

Was Vatican II Infallible?

A refutation of John Daly

By Robert J. Siscoe

Part I

The adherents of the Sedevacantist thesis defend their position in one of two ways, namely, by pointing to a situation, in the realm of being or in the realm of action, from which their conclusion follows necessarily. Regarding the former, they maintain that the Pope is a heretic (in the realm of being), and therefore cannot be the Pope. This argument was addressed in the article *Sedevacantism and the Manifest Heretic*. (1) Regarding the realm of action, they point to certain things that have apparently issued forth from the Church over the past 50 years, which they insist are contrary to the Church's infallibility. Since these acts are said to be a violation of the infallibility promised to the Church founded by Christ, they maintain that the Church from which they issued cannot be the true Church, and consequently its head cannot be the true Pope. As one can see, this argument extends beyond the person of the Pope to encompass the entire *ecclesia docens*. According to this theory, there is not "a diabolical disorientation of the upper hierarchy", as spoken of by Sr. Lucy, but a complete defection of the upper hierarchy; not an infiltration and subversion of the Church resulting in a corruption of its human element (which is undergoing a Passion similar to that of Christ), but the complete destruction of the visible Church and its replacement with a New Church.

One of the things alleged to be an "impossibility" (2) that has come from the Church is the Second Vatican Council, which they claim violated the infallibility promised to the true Church. This was the subject of an article written by John Daly, and published in *Four Marks*, which argues that Vatican II met the necessary conditions for infallibility, and therefore should have been protected from error. While Mr. Daly acknowledges that Paul VI himself admitted that Vatican II explicitly "avoided proclaiming in an extraordinary manner any dogma carrying the mark of infallibility" (3), he nevertheless claims that Vatican II met the conditions for infallibility in another way. He maintains that Vatican II was an act of the Ordinary Universal Magisterium, which is also infallible, and therefore its documents should have been free from all error. His conclusion is that, if the documents of Vatican II contain errors, it proves that Paul VI could not have been a true Pope, since the Bishops throughout the world when united to the Pope teach infallibly.

Mr. Daly's argument is simply another species of an error common amongst Sedevacantist apologists, who, like their *Novus Ordo* counterparts, extend infallibility beyond the boundaries established by the Church. This error by *excess* fails to properly comprehend the nature of infallibility, as well as the necessary conditions that must be present for infallibility to be engaged. Before delving into the matter, we will allow Mr. Daly to explain his position. His article, which is long on *ipse dixit* assertions, and short on authoritative sources to back them up, begins as follows:

“Most traditional Catholics know that Vatican II taught heresies and other errors. They rightly refuse to accept this false teaching. But when asked how it can be right to reject the teaching of a General Council of the Catholic Church, they reply that Vatican II was a special kind of council; it was non-dogmatic and non-infallible. As such it could err, and did err, and Catholics may reject its errors without doubting the legitimacy of the authority that promulgated those errors. They will often add that the promulgating authority – Paul VI – himself explicitly declared that his council was non-infallible and non-dogmatic.

“This popular explanation rides rough-shod over Catholic doctrine and plain reality. The truth is that Vatican II so plainly fulfils the conditions required for infallibility that not even Paul VI ever dared to deny this. Hence if its teaching contains egregious errors against the faith, this fact necessarily calls into question the papal status of Paul VI himself.

“To show that this is so, let us look more closely at the ways in which the Church infallibly teaches divine truth to her children. Here is what the 1870 Vatican Council taught:

‘All those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the Word of God, written or handed down, and are proposed by the Church either by a solemn judgment or by her ordinary and universal magisterium to be believed as divinely revealed’. (Dogmatic constitution *Dei Filius*, chapter 3, “Concerning Faith”)

“It is quite extraordinary how many traditional Catholics, including some sedevacantists, have entirely forgotten one of these two means which the Church uses to teach us. It is very often asserted that only the solemn definitions of popes and councils oblige under pain of heresy and are protected by infallibility. Yet here we see just such a solemn definition stating that Catholics have an identical obligation to believe the Church's teachings (under pain of heresy) irrespective of whether this teaching is communicated by ‘solemn judgments’ or by the “ordinary and universal magisterium”. Both are equally infallible.”

Mr. Daly's argument can be summarized as follows: while it is true that Vatican II did not issue any solemn definitions, its teachings came from the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium, which is also infallible. If Vatican II contains errors, it necessarily follows that Paul VI was not a true Pope, since infallibility would have prevented a true Pope, teaching in union with the Bishops of the world, from promulgating such documents.

What Mr. Daly doesn't seem to realize is that in addition to *who* is doing the teaching, *what* is taught, and *how* it is taught, are necessary conditions for infallibility

to be engaged. To put it another way, the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium (the *who*) is indeed an *organ* of infallibility, but due to the nature of infallibility, in order for a teaching to be protected from error, the subject matter taught (the doctrines), and the manner in which they are taught, must meet specific conditions.

In order to sort out the confusion implicit in Mr. Daly's argument, we will begin by examining the teaching from the First Vatican Council upon which he bases his argument. We will consider this teaching in light of the explanation of Church approved theologians, who specify and explain the conditions for infallibility contained within it. I will use as my primary authority the three volume manual of Dogmatic Theology by Monsignor G. Van Noort, S.T.D., an author whose authority Sedevacantists recognize, and whose writings they often cite. Using Msgr. Van Noort as my primary authority will demonstrate something I discovered years ago, namely, that a careful and thorough reading of the authorities cited by Sedevacantist apologists will usually reveal the errors contained within their arguments.

The Subject Matter – The *What*

We will begin by considering two aspects of the teaching from the First Vatican Council that Mr. Daly seems to have overlooked. Firstly, the Council states that the doctrine proposed by the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium must be “contained in the Word of God, written or handed down”. In other words, the *subject matter* specified consists of the truths revealed by God, which is limited to that which is contained within deposit of Faith, the sources of which are Scripture and Tradition. (4) Since public Revelation ended with the death of the last apostle, a novelty or error taught by Vatican II cannot constitute a *revealed truth* “contained in the Word of God”. Therefore, such novelties are excluded from the *subject matter* specified by the teaching from the First Vatican Council that Mr. Daly cites.

Secondly, to confirm that the subject matter referred to is limited to *revealed truths*, the Council further states that the truths must be “proposed by the Church either by a solemn judgment or by her Ordinary and Universal Magisterium *to be believed as divinely revealed*”. The phrase “*to be believed as divinely revealed*” refers exclusively to truths contained within Scripture or Tradition, since these alone have been revealed by God. Msgr. Van Noort explains the meaning of this phrase used by Vatican I. He begins by saying “the *subject matter* of divine-Catholic faith are all those truths proposed by the Church's Magisterium *as divinely revealed*”, and then adds:

“Note the phrase: *as divinely revealed*. To meet this requirement the truths must: (a) be contained in public revelation, the depositories of which are Sacred Scripture and divine apostolic tradition. (5)

In the following quote, Canon Rene Berthod, who was a distinguished professor of the Canons of the Grand St. Bernard, also addressed the subject matter referred to in the definition from the First Vatican Council.

“In the conciliar definition, the obligation to believe has a specific object: one must believe all that is *contained in the deposit of revelation* and what the Church proposes to be believed as *revealed truth*. It does not designate, as is sometimes said, everything that the Magisterium proposes, but only those propositions the Magisterium propounds *as revealed truth*.” (6)

Msgr. Van Noort explained why revealed truths alone constitute the subject matter of divine faith. He explained that “*only those things* which have been revealed by God form the subject matter (material object) of divine faith” because “only these matters fall under the formal motive of faith which is the authority of God revealing.” (7)

Since, as Mr. Daly would have to concede, the novelties and apparent errors of Vatican II are not revealed truths contained in the deposit of Revelation, nor were they definitively proposed as such during Vatican II, they lack the *quiddity* necessary to be the object of an infallible teaching of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium that must be believed *as divinely revealed*. Hence, *by their very nature*, the novelties of Vatican II are excluded from the teaching of the First Vatican Council that Mr. Daly cites as the authority for his position.

Before discussing *how* a doctrine must be proposed for it to be considered infallible, it will be helpful to consider the two general categories of revealed truths. This will further clarify the scope of the subject matter referred to in the aforementioned teaching from Vatican I, and at the same time explain the difference between *Divine and Catholic faith* and *Ecclesiastical Faith*, terms used several times in Mr. Daly’s article without their respective objects being specified or clarified.

The *subject matter* of revelation consists of truths revealed by God and contained in the sources of Revelation in one of two ways: either *formally* or *virtually*.

Formally Revealed: A truth is said to be *formally* contained in Revelation if it is disclosed in Scripture or Tradition, either explicitly or implicitly. It is *explicitly* revealed if the doctrine itself is taught using terminology that is absolutely clear and unmistakable. A doctrine is *implicitly* revealed if it is contained in Scripture or Tradition in a vague fashion, not in precise terms, but in *equivalent* terms. (8) Another way a doctrine is contained implicitly in the sources of Revelation is when the truth is deduced from two explicitly revealed premises. Van Noort uses the following as an example: a) “Grace is required for each and every supernatural work” (explicitly revealed); b) “the beginning of faith is a supernatural work” (explicitly revealed). The conclusion: “Grace is required for the beginning of Faith”, is said to be *implicitly* contained in Revelation. (9)

Virtually Revealed: A truth is said to be *virtually* contained within the sources of Revelation when the doctrine is not itself disclosed, but is deduced from two premises, only one of which is explicitly revealed, while the other is known by reason. (10) Another name for a truth only virtually contained in Revelation is a *theological conclusion*.

Divine and Catholic Faith vs. Ecclesiastical Faith

Divine Faith is faith in the authority of God revealing; *Ecclesiastical Faith* is faith in the authority of the Church teaching. (11) Truths that have been *formally* revealed by God must be believed with Divine and Catholic Faith (12), but according to a majority of theologians (13), including Van Noort and Tanquerey (14), Catholics are only required to accept truths *virtually* contained within the sources of Revelation with *Ecclesiastical Faith*. The eminent theologian, Msgr. Joseph Clifford Fenton, who happened to adhere to the minority opinion on this point, admitted that “a great number of the manuals of sacred theology current in our time assert that... the assent due to these teachings [truths virtually contained in Revelation] is that of a strictly Ecclesiastical Faith.” (15)

The distinction between the two kinds of faith owed to the two categories of doctrine is due to the differing motives for belief, which correspond to the authority of the teacher. The teacher can be a) God, b) the Church, or c) man. The motive for believing a truth formally revealed by God is “the authority of God Himself revealing, who can neither deceive nor be deceived”, (16) whereas the motive for believing a truth only *virtually* contained in Revelation, is the authority of the Church teaching. Hence *Divine Faith* is owed to the former, while only *Ecclesiastical Faith* is owed to the latter. The term Divine and Catholic Faith is used to designate the kind of faith owed to doctrines that have been revealed by God and also definitively proposed by the Church. (17) When a teaching is believed on the authority of man, it is called human faith. (18)

The distinction between Divine and Catholic Faith and Ecclesiastical Faith is important because the definition from the First Vatican Council specifies that the *subject matter* for an infallible teaching of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium consists of truths that “are to be believed with *Divine and Catholic faith*”, which, according to a majority of theologians, limits the scope of the subject matter to truths contained within the sources of Revelation *formally*. This necessarily excludes the novelties and apparent errors of Vatican II, which, as Mr. Daly would have to concede, are not contained in the sources of revelation, either formally or virtually. (19)

It should be noted that the question is *not* whether the Church is infallible when it definitively proposes truths only virtually contained in the sources of revelation, but whether such truths are to be adhered to with *Divine and Catholic Faith*, since this is what the teaching from the First Vatican Council specifies. Neither is it a question of whether Vatican II was promulgated authoritatively, but only if the novelties and apparent errors authoritatively promulgated are a violation of the Church’s infallibility, as Mr. Daly claims.

To conclude this point: According to the First Vatican Council, the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium is infallible when *what* it teaches – the *subject matter* – is a truth revealed by God and contained within the sources of revelation. Since none of the errors, or novelties, of Vatican II are contained within the sources of Revelation,

even if one believes that Vatican II was an act of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium, the *novel nature* of such teachings, in and of itself, excludes them from being the object of an infallible teaching that must be believed with Divine and Catholic Faith, since, as Van Noort said, “nothing can be believed by divine faith *and nothing can be proposed by the Church as a dogma of faith* unless it has been revealed by God.” (20) Consequently, the novelties and apparent errors of Vatican II do not form part of the *subject matter* (material object), specified in the definition of the First Vatican Council.

The Manner of Teaching - The *How*

Another condition for infallibility that Mr. Daly’s article fails to address is *how* a doctrine must be proposed for it to be infallible. Theologians explain that they must be proposed in a clear and definitive manner. This condition is necessary whether it is a question of Papal Infallibility or conciliar infallibility, since *active infallibility* is only engaged when the Church *defines* a doctrine. (21)

The Jesuit theologian, Fr. Sisto Cartechini, explains that a doctrinal definition must be worded in such a way that it conveys absolute certainty. He wrote:

“For there to be an infallible definition, i.e., a dogma, it is necessary that the matter be proposed in such a way as to convey absolute certainty. Without this certainty, the definition would only have the character of a probability; people’s minds would remain uncertain and unable to adhere to it with unconditional faith as required by dogma” (Dall’Opinione al Domma, Rome, 1953).

Ambiguous and confusing assertions do not suffice to engage the Church’s infallibility. And if there is one characteristic of the Second Vatican Council that few deny, it is the ambiguous nature of its documents, the fruits of which have been fifty years of doctrinal confusion.

[Insert quote from Kasper here: “The successor of John XXIII, Paul VI, was basically on the side of the majority but sought to involve the minority and, in line with the ancient tradition, tried to obtain approval of the conciliar documents as much as possible by consensus.... He succeeded but paid a price. In many places [the Council Fathers] had to find compromise formulas, in which, often, the positions of the majority are located immediately next to those of the minority, designed to delimit them. Thus, the conciliar texts themselves have a huge potential for conflict, open the door to a selective reception in either direction.”]

In the following quote, Van Noort explains what the First Vatican Council meant by the phrase “*are proposed for our belief*” and how this relates to infallibility:

“Note the phrase: *are proposed for our belief*. This means (a) *a clear and unmistakable proposal*; one which removes any doubts on the part of the Church viewed as a single organism and, consequently, any doubts on the part of all Catholics sufficiently instructed to make a judgment of this sort.... A merely implicit or obscure proposal of a truth is normally not sufficient to make the entire membership of the Church reach certitude about the *revealed character* of such a truth. In such cases, the lack of knowledge or the hesitation on the part of many Catholics should be attributed not so much to the ignorance of the individual *as to the obscure presentation of the matter* by the Magisterium. It means: (b) *a definitive proclamation which amounts to a real law* demanding an absolute firm assent on the part of every Catholic. *Only a proposal of this sort is infallible.*” (22)

Notice that the doctrine must be proposed both *clearly* and *definitively*. The apparent errors and novelties of Vatican II fail on each point, since they are often cloaked in an ambiguous double-speak that allows for more than one interpretation. Furthermore, and even if one maintains that errors were clearly taught during the Council, they were not defined, since, as Cardinal Ratzinger admitted, Vatican II “defined no dogmas at all”. (23) Hence the *how* condition for infallibility is completely lacking.

Are Conciliar Documents Infallible?

Having discussed the conditions for infallibility, we will now directly address the question of whether the contents of a conciliar document are necessarily infallible. Do the words of Paul VI, “we order and command that all that the Council has decided in synod be sacredly and religiously held by all of Christ’s faithful” suffice to render the teachings of Vatican II infallible, and therefore necessarily free from all error? Are the Sedevacantists correct when they maintain that infallibility would have prevented a true Pope from ratifying conciliar documents containing errors? As an aside, even if this argument was valid, it would of course only apply to Paul VI (and not those elected after him), since he alone ratified the documents of Vatican II. Similarly, the assertion that a true Pope could not have “promulgated” the *Novus Ordo Mass* would only apply to Paul VI, since he alone published the new Missal. But, as we will now see, this argument is, in fact, not valid, since not all that is contained within a conciliar document is necessarily free from error.

In order for a Council to enjoy infallibility, the *what* and *how* conditions discussed above must be present. This is true due to the very nature of infallibility, which is a negative charism (*gratia gratis data*) which is only engaged when the necessary conditions are met. Infallibility does not reside in the mind of the members of the Magisterium as permanent habit, but is dependent in its exercise upon an external help. The charism is only habitual in the sense that it will remain with the Church

forever, but it is only actually engaged when the Church teaches definitively. Van Noort explains:

“Infallibility must not be thought of as a habit permanently residing in the minds of the Church’s official teachers... It is rather a privilege *which depends for its exercise on some objective external help*. This privilege can be called habitual in the sense that it was promised by a definite divine decree. But it is in actual existence *only when something is being defined*”. (24)

Since infallibility only applies to doctrinal definitions, it is within the realm of possibility that a council could err when it is not defining a doctrine. In this case the principle enunciated by St. Thomas applies: *quod possibile est non esse, quandoque non est* – “that which is not impossible, will sometimes be”. Arnaldo De Silveira, who wrote a monumental work on the question of a heretical Pope, applied this metaphysical principle to the teaching of a council specifically. After noting that a Pope can err if he does not meet the conditions for infallibility set down by the First Vatican Council, he wrote:

“[T]he same thing must be said in relation to the conciliar documents which do not fulfill the same conditions. ... when a council does not intend to define dogmas, strictly speaking it can fall into errors. Such a conclusion follows from the symmetry existing between the pontifical infallibility and that of the Church, stressed by the First Vatican Council”. (25)

It should also be noted that when doctrines are defined by a Pope or council, infallibility only applies to the specific doctrines that are defined, and not the entire document in which the definitions are contained. Commenting on this point, Van Noort wrote:

“[T]he Church's rulers are infallible not in any and every exercise of their teaching power; but only when, using all the fullness of their authority, they clearly intend to bind everyone to absolute assent or, as common parlance puts it, when they ‘define’ something in matters pertaining to the Christian religion. That is why all theologians distinguish *in the dogmatic decrees of the councils or of the popes* between those things set forth therein by way of definition and those used simply by way of illustration or argumentation. For *the intention of binding all affects only the definition*, and not the historical observations, reasons for the definition, and so forth. *And if in some particular instances the intention of giving a definitive decision were not made sufficiently clear, then no one would be held by virtue of such definitions, to give the assent of faith: a doubtful law is no law at all.*” (26)

In summary, infallibility only applies to doctrinal definitions contained within conciliar documents, and if the intention of giving a definitive decision is not made sufficiently clear, no one is bound to give the assent of Faith. This teaching of Msgr. Van Noort is in agreement with the 1917 and 1983 Code of Canon Law, both of

which teach that “nothing is to be understood as dogmatically declared or defined unless this is manifestly the case”. (27)

Is there anyone who would honestly contend that Vatican II, which “defined no dogma at all”, and about which Paul VI himself said specifically “avoided issuing solemn dogmatic definitions backed by the Church's infallible teaching authority,” met this condition? Simply because the title of a conciliar document contains the word “dogmatic” does not suffice to render the other conditions for infallibility null, as Mr. Daly implies several times in his article.

Msgr. Van Noort further explains that even in the dogmatic decrees in which doctrines are defined, it is only the definition itself that is infallible.

“Finally, please note the term *definitions*. In the very dogmatic decrees issued by councils and popes *it often happens* that matters are mentioned which are by no means meant to be defined... No assent of faith is exacted for such matters.” (28)

On this same point, citing the authority of St. Robert Bellarmine, Fr. Sylvester Berry said:

“A large majority of the acts of councils are not infallible definitions, because they are not intended as such. ‘Neither the discussions which precede a dogmatic decree, nor the reasons alleged to prove and explain it, are to be accepted as infallibly true. Nothing but the actual decrees are of faith, and these only if they are intended as such’.” (29)

The article on Infallibility, in the 1913 Catholic Encyclopedia, elaborates further on this point. It explains that, before giving the assent of Faith, “the believer has a right to be certain that the teaching in question is *definitive (since only definitive teaching is infallible)*”, and then adds:

“It need only be added here that not everything in a conciliar or papal pronouncement, in which some doctrine is defined, is to be treated as definitive and infallible. For example, in the lengthy Bull of Pius IX defining the Immaculate Conception the strictly definitive and infallible portion is comprised in a sentence or two; *and the same is true in many cases in regard to conciliar decisions*. The merely argumentative and justificatory statements embodied in definitive judgments, however true and authoritative they may be, *are not covered by the guarantee of infallibility* which attaches to the strictly definitive sentences — unless, indeed, their infallibility has been previously or subsequently established by an independent decision.” (30)

Since Vatican II specifically avoided defining any doctrines, infallibility was not engaged during the Council - just like Paul VI said. The only infallible doctrines contained within the documents of Vatican II are those that were defined prior to the Council, as Bishop Butler of England admitted two years after the close of Vatican II, when he said, “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 of itself infallible." (31)

In conclusion, since the necessary conditions for infallibility were not present during Vatican II, errors contained within the Conciliar documents do not violate the Church's promise of infallibility. Therefore, the conciliar errors do not "prove" Paul VI was not Pope. Furthermore, if any *revealed truths* were proposed *definitively* during Vatican II, the teaching would have been infallible, not by virtue of the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium, as Mr. Daly maintains, but by the Extraordinary Magisterium, since definitions from a general council constitute *solemn decrees*. (32) In other words, if the *what* and the *how* conditions were present during Vatican II, the Extraordinary Magisterium itself would have been engaged, and consequently the *who* would not have been the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium, but the Solemn and Extraordinary Magisterium. (33)

In Part II we will consider the Ordinary and Universal Magisterium specifically.

Footnotes

- 1) Robert J. Siscoe, Remnant, 3-27-2013 (online)
- 2) See *The Impossible Crisis* by John Daly, Four Marks, April 2009.
- 3) "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." (Paul VI, General Audience , December 1, 1966 published in L'Osservatore Romano 1/21/1966)
- 4) We should also note that it extends to definitive decisions on doctrines directly opposed to revealed truth (condemnation of heresies), since "he who known with infallible certitude the truth of a proposition knows with the same infallibility the falseness of a contradictory or contrary proposition". Van Noort, *Christ's Church*, pg 110
- 5) Van Noort, *The Sources of Revelation*, pg. 220
- 6) *The Infallibility of the Church's Ordinary Magisterium*, included in the book *Pope or Church*, pg 57
- 7) Van Noort, *The Sources of Revelation*, pg. 205
- 8) *Ibid.* pg. 206
- 9) *Ibid.* pg. 207
- 10) *Ibid.* pg. 206
- 11) *Ibid.* pg. 187-188
- 12) *Ibid.* pg. 195
- 13) Van Noort discusses both opinions and provides a compelling refutation of those who maintain that Divine and Catholic Faith is due to truths only *virtually* contained in Revelation (*Ibid.* pg 209-210). Also see Tanquerey, *Dogmatic Theology*, Vol. 1, pg 204.
- 14) Tanquerey, *Dogmatic Theology*, Vol. 1, Pg 145.
- 15) Fenton, *The Question of Ecclesiastical Faith*, A. E. R., April, 1953.
- 16) Van Noort, *The Sources of Revelation*. pg. 197, 205
- 17) Tanquerey, *Dogmatic Theology*, Vol. 1, pg. 205-206.
- 18) Van Noort, *The Sources of Revelation*, pg. 188
- 19) It should also be noted that the minority of theologians who hold that Divine and Catholic Faith is owed to truths only *virtually* revealed, all agree that such an assent is only owed when these doctrines have been "defined by the Church" (*Ibid.* pg 210).
- 20) Van Noort, *The Sources of Revelation* pg. 262
- 21) "Active infallibility may be defined as follows: the privilege by which the teaching office of the Church, through the assistance of the Holy Spirit, is preserved immune from error *when it defines a doctrine* of faith or morals.... the words 'when it defines a doctrine of faith or morals' limits the inerrancy to *definite subject matter*." Van Noort, *Dogmatic Theology*, *Christ's Church*, pg 103
- 22) Van Noort, *The Sources of Revelation* pg. 220-221
- 23) "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" – Card. Ratzinger, July 17, 1988.
- 24) Van Noort, *Christ's Church*, pg 120
- 25) A. de Silveira, *The Theological Hypothesis of a Heretic Pope*, pg. 189
- 26) Van Noort, *Christ's Church*, pg. 104

- 27) Canon 1323.3, 1917. The 1983 Code removed the words “dogmatically declared” - Canon 749.3
- 28) Van Noort, *The Sources of Revelation*, pg 221-222
- 29) S. Berry, *The Church of Christ*, Pg. 261
- 30) *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1913, Vol. VII, pg 800
- 31) *The Tablet*, 11/26/1967
- 32) Van Noort, *The Sources of Revelation* pg 221
- 33) Tanquerey, *Dogmatic Theology*, Vol. 1, Pg 174