

The Smalcald Articles: “Of the Papacy”

-- Today

By Carleton A. Toppe

[Presented at the Fox River Valley Conference, Northern Wisconsin District, Manitowoc, WI, 31 January 1989]

When Martin Luther wrote his *Ninety-five Theses*, his attitude toward the papacy was still respectful. Though he raised some sharp questions regarding the Pope’s management of purgatory and his preoccupation with his revenues (couched as “shrewd questions of the laity”), he still expressed concern for “the reverence which is due the pope from slander.”ⁱ Though the indulgence traffic was the target of his *Theses*, Luther expressed the confidence that “if...indulgences were preached according to the spirit and intention of the pope, all...doubts [about the pope’s responsibility for Tetzel’s reprehensible traffic in indulgences] would be readily resolved. Indeed, they would not exist.”ⁱⁱ When he wrote the *Ninety-five Theses*, Luther “still concluded that the Pope must be innocent and his intentions above reproach.”ⁱⁱⁱ He still retained great respect for Pope Leo.

But he did raise enough questions and suspicions to cause Sylvester Prierias (who was appointed by Pope Leo to write a rebuttal of Luther’s *Theses*) to bring the question of papal authority to the forefront as “the issue on which Luther and the curia would collide.”^{iv} In his “Dialogue Concerning the Power of the Pope against the Presumptuous Positions of Martin Luther,” Prierias set up four basic premises for discussion and refutation of Luther’s *Theses*: “All four premises are related to papal power and infallibility. First, Prierias defines the universal church virtually as the Roman Church, the head of all the churches, and the Roman Church virtually as the pope who is head of the church, although in a different way from Christ. Second, Prierias determines that neither a true council of the church, the Roman Church, nor the pope himself, when he rules in his office as pope and seeks the truth to the best of his ability, is able to err. Third, Prierias asserts that anyone who does not rely on the doctrine of the Roman Church and of the pope as the infallible rule of faith, from which even sacred Scripture draws its strength, is a heretic. Finally, in the premise that is most crucial to his case against Luther, Prierias argues that it is improper to distinguish between the teachings and the practices of the Roman Church.”^v Prierias considered the issue of papal power and infallibility to be basic in Luther’s challenge to Rome’s indulgence practice.

Prierias did not destroy Luther’s respect for Leo. Luther still had confidence that the Pope would right all things. But after encountering Cajetan’s well-crafted but extravagant defense of the authority of the Pope, after seeing the papal instruction to Cajetan, calling for Luther’s arrest and recantation, and after debating Eck’s thirteenth proposition (concerning the power of the Pope) at Leipzig in July of 1519, Luther began to change his mind about the papacy. He refuted Proposition Thirteen with both exegetical and historical arguments. His study of Matthew 16:18-19 and John 21:16 convinced him that the popes did not rule by divine right, and Eck’s debating tactics forced Luther “time and again to place the clear meaning of Scripture as Luther perceived it over the opinion of a church father.”^{vi}

Schwiebert describes the position in which Luther found himself after the debate: “In the Leipzig Debate [Luther] came face to face with the orthodox Roman position on sin, grace, justification, the Church, and papal power, and he began to realize how far he had really drifted. Eck’s blind, fanatical acceptance of a position that seemed untenable on the basis of the clearly revealed Word of God made Luther realize that the whole Roman hierarchy rested on a very flimsy foundation. He determined that the principle of *sola scriptura* would have to be the basis for testing all decisions of church councils and the official decrees of the Papacy as recorded in Canon Law.”^{vii} But even before the debate, Luther had written to Spalatin, wondering out loud “whether Rome, by its insistence on opposing...Gospel reform, might not even be the Antichrist or at least his apostle.”^{viii} By the end of 1519, Luther was well on his way to identifying the papacy with the Antichrist, especially because its authority was being exercised to the detriment of the gospel. “More and more he was convinced that the papacy

could not be regarded as a neutral institution, but that it was Antichrist, a demonic institution striking at the God-given ordinances of spiritual and temporal power.”^{ix}

By 1521 Luther’s time “under the papacy” was over. He no longer stood “under” but “over against” the papacy. “The contrast between Christ and the pope, whose similarity to the Antichrist dominated his thought, hardened into irreconcilable alternatives.”^x “For Luther, the papacy as an issue was settled. Making ironical use of scholastic logic, Luther says that the investigation into the existence and nature of the pope has been concluded. It has been established that the pope is the Antichrist and that all that remains is to elaborate on that conclusion.”^{xi} Leo X’s “*Exsurge, Domine*” and “*Decet Romanum Pontificem*” had indeed precipitated the complete outward excommunication of Luther from the church of Rome and its head, but it was Luther’s study of Scripture and his knowledge of history that had alienated him from the papacy prior to the issuance of the papal bulls.

Fifteen years lay between this matured conviction and Luther’s writing of Part II, Article IV, of *The Smalcald Articles* – “Of the Papacy.” He wrote *The Smalcald Articles* on pain of culpability under the solemn charge his Elector laid upon him to set down the articles “which he is determined to adhere to and abide by at the council as well as upon his departure from this world and before the judgment of Almighty God, and in which we cannot yield without becoming guilty of treason against God, even though property and life, peace or war are at stake.”^{xii} But even aside from this obligation laid upon him by Elector John Frederick, Luther’s experiences with the Roman church between 1519 and 1536 would have been sufficient to account for the frankness, boldness, and defiance exhibited in the article, “Of the Papacy.” Fifteen years of unremitting—one might say unrelenting—testimony against the Church of Rome, 15 years of contending for reformation in its head and members, above all, 15 years of deepening acquaintance with the Word and with its gospel treasure, on which Luther staked everything, would have resolved itself in the same rousing call to arms against the antichristian papacy that we hear in his opening charge in Part II, Article IV, “Of the Papacy”: “That the Pope is not, according to divine law [*iure divino*] or to the Word of God the head of all Christendom (for this [name] belongs to One only, whose name is Jesus Christ), but is only the bishop and pastor of the Church at Rome...” A few paragraphs farther on that charge rises to a crescendo: “The Pope is the very Antichrist, who has exalted himself above, and opposed himself against Christ, because he will not permit Christians to be saved without his power, which, nevertheless, is nothing and is neither ordained nor commanded by God.” Since Article IV, “Of the Papacy,” is our text, let us now give attention to Luther’s interpretation of the papacy as he knew it 450 years ago.

1) That *the Pope is not, according to the Word of God the head of all Christendom* (for this name belongs to One only, whose name is Jesus Christ), but is only the bishop and pastor of the Church at Rome, and of those who voluntarily or through a human creature (that is, a political magistrate) have attached themselves to him, to be Christians, not under him as a lord, but with him as brethren [colleagues] and comrades, as the ancient councils and the age of St. Cyprian show.

In his opening paragraph he calls the Pope a usurper. God did not seat him on his throne; God did not endow him with his tiara. No divine law sanctioned his supremacy; no word of God declared his headship over all Christendom. Matthew 16 and John 21 do not invest him with his authority. God’s word requires of ministers that they be humble as children (Mt. 18); that they be brethren, not masters (Mt. 23); that they be examples, not lords (1 Pet. 5). All alike possess the office of the keys (John 20). One is Master, one is Lord; his name is Jesus Christ. One is the head of all Christendom. Only to him has been given a name which is above every name. Only at the name of Jesus every knee should bow. Only he deserves a divine tiara; only he has the rule over all things in heaven, things in earth, and things under the earth; only he is Lord of all.

The only authority Luther grants to the Pope is the supervision of a bishopric, one of perhaps hundreds in Luther’s day, one of several thousand today. The only extension of his power Luther grants him is in the voluntary attachment of individuals outside his episcopal precincts, but not as vassals; they are “brethren and

comrades.” And history backs Luther’s position on the papacy. To the early church councils and to Cyprian, the bishop of Carthage (d. 258), the bishop of Rome was not the head God gave to the church; he was one of a fraternity of bishops, a “brother,” not a primatial lord.

2) But today none of the bishops dare to address the Pope as brother as was done at that time [in the age of Cyprian]; but they must call him most gracious lord, even though they be kings or emperors. This [such arrogance] we will not, cannot, must not take upon our conscience [with a good conscience approve]. Let him, however, who will do it, do so without us [at his own risk].

Yet this “brother” seized the headship over both church and state, over prelates and princes. (In parentheses Luther could have added: as did Gregory VII and Boniface VIII.) To Luther, this papal usurpation is sheer arrogance to which he will not submit, which he “will not, cannot, must not” take upon his conscience.

3) Hence it follows that all things which the Pope, from a power so false, mischievous, blasphemous, and arrogant, has done and undertaken, have been and still are purely diabolical affairs and transactions (with the exception of such things as pertain to the secular government, where God often permits much good to be effected for a people, even through a tyrant and [faithless] scoundrel) for the ruin of the entire holy [catholic or] Christian Church (so far as it is in his power) and for the destruction of the first and chief article concerning the redemption made through Jesus Christ.

Professor John Meyer comments: “The arrogance of the Papacy in usurping the rule both over the visible Church and over temporal government is not its worst offense. The harm which it does to the souls of men by leading them to trust in their own righteousness, achieved by works and penances, is far greater.”^{xiii} In the exercise of his secular authority, though it was usurped, the Pope could (and often did) render good service, but the exercise of his spiritual power was catastrophic for the church. It was ruinous to the very heart and soul of the Christian religion: the first and chief article concerning the redemption made by Jesus Christ. Into this article (Part II, Article I) Luther had poured the life blood of his theology: “That Jesus Christ, our God and Lord, died for our sins, and was raised again for our justification. And He alone is the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world, and God has laid upon Him the iniquities of us all. – There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved. With His stripes we are healed.”^{xiv} Those who cherish this gospel do not balk at Luther’s indictment of the Supreme Pontiff for exercising a power that is “false, mischievous [*freveler*], blasphemous, and arrogant” and which has perpetrated “purely diabolical affairs and transactions...to the ruin of the entire holy Christian Church...” Everyone who has a grasp of what it cost our Savior Jesus Christ to establish the gospel, and everyone who has an awareness of what it cost Luther to restore that gospel knows why there is so much heat in Luther’s denunciation.

4) For all his bulls and books are extant, in which he roars like a lion (as the angel in Rev.12 depicts him,) [crying out] that no Christian can be saved unless he obeys him and is subject to him in all things that he wishes, that he says, and that he does. All of which amounts to nothing less than saying: Although you believe in Jesus Christ and have in Him [alone] everything that is necessary to salvation, yet it is nothing and all in vain unless you regard [have and worship] me as your god, and be subject and obedient to me. And yet it is manifest that the holy Church has been without the Pope for at least more than five hundred years, and that even to the present day the churches of the Greeks and of many other languages neither have been nor are yet under the Pope.

That “false, mischievous [*freveler*], blasphemous, and arrogant” power went so far as to attempt to deny salvation to Christians who did not acknowledge him as their spiritual head. The Pope dared to interdict the

universal promise of the gospel to all who believe, and to appropriate worship and obedience that is due God alone.

At Leipzig, Luther surprised Eck with his wide-ranging knowledge of history. Here he demonstrates from history that Christians can be saved outside the Roman church because they were saved for centuries in the early church where there was no pope, and are being saved now in churches that are not under the Pope.

5) Besides, as often remarked, it is a human figment which is not commanded, and is unnecessary and useless; for the holy Christian [or catholic] Church can exist very well without such a head, and it would certainly have remained better [purer, and its career would have been more prosperous] if such a head had not been raised up by the devil.

6) And the Papacy is also of no use in the Church, because it exercises no Christian office; and therefore it is necessary for the Church to continue and to exist without the Pope.

In fact, the headship of the Roman Catholic church is dispensable today, since the devil is active in it. Nor is the Pope needed, because he “exercises no Christian office.” It is Christ, not the Pope, who preserves his church.

7) And supposing that the Pope would yield this point, so as not to be supreme by divine right or from God’s command, but that we must have [there must be elected] a [certain] head, to whom all the rest adhere [as their support] in order that the [concord and] unity of Christians may be preserved against sects and heretics, and that such a head were chosen by men, and that it were placed within the choice and power of men to change or remove this head, just as the Council of Constance adopted nearly this course with reference to the Popes, deposing three and electing a fourth; supposing, I say, that the Pope and See at Rome would yield and accept this (which, nevertheless is impossible; for thus he would have to suffer his entire realm and estate to be overthrown and destroyed, with all his rights and books, a thing which, to speak in few words, he cannot do), nevertheless, even in this way Christianity would not be helped, but many more sects would arise than before.

When *The Smalcald Articles* were being considered by the Lutheran princes and theologians at Smalcald, Melancthon expressed his willingness to allow the Pope headship over the other bishops “by human right” (*iure humano*) if he would allow the gospel to have free course. What he was proposing was a popular election of the Pope in the interest of “harmony and unity” in the church. Luther considers this eventuality very hypothetical. The mode of human government is not the mode of the government of the church.

8) For since men would have to be subject to this head, not from God’s command, but from their personal good pleasure, it would easily and in a short time be despised, and at last retain no member; neither would it have to be forever confined to Rome or any other place, but it might be wherever and in whatever church God would grant a man fit for the [taking upon him such a great] office. Oh, the complicated and confused state of affairs [perplexity] that would result!

Luther is sure that the Pope would not accept his office unless it was bestowed *iure divino*. Popular election has a corollary: popular rejection. Only if the Pope was appointed by divine right would his power and privilege be secure. Furthermore, a weak central government would command little respect and would invite independent action and disintegration. If his rule was only by human right, it would produce confusion and rivalry. Nor should we forget that if the Pope should allow himself to be chosen by popular choice, he would still have to admit that his claim to *iure divino* was in error.

9) Therefore the Church cannot be better governed and preserved than if we all live under one head, Christ, and all the bishops equal in office, (although they be unequal in gifts), be diligently joined in unity of doctrine, faith, Sacraments, prayer, and works of love, etc., as St. Jerome writes that the priests at Alexandria together and in common governed the churches, as did also the apostles, and afterwards all bishops throughout all Christendom, until the Pope raised his head above all.

Luther cannot leave the subject of church government without describing the “better” kind of church polity: one head, Christ, and all bishops of equal rank. Contrary to what the Roman church believes, the unity of the church is not assured by hierarchical organization and legislation, but by sharing a common doctrine, faith, worship, and service, with everyone taking orders from the head of the church—as it was the practice in the early church. But the Pope’s vaulting ambition destroyed this equality and brotherhood.

10) This teaching shows forcefully that the Pope is the very Antichrist, who has exalted himself above, and opposed himself against Christ, because he will not permit Christians to be saved without his power, which, nevertheless, is nothing, and is neither ordained nor commanded by God.

The thought of such arrogance calls forth Luther’s strongest denunciation of the papacy. The Pope “is the very Antichrist [*der rechte Endechrist oder Widerchrist*], who has exalted himself above and opposed himself against Christ.” Of this bold declaration Professor Meyer remarks: “That the Pope is the very Antichrist was an article of faith with Luther. He could not believe in Jesus Christ as his only Savior without denouncing the Pope as Christ’s great adversary.”^{xv} Who could be a greater enemy of Christ and the church than one who subverted the gospel and the doctrine of justification by faith (“the chief article”) while masquerading as Christ’s own vicar?

11) This is, properly speaking, *to exalt himself above all that is called God*, as Paul says, 2 Thess. 2,4. Even the Turks or the Tartars, great enemies of Christians as they are, do not do this, but they allow whoever wishes to believe in Christ, and take bodily tribute and obedience from Christians.

12) The Pope, however, prohibits this faith, saying that to be saved a person must obey him. This we are unwilling to do, even though on this account we must die in God’s name.

It is evident that Luther bases his identification of the Pope as the Antichrist on 2 Thess. 2, where Paul uses the two words, “opposes” and “exalts” [himself], which distill the essence of his article on the papacy. The great sin of the Antichrist is that he exalts himself above Christ and from his exalted position opposes Christ’s all-sufficient work.

13) This all proceeds from the fact that the Pope has wished to be called the supreme head of the Christian Church by divine right. Accordingly he had to make himself equal and superior to Christ, and had to cause himself to be proclaimed the head and then the lord of the Church, and finally of the whole world, and simply God on earth, until he has dared to issue commands even to the angels in heaven.

The errors and evils of the papacy are traceable to his self-exaltation to supreme headship of the Christian church by divine right. Luther sees a crass example of such self-exaltation in the Pope’s presumption to issue commands even to Christ’s own angels in heaven (which he did when he commanded the angels to

carry Rome pilgrims directly to heaven if they died while they were observing the golden year). “How could he become more arrogant?” Luther asked in a sermon on Matt.18:18.

14) And when we distinguish the Pope’s teaching from, or measure and hold it against, Holy Scripture, it is found [it appears plainly] that the Pope’s teaching, where it is best, has been taken from the imperial and heathen law, and treats of political matters and decisions or rights, as the Decretals show; furthermore, it teaches of ceremonies concerning churches, garments, food, persons, and [similar] puerile, theatrical and comical things without measure but in all these things nothing at all of Christ, faith, and the commandments of God. Lastly, it is nothing else than the devil himself, because above and against God he urges [and disseminates] his [papal] falsehoods concerning masses, purgatory, the monastic life, one’s own works and [fictitious] divine worship (for this is the very Papacy [upon each of which the Papacy is altogether founded and is standing]), and condemns, murders, and tortures all Christians who do not exalt and honor these abominations [of the Pope] above all things. Therefore, just as little as we can worship the devil himself as Lord and God, we can endure his apostle, the Pope, or Antichrist, in his rule as head or lord. For to lie and to kill, and to destroy body and soul eternally, that is wherein his papal government really consists, as I have very clearly shown in many books.

In summary fashion Luther now records the Pope’s teachings or the orders he has issued as the assumed supreme head of the church. Since the Pope claims secular authority, he issues pronouncements and decrees in political and judicial matters. Here he has some competence because he has the support of the best “imperial and heathen law.” The Pope’s teachings in ceremonial and liturgical matters Luther, considers claptrap and much unchristian ado about nothing. It is the third sphere of the Pope’s teachings that Luther identifies as most noxious. They are lies; they are damning, murderous, and inhuman; they are diabolical. They express themselves in such central doctrines of the papacy as masses, purgatory, the monastic life, one’s own works, and divine worship (the very papacy).

In rejecting these satanic teachings, Luther repeats his hard words and harsh charges; the papacy governs by lies and murder. It destroys body and soul eternally. In the light of the cross and of the crown, his words are valid.

15) In these four articles they will have enough to condemn in the Council. For they cannot and will not concede us even the least point in one of these articles. Of this we should be certain and animate ourselves with [be forewarned and made firm in] the hope that Christ, Our Lord, has attacked His adversary, and he will press the attack home [pursue and destroy him] both by His Spirit and coming. Amen.

In paragraph 15 Luther refers to “these four articles.” They are the four articles comprising Part II of *The Smalcald Articles*: 1) the “chief article” [*der Hauptartikel*], of the Office and Word of Jesus Christ, of justification by faith; 2) of the Mass; 3) of Chapters and Cloisters; and 4) of the Papacy. These articles are the bedrock of Luther’s “deathbed” confession; they are non-negotiable. If we compromise them, the papists will triumph and we lose the gospel. In faith, Luther commits his cause to the Lord Christ with a fervent Amen.

16) For in the Council we will stand not before the Emperor or the political magistrate, as at Augsburg (where the Emperor published a most gracious edict, and caused matters to be heard kindly [and dispassionately], but [we will appear] before the Pope and devil himself, who intends to listen to nothing, but merely [when the case has been publicly announced] to condemn, to murder and to force us to idolatry. Therefore we ought not here to kiss his feet, or to say: “Thou art my gracious lord,” but as the angel in Zechariah 3,2 said to Satan: *The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan.*

In the final paragraph Luther harbors no illusions about the Council where *The Smalcald Articles* are to be presented at Mantua. The papal court will grant no quarter. There will be no justice, no exculpation, no forbearance, as at Augsburg. But Luther is not dismayed. He dismisses his prospective judge with a final malediction, denunciation, and anathema. Luther was in dead earnest about the Antichrist.

Professor Meyer concludes his comments on these teachings: “With these statements the Smalcald Articles conclude our confession concerning the Antichrist. They show how our Christian faith in the forgiveness of our sins by the grace of God, for Christ’s sake, without any merit or worthiness on our part, recoils instinctively from the Pope’s distortion of this central article of the Gospel, and shuns the Papacy itself as the Antichrist, because it perpetrates its falsifications under the name of Christ.”^{xvi}

Melanchthon’s *Tractatus*, printed as an appendix or supplement to Luther’s article “Of the Papacy,” is, in its own right, a very adequate statement on the papacy and the Antichrist. In organization it is more structured than Luther’s article. It rests its case on more exegesis of Scripture texts and on more historical data. Melanchthon’s presentation lacks some of the vigor of Luther’s; it doesn’t have the aura of his veteran colleague’s authority, but it distills the same truth: the Pope is the very Antichrist.

W.D. Allbeck compares Luther’s and Melanchthon’s presentations: “Both men rejected the pope’s claim to supremacy in the church by divine right. Both repudiated the claim that obedience to the pope and faith in his claims are necessary to salvation. Both charge that he is the Antichrist.... Both remembered...papal cruelty.... But Luther was more bitter in his rejection of the pope. He would consent to no pope, even by human right. He was completely and finally through with popes.”^{xvii}

Professor Meyer is not alone in his perception of the Pope as the Antichrist. W.D. Allbeck hails from the former Lutheran Church in America, which is not notable for its confessionalism, but he commends Luther’s uncompromising indictment of the Antichrist. At the close of his commentary on this article he wrote: “The vehemence of Luther’s declarations might give the impression that he was an obstinate, lawless rebel, full of personal spite. But when all four articles [of Part II] are viewed together, it becomes evident that here is a profound doctrine of salvation meeting the antagonism of a strongly entrenched and desperately vicious papal system. Here is a vigorous, unwavering commitment to Christ as the only Saviour. The assurance of our salvation lies in him. Luther earnestly resented anything that detracted from Christ or that jeopardized the certainty of eternal life. And in these articles he hotly says so. The heat is not only in his denunciations; it is also in his loyalty to his Savior.”^{xviii}

In his article on the papacy Luther supported his characterization of the papacy with the comment: “...as I have very clearly shown in many books.” A glance at the index to *The American Edition of Luther’s Works* substantiates that impression. Forty-seven (of 54) volumes of the *American Edition* have a total of over 220 references (a number of them multi-page) to the Antichrist. After he established his doctrine of the Antichrist between 1517 and 1522, he felt no compulsion to revise it. The papacy remained the mortal enemy of the gospel.

Luther’s continuing indictment of the papacy corresponded to the papacy’s persistence in its errors. As long as the papacy persisted in coercing the people and undermining their faith, Luther persisted in his opposition to the papacy. Hendrix observes: “As long as the pope did not allow the faithful to believe, Luther would not allow the people to believe the pope. As long as the Antichrist under the guise of the papacy was still seducing the people, he would continue to expose that abomination and to denounce the popes as archliars.”^{xix}

Luther’s rejection of the papacy persisted to the very end of his life. “The prayer he uttered [*Impleat vos Deus odio papae*?] on the night of his death apparently testifies to that rejection.”^{xx} The year before his death he wrote “Against the Roman Papacy, An Institution of the Devil.” It was “blatant satire,” it was coarse and offensive, but it was also his “most definitive statement regarding the papacy and his apocalyptic interpretation of its place in the history of the Christian Church.”^{xxi}

Does that rejection persist in the church that still bears his name? There is little doubt that Luther’s stand on the Antichrist is considered passé and embarrassing by most Lutherans today. The former LCA and ALC were abandoning their confessional position on the papacy during the first half of this century. Since Vatican II

Comment [o1]:

they have, to all intents and purposes, completely forsaken it. They have no inclination and no desire to be filled with hatred of the Antichrist.

The Abiding Word, a collection of doctrinal essays published on the occasion of the celebration of the centennial of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod in 1947, still includes an essay on the Antichrist that comes out of the Walther-Pieper confessional mold. But by 1959 the LC-MS no longer had the desire, if not the confessional strength, to reaffirm publicly its classic position on the Antichrist. Though its representatives had agreed to do so, it did not join the WELS and the ELS in formally reaffirming its position on the papacy. To most Lutherans in our country, Luther's article on the Antichrist is time-bound and no longer relevant. (It must have been embarrassing for the LC-MS editors and publisher of *The American Edition of Luther's Works* to discover that they had not included *The Smalcald Articles* among his works.)

The Braaten-Jenson *Christian Dogmatics*, in use at most Lutheran seminaries in our country, devotes only two lonely sentences to the doctrine of the papal Antichrist. One records Luther's belief that the Pope was the Antichrist; the other states that the Franciscans denounced Emperor Frederick II as the Antichrist. There would seem to be correlation between the heterodoxy of a Lutheran church body that approves such universalistic theologians as Braaten and Jenson, and its perception of the Antichrist. Lutherans who no longer possess the confessional vision to recognize the Antichrist, nor the confessional strength to stand with Luther in condemning him, may be said to have lost no small measure of their perception both of who Jesus Christ really is and of the salvation he has won.

Where does our synod stand on the doctrine of the Antichrist? This question may arise, not because there is public evidence of erosion of our confessional commitment to this article, but because there is a perception abroad that the Roman Catholic church has changed; that it is no longer the church Luther knew; that it has experienced the *aggiornamento* of Vatican II.

After we became a confessional church body in the late 1860s, our theological position on the Antichrist was that of Adolf Hoenecke, which corresponded to that of C.F.W. Walther and Franz Pieper in the Missouri Synod. Hoenecke's statement on the Antichrist specifically identifies the Pope as the Antichrist: "*Der in der Schrift geweisssagte grosse Widerchrist und grösste Feind der Kirche ist nicht mehr zu erwarten, sondern bereits im Papsttum vorhanden. Das nun, worauf alle diese [bes. aus 2. Thess.] Anzeichen trefflich, ja allein passen, ist das Papsttum, und dieses daher der Widerchrist.*"^{xxii}

Franz Pieper wrote in his *Christian Dogmatics*: "Likewise the Pope must be the Antichrist because everything that Scripture foretells of the Antichrist fits him and cannot be shown to be true of any other.... We should diligently note this truth and material, that the Roman Pope is the Antichrist."^{xxiii}

John Schaller succeeded Adolf Hoenecke in the department of systematic theology at our seminary. John P. Meyer followed him in 1920. His dogmatics course was based on Adolf Hoenecke's *Ev. Luth. Dogmatik* and John Schaller's *Biblical Christology*. Professor Meyer maintained Dr. Hoenecke's position on the Antichrist and taught it for nearly a half century to our Wisconsin Synod ministry. In 1945, at a time when union negotiations between the Missouri Synod and the American Lutheran Church focused attention on the doctrine of the Antichrist, because the ALC declared that the identification of the Pope as the Antichrist was only a historical judgment, Professor Meyer published an essay on the Antichrist in the *Quartalschrift*. We recognize his commitment to Luther's doctrine in his reaction to the ALC's waffling:

As justification by grace is an article of faith [not a mere historical judgment], so it is an article of faith that the Pope who condemns justification by grace is the very Antichrist. What greater falling away from Christ is conceivable than when the Pope condemns what Christ proclaims? ...it is the most direct opposition of a usurper, who brazenly deposes God and His Christ and himself occupies the throne. What more is needed than this basic fact to identify the Pope as the very Antichrist? *Papam esse ipsum verum Antichristum* indeed an article of faith.^{xxiv}

Pastor W.F. Schink stated in his conference paper, published in the *Quartalschrift*: "...comparing prophecy with words and works of the Papacy, we can with perfect certainty draw the conclusion that the Pope

in whom the Papacy is concentrated is the Antichrist. This teaching rests on Scripture, and not on a human opinion, but on the facts of history.”^{xxv} “A Lutheran preacher should know, believe, and teach this article or frankly confess that he no longer subscribes to the Confessions of the Lutheran Church.”^{xxvi}

In 1965 Pastor E. Arnold Sitz write in the opening sentence of his paper, “Of the Antichrist”: “It is the purpose of this paper to show that the Antichrist of Holy Scripture is, and according to the Word of God can be, none other than the Pope.”^{xxvii} “From what has been cited above from Holy Writ [II Thess. et al] it must be plain to every child of God that the doctrine of the Antichrist is a matter of revelation from God to faith and not a subject of human, historical judgment.”^{xxviii}

This spring the *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* published Professor W.R. Gawrisch’s “Antichrists and the Antichrist.” Gawrisch, the chairman of the department of systematic theology at Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary, writes: “The question now arises, Who or what is this Antichrist? It is obvious that there is only one phenomenon in the history of the church that has all the marks of the Antichrist given in Paul’s prophecy. That is the Roman papacy. Its anathema on the biblical doctrine of justification is the very acme of lawlessness.”^{xxix}

Luther’s definition of the Antichrist is still being taught at Northwestern College, where *The Smalcald Articles* are a part of the pre-seminary curriculum of the college. It is still being taught at Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary. It is still being upheld in conference papers across our synod. The resolution of the 1959 convention of the Synod concerning the Antichrist is still the official teaching of the Synod (quoted by Professor Gawrisch, e.g.), and it is the measure of every conference paper on that subject. The Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod still stands with Luther in his conviction that “*papam esse ipsum verum Antichristum.*” This official statement of the WELS in 1959 deserves recognition here as a compendium of our teaching in this year of our Lord:

Statement on the Antichrist

- II. Scripture...speaks...of a particular personal embodiment of the antichristian power in which the iniquity of false teaching finds its climax, II Thess.2:1-12. [Here the statement quotes the II Thessalonians passage and declares that it is using the term “antichrist” in the personal sense in this passage. Passages from the *Apology*, from *The Smalcald Articles*, and from Melancthon’s *Tractatus* follow.]
- III. The passage (II Thess.2:1-12) promises that God will reveal the “man of sin” and states the tokens, or marks, by means of which God will reveal him to the eyes of faith.

Among these marks are:

- 1. He “as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God.” He is a religious power demanding allegiance, usurping authority in the Church and tyrannizing Christian consciences. cf. *The Smalcald Articles* II, 4, 10-14.
- 2. He is an embodiment of Satanic power. This is manifested
 - a. in the fact that he appears as the one “who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God.” He is God’s Adversary.
 - b. and in the fact that his opposition to God is an opposition of disguise and deceit. He opposes God by usurping the place and name of God (II Thess.2:4). The Satanic appears, characteristically, in religious form: the “coming” of Antichrist is pitted against the “coming” of Christ, his signs and lying wonders against the miracles of Christ, faith in his lie against faith in the truth of Christ (II Thess.2:10,11).

- IV. Therefore on the basis of a renewed study of the pertinent Scriptures we reaffirm the statement of the Lutheran Confessions that “the Pope is the very Antichrist,” especially since he anathematizes the doctrine of justification of faith alone and sets himself up as the infallible head of the Church.

We thereby affirm that we identify this “Antichrist” with the Papacy as it is known to us today, which shall, as II Thess.2:8 states, continue to the end of time, whatever form or guise it may take. We make this confession in the confidence of faith. The Antichrist cannot deceive us if we remain under the revelation given us in the Apostolic word (II Thess.2:13,17), for in God’s gracious governance of history the Antichrist can deceive only those who “receive not the love of the truth” (II Thess.2:10-12).

We reject the idea that the fulfillment of this prophecy is to be sought in the worship of any merely secular political power (II Thess.2:4).

We reject the idea that the teaching that the Papacy is the Antichrist rests on a merely human interpretation of history or is an open question. We hold rather that this teaching rests on the revelation of God in Scripture which finds its fulfillment in history. The Holy Spirit reveals this fulfillment to the eyes of faith. Since Scripture teaches that the Antichrist would be revealed and gives the marks by which the Antichrist is to be recognized (II Thess.2:6,8), and since this prophecy has been clearly fulfilled in the history and development of the Roman Papacy, it is Scripture which reveals that the Papacy is the Antichrist.

(“Adopted without a dissenting voice and with the full consent of those present in the convention.”)^{xxx}

It’s there—Luther’s Antichrist, the evil power throned in the midst of the church, the usurper and the tyrant, God’s Adversary and Satan’s plenipotentiary, the liar and the deceiver and the murderer of souls, the consummate and obdurate enemy of Christ and the gospel. It’s there—Luther’s faith, Luther’s reliance on the Word, Luther’s commitment of his cause to “Christ, our Lord, [who] has attacked His adversary, and [who] will press the attack home both by His Spirit and coming.”

Then why this essay? To beat the drums for a doctrine that has become suspect in our synod, so that we can preserve our doctrinal integrity? I trow not. I hope it isn’t necessary. I prefer to believe that this assignment has been given because there is a question in the air. Is the papacy of 1988 the same as the papacy of 1536? The Roman Catholic church we know today does not appear to be the “evil empire” Luther contended against. The authors of the “*Dictatus*” and “*Unam Sanctam*” hardly seem to be appropriate whipping boys today. The pathetic lament of a classmate of mine implies that the Church of Rome has abandoned much of its past: “What are they doing to my church?” The spectacle of the Catholic church “in eruption” shook the faithful in the 1960’s and 1970’s. As they witnessed “the great exodus from the priesthood and religious life,” “the falling off of vocations, the closing of Catholic schools, the breakdown of respect for ecclesiastical authority, and erosion of traditional moral norms, especially in the area of sexual conduct,”^{xxxii} they were stunned by an impact a progressive theologian likened to that of “a massive surgical operation carried out without anesthesia on a patient who thought he was in the best of health.”^{xxxiii}

Should Richard J. Neuhaus’ sneering remark about the “dull heresy”^{xxxiii} which the WELS (where, incidentally, he has relatives) is still pursuing be taken more seriously than to dismiss it out of hand as a liberal’s knee-jerk reaction to orthodox Lutheranism? What is the Roman Catholic church today? What is the Roman papacy today?

Whether it is viewed as the *aggiornamento* of a reactionary church, as a recommitment to devotion and service, or as the opening of a Pandora's box, the Vatican II Council (1962-1965) has set an agenda and the tone for the Roman church ever since. Much of what has developed in that church since the 1960s has been implementation of its 16 constitutions, decrees, and declarations, or it has been reaction to them. Its tensions and struggles, its action and reaction can hardly be comprehended without an acquaintance with the milieu and the documents of the Council. The books and essays of Catholic and Protestant scholars constantly key off "*Lumen Gentium*," "*Dei Verbum*," "*Gaudium et Spes*" and other Council documents in their definition and interpretation of the papal church.

We need to know the purpose of the Vatican II Council to understand subsequent changes in the Roman Catholic church. Pope John XXIII had a cherished dream, the reunion of all Christians. To carry out that dream, and even the dream of a unity of all mankind, Pope John convoked the church's Twenty-first Ecumenical Council. He looked forward to a "visible unity in truth," the unity of Catholics among themselves, the unity "of prayers and ardent desires with which those Christians separated from the Apostolic See aspire to be united with us"; and the unity in "esteem and respect for the Catholic Church which animates those who follow non-Christian religions."^{xxxiv} And to achieve that respect he called for a recommitment to devotion and service. In token of his purpose Pope John called the Council the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council.

And ecumenical it was. The documents, in particular the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, and the Decree on Ecumenism, convey the declaration and the substance of this purpose. The wording of the presentations communicates the sense of such purpose. They breathe the spirit of unity and state what Rome is prepared to do to achieve it, in doctrine and in practice. Vatican II was a far cry from Trent and its ultimatums to the heretics—repent, return, conform.

The tone was conciliatory. In his introduction to "*Lumen Gentium*," (The Church) Avery Dulles observes, "The tone of the document is...strongly ecumenical. Every effort is made to speak in language which will be readily understood by other Christians and by all men of good will, and to explain Catholic teaching in a way that avoids giving unnecessary offense to persons accustomed to other modes of thought and speech."^{xxxv} A footnote to Chapter VIII, The Role of the Blessed Virgin...in the Mystery of Christ and the Church, explains why the subject was treated in a rather low-key final chapter of the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, rather than to be given the full-fledged status of a separate Declaration or Decree: "The Council in its choice of language and emphasis tries to avoid anything which might unnecessarily offend the sensibilities of the separated brethren."^{xxxvi}

There was a deliberate avoidance of all polemical tendencies. Pope John XXIII spoke of applying the "medicine of mercy" rather than measures of stern harshness as the Council engaged in "its essential ministry of healing or reconciliation."^{xxxvii} Protestant defectors and heretics are called "separated brethren," who are also being led by Jesus and the Holy Spirit.

The Council came out for preaching, Protestant style, that is governed by sacred Scripture. The abundance of Scripture references cited in the documents compares favorably with the use of Scripture references in a WELS conference paper. "Easy access to sacred Scripture should be provided for all the Christian faithful."^{xxxviii} "The loving mother of all" smiles at us Protestants, "spreading abroad the fullness of Christian charity."^{xxxix}

Both Catholic and Protestant writers have reflected this cordiality and ecumenism in the years following the Vatican II Council. Back in 1959, when Jaroslav Pelikan wrote *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism*, he viewed it as almost impossible that Rome would even consider reunion with Protestantism, not to mention that Rome would take the ecumenical initiative to effect such a reunion, "as in fact it did at the Second Vatican Council, and has continued to do so since."^{xl}

Karl Rahner, the great German theologian who served at the Vatican II Council as a "*peritus*" and has been recognized as "the most powerful man" at the Council, was a promoter of Catholic-Protestant reunion. He expressed himself rather forcefully when an interviewer questioned whether a pope from Poland, "where one does not care a bit about other churches," could be ready for "aggressive ecumenical thinking": "If the pope,

because of his Polish descent, is not used to taking other churches into account because he had never, as it were, laid eyes on them, for goodness' sake, he can learn to!"^{xli}

The attitude of Pope John Paul II toward Protestantism may not be established as much from specific ecumenical invitations as from his acceptance of Protestant emphases. Note his christocentric commitment: "Make no mistake about it," writes James V. Schall, "the real root of opposition to John Paul II arises from his insistence...that Christianity, as it is found in its Scriptures and Creeds and rites, is true."^{xlii} John Paul's repetition that "Christ is...the sole redeemer is intended to deny any theory of human worth or salvation that does not base itself squarely in the sacrificial redemption of Christ."^{xliii} "The Gospel itself ought not to be changed 'on contact' with various cultures."^{xliv}

Sola Scriptura Protestants also value his sturdy insistence, despite the gainsaying of some American bishops, that pre-marital sex and abortion and homosexuality are wrong because that is what Scripture says. The Pope's social concerns endear him to Protestant social gospelites, while his judgment that liberation theology is "another gospel"^{xlv} strikes a responsive chord in the hearts of Protestants who reject social-gospel enthusiasm.

To our Lutheran man on the street, his Catholic neighbor's worship is most apparent evidence that the Catholic church has drawn closer to the Protestant churches. Where Patrick O'Brien and Jose Chavez now attend church, American is spoken instead of Latin, and their hymnal includes a host of Protestant hymns, even "A Mighty Fortress." The lectors read Scripture lessons to the congregation and say, "This is the word of the Lord." Priests are getting practice in preaching sermons (at least homilies). Sunday services include common prayers. General absolutions are replacing private confessionals. Catholic priests and Protestant pastors officiate jointly at weddings. And it is difficult to call the affable priest down the street a servant of the Antichrist.

There was no such ecumenical climate back in the 1940s, when Harold Fey wrote a notable series of articles for "The Christian Century" on the question, "Can Catholicism Win America?" and Paul Blanshard published his disturbing book, "American Freedom and Catholic Power." Both of these anti-Catholic theses were still on the minds of Democratic politicians when John F. Kennedy addressed the Baptist ministers of Houston in his presidential campaign, to disarm them and all Protestant America of the notion that the Pope either directly *or indirectly* sought to impose his will on the general populace or the public acts of its officials. Today Catholics cannot agree even among themselves on what it would mean to make America Catholic. Furthermore, Catholicism in the U.S. has to a large extent become old-line liberal NCC Protestantism. Catholicism has become "American."

Has the papal church relaxed its doctrine and practice to such an extent that Lutherans could envision reconciliation with the Roman Catholic church? Or is the Pope still the Antichrist?

For Luther, papal primacy was the issue. He denied primacy to the Pope in his opening statement in the *Smalcald Article* "Of the Papacy": "That the Pope is not, according to divine law or to the Word of God the head of all Christendom..." He branded the Pope's claim to headship over both church and state sheer arrogance to which he, Luther, "will not, cannot, must not" submit (paragraph 2). The exercise of this arrogated power over the souls of men destroyed the heart and soul of the Christian religion: the first and chief article concerning the redemption made by Jesus Christ (paragraph 3). That presumptuous power went so far as to attempt to deny salvation to Christians who did not acknowledge him as their spiritual head. In paragraph 10 Luther denounced the self-elevating Pope as "the very Antichrist, who has exalted himself above and opposed himself against Christ." In his article on the papacy Luther singles out the Pope's usurpation of headship in the church as primary evidence that he is the Antichrist.

Though Hans Küng, a well-known maverick theologian in the Roman church, has questioned the infallibility of the Pope in view of papal errors (and was deprived of his license to teach theology at Tübingen), and has pressed hard against the limits of Catholic doctrine with his unorthodoxy, he has not renounced the papacy as an institution of the Roman Catholic church. He upholds a Petrine ministry but with less emphasis on the primacy of pure authority and more on the primacy of service. He may be Protestant in his rejection of much of the exegetical and historical support Rome cites for its doctrine of the papacy, but he is still a son of Rome in this: the whole Church needs a pope. "A Petrine ministry in the Church makes sense and every Catholic will affirm it."^{xlvi}

Few Catholic theologians, if any, had a larger hand in the changes ratified by Vatican II than did Karl Rahner. “Long before he died [in 1984], he had been acclaimed as the most influential Roman Catholic theologian of the century.”^{xlvii} His capacious, facile mind was hesitant about making absolutistic, simplistic assertions about truth and doctrine. His circumstantial, complex observations (“Germanic systematizations of infinite distinctions,” as Neuhaus puts it) do not make for easy reading. But there was a bottom line. Regarding dissenting Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre’s traditionalism he declared: “The Church has certainly room for different mentalities. But unlike others who have a quarrel with Rome, Lefebvre contests the authority of the pope. And this is simply no longer Catholic. I repeat: This is not Catholic.”^{xlviii} According to Rahner, anyone who contests the primacy of the Pope cannot be a true member of the true church.

In *The Limits of the Papacy*, Patrick Granfield, a professor of theology at the Catholic University of America, and past president of the Catholic Theological Society of America, quotes the 1983 Code of Canon Law, the Church’s principal legislative document, to certify papal primacy: “The Code declares that the Bishop of the Church of Rome is head of the College of Bishops, Vicar of Christ, and pastor of the universal Church; he enjoys supreme, full, immediate, and universal ordinary power in the Church, which he can always exercise freely (canon 331).”^{xlix} “No human authority can legitimately impede papal action; any attempt to do so would be a crime (canon 1375).”^l “Nothing important and extraordinary is to be done by the Curia without the knowledge and approval of the Pope.”^{li} “The Pope is the supreme Judge of the entire Catholic world.”^{lii} “No appeal nor recourse is allowed for any decision or decree of the Pope (canon 333,3). The Pope alone has the right to judge heads of states, cardinals, legates...and other cases that he has reserved to himself (canon 1405,1).”^{liii} (The Pope still “receives” heads of state. Who “receives” the Pope?) “The two Vatican Councils and the Code of Canon Law leave no doubt that the Pope has the fullness of executive, legislative, and judicial power. Papal authority, either directly or through the Curia, touches the lives of every Catholic—bishops, clerics, religious, and laity. No one is exempt and no aspect of Catholic life is unaffected.”^{liv} No wonder Granfield concludes his book with the observation that “the papacy remains a major barrier” to “eventual Christian unity,”^{lv} despite papal limitations on the expression of the Pope’s primacy.

The present incumbent of the papal office unreservedly identifies himself as the universal pastor: “(But) the welcome of a population which comes to meet (me [in Turin] is) not so much (for) my person, but rather for the one who is invested, by divine plan, with the Apostolic mandate as universal pastor, with direct responsibility towards every Christian, and, indeed, towards every man.”^{lvi} J.V. Schall asserts, in *The Church, the State and Society in the Thought of John Paul II*, that “the very claim to the full truth [is] a claim John Paul often makes.”^{lvii} He concludes his book by claiming “that the truth of God still remains visible and viable because of and through a Church in which there is a man who sees himself...to be Pope, to be responsible for the teaching of Christianity as it has been handed down to us. There is no other truth.”^{lviii} Paul Johnson identifies John Paul’s goal: “With all the strength of his faith, and all the power of his intellect, and all the magic of his personality, he is striving to rebuild the authority of the papacy.”^{lix}

The Documents of Vatican II do not express this claim to papal and infallible primacy as anathematically as “*Pastor Aeternus*” of Vatican I did. Vatican II is “more scriptural than juridical, more ecumenical than polemical, more pastoral than dogmatic.”^{lx} But they make their support of papal primacy very clear. “*Lumen Gentium*” states: “[Jesus Christ] placed blessed Peter over the other apostles and instituted in him a permanent and visible source and foundation of unity of faith and fellowship.” “...the sacred primacy of the Roman Pontiff and of his infallible teaching authority, this sacred Synod again proposes to be firmly believed by all the faithful.”^{lxi} “...the Roman Pontiff has full, supreme, and universal power over the Church. And he can always exercise this power freely.”^{lxii} “Religious submission of will and of mind must be shown in a special way to the authentic teaching authority of the Roman Pontiff, even when he is not speaking *ex cathedra*.”^{lxiii}

In the “Dogmatic Constitution of the Church” the Council spells out its reconfirmation of the 1870 doctrine of papal infallibility: “This infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed His Church to be endowed in defining a doctrine of faith and morals extends as far as extends the deposit of divine revelation, which must be religiously guarded and faithfully expounded. 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 (cf. Lk.22:32), he proclaims by a definitive act some doctrine of faith or morals. Therefore his definitions, of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church, are justly styled irrefragable, for they are pronounced with the assistance of the Holy Spirit, an assistance promised to him in blessed Peter. Therefore they need no approval of others, nor do they allow an appeal to any other judgment. For them the Roman Pontiff is not pronouncing judgment as a private person. Rather, as the supreme teacher of the Church, as one in whom the charism of the infallibility of the Church herself is individually present, he is expounding or defending a doctrine of Catholic faith.”^{lxiv}

Much of this infallible teaching authority is also the prerogative of the college of bishops through their association with the Pope, though it can be exercised only with his consent. Canon 749.2 on the Teaching Office of the Church states: “The college of bishops also possesses infallible teaching authority when the bishops exercise their teaching office gathered together in an ecumenical council when, as teachers and judges of faith and morals, they declare that for the universal Church a doctrine of faith or morals must be definitively held; they also exercise it scattered throughout the world but united in a bond of communion among themselves and with the successor of Peter when together with that same Roman Pontiff in their capacity as authentic teachers of faith and morals they agree on an opinion to be held as definitive.”^{lxv} “Under the bishop of Rome,” and “never without this head, the episcopal order is the subject of supreme and full power over the universal Church. But this power can be exercised only with the consent of the Roman Pontiff.”^{lxvi}

Small wonder that Samuel McCrea Cavert, former general secretary of the National Council of Churches, exclaims, in his response to the Decree on Ecumenism: “The Decree does not really reconcile its ecumenical outlook with its assumption that the Roman Catholic is the only true Church. This assumption is explicit in the statement that ‘it is through Christ’s Catholic Church alone, which is the all-embracing means of salvation, that the fullness of the means of salvation can be obtained.’ Associated with this is the further assumption of the primacy of Peter and of his jurisdiction over the whole Church. These assumptions seem to indicate that the Roman Catholic understanding of ecumenism is unchangeably Rome-centered.”^{lxvii}

Developments in the Church of Rome since Vatican II are *prima facie* evidence of consolidation, or “reconsolidation,” of papal primacy. When Rome temporarily lost its clear sense of authority in the Petrine episcopacy as a result of the liberal, modernistic excesses of the 1960s, the faithful, many of its bishops, and its conservative theologians galvanized themselves for a latter-day counter-reformation in their church. A dominant aspect of the counter-reformation has been a reestablishment of traditional authority in the Catholic church.

In *The Desolate City*, Anne Muggeridge voices this reaction: “It is hard to imagine how much would now be left of the Church’s inherited teaching without the papal authority exercised during the modernist crisis, and without John Paul II.”^{lxviii} For her, John Paul is the great hope of the Church as he proceeds to undo the disorder Vatican II invited into the Church. If John Paul has an overriding purpose in his office, it is to restore the authority of the papacy; without that control the ship is rudderless. Applying Neuhaus’ metaphor to the restoration of the Pope’s authority: “John Paul II, Cardinal Ratzinger, and others are trying to put the package together and wrap it up tightly so that it does not become undone once again.”^{lxix}

The results of the Extraordinary Synod of 1985, which reviewed the resolutions of Vatican II, was a cause for self-congratulation by John Paul and his “theological patrolman,” Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, whose *Report* dominated the conference. John Paul’s power was undiminished; rather, it was enhanced because he convinced the progressives that Vatican II decrees and resolutions still mattered to him (a tribute also to John Paul’s not inconsiderable political and diplomatic skills).

An even more recent incident exhibits this restoration of papal authority. When American bishops, meeting at Collegeville, MN (a laboratory for liberal Catholicism), issued a statement on the AIDS matter, they came out (ala C. Everett Koop) for the use of condoms to stay the plague. When the Pope and his prefect, Ratzinger, heard about it, they reminded the bishops that the Pope should have been consulted. The bishops scurried to withdraw the statement and are now fretting about producing a revised statement that will not cost them loss of face with their constituencies. (One wonders whether the Collegeville conference would not have

thumbed its nose at Paul VI and his controversial “*Humanae Vitae*,” had *he* demurred at a negative statement from such a conference.)

The Catholic claim that the Pope has primatial authority has not changed since Luther’s day. Even after the disruption occasioned by Vatican II the Roman church plainly declares that he is the Vicar of Christ; even today he is in charge, though there are provinces in his empire where he must exercise his power with caution, lest he precipitate defection or a schism.

The doctrine of the primacy of the Pope rests on pseudoexegesis of Scripture (esp. Matt. 16, Luke 22, and John 21) and on tradition. Tradition is still “alive and well” in the Roman church. Today the Roman church still supports its papal claims with the “revelation” of tradition as it did in Luther’s day.

What does the Catholic church claim for tradition today? S.A. Hardon’s *The Catholic Catechism* paraphrases the Vatican II “Constitution on Divine Revelation” regarding tradition: “Sacred Tradition takes the word of God entrusted by Christ the Lord and the Holy Spirit to the apostles, and hands it to their successors in its full purity. Thus, led by the light of the Spirit of truth, they may in proclaiming it preserve this word of God faithfully, explain it, and make it more widely known. Consequently it is not from Sacred Scripture alone that the Church draws her certainty about everything which has been revealed. Both Sacred Tradition and Sacred Scripture are to be accepted and venerated with the same sense of loyalty and reverence.”^{lxx} They form “one sacred deposit.” They are “interdependent.” Arthur Piepkorn concurs: “Modern biblical [historical criticism] studies have helped to give the entire Scripture-tradition problem a new dimension. It is seen with increasing clarity that the sacred Scriptures themselves are part of the process of tradition, and hence the line of demarcation between written revelation (in the sacred Scriptures,) and oral revelation (in ecclesiastical tradition) is no longer as sharp as it was once held to be.”^{lxxi}

“The main *instruments* or channels by which Tradition has been (and is now) transmitted to the people of God [are] the professions of faith, like the Apostles’ and Nicene Creeds; the Church’s liturgy and unvarying practices since apostolic times; the writings of ancient Fathers and archaeological monuments testifying to what Christians believed and how they worshipped over the centuries. Yet, all of these are only instrumental of the *organ* of Tradition in the Catholic Church, which is the Church’s teaching authority, or magisterium, namely the bishops as successors of the apostles collegially united among themselves and under the bishop of Rome.”^{lxxii}

It is tradition that supports papal primacy, and because it does it is part and parcel of the dogma of that primacy. It is tradition that sponsors the God-challenging and God-defying power assumed by the papacy. Tradition backs the usurper who claims a kingdom that is not his own. It upholds a power that Luther characterized in Part II, Article IV, “Of the Papacy,” in *The Smalcald Articles* as “false, mischievous [*freveler*], blasphemous, and arrogant.” Deservedly, tradition which elevates a mortal man to such a throne must come under the indictment the Word of God pronounces on the one who occupies that throne.

The papacy grounds its primacy on tradition. Tradition, on the other hand, would be ineffectual if it were not promoted and certified by the papacy. We have here a closed circle, indeed, a vicious circle, inasmuch as it has generated and maintained the Antichrist. The only breakthrough in this closed circuit is Luther’s. The Word of God, not tradition, is the true authority. It determines headship in the church.

Not only is the papacy to be arraigned for its arrogant assumption of authority in the church; it is also to be indicted for the “diabolical affairs and transactions” its authority has perpetrated, chiefly its denunciation of the doctrine of justification by faith. Note Luther’s indictment in “Of the Papacy”: “Hence [from papal assumption of headship] it follows that all things which the Pope, from a power so false, mischievous [*freveler*], blasphemous, and arrogant, has done and undertaken, have been and still are purely diabolical affairs and transactions (with the exception of such things as pertain to the secular government...) for the ruin of the entire holy...Christian Church (so far as it is in his power) and for the destruction of the first and chief article concerning the redemption made through Jesus Christ.”

“The first and chief article” (*articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*; “*Hauptartikel*”) is familiar to every student of *The Smalcald Articles* as the *sola gratia*, *sola fide* article of faith in Jesus Christ, our only Savior and our only way of salvation. Luther compiles his *sola gratia* statement from Romans 3: “All have sinned and are

justified without merit...by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, in his blood.” Likewise, his *sola fide* corollary: “For we conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the Law.” This is our article of justification by faith.

The doctrine of justification by faith is the quintessence of Christian doctrine. It is the doctrine of Christianity that is most directly opposed to the salvation doctrine of non-Christian religions. The doctrine that man is saved only through faith, without his own works, is the only doctrine by which man can be saved. To depart from faith that justification by grace alone can save us is to fall under Paul’s indictments of the Galatians: “By observing the law no one will be justified” (Gal.2:16). “If righteousness could be gained through the law, Christ died for nothing” (Gal.2:21). Again and again, in Part II of *The Smalcald Articles* (“Of the Mass,” “Of Chapters and Cloisters,” and “Of the Papacy”) Luther cites this *Hauptartikel* as his chief indictment of the papacy and the Roman church. Again and again he ranges its substance (even if he does not name the article)—*sola gratia* and *sola fide* (“no faith nor Christ”)—against the Roman errors (especially Repentance and Confession) he deals with in Part III of *The Smalcald Articles*. In the papal rejection of the *Hauptartikel* Luther saw primary evidence of the reality of the papal Antichrist. Luther’s Articles were written 11 years before the Council of Trent forged its notorious propositions regarding the doctrine of justification by faith. In them we see the papal authority Luther rejected taking dead aim at the *sola gratia* and *sola fide* of his *Hauptartikel*:

If any one saith, that men are justified, either by the sole imputation of the justice of Christ, or by the sole remission of sins, to the exclusion of *gratia* and the charity which is poured forth in their hearts by the Holy Ghost, and is inherent in them; or even that the grace, whereby we are justified, is only the favor of God, let him be anathema – Canon 11

If any one saith, that justifying faith is nothing else but confidence in the divine mercy which remits sins for Christ’s sake; or that this confidence alone is that whereby we are justified; let him be anathema – Canon 12

If any one saith, that the man who is justified and how perfect soever, is not bound to observe the commandments of God and of the Church, but only to believe, as if indeed the Gospel were a bare and absolute promise of eternal life, without the condition of observing the commandments; let him be anathema – Canon 20^{lxxiii}

We may wonder whether Luther would have referred to these canons in his articles on the Mass and on the papacy, had the canons been formulated before he wrote *The Smalcald Articles*. He certainly would not have been obliged to do so, since he would have recognized in them the familiar errors he had been contending against for nearly two decades and had answered in *The Smalcald Articles*. Tridentinum only crystallized them. But ever since Tridentinum, Luther’s followers have quoted them. They have the ring of *Roma aeterna* bronze in them to remind us that Rome has not recanted its denunciation of the *sola gratia* and *sola fide* of Luther’s (and our) *Hauptartikel*.

Yet we need to ask, “Do these formulations of the Council of Trent still have currency today?” *The Documents of Vatican Two* does not include an article on justification by faith. The burden of the Council’s deliberations was the doctrine of the church, its essence, its function, its significance for its members, and its relation to the Christian churches and the non-Christian world outside the Roman church. But in his opening speech at the Vatican Council in 1962 Pope John XXIII did state: “...the Church should never depart from the sacred patrimony of truth received from the Fathers.”^{lxxiv} Furthermore, “When Vatican II began some 20 years ago, all participants were pledged to reaffirm the Canons and Decrees of Trent, particularly what they teach about justification.”^{lxxv}

The merit concept, from which the Tridentine renunciation of the doctrine of justification by faith flows, is still engrained in Catholicism. One cannot understand Catholicism without recognizing its preeminence and prevalence in Rome’s theology. Hardon’s catechism, an exposition of Vatican II theology, states it more

forthrightly than much current Catholic literature does: “Without liberty of choice, merit is impossible; and without merit we cannot speak of saint or degrees of sanctity...”^{lxxvi} “...sanctifying grace...enables us to perform actions that are meritorious of heaven.”^{lxxvii}

The merit concept finds its highest expression in the celebration of the Eucharist. (Contemporary Catholic literature seems to have retired the word “Mass.”) “*Lumen Gentium*” describes the Eucharist as “the focus and apex of the whole Christian life.”^{lxxviii} Granfield declares, “The theology of the Church must be related to the doctrine of the eucharist, since the full mystery of the Church is actualized in the eucharistic celebration. ‘No other action of the Church,’ according to Vatican II, ‘can match its claim to efficacy, nor equal the degree of it.’”^{lxxix} Karl Rahner, who is often circumstantial and tentative in his statements, is clear here: “The Eucharist belongs to the essence of Christianity and has deep doctrinal roots. It cannot be compromised.”^{lxxx}

Taking part in the Eucharistic Sacrifice by “offering the Immaculate Victim to God, not only through the hands of the priest, but also with him”^{lxxxi} is the greatest work a Catholic is told he can do—to make his contribution to the greatest work recorded in the history of mankind, the divine work of salvation performed by Christ on the cross but endlessly reenacted at Catholic altars. To believe that one can receive credit for making such participation is the ultimate synergism and the ultimate affront to the grace and glory of God.

The Mass has also nurtured proliferation of the merit system of the Catholic church. Recall the “vermin brood” that the “*Drachenschwanz*” of the Mass spawned: the synergistic piety and devotion of purgatory, the pilgrimages, the relics, the indulgences, and the invocation of saints. The Mass is their source and their sustenance. Theodore Hoyer observes: “The whole machinery of the Papacy is organized against this doctrine [justification by faith]. There are a host of teachings promulgated by the Papacy which by no stretch of the imagination can ever be brought into harmony with this cardinal doctrine, e.g., indulgences, penances, fasts, prayers, alms, pilgrimages, works of supererogation, purgatory, the mass, etc. Nor do they ever pretend that they can be harmonized; they want to have nothing to do with justification by faith. The whole edifice of the Papacy falls if justification by faith is admitted.”^{lxxxii}

This mass “remains, as always, the powerful unifying center of Catholic life.”^{lxxxiii} In the Mass is the mystique, the power, the quintessence of the Catholic church. Though Catholic worship practices and customs, which the faithful believed were immutable law, reeled during the seismic tremors generated by Vatican II, and though the Mass has been clothed in strange, new garb, the Mass has held its place in the worship and devotion of faithful Catholics. “It is the Mass that matters” was the word of the Reformers. It still matters today.

Whoever has jurisdiction over the celebration of the Mass has the power in the Roman church. Whoever is in charge of Holy Orders to execute the sacrifice of the Mass exercises central authority in its midst. And that is the Pope at Rome. If his church should lose the Mass, he would lose his sovereignty. Luther’s judgment is still valid: “When the Mass falls, the Papacy lies in ruins.”^{lxxxiv}

The Mass mirrors the essential character of the Antichrist which Paul delineates in 2 Thessalonians. In its posture of reverence and devotion, in the exalted claims it makes, in its prominence in the church, in its train of anti-Christian error, in the Christ-denying “gospel” it opposes to the Christ-redemption it acts out we see the blasphemy of the Antichrist. While the Mass abides, the Antichrist remain. The Mass is his image.

These three aspects of the doctrine of the Antichrist are considerations basic to our conviction that the Pope is the Antichrist. The Pope is the Antichrist on the basis of his primatial claims that usurp the sovereignty of Christ and exalt a Pope above the Son of God; on the basis of his elevation of tradition above the authority of the God-breathed Word in the establishment of the papacy; and on the basis of the papacy’s denunciation of the central doctrine of salvation, justification by faith. To the Christian who knows Scripture and the way of salvation it proclaims, and honors it as God’s truth, no other proof is needed. These three considerations compel the choice between divine truth and human fabrication, between the true Christ and a pseudo-Christ, between God’s way of salvation by grace and man’s way of salvation by works.

Modern Protestantism, including Lutherans, refuses to see the identification of the Pope with the Antichrist of Scripture. Franz Pieper saw evidence of work-righteousness and unbelief in their denial: “The nearly unanimous denial also on the part of modern Protestant theologians, including Lutherans, that the Pope is

the Antichrist...stems from their opposition to the *sola gratia* synergism and their 'liberal' attitude toward Scripture (rejection of Verbal Inspiration). Because of his false position they do not see (1) what an outrage the renunciation and anathematizing of the doctrine of justification is, (2) what a heinous offense the Pope is committing by suppressing the authority of the Word of God, and thus of Christ, and supplanting it with his own authority, and that under the cloak of Christ's name and with a great show of sanctity."^{lxxxv}

Protestantism, generally, rejects the doctrine of the Antichrist even when there may be more evidence that the Roman church is the church of the Antichrist today than in Luther's day, even when the papacy is now heaping more humiliation on the world's Redeemer than it did in the Reformer's day. Today historical criticism, for example, is destroying even the fundamentals of Christian truth. In Luther's day the Roman church still professed faith in the Trinity, the inspiration of Scripture, and the deity of Christ, because Scripture declared these truths. Today "Roman Catholic scientific biblical scholarship operates with all the tools of historical criticism, form history, and redaction history in the production of commentaries and translations."^{lxxxvi} Today, Thomas Sheehan reports: "In Roman Catholic seminaries, for example, it is now common teaching that Jesus of Nazareth did not assert any of the divine or messianic claims the Gospels attribute to him and that he died without believing he was Christ or the Son of God, not to mention the founder of a new religion." "Today, Sheehan contends, 'one would be hard pressed' to find a Catholic biblical scholar who maintains that Jesus was the divine Son of God, or who believes in the doctrines of the Trinity, the virginity of Mary, the miracles, the founding of the Church by Jesus, the Resurrection, or immortal life."^{lxxxvii}

While the Pope can hardly be accused of having stated that he rejects such fundamental doctrines, in effect he is vitiating them. He is a universalist who does not hesitate to pray and worship with non-Christians (as he did at Assisi in 1986). He told Moslems in Casablanca in 1985: "We believe in the same God, the only God, the living God, the God who creates worlds and brings its creatures to perfection."^{lxxxviii} The Pope and his church approve what is "true and holy" in Hinduism and Buddhism. For the Pope, Christ-denying Jews are brethren. Instead of being the sole hope of salvation for unbelievers, the gospel of Jesus Christ is no more than an "add-on" to pagan virtues.

The concern for the salvation of society is displacing the concern for the salvation of souls. The introduction to *The Documents of Vatican II* states: "Taken as a whole, the documents are especially noteworthy for their concern with the poor, for their insistence on the unity of the human family and therefore on the wrongness of discrimination, for their repeated emphasis on the Christian's duty to help build a just and peaceful world, a duty which he must carry out in brotherly cooperation with all men of good will."^{lxxxix} If this sounds like a quotation from NCC literature of 50 years ago, it is because the Catholic Church in America has belatedly appropriated the social gospel of liberal Protestants, just as it has contracted the virus of its historical criticism.

In the crisis generated by Vatican II, papal Rome has been forced to reexamine its posture, its role, and its very essence, but it has only confirmed its antichristian teaching and practice. It has strayed even farther from the truth it still possessed when this century began. It has been weighed in the balance of the three great *solas* and has been found wanting. Above the God-revealed *sola scriptura* it still elevates tradition—the experience and the mind of the "Church." To the God-given *sola gratia* it still adds its *sine qua non* of human merit. To the God-ordained *sola fide* it still opposes its mandate of obedience to "the commandments of God and of the church." If anything, despite its professed allegiance to Christ, despite its "Lord, Lord," it has become even more "Christ-less" than before. If anything, it has added its weight and prestige to the forces that are building up to dissolve Christian faith and Christian confession in our day. If anything, there is even more reason to declare, "*Papam esse ipsum verum Antichristum*," and even more reason to pray that the confidence of Luther's closing prayer will abide with us: "Of this we should be certain and animate ourselves with the hope that Christ, our Lord, has attacked His adversary, and he will press the attack home both by His Spirit and coming. Amen."

Addendum

- p. 18** Michael Novak, a Catholic intellectual not known for his conservatism, confirms Rahner's declaration. "Ours is not an egalitarian church. It is a hierarchical Church, with one head, the vicar of Christ. If we did not think that to be apart from that head were to be like an ingot without fire, who for a minute would get up to go to the 7:00 A.M. mass?"^{xc}
- p. 21** In the minds of Catholic liberals like Hans Küng and Leonard Swidler, Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger is now the arch villain who has betrayed the Vatican II agenda he once appeared to espouse. Küng and others of his ilk portray him as the hatchet man for reactionary Pope John Paul II, compare him with "Dostoyevsky's grand inquisitor," and depict him as operating the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (previously the Sacred Office) like the Inquisition of old. They shudder at his reactionary "nightmare theology." But whoever wants to follow the titanic struggle for the heart and soul of the Catholic church today does well to keep Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger in view. He is John Paul II's spokesman, his first lieutenant, his champion.^{xc1}
- p.28** Here Avery Dulles, a "clear and balanced" Catholic theologian at the Catholic University of America, whom Richard Neuhaus calls "the most widely respected Catholic theologian in America today," quotes Charles Krauthammer's acid comment approvingly: "We now have a generation of experience with liberal programs...the bishops appear to have just discovered them."^{xcii}
- p.28** *Shepherds Speak* presents eighteen bishops speaking on a variety of such "thorny and complex" issues as sanctuary, capital punishment, apartheid, disarmament, dissent in the Church, economic justice in the Church, poverty in America, women in the Church. Their agenda is touted as "a succinct guide to reentry into a Church rekindled by the spirit of Vatican II." Joseph Cardinal Bernardin, John Roach, and Rembert Weakland are among the contributors.^{xciii}
- p.28** Avery Dulles grants that *sola scriptura*, *sola gratia*, and *sola fide* "can be understood in a Catholic sense and therefore need not be repudiated by the Catholic church. But I also think that these principles can be interpreted as denying the Catholic doctrines of tradition, good works, and merit." Those doctrines are "binding" for Catholicism, even though Dulles extends himself in *The Reshaping of Catholicism* to craft an approach to ecumenism and doctrinal agreement with Protestantism.^{xciv}

- ⁱ *Luther's Works* (Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia, 1957) vol. XXXI, p. 32.
- ⁱⁱ *Ibid.*, p. 33.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Edward G. Schwiebert, *Luther and His Times* (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1950), p. 318.
- ^{iv} Scott H. Hendrix, *Luther and the Papacy* (Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1981), p. 46.
- ^v *Ibid.*, pp. 47-48.
- ^{vi} *Ibid.*, p. 88.
- ^{vii} Schwiebert, op. cit., p. 416.
- ^{viii} *Ibid.*, p. 417.
- ^{ix} *Luther's Works*, op. cit., vol. XL, p. xv.
- ^x Hendrix, op. cit., p. 123.
- ^{xi} *Ibid.*, p. 129.
- ^{xii} F. Bente, editor with W.H.T. Dau, *Triglot Concordia* (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1921), p. 52.
- ^{xiii} Joh. P. Meyer, *Studies in the Smalcald Articles*, (privately reproduced from *The Northwestern Lutheran* by Stephen J. Lawrenz), p. 33.
- ^{xiv} *Triglot*, op. cit., pp. 461, 463.
- ^{xv} Meyer, op. cit., p. 32.
- ^{xvi} *Ibid.*, p. 33.
- ^{xvii} Willard D. Allbeck, *Studies in the Lutheran Confessions* (Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia, 1952), p. 209.
- ^{xviii} *Ibid.*, p. 198.
- ^{xix} Hendrix, op. cit., p. 159.
- ^{xx} *Ibid.*, p. 146.
- ^{xxi} Theodore Letis, quoted in "Christian News," June 13, 1988, p. 9.
- ^{xxii} Adolf Hoenecke, *Dogmatik*, Band IV, s. 219.
- ^{xxiii} Franz Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatik* (Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1924), translated from the German by Theo. Engleder et al., 1950, vol. III, p. 467.
- ^{xxiv} Joh. P. Meyer, "Papam Esse Ipsum Verum Antichristum," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, vol. 40, no. 2, (April 1943), pp. 102-103.
- ^{xxv} Wm. F. Schink, "The Scriptural Doctrine of the Antichrist," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, vol. 55, no. 2, (April 1958), p. 101.
- ^{xxvi} *Ibid.*, p. 103.
- ^{xxvii} E. Arnold Sitz, "Of the Antichrist," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*, vol. 62, no. 1 (January 1965), p. 1.
- ^{xxviii} *Ibid.*, p. 15.
- ^{xxix} Wilbert R. Gawrisch, "Antichrists and the Antichrist," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly*, vol. 85, no. 2 (April 1988), p. 115.
- ^{xxx} *Proceedings of the Thirty-fifth Convention, Ev. Luth. Joint Synod of Wisconsin and Other States*, 1959, pp. 200-205.
- ^{xxxi} Philip Gleason, *Keeping the Faith* (University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame, IN, 1987), p. 138.
- ^{xxxii} Quoted by Gleason, op. cit., p. 176.
- ^{xxxiii} Quoted in "Christian News," June 13, 1988, p. 11.
- ^{xxxiv} Walter M. Abbott, general editor, *The Documents of Vatican II* (Guild Press, New York, 1966), p. 717.
- ^{xxxv} *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.
- ^{xxxvi} *Ibid.*, p. 94.
- ^{xxxvii} *Ibid.*, p. 307.
- ^{xxxviii} *Ibid.*, p. 125.
- ^{xxxix} *Ibid.*, p. 11.
- ^{xl} Richard J. Neuhaus, *The Catholic Moment* (Harper & Row, San Francisco, 1987), p. 13.
- ^{xli} *Karl Rahner in Dialogue*, edited by Paul Imhof and Hubert Biallowons (Crossroad, New York, 1986), p. 287.
- ^{xlii} James V. Schall, *The Church, the State and Society in the Thought of John Paul II* (Franciscan Herald Press, Chicago, 1982), p. 11.
- ^{xliiii} *Ibid.*, p. 79.
- ^{xliiv} *Ibid.*, pp. 69-70.
- ^{xlv} Neuhaus, op. cit., p. 197.
- ^{xlvi} Hans Küng, *Infallible? An Inquiry* (Doubleday & Co., Garden City, NY, 1971), p. 27.
- ^{xlvii} Neuhaus, op. cit., p. 131.
- ^{xlviii} Quoted in Neuhaus, op. cit., p. 132.
- ^{xlix} Patrick Granfield, *The Limits of the Papacy* (Crossroad, New York, 1987), p. 45.
- ^l Granfield, op. cit., p. 46.
- ^{li} *Ibid.*, p. 48.
- ^{lii} *Ibid.*, p. 49.
- ^{liii} *Ibid.*, p. 50.
- ^{liv} *Ibid.*, p. 50.

- ^{lv} Ibid., p. 192.
- ^{lvi} Schall, op. cit., p. 4.
- ^{lvii} Ibid., p. 146.
- ^{lviii} Ibid., pp. 148-149.
- ^{lix} Quoted by Granfield, op. cit., pp. 6-7.
- ^{lx} Granfield, op. cit., p. 43.
- ^{lxi} *Documents*, op. cit., p. 38.
- ^{lxii} Ibid., p. 43.
- ^{lxiii} Ibid., p. 48.
- ^{lxiv} Ibid., pp. 48-49.
- ^{lxv} Ibid., variant quote, pp. 48-49.
- ^{lxvi} Ibid., p. 43.
- ^{lxvii} Ibid., p. 369.
- ^{lxviii} Anne R. Muggeridge, *The Desolate City* (Harper & Row, San Francisco, 1986), p. 70.
- ^{lxix} Neuhaus, op. cit., p. 68.
- ^{lxx} John A. Hardon, *The Catholic Catechism* (Doubleday & Co., Garden City, NY, 1975), p. 47.
- ^{lxxi} Arthur C. Piepkorn, *Profiles in Belief* (Harper & Row, New York, 1988), p. 220.
- ^{lxxii} Hardon, op. cit., p. 48.
- ^{lxxiii} Quoted from W.F. Schink, op. cit., pp. 84-85.
- ^{lxxiv} *Documents*, op. cit., p. 714.
- ^{lxxv} "Christian News," June 13, 1988, p. 13.
- ^{lxxvi} Hardon, op. cit., p. 170.
- ^{lxxvii} Ibid., p. 189.
- ^{lxxviii} *Documents*, op. cit., p. 28.
- ^{lxxix} Granfield, op. cit., p. 111.
- ^{lxxx} *Karl Rahner in Dialogue*, op. cit., p. 282.
- ^{lxxxi} *Documents*, op. cit., p. 154.
- ^{lxxxii} Theodore Laetsch, editor, *Doctrinal Essays, The Abiding Word* (Concordia, St. Louis, 1947), Theo. Hoyer, "The Papacy," vol. 2, p. 751.
- ^{lxxxiii} "Time," February 4, 1985, p. 55.
- ^{lxxxiv} *Triglot*, op. cit., p. 465.
- ^{lxxxv} Pieper, op. cit., pp. 467-468.
- ^{lxxxvi} Piepkorn, op. cit., p. 220.
- ^{lxxxvii} Muggeridge, op. cit., pp. 120-121.
- ^{lxxxviii} Quoted in "Christian News," June 13, 1988, p. 8.
- ^{lxxxix} *Documents*, op. cit., p. xvii.
- ^{xc} *Vatican Authority and American Catholic Dissent*, edited by William W. May (Crossroad, New York, 1987), p. 84.
- ^{xci} *The Church in Anguish: Has the Vatican Betrayed Vatican II?*, edited by Hans Küng and Leonard Swidler (Harper & Row, San Francisco, 1987), passim, pp. 1-17, 58-88.
- ^{xcii} Avery Dulles, *The Reshaping of Catholicism: Current Challenges in the Theology of the Church* (Harper & Row, San Francisco, 1988), p. 234.
- ^{xciii} *Shepherds Speak: American Bishops Confront the Social and Moral Issues That Challenge Christians Today*, edited by Dennis M. Corrado and James F. Hinchey (Crossroad, New York, 1988).
- ^{xciv} Dulles, op. cit., p. 234.