

History of the Devil's Advocate

Most people have heard the phrase *devil's advocate*. In colloquial parlance, a devil's advocate is a person who argues against a position he favors for the purpose of testing the argument for weaknesses. If you have ever devised a plan of action and then mentally run through all the ways it could potentially go wrong, you have played the role of the devil's advocate. We do this to reinforce the strength of an argument by taking an opponent's view of it.

Within the Catholic Church, the devil's advocate was the official name of the *Promoter Fidei*, an official of immense importance in the process of canonization. The office is first attested during the pontificate of Leo X (1513-1521) and was formally established by Sixtus V in 1587 as part of the reforms of the Counter-Reformation. The duty of the Promotor Fidei was to oversee every aspect of the beatification and canonization process for procedural integrity. This encompassed a variety of duties: ensuring no person received the honors of sainthood rashly, that proper juridical form was observed, and that every potential weakness or objection to the saint's canonization was raised and evaluated in order that only those who were truly worthy would be raised to the dignity of the altars. Since the Promotor Fidei took a juridical position *against* the canonization of any given saint, it was joked that he was taking the devil's part in the proceedings, hence the common appellation "Devil's Advocate" (*advocatus diaboli*). This essay will examine the historical origins, office, and rationale behind the *advocatus diaboli*, as well as the consequences attendant upon the abolition of office by John Paul II in 1982.

Historical Development of the Legal Aspects of Canonization

The first mention of anything like an *advocatus diaboli* was during the preliminary studies on the beatification of St. Lawrence Justinian under the pontificate of Leo X (1513-1521). As part of the preparatory work on the cause, Leo appointed a theologian specifically tasked with challenging the evidence of St. Lawrence's sanctity. St. Lawrence was beatified under Leo's successor Clement VII in 1524, the first *beatus* whose virtues were formally scrutinized by an *advocatus diaboli*. In 1587 the office became official under Sixtus V with the title Promotor Fidei as a member of the Roman Congregation of Rites. In 1708 the Promotor Fidei was elevated to become the most important office in the Congregation.

But focusing solely on the establishment of the office and its institutional development gives us only a partial picture, for even Leo X was drawing on a much older legal tradition when he called for an *advocatus diaboli* in the case of St. Lawrence Justinian. The rationale behind Tridentine era popes' enthusiastic embrace of the office is bound up with the larger historical development of the cult of the saints.

In the first millennium of the Church, the *cultus* of a local saint was promulgated by the authority of the bishop of the diocese in which the saint had lived or worked. Renowned saints of the magnitude of St. Augustine of Hippo or St. Isidore of Seville attracted devotion even outside their respective dioceses and became honored by the Church universal without any formal canonization process. This can be viewed as a kind of informal canonization by acclamation—although it is important to note that even at this early stage the public veneration of a saint was still subject to local ecclesiastical oversight.

For historical reasons that go beyond the scope of this essay, these local canonizations increasingly fell short of the standards expected by Church during the latter first millennium. The patchwork, slipshod nature of these local canonizations aroused the attention of the papacy. Beginning in the late Carolingian era, the popes began exercising a more direct role in canonizations, reviewing bishops' determinations—or chastising them for raising people to the altars too rashly—sometimes even overriding their decisions and ordering the locally canonized saint to be struck from the calendar, as Pope Alexander III did in 1173. It was this same pontiff who centralized canonizations under the exclusive authority of the Holy See by a papal bull promulgated in 1170. This was the beginning of the “modern” canonization process as we now know it.

Why did the Holy See insist on taking over the canonization process at this time? The immediate cause of Alexander III's bull of 1170 was a botched local canonization in which a bishop allowed the veneration of a man who had been killed in a drunken fight. The pope scolded the careless bishop, warning that “for the future you will not presume to pay him reverence, as, even though miracles were worked through him, it would not allow you to revere him as a saint unless with the authority of the Roman Church.”¹ But these sorts of interventions must be understood in the context of broader currents within the Church. The assumption of all canonizations by the Holy See took place concurrently with the canonist movement of the 11th-13th centuries. The canonist movement was a largely legal revolution in the Church's governance. Freed from the dominion of secular rulers following the Investiture Controversy, the Church embarked upon the difficult but important process of streamlining its administration based on traditional precedents, which in meant bringing centuries of disparate practices from all corners of Christendom into harmony and deducing general legal principles from them. This monumental process of gathering and codifying centuries of canonical tradition was headed by men such as the canonists Anselm of Lucca (c. 1083), Roland Bandinelli (later Alexander III) and most famously Gratian (c. 1150), compiler of the *Decretals*.

¹ Camillo Beccari, “Beatification and Canonization”. In *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1907). Retrieved April 8, 2021 from New Advent: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/02364b.htm>. See also, Gregory IX, *Decretales*, III, “De reliquiis et veneratione sanctorum”

The subsequent revival in the study of canon law was pioneered by disciples of such men, known as the Decretists. The Decretist revival lasted into the mid-13th century and was characterized by a desire to apply regularized legal norms to every aspect of the Church's governance. The development of the canonization procedure at this time reflected a desire to move canonization away from the realms of hearsay and popular piety towards a firm, legal footing that lent the process more credibility, thus safeguarding the integrity of the faith. The development of legal norms for canonization can be characterized as law applied to saint-making.

A similar legal development paralleled the assumption of canonizations by the Holy See: the emergence of the Courts of the Inquisition, first episcopal and then papal. If canonization was law applied to saint-making, the inquisitorial courts were law applied to dealing with heresy. Because of this emphasis on legal procedure, it made sense that both the Inquisition and canonization procedure were viewed in terms of a trial. The alleged saint was the defendant, and his sanctity must be defended against possible accusations. While the exact canonical procedures for canonizations between the 12th century and the Tridentine period are not known with surety, it is certain that they were viewed in terms of a trial. This is exemplified in the surviving records, such as the those surrounding the canonization of St. Dominic in 1234. Witnesses were interviewed, depositions taken, and "evidence" carefully cataloged, and "testimonies" noted.

Establishment and Role of the *Promotor Fidei*

Although the office of the Promotor Fidei (*advocatus diaboli*) did not exist in the time of St. Dominic, we can already see the fundamental principles in place that would later be adopted by the Promotor Fidei. In Dominic's canonization we see the testimony of many witnesses to the saint's holiness, but we also see witnesses who could potentially debunk the claims of Dominic's sanctity. For example, St. Dominic's confessor is interviewed, and while of course the specific content of Dominic's confessions was not recounted, the inquisitors wish to know if St. Dominic had ever committed a mortal sin. The confessor, a Brother Bonaventure of Verona, stated that he did not believe that Dominic had ever committed a mortal sin.² Brother William of Monferrat, who spent a considerable amount of time in the company of Dominic, was asked whether he ever saw St. Dominic deviate from the Rule. He replied in the negative.³

We can see here an example of the "trial mentality" that developed in medieval canonizations: witnesses might give testimony in favor of the sanctity of a *beatus*, but those witnesses must be cross examined. Yes, you witnessed a miracle, but did you witness any deviation of the Rule? Yes, you witnessed extreme acts of virtue, but were you aware of any

² Bologna Canonization Hearings of Dominic Guzman, Testimony of Bonaventure of Verona, 5

³ Ibid., Testimony of William of Montferrat, 12

occasion on which the person in question could have sinned? Ever? While canonizations were weighted in favor of the candidate, we nevertheless see the presence of a vigorous “prosecution”, a line of questioning that probes for weak points in the defense. In this sense the canonizations bear a strong resemblance to Inquisitorial hearings, which is not surprising since the two institutions developed simultaneously. There was sometimes a cross-over between the two: at Dominic’s canonization hearings, the ecclesiastics in charge of hearing testimonies were also inquisitors.

During the age of the Protestant Revolt, the Church’s doctrines of the communion of saints and the cult of the saints were called into question, as well as the practices that had developed out of these cults (veneration of relics, for example). Following the lead of certain Renaissance Humanists such as Erasmus—who had mocked the veneration of relics and considered much of 15th century cult of the saints questionable—the Protestant Reformers launched an all-out attack upon the Catholic veneration of the saints. Although there were many theological and biblical arguments put forth, many of the Reformers, including Luther, objected on what we might call the ‘methodological grounds’: relics were not properly authenticated, local cults were often of questionable historicity, the *acta* and *vitae* of many popular saints were mostly legendary, and the deeds of many saints were not sufficiently verified. Given the literacy of the age, coupled with its advancements in science and medicine, the Tridentine Church deemed that a more thorough scrutiny of the lives and deeds of alleged saints was appropriate. Hence in 1587, Pope Sixtus V created the office of the Promotor Fidei, which took many of the prosecutorial practices that had already emerged in medieval canonizations and concentrated them in the hands of a single individual.

What was to be the role of the new Promotor Fidei? Back when Pope Gregory IX opened the commission of inquiry into the sanctity of St. Dominic, the pope had stated the purpose of the investigations was to ensure that the Church was “eager to affirm certainties and slow to credit doubtful matters.”⁴ This was the conceptual framework behind the establishment of the Promotor Fidei. Following the trial model established in the Middle Ages, the Church appoints its own “prosecutor” to try to disprove the sanctity of alleged saints. The power entrusted to the Promotor Fidei was very weighty, as he served as a kind of gatekeeper over the Church’s calendar of *sancti*. His importance grew in the post-Tridentine period, such that in 1708 he became the most important official in the Roman Congregation of Rites. His job was to scrutinize everything relating to the saint’s life and deeds. The 1913 *Catholic Encyclopedia* sums up his role as:

...to prevent any rash decisions concerning miracles or virtues of the candidates for the honours of the altar. All documents of beatification and canonization processes must be submitted to his examination, and the difficulties and doubts he raises over

⁴ The Decree of Gregory IX, Instituting the Commission of Inquiry, Rome, July 13, 1233

the virtues and miracles are laid before the congregation and must be satisfactorily answered before any further steps can be taken in the processes. It is his duty to suggest natural explanations for alleged miracles, and even to bring forward human and selfish motives for deeds that have been accounted heroic virtues...His duty requires him to prepare in writing all possible arguments, even at times seemingly slight, against the raising of any one to the honours of the altar. The interest and honour of the Church are concerned in preventing any one from receiving those honours whose death is not juridically proved to have been precious in the sight of God.⁵

Any documents or processes not submitted to the scrutiny of the Promotor Fidei became null and void by that very fact. Because of his duty to suggest alternate explanations for alleged miracles and virtues, he was nicknamed the “devil’s advocate” (*advocatus diaboli*). He thus served as a kind of filter to screen out candidates whose sanctity was not beyond doubt, or who were perhaps being canonized out of rashness, popular appeal, or the fickle moods of the day. The thinking was that if the deeds of a saint truly were miraculous, they would stand up to every kind of scrutiny—indeed, they *must* stand up to scrutiny if they are to be placed before the faithful and the world as witnesses to the reality of God’s grace.

Every action of the saint was to be scrutinized, even ones that are seemingly harmless. The definitive post-Tridentine work on how canonization proceedings are to be carried out was written by Prospero Lambertini, who was Promotor Fidei for twenty years and later became Pope Benedict XIV (1740-1758). His classic work *De Servorum Dei Beatificatione et de Beatorum Canonizatione* laid down the principles that were followed in canonization proceedings until the post-Vatican II era. In this work we see examples of the kinds of seemingly slight questions the Promotor Fidei would raise in objection to a candidate’s sanctity. In this passage, we see the question posed of whether a candidate who committed much of their thought to writing might be guilty of vanity:

There have been servants of God, as we have seen, who at the command of their superiors, committed their own lives to writing, giving therein an account, not only of their own praiseworthy actions, but likewise of the various gifts and graces bestowed on them by God. And there are others, again, who, though they have not published such things, have yet communicated them by word of mouth to their confessors, their companions, or others. In this state of things, then, a doubt is raised whether they have been guilty of the sin of self-conceit or vain-glory. Certainly there are not

⁵ William Fanning, “Promotor Fidei.” In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 12 (New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1911) Retrieved July 11, 2013 <<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/12454a.htm>. See also, Richard Burtzell, “Advocatus Diaboli.” In *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 1 (New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1907) Retrieved July 11, 2013 <<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/01168b.htm>>

wanting examples of saints who have done this and the like [he goes on to cite the examples of St. Paul, St. Ignatius Loyola, and other saints who were prolific writers].

...If anyone should suppose from these and such like examples that every one may, without the fault of boasting and vain-glory, set forth his own praiseworthy actions, he would deceive himself...Every one, therefore, sees that it is necessary to be acquainted with some rules, in order to pass a correct judgment, so often as examination is made into the causes of such servants of God as have committed to writing, or related to others, their own great and noble actions ; a judgment, I mean, as to this point, whether their doing so is to be ascribed to virtue or to vice, the vice, namely, to vain glory, which is reprov'd by the Apostle in his Epistle to the Galatians.⁶

This passage demonstrates the level of scrutiny candidates were subjected to. It may have occurred to us to ask whether a candidate for sainthood had any serious character defects; Lambertini suggests we should inquire about selfish motives in even their good deeds, such as writing. How many people would think to question the integrity of a candidate for sainthood based on the fact that they wrote a lot? But Lambertini—and Church Tradition following him—insist that every act and motive must be questioned, no matter how slight. While no saint is absolutely perfect, the Promotor Fidei's job was to ensure that those raised to the sacred dignity of sainthood be as perfect as possible. It was an incredibly high standard.

It might be supposed that such a scrutiny into the motives of saintly individuals would be contrary to faith, a kind of pessimistic impiety. After all, St. Paul tells us that charity “believes all things” (1 Cor. 13:7) and that we should rejoice in the good lives of holy men and women rather than scrutinize them searching for flaws. It is true that love must “believe all things”, but we are also admonished to temper our credulity: “Test all things; hold fast to that which is good” (1 Thess 5:21). In other words, measure all things against the standard of Christ, retain everything that measures up, and then believe those things that remain. Recall the Catholic Encyclopedia's statement that “the interest and honour of the Church are concerned” in questions of canonizations. The faith of the Christian people and the integrity of the Church's message is weakened if non-suitable candidates are raised to the altars.

Understood properly, then, it would actually be a sin against faith *not* to scrutinize the lives of candidates. To fail to ask sufficient questions about their sanctity would be to compromise the certitude of faith in the eyes of the faithful. This is why Lambertini quotes

⁶ Prospero Lambertini, *De Servorum Dei Beatificatione et de Beatorum Canonizatione*, “On Heroic Virtues”, c. 1:3,8

Fr. Bartoli, biographer of St. Robert Bellarmine, in saying that the desirable end in any canonization is “the edification of His Church, for the glory of His name”⁷ and why Pope Alexander III chastises a bishop in 1173 for allowing a man unsuitably scrutinized to be honored as a saint, as we have seen.

Abolition of the Promotor Fidei and Consequences

The Promotor Fidei had many responsibilities, but in essence his job was to ensure that canonizations remained matters of objective fact. This is why four miracles were traditionally required as well. This gave demonstrable evidence that the saint was among the blessed, for “no man could so such signs unless God were with Him” (John 3:2). This meant that canonizations were rare events; from 1900 to 1978, only 98 saints were canonized. As we shall see, this pales in comparison to the number of post-1978 canonizations.

By the 20th century, some had begun to claim that the process for getting saints canonized was too cumbersome. A few reforms were made during the pontificate of Pius XI, such as establishing a special department for the study of “historical” causes, as distinct from the department which studied the theological aspects of a candidate’s life. But bishops continued to complain that the process was too burdensome and repeatedly asked the pope for a more streamlined approach, something less bureaucratic which would nevertheless still preserve the integrity of the investigative process. Pope Paul VI subsequently created the Congregation for the Causes of Saints in 1969, making it distinct from the Sacred Congregation of Rites (which thereafter became the CDW). This was a first step.

The real reform came during the pontificate of John Paul II, who in 1983, issued the constitution *Divini Perfectionis Magister* which overhauled the entire canonization process as it had been known since the Tridentine era, abrogating all previous law on the process and laying down new norms. Under John Paul II’s reforms, the role of the Promotor Fidei is replaced by a Secretary, whose job is mainly that of a chairman to ensure that procedure is followed. The theological writings of a saint are examined by theological censors who look for theological errors in the works. Others, called Relators, prepare reports documenting virtues and a medical board documents alleged miracles.

What of the Promotor Fidei? Contrary to popular belief, his office has not been abolished, although John Paul II altered it to such a degree that it is no longer recognizable as the same office established by Sixtus V. In Chapter 2 of *Divini Perfectionis Magister*, John Paul II says:

The Sacred Congregation is to have one Promotor of the Faith or Prelate Theologian.

⁷ Lambertini, *De Servorum Dei*, “On Heroic Virtues”, c. 1:21 and Gregory IX, *Decretales*, III, “De reliquiis et veneratione sanctorum”

His responsibility is:

1. to preside over the meeting of the theologians, with the right to vote;
2. to prepare the report on the meeting itself;
3. to be present as an expert at the meeting of the Cardinals and Bishops, although without the right to vote.⁸

We can see that in *Divini Perfectionis Magister* the “trial” nature of the canonization process has been abolished. Instead of a candidate being on trial and having to face accusations by the Promotor Fidei as the Church’s “prosecutor”, the procedure now takes the form of a committee meeting where experts present reports. Glaring problems with a candidate’s life or miracles still must be accounted for, but the inquisitorial aspect of the procedure has been eliminated. As an example of this, compare the old system, where the Promotor Fidei was charged with not only presiding and preparing a report, but actively seeking out naturalistic causes for miracles and selfish motives in the life of the candidate. Their job was not only to point out problems, but actively seek them out. Furthermore, the canonization process could not move forward until every one of the Promotor Fidei’s objections were answered to his satisfaction, giving him an effective veto power on the whole canonization.

In the modern procedure, the Promotor Fidei does not actively seek out problems and no longer has veto power over the process; his influence is reduced to presenting a report and being on hand as an “expert” whose opinion may be solicited. There is nothing in the modern procedure where the Promotor Fidei submits a list of objections that *must* be answered by the Postulators. Nor is there any mandate for the Promotor Fidei to personally approve all evidence and documentation in the procedure on pain of nullity. With the removal of the prosecutorial role of the Promotor Fidei and the reduction of his authority, the nature of the proceedings is fundamentally transformed: instead of a forum for arguing for or against a candidate’s virtues, the Congregation for the Causes of Saints now becomes more of a committee that collects favorable testimonies of candidates and issues reports on them. The corresponding reduction of necessary miracles from four to two further decreases the burden of proof in favor of the candidate.

The result is that the modern Congregation has been unfavorably compared to a “saint making factory.” Above we noted that there were 98 canonizations from 1900 to 1978, an average of 1.2 per year. When we come to John Paul II’s pontificate, the Church canonized 480 saints from 1978 to 2005, an average of 17.7 per year, *almost a 1000% increase*. This increase is unprecedented; besides canonizing more saints than all his 20th century

⁸ John Paul II, *Divini Perfectionis Magister*, II, 10:1-3 (1983)

predecessors, Cardinal Saraiva Martins estimated that John Paul II alone canonized more saints than all of the preceding popes combined going back to 1588.⁹

The Church still may and at times does employ hostile witnesses to try to find fault with candidates, but very commonly these specialists are not Catholic, have no background in theology, and the objections they raise are of a very worldly nature. For example, atheists Aroup Chatterjee and Christopher Hitchens were asked to testify against Mother Teresa in her 2002 hearings. Their objections were absurd: Chatterjee objected that Mother Teresa damaged the reputation of Calcutta and that her charity was not effective in reducing the sum total of poverty in the region. Such worldly objections were noted and then studiously ignored by the Congregation. Meanwhile, problems that truly did have a bearing on Catholic theology—like Mother Teresa’s practice of praying with pagans, encouraging Hindus to be better Hindus, her syncretist statements that all religions worship the same God, and the extremely questionable nature of her miracle—were never addressed.¹⁰ Such objections were not addressed because there was nobody designated to bring forward potentially damning evidence against the candidate. She was duly beatified without these issues ever being resolved.

While it can be plausibly argued reforms and basic elimination of the Promotor Fidei from his traditional role do not necessarily mean the integrity of the process is compromised, it is undeniable that John Paul II eliminated safeguards that had been put in place by previous popes for the very purpose of preserving “the interest and honour of the Church” and “for the edification of His Church, for the glory of His name.” Therefore, there is a strong argument to be made that in eliminating these safeguards the modern Magisterium has indeed comprised the soundness of the process.

Another troubling aspect of the modern Magisterium’s approach is the rationale that underlies the massive increase in canonizations. Rather than proclaiming saints because they were in fact objectively saintly, the modern canonizations seem to have an ulterior motive: to showcase the universal call to holiness taught at Vatican II. In commenting upon the many canonizations of John Paul II, Cardinal Martins stated that John Paul II viewed his canonizations in the context of a “fulfillment” of the vision of the Council:

The first reason the Pope gave [for so many canonizations] was that he, by beatifying so many Servants of God, did no more than implement the Second Vatican Council, which vigorously reaffirmed that holiness is the essential note of the Church...Therefore, John Paul II said, holiness is what is most important in the Church, according to the Second Vatican Council. Then no one should be surprised

⁹ <http://www.ewtn.com/library/MARY/zmanysaints.HTM>

¹⁰ For the problems with Mother Teresa’s miracle, see “Should Mother Teresa be Canonized?” at <http://unamsanctamcatholicam.blogspot.com/2007/09/should-mother-teresa-be-canonized.html> (Sept. 4, 2007)

by the fact that the Pope wished to propose so many models of holiness to Christians, to the People of God.

The second reason is the extraordinary ecumenical importance of holiness. In *Novo Millennio Ineunte*, the Pope said that the holiness of the saints, blessed and martyrs is perhaps the most convincing ecumenism, these are his words, because holiness, he said with even stronger words, has its ultimate foundation in Christ, in whom the Church is not divided. Therefore, the ecumenism we all want calls for many saints, so that the convincing ecumenism of holiness is placed in the candelabrum of the holiness of the Church.¹¹

Who knows whether Cardinal Martins really spoke John Paul's mind on this or not—but if so, it is telling. The argument seems to be not that there are more saintly men and women, but that the cotemporary ecclesial vision *demand*s more. Yet we know holiness is not affirmed by removing the safeguards put in place by Tradition, safeguards whose very existence ensured that only true models of holiness were proposed. One cannot make more orange juice by simply pouring more water into the pitcher. What we have with the modern Magisterium's approach is essentially pouring more water into the pitcher. The addition technically increases volume, but the content of the resulting mixture is not as pure.

The Cardinal's statement about ecumenism is more interesting, because the Cardinal basically admits an ulterior motive in the modern canonizations, that “the ecumenism we want calls for many saints”—and therefore we must have more saints! Where does this leave us? While the Promotor Fidei ensured that canonizations remained an objective matter, the subsuming of canonization to the “needs” of the modern Church has effectively subjectivized the procedure. A canonization is no longer about whether a candidate truly meets the Church's standard of holiness, but on what role models the modern Church “needs” at any given time to promote its particular vision. This is not entirely unprecedented; one might recall the hasty canonization of St. Thomas Becket because the Church of the time “needed” a martyr in its struggle against royal domination. While such things certainly happened in the past, today they have been institutionalized in the very methodology of the proceedings themselves, which is of much greater import.

Are modern canonizations to be questioned? The traditional opinion of most theologians has tended towards the infallibility of canonizations, at least in their final determination—that is to say, the fact of a canonization was considered certain, but not necessarily the integrity of the evidence, procedure, or methodology, which were all matters of human prudence. If so, what we are witnessing today is not saints who are not really saintly, but saints whose level of sanctity is much lower than that expected by previous

¹¹ <http://www.ewtn.com/library/MARY/zmanysaints.HTM>

generations, and less able to withstand the scrutiny of detractors. Whereas nobody could doubt the miracles at Lourdes (which even converted atheists), not even the husband of the woman Mother Teresa healed believes in the legitimacy of the miracle, nor do the doctors. Yet, because of the loss of the Promotor Fidei's role, these objections do not ultimately need to be resolved. The process allows them to be ignored. In the old days, the Promotor Fidei would attack or scrutinize even the good deeds of candidate; now, even questionable issues are disregarded.

Incidentally, in fall of 1965 when some bishops began calling for the canonization of John XXIII only three years after his death, the effort was blocked by the powerful Cardinal Suenens and by Pope Paul VI himself, on the premise that it was rash to propose a candidate for canonization so soon after his death.¹²

Does the Church need models of holiness? Absolutely. How do we get them? By cultivating a spiritual atmosphere in our parishes and homes that nourishes real saints, so that we actually have an objective increase in the amount of saintly people. We cannot get more saints by making it easier to proclaim saints. We cannot make more juice by adding water to it.

¹² Roberto de Mattei, *The Second Vatican Council: An Unwritten History* (Fitzwilliam, NH: Loreto Publications, 2010), 459