more or less than seven”. Denz. 844.

Pope Benedict XIV imposed a profession of the Catholic Faith which states: “I profess that there are seven sacraments of the New Law, instituted by Christ, our Lord, for the salvation of the human race”. Denz. 1470.

Pope Pius IV taught and insisted upon the same doctrine in his profession of Faith. Bull *Iniunctum nobis*, Nov. 13, 1565, Denz. 996. The Council of Florence and Pope Eugenius IV solemnly taught the same, as did the Second Council of Lyons and Pope Gregory X. Denz. 695 & 465.

If the council were not wrong to call the Church Herself a sacrament, then the Council of Trent’s infallible teaching and the many traditional Catholic professions of Faith would all be false, because the Church would Herself be an eighth Sacrament. Clearly, the Church is not a sacrament. This is why, before Vatican II, every Catholic catechism and reference work taught “that there are seven sacraments of the New Law, and seven only.” See, e.g., *A Catholic Dictionary*, William E. Addis, Third Edition, Catholic Publication Society, Co., New York, 1884, entry: *Sacraments of the Gospel*.

Vatican II here returns to the imprecise language of the early Church, impliedly denying the last 900+ years of guidance given by the Holy Ghost and impliedly promoting the error of antiquarianism. Pope Pius XII **condemned** antiquarian errors set out in the following two paragraphs:

14. In theology some want to reduce to a minimum the meaning of dogmas; and to free dogma itself from terminology long established in the Church and from philosophical concepts held by Catholic teachers, to bring about a return in the explanation of Catholic doctrine to the way of speaking used in Holy Scripture and by the Fathers of the Church. They cherish the hope that when dogma is stripped of the elements which they hold to be extrinsic to divine revelation, it will compare advantageously with the dogmatic opinions of those who are separated from the unity of the Church and that in this way they will gradually arrive at a mutual assimilation of Catholic dogma with the tenets of the dissidents.”

15. Moreover they assert that when Catholic doctrine has been reduced to this condition, a way will be found to satisfy modern needs

Humani Generis, ¶¶ 14-15.

Vatican II's return here to the less precise, more general use of the term “sacrament”, is an antiquarian error which serves to promote false ecumenism. Protestants reject the Catholic doctrine of the seven Sacraments being outward signs of the grace they themselves convey (“*ex opere operato*”). See, Thomas Cranmer, *Questions and Answers concerning the Sacraments*, answer to Qs. 5-6. However, Protestants (often) have no

problem with the word “sacrament”, as long as the word is not given the traditional (pre-conciliar) Catholic meaning. *Id.* Thus, Vatican II is obscuring the Catholic truth and making possible a superficial and false agreement on doctrine, with the Protestants. Many Protestants have no objection to a more general notion of sacrament, which more generally means a sign of a mystery and which term applies to many things beside the true seven Sacraments of the New Law.

Lumen Gentium’s revolutionary definition of the Catholic Church is the key to the undermining of the whole supernatural order. Here is the traditional definition of the Catholic Church (as pertaining to the Church Militant):

Q. What is the Catholic Church?

A. The Catholic Church is the Union or Congregation of all the baptized who, still living on earth, profess the same Faith and the same Law of Jesus Christ, participate in the same Sacraments, and obey their lawful Pastors, particularly the Roman Pontiff.

Catechism of St. Pius X, from section *On the Church*, Q.8.

According to *Lumen Gentium*, no longer are Catholics united in the same seven Sacraments. Instead they are members of a “Church... [that] is in the nature of a sacrament – a sign and instrument, that is, of communion with God and of unity among all men”. (§1). The Church is consequently only a sign or a means of salvation, and is no longer the one and only Ark of salvation.

It is true that §1 of *Lumen Gentium* says that “the Church is in Christ like a sacrament”. But the council says below (§48) that the Church **is** a sacrament. Pope John Paul II followed the council by also plainly saying that the Church **is** a sacrament. He listed the chief novel teachings of Vatican II, to include that “the Church, the universal sacrament of salvation, is shown to be the people of God”. Pope John Paul II, *Sacrae Disciplinae Leges*, January 25, 1983 (emphasis added).

Moreover, Pope Benedict XVI stated that the writings of Pope John Paul II “are the authentic interpretation of Vatican II.” <http://www.dici.org/en/news/benedict-xvi-on-polish-television-john-paul-ii-authentic-interpreter-of-vatican-ii/>.

Pope John Paul II not only called the Church a sacrament but also said many other things are “sacraments”. For example, he says man is a “sacrament”. *See, e.g.*, Pope John Paul II, General Audience 2-20-80. He says the world is a “sacrament”. *Id.* He says the human body is a “sacrament”. *Id.* In this practice of calling practically “everything” a sacrament, the conciliar church follows the Protestants. *See, e.g.*, Thomas Cranmer, *Questions and Answers concerning the Sacraments*, answer to Q. 4. Not only does conciliar usage conform with fuzzy Protestant “theology”, but this usage also takes any specific meaning out of *Lumen Gentium*’s already-blurry statement that the Church is like a sacrament.

Vatican II not only destroys the clarity of terminology which the Holy Ghost had developed in the Church’s explanation of the sacraments, but this same designation of the Church being “like a sacrament” serves to de-emphasize the Church’s role as a visible institution, making the Church rather amorphous, in order to prepare the way for the notion of universal salvation (as will be discussed below).

of a very closely² knit union with God and of the unity of the whole human race³, it desires now to unfold more fully to the faithful⁴ of the

After the council, conciliar theologians (and the hierarchy) made more explicit the council's description of an amorphous church. One of countless examples of this explication is by Fr. Richard McBrien, who, as of 2013, is the Crowley-O'Brien Professor of Theology at the University of Notre Dame. Fr. McBrien explained: **"The first and most basic ecclesiological principle at Vatican II is that the Church is a *mystery*, or *sacrament*, and not only or even primarily an institution or organization."** See, *Vatican II themes: The church as mystery, or sacrament*, July 18, 2011, as published in the *National Catholic Reporter*, <http://ncronline.org/blogs/essays-theology/vatican-ii-themes-church-mystery-or-sacrament>.

² We give one last reminder to the reader: this text here (*viz.*, "... closely knit union ...") is a continuation of the council's own text of *Lumen Gentium*. The Calibri sans-serif font indicates this fact. The solid line on this page, on the seven pages immediately above this page and on many pages below here, shows that the serif font text below the line is not the council's text but rather is an annotation.

³ Here in the third sentence, the council begins to teach the naturalism, which is a theme to which the council repeatedly returns, in *Lumen Gentium* and other council documents. Where Vatican II here says that the "Church is ... a sign and instrument ... of the unity of the whole human race", this echoes *Gaudium et Spes* (§3), where the council teaches that the Church has the task of assisting in "fostering that brotherhood of all men".

A little lower in *Gaudium et Spes*, the council sets forth its naturalistic vision this way: "[H]uman culture must evolve today

in such a way that it can develop the whole human person harmoniously and at the same time assist men in those duties which all men, especially Christians, are called to fulfill in the fraternal unity of the one human family.” *Gaudium et Spes* §56.

Pope John XXIII taught that the aim of the council is to unite the human race: “[S]uch is the aim of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, which... prepares, as it were, and consolidates the path toward that unity of mankind which is required as a necessary foundation, in order that the earthly may be brought to the resemblance of that heavenly city” John XXIII, Pope John’s Opening Speech to the Council, *The Documents of Vatican II*, Abbott (general editor), p.718.

Pope John Paul II explicitly taught this conciliar doctrine of universal brotherhood: “The restoration of unity of all Christians was one of the principal purposes of the Second Vatican Council (*cf.*, *Unitatis Redintegratio* §1) and since my election I have formally committed myself to promote and execute its norms and its orientations, considering it as my primordial duty.” *Address to the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity*, 11-18-78. For Pope John Paul II, this “restoration of the unity of Christians” is but one step towards a greater unity, that of the whole human family. He explained: “The unity of Christians is open to a unity ever more vast, that of all humanity.” *Angelus Message*, 1-17-82.

http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/angelus/1982/documents/hf_jp-ii_ang_19820117_sp.html.

Pope John Paul II said he deemed it a duty to “take once again into our hands the *Magna Charta* of the Council, that is, the Dogmatic Constitution *Lumen Gentium*”. First Radio Message *Urbi et Orbi*, 10-17-78. This “taking in hand” was “not merely in order that the vital communion in Christ of all who believe and hope in him should be accomplished, but also in order to

contribute to bringing about a fuller and closer unity of the whole human family.” *Id.*

The utopian goal of universal brotherhood is a consequence of the conciliar church’s naturalistic love for man as he is, departing from the perennial Catholic mission of preaching “from the housetops” that man must undergo supernatural conversion and enter the Catholic Church. Speaking for the council, at its close, Pope Paul VI told the “modern humanists” that “we too, in fact, we more than any others, honor mankind.” (The Latin is “*nam nos etiam, immo nos prae ceteris, hominis sumus cultores*”.) December 7, 1965, closing speech of Vatican II.

Vatican II intentionally refocused the Church toward being more man-centered, thereby bringing it more in line with secular society. Pope Paul VI explained the council’s man-centeredness this way: “Has all this, and everything we could say about the human value of the Council, perhaps deflected the spirit of the Church in the Council towards the anthropocentric thrust of modern culture? Not deflected, but given it an orientation.” 12-7-65 homily, published on 12-8-65 in *Osservatore Romano*.

In a speech on December 7, 1965, Pope Paul VI said:

[O]ne must realize that this [Second Vatican] Council, which exposed itself to human judgment, insisted very much more upon this pleasant side of man, rather than on his unpleasant one. Its attitude was very much and deliberately optimistic. A wave of affection and admiration flowed from the Council over the modern world of humanity.

http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/speeches/1965/docum

ents/hf_p-vi_spe_19651207_epilogo-concilio_en.html.

In contrast to the conciliar teaching, the Catholic Church's real founding mission is not the unity of mankind. The Church is a sign of contradiction, like our Lord was and is. He said "Do not think that I came to bring peace upon earth; I came not to bring peace, but the sword." Matt. 10; 34.

The Church's mission is to take as many people as possible from the human race as a whole and save their souls by bringing them into the Catholic Church. As our Lord said: "I pray not for the world, but for them whom [God the Father] hast given Me". John, 17; 9. Our Lord gave Her this mission: "Going therefore, teach ye all nations; baptizing them". Matt. 28:19.

Echoing St. Augustine, Pope Leo XIII explained the irreconcilability of the world (*i.e.*, those who refuse the true Catholic Church) and those belonging to the Catholic Church:

This twofold kingdom St. Augustine keenly discerned and described after the manner of two cities, contrary in their laws because striving for contrary objects; and with a subtle brevity he expressed the efficient cause of each in these words: "Two loves formed two cities: the love of self, reaching even to contempt of God, an earthly city; and the love of God, reaching to contempt of self, a heavenly one." At every period of time each has been in conflict with the other

Humanum Genus, Pope Leo XIII's encyclical *On Freemasonry*, §2.

Sacred Scripture teaches: "[K]now you not that the friendship of this world is the enemy of God? Whosoever therefore will be a

friend of this world, becometh an enemy of God. James 4:4.

Thus, the Church's essential mission is to convert the greatest possible number of souls to Christ by bringing them into the true Catholic Church. This founding mission is why it was the constant practice of the popes throughout the centuries to work for the return of dissidents to the unique true Church. For example, Pope Pius XI taught: “The **union of Christians can only be furthered by promoting the return to the one true Church of Christ** of those who are separated from it”. *Mortalium Animos*, January 6, 1928, §15 (emphasis added).

Pope Pius XII repeated the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church, in his 1949 *Instruction on the Ecumenical Movement*: “True reunion can only come about by the return of dissidents to the one true Church of Christ [viz., the Catholic Church].” Dec. 20, 1949 *The Instruction from the Holy Office on the Ecumenical Movement*, entire English translation published in *The Tablet* of London, March 4, 1950.

Whereas the traditional Catholic Church sought unity by bringing men into the Catholic Church, by contrast, the post-conciliar church seeks (a superficial) unity of all men without bringing them into the Catholic Church. For example, the conciliar church declares: “we reject ... uniatism ... as the method for the search for unity Pastoral activity in the Catholic Church, Latin as well as Oriental, no longer aims at having the faithful [sic!] of one Church pass over to the other.” *Declaration of the Joint International Commission for the Theological Dialogue between the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church*, June 23, 1993, ¶22.

Whereas the Catholic Church’s perennial focus was not on achieving the unity of the whole human race but rather on the

unity of those men who are willing to join the one true Church, Vatican II's quest greatly contrasts to this. Vatican II's goal of the unity of all mankind is the same impossible and naturalistic ideal that Freemasonry claims as its "great mission". See, e.g., *The Builders – A Story and Study of Freemasonry*, by Joseph Fort Newton, p.111, first published in 1914, republished in 2008 by forgottenbooks.com.

Vatican II's ideal of uniting all mankind is also the professed goal of the United Nations and worldwide Jewish interests. See, e.g., *United Nations Charter*, ch. 1, art. 1; see also, e.g., Israeli Prime Minister, David Ben-Gurion's remark in 1948: "We consider that the United Nations ideal is the Jewish ideal" and that Jewish policy "must be the unity of the human race." *Time Magazine, Israel: The Watchman*, August 16, 1948, found at: <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,798932,00.html>.

Along with Vatican II's mission of the unity of the human race, that council also joins the Masons in promoting their essentially-related, this-worldly goals, of world peace and social justice focused on this world. This is why Pope Benedict XVI gave "special thanks" to "secular humanists" who, the pope said, "have been willing to share this [Assisi III] pilgrimage with us as a sign of their desire to **work together to build a better world.**" Speech at Assisi, October 27, 2011, (emphasis added) at: <http://www.catholicnews.com/data/stories/cns/1104244.htm>.

Vatican II's *Decree on Ecumenism* devotes a section to "collaboration with our separated brethren", who are invited to join in the crusade "against the afflictions of our times, such as famine and natural disasters, illiteracy and poverty, lack of housing and the unequal distribution of wealth". Ch. 2, ¶12. *Gaudium et Spes* summarizes the council's this-worldly focus by

saying that “earthly progress ... is of vital concern to the kingdom of God”. ¶39.

At the start of the Council, the council fathers showed their *this-worldly* focus in their “Message to the World”. In this message, they expressed an expectation of material progress: “While we hope that through the Council's labors the light of faith shines more clearly and alive, we await a spiritual renaissance from which also comes a happy impulse that favors human well-being, that is, scientific invention, progress of the arts, technology, and a greater diffusion of culture.” The council fathers then invited everyone in the world to work with them toward universal brotherhood: “We invite all to collaborate with us in order to install in the world a more well-ordered civil life and a greater fraternity.” *Id.* Notice also that the council’s “Message to the World” defines “human well-being” only in terms of natural goods. By contrast, the truth is that the highest and crucial elements of “human well-being” are all supernatural.

According to Vatican II, Catholics have “the obligation to work with all men for the construction of a more human world”. *Gaudium et Spes*, §57. They ought to fight for a “human culture favorable to personal dignity and free from any discrimination on the grounds of race, sex, nation, of religion, or social condition”. *Id.*, at §60. This is the type of culture promoted by the UN and its institutions, and whose characteristics necessarily mandate the disappearance of the entire idea of Catholic culture.

The quote immediately above, in which Vatican II condemns all religious discrimination, is just one more of the many errors adopted by Vatican II from the Catholic Church’s Freemasonic enemies. Religious liberty for everyone, is a necessary aspect of

the Masonic plan for forming a naturalistic human “paradise” on earth. Vatican II’s adoption of religious liberty is the opposite of the Church’s consistent teaching before Vatican II and is the opposite of Pope Pius IX’s infallible teaching in *Quant Cura*. See, the comparison set forth at <http://www.scribd.com/doc/46116957>.

As quoted above, the council promotion of the Masonic unity of all men includes a blanket condemnation of “discrimination on the grounds of ... sex”. In fact, men and women have different God-given roles, in marriage, in society and in the Church. Therefore, the traditional Catholic position is that there are good grounds for some “discrimination on the grounds of ... sex”. This is seen in many ways, including in the impossibility of women being ordained to the priesthood. It is also seen in the traditional prohibition of women publicly teaching the Faith. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.177, a.2. The conciliar church’s revolutionary designation of three women (so-called) “Doctors” of the Church, is an application of *Lumen Gentium*’s erroneous promotion of Masonic unity and its opposition to reasonable discrimination between the sexes, based on their God-given roles.

The post-conciliar hierarchy has further elaborated on Vatican II’s this-worldly focus on Masonic and naturalistic “social justice” initiatives. For example, Pope Benedict XVI calls for a *this-worldly* one world government: “To manage the global economy; to revive economies hit by the crisis; to avoid any deterioration of the present crisis and the greater imbalances that would result; to bring about integral and timely disarmament, food security and peace; to guarantee the protection of the environment and to regulate migration: for all this, there is urgent need of a true world political authority”. *Caritas in Veritate*, §67.

In 1965, Pope Paul VI showed he had the same *this-worldly* focus on naturalistic, human solutions to the world's problems, when he stated that: "The peoples of the earth turn to the United Nations as the last hope of concord and peace". *Pope Paul VI's Address to United Nations General Assembly*, October 4, 1965.

Pope Benedict XVI exhorts all "Christians" – both Catholics and heretics alike – to "work together in building a world where individuals and peoples shall not hurt or destroy". 1-1-11 *World Peace Day* message. Pope Benedict XVI echoes the Masonic goal of harnessing all religions and all other human institutions to create a naturalistic "paradise" on earth. As Pope Benedict XVI teaches, all of the "great religions can constitute an important factor of unity and peace for the human family". 1-1-11 *Angelus* message.

Vatican II preaches the gospel of man's social progress, working at their naturalistic pursuits, as citizens of the world:

Christians should rather rejoice that, following the example of Christ who worked as an artisan, they are free to give proper exercise to all their earthly activities and to their humane, domestic, professional, social and technical enterprises by gathering them into one vital synthesis with religious values, under whose supreme direction all things are harmonized unto God's glory. In carrying out this unification, the laity will be acting as citizens in the world, whether individually or socially, [and] they will keep the laws proper to each discipline, and labor to equip themselves with a genuine expertise in their various fields. They will gladly work with men seeking the same goals.

... For whoever promotes the human community at the family level, culturally, in its economic, social and political dimensions, both nationally and internationally, such a one, according to God's design, is contributing greatly to the Church as well, to the extent that she depends on things outside herself.

Gaudium et Spes, §§ 43 & 44. In §§ 13 & 28 of *Lumen Gentium* below, the council further addresses the themes of the riches of this world and the social justice issue of economic inequality.

Whereas, Vatican II says (immediately above) that whoever promotes the human community by economic and other naturalistic work, contributes “greatly” to the Church, how different was the spiritual emphasis and supernatural outlook of the pre-conciliar Catholic Church! For example, a few years before the council, Pope Pius XII said: “[T]he more [men] are detached from the vanities of this world and from inordinate love of temporal things, the more apt they will be to perceive the light of heavenly mysteries. But the vanity and emptiness of earthly things are more manifest today than perhaps at any other period”. *Mystici Corporis*, §4.

In his *Syllabus of Errors*, Pope Pius IX infallibly condemned this proposition:

80. The Roman Pontiff can, and ought to, reconcile himself, and come to terms with progress, liberalism and modern civilization.

Quanta Cura, to which this syllabus is attached, makes clear that Pope Pius IX is condemning this error *ex cathedra*, under the conditions for infallibility set forth in the First Vatican Council.

⁴ One might think that the phrase “faithful of the Church” is synonymous with the term Catholic. That is the objective truth but is often not the conciliar manner of speaking. When the council refers to Catholics in particular, it tends to specifically refer to them as “Catholic faithful”, to distinguish them from the broader group of “all who believe in Christ”. *See, e.g., §13 below.* Taking their cue from Vatican II, the conciliar popes speak the same way. For example, during an ecumenical event with the Anglican (so-called “Archbishop”) Rowan Williams of Canterbury, Pope Benedict XVI urged “all the faithful -- both Catholic and Anglican” to “work for unity”. 3-12-12 *Catholic News Service* report: *Catholics, Anglicans need to renew commitment to unity, Pope says*, found at this link: <http://www.catholicregister.org/columns/item/14042-catholics-anglicans-need-to-renew-commitment-to-unity-pope-says>.

As Pope Benedict XVI shows in the quote immediately above, the modern church practice is to seek superficial, exterior unity with heretics without any requirement that they abjure their errors which are contrary to the Catholic Faith. As the Anglican “convert”, Msgr. Keith Newton, said about the entire group of recent Anglican “converts” to Catholicism: “We've not been asked to deny anything.” Msgr. Newton should know this, because he is the U.K. Ordinary appointed by the Vatican for the Anglican “converts” in England. *Vatican Insider*, 3-1-12 article: *Anglican Catholics and the experience of the Ordinariate*, found at this link: <http://vaticaninsider.lastampa.it/en/homepage/world-news/detail/articolo/anglicani-anglicans-anglicanos-united-kingdom-gran-bretana-gran-bretagna-13118/>.

By contrast to the modern practice, the Church traditionally demanded that converts from a false religion abjure their schism or heresy when they return to the Catholic Church (CIC 1917,

Church and to the whole world its own inner nature and universal mission. This it intends to do following faithfully the teaching of previous councils. The present-day conditions of the world add greater urgency to this work⁵ of the Church so that all men, joined more closely today by various social, technical and cultural ties, might also attain fuller unity in Christ.⁶

Can. 2314, §2). Denz. 1848. “[I]n the conversion of heretics, ... if it shall be established that [their baptism] was valid, they will have to be received only for the profession of faith.” *The Reception of Converted Heretics* (From the Decree of the Holy Office, Nov. 20, 1878).

⁵ The phrase “this work” can grammatically only refer to the Church unfolding more fully her “own inner nature and universal mission”. Thus, *Lumen Gentium* says that present conditions add greater urgency to the Church explaining Her nature and mission “so that all men ... might also attain fuller unity in Christ”.

Thus, the council says (without explanation) that various purely-natural ties make it more urgent that the Church unfold Her nature. But isn’t it true that it is always of greatest urgency that the Church should teach the full truth, including about Herself? It would seem so. Suffice it to say that the council does not explain its dubious statement or support it by any reason, by any appeal to Divine Tradition, by any appeal to Sacred Scripture or even by any appeal to any non-infallible authority in the Church which ever taught this novelty.

⁶ The council erroneously says here that it is the work of the Church “that all men ... attain **fuller** unity in Christ”, thereby erroneously indicating that all men are already united to Christ.

The council states this error more openly elsewhere. In *Gaudium et Spes*, the council states that: “For by His incarnation the Son of God has united Himself in some fashion with every man.” §22.

To the extent that this union which the council points to, is a non-spiritual reality, like a swan and a snowdrift being “united” insofar as they both share the color white, the council ignores the all-important union of the elect with Christ, through Sanctifying Grace. Only this union results in eternal salvation. As St. Thomas Aquinas teaches, quoting St. Augustine:

Sanctifying Grace is given chiefly in order that man's soul may be united to God by charity. Wherefore Augustine says (De Trin. xv, 18): “A man is not transferred from the left side to the right, unless he receives the Holy Ghost, by Whom he is made a lover of God and of his neighbor.”

Summa, IIa IIae, Q.172, a.4, *Respondeo*. But the conciliar church downplays this union resulting from Sanctifying Grace because this Catholic doctrine displeases heretics and is an obstacle to the (false) ecumenism promoted by the conciliar church.

On the other hand, to the extent that the council believes that its statement (regarding attaining fuller union in Christ) refers to a spiritual reality, this is the heresy of naturalism, *viz.*, that our spiritual union with Christ results from our nature (since all men, because they are men, are united to Christ).

Pope John Paul II (who Pope Benedict XVI calls the best interpreter of Vatican II, [see ftnt. 1]) elaborates on the new

2. The eternal Father, by a free and hidden plan of His own wisdom and goodness, created the whole world. His plan was to raise men to

doctrine that *Lumen Gentium* gives here. Pope John Paul II teaches that:

[E]ach [man] is included in the mystery of the Redemption and with each one Christ has united himself forever through this mystery That is, man in all the fullness of the mystery in which he has become a sharer in Jesus Christ, the mystery in which each one of the four thousand million human beings living on our planet has become a sharer from the moment he is conceived”.

Redemptor Hominis, §13. Thus, Pope John Paul II teaches, “in the Holy Spirit, each person and all peoples have become, by the Cross and resurrection of Christ, children of God, participants in the divine nature and heirs of eternal life.” Message to the Peoples of Asia, Feb. 21, 1981, §2.

Whereas conciliar theology (falsely) assures us that union with Christ only requires that all of us simply “be ourselves”, in traditional Catholic theology, the goal of union with Christ requires Sanctifying Grace, virtue and effort cooperating with God’s grace. Thus, the council’s statement serves an ecumenical purpose and promotes universal salvation. For if all men are united to Christ, then all men are also united to His Body, the Church of Christ.

The council’s imprecise statement (which is the subject of this annotation) is one of countless examples of the council’s chronic, fuzzy thinking, caused by the council fathers’ embrace of poisonous modern philosophies and rejection of the clear precision of St. Thomas Aquinas.

a participation of the divine life. Fallen in Adam, God the Father did not leave men to themselves, but ceaselessly offered helps to salvation, in view of Christ, the Redeemer "who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature".⁽²⁾ All the elect, before time began, the Father "foreknew and predestined to become conformed to the image of His Son, that he should be the firstborn among many brethren".⁷⁽³⁾ He planned to assemble in the holy

⁷ There is the glaring omission here and in every document of Vatican II, that there is no specific reference to Our Lord Jesus Christ the Redeemer making satisfaction for our sins because of the infinite debt of justice which man incurred to God because of sin. There is only the reference to our Lord as the Image of the Father and the reference to predestination strengthens the idea that sin is not a great obstacle to salvation.

This glaring omission apparently arises from the council's *a priori* choice to present only a "happy" picture of man and his actions, rather than a true and complete picture. As Pope Paul VI said (in the quote above), the council "insisted very much more upon this pleasant side of man, rather than on his unpleasant one. Its attitude was very much and deliberately optimistic." See the text at:

http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/paul_vi/speeches/1965/documents/hf_p-vi_spe_19651207_epilogo-concilio_en.html. The "unpleasant" side of man and the infinite debt incurred by sin, do not fit with the evolving conciliar doctrine of universal salvation.

This failure to refer to the infinite debt of our sins thus tends to make Our Lord's passion and death into nothing more than an example of how we should suffer for our fellow-man. As Pope Benedict XVI taught on this same theme, our Lord "summon[s] us to spend our lives following in his footsteps and becoming signs of his consolation and salvation. 'To suffer with the other

Church all those who would believe in Christ.⁸ Already from the beginning of the world the foreshadowing of the Church took place. It

and for others; to suffer for the sake of truth and justice; to suffer out of love and in order to become a person who truly loves fundamental elements of humanity”. Pope Benedict XVI, Sermon at World Youth Day, Aug 20, 2011. This naturalistic dedication to humanity and willingness to sacrifice for social justice, are part of this same de-emphasis on sin being an infinite offense against God.

⁸ This statement is imprecise and suggests universal salvation or at least universal salvation of everyone who “believes in Christ”. God the Father, (purportedly) bringing everyone who “believes in Christ” into the “holy Church”, minimizes many other requirements for being in the one, true Catholic Church, e.g., accepting as true all other articles of the true Catholic Faith, accepting Catholic moral teaching, submission to the authority of the pope, etc. This imprecision and suggestion of universal salvation is a theme continually played throughout *Lumen Gentium*, throughout other council documents and throughout the post-conciliar church. For example, Pope John Paul II calls our Lord’s Precious Blood “the everlasting, invincible guarantee of universal salvation.”

http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/2002/october/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_20021003_ss-salvatore-s-brigida_en.html.

To give a more complete picture regarding Pope John Paul II’s teaching on this subject, he elsewhere taught that there **might** be people in hell: “Eternal damnation remains a possibility, but we are not granted, without special divine revelation, the knowledge of whether or which human beings are effectively involved in it.” General Audience on July 28, 1999 (emphasis added).

was prepared in a remarkable way throughout the history of the people of Israel and by means of the Old Covenant.(1*) In the present era of time the Church was constituted and, by the outpouring of the Spirit, was made manifest. At the end of time it will gloriously achieve completion, when, as is read in the Fathers, all the just, from Adam and "from Abel, the just one, to the last of the elect,"(2*) will be

The post-Vatican II church is full of similar scandalous assertions. For example, Pope Benedict XVI declared: "Man needs to know that his life has a meaning, and that he is awaited, at the conclusion of his earthly sojourn, so as to share forever in Christ's glory in heaven. Your mission is to bring the portion of the people of God entrusted to your care to recognize this glorious destiny." Pope Benedict XVI's address in Lourdes, from September 15, 2008 Catholic New Agency report.

Again, Pope Benedict XVI indicated that all people go to heaven, when he said on November 2, 2011 that we remain united with "our dear departed ones" in the communion of saints. <http://www.radiovaticana.org/EN1/Articolo.asp?c=534306>. This statement would be false, if those deceased persons were in hell. Therefore, the pope implies that none of "our dear departed ones" go to hell.

Archbishop Mueller (as head of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith) teaches that we cannot say even a single person will ever go to hell: "Whether any human beings at all have persisted until death in radical resistance to love, is something that eludes our knowledge not only incidentally but as a matter of principle."

http://sspx.org/miscellaneous/mulling_over_archbishop_mueller_7-9-2012.htm.

gathered together with the Father in the universal Church.⁹

3. The Son, therefore, came, sent by the Father. It was in Him, before the foundation of the world, that the Father chose us and predestined us¹⁰ to become adopted sons, for in Him it pleased the Father to re-

⁹ Even assuming that the phrase “universal Church” means the Catholic Church rather than some broader “Church of Christ” (see, later annotations on this issue), this notion of God the Father being the Divine Person “in the universal Church” with the just, is a novelty with no support in the teachings of the Catholic Church before Vatican II.

¹⁰ Every person who is predestined, goes to heaven. As St. Augustine explains in his great anti-Pelagian tracts: “Predestination is nothing else than the foreknowledge and foreordaining of those gracious gifts which make certain the salvation of all who are saved.” (The Latin is: “Prædestinatio nihil est aliud quam præscientia et præparatio beneficiorum, quibus certissime liberantur [*i.e.* salvantur], quicumque liberantur.” “*De dono persever.*, xxxv.) Thus, the council’s statement here implies all persons referred to as “us”, will go to heaven. In the context of the council, this promotes the heresy of universal salvation.

In countless places, the council promotes universal salvation, saying that all men are united to Christ [*Gaudium et spes* §22] and that “we” will reign in heaven after we die. See, *Lumen Gentium*, §7 below. To the extent one supposes that the council fathers did not necessarily include themselves and did not include everyone when they said that God predestined “us” and that “we” will reign in heaven, we should consider how the conciliar and post-conciliar popes speak. For by their office, the popes, more than all other persons, have the duty to explain Church teaching and what the council is saying.

establish all things.(4) To carry out the will of the Father, Christ inaugurated the Kingdom of heaven on earth and revealed to us the mystery of that kingdom. By His obedience He brought about redemption. The Church, or, in other words, the kingdom of Christ

Here are the words of Pope John XXIII, “canonizing” himself as he was dying: “I will watch [the council’s] joyful conclusion from heaven, where I hope, rather, where I am certain the Divine Mercy will draw me.” *Inside the Vatican*, February 1996, reprinted at: <http://www.ewtn.com/library/liturgy/seekpres.txt>.

Here is the teaching of Pope John Paul II, whom Pope Benedict XVI called the authentic interpreter of the council (see annotation #1): “[I]n the Holy Spirit, each person and all peoples have become, by the Cross and resurrection of Christ, children of God, participants in the divine nature and heirs of eternal life.” *Message to the Peoples of Asia*, Feb. 21, 1981, §2.

Here is Pope John Paul II again promoting universal salvation, where he calls our Lord’s Precious Blood “the everlasting, invincible guarantee of universal salvation.” See, this link: http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/speeches/2002/october/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_20021003_ss-salvatore-s-brigida_en.html.

One could give many other quotes, from all of the post-conciliar popes, showing that, starting with the council, the conciliar church adopted the modernist heresy that “everyone” goes to heaven. One of the clear consequences of this new conciliar attitude, is the conciliar church opening “full blast” the spigot of official canonizations. Plainly, in the entire broad context of the council and as shown by the popes interpreting the council, the council’s words here (and in many other places) promote universal salvation.

now present in mystery, grows visibly through the power of God in the world. This inauguration and this growth are both symbolized by the blood and water which flowed from the open side of a crucified Jesus,⁽⁵⁾ and are foretold in the words of the Lord referring to His death on the Cross: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all things to myself".⁽⁶⁾ As often as the sacrifice of the cross in which Christ our Passover was sacrificed, is celebrated on the altar, the work of our redemption is carried on, and, in the sacrament¹¹ of the eucharistic¹² bread¹³, the unity of all believers¹⁴ who form one body in

¹¹ This reference to "sacrament" is no obstacle to ecumenism because the Protestants have no objection to the word "sacrament", as long as it is a word that does not have the clear Catholic meaning. Thomas Cranmer, *Questions and Answers concerning the Sacraments*, answer to Qs. 1-2. The council never plainly teaches the Catholic dogma of what a Sacrament is.

¹² Protestants, such as the arch-heretic Thomas Cranmer, have no problem with the word "eucharist", as long as the meaning is not specifically the Catholic meaning. Concerning the Holy Eucharist, Cranmer gave his understanding which was compatible with his heresy: "[In the] eucharist ... "we [are] incorporated [sic] unto Christ, and made lively members of his [sic] body [sic], nourished and fed to the everlasting life". Thomas Cranmer, *Questions and Answers concerning the Sacraments*, answer to Q. 7. Thus, the council's statement here is no obstacle to ecumenism.

¹³ Notice this reference to the Mass does not call it a "Sacrifice", much less the unbloody, redemptive Sacrifice of Calvary. The council's expression fits with other conciliar attempts to please the Protestants by minimizing Catholic dogma. The council uses ecumenical terminology for the Holy Mass, emphasizing the Holy Mass as a meal. This is a hallmark of the conciliar revolution. Archbishop Annibale Bugnini, one of the chief

architects of the liturgical revolution, declared that his goal was “to help in any way the road to union of the separated brethren, by removing every stone that could even remotely constitute an obstacle or difficulty”. Quoted in *Reasons for Resistance; The Hierarchy of the Catholic Church Speaks on the Post-Vatican II Crisis*, by Jason A. Roberts, O.S.S.M, Queen of Martyrs Press. p.21.

The new mass’s *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* said the same thing in its §7: “In the Mass or Lord’s Supper the people of God are called together into one place where the priest presides over them. They assemble to celebrate the Memorial of the Lord. Hence the promise of Christ: “Wherever two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.” [Latin text (1969 version): *Cena dominica sive missa est sacra synaxis seu congregatio populi Dei in unum convenientis, sacerdote praeside, ad memoriale Domini celebrandum. Quare de sanctae Ecclesiae locali congregatione eminenter valet promissio Christi: “Ubi sunt duo vel tres congregatae in nomine meo, ibi sum in medio eorum”* (Mt. 18:20).]

In this same vein, the council refers to the Mass and Blessed Sacrament as “a meal of brotherly solidarity” in *Gaudium et spes*, ¶38.

As shown above, the conciliar notion of “sacrament” is any sign that makes present a hidden reality. Thus, conciliar theology considers the Mass to be both a Last Supper memorial as well as a sacrament, *viz.*, because the liturgical actions of the Mass make present the hidden reality of our Lord’s life, death and resurrection. As the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* explains, “The Eucharist is the memorial of Christ’s Passover, that is, of the work of salvation accomplished by the life, death, and

resurrection of Christ, a work made present by the liturgical action.” (CCC §1409).

¹⁴ This statement is imprecise. It can be easily taken to mean that all persons who believe in anything, *i.e.*, who have any sort of faith “form one body in Christ”, implying salvation outside the Catholic Church or even universal salvation. This same imprecision is contained a few lines below here, where it is stated as a consequence of the Holy Ghost’s sanctification of the Church, that all believers have access to the Holy Trinity: “the Holy Spirit was sent [to] ... sanctify the Church, and thus, all those who believe would have access through Christ in one Spirit to the Father.”

One powerful reason to construe the council’s use of the word “believer”, to mean any person with any faith regardless of what he believes in, is because the post-conciliar church talks that way. In the post-conciliar church, a person is strongly urged to be a “believer”, but what he believes is de-emphasized. Persons in all religions, including all false religions, are “believers” and Vatican II suggests immediately above, that all believers are good, and have access to the Blessed Trinity.

Nor should the reader suppose that the council’s praise of “believers” is only praising those beliefs which heretics (and others) have in common with the true Catholic Faith. Pope Benedict XVI has declared Vatican II as his compass. *See*, <http://www.catholicnews.com/data/stories/cns/0505788.htm>. But he assures the world that the “Church ... ‘has a high regard for ... doctrines ... differing in many ways from her own teaching’” and says that such doctrines of false religions “often reflect a ray of that truth which enlightens all men and women”. 1-1-11 *World Peace Day* message, citing Vatican II, *Nostra Aetate*, section 2. Thus, Pope Benedict tells us that Catholics, and the

rest of the world, are enlightened by the doctrines of false religions!

Pope Benedict XVI shows the conciliar church's relativism regarding what "believers" believe. He says that "it is not fitting to state in an exclusive way: 'I possess the truth'." *Ecclesia In Medio Oriente*, 9-12-12, §27. Moreover, for the conciliar church, the truth is not an end but a continual journey, without end. As Pope Benedict XVI teaches: "The truth is not possessed by anyone; it is always a gift which calls us to undertake a journey of ever closer assimilation to truth." *Id.*

Pope John Paul II similarly praised all believers who believe in something:

O God of infinite majesty! The Trappist or the Carthusian confesses this God by a whole life of silence. The Bedouin wandering in the desert turns toward him when the hour of prayer approaches. And this Buddhist monk absorbed in contemplation, who purifies his spirit in turning it towards Nirvana: but is it only towards Nirvana? ... The Church of the Living God unites in her precisely these peoples who in some manner participate to this admirable and fundamental transcendence of the human spirit, because she knows that no one can appease the most profound aspirations of this spirit but He alone, the God of infinite majesty.

Karol Wojtyla, *The Sign of Contradiction*, Ed. Fayard, 1979, pp. 31-32.

The conciliar church takes the position that the heresies of sects are “doctrinal formulations which differ from those normally in use [in the Catholic Church, but] ... say the same thing” as Catholic dogma. Pope John Paul II, *Ut Unum Sint*, §38. The conciliar church pretends that the difference between the true Faith and various heresies are simply “divisions brought about ... due in large part to misunderstandings”. *Common Christological Declaration between the Catholic Church and the Assyrian Church of the East*. Pope John Paul II taught:

Intolerant polemics and controversies have made incompatible assertions out of what was really the result of two different ways of looking at the same reality. Nowadays we need to find the formula which, by capturing the reality in its entirety, will enable us to move beyond partial readings and eliminate false interpretations.

Pope John Paul II, *Ut Unum Sint*, §38.

According to Vatican II and the post-conciliar hierarchy, both parties are responsible for these divisions, which Vatican II analyzes as a breach of charity, not a lack of the true Faith by those outside the true Catholic Church. As Vatican II explains:

In subsequent centuries much more serious dissensions appeared for which, often enough, men of both sides were to blame. ... There can be no ecumenism worthy of the name without interior conversion. For it is from newness of attitudes of mind, from self-denial and unstinted love, that desires of unity take their rise and develop in a mature way.

Unitatis Redintegratio, §§ 3 & 7. See also, Pope John Paul II, *Ut Unum Sint*, §11.

In this way, the heretics' heresy (which is a sin against Faith and which is the true cause of separation of heretics from the true Catholic Church), "becomes" instead a sin against charity, which is imputed equally to heretics and to Catholics. Thus, heresy is not mentioned and all that a man needs is love, not the true Faith. Pope Benedict XVI taught: "What is necessary for a man to be Christian? ... The first response is: He who has love has everything. Love is sufficient in itself and nothing else is necessary." Joseph Ratzinger, "Necessità della missione della Chiesa nel mondo," in V.A. *La fine della Chiesa come società perfetta*, Verona: Mondadori, 1968, p. 71.

In fact, the truth of the particular statements of the Faith is so minimized by the council and the conciliar church, that Faith is claimed to be the same as love. On June 28, 2008, while inaugurating the Pauline year with various heretics, including Bartholomew I, Pope Benedict XVI stated: "[St. Paul's] **faith was the experience of being loved** by Jesus Christ [T]his **faith was love** for Jesus Christ".

http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/homilies/2008/documents/hf_ben-xvi_hom_20080628-vespri_en.html (emphasis added).

Pope Benedict XVI went on to claim that St. Paul's faith was not "a theory [or] an opinion". This claim fits with Pope Benedict's teaching that St. Paul's "faith was love". Pope Benedict's statements deny that faith is in the intellect, as in a subject, and thus his statements are contrary to the true traditional Catholic teaching. See, e.g., *Summa* IIa IIae, Q.4, a.2.

In this way, taking cues from Vatican II praising “believers” without reference to the truth or the content of their belief, the conciliar church treats faith as an “encounter”. Thus, in the 2011 ordinary general assembly of the Church’s bishops, the notion of faith-encounter is described in several places. For example:

Transmitting the faith means to create in every place and time the conditions for this personal encounter of individuals with Jesus Christ. The faith-encounter with the person of Jesus Christ is a relationship with him, ‘remembering him’ (in the Eucharist) [making the Mass into a mere memorial] and, through the grace of the Spirit, having in us the mind of Jesus Christ. ... Being Christian is not the result of an ethical choice or a lofty idea, but the encounter with an event, a person, which gives life a new horizon and a decisive direction.

Lineamenta, 2-2-11, ch.11 (parenthetical words in Vatican original; bracketed words added).

The truth, by contrast, is that “the union of Christians can only be promoted by promoting the return to the one true Church of Christ of those who are separated from it”. Pope Pius XI, *Mortalium Animos*, January 6, 1928, ¶10.

As the First Vatican Council teaches:

[Faith is] a supernatural virtue by which, under the inspiration and the aid of the grace of God, we believe that which He has revealed to us to be true: we believe it, not because of the intrinsic truth of the things seen by the natural light of our reason,

Christ (8) is both expressed and brought about. All men are called¹⁵ to this union with Christ, who is the light of the world, from whom we go forth, through whom we live, and toward whom our whole life strains.

but because of the very authority of God who has revealed us these truths, Who can neither deceive nor be deceived.

Vatican I, Session 3, ch.3, Denz. 3008.

The above conciliar error is reduced to the false assertion that there is good in all religions, and souls are saved in any of them. Pope Pius XI condemned this error:

[It is a] false opinion which considers all religions to be more or less good and praiseworthy, since they all in different ways manifest and signify that sense which is inborn in us all, and by which we are led to God and to the obedient acknowledgement of His rule. Not only are those who hold this opinion in error and deceived, but also in distorting the idea of true religion they reject it, and little by little, turn aside to naturalism and atheism, as it is called; from which it clearly follows that one who supports those who hold these theories and attempt to realize them, is altogether abandoning the divinely revealed religion.

Mortalium Animos, §2.

¹⁵ This imprecise statement, whose most obvious meanings are false, has been used to promote the post-conciliar falsehood of universal salvation. Whereas the council says “all men are called” to union with Christ, Christ Himself says that: “Many

4. When the work which the Father gave the Son to do on earth (9) was accomplished, the Holy Spirit was sent on the day of Pentecost in order that He might continually sanctify the Church, and thus, all those who believe would have access through Christ in one Spirit¹⁶ to the

[not all men] are called, but few are chosen.” Matt. 22: 14 (emphasis added).

Pope Pius XII insisted that God has no obligation to call all men to salvation. He condemned the heretical naturalism of Henri de Lubac as follows: “Some ... **destroy the gratuity of the supernatural order, since God, they say, cannot create intellectual beings without ordering and calling them to the beatific vision.**” *Humani generis*, §26 (emphasis added).

¹⁶ This statement erroneously obscures the role of Sanctifying Grace in salvation and in union with God. The council says here that “all ... who believe ... have access ... in one Spirit to the Father”. “Access” to God is “permission, liberty or ability to ... approach or communicate with a person”. *Merriam-Webster Collegiate Dictionary*, Eleventh Ed. So, *e.g.*, we say that we have “access to the president” if he is willing to receive and consider a communication from us.

When the council says here that “all ... who believe ... have access ... in one Spirit to the Father”, the word “all” shows that this statement includes both those who have a dead Faith, (*i.e.*, those who have the true Faith but who are in mortal sin [*cf.*, *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.4, a.4, ad 4]) and also those who are believers in some heretical faith, (although such heretical faith is not even supernatural [*cf.*, *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.5, a.3, *Respondeo*]).

The persons in both of these groups do not have Sanctifying Grace. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.5, a.3, *Sed contra*. But God is not

Father. (10) He is the Spirit of Life, a fountain of water springing up to life eternal.(11) To men, dead in sin, the Father gives life through Him, until, in Christ, He brings to life their mortal bodies.(12) The Spirit dwells in the Church¹⁷ and in the hearts of the faithful, as in a

moved by the prayers of those who are not in the state of Sanctifying Grace. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.178, a.2, ad 1. This is because “whosoever has not charity is wicked, because ‘this gift alone of the Holy Ghost distinguishes the children of the kingdom from the children of perdition’, as Augustine says (*De Trin.* xv, 18).” *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.178, a.2, *Sed contra*. Since God is not moved by their prayers, how can it be said they have access to God?

When one sees the rank naturalism frequently asserted in the council’s teaching, it is no wonder that the conciliar church hates St. Thomas Aquinas! Pope Pius XI taught that:

[I]f we are to avoid the errors which are the source and fountain-head of all the miseries of our time, the teaching of Aquinas must be adhered to more religiously than ever. For Thomas refutes the theories propounded by Modernists in every sphere, ... in dogmatic theology, **by distinguishing the supernatural from the natural order**”.

Studiorum Ducem, ¶27.

¹⁷ As is clear below, “Church” does not refer only to the one true Catholic Church. See, §8 below. “Church” refers to a large amorphous pneumatological entity.

Notice also that the sentence says that the Holy Ghost dwells in all of the faithful and thus all “faithful” are in the state of Sanctifying Grace. This is because the Catholic Faith teaches us

temple.(13) In them He prays on their behalf and bears witness to the fact that they are adopted sons.¹⁸(14) The Church, which the Spirit guides in the way of all truth(15) and which He unified in communion and in works of ministry, He both equips and directs with hierarchical and charismatic¹⁹ gifts and adorns with His fruits.(16) By the power of

that Sanctifying Grace and the indwelling of the Holy Ghost come together. For “with Sanctifying Grace, the Holy Ghost enters our soul”. *My Catholic Faith*, by Bishop Louis Morrow, My Mission House (publisher), Kenosha, WI, 1949, §39.

Since the council includes heretics, schismatics and Catholics in mortal sin among the “faithful”, the council is here saying that they all have Sanctifying Grace. This is not only false but would mean that there would be salvation outside the Catholic Church, since whoever dies with Sanctifying Grace goes to heaven. See the annotations on this topic below.

¹⁸ The error in this sentence cascades from the error in the sentence before. Because the council teaches that all of the “faithful” have the Holy Ghost (and thus Sanctifying Grace), here the council states the consequence: that all the “faithful” (including heretics and schismatics) are adopted sons of God.

¹⁹ The council here uses the present tense (when it says that the Holy Ghost “equips” the Church with charismatic gifts). Taking this phrase, “charismatic gifts” to mean extraordinary gifts (like speaking in tongues never learned), the council’s statement lends support to the dangerous and heterodox *Charismatic Movement* which began in Protestantism and infected the Catholic Church after Vatican II. See the history of the “Catholic” Charismatic Movement recounted in *Catholic Family News*, posted at: <http://salbert.tripod.com/index-3a.html>. See also, <http://www.cfnews.org/page88/files/00fdb6cfb3f525321e198f233ebd3ca0-108.html>, and:

the Gospel He makes the Church keep the freshness of youth. Uninterruptedly He renews it and leads it to perfect union with its Spouse.²⁰ (3*) The Spirit and the Bride both say to Jesus, the Lord, "Come!"(17)

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Catholic_Charismatic_Renewal.

One might think that this phrase, “charismatic gifts” could mean that the Holy Ghost gives to persons who are in the state of grace, the grace to properly perform their duties of state. See, 1911 Catholic Encyclopedia, vol. III, p. 589 (under the topic “Charismata”). However, that is not how the council uses the phrase elsewhere, *e.g.*, in §§ 7 & 12, where that phrase is used to mean “extraordinary gifts”.

Whatever the council meant by this phrase, it is imprecise and was used for evil after the council. Taking only one example of this evil, see the charismatic website <http://www.tfadc.org/spiritual-gifts>, where this text of *Lumen Gentium* is quoted to refer generally to the spirit bringing “passionate excitement” to the Charismatics.

²⁰ The council here says that the Holy Ghost renews and makes fresh the Church by the power of the Gospel. Why does the council not mention that this renewal also only comes about through Sanctifying Grace? For there can be no “freshness” in persons dead with mortal sin and there can be no union with the Church’s Spouse, our Lord Jesus Christ, without Sanctifying Grace. Judging from the council’s ecumenical tone, the answer is plainly that the reference to the Catholic doctrine of Sanctifying Grace would not serve ecumenism. By contrast, Protestants are not offended by reference to the power of the Gospel.

Thus, the Church has been seen as "a people²¹ made one with the unity of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit."(4*)

5. The mystery of the holy Church is manifest in its very foundation. The Lord Jesus set it on its course by preaching the Good News, that is, the coming of the Kingdom of God, which, for centuries, had been promised in the Scriptures: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand"(18). In the word, in the works, and in the presence of Christ, this kingdom was clearly open to the view of men. The Word of the Lord is compared to a seed which is sown in a field;(19) those who hear the Word with faith and become part of the little flock of Christ,(20) have received the Kingdom itself.²² Then, by its own power the seed sprouts²³ and grows until harvest time.(21) The Miracles of

²¹ This "definition" promotes a horizontal, non-hierarchical picture of the Church. See, e.g., the annotations to Chapter II, below.

²² This explanation omits what the Protestants deny, *viz.*, that God never gives the supernatural gift of Faith without also giving Sanctifying Grace, which is the cause of supernatural Faith. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.4, a.4, ad 3. The council's explanation here leaves faith on a more naturalistic level of persons listening and being convinced, as if this were accomplished by man's purely natural faculties.

²³ Here, the council asserts that the "Word of faith" grows by its own power. This is false. The truth is that grace causes the growth and perfection of supernatural Faith. As St. Thomas Aquinas explains:

Grace causes faith not only when faith begins anew to be in a man, but also as long as faith lasts. For it has been said above (Ia, Q.104, a.1; Ia IIae, Q.109, a.9) that God is always working man's

Jesus also confirm that the Kingdom has already arrived on earth: "If I cast out devils by the finger of God, then the kingdom of God has come upon you".(22) Before all things, however, the Kingdom is clearly visible in the very Person of Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Man, who came "to serve and to give His life as a ransom for many."(23)

When Jesus, who had suffered the death of the cross for mankind, had risen, He appeared as the one constituted as Lord, Christ and eternal Priest,(24) and He poured out on His disciples the Spirit promised by the Father.(25) From this source the Church, equipped with the gifts of its Founder and faithfully guarding His precepts of charity, humility and self-sacrifice, receives the mission to proclaim and to spread among all peoples the Kingdom of Christ and of God and to be, on earth, the initial budding forth of that kingdom. While it slowly grows, the Church strains toward the completed Kingdom and, with all its strength, hopes and desires to be united in glory with its King.

6. In the Old Testament the revelation of the Kingdom is often conveyed by means of metaphors. In the same way the inner nature of the Church is now made known to us in different images taken either from tending sheep or cultivating the land, from building or even from

justification, even as the sun is always lighting up the air. Hence grace is not less effective when it comes to a believer than when it comes to an unbeliever: since it causes faith in both, in the former by confirming and perfecting it, in the latter by creating it anew.

Summa, IIa IIae, Q.4, a.4, ad 3 (parenthetical citation in original of the English translation from which this quote was taken). The council's omission of this truth which the Protestants deny, serves to promote (false) ecumenism.

family life and betrothals, the images receive preparatory shaping in the books of the Prophets.

The Church is a sheepfold whose one and indispensable door is Christ.(26) It is a flock of which God Himself foretold He would be the shepherd,(27) and whose sheep, although ruled by human shepherds; are nevertheless continuously led and nourished by Christ Himself, the Good Shepherd and the Prince of the shepherds,(28) who gave His life for the sheep.(29)

The Church is a piece of land to be cultivated, the tillage of God.(30) On that land the ancient olive tree grows whose holy roots were the Prophets and in which the reconciliation of Jews and Gentiles has been brought about and will be brought about.(31) That land, like a choice vineyard, has been planted by the heavenly Husbandman.(32) The true vine is Christ who gives life and the power to bear abundant fruit to the branches, that is, to us, who through the Church remain in Christ without whom we can do nothing.(33)

Often the Church has also been called the building of God.(34) The Lord Himself compared Himself to the stone which the builders rejected, but which was made into the cornerstone.(35) On this foundation the Church is built by the apostles,(36) and from it the Church receives durability and consolidation. This edifice has many names to describe it: the house of God (37) in which dwells His family; the household of God in the Spirit;(38) the dwelling place of God among men;(39) and, especially, the holy temple. This Temple, symbolized in places of worship built out of stone, is praised by the Holy Fathers and, not without reason, is compared in the liturgy to the Holy City, the New Jerusalem (5*). As living stones we here on earth are built into it.(40) John contemplates this holy city coming down from heaven at the renewal of the world as a bride made ready and adorned for her husband.(41)

The Church, further, "that Jerusalem which is above" is also called "our mother".(42) It is described as the spotless spouse of the spotless Lamb,(43) whom Christ "loved and for whom He delivered Himself up that He might sanctify her",(44) whom He unites to Himself by an unbreakable covenant, and whom He unceasingly "nourishes and cherishes",(45) and whom, once purified²⁴, He willed to be cleansed and joined to Himself, subject to Him in love and fidelity,(46) and whom, finally, He filled with heavenly gifts for all eternity, in order that we may know the love of God and of Christ for us, a love which surpasses all knowledge.(47) The Church, while on earth it journeys in a foreign land away from the Lord,(48) is like in exile. It seeks and experiences those things which are above, where Christ is seated at

²⁴ One recurring problem in the council documents and in the post-conciliar church, is the failure to distinguish between the Catholic Church as the Spotless Bride of Christ, and the human element of the Church. The Church Herself, Who possesses the Mark of Holiness, needs no purification. The human element (*i.e.*, individual Catholics), does need purifying. This conciliar blurring of this crucial distinction serves to promote ecumenism, since the conciliar church promotes the idea that "both sides" are at fault for the division between the Catholic Church and heretics. *See, e.g.*, the annotations to §8 below & §3 above.

The true Catholic doctrine is that the Church is in no way blamable for the division of heretics from the true Church, any more than the Church is responsible for the theft of a car, because it was done by a Catholic, even if he was a member of the Catholic Church's hierarchy. "The Catholic Church is Holy. ... The misdeeds of some members, or abuses occurring within the Church are due not to the Church, but to the perversity of men." *The Catechism Explained*, Rev. Francis Spirago, p. 244, TAN Books and Publishers 1993 (reprinting the 1899 edition).

the right-hand of God, where the life of the Church is hidden with Christ in God until it appears in glory with its Spouse.(49)

7. In the human nature united to Himself the Son of God, by overcoming death through His own death and resurrection, redeemed man and re-molded him into a new creation.²⁵ (50) By communicating His Spirit, Christ made His brothers, called together from all nations, mystically the components of His own Body.

In that Body the life of Christ is poured into the believers who, through the sacraments, are united in a hidden²⁶ and real way to Christ who

²⁵ This passage suggests that each man has already been transformed “into a new creature”. Note that the council uses the past tense, when it says that “man [was] ... re-molded ... into a new creation”. Whereas the traditional teaching of the Church is that each man is re-molded beginning during his life when he receives the supernatural life of Sanctifying Grace, the theological virtues, the indwelling of the Holy Ghost, the infused moral virtues and the rest of the full spiritual life. The council here promotes the error that each man’s re-molding has already occurred through the fact of Christ's incarnation, sacrifice, and resurrection. This is the error of the objective and universal redemption which removes the practical roles of free will, supernatural faith, Sanctifying Grace and good works, in obtaining salvation. *See*, the discussion below.

²⁶ The “believers” are said to be united in a hidden way, because “believer” here means everyone who believes (in the generic sense of the word), including persons who believe in things directly contrary to the Catholic Faith. Thus, the unity of “believers” is hidden because the unity is not apparent and it is contrary to appearances (and to common sense) that people who believe opposite things are united. Below, the council elaborates on its error here, where the council describes the difference

suffered and was glorified.(6*) Through Baptism we are formed in the likeness of Christ: "For in one Spirit we were all baptized into one body".(51) In this sacred rite a oneness with Christ's death and resurrection is both symbolized and brought about: "For we were buried with Him by means of Baptism into death"; and if "we have been united with Him in the likeness of His death, we shall be so in the likeness of His resurrection also".(52) Really partaking of the body of the Lord²⁷ in the breaking of the Eucharistic bread²⁸, we are taken up into communion with Him and with one another. "Because the bread is one, we though many, are one body, all of us who partake of the one bread".(53) In this way all of us are made members of His Body,(54) "but severally members one of another".(55)

As all the members of the human body, though they are many, form one body, so also are the faithful in Christ.(56) Also, in the building up

between the broad, hidden, Church of Christ, and the narrower, visible Catholic Church. *See*, especially §8.

²⁷ This statement is not an obstacle to ecumenism because Protestants do not object to the Eucharist being "really" the Body of the Lord, as long as this means a real spiritual sense and not corporeally and in substance. *See* the annotations to §11 below.

²⁸ This protestantized definition of the Mass promotes ecumenism, as discussed below. It is irrelevant that the modernists justify their use of protestantized terms by the reference to the terminology of the early Church, for the reasons given in annotations in §1 above. This is the antiquarian heresy. *See, e.g.*, the annotations in §1 above.

of Christ's Body various members and functions²⁹ have their part to play. There is only one Spirit who, according to His own richness and the needs of the ministries, gives His different gifts for the welfare of the Church.(57) What has a special place among these gifts is the grace of the apostles to whose authority the Spirit Himself subjected even those who were endowed with charisms.(58) Giving the body unity through Himself and through His power and inner joining of the members, this same Spirit produces and urges love among the believers.³⁰ From all this it follows that if one member endures

²⁹ Notice this reference to diversity of the clergy by function. This theme continually recurs in the council's teaching, to promote ecumenism, because it conforms to the Protestant notion that the clergy (ministers) do not differ from laymen by an indelible character on their souls but only by the office, duties and functions which they are assigned. Thomas Cranmer, *Questions and Answers concerning the Sacraments*, answer to Q. 9.

³⁰ Again, here is a reference to "believers" without mention of what they believe in, nor requiring that they all have the very same (Catholic) Faith. Traditionally, the Four Marks of the True Catholic Church include unity of Faith. *Council of Trent Catechism*, at Article 9 of the Creed. As shown in *Lumen Gentium* and countless other places, the conciliar church no longer insists on this crucial unity.

Further, the Catholic Church must always be visible, under one visible head. *Council of Trent Catechism*, at Article 9 of the Creed. The council's description of the Church in this paragraph, omits to mention these essential elements of unity and suggests instead that the "inner joining" of believers suffices for unity. This is the pneumatological heresy discussed below.

anything, all the members co-endure it, and if one member is honored, all the members together rejoice.(59)

The Head of this Body is Christ. He is the image of the invisible God and in Him all things came into being. He is before all creatures and in Him all things hold together. He is the head of the Body which is the Church. He is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead, that in all things He might have the first place.(60) By the greatness of His power He rules the things in heaven and the things on earth, and with His all-surpassing perfection and way of acting He fills the whole body with the riches of His glory.

All the members ought to be molded in the likeness of Him, until Christ be formed in them.(62) For this reason we, who have been made to conform with Him, who have died with Him and risen with Him, are taken up into the mysteries of His life, until we will reign³¹ together with Him.(63) On earth, still as pilgrims in a strange land, tracing in trial and in oppression the paths He trod, we are made one with His sufferings like the body is one with the Head, suffering with Him, that with Him we may be glorified.(64)

From Him "the whole body, supplied and built up by joints and ligaments, attains a growth that is of God".(65) He continually distributes in His body, that is, in the Church, gifts of ministries in which, by His own power, we serve³² each other unto salvation so

³¹ The council fathers here indicate that they are certain of their own salvation (and perhaps, also, that of each reader). This is part of the promotion of universal salvation and echoes many other conciliar "canonizations", e.g., as quoted above. See, e.g., the annotations to §3 above.

³² This reference here to the clergy serving, *i.e.*, authority as a service, is a conciliar novelty identified as such by Pope John

that, carrying out the truth in love, we might through all things grow unto Him who is our Head.(66)

In order that we might be unceasingly renewed in Him,(67) He has shared with us His Spirit who, existing as one and the same being in the Head and in the members, gives life to, unifies and moves through the whole body. This He does in such a way that His work could be compared by the holy Fathers with the function which the principle of life, that is, the soul, fulfills in the human body.(8*)

Christ loves the Church as His bride, having become the model of a man loving his wife as his body;(68) the Church, indeed, is subject to its Head.(69) "Because in Him dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily", (70) He fills the Church, which is His body and His fullness, with His divine gifts (71) so that it may expand and reach all the fullness of God.(72)

8. Christ, the one Mediator, established and continually sustains here on earth His holy Church, the community of faith, hope and charity, as an entity with visible³³ delineation (9*) through which He

Paul II (see the preface of this book). This novelty is discussed below.

³³ The council's progression of thought is shown here. First, in §7 (above), the council refers to the Church composed of people with invisible bonds. That is, the council says the Church is composed of "believers who ... are united in a **hidden** and real way to Christ", whose power causes an "**inner** joining of the members". (Emphasis added.) The council continues this same thought here in §8, where this same "hidden" Church is called "the Mystical Body of Christ", "the spiritual community", "the Church enriched with heavenly things" and the "divine ... element".

But here in §8, something more is added. Here, this Church of inwardly joined members is contrasted to the visible Catholic Church having “hierarchical organs”, which is a “visible assembly”, an “earthly Church” and the “human element”. The council says that these two are not one simply, but “form one complex reality”.

The council indicates (in §8 and afterwards) that the invisible Church is larger than the visible Catholic Church and so the council proceeds to teach about the salvific elements of that part of the Church which are not the visible Catholic Church. In this way, the council indicates that the Church of Christ (*i.e.*, the Mystical Body of Christ), is not of itself something visible, although (as the council says below) the Church of Christ subsists in the Catholic Church, which is visible.

This difference between the invisible Church of Christ and the visible Catholic Church, is made more explicit in Vatican II’s document *Unitatis Redintegratio*, and in the many writings and speeches of Pope John Paul II, the best interpreter of Vatican II (see the annotations to §1). They teach that the one Church of Christ is present in Protestant (so-called) “churches”.

For example, Vatican II teaches:

Moreover, some and even very many of the significant elements and endowments which together go to build up and give life to the Church itself, can exist outside the visible boundaries of the Catholic Church: the written word of God; the life of grace; faith, hope and charity, with the other interior gifts of the Holy Spirit, and visible elements too. All of these, which come from Christ and lead back to Christ, belong by right to the one

Church of Christ. ... For men who believe in Christ and have been truly baptized are in communion with the Catholic Church even though this communion is imperfect. The differences that exist in varying degrees between them and the Catholic Church – whether in doctrine and sometimes in discipline, or concerning the structure of the Church – do indeed create many obstacles, sometimes serious ones, to full ecclesiastical communion.

Unitatis Redintegratio, §3.

Similarly, Pope John Paul II taught:

Indeed, the elements of sanctification and truth present in the other Christian Communities, in a degree which varies from one to the other, constitute the objective basis of the communion, albeit imperfect, which exists between them and the Catholic Church. To the extent that these elements are found in other Christian Communities, the **one Church of Christ is effectively present in them.**

Ut Unum Sint, §11 (emphasis added).

Pope Benedict XVI spoke similarly:

“The Church awakens in souls”: this sentence of Guardini has been nurtured for a long time. In fact, it shows that *the Church has been finally recognized and lived as something interior*, which does not exist as some sort of institution facing us, but rather living in ourselves. If, up until then, the

Church had been considered primarily as a structure and an organization, *we have finally become aware that we ourselves are the Church*. She was much more than an organization: she was the organism of the Holy Ghost, *something vital, in the depths of our conscience*. This new understanding of the Church finds its linguistic expression in the concept of the “Mystical Body of Christ”.

J. Ratzinger, *Ecclesiology of Vatican II*, a conference given Sept. 15, 2001, on the occasion of the opening of the Pastoral Congress of the Diocese of Aversa, (emphasis added).

Again, Pope John Paul II, while still a cardinal, elaborated on this idea of an invisible true Church broader than the Catholic Church:

God of boundless majesty.... This God is professed in silence by the Trappist or the Carthusian. It is to him that the desert Bedouin turns at his hour for prayer. And perhaps the Buddhist too, wrapt in contemplation as he purifies his thought, preparing the way to Nirvana. God is his absolute transcendence. ... **The Church of the living God gathers together all men, who in one way or another share this marvelous transcendence of the human spirit.**

Karol Wojtyla, *The Sign of Contradiction*, Seabury Press, New York, 1979, pp.16-17 (emphasis added).

The Catholic Church traditionally condemned this error, *viz.*, that the true Church is invisible, with the visible “churches”

being parts of the one true Church. Below, we take just a few examples.

Less than twenty years before Vatican II, Pope Pius XII taught:

[I]t is not enough that the Body of the Church should be an unbroken unity; it must also be something definite and perceptible to the senses as Our predecessor of happy memory, Leo XIII, in his Encyclical *Satis Cognitum* asserts: '[T]he Church is visible because she is a body. Hence they err in a matter of divine truth, who imagine the Church to be invisible, intangible, a something merely 'pneumatological' as they say, by which many Christian communities, though they differ from each other in their profession of faith, are united by an invisible bond.'

Mystici Corporis Christi, §14.

Pope Pius XI similarly taught that the true Church is not invisible:

Christ our Lord instituted His Church as a perfect society, external of its nature and perceptible to the senses, which should carry on in the future the work of the salvation of the human race, under the leadership of one head, with an authority teaching by word of mouth, and by the ministry of the sacraments, the founts of heavenly grace

For since the Mystical Body of Christ, in the same manner as His physical body, is one, compacted and fitly joined together, it were foolish and out of place to say that the Mystical Body is made up of

members which are disunited and scattered abroad: whosoever therefore is not united with the Body is no member of it, neither is he in communion with Christ its head.

Mortalium Animos, §§ 6 & 10.

Pope Pius IX taught the same:

None [of these religious societies differing among themselves and separated from the Catholic Church], not even taken as a whole, constitutes *in any way* and are not that one, Catholic Church founded and made by Our Lord and which He wished to create. Further, one cannot say *in any way* that these societies are either *members* or *parts* of that same Church, because they are visibly separated from Catholic Unity.

Apostolic Letter *Jam vos omnes*, September 13, 1868 (emphasis in the original).

Pope Leo XIII taught the same:

Jesus Christ never conceived of, nor instituted, a Church formed of many communities which were brought together by certain general traits – but which would be *distinct one from another* and not bound together among themselves by ties which make the Church one and indivisible - since we clearly profess in the Creed of our Faith: ‘I believe in one...Church.’

Satis Cognitum §4 (emphasis in the original).

communicated truth and grace to all.³⁴ But, the society structured with hierarchical organs and the Mystical Body of Christ, are not to be

³⁴ This is ambiguous. It can be taken to mean that the Church communicates grace and truth not to everyone but to all to whom it is communicated. Or this statement can be taken to mean that grace and supernatural truth is given to absolutely all men. Because the council and post-conciliar church frequently promote universal salvation, the latter construction seems to be the correct one.

It is plainly false to say that everyone receives grace. This is clearest in the case of unbaptized babies who die and go to Limbo. Further, St. Thomas, quoting (and following) the Doctor of Grace, St. Augustine, teaches that not all of even those above the age of reason, receive grace. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.2, a.5. ad 1. St. Thomas explains that to think that it is somehow not fair or just that God does not give all men grace, is a failure to understand that grace is a free gift of God's generosity:

There is a twofold giving. One belongs to justice, and occurs when we give a man his due: in such like givings, [the sin of] respect of persons takes place. The other giving belongs to liberality, when one gives *gratis* that which is not a man's due: such is the bestowal of the gifts of grace, whereby sinners are chosen by God. In such a giving there is no place for respect of persons, because anyone may, without injustice, give of his own as much as he will, and to whom he will, according to Matt. 20:14 & 15: "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will? ... Take what is thine, and go thy way."

Summa, IIa IIae, Q.63, a.1, ad 3.

considered as two realities, nor are the visible assembly and the spiritual community, nor the earthly Church and the Church enriched with heavenly things; rather they form one complex reality which coalesces from a divine and a human element.(10*) For this reason, by

The error that everyone receives grace not only aids the advocates of universal salvation, but this error also promotes the heresy of naturalism. When grace is seen as something given to every man *because he is a man*, then this tends to reduce the supernatural to the natural order. That is why Pope Pius XII insisted that God has no obligation to give grace, in connection with his condemnation of the heretical naturalism of Henri de Lubac: “Some ... **destroy the gratuity of the supernatural order, since God, they say, cannot create intellectual beings without ordering and calling them to the beatific vision.**” *Humani generis*, §26 (emphasis added).

Although it is very hard to “prove a negative”, our investigation over more than three decades, shows that no Church Fathers, Doctors or pre-conciliar popes have ever taught that everyone receives grace. No reputable theologian of any sort had taught this error until approximately the twentieth century, when the influence of modernism began promoting universal salvation and began to influence even very orthodox theologians (without their knowledge).

Obviously, the doctrine of universal salvation is advanced a step by asserting that everyone receives grace because this error appears to narrow the gap between the Catholic truth and the heresy of universal salvation. Those orthodox theologians who assert that everyone receives grace, sometimes seek support from a misreading of various Fathers of the Church but a reading of those Fathers in context, makes it clear that they do not teach that everyone receives grace.

no weak analogy, it is compared to the mystery of the incarnate Word. As the assumed nature inseparably united to Him, serves the divine Word as a living organ of salvation, so, in a similar way, does the visible social structure of the Church serve the Spirit of Christ³⁵, who vivifies it, in the building up of the body.(73) (11*)

³⁵ That is, our Lord's human nature was an Organ (*i.e.*, a tool) for saving others. Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, in no way needed to be redeemed and was assured of eternal beatitude. *See, e.g., Summa*, IIIa, Q.34, a.1 & Q.15, a.1. In the analogy made here, the Divine Word is to His human body, as the Spirit of Christ is to the corporeal element of the Church on earth. This analogy points to a similarity but also to the big difference that our Lord's body did not need to be redeemed and was in no danger of damnation. By contrast, the visible members of the Church themselves do need to be redeemed and are not inexorably going to heaven.

We would wish to think that this big difference is an unintended aspect of the analogy which does not “fit” or correspond well. However, in the conciliar milieu of universal salvation, where the council fathers “canonize” themselves [see *e.g.*, the annotations to §§ 3 & 7 above] following the example of Pope John XXIII, one cannot assume that the council fathers do not intend this analogy to suggest the same thing here, *viz.*, that their own salvation is assured.

Nor are the council's “canonizations” necessarily limited to the council fathers. Elsewhere, the council says that: “This [whole] people of God, though still in its members liable to sin, is ever growing in Christ during its pilgrimage on earth, and is guided by God's gentle wisdom, according to His hidden designs, until it shall happily arrive at the fullness of eternal glory in the heavenly Jerusalem.” *Unitatis Redintegratio*, §3.

This is the one Church of Christ which in the Creed is professed as one, holy, catholic³⁶ and apostolic, (12*) which our Saviour, after His Resurrection, commissioned Peter to shepherd,(74) and him and the other apostles to extend and direct with authority,(75) which He erected for all ages as "the pillar and mainstay of the truth".(76) This Church constituted and organized in the world as a society, subsists in³⁷ the Catholic Church, which is governed by the successor of Peter

³⁶ One should not be misled into the error that this reference to (small “c”) catholic is a reference to the (large “C”) Catholic Church. Both the council and Protestants use this word “catholic” to mean “universal” in the sense which includes Protestants and other non-Catholics. See, e.g., the annotations to §13 below.

³⁷ Having treated in §7, of the Church which is a hidden union of “believers”, and then having begun talking about the visible Church, now, in §8, the council does not restate the traditional teaching of the Church, that the Church of Christ (*i.e.*, the Mystical Body of Christ) **is** the Catholic Church. This traditional teaching is treated later in this annotation.

Instead, the council makes a distinction between the invisible church (discussed in section §7) and the visible Catholic Church (discussed in section §8).

The council errs gravely here, by using the phrase “subsists in”, instead of “is”. According to *Webster’s Seventh Collegiate Dictionary*, “subsist” means “to have existence, be, persist, continue, to receive maintenance (as food and clothing), [or] live”. Thus, substituting the meaning of “subsist”, the council is here saying that the Church of Christ is in the Catholic Church. The preposition “in” creates the problem. That the Church of Christ “subsists in” the Catholic Church, plainly does not mean that the Church of Christ **is** the Catholic Church, any more than

to say that “Socrates subsists in (*i.e.* is in) Athens”, is the same thing as saying that “Socrates **is** Athens”.

Pope John Paul II (who Pope Benedict XVI calls the best interpreter of Vatican II, [see the annotations to §1]), understands the council’s new ecclesiology in this way. Pope John Paul II preached a sermon containing the following invitation made to the (schismatic) “Orthodox Patriarch”, Dimitrios I: “I invite you to pray with fervor for the full communion of our Churches. ... Beg the Lord that **we, pastors of Sister-Churches**, might be the best instruments in this historic hour, to **govern these Churches**, that is, to serve them as the Lord wishes, and **thus to serve the unique Church which is His Body.**” This quote can be found at: http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/homilies/1979/documents/hf_jp-ii_hom_19791129_turkey-istanbul_sp.html (emphasis added).

Pope Benedict XVI followed Pope John Paul II in this teaching. In 2011, he called all “Christians” – both Catholics and heretics alike – one “religious group”. 1-1-11 *World Peace Day* message. He also taught that “Christians [including non-Catholics] ... encounter one another **in the Church**”. *Id* (emphasis added).

As with so many other conciliar teachings, the Church’s pre-Vatican II doctrine is completely different. In 1950, Pope Pius XII **condemned the error** that the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are not one and the same thing:

Some say they are not bound by the doctrine, explained in Our Encyclical Letter [*Mystici Corporis*] of a few years ago, and based on the sources of revelation, which teaches that **the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same thing.**

Some reduce to a meaningless formula the necessity of belonging to the true Church in order to gain eternal salvation.

Humani Generis §27 (emphasis added; bracketed words added).

Pope Leo XIII likewise condemned the error that the true Church is composed of multiple churches which are generically similar: “Jesus Christ did not, in point of fact, institute a Church to embrace several communities similar in nature, but in themselves distinct, and lacking those bonds which render the Church unique and indivisible”. *Satis Cognitum*, §4.

Less than twenty years before Vatican II, Pope Pius XII specifically **condemned** what Vatican II teaches in §§ 7 & 8, *viz.*, that the Church of hidden spiritual bonds is larger than the visible, juridical Church:

For this reason We deplore and condemn the pernicious error of those who dream of an imaginary Church, a kind of society that finds its origin and growth in charity, to which, somewhat contemptuously, they oppose another, which they call juridical. But this distinction which they introduce is false: for they fail to understand that the reason which led our Divine Redeemer to give to the community of men He founded the constitution of a Society, perfect in its kind and containing all the juridical and social elements – namely, that He might perpetuate on earth the saving work of Redemption – was also the reason

and by the Bishops in communion with him,(13*) although many elements of sanctification³⁸ and of truth³⁹ are found outside of its

why He willed it to be enriched with the heavenly gifts of the Paraclete.

Mystici Corporis §65.

Pope Benedict XVI admitted that *Lumen Gentium*'s teaching was different from the Church's pre-conciliar teaching. In 2000, he stated:

At this point it becomes necessary to investigate the word *subsistit* somewhat more carefully. With this expression, the **Council differs from the formula of Pius XII**, who said in his Encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi*: "The Catholic Church "is" (est) the one mystical body of Christ". **The difference between *subsistit* and *est* conceals within itself the whole ecumenical problem.**

Ecclesiology Of The Constitution On The Church, Vatican II, 'Lumen Gentium', L'Osservatore Romano, Weekly Edition in English, 9-19-01, p.5 (emphasis added; bracketed words in original).

³⁸ Having separately discussed the "hidden" (*i.e.*, "inner") union in the Mystical Body of Christ in section §7, and then the visible Catholic Church in section §8, the council now indicates what parts of the "hidden" (*i.e.*, "inner") Mystical Body of Christ exist besides that part which "subsists" in the visible Catholic Church.

The Council here says that there are means for sanctifying souls outside the Catholic Church. This is the same assertion that the

council makes elsewhere. For example:

The brethren divided from us also use many liturgical actions of the Christian religion. These most certainly can truly engender a life of grace in ways that vary according to the condition of each Church or Community. These liturgical actions must be regarded as capable of giving access to the community of salvation.

It follows that the separated Churches and Communities as such, though we believe them to be deficient in some respects, have been by no means deprived of significance and importance in the mystery of salvation. For the Spirit of Christ has not refrained from using them as means of salvation

Unitatis Redintegratio, §3.

Below, the council gives specific examples of the sanctification of souls outside the Catholic Church, *e.g.*, in §15, when discussing the baptisms occurring in Protestant “churches”.

Because the council asserts that there are means for sanctifying souls outside the Catholic Church, this means that souls can go to heaven outside the Catholic Church, because souls that die while sanctified, go to heaven. Thus, the council is indirectly (but clearly) denying the dogma of the Faith: *Extra ecclesia, non salus* (*i.e.*, No salvation outside the Catholic Church). This dogma will be treated a few annotations from now.

³⁹ Elsewhere, Vatican II says the same thing in other words. For example, the council says that, in dialoguing with non-

Catholics, during which “experts” from different “Churches and Communities” each “explains the teaching of his Communion in greater depth and brings out clearly its distinctive features”, and thus it happens that “everyone gains a truer knowledge and more just appreciation of the teaching and religious life of both Communions.” *Unitatis Redintegratio*, §4.

The post-conciliar church puts into practice Vatican II’s teaching that false religions are a source of truth. For example, at the invitation of Pope Benedict XVI, the (schismatic, “Orthodox”) Ecumenical “Patriarch” Bartholomew I was invited to lecture the full synod of Catholic Bishops on Ecclesiastical unity! In other words, someone outside the True Church’s unity was lecturing the Catholic hierarchy about unity. This same event put into practice Vatican II’s (erroneous) teaching that false religions are a source of sanctification also, when, at the end of his lecture, Bartholomew I “blessed” the pope and the bishops. *See, Unity of the Church Is Unbreakably Related With Her Mission*, Zenit.org, October 19, 2008, <http://www.zenit.org/article-23981?l=english>.

To take only one more example: Pope Benedict XVI invited a Jewish rabbi to lecture this same full synod of Catholic bishops on topics which were “theological and explicitly religious”, according to the *Catholic News Service*. This showed that the conciliar church considers even persons that reject Our Lord Jesus Christ, as valuable authorities regarding truths belonging to the True Faith and that the conciliar church considers such persons as having important theological truths to teach the full Catholic hierarchy. *See, Rabbi addresses bishops’ synod in a ‘signal of hope’*, October 8, 2008, http://www.catholicnewsagency.com/news/rabbi_addresses_bishops_synod_in_a_signal_of_hope/.

visible structure.⁴⁰ These elements, as gifts⁴¹ belonging to the Church of Christ, are forces impelling toward catholic unity.⁴²

The traditional teaching of the Church is that no heretical cult (*i.e.*, false “religion”) has any truth of itself. Heretical faith is purely human and natural. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.5, a.3, *Respondeo*. A heretical cult is entirely false, except for any tiny bits of the truth and of the good which are a reflection of sound reason in the natural order or a residue of the original revelation or come from Catholic revelation. Any such truths properly belong to the true Catholic religion and not to the false “religions” *as such*.

⁴⁰ This statement promotes ecumenism and is false, in the sense in which the council’s statement is reasonably taken. This statement could mean (but does not mean) that Mass can be offered outside a physical Catholic Church building, *e.g.*, when a missionary priest offers Mass in the wilderness, or when the sacrament of Extreme Unction is offered in a hospital room, which is outside the physical Church building. Again, that is not what the council means here.

The council clearly means that false religions give holiness (including the sacraments) to those adhering to such false “religions”. *See*, the annotations to §15, below. The council’s statement is false. All valid sacraments are Catholic Sacraments and all persons administering those sacraments are empowered by the Catholic Church to administer the (Catholic) sacrament. So, if a Protestant administers a baptism validly, it is because the Catholic Church gives the power even to heretics, to administer this Catholic Sacrament although that heretic is entirely unworthy to do so, due to his heresy. *Summa*, IIIa, Q.67, a.5.

St. Augustine explains that “the baptism of the Church, ... is holy in itself, wherever it may be; and ... therefore belongs not to those who separate themselves, but to the Body from which they are separated”. *On Baptism, against the Donatists*, Bk.1, ch.12, ¶19.

So this baptism (assuming it is valid) is a Catholic baptism and a Catholic Sacrament, regardless of the intent of the heretic administering it. As St. Augustine teaches us: “There is only one Church, called Catholic, and it is she who, in those communities separated from her unity, acts in those things which, within these sects, *remain her own property*”. *De Baptismo contra Donatistas*, Bk. 1, ch. 10, ¶14. Again, St. Augustine explains: “[I]t is not the baptism of schismatics or heretics, but of God and of the Church, wheresoever it may be found”. *On Baptism, against the Donatists*, Bk. 1, ch. 14, ¶22.

Likewise, if a validly-ordained sedevacantist (or other schismatic) priest were to offer a Catholic Mass, it is because he receives this Catholic power from the Catholic Church. This fact is not changed by the unworthiness of the Sacrament’s administrator. If the priest is a schismatic, he retains the power of confecting Mass and the Sacraments, although he is entirely unworthy (and forbidden) to do so, just as a Catholic priest who is in mortal sin retains the power to confect the Sacraments (but is forbidden to do so under most circumstances).

So non-Catholic groups **as such**, since they are outside the “visible structure” of the Catholic Church, cannot sanctify souls because ***there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church***. This is an unchangeable dogma of the Faith, which has been repeatedly taught infallibly. For example:

Council of Florence and Pope Eugene IV: “The most Holy Roman Church firmly believes, professes and preaches that none

of those existing outside the Catholic Church, not only pagans, but also Jews and heretics and schismatics, can have a share in life eternal; but that they will go into the ‘eternal fire which was prepared for the devil and his angels’ (Matthew 25:41), unless before death they are joined with Her”. Session 11.

Pope Boniface VIII: “With Faith urging us, we are forced to believe and to hold the one, holy, Catholic Church and that, apostolic, and we firmly believe and simply confess this (Church) outside which there is neither salvation, nor remission of sin”. *Unam Sanctam*, 1302, Denz. 468.

Pope Pius IX: “There is only one true, holy, Catholic Church, which is the Apostolic Roman Church. There is only one See founded in Peter by the word of the Lord, outside of which we cannot find either true faith or eternal salvation. He who does not have the Church for a mother cannot have God for a father, and whoever abandons the See of Peter on which the Church is established trusts falsely that he is in the Church.” *Singulari Quidem*, §4.

Pope Pius XI: “The Catholic Church alone is keeping the true worship. This is the font of truth, this is the house of faith, this is the temple of God; if any man enters not here, or if any man goes forth from it, he is a stranger to the hope of life and salvation.” *Mortalium Animos*, §11.

Saint Cyprian of Carthage, a Father of the Church: In writing against the heretics of his time who denied the “faith and truth of the Catholic Church”, he wrote that “there is no salvation out of the Church”. 3rd Century, Letter LXXII, to Jubaianus, *Concerning the Baptism of Heretics*, ¶¶ 20 & 21.

Pope Sylvester II: “I believe that in Baptism all sins are forgiven, that one which was committed originally as much as those which are voluntarily committed, and I profess that outside the Catholic Church no one is saved.” Profession of Faith, 991 AD.

Pope Innocent III: “By the heart, we believe and by the mouth we confess the one Church, not of heretics but the Holy Roman, Catholic and Apostolic Church, outside which we believe that no one is saved.” *Fitts exemplo*, 1208, *Denz.* 423.

St. Thomas Aquinas, Doctor of the Church, teaches that “there is but one Church in which men find salvation, just as outside the Ark of Noah it was not possible for anyone to be saved.” *Commentary on the Apostles’ Creed*, at the article “The Holy Catholic Church”.

Saint Augustine, Doctor of the Church: “He who is separated from the body of the Catholic Church, however laudable his conduct may otherwise seem, will never enjoy eternal life, and the anger of God remains on him by reason of the crime of which he is guilty in living separated from Christ.” Epist. 141.

Pope St. Gregory the Great, Doctor of the Church, affirms that “[t]he Holy Catholic Church teaches that ... all those who are separated from Her will not be saved.” *De Moralis*, bk.14, §5.

⁴¹ Besides the evidence given a few annotations above here, there is a vast body of other evidence, showing that the council and post-conciliar hierarchy think the Catholic Church receives good gifts from heretical sects. For example, in the context of talking about “the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Churches”, Pope John Paul II taught that “Communion is made fruitful by

Just as Christ carried out the work of redemption in poverty and persecution, so the Church is called to follow the same route that it might communicate the fruits of salvation to men. Christ Jesus, "though He was by nature God . . . emptied Himself, taking the nature of a slave",⁽⁷⁷⁾ and "being rich, became poor"⁽⁷⁸⁾ for our sakes. Thus, the Church, although it needs human resources to carry out its mission, is not set up to seek earthly glory, but to proclaim, even by its own example, humility and self-sacrifice. Christ was sent by the Father "to bring good news to the poor, to heal the contrite of heart",⁽⁷⁹⁾ "to seek and to save what was lost".⁽⁸⁰⁾ Similarly, the Church encompasses with love all who are afflicted with human suffering and in the poor and afflicted sees the image of its poor and suffering Founder. It does all it can to relieve their need and in them it strives to serve Christ. While Christ, holy, innocent and undefiled⁽⁸¹⁾ knew nothing of sin,⁽⁸²⁾ but came to expiate only the sins of the people,⁽⁸³⁾

the exchange of gifts between the Churches insofar as they complement each other." *Ut unum sint*, §§ 57-58.

⁴² So having stated that people can obtain truth and holiness outside the Catholic Church, here the council says that the benefit received by both the Catholic Church and non-Catholic "churches" by their exchange of gifts, is a force uniting the True Catholic Church and the false "churches", in a larger "church". This statement further supports the council's teaching that the Catholic Church alone is not the true Church. This Vatican edition of *Lumen Gentium* has a small "c" for Catholic here (although capitalizing the word "Catholic" in various other places in this document), because the unity described is not unity in the Catholic Church, but rather, is a universal unity in the larger "Church of Christ". As in so many other places in the council texts, this statement promotes the pneumatological heresy. *See, also*, the annotations to §13 below.

the Church, embracing in its bosom sinners, at the same time holy and always in need of being purified,⁴³ always follows the way of penance

⁴³ The council here contradictorily says that the Church is holy, yet is not holy, and is pure, yet impure. It is impossible for our Lord (including His Mystical Body, as such) to sin or to be impure. The Catholic Church in Herself, is completely holy, with no need of purification. Only individual Catholics (including popes) sin and need purification and repentance. “The Catholic Church is Holy. ... The misdeeds of some members, or abuses occurring within the Church are due not to the Church, but to the perversity of men.” *The Catechism Explained*, Rev. Francis Spirago, p. 244, TAN Books and Publishers 1993 (reprinting the 1899 edition).

Thus, the Church Herself has nothing for which She should apologize. The council’s false and fuzzy notion that the Catholic Church Herself needs purifying, results in Pope John Paul II’s grievous scandals when he continually apologized in the name of the Church, for the Church’s (supposed) sins: “We are asking pardon for the divisions among Christians, for the use of violence that some have committed in the service of truth, and for attitudes of mistrust and hostility assumed towards followers of other religions.” *Pope Says Sorry For Sins Of Church*, 3-13-00 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2000/mar/13/catholicism.religion>.

As Cardinal Kasper phrased it: “The Second Vatican Council recognized that the Catholic Church was responsible for the division of Christians and underlined that the re-establishing of unity presupposed the conversion of each and every one of us to the Lord.” Cardinal Kasper, *The Common Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification: A Reason for Hope*.

The countless conciliar apologies for the Church’s (so-called) “sins”, has gravely obscured the Church’s mark of Holiness,

and renewal.⁴⁴ The Church, "like a stranger in a foreign land, presses forward amid the persecutions of the world and the consolations of

which was once so powerful in attracting wandering souls to the one true Fold. These sinful conciliar apologies have predictably humiliated the Catholic Church and make Her enemies haughty.

Before Vatican II, the Church was so far from making (false) apologies for heretics and schismatics going astray, that the Church was even careful not to over-emphasize any faults of individual Catholics, in this apostasy. In 1949, the Vatican Holy Office warned: "They [the bishops] will keep careful guard, and with a real insistence, that those who teach the history of the Reform and the Reformers not exaggerate the defects of Catholics and hide the faults of the Reformers, or emphasize certain rather accidental elements to such an extent that one scarcely sees or perceives that which is essential, the defection from the Catholic faith." 12-20-49 Instruction *De Motione Ecumenica* (bracketed words added).

⁴⁴ The council here says that the Church "always follows the way of ... renewal". Pope John Paul II spoke similarly: "reform which is continuous ... [is] one of the distinctive and most important aspects of ecumenism". *Ut Unum Sint*, §17. He continues: "Taking up an idea expressed by Pope John XXIII at the opening of the Council, the *Decree on Ecumenism* mentions the way of formulating doctrine as one of the elements of a continuing reform." *Id.*, at §18.

The conciliar church, then, is in a continual process of change which fits the conciliar church's character as a revolution. As quoted above in the preface, Cardinal Congar called Vatican II the "October Revolution" in the Church. As also quoted in the preface, Cardinal Suenens likened Vatican II to the French

Revolution. As Pope Francis asked the crowds of Rio de Janeiro in July 2013: “Are you ready to ride this wave of revolution of faith?”

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/the_americas/pope-visits-rio-slum-says-rich-need-to-help/2013/07/25/2fb56e3a-f548-11e2-81fa-8e83b3864c36_story.html.

Like other revolutions, the conciliar revolution is continual and progressive. No revolution, including this one, is satisfied with its first victories against the old order which it is overthrowing. Just like a cancer, a revolution does not stay at its initial stage but progressively grows and becomes more virulent. This is true of the conciliar revolution.

This is why Pope Benedict XVI used to be considered a liberal at the time of the council, and by the time he became pope, was considered an arch-conservative, even though he recognized that he himself did not change. Interview with Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger by Walter Falceta, Jr., 'Acao pastoral requer espiritualidade' in *O Estado de S. Paulo*, July 29, 1990. The change in the way Cardinal Ratzinger is viewed is due to the progression of the conciliar revolution around him.

Also, as Pope Francis did in the quote above, it is typical of a revolution that the people are told to take matters into their own hands to advance the revolution. Here is Cardinal Kasper, inciting the people:

The ecumenical movement is a somewhat complex process, and it would be an error to wait, from the Catholic side, that everything be done by Rome The intuitions, the challenges must also come from local Churches, and much must be done on a local level before the universal Church makes it her own.

God"(14*), announcing the cross and death of the Lord until He comes."(84) By the power of the risen Lord it is given strength that it might, in patience and in love, overcome its sorrows and its challenges, both within itself and from without, and that it might reveal to the world, faithfully though darkly, the mystery of its Lord until, in the end, it will be manifested in full light.

CHAPTER II ON THE PEOPLE OF GOD⁴⁵

Cardinal Kasper, *The Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification: A Reason for Hope*".

⁴⁵ Pope John Paul II admitted that "the doctrine in which the Church is presented as the people of God" is a "novelty" of the Second Vatican Council". *Sacrae Disciplinae Leges*, 1-25-83.

This emphasis on the "people of God", instead of the Mystical Body of Christ, de-emphasizes the hierarchical nature of the Church, since a body is hierarchical (with some parts more important and controlling other parts) but a "people" is not clearly hierarchical. This de-emphasis of hierarchy panders to the Protestants, as well as to "we are church" modernist "Catholics".

The egalitarian promotion of the Church as the "people of God" also obscures the essential differences resulting from the characters given in priestly ordination and in Episcopal consecration. This same de-emphasis of Catholic doctrine occurs again in §13 below, where the hierarchy and clergy are lumped together with laymen as "members of the people of God".

9. At all times and in every race God has given welcome to whosoever fears Him and does what is right.⁴⁶ (85) God, however, does not make men holy and save them merely as individuals, without bond or link between one another. Rather has it pleased Him to bring men together as one people, a people which acknowledges Him in truth and serves Him in holiness. He therefore chose the race of Israel as a people unto Himself. With it He set up a covenant. Step by step He taught and prepared this people, making known in its history both Himself and the decree of His will and making it holy unto Himself. All these things, however, were done by way of preparation and as a figure of that new and perfect covenant, which was to be ratified in Christ, and of that fuller revelation which was to be given through the

⁴⁶ This statement is true but is incomplete and very misleading. It promotes the heresies of naturalism, Pelagianism and universal salvation. The council makes it sound as if God's action is only a response to the action of the person who "fears Him and does what is right". This is false.

Our Lord tells us: "You have not chosen me: but I have chosen you". John, 15:16. Further, our Lord tells us: "without Me, you can do nothing". John, 15:5. Again, our Lord tells us: "No man can come to Me, except the Father, Who hath sent Me, draws him". John, 5:44. Thus, we can neither fear God nor do what is right, unless God gives it to us to do so. *Summa*, Ia IIae, Q.109, aa. 2 & 6.

Therefore, the council's statement is incomplete, misleading and promotes some of the principle heresies of our time, because we will not fear God nor do what is right unless God gives us the grace to do so. So God welcomes those who fear Him and who do what is right, but only because God first gave them the grace to fear Him and do what is right. See, St. Augustine, *On the Baptism of Infants*, Bk.II, ch.31.

Word of God Himself made flesh. "Behold the days shall come saith the Lord, and I will make a new covenant with the House of Israel, and with the house of Judah . . . I will give my law in their bowels, and I will write it in their heart, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people . . . For all of them shall know Me, from the least of them even to the greatest, saith the Lord.(86) Christ instituted this new covenant, the new testament, that is to say, in His Blood,(87) calling together a people made up of Jew and gentile, making them one, not according to the flesh but in the Spirit. This was to be the new People of God. For those who believe in Christ, who are reborn not from a perishable but from an imperishable seed through the word of the living God,(88) not from the flesh but from water and the Holy Spirit,⁴⁷(89) are finally established as "a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people . . . who in times past were not a people, but are now the people of God".(90)

That messianic people has Christ for its head, "Who was delivered up for our sins, and rose again for our justification", (91) and now, having won a name which is above all names, reigns in glory in heaven. The state of this people is that of the dignity and freedom of the sons of

⁴⁷ The phrase "people of God" is here defined to be everyone who "believes in Christ" and is baptized. Of course, the condition that a person "believes in Christ" is fuzzy and the council indicates that this group includes non-Catholics. See, e.g., §15 below. But the council's position here is false and is a novelty. All faith other than the Catholic Faith is purely human and merely natural. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.5, a.3, *Respondeo*. Even worse (because false), as shown in the annotations to the next paragraph, the council indicates that all of the "people of God" including these non-Catholics, are in the state of Sanctifying Grace.

God⁴⁸, in whose hearts the Holy Spirit dwells⁴⁹ as in His temple. Its law is the new commandment to love as Christ loved us.(92) Its end is the

⁴⁸ The council errs by saying that “The state of this people [of God] is that of the dignity and freedom of the sons of God”. This treats every member of the “people of God” as having actual dignity, rather than mere potential dignity. According to the definition of the phrase, “people of God” (discussed in an annotation right above and in §15 below), it includes non-Catholics and also Catholics who are in mortal sin.

But, a man possesses actual dignity when he lives according to grace and reason. Not every man in this “people of God” (as defined by the council), lives this way and has actual dignity. Instead, the council confuses actual dignity with man’s potential dignity *i.e.*, man having a nature which makes him the type of creature which can live according to grace and reason.

St. Thomas Aquinas lucidly explains how man loses his dignity through sin:

By sinning, man departs from the order of reason, and consequently falls away from the dignity of his manhood, insofar as he is naturally free, and exists for himself, and he falls into the slavish state of the beasts Hence, although it is evil in itself to kill a man so long as he preserves his dignity, yet it may be good to kill a man who has sinned, even as it is to kill a beast. For a bad man is worse than a beast, and is more harmful, as the Philosopher states (Polit. i, 1 and Ethic. vii, 6).

Summa, IIa IIae, Q.64, a.2, ad 3 (emphasis added).

Pope St. Leo the Great, Doctor of the Church, also teaches that man loses his dignity through sin. He warns those who

have received Sanctifying Grace, not to lose their dignity through sin: “O Christian, learn thy **dignity**; and being made a partner of the Divine nature, refuse to return **by evil deeds** to your former **worthlessness**.” Sermon 21, *On The Mystery of the Nativity* (emphasis added); [The Latin text is: “Agnosce, O Christinane, dignitatem tuam; et Divinae consors factus naturae, noli in veterem vilitatem degeneri conversatione redire.” Migne’s Latin Fathers, vol. 54, col. 190].

The council makes this grave error in many places, confusing man’s actual dignity with potential dignity. For example, elsewhere, the council proclaims the “the exalted dignity proper to the human person, since he stands above all things, and his rights and duties are universal and inviolable”. *Gaudium et spes*, §26. According to the council, because man’s dignity cannot be lost, this is why the council says that everyone has a right to a “human culture favorable to personal dignity and free from any discrimination” regardless of his religion. *Id.*, at §60. In other words, no matter what beast or idol he worships, his rights remain inviolate.

The council’s error here is humanism and is not the teaching of the Catholic Church. The truth is that, “the Lord hath made all things for Himself”, including man. Prov. 16:4. In fact, a psalm about man’s fallen condition even refers to the loss of man’s dignity through sin, and refers back in time to “when” man “was in honor”. Ps. 48:13 & 48:21.

Lastly, man’s dignity and true freedom go together. As St. Paul says, through adherence to the true Catholic Faith and practice of the Catholic life of grace, we have “the freedom wherewith Christ has made us free.” Galatians 4:31. Thus, the council is right to link dignity and freedom here but gravely errs by attributing both of them to the “people of God” without regard

for the essential condition that man's life be lived according to grace and reason.

⁴⁹ In this sentence, the council here says that the Holy Ghost dwells in the hearts of all of the people of God. But the Catholic Faith teaches us that Sanctifying Grace and the indwelling of the Holy Ghost come together. This is because “with Sanctifying Grace, the Holy Ghost enters our soul”. *My Catholic Faith*, by Bishop Louis Morrow, My Mission House (publisher), Kenosha, WI, 1949, §39.

Therefore, the council's inclusion of non-Catholics in the “people of God”, and the council's assertion that the Holy Ghost dwells in all of the people of God, would mean that even non-Catholics are in the state of Sanctifying Grace. This assertion wrongly ignores that there is no justification or Sanctifying Grace outside the Catholic Church.

But if there could be Sanctifying Grace or justification outside the Catholic Church, there could be salvation outside the Catholic Church, since anyone who dies justified, and in the state of Sanctifying Grace, saves his soul. But it is a dogma (treated a few annotations above here) that outside the Catholic Church, there is no salvation.

The truth is that a person comes into the Catholic Church by Sanctifying Grace and receiving the infused Catholic Faith (which is infused with Sanctifying Grace, as explained in the annotations to §5 above). Thus, the council is plainly wrong that there can be non-Catholics who have Sanctifying Grace.

Further, not even all Catholics have Sanctifying Grace. As explained in the annotations to §5 above, the Catholic Church has members whose souls are dead in mortal sin. For these also,

kingdom of God, which has been begun by God Himself on earth, and which is to be further extended until it is brought to perfection by Him at the end of time, when Christ, our life,(93) shall appear, and “creation itself will be delivered from its slavery to corruption into the freedom of the glory of the sons of God”.(94) So it is that that messianic people, although it does not actually include all men, and at times may look like a small flock, is nonetheless a lasting and sure seed of unity, hope and salvation for the whole human race. Established by Christ as a communion⁵⁰ of life, charity and truth, it is also used by Him as an instrument for the redemption of all,⁵¹ and is sent forth into the whole world as the light of the world and the salt of the earth.(95)

the council errs in saying that in their “hearts the Holy Spirit dwells”.

⁵⁰ The Church as a “communion” is one of the novelties of Vatican II. See, Pope John Paul II, *Sacrae Disciplinae Leges*. This novelty promotes a horizontal understanding of the Church and promotes ecumenism and collegiality.

⁵¹ The council says that the “people of God” is an instrument for the redemption of all men. In fact, Christ’s redemptive sacrifice was infinite and “is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world.” I John, 2:2.

But Providence Wills that man receives the dignity of being a secondary cause of the salvation of others, by being used by Providence. *Summa*, Ia, Q.22, a.3, *Respondeo*. In this way, we “fill up those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ” by assisting in applying Christ’s merits to others (and to ourselves). Colossians, 1:24.

But the Church was not the instrument of Christ’s super-sufficient Sacrifice on the Cross (which sufficed in merit to redeem all, *Summa*, IIIa, Q.1, a.4, *Respondeo*) because the

Israel according to the flesh, which wandered as an exile in the desert, was already called the Church of God.(96) So likewise the new Israel which while living in this present age goes in search of a future and abiding city (97) is called the Church of Christ.(98) For He has bought it for Himself with His blood,(99) has filled it with His Spirit and provided it with those means which befit it as a visible and social union. God gathered together as one all those who in faith look upon Jesus as the author of salvation and the source of unity and peace, and established them as the Church⁵² that for each and all it may be the visible sacrament⁵³ of this saving unity. (1*) While it transcends all limits of time and confines of race, the Church is destined to extend to all regions of the earth and so enters into the history of mankind. Moving forward through trial and tribulation, the Church is strengthened by the power of God's grace, which was promised to her by the Lord, so that in the weakness of the flesh she may not waver

Church was only then “born from the side of the Savior on the Cross”, as Pope Pius XII explains, following the Fathers and Doctors of the Church. *Mystici Corporis*, ¶¶ 28, 28 & 59.

But to the extent that the council means the Church is an instrument in saving souls and applying Christ's merits to them, it is false that salvation is applied to or is even offered to “all”. Under this interpretation of the council's imprecise statement, the council would be promoting the error of universal salvation.

⁵² Here the council again (falsely) tells us that anyone is part of the Church as long as he believes (in some way) that Jesus saves, and that He brings peace and unity. This includes non-Catholics.

⁵³ Calling the Church a “sacrament”, is an antiquarian error promoting ecumenism. See the annotation on this subject in §1 above.

from perfect fidelity, but remain a bride worthy of her Lord, and moved by the Holy Spirit may never cease to renew⁵⁴ herself, until through the Cross she arrives at the light which knows no setting.

10. Christ the Lord, High Priest taken from among men,(100) made the new people "a kingdom and priests⁵⁵ to God the Father".(101) The

⁵⁴ Regarding this reference to continual “renewal” in the service of the conciliar revolution and ecumenism, see the two annotations on this subject above, in §8.

⁵⁵ This statement is imprecise and blurs the exterior, ministerial priesthood of the clergy with the common, internal “priesthood” of the laity. Laymen are joined through baptism, to the Mystical Body of the eternal High Priest, who is Christ. Being part of His Mystical Body, laymen likewise have a participation in the priesthood because they are members of the Mystical Body of the High Priest, our Lord Jesus Christ. Laymen offer themselves and their prayers, in a common, internal “priesthood”, as part of the Mystical Body of Christ. *Council of Trent Catechism*, under *Holy Orders*.

Even if we were to assume that it is not false to call all laymen “priests” in some way, there is no benefit to doing this in practice, since, if all Catholics are thus “priests”, then that name adds no clarity and it refers to no one who is not already referred to by the name “Catholic”.

Further, there is a great danger that, by calling every Catholic by the name “priest”, this will blur the difference between the external, ministerial priesthood and the common, internal “priesthood” of the layman. Vatican II’s great emphasis on the common, internal “priesthood” of the layman has born the fruit that any sensible person would expect: it caused the conciliar church to blur and confuse this common “priesthood” with the

baptized, by regeneration and the anointing of the Holy Spirit, are consecrated as a spiritual house and a holy priesthood,⁵⁶ in order that through all those works which are those of the Christian man they may offer spiritual sacrifices and proclaim the power of Him who has called them out of darkness into His marvelous light.(102) Therefore all the disciples of Christ, persevering in prayer and praising God,(103) should present themselves as a living sacrifice,⁵⁷ holy and pleasing to

external, ministerial priesthood. See, e.g., appendix 3 to the document located here:

<http://www.scribd.com/doc/15270936/Doubtfulness-of-New-Catholic-Ordination-Rite>. This blurring and confusion serve to promote ecumenism by obscuring the Catholic doctrine of the priesthood, which Protestants deny.

The obvious danger of blurring the distinction between “priesthoods” is why the Catholic Church has always been very cautious and did not emphasize any theoretical or possible way a layman could be called a “priest”. As the 1913 Catholic Encyclopedia explains: “Catholic clergy alone are entitled to the designation ‘priest’”. Vol. 12, under heading “Priesthood”. As the Council of Trent teaches: “if any one affirms, that all Christians [*i.e.*, all Catholics] indiscriminately are priests ..., he clearly does nothing but confound the ecclesiastical hierarchy”. 23rd session, ch.4 (bracketed words added). *Lumen Gentium* is causing precisely this harm about which the pre-Vatican II Church warned!

⁵⁶ Here is more excessive emphasis on the “priesthood” of laymen.

⁵⁷ During this talk about “spiritual sacrifices”, “proclaim[ing] the power”, “prayer”, “praising”, and “present[ing] themselves as a living sacrifice”, one could justly ask why there is no mention of the one Infinite Sacrifice on which all of these depend, *viz.*, the Catholic Mass, which is our Lord’s Sacrifice on the Cross,

God.(104) Everywhere on earth they must bear witness to Christ and give an answer⁵⁸ to those who seek an account of that hope of eternal life which is in them.(105)

Though they differ from one another in essence and not only in degree, the common priesthood of the faithful and the ministerial or hierarchical priesthood⁵⁹ are nonetheless interrelated: each of them in

renewed daily on Catholic altars in an unbloody manner. One answer to why the council omitted this all-important aspect, is that this paragraph refers to all “Christians” and “disciples of Christ”. But the council falsely includes heretics in these terms. *See*, annotation to §15 below. Thus, referring to the crucial importance of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass here would call to mind that there is no justification (or salvation) outside the Catholic Church. *See*, annotation to §9 above. This reminder would contradict the council’s goal of (false) ecumenism and would be an obstacle to promoting universal salvation.

⁵⁸ Because the council here includes heretics as “Christians” and “disciples of Christ”, [*see*, the annotations to §15 below] the council falsifies Catholic teaching further, by saying here that non-Catholics can be true witnesses to Christ and can “give an answer” which can truly come only from the Catholic Faith and from no other.

Likewise, in this same sentence, the council includes non-Catholics among those who can have a justified “hope of eternal life”. But, non-Catholics can have only a false and vain presumption, not the true supernatural, theological virtue of Hope, since outside the Catholic Church there is no salvation. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.21, a.1, *Respondeo*.

⁵⁹ The council never clarifies this statement and the reader is left with the fuzzy notion that perhaps this difference in

its own special⁶⁰ way is a participation in the one priesthood of Christ.(2*) The ministerial priest, by the sacred power he enjoys, teaches⁶¹ and rules⁶² the priestly people⁶³; acting in the person of

“essence” means a difference in “essential” function, as the Protestants assert.

⁶⁰ This is false. The exterior, ministerial priesthood has a very special way of participation in the one priesthood of Christ, as an *alter Christus*. The common, interior “priesthood” does not have any special way, but only the general way, open to every Catholic, to participate in the one priesthood of Christ.

It is a recurring theme throughout the documents of Vatican II, that the council patronizingly wants everyone to know that he is “special”. Another example (among countless others) of this tendency, is the council telling all parts of the Church that each has special gifts with which it can enrich the entire Church. See, §13 below.

⁶¹ By placing the priest’s teaching function first and downplaying his offering the Holy Mass and his administering the seven Sacraments, the council here suggests that the most important “function” of a priest is to preach. This is the Protestant position. Thomas Cranmer, *Questions and Answers concerning the Sacraments*, answer to Q. 9. The council’s emphasis here fits the council’s ecumenical push, seeking to minimize whatever is denied by the Protestants. For a catalogue of the conciliar church’s efforts to protestantize the Catholic doctrine of the priesthood, see, the appendices to the article located at this link:
<http://www.scribd.com/doc/15270936/Doubtfulness-of-New-Catholic-Ordination-Rite>.

This same error (giving the most prominent role to teaching) is even more strongly promoted in a different document of Vatican

II, *Presbyterorum Ordinis*. In that document, it is erroneously stated: “The people of God is formed into one in the first place by the Word of the living God, which is quite rightly sought from the mouth of priests. For since nobody can be saved who has not first believed, it is the **first task** of priests as co-workers of the bishops to preach the gospel of God to all men.” *Presbyterorum Ordinis* §4.

In fact, the truth is that the most important role of a priest is to celebrate Holy Mass and the second most important role is to hear confessions. Council of Trent (Sess. XXIII, ch. 1, Dz. 957). Preaching is **not necessary** to the definition of the priest. A priest might be a monk or otherwise have no role in preaching. However, it is incomprehensible for a priest to not continually offer up to God the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass.

⁶² The truth is that ruling is not essential to the essence of the priesthood. But ruling is given such prominence here and by Protestants because conciliar priests and Protestant ministers are essentially the presidents of their assemblies. *See*, the appendices to the article located at this link: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/15270936/Doubtfulness-of-New-Catholic-Ordination-Rite>.

⁶³ The council continues here the obsessive focus on the priesthood of the laity, in the service of ecumenism and in order to de-emphasize the true, exterior, ministerial priesthood denied by Protestants. The council here, and in many other places, also promotes the error of collegiality by promoting a more democratic church where the people are priests and so authority comes from “below”, through parish councils, etc.

Christ, he makes present the Eucharistic sacrifice⁶⁴, and offers it to God in the name of all the people. But the faithful, in virtue of their royal priesthood, join in the offering⁶⁵ of the Eucharist.(3*) They likewise exercise that priesthood⁶⁶ in receiving the sacraments, in

⁶⁴ This is imprecise. The phrasing of this sentence would be acceptable to Protestants, who deny the Catholic dogma of transubstantiation and who deny the essence of the Mass as the very same sacrifice of our Lord on the cross, offered on the Catholic altar in an unbloody manner. However, even Protestants could agree that a minister can “make present” the sufferings of Christ, just as a good story-teller can “make present” an exciting battle.

Moreover, it would be naïve to assume that the mention of “Eucharistic sacrifice” is a clear teaching of the true Catholic Faith regarding the Mass. Protestants, following Luther, generally have no objection to the Eucharist being a sacrifice, as long as this means it is a sacrifice of praise, not an unbloody renewal of the very same Sacrifice of our Lord on the Cross.

Protestants hold that, “once a conscience has been uplifted by faith and realizes its freedom from terror, then it fervently gives thanks for the benefits of Christ and for His suffering. ... In this way the ceremony becomes a sacrifice of praise.” *Apology of the Augsburg Confession*, one of the confessional writings of the Lutheran church, written by Philip Melancthon and included in the *Book of Concord*. Art. 24, ¶74.

⁶⁵ Here is more emphasis on the “priesthood of the people”, to de-emphasize what the Protestants deny, *viz.*, true Catholic ministerial and exterior priesthood.

⁶⁶ This phrase “exercise that priesthood” is imprecise and very misleading. It is not an expression that the Catholic Church traditionally used regarding laymen, because it lends itself (and

prayer and thanksgiving, in the witness of a holy life, and by self-denial and active charity.

11. It is through the sacraments and the exercise of the virtues that the sacred nature and organic structure of the priestly community⁶⁷ is brought into operation. Incorporated in the Church through baptism, the faithful are destined by the baptismal character for the worship of the Christian⁶⁸ religion; reborn as sons of God they must confess

is actually given) heterodox interpretations, blurring the difference between the ministerial, exterior priesthood and the common, interior “priesthood”. Whereas the Catholic priest has powers of ordination to exercise, there is no “priesthood” for the laity to “exercise” other than simply being Catholic and leading the Catholic life, as a member of the Mystical Body of Christ. The council continues to “go out of its way” here, to focus on the “priesthood” that every Catholic has and makes misleading comparisons to blur the distinction between Catholic priests and laymen.

⁶⁷ This fuzzy statement obscures the difference in essence between the ministerial priesthood and what is called the “priesthood” of the faithful. The phrase “priestly community” apparently refers to everyone, including laymen, and is another formula the council uses to promote a horizontal “democratic” church.

⁶⁸ The council includes heretics in this phrase “Christian”. See, §15 below. Thus, the council includes heretical “religions” in its statement that the baptismal character makes us fit for “the worship of the Christian religion”. This statement promotes ecumenism, since it means that other (false) “religions” are good, because our baptismal character destines us for practicing them.

before men the faith⁶⁹ which they have received from God through the Church (4*). They are more perfectly bound to the Church by the sacrament of Confirmation, and the Holy Spirit endows them with special strength so that they are more strictly obliged to spread and defend the faith, both by word and by deed, as true witnesses of Christ (5*). Taking part in the Eucharistic sacrifice, which is the fount and apex of the whole Christian life, they offer⁷⁰ the Divine Victim to God, and offer themselves along with It.(6*) Thus both by reason of

Further, the council teaches the error that the heretical sects are part of the “Church of Christ”. *See*, §8 above. Thus, the council here uses the phrase “Christian religion” in the singular, since the council says that true Catholic religion and heretical sects are all part of one religion and one larger church, which the council calls the “Church of Christ”.

⁶⁹ As shown above, this reference to “faith” does not mean exclusively, the Catholic Faith. Among countless examples showing this in the conciliar church, is the March 14, 2012 U.S. Bishops’ *Statement on Religious Freedom*, which appealed to “the Catholic faithful, and all people of faith” to join together in prayer.

Because this “faith” includes a heretic’s faith, the council is here saying that God gives these heretics their heretical faith, although this is false. The Catholic Church has always taught that the faith of heretics is not from God but is purely human and natural. *See, e.g., Summa, IIa IIae, Q.5, a.3, Respondeo.*

⁷⁰ Although it is true that laymen can in some way be said to offer the Divine Victim, this phrase is used here as part of confusing the exterior, ministerial priesthood and the common “priesthood” of laymen, as members of the Mystical Body of Christ the Eternal Priest.

the offering and through Holy Communion all take part in this liturgical service, not indeed, all in the same way but each in that way which is proper to himself. Strengthened in Holy Communion by the Body of Christ,⁷¹ they then manifest in a concrete way that unity of the people

⁷¹ Notice this phrasing is open to the Protestant teaching that Holy Communion is merely the Body of Christ through signification, not through Transubstantiation. Here is one such heretical formulation which is not inconsistent with the council's statement here:

Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, do then also **inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporeally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ** crucified, and all benefits of His death: **the body and blood of Christ being then not corporeally or carnally in, with, or under the bread and wine; yet as really, but spiritually present to the faith of believers** in that ordinance as the elements themselves to their outward senses.

Westminster Confession, XXIX, vii (emphasis added). *See, also*, other similar Protestant formulas of transignification (which deny the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation, and which are quoted in the appendix of *The Doctrines of the Episcopal Church not Romish*, Wm. Meade, Gideon (publisher), Washington, 1844.

Further, notice this entire paragraph about the Sacraments, omits the crucial effect of all of the Sacraments, *viz.*, that they are channels of Sanctifying Grace. *Summa*, IIIa, Q.60, a.3, *Respondeo*. This glaring omission is in the service of (false) ecumenism.

of God which is suitably signified and wondrously brought about by this most august sacrament.

Those who approach the sacrament⁷² of Penance obtain pardon from the mercy of God for the offence committed against Him and are at the same time reconciled with the Church, which they have wounded by their sins, and which by charity, example, and prayer seeks their conversion.⁷³ By the sacred anointing of the sick⁷⁴ and the prayer of

⁷² Many Protestants would not object to the council's treatment of Penance here. The Protestant heresiarch, Cranmer, both called Penance a sacrament and also agreed that it involved God pardoning sinners but Cranmer denied the Catholic doctrine of the Sacrament of Penance. Thomas Cranmer, *Questions and Answers concerning the Sacraments*, answer to Q. 7.

⁷³ Catholic doctrine is that the Sacraments do what they signify. That is, the Sacraments cause their effects *ex opere operato*. See, e.g., St. Thomas Aquinas, *Comm. on IV Sent.* d.1, Q.1, a.4; Council of Trent, Sess. VII, Canons 6 & 8; *Council of Trent Catechism*, Section re *The Sacraments in General*.

The statements made here, in *Lumen Gentium*, obscure this Catholic doctrine by remaining open to the Protestant error that God's pardoning of the penitent is not done directly through the Sacrament of Penance but that the Sacrament is merely the occasion of the pardon. According to Catholic Sacramental doctrine, forgiveness comes from the Sacramental absolution of the priest, who judges and imposes a judicial sentence upon the penitent.

Similarly, when stating that the penitent is also reconciled with the Church, *Lumen Gentium* makes the grave omission that the Church's priest directly caused the penitent's pardon by the Sacrament of Penance, which causes the forgiveness it signifies. Instead, *Lumen Gentium* mentions only the role of the Church's

“charity, example and prayer” because the Protestants also would list these factors in a sinner’s forgiveness.

Lumen Gentium’s statements in this paragraph are acceptable to many Protestants because they generally have no objection to the word “sacrament”, nor any objection to the idea that sacraments are signs. However, they object to the Catholic doctrine that Sacraments do what they signify. See, Protestant errors discussed in the 1913 *Catholic Encyclopedia*, under the heading *Sacrament*.

This paragraph continues the council’s grave omission of any mention of the Sacraments causing Sanctifying Grace. There is no mention also of the Catholic doctrine of the efficacy of the Sacrament of Penance in remitting the punishment due to sin. Both of these omissions promote ecumenism by remaining silent about Catholic dogmas which heretical sects deny.

It is false and fuzzy to say, as the council does here, that the Church is wounded by sin, any more than God Himself is wounded by sin. God and His Church love souls and they want the salvation of souls. But the only “wound” that God and His Church receive is the wound of knowing that someone else has wounded himself. The Church is holy and perfect, just as God is. The Church is no more wounded by sin than She is harmed by persecution. As St. John Chrysostom declared: “The Church ... is always in full vigor.” Second Sermon, *de Eutropia*, §6. As *My Catholic Faith* explains:

The powers of evil will beat in vain against [the Catholic Church]. They will break themselves and perish, but the Church will remain indefectible. [T]he Church [remains] exactly as Christ founded it, and stronger than ever. ... Christ meant His

her priests the whole Church commends⁷⁵ the sick to the suffering⁷⁶ and glorified Lord, asking that He may lighten their suffering and save them;(106) she exhorts them, moreover, to contribute to the welfare of the whole people of God by associating themselves freely with the passion and death of Christ.(107) Those of the faithful who are consecrated by Holy Orders are appointed⁷⁷ to feed the Church in

Church to endure to the end of the world. It is to be indestructible and unchanging.

My Catholic Faith, by Bishop Louis Morrow, My Mission House publishers, Kenosha, WI, 1949, §69.

⁷⁴ The Sacrament of Extreme Unction is here called the “anointing of the sick”. The council’s words here obscure the facts that the valid matter of this Sacrament is a person in danger of death and that this Sacrament is an immediate preparation for death. Council of Trent, Second Sess., Ch.3.

⁷⁵ In *Lumen Gentium*’s statement here, there is nothing with which a Protestant could not agree. See, 1913 *Catholic Encyclopedia*, under the heading *Extreme Unction*, (examining Protestant errors regarding this Sacrament). The council here gives no suggestion that the Sacrament of Extreme Unction causes what it signifies (*ex opere operato*). Rather, *Lumen Gentium* merely suggests that this Sacrament is simply a way of commending the sick to the Lord and asking for His help. Thus, the council’s treatment here obscures the truth and promotes ecumenism by remaining silent about dogmas which the heretics deny.

⁷⁶ Use of the present tense in the word “suffering”, suggests that Our Lord Jesus Christ continues to suffer. This is false.

⁷⁷ Although it is true that priests are appointed, this focus on appointment and minimizing of the essential character of Holy

Christ's name with the word and the grace of God.⁷⁸ Finally, Christian spouses, in virtue of the sacrament of Matrimony, whereby they

Orders serves ecumenism by being acceptable to Protestants. The council's language here also serves to blur the essential difference between priests and laymen, as well as to obscure the sacrificial nature of the priesthood, whose first and essential duty is to offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. In this way, the council promotes collegiality, as well as ecumenism.

⁷⁸ This statement of the ways that priests feed laymen makes the grave omission of failing to refer to the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist. This fits with *Lumen Gentium's* obscuring that the Sacraments do what they signify. Obviously, if the Holy Eucharist is merely a sign (as Protestants and modernists say) then there is no reason to refer to it here.

The council's explanation of Holy Orders here obscures the truth and suggests that the essence of Holy Orders is that, through means of a consecration, a man is appointed to feed men with doctrine and grace. This fits with the Protestant view that "ordination" is a means of appointing a man to be the leader of the congregation. See this link:

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ordination#Protestantism>

Nor should the reader naively think that the council's reference to "grace" here somehow makes this passage become a clear statement of Catholic doctrine and incompatible with the errors of heretical sects. For example, the Methodists (a sub-sect of Protestant), considers "grace" to be "the love and mercy given to us by God because God desires us to have it, not because of anything we have done to earn it". See, <http://www.umc.org/site/c.lwL4KnN1LtH/b.2310047/>. Thus, a Methodist would have no problem agreeing that a "priest" or

signify and partake of the mystery of that unity and fruitful love which exists between Christ and His Church,(108) help each other to attain to holiness in their married life and in the rearing and education of their children.⁷⁹ By reason of their state and rank in life they have their own special gift among the people of God.(109) (7*) From the wedlock of Christians⁸⁰ there comes the family, in which new citizens of human society are born, who by the grace of the Holy Spirit received in baptism are made children of God, thus perpetuating the people of God through the centuries. The family is, so to speak, the domestic church. In it parents should, by their word and example, be the first

minister feeds people with “the word and the grace of God”, as the council says here.

⁷⁹ This statement omits all Catholic dogma which the Protestants deny. There is mention neither of Sanctifying Grace nor of the particular sacramental grace which is proper to Matrimony. Further, there is no mention that Marriage is a lifelong bond which cannot be broken by divorce. Lastly, because marriage is a natural institution, the next sentence does not change the council’s glaring omissions. Spouses having “their own special gift” is not a clear reference to anything supernatural, much less is it a clear teaching of any dogma denied by the heretics. Thus, the council continues its promotion of ecumenism.

⁸⁰ This is a further promotion of ecumenism by inclusion of heretics and schismatics here (as so-called Christians), in these statements about marriage. Further, the council falsely indicates that the Sacrament of Baptism (and presumably also the Sacrament of Marriage) received by heretics and schismatics above the age of reason, give Sanctifying Grace and the Holy Ghost. See, the Catholic Church’s teaching to the contrary, in the annotations to §15 below.

preachers of the faith to their children; they should encourage them in the vocation which is proper to each of them, fostering with special care vocation to a sacred state.

Fortified by so many and such powerful means of salvation, all the faithful, whatever their condition or state, are called by the Lord, each in his own way, to that perfect holiness whereby the Father Himself is perfect.

12. The holy people of God shares also in Christ's prophetic office;⁸¹ it spreads abroad a living witness to Him, especially by means of a life of faith and charity and by offering to God a sacrifice of praise, the tribute of lips which give praise to His name.(110) The entire body of the faithful, anointed as they are by the Holy One,(111) cannot err in matters of belief.⁸² They manifest this special property by means of

⁸¹ This is not the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church! St. Thomas Aquinas specifically states that prophesy is not a gift given to all men or to all Catholics. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q. 171, introduction.

It is a novelty of Vatican II to assert that all Catholics share “in Christ’s prophetic office”. Pope John Paul II listed as a “novelty of the Second Vatican Council”, “the doctrine ... according to which all the members of the people of God, in the way suited to each of them, participate in the threefold office of Christ: priestly, prophetic and kingly”. *Sacrae Disciplinae Leges*, 1983.

⁸² This statement is true about all Catholics – including all priests and bishops (as is shown immediately below), *viz.*, all Catholics together cannot collectively apostatize, leaving absolutely no one remaining in the Church. This is true because the Church is indefectible and will continue until the end of time. In other words, there will always be some Catholics left

somewhere, even if there is a general apostasy from the Church. Thus, on one “level” this statement is true but does not “say” anything except the Church is indefectible.

But while appearing innocent, the council’s statement is insidious and revolutionary. Notice the council introduces infallibility as an attribute of the “people of God” first (both in emphasis and in sequence), before treating the authority of the pope and hierarchy. Pope Benedict XVI (before becoming pope) explained the importance of this ordering, which is the same both in *Lumen Gentium* and in his Instruction *Donum Veritatis*:

Looking at the articulation [*i.e.*, structure or outline] of the document [*Donum Veritatis*], one is almost struck by the fact that we have not introduced it by speaking first about the Magisterium but rather about the topic of truth as a gift from God to his [*sic*] people. The truth of faith is not given to isolated individuals [*e.g.*, the pope or bishops]; rather through it God wanted to give life to a history and to a people. **The truth is located in the communitarian subject: the people of God, the Church.**

L’Osservatore Romano, English edition, July 2, 1990, page 5 (emphasis added; bracketed words added).

What emerges on this issue, from the conciliar revolution, is the view of that the Church’s hierarchy conforms its teaching to what the “people of God” come to believe.

This is how Pope John Paul II explained this egalitarian view:

In the Church, the school of the living God, Bishops and the faithful are all fellow disciples, and all need

to be taught by the Spirit. Many indeed are the places from which the Spirit imparts His inner teaching: first of all, in the heart of every person, and then in the life of the various particular Churches, where the various needs of individuals and the various ecclesial communities emerge and make themselves heard, not only in languages that are known but also in those that are new and different.

The Spirit also makes Himself heard as He awakens in the Church different forms of charisms and services. For this reason too, there were frequent calls during the Synod for Bishops to have direct and personal contact with the faithful living in the communities entrusted to their pastoral care, following the example of the Good Shepherd who knows His sheep and calls each by name. Indeed, frequent meetings of the Bishop with his priests, in the first place, and then with the deacons, consecrated persons and their communities, and with the laity, individually and in their various forms of association, are of great importance for the exercise of effective ministry among the people of God.

Pope John Paul II, Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation *Pastores Gregis*, October 16, 2003, §28 (emphasis added).

But this is false and is the opposite of the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church! The truth is that the hierarchy is the teachers – the *ecclesia docens* – whereas laymen are the persons receiving this teaching – the *ecclesia discerns*. See, 1913 *Catholic Encyclopedia*, under the heading *Church*.

the whole peoples' supernatural discernment in matters of faith when

Further, the duty of the Church's teachers is merely to pass down faithfully the truth they have received. For this reason, Vatican I taught infallibly that the duty of the Church's teachers is to "**religiously guard and faithfully expound the revelation or Deposit of Faith transmitted by the Apostles.**" Vatican I, *Pastor Aeternus*, Sess. 4, ch.4, #6 (emphasis added). The Church's teachers have a duty to avoid teaching any novelties. *See*, the preface of this book.

Thus, the council errs here in blurring the distinction between the *Church Teaching* and the *Church Learning*. This fits with the Protestant error that every individual is inspired directly by God and that no teacher can authoritatively command the consent of others.

The council says that the people are "anointed ... by the Holy One" and so indicates that the belief of the people is the human origin of a doctrine's infallibility. For "the truth is located in the communitarian subject: the people of God, the Church." [Pope Benedict XVI] and "the Spirit imparts His inner teaching: first of all, in the heart of every person" [Pope John Paul II]. But the truth regarding Magisterial teachings is that "*such definitions of the Roman Pontiff from himself, but not from the consensus of the Church, are unalterable.*" Vatican I, *Pastor Aeternus*, Sess. 4, Ch. 4, #9. Thus, the truth is that the opinions of Catholic laymen are only an indirect sign of the truth, insofar as one can discover what a teacher (the Magisterium) is teaching by discerning what his students (the laymen) have learned. Contrary to Protestant and conciliar teachings, laymen are not given the direct enlightenment of the Holy Ghost to learn the truth but are given Sanctifying Grace to accept the Faith from the Teaching Church.

"from the Bishops down to the last of the lay faithful" (8*) they show universal agreement in matters of faith and morals.⁸³ That discernment in matters of faith is aroused and sustained by the Spirit of truth. It is exercised under the guidance of the sacred teaching authority, in faithful and respectful obedience to which the people of God accepts that which is not just the word of men but truly the word of God.(112) Through it, the people of God adheres unwaveringly to the faith given once and for all to the saints,(113) penetrates it more deeply with right thinking, and applies it more fully in its life.

It is not only through the sacraments and the ministries of the Church that the Holy Spirit sanctifies and leads the people of God and enriches it with virtues, but, "allotting his gifts to everyone according as He wills,(114) He distributes special graces among the faithful of every rank. By these gifts He makes them fit and ready to undertake the various tasks and offices which contribute toward the renewal and building up of the Church, according to the words of the Apostle: "The manifestation of the Spirit is given to everyone for profit".(115) These charisms, whether they be the more outstanding or the more simple and widely diffused, are to be received with thanksgiving and consolation for they are perfectly suited to and useful for the needs of the Church. Extraordinary gifts are not to be sought after, nor are the fruits of apostolic labor to be presumptuously expected from their

⁸³ This is a continuation of the same group of errors: *viz.*, the council says that the entire undifferentiated body of the faithful – the bishops lumped together with everyone else -- are enlightened by the Holy Ghost to make the judgment concerning what is part of the Catholic Faith, and everyone together (including the bishops) comes to an agreement. Whereas the truth is that the *Church Teaching* passes down only what was already taught and the *Church Learning* accepts only this traditional teaching from its teachers.

use; but judgment as to their genuinity and proper use belongs to those who are appointed leaders in the Church, to whose special competence it belongs, not indeed to extinguish the Spirit, but to test all things and hold fast to that which is good.(116)

13. All men are called⁸⁴ to belong to the new people of God. Wherefore this people, while remaining one and only one, is to be spread throughout the whole world and must exist in all ages, so that the decree of God's will may be fulfilled. In the beginning God made human nature one and decreed that all His children⁸⁵, scattered as they were, would finally be gathered together as one.⁸⁶ (117) It was

⁸⁴ Our Lord says the opposite and teaches that all men are not called, but “many are called but few are chosen.” Matt. 22:14. Further, St. Paul said that God calls only those whom He justifies. Romans, 8:30. Plainly, not all men have a chance after their conception, of actually becoming Catholics. For example, unbaptized babies, dying before the age of reason, have no such chance of “belonging to the new people of God.” See the annotations to §8 above.

⁸⁵ In this sentence and in the one immediately following, the council says that all men are God’s children (or sons). The Church’s traditional teaching is the opposite: “[People] can in no wise be counted among the children of God unless they take Christ Jesus as their Brother, and at the same time the Church as their mother.” Pope Leo XIII, *Satis Cognitum*, §16.

⁸⁶ This statement is false and promotes universal salvation. The council’s footnote #117 refers to God’s children being gathered together in one Church. However, it is a conciliar novelty to interpret St. John’s Gospel (11:52) here as applying to all men. For example, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Gregory the Great and St. Augustine all explain that St. John’s Gospel here refers not to all men but only to those men who actually save

for this purpose that God sent His Son, whom He appointed heir of all things,(118) that he might be teacher, king and priest of all, the head of the new and universal people of the sons of God.⁸⁷ For this too God sent the Spirit⁸⁸ of His Son as Lord and Life-giver. He it is who brings together the whole Church⁸⁹ and each and every one of those who

their souls. *See*, St. Thomas Aquinas, *Lectures on St. John*, 11:52; and St. Thomas Aquinas, *Catena Aurea*, on St. John 11:52. St. Thomas harmonizes this passage in St. John's Gospel, with St. Paul's statement in Rom. 8:29, explaining that the children of God which St. John refers to, are the same elect that St. Paul refers to as the "many brethren" of our Lord – notably saying "many", not "all men".

⁸⁷ The council's fuzzy statement here promotes the heresy of universal salvation. The council says that "the new and universal people of the sons of God" includes "all". But our Lord said the opposite: "I have manifested thy name to the men whom thou hast given me out of the world. ... "I pray not for the world, but for them whom thou hast given me And not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in me". John 17: 6. 9. 20 (emphasis added).

⁸⁸ It is false that the Holy Ghost was sent for all men or for a purported universal people of God. *See, e.g.*, the annotations immediately above this one, as well as the annotations to §8 above. But the council's error here fits with the conciliar revolution's promotion of universal salvation. *See, e.g.*, the annotations to §3 above.

⁸⁹ The Holy Ghost is, as it were, the soul of the Catholic Church. However, the council includes heretical sects in its definition of "Church". For this reason, the council's statement here is false, because the Holy Ghost does not bring the Catholic Church together with the heretical sects. *See, e.g.*, the

believe⁹⁰, and who is the well-spring of their unity in the teaching of the apostles and in fellowship, in the breaking of bread⁹¹ and in prayers⁹².(119)

annotations to §8 above. The Holy Ghost dwells by Sanctifying Grace in Catholics who are in the state of grace. But no one is justified or saved who is not part of the Catholic Church. See the annotations above, especially the annotations in §9.

⁹⁰ This statement promotes that error that there is salvation outside the Catholic Church by falsely asserting that the Holy Ghost dwells in all “who believe” without any regard for what they believe. The only faith which can supernaturally unite men and save their souls, is the true Catholic Faith, which is caused by Sanctifying Grace. The Holy Ghost creates this supernatural unity by infusion of the theological virtue of charity, which is Divine friendship. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.23, a.1.

The council’s statement here is also false and over-inclusive in a second respect. Not only does the Holy Ghost not dwell in those who do not have the Catholic Faith, but He does not even dwell in Catholics who are in mortal sin. *See*, the annotations to §4 above.

⁹¹ This reference to the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass is protestantized and is entirely acceptable to Protestants and fits with other modernist formulae, which describe the Mass as merely a memorial meal. *See, e.g.*, the definition of the Mass set forth in Article 7 of the *General Instruction for the New Order of Mass*: “The Lord's Supper or Mass is the sacred assembly or congregation of the people of God gathering together, with a priest presiding, to celebrate the memorial of the Lord.”

Contrast this conciliar treatment with the traditional Catholic definition of the Mass:

The Holy Mass is the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ offered on our altars under the appearances of bread and wine, in commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross. ... The Sacrifice of the Mass is substantially the same as that of the Cross, for the same Jesus Christ, Who offered Himself on the Cross, it is Who offers Himself by the hands of the priests

Catechism of St. Pius X, Qs. 4 & 5 under the topic “The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass”.

Notice too, that council’s statement here also promotes (false) ecumenism by reference to “unity in the teaching of the apostles”. While it is true that the Catholic Church now teaches the very same faith as that taught by the apostles, nonetheless this statement gives a false appearance of unity with the heretics because they, also, claim (falsely) to follow the teachings of the apostles but do not really do so because they refuse the teachings of the true Church.

⁹² The council here falsely asserts that the Holy Ghost is “the well-spring of their unity in ... prayers”, and the council includes even non-Catholics, in this unity. But God does not hear, nor is He moved by, the prayers of those who are not Catholic and are not in the state of Sanctifying Grace. *See*, the annotations to §4 above. Thus, there can be no real union of prayers, with those who are not Catholics in the state of Sanctifying Grace.

Further, the council here promotes inter-faith prayer meetings, which were always condemned by the Catholic Church before Vatican II. *See*, the annotations to §15 below.

It follows that though there are many nations there is but one people of God, which takes its citizens from every race, making them citizens of a kingdom which is of a heavenly rather than of an earthly nature. All the faithful, scattered though they be throughout the world, are in communion with each other in the Holy Spirit⁹³, and so, “he who dwells in Rome knows that the people of India are his members”⁹⁴(9*).

⁹³ This statement promotes the pneumatological heresy and universal salvation because it refers to all of the “faithful”, including non-Catholics, (invisibly) united in the Holy Ghost. The council’s statement here ignores the visible nature of the true Church and makes no reference to the necessary unity of Faith, unity of Sacraments and unity under one visible head, the pope.

The council’s statement here is also false in another respect because the Holy Ghost does not dwell in, or unite, non-Catholics or those Catholics who are not in the state of grace. See the many annotations above on this issue.

⁹⁴ The council uses this quote from St. John Chrysostom to promote universal salvation. But this quote is used to falsify what St. John Chrysostom actually taught. The council’s insidious statement makes it appear that all of the people of India are part of the “faithful”, even though only a tiny fraction of persons in that pagan country are Catholic. Thus, *Lumen Gentium* implies that, since most Indians are pagan but the whole people are nonetheless part of the “faithful”, then non-Catholics (including everybody!) are part of the “faithful” and part of the “universal people of the sons of God”. This fits how the conciliar church talks. See, e.g., many quotes above, from Pope John Paul II.

But what St. John Chrysostom really says is that only Catholics, *i.e.*, true members of the Mystical Body of Christ are members of one Body and of each other, regardless of where they are,

Since the kingdom of Christ is not of this world,(120) the Church or people of God⁹⁵ in establishing that kingdom takes nothing away from the temporal welfare of any people. On the contrary it fosters and takes to itself, insofar as they are good, the ability, riches⁹⁶ and customs in which the genius of each people expresses itself.⁹⁷ Taking

throughout the world. St. John Chrysostom most certainly did not hold that all persons in India are part of the “faithful”, *i.e.*, part of the Mystical Body of Christ. In fact, St. John Chrysostom specifically addressed the fate of pagans, such as those same persons in India: “Well should the pagan weep and lament, who, knowing not God, dying goes straight to punishment.” Second Sermon *On the Consolation of Death*, §7.

⁹⁵ The council again promotes universal salvation by equating the “people of God” (which includes everyone), with the “Church”. Further, this horizontal, or democratic phrasing makes the people to be the Church and so the members of the hierarchy become merely parts of the Church because they are people too. This promotes the conciliar error of collegiality. *See*, the annotations to §12 above.

⁹⁶ This continues the council’s undue focus on this-worldly matters.

⁹⁷ This patronizing sentence promotes the idea that everyone’s “culture” is valuable and shows “genius”, no matter how wayward or backward it is. Pope Paul VI explained the council’s man-centeredness this way: “Has all this, and everything we could say about the human value of the Council, perhaps deflected the spirit of the Church in the Council towards the anthropocentric thrust of modern culture? Not deflected, but given it an orientation.” 12-7-65 homily, published on 12-8-65 in *Osservatore Romano*.

them to itself it purifies, strengthens, elevates and ennobles them.⁹⁸ The Church in this is mindful that she must bring together the nations⁹⁹ for that king to whom they were given as an inheritance,(121) and to whose city they bring gifts and offerings.(122) This characteristic of universality¹⁰⁰ which adorns the people of God is a gift from the Lord Himself. By reason of it, the Catholic Church strives constantly and with due effect to bring all humanity¹⁰¹ and all

This passage of *Lumen Gentium* is used to promote inculturation in the conciliar church. For example, Pope John Paul II quoted this passage in Kinshasa, on May 3, 1980, when he promoted the “Africanization of the Church”. *Inculturization – Gospel and culture*, by Mariasusai Dhavamony, vol. 44, Pontifical Gregorian University of Rome, 1995, p.34.

⁹⁸ There is a foreign element introduced here, *viz.*, the this-worldly focus on purifying and strengthening each people’s “riches”. At best, this focus is alien to the Catholic Church’s traditional focus. At worse, this focus on “riches” – a this-worldly concern – lends itself to promoting the Masonic and naturalistic liberation theology.

⁹⁹ So the Church’s mission is unity of nations? This fits with the council’s false promotion of the Masonic universal brotherhood of all men. (*See*, many annotations above.) The truth is that the Church’s goal is to save as many individual souls as possible, from every nation, by converting them to the one, true Catholic Church.

¹⁰⁰ This promotes the heresies of ecumenism and of universal salvation because the “universal people of the sons of God” includes non-Catholics.

¹⁰¹ The council here asserts that all people were previously with Christ (because they need to go back to Him): The “Catholic Church strives ... to bring all humanity ... back to its

its possessions¹⁰² back to its source in Christ, with Him as its head and united¹⁰³ in His Spirit. (10*)

In virtue of this catholicity each individual part contributes through its special gifts¹⁰⁴ to the good of the other parts and of the whole Church.

source in Christ”. Whereas a person can speak of God the Creator being our origin and thus, because He is our final end also, our end is to go “back” to Him. To the extent that one could say that reference to Christ Who is the God-Man, is a reference to the Creator, it could be said all men “go back to Him”. However, in context, it is clear that what the council is doing here is referring to all men united to Christ as declared in *Gaudium et Spes*: “For by His incarnation the Son of God has united Himself in some fashion with every man.” §22. In this, the council promotes universal salvation.

¹⁰² The council here asserts that all material goods were previously with Christ (because they need to go back to Him): The “Catholic Church strives ... to bring all ... possessions ... back to its source in Christ”. Not only is it unclear what the council means here, but this continues the council’s undue focus on material goods. The present statement echoes the council’s statement a little above here, stating that the people of God “fosters and takes to itself ... riches”.

¹⁰³ Here again, the council assigns to the Catholic Church the task of uniting all humanity: “[T]he Catholic Church strives constantly ... to bring all humanity ... to its source in Christ, ... **united** in His Spirit.” As shown above, uniting all men is a Masonic goal and is not the Catholic Church’s mission.

¹⁰⁴ The council here says that all parts of humanity have “special gifts” which benefit all other men and the entire Catholic Church. That is, every culture, no matter how

primitive and pagan, has special gifts through which it can enrich those parts of Catholic Christendom which were blessed with high Catholic culture and the greatest wisdom and keenest insights, of the western world. This makes every group and person into a teacher and an authority upon their unique gifts which can be given to those who have already been blessed with the objectively highest culture of Western Catholic Christendom. This horizontal, democratic view, that “everyone is right and good” is obviously absurd to an educated and cultured Catholic mind, just as it is obviously absurd to a refined man of music that every people’s culture and even every person’s musical art is a special musical gift to the world. The same holds true in every other art and science, but especially the sacred sciences which are at issue here.

The conciliar church has continually promoted *Lumen Gentium*’s error here, that we should “sit at the feet” of darkened intellects and absorb their “wisdom”. For example, Pope John Paul II stated: “Communion is made fruitful by the exchange of gifts between the Churches insofar as they complement each other.” *Ut Unum Sint*, §57. Applying this principle to the relations between the Catholic Church and the (heretical and schismatic) Orthodox sect, Pope John Paul II develops this theme:

Today, the two sister Churches of East and West understand that without a mutual acceptance of the profound reasons underlying their own understanding of what characterizes each of them, and without a reciprocal giving of the treasures of insight that they bear, the Church of Christ cannot manifest the full maturity of the form she received in the beginning, in the Upper Room.

Allocution in the Basilica St. Nicolas of Bari, February 26, 1984.

Through the common sharing of gifts and through the common effort to attain fullness in unity¹⁰⁵, the whole and each of the parts receive increase¹⁰⁶. Not only, then, is the people of God made up of different peoples but in its inner structure also it is composed of various ranks. This diversity among its members arises either by reason of their duties, as is the case with those who exercise the sacred ministry¹⁰⁷ for

¹⁰⁵ It is a grave error that the Catholic Church ever lacks perfect unity. This is to hold the heresy that the Catholic Church lacks anything in the first Mark of the Church: *viz.*, that She is always perfectly One. See the annotations above, on this subject.

¹⁰⁶ There is no *essential* gain of the Catholic Church, the pure Bride of Christ, by additional souls finding the joyous blessing of entering the true Catholic Church. Phrased differently, the Good Shepherd's One Sheepfold is not essentially improved by additional sheep finding Its safety.

Nor should the reader mistakenly believe that this reference to increase refers to the mere material increase in the number of Catholics by adding a new Catholic. This interpretation would be false because the addition of this new Catholic would not be a material "increase" to "each of the parts" of the Church, as the council states here.

¹⁰⁷ Sacred ministers, that is, the ordained clergy, are not differentiated from laymen simply "by reason of their duties", as the council indicates here. This is the false, Protestant notion that priests and bishops are simply laymen who have been delegated a religious function. *See*, annotations above, on this subject. The Catholic truth is that priests and bishops differ by the indelible characters on their souls and the sacramental powers they possess.

the good of their brethren, or by reason of their condition and state of life, as is the case with those many who enter the religious state and, tending toward holiness by a narrower path, stimulate their brethren by their example.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, within the Church particular Churches¹⁰⁹ hold a rightful place; these Churches retain their own traditions, without in any way opposing the primacy of the Chair of

¹⁰⁸ What about the prayers of professed religious?

¹⁰⁹ The council's emphasis on the multiplicity of "churches" promotes the view that the Church is a confederation of separate churches. This emphasis promotes collegiality by de-emphasizing the monarchical nature of the Church's government and the pope's authority. See, §23 below. The term "particular church" is a novelty. *New Commentary on the Code of Canon Law*, John Beal, The Canon Law Society of America, © 2000, p. 504.

As Pope John Paul II recognized, Vatican II's teaching regarding these "relations ... between the particular Churches and the universal Church", is one of the novelties of Vatican II. *Sacrae Disciplinae Leges*, January 25, 1983 (emphasis added). Pope Benedict explained these relations this way: "The Pope is not the bishops' ruler, he is the servant of the community. ... There is a community of local Churches which have the Pope as their reference point." Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger quoted in *Catholic Family News*, May 2001, page 4, taken from *Deutsche Presse-Agentur*, April 3, 2001.

Further, the council's usage of the term "particular churches" also promotes ecumenism because the "particular Churches" are often then lumped together with the non-Catholic sects which are also called "churches" within the Church of Christ. See, §15 below.

Peter, which presides¹¹⁰ over the whole assembly of charity (11*) and protects legitimate differences, while at the same time assuring that such differences do not hinder unity but rather contribute toward it.¹¹¹ Between all the parts of the Church there remains a bond of close communion¹¹² whereby they share spiritual riches, apostolic workers and temporal resources. For the members of the people of God are called to share these goods in common, and of each of the Churches the words of the Apostle hold good: "According to the gift that each has received, administer it to one another as good stewards of the manifold grace of God".(123)

All men¹¹³ are called to be part of this catholic¹¹⁴ unity of the people of God which in promoting universal peace presages it.¹¹⁵ And there

¹¹⁰ The downplaying of the Church's monarchical government is continued by reference to the pope as *presiding*, as if he were a president.

¹¹¹ The council does not develop this assertion and it is unclear how this difference (otherness) can contribute to unity (lack of otherness).

¹¹² This conciliar doctrine of the Church as a "communion" or federation of its parts, is one of the novelties identified by Pope John Paul II. *Sacrae Disciplinae Leges*, January 25, 1983. This is false of the Mystical Body of Christ, just as it is false to call a human body a collection of organs and tissue.

¹¹³ This statement promotes the error of universal salvation. This statement is obviously false, because, *e.g.*, unbaptized babies who die without reaching the age of reason, do not save their souls and do not belong to the Catholic Church. Further, not all men receive grace during their lifetimes nor do they all

have a chance to join the Catholic Church, during their lifetimes. *See*, annotations to §8 above.

¹¹⁴ This use of “small c” catholic, apparently is in contrast to the use of “large C” Catholic, two lines later. This is another example of the council’s antiquarian errors, ignoring the clarity of terminology which the Catholic Church developed over the centuries under the guidance of the Holy Ghost.

The council’s use of “small c” catholic, promotes ecumenism because the council is using the language of the Protestants. As heretical minister Timothy George explained accurately, “Protestants, of course, do not equate ‘catholic’ with ‘Roman Catholic.’ ... For Protestants, these phrases can evoke unity and community.”

http://www.christianitytoday.com/ch/asktheexpert/ask_apostlesc reed.html

The council’s use of “small c” catholicity apparently refers to the pan-religious “Church of Christ” – a.k.a the “people of God” – which the council erroneously indicates to be larger than the Catholic Church.

¹¹⁵ The Catholic Church is essentially united and in perfect order. Therefore, the Church is essentially at peace within Herself. For “peace is the tranquility of order”, as St. Thomas Aquinas explains, quoting St. Augustine. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.29, a.1, ad 1.

But all men will never be at peace interiorly, because all men will never become part of the Catholic Church, and there is no Sanctifying Grace and no Charity, among those remaining outside the Church. Without Sanctifying Grace and Charity, those men will never have the proper ordering toward God and

belong to or are related to it in various ways, the Catholic faithful,¹¹⁶ all who believe in Christ,¹¹⁷ and indeed the whole of mankind, for all men are called by the grace of God to salvation.¹¹⁸

thus, they will not have the tranquility of this order, which is peace.

Likewise, all men will not be at exterior peace with one another, since war and conflict is caused by (and is a punishment for) sin. Sanctifying Grace and Charity are the remedy for sin and there can be no peace without the Prince of Peace, our Lord Jesus Christ. Isaiah 9:6.

But to “presage” means to predict or indicate the future. Since there will be no “universal peace” in this life, there does not seem to be any true presaging of universal peace in this life. (The council does not seem to be talking about peace in heaven, in this passage, which would not be shared by all men in any event.) The council’s dream here, of universal peace on earth, seems to be the same as the council’s utopian dream of the fraternal unity of all mankind. *See*, the annotations to §1 above.

Lastly, the way to best promote peace on earth is to promote conversion to the Catholic Church and true sanctity, living the Catholic life. But the conciliar church no longer promotes conversion to the Catholic Faith as the only means of salvation but now preaches ecumenism and interreligious dialogue. *See*, the annotations to §1 above.

¹¹⁶ There is apparently a distinction made here, regarding the “faithful”. *See*, the annotations to §1 above. Here reference is made to the “Catholic faithful”, as opposed to those who are among the “faithful” but are not Catholic. Notice this list proceeds from the most specific to the more general. First, the

14. This Sacred Council wishes to turn its attention firstly to the Catholic faithful.¹¹⁹ Basing itself upon Sacred Scripture and Tradition, it teaches that the Church, now sojourning on earth as in exile, is necessary for salvation. Christ, present to us in His Body, which is the Church, is the one Mediator and the unique way of salvation. In explicit terms He Himself affirmed the necessity of faith and

“Catholic faithful”, then “all who believe in Christ” and lastly and most broadly, “the whole of mankind”.

¹¹⁷ The council might be using the phrase “all who believe in Christ” here, to be synonymous with the term “believers”, but this phrase clearly includes both persons who have the true Catholic Faith and also those whose (heretical) faith is merely human and natural. *See*, the annotations to §8 above.

This *different ways of relation* to the “people of God” foreshadows the conciliar error of different degrees of communion in the Church. However, this foreshadowing does not unambiguously contain that latter error, since it could be said (contrary to the council’s manifest intent) that persons outside the Catholic Church are related to Her, as lost sheep are related to the One True Sheepfold. To use the analogy given in the *Council of Trent Catechism*, heretics and schismatics are like “deserters” in relation to “the army from which they have deserted.” Quoted from the Creed section, “I believe in the Holy Catholic Church”.

¹¹⁸ It is erroneous both that all men receive grace and also that all men are “called” to salvation. *See*, the annotations to §8 & §13 above.

¹¹⁹ Again, according to (false) conciliar theology, this is a narrower group of persons than the “faithful” taken more generally.

baptism¹²⁰(124) and thereby affirmed also the necessity of the Church, for through baptism as through a door men enter the Church.¹²¹ Whosoever, therefore, knowing that the Catholic Church was made necessary by Christ, would refuse to enter or to remain in it, could¹²²

¹²⁰ As a means of promoting ecumenism, this statement greatly minimizes all the rest of things the Catholic Church teaches us to be necessary for salvation, but which the Protestants deny.

¹²¹ The council says that because Our Lord affirmed the necessity of Faith and Baptism, this resulted “thereby” in our Lord affirming the necessity of the Church. In fact, our Lord affirmed the necessity of the Church directly, in many places, including when He said: “He who hears you hears Me; and he who rejects you rejects Me.” Luke 10:16. Further, the Catholic Church has repeatedly declared the dogma that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church. *See*, the annotations to §8 above.

Moreover, the council makes a very odd argument here, confusing cause and effect. The council says that baptism makes the Church necessary because “through baptism as through a door, men enter the Church”. This strange argument is like saying that it is necessary that one’s home exists because he enter his home when he goes through his home’s door.

¹²² Notice that this statement is put in the grammatical subjunctive, as if such refusal to enter or remain in the Church is merely a hypothetical possibility, rather than a reality, for all schismatics, heretics, Jews and pagans. Notice further than the council says this in the section directed only to Catholics. The council betrays non-Catholics by not telling them about the need to become Catholic.

not be saved.

They are fully¹²³ incorporated in the society of the Church who, possessing the Spirit of Christ accept her entire system and all the means of salvation given to her, and are united with her as part of her visible bodily structure and through her with Christ, who rules her through the Supreme Pontiff and the bishops. The bonds which bind men to the Church in a visible way are profession of faith, the sacraments, and ecclesiastical government and communion. He is not saved, however, who, though part of the body of the Church, does not persevere in charity. He remains indeed in the bosom of the Church, but, as it were, only in a "bodily" manner and not "in his heart."(12*) All the Church's children should remember that their exalted status is to be attributed not to their own merits but to the special grace of Christ. If they fail moreover to respond to that grace in thought, word and deed, not only shall they not be saved but they will be the more severely judged.(13*)

Catechumens who, moved by the Holy Spirit, seek with explicit intention to be incorporated into the Church¹²⁴ are by that very

¹²³ This language of full incorporation (or communion), versus partial communion, is a novelty which is opposed to the traditional teaching of the Church and promotes (false) ecumenism. The council's statement here implies that there is a partial communion with the Church for those who don't fulfill all of the conditions fulfilled by persons in full communion (*viz.*, they "accept her entire system and all the means of salvation", *etc.*). The Catholic Faith, of course, teaches us that, if one rejects even a single dogma, he is a heretic and is outside the Church.

¹²⁴ The council's statement is true, provided that we understand this movement of the Holy Ghost to include Sanctifying Grace and the theological virtues of Faith, Hope and

intention joined with her. With love and solicitude Mother Church already embraces them as her own.¹²⁵

15. The Church recognizes that in many ways she is linked¹²⁶ with those who, being baptized¹²⁷, are honored with the name of

Charity. However, when the council says that a catechumen is joined to the Church simply through intention to join the Church, the council's silence (*e.g.*, concerning the role of Sanctifying Grace) also suffers a naturalistic interpretation that minimizes those Catholic teachings which displeases the Protestants.

¹²⁵ This statement is dangerously imprecise and minimizes the Sacrament of Baptism, promoting the heresy of universal salvation. The council states that catechumens are already Catholic but then gives no indication that baptism is still necessary for them. Although God can save someone without the Sacrament of Baptism, Divine Law still imposes the reception of this Sacrament upon every man, if its reception is not impossible. As the Council of Trent declared: "If any one saith, that baptism is free, that is, not necessary unto salvation; let him be anathema." *On Baptism*, Canon 5. Further, "all are bound to be baptized: and without Baptism there is no salvation for men." *Summa*, IIIa Q.68, a.1, *Respondeo*. But the council's statement here promotes ecumenism because Protestants deny that Baptism is essential to salvation.

¹²⁶ Vatican II elsewhere identifies this "linking" as partial communion:

For men who believe in Christ and have been properly baptized *are put in some, though imperfect, communion* with the Catholic Church. Without doubt, the differences that exist in varying

degrees between them and the Catholic Church whether in doctrine and sometimes in discipline, or concerning the structure of the Church do indeed create many obstacles, sometimes serious ones, *to full ecclesiastical communion*. The ecumenical movement is striving to overcome these obstacles. ... But even in spite of them it remains true that all who have been justified by faith in baptism are incorporated into Christ.

Unitatis Redintegratio, §3 (emphasis added).

But there is no true partial communion with the Church! “Whosoever ... is not united with the Body *is no member thereof, neither is he in communion* with Christ its Head.” Pius XI, *Mortalium Animos* Jan. 6, 1928, §15.

Those who profess a false (*i.e.*, non-Catholic) religion are separated precisely because they rebel against the teaching of the Church and thereby resist the Holy Ghost. On the other hand, anyone who has the true Catholic Faith formally and is a material heretic only (because of his ignorance), is fully a Catholic and not simply linked in some way to the Church. To assert that there are links which are an imperfect communion, as the conciliar church does, is false and denies the Mark of the Church called “One”, *viz.*, Her unity.

However much it might be supposed (though wrongly) that the Church is “linked” to apostates and heretics, they have no true part with her nor are they part of Christ’s Mystical Body, outside of which there is no salvation. *See*, the annotations to §8 above.

¹²⁷ Beginning at the Second Vatican Council, the conciliar church came to consider heretics and schismatics to have a

“deep communion” with the Catholic Church because of their baptism. Here is how Pope John Paul II explains this revolutionary new error: “the very expression *separated brethren* tends to be replaced today by expressions which more readily evoke the deep communion linked to the baptismal character There is an increased awareness that we all belong to Christ. The ‘universal brotherhood’ of Christians has become a strong ecumenical conviction.” *Ut Unum Sint*, §42.

But the council is asserting the opposite of the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church! The truth is that heretics and schismatics are unfaithful to their baptism and desecrate it. St. Augustine calls the baptism of a person who refuses the Catholic Faith, a “sacrilegious vanity”. Migne's *Patrologia*, vol.46, Sermon VIII, col. 840. This is true because, when a heretic receives the Catholic Sacrament of Baptism, while resisting the true Catholic Faith and the true Catholic Church, he is irreverently treating this Sacrament (*viz.*, Baptism), which is something sacred. But to treat irreverently something which is sacred, is a sacrilege. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.99, a.1. Thus, a heretic commits a sacrilege when he is baptized and *Lumen Gentium* honors heretics for these evil deeds (and mortal sins).

Those who fail to profess the true Catholic religion, are worse off for having been baptized and will have a lower place in hell as a punishment, if they don't enter the one true Catholic Church. This is why apostates and heretics are worse and lower than pagans, as St. Thomas explains:

[T]he unbelief of heretics, who confess their belief in the Gospel, and resist that faith by corrupting it, is a more grievous sin than that of the Jews, who have never accepted the Gospel faith. Since, however, they accepted the figure of that faith in

the Old Law, which they corrupt by their false interpretations, their unbelief is a more grievous sin than that of the heathens, because the latter have not accepted the Gospel faith in any way at all.

Summa, IIa IIae, Q.10, a.6.

That is why it is the consistent teaching of the Catholic Church to not baptize children who will not be brought up Catholic.

Summa, IIa IIae, Q.10, a.12.

St. Augustine gives the traditional teaching of the Church, that “men may be baptized in communions severed from the Church, in which Christ’s baptism is given and received in the said celebration of the sacrament, but it will only then avail for the remission of sins, when the recipient, being reconciled to the unity of the Church, is purged from the sacrilege of deceit [*viz.*, schism], by which his sins were retained, and their remission prevented.” *On Baptism, against the Donatists*, Bk. 1, ch. 12, ¶18.

As **Pope Gregory XVI** declares: “A schismatic flatters himself falsely if he asserts that he, too, has been washed in the waters of regeneration. Indeed Augustine would reply to such a man: “The branch has the same form when it has been cut off from the vine; but of what profit for it is the form, if it does not live from the root?” *Mirari Vos*, ¶13.

St. Fulgentius explains eloquently the uselessness of Baptism outside the Catholic Church:

Whether in the Catholic Church or in any heretical or schismatic church, if anyone receives the Sacrament of Baptism, he receives it intact; but he

will not have salvation if he received that Sacrament outside the Catholic Church. Eternal life can never in any way be obtained by one who, with the Sacrament of Baptism, remains a stranger to the Catholic Church. Hold most firmly, and do not doubt at all, that **the Sacrament of Baptism can exist among heretics, but that outside the Catholic Church it cannot be of profit.** For the unity of this ecclesiastical society is of such value for salvation that he is not saved by Baptism to whom it has not been administered where it ought to have been. Hold most firmly, and do not doubt at all, that everyone baptized outside the Catholic Church cannot be made a partaker of eternal life if, before the end of this earthly life, he does not return to the Catholic Church and become incorporated in Her.

On Faith, to Peter §43.

Although the council here praises the baptisms occurring in heretical sects, one can clearly see Satan's hand in those baptisms. Heretical sects tend to baptize their children after those children reach the age of reason. If the heretical sects had baptized their children as infants (assuming those baptisms were valid), then those children would live for several years (*viz.*, before the age of reason) as Catholics, in Sanctifying Grace. However, by waiting until these children are capable of apostasy, those heretical sects prevent the children from living even a single day as Catholics, in Sanctifying Grace, before those children are capable of abjuring the true Faith. As horrific as these truths are, these are the baptisms which the council praises!

Christian¹²⁸, though they do not profess the faith in its entirety¹²⁹ or do not preserve unity of communion with the successor of Peter.¹³⁰ (14*)

¹²⁸ Vatican II does not accord the name “Christian” to heretics and schismatics out of mere politeness (however scandalous this would be). Worse than that, the council insists that this name is the right of heretics:

But even in spite of [obstacles to unity] it remains true that all who have been justified by faith in baptism are incorporated into Christ; they therefore have a right to be called Christians, and with good reason are accepted as brothers by the children of the Catholic Church ...

Unitatis Redintegratio, §3 (emphasis added).

But the Catholic Church has always taught the opposite! For example:

Pope Pius XII: “To be Christian one must be Roman. One must recognize the oneness of Christ’s Church that is governed by one successor of the Prince of the Apostles who is the Bishop of Rome, Christ’s Vicar on earth.” Allocution to the Irish pilgrims of October 8, 1957.

Pope Leo XIII: “So long as the member lives in the body, it lived; separated, it lost its life. **Thus the man, so long as he lives in the body of the [Catholic] Church, he is a Christian; separated from her, he becomes a heretic**”. Encyclical *Satis cognitum* ¶5.

St. Peter Canisius, Doctor of the Church:

Q. Who is to be called a Christian?

A. He who confesses the doctrine of Jesus Christ in his Church. Hence, he who is truly a Christian thoroughly detests all cults and sects found outside the doctrine and outside the Church of Christ, everywhere and among all peoples, as for example the Jewish, the Mohammedan, and the heretical cults and sects.

The Sum of Christian Doctrine, Pt.1, Q.1.

St. Augustine, Father and Doctor of the Church takes as natural, the distinction between heretics and true Christians, who are Catholic: “The people I was describing know and observe these things; for they are Christians, not heretics.” *On the Morals of the Catholic Church*, ch. 33, ¶72.

St. Cyprian, Father of the Church teaches: “[A schismatic] professes himself to be a Christian in such a way as the devil often feigns himself to be Christ”. Treatise I, *On the Unity of the Church*, ¶14.

It is a very old situation that persons are born into religious errors and have (perhaps) not examined those errors carefully. In fact, this problem is as old as the Church Herself. Not only have there been many occasions for persons to be born into heresy almost from the beginning of the Catholic Church (*e.g.*, in Arian times, Manichean times, Donatist times, Albigensian times, *etc.*), but this situation is the same as for all other non-believers also. Pagans and Jews have been born into their errors too, during the entire life of the Church. Thus, we are not now in a new situation that the great doctors of the Church could not have foreseen, which would require anyone to “update” the Church’s teaching to fit our age.

There *is* some sense in which no one would commit any single sin (including apostasy), if he fully understood all of the consequences of his actions. As St. Thomas teaches:

Unbelievers are in ignorance of things that are of faith, for neither do they see, nor know, them in themselves, nor do they know them to be credible. The faithful, on the other hand, know them, not as by demonstration, but by the light of faith which makes them see that they ought to believe them

Summa, IIa IIae, Q.1, a.5 ad 1.

Although ignorance is in some way part of every sin including unbelief in the true Faith, all culpability also requires some knowledge in some way, that particular conduct is wrong; otherwise, the person would not be culpable for his sin.

We might assume that a man is invincibly ignorant if he has never had the full Catholic Faith explained to him, and thus we might suppose that he is not culpable for rejecting the true Faith. However, we don't really know every opportunity that such person has had. His subjective culpability is known to God, not to men (or at least it is known to men only imperfectly). God knows the hearts of men. God judges on a basis that might not appear to us. For example, to us a person might appear invincibly (*i.e.*, inculpably) ignorant of the Catholic Faith because we have good reason to think the Faith was never explained to him. But, however respectable such a person appears, we don't know his interior. Perhaps the person does not reject even those sins which are contrary to reason (such as all lying and all theft). Perhaps God might judge that man as having rejected Catholicism because he rejected the truth or justice more generally. Again, God will judge the internal forum

(the conscience) of that person. Man makes mistakes by doing so.

Thus, from the last few paragraphs of this annotation, it is clear that: 1) all sin involves some ignorance and this ignorance does not necessarily remove culpability; and that 2) man can err regarding the interior culpability of another man.

Further, as shown earlier in this book, it is a dogma of the Catholic Church, that *Outside the Catholic Church, there is no salvation*. Thus, for a person who is not visibly/externally part of the Catholic Church, the only way for him to get to heaven is if he formally has the Catholic Faith, Sanctifying Grace, Hope and Charity and is really, truly and interiorly part of the Catholic Church but has some errors for which he is not blamable, which cause him through ignorance to not explicitly embrace the one true visible Catholic Church.

Thus, it is false to call anyone a “Christian” (*i.e.*, a true follower of Christ), unless he is Catholic. It would be false to call anyone a “Christian”, if he is outside the visible Catholic Church, unless he is truly a member of the Catholic Church but because of his invincible, inculpable ignorance, he was not part of the Church visibly, *i.e.*, exteriorly.

If we were to call Protestants by the name “Christians”, on the theory that we can’t rule out the possibility that they are in perfect good faith but invincibly ignorant – thereby resulting in their truly being part of the Catholic Church – although they neither appear to be nor know they are, then we should call all Jews and pagans by the name “Christian” for the same reason, because we cannot rule out a similar, interior, perfect good will. Not only that, this same principle applies not only to the name “Christian” but also to the name “Catholic”, since anyone who is

truly Christian (and truly a follower of Christ), is also a Catholic. Thus, according to the harmful and foolish conciliar practice of blindly presuming that every heretic has perfect good will, then we should call all heretics, Jews and pagans by the name “Catholic”.

But there’s more: if we foolishly think that we cannot rule out that all men are interior Catholics – yet don’t belong to the one, true, visible Catholic Church because they are invincibly ignorant, we similarly cannot rule out the possibility that they are not only Catholic but also are extremely saintly because of their (supposed) good will, invincible ignorance and presumed charity! Thus, to apply consistently the foolish conciliar notion that we should call heretics by the name “Christians”, we should also call everyone a saintly Catholic, including rock-music-blaring, drug-addicted, blaspheming derelicts.

However, it has never been the practice of men (nor is it reasonable) to assume in the external forum (where men judge) the complete lack of interior (subjective) culpability of all men for all of their actions, simply because they could possibly lack culpability in the internal forum of their conscience, which is known with certainty, by God alone. We don’t say “Hitler was a holy man”, simply because we can’t rule out the possibility that God will judge him to be holy because of some completely hidden (invincible) ignorance and (hypothetical) good will. Similarly, with Stalin, Attila the Hun, Luther and all of the rest of the enemies of mankind. We don’t assume they are holy and blameless and call them such, although we acknowledge that we cannot entirely rule out this possibility, nor can we be positive they are in hell.

Likewise, the Church judges this same way also and this is the only way any man can judge. She calls an outward heretic by this name, just as men call an outward thief, by that name. **St.**

Thomas Aquinas explained: “[W]ith regard to man's internal disposition we consider his spiritual state in relation to the Divine judgment, while with regard to his external actions we consider man's spiritual state in relation to the Church.”

Summa, IIa IIae, Q.184, a.4, *Respondeo*. Because the name “Christian”, when used by Catholics or the Catholic Church, pertains to external actions, no non-Catholic should ever be called a “Christian”.

Similarly, **Pope Leo XIII** explained that: “Of the state of mind and of the intention, the Church does not judge, as they are interior; but insofar as they are apparent, she must judge them”. *Apostolicae Curae*, ¶33.

Pope St. Pius X explained this principle the same way, when judging of the modernists:

Although they express their astonishment that we should number them amongst the enemies of the Church, no one will be reasonably surprised that we should do so, if, leaving out of account the internal disposition of soul, of which God alone is the judge, he considers their doctrines, their manner of speech, and their action [which are the objective criteria upon which one judges]. Nor, indeed, would he be wrong in regarding them as the most pernicious of all the adversaries of the Church.

Pascendi Dominici gregis, ¶3 (bracketed words added). Again, because the name “Christian”, when used by Catholics or the Catholic Church, pertains to external actions, no non-Catholic should ever be called a “Christian”.

Pope Benedict XIV explains this in connection with the hypothetical case of a heretic dying for a dogma which he held in common with the Catholic Church. The pope explains that even if that heretic were invincibly ignorant of his heresy, and thus, even if he were a martyr in God's Eyes, the Church would never call him a martyr, since the Church judges only on the outside and judges the heretic to be outside the Church, since that heretic publicly professed heresy. Citing and following St. Thomas Aquinas, Pope Benedict XIV further teaches that the Church judges the heretic to not have the gift of supernatural Faith. *De servorum Dei beatificatione et beatorum canonizatione*, Bk.III, ch.20, ¶3.

These judgments by the Catholic Church or by anyone else, do not exclude the possibility that the person could go to heaven, is holy and blameless. But man judges outward, blamable conduct in the external forum. Thus, for the same reason, it is unreasonable, is contrary to the practice of men generally and is contrary to the Catholic Church's entire history, to call heretics by the name "Christian".

¹²⁹ The council falsely indicates that heretics can have part of the Faith without having all of it. But this is false and is opposed to the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church! For example:

Pope Benedict XV: "Such is the nature of Catholicism that it does not admit of more or less, but **must be held as a whole or as a whole rejected**: "This is the Catholic faith, which unless a man believe faithfully and firmly; he cannot be saved". *Ad Beatissimi Apostolorum*, ¶24, quoting the Athanasian Creed (emphasis added).

Pope Leo XIII: "[H]e who dissents even in one point from divinely revealed truth absolutely rejects all the faith,

since he thereby refuses to honor God as the supreme truth and the *formal motive of faith*". *Satis Cognitum*, ¶9 (emphasis added).

St. John Cassian teaches: "one who denies one portion of the ... Catholic Faith ... cannot confess the other. For all parts of it are so bound up and united together that one cannot stand without the other and **if a man denies one point out of the whole number, it is of no use for him to believe all the others.**" *On The Incarnation – against Nestorius*, Bk. VI, ch.17 (emphasis added).

Pope Pius VIII: When condemning the error that "various religions" are good because they hold some truth, remarked that: "the various religions do not often agree among themselves. If one is true, the other must be false; **there can be no society of darkness with light.**" *Traditi Humilitati*, ¶4.

Further, *Lumen Gentium* falsely indicates that heretics can benefit by holding some of doctrines which are part of the true Catholic Faith, even though those heretics reject other doctrines of the true Faith. The Catholic Church has always taught the opposite. For example:

St. Thomas Aquinas teaches:

It is written (2 Pet. 2:21): "It had been better for them not to have known the way of justice, than after they have known it, to turn back." Now the heathens have not known the way of justice, whereas **heretics ... have abandoned it after knowing it in some way. Therefore, theirs is the graver sin. ...**

[T]he unbelief of heretics, who confess their belief in the Gospel, and **resist that faith by corrupting it**, is a more grievous sin than that of the Jews, who have never accepted the Gospel faith. ... Hence, speaking absolutely, the **unbelief of heretics is the worst**.

Summa, IIa IIae, Q.10, a.6, *Sed. cont. & Resp.* (emphasis added).

The **Athanasian Creed**: “Whosoever wishes to be saved must, first of all, hold the Catholic faith, which, unless a man shall have held it **whole and inviolate**, he will most certainly perish forever.” The Creed concludes: “This is the Catholic faith, which unless a man shall have believed it faithfully and firmly, he cannot be saved.” (Emphasis added.)

Pope Gregory XVI: “[W]ithout a doubt ... persons of any religion whatever ... will perish forever, **unless they hold the Catholic faith whole and inviolate**.” *Mirari Vos (On Liberalism and Religious Indifferentism)*, ¶13 (emphasis added).

Saint Augustine: “In many things they are with me, only in a few they are not with me; but **because of these few points they have separated themselves from me, it doesn’t mean anything that they be with me with all the rest**.” *Comm. Psalmo 54*, §19.

¹³⁰ The council falsely indicates that schismatics can have any link that matters, and can save their souls, without being Catholic. The traditional teaching of the Church is that schismatics are utterly lost, unless they join the one, true Catholic Church. No prayers or good works or anything else, will help them if they do not become Catholic. For example:

Pope Boniface VIII: “We declare, state, define, and pronounce that it is absolutely necessary for the salvation of every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.” Bull *Unam Sanctam*.

Pope Pius IX stated: “**He who abandons the See of Peter on which the Church is founded, is falsely persuaded that he is in the Church**”. *Quartus supra*, 1-6-1873, §8 (emphasis added).

Pope Pius XI declared: “[I]n [the] one Church of Christ no man can be or remain who does not accept, recognize and obey the authority and supremacy of Peter and his legitimate successors.” *Mortalium Animos*, ¶11.

Pope Clement VIII declared that schismatics are “no longer members of the Body of Christ which is the Church, as they [are] no longer linked with Her visible head, the Sovereign Pontiff of Rome”. *Magnus Dominus*, 12-23-1595.

St. Augustine teaches, speaking to schismatics: “That which belongs to you, is your impiety in separating yourselves from us; for if, in all other things, you think and you possess the truth, yet in persevering in your separation ... you lack that which lacks in him who has not charity.” *De Baptismo contra donatistas*, Bk.1, ch.14, §22.

Again, **St. Augustine**: “So in the points in which schismatics and heretics neither entertain different opinions nor observe different practice from ourselves, we do not correct them when they join us, but ... these things do them no good so long as they are schismatics or heretics, on account of other points in which they differ from us, not to mention the most grievous sin that is

For there are many who honor Sacred Scripture,¹³¹ taking it as a norm of belief¹³² and a pattern of life¹³³, and who show a sincere¹³⁴ zeal.¹³⁵

involved in separation itself”. *De Baptismo contra donatistas*, Bk.1, ch.13, §21.

¹³¹ The council promotes false ecumenism, by listing (as Pope John Paul II explains) “at length ‘the elements of sanctification and truth’ which in various ways are present and operative beyond the visible boundaries of the Catholic Church”. *Ut unum sint*, ¶12. Here in §15 is the list of the “elements” which the council referred to earlier, in §8 above.

One of these “elements of sanctification and truth” listed here, is that the Protestants honor the Bible. However, the council speaks falsely here, in the service of ecumenism, because the Protestants reject various books of the Old Testament and some Protestants also reject certain books of the New Testament. See, 1913 Catholic Encyclopedia, under the headings *Canon of the Old Testament* and *Canon of the New Testament*.

The complete list of the true books of the Bible is infallibly declared by the Council of Trent. Denz. 784. But how can it be said that Protestants honor the Bible when they reject parts of it? Clearly, their rejecting parts of the Bible, greatly insults God and dishonors the Bible.

Further, the First Vatican Council solemnly condemned anyone who does not accept the entire Catholic Bible: “If anyone shall not accept the entire books of Sacred Scripture with all their divisions, just as the sacred Synod of Trent has enumerated them [listed in Denz. #784], as canonical and sacred, or denies that they have been inspired by God: let him be anathema.” Denz. 1809, §4.

So, the Protestants are anathematized (*i.e.*, condemned, cut off and denounced) by the First Vatican Council because of their position regarding the Bible, and Vatican II (shockingly) declares that Protestants honoring the Bible, is an element of their sanctification!

¹³² Heretics and schismatics do not truly take Sacred Scripture for their norm of belief. For, to do that, they would have to understand it correctly. But it is impossible to correctly understand Sacred Scripture outside the Catholic Church. As **Doctor of the Church, St. Hilary of Poitiers**, explains, when commenting upon our Lord sitting in a boat while teaching the people on shore:

There is moreover a reason in the subject of His discourse why the Lord should sit in the ship, and the multitude stand on the shore. For He was about to speak in parables, and by this action signifies that **they who were without the Church could have no understanding of the Divine Word. The ship offers a type of the Church, within which the word of life is placed, and is preached to those without, and who as being barren sand cannot understand it.**

Catena Aurea of St. Thomas Aquinas, quoting St. Hilary of Poitiers' commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel, ch. 13 (emphasis added).

Again, **St. Hilary of Poitiers**, explaining how heretics cannot understand Sacred Scripture, states:

For there have risen many who have given to the plain words of Holy Writ some arbitrary interpretation of their own Heresy lies in the sense assigned, not in the word written; the guilt is that of the expositor, not of the text.

Treatise On the Trinity, Bk. II, §3.

Thus, *Lumen Gentium* errs in the service of ecumenism, by falsely asserting that heretics can take the Bible for their “norm of belief” even though they are heretics. For, if heretics truly took the Bible as their norm of belief, then manifestly they would be Catholic. As **Pope Leo XIII** explains, quoting St. Augustine:

[T]hey, who take from Christian doctrine what they please [*i.e.*, heretics], lean on their own judgments, not on faith; and not “bringing into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ” (2 Cor. x., 5), they more truly obey themselves than God. **“You, who believe what you like, believe yourselves rather than the gospel”** (S. Augustinus, lib. xvii., *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, cap. 3).

Satis Cognitum, ¶9 (emphasis added).

So heretics can never truly take Sacred Scripture for their norm of belief because they cannot truly understand Sacred Scripture. This is why Pope Leo XIII cautions us against reading the “works of non-Catholics” because: “the sense of Holy Scripture can nowhere be found incorrupt outside of the Church, and cannot be expected to be found in writers who, being without the true faith, only gnaw the bark of the Sacred Scripture, and never attain its pith.” *Providentissimus Deus*, ¶15.

Lastly, as explained by **St. Alphonsus Maria de Liguori, Doctor of the Church**:

Take away the authority of the Church and neither Divine Revelation nor natural reason itself is of any use, for each of them may be interpreted by every individual according to his own caprice. From this accursed liberty of conscience has arisen the immense variety of heretical and atheistic sects. If you take away obedience to the Church, there is no error which will not be embraced.

Exposition of the Council of Trent, Part 16, §29.

¹³³ Heretics cannot take Sacred Scripture for their pattern of life. For, to do that, they would have to understand it correctly, which they cannot. *See*, the footnote immediately preceding this one.

Any honest observation of heretical and schismatic sects, shows that it is wrong to say they are holy. Holiness is a Mark only of the true Catholic Church. As the *Council of Trent Catechism* teaches, non-Catholic sects “are sunk in the **most pernicious errors** both doctrinal and **moral**.” Under the section *Creed*; IX article, *Apostolicity*.

¹³⁴ *Lumen Gentium* rashly asserts that heretics generally, and schismatics generally, are sincere. Pope Pius IX taught that “a spirit of docility and unity [is] a spirit clearly absent from all who are not joined with this holy see of Peter”. *Neminem Vestrum*, ¶14.

¹³⁵ This phrase of the council is similar to the one a little above, calling them all Christians. The traditional teaching of the

Church never assumed that heretics and schismatics were all blameless and invincibly ignorant. As St. Augustine told heretics and schismatics: “that which is yours are your bad sentiments and sacrilegious practices, and [the fact] that you have the impiety to separate yourselves from us.” *On Baptism, against the Donatists*, Bk. 1, ch. 14, ¶22.

As **Pope Benedict XIV** declared:

Our great hope is that those who long ago, deceived by lies of the devil, left the Church might now return to the unity of the Catholic faith. Do they not hear her voice calling them most lovingly to her embrace? Do they not understand that **when they left the faith they began to direct their course by human conventions** and they handed themselves over to be taught by others who willfully led them astray with various foreign doctrines? But alas! **How many there are among them who are not ignorant of these things!** And indeed they do not deny that the foundations of each individual sect are weak and, if shaken a little, collapse easily. **But what is more to be deplored is their evil lack of interest in the things of God. Because of this they despise the light of truth and the voice of their conscience. As enemies both of the Catholic Church and of their own souls, they refuse to understand what they ought to do. Nor do they wish to examine the straightway of the Lord which is the only way back to the portals of salvation.** May they at least be awakened by the example of your faith and devotion to consider that they will have no excuse on the Judgment Day if they continue to spurn the

They lovingly believe in God¹³⁶ the Father¹³⁷ Almighty and in Christ, the Son of God and Saviour.¹³⁸ (15*) They are consecrated by baptism¹³⁹,

reasons which have been offered to them for recognizing the truth. May your obvious agreement in the worship of God, in the discipline of Christian life, and in reverence toward the Pope, spiritual Father of every Catholic, all serve as an incentive for emulation and an occasion for shame among those who have left the Church.

Encyclical *Peregrinantes*, ¶10 (emphasis added).

¹³⁶ Manifestly, heretics and schismatics cannot lovingly believe in God, when they stubbornly refuse to believe His Word and accept the authority of His Church.

¹³⁷ The traditional teaching of the Church is that heretics and schismatics cannot have God for their Father. For example, **Pope Pius IX** teaches: “He who does not have the Church for a mother **cannot have God for a Father**”. *Singulari Quidem*, §4 (emphasis added).

Saint Cyprian, Father of the Church, also teaches: “He who has not the Church for his mother **cannot have God for his Father**.” Treatise I, *On the Unity of the Church*, ¶6 (emphasis added).

¹³⁸ Above, the council rashly called heretics and schismatics by the name “Christian”. Here the council’s error is similar, asserting that they love or faithfully follow Christ.

¹³⁹ This is yet another instance of the council’s grave error that the baptism of heretics and schismatics helps them while

in which they are united with Christ.¹⁴⁰ They also recognize and accept other sacraments¹⁴¹ within their own Churches¹⁴² or ecclesiastical

outside the Catholic Church. See the annotations on this issue above, in this section (§15).

¹⁴⁰ As shown in the annotations a little above here, heretics and schismatics are not truly united with Christ. However, the council's (erroneous) assertion here that they are united with Christ, both promotes the (pneumatological) error that they are united with His Mystical Body, and promotes the error of universal salvation.

¹⁴¹ **St. Bonaventure, Doctor of the Church**, explains the truth concerning all of the Sacraments, which, regarding Baptism in particular, was set forth above: “Outside the unity of Faith and Love which makes us sons and members of the Church, no one can be saved; hence, **if the Sacraments are received outside the Church, they are NOT effective for salvation even though [*i.e.*, even if] they are true [*i.e.*, valid] Sacraments**. However, **they can become useful if one returns to Holy Mother the Church, whose sons alone Christ considers worthy of eternal inheritance**. *Breviloquium*, Part VI, ch.5, §4 (emphasis added; bracketed words added).

¹⁴² Speaking correctly, it is an error to say that any groups of non-Catholics are a “church”. Outside the Catholic Church, there are only individual lost sheep, that is, heretics, schismatics and other non-Catholics. The Catholic Church is the Mystical Body of Christ. There is no other “christ” to which the heretics or schismatics can be united as to a mystical body. Besides the Catholic Church, referring to other groups as “churches”, is an incorrect shorthand merely used to describe lost sheep that have gone astray in a particular direction, *e.g.*, over the same cliff or into the same swamp. However, even such

lost sheep who have wandered in a particular direction, do not thereby constitute another flock.

Because non-Catholic sects do not deserve the name “church”, the *Council of Trent Catechism* refers to them as “societies **arrogating to themselves the name of “church”**”. Under the heading *Creed*; IX article, *Apostolicity* (emphasis added). The *Council of Trent Catechism* likens heretics and schismatics to “deserters” in relation to “the army from which they have deserted.” Under the Creed section, “I believe in the Holy Catholic Church”.

Pope St. Pius X called the Eastern schismatics “sheep scattered abroad”. *Ex quo, non labente*.

Pope Pius XII called all non-Catholics “straying sheep”. *Mystici Corporis*, ¶104.

Here is an example of how non-Catholic groups were described before Vatican II: “[H]e who is truly a Christian thoroughly detests **all cults and sects** found outside the doctrine and outside the Church of Christ, everywhere and among all peoples, as for example, the **heretical cults and sects.**” **St. Peter Canisius, Doctor of the Church, *The Sum of Christian Doctrine*, Pt.1, Q.1.**

When Vatican II called non-Catholic sects by the name “church”, this was revolutionary and was not unnoticed by the Protestants. For example, Dr. Robert McAfee Brown, a Protestant observer at Vatican II, was quick to praise Vatican II’s new approach. Dr. Brown was well aware of the traditional Catholic teaching and he celebrated the drastic change of attitude that Vatican II wrought. He did not see continuity in Vatican II, but rupture with the past, and he rejoiced. In his

communities.¹⁴³ Many of them rejoice in the episcopate¹⁴⁴, celebrate the Holy Eucharist¹⁴⁵ and cultivate devotion toward the Virgin Mother

1967 book, *The Ecumenical Revolution*, he applauds the Council's Decree on Ecumenism:

The document makes clear how new is the attitude that has emerged. No more is there talk of “schismatics and heretics” but rather of “separated brethren.” No more is there an imperial demand that the dissidents return in penitence to the Church who has no need of penitence; instead there is recognition that both sides are guilty of the sins of division and must reach out penitentially to one another. **No more are Protestants dismissed merely as “sects” or psychological entities alone; instead it is acknowledged that there is a measure of “ecclesial reality” to be found within their corporate life.**

Robert McAfee Brown, *Ecumenical Revolution*, Doubleday, Garden City, 1967 (2nd ed. 1969), pp. 67-8. (emphasis added)

¹⁴³ The same revolutionary error is present here regarding the phrase “ecclesiastical communities” as is present in the council calling heretics and schismatics by the term “churches”. See the preceding annotation. The council breaks with the past and treats the social groupings of wandering sheep, as if they were a real flock and had “ecclesial reality”.

¹⁴⁴ This “rejoicing in the episcopate” says nothing about validity and is fuzzy enough statement to allow the post-conciliar popes to treat invalid Protestant “bishops” as if there were real bishops.

of God.¹⁴⁶(16*) They also share with us in prayer¹⁴⁷ and other spiritual benefits.¹⁴⁸ Likewise we can say that in some real way they are joined

The council also makes the grave error of ignoring the truth that Episcopal consecrations and priestly ordinations are matters for greater punishment of the damned, just like baptismal characters are also, since to whom more is given, more is expected.

¹⁴⁵ **St. Jerome, Doctor of the Church**, teaches that the Holy Eucharist gives no help to those outside the Catholic Church because the Catholic Church is “where alone the paschal Lamb can be rightly eaten”. St. Jerome, Epistle 15 ¶2 *ad Damasum*. *Lumen Gentium* falsely asserts that there is good in every religion. Although it is true that all creatures are good insofar as they have being, all false “religions” are bad simply speaking, because they do not have the good they should have. To the extent that any heretical or schismatic sects have valid bishops or “celebrate the Holy Eucharist”, this simply means they offend God more gravely, since their sacrileges are thus valid sacrileges. That is, any sects offend God more greatly, if they have real bishops who preach their evil doctrine or conduct their offensive ceremonies. Likewise, to the extent that sects have validly consecrated Hosts, those sects are objectively more culpable for bringing God down into a place of heresy and sacrilege, which is objectively the enemy camp, set in battle-array against Christ and His true Church.

¹⁴⁶ The council’s statement is false. As **St. Alphonsus de Liguori, Doctor of the Church**, teaches: “The holy Church herself attributes to the merits of Mary’s faith, the destruction of all heresies: ‘Rejoice, O Virgin Mary; for thou alone hast destroyed all heresies throughout the world.’” *The Glories of Mary*, Redemptorist Press, London, 1852, p. 452, quoting *The Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary* (emphasis added).

Those who are not in the Catholic Church, which is her Son's Mystical Body, cannot truly be devoted to our Lady. For all non-Catholic "religions" and their teachings, are of the devil, since "all of the gods of the gentiles are devils". Psalms 95:5. But our Lady crushes the head of the devil [Gen. 3:15] as well as his (false) doctrines and his schisms. Thus, it is false that non-Catholics can truly "cultivate devotion toward the Virgin Mother of God".

Permeating *Lumen Gentium*, here and in many places, is the ecumenical and minimizing spirit of "let's focus on what unites us and ignore what divides us". This error is called "Eirenism" and was condemned many times before Vatican II. For example:

Pope Pius XI:

[I]n connection with things which must be believed, it is nowise licit to use that distinction which some have seen fit to introduce between those articles of faith which are *fundamental* and those which are not fundamental, as they say, as if the former are to be accepted by all, while the latter may be left to the free assent of the faithful: for the supernatural virtue of faith has a formal cause, namely the authority of God revealing, and this is patient of no such distinction.

Mortalium Animos, §9

Pope Leo XIII described Eirenism and condemned it as follows:

[I]n order to more easily attract those who differ from her, the Church should **shape her teachings more in accord with the spirit of the age and relax some of her ancient severity** and make

some concessions to new opinions. Many think that these concessions should be made not only in regard to ways of living, but even in regard to doctrines which belong to the deposit of the faith. They contend that it would be opportune, in order to gain those who differ from us, **to omit certain points of her teaching which are of lesser importance, and to tone down the meaning which the Church has always attached to them.** It does not need many words, beloved son, to prove the falsity of these ideas

Encyclical *Testem Benevolentiae*.

Pope Pius XII identified and condemned (ahead of time) the council's error in this way:

Another danger is perceived which is all the more serious because it is more concealed beneath the mask of virtue. There are many who, deploring disagreement among men and intellectual confusion, through an imprudent zeal for souls, are urged by a great and ardent desire to do away with the barrier that divides good and honest men; these advocate an "Eirenism" according to which, by setting aside the questions which divide men, they aim not only at joining forces to repel the attacks of atheism, but also at reconciling things opposed to one another in the field of dogma. And as in former times some questioned whether the traditional apologetics of the Church did not constitute an obstacle rather than a help to the winning of souls for Christ, so today some are presumptuous enough to question seriously whether theology and

theological methods, such as with the approval of ecclesiastical authority are found in our schools, should not only be perfected, but also completely reformed, in order to promote the more efficacious propagation of the kingdom of Christ everywhere throughout the world among men of every culture and religious opinion.

Humani generis, §11.

¹⁴⁷ The council's statement is fuzzy, that non-Catholics "share with us in prayer". To the extent that the council's statement here simply means that non-Catholics say the same words of prayers, just like Catholics do, this is irrelevant because what matters is whether God hears our prayers. But as shown in the annotations to §4 above, non-Catholics are not in the state of Sanctifying Grace (for Sanctifying Grace would justify them, would make them Catholic and allow them to go to heaven). But as also shown above, anyone who is not in the state of Sanctifying Grace does not move God by his prayers. *Id.* Thus, it is irrelevant whether heretics say the words of prayers like Catholics do, because Catholic's prayers are heard and heretics' are not.

The council's statement is like the statement that "birds and crazy people both try to fly". That statement might be true, but birds accomplish something because they actually fly into the air, whereas crazy people go nowhere, regardless of how much they flap their arms. Applying this analogy: non-Catholics move their lips (like crazy people flap their arms), but obtain no results but to delude themselves.

However, when the council says here that non-Catholics "share with us in prayer", this "sharing" could indicate that Catholics should pray together with non-Catholics, sharing prayer

meetings with them, *etc.* To the extent this is the meaning, this fits with the practices of the conciliar church and is similar to what the council says elsewhere: “[I]t is allowable, indeed desirable, that Catholics join in prayer with their separated brethren.” *Unitatis Redintegratio*, §8.

This is the opposite of the consistent teaching of the Church before Vatican II. The Catholic Church “has constantly forbidden Her children to hold any communication, in religious matters, with those who are separated from her communion”. *The Sincere Christian*, by Bishop George Hay, vol.2, p.373.

From very ancient times, the Church has decreed that: “If any bishop, or priest, or deacon, shall join in prayers with heretics, let him be suspended from communion”. *Id.*, quoting Canon 44 of the apostolical canons.

Further, “If any clergyman or laic [*i.e.*, layman] shall go into the synagogue of the Jews or the meetings of heretics, to join in prayer with them, let him be deposed and deprived of communion”. *Id.*, quoting Canon 63 of the apostolical canons.

So also,

[I]n one of Her [*viz.*, the Catholic Church’s] most respected councils, held in the year 398, at which the great St Augustine was present, She speaks thus: “None must either pray or sing psalms with heretics; and whosoever shall communicate with those who are cut off from the communion of the Church, whether clergyman or laic [*i.e.*, layman],

let him be excommunicated,” Council of Carthage, iv, §§72 & 73.

Id.

Further, the Council of Laodicea decreed: “No one shall pray in common with heretics or schismatics”. Council of Laodicea, Canon 33.

The Catholic Church’s constant prohibition against praying with heretics and schismatics makes perfect sense because those outside the Church maintain the posture of being enemies of God, since all those not in the state of Sanctifying Grace are exactly that. It would be complete stupidity to join with God’s enemies to attempt to be heard by Him.

¹⁴⁸ The council’s statement here promotes ecumenism, but the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church is that the Sacraments do not benefit heretics and schismatics: “For all the sacraments of Christ, if not combined with the love which belongs to the unity of Christ, are possessed not unto salvation, but unto judgment.” St. Augustine, *ad Petilian, the Donatist*, Bk. III, ch.40, ¶46.

Further, non-Catholics do have not Charity. *See*, the annotation right above this one and also the annotation on this subject, in §4 above. So whatever good works non-Catholics do profit them nothing. As St. Paul said, “[I]f I should distribute all my goods to feed the poor, and if I should deliver my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing. 1 Corin. 13:3.

Further, as the Council of Florence and Pope Eugene IV taught:

[S]o important is the unity of this ecclesiastical body that only those remaining within this unity ...

with us in the Holy Spirit,¹⁴⁹ for to them too He gives His gifts and graces whereby He is operative among them¹⁵⁰ with His sanctifying

can receive an eternal recompense for their fasts, their almsgivings, their other works of Christian piety and the duties of a Christian soldier. No one, let his almsgiving be as great as it may ... can be saved, unless he remain within the bosom and the unity of the Catholic Church.

Cantate Domino.

St. Augustine, Doctor of the Church, teaches the same: “[I]f they [*viz.*, heretics] distribute of themselves their own substance to the poor, as many do, ... in the different heretical bodies [*i.e.*, sects] ... they cannot attain to eternal salvation, even with all those good things, which profit them not”. *On Baptism, against the Donatists*, Bk. 1, ch.9.

Thus, non-Catholics receive no spiritual benefits for anything they do and so do not share in good works, in the sense of meriting from them. It is true that they can receive benefit from the good works of Catholics and offered up for them, just as the souls in Purgatory and just as the pagans (and everyone else) can also share in the good works of Catholics. But it is clear that this is not what the council means here.

All graces and “spiritual benefits” which God gives to those persons outside the visible structure of the Church are given the without merits of those persons, in order to bring them into the Catholic Church, to live the Catholic life and live it abundantly. *Summa*, Ia IIae, Q.109, a.2, & Q.114, a.5.

¹⁴⁹ This error of the council has been condemned many times, including less than 20 years before the council, when Pope Pius

XII declared: “[T]hose who are divided in faith or government cannot be living in the unity of such a Body [viz., the Catholic Church], nor can they be living the life of its one Divine Spirit.” Pope Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis* §22 (emphasis added).

St. Augustine teaches the same thing:

What the soul is to the body of man, the Holy Ghost is to the Body of Christ: which the Church is. What the soul does in all the members of one body, this the Holy Ghost does throughout the Church. ... It happens sometimes in the human body, that from this same body something is cut off, a hand, a finger, a foot. Do you think the soul follows the part cut thus off? While it belonged to the body, it lived. Cut off, it loses its life. So likewise, the **Christian Catholic man: while in the Body he lives; becoming a heretic, he is cut off: for the Spirit follows no amputated member.** If therefore you wish to live in the Holy Ghost, hold fast to the bond of charity, love the truth, long for unity, that you may attain to eternity.

Sermon 267, *The Holy Ghost: Soul of the Church*, §IV (emphasis added).

St Augustine also teaches: “Who is not in this [Catholic] Church, does not now receive the Holy Ghost.” Lectures on St. John’s Gospel, tract 32, §7 (bracketed word added). St. Augustine then continues: “[W]e too receive the Holy Ghost if we love the Church, if we are joined together by charity, if we rejoice in the Catholic name and faith.” *Id.*, at §8.

power. Some indeed He has strengthened to the extent of the shedding of their blood.¹⁵¹ In all of Christ's disciples¹⁵² the Spirit

¹⁵⁰ Here is the council's corollary error to the error earlier in this sentence, *viz.*, because the council teaches the revolutionary error that heretics and schismatics are joined with Catholics in the Holy Ghost, the council then (falsely) concludes that He is operative in heretics and schismatics, giving them a life of Sanctifying Grace and His Gifts, outside the Catholic Church. As shown above, this is false and contrary to the consistent teaching of the Church. In fact, all who receive Sanctifying Grace are thereby in the Catholic Church and are no longer lost sheep wandering in the brambles and swamps outside the true Fold.

¹⁵¹ Murdered missionaries who promoted a false religion, cannot be considered martyrs since they were not witnesses to the true Faith. All those who shed their blood (purportedly) for Christ but are outside the Catholic Church, are damned and their death avails them nothing.

Council of Florence & Pope Eugene IV: “No one, even if he **pours out his blood** for the name of Christ, can be saved unless he remains within the bosom and unity of the Catholic Church.” Bull *Cantate Domino*, Denz. 714 (emphasis added).

St. Augustine: “[I]f, under the pressure of any persecution, they [*viz.*, schismatics] **give their bodies with us to be burned** for the faith which they like us confess: yet because they do all these things apart from the Church, not “forbearing one another in love,” nor “endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace,” insomuch as they have not charity [since schism is a sin against charity], **they cannot attain to eternal salvation**, even with all those good things which profit them

not”. *On Baptism, against the Donatists*, Bk.1, ch.9 (emphasis added; bracketed words added).

Saint Cyprian of Carthage: “[N]ot even the baptism of a public confession and blood can profit a heretic to salvation, because there is no salvation out of the Church”. Letter LXXII, ¶21. **“He cannot be a martyr who is not in the Church”**. Treatise I, *On the Unity of the Church*, ¶14 (emphasis added).

Pope Pelagius II:

Those who were not willing to be in agreement in the Church of God, cannot remain with God; although given over to flames and fires, they burn, or thrown to wild beasts, they lay down their lives, there will not be [for them] that crown of faith, but the punishment of faithlessness, not a glorious result, but the ruin of despair. **Such a one can be slain; he cannot be crowned.**

Denz. 247 (emphasis added; bracketed words added).

Council of Laodicea: “No Christian shall ... turn to false martyrs, that is, to those of the heretics”. Canon 34 (emphasis added).

Writing on the topic “*Concerning The False Martyrs Of The Heretics And Schismatics*”, **Pope Benedict XIV** explains that the Church would never recognize a heretic to be a martyr even if he were killed for a dogma he held in common with the Catholic Church, because the Church considers him in light of his public (exterior) adherence to heresy. Pope Benedict XIV adds that this is true even if it were (hypothetically) true that the heretic were not culpable for his heresy, because of

arouses the desire to be peacefully united, in the manner determined by Christ¹⁵³, as one flock under one shepherd,¹⁵⁴ and He prompts them to pursue this end. (17*) Mother Church never ceases to pray, hope and work that this may come about.¹⁵⁵ She exhorts her children to

invincible ignorance of the true Faith. *De servorum Dei beatificatione et beatorum canonizatione*, Bk. III, ch.20, ¶3.

¹⁵² The council here includes heretics and schismatics among “Christ’s disciples”, since this entire section pertains to heretics and schismatics.

¹⁵³ The “manner determined by Christ” for peaceful unity is to be a member of His Catholic Church. It is a grave omission for the council to affirm that persons outside the Catholic Church are moved by the Holy Ghost to desire unity “in the manner determined by Christ”, as if Christ could determine any manner or the Holy Ghost could move toward any unity other than that those heretics and schismatics abjure their errors and enter into the one true Church. As Pope Pius XI taught: “[U]nity can only arise from one teaching authority, one law of belief and one faith”. *Mortalium animos*, ¶9.

¹⁵⁴ This is a reference to Christ, not to the pope, as is clear from the fact that the council says that the Holy Ghost “arouses the desire” in heretics and schismatics “to be peaceably united ... under one shepherd”. But the heretics and schismatics certainly do not desire to be under the pope.

¹⁵⁵ The Catholic Church lacks no unity in Herself. She is fully One and this is one of Her Four Marks. Pope Pius XI taught: “[T]he **Mystical Body of Christ**, in the same manner as His physical body, **is one, compacted and fitly joined together**”. *Mortalium animos*, ¶10 (emphasis added).

purification and renewal¹⁵⁶ so that the sign of Christ may shine more brightly over the face of the earth.

16. Finally, those who have not yet received the Gospel¹⁵⁷ are related in various ways to the people of God.¹⁵⁸(18*) In the first place we must

The fact that there are lost sheep (heretics, schismatics and all other non-Catholics) outside the one true Sheepfold, does not diminish the Church's unity at all. Their wandering in the swamps and among the brambles outside the true Fold, simply means that those lost sheep are in grave danger. But the Church does not need them for Her unity. As Pope Pius XI exclaimed, in his thirst for the souls of non-Catholics:

Would that it were Our happy lot to do that which so many of Our predecessors could not: to embrace with fatherly affection those children, whose unhappy separation from Us, We now bewail. Would that God our Savior, "Who will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth", would hear us when **We humbly beg that He would deign to recall all who stray, to the unity of the Church!**

Pope Pius XI, *Mortalium animos*, ¶12 (emphasis added).

¹⁵⁶ This statement continues the council's call for the renewal which is the continual change of a revolution. See, the annotation on this topic, in §8 above.

¹⁵⁷ Having finished talking about heretics and schismatics, the council now begins to talk about other non-Catholics. Notice how the council erroneously includes heretics and schismatics among those who have "received the Gospel". The truth, of

recall the people to whom the testament¹⁵⁹ and the promises were given and from whom Christ was born according to the flesh.(125) On

course, is that heretics and schismatics have rejected the Gospel, since they are not Catholic.

¹⁵⁸ This statement is a practical denial of the doctrine "*Outside the Church no salvation*" and is gravely imprecise. It would be true that Jews and pagans are related by being spiritually dead in various ways. But it is clear that the council means something very different and revolutionary, as the council shows below, when it talks about the Jews and heathens in hopeful language that they are saving their souls.

This fits also with the conciliar church's view that all "religions" are good. To take one of countless examples: Pope John Paul II indicated the goodness of Islam when he proclaimed: "May Saint John Baptist protect Islam" on May 21, 2000.

http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/travels/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_20000321_wadi-al-kharrar_en.html

¹⁵⁹ Note the failure to mention this testament is the Old Testament, which name "old" shows it has been superseded and abolished by a New Testament. The Old Testament has now been superseded because it was merely the preparation for the new one. These crucial truths are concealed for the sake of cultivating a false and apparent unity with the Jews, without their conversion to the Catholic Faith.

As Pope Pius XII taught shortly before Vatican II:

[F]irst of all, by the death of our Redeemer, the New Testament took the place of the **Old Law, which had been abolished**; then the Law of Christ together with its mysteries, enactments,

account of their fathers this people remains most dear¹⁶⁰ to God, for God does not repent of the gifts He makes nor of the calls¹⁶¹ He

institutions, and sacred rites was ratified for the whole world in the blood of Jesus Christ. For, while our Divine Savior was preaching in a restricted area – He was not sent but to the sheep that were lost of the House of Israel – the Law and the Gospel were together in force; but on the gibbet of His death **Jesus made void the Law with its decrees, fastened the handwriting of the Old Testament to the Cross**, establishing the New Testament in His blood shed for the whole human race.

Mystici Corporis, Pope Pius XII, ¶29.

“On the Cross, Christ consummated the building of the Church. The **Old Covenant ceased** and the New Covenant, sealed with the blood of Christ, began.” *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, Ludwig Ott, 1954, reprinted by TAN, Rockford, IL, 1974 (emphasis added).

¹⁶⁰ This “people” is “dear” to God only if they enter and remain in His true Church. Jews, like everyone else, are not “dear” to God, nor can they avoid hell, if they do not submit to the Kingship of our Lord Jesus Christ. Our Lord told “the Jews ... if you believe not that I am He [*i.e.*, the Christ], you shall die in your sin.” John, 8:24.

No one honors God – neither Jews nor non-Jews –if they reject our Lord Jesus Christ: “He who honoreth not the Son, honoreth not the Father, who hath sent Him”. John, 5:23.

St. Thomas Aquinas quoting **St. Augustine**, explains how Jewish ceremonies are now greatly offensive to God:

All ceremonies are professions of faith, in which the interior worship of God consists. Now man can make profession of his inward faith, by deeds as well as by words: and in either profession, if he makes a false declaration, he sins mortally. Now, though our faith in Christ is the same as that of the fathers of old; yet, since they came before Christ, whereas we come after Him, the same faith is expressed in different words, by us and by them. For by them was it said: “Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son”, where the verbs are in the future tense: whereas we express the same by means of verbs in the past tense, and say that she “conceived and bore”.

In like manner the ceremonies of the Old Law betokened Christ as having yet to be born and to suffer: whereas our sacraments signify Him as already born and having suffered. **Consequently, just as it would be a mortal sin now for anyone, in making a profession of faith, to say that Christ is yet to be born, which the fathers of old said devoutly and truthfully; so too it would be a mortal sin now to observe those ceremonies which the fathers of old fulfilled with devotion and fidelity.** Such is the teaching of Augustine (Contra Faust. xix, 16), who says: “It is no longer promised that He shall be born, shall suffer and rise again, truths of which their [Old Testament] sacraments were a kind of image: but it is declared that He is already born, has suffered and risen again; of which our [New

Testament] sacraments, in which Christians share, are the actual representation.”

Summa, Ia IIae, Q.103, a.4, *Respondeo* (bracketed words added).

Therefore, St. Thomas explains:

[A]t the time of the New Law, the mysteries of Christ being already accomplished, it is pernicious to make use of the ceremonies of the Old Law whereby the mysteries of Christ were foreshadowed as things to come; just as it would be pernicious for anyone to declare that Christ has yet to suffer.”

Summa, IIa IIae, Q.93, a.1, *Respondeo*.

St. Thomas thus ranks as follows, the sinfulness of Jewish religious practice in comparison with the heathens:

[T]he observance of the Law during the time of grace is not quite equal to idolatry as to the genus of the sin, but almost equal, because both are species of pestiferous superstition.

Summa, IIa IIae, Q.94, a.3, ad 5.

Although God is more greatly angered by heretics than by Jews (who have not joined His true Church by baptism), God is more angered by Jews than by pagans. As St. Thomas Aquinas explains:

Since, [the Jews] accepted the figure of [the Catholic] Faith in the Old Law, which they corrupt by their false interpretations, ... [therefore] their unbelief is a more grievous sin than that of the

heathens, because the latter have not accepted the Gospel Faith in any way at all.

Summa, IIa IIae, Q.10, a.6, *Respondeo*.

Quoting St. Peter, the first pope, St. Thomas explains:

It is written (2 Pet. 2:21): “It had been better for them not to have known the way of justice, than after they have known it, to turn back.” Now the heathens have not known the way of justice, whereas ... Jews have abandoned it after knowing it in some way [*viz.*, in figure]. Therefore, theirs is the graver sin.

Summa, IIa IIae, Q.10, a.6, *Sed contra* (bracketed words added).

As our Lord said to the Catholics in Smyrna about the Jews that resisted Him and His true Church: “thou art blasphemed by them that say they are Jews and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan.” Apocalypse, 2:9.

Our Lord declared to the Jews who rejected Him: “I say to you, that the Kingdom of God will be taken away from you and will be given to a people yielding its fruits.” Matt. 21:43.

The Catholic Church has always condemned those who adhere to the enemies of the Church. But the Church welcomes with open arms, all Jews and all others who forsake their errors and join the one true Church. Here are some of the condemnations of those Jews who continue to resist the Catholic Church and to adhere to our Lord’s enemies:

St. Stephen, the Protomartyr:

You stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears! You always resist the Holy Ghost. As your fathers behaved, so do you also. Which of the prophets have your fathers not persecuted? And they have slain them who foretold the coming of the Just One, of Whom you have now been the betrayers and murderers.

Acts 7:51-52.

St. Paul the Apostle:

The Jews, who both killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets and have persecuted us, do not please God, and are enemies to all men; prohibiting us from speaking to the Gentiles so that they might be saved; to fill up their sin always: for the wrath of God has come upon them to the end.

I Thess. 2:14-16.

Anyone who now practices the Old Testament religion greatly offends God. As explained by **St. Augustine, Doctor of the Church**: “after the Gospel truth had been preached, the legal observances became deadly”. Quoted in *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.93, a.1, *Sed contra*.

St. John Chrysostom, Doctor of the Church, clearly opposed *Lumen Gentium*'s position that Jews (or anyone else) can be dear to God without converting to the true Catholic Faith:

Well should the Jew mourn who, not believing in Christ, has assigned his soul to perdition.

Sermon: *On the Consolation of Death* (Second Sermon), §7.

[T]he Jews say that they, too, adore God. God forbid that I say that. No Jew adores God! Who says so? The Son of God says so. For he said: 'If you were to know my Father, you would also know me. But you neither know me nor do you know my Father'. ... If, then, the Jews fail to know the Father, if they crucified the Son, if they thrust off the help of the Spirit, who should not make bold to declare plainly that the synagogue is a dwelling of demons? God is not worshipped there. Heaven forbid! From now on, it remains a place of idolatry.

Sermon *Adversus Judaeos*, Sermon 1, pt.3.

[Jews are] men who stubbornly oppose God's laws [and a synagogue is] a place where they outrage the Father, blaspheme the Son, and reject the Holy Ghost, the Giver of life.

Sermon *Adversus Judaeos*, Sermon 6, pt.6.

Council of Florence explains how the Old Testament practices now greatly offend God:

[The Catholic Church] firmly believes, professes, and teaches that the matter pertaining to the law of the Old Testament, of the Mosiac law, which are divided into ceremonies, sacred rites, sacrifices, and sacraments, because they were established to signify something in the future, although they were suited to the divine worship at that time, after our Lord's coming had been signified by them, ceased,

and the sacraments of the New Testament began;
 ... but **after the promulgation of the Gospel it asserts that they cannot be observed without the loss of eternal salvation.**

11th Session, Denz. 712

And so, like all other men, Jews are lost sheep, unless they enter the true Church. Outside the true Church, they are now merely a sect of error. This is what **St. Peter Canisius, Doctor of the Church**, teaches: a Christian thoroughly detests all cults and sects found outside the doctrine and outside the Church of Christ, everywhere and among all peoples, as for example, the Jewish ... sect". *The Sum of Christian Doctrine*, Pt.1, Q.1.

Clearly, as is also true with hundreds of other statements in *Lumen Gentium*, the council's assertion that the Jews (or anyone else) "remain most dear to God", is completely false, unless they convert to the Catholic Faith. The council's teaching on this and hundreds of other issues, is a complete rupture with the consistent and continual teaching of the Catholic Church before Vatican II. See the purpose of this book, at the beginning of the preface.

¹⁶¹ It is true that God does not repent of the gifts He makes or the calls He issues. But anyone who makes bad use of His gifts manifests God's Justice through his damnation.

God is all-Wise and Omniscient. He does not repent of His gifts but He cuts off from salvation those who do not become Catholic and remain in His Church. Following St. Augustine, Pope Pius XII explains that:

[W]ith the rending of the veil of the temple it happened that the dew of the Paraclete's gifts,

issues.(126) But the plan of salvation also includes those who acknowledge the Creator.¹⁶² In the first place amongst these there are the Mohammedans¹⁶³, who, professing to hold the faith of

which heretofore had descended only on the fleece, that is on the people of Israel, fell copiously and abundantly (while the fleece remained dry and deserted) on the whole earth, that is on the Catholic Church, which is confined by no boundaries of race or territory.

Mystici Corporis ¶31.

¹⁶² God’s plan includes zealous missionary activity, attempting to convert those who don’t know the true, Triune God, and bring them into the true Church. As St. Francis of Assisi told the Muslim Sultan Malek-el-Kamil: “We have come to preach faith in Jesus Christ to you, that you will renounce Mohammad, that wicked slave of the devil, and obtain everlasting life like us.” *Saint Francis of Assisi*, by Omer Englebert, Franciscan Herald Press, 1966, Pg. 178-9.

¹⁶³ Although seeking to convert all individual Muslims to the true Church, the Catholic Church traditionally taught the hatred of the Muslim sect:

St. Peter Canisius, Doctor of the Church, teaches: “a Christian thoroughly detests all cults and sects found outside the doctrine and outside the Church of Christ, everywhere and among all peoples, as for example the ... Mohammedan sect”. *The Sum of Christian Doctrine*, Pt.1, Q.1.

Pope Callixtus III called Islam “the diabolical sect of the reprobate and faithless Mahomet”. *History of the Popes*, Ludwig

Abraham,¹⁶⁴ along with us adore¹⁶⁵ the one and merciful God,¹⁶⁶ who on the last day will judge¹⁶⁷ mankind. Nor is God far distant¹⁶⁸ from

Pastor, vol. 2, Catholic Standard Library, London, 1891, p. 346.

The Council of Basel called Islam “the abominable sect of Mahomet”. Session 19.

How contrary is the conciliar church’s new attitude to false religions! Besides the council’s favorable treatment of Islam here in *Lumen Gentium*, the council also promotes Islam even more strongly in *Nostra Aetate*: “The Church regards with esteem also the Moslems.” §3.

The post-conciliar popes follow the council’s lead: Pope John Paul II indicated the goodness of Islam when he proclaimed: “May Saint John Baptist protect Islam” on May 21, 2000. http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/travels/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_20000321_wadi-al-kharrar_en.html
Pope Francis promoted the (supposed) spiritual benefits of Islam when he referred to the “abundant spiritual fruit ... of Ramadan”. <http://www.romereports.com/palio/pope-francis-greets-muslims-for-the-start-of-ramadan-english-10488.html>.

¹⁶⁴ A way of rephrasing this, is that the Muslims claim that they have the Faith of Abraham. Muslims claim Abraham and our Lord Jesus Christ, as prophets of lesser stature than Mohammed. However, in no way do Muslims truly profess the Faith of Abraham because Abraham’s Faith was the Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, true God, coming in the future. Anyone with the Faith of Abraham, after our Lord’s coming, would be a Catholic.

¹⁶⁵ **Pope St. Gregory the Great, Doctor of the Church**, affirms that “The Holy Catholic Church teaches that God cannot

be adored except within her fold”. Pope St. Gregory the Great, *De Moralibus*, Bk.14, §5.

Pope Gregory XVI teaches exactly the same thing. *Summo Iugiter Studio*, §5. Thus, Muslims do not adore the true God.

This traditional teaching of the Church could not be otherwise, since God can be adored only by His friends, *i.e.*, those in Sanctifying Grace. See the annotation on this topic, at §4 above. This truth applies not just to Muslims but to all heretics, schismatics, apostates, Jews and heathens also.

¹⁶⁶ It is false to say that Muslims recognize the same true God that Catholics do. For Muslims deny that God is a Trinity. *Koran*, 5:73. They further deny that Our Lord Jesus Christ is God. *Koran*, 5:72.

But to make any error about God, results in not knowing God at all, since He is wholly simple. As St. Thomas Aquinas explains:

Unbelievers cannot be said “to believe in a God” as we understand it in relation to the act of faith. For they do not believe that God exists under the conditions that faith determines; hence they do not truly imply belief in a God, since, as the Philosopher observes (Metaph. ix, text. 22) “to know simple things defectively is not to know them at all.”

Summa, IIa IIae, Q.2. a.2. ad 3.

St. Thomas’ lucid explanation also applies to explain why the Jews of the present day do not worship the true (Catholic) God, since they deny He is a Trinity. *Summa*, IIIa, Q.3, a.3, ad 2.

Further, the authority of St. John Chrysostom's teaching (in a footnote a little above here) concerning the offensiveness of Jewish worship, also applies to Muslims for the same reason, *viz.*, Muslims likewise deny the true God.

¹⁶⁷ The Muslim idea of judgment is entirely different from the true Catholic doctrine. Thus, the fact that Muslims have in common with Catholics that there will be a Judgment, is irrelevant because Muslims hold the opposite of Catholics, regarding what will occur then. In addition to their notion of heaven being entirely carnal, (*see, e.g.*, Koran 78:32-33), Muslims hold that all Catholics go to hell. Koran 3:85 & 3:91. Nothing could be further from the infallible Catholic dogma that there is no salvation outside the Catholic Church!

As **St. Peter Mavimenus** declared: "Whoever does not embrace the Catholic Christian religion will be damned, as was your false prophet Mohammed." *Roman Martyrology*, February 21st.

¹⁶⁸ In the science of Sacred Doctrine, as also in common, ordinary speech, to be metaphorically "distant" means to be an enemy or at least without friendship, just as being "close" refers to possessing friendship or love. For example, "Draw nigh to God, and he will draw nigh to you." James, 4:8.

So the council here is wrongly saying that God is not the enemy of those who do not know Him and love Him. But the truth is that anyone who lacks Sanctifying Grace is God's enemy, since every man is at enmity with God through original sin, until he becomes His friend through the friendship of Charity, only acquired with Sanctifying Grace. As St. Thomas teaches: "whosoever has not charity is wicked, because 'this gift alone of the Holy Ghost distinguishes the children of the kingdom from

those who in shadows and images seek the unknown God,¹⁶⁹ for it is He who gives to all men life and breath¹⁷⁰ and all things,(127) and as Saviour wills that all men be saved.¹⁷¹(128) Those also can attain to salvation who through no fault of their own do not know the Gospel of

the children of perdition’, as Augustine says (De Trin. xv, 18).”
Summa, IIa IIae, Q.178, a.2, *Sed contra*.

As our Lord taught us: “No man can come to me, except the Father, who hath sent me, draws him”. John 6:44. So the truth is the opposite of what the council teaches here. The truth is that God is far distant from any man who does not have the Charity and Sanctifying Grace which makes him a Catholic and a friend of God.

¹⁶⁹ “[A]ll the gods of the gentiles are devils”. Psalm 95:5.

¹⁷⁰ The only apparent reason why the council would connect the situation of the heathens, with the fact that God gives these natural goods to all men, is because the council is connecting knowledge about God which is attainable by natural reason (because God is the first Cause and first Mover, *Summa*, Ia Q.2 a.3) with God (supposedly) saving the souls of the heathens. This is the heresy of naturalism. No one is saved by natural knowledge, even natural knowledge about God giving “all men life and breath”, because “without Faith, it is impossible to please God.” Hebrews, 11:6.

¹⁷¹ Stated another way, the council is stating here that God is near to those who seek but do not know God, because He gave them natural gifts and wants them to be saved. This statement promotes the heresies of universal salvation and naturalism. Natural virtues are not meritorious without Sanctifying Grace. See the annotations to §16 above.

Christ or His Church, yet sincerely seek God and moved by grace strive by their deeds to do His will as it is known to them through the dictates of conscience.¹⁷²(19*) Nor does Divine Providence deny the

¹⁷² This statement is very misleading and promotes universal salvation by implication. Among those who are ignorant of the true Faith (non-Catholics), the council describes those who “sincerely seek God and [are] moved by grace”. In fact, no one can **sincerely** seek God unless he is moved by grace.

The council describes those who “strive by their deeds to do His will as it is known to them through the dictates of conscience”. In fact, no one will follow his conscience without grace. St. Thomas explains that:

[I]n the state of perfect nature, man referred the love of himself and of all other things to the love of God as to its end; and thus he loved God more than himself and above all things. But **in the state of corrupt nature, man** falls short of this in the appetite of his rational will, which, unless it is cured by God’s grace, **follows its private good**, on account of the corruption of nature.

Summa, Ia IIae, Q.109, a.3, *Respondeo*.

It is true that a man who has Sanctifying Grace can save his soul outside of the visible Catholic Church, in ignorance of the truth of some material statements of our Faith. However, this man in Sanctifying Grace will be a Catholic, in fact. In the context of the modernist promotion of universal salvation, it is misleading for the council to make statements like this, while also making other statements promoting universal salvation and without making the proper distinctions (which the Catholic Church makes) on this subject.

helps necessary for salvation¹⁷³ to those who, without blame on their part¹⁷⁴, have not yet arrived at an explicit knowledge of God¹⁷⁵ and

¹⁷³ Pope Pius IX infallibly condemned, in his Syllabus of Errors:

16. Man may, in the observance of any religion whatever, find the way of eternal salvation, and arrive at eternal salvation.

17. Good hope at least is to be entertained of the eternal salvation of all those who are not at all in the true Church of Christ.

Quanta Cura, to which this syllabus is attached, makes clear that Pope Pius IX is condemning these errors *ex cathedra*, under the conditions for infallibility set forth in the First Vatican Council.

¹⁷⁴ Because of Original Sin, there are no persons who are “without blame on their part”. Original Sin is a sufficient reason for God not to give a man any grace. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.2 a.5. ad 1 (quoting St. Augustine). The council’s denial that we are in some way blamable for the Original Sin on our soul is a promotion of universal salvation.

Original Sin is voluntary in us, in some way, but not in the same way in which actual sin is voluntary in us. Instead, Original Sin is voluntary in us in the same way as a murder is voluntary in the hand which wields the knife or the foot which walked to the scene. St. Thomas explains that:

[W]e must explain the matter ... by saying that all men born of Adam may be considered as one man, inasmuch as they have one common nature, which they receive from their first parents; even as in civil

matters, all who are members of one community are reputed as one body, and the whole community as one man. Indeed Porphyry says (*Praedic., De Specie*) that “by sharing the same species, many men are one man.” Accordingly, the multitude of men born of Adam are as so many members of one body. Now the action of one member of the body, of the hand for instance, is voluntary not by the will of that hand, but by the will of the soul, the first mover of the members. Wherefore a murder which the hand commits would not be imputed as a sin to the hand considered by itself as apart from the body, but is imputed to it as something belonging to man and moved by man's first moving principle. In this way, then, the disorder which is in this man born of Adam, is voluntary, not by his will, but by the will of his first parent, who, by the movement of generation, moves all who originate from him, even as the soul's will moves all the members to their actions. Hence the sin which is thus transmitted by the first parent to his descendants is called “original”, just as the sin which flows from the soul into the bodily members is called “actual”. And just as the actual sin that is committed by a member of the body, is not the sin of that member, except inasmuch as that member is a part of the man, for which reason it is called a “human sin”; so original sin is not the sin of this person, except inasmuch as this person receives his nature from his first parent, for which reason it is called the “sin of nature”, according to Eph. 2:3: “We . . . were by nature children of wrath.”

Summa, Ia IIae, Q.81, a.1, *Respondeo* (emphasis added).

with His grace strive to live a good life.¹⁷⁶ Whatever good or truth is found amongst them is looked upon by the Church as a preparation

¹⁷⁵ The council's statement here is false, fuzzy and dangerous. What does it mean for the council to say that these heathens are "without blame" and are "with His grace" yet they have not come to an "explicit knowledge of God"?

Whoever has Sanctifying Grace, has the Catholic Faith which is caused by it. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.4, a.4, ad 3. Further, anyone who does not have the explicit knowledge of God is blamable for this by his own actual sins, or at least because of Original Sin, as St. Thomas Aquinas explains, following St. Augustine. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.2, a.5. ad 1. The council here teaches the opposite of what the Church traditionally taught!

When the council says the heathen don't have an "explicit knowledge of God", this appears to mean that those heathen have an implicit knowledge of God. But that is not enough! As St. Paul teaches: "[H]e that cometh to God must believe that He is, and is a Rewarder to them that seek Him". Hebrews 11:6.

¹⁷⁶ The council's statement here is circular. The council says that God gives "the helps necessary for salvation" to those persons to whom He has given His grace. But graces are "helps necessary for salvation". Thus, the council says that God does not deny to those persons the things which the council assumes God gave to such persons.

But if the council's statement is construed as meaning that it is always true that everyone with grace will ever be given more grace (*i.e.*, will not be denied additional help), this statement would be false and contrary to the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church. It would mean that no man who has ever received any grace, could ever lose grace (at least permanently).

for the Gospel.(20*) She knows that it is given by Him who enlightens all men¹⁷⁷ so that they may finally have life.¹⁷⁸ But often men, deceived by the Evil One,¹⁷⁹ have become vain in their reasonings and have exchanged the truth of God for a lie, serving the creature rather than the Creator.(129) Or some there are who, living and dying in this world without God, are exposed to final despair. Wherefore to promote the

¹⁷⁷ God enlightens all men by giving them a rational nature. As St. Thomas explains: “Every truth ... is from the Holy Ghost as bestowing the natural light, and moving us to understand ... the truth”. *Summa*, Ia IIae, Q.104, a.1. ad 1. However, God does not give supernatural enlightenment to all men, as is especially clear in the case of unbaptized babies who die before the age of reason.

¹⁷⁸ This is an imprecise statement which promotes universal salvation. The council cannot be talking about the natural life of all men, for natural life does not come “finally” but rather comes at the same instant men get their being. The council’s statement could mean that all men “finally” get grace, which is the life of the soul. But that is false, as is especially clear in the case of unbaptized babies who die before the age of reason. Lastly, the council could mean that everyone “finally” gets eternal life in heaven. That is the heresy of universal salvation.

¹⁷⁹ The council’s statement is fuzzy, and mentions only the role of the devil, and does not mention the world and the flesh as causes of sin. Even without the devil’s influence, no man without grace can entirely avoid sinning and pursuing his own private good, as St. Thomas teaches (quoted a few annotations above here). The council’s omission of any mention of the world fits with the council’s excessive enthusiasm regarding the world, as quoted above. The council’s omission of mention of the flesh as a cause of sin, fits with the council’s downplaying Original Sin and promotion of universal salvation.

glory of God and procure the salvation of all of these, and mindful of the command of the Lord, "Preach the Gospel to every creature", (130) the Church fosters the missions with care and attention.

17. As the Son was sent by the Father, (131) so He too sent the Apostles, saying: "Go, therefore, make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world". (132) The Church has received this solemn mandate of Christ to proclaim the saving truth from the apostles and must carry it out to the very ends of the earth. (133) Wherefore she makes the words of the Apostle her own: "Woe to me, if I do not preach the Gospel", (134) and continues unceasingly¹⁸⁰ to send heralds of the Gospel until such time as the infant churches are fully established and can themselves continue the work of evangelizing. For the Church is compelled by the Holy Spirit to do her part that God's plan may be fully realized, whereby He has constituted

¹⁸⁰ Woe to the post-Vatican II Church hierarchy which has made agreements not to evangelize the lost sheep who adhere to the false religions! For example, the conciliar church promised:

Pastoral activity in the Catholic Church, Latin as well as Oriental, no longer aims at having the faithful of one Church pass over to the other; that is to say, it no longer aims at proselytizing among the Orthodox. It aims at answering the spiritual needs of its own faithful and it has no desire for expansion at the expense of the Orthodox Church.

Balamand Agreement, which the Vatican entered with the (schismatic) Orthodox, on June 23rd, 1993, ¶22.

Christ as the source of salvation for the whole world.¹⁸¹ By the proclamation of the Gospel she prepares her hearers to receive and profess the faith¹⁸². She gives them the dispositions necessary for baptism, snatches them from the slavery of error and of idols and incorporates them in Christ so that through charity they may grow up into full maturity in Christ. Through her work, whatever good is in the minds and hearts of men, whatever good lies latent in the religious practices¹⁸³ and cultures of diverse peoples, is not only saved from

¹⁸¹ As shown above, this statement and similar conservative-sounding statements do not mean that the council is proclaiming the Catholic truth of no salvation outside the Catholic Church. Vatican II and the conciliar church still maintain that, in some way, Christ is the source of salvation even for those who never become Catholic. It is central to (false) conciliar theology that “[T]he Son of God has united Himself in some fashion with every man.” *Gaudium et Spes*, §22.

¹⁸² The word “faith” here, does not refer exclusively to the one, true Catholic Faith, nor has the conciliar church understood the word “faith” in this way. This fact is clear from the many annotations in this book regarding “believers”, the “faithful” and “faith”.

¹⁸³ Every false (*i.e.*, non-Catholic) religion arises from sin and “all the gods of the gentiles are devils”. Psalm 95:5. Their sacrifices are offered “to devils and not to God”. I Cor. 10:20. So the council is saying, in effect, that the religious practices of the devils’ religions contain elements to be preserved and used! The council says this to promote ecumenism. There are countless instances of the conciliar church following what the council teaches here. For example, Pope Benedict XVI gave permission to the:

[Anglican] Ordinariate ... to celebrate the Holy Eucharist and the other Sacraments, the Liturgy of

destruction but is also cleansed, raised up and perfected unto the glory of God, the confusion of the devil and the happiness of man. The obligation of spreading the faith is imposed on every disciple of Christ, according to his state.¹⁸⁴ (21*) Although, however, all the faithful can

the Hours and other liturgical celebrations according to the liturgical books proper to the Anglican tradition, ... to maintain the liturgical, spiritual and pastoral traditions of the Anglican Communion ... as a precious gift and as a treasure to be shared.

Anglicanorum Coetibus, §III.

¹⁸⁴ As shown in many annotations above, “faith” does not exclusively mean the Catholic Faith and the phrase “disciples of Christ” does not exclusively refer to Catholics. According to Vatican II and the conciliar church, spreading one’s faith does not mean seeking converts. Pope Benedict XVI exclaimed that: “[T]his unity [sought by the Church] does not mean what could be called ecumenism of the return: that is, to deny and to reject [a non-Catholic’s] own faith history. Absolutely not!” Aug 19, 2005 Address, Cologne, Germany.

Spreading one’s faith means sharing and dialoguing. The council says this is an obligation of heretics and schismatics too, as well as Catholics. The council envisions gatherings at which persons from different “Churches and Communities” each “explains the teaching of his Communion in greater depth and brings out clearly its distinctive features”, and thus it happens that “everyone gains a truer knowledge and more just appreciation of the teaching and religious life of both Communions.” *Unitatis Redintegratio*, §4.

baptize, the priest alone can complete the building up of the Body in the eucharistic sacrifice.¹⁸⁵ Thus are fulfilled the words of God, spoken through His prophet: "From the rising of the sun until the going down thereof my name is great among the gentiles, and in every place a clean oblation is sacrificed and offered up in my name".(135)(22*) In this way the Church both prays and labors in order that the entire world may become the People of God, the Body of the Lord and the Temple of the Holy Spirit, and that in Christ, the Head of all, all honor and glory may be rendered to the Creator and Father of the Universe.¹⁸⁶

Vatican II's teaching here was put into practice by Pope Benedict XVI when he invited the (schismatic) "Orthodox" "Patriarch" Bartholomew I to lecture the world's Catholic bishops on religious topics. See annotations to §8 above.

¹⁸⁵ This is a very muted reference to the Mass, in language to which the Protestants would not object. As shown below (annotations to §20), the Protestants don't object to "the priest alone" being delegated the duty or function of the "eucharistic sacrifice". As shown above (annotations to §10), Protestants do not object to the Eucharist being a sacrifice (of praise).

The council continues its Protestant-pleasing narrative in the next few lines, by referring to the Church praying and laboring but omitting all reference to the Mass being the same Sacrifice as our Lord on the Cross, offered in an unbloody manner, for the living and the dead.

¹⁸⁶ All through the above statements, some of which can have a Catholic meaning, there is entirely an absence of any declaration of the requirement that all men must become Catholic. The "people of God" and "the [Mystical] Body of the Lord", have broader meanings, as shown above.

CHAPTER III

ON THE HIERARCHICAL STRUCTURE OF THE CHURCH AND IN PARTICULAR ON THE EPISCOPATE

18. For the nurturing and constant growth of the People of God, Christ the Lord instituted in His Church a variety of ministries, which work for the good of the whole body. For those ministers, who are endowed with sacred power, serve¹⁸⁷ their brethren, so that all who are of the People of God, and therefore enjoy a true Christian dignity,¹⁸⁸ working toward a common goal freely and in an orderly way, may arrive at salvation.

This Sacred Council, following closely in the footsteps of the First Vatican Council, with that Council teaches and declares that Jesus Christ, the eternal Shepherd, established His holy Church, having sent forth the apostles as He Himself had been sent by the Father;(136) and

¹⁸⁷ The council here promotes the novelty which Pope John Paul II identified and called “authority as a service”. See, *Sacrae Disciplinae Leges*.

¹⁸⁸ Although the council’s position is not stated with precision, notice the ecumenical implication of its statement. “[A]ll who are of the people of God ... enjoy a true Christian dignity”. However, the council says in Chapter II that heretics and schismatics are contained in the people of God. Thus, the council repeats its prior error (in Chapter II) that heretics and schismatics have true, actual Christian dignity, rather than only potential dignity. The council further errs by including those Catholics in mortal sin, among those who have an actual “true Christian dignity”. See the annotations in Chapter II, on these topics.

He willed that their successors, namely the bishops, should be shepherds in His Church even to the consummation of the world. And in order that the episcopate itself might be one and undivided, He placed Blessed Peter over the other apostles, and instituted in him a permanent and visible source and foundation of unity of faith and communion.(1*) And all this teaching about the institution, the perpetuity, the meaning and reason for the sacred primacy of the Roman Pontiff and of his infallible magisterium, this Sacred Council again proposes to be firmly believed by all the faithful. Continuing in that same undertaking, this Council is resolved to declare and proclaim before all men the doctrine concerning bishops, the successors of the apostles, who together¹⁸⁹ with the successor of Peter, the Vicar of Christ,(2*) the visible Head of the whole Church, govern the house of the living God.

19. The Lord Jesus, after praying to the Father, calling to Himself those whom He desired, appointed twelve to be with Him, and whom He would send to preach the Kingdom of God;(137) and these apostles(138) He formed after the manner of a college or a stable group,¹⁹⁰ over which He placed Peter chosen from among them.(139)

¹⁸⁹ Notice that in all of the council's statements above (and below), there is an absence of the explicit Catholic doctrine that the papacy is a monarchy and the bishops are subject to the pope's monarchical authority. Instead, the council says only that the bishops govern the Church "together with" the pope, rather than under the pope. The council's omission here fits with the error discussed below, of a dual supremacy in the Church. It is true that the bishops govern together with the pope, in that each one governs his diocese under the pope. However, the bishops have no authority to govern except authority which is derived from, and delegated by, the pope.

¹⁹⁰ It is false to say that the apostles were often or long assembled together after the birth of the Church which occurred

He sent them first to the children of Israel and then to all nations,(140) so that as sharers in His power they might make all peoples His

at our Lord's death. But the council is making the misleading argument that apostles were a standing body and thus the bishops are too. The council's premise and conclusion are false.

It is a complete departure from traditional Catholic doctrine and practice that the bishops of the Church constitute a permanent standing body. Before Vatican II, the assembly of bishops was always an unusual event, which only occurred infrequently.

After Vatican II, however, we see the novelty of continual collegial assemblies, for example, 300-bishop synods every year or two, with what the Vatican calls a "General Assembly" of the world's bishops every 3-4 years. *See,*

<http://ncronline.org/news/vatican/synod-surfaces-ferment-over-mission> & see also:

http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/synod/documents/rc_synod_d oc_20110202_lineamenta-xiii-assembly_en.html.

The pope delegates to each bishop the authority to govern the individual diocese over which the pope places him. Each bishop is answerable directly to the pope for his governance of that diocese. For brief and unusual periods, the pope confers upon each bishop the right and obligation of attending a council to consider and give his views and vote on broader matters outside the particular bishop's diocese.

In contrast to Catholic tradition, the council makes the revolutionary change of declaring that the world's bishops are a "stable group". Pope John Paul II identified this as one of the novelties of Vatican II, which he called the new "relations ... between collegiality and the primacy" in the Church. *Sacrae Disciplinae Leges*, January 25, 1983.

disciples, and sanctify and govern them,(141) and thus spread His Church, and by ministering to it under the guidance of the Lord, direct it all days even to the consummation of the world.(142) And in this mission they were fully confirmed on the day of Pentecost(143) in accordance with the Lord's promise: "You shall receive power when the Holy Spirit comes upon you, and you shall be witnesses for me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and in Samaria, and even to the very ends of the earth".(144) And the apostles, by preaching the Gospel everywhere,(145) and it being accepted by their hearers under the influence of the Holy Spirit, gather together the universal Church, which the Lord established on the apostles¹⁹¹ and built upon blessed

¹⁹¹ There is some way in which it could truthfully be said that Our Lord built His Church upon all of the apostles, St. Peter being described (merely) as the "chief". This particular formulation here fits with the council's error of dual supremacy, as discussed below. This conciliar formulation is not the traditional manner of stating the Church's government. Our Lord told St. Peter that upon him, *i.e.*, "upon this rock" He would build His Church. The pope is the monarch, with the authority of all of his representatives flowing from or through him, as the source on earth, of their authority. So the council promotes collegiality when it describes the Church as established on the apostles and built on St. Peter.

Further, the council promotes collegiality and a horizontal view of the Church, when the council teaches here that the converts made by the apostles are the gathering together of the Church. Instead, the truth is that the Church was already perfect and fully in existence. The converts were not the gathering together of the Church but were gathered into the perfect Church which already existed.

Peter, their chief, Christ Jesus Himself being the supreme cornerstone.(146)(3*)

20. That divine mission, entrusted by Christ to the apostles, will last until the end of the world,(147) since the Gospel they are to teach is for all time the source of all life for the Church.¹⁹² And for this reason

¹⁹² This statement can be taken in a true sense because there is no spiritual life outside the Catholic Church. However, this statement promotes ecumenism because it promotes the conciliar error that the Gospel is the source of life for the Church (together with Sanctifying Grace, the Sacraments, *etc.*), but the Jews have the Old Testament as their source of life, and the heathens have their natural good deeds, or natural knowledge of God, *etc.*

For example, the conciliar church teaches that the Jews follow God by being “attentive to the same God” and carefully following (“hanging on”) His word, with the same memory, hope and responsibility as Catholics and the same heritage of the prophets. Here are the Vatican words:

Attentive to the same God who has spoken, hanging on the same word, we [Catholics and Jews together] have to witness to one same memory and one common hope in Him who is the master of history. We must also accept our responsibility ***to prepare the world for the coming of the Messiah by working together for social justice, respect for the rights of persons and nations and for social and international reconciliation.*** To this we are driven, Jews and Christians, by the command to love our neighbor,

the apostles, appointed as rulers in this society, took care to appoint successors.

For they not only had helpers in their ministry,(4*) but also, in order that the mission assigned to them might continue after their death, they passed on to their immediate cooperators, as it were, in the form of a testament, the duty of confirming and finishing the work¹⁹³ begun by themselves,(5*) recommending¹⁹⁴ to them that they attend to the

by a common hope for the Kingdom of God and by the great heritage of the Prophets.

Notes for a Correct Presentation of Jews and Judaism in the preaching and Catechesis of the Catholic Church, ¶11 (bracketed words added).

¹⁹³ Here, and in the paragraph immediately above, the council suggests the heresy that apostolic succession means passing on the apostolic mission. The conciliar church recognizes that it is an obstacle to ecumenism that most heretical sects do not have apostolic succession. Thus, the conciliar church has floated trial balloons regarding the redefinition of the Catholic concept of apostolic succession, so that it would no longer be a “historical chain of laying on of hands running back through the centuries to one of the apostles [because] this would be a very mechanical and individualistic vision”. Cardinal Kasper, *May They All be One? But How? A Vision of Christian Unity for the Next Generation*, <http://www.thetablet.co.uk/article/6889>.

Instead, apostolic succession would be redefined to refer to a “collegial membership in a *collegium*, which as a whole goes back to the apostles by sharing the same apostolic faith and the same apostolic mission.” *Id.*

¹⁹⁴ De-emphasizing hierarchical authority, the Episcopal mandate becomes the following of a recommendation. There is

whole flock in which¹⁹⁵ the Holy Spirit placed them to shepherd the Church of God.(148) They therefore appointed¹⁹⁶ such men, and gave them the order that, when they should have died, other approved men would take up their ministry.¹⁹⁷(6*) Among those various ministries which, according to tradition, were exercised in the Church from the earliest times, the chief place belongs to the office of those who, appointed to the episcopate, by a succession running from the beginning,(7*) are passers-on of the apostolic seed.(8*) Thus, as St. Irenaeus testifies, through those who were appointed¹⁹⁸ bishops by

no reference to charging the new bishops with a solemn mandate under vow, as St. Thomas explains it to be. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.185, a.4.

¹⁹⁵ Note the council's phrasing. In the conciliar context, where the authority of the layman is emphasized and where the council uses words suggesting the horizontalness of the Church, here the bishops are said to be "in" the flock, rather than "over" the flock, to de-emphasize their God-given authority and to support the conciliar idea that the Episcopacy is a "service".

¹⁹⁶ This fits with the Protestant theory that "bishops" and ministers merely fulfill offices by appointment. But the council is silent here about the Sacrament of ordination (and Episcopal consecration) causing any real and permanent change – an indelible character – in the soul of the man, because the Protestants deny these truths.

¹⁹⁷ This also suggests the conciliar error that apostolic succession consists in a common mission, as Cardinal Kasper proposes, in the quote above.

¹⁹⁸ All of the statements in this paragraph easily allow a Protestant interpretation, including here, *e.g.*, where the sacramental power of Orders is de-emphasized by reference only

the apostles, and through their successors down in our own time, the apostolic tradition is manifested (9*) and preserved.(10*)

to the “appointment” of a new bishop. Obviously, the truth is that no “appointing” of a bishop can make one, without Episcopal consecration creating a bishop.

Here is the Protestant position, as declared by Martin Luther:

The first wall built by the Romanists is the distinction between the clergy and the laity. It is pure invention that pope, bishop, priests, and monks are called the spiritual estate while princes, lords, artisans and peasants are called the temporal estate. This is indeed a piece of deceit and hypocrisy. All Christians are truly of the spiritual estate, and there is no difference among them except that of office ... The pope or bishop anoints, confers the tonsure, ordains, consecrates, and prescribes garb different from that of the laity. He might well make a man into a hypocrite in so doing, but never a Christian or a spiritual man
Whoever comes out of the water of baptism can boast that he is already a consecrated priest, bishop, and pope, although of course it is not seemly that just anybody should exercise such office.

Quoted in *German Humanism and Reformation*, Reinhart P. Becker, editor, Continuum Publishing, N.Y., 1982, pp. 152-154 (emphasis added).

Bishops, therefore, with their helpers, the priests and deacons, have taken up the service of the community,¹⁹⁹ (11*) presiding in place of God over the flock,(12*) whose shepherds they are, as teachers for doctrine, priests for sacred worship, and ministers for governing.²⁰⁰(13*) And just as the office granted individually to Peter,

¹⁹⁹ Here is the erroneous emphasis regarding the hierarchy of the Catholic Church being a “service”. Pope John Paul II stated that “authority as a service” is a “novelty” of the Second Vatican Council”. *Sacrae Disciplinae Leges*, 1983. This fits with the Protestant view that ordination is merely a delegation by the people, to authorize a particular minister for service.

A person might wrongly think that “authority as a service” simply means that a bishop is charged with exercising his authority for the good of his flock. However, that is obvious and is not new. Thus, Pope John Paul II does not mean that. Further, Pope Benedict XVI also does not understand “authority as a service” in this fashion. As Pope Benedict explained: “The Pope is not the bishops’ ruler, he is the servant of the community. ... There is a community of local Churches which have the Pope as their reference point.” Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger quoted in *Catholic Family News*, May 2001, page 4, taken from *Deutsche Presse-Agentur*, April 3, 2001.

²⁰⁰ All of this is consistent with the Protestant errors and Protestant language. The council here lists first that bishops are teachers, next that they preside in sacred worship, without any specific mention of a bishop’s unique Sacramental powers or even of a priest’s unique Sacramental powers. There is no mention of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, which the Protestants despise, but only mention of “sacred worship”, which Protestants acknowledge. Lastly, the council refers to governing, which Protestant false “bishops” do too, having been delegated this

the first among the apostles,²⁰¹ is permanent and is to be transmitted to his successors, so also the apostles' office of nurturing²⁰² the Church is permanent, and is to be exercised without interruption by the sacred order of bishops. (14*) Therefore, the Sacred Council teaches that bishops by divine institution have succeeded to the place of the apostles, (15*) as shepherds of the Church, and he who hears them, hears Christ, and he who rejects them, rejects Christ and Him who sent Christ.(149)(16*)

21. In the bishops, therefore, for whom priests are assistants, Our Lord Jesus Christ, the Supreme High Priest, is present in the midst of those who believe.²⁰³ For sitting at the right hand of God the Father, He is

“authority” from below. See the quote from Martin Luther, in an annotation a little above this one.

²⁰¹ This characterization of the pope fits with the (false) Protestant view, *e.g.*, of the Anglicans, that the pope is the first among equals and is not an absolute monarch who is subject to no one but God.

²⁰² There is no proclamation of Catholic doctrine here. In furtherance of ecumenism, the council's muted statement is something that Protestants would have no trouble saying about their own false “bishops”. Instead of the bishop being the ruler of his diocese, he is made a nurturer.

²⁰³ The council's statement here promotes ecumenism because it seems to place the bishops' authority and Episcopal power on a merely subjective level, as if the bishops' possession of our Lord's power and authority depends on a believer's belief. The Catholic truth is that a bishop has our Lord's power and authority in the midst of everyone, including heretics and

not absent from the gathering²⁰⁴ of His high priests,(17*) but above all through their excellent service²⁰⁵ He is preaching the word of God to all nations, and constantly administering the sacraments of faith²⁰⁶ to

pagans, regardless of whether they accept this truth, his power and his authority.

²⁰⁴ The gathering of bishops in a council was traditionally an uncommon event. Elevating this gathering as the occasion on which our Lord is not absent, fits with the post-conciliar novelty of a conference of bishops being a standing body and also fits with the continual synods held in the conciliar church. All of this serves to reduce the individual bishop's authority and responsibility in his own diocese.

²⁰⁵ Here, the council again emphasizes *authority as a service*. Although Pope John Paul II identified "authority as a service" as a novelty of Vatican II, the quote from Martin Luther (a little above here), shows that this idea is not new to Protestants, since for them, "ordination" is merely the people designating a person to serve the people in a particular office. Thus, on this issue, as in so many other issues, the conciliar church's novelty is merely "warmed-over" Protestantism.

²⁰⁶ As the Council of Trent declared, "the Sacrament of Baptism ... is the sacrament of faith". Session VI, ch.7. This is because it is the usual occasion, *e.g.*, in infant baptism, for first receiving the infused virtue of supernatural Faith.

The council teaches two novelties here, when it refers to "sacraments [plural] of faith". The first novelty is that the council is not referring to Baptism as the "Sacrament of Faith", since the council says these sacraments are given "to those who believe", whereas Baptism is administered primarily to infants,

those who believe, by their paternal functioning.²⁰⁷ (150) He incorporates new members in His Body by a heavenly regeneration²⁰⁸, and finally by their wisdom and prudence He directs and guides the People of the New Testament²⁰⁹ in their pilgrimage toward eternal happiness. These pastors, chosen to shepherd the Lord's flock of the elect, are servants of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God,(151) to whom has been assigned the bearing of witness to the

who do **not** already believe (so that babies come to believe through receiving the infused virtue of Faith, by being baptized). The second novelty is the promotion of ecumenism by referring to the sacraments (plural) of faith because this fits with Protestant (and conciliar) theology, in which the purpose of all of the sacraments is chiefly to be a sign of faith and to inflame the faith. Thus, in conciliar/Protestant “theology”, all sacraments are “sacraments of faith”.

²⁰⁷ Here is another promotion of *authority as a service* and the council continues to speak as the Protestants do, in terms of the function a man discharges, rather than what is essential. The council does not mention here the unique powers possessed only by bishops, which powers the Protestants would deny.

²⁰⁸ It is odd that this reference to Baptism would come in the section of *Lumen Gentium* concerning bishops, rather than another section more focused on the lower rank of the priesthood, which usually administers baptism. In any case, though, this reference to “heavenly regeneration” is acceptable to Protestants and is entirely devoid of the crucial Catholic Sacramental doctrine denied by heretics.

²⁰⁹ There is an implicit division here in the “people of God” between the “people of the New Testament” and the Jews, whom the council calls the “people of the Testament”.

Gospel of the grace of God,(152) and the ministration of the Spirit and of justice in glory.(153)

For the discharging of such great duties, the apostles were enriched by Christ with a special outpouring of the Holy Spirit coming upon them,(154) and they passed on this spiritual gift²¹⁰ to their helpers by the imposition of hands,(155) and it has been transmitted down to us in Episcopal consecration.(18*) And the Sacred Council teaches that by Episcopal consecration the fullness of the sacrament of Orders is conferred, that fullness of power, namely, which both in the Church's liturgical practice and in the language of the Fathers of the Church is called the high priesthood, the supreme power of the sacred ministry. (19*) But Episcopal consecration, together with the office of sanctifying, also confers the office of teaching and of governing, which, however, of its very nature, can be exercised only in hierarchical communion with the head and the members of the

²¹⁰ The first two citations in the council's footnote (#154) draw the reader's attention to the descent of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost. However, it is a novelty with no support in traditional Catholic teaching, that the consecration of a bishop gives to that new bishop the "special outpouring" of the Holy Ghost which the apostles received at Pentecost, and the special gifts given then, such as the gift of tongues.

The gift which the apostles passed on to the bishops whom they consecrated, was the gift given at their own consecration, at the Last Supper. Of course, just as every sacrament has its own particular sacramental grace, it is true that Episcopal consecration gives the recipient a particular sacramental grace. But that sacramental grace is not one of those which the Holy Ghost gave to the apostles at Pentecost.

college.²¹¹ For from the tradition, which is expressed especially in liturgical rites and in the practice of both the Church of the East and of the West, it is clear that, by means of the imposition of hands and the words of consecration, the grace of the Holy Spirit is so conferred,(20*) and the sacred character so impressed,(21*) that bishops in an eminent and visible way sustain the roles of Christ Himself as Teacher, Shepherd and High Priest, and that they act in His person.(22*) Therefore it pertains to the bishops to admit newly elected²¹² members into the Episcopal body by means of the sacrament of Orders.

²¹¹ This statement is imprecise. A bishop can govern his diocese only under and in communion with the pope, whose authority the bishop exercises in his own diocese. However, the statement that a bishop can govern his diocese “only in ... communion with ... the members of the college” of bishops, wrongly suggests that the bishop’s authority in his diocese is somehow derived from the college of bishops. This statement is false but is used to justify the error of collegiality, *i.e.*, the novelty of standing national conferences of bishops.

²¹² Whereas the council’s reference to election of bishops suggests a vote, it is finally in the pope’s sole authority to designate or approve any Episcopal candidate. The pope can permit some other persons to elect or choose a candidate for the Episcopacy but it is solely by the pope’s authority, direct or indirect, that an Episcopal candidate can be designated. As Pope Pius XII decreed:

[I]t has been clearly and expressly laid down in the canons that it pertains to the one Apostolic See to judge whether a person is fit for the dignity and burden of the Episcopacy, and that complete freedom in the nomination of bishops is the right of the Roman Pontiff. But if, as happens at times,

22. Just as in the Gospel, the Lord so disposing, St. Peter and the other apostles constitute one apostolic college, so in a similar way the Roman Pontiff, the successor of Peter, and the bishops, the successors of the apostles, are joined together.²¹³ Indeed, the very ancient practice whereby bishops duly established in all parts of the world were in communion with one another and with the Bishop of Rome²¹⁴ in a bond of unity, charity and peace,(23*) and also the councils assembled together,(24*) in which more profound issues were settled in common, (25*) the opinion of the many having been prudently

some persons or groups are permitted to participate in the selection of an Episcopal candidate, this is lawful only if the Apostolic See has allowed it in express terms and in each particular case for clearly defined persons or groups, the conditions and circumstances being very plainly determined.

Ad Apostolorum Principis, ¶38.

Lastly, the use of the word “admit” sounds like entering a club, which characterization fits with the council’s novelty that the bishops are a “stable group”.

²¹³ Here the council makes more explicit its collegiality argument for which it made the false statement (above, in §19) that the apostles stayed together as a “stable group”. This is false, after the beginning of the Church (at our Lord’s death).

²¹⁴ Although it is true that the pope, who is the monarch of the entire Church, is also the Bishop of Rome, this title is favored by the conciliar church because it promotes collegiality and suggests that the pope is more like an equal of the other bishops of the world, as the council (in §20) calls St. Peter the “first among the apostles”.

considered,(26*) both of these factors are already an indication of the collegiate character and aspect of the Episcopal order; and the ecumenical councils held in the course of centuries are also manifest proof of that same character. And it is intimated also in the practice, introduced in ancient times, of summoning several bishops to take part in the elevation of the newly elected to the ministry of the high priesthood. Hence, one is constituted a member of the Episcopal body in virtue of sacramental consecration and hierarchical communion with the head and members of the body²¹⁵.

But the college or body of bishops has no authority unless it is understood together with the Roman Pontiff, the successor of Peter as its head. The pope's power of primacy over all, both pastors and faithful, remains whole and intact. In virtue of his office, that is as Vicar of Christ and pastor of the whole Church, the Roman Pontiff has full, supreme and universal power over the Church. And he is always free to exercise this power. The order of bishops, which succeeds to the college of apostles and gives this apostolic body continued existence, is also the subject of supreme and full power over the universal Church,²¹⁶ provided we understand this body together with

²¹⁵ This whole paragraph continues the strong emphasis on the bishops as a body, in furtherance of the conciliar novelty of the bishops as a standing assembly. This is the conciliar error of collegiality.

The reference to a bishop becoming “a member of the Episcopal body in virtue of sacramental consecration” is not incompatible with Protestantism, since Protestants also have ceremonies and rituals for designating a minister for his office.

²¹⁶ This fuzzy and illogical statement wrongly indicates that there are dual authorities in the Church: 1) the pope singly and 2) all the bishops together. However, this statement is true to the extent that the bishops have their power as delegated by the

pope and their governing power is none other than the power of the pope delegated to the bishops and exercised by them under the pope and as appointed by the pope, as long as the pope chooses them to do so. As Pope Pius VI explained: “[B]ishops receive their authority from him [viz., the pope]”. *Super soliditate*, ¶4.

Pope John Paul II identified as one of the novelties of Vatican II, the “hierarchical constitution [of the Church] based on the College of Bishops united with its Head.” *Sacrae Disciplinae Leges*, 1983.

The 1983 Code of Canon Law teaches the new and false conciliar doctrine of *dual supreme authority* in the Church, even more boldly than the council itself, by further obscuring the dependence of the bishops upon the pope. When canon 749 talks about the infallibility of the College of Bishops, it makes no mention of the pope and the necessity of the pope confirming what this college teaches:

Canon 749 §2 The College of Bishops ... possesses infallibility in its teaching when the Bishops, gathered together in an Ecumenical Council and exercising their magisterium as teachers and judges of faith and morals, definitively declare for the universal Church a doctrine to be held concerning faith or morals

Before he became pope, Pope Benedict XVI promoted this error of dual supremacy, when he stated: “The Pope is not the bishops’ ruler”. Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, quoted in *Catholic Family News*, May 2001, p.4, taken from *Deutsche Presse-Agentur*, April 3, 2001.

Pope John Paul II minimized the papal primacy in a similar manner, when he taught:

When the Catholic Church affirms that the office of the Bishop of Rome corresponds to the will of Christ, she does not separate this office from the mission entrusted to the whole body of Bishops, who are also ‘vicars and ambassadors of Christ’. The Bishop of Rome is a member of the ‘College’, and the Bishops are his brothers in the ministry.

Ut Unum Sint, ¶95.

This concept – of a double supreme authority – makes no sense, any more than two spouses can each be the head of the family, since there cannot be two greatest authorities. The conciliar church’s error of two supreme authorities in the Church is thus analogous to the false and contradictory conciliar error of “mutual submission” of spouses, as authorities in the family. Pope John Paul II, *Mulieris dignitatem*, §24.

The council’s contradiction (in positing dual supreme authorities within the Church), is one example the modernists’ propensity to contradict themselves. As Pope St. Pius X explained:

In their writings and addresses [Modernists] seem not infrequently to advocate doctrines which are contrary one to the other, so that one would be disposed to regard their attitude as double and doubtful. But this is done deliberately and advisedly, and the reason of it is to be found in their opinion as to the mutual separation of science and faith. Thus in their books one finds some things which might well be approved by a Catholic, but on turning over the page one is confronted by

other things which might well have been dictated by a rationalist.

Pascendi Dominici gregis §18.

If the bishops add anything to the weight of the pope's separate authority, then he is not himself the supreme authority. However, the Catholic Church infallibly declared that the pope **is** the **only** supreme authority, **all by himself**.

Here is the First Vatican Council's infallible teaching:

[U]pon Simon Peter alone Jesus, after His resurrection, conferred the jurisdiction of the highest pastor and rector over his entire fold, saying: "Feed my lambs," "Feed my sheep" [John 21:15 ff.]. To this teaching of Sacred Scriptures, so manifest as it has been always understood by the Catholic Church, are opposed openly the vicious opinions of those who perversely deny that **the form of government in His Church was established by Christ the Lord; that to Peter alone, in preference to the other apostles, whether individually or all together,** was confided the true and proper primacy of jurisdiction by Christ. ...

[T]he Roman pontiff is the successor of Blessed Peter, the prince of the apostles, true vicar of Christ, head of the whole church and father and teacher of all Christian people. **To him, in blessed Peter, full power has been given by our Lord Jesus Christ, to tend, rule and govern the universal church.** ...

[The] bishops ... **tend and govern individually the particular flocks which have been assigned to them.**

Session IV, ch. 1 & 3 (emphasis added; bracketed citation in the original).

As Pope Pius XI taught: “Christ our Lord instituted His Church ... under the leadership of **one head**”. *Mortalium Animos*, §6. Plainly, the Catholic Church does not have dual supreme heads.

Similarly, Pope Pius IX taught what the Catholic Church had always taught before Vatican II:

We teach and declare that the Roman Church, through Our Lord's direction, possesses ordinary power over all of the other churches [*i.e.*, different rites of the Church], and that this jurisdictional power of the Roman Pontiff, which is truly Episcopal, is immediate. To this power the pastors [*i.e.*, the bishops], and the faithful of every rite and of every station, both individually and collectively, are bound by a necessity of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, not only in what concerns the Faith and customs, but also in what relates to the discipline and governing of the Church all over the world This is the Catholic doctrine from which no one can distance himself without prejudicing his faith and his salvation.

Therefore, whoever would affirm that the Roman Pontiff has only the duty of overseeing or of directing, but not full and supreme jurisdictional power over the entire Church, not only in matters regarding the faith and customs, but also in

its head the Roman Pontiff and never without this head.(27*) This power can be exercised only with the consent of the Roman Pontiff. For our Lord placed Simon alone as the rock and the bearer of the keys of the Church,(156) and made him shepherd of the whole flock;(157) it is evident, however, that the power of binding and loosing, which was given to Peter,(158) was granted also to the college of apostles, joined with their head.(159)(28*) This college, insofar as it is composed of many, expresses the variety and universality of the People of God, but insofar as it is assembled under one head, it expresses the unity of the flock of Christ. In it, the bishops, faithfully recognizing the primacy and pre-eminence of their head, exercise their own authority²¹⁷ for the good of their own faithful, and indeed of the whole Church, the Holy Spirit supporting its organic structure and harmony with moderation. The supreme power in the universal Church, which this college

matters regarding the discipline and governance of the Church throughout the world, and who otherwise affirms that the Roman Pontiff has only a very important share, but not the entire fullness of this supreme power; or who would say that his power is not ordinary and immediate, both over each and every church, and over each and every pastor and faithful, is excommunicated.

Inter Gravissimas Afflictiones.

²¹⁷ The bishops' "own authority" to govern is the authority of the pope, delegated to them. Pope Pius XII took occasion to speak of the Bishops' power of jurisdiction and he described it as something "which they receive directly (the Latin word is "*immediate*") from the same Supreme Pontiff." *Mystici Corporis*, ¶42.

enjoys²¹⁸, is exercised in a solemn way in an ecumenical council. A council is never ecumenical unless it is confirmed or at least accepted as such by the successor of Peter; and it is the prerogative of the Roman Pontiff to convoke these councils, to preside over them and to confirm them.(29*) This same collegiate power can be exercised together with the pope by the bishops living in all parts of the world, provided that the head of the college calls them to collegiate action, or at least approves of or freely accepts the united action of the scattered²¹⁹ bishops, so that it is thereby made a collegiate act.

23. This collegial union is apparent also in the mutual relations of the individual bishops with particular churches²²⁰ and with the universal Church. The Roman Pontiff, as the successor of Peter, is the perpetual and visible principle and foundation of unity of both the bishops and

²¹⁸ This is another imprecise and erroneous statement used to suggest that the bishops collectively are a second supreme authority in the Church, and that somehow their jurisdictional authority is not simply a delegation of the pope's authority, which adds no authority to his authority.

²¹⁹ It is inherent to the notion of collegiate activity, that it be the act of an assembly or gathering. *E.g.*, the many definitions of "college" published during the Second Vatican Council, in the large, two volume library edition of *Funk & Wagnalls Standard Dictionary*, International Edition, © 1958-1965.

²²⁰ As shown above, the phrase "particular churches" is a novelty. The council is here asserting that the union of all bishops throughout the world appears in the individual bishop's own relationship to his own diocese. Even if this statement is in some way not false, the council seems to be "bending over backwards" to again emphasize the bishops' collective role in the Church, in order to promote the conciliar error of collegiality.

of the faithful.(30*) The individual bishops, however, are the visible principle and foundation of unity in their particular churches,²²¹ (31*) fashioned after the model of the universal Church, in and from which churches comes into being the one and only Catholic Church.²²²(32*)

²²¹ These “particular churches” are nothing other than the one, true Catholic Church in that diocese.

²²² This is the conciliar error of “the Church ... seen as a ‘communion’” or federation, which is a novelty identified by Pope John Paul II. *Sacrae Disciplinae Leges*.

It is false that the Catholic Church comes into being from the local parts of the Church. Rather, the opposite is true. Just like the living human body does not come into being from the body’s parts, likewise, the whole Church does not come into being from the local parts of the Church.

Further, just as the soul of the whole man gives the man’s parts their life as part of the man, likewise the Holy Ghost gives the local parts of the Church their mystical Life as part of the entire Mystical Body of Christ. This truth is obvious from the fact that the Holy Catholic Church was already in being at Her founding, before those local Churches existed. They depend on Her. She does not depend on them.

This is a serious error both because it creates problems understanding the Church and Her history generally, but also because this error promotes the heresy of collegiality, the democratization of the Church and the view that the parts of the Church are somehow necessary to the Church’s existence or essence. As explained above, the Church remains One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic, regardless of what Her local parts might

For this reason the individual bishops represent each his own church, but all of them together²²³ and with the Pope represent the entire Church in the bond of peace, love and unity.

The individual bishops, who are placed in charge of particular churches, exercise their pastoral government over the portion of the People of God committed to their care, and not over other churches nor over the universal Church. But each of them, as a member of the episcopal college and legitimate successor of the apostles, is obliged by Christ's institution and command to be solicitous for the whole Church,(33*) and this solicitude, though it is not exercised by an act of jurisdiction, contributes greatly to the advantage of the universal Church. For it is the duty of all bishops to promote and to safeguard the unity of faith and the discipline common to the whole Church, to instruct the faithful to love for the whole mystical body of Christ, especially for its poor and sorrowing members and for those who are suffering persecution for justice's sake,(160) and finally to promote every activity that is of interest to the whole Church, especially that the faith may take increase and the light of full truth appear to all men. And this also is important, that by governing well their own church as a portion of the universal Church, they themselves are

do to harm themselves and cut themselves off from the Divine Life.

²²³ The error in the sentence immediately preceding, now cascades further, because the council now says that the bishops collectively represent the entire Church, because they collectively represent the parts which give the Church Her being. These errors promote, and are part of, the conciliar error of collegiality.

effectively contributing to the welfare of the whole Mystical Body, which is also the body of the churches.²²⁴(34*)

The task of proclaiming the Gospel everywhere on earth pertains to the body of pastors, to all of whom in common Christ gave His command, thereby imposing upon them a common duty, as Pope Celestine in his time recommended to the Fathers of the Council of Ephesus.(35*) From this it follows that the individual bishops, insofar as their own discharge of their duty permits, are obliged to enter into a community of work among themselves and with the successor of Peter²²⁵, upon whom was imposed in a special way the great duty of spreading the Christian name²²⁶.(36*) With all their energy, therefore, they must supply to the missions both workers for the harvest and also spiritual and material aid, both directly and on their own account, as well as by arousing the ardent cooperation of the faithful. And

²²⁴ Here again, the council inverts the true order in the Church. To call the Mystical Body of Christ “the body of churches” is like calling a man “the body of parts” or “the body of organs”. We never speak like that because it falsifies the truth that the bodily parts have their being from the whole, not the whole from the bodily parts (except accidentally).

²²⁵ This is one of many places where the council places first the unity of the bishops with each other, and places second the unity they have with the pope. This promotes the error of collegiality.

²²⁶ Regarding the “spreading the Christian name”: where is the call to “spread the one true Catholic Faith, without which no one can be saved”? The council’s expression here promotes ecumenism and would win general approval from Protestants (who falsely call themselves “Christian” and want the (generic) “Christian name” spread.

finally, the bishops, in a universal fellowship of charity, should gladly extend their fraternal aid to other churches²²⁷, especially to

²²⁷ Here is another of the countless “time bombs” which were planted in the council’s documents, to explode afterwards, causing great destruction in the Church. The council says that bishops should give “fraternal aid to other churches”. But the council uses the term “churches” to include false religions, as shown in §15 above. In this way, the council’s words promote giving aid to heretical and schismatic sects.

This understanding of the council’s words fits well with the words and deeds of the post-conciliar church. For example, in an encyclical devoted to relations with “members of Churches and Ecclesial Communities not in full communion with the Catholic Church”, Pope John Paul II promoted mutual aid between Catholics and heretics (or schismatics), with these words:

Relations between Christians are not aimed merely at mutual knowledge, common prayer and dialogue. They presuppose and from now on call for every possible form of practical cooperation at all levels: pastoral, cultural and social, as well as that of witnessing to the Gospel message. “Cooperation among all Christians vividly expresses that bond which already unites them, and it sets in clearer relief the features of Christ the Servant”. This cooperation based on our common faith is not only filled with fraternal communion, but is a manifestation of Christ himself. Moreover, ecumenical cooperation is a true school of ecumenism, a dynamic road to unity. Unity of action leads to the full unity of faith: “Through such cooperation, all believers in Christ are able to learn easily how they can understand each other better and esteem each other more, and how the road to

neighboring and more needy dioceses in accordance with the venerable example of antiquity.

By divine Providence it has come about that various churches²²⁸, established in various places by the apostles and their successors, have in the course of time coalesced into several groups, organically united, which, preserving the unity of faith and the unique divine constitution of the universal Church²²⁹, enjoy their own discipline, their own liturgical usage, and their own theological and spiritual heritage. Some of these churches, notably the ancient patriarchal churches, as parent-stocks of the Faith, so to speak, have begotten others as daughter churches, with which they are connected down to

the unity of Christians may be made smooth”. In the eyes of the world, cooperation among Christians becomes a form of common Christian witness and a means of evangelization which benefits all involved.

Ut unum sint, ¶40.

²²⁸ This paragraph, referring to those “churches” which are parts of the “universal Church”, is not inconsistent with the time bomb planted immediately above, since in *Lumen Gentium* (§15) and in many other places, the council and post-conciliar church promote mutual aid, exchanged gifts, dialogue with and appreciation of the (false) “churches”.

²²⁹ This phrase “universal Church” fits well with *Lumen Gentium*’s prior references to “Church of Christ”, as broader and larger than the Catholic Church. This reference also fits well with the council’s references to the “small c” catholic church. See, especially the annotations to §7 & §8 above.

our own time by a close bond of charity in their sacramental life and in their mutual respect for their rights and duties.(37*) This variety of local churches with one common aspiration is splendid evidence of the catholicity of the undivided Church. In like manner the Episcopal bodies²³⁰ of today are in a position to render a manifold and fruitful assistance, so that this collegiate feeling may be put into practical application.

24. Bishops, as successors of the apostles, receive from the Lord, to whom was given all power in heaven and on earth, the mission to teach all nations and to preach the Gospel to every creature, so that all men may attain to salvation by faith, baptism and the fulfillment of the commandments.(161) To fulfill this mission, Christ the Lord promised the Holy Spirit to the Apostles, and on Pentecost day sent the Spirit from heaven, by whose power they would be witnesses to Him before the nations and peoples and kings even to the ends of the earth.(162) And that duty, which the Lord committed to the shepherds of His people, is a true service, which in sacred literature is significantly called "diakonia" or ministry.(163)

The canonical mission of bishops can come about by legitimate customs that have not been revoked by the supreme and universal authority of the Church, or by laws made or recognized by that authority, or directly through the successor of Peter himself²³¹; and if

²³⁰ Vatican II's novel emphasis on the role of "Episcopal bodies" foreshadows the subsequent novelty of active, standing, national councils of bishops and continual Episcopal synods, promoting bureaucracy and *governance-by-committee* in the Church. The council's statement here is further promotion of the conciliar error of collegiality.

²³¹ Promoting the error of collegiality, notice the council here juxtaposes "the supreme and universal authority of the Church" on the one hand, to "the successor of Peter", on the other hand.

the latter refuses or denies apostolic communion, such bishops cannot assume any office.(38*)

25. Among the principal duties of bishops the preaching of the Gospel occupies an eminent place.(39*) For bishops are preachers of the faith, who lead new disciples to Christ, and they are authentic teachers, that is, teachers endowed with the authority of Christ, who preach to the people committed to them the faith they must believe and put into practice, and by the light of the Holy Spirit illustrate that faith. They bring forth from the treasury of Revelation new things and old,(164) making it bear fruit and vigilantly warding off any errors that threaten their flock.(165) Bishops, teaching in communion with the Roman Pontiff, are to be respected by all as witnesses to divine and Catholic truth.²³² In matters of faith and morals, the bishops speak in the name of Christ and the faithful are to accept their teaching and adhere to it with a religious assent. This religious submission of mind and will must be shown in a special way to the authentic magisterium of the Roman Pontiff, even when he is not speaking *ex cathedra*; that

In this way, the council is indicating that the pope is not himself alone, the sole, supreme and universal authority of the Church.

²³² In §8 above, the council says that truth is found outside the visible Catholic Church and properly belongs to the “Church of Christ”. Here in §25, the council’s phrase “divine and Catholic truth” apparently makes this same distinction. The “divine truth” belongs to the Church of Christ, called the Church possessing the “divine element”. The “Catholic truth” (with a capital “C”) belongs to the “earthly Church”, the “visible assembly” and “human element”. *See*, §8 above. This would mean that the bishops are teachers both of the doctrines common to all of the “Church of Christ” as well as those doctrines which are taught only by the Catholic Church.

is, it must be shown in such a way that his supreme magisterium is acknowledged with reverence, the judgments made by him are sincerely adhered to, according to his manifest mind and will. His mind and will in the matter may be known either from the character of the documents, from his frequent repetition of the same doctrine, or from his manner of speaking.

Although the individual bishops do not enjoy the prerogative of infallibility, they nevertheless proclaim Christ's doctrine infallibly whenever, even though dispersed through the world, but still maintaining the bond of communion among themselves²³³ and with the successor of Peter, and authentically teaching matters of faith and morals, they are in agreement on one position as definitively to be held.(40*) This is even more clearly verified when, gathered together in an ecumenical council, they are teachers and judges of faith and morals for the universal Church, whose definitions²³⁴ must be adhered to with the submission of faith.(41*)

²³³ This is one of many places, where the council places first the unity of the bishops with each other, and places second the unity they have with the pope. This promotes the error of collegiality.

²³⁴ This word “definitions” is crucial. Not everything taught as a matter of faith or morals, is defined as a dogma that all Catholics must believe. Vatican II itself is a perfect example of this, where all of the council’s statements which could be viewed as pertaining to faith or morals, are nonetheless not infallible, as shown in the preface above, and as stated in *Lumen Gentium*’s appendix (which is included below as part of the Vatican’s official text). This appendix states: “Taking conciliar custom into consideration and also the pastoral purpose of the present Council, the sacred Council defines as binding on the Church only those things in matters of faith and morals which it shall openly declare to be binding.”

And this infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed His Church to be endowed in defining doctrine of faith and morals, extends as far as the deposit of Revelation extends, which must be religiously guarded and faithfully expounded. And this is the infallibility which the Roman Pontiff, the head of the college of bishops, enjoys in virtue of his office, when, as the supreme shepherd and teacher of all the faithful, who confirms his brethren in their faith,(166) by a definitive act he proclaims a doctrine of faith or morals.(42*) And therefore his definitions, of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church, are justly styled irreformable, since they are pronounced with the assistance of the Holy Spirit, promised to him in blessed Peter, and therefore they need no approval of others, nor do they allow an appeal to any other judgment. For then the Roman Pontiff is not pronouncing judgment as a private person, but as the supreme teacher of the universal Church, in whom the charism of infallibility of the Church itself is individually present, he is expounding or defending a doctrine of Catholic faith.(43*) The infallibility promised to the Church resides also in the body of Bishops, when that body exercises the supreme magisterium with the successor of Peter.²³⁵ To these definitions the assent of the Church can never be wanting, on account of the activity of that same Holy Spirit, by which the whole flock of Christ is preserved²³⁶ and progresses in unity of faith.(44*)

²³⁵ Although this statement is true, by implication it is the council's further promotion of the conciliar errors of collegiality and dual supreme authority.

²³⁶ This is another promotion of the same error found in §12 above. The council is promoting the revolutionary idea of the Holy Ghost protecting all of the people from doctrinal error. This statement thus promotes a horizontal view of the Church and the false notion of the "people of God" as a source of

But when either the Roman Pontiff or the Body of Bishops²³⁷ together with him defines a judgment, they pronounce it in accordance with Revelation itself, which all are obliged to abide by and be in conformity with, that is, the Revelation which as written or orally handed down is transmitted in its entirety through the legitimate succession of bishops and especially in care of the Roman Pontiff himself, and which under the guiding light of the Spirit of truth is religiously preserved and faithfully expounded in the Church.(45*) The Roman Pontiff and the bishops, in view of their office and the importance of the matter, by fitting means diligently strive to inquire properly into that revelation and to give apt expression to its contents;(46*) but a new public revelation they do not accept as pertaining to the divine deposit of faith.(47*)

26. A bishop marked with the fullness of the sacrament of Orders, is "the steward of the grace of the supreme priesthood," (48*) especially in the Eucharist, which he offers or causes to be offered,(49*) and by which the Church continually lives and grows. This Church of Christ²³⁸

teaching and of dogma. This error is widely promoted by the post-conciliar church. *See*, the annotations to §12 above.

²³⁷ The pope can infallibly teach a doctrine by himself (to which all bishops must consent implicitly) or the pope can infallibly teach a doctrine in which the other bishops join him explicitly, *e.g.*, in a council. Nonetheless the infallibility is still the pope's own. The council's statement here is another promotion of the conciliar errors of collegiality and dual supreme authority. *See*, the annotations to §22 above.

²³⁸ Look how the "Church of Christ" is identified in this paragraph: the faithful and pastors brought together by the Gospel and the Lord's Supper. Many Protestants would accept

is truly present in all legitimate local congregations of the faithful which, united with their pastors, are themselves called churches in the New Testament.(50*) For in their locality these are the new People called by God, in the Holy Spirit and in much fullness.(167) In them the faithful are gathered together by the preaching of the Gospel of Christ, and the mystery of the Lord's Supper is celebrated²³⁹, that by the food and blood of the Lord's body the whole brotherhood may be joined together.²⁴⁰(51*) In any community of the altar, under the sacred ministry of the bishop,(52*) there is exhibited a symbol of that charity and "unity of the mystical Body, without which there can be no salvation."(53*) In these communities, though frequently small and poor, or living in the Diaspora, Christ is present²⁴¹, and in virtue of His

this explanation. This fuzzy phrasing also allows the inclusion of heretical sects as part of the broad "Church of Christ".

²³⁹ This oblique reference to Catholic truth regarding the Holy Mass, the unbloody sacrifice of Calvary, in which our Lord is really, substantially present, is couched in terms which the Protestants would accept. This serves ecumenism.

²⁴⁰ This and the following sentence, portray a community meal, rather than describing the essence of a Catholic Mass. This obscuring of those doctrines denied by the Protestants, promotes ecumenism. In other words, the council here seeks to promote a superficial "unity" which obscures the dramatic differences which exist between the true Catholic religion and the heretical sects.

²⁴¹ As pointed out in the annotations immediately above, the council talks in terms the Protestants would accept, referring to the Mass as the brotherhood being joined together for the food and blood of the Lord's Supper. Here, now, the council further suggests that "food and blood" is merely symbolic and not our

presence there is brought together one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church.²⁴² (54*) For "the partaking of the body and blood of Christ does nothing other than make us be transformed into that which we consume". (55*)

Every legitimate celebration of the Eucharist is regulated by the bishop, to whom is committed the office of offering the worship of Christian religion to the Divine Majesty and of administering it in accordance with the Lord's commandments and the Church's laws, as further defined by his particular judgment for his diocese.

Bishops thus, by praying and laboring for the people, make outpourings in many ways and in great abundance from the fullness of Christ's holiness. By the ministry of the word they communicate God's power to those who believe unto salvation(168) and through the sacraments, the regular and fruitful distribution of which they regulate by their authority,(56*) they sanctify the faithful. They direct the conferring of baptism, by which a sharing in the kingly priesthood²⁴³ of

Lord's real, substantial presence, by emphasizing that **the Lord is present in the gathering together of the community.**

²⁴² Here again is the novelty described by Pope John Paul II when he referred to the church as a "communion". *Sacrae Disciplinae Leges*. This is the error that in virtue of our Lord's presence in the parts of the Church, the one, holy Catholic Church exists as a whole. This is backwards! The truth is that in virtue of the one Mystical Body, the Catholic Church, the local parts are parts of that Church. See the annotations on this subject a little above here.

²⁴³ Through repetition without precise explanation, the council blurs the distinction between the common, internal "priesthood" of all Catholics, and the exterior, ministerial priesthood. See, e.g., the annotations on this subject in §10 above. The council's

Christ is granted. They are the original ministers of confirmation, dispensers of sacred Orders and the moderators of penitential discipline, and they earnestly exhort and instruct their people to carry out with faith and reverence their part in the liturgy²⁴⁴ and especially in the holy sacrifice of the Mass. And lastly, by the example of their way of life they must be an influence for good to those over whom they preside²⁴⁵, refraining from all evil and, as far as they are able with God's help, exchanging evil for good, so that together with the flock committed to their care they may arrive at eternal life.(57*)

27. Bishops, as vicars and ambassadors of Christ, govern the particular churches entrusted to them (58*) by their counsel, exhortations, example, and even by their authority and sacred power, which indeed they use only for the edification of their flock in truth and holiness, remembering that he who is greater should become as the lesser and

blurring of Catholic truth here, promotes ecumenism and fits with Protestant heresy.

²⁴⁴ There is another “time bomb”, planted in the council documents. By vague reference to the laity’s “part in the liturgy”, without any explanation of what this means, the council gave an opening to the liturgical revolutionaries to promote novelties such as lay lectors, lay Eucharistic ministers, laymen “bringing up the gifts”, liturgical dancing, *etc.*

²⁴⁵ The word “preside” is an erroneous choice of terms because it suggests a presidency, whereas the bishop is more like a monarch within his own diocese. But this term “preside” helps to set the conciliar tone which has resulted in the erosion of Episcopal authority and the advent of the diocesan council, *etc.*

he who is the chief become as the servant²⁴⁶.(169) This power, which they personally exercise in Christ's name, is proper, ordinary and immediate, although its exercise is ultimately regulated by the supreme authority of the Church²⁴⁷, and can be circumscribed by certain limits, for the advantage of the Church or of the faithful. In virtue of this power, bishops have the sacred right and the duty before the Lord to make laws for their subjects, to pass judgment on them and to moderate everything pertaining to the ordering of worship and the apostolate.

The pastoral office or the habitual and daily care of their sheep is entrusted to them completely; nor are they to be regarded as vicars of the Roman Pontiffs, for they exercise an authority that is proper to them,²⁴⁸ and are quite correctly called "prelates," heads of the people

²⁴⁶ This sentence de-emphasizes Episcopal authority and promotes the conciliar novelty of “authority as a service”. See, the annotations above, on this subject. When the council lists “counsel, exhortations [and] example” first and then says “even by their authority”, this tells the bishops that they should use their authority less and, perhaps, only as a last resort. The council’s statement here has resulted in a practical erosion of Episcopal authority and the bishops’ reluctance to use their authority.

²⁴⁷ The council here says a bishop’s authority is regulated “by the supreme authority of the Church”, rather than simply saying “by the pope”, because the council (wrongly) holds there are two supreme authorities. See §24 above. This promotes the error of collegiality, introducing the conciliar novelty that the bishops collectively can limit a bishop’s authority in his diocese.

²⁴⁸ The bishops’ jurisdiction and authority to govern are entirely derived from the pope’s authority, which the pope delegates to them. See, the annotations to §22 above. Evidence

whom they govern.(59*) Their power, therefore, is not destroyed by the supreme and universal power, but on the contrary it is affirmed, strengthened and vindicated by it,(60*) since the Holy Spirit unfailingly preserves the form of government established by Christ the Lord in His Church.

A bishop, since he is sent by the Father to govern his family, must keep before his eyes the example of the Good Shepherd, who came not to be ministered unto but to minister,(170) and to lay down his life for his sheep.(171) Being taken from among men, and himself beset with weakness, he is able to have compassion on the ignorant and erring.(172) Let him not refuse to listen to his subjects, whom he cherishes as his true sons and exhorts to cooperate readily with him. As having one day to render an account for their souls,(173) he takes care of them by his prayer, preaching, and all the works of charity, and not only of them but also of those who are not yet of the one flock, who also are commended to him in the Lord. Since, like Paul the

of this is the fact that the pope places each bishop in his diocese, and the bishop reigns there only until removed by the pope.

Further, the pope can not only remove any bishop from his diocese at any time, but the pope can also countermand any decision, act or omission of any bishop, at any time. This false conciliar statement about the bishops' authority, further promotes Vatican II's error re dual supreme authority in the Church.

The council's promotion of collegiality is even stronger when one compares the council's statement here (that the bishops are not vicars of the pope, with the statement earlier in this section, emphasizing that the bishops are "vicars of Christ" (which the pope is also).

Apostle, he is debtor to all men, let him be ready to preach the Gospel to all,(174) and to urge his faithful to apostolic and missionary activity. But the faithful must cling to their bishop, as the Church does to Christ, and Jesus Christ to the Father, so that all may be of one mind through unity²⁴⁹,(61*) and abound to the glory of God.(175)

28. Christ, whom the Father has sanctified and sent into the world, (176) has through His apostles, made their successors, the bishops, partakers of His consecration and His mission.(62*) They have legitimately handed on to different individuals in the Church various degrees of participation in this ministry. Thus the divinely established ecclesiastical ministry is exercised on different levels by those who from antiquity have been called bishops, priests and deacons.(63*) Priests, although they do not possess the highest degree of the priesthood, and although they are dependent on the bishops in the exercise of their power, nevertheless they are united with the bishops in sacerdotal dignity.(64*) By the power of the sacrament of Orders,(65*) in the image of Christ the eternal high Priest,(177) they are consecrated to preach the Gospel and shepherd the faithful and to celebrate divine worship²⁵⁰, so that they are true priests of the New Testament.(66*) Partakers of the function of Christ the sole Mediator,(178) on their level of ministry, they announce the divine

²⁴⁹ The council's statement here appears to be backwards, since unity is the effect of being of one mind, rather than its cause. The faithful are united by being of one mind.

²⁵⁰ Protestants would not object to this description that priests have the power to preach, to be shepherds and to celebrate "divine [sic] worship". Protestants claim these same powers for their own ministers. As above, notice the council again gives priority to preaching (as the Protestants do), although preaching is not essential to the priesthood (as is offering the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass).

word to all. They exercise their sacred function especially in the Eucharistic worship or the celebration of the Mass by which acting in the person of Christ (67*) and proclaiming His Mystery they unite the prayers of the faithful with the sacrifice of their Head and renew and apply (68*) in the sacrifice of the Mass until the coming of the Lord(179) the only sacrifice of the New Testament namely that of Christ offering Himself once for all a spotless Victim to the Father.(180) For the sick and the sinners among the faithful, they exercise the ministry of alleviation²⁵¹ and reconciliation²⁵² and they present the needs and the prayers of the faithful to God the Father.(181) Exercising within the limits of their authority the function of Christ as Shepherd and Head,(69*) they gather together God's family as a brotherhood all of one mind,(70*) and lead them in the Spirit, through Christ, to God the Father. In the midst of the flock²⁵³ they adore Him in spirit and in truth.(182) Finally, they labor in word and doctrine,(183) believing what they have read and meditated upon

²⁵¹ This “ministry of alleviation” is a changed terminology which accompanies the change in the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, which was formerly only given to those in actual danger of death, but now is simply the ritual “anointing of the sick”. The council’s fuzzy phrasing here is in terms which Protestants could accept.

²⁵² This “reconciliation” is a conciliar reference to the Sacrament of Penance and here foreshadows the new conciliar theology of reconciliation. The council’s fuzzy phrasing here is in terms which Protestants could accept.

²⁵³ This paragraph gives a very muted treatment of the priest’s authority. For example, here the priest is described as “in” rather than “over” the flock.

in the law of God, teaching what they have believed, and putting in practice in their own lives what they have taught.(71*)

Priests, prudent cooperators with the Episcopal order,(72*) its aid and instrument, called to serve the people²⁵⁴ of God, constitute one priesthood (73*) with their bishop although bound by a diversity of duties²⁵⁵. Associated with their bishop in a spirit of trust and generosity, they make him present in a certain sense in the individual local congregations, and take upon themselves, as far as they are able, his duties and the burden of his care, and discharge them with a daily interest. And as they sanctify and govern under the bishop's authority, that part of the Lord's flock entrusted to them they make the universal Church visible in their own locality and bring an efficacious assistance to the building up of the whole body of Christ.(184) Intent always upon the welfare of God's children, they must strive to lend their effort to the pastoral work of the whole diocese, and even of the entire Church. On account of this sharing in their priesthood and mission, let priests sincerely look upon the bishop as their father and reverently obey him. And let the bishop regard his priests as his co-workers and as sons and friends, just as Christ called His disciples now not servants but friends.(185) All priests, both diocesan and religious, by reason of Orders and ministry, fit into this body of bishops and

²⁵⁴ Although this statement is true when properly understood, it is more emphasis promoting the conciliar novelty of “authority as a service”.

²⁵⁵ In the paragraph above this one, notice the references to priests distinguished by the “function” and here distinguished from bishops by their “diversity of duties”. All of this promotes ecumenism by describing priests and bishops in terms which fit Protestant heresy and the conciliar novelty of “authority as a service”.

priests, and serve the good of the whole Church according to their vocation and the grace given to them.

In virtue of their common sacred ordination and mission, all priests²⁵⁶ are bound together in intimate brotherhood, which naturally and freely manifests itself in mutual aid, spiritual as well as material, pastoral as well as personal, in their meetings and in communion of life, of labor and charity.

Let them, as fathers in Christ, take care of the faithful whom they have begotten by baptism and their teaching.(186) Becoming from the heart a pattern to the flock,(187) let them so lead and serve their local community that it may worthily be called by that name, by which the one and entire people of God is signed, namely, the Church of God.²⁵⁷(188) Let them remember that by their daily life and interests they are showing the face of a truly sacerdotal and pastoral ministry to the faithful and the infidel, to Catholics and non-Catholics, and that to

²⁵⁶ As shown a little higher in this section, the “mission” referred to in this sentence is the bishop’s mission of care for his flock. It is false that all priests are necessarily bound to a bishop’s mission of saving souls, although the bishops themselves are irrevocably bound. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.184, a.8, ad 4 & 5.

²⁵⁷ Again, there is horizontal focus to conciliar statements like this, that the “local community” (which is comprised mostly of laity), is the “Church of God”. While this statement does not deny that the Catholic Church is a monarchy, it omits mention of it. The traditional Catholic maxim is “Where Peter is, there is the Church.” The corresponding horizontal statement fitting with conciliar emphasis would be *where the people are, there is the church.*

all they bear witness to the truth and life, and as good shepherds go after those also,(189) who though baptized in the Catholic Church have fallen away from the use of the sacraments, or even from the faith.

Because this human race today is joining more and more into a civic, economic and social unity, it is that much the more necessary that priests, by combined effort and aid, under the leadership of the bishops and the Supreme Pontiff, wipe out every kind of separateness²⁵⁸, so that the whole human race may be brought into

²⁵⁸ This statement is imprecise, overbroad and specifically identifies three types of diversity among peoples: civic, economic and social.

First of all, to the extent that Vatican II is here calling for wiping out civic “separateness” – *i.e.*, separate nations – by creating a one-world government, that is a novelty which is much more likely to occur in a new world order ruled by the antichrist than it is likely to occur in a one-world government which is subject to Christ the King.

Further, it is an unprecedented novelty to give to priests the job of striving for world civic unity and wiping out the current order of the world’s multiple countries (although it is true that every country must submit to and follow Christ and His Church).

Following the council’s teaching, the conciliar church promotes one-world government. For example, Pope Benedict XVI declared that:

To manage the global economy; to revive economies hit by the crisis; to avoid any deterioration of the present crisis and the greater imbalances that would result; to bring about integral and timely

disarmament, food security and peace; to guarantee the protection of the environment and to regulate migration: for all this, **there is urgent need of a true world political authority....**

Caritas in veritate, ¶67 (emphasis added).

Further, when Vatican II here dedicates all priests to wiping out all economic separateness, that is a task never before given to them by the Catholic Church! The council's fuzzy statement can be taken as calling for wiping out private property (which is a type of economic separateness). This is the agenda of the Church's enemies: the communists, socialists and promoters of liberation theology. But private property is natural to man, is protected by the Church and is based on man's rational nature. As Pope Leo XIII taught:

Catholic wisdom most skillfully provides for public and domestic tranquility, supported by the precepts of divine law, through what it holds and teaches concerning the right of ownership and the distribution of goods which have been obtained for the necessities and uses of life. For when Socialists proclaim the right of property to be a human invention repugnant to the natural equality of man, and, seeking to establish community of goods, think that poverty is by no means to be endured with equanimity; and that the possessions and rights of the rich can be violated with impunity, **the Church, much more properly and practically, recognizes inequality among men, who are naturally different in strength of body and of mind; also in the possession of goods**, and it orders that right of property and of ownership,

which proceeds from nature itself, be for everyone intact and inviolate; for it knows that theft and raping have been forbidden by God, the author and vindicator of every right, in such a way that one may not even look attentively upon [*i.e.*, covet] the property of another, and “that thieves and robbers, no less than adulterers and idolaters are excluded from the kingdom of heaven” [*cf.* 1 Cor. 6:9f.].

Dec. 28, 1878 Encyclical, *Quod Apostolici muneris*, Denz. 1851, (first bracketed comment added to give an alternate translation; bracketed citation in original; bold emphasis added).

The council’s call for wiping out economic separateness can be taken as a call for wiping out poverty. But this is impossible, as our Lord said: “[T]he poor will be always with you, and whensoever you will, you may do them good”. Mark 14:7.

Following St. Basil, St. Thomas Aquinas teaches that it is part of the Divine plan that wealth is distributed unequally in order that some have the opportunity to exercise the virtue of giving alms and being good stewards of material goods, while others have the opportunity to exercise patience in need. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.32, a.5, ad 2.

In any case, it is a revolutionary error to assign priests the duty of correcting this-worldly economic inequality. Instead, priests should work to save souls and promote virtues and the works of mercy. These works of virtue and mercy will have a salutary effect on the distribution of material goods through almsgiving. But the focus should be spiritual, not economic.

Moreover, there are many types of separateness which are good, which here the priests are assigned to wipe out. For example, it is good and natural for people to have their own cultures, music,

the unity of the family of God.

29. At a lower level of the hierarchy are deacons, upon whom hands are imposed "not unto the priesthood, but unto a ministry of service." (74*) For strengthened by sacramental grace, in communion with the bishop and his group of priests they serve in the diaconate of the liturgy, of the word, and of charity to the people of God. It is the duty

language, cuisine, etc. It is unprecedented (as well as foolish) to marshal the priesthood to wipe out such differences.

Whatever the council meant to say, its call to "wipe out every kind of separateness" or otherness of any type is not only impossible (and therefore, foolish to attempt) but is also evil. The very idea of "order" includes within it the concept of priority and of posteriority, and hence, of difference. In fact, that very separateness, *i.e.*, the distinctions among people, is the principle of all social, political, economic, military and religious order, since difference is a principle of order. For example, in a proper military order, an army cannot have all generals or all privates. Quoting Aristotle, St. Thomas Aquinas teaches: "[T]he terms 'before' and 'after' are used in reference to some principle. Now order implies that certain things are, in some way, before or after", showing that there is good "separateness" which should not be wiped out. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q. 26, Art. 1.

Further, the council's statement is not only evil but is also illogical. The reason why the council wants to wipe out "every kind of separateness" is "because this human race today is joining more and more into a civic, economic and social unity". The council's "reasoning" is as logical as saying that, because more and more species of flowers are becoming extinct, it is necessary that we dedicate ourselves to wiping out all remaining species of flowers.

of the deacon, according as it shall have been assigned to him by competent authority, to administer baptism solemnly, to be custodian and dispenser of the Eucharist, to assist at and bless marriages in the name of the Church, to bring Viaticum to the dying, to read the Sacred Scripture to the faithful, to instruct and exhort the people, to preside²⁵⁹ over the worship and prayer of the faithful, to administer sacramentals, to officiate at funeral and burial services. Dedicated to duties of charity and of administration, let deacons be mindful of the admonition of Blessed Polycarp: "Be merciful, diligent, walking according to the truth of the Lord, who became the servant of all."(75*)

Since these duties, so very necessary to the life of the Church, can be fulfilled only with difficulty in many regions in accordance with the discipline of the Latin Church as it exists today, the diaconate can in the future be restored as a proper and permanent rank of the hierarchy.²⁶⁰ It pertains to the competent territorial bodies of

²⁵⁹ The council here emphasizes the broad role of the deacon in regular parish life, as preparation for the married, permanent diaconate promoted in the conciliar church following the council. Notice the element of the cleric as president, presiding over the people of God during "worship". This fits with the conciliar church's shift toward priestless "masses" on Sundays, in some parts of the Church.

²⁶⁰ Under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, the Church long ago moved away from whatever prior practice it might have had in the early Church, of ordaining deacons who were not intended for further ordination to the priesthood. The council here promotes the heresy of antiquarianism, by rejecting the guidance of the Holy Ghost Who ended any such prior practice of a permanent diaconate.

bishops²⁶¹, of one kind or another, with the approval of the Supreme Pontiff, to decide²⁶² whether and where it is opportune for such deacons to be established for the care of souls. With the consent of the Roman Pontiff, this diaconate can, in the future, be conferred upon men of more mature age, even upon those living in the married state.²⁶³ It may also be conferred upon suitable young men, for whom the law of celibacy must remain intact.

²⁶¹ This is a regrettable time bomb and promotes the novelty of standing national councils of bishops, increasing bureaucracy and going far toward trying to change the governing structure of the Church. From antiquity, the Catholic Church has been a monarchy which had individual bishops, in individual dioceses, each responsible for governing his particular diocese, answerable directly to the pope, without any standing, bureaucratic body in between.

²⁶² The council here proposes a particular issue (*viz.*, establishing a permanent diaconate) on which bishops' conferences would have authority over how individual dioceses should be run. This revolutionizes the government of the Church.

²⁶³ Thus, the deacon, married and with a family, does not enter into the life of serving God full-time but as a sort of hobby or part-time job, or full-time job at a family-man's wage. The council's decree blurs in people's minds the difference between priest and layman, with the council promoting the family man with a clerical role.

Moreover, this council decree weakens the Church's requirement of celibacy. After this, throughout the Church, a man can both serve the Church as a cleric and also have a family. This

CHAPTER IV THE LAITY

30. Having set forth the functions²⁶⁴ of the hierarchy, the Sacred Council gladly turns its attention to the state of those faithful called the laity. Everything that has been said above concerning the People of God is intended for the laity, religious and clergy alike²⁶⁵. But there are certain things which pertain in a special way to the laity, both men and women, by reason of their condition and mission. Due to the special circumstances of our time the foundations of this doctrine must be more thoroughly examined. For their pastors know how much the laity contribute to the welfare of the entire Church. They also know that they were not ordained by Christ to take upon themselves alone the entire salvific mission of the Church toward the world. On the contrary they understand that it is their noble duty to shepherd the faithful and to recognize their ministries²⁶⁶ and charisms²⁶⁷, so that

naturally prompts a man to ask why he should not “have both”, rather than make the sacrifice of celibacy.

²⁶⁴ Here is further promotion of the (false) Protestant concept of the “ministry” as a mere function or office.

²⁶⁵ This shows what was said in an annotation to Chapter II above, *viz.*, that the phrase “people of God” is a horizontal phrase, blurring the difference between priests and laymen.

²⁶⁶ The council’s novel characterization here that laymen have “ministries”, serves to blur the distinction between priests and laymen, promoting ecumenism by such statements with which Protestants would agree.

²⁶⁷ With the reference here to “charisms”, which the council calls “extraordinary gifts” in §12 above, the council again plants

all according to their proper roles may cooperate in this common undertaking with one mind. For we must all "practice the truth in love, and so grow up in all things in Him who is head, Christ. For from Him the whole body, being closely joined and knit together through every joint of the system, according to the functioning in due measure of each single part, derives its increase to the building up of itself in love".(190)

31. The term laity is here understood to mean all the faithful except those in holy orders and those in the state of religious life specially approved by the Church. These faithful are by baptism made one body with Christ and are constituted among the People of God; they are in their own way made sharers in the priestly, prophetic, and kingly functions²⁶⁸ of Christ; and they carry out for their own part the mission of the whole Christian people in the Church²⁶⁹ and in the world.

a time bomb which will later explode. The council promotes the un-Catholic, heterodox Charismatic and Pentecostal movements within the Church. The council promotes the error that the Holy Ghost gives gifts now – such as speaking in tongues never learned, as He gave those gifts at the beginning of the Church. This was so contrary to the Church before Vatican II, that the well-known Msgr. Ronald Knox declared only a few years before Vatican II: “To speak in tongues you had never learned was, and is, a recognized symptom in cases of alleged diabolic possession.” *Enthusiasm*, (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1950), p. 551.

²⁶⁸ This is a false statement and a novelty of Vatican II. *See*, the annotations on this subject in §12 above.

²⁶⁹ Because the council asserts that heretics and schismatics are “Christians”, this independent clause contains two errors: 1) it shows that heretics and schismatics are “in the Church”; and

What specifically characterizes the laity is their secular nature. It is true that those in holy orders can at times be engaged in secular activities, and even have a secular profession. But they are by reason of their particular vocation especially and professedly ordained to the sacred ministry. Similarly, by their state in life, religious give splendid and striking testimony that the world cannot be transformed and offered to God without the spirit of the beatitudes. But the laity, by their very vocation, seek the kingdom of God by engaging in temporal affairs and by ordering them according to the plan of God. They live in the world, that is, in each and in all of the secular professions and occupations. They live in the ordinary circumstances of family and social life, from which the very web of their existence is woven. They are called there by God that by exercising their proper function²⁷⁰ and led by the spirit of the Gospel they may work for the sanctification of the world from within as a leaven. In this way they may make Christ known to others, especially by the testimony of a life resplendent in faith, hope and charity. Therefore, since they are tightly bound up in all types of temporal affairs it is their special task to order and to throw light upon these affairs in such a way that they may come into being and then continually increase according to Christ to the praise of the Creator and the Redeemer.

32. By divine institution Holy Church is ordered and governed with a wonderful diversity. "For just as in one body we have many members, yet all the members have not the same function, so we, the many, are

2) it shows that heretics and schismatics have a "mission" to work and spread their errors.

²⁷⁰ Here is more focus on "function", as what distinguishes between laymen and priests. In other words, laymen are those functioning as laymen. Priests are those functioning as priests. This obscures the essential difference caused permanently by the character of ordination.

one body in Christ, but severally members one of another".(191) Therefore, the chosen People of God is one: "one Lord, one faith,²⁷¹ one baptism"(192); sharing a common dignity²⁷² as members from their regeneration in Christ, having the same filial grace and the same vocation to perfection; possessing in common one salvation,²⁷³ one

²⁷¹ Since the council includes heretics and schismatics in the phrase the "People of God", here where the council says they have "one faith", this shows the conciliar error of Eirenism discussed above, minimizing "unimportant" Catholic dogmas and focusing on "what we have in common" with the heretics and schismatics.

²⁷² Given the council's erroneous definition of the phrase "people of God" (see annotations to §8) to include non-Catholics and those Catholics who are not in the state of Sanctifying Grace, the council here again fails to teach Catholic doctrine and fails to distinguish between actual and potential dignity. See the annotations on this subject, in §9 above.

This statement is erroneous in a second way. The council and conciliar church promote a horizontal church, downplaying any difference between priests and laymen. Here the council says that all members of the "People of God" have one "common dignity". But the "People of God" includes bishops, priests and laymen. It follows that bishops, priests and laymen have one "common dignity", ignoring the permanent elevation in dignity possessed by bishops and priests.

²⁷³ This statement is false. The council uses the present tense when it says that all of the "people of God" have "filial grace". But above, the council defines the "people of God" to include those persons without grace, both non-Catholics and those Catholics whose souls are dead in mortal sin.

hope and one undivided charity. There is, therefore, in Christ and in the Church no inequality on the basis of race or nationality, social condition or sex,²⁷⁴ because "there is neither Jew nor Greek: there is neither bond nor free: there is neither male nor female. For you are all 'one' in Christ Jesus" .(193)

Secondly, the council here promotes universal salvation by saying that all of the "people of God" have in common "one salvation" as something they are "possessing", rather than as a goal which they might not reach.

Lastly, the council makes a similar error when it asserts that all of the "people of God" have the theological virtues of Hope and Charity, as if non-Catholics and persons in mortal sin could have those infused theological virtues.

Non-Catholics do not have Charity, for otherwise there would be salvation outside the Catholic Church, since any (hypothetical) non-Catholic with Charity would go to heaven if he died with Charity.

Likewise, mortal sin is incompatible with Charity and so a Catholic in mortal sin cannot have Charity.

²⁷⁴ It is false that there is no inequality based on sex, since it is specifically because they are women that women cannot be called to the priesthood. Further, there are many differences in Church law and doctrine, stemming from difference in sex. For example, St. Thomas Aquinas explains why women, based on their sex, cannot teach the entire Church, but can only teach privately. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.177, a.2, quoting St. Paul. This difference in sex is one reason why the Church traditionally did not have any women Doctors of the Church, although the revolutionary conciliar church now has declared some.

If therefore in the Church everyone does not proceed by the same path, nevertheless all are called to sanctity and have received an equal privilege of faith²⁷⁵ through the justice of God.(194) And if by the will of Christ some are made teachers, pastors and dispensers of mysteries on behalf of others, yet all share a true equality with regard to the dignity²⁷⁶ and to the activity common to all the faithful for the building up of the Body of Christ. For the distinction which the Lord made between sacred ministers and the rest of the People of God bears within it a certain union, since pastors and the other faithful are bound to each other by a mutual need. Pastors of the Church, following the example of the Lord, should minister to one another and to the other faithful²⁷⁷. These in their turn should enthusiastically lend

²⁷⁵ Where the council says that “all ... in the Church ... are called to sanctity and have received an equal privilege of faith”, the council is using the false, overly broad definition of the Church, which it sets forth above. This promotes universal salvation by viewing as equal the supernatural gift of Faith possessed by Catholics, and the (false) natural, human faith of non-Catholics. See the annotations to §4 above.

²⁷⁶ As shown above, the council erroneously defines the term “faithful” to include non-Catholics and also Catholics who do not have Sanctifying Grace. Thus, the council here again fails to make the Catholic distinction between actual and potential dignity. See the annotations to §9 above.

Even aside from the council’s erroneous inclusion of persons without Sanctifying Grace in the group of persons with dignity, the council’s statement is also erroneous because it promotes collegiality by blurring the distinction between priests and laymen, by saying that they all have “true equality” of dignity.

²⁷⁷ Here, priests are included among the “faithful”. Above and below, there are other places where the council calls priests part

their joint assistance to their pastors and teachers. Thus in their diversity all bear witness to the wonderful unity in the Body of Christ. This very diversity of graces, ministries and works gathers the children of God into one, because "all these things are the work of one and the same Spirit".(195)

Therefore, from divine choice the laity have Christ for their brother who though He is the Lord of all, came not to be served but to serve.(196) They also have for their brothers those in the sacred ministry who by teaching, by sanctifying and by ruling with the authority of Christ feed the family of God so that the new commandment of charity may be fulfilled by all. St. Augustine puts this very beautifully when he says: "What I am for you terrifies me; what I am with you consoles me. For you I am a bishop; but with you I am a Christian. The former is a duty; the latter a grace. The former is a danger; the latter, salvation" (1*).

33. The laity are gathered together in the People of God and make up the Body of Christ²⁷⁸ under one head. Whoever they are, they are

of the "faithful". For example, right above this place, the council refers to "pastors and the other faithful".

On the other hand, the council inconsistently speaks as if priests and bishops were not members of the "faithful". For example, the council refers separately to "both pastors and faithful" (§22 above) and talks "of both the bishops and of the faithful" (§23 above).

²⁷⁸ This statement that "[t]he laity ... make up the Body of Christ" is overbroad, and seems to exclude the bishops, priests, other clerics and religious. This same statement is false also as indicating that the schismatics and heretics who are included in

called upon, as living²⁷⁹ members, to expend all their energy for the growth of the Church and its continuous sanctification, since this very energy is a gift of the Creator and a blessing of the Redeemer.²⁸⁰

The lay apostolate, however, is a participation in the salvific mission of the Church itself. Through their baptism and confirmation all are commissioned to that apostolate by the Lord Himself. Moreover, by the sacraments, especially holy Eucharist, that charity toward God and man which is the soul of the apostolate is communicated and nourished. Now the laity are called in a special way to make the Church present and operative in those places and circumstances where only through them can it become the salt of the earth (2*). Thus every layman, in virtue of the very gifts bestowed upon him, is at

the phrase “People of God” are included in the [Mystical] Body of Christ.

²⁷⁹ Sanctifying Grace is the life of the soul, as shown above. But the council here says that all laymen are “called upon, as living members”. But not all the laity (as defined by the council) have Sanctifying Grace – neither the non-Catholics nor Catholics in mortal sin. Thus, it is wrong and promotes universal salvation and ecumenism for the council to call all of them “living members”.

²⁸⁰ This “energy” is apparently a reference to a natural good, hence the council says that it is a gift of the Creator. However, this energy would not be “a blessing of the Redeemer” as such, since the words “blessing” and “Redeemer” refer to supernatural goods and to the supernatural order. As quoted above, Pope Pius XI identified the confusion of the natural with the supernatural, as one of the most common errors of the modernists. *Studiorum Ducem*, ¶27.

the same time a witness and a living instrument of the mission of the Church itself "according to the measure of Christ's bestowal".(197)

Besides this apostolate which certainly pertains to all Christians²⁸¹, the laity can also be called in various ways to a more direct form of cooperation in the apostolate of the Hierarchy (3*). This was the way certain men and women assisted Paul the Apostle in the Gospel, laboring much in the Lord.(198) Further, they have the capacity to assume from the Hierarchy certain ecclesiastical functions²⁸², which are to be performed for a spiritual purpose.

Upon all the laity, therefore, rests the noble duty of working to extend the divine plan of salvation to all men of each epoch and in every land. Consequently, may every opportunity be given them so that, according to their abilities and the needs of the times, they may zealously participate in the saving work of the Church.

²⁸¹ Because the council includes heretics and schismatics among "Christians", the council wrongly includes heretics and schismatics here, among the witnesses for Christ.

²⁸² In vague language subject to interpretation after the council, the council here promotes the idea of laymen assuming unspecified "ecclesiastical functions". The conciliar church has followed the council's teaching here by instituting lay lectors at Mass, "lay Eucharistic ministers", and many other such novelties.

Further, the council's statement here attacks the Catholic mind. For the council distinguishes between priests and laymen by "function" and then promotes giving them similar functions. The actual result seen in the conciliar church is the widespread conviction among Catholics that there is no real difference between priests and laymen, other than function.

34. The supreme and eternal Priest, Christ Jesus, since he wills to continue his witness and service also through the laity, vivifies them in this Spirit and increasingly²⁸³ urges them on to every good and perfect work.

For besides intimately linking them to His life and His mission, He also gives them a sharing in His priestly function²⁸⁴ of offering spiritual worship for the glory of God and the salvation of men. For this reason the laity, dedicated to Christ and anointed by the Holy Spirit, are marvelously called and wonderfully prepared²⁸⁵ so that ever more

²⁸³ There is no explanation here and no apparent theological or logical reason why our Lord's Will to use the laity for His work would cause Him to "increasingly" urge them, rather than to always urge them at the same high level.

²⁸⁴ The "priesthood" of the layman is simply to be a (lay) member of Christ's Mystical Body. However, this statement continues the council's excessive and misleading emphasis of the "priesthood" of the layman, which excessiveness is plain in the bad post-conciliar fruits of blurring the distinction between priest and laymen. See, e.g., appendix 3 to the document located here: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/15270936/Doubtfulness-of-New-Catholic-Ordination-Rite>.

²⁸⁵ Because the council uses a broad definition of "faithful", to include heretics and schismatics, this statement is false, *viz.*, that all heretics and schismatics are "called" and "prepared" by the Holy Ghost, Who prepares men with His Sanctifying Grace and infused virtues, especially theological virtues (which come to a soul with Sanctifying Grace). This error of the council flows from its error a little above, when the council says that all laymen are living members.

abundant fruits of the Spirit may be produced in them. For all their works, prayers and apostolic endeavors, their ordinary married and family life, their daily occupations, their physical and mental relaxation, if carried out in the Spirit, and even the hardships of life, if patiently borne—all these become "spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ".(199) Together with the offering of the Lord's body, they are most fittingly offered in the celebration of the Eucharist. Thus, as those everywhere who adore in holy activity, the laity consecrate the world itself to God.

35. Christ, the great Prophet, who proclaimed the Kingdom of His Father both by the testimony of His life and the power of His words, continually²⁸⁶ fulfills His prophetic office until the complete

Even with respect to Catholics only, the council is wrong to say that all laymen “are” (using the present tense) “prepared”, thereby implying they are currently in the state of Sanctifying Grace. This error too, flows from the council’s error a little above, where the council says that all laymen “are” (using the present tense) living members.

Regarding Catholics who are in the state of Sanctifying Grace, that Sanctifying Grace (and infused virtues which come with this grace) is the preparation. However, the council does not state this Catholic teaching because the council’s ecumenical goals would not be advanced by mention of Catholic doctrines denied by the heretics.

²⁸⁶ This is not the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church! Whatever the council means by Christ continually fulfilling a prophetic office, He no longer prophesizes. St. Thomas teaches that Christ could prophesize while living on earth but no longer can prophesize, because previously: “Christ was at the same time comprehensor [*i.e.*, beholder of the Beatific Vision] and a wayfarer. Consequently, the notion of prophecy is not applicable

manifestation of glory. He does this not only through the hierarchy who teach²⁸⁷ in His name and with His authority, but also through the laity²⁸⁸ whom He made His witnesses and to whom He gave understanding of the faith (*sensu fidei*) and an attractiveness in speech²⁸⁹ (200) so that the power of the Gospel might shine forth in their daily social and family life. They conduct themselves as children of the promise, and thus strong in faith and in hope they make the most of the present, (201) and with patience await the glory that is to come.²⁹⁰ (202) Let them not, then, hide this hope in the depths of their

to Him as a comprehensor, but only as a wayfarer.” *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.174, a.5, ad 3. But Christ is no longer a wayfarer; thus, He no longer prophesizes.

²⁸⁷ This is not the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church! The council confuses the gift of prophesy, which is an unusual, transitory gift [*Summa*, IIa IIae, Q. 171, a. 2] given only to a few, with the duty given to all of the hierarchy (and to some priests and laymen) of teaching the Divinely revealed Faith. See, St. Thomas Aquinas’ treatment of the gift of prophesy, contained in his treatise on *Acts Which Pertain to Certain Men*, *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q. 171-173.

²⁸⁸ This is a novelty of Vatican II. The Catholic Church has not traditionally taught that laymen’s good example and holiness of life is prophesy.

²⁸⁹ The council seems to imply that the gift of “attractiveness in speech” is given to all laymen. However, just as attractiveness of speech as a natural gift is only given to certain men, likewise, the supernatural gift of “attractiveness in speech” is only given some certain men. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.177, a.1.

²⁹⁰ This statement falsely makes it sound as if all of the laity always conduct themselves virtuously. This statement also

hearts, but even in the program of their secular life let them express it by a continual conversion²⁹¹ and by wrestling "against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual forces of wickedness.(203)

Just as the sacraments of the New Law, by which the life and the apostolate of the faithful are nourished, prefigure a new heaven and a new earth,(204) so too the laity go forth as powerful proclaimers of a faith in things to be hoped for,(205) when they courageously join to

promotes universal salvation by falsely making it sound as if all laymen will certainly save their souls. This is part of the deliberate (and false) optimism which Pope Paul VI explained to characterize the council. *See*, the annotations to §1 above.

²⁹¹ This is not a traditional teaching of the Church, but is a conciliar novelty promoting ecumenism, by making "conversion" something for everyone to do, and not a definitive act for non-Catholics. Further, this new conciliar doctrine of continual conversion, promotes the revolutionary doctrine of continual "progress". *See*, the annotations above, to §8.

Traditionally, "conversion" was a definitive act of religion. As the 1913 Catholic Encyclopedia explains:

In the Middle Ages the word *conversion* was often used in the sense of forsaking the world to enter the religious state. Thus, St. Bernard speaks of his conversion. The return of the sinner to a life of virtue is also called a conversion. **More commonly do we speak of the conversion of an infidel to the true religion, and most commonly of the conversion of a schismatic or heretic to the Catholic Church.**

1913 Catholic Encyclopedia, under the heading *Conversion*.

their profession of faith a life springing from faith. This evangelization, that is, this announcing of Christ by a living testimony as well as by the spoken word, takes on a specific quality and a special force in that it is carried out in the ordinary surroundings of the world.²⁹²

In connection with the prophetic function²⁹³ is that state of life which is sanctified by a special sacrament obviously of great importance, namely, married and family life.²⁹⁴ For where Christianity pervades the entire mode of family life, and gradually transforms it²⁹⁵, one will

²⁹² As in countless other statements, the council's words are nearly meaningless. Is it not true that any "evangelization", by anyone, anywhere, under any circumstances, can be said to have "a specific quality and a special force", as the council says here with reference to laymen? Is any quality not "specific"? Is any force not "special"? And, in the next sentence: is any Sacrament not "special"? Is any Sacrament not "of great importance"?

²⁹³ Again the council blurs Faith and prophesy and asserts the novelty that a Catholic living his Faith is a prophet, *i.e.*, exercises a "prophetic function". Pope John Paul II identified this conciliar teaching as a novelty in *Sacrae Disciplinae Leges*.

²⁹⁴ It is a novelty unsupported by the traditional Catholic understanding of what a Sacrament is, to call "married and family life" a Sacrament. In fact, neither of them are Sacraments but rather the marriage itself is. As explained above, the council makes the grave error here of mistaking the species for the genus, calling all signs indiscriminately by the name of a very particular sign, *viz.*, a Catholic Sacrament. This error promotes ecumenism, as explained above. See, the annotations to §1.

²⁹⁵ It is an apparent contradiction, to both say that Catholicism "pervades the entire mode of family life" and also

find there both the practice and an excellent school of the lay apostolate. In such a home husbands and wives find their proper vocation in being witnesses of the faith and love of Christ to one another and to their children. The Christian family loudly proclaims both the present virtues of the Kingdom of God and the hope of a blessed life to come. Thus by its example and its witness it accuses the world of sin and enlightens those who seek the truth.

Consequently, even when preoccupied with temporal cares, the laity can and must perform a work of great value for the evangelization of the world. For even if some of them have to fulfill their religious duties on their own, when there are no sacred ministers or in times of persecution; and even if many of them devote all their energies to apostolic work; still it remains for each one of them to cooperate in the external spread and the dynamic growth of the Kingdom of Christ in the world. Therefore, let the laity devotedly strive to acquire a more profound grasp of revealed truth, and let them insistently beg of God the gift of wisdom.

36. Christ, becoming obedient even unto death and because of this exalted by the Father,(206) entered into the glory of His kingdom. To Him all things are made subject until He subjects Himself and all created things to the Father that God may be all in all.(207) Now Christ has communicated this royal power to His disciples that they might be

that this life is still being gradually transformed. If there is a gradual improvement or transformation, this would only be needed because that family life was not entirely pervaded by Catholicism already.

Further, because the council (over-broadly) defines “Christianity” to include heretics and schismatics, the council is here praising even family life which is entirely pervaded by Protestantism, which permits divorce, artificial contraception, *etc.*

constituted in royal freedom and that by true penance and a holy life they might conquer the reign of sin in themselves.(208) Further, He has shared this power so that serving Christ in their fellow men they might by humility and patience lead their brethren to that King for whom to serve is to reign. But the Lord wishes to spread His kingdom also by means of the laity, namely, a kingdom of truth and life, a kingdom of holiness and grace, a kingdom of justice, love and peace (4*). In this kingdom creation itself will be delivered from its slavery to corruption into the freedom of the glory of the sons of God.(209) Clearly then a great promise and a great trust is committed to the disciples: "All things are yours, and you are Christ's, and Christ is God's".(210)

The faithful, therefore, must learn the deepest meaning and the value of all creation,²⁹⁶ as well as its role in the harmonious praise of God.

²⁹⁶ In this statement, the council returns to its excessive focus on this world and material concerns. The council tells us of the “deepest meaning and value of all creation”. In stark contrast, St. John the Evangelist warned us: “Love not the world, nor the things which are in the world. If any man loves the world, the charity of the Father is not in him.” 1 John 2:15.

The council’s teaching (in this paragraph) continues with further unseemly focus on material goods. The council considers it important to make sure that laymen don’t forget to “vigorously contribute” to perfecting material goods with their job skills.

St. Ignatius of Loyola had a completely different focus, explaining the Church’s traditional teaching as follows:

Man is created to praise, reverence and serve God our Lord, and by this means to save his soul. And the other things on the face of the earth are created

They must assist each other to live holier lives even in their daily occupations. In this way the world may be permeated by the spirit of Christ and it may more effectively fulfill its purpose in justice, charity and peace.²⁹⁷ The laity have the principal role in the overall fulfillment

for man and that they might help him in prosecuting the end for which he is created. From this it follows that man is to use them as much as they help him on to his end, and ought to rid himself of them so far as they hinder him as to it.

For this **it is necessary to make ourselves indifferent to all created things in all that is allowed to the choice of our free will** and is not prohibited to it; so that, on our part, we want not health rather than sickness, riches rather than poverty, honor rather than dishonor, long rather than short life, and so in all the rest; desiring and choosing only what is most conducive for us to the end for which we are created.

Spiritual Exercises, Principle and Foundation (emphasis added).

St. Thomas teaches that:

[T]emporal goods that accrue to those who are unworthy, are so disposed according to God's just ordinance, either for the correction of those men, or for their condemnation, and such goods **are as nothing in comparison with the goods to come, which are prepared for good men.**

Summa, IIa IIae, Q.36, a.2, *Respondeo*.

²⁹⁷ It is a novelty for the council to concern itself with fulfilling the purpose of the world in justice, charity and peace. Rather,

of this duty. Therefore, by their competence in secular training and by their activity, elevated from within by the grace of Christ, let them vigorously contribute their effort, so that created goods may be perfected by human labor, technical skill and civic culture²⁹⁸ for the

being imbued with justice, charity and peace belongs to the Church.

The Catholic Church refers to the “world” in three ways, all of them negative. One refers to the temptations of temporal life, and in this respect the Church refers to the causes of sin being “the world, the flesh and the devil”.

The second way in which the Church refers to the “world” is as an enemy of Christ, concerning which St. James warns us: “[K]now you not that the friendship of this world is the enemy of God? Whosoever therefore will be a friend of this world becometh an enemy of God”. James 4:4.

Third, the Church refers to the “world”, meaning the lost sheep outside the Catholic Church. These lost sheep can only be saved by ceasing to be the “world”, by entering the Catholic Church. It is in this third sense that St. John says that “God so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son”. John 3:16. In none of these senses does the Church seek to help the world “fulfill its purpose in justice, charity and peace”.

²⁹⁸ This is a purely natural focus, including the council’s reference to “civic culture”. Here is the purely humanistic view of “culture” which the council promotes:

The word “culture” in its general sense indicates everything whereby man develops and perfects his many bodily and spiritual qualities; he strives by his knowledge and his labor, to bring the world

benefit of all men²⁹⁹ according to the design of the Creator and the light of His Word. May the goods of this world be more equitably distributed among all men,³⁰⁰ and may they in their own way be

itself under his control. He renders social life more human both in the family and the civic community, through improvement of customs and institutions. Throughout the course of time he expresses, communicates and conserves in his works, great spiritual experiences and desires, that they might be of advantage to the progress of many, even of the whole human family.

Gaudium et spes, §53.

There is nothing essentially supernatural about these phrases, not to mention the absence of any mention of the True Catholic Religion. For example, the natural truths known in the intellect because they are immaterial, are among man's "spiritual qualities" and "spiritual experiences".

²⁹⁹ The council here focuses on competence in secular training to perfect created goods by natural means for the benefit of all men. There is an emphasis on material progress and there is no specific reference to the supernatural here. This is a Masonic focus and a utopian dream. See, the annotations to §1 above.

³⁰⁰ The Catholic Church has always advocated charity and almsgiving, but never advocated involuntary wealth redistribution. The language used here, calling for "more equitable distribution among all men" of "the goods of this world", would seem to call for compulsion (as do liberation theology, socialism and Marxism), rather than calling for almsgiving, as does Catholicism. This is true because the council's emphasis is on more equal distribution among all men, rather than emphasizing individual almsgiving.

Pope Benedict XVI appears to promote this compulsory income redistribution, in his call for a one-world government:

To manage the global economy; to revive economies hit by the crisis; to avoid any deterioration of the present crisis and the greater imbalances that would result; to bring about integral and timely disarmament, food security and peace; to guarantee the protection of the environment and to regulate migration: for all this, there is urgent need of a true world political authority ...

Caritas in Veritate, ¶67.

St. Thomas Aquinas gives the traditional teaching of the Church, strongly advocating individual charity and almsgiving: "It is the hungry man's bread that you withhold, the naked man's cloak that you store away, the money that you bury in the earth is the price of the poor man's ransom and freedom." *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.66, a.7, *Respondeo*, quoting St. Ambrose. Note that St. Thomas and St. Ambrose tell "**you**" (the reader) of your duty to (voluntarily) give alms. By contrast, Marxism, liberation theology and the council rail against *the system* of unequal wealth rather than focus on individual almsgiving.

Far from advocating involuntary wealth re-distribution, St. Thomas Aquinas shows that the order in God's plan does not involve economic equality: "Why are you rich while another is poor, unless it be that you may have the merit of a good stewardship, and he the reward of patience?" *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.66, a.2, ad 2. quoting St. Basil (Hom. in Luc. xii, 18).

conducive to universal progress in human and Christian freedom.³⁰¹ In this manner, through the members of the Church, will Christ

³⁰¹ The council states: “May the goods of this world ... in their own way be conducive to universal progress in human and Christian freedom”. The council elaborates on this freedom elsewhere: “The Church ... proclaims the rights of man; she ... greatly esteems the dynamic movements of today by which these rights are everywhere fostered.” *Gaudium et Spes*, §41.

Just as the council is excessively focused on this-worldly matters and material goods, so the council also is excessively focused on the rights of man, which is also the focus of the Freemasons. How different is the traditional teaching of the Church! For example, Pope Leo XIII declared: “[T]he world has heard enough of the so-called ‘rights of man’. Let it hear something of the rights of God.” *Tametsi Futura*, §13.

Contrasting to the council’s focus on “the goods of this world” promoting freedom, the traditional Catholic focus was on the true cause of freedom, our Lord Jesus Christ, Who proclaimed that He is the Truth [John 14:6] and “the Truth will make you free”. John 8:32.

The traditional teaching of the Church is that true freedom is being unimpeded in serving the true God in His true Catholic Church. This is accomplished through sanctifying oneself by living the true Catholic Faith and the Catholic Sacramental life.

But this is not what the council means. Instead, the council means what the Masons mean, the liberty (or license) to do what you want, as long as the public order is maintained. Regarding religious liberty to practice false religions, the council taught: “[N]or is anyone to be restrained from acting in accordance with his own beliefs, whether privately **or publicly**, whether alone **or in association with others**....” *Documents of Vatican II*,

progressively illumine the whole of human society³⁰² with His saving light.

Moreover, let the laity also by their combined efforts remedy the customs and conditions of the world, if they are an inducement to sin, so that they all may be conformed to the norms of justice and may

Fr. Abbott (General Editor), *Dignitatis Humanae*, pp. 679-80 (emphasis added).

The council teaches that this religious liberty “continues to exist even in those who do not live up to their obligation of seeking the truth and adhering to it.” *Id.* The council does say that religious liberty has “due limits” but makes clear that these limits concern peace and safety: “[N]or is the exercise of this right to be impeded, provided that the just requirements of public order are observed.” *Id.*

The council’s teaching is substantially identical to the Masonic Article 10 of the French Revolution’s 1789 *Declaration of the Rights of Man*: “No one can be molested for his opinions, even for his religious opinions, provided their manifestation does not trouble the public order established by law.”

³⁰² In this paragraph, the council states its desire for wealth re-distribution and desires that this re-distribution will promote (false) freedom for men. The council then illogically says that this freedom will, in turn, cause Christ to “progressively illumine the whole of human society”. In fact, freedom for error, or license, such as is promoted by the council and by the Masons, destroys true freedom, as the popes have continually warned. See, the lengthy catalogue of Church condemnations of religious liberty for error, at <http://www.scribd.com/doc/46116957/Social-Kingship-of-Our-Lord>.

favor the practice of virtue rather than hinder it. By so doing they will imbue culture and human activity with genuine moral values; they will better prepare the field of the world for the seed of the Word of God; and at the same time they will open wider the doors of the Church by which the message of peace may enter the world.³⁰³

Because of the very economy of salvation the faithful should learn how to distinguish carefully between those rights and duties which are theirs as members of the Church³⁰⁴, and those which they have as members of human society. Let them strive to reconcile³⁰⁵ the two, remembering that in every temporal affair they must be guided by a

³⁰³ Here the council enlists the laity to work for social justice and natural virtue, to prepare the world for “the Word of God” and “the message of peace”. The council’s statement here could be approved by any heretical (or schismatic) sect. In the context of Vatican II and the conciliar church, this is a promotion of ecumenism and a pan-religion of peace.

³⁰⁴ As shown above, the council’s expression “faithful ... of the Church” is not limited to Catholics, but means more broadly those who have some type of “faith”, as members of the broader “Church of Christ”. See, annotations to §8 above. That is also why this paragraph uses the word “Christian”, instead of “Catholic”.

³⁰⁵ It is impossible for there to be any true need to reconcile a man’s rights and duties as a Catholic with his rights and duties as a man or as a citizen. For in the virtue of obedience, there is a hierarchy of duties because there is a hierarchy of superiors. “We ought to obey God, rather than men.” Acts, 5:29. There can be no true right or duty to sin or to follow a lower authority, in disobedience to a higher authority.

Christian conscience³⁰⁶, since even in secular business there is no human activity which can be withdrawn from God's dominion. In our own time, however, it is most urgent that this distinction and also this harmony should shine forth more clearly than ever in the lives of the faithful,³⁰⁷ so that the mission of the Church may correspond more fully to the special conditions of the world today. For it must be admitted that the temporal sphere is governed by its own principles,³⁰⁸ since it is rightly concerned with the interests of this

³⁰⁶ Here is the grave omission of any reference to being guided by the teaching authority of the Catholic Church. Any Protestant could accept the council's statement here because Protestants accept the concept of conscience but don't recognize the binding character of an infallible teaching Church. The council's grave omission here, promotes ecumenism.

³⁰⁷ It is baffling why the council would say that "it is most urgent that this distinction [between Catholic and secular rights/duties] ... should shine forth more clearly than ever in the lives of the faithful." Why isn't there always an equal (and great) need for this distinction, in every age?

So the council seems to say here that it is somehow important for a person to remember that, in a particular secular pursuit, "I am acting as a citizen, not as a Christian" (or *vice versa*), yet he must at all times "be guided by a Christian conscience" anyway. This confused way of looking at life is quite different from the traditional Catholic teaching that, at all times, a man should act as a Catholic man!

³⁰⁸ This statement is false. The council apparently approves of "the temporal sphere [being] governed by its own principles" because the council says that the temporal sphere is "rightly concerned with the interests of this world." However, it is the duty of all men and their civil governments to always make their

world. But that ominous doctrine which attempts to build a society with no regard whatever for religion,³⁰⁹ and which attacks and

decisions and conduct their activities so as to further their end of eternal beatitude in heaven. St. Thomas Aquinas, *On Kingship* Bk.1, ch.15. Thus, all men and all civil governments must conduct their activities according to principles that give all priority to spiritual and eternal goods and interests. So all men and their governments must order all of their actions to their supernatural end, and they must not be governed by separate, merely temporal principles. Even use of material goods is governed by our eternal goal, as St. Ignatius of Loyola shows in the *Principle and Foundation* of the Ignatian Exercises, quoted above.

³⁰⁹ This is another paragraph which serves to promote pan-“Christianity” or even a universal religion, with no mention made of the one, true Catholic Faith, without which it is impossible to please God or save one’s soul. This fits with the conciliar popes’ constant promotion of the importance of believing *something* and having *some type* of religion or faith. It is the opposite of the pre-Vatican II popes’ constant solicitude for bringing the lost sheep into the Catholic fold so that they can save their souls!

Because it is a grave offence against God to practice or promote any “religion” but the one true Catholic religion, it is the duty of all men (individually and collectively) to not only avoid having any positive “regard” for any other “religion”, but to do what they practically can, under the circumstances that exist, to suppress or discourage all non-Catholic “religions”. See, the catalogue of Catholic teaching on this, posted at <http://www.scribd.com/doc/46116957/Social-Kingship-of-Our-Lord>.

destroys the religious liberty³¹⁰ of its citizens, is rightly to be rejected (5*).

37. The laity have the right, as do all Christians³¹¹, to receive in abundance from their spiritual shepherds the spiritual goods of the Church, especially the assistance of the word of God and of the sacraments (6*). They should openly reveal to them their needs and desires with that freedom and confidence which is fitting for children of God and brothers in Christ. They are, by reason of the knowledge, competence or outstanding ability which they may enjoy, permitted and sometimes even obliged to express their opinion on those things which concern the good of the Church (7*). When occasions arise, let this be done through the organs erected by the Church for this purpose. Let it always be done in truth, in courage and in prudence, with reverence and charity toward those who by reason of their sacred office represent the person of Christ.

The laity should, as all Christians, promptly accept in Christian obedience decisions of their spiritual shepherds, since they are representatives of Christ as well as teachers and rulers in the Church.

³¹⁰ The council is promoting here a false, naturalistic religious liberty which is founded on Masonic humanism and which is a denial of the Truth. As the Vatican's Permanent Observer to the United Nations in Geneva, Archbishop Silvano Tomasi, declared on September 13, 2012: "We stand for religious freedom so as to free others to become fully human".
http://en.radiovaticana.va/news/2012/09/13/vatican:_we_stand_for_religious_liberty/en1-620645.

³¹¹ Notice all of these following paragraphs (as is generally true of the council's documents) contains nothing with which the Protestants could not agree.

Let them follow the example of Christ, who by His obedience even unto death, opened to all men the blessed way of the liberty of the children of God. Nor should they omit to pray for those placed over them, for they keep watch as having to render an account of their souls, so that they may do this with joy and not with grief.(211)

Let the spiritual shepherds recognize and promote the dignity as well as the responsibility of the laity in the Church. Let them willingly employ their prudent advice. Let them confidently assign duties to them in the service of the Church, allowing them freedom and room for action. Further, let them encourage lay people so that they may undertake tasks on their own initiative. Attentively in Christ, let them consider with fatherly love the projects, suggestions and desires proposed by the laity.(8*) However, let the shepherds respectfully acknowledge that just freedom which belongs to everyone in this earthly city.³¹²

A great many wonderful things are to be hoped for from this familiar dialogue between the laity and their spiritual leaders: in the laity a strengthened sense of personal responsibility; a renewed enthusiasm;

³¹² As is true with virtually all of the council's statements which are not clearly false, they possess the wrong "flavor", susceptible to mischievous use. For example, these statements about the interaction of laymen and the hierarchy, have the "flavor" of admonishing the hierarchy to "go easy" using their authority. The spirit of that admonition has done much harm in the conciliar church. It has caused the hierarchy to doubt or deny their authority and their strict duty to use their authority.

Among the fruits of the conciliar teachings here are the explosion of ecclesiastical bureaucracy, the erosion of the priest's authority, through the parish council, the erosion of the bishop's authority, through the many diocesan councils, *etc.*

a more ready application of their talents to the projects of their spiritual leaders. The latter, on the other hand, aided by the experience of the laity, can more clearly and more incisively come to decisions regarding both spiritual and temporal matters. In this way, the whole Church, strengthened by each one of its members, may more effectively fulfill its mission for the life of the world.

38. Each individual layman must stand before the world as a witness to the resurrection and life of the Lord Jesus and a symbol of the living God. All the laity as a community and each one according to his ability must nourish the world³¹³ with spiritual fruits.(212) They must diffuse

³¹³ This phrasing and the council's entire outlook on the world, is a novelty. Vatican II and the conciliar church consider the world to be good **as is, without conversion to the Catholic religion**. Pope Paul VI proclaimed that the Council caused the Church to “substantially” change Her “judgment and approach to the world”. See, his 3-5-69 Audience.

Vatican II and the conciliar church view the world **without conversion to the Catholic religion**, as worthy of honor: “[W]e, more than any others, honor mankind”. Pope Paul VI, December 7, 1965 discourse closing of Vatican II.

The Vatican II church holds that the “human race today is joining more and more into a ... unity” [*Lumen Gentium* §28] and that “the Son of God has united Himself in some fashion with every man”. *Gaudium et spes*, §22. “[M]an ... is the only creature on earth which God willed for itself”. *Gaudium et spes*, §24. Thus, “all things on earth should be related to man as their center and crown.” *Gaudium et spes* §12. Thus, “the temporal sphere is ... rightly ... governed by its own principles”, [*Lumen Gentium* §28] and not by specifically Catholic principles.

At the end of the council, Pope Paul VI told the world that the council sent “a wave of affection and admiration” to “the modern world of humanity” and that Vatican II “not only respected, but honored ... [t]he modern world’s values”. See, his 12-7-65 speech.

The conciliar church holds that all men: schismatics, heretics, Jews, Muslims and heathens, can all save their souls without becoming Catholic. As Pope Benedict XVI explained in 2005: “[T]his unity ... of the disciples of Christ ... does not mean what could be called ecumenism of the return: that is, to deny and to reject one’s own faith history. Absolutely not!” Address to the Ecumenical Meeting, Cologne, August 19, 2005.
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2005/august/documents/hf_ben-xvi_spe_20050819_ecumenical-meeting_en.html.

In the conciliar church, “the Jews should not be presented as repudiated or cursed by God”. *Nostra Aetate* §4. “The Catholic Church neither conducts nor supports any specific institutional mission work directed toward the Jews,” Catholic News Service, quoting Cardinal Kurt Koch, president of the Pontifical Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews and a member of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith
<http://www.catholicnews.com/data/stories/cns/1202023.htm>.

Pope John Paul II indicated the goodness of Islam when he proclaimed: “May Saint John Baptist protect Islam” on May 21, 2000.
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/travels/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_20000321_wadi-al-kharrar_en.html

There is no attempt to convert heretics and, in 2009, the Vatican “denied it was poaching converts in the Anglican pond.” 11-22-09 *Associated Press* report: *Vatican, Anglicans pledge to*

in the world that spirit which animates the poor,³¹⁴ the meek, the peace makers—whom the Lord in the Gospel proclaimed as

strengthen ties at http://articles.boston.com/2009-11-22/news/29260993_1_anglicans-archbishop-rowan-williams-vatican-city.

In the conciliar church, religious unity now means “neither absorption nor fusion”. Pope John Paul II, 2-26-84 allocution in the Basilica St. Nicolas of Bari.

The traditional teaching of the Catholic Church was the opposite! Catholics sought to bring each man into the Church. But Catholics would not “nourish the world”. As our Lord told us: “If the world hates you, know ye, that it hath hated Me before you. If you had been of the world, the world would love its own: but because you are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.” John 15: 18-19. Catholics were and are required to be a contradiction to the world and to oppose the world, although we must help lost sheep (non-Catholics) to find and enter the one, true Sheepfold.

³¹⁴ This statement should refer to the “poor in spirit”, not simply to the “poor” for two reasons: 1) this both would be more faithful to the text cited by the council in endnote #213 (*viz.*, Matt. 5:3-9); and 2) because poverty of spirit is a virtue but poverty, simply speaking, is not a virtue, but is only a circumstance disposing a man to certain virtues, including poverty of spirit and humility. As St. Thomas explains:

[Poverty] may be considered in two ways. First, as being actual: and thus it is not essential, but a means, to perfection, as stated above. Hence nothing hinders the state of perfection from being without renunciation of one's possessions, and the

blessed.(213) In a word, "Christians must be to the world what the soul is to the body."³¹⁵(9*)

CHAPTER V

THE UNIVERSAL CALL TO HOLINESS IN THE CHURCH

same applies to other outward practices. Secondly, it may be considered in relation to one's preparedness, in the sense of being prepared to renounce or give away all: and this belongs directly to perfection.

Summa, IIa IIae, Q.184, a.7, ad 1.

³¹⁵ This is a misplaced and inaccurate metaphor. The Catholic can be a good example and an instrumental cause in a non-Catholic's conversion and coming to holiness. St. John Chrysostom says this in his sermon which is not quoted but which is cited in the (later-added) footnote #9. However, the Catholic is in no way the form of the body (which is the world, in this analogy).

The Holy Ghost is sometimes metaphorically said to be the "Soul" of the Mystical Body of Christ because the Holy Ghost, by His sanctifying and indwelling in those who have Sanctifying Grace, can be said to unify and make the Church what it is, *viz.*, one, unified Mystical Body. This is not true of Catholics with respect to the world. Catholics seek to bring people from the world into the unity of the Catholic Church. Catholics do not seek the unity of the world in a (Masonic) brotherhood of all men, which the council promotes here.

39. The Church, whose mystery is being set forth by this Sacred Synod, is believed to be³¹⁶ indefectibly holy. Indeed Christ, the Son of God, who with the Father and the Spirit is praised as "uniquely holy," (1*) loved the Church as His bride, delivering Himself up for her. He did this that He might sanctify her.(214) He united her to Himself as His own body and brought it to perfection by the gift of the Holy Spirit for God's glory. Therefore in the Church, everyone whether belonging to the hierarchy, or being cared for by it, is called to holiness, according to the saying of the Apostle: "For this is the will of God, your sanctification".(215) However, this holiness of the Church is unceasingly manifested, and must be manifested, in the fruits of grace which the Spirit produces in the faithful; it is expressed in many ways in individuals, who in their walk of life, tend toward the perfection of charity, thus causing the edification of others; in a very special way this (holiness) appears in the practice of the counsels, customarily called "evangelical." This practice of the counsels, under the impulsion of the Holy Spirit, undertaken by many Christians, either privately or in a Church-approved condition or state of life, gives and must give in the world an outstanding witness and example of this same holiness.

40. The Lord Jesus, the divine Teacher and Model of all perfection, preached holiness of life to each and every one of His disciples of

³¹⁶ The council promotes ecumenism by using this weak passive voice, saying that the Church "is believed to be" holy. All non-Catholics would agree that it is believed (by some people) that the Church is holy. This is similar to the statement that "Buddha is believed to be reincarnated". Neither statement directly declares the truth but refers to an opinion being held by some people. The courageous, traditional Catholic statement is that the Catholic Church is indefectibly holy. The council causes the same problem with the weak passive voice in the following sentence.

every condition. He Himself stands as the author and consumator of this holiness of life: "Be you therefore perfect, even as your heavenly Father is perfect".(216)(2*) Indeed He sent the Holy Spirit upon all men³¹⁷ that He might move them inwardly to love God with their whole heart and their whole soul, with all their mind and all their strength(217) and that they might love each other as Christ loves them.(218) The followers of Christ are called by God, not because of their works, but according to His own purpose and grace. They are justified in the Lord Jesus, because in the baptism of faith they truly become sons of God and sharers in the divine nature.³¹⁸ In this way

³¹⁷ This statement promotes universal salvation and ecumenism. It says that the Holy Ghost and therefore, His grace are given to all men. *See*, the annotations to §9 above. This statement is false, since not all men receive grace, as is clear, *e.g.*, in the case of unbaptized infants that die before reaching the age of reason. *See*, the annotations to §8 above.

³¹⁸ In this statement, the council again promotes ecumenism by omission of the full Catholic truth. The council continues to downplay the Catholic doctrine of Sanctifying Grace, which the Protestants deny. Baptism brings with it, not only the infused theological virtue of Faith but also Sanctifying Grace (which is the cause of Faith), as well as Hope and Charity (along with the other infused virtues). No man is justified without these nor becomes a son of God, without these. *See*, annotations to §§ 4 & 9 above. The Protestants would not object to the generic reference to "grace" in the previous sentence because they acknowledge grace in the general sense referring to all of God's generous gifts to man.

This passage promotes ecumenism in a further way, because the council includes heretics and schismatics as "followers of Christ". The council here says that the followers of Christ are justified by baptism and "are really made holy". But this is not

they are really made holy³¹⁹. Then too, by God's gift, they must hold on to and complete in their lives this holiness they have received. They are warned by the Apostle to live "as becomes saints", (219) and to put on "as God's chosen ones, holy and beloved a heart of mercy, kindness, humility, meekness, patience", (220) and to possess the fruit of the Spirit in holiness. (221) Since truly we all offend in many things (222) we all need God's mercies continually and we all must daily pray: "Forgive us our debts" (223) (3*)

Thus it is evident to everyone, that all the faithful of Christ of whatever rank or status, are called to the fullness of the Christian life and to the perfection of charity; (4*) by this holiness as such a more

true of anyone who is baptized but persists in his formal heresy or schism. For, as shown above, the traditional teaching of the Church is that baptism avails nothing and is a sacrilege when given to heretics and schismatics who continue to reject Catholicism. See the annotations to §15 above.

³¹⁹ Here continues the council's grave omissions in the service of ecumenism. In these two sentences, the council says that "the baptism of faith [causes men to] ... really [be] made holy". The Catholic doctrine is that Sanctifying Grace given in the Sacrament of Baptism, causes the theological virtues including Charity. As St. Thomas Aquinas teaches, quoting St. Augustine:

Sanctifying Grace is given chiefly in order that man's soul may be united to God by charity. Wherefore Augustine says (De Trin. xv, 18): "A man is not transferred from the left side to the right, unless he receives the Holy Ghost, by Whom he is made a lover of God and of his neighbor."

Summa, IIa IIae, Q.172, a.4, *Respondeo*.

human³²⁰ manner of living is promoted in this earthly society. In order that the faithful may reach this perfection, they must use their strength accordingly as they have received it, as a gift from Christ. They must follow in His footsteps³²¹ and conform themselves to His image seeking the will of the Father in all things. They must devote themselves with all their being to the glory of God and the service of their neighbor. In this way, the holiness of the People of God will grow into an abundant harvest of good, as is admirably shown by the life of so many saints in Church history.

41. The classes and duties of life are many, but holiness is one—that sanctity which is cultivated by all who are moved by the Spirit of God, and who obey the voice of the Father and worship God the Father in spirit and in truth. These people follow the poor Christ, the humble and cross-bearing Christ in order to be worthy of being sharers in His glory. Every person must walk unhesitatingly according to his own personal gifts and duties in the path of living faith, which arouses hope and works through charity.

In the first place, the shepherds of Christ's flock must holily and eagerly, humbly and courageously carry out their ministry, in imitation

³²⁰ This statement promotes naturalism, since it promotes the conciliar idea that the goal is to help all men “to become fully human”, as shown in the quote by the Vatican’s U.N. Observer, a little above here. The truth constantly proclaimed by the Catholic Church before Vatican II, is that our goal is a supernatural one, *i.e.*, above our human nature. Our goal is not merely to be “fully human” or to live in “a more human manner”!

³²¹ The conciliar church tends to downplay the infinite, expiatory character of our Lord’s sacrifice and to promote Christ as (merely) an example. This conciliar emphasis serves as an ecumenical bridge to those who do not recognize Him as Divine, but merely consider Him as a Teacher of mankind.

of the eternal high Priest, the Shepherd and Guardian of our souls. They ought to fulfill this duty in such a way that it will be the principal means also of their own sanctification. Those chosen for the fullness of the priesthood are granted the ability of exercising the perfect duty of pastoral charity by the grace of the sacrament of Orders. This perfect duty of pastoral charity (5*) is exercised in every form of episcopal care and service, prayer, sacrifice and preaching. By this same sacramental grace, they are given the courage necessary to lay down their lives for their sheep, and the ability of promoting greater holiness in the Church by their daily example, having become a pattern for their flock.(224)

Priests, who resemble bishops to a certain degree in their participation of the sacrament of Orders, form the spiritual crown of the bishops.(6*) They participate in the grace of their office and they should grow daily in their love of God and their neighbor by the exercise of their office through Christ, the eternal and unique Mediator. They should preserve the bond of priestly communion, and they should abound in every spiritual good and thus present to all men a living witness to God.(7*) All this they should do in emulation of those priests who often, down through the course of the centuries, left an outstanding example of the holiness of humble and hidden service. Their praise lives on in the Church of God. By their very office of praying and offering sacrifice for their own people and the entire people of God, they should rise to greater holiness. Keeping in mind what they are doing and imitating what they are handling,(8*) these priests, in their apostolic labors, rather than being ensnared by perils and hardships, should rather rise to greater holiness through these perils and hardships. They should ever nourish and strengthen their action from an abundance of contemplation, doing all this for the comfort of the entire Church of God. All priests, and especially those who are called "diocesan priests," due to the special title of their ordination, should keep continually before their minds the fact that

their faithful loyalty toward and their generous cooperation with their bishop is of the greatest value in their growth in holiness.

Ministers of lesser rank are also sharers in the mission and grace of the Supreme Priest. In the first place among these ministers are deacons, who, in as much as they are dispensers of Christ's mysteries and servants of the Church,(9*) should keep themselves free from every vice and stand before men as personifications of goodness and friends of God.(225) Clerics, who are called by the Lord and are set aside as His portion in order to prepare themselves for the various ministerial offices under the watchful eye of spiritual shepherds, are bound to bring their hearts and minds into accord with this special election (which is theirs). They will accomplish this by their constancy in prayer, by their burning love, and by their unremitting recollection of whatever is true, just and of good repute. They will accomplish all this for the glory and honor of God. Besides these already named, there are also laymen, chosen of God and called by the bishop. These laymen spend themselves completely in apostolic labors, working the Lord's field with much success.(10*).

Furthermore, married couples and Christian parents should follow their own proper path (to holiness) by faithful love. They should sustain one another in grace throughout the entire length of their lives. They should embue their offspring, lovingly welcomed as God's gift, with Christian doctrine and the evangelical virtues. In this manner, they offer all men the example of unwearying and generous love; in this way they build up the brotherhood of charity; in so doing, they stand as the witnesses and cooperators in the fruitfulness of Holy Mother Church; by such lives, they are a sign and a participation in that very love, with which Christ loved His Bride and for which He delivered Himself up for her.(11*) A like example, but one given in a different way, is that offered by widows and single people, who are able to make great contributions toward holiness and apostolic endeavor in the Church. Finally, those who engage in labor—and

frequently it is of a heavy nature—should better themselves³²² by their human labors. They should be of aid to their fellow citizens. They should raise all of society, and even creation itself, to a better mode of existence. Indeed, they should imitate by their lively charity, in their joyous hope and by their voluntary sharing of each others' burdens, the very Christ who plied His hands with carpenter's tools and Who in union with His Father, is continually working for the salvation of all men.³²³ In this, then, their daily work they should climb to the heights of holiness and apostolic activity.

May all those who are weighed down with poverty, infirmity and sickness, as well as those who must bear various hardships or who suffer persecution for justice sake—may they all know they are united with the suffering Christ in a special way for the salvation of the

³²² This end to the paragraph lacks cohesion with the rest of what the council treats here. The council discusses different “states” of life and then adds a section about whoever happens to work hard for a living, whatever his “state” in life is. Further, this section, like so many sections of the council’s texts, descends to the banal and obvious. Do those who engage in labor really need a Church council to tell them that they “should better themselves by their human labors”?

³²³ Christ’s Sacrifice on the Cross was sufficient in merit to redeem and save all men. *Summa*, IIIa, Q.1, a.4, *Respondeo*. However, our Lord prayed not for all men but for them whom God the Father gave to Him. John, 17;9. For not all men have a chance for salvation besides the test all men had, in their principle (Adam), in the Garden of Eden. Thus, the council’s statement is false, that Christ continually works for the salvation of all men. See, the annotations on this subject above, especially in §§ 16, 13, 8 & 3.

world.³²⁴ The Lord called them blessed³²⁵ in His Gospel and they are those whom "the God of all graces, who has called us unto His eternal glory in Christ Jesus, will Himself, after we have suffered a little while, perfect³²⁶, strengthen and establish".(226)

Finally all Christ's faithful, whatever be the conditions, duties and circumstances of their lives—and indeed through all these, will daily

³²⁴ This is false, in any relevant way of taking this statement. The very fact of being poor or sick creates only a superficial and non-meritorious similarity (or “union” with Christ) and such a similarity does not promote salvation, except as a circumstance which might lead to virtue. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.184, a.7, ad 1. See also, the annotations on this subject, in §1 above. The truth is that it is only by man uniting his heart and will to Christ’s Heart and Will, that he is truly “united with the suffering Christ” in a way that matters.

³²⁵ *Lumen Gentium* lists “all those” who are poor, sick or bearing hardships, along with those “who suffer persecution for justice sake”, all as persons who Christ called “blessed” in the Gospel. It is false that He called them all “blessed”, nor not does sickness itself render a person blessed, except as a circumstance which he might use as an occasion of supernatural good. *Cf.*, *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.184, a.7, ad 1. It is manifest that a person can be sick, while at the same time he is also evil.

³²⁶ Promoting the heresy of universal salvation, the council here indicates to the poor, the sick and various others, that they will go to heaven. This quote from St. Peter’s first epistle does not support the council’s statement at all. St. Peter is not referring to any of the specific groups to which the council refers. In this chapter (5), St. Peter shows plainly that he is simply saying in general that God sanctifies Catholics, not specifying any particular groups suffering crosses.

increase in holiness³²⁷, if they receive all things with faith from the hand of their heavenly Father and if they cooperate with the divine will. In this temporal service, they will manifest to all men the love with which God loved the world.

42. "God is love, and he who abides in love, abides in God and God in Him".(227) But, God pours out his love into our³²⁸ hearts through the Holy Spirit, Who has been given to us;(228) thus the first and most necessary gift is love,³²⁹ by which we love God above all things and our neighbor because of God. Indeed, in order that love, as good seed may grow and bring forth fruit in the soul, each one of the faithful must willingly hear the Word of God and accept His Will, and must complete

³²⁷ This conditional statement is true only of faithful Catholics in the state of Sanctifying Grace. The council's broader, erroneous definition of "faithful" renders the council's statement false. For non-Catholics and those Catholics in mortal sin cannot increase in holiness because they have no holiness to increase, being devoid of Sanctifying Grace.

³²⁸ This paragraph promotes universal salvation by containing additional statements which, in the context of the council, seem to say that either all readers (or at least council fathers) are in the state of Sanctifying Grace and possess the Holy Ghost.

³²⁹ The councils' statement here is fuzzy and misleading. Supernatural charity is not first among all gifts given in time, for natural gifts come first. Among the supernatural gifts, charity is not first in time, since it comes to a person at the same time as Sanctifying Grace and the supernatural virtue of Faith and is caused by Sanctifying Grace. Moreover, Faith is prior to Charity according to reason, since one cannot love Whom he does not know. Charity can be said to be "first in excellence".

what God has begun by their own actions with the help of God's grace. These actions consist in the use of the sacraments and in a special way the Eucharist, frequent participation in the sacred action of the Liturgy, application of oneself to prayer, self-abnegation, lively fraternal service and the constant exercise of all the virtues. For charity, as the bond of perfection and the fullness of the law,(229) rules over all the means of attaining holiness and gives life to these same means.(12*) It is charity which guides us to our final end. It is the love of God and the love of one's neighbor which points out the true disciple of Christ.

Since Jesus, the Son of God, manifested His charity by laying down His life for us, so too no one has greater love than he who lays down his life for Christ and His brothers.(230) From the earliest times, then, some Christians³³⁰ have been called upon—and some will always be called upon—to give the supreme testimony of this love to all men, but especially to persecutors. The Church, then, considers martyrdom as an exceptional gift and as the fullest proof of love. By martyrdom a disciple is transformed into an image of his Master by freely accepting death for the salvation of the world—as well as his conformity to Christ in the shedding of his blood. Though few are presented such an opportunity, nevertheless all must be prepared to confess Christ before men. They must be prepared to make this profession of faith even in the midst of persecutions, which will never be lacking to the Church, in following the way of the cross.

Likewise, the holiness of the Church is fostered in a special way by the observance of the counsels proposed in the Gospel by Our Lord to His disciples.(13*) An eminent position among these is held by virginity or

³³⁰ Because of the council's false, ecumenical definition of "Christian", this statement about martyrs also becomes false and ecumenical, as was the council's statement on this subject in §15. See, the annotations on this subject in §15.

the celibate state.(231) This is a precious gift of divine grace given by the Father to certain souls,(232) whereby they may devote themselves to God alone the more easily, due to an undivided heart. (14*) This perfect continency, out of desire for the kingdom of heaven, has always been held in particular honor in the Church. The reason for this was and is that perfect continency for the love of God is an incentive to charity, and is certainly a particular source of spiritual fecundity in the world.

The Church continually keeps before it the warning of the Apostle which moved the faithful to charity, exhorting them to experience personally what Christ Jesus had known within Himself. This was the same Christ Jesus, who "emptied Himself, taking the nature of a slave . . . becoming obedient to death",(233) and because of us "being rich, he became poor".(234) Because the disciples must always offer an imitation of and a testimony to the charity and humility of Christ, Mother Church rejoices at finding within her bosom men and women who very closely follow their Savior who debased Himself to our comprehension. There are some who, in their freedom as sons of God, renounce their own wills and take upon themselves the state of poverty. Still further, some become subject of their own accord to another man, in the matter of perfection for love of God. This is beyond the measure of the commandments, but is done in order to become more fully like the obedient Christ.(15*)

Therefore, all the faithful of Christ are invited to strive for the holiness and perfection of their own proper state. Indeed they have an obligation to so strive. Let all then have care that they guide aright their own deepest sentiments of soul. Let neither the use of the things of this world nor attachment to riches, which is against the spirit of evangelical poverty, hinder them in their quest for perfect love. Let them heed the admonition of the Apostle to those who use this world;

let them not come to terms with this world; for this world, as we see it, is passing away.(235)(16*)

CHAPTER VI RELIGIOUS

43. The evangelical counsels of chastity dedicated to God, poverty and obedience are based upon the words and examples of the Lord. They were further commended by the apostles and Fathers of the Church, as well as by the doctors and pastors of souls. The counsels are a divine gift, which the Church received from its Lord and which it always safeguards with the help of His grace. Church authority has the duty, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, of interpreting these evangelical counsels, of regulating their practice and finally to build on them stable forms of living. Thus it has come about, that, as if on a tree which has grown in the field of the Lord, various forms of solidarity and community life, as well as various religious families have branched out in a marvelous and multiple way from this divinely given seed. Such a multiple and miraculous growth augments both the progress of the members of these various religious families themselves and the welfare of the entire Body of Christ.(1*) These religious families give their members the support of a more firm stability in their way of life and a proven doctrine of acquiring perfection. They further offer their members the support of fraternal association in the militia of Christ and of liberty strengthened by obedience. Thus these religious are able to tranquilly fulfill and faithfully observe their religious profession and so spiritually rejoicing make progress on the road of charity.(2*)

From the point of view of the divine and hierarchical structure of the Church, the religious state of life is not an intermediate state between the clerical and lay states. But, rather, the faithful of Christ are called

by God from both these states of life so that they might enjoy this particular gift in the life of the Church and thus each in one's own way, may be of some advantage to the salvific mission of the Church.(3*)

44. The faithful of Christ bind themselves to the three aforesaid counsels either by vows, or by other sacred bonds, which are like vows in their purpose. By such a bond, a person is totally dedicated to God, loved beyond all things. In this way, that person is ordained to the honor and service of God under a new and special title. Indeed through Baptism a person dies to sin and is consecrated to God. However, in order that he may be capable of deriving more abundant fruit from this baptismal grace, he intends, by the profession of the evangelical counsels in the Church, to free himself from those obstacles, which might draw him away from the fervor of charity and the perfection of divine worship. By his profession of the evangelical counsels, then, he is more intimately consecrated to divine service.(4*) This consecration will be the more perfect, in as much as the indissoluble bond of the union of Christ and His bride, the Church, is represented by firm and more stable bonds.

The evangelical counsels which lead to charity (5*) join their followers to the Church and its mystery in a special way. Since this is so, the spiritual life of these people should then be devoted to the welfare of the whole Church. From this arises their duty of working to implant and strengthen the Kingdom of Christ in souls and to extend that Kingdom to every clime. This duty is to be undertaken to the extent of their capacities and in keeping with the proper type of their own vocation. This can be realized through prayer or active works of the apostolate. It is for this reason that the Church preserves and fosters the special character of her various religious institutes.

The profession of the evangelical counsels, then, appears as a sign which can and ought to attract all the members of the Church to an

effective and prompt fulfillment of the duties of their Christian vocation. The people of God have no lasting city here below, but look forward to one that is to come. Since this is so, the religious state, whose purpose is to free its members from earthly cares, more fully manifests to all believers the presence of heavenly goods already possessed here below. Furthermore, it not only witnesses to the fact of a new and eternal life acquired by the redemption of Christ, but it foretells the future resurrection and the glory of the heavenly kingdom. Christ proposed to His disciples this form of life, which He, as the Son of God, accepted in entering this world to do the will of the Father. This same state of life is accurately exemplified and perpetually made present in the Church. The religious state clearly manifests that the Kingdom of God and its needs, in a very special way, are raised above all earthly considerations. Finally it clearly shows all men both the unsurpassed breadth of the strength of Christ the King and the infinite power³³¹ of the Holy Spirit marvelously working in the Church.

Thus, the state which is constituted by the profession of the evangelical counsels, though it is not the hierarchical structure of the Church, nevertheless, undeniably belongs to its life and holiness.

45. It is the duty of the ecclesiastical hierarchy to regulate the practice of the evangelical counsels by law, since it is the duty of the same hierarchy to care for the People of God and to lead them to most fruitful pastures.(236) The importance of the profession of the evangelical counsels is seen in the fact that it fosters the perfection of love of God and love of neighbor in an outstanding manner and that this profession is strengthened by vows.(6*) Furthermore, the

³³¹ This statement is false. The existence of the religious state does not show that the Holy Ghost's power is infinite. The fact of the religious state simply shows that His power is great enough to do that particular work.

hierarchy, following with docility the prompting of the Holy Spirit, accepts the rules presented by outstanding men and women and authentically approves these rules after further adjustments. It also aids by its vigilant and safeguarding authority those institutes variously established for the building up of Christ's Body in order that these same institutes may grow and flourish according to the spirit of the founders.

Any institute of perfection and its individual members may be removed from the jurisdiction of the local Ordinaries by the Supreme Pontiff and subjected to himself alone. This is done in virtue of his primacy over the entire Church in order to more fully provide for the necessities of the entire flock of the Lord and in consideration of the common good.(7*) In like manner, these institutes may be left or committed to the charge of the proper patriarchal authority. The members of these institutes, in fulfilling their obligation to the Church due to their particular form of life, ought to show reverence and obedience to bishops according to the sacred canons. The bishops are owed this respect because of their pastoral authority in their own churches and because of the need of unity and harmony in the apostolate.(8*).

The Church not only raises the religious profession to the dignity of a canonical state by her approval, but even manifests that this profession is a state consecrated to God by the liturgical setting of that profession. The Church itself, by the authority given to it by God, accepts the vows of the newly professed. It begs aid and grace from God for them by its public prayer. It commends them to God, imparts a spiritual blessing on them and accompanies their self-offering by the Eucharistic sacrifice.

46. Religious should carefully keep before their minds the fact that the Church presents Christ to believers and non-believers alike in a striking

manner daily through them. The Church thus portrays Christ in contemplation on the mountain, in His proclamation of the kingdom of God to the multitudes, in His healing of the sick and maimed, in His work of converting sinners to a better life, in His solicitude for youth and His goodness to all men, always obedient to the will of the Father who sent Him.(9*)

All men should take note that the profession of the evangelical counsels, though entailing the renunciation of certain values which are to be undoubtedly esteemed, does not detract from a genuine development of the human persons, but rather by its very nature is most beneficial to that development. Indeed the counsels, voluntarily undertaken according to each one's personal vocation, contribute a great deal to the purification of heart and spiritual liberty. They continually stir up the fervor of charity. But especially they are able to more fully mold the Christian man to that type of chaste and detached life, which Christ the Lord chose for Himself and which His Mother also embraced. This is clearly proven by the example of so many holy founders. Let no one think that religious have become strangers to their fellowmen or useless citizens of this earthly city by their consecration. For even though it sometimes happens that religious do not directly mingle with their contemporaries, yet in a more profound sense these same religious are united with them in the heart of Christ and spiritually cooperate with them. In this way the building up of the earthly city may have its foundation in the Lord and may tend toward Him, lest perhaps those who build this city shall have labored in vain. (10*)

Therefore, this Sacred Synod encourages and praises the men and women, Brothers and Sisters, who in monasteries, or in schools and hospitals, or in the missions, adorn the Bride of Christ by their unswerving and humble faithfulness in their chosen consecration and render generous services of all kinds to mankind.

47. Let each of the faithful called to the profession of the evangelical counsels, therefore, carefully see to it that he persevere and ever grow in that vocation God has given him. Let him do this for the increased holiness of the Church, for the greater glory of the one and undivided Trinity, which in and through Christ is the fount and the source of all holiness.

CHAPTER VII

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL³³² NATURE

OF THE PILGRIM CHURCH

AND ITS UNION WITH THE CHURCH IN HEAVEN

48. The Church, to which we are all called in Christ Jesus, and in which we acquire sanctity³³³ through the grace of God, will attain its full

³³² This term, “eschatological” refers to the end of the world and ultimate end of man.

³³³ This statement could, perhaps, be taken to mean that any persons who are called and sanctified, are only called and sanctified through the Catholic Church. This would be true but is in complete contradiction to what the council says in many places.

Moreover, *Lumen Gentium*, other conciliar documents and the post-conciliar church all promote universal salvation. Therefore, in this context, it seems clear that this sentence should be taken as promoting universal salvation by its assertion that all men (all readers) are called and sanctified or at least that all council fathers are asserting their own sanctity.

perfection³³⁴ only in the glory of heaven, when there will come the time of the restoration of all things.(237) At that time the human race as well as the entire world, which is intimately related to man and attains to its end through him³³⁵, will be perfectly reestablished in Christ.(238)

Christ, having been lifted up from the earth has drawn all to Himself.(239) Rising from the dead(240) He sent His life-giving Spirit

The context is important for seeing the meaning of the council's statements. Similarly, the noun "bat" can refer to either a stick of wood used in an American sport or it can refer to a flying mammal. However, in the context of an American newspaper's sports section, when there is a statement that a certain athlete had a bat in his hand, the context removes any ambiguity which would otherwise be present in that statement. So here too, the council's statement unambiguously promotes universal salvation.

³³⁴ The Church Herself is already perfect and the council speaks falsely by saying that the Church has yet to attain its full perfection. The council's false statement here fits with the council's call for the Church to continually purify Herself and also fits with the many occasions on which the conciliar church apologized for the supposed sins of the Church.

³³⁵ Elsewhere, the council (falsely) says that everything on earth should be man-centered. *See*, the annotations to §38 above. Thus, the present unclear statement is probably meant to be consistent with that man-centeredness and is probably meant to (falsely) assert that the entire world attains its end by being centered upon man. However, the Catholic Church has always taught that everything must be God-centered. *See*, the annotations to §9 above.

upon His disciples and through Him has established His Body which is the Church as the universal sacrament³³⁶ of salvation. Sitting at the right hand of the Father, He is continually active in the world that He might lead men to the Church and through it join them to Himself and that He might make them partakers of His glorious life by nourishing them with His own Body and Blood. Therefore the promised restoration which we are awaiting has already begun in Christ, is carried forward in the mission of the Holy Spirit and through Him continues in the Church in which we learn the meaning of our terrestrial life through our faith, while we perform with hope in the future the work committed to us in this world by the Father, and thus work out our salvation.(241)

Already the final age of the world has come upon us (242) and the renovation of the world is irrevocably decreed and is already anticipated in some kind of a real way; for the Church already on this earth is signed with a sanctity which is real although imperfect.³³⁷ However, until there shall be new heavens and a new earth in which justice dwells,(243) the pilgrim Church in her sacraments and institutions, which pertain to this present time, has the appearance of

³³⁶ This is a novel and erroneous use of the word “sacrament”. See, the annotations to §1 above.

³³⁷ The Divine element of the Church is perfect. The human element (*viz.*, each human member of the Church) is imperfect, *i.e.*, the Church contains members and they are sinners. However, the conciliar church fails to make this distinction, and promotes ecumenism by promoting the continual need for “conversion” by the Catholic Church and the Catholic Church’s continual apologies for Her own “sins”. See, *e.g.*, Pope John Paul II, *Ut unum sint*, §34 & 82 and the annotations to §8 above.

this world³³⁸ which is passing and she herself dwells among creatures who groan and travail in pain until now and await the revelation of the sons of God.(244)

Joined with Christ in the Church and signed with the Holy Spirit "who is the pledge of our inheritance",(245) truly we are called³³⁹ and we are sons of God³⁴⁰(246) but we have not yet³⁴¹ appeared with Christ in

³³⁸ The council's statement here is false. The council says that the Church's Sacraments and institutions appear to be the world. It is false to say that the Church's Sacraments and institutions appear to be part of "the world" in the sense of temptations to sin, *i.e.*, "the world, the flesh and the devil". It is false to say that the Church's Sacraments and institutions appear to be "the world" in the sense of being an enemy of God. It is false to say that the Church's Sacraments and institutions appear to be the world in the sense of being lost sheep outside the Catholic Church which must be saved. See the discussion of "the world" in the annotations to §36 above.

To the extent that the reader would interpret the council's reference to "the world" here to refer to physical goods, that interpretation is wrong also, since the physical goods involved in the Church's Sacraments and institutions don't merely have "the appearance" of physical goods. Those physical goods involved in the Church's Sacraments and institutions **are** physical goods.

³³⁹ When the council says "we are called", in the context of the rest of the council's teachings, it apparently means the same thing as when the council says earlier, "all men are called". This is the error of promoting universal salvation, as noted above. *See*, the annotations to §13 above.

³⁴⁰ When the council says "we are sons of God", that statement promotes the error of universal salvation, just as is the council's statements that we, *viz.*, "all men are called" *See*, the

glory,(247) in which we shall be like to God, since we shall see Him³⁴² as He is.(248) And therefore "while we are in the body, we are exiled from the Lord (249) and having the first-fruits of the Spirit³⁴³ we groan within ourselves(250) and we desire to be with Christ".(251) By that same charity³⁴⁴ however, we are urged to live more for Him, who died for us and rose again.(252) We strive therefore to please God in all things(253) and we put on the armor of God, that we may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil and resist in the evil day.(254) Since however we know not the day nor the hour, on Our Lord's advice we must be constantly vigilant so that, having finished the course of our earthly life,(255) we may merit to enter into the marriage feast with Him and to be numbered among the blessed(256) and that we may not be ordered to go into eternal fire(257) like the

annotations to §13 above. *Cf.*, Romans, 8:16-17, re the expression "sons of God".

³⁴¹ The council's usage of the word "yet", indicates that we will surely attain glory in the future. This statement promotes the errors of universal salvation and self-canonization noted above.

³⁴² These are the errors of universal salvation and self-canonization noted above, and the council here says that we all **shall** obtain the beatific vision of God!

³⁴³ Here is more of the council treating everyone as receiving grace, possessing "the first-fruits of the Spirit". This council statement promotes universal salvation.

³⁴⁴ Here is more of the council treating everyone as receiving Sanctifying Grace, saying that everyone possesses charity, which only comes with Sanctifying Grace, as shown above. This council statement promotes universal salvation.

wicked and slothful servant,(258) into the exterior darkness where "there will be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth".³⁴⁵(259) For before we reign with Christ in glory, all of us will be made manifest³⁴⁶ "before the tribunal of Christ, so that each one may receive what he has won through the body, according to his works, whether good or evil"(260) and at the end of the world "they who have done good shall come forth unto resurrection of life; but those who have done evil unto resurrection of judgment".(261) Reckoning therefore that "the sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory to come that will be revealed in us",(262) strong in faith we³⁴⁷ look for the "blessed hope and the glorious coming of our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ"(263) "who will refashion the body of our

³⁴⁵ This slightly oblique statement is the **only reference to hell in any of the documents of Vatican II**. A clear and fearless teaching of the dogma of hell is incompatible with the council's teachings which serve to promote universal salvation. Thus, hell is only obliquely mentioned in connection with the council fathers here saying that "we" will avoid going there. The following sentence is one of many statements of the council assuring the reader that "we [shall] reign with Christ in glory".

³⁴⁶ Here is further evidence that the council's use of "we" means all bishops and readers, since both bishops and all readers will receive their particular judgments. The council says that "all of us" will have their deeds manifest "before we reign with Christ in glory". This is more of the council's repeated promotion of universal salvation.

³⁴⁷ Whether the bishops are referring only to themselves or to everyone (*i.e.*, the reader), the bishops nonetheless proclaim not only their future beatitude but also how strong their faith is! This supreme confidence in their own strong faith and infallible salvation, is certainly neither a feature of the council fathers of any other Church councils nor is it a feature of the saints.

lowliness, conforming it to the body of His glory(264), and who will come "to be glorified in His saints and to be marveled at in all those who have believed"(265).

49. Until the Lord shall come in His majesty, and all the angels with Him (266) and death being destroyed, all things are subject to Him,(277) some of His disciples are exiles on earth, some having died are purified, and others are in glory beholding "clearly God Himself triune and one, as He is";(1*) but all in various ways and degrees are in communion in the same charity of God and neighbor and all sing the same hymn of glory to our God. For all who are in Christ, having His Spirit, form one Church and cleave together in Him.(268) Therefore the union of the wayfarers with the brethren who have gone to sleep in the peace of Christ is not in the least weakened or interrupted, but on the contrary, according to the perpetual faith of the Church, is strengthened by communication of spiritual goods.(2*) For by reason of the fact that those in heaven are more closely united with Christ, they establish the whole Church more firmly in holiness, lend nobility to the worship which the Church offers to God here on earth and in many ways contribute to its greater edification.(269)(3*) For after they have been received into their heavenly home and are present to the Lord,(270) through Him and with Him and in Him they do not cease to intercede with the Father for us,(4*) showing forth the merits which they won on earth through the one Mediator between God and man,(271) serving God in all things and filling up in their flesh those things which are lacking of the sufferings of Christ for His Body which is the Church.(272)(5*) Thus by their brotherly interest our weakness is greatly strengthened.

50. Fully conscious of this communion of the whole Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, the pilgrim Church from the very first ages of the Christian religion has cultivated with great piety the memory of the dead,(6*) and "because it is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for

the dead that they may be loosed from their sins", (273) also offers suffrages for them. The Church has always believed that the apostles and Christ's martyrs who had given the supreme witness of faith and charity by the shedding of their blood, are closely joined with us in Christ, and she has always venerated them with special devotion, together with the Blessed Virgin Mary and the holy angels. (7*) The Church has piously implored the aid of their intercession. To these were soon added also those who had more closely imitated Christ's virginity and poverty, (8*) and finally others whom the outstanding practice of the Christian virtues (9*) and the divine charisms recommended to the pious devotion and imitation of the faithful. (10*)

When we look at the lives of those who have faithfully followed Christ, we are inspired with a new reason for seeking the City that is to come (274) and at the same time we are shown a most safe path by which among the vicissitudes of this world, in keeping with the state in life and condition proper to each of us, we will be able to arrive at perfect union with Christ, that is, perfect holiness. (11*) In the lives of those who, sharing in our humanity, are however more perfectly transformed into the image of Christ, (275) God vividly manifests His presence and His face to men. He speaks to us in them, and gives us a sign of His Kingdom, (12*) to which we are strongly drawn, having so great a cloud of witnesses over us (276) and such a witness to the truth of the Gospel.

Nor is it by the title of example only that we cherish the memory of those in heaven, but still more in order that the union of the whole Church may be strengthened in the Spirit by the practice of fraternal charity. (277) For just as Christian communion among wayfarers brings us closer to Christ, so our companionship with the saints joins us to Christ, from Whom as from its Fountain and Head issues every grace and the very life of the people of God. (13*) It is supremely fitting, therefore, that we love those friends and coheirs of Jesus Christ, who are also our brothers and extraordinary benefactors, that we render

due thanks to God for them (14*) and "suppliantly invoke them and have recourse to their prayers, their power and help in obtaining benefits from God through His Son, Jesus Christ, who is our Redeemer and Savior."(15*) For every genuine testimony of love shown by us to those in heaven, by its very nature tends toward and terminates in Christ who is the "crown of all saints,"(16*) and through Him, in God Who is wonderful in his saints and is magnified in them.(17*)

Our union with the Church in heaven is put into effect in its noblest manner especially in the sacred Liturgy, wherein the power of the Holy Spirit acts upon us through sacramental signs. Then, with combined rejoicing we celebrate together the praise of the divine majesty;(18*) then all those from every tribe and tongue and people and nation (278) who have been redeemed by the blood of Christ and gathered together into one Church, with one song of praise magnify the one and triune God. Celebrating the Eucharistic sacrifice therefore, we are most closely united to the Church in heaven in communion with and venerating the memory first of all of the glorious ever-Virgin Mary, of Blessed Joseph and the blessed apostles and martyrs and of all the saints.(19*)

51. This Sacred Council accepts with great devotion this venerable faith of our ancestors regarding this vital fellowship with our brethren who are in heavenly glory or who having died are still being purified; and it proposes again the decrees of the Second Council of Nicea,(20*) the Council of Florence (21*) and the Council of Trent.(22*) And at the same time, in conformity with our own pastoral interests, we urge all concerned, if any abuses, excesses³⁴⁸ or defects have crept in here or

³⁴⁸ This is another "time bomb" planted in the council documents, set to explode afterwards. Although the council says that it "accepts" and "proposes" past Church teaching regarding Purgatory and devotion to the saints, the council de-emphasizes these devotions and practices by urging everyone to guard

there, to do what is in their power to remove or correct them, and to restore all things to a fuller praise of Christ and of God. Let them therefore teach the faithful that the authentic cult of the saints consists not so much in the multiplying of external acts³⁴⁹, but rather in the greater intensity of our love, whereby, for our own greater good and that of the whole Church, we seek from the saints "example in

against all excessive devotion to the saints, and strive to correct it.

Before Vatican II, there was no significant excessive devotion to the saints or to the souls in Purgatory. Instead, the council's urging promotes ecumenism, by de-emphasizing doctrines which Protestants reject. The council urging against the excessive devotion to the saints and to the souls in Purgatory, makes as much sense as it would for the council to urge everyone to carefully avoid neglecting our worldly affairs and avoid focusing excessively on prayer.

This conciliar statement, along with others, contributed to a precipitous decline among Catholics, of devotion to the saints and to the souls in Purgatory, as well as contributing to the disbelief in Purgatory.

³⁴⁹ Of course, it is always an error for any person to focus only on external acts of religion of any sort, without any regard for charity. But notice the council's admonition to avoid the excessive multiplication of external acts comes only in connection with devotion to the saints. Above, where the council continually promotes actions in the world, cooperating with our fellow man, nowhere will you find an admonishment to Catholics to not focus so much on "multiplying of external acts [of cooperating with our fellow man], but rather in the greater intensity of our love". Here again, the council's statement effectively diminished devotion to the saints.

their way of life, fellowship in their communion, and aid by their intercession."(23*) On the other hand, let them teach the faithful that our communion with those in heaven, provided that it is understood in the fuller light of faith according to its genuine nature³⁵⁰, in no way weakens³⁵¹, but conversely, more thoroughly enriches the laudatory worship we give to God the Father, through Christ, in the Spirit.(24*)

For all of us, who are sons of God³⁵² and constitute one family in Christ,(279) as long as we remain in communion with one another³⁵³ in

³⁵⁰ Verbosity is inseparable from Vatican II, as is clear from virtually any randomly selected text. Here, *e.g.*, the council's prolix phrase "provided that it is understood in the fuller light of faith according to its genuine nature", could be replaced with the word "true".

³⁵¹ In this paragraph and the one immediately before it, the council refers to: 1) communion with the saints; and 2) venerating/seeking their aid. The council now urges "all concerned" to teach that communion with the saints does not weaken the worship we give to God.

Note that the council does not say the same thing about venerating the saints or seeking their aid. Instead, the council stressed that no one should venerate the saints excessively. All of this promotes ecumenism, since the Protestants deny that we should venerate the saints or seek their aid but Protestants agree that communion with the saints does not diminish worship of God.

³⁵² As shown in the annotations above, in this conciliar context, the council's statement here rashly professes that "all of us" without exception are in the state of Sanctifying Grace.

mutual charity and in one praise of the most holy Trinity, are corresponding with the intimate vocation of the Church and partaking in foretaste the liturgy of consummate glory.(25*) For when Christ shall appear and the glorious resurrection of the dead will take place, the glory of God will light up the heavenly City and the Lamb will be the lamp thereof.(280) Then the whole Church of the saints in the supreme happiness of charity will adore God and "the Lamb who was slain",(281) proclaiming with one voice: "To Him who sits upon the throne, and to the Lamb blessing, and honor, and glory, and dominion forever and ever".(282)

CHAPTER VIII

THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY,³⁵⁴ MOTHER OF GOD IN THE MYSTERY OF CHRIST AND THE CHURCH

³⁵³ The council's statement promotes ecumenism and the pneumatological heresy by omitting the need to be in the Catholic Church and subject to the pope. Protestants and schismatics deny these essential truths but would not object to the council's statement here.

³⁵⁴ When one reads *Lumen Gentium* as a whole, he sees that it is incongruous for this last chapter to be about the Blessed Virgin Mary since this chapter is after the chapter about the end of the world, which concludes with the finality of this statement: "[T]he whole Church of the saints in the supreme happiness of charity will adore God ... forever and ever".

However, this chapter (on Our Lady) was not originally part of *Lumen Gentium*. The council's preparatory committee had prepared an entire document regarding Our Lady, in which she was proclaimed the *Mediatrix of All Graces* and the *Mother of the Church*. But Protestants (and their sympathizers in the

Church) loudly rejected giving our Lady prominence by devoting a separate document to her. They further rejected that ***all Graces*** come through her. Lastly, the Protestants were upset by Mary being called “Mother of the Church”, since Vatican II teaches that the Church includes Protestants (and so she would be their mother too).

Council liberals joined the Protestant protests. Council peritus (*i.e.*, expert), Fr. Karl Rahner, S.J., claimed that a separate council document on the Blessed Virgin Mary would do “unimaginable harm ... from the ecumenical point of view” unless it were entirely redrafted. *The Rhine Flows Into The Tiber*, Fr, Ralph M. Wiltgen, TAN, Rockford, IL, 1967, p. 91.

Cardinal Frings wanted the draft document on the Blessed Virgin Mary to be added to *Lumen Gentium* because, among other things, “such action would do much to foster dialogue with the separated Christians.” *Ibid.*, p.93.

Professor Oscar Cullmann, a Lutheran observer at the council, said that the subsequent decision to add the draft document on the Blessed Virgin Mary to *Lumen Gentium*, “was intended to weaken Mariology”. *Ibid.*, pp. 158-59.

This document on the Blessed Virgin Mary was redrafted, as noted by a protestant observer at the council, Dr. Robert McAfee Brown. Dr. McAfee Brown happily remarked that the draft document on the Blessed Virgin Mary, (which became chapter 8 of *Lumen Gentium*) was entirely reworked and was “deliberately couched in as Biblical a framework as possible, replacing the string of papal quotations that had characterized the earlier draft, so that there might be an ecumenical meeting point with Protestants and Orthodox, both of whom affirm the authority of

I. Introduction

52. Wishing in His supreme goodness and wisdom to effect the redemption of the world, "when the fullness of time came, God sent His Son, born of a woman...that we might receive the adoption of sons".(283) "He for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Spirit from the Virgin Mary."(1*) This divine mystery of salvation is revealed to us and continued in the Church, which the Lord established as His body. Joined to Christ the Head and in the unity of fellowship with all His saints, the faithful must in the first place reverence the memory "of the glorious ever Virgin Mary, Mother of our God and Lord Jesus Christ".(2*)

53. The Virgin Mary, who at the message of the angel received the Word of God in her heart and in her body and gave Life to the world, is acknowledged and honored³⁵⁵ as being truly the Mother of God and Mother of the Redeemer. Redeemed by reason of the merits of her

Biblical but not papal statements." *The Ecumenical Revolution*, R. McAfee Brown, Doubleday, New York, 1969, p. 321.

This council history (reworking a separate council document on Our Lady to attach to the end of *Lumen Gentium*) is also the reason why Chapter VIII is the only chapter of this document which has subheadings.

³⁵⁵ The weak passive voice, used in this statement, is something with which even heathens could agree, *viz.*, that the Virgin Mary is acknowledged and honored in this way (by some people), aside from the question of what the truth is. This is similar to the truth that Mohammed "is acknowledged and honored" as a prophet (*viz.*, by Mohammedans), regardless of the truth.

Son and united to Him by a close and indissoluble tie, she is endowed with the high office and dignity of being the Mother of the Son of God, by which account she is also the beloved daughter of the Father and the temple of the Holy Spirit³⁵⁶. Because of this gift of sublime grace she far surpasses all other creatures, both in heaven and on earth. At the same time, however, because she belongs to the offspring of

³⁵⁶ Everyone in the state of Sanctifying Grace is a temple of the Holy Ghost. The Blessed Virgin Mary is more, and uniquely is the Spouse of the Holy Ghost. As St. Louis de Montfort teaches:

When the **Holy Ghost, her spouse**, finds Mary in a soul, he hastens there and enters fully into it. He gives himself generously to that soul according to the place it has given to his spouse. One of the main reasons why **the Holy Ghost** does not work striking wonders in souls is that he fails to find in them a sufficiently close union with **His faithful and inseparable spouse**. I say "inseparable spouse", for from the moment the substantial love of the Father and the Son [*viz.*, the Holy Ghost] espoused Mary to form Jesus, the head of the elect, and Jesus in the elect, He has never disowned her, for she has always been faithful and fruitful.

True Devotion to Mary, Part 1, §36 (emphasis added; bracketed words added).

Unfortunately, the council omitted this crucial glory of Mary, even though the mention of her as the daughter of the Father and mother of the Son, naturally and strongly called for the council to recognize her as the spouse of the Holy Ghost. This is another aspect of the council's minimizing Marian doctrine in the name of ecumenism.

Adam she is one with all those who are to be saved. She is "the mother of the members of Christ . . . having cooperated by charity that faithful might be born in the Church, who are members of that Head."(3*) Wherefore she is hailed as a pre-eminent and singular³⁵⁷ member of the Church, and as its type and excellent exemplar in faith and charity. The Catholic Church, taught by the Holy Spirit, honors³⁵⁸ her with filial affection and piety as a most beloved mother.

54. Wherefore this Holy Synod, in expounding the doctrine on the Church, in which the divine Redeemer works salvation, intends to describe with diligence both the role of the Blessed Virgin in the mystery of the Incarnate Word and the Mystical Body, and the duties of redeemed mankind toward the Mother of God, who is mother of Christ and mother of men, particularly of the faithful. It does not, however, have it in mind to give a complete doctrine on Mary, nor does it wish to decide those questions which the work of theologians has not yet fully clarified. Those opinions therefore may be lawfully retained which are propounded in Catholic schools concerning her, who occupies a place in the Church which is the highest after Christ and yet very close to us.(4*)

³⁵⁷ Even the Protestants can accept her singularity, since no one else was chosen as the mother of Jesus.

³⁵⁸ This is the weakened substitute for the declaration that the Blessed Virgin Mary is the *Mother of the Church*. Instead, the council says that the Catholic Church honors her as mother. Even the Protestants don't deny that the Catholic Church, which in conciliar teaching is only a part of the "Church of Christ", honors her in this way.

II. The Role of the Blessed Mother in the Economy of Salvation

55. The Sacred Scriptures of both the Old and the New Testament, as well as ancient Tradition show the role of the Mother of the Savior in the economy of salvation in an ever clearer light and draw attention to it. The books of the Old Testament describe the history of salvation, by which the coming of Christ into the world was slowly prepared. These earliest documents, as they are read in the Church³⁵⁹ and are understood in the light of a further and full revelation, bring the figure of the woman, Mother of the Redeemer, into a gradually clearer light. When it is looked at in this way, she is already prophetically foreshadowed in the promise of victory over the serpent which was given to our first parents after their fall into sin.(284) Likewise she is the Virgin who shall conceive and bear a son, whose name will be called Emmanuel.(285) She stands out among the poor and humble of the Lord, who confidently hope for and receive salvation from Him. With her the exalted Daughter of Sion, and after a long expectation of the promise, the times are fulfilled and the new Economy established, when the Son of God took a human nature from her, that He might in the mysteries of His flesh free man from sin.

56. The Father of mercies willed that the incarnation should be preceded by the acceptance of her who was predestined to be the mother of His Son, so that just as a woman contributed to death, so also a woman should contribute to life. That is true in outstanding fashion of the mother of Jesus, who gave to the world Him who is Life

³⁵⁹ This weak manner of expression promotes ecumenism, since even Jews and Muslims would not deny that (apart from the truth) this statement describes how “the earliest documents” are “read in the Church”. Likewise, the next sentence does not boldly proclaim the truth but timidly says that the Old Testament can be “looked at in this way”.

itself and who renews all things, and who was enriched by God with the gifts which befit such a role. It is no wonder therefore that the usage prevailed³⁶⁰ among the Fathers whereby they called the mother of God entirely holy and free from all stain of sin, as though fashioned by the Holy Spirit and formed as a new creature.(5*) Adorned from the first instant of her conception with the radiance of an entirely unique holiness, the Virgin of Nazareth is greeted, on God's command, by an angel messenger as "full of grace", (286) and to the heavenly messenger she replies: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord, be it done unto me according to thy word".(287) Thus Mary, a daughter of Adam, consenting to the divine Word, became the mother of Jesus, the one and only Mediator. Embracing God's salvific will with a full heart and impeded by no sin, she devoted herself totally as a handmaid of the Lord to the person and work of her Son, under Him and with Him, by the grace of almighty God, serving the mystery of redemption. Rightly therefore the holy Fathers see her as used by God not merely in a passive way, but as freely cooperating in the work of human salvation through faith and obedience. For, as St. Irenaeus says, she "being obedient, became the cause of salvation for herself and for the whole human race."(6*) Hence not a few of the early Fathers gladly assert in their preaching, "The knot of Eve's disobedience was untied by Mary's obedience; what the virgin Eve bound through her unbelief, the Virgin Mary loosened by her faith."(7*) Comparing Mary with Eve, they call

³⁶⁰ Notice the council avoids mentioning the Church's infallible declaration that our Lady was truly Immaculately Conceived, because that would displease the Protestants. Instead, the council promotes ecumenism by merely mentioning the historical "usage" of the Fathers. When the council uses the phrase "as though" in relation to the Holy Ghost perfecting our Lady, this phrase suggests that the Fathers' teaching was merely a metaphor.

her "the Mother of the living,"(8*) and still more often they say: "death through Eve, life through Mary."(9*)

57. This union of the Mother with the Son in the work of salvation is made manifest from the time of Christ's virginal conception up to His death; it is shown first of all when Mary, arising in haste to go to visit Elizabeth, is greeted by her as blessed because of her belief in the promise of salvation and the precursor leaped with joy in the womb of his mother.(288) This union is manifest also at the birth of Our Lord, who did not diminish His mother's virginal integrity but sanctified it,(10*) when the Mother of God joyfully showed her firstborn Son to the shepherds and Magi. When she presented Him to the Lord in the temple, making the offering of the poor, she heard Simeon foretelling at the same time that her Son would be a sign of contradiction and that a sword would pierce the mother's soul, that out of many hearts thoughts might be revealed.(289) When the Child Jesus was lost and they had sought Him sorrowing, His parents found Him in the temple, taken up with the things that were His Father's business; and they did not understand the word of their Son. His Mother indeed kept these things to be pondered over in her heart.(290)

58. In the public life of Jesus, Mary makes significant appearances. This is so even at the very beginning, when at the marriage feast of Cana, moved with pity, she brought about by her intercession the beginning of miracles of Jesus the Messiah.(291) In the course of her Son's preaching she received the words whereby in extolling a kingdom beyond the calculations and bonds of flesh and blood, He declared blessed(292) those who heard and kept the word of God, as she was faithfully doing.(293) After this manner the Blessed Virgin advanced in her pilgrimage of faith, and faithfully persevered in her union with her Son unto the cross, where she stood, in keeping with the divine plan,(294) grieving exceedingly with her only begotten Son, uniting herself with a maternal heart with His sacrifice, and lovingly

consenting to the immolation of this Victim which she herself had brought forth. Finally, she was given by the same Christ Jesus dying on the cross, as a mother to His disciple with these words: "Woman, behold thy son".(295) (11*)³⁶¹

59. But since it has pleased God not to manifest solemnly the mystery of the salvation of the human race³⁶² before He would pour forth the Spirit promised by Christ, we see the apostles before the day of Pentecost "persevering with one mind in prayer with the women and Mary the Mother of Jesus, and with His brethren", (296) and Mary by her prayers imploring the gift of the Spirit, who had already overshadowed her in the Annunciation. Finally, the Immaculate Virgin, preserved free from all guilt of original sin, (12*) on the completion of her earthly sojourn, was taken up body and soul into heavenly glory, (13*) and exalted by the Lord as Queen of the universe, that she might be the more fully conformed³⁶³ to her Son, the Lord of lords (297) and the conqueror of sin and death. (14*)

³⁶¹ The traditional teaching of the Church is that our Lord gave her to us as our Mother also, by this same action. When the council ignores this Catholic teaching, it serves to please the Protestants!

³⁶² This ambiguous phrase, the "salvation of the human race", is false if it means that all men are saved. In light of the council's promotion of universal salvation in many places, this phrase here also tends to promote universal salvation.

³⁶³ This unfortunate sentence is ambiguous. It should be taken to mean that our Lady was more fully conformed to her Son by her outward Queenship. Our Lady's coronation did not make her more interiorly conformed, since she was already completely conformed to her Son interiorly.

III. On the Blessed Virgin and the Church

60. There is but one Mediator as we know from the words of the apostle, "for there is one God and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a redemption for all".(298) The maternal duty of Mary toward men in no wise obscures or diminishes this unique mediation of Christ, but rather shows His power. For all the salvific influence of the Blessed Virgin on men originates, not from some inner necessity, but from the divine pleasure. It flows forth from the superabundance of the merits of Christ, rests on His mediation, depends entirely on it and draws all its power from it. In no way does it impede, but rather does it foster the immediate union³⁶⁴ of the faithful with Christ.

61. Predestined from eternity, by that decree of divine providence which determined the incarnation of the Word, to be the Mother of God, the Blessed Virgin was on this earth the virgin Mother of the Redeemer, and above all others and in a singular way the generous associate and humble handmaid of the Lord. She conceived, brought forth and nourished Christ. She presented Him to the Father in the temple, and was united with Him by compassion as He died on the Cross. In this singular way she cooperated by her obedience, faith, hope and burning charity in the work of the Savior in giving back supernatural life to souls. Wherefore she is our mother in the order of grace.

³⁶⁴ Mary is the *Mediatrice of all Graces* and the *Neck of the Mystical Body of Christ*. Note how the council downplays her place and prerogatives, trying to cut her out of her role and insist that we go directly to Christ without our Lady. The council does the same thing again in §62.

62. This maternity of Mary in the order of grace began with the consent which she gave in faith at the Annunciation and which she sustained without wavering beneath the cross, and lasts until the eternal fulfillment of all the elect.³⁶⁵ Taken up to heaven she did not lay aside this salvific duty, but by her constant intercession continued to bring us the gifts of eternal salvation³⁶⁶. (15*) By her maternal charity, she cares for the brethren of her Son, who still journey on earth surrounded by dangers and cultics,³⁶⁷ until³⁶⁸ they are led into

³⁶⁵ This is false. A mother does not “retire” from being a mother. Even a foster mother does not “retire”. Our Lady’s motherhood of all of the elect will never end, not even in heaven. This fits with the fact that she remains mother of her Divine Son, so likewise she remains mother of all of the members of her Divine Son, that is, His Mystical Body. She will remain forever, queen and mother of the elect.

Further, if the Blessed Virgin Mary ceased to be the Mother of the elect, then there would come a time when the saints should cease to honor her as a mother. This is a false and impious assertion.

³⁶⁶ This statement is fuzzy but can promote the heresy of universal salvation, as other statements of the council do, if it is taken as meaning that our Lady brings everyone Sanctifying Grace, (whereas the truth is that not everyone receives grace). See the annotations to §8, above.

Further, this statement can promote the heresy of universal salvation to the extent that it is taken as meaning that everyone (*i.e.*, “us”) will receive eternal salvation.

³⁶⁷ The Vatican’s English translation is the word “cultics”, for the Latin phrase “angustiis versantibus” (in the Latin original of

the happiness of their true home. Therefore the Blessed Virgin is invoked by the Church under the titles of Advocate, Auxiliatrix, Adjutrix, and Mediatrix³⁶⁹.(16*) This, however, is to be so understood

Lumen Gentium). This is inexplicable. An accurate rendering of the phrase would be “continual difficulties”.

³⁶⁸ This statement promotes universal salvation by suggesting that all “brethren of [Our Lady’s] Son” will reach heaven.

A person could make the false defense of the council’s statement here by saying that “brethren” means only those who eventually reach heaven. But that can’t be what the council means because this would mean that a person who is eventually damned would not presently be among the “brethren of [Our Lady’s] Son” even though such person was presently in the state of Sanctifying Grace and possessed of the charity which makes him a friend of God. See, the annotations to §13 above.

The council’s statement here contains a further error, to the extent that it implies that the care of our Lady’s “maternal charity” will end in heaven, whereas the truth is that she will keep both her maternal relation to the blessed and also her charity for them.

³⁶⁹ The liberal alliance of council fathers, especially the Rhine group, was not opposed to calling the Blessed Virgin Mary a “Mediatrix”. They opposed calling her “Mediatrix of All Graces”. *The Rhine Flows Into The Tiber*, Wiltgen, p.92.

The council’s statement here is further weakened by use of the passive voice. The council does not declare that the Blessed Virgin is our Mediatrix but rather that she “is invoked” as such. This statement promotes ecumenism since everyone can agree

that it neither takes away from nor adds anything³⁷⁰ to the dignity and efficaciousness of Christ the one Mediator.(17*)

For no creature could ever be counted as equal with the Incarnate Word and Redeemer. Just as the priesthood of Christ is shared in various ways both by the ministers and by the faithful, and as the one

(apart from the truth of the matter) that she “is invoked” in this way, by some people.

³⁷⁰ Throughout this chapter, how timid (and prolix) are the cautions given by the council to make sure that no one honors our Lady “excessively”! How different was the boldness of the Church’s traditional teachings! *See, e.g.*, Pope Pius XII’s encyclical, *Ad Caeli Reginam*, confidently overflowing with exquisite praise for the Blessed Virgin Mary, and issued only the decade before the council. What a contrast to the council’s devotion-less Scriptural narrative here!

Further, devotion to our Lady and recognition of her titles **do** add something: they identify the path through which our Lord wills that we approach Him, since He is the Head of His Mystical Body and she is the Neck. As **St. Alphonsus de Ligouri, Doctor of the Church**, explains:

That it is most useful to have recourse to the intercession of Mary can only be doubted by those who have not faith. ... [T]he **intercession of Mary is even necessary to salvation: we say necessary – not absolutely, but morally. This necessity proceeds from the Will of God Itself, that all graces that He dispenses should pass through the hands of Mary**

The Glories of Mary, Pt.1, ch.5, §1.

goodness of God is really communicated in different ways to His creatures, so also the unique mediation of the Redeemer does not exclude but rather gives rise to a manifold³⁷¹ cooperation which is but a sharing in this one source.³⁷²

The Church does not hesitate to profess this subordinate role of Mary.³⁷³ It knows it through unfailing experience of it and commends it to the hearts of the faithful, so that encouraged by this maternal help they may the more intimately adhere to the Mediator and Redeemer.

³⁷¹ In other words, the council is saying that the Blessed Virgin Mary is simply one of the many (“manifold”) instances of cooperating with her Son. This minimizing of our Lady is directly contrary to the uniqueness of her prerogatives, as constantly taught by the Church before the council. She is the One Mother of God, the one mother of us all, the one Mediatrix of All Graces, the one Neck of the Mystical Body of Christ, the one Queen of All Creation, *etc., etc.*

³⁷² Before he became pope, Pope Benedict XVI used the council’s vague, open-ended statement here to promote ecumenism by using this statement to support the idea that non-Catholic “religions” are part of the many-faceted cooperation with Christ’s mediation. *Dominus Iesus*, §14. This fits with the council’s teaching that other religions are a means of salvation.

³⁷³ Although Vatican II’s documents are always poorly drafted, notice that the council knows how to use the active voice when it wants to do so. The council “does not hesitate” to say Mary is subordinate to Christ, because the Protestants approve of this truth. The council here does not say here that “Mary is regarded as subordinate to Christ” – using the passive voice as the council does regarding doctrines which would displease the Protestants.

63. By reason of the gift and role of divine maternity, by which she is united with her Son, the Redeemer, and with His singular graces and functions, the Blessed Virgin is also intimately united with the Church. As St. Ambrose taught, the Mother of God is a type of the Church in the order of faith, charity and perfect union with Christ.(18*) For in the mystery of the Church, which is itself rightly called mother and virgin, the Blessed Virgin stands out in eminent and singular fashion as exemplar both of virgin and mother. (19*) By her belief and obedience, not knowing man but overshadowed by the Holy Spirit, as the new Eve she brought forth on earth the very Son of the Father, showing an undefiled faith, not in the word of the ancient serpent, but in that of God's messenger. The Son whom she brought forth is He whom God placed as the first-born among many brethren,(299) namely the faithful, in whose birth and education she cooperates with a maternal love.

64. The Church indeed, contemplating her hidden sanctity, imitating her charity and faithfully fulfilling the Father's will, by receiving the word of God in faith becomes herself a mother. By her preaching she brings forth to a new and immortal life the sons who are born to her in baptism, conceived of the Holy Spirit³⁷⁴ and born of God. She herself is

³⁷⁴ Here in Chapter VIII, we have a unique opportunity to gauge the lack of acuity of the conciliar church's thought, in direct contrast to the traditional phrasing of the very same dogma. At the beginning of Chapter VIII, the council quotes a typical traditional phrasing of the truth of the incarnation as follows: that Our Lord Jesus Christ "was incarnate by the Holy Spirit from the Virgin Mary". See, §52 above, quoting the Nicene Creed from the traditional Mass. However, here in §64, as well as in §65, this official Vatican text refers to our Lord being "conceived of the Holy Spirit". The council presumably intended the meaning of these phrases to be the same. However, the traditional, pre-conciliar formulation is much better and clearer.

In the traditional phrase, “incarnate by the Holy Spirit from the Virgin Mary”, the preposition “by” implies an agent cause (*i.e.*, identifies whose action caused the change) and the preposition “from” (or “of”) implies a material cause (*i.e.*, identifies what material it was made out of). That is why we say that the wooden bowl was made by the carpenter and from (or “of”) wood. St. Thomas Aquinas explains this admirably, quoting St. Ambrose. *Summa*, IIIa, Q.32, a.2, ad 1.

By contrast, when the council is not quoting the traditional formulation of this dogma, this official Vatican version of *Lumen Gentium* refers to our Lord being conceived of the Holy Spirit. The preposition “of” more properly implies a material cause, as we say that a bowl is made of wood.

This comparison is a perfect example – one among countless examples throughout the council’s documents – where the council’s own words demonstrate a lack of acuity and a serious poverty of expression which is not found in the countless superb expressions of the Catholic Faith which have existed throughout the history of the Church, going back to antiquity.

This particular example is taken from the Vatican’s official English translation but it also has a partial correspondence in the Latin original of *Lumen Gentium*. This passage is an especially useful example because, in the same place the council quotes the careful, exact, rich traditional formulation of a dogma and then the council’s own version, which is inattentive at best.

Even aside from *Lumen Gentium*’s serious, substantive errors – which are legion – the council shows its inattention in most of the rest of its documents. This compels the conclusion that the Catholic Church would be far better off if these documents had never been written.

a virgin, who keeps the faith given to her by her Spouse whole and entire. Imitating the mother of her Lord, and by the power of the Holy Spirit, she keeps with virginal purity an entire faith, a firm hope and a sincere charity.(20*)

65. But while in the most holy Virgin the Church has already reached that perfection³⁷⁵ whereby she is without spot or wrinkle, the followers of Christ still strive to increase in holiness by conquering sin. (300) And so they turn their eyes to Mary who shines forth to the whole community of the elect as the model of virtues. Piously meditating on her and contemplating her in the light of the Word made man, the Church with reverence enters more intimately into the great mystery of the Incarnation and becomes more and more like her Spouse. For Mary, who since her entry into salvation history unites in herself and re-echoes the greatest teachings of the faith as she is proclaimed and venerated, calls the faithful to her Son and His sacrifice and to the love of the Father. Seeking after the glory of Christ, the Church becomes more like her exalted Type, and continually progresses in faith, hope and charity, seeking and doing the will of God in all things. Hence the Church, in her apostolic work also, justly looks

Vatican II's lack of acuity was what concerned Bishop Thomas Morris when he expressed his view that the council's documents were "tentative" and were not "carefully formulated". Bishop Morris is quoted in the preface of this book.

³⁷⁵ This is a fuzzy, novel statement. The council foreshadows the conciliar church's errant doctrine of "partial communion", by asserting here a sliding scale of the degrees of perfection by which the Church is present in Her children. By contrast, the traditional Catholic teaching is that a person is a Catholic or he is not. There is no status of the Church being imperfectly in a Catholic, or a person having imperfect communion with the Church.

to her, who, conceived of the Holy Spirit, brought forth Christ, who was born of the Virgin that through the Church He may be born and may increase in the hearts of the faithful also. The Virgin in her own life lived an example of that maternal love, by which it behooves that all³⁷⁶ should be animated who cooperate in the apostolic mission of the Church for the regeneration of men.

IV. The Cult of the Blessed Virgin in the Church

66. Placed by the grace of God, as God's Mother, next to her Son, and exalted above all angels and men, Mary intervened in the mysteries of Christ and is justly honored by a special cult in the Church. Clearly from earliest times the Blessed Virgin is honored under the title of Mother of God, under whose protection the faithful took refuge in all their dangers and necessities.(21*) Hence after the Synod of Ephesus the cult of the people of God toward Mary wonderfully increased in veneration and love, in invocation and imitation, according to her own prophetic words: "All generations shall call me blessed, because He that is mighty hath done great things to me".(301) This cult, as it always existed, although it is altogether singular, differs essentially from the cult of adoration which is offered to the Incarnate Word, as well to the Father and the Holy Spirit, and it is most favorable to it.

³⁷⁶ Grammatically, the council is stating that we should all be animated by “maternal love”. This is a novelty. Moreover, it minimizes our Lady’s importance and takes away her unique perfection to say (as the council says here) that our Lady is merely “an example” of maternal love, and that we should all have the same maternal love she has! Whether or not the council meant to say that our love should be maternal, the council minimizes our Lady by presenting her as merely “an example” of love.

The various forms of piety toward the Mother of God, which the Church, within the limits of sound and orthodox doctrine, according to the conditions of time and place, and the nature and ingenuity of the faithful, has approved, bring it about that while the Mother is honored, the Son, through whom all things have their being (302) and in whom it has pleased the Father that all fullness should dwell,(303) is rightly known, loved and glorified and that all His commands are observed.³⁷⁷

67. This most Holy Synod deliberately teaches this Catholic doctrine and at the same time admonishes all the sons of the Church that the cult, especially the liturgical cult, of the Blessed Virgin, be generously fostered, and the practices and exercises of piety, recommended by the magisterium of the Church toward her in the course of centuries be made of great moment, and those decrees, which have been given in the early days regarding the cult of images of Christ, the Blessed Virgin and the saints, be religiously observed.(22*) But it exhorts theologians and preachers of the divine word to abstain zealously both from all gross exaggerations as well as from petty narrow-mindedness in considering the singular dignity of the Mother of God.³⁷⁸(23*)

³⁷⁷ We leave it up to the reader to rephrase this 83-word sentence to say the same thing in 14 words or less. Likewise, regarding the 88-word sentence which immediately follows this one.

³⁷⁸ The “flavor” of the council’s admonishment here, is to warn everyone not to be too devoted to our Lady and don’t emphasize too much how she is greater than the other saints. This theme is sprinkled through the council’s documents.

These warnings, in their context, cause a clear and great harm because of the implied message, even though the council’s words are not strictly false. This is like the implied message people would receive if, whenever a particular man was mentioned,

Following the study of Sacred Scripture, the Holy Fathers, the doctors and liturgy of the Church, and under the guidance of the Church's magisterium, let them rightly illustrate the duties and privileges of the Blessed Virgin which always look to Christ, the source of all truth, sanctity and piety. Let them assiduously keep away from whatever, either by word or deed, could lead separated brethren³⁷⁹ or any other

they were given the general warning to “be careful to avoid pick-pockets”.

Those who are blind to this implication and who defend the council's literal words, cannot reasonably explain how true devotion to Mary has plummeted since the council and that any existing devotion has a more emotional, less doctrinal foundation. One indication that this is true is the fact that true devotion to Mary always comes with an intolerance of heresy, since our Lady crushes heresy. *See*, the annotations to §15 above. By contrast, intolerance of heresy is almost non-existent in the conciliar church.

³⁷⁹ This phrase “separated brethren” is an error and novelty, promoting ecumenism. This phrase especially lends itself to a false, liberal meaning because of the other novel teachings in this same document, suggesting that the true Church is not coextensive with the Catholic Church.

Further, no revolution stands still, including the conciliar revolution. *See*, the annotations to §8 above, as well as the hierarchy's repeated characterizations of the council as a revolution, as shown in the preface above.

The conciliar revolution has “advanced” far enough so that this phrase “separated brethren” is now often superseded by expressions which more fully hide the fact that heretics and

into error regarding the true doctrine of the Church.³⁸⁰ Let the faithful remember moreover that true devotion consists neither in sterile or transitory affection,³⁸¹ nor in a certain vain credulity, but proceeds

schismatics must become Catholics to save their souls. For example, Pope John Paul II gladly noted that:

[T]he very expression *separated brethren* tends to be replaced today by expressions which more readily evoke the deep communion linked to the baptismal character There is an increased awareness that we all belong to Christ” The “universal brotherhood” of Christians has become a strong ecumenical conviction.

Ut unum sint, §42 (emphasis in the original).

³⁸⁰ The ecumenical concern (*viz.*, what will the heretics and schismatics think of us?) is at the heart of the council’s minimizing devotion to our Lady. The council is warning Catholics not to appear “too devoted” to our Lady, lest it be an “obstacle” to our “separated brethren”.

How different is the traditional teaching of the Church, where the truth was courageously and plainly taught! Whereas the conciliar church hides the truth, before Vatican II the truth was not hidden because hiding the truth offends God and – viewed correctly – is also a great offense against our neighbor, both Catholics and heretics.

³⁸¹ These platitudes could be trotted out concerning any devotion. The council could also have warned Catholics not to have a “sterile or transitory affection” for our Lord and avoid “vain credulity” regarding Him. However, the council does not do this because the council’s aim is not to please the Protestants by minimizing devotion to our Lord. Rather, the council is

from true faith, by which we are led to know the excellence of the Mother of God, and we are moved to a filial love toward our mother and to the imitation of her virtues.

V. Mary the sign of created hope and solace to the wandering people of God

68. In the interim just as the Mother of Jesus, glorified in body and soul in heaven, is the image and beginning of the Church as it is to be perfected in the world to come, so too does she shine forth on earth, until the day of the Lord shall come,(304) as a sign of sure hope and solace to the people of God during its sojourn on earth.

69. It gives great joy and comfort to this holy and general Synod that even among the separated brethren³⁸² there are some who give due³⁸³

pleasing them by minimizing devotion to our Lady and all of the saints.

Further, aside from the destructiveness of the council's implied warning, the council's vague admonitions seem practically useless as a concrete warning. Who, among persons with (hypothetical) vain credulity would recognize this fact because of the councils' warning? Who, among persons with (hypothetical) transitory affection would recognize and correct his devotion based on the council's warning?

³⁸² Here is a further example of the conciliar error of promoting ecumenism by using the expression "separated brethren".

³⁸³ It is false and makes no sense to hold that anyone who is not Catholic gives due honor to our Lady. See, the annotations to §15 above, among others. Our Lady is dishonored by anyone

honor to the Mother of our Lord and Savior, especially among the Orientals, who with devout³⁸⁴ mind and fervent impulse give honor to the Mother of God, ever virgin.(24*) The entire body of the faithful³⁸⁵ pours forth instant supplications to the Mother of God and Mother of men that she, who aided the beginnings of the Church by her prayers, may now, exalted as she is above all the angels and saints, intercede

who does not belong to her Son's One, True Catholic Church, outside of which there is no salvation. To the extent that this document is supposing that such persons are not culpable for being outside the visible Catholic Church and thus, are themselves part of the true Catholic Church although they not part of it visibly, such supposition is greatly misleading and harmful to the goal of bringing such persons into the visible Catholic Church.

This assumption (that schismatics and others are all already part of the true Church, but because of their ignorance, are not part of the visible Church) is a rash novelty completely contrary to the Church's teaching before Vatican II and even is completely contrary to the practice of all human societies everywhere. *See*, the annotations to §15 above.

³⁸⁴ The council obscures the fact that non-Catholics cannot have supernatural fervor or meritorious devotion – otherwise they would be Catholic. As shown above, there is no true devotion without the Sanctifying Grace and supernatural charity which is found only in the Catholic Church.

³⁸⁵ This statement is dangerous, especially immediately following the suggesting that non-Catholics are holy and devout. It is totally false, novel and non-traditional to refer to non-Catholics as “faithful”, as the council does. *See*, the annotations to §1 above, among others.

before her Son in the fellowship of all the saints, until all³⁸⁶ families of people, whether they are honored with the title of Christian³⁸⁷ or whether they still do not know the Savior, may be happily gathered together in peace and harmony into one people of God, for the glory of the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity.³⁸⁸

Each and all these items which are set forth in this dogmatic Constitution have met with the approval of the Council Fathers. And We by the apostolic power given Us by Christ together³⁸⁹ with the

³⁸⁶ This is a promotion of the error that all peoples, including all schismatics, heretics, Jews and heathens, will enjoy together a brotherhood of happiness and peace, without any requirement that they become Catholics and devote their lives to the true sanctity which is impossible outside the Catholic Church (and which is not even achieved by all within the Catholic Church).

³⁸⁷ This again is a revolutionary reference to heretics and schismatics, as “Christians”. *See*, the annotations to §15 above.

³⁸⁸ This statement scandalously suggests universal salvation – when, in the end, all will save their souls.

³⁸⁹ Pope Paul VI is speaking in the (traditional) monarchical plural and has not yet adopted the post-conciliar practice of the pope referring to himself in the singular. However, he has already adopted the post-conciliar papal practice of speaking imprecisely, where he here says that his “apostolic power” is given to him “together with the Venerable Fathers”. His statement here lends itself to being understood as saying that the pope’s power is not unique, supreme and diverse from that of the other bishops of the Church.

The more decentralized authority which the Second Vatican Council promotes in furtherance of collegiality, is indicated here

Venerable Fathers in the Holy Spirit, approve, decree and establish it and command that what has thus been decided in the Council be promulgated for the glory of God.

Given in Rome at St. Peter's on November 21, 1964.

APPENDIX
From the Acts of the Council*
'NOTIFICATIONES' GIVEN BY THE SECRETARY GENERAL
OF THE COUNCIL AT THE 123rd GENERAL
CONGREGATION,
NOVEMBER 16, 1964

A question has arisen regarding the precise theological note which should be attached to the doctrine that is set forth in the Schema de Ecclesia and is being put to a vote.

The Theological Commission has given the following response regarding the Modi that have to do with Chapter III of the de Ecclesia Schema: "As is self-evident, the Council's text must always be interpreted in accordance with the general rules that are known to all."

On this occasion the Theological Commission makes reference to its Declaration of March 6, 1964, the text of which we transcribe here:

with Pope Paul VI certifying the council documents with the other bishops of the Catholic Church. This contrasts, *e.g.*, with the First Vatican Council, where Pope Pius IX certified those council documents by his sole authority.

"Taking conciliar custom into consideration and also the pastoral purpose of the present Council, the sacred Council defines as binding on the Church only those things in matters of faith and morals which it shall openly declare to be binding.³⁹⁰ The rest of the things which the sacred Council sets forth, inasmuch as they are the teaching of the Church's supreme magisterium, ought to be accepted and embraced by each and every one of Christ's faithful according to the mind of the sacred Council. The mind of the Council becomes known either from the matter treated or from its manner of speaking, in accordance with the norms of theological interpretation."

The following was published as an appendix to the official Latin version of the Constitution on the Church.

A preliminary note of explanation is being given to the Council Fathers from higher-authority, regarding the Modi bearing on Chapter III of the Schema de Ecclesia; the doctrine set forth in Chapter III ought to be explained and understood³⁹¹ in accordance with the meaning and

³⁹⁰ It is evident from a plain reading of this document, *Lumen Gentium*, that nothing in it was "openly declared to be binding", as a new definition of an infallible dogma, although the council did teach certain truths which had already been defined dogmas.

³⁹¹ There are only two possible reasons an ambiguity is allowed in a formal communication such as the council's documents: either the drafter was too unskilled to remove the ambiguity, or the drafter intentionally did not want to do so.

Sometimes a drafter is not skilled enough to avoid every ambiguity and so the document must be clarified later, to repair that deficiency. Here, however, at least some of *Lumen Gentium*'s ambiguities were noted while the document was still being finalized and those parts of the text were not changed.

intent of this explanatory note.

Preliminary Note of Explanation

The Commission has decided to preface the assessment of the Modi with the following general observations.

1. "College" is not understood in a strictly juridical sense, that is as a group of equals who entrust their power to their president, but as a stable group³⁹² whose structure and authority must be learned from Revelation. For this reason, in reply to Modus 12 it is expressly said of the Twelve that the Lord set them up "as a college or stable group." Cf. also Modus 53, c.

For the same reason, the words "Ordo" or "Corpus" are used throughout with reference to the College of bishops. The parallel between Peter and the rest of the Apostles on the one hand, and between the Supreme Pontiff and the bishops on the other hand, does not imply the transmission of the Apostles' extraordinary power to their successors; nor does it imply, as is obvious, equality between the

When has any other council of the Church or any treatise or other serious document ever been so fuzzy or ambiguous that even when originally published, it is accompanied by an explanation to clear up how it "ought to be explained and understood"?

³⁹² This erroneous reference to the bishops being a "stable group", as other such references which the council makes, promotes the error of collegiality and the harm of standing bishops conferences which tend to destroy the authority of the bishops in their own dioceses as well as to weaken the monarchical power of the pope, acting independently of these Episcopal "legislatures".

head of the College and its members, but only a proportionality between the first relationship (Peter-Apostles) and the second (Pope-bishops). Thus the Commission decided to write "pari racione," not "eadem racione," in n. 22. Cf. Modus 57.

2. A person becomes a member of the College by virtue of Episcopal consecration and by hierarchical communion with the head of the College³⁹³ and with its members. Cf. n. 22, end of §1.

In his consecration a person is given an ontological participation in the sacred functions [munera]; this is absolutely clear from Tradition, liturgical tradition included. The word "functions [munera]" is used deliberately instead of the word "powers [potestates]," because the latter word could be understood as a power fully ready to act.³⁹⁴ But

³⁹³ This phrase continues to minimize the power of the pope by referring to him as the dean of the college, rather than as a supreme monarch.

³⁹⁴ This explanation is entirely unpersuasive, about why the bishops are said to have "functions" rather than "powers", although this explanation "gave cover" to conservative bishops to persuade them to sign *Lumen Gentium* during the council. As shown above, this focus on "function" promotes ecumenism by being consistent with Protestant heresy. See, the annotations to §20 above, among other annotations throughout.

The council could have, and should have, referred to Episcopal power, and added an explanation that certain Episcopal powers sometimes require jurisdiction for their exercise.

However, this jurisdiction pertains to the exercise of Episcopal power, and should not be confused with the power itself. This is clear because Episcopal power can never be supplied to a layman by a state of necessity arising in the Church. By

for this power to be fully ready to act, there must be a further canonical or juridical determination through the hierarchical authority. This determination of power can consist in the granting of a particular office or in the allotment of subjects, and it is done according to the norms approved by the supreme authority. An additional norm of this sort is required by the very nature of the case, because it involves functions [munera] which must be exercised by many subjects cooperating in a hierarchical manner in accordance with Christ's will. It is evident that this "communion" was applied in the Church's life according to the circumstances of the time, before it was codified as law.

For this reason it is clearly stated that hierarchical communion with the head and members of the church is required. Communion is a notion which is held in high honor in the ancient Church (and also today, especially in the East). However, it is not understood as some kind of vague disposition, but as an organic reality which requires a juridical form and is animated by charity. Hence the Commission,

contrast, jurisdiction can be supplied to a bishop who has Episcopal power but does not have ordinary jurisdiction.

Further, the council blurs the difference between the bishops' exercise of the powers inherent in their orders and the licitness of doing so. That is, for most exercises of his powers of consecration (or ordination), a bishop (or a priest) does have power which is "fully ready to act" as far as ability to act, even though not as far as whether he has permission to do so (or, sometimes, jurisdiction, as noted immediately above).

As far as the "allotment of subjects" referred to a few sentences from now, this is proper to a bishop to rule but not a necessary or essential part of being a bishop that the pope give him a particular flock for which to care.

almost unanimously, decided that this wording should be used: "in hierarchical communion." Cf. Modus 40 and the statements on canonical mission (n. 24).

The documents of recent Pontiffs regarding the jurisdiction of bishops must be interpreted in terms of this necessary determination of powers.

3. The College,³⁹⁵ which does not exist without the head, is said "to exist also as the subject of supreme and full power in the universal Church." This must be admitted of necessity so that the fullness of power belonging to the Roman Pontiff is not called into question. For the College, always and of necessity, includes its head, because in the college he preserves unhindered his function as Christ's Vicar and as Pastor of the universal Church. In other words, it is not a distinction between the Roman Pontiff and the bishops taken collectively, but a distinction between the Roman Pontiff taken separately and the Roman Pontiff together with the bishops.³⁹⁶ Since the Supreme Pontiff is head of the College, he alone is able to perform certain actions which are not at all within the competence of the bishops, e.g.,

³⁹⁵ The doctrine on collegiality, as it is expressed in no. 22 of the Constitution *Lumen Gentium*, including no. 3 of the *Nota praevia* here, contradicts the traditional teaching of the Church, including the infallible teaching of the First Vatican Council on the uniqueness of the subject of supreme power in the Church, in the Constitution *Pastor aeternus*. See, the annotations to §22 above.

³⁹⁶ As discussed above, the bishops all derive their authority from the pope so that they have a share in his authority only to the extent he has delegated it to each of them, for only as long as he has delegated it to each.

convoking the College and directing it, approving norms of action, etc. Cf. Modus 81. It is up to the judgment of the Supreme Pontiff, to whose care Christ's whole flock has been entrusted, to determine, according to the needs of the Church as they change over the course of centuries, the way in which this care may best be exercised—whether in a personal or a collegial³⁹⁷ way. The Roman Pontiff, taking account of the Church's welfare, proceeds according to his own discretion in arranging, promoting and approving the exercise of collegial activity.

4. As Supreme Pastor of the Church, the Supreme Pontiff can always exercise his power at will, as his very office demands. Though it is always in existence³⁹⁸, the College is not as a result permanently engaged in strictly collegial activity; the Church's Tradition makes this clear. In other words, the College is not always "fully active [in actu pleno]"³⁹⁹; rather, it acts as a college in the strict sense only from time to time and only with the consent of its head. The phrase "with the consent of its head" is used to avoid the idea of dependence on some kind of outsider; the term "consent" suggests rather communion

³⁹⁷ The pope has no power to change the Church's form of government from that of a monarchy.

³⁹⁸ Promoting collegiality, the council here confuses what is actual, with what is potential. Disbursed around the world, the bishops do not always form an actual college but only a potential college (*i.e.*, group), that is, they can be brought together to become an actual college (*i.e.*, group). Something which is potential, is something which **can** exist, not what **does** exist. Thus, it is false to say that the college of bishops "**is** always in existence".

³⁹⁹ As shown immediately above, the college of bishops is simply **not** active ["in actu"], at all times.

between the head and the members, and implies the need for an act which belongs properly to the competence of the head. This is explicitly affirmed in n. 22, 12, and is explained at the end of that section⁴⁰⁰. The word "only" takes in all cases. It is evident from this that the norms approved by the supreme authority must always be observed. Cf. Modus 84.

It is clear throughout⁴⁰¹ that it is a question of the bishops acting in conjunction with their head, never of the bishops acting independently of the Pope. In the latter instance, without the action of the head, the bishops are not able to act as a College: this is clear from the concept of "College."⁴⁰² This hierarchical communion of all the bishops with the Supreme Pontiff is certainly firmly established in Tradition.

⁴⁰⁰ If the council truly did explicitly affirm the truth as it claims, in the body of *Lumen Gentium*, then why is this *Nota praevia* taking the time to tell us how that passage "ought to be explained and understood"?

⁴⁰¹ Again, if it were truly "clear throughout", as asserted here, then why is this explanatory note needed, to tell the reader how "the doctrine ... ought to be explained and understood"?

⁴⁰² When one peruses the definitions in any dictionary, one sees that it is certainly not "clear from the concept of 'college'" that it includes a head without which the assembled body of the college cannot act. *E.g.*, the many definitions of "college" published during the Second Vatican Council, in the large, two-volume library edition of *Funk & Wagnalls Standard Dictionary*, International Edition, © 1958-1965.

N.B. Without hierarchical communion the ontologico-sacramental function [munus], which is to be distinguished from the juridico-canonical aspect, cannot⁴⁰³ be exercised. However, the Commission has decided that it should not enter into question of liceity and validity.⁴⁰⁴ These questions are left to theologians to discuss—specifically the question of the power exercised *de facto* among the separated Eastern Churches,⁴⁰⁵ about which there are various explanations."⁴⁰⁶

⁴⁰³ The council's statement is muddled. Those powers a bishop possesses which enable him to perform an Episcopal act, *e.g.*, ordain a priest, **may** not (*i.e.*, it is illicit) be exercised without authority but **can** (*i.e.*, it is valid) be exercised without authority.

⁴⁰⁴ This is the very issue treated in this passage! So, this is the state of the topic: the council uses a term unobjectionable to the Protestants and which fits with Protestant heresy: that church leadership is exercise of an office, function or duty. But the council does not want to address whether bishops have powers which are not shared by everyone, which would allow them to confect sacraments validly, even without the pope's permission.

⁴⁰⁵ As shown above, it is an error and novelty to describe the schismatics and heretics (who are outside the Catholic Church) as if they constituted some other "church". Before the novelties of Vatican II, such unfortunate, lost sheep were not referred to by the Catholic Church as if their human grouping with other persons espousing the same errors (which are objectively mortal sins), had any status other than as individual lost sheep who happened to head into the same swamp. *See*, the annotations to §15 above.

⁴⁰⁶ **Epilogue note:** We return to the question we asked at the beginning of this book: *viz.*, is Vatican II consistent with the traditional teachings of the Church? The answer, it seems, is

that it is impossible to reconcile a very large number of Vatican II's teachings with what the Church has always taught.

It is clear that *Lumen Gentium* teaches things on virtually every page which are inconsistent with the traditional teachings of the Catholic Church. It is evident from reading *Lumen Gentium* that much of its text is orthodox, at least when an orthodox meaning is imposed upon the ambiguities in the text, while ignoring the context which indicates another meaning instead.

However, this is certainly no endorsement of the document and it would be better if it had never been written. With respect to even the orthodox statements in *Lumen Gentium*, we challenge the reader to find even a single statement in the text (aside from the quotations) that was not made better and more clearly in the *pre-Vatican II* Church's Magisterium, *e.g.*, in Pope Pius XII's encyclical on the Church, *Mystici Corporis*.

However, the pope, perhaps with a future council, will be tasked with making an authoritative judgment on the character of Vatican II's teachings. We, meanwhile, must simply do our very best to avoid contagion with the virus of modernism, to the best of our ability. See the quote from St. Vincent Lerins, in the preface of this book.

Do the errors of Vatican II prove the sedevacantists are correct in their rash judgment that we have no pope? Certainly not! While it is every Catholic's job to do his best to avoid the contagion of heresy – even if that heresy comes from the pope – it is only the job of the Church's authorities to discipline and depose someone, based on heresy, and then, to discipline and depose only their own subordinates. Thus, *e.g.*, one bishop cannot depose a bishop in another diocese and no one can judge

+ PERICLE FELICI

Titular Archbishop of Samosata

Secretary General of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council

ENDNOTES [Contained in the Vatican's Official English Edition]

- 1 Cf. Mk. 16:15.
- 2 Col. 1:15.
- 3 Rom. 8:29.
- 4 Cf. Eph. 1:4-5 and 10.
- 5 Cf. Jn. 19:34.
- 6 Jn. 12:32.
- 7 1 Cor 5:7.
- 8 Cf. 1 Cor. 10:17.
- 9 Cf. Jn. 17:4.
- 10 Cf Eph. 1:18.
- 11 Cf Jn. 4:14; 7:38-39.
- 12 Cf. Rom. 8:10-11.
- 13 Cf. Cor. 3:16; 6:19.
- 14 Cf. Gal. 4:6; Rom. 8:15-16 and 26.
- 15 Cf. Jn. 16:13.
- 16 Cf. Eph. 1:11-12; 1 Cor. 12:4 Gal. 5:22.
17. Rev. 22:17
18. Mk. 1:15; cf. Mt. 4:17.
19. Mk. 4:14.
- 20 Lk. 12:32.
- 21 Cf. Mk. 4:26-29.
- 22 Lk. 11:20; cf. Mt.12:28.
- 23 Mk. 10:45.
- 24 Cf. Acts 2:36; Heb. 5:6; 7:17-21.

the pope and declare him to have lost his office. *Summa*, IIa IIae, Q.60, aa. 4 & 6.

- 25 Cf. Acts 2:33.
 26 Jn. 10:1-10.
 27 Cf. Is. 40:11; Ex. 34:11ff.
 28 Cf Jn. 10:11; 1 Pt. 5:4.
 29 Cf. Jn. 10:11-15.
 30 I Cor. 3:9.
 31 1 Rom. 11:13-26.
 32 Mt. 21:33-43; cf. Is. 5:1 ff.
 33 Jn. 15:1-5.
 34 1 Cor. 3:9.
 35 Mt 21:42; cf. Acts 4:11; 1 Pt. 2:7; Ps. 117:22.
 36 Cf. 1 Cor. 3:11.
 37 1 Tim. 3:15.
 38 Eph. 2:19-22.
 39 Rev. 21:3.
 40 1 Pt. 2:5.
 41 Rev. 21:16.
 42 Gal. 4:26; cf. Rev. 12:17.
 43 Rev. 19:7; 21:2 and 9; 22:17
 44 Eph. 5:26.
 45 Eph. 5:29.
 46 Cf. Eph. 5:24.
 47 Cf. Eph. 3:19.
 48 Cf. 2 Cor. 5:6.
 49 Cf. Col. 3:1-4.
 50 Cf. Gal. 6:15; 2 Cor. 5:17.
 51 1 Cor. 12:13.
 52 Rom. 6:15.
 53 1 Cor. 10:17.
 54 Cf. 1 Cor 12:27.
 55 Rom. 12:5.
 56 Cf. 1 Cor. 12:12.
 57 Cf. 1 Cor. 12.1-11.

- 58 Cf. 1 Cor. 14.
- 59 Cf. I Cor. 12:26.
- 60 Cf. Col. 1:15-18.
- 61 Cf. Eph. 1:18-23.
- 62 Cf. Gal. 4:19.
- 63 Cf. Phil. 3:21; 2 Tim. 2:11; Eph. 2:6; Col. 2:12 etc.
- 64 Cf. Rom. 8:17.
- 65 Col. 2:19.
- 66 Cf. Eph. 4:11-16.
- 67 Cf. Eph. 4:23.
- 68 Cf. Eph. 5:25-28.
- 69 Ibid. 23-24.
- 70 Col. 2:9.
- 71 Cf. Eph. 1:22-23.
- 72 Cf. Eph. 3:19.
- 73 Cf. Eph. 4:16.
- 74 Jn. 21:17.
- 75 Cf. Mt. 28:18, f.
- 76 1 Tim. 3:15.
- 77 Phil. 2:6.
- 78 2 Cor. 8:9.
- 79 Lk. 4:18.
- 80 Lk. 19:10.
- 81 Heb. 7:26.
- 82 2 Cor. 5:21.
- 83 Cf. Heb. 2:17.
- 84 Cf. 1 Cor. 11:26.
- 85 Cf. Acts 10:35.
- 86 Jer. 31:31-34.
- 87 Cf. 1 Cor. 11:25.
- 88 Cf. 1 Pt. 1:23.
- 89 Cf. Jn. 3:5-6.
- 90 1 Pt. 2:9-10.
- 91 Rom. 4:25.

- 92 Cf. Jn. 13:34.
- 93 Cf. Col. 3:4.
- 94 Rom. 8:21.
- 95 Cf. Mt. 5:13-16.
- 96 Neh. 13:1; cf. Deut. 23:1 ff; Num. 20:4.
- 97 Cf. Heb. 13:14.
- 98 Cf. Mt. 16:18.
- 99 Cf. Acts 20:28.
- 100 Cf. Heb. 5:1-5.
- 101 Cf Rev. 6:1; cf. 5:9-10
- 102 Cf. 1 Pt.2:4-10.
- 103 Cf. Acts 2:42-47.
- 104 Cf. Rom. 12:1.
- 105 Cf 1 Pt. 3:15
- 107 Cf. Rom; 8:17; Col. 1:24; 2 Tim. 2:11-12; 1 Pet. 4:13.
- 108 Cf. Eph. 5:32.
- 109 Cf. 1 Cor. 7, 7.
- 110 Cf. Heb. 13:15.
- 111 Cf. Jn. 2:20, 27
- 112 Cf. 1 Thess. 2:13.
- 113 Cf. Jud. 3
- 114 1 Cor. 12:11.
- 115 Cf. 1 Thess 5:12, 19-21.
- 117 Cf. Jn. 11:52.
- 118 Cf. Heb. 1:2.
- 119 Cf. Acts 2:42.
- 120 Cf. Jn. 18:36
- 121 Cf. Ps. 2:8.
- 122 Cf. Ps. 71 (72):10; Is. 60:4-7; Rev. 21:24.
- 123 1 Pet. 4:10.
- 124 Cf. Mk. 16:16; Jn. 3.5.
- 125 Cf. Rom. 9:4-5
- 126 Cf. Rom. 1 l:28-29.

- 127 Cf. Acts 17:25-28.
- 128 Cf. 1 Tim. 2:4.
- 129 Cf Rom. 1:21, 25.
- 130 Mk. 16:16.
- 131 Cf. Jn. 20:21.
- 132 Mt. 2:18-20.
- 133 Cf. Acts 1:8.
- 134 I Cor. 9:16.
- 135 Mal. 1:11
- 136 Jn. 20:21.
- 137 Mk. 3:13-19; Mt. 10:1-42.
- 138 Cf Lk. 6:13.
- 139 Cf. Jn. 21:15-17.
- 140 Rom. 1:16.
- 141 Cf. Mt. 28:16-20; Mk. 16:15; Lk. 24:45-48; Jn. 20:21-23.
- 142 Cf. Mt. 28:20.
- 143 Cf. Acts 2:1-26.
- 144 Acts 1:8.
- 145 Cf. Mk. 16:20.
- 146 Cf. Rev. 21:14; Mt. 16:18; Eph. 2:20.
- 147 Cf. Mt. 28:20.
- 148 Cf. Acts 20:28.
- 149 Cf. Lk. 10:16.
- 150 Cf. 1 Cor. 4:15.
- 151 Cf. 1 Cor. 4:1.
- 152 Cf. Rom. 15:16; Acts 20:24.
- 153 Cf. 2 Cor. 3:8-9.
- 154 Cf Acts 1:8, 2:4, Jn. 20:22-23.
- 155 Cf 1 Tim. 4:14; 2 Tim. 1:6-7.
- 156 Cf. Mt. 16:18-19.
- 157 Cf. Jn. 21:15 ff.
- 158 Mt. 16:19.
- 159 Mt. 18:18, 28:16-20.
- 160 Cf . Mt. 5:10.

- 161 Cf. Mt. 28:18; Mk. 16:15-16; Acts 26:17 ff.
162 Cf Acts 1:8- 2:1 ff, 9:15.
163 Cf Acts 1:17, 25; 21:19; Rom. 11:13; 1 Tim. 1:12.
164 Cf. Mt. 13:52.
165 Cf. 2 Tim. 4:1-4.
166 Cf. Lk. 22:32.
167 Cf. 1. Thess. 1:5.
168 Cf. Rom. 1:16.
169 Cf. Lk. 22:26-27.
170 Cf. Mt. 20:28; Mk. 10:45.
171 Cf. Jn. 10:11.
172 Cf. Heb. 5:1-2.
173 Cf. Heb. 13:17.
174 Cf. Rom. 1:14-15.
175 Cf. 1 Cor. 4:15.
176 Jn. 10:36.
177 Heb. 5:1-10, 7:24, 9:11-28.
178 1 Tim. 2:5.
179 Cf. 1 Cor. 11:26.
180 Cf. Heb. 9:11-28.
181 Heb. 5:1-4.
182 Jn. 4:24.
183 Cf. 1 Tim. 5:17.
184 Cf. Eph. 4:12.
185 Cf. Jn. 15:15.
186 Cf. 1 Cor. 4:15; 1 Pt. 1:23.
187 1 Pt. 5:3.
188 Cf 1 Cor. 1:2; 2 Cor. 1:1.
189 Cf Lk. 15:4-7.
190 Eph. 4:15-16.
191 1 Rom. 12:4-5
192 Cf. Eph. 4:5.
193 Gal. 3:28; cf. Col. 3.11.

- 194 Cf. 2 Pt. 1:1.
- 195 1 Cor. 12:11.
- 196 Cf. Mt. 20:28.
- 197 Eph. 4:7.
- 198 Cf. Phil. 4:3; Rom. 16:3ff.
- 199 Pt. 2:5.
- 200 Cf. Acts 2:17-18; Rev. 19:10.
- 201 Cf. Eph. 5:16; Col. 4:5.
- 202 Cf. Rom. 8:25.
- 203 Eph. 6:12
- 204 Cf. Rev. 21:1.
- 205 Cf. Heb. 11:1
- 206 Cf. Phil. 2:8-9.
- 207 Cf 1 Cor. 15:27
- 208 Cf. Rom. 6:12.
- 209 Cf Rom. 8:21.
- 210 1 Cor. 3:23.
- 211 Cf. Heb. 13:17.
- 212 Cf. Gal. 5:12.
- 213 Cf Mt. 5:3-9.
- 214 Cf Eph. 5:25-26.
- 215 I Thess. 4.3; cf. Eph.1:4.
- 216 Mt. 5:48.
- 217 Cf. Mk. 12:30.
- 218 Cf. Jn. 13.34; 15:12.
- 219 Eph. 5:3.
- 220 Col . 3:12.
- 221 Cf. Gal. 5:22; Rom. 6:22.
- 222 Cf. Jas. 3:2.
- 223 1 Mt. 6:12.
- 224 Cf. 1 Pt. 5:3.
- 225 Cf. 1 Tim. 3:8-10 and 12-1
- 226 1 Pt. 5:10.
- 227 1 Jn. 4:16.

- 228 Cf. Rom. 5:5.
229 Cf. Col. 3:14; Rom. 13:10.
230 Cf. 1 Jn. 3:16; Jn. 15:13.
231 Cf 1 Cor. 7:32-34.
232 Cf Mt. 19:11; 1 Cor.7:7.
233 Phil. 2:7-8.
234 2 Cor. 8:9.
235 Cf 1. Cor. 7:31ff.
236 Ezech. 34:14.
237 Acts 3:21.
238 Cf Eph. 1:10; Col. 1:20; 2 Pt.3:10-13.
239 Cf. Jn. 12:32.
240 Cf. Rom. 6:9.
241 Cf. Phil. 2:12.
242 Cf 1 Cor. 10:11.
243 Cf. 2. Pt. 3:13.
244 Cf. Rom. 8:19-22.
245 Eph. 1:14.
246 Cf. 1 Jn. 3:1.
247 Cf. Col. 3.4
248 Cf. 1 Jn. 3:2
249 2 Cor. 5:6.
250 Cf. Rom. 8:23.
251 Cf. Phil. 1:23.
252 Cf. 2 Cor 5:15.
253 Cf. 2 Cor. 5:9.
254 Cf. Eph.6:11-13.
255 Cf. Heb 9:27.
256 Cf. Mt. 25:31-46.
257 Cf. Mt. 25:41.
258 Cf. Mt. 25:26.
259 Mt. 22:13 and 25:30.
260 2 Cor. 5:10.

- 261 Jn. 5:29; Cf. Mt. 25:46.
262 Rom. 8:18; cf. 2 Tim. 2:11-12.
263 Tit. 2:13.
264 Phil. 3:21.
265 2 Thess. 1:10.
266 Cf. Mt. 25:31.
267 Cf. 1 Cor. 15:26-27.
268 Cf. Eph. 4:16.
269 Cf. 1 Cor. 12:12-27.
270 Cf. 2 Cor. 5:8.
271 Cf. 1 Tim. 2:5.
272 Cf. Col. 1:24.
273 2 Macc. 12:46.
274 Cf. Heb. 13:14; 11:10.
275 Cf. 2 Cor. 3:18.
276 Cf. Heb. 12:1.
277 Cf. Eph. 4:1-6.
278 Cf. Rev. 5:9.
279 Cf. Heb. 3:6.
280 Cf. Rev. 21:24.
281 Rev. 5:12.
282 Rev. 5:13-14.
283 Gal. 4:4-5.
284 Cf. Gen. 3:15.
285 Cf. Is 7:14; cf. Mich. 5:2-3; Mt. 1:22-23.
286 Cf. Lk. 1:28.
287 Lk. 1:38.
288 Cf. Lk. 1:41-45.
289 Cf. Lk. 2:34-35.
290 Cf. Lk. 2:41-51.
291 Cf. Jn. 2:1-11.
292 Cf. Mk. 3:35; Lk. 11:27-28.
293 Cf. Lk. 2:19, 51.
294 Cf. Jn. 19:25.

295 Cf. Jn. 19:26-27.

296 Acts 1:14.

297 Cf Rev. 19:16

298 1 Tim. 2:5-6.

299 Rom. 8:29.

300 Cf. Eph 5:27.

301 Lk. 1:48.

302 Cf. Col. 1:15-16.

303 Col 1:19.

304 Cf. 2 Pt. 3:10.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (*)

Chapter I

(1) Cfr. S. Cyprianus, Epist. 64, 4: PL 3, 1017. CSEL (Hartcl), III B p. 720.

S. Hilarius Pict., In Mt 23, 6: PL 9, 1047. S. Augustinus, passim. S.

Cyrillus Alex., Glaph in Gen. 2, 10: PG 69, 110 A.

(2) Cfr. S. Gregorius M., Hom in Evang. 19, 1: PL 76, 1154 B. S

Augustinus, Serm. 341, 9, 11: PL 39, 1499 s. S. Io. Damascenus, Adv.

Iconocl. 11: PG 96, 1357.

(3) Cfr. S. Irenaeus, adv. Haer, 111 24, 1: PG 7, 966 B; Harvey 2, 13i, ed. Sagnard, Sources Chr., p 398.

(4) S. Cyprianus, De Orat Dom. 23: PL 4, 553, Hartel, III A, p. 28S. S.

Augustinus, Serm. 71, 20, 33: PL 38, 463 s. S. Io. Damascenus, Adv.

Iconocl. 12: PG 96, 1358 D.

(5) Cfr. Origenes, In Matth. 16, 21: PG 13, 1443 C, Tertullianus Adv.

Marc. 3, 7: PL 2, 357 C, CSEL 47, 3 p. 386. Pro documentis liturgicis, cfr.

Sacramentarium Gregorianum: PL 78, 160 B. Vel C. Mohlberg, Liber

Sactamentorum romanae ecclesiae, Romao 1950, p. 111, XC:..Deus,

qui ex omni coaptacione sanctorum aeternum tibi condis

habitaculum..... Hymnus Urbs Ierusalem beata in Breviario monastico,

et Coclest urbs Ierusalem in Breviario Romano.

(6) Cfr. S. Thomas, Sumtna Theol. III, q. 62, a. 5, ad 1.

(7) Cfr. Pius XII, Litt. Encycl Mystici Corporis, 29 iun. 1943 AAS 35

(1943), p. 208.

(8) Cfr. Leo XIII, Epist. Encycl. Divinum illud, 9 maii 1897: AAS 29 (1896-97) p. 650. Pius XII, Litt. Encycl. Mystici Corporis, 1. c., pp 219-220; Denz. 2288 (3808). S. Augustinus, Serm. 268, 2: PL 38 232, ct alibi. S. Io. Chrysostomus n Eph. Hom. 9, 3: PG 62, 72. idymus Alex., Trin. 2, 1: PG 39 49 s. S. Thomas, In Col. 1, 18 cet. 5 ed. Marietti, II, n. 46-Sicut constituitur unum eorpus ex nitate animae, ita Ecelesia ex unil atc Spiritus.....

(9) Leo XIII, Litt. Encycl. Sapientiae christianae, 10 ian. 1890 AAS 22 (1889-90) p. 392. Id., Epist. Encycl. Satis cognitum, 29 iun. 1896; AAS 28 (1895-96) pp. 710 ct 724 ss. Pius XII, Litt. Eneyel. Mystici Corporis, 1. c., pp. 199-200.

(10) Cfr. Pius XII, Litt. Encycl. Mystici Corporis, 1. c., p. 221 ss. Id., Lin. Encycl. Humani generis, 12 Aug. 1950: AAS 42 (1950) p. 571.

(11) Leo XIII, Epist. Encycl. Satis cognitum, 1. c., p. 713.

(12) Cfr. Symbolum Apostolicum: Denz. 6-9 (10-13); Symb. Nic.-Const.: Denz. 86 (150), coll. Prof. fidei Trid.: Denz. 994 et 999 (1862 et 1868).

(13) Dieitur. Saneta (catholica apostolica) Romana Ecelesia .: in Prof. fidei Trid., 1. c. et Concl. Vat. I, Sess. III, Const. dogm. de fide cath.: Denz. 1782 (3001).

(14) S. Augustinus, Civ. Dei, XVIII, 51, 2: PL 41, 614.

Chapter II

(1) Cfr. S. Cyprianus, Epist. 69, 6: PL 3, 1142 B; Hartel 3 B, p. 754: inseparabile unitatis sacramentum ..

(2) Cfr. Pius XII, Alloc. Magnificate Dominum, 2 nov. 1954: AAS 46 (1954) p. 669. Litt. Encycl. Mediator Dei, 20 nov. 1947: AAS 39 (1947) p. 555.

(3) Cfr. Pius XI, Litt. Encycl. Miserentissimus Redemptor, 8 maii 1928: AAS 20 (1928) p. 171 s. Pius XII Alloc. Vous nous avez, 22 sept. 1956: AAS 48 (1956) p. 714.

(4) Cfr. S. Thomas, Summa Theol. III, q. 63, a. 2.

(5) Cfr. S. Cyrillus Hieros., Catech. 17, de Spiritu Sancto, II, 35-37: PG 33, 1009-1012. Nic. Cabasilas, De vita in Christo, lib. III, de utilitate chrismatis: PG 150, 569-580. S. Thomas, Summa Theol. III, q. 65, a. 3 et q. 72, a. 1 et 5.

- (6) Cfr. Pius XII, Litt. Encycl. *Mediator Dei* 20 nov. 1947: AAS 39 (1947), praesertim p. 552 s.
- (7) I Cor. 7, 7: . Unusquisque proprium donum (idion charisma) habet ex Deo: alius quidem sic alius vero sic .. Cfr. S. Augustinus, *De Dono Persev.* 14, 37: PL 45, 1015 s.: Non tantum continenti Dei donum est, sed coniugatorum etiam castitas.
- (8) Cfr. S. Augustinus, *D Praed. Sanct.* 14, 27: PL 44, 980.
- (9) Cfr. S. Io. Chrysostomus, *In Io. Hom.* 65, 1: PG 59, 361.
- (10) Cfr. S. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* III, 16, 6; III, 22, 1-3: PG 7, 925 C-926 Aet 955 C - 958 A; Harvey 2, 87 s. et 120-123; Sagnard, *Ed. Sources Chret.*, pp. 290-292 et 372 ss.
- (11) Cfr. S. Ignatius M., *Ad Rom.*, Praef.: Ed. Funk, I, p. 252.
- (12) Cfr. S. Augustinus, *Bapt. c. Donat.* V, 28, 39; PL 43, 197: Certe manifestum est, id quod dicitur, in Ecclesia intus et foris, in corde, non in corpore cogitandum. Cfr. *ib.*, III, 19, 26: col. 152; V, 18, 24: col. 189; *In Io. Tr.* 61, 2: PL 35, 1800, et alibi saepe.
- (13) Cfr. *Lc.* 12, 48: Omni autem, cui multum datum est, multum quaeretur ab eo. Cfr. etiam *Mt.* 5, 19-20; 7, 21-22; 25 41-46; *Iac.*, 2, 14.
- (14) Cfr. Leo XIII, *Epist. Apost. Praeclara gratulationis*, 20 iun. 1894; AAS 26 (1893-94) p. 707.
- (15) Cfr. Leo XIII, *Epist. Encycl. Satis cognitum*, 29 iun. 1896: ASS 28 (1895-96) p. 738. *Epist. Encycl. Caritatis studium*, 25 iul. 1898: ASS 31 (1898-99) p. 11. Pius XII, *Nuntius radioph. Nell'alba*, 24 dec. 1941: AAS 34 (1942) p. 21.
- (16) Cfr. Pius XI, *Litt. Encycl. Rerum Orientalium*, 8 sept. 1928: AAS 20 (1928) p. 287. Pius XII, *Litt. Encycl. Orientalis Ecclesiae*, 9 apr. 1944: AAS 36 (1944) p. 137
- (17) Cfr. *Inst. S.S.C.S. Officii* 20 dec. 1949: AAS 42 (1950) p.142.
- (18) Cfr. S. Thomas, *Summa Theol.* III, q. 8, a. 3, ad 1.
- (19) Cfr. *Epist. S.S.C.S. Officii ad Archiep. Boston.*: Denz. 3869-72.
- (20) Cfr. Eusebius Caes., *Praeparatio Evangelica*, 1, 1: PG 2128 AB.
- (21) Cfr. Benedictus XV, *Epist. Apost. Maximum illud*: AAS 11 (1919) p. 440, praesertim p. 451 ss. Pius XI, *Litt. Encycl. Rerum Ecclesiae*: AAS 18

(1926) p. 68-69. Pius XII, Litt. Encycl. Fidei Donum, 21 apr. 1957: AAS 49 (1957) pp. 236-237.

(22) Cfr. Didache, 14: ed. Funk I, p. 32. S. Iustinus, Dial. 41: PG 6, 564. S. Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. IV 17, 5; PG 7, 1023; Harvey, 2, p. 199 s. Conc. Trid., Sess. 22, cap. 1; Denz. 939 (1742).

Chapter III

(1) Cfr. Conc. Vat. I, Sess. IV, Const. Dogm. Pastor aeternus. Denz. 1821 (3050 s.).

(2) Cfr. Conc. Flor., Decretum pro Graecis: Denz. 694 (1307) et Conc. Vat. I, ib.: Denz. 1826 (3059)

(3) Cfr. Liber sacramentorum S. Gregorii, Praefatio in Cathedra S. Petri, in natali S. Mathiae et S. Thomas: PL 78, 50, 51 et 152. S. Hilarius, In Ps. 67, 10: PL 9, 450; CSEL 22, p. 286. S. Hieronymus, Adv. Iovin. 1, 26: PL 23, 247 A. S. Augustinus, In Ps. 86, 4: PL 37, 1103. S. Gregorius M., Mor. in Iob, XXVIII, V: PL 76, 455-456. Primasius, Comm. in Apoc. V: PL 68, 924 BC. Paschasius Radb., In Matth. L. VIII, cap. 16: PL 120, 561 C. Cfr. Leo XIII, Epist. Et sane, 17 dec. 1888: AAS 21 (1888) p. 321.

(4) Cfr. Act 6, 2-6; 11, 30; 13, 1, 14, 23; 20, 17; 1 Thess. 5, 12-13; Phil. 1, 1 Col. 4, 11, et passim.

(5) Cfr. Act. 20, 25-27; 2 Tim. 4, 6 s. coll. c. I Tim. 5, 22; 2 Tim. 2, 2 Tit. 1, 5; S. Clem. Rom., Ad Cor. 44, 3; ed. Funk, 1, p. 156.

(6) S. Clem. Rom., ad Cor. 44, 2; ed. Funk, I, p. 154 s.

(7) Cfr. Tertull., Praescr. Haer. 32; PL 2, 52 s.; S. Ignatius M., passim.

(8) Cfr. Tertull., Praescr. Haer. 32; PL 2, 53.

(9) Cfr. S. Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. III, 3, 1; PG 7, 848 A; Harvey 2, 8; Sagnard, p. 100 s.: manifestatam.

(10) Cfr. S. Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. III, 2, 2; PG 7, 847; Harvey 2, 7; Sagnard, p. 100: . custoditur ,, cfr. ib. IV, 26, 2; col. 1053, Harvey 2, 236, necnon IV, 33, 8; col. 1077; Harvey 2, 262.

(11) S. Ign. M., Philad., Praef.; ed. Funk, I, p. 264.

(12) S. Ign. M., Philad., 1, 1; Magn. 6, 1; Ed. Funk, I, pp. 264 et 234.

(13) S. Clem. Rom., 1. c., 42, 3-4, 44, 3-4; 57, 1-2; Ed. Funk. I, 152, 156, 171 s. S. Ign. M., Philad. 2; Smyrn. 8; Magn. 3; Trall. 7; Ed. Funk, I, p.

- 265 s.; 282; 232 246 s. etc.; S. Iustinus, Apol., 1, 6S G 6, 428; S. Cyprianus, Epist. assim.
- (14) Cfr. Leo XIII, Epist. Encycl. Satis cognitum, 29 iun. 896: ASS 28 (1895-96) p. 732.
- (15) Cfr. Conc. Trid., Sess. 23, ecr. de sacr. Ordinis, cap. 4; enz. 960 (1768); Conc. Vat. I, ess. 4 Const. Dogm. I De Ecclesia Christi, cap. 3: Denz. 1828 (3061). Pius XII, Litt. Encycl. Mystici Cororis, 29 iun. 1943: ASS 35 (1943) p. 209 et 212. Cod. Iur. Can., c. 29 1.
- (16) Cfr. Leo XIII, Epist. Et sane, 17 dec. 1888: ASS 21 (1888) p. 321 s.
- (17) S. Leo M., Serm. 5, 3: PL 54, 154.
- (18) Conc. Trid., Sess. 23, cap. 3, citat verba 2 Tim. 1, 6-7, ut demonstret Ordinem esse verum sacramentum: Denz. 959 (1766).
- (19) In Trad. Apost. 3, ed. Botte, Sources Chr., pp. 27-30, Episcopo tribuitur primatus sacerdotii. Cfr. Sacramentarium Leonianum, ed. C. Mohlberg, Sacramentarium Veronense, Romae, 1955, p. 119: ad summi sacerdotii ministerium... Comple in sacerdotibus tuis mysterii tui summam.... Idem, Liber Sacramentorum Romanae Ecclesiae Romae, 1960, pp. 121-122: Tribuas eis, Domine, cathedram episcopalem ad regendam Ecclesiam tuam et plebem universam.. Cfr. PL 78, 224.
- (20) Trad. Apost. 2, ed. Botte, p. 27.
- (21) Conc. Trid., Sess. 23, cap. 4, docet Ordinis sacramentum imprimere characterem indelebilem: Denz. 960 (1767) . Cfr. Ioannes XXIII, Alloc. Iubilare Deo, 8 maii 1960: AAS S2 (1960) p. 466. Pallius VI, Homelia in Bas, Vaticana, 20 oct. 1963: AAS 55 (1963) p. 1014.
- (22) S. Cyprianus, Epist. 63, 14: PL 4, 386; Hartel, III B, p. 713: Sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur .. S. Io. Chrysostomus, In 2 Tim. Hom. 2, 4: PG 62, 612: Sacerdos est symbolon . Christi. S. Ambrosius, In Ps. 38, 25-26: PL 14, 105 1-52: CSEL 64, 203- 204. Ambrosiascr In I Tim. S 19: PL 17, 479 C et in Eph. 4, 1;-12: col. 387. C. Theodorus Mops., from. Catech. XV, 21 et 24: ed. Tonneau, pp. 497 et 503. Hesychiu Hieros., In Lcv. L. 2, 9, 23: PG 93, 894 B.

- (23) Cfr. Eusebius, *Hist. ecl.*, V, 24, 10: GCS II, 1, p. 49S; cd. Bardy, *Sources Chr.* II, p. 69 Dionysius, apud Eusebium, *ib.* VII 5, 2: GCS 11, 2, p. 638 s.; Bardy, II, p. 168 s.
- (24) Cfr. de antiquis Conciliis, Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* V, 23-24: GCS 11, 1, p. 488 ss.; Bardy, 11, p. 66 ss. et. passim. *Conc. Nicaenum. Can. S: Conc. Oec. Decr.* p. 7.
- (25) Tertullianus, de Iciunio, 13: PL 2, 972 B; CSFL 20, p. 292, lin. 13-16.
- (26) S. Cyprianus, *Epist.* 56, 3: Hartel, 111 B, p. 650; Bayard, p.154.
- (27) Cfr. *Relatio officialis Zinelli*, in *Conc. Vat. I: Mansi S2,1 109 C.*
- (28) Cfr. *Conc. Vat. 1, Schema Const. dogm. 11, de Ecclesia Christi, c. 4: Mansi S3, 310. Cfr. Relatio Kleutgen de Schemate reformato: Mansi S3, 321 B - 322 B et declaratio Zinelli: Mansi 52 1110 A. Vide etiam S. Leonem M. Scrm. 4, 3: PL 54, 151 A.*
- (29) Cfr. *Cod. Iur. Can., c. 227.*
- (30) Cfr. *Conc. Vat. I, Const. Dogm. Pastor aeternis: Denz. 1821 (3050 s.).*
- (31) Cfr. S. Cyprianus, *Epist.* 66, 8: Hartel 111, 2, p. 733: .. *Episcopus in Ecclesia et Ecclesia in Episcopo ..*
- (32) Cfr. S. Cyprianus, *Epist.* SS, 24: Hartel, p. 642, line. 13: . *Una Ecclesia per totum mundum in multa membra divisa .. Epist. 36, 4: Hartel, p. 575, lin. 20-21.*
- (33) Cfr. Pius XII, *Litt. Encycl. Fidci Donum*, 21 apr. 1957: AAS 49 (1957) p. 237.
- (34) Cfr. S. Hilarius Pict., *In Ps. 14, 3: PL 9, 206; CSEL 22, p. 86. S. Gregorius M., Moral, IV, 7, 12: PL 75, 643 C. Ps. Basilius, In Is. 15, 296: PG 30, 637 C.*
- (35) S. Coelestinus, *Epist.* 18, 1-2, ad *Conc. Eph.*: PL 50, 505 AB-Schwartz, *Acta Conc. Oec. 1, I, i, p. 22. Cfr. Benedictus XV, Epist. Apost. Maximum illud: AAS 11 (1919) p. 440, Pius XI. Litt. Encycl. Rerum Ecclesiae, 28 febr. 1926: AAS 18 (1926) p. 69. Pius XII, Litt. Encycl. Fidei Donum, 1. c.*
- (36) Leo XIII, *Litt. Encycl. I Grande munus*, 30 sept. 1880: ASS 13 (1880) p. 14S. Cfr. *Cod. Iur. | Can., c. 1327; c. 13S0 2.*

- (37) De iuribus Sedium patriarchalium, cfr. Conc. Nicaenum, I can. 6 de Alexandria et Antiochia, et can. 7 de Hierosolymis: Conc. I Oec. Decr., p. 8. Conc. Later. IV, anno 1215, Constit. V: De dignitate Patriarcharum: ibid. p. 212.-| Conc. Ferr.-Flor.: ibid. p. 504.
- (38) Cfr. Cod. Iuris pro Eccl. I Orient., c. 216-314: de Patriarchis; c. 324-399: de Archiepiscopis I maioribus; c. 362-391: de aliis dignitariis; in specie, c. 238 3; 216; 240; 251; 255: de Episcopis a Patriarch nominandis.
- (39) Cfr. Conc. Trid., Decr. de I reform., Sess. V, c. 2, n. 9; et Sess. I XXIV, can. 4; Conc. Oec. Decr. pp. 645 et 739.
- (40) Cfr. Conc. Vat. I, Const. dogm. Dei Filius, 3: Denz. 1712I (3011). Cfr. nota adiecta ad Schema I de Eccl. (desumpta ex S. Rob. Bellarmino): Mansi 51, I 579 C, necnon Schema reformatum I Const. II de Ecclesia Christi, cum I commentario Kleutgen: Mansi 53, 313 AB. Pius IX, Epist. Tuas libener: Denz. 1683 (2879).
- (41) Cfr. Cod. Iur. Can., c. 1322-1323.
- (42) Cfr. Conc. Vat. I, Const. dogm. Pastor Aeternus: Denz. 1839 (3074).
- (43) Cfr. explicatio Gasser in Conc. Vat. I: Mansi 52, 1213 AC.
- (44) Gasser, ib.: Mansi 1214 A.
- (45) Gasser, ib.: Mansi 1215 CD, 1216-1217 A.
- (46) Gasser, ib.: Mansi 1213.
- (47) Conc. Vat. I, Const. dogm. Pastor Aeternus, 4: Denz. 1836 (3070) no. 26
- (48) Oratio consecrationis episcopalis in ritu byzantino: Euchologion to mega, Romae, 1873, p. 139.
- (49) Cfr. S. Ignatius M. Smyrn 8, 1: ed. Funk, 1, p. 282.
- (50) Cfr. Act. 8, 1; 14, 22-23; 20, 17, et passim.
- (51) Oratio mozarabica: PL 96 7S9 B
- (52) Cfr. S. Ignatius M., Smyrn 8, 1: ed. Funk, I, p. 282.
- (53) S. Thomas, Summa Theol. III, q. 73, a. 3.
- (54) Cfr. S. Augustinus, C. Faustum, 12, 20: PL 42, 26S Serm. 57, 7: PL 38, 389, etc.
- (55) S. Leo M., Serm. 63, 7: PL 54, 3S7 C.

- (56) *Traditio A postolica Hippolyti*, 2-3: ed. Botte, pp. 26-30.
- (57) Cfr. *textus examinis in initio consecrationis episcopalis, et Oratio in fine vissae eiusdem consecrationis, post Te Deum.*
- (58) Benedictus XIV, *Br. Romana Ecclesia*, 5 oct. 1752, p 1: *Bullarium Benedicti XIV*, t. IV, Romae, 1758, 21: . *Episcopus Christi typum gerit, Eiusque munere fungitur.* Pius XII, *Litt. Encycl. Mystici Corporis*, 1. c., p. 211: . *Assignatos sibi greges singuli singulos Christi nomine pascunt et regunt.*
- (59) Leo XIII, *Epist. Encycl. Satis cognitum*, 29 iun. 1896: ASS 28 (1895-96) p. 732. *Idem, Epist. Officio sanctissimo*, 22 dec. 1887: AAS 20 (1887) p. 264. Pius IX *itt. Apost. ad Episcopos Geraniae*, 12 mart. 1875, et *alloc. onsis.*, 15 mart. 1875: Denz. 112-3117, in nova ed. tantum.
- (60) *Conc. Vat. I, Const. dogm. Pastor aeternus*, 3: Denz. 1828 (3061) . Cfr. *Relatio Zinelli: Mand 1 2*, 1114 D.
- (61) Cfr. S. Ignatius M., *ad ephes. 5, 1*: ed. Funk, I, p. 216.
- (62) Cfr. S. Ignatius M., *ad phes. 6, 1*: cd. Funk, I, p. 218.
- (63) Cfr. *Conc. Trid., Sess. 23, sacr. Ordinis, cap. 2*: Denz. 958 (1765), et *can. 6*: Denz. 966 (1776).
- (64) Cfr. Innocentius I, *Epist. d Decentium*: PL 20, 554 A; *sansi 3*, 1029; Denz. 98 (215): *Presbyteri, licet secundi sint sa erdotcs, pontificatus tamen api em non habent..* S. Cyprianus, *Epist. 61, 3*: ed. Hartel, p. 696.
- (65) Cfr. *Conc. Trid., l. c.*, Denz. 962-968 (1763-1778), et in specie I an. 7: Denz. 967 (1777). Pius I II, *Const. Apost. Sacramentum ordinis*: Denz. 2301 (3857-61).
- (66) Cfr. Innocentius I, 1. c. S. Gregorius Naz., *Apol. II, 22*: PGS, 432 B. *Ps.-Dionysius, Eccl. ier., 1, 2*: PG 3, 372 D.
- (67) Cfr. *Conc. Trid., Sess. 22*: Denz. 940 (1743). Pius XII, *Litt. Encycl. Mediator Dei*, 20 nov. 1947: AAS 39 (1947) p. 553; Denz. 2300 (3850).
- (68) Cfr. *Conc. Trid. Sess. 22*: Denz. 938 (1739-40). *Conc. Vat.II, Const. De Sacra Liturgia*, n. 7 et n. 47.
- (69) Cfr. Pius XII, *Litt. Encycl. Mediator Dei*, 1. c., sub. n. 67.
- (70) Cfr. S. Cyprianus, *Epist. 11, 3*: PL 4, 242 B; Hartel, II, 2, p. 497.
- (71) *Ordo consecrationis sacerdotalis, in impositione vestimentorum.*

(72) Ordo consecrationis sacerdotalis in praefatione.

(73) Cfr. S. Ignatius M. Philad. 4: ed. Funk, I, p. 266. S. Cornelius I, apud S. Cyprianum, Epist. 48, 2: Hartel, III, 2, p. 610.

(74) Constitutiones Ecclesiac aegyptiacae, III, 2: ed. Funk, Didascalia, II, p. 103. Statuta Eccl. Ant. 371: Mansi 3, 954.

(75) S. Polycarpus, Ad Phil. 5, 2: ed. Funk, I, p. 300: Christus dicitur . omnium diaconus factus .. Cfr. Didache, 15, 1: ib., p. 32. S. Ignatius M. Trall. 2, 3: ib., p. 242. Constitutiones Apostolorum, 8, 28, 4: ed. Funk, Didascalia, I, p. 530.

Chapter IV

(1) S. Augustinus, Serm. 340, 1: PL 38, 1483.

(2) Cfr. Pius XI, Litt. Encycl. Quadragesimo anno 15 maii 1931: AAS 23 (1931) p. 121 s. Pius XII, Alloc. De quelle consolation, 14 oct. 1951: AAS 43 (1951) p. 790 s.

(3) Cfr. Pius XII, Alloc. Six ans se sont ecoules, 5 oct. 1957: AAS 49 (1957) p. 927. De mandato et missione canonica, cfr. Decretum De Apostolatu laicorum, cap. IV, n. 16, cum notis 12 et 15.

(4) Ex Praefatione festi Christi Regis.

(5) Cfr. Leo XIII, Epist. Encycl. Immortale Dei, 1 nov. 1888: ASS 18 (1888) p. 166 ss. Idem, Litt. Encycl. Sapientiae christianae, 10 ian. 1890: ASS 22 (1889-90) p. 397 ss. Pius XII, Alloc. Alla vostra filiale. 23 mart. 1958: AAS 50 (1958) p. 220: la legittima sana laicità dello Stato ..

(6) Cod. Iur. Can., can. 682.

(7) Cfr. Pius XII, Alloc. De quelle consolation, 1. c., p. 789: Dans les batailles decisives, c'est parfois du front que partent les plus heureuses initiatives.. Idem Alloc. L'importance de la presse catholique, 17 febr. 1950: AAS 42 (1950) p. 256.

(8) Cfr. I Thess. 5, 19 et 1 Io. 4, 1.

(9) Epist. ad Diogneum, 6: ed. Funk, I, p. 400. Cfr. S. Io. Chrysostomus, In Matth. Hom. 46 (47) 2: PG 58, 78, de fermento in massa.

Chapter V

- (1) Missale Romanum, Gloria in excelsis. Cfr. Lc. 1, 35; Mc. 1, 24, Lc. 4, 34; Io. 6, 69 (ho hagios tou theou); Act. 3, 14; 4, 27 et 30; Hebr. 7, 26, 1 Io. 2, 20; Apoc. 3, 7.
- (2) Cfr. Origenes, Comm. Rom. 7, 7: PG 14, 1122 B. Ps.- Macarius, De Oratione, 11: PG 34, 861 AB. S. Thomas, Summa Theol. II-II, q. 184, a. 3.
- (3) Cfr. S. Augustinus Retract. II, 18: PL 32, 637 s. Pius XII Litt. Encycl. Mystici Corporis, 29 iun. 1943: AAS 35 (1943) p. 225.
- (4) Cfr. Pius XI, Litt. Encycl. Rerum omnium, 26 ian. 1923: AAS 15 (1923) p. 50 ct pp. 59-60. Litt. Encycl. Casti Connubii, 31 dec. 1930: AAS 22 (1930) p. 548. Pius XII, Const. Apost. Provida Mater, 2 febr. 1947: AAS 39 (1947) p. 117. Alloc. Annus sacer, 8 dec. 1950: AAS 43 (1951) pp. 27-28. Alloc. Nel darvi, 1 iul. 1956: AAS 48 (1956) p. 574 s.
- (5) Cfr. S. Thomas, Summa Theol. II-II, q. 184, a. 5 et 6. De perf. vitae spir., c. 18. Origenes, In Is. Hom. 6, 1: PG 13, 239.
- (6) Cfr. S. Ignatius M., Magn. 13, 1: ed. Funk, I, p. 241.
- (7) Cfr. S. Pius X, Exhort. Haerent animo, 4 aug. 1908: ASS 41 (1908) p. 560 s. Cod. Iur. Can., can. 124. Pius XI, Litt. Encycl. Ad catholici sacerdotii, 20 dec. 1935: AAS 28 (1936) p. 22 s.
- (8) Ordo consecrationis sacerdotalis, in Exhortatione initiali.
- (9) Cfr. S. Ignatius M., Trall. 2, 3: cd. Funk, I, p. 244.
- (10) Cfr. Pius XII, Alloc. Sous la maternelle protection, 9 dec. 1957: AAS 50 (1958) p. 36.
- (11) Pius XI, Litt. Encycl. Casti Connubii, 31 dec. 1930. AAS 22 (1930) p. 548 s. Cfr. S. Io Chrysostomus, In Ephes. Hom. 20, 2: P. 62, 136 ss.
- (12) Cfr. S. Augustinus, Enchir. 121, 32: PL 40 288. S. Thomas Summa Theol. II-II, q. 184, a. 1. Pius XII, Adhort. Apost. Menti nostrae, 23 sept. 1950: AAS 42 (1950) p. 660.
- (13) De consiliis in genere, cfr. Origenes, Comm. Rom. X, 14: PG 14 1275 B. S. Augustinus, De S. Virginitate, 15, 15: PL 40, 403. S. Thomas, Summa Theol. I-II, q. 100, a. 2 C (in fine); II-II, q. 44, a. 4 ad 3
- (14) De praestantia sacrae virginitatis, cfr. Tertullianus, Exhort. Cast. 10: PL 2, 925 C. S. Cyprianus, Hab. Virg. 3 et 22: PL 4, 443 B et 461 A. A.

S. Athanasius (?), De Virg.: PG 28, 252 ss. S. Io. Chrysostomus, De Virg.: PG 48, 533 u.

(15) De spirituali paupertate et oboedientia testimonia praccipua S.Scripturae et Patrum afferuntur in Relatione pp. 152-153.

(16) De praxi effectiva consiliorum quae non omnibus imponitur, cfr. S. Io. Chrysostomus, In Matth. Hom. 7, 7: PG S7, 8 l s. 5. Ambrosius, De Vidu s, 4, 23: PL 16, 241 s.

Chapter VI

(1) Cfr. Rosweydu, Viqae Patrum, Antwerpiae 1628. Apophtegmata Patrum: PG 65. Palladius, Historia Lausiaca: PG 34, 995 ss.; ed. C. Butler, Cambridge 1898 (1904). Pius XI, Const. Apost. Umbratitem, 8 iul. 1924: AAS 16 (1924) pp. 386-387. Pius XII, Alloc. Nous sommes heureux, 11 apr.1958: AAS 50 (1958) p. 283.

(2) Paulus VI, Alloc. Magno gaudio, 23 maii 1964: AAS 56 (1964) p. 566.

(3) Cfr. Cod. Iur. Can., c. 487 et 488, 40. Pius XII, Alloc. Annus sacer, 8 dec. 1950, AAS 43 (1951) p. 27 s. Pius XII, Cons. Apost. Provida Mater, 2 Febr. 1947: AAS 39 (1947) p. 120 ss.

(4) Paulus VI, 1. c., p. S67.

(5) Cfr. S. Thomas, Summa Theol. II-II, q. 184, a. 3 et q. 188, a. 2. S. Bonaventura, Opusc. X, Apologia Pauperum, c. 3, 3: cd. Opera, Quaracchi, t. 8, 1898, p. 245 a.

(6) Cfr. Conc. Vat. I. Schema De Ecclesia Christi, cap. XV, et Adnot. 48: Mansi 51, 549 s. et 619 s. Leo XIII, Epist. Au milieu des consolations, 23 dec. 1900: AAS 33 (1900-01) p. 361. Pius XII, Const. Apost. Provida Mater, 1. c., p. 1145.

(7) Cfr. Leo XIII, Const. Romanos Pontifices, 8 maii 1881: AAS 13 (1880-81) p. 483. Pius XII, Alloc. Annus sacer, 8 dec. 1950: AAS 43(1951) p. 28 8.

(8) Cfr. Pius XII, Alloc. Annus sacer, 1. c., p. 28. Pius XII, Const. Apost. Sedes Sapientiae, 31 maii 1956: AAS 48 (1956) p. 355. Paulus VI, 1. c., pp. 570-571.

(9) Cfr. Pius XII Litt. Encycl. Mystici Corporis, 19 iun. 1943: AAS 35 (1943) p. 214 s.

(10) Cfr. Pius XII, Alloc. Annus sacer, 1. c., p. 30. Alloc. Sous la maternelle protection, 9 dec. 1957: AAS 50 (1958) p. 39 s.

Chapter VII

(1) Conc. Florentinum, Decretum pro Graecis: Denz. 693 (1305).

(2) Praeter documenta antiquiora contra quamlibet formam evocationis spirituum inde ab Alexandro IV (27 sept. 1958), cfr Encycl. S.S.C.S. Officii, De magne tismi abusu, 4 aug. 1856: AAS (1865) pp. 177-178, Denz. 1653 1654 (2823-2825); responsiones S.S.C.S. Offici, 24 apr. 1917: 9 (1917) p. 268, Denz. 218 (3642).

(3) Videatur synthetice espositi huius doctrinae paulinae in: Pius XII, Litt. Encycl. Mystici Corporis AAS 35 (1943) p. 200 et passim

(4) Cfr., i. a., S. Augustinus, Enarr. in Ps. 85, 24: PL 37, 1095 S.

Hieronymus, Liber contra Vigilantium, b: PL 23, 344. S. Thomas In 4m Sent., d. 45, q. 3, a. 2. Bonaventura, In 4m Sent., d. 45, a. 3, q. 2; etc.

(5) Cfr. Pius XII, Litt. Encycl. Mystici Corporis: AAS 35 (1943) p. 245.

(6) Cfr. Plurimae inscriptione in Catacumbis romanis.

(7) Cfr. Gelasius I, Decretalis De libris recipiendis, 3: PL 59, 160, Denz. 165 (353).

(8) Cfr. S. Methodius, Symposion, VII, 3: GCS (Bodwetsch), p. 74

(9) Cfr. Benedictus XV, Decretum approbationis virtutum in Causa beatificationis et canonizationis Servi Dei Ioannis Nepomuceni Neumann: AAS 14 (1922) p. 23; plures Allocutiones Pii X de Sanctis: Inviti all'croismo Disorsi... t. I-III, Romae 1941-1942, passim; Pius XII, Discorsi Radiomessagi, t. 10, 1949, pp 37-43.

(10) Cfr. Pius XII, Litt. Encycl. : Mediator Dei: AAS 39 (1947) p. 581.

(11) Cfr. Hebr. 13, 7: Eccli 44-50, Nebr. 11, 340. Cfr. etiam Pius XII, Litt. Encycl. Mediator Dei: AAS 39 (1947) pp. 582-583

(12) Cfr. Cone. Vaticanum Const. De fide catholica, cap. 3 Denz. 1794 (3013).

(13) Cfr. Pius XII, Litt. Encycl. Mystici Corporis: AAS 35 (1943) p. 216.

(14) Quoad gratitudinem erga ipsos Sanctos, cfr. E. Diehl, Inscriptiones latinae christianae veteres, 1, Berolini, 1925, nn. 2008 2382 et passim.

(15) Conc. Tridentinum, Sess. 25, De invocatione... Sanctorum: Denz. 984 (1821) .

- (16) Breviarium Romanum, Invitatorium infesto Sanctorum Omnium.
- (17) Cfr. v. g., 2 Thess. 1, 10.
- (18) Conc. Vaticanum II, Const. De Sacra Liturgia, cap. 5, n. 104.
- (19) Canon Missae Romanae.
- (20) Conc. Nicaenum II, Act. VII: Denz. 302 (600).
- (21) Conc. Florentinum, Decretum pro Graecis: Denz. 693 (1304).
- (22) Conc. Tridentinum Sess. 35, De invocatione, veneratione et reliquiis Sanctorum et sacris imaginibus: Denz. 984-988 (1821-1824); Sess. 25, Decretum de Purgatorio: Denz. 983 (1820); Sess. 6, Decretum de iustificatione, can. 30: Denz. 840 (1580).
- (23) Ex Praefatione, aliquibus dioecesibus concessa.
- (24) Cfr. S. Petrus Canisius, Catechismus Maior seu Summa Doctrinae christiana, cap. III (ed. crit. F. Streicher) pas I, pp. 15-16, n. 44 et pp. 100-101, n. 49.
- (25) Cfr. Conc. Vaticanum II Const. De Sacra Liturgia, cap. 1 n. 8.
- Chapter VIII
- (1) Credo in Missa Romana: Symbolum Constantinopolitanum: Mansi 3, 566. Cfr. Conc. Ephesinum, ib. 4, 1130 (necnon ib. 2, 665 et 4, 1071); Conc. Chalcedonense, ib. 7, 111-116; Cow. Constantinopolitanum II, ib. 9, 375-396.
- (2) Canon Missae Romanae.
- (3) S. Augustine, De S. Virginitate. 6: PL 40, 399.
- (4) Cfr. Paulus Pp. VI, allocutio in Concilio, die 4 dec. 1963: AAS 56 (1964) p. 37.
- (5) Cfr. S. Germanus Const., Nom. in annunt. Deiparae: PG 98, 328 A; In Dorm. 2: col. 357. Anastasius Antioch., Serm. 2 de Annunt., 2: PG 89, 1377 AB; Serm. 3, 2: col. 1388 C. S. Andrcas Cret. Can. in B. V. Nat. 4: PG 97, 1321 B. In B. V. Nat., 1: col. 812 A. Hom. in dorm. 1: col. 1068 C. - S. Sophronius, Or. 2 in Annunt., 18: PG 87 (3), 3237 BD.
- (6) S. Irenaeus, Adv. Hacr. III, 22, 4: PG 7, 9S9 A; Harvey, 2, 123.
- (7) S. Irenaeus, ib.; Harvey, 2, 124.
- (8) S. Epiphanius, Nacr. 78, 18: PG 42, 728 CD; 729 AB.

- (9) S. Hieronymus, Epist. 22, 21: PL 22, 408. Cfr. S. Augwtinus, Serm. Sl, 2, 3: PL 38, 335; Serm. 232, 2: col. 1108. - S. Cyrillus Hieros., Catech. 12, 15: PG 33, 741 AB. - S. Io. Chrysostomus, In Ps. 44, 7: PG 55, 193. - S. Io. Damascenus, Nom. 2 in dorm. B.M.V., 3: PG 96, 728.
- (10) Cfr. Conc. Lateranense anni 649, Can. 3: Mansi 10, 1151. S. Leo M., Epist. ad Flav.: PL 54, 759. - Conc. Chalcedonense: Mansi 7, 462. - S. Ambrosius, De inst. virg.: PL 16, 320.
- (11) Cfr. Pius XII, Litt. Encycl. Mystici Corporis, 29 iun. 1943: AAS 35 (1943) pp. 247-248.
- (12) Cfr. Pius IX, Bulla Ineffabilis 8 dec. 1854: acta Pii IX, I, I, p. 616; Denz. 1641 (2803).
- (13) Cfr. Pius XII, Const. Apost. Munificensissimus, 1 no. 1950: AAS 42 (1950) ú Denz. 2333 (3903). Cfr. S. Io. Damascenus, Enc. in dorm. Dei gcnitricis, Hom. 2 et 3: PG 96, 721-761, speciatim col. 728 B. - S. Germanus Constantinop., in S. Dei gen. dorm. Serm. 1: PG 98 (6), 340-348; Serm. 3: col. 361. - S. Modestus Hier., In dorm. SS. Deiparae: PG 86 (2), 3277-3312.
- (14) Cfr. Pius XII Litt. Encycl. Ad coeli Reginam, 11 Oct. 1954: AAS 46 (1954), pp. 633-636; Denz. 3913 ss. Cfr. S. Andreas Cret., Hom. 3 in dorm. SS. Deiparae: PG 97, 1089-1109. - S. Io. Damascenus, De fide orth., IV, 14: PG 94, 1153-1161.
- (15) Cfr. Kleutgen, textus reformstus De mysterio Verbi incarnati, cap. IV: Mansi 53, 290. cfr. S. Andreas Cret., In nat. Mariac, sermo 4: PG 97, 865 A. - S. Germanus Constantinop., In annunt. Deiparae: PG 98, 321 BC. In dorm. Deiparae, III: col. 361 D. S. Io. Damascenus, In dorm. B. V. Mariae, Hom. 1, 8: PG 96, 712 BC-713 A.
- (16) Cfr. Leo XIII, Litt. Encycl. Adiutricem populi, 5 sept. 1895: ASS 15 (1895-96), p. 303. - S. Pius X, Litt. Encycl. Ad diem illum, 2 febr. 1904: Acta, I, p. 154- Denz. 1978 a (3370) . Pius XI, Litt. Encycl. Miserentissimus, 8 maii 1928: AAS 20 (1928) p. 178. Pius XII, Nuntius Radioph., 13 maii 1946: AAS 38 (1946) p. 266.
- (17) S. Ambrosius, Epist. 63: PL 16, 1218.
- (18) S. Ambrosius, Expos. Lc. II, 7: PL 15, 1555.

- (19) Cfr. Ps.-Petrus Dam. Serm. 63: PL 144, 861 AB. Godefridus a S. Victore. In nat. B. M., Ms. Paris, Mazarine, 1002, fol. 109 r. Gerhohus Reich., De gloria et honore Filii hominis, 10: PL 194, 1105AB.
- (20) S. Ambrosius, l. c. et Expos. Lc. X, 24-25: PL 15, 1810.
S. Augustinus, In Io. Tr. 13, 12: PL 35 1499. Cfr. Serm. 191, 2, 3: PL 38 1010; etc. Cfr. ctiam Ven. Beda, In Lc. Expos. I, cap. 2: PL 92, 330. Isaac de Stella, Serm. 51. PL 194, 1863 A.
- (21) Sub tuum praesidium
- (22) Conc. Nicaenum II, anno 787: Mansi 13. 378-379; Denz. 302 (600-601) . Conc. Trident., sess. 2S: Mansi 33, 171-172.
- (23) Cfr. Pius XII, Nuntius radioph., 24 oct. 1954: AAS 46 (1954) p. 679. Litt. Encycl. Ad coeli Reginam, 11 oct. 1954: AAS 46 (1954) p. 637.
- (24) Cfr. Pius XI, Litt. Encycl. Ecclesiam Dei, 12 nov. 1923: AAS 15 (1923) p. 581. Pius XII, Litt. Encycl. Fulgens corona, 8 sept. 1953: AAS 45 (1953) pp. 590-591.