

Gutting the Gospels

The Sacrilegious Stripping of the Novus Ordo Lectionary

By Jacob Michael

Introduction

When the *Consilium ad exsequendam Constitutionem de Sacra Liturgica* (Concilium for the Implementation of the Constitution on the Liturgy) released its new creation called the *Novus Ordo Missae*, very few people were aware that a full-scale liturgical revolution had been set in motion. This *New Order of the Mass* (hereafter, NOM) was not, as some claimed, merely a “restoration” of the Traditional Mass. Rather, it was a complete, wall-to-wall, top-to-bottom innovation - a brand new creation, conceived in the minds of the members of the Concilium. Far from an organic development of the Traditional Mass, this was a new entity altogether, an entity which borrowed here and there from the content of the Traditional Mass.

When one compares the two liturgies, the Traditional Mass (hereafter, TM) and the NOM, one finds striking differences in every single area of the liturgy. Dr. Thomas Droleskey has recently written a book on the changes in the rubrics; Kevin Tierney and I have been working on a manuscript that focuses on the changes to the propers of the Mass (the introits, collects, secrets, communion prayers, etc.); many other books have been written to describe the changes to the overall form of the Mass, including the commons (the Kyrie, the Gloria, the Credo, the Canon of the Mass, etc.).

What has not been discussed in great detail, and which I will cover in this manuscript, are the many changes that were made to the Lectionary of Readings (the weekly epistle and Gospel readings). I had stumbled upon these gross anomalies quite by accident whilst comparing the propers of the two liturgies one evening, and was immediately intrigued (and horrified) by what I found.

How many times have you heard it said that the New Lectionary of the NOM more fully opened up the treasures of Sacred Scripture for the faithful, allowing them (some say) to hear the entire bible read during the course of a three-year period? At first glance, this may seem true. The Lectionary was changed from a one-year cycle of readings to a three-year cycle; surely this would mean that more Scripture would be covered over the course of three years. In addition to the traditional epistle and Gospel reading, a reading from the Old Testament was added to the New Lectionary; this, too, adds to the illusion that more Scripture is being read to the faithful during the Mass.

As I began to examine the actual content of the readings, however, I discovered something shocking: the readings were not at all “seamless,” as some had claimed. The Lectionary would, for example, take the faithful through St. Matthew chapter 3, verses 1-6 on one Sunday, skip verses 7-11, and continue on the next Sunday with verses 12-20. This example is fabricated for the purposes of illustration, but you get the point: certain verses, sometimes entire sections of verses in fact, were just simply missing from the Lectionary. What purpose would this serve?

I began to investigate more closely, searching my bible and reading the verses that had been passed over in the NOM Lectionary to see what they said. Time after time, I found the exact same thing: the verses that had been excised from the Lectionary consistently

dealt with the same subjects. In every case, the offending verses spoke of miracles that could not be otherwise explained by natural causes, of Our Lord's continual confrontation with the Jews and the Jewish leaders, of the uselessness of material goods and worldly wealth, of the necessity of self-denial and bodily mortification, of sin and the possibility of damnation, of hell, of the role of women in the home and in the Church, and other such subjects that would normally be deemed "offensive" to modern ears.

The same patterns could be detected equally in the Gospels and epistles alike! In the process of giving the faithful a "more complete" bible, the revolutionaries had managed to complete strip the Sacred Scriptures of anything that offended Modern Man, of anything that was ... well, "too Catholic."

I firmly believe that, having examined the content of these readings several times, these clear patterns are in no way coincidental. The passages were (as it becomes clear upon close scrutiny and examining the Lectionary on the whole) very skillfully and deliberated edited in order to present a Christ and Christendom that in no way conflicts with Modern Man's inclinations. The Christ of the New Lectionary is loving, joyful, peaceful, calling all men to life, inviting all men to participate in the resurrection, exhorting us to love each other and help the needy. In short, the New Christ is fully humanitarian, the quintessential member (and founder) of the Civilization of Love.

Now, it is true, Our Lord certainly was loving, joyful, concerned with the welfare of mankind, etc., but the Gospels also present us with a Christ who warns us of sin, hell, damnation, the dangers of money and worldly possessions. This side of Our Lord's ministry has been carefully removed from the New Lectionary, effectively giving us the "Hippie Christ" of the 60s and 70s.

It is my hope that many will read the facts I am about to present, and carefully consider whether the NOM is not truly a wholesale revolution, calculated to de-Catholicize the Christian world through constant exposure to a lop-sided liturgy, and in particular, through an imbalanced presentation of the Gospels.

This work is prayerfully dedicated to St. Jerome, whose careful and constant labor produced for the Church the Latin Vulgate edition of Sacred Scripture.

St. Jerome, pray for us.

+JMJ+

March/April, 2004

Mangling St. Matthew

*Author's note: In this and each of the following chapters, the Gospel texts that were removed will be referenced, followed by a commentary on the content of those verses and the probable reasons why they were deleted from the New Lectionary. I repeat again for the sake of clarity: the verses referenced here are those have been **removed** in the New Lectionary version of the Gospels.*

4:18-25

These verses tell us the story of Jesus calling His first disciples, Ss. Peter, Andrew, James, and John. There is nothing seemingly offensive in these verses, it is true, and so those verses (18-23) are found in the New Lectionary. However, they are part of what is called the “short form” of the reading. In many of the Gospel readings, a short form and a longer form are given, the longer form containing verses that are set aside with brackets, and may be omitted from the reading at the discretion of the priest.

In this particular case, it is verses 24-25 which are made optional, and these certainly might be deemed unfit for modern ears, for they read, in part: “they brought him all the sick, those afflicted with various diseases and pains, demoniacs, epileptics, and paralytics, and he healed them.”

It will be noted here, at the outset, that the New Lectionary does contains stories of the miracles of Jesus. However, those miracles that could not otherwise be explained by appealing to natural causes have been passed over. It has been posited by some modern

scholars that when the Gospels tell of Jesus healing the demon-possessed, the afflicted were not truly possessed by demons (modernists always play down the role of angels and demons in the natural world) but, rather, suffered from epilepsy. In these verses above, however, “demoniacs” and “epileptics” are listed separately, thus showing that there were truly cases of genuine demon-possession that cannot be passed off as epilepsy.

Remember, the role of the exorcist has been virtually absent in the Church since the Second Vatican Council.

5:17-19

These verses were likely eliminated for the very simple reason that they record the words of Jesus as follows: “Whoever then relaxes one of the least of these commandments and teaches men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven.” The modern Church does not like to talk about the possibility of anyone not receiving their heavenly reward to the fullest.

5:22b-26

As with the previous set of verses, so also these verses have been excised from the Lectionary because they speak of the reality of hell: “whoever says, ‘You fool!’ shall be liable to the hell of fire.”

Also included in this set of deleted verses is the following: “Make friends quickly with your accuser, while you are going with him to court, lest your accuser hand you over to the judge, and the judge to the guard, and you be put in prison; truly, I say to you, you will never get out till you have paid the last penny.”

Those verses have been traditionally used by the saints and the Fathers to defend the Church’s doctrine concerning Purgatory. Since Purgatory is a virtual non-entity in the NOM (as a comparison of the prayers on the feast of All Souls’ day will show), these verses were left out.

5:29-32

We find in these verses two very offensive teachings: “If your right eye causes you to sin, pluck it out and throw it away; it is better that you lose one of your members than that your whole body be thrown into hell.”

Once again, the reality of hell and damnation is passed over in the New Lectionary.

We also read: “I say to you that every one who divorces his wife, except on the ground of unchastity, makes her an adulteress; and whoever marries a divorced woman commits adultery.”

This prompts a rather interesting question: has the recent increase in illegitimate annulments been the result of the elimination of such verses, or were these verses eliminated because the hierarchy had already compromised their views on divorce and remarriage? Which came first, the chicken or the egg?

6:7-15

Here we come across a strange and ubiquitous phenomenon in the New Lectionary. As you may know, much of what is contained in St. Matthew is repeated in St. Mark and St. Luke, and vice versa. The synoptic gospels (Matthew, Mark, and Luke) are remarkably similar in their content, varying only in minor details. Very often, the New Lectionary excludes something from St. Matthew that is repeated in St. Mark, or excludes something from St. Luke that is repeated in St. Matthew, and so on. However, when you compare the two (or three) accounts in the synoptic texts, you discover exactly why one version of the text was chosen for the Lectionary and one was not.

In this case, the above verses show Our Lord teaching His disciples the *Pater Noster* prayer. The Lectionary includes this same account from St. Luke's Gospel, but excludes St. Matthew's version, for three very important reasons.

We read: "And in praying do not heap up empty phrases as the pagans do; for they think that they will be heard for their many words." The New Lectionary excludes the idea that the prayers of pagans will not be heard.

We read further, after the actual prayer is given: "For if you forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father also will forgive you; but if you do not forgive men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses." The reality of judgment and damnation is again conveniently excluded.

Finally, the phrase, "on earth as it is in heaven," which follows "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done," is not found in St. Luke, but it is found in St. Matthew. This phrase applies both to the petition "thy kingdom come," as well as "thy will be done." The former sentiment, "thy kingdom come... on earth as it is in heaven," is *persona non grata* in the NOM, because it too strongly supports the concept of the Social Kingship of Christ.

None of these three concepts is found in St. Luke's account of the prayer, and thus, his more "sanitized" version is chosen for the readings.

6:19-23

This passage highlights another sentiment that is not welcome in the NOM: "Do not lay up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust consume and where thieves break in and steal." As noted in the introduction, the worthlessness of earthly goods is heavily downplayed in the NOM.

7:1-20

While portions of this passage may be found in the Lectionary under St. Luke's Gospel, there are certain verses here that are peculiar to St. Matthew's Gospel, and were edited from the Lectionary. Those peculiarities are as follows:

"Do not give dogs what is holy; and do not throw your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under foot and turn to attack you." This text has been traditionally applied to schismatics and heretics.

"The gate is wide and the way is easy, that leads to destruction, and those who enter by it are many. For the gate is narrow and the way is hard, that leads to life, and those who find it are few." Again, for the liberal priests who hold that Hell is empty and that all will be saved, this verse is rather problematic.

"Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing but inwardly are ravenous wolves. You will know them by their fruits ... Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire." In the NOM, there is no such thing as a "false prophet" who teaches heresy, and neither is there the possibility of being "thrown into the fire."

7:28-29

We finally come to the first instance of "anti-Semitism" in Scripture. This passage reads: "the crowds were astonished at [Jesus'] teaching, for he taught them as one who had authority, and not as their scribes." This hints at the constant hostility and confrontation between Jesus and the Jewish leaders, making this passage a prime candidate for the waste-basket.

8:1-34

Large sections of this passage are found in the Lectionary under St. Mark's Gospel and St. Luke's Gospel, but what is not found is the story of Jesus healing the demoniac: "And when he came to the other side, to the country of the Gadarenes, two demoniacs met him, coming out of the tombs, so fierce that no one could pass that way ... And he said to them, 'Go.' So they came out and went into the swine; and behold, the whole herd rushed down the steep bank into the sea, and perished in the waters."

While not all suggestions of demon possession are omitted from the Lectionary (Mark 1:32 is included, for example), this instance is rather prolonged and prominent - the demons actually speak, and transfer to another host. Perhaps this was considered too much for the modern mind to actually believe.

9:14-35

The story in this passage of Jesus healing the woman of her issue of blood is contained in Mark 5:21-43 and found in the New Lectionary, along with the story of Jesus raising Jairus' daughter from the dead.

However, this lengthy passage has a “short form” in the New Lectionary, and the entire section of the passage that relates the story of the woman and her issue of blood is made optional.

On the surface, it would seem that this may be another example of the aversion to miracle stories exhibited in the NOM. On the other hand, why would the Lectionary leave in the part about raising a girl from the dead? Which is the greater miracle?

The explanation is not that difficult to see: there is one aspect of this miracle (raising the girl from the dead) that makes it acceptable to the modern mind, namely, that it can be explained away by natural causes. Jesus tells the crowd, “Depart; for the girl is not dead but sleeping.” Thus, the majority of liberal priests will say, “See? Even Jesus admits it wasn't a miracle!” Therefore, this miracle is acceptable in the New Lectionary.

Verses 32-34 are omitted from the New Lectionary and are not found in the other Gospels. In these verses, we read: “And when the demon had been cast out, the dumb man spoke; and the crowds marveled, saying, ‘Never was anything like this seen in Israel.’ But the Pharisees said, ‘He casts out demons by the prince of demons.’”

In cutting these few verses from the Lectionary, the NOM manages to eliminate both demons and anti-Semitism.

10:9-25

While most of these verses are covered in the other Gospels, there are a few peculiarities of St. Matthew's Gospel here that are specifically eliminated in the New Lectionary.

We read: “And if any one will not receive you or listen to your words, shake off the dust from your feet as you leave that house or town. Truly, I say to you, it shall be more tolerable on the day of judgment for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah than for that town.”

Here is a peculiar aspect of St. Matthew's Gospel that is not found in the other accounts: “the day of judgment.”

We also find this hair-raising prediction of how the Apostles will be treated by the Jews after Jesus ascends to Heaven and leaves them to carry on His work: “Beware of men; for they will deliver you up to councils, and flog you in their synagogues ... Brother will deliver up brother to death, and the father his child, and children will rise against parents and have them put to death; and you will be hated by all for my name's sake. But he who endures to the end will be saved. When they persecute you in one town, flee to the next”

This bit of anti-Semitism could certainly not be left in the new, politically-correct version of the readings, which knows nothing of Man's hostility to the Gospel message.

10:34-36

In this passage, we find a contradiction of what the NOM constantly portrays in its vision of "peace" with no hostility. Our Lord says: "Do not think that I have come to bring peace on earth; I have not come to bring peace, but a sword. For I have come to set a man against his father, and a daughter against her mother, and a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; and a man's foes will be those of his own household."

This image of Christ does not fit at all with the "Hippie Jesus" of the NOM, so the passage was simply left out.

11:12-24

This section of verses hardly needs any commentary. It is nothing less than one sustained condemnation of the Jews who rejected Jesus, from the lips of Our Lord Himself: "But to what shall I compare this generation? ... the Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, 'Behold, a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners!' ... I tell you, it shall be more tolerable on the day of judgment for Tyre and Sidon than for you ... You shall be brought down to Hades ... I tell you that it shall be more tolerable on the day of judgment for the land of Sodom than for you."

Note that this is the second time a reference to Sodom has been eliminated. Could it be that the New Lectionary does not wish to remind the readers of the sin of sodomy, which takes its name from the city of Sodom?

12:1-50

Once again, we find a case of selective editing. Most of these verses are covered under St. Mark's Gospel, with a few notable exceptions.

We find that this text is missing entirely: "Then [Jesus] said to the man, 'Stretch out your hand.' And the man stretched it out, and it was restored, whole like the other. But the Pharisees went out and took counsel against him, how to destroy him." As usual, the confrontation between Jesus and the Pharisees is eliminated from the readings.

We read later in the text: "Then some of the scribes and Pharisees said to him, 'Teacher, we wish to see a sign from you.' But he answered them, 'An evil and adulterous generation seeks for a sign; but no sign shall be given to it except the sign of the prophet Jonah. For as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so will the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh will arise at the judgment with this generation and condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and behold, something greater than Jonah is here.'"

Besides the fact that Our Lord calls the Pharisees an “evil and adulterous generation” which will be condemned, there is also the problem of His reference to “the prophet Jonah,” “the belly of the whale,” and the “men of Ninevah.” Most liberal priests deny that the story of Jonah is anything more than a fairy-tale, but these words from Jesus very much lend credibility to the historicity of that Old Testament book.

16:1-12

This section from St. Matthew’s Gospel also proves to be a prime candidate for the chopping block: “And the Pharisees and Sadducees came, and to test him they asked him to show them a sign from heaven. He answered them ... ‘An evil and adulterous generation seeks for a sign, but no sign shall be given to it except the sign of Jonah’ ... Jesus said to [His disciples], ‘Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees’ ... they understood that he did not tell them to beware of the leaven of bread, but of the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees.”

More anti-Semitism and hostility between Jesus and the Jewish leaders.

16:28

This single verse is truly an oddity. It is repeated in the Gospels of Ss. Mark and Luke, and it has likewise been deleted from those accounts. Why such animosity for this one verse? It says, “Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.”

This was stricken from the Gospel records because liberal priests insist that Jesus was speaking literally here of the Second Coming, and that He was mistaken and confused as to when that Second Coming would be.

17:10-27

The healing of an epileptic and demon-possessed boy is contained in this set of verses, and is removed from the Lectionary because, as mentioned before, liberal priests like to claim that epilepsy was what the under-educated first century Christians and Jews mistook for “demon-possession.” This passage presents a problem for them, because St. Matthew identifies them as two distinct afflictions and says this young boy suffered from both.

Additionally, in these verses, Jesus calls the Jews a “wicked and perverse generation” again, demonstrating again His rampant anti-Semitism.

Verses 24-27, the story of St. Peter going out, at Jesus' command, to catch the fish with coins in its mouth and pay the temple tax using those coins, are also stricken from the Lectionary. The NOM goes out of its way to avoid the miraculous.

20:17-34

In these verses, we are again confronted with anti-Semitism: “And as Jesus was going up to Jerusalem, he took the twelve disciples aside, and on the way he said to them, ‘Behold, we are going up to Jerusalem; and the Son of man will be delivered to the chief priests and scribes, and they will condemn him to death, and deliver him to the Gentiles to be mocked and scourged and crucified.’”

21:12-27

This passage contains a few controversial judgments of Jesus against the Jews and the Old Covenant. It has become popular in the modern Church to suggest that the Jews still have a saving covenant with God, but Jesus’ actions and words in these verses suggest otherwise.

The first thing we find is that Jesus refused to stay in the city of Jerusalem, an implicit judgment against the city: “And leaving [the Pharisees], he went out of the city to Bethany and lodged there.”

The next thing we read is, “In the morning, as he was returning to the city, he was hungry. And seeing a fig tree by the wayside he went to it, and found nothing on it but leaves only. And he said to it, ‘May no fruit ever come from you again!’ And the fig tree withered at once.” This, too, is an implied judgment against Jerusalem and the barrenness of the Old Covenant.

When His disciples marvel at this miracle, Jesus’ response is this: “Truly, I say to you, if you have faith and never doubt, you will not only do what has been done to the fig tree, but even if you say to this mountain, ‘Be taken up and cast into the sea,’ it will be done.” The reference to “this mountain” is, of course, a reference to Mount Zion and the Jerusalem Temple, which Jesus here indicates will soon be destroyed.

23:13-39

Anyone who is familiar with the Gospel accounts will immediately recognize why this large section of Matthew 23 was deleted. It reads, in part: “But woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! ... you shut the kingdom of heaven against men; for you neither enter yourselves, nor allow those who would enter to go in ... you traverse sea and land to make a single proselyte, and when he becomes a proselyte, you make him twice as much a child of hell as yourselves ... You blind guides, straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel! ... you are like whitewashed tombs, which outwardly appear beautiful, but within they are full of dead men’s bones and all uncleanness. So you also outwardly appear righteous to men, but within you are full of hypocrisy and iniquity ... You serpents, you brood of vipers, how are you to escape being sentenced to hell? Therefore I send you prophets and wise men and scribes, some of whom you will kill and crucify, and some you will scourge in your synagogues and persecute from town to town, that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed on earth, from the blood of innocent Abel to the blood of Zechariah the son of Barachiah, whom you murdered between the

sanctuary and the altar. Truly, I say to you, all this will come upon this generation. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, killing the prophets and stoning those who are sent to you! How often would I have gathered your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, and you would not! Behold, your house is forsaken and desolate.”

This kind of intense conflict between Jesus and the Pharisees, along with the harsh judgments He pronounces against them, is hard to reconcile with the modern Church-Jew inter-religious relations.

25:16-18 and 25:22-30

This is, perhaps, the most blatant example of the sanitizing of the Gospels which we are examining. Matt. 25 contains the parable of the three servants who were entrusted with talents (that is, money) by their master while he went away on a journey. If you remember your bible stories, you'll recall that two of the three servants labored to increase the talents they were given, while the third servant did nothing but bury his talents.

Not in the New Lectionary. After the servants are given the talents, the Lectionary omits this: “He who had received the five talents went at once and traded with them; and he made five talents more. So also, he who had the two talents made two talents more. But he who had received the one talent went and dug in the ground and hid his master's money.”

The story then continues and ends with the master heaping praise upon one of the faithful servants: “Well done, good and faithful servant; you have been faithful over a little, I will set you over much; enter into the joy of your master.”

It entirely omits the ending of the story, wherein the lazy servant is chastised: “You wicked and slothful servant ... you ought to have invested my money with the bankers, and at my coming I should have received what was my own with interest. So take the talent from him, and give it to him who has the ten talents. For to every one who has will more be given, and he will have abundance; but from him who has not, even what he has will be taken away. And cast the worthless servant into the outer darkness; there men will weep and gnash their teeth.”

26:47-68 and 27:1-10

The account of the Passion of Christ has been heavily altered, and much of it has been made optional in the New Lectionary. We find that any suggestion of Jewish involvement in the crucifixion has been removed: “While he was still speaking, Judas came, one of the twelve, and with him a great crowd with swords and clubs, from the chief priests and the elders of the people ... Now the chief priests and the whole council sought false testimony against Jesus that they might put him to death ... When morning came, all the chief priests and the elders of the people took counsel against Jesus to put

him to death; and they bound him and led him away and delivered him to Pilate the governor.”

The most controversial passage, in which the Jews cry out “let his blood be upon us and on our children,” now simply reads that the “crowd” made this damning statement. There is no suggestion that it was a Jewish crowd.

Finally, as is the case in all of the Gospels, the story of Judas is missing: “Judas, his betrayer, saw that he was condemned, he repented and brought back the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and the elders, saying, ‘I have sinned in betraying innocent blood.’ They said, ‘What is that to us? See to it yourself.’ And throwing down the pieces of silver in the temple, he departed; and he went and hanged himself.”

In promoting the liberal theology of universal salvation and the emptiness of Hell, liberal priests have to avoid the subject of Judas, who is clearly condemned to Hell by Our Lord in Sacred Scripture. Thus, as we move through the Gospels, any trace of Our Lord’s condemnations of Judas as a “son of perdition,” Judas’ betrayal of Christ, and his shameful death have been carefully expunged from the Lectionary.

28:11-15

We end our examination of St. Matthew’s Gospel with this startling omission from the Resurrection account: “While they were going, behold, some of the guard went into the city and told the chief priests all that had taken place. And when they had assembled with the elders and taken counsel, they gave a sum of money to the soldiers and said, ‘Tell people, “His disciples came by night and stole him away while we were asleep.” And if this comes to the governor’s ears, we will satisfy him and keep you out of trouble.’ So they took the money and did as they were directed; and this story has been spread among the Jews to this day.”

Clearly, this is another case of anti-Semitism that cannot be embraced by the modern Church, and so these verses were left out.

Messing with St. Mark

3:7-19

This passage contains a brief description of the beginning of Jesus' ministry, but it also contains two rather offensive details that earned it the honor of being left out of the Lectionary: "[Jesus] had healed many, so that all who had diseases pressed upon him to touch him. And whenever the unclean spirits beheld him, they fell down before him and cried out, 'You are the Son of God.'" As usual, any hint of the miraculous and/or the existence of demon spirits is not included in the readings.

4:1-25

The parable of the sower and the seed is missing from St. Mark's Gospel, but it is covered in the Lectionary under the reading from Matt. 13:1-23. However, there is once again a shorter and longer form given, and when we look to see what is omitted in the short form, we find the following: "And when he was alone, those who were about him with the twelve asked him concerning the parables." The passage then goes on with the words of Our Lord, giving the explanation of the parable's meaning.

It is interesting that the Lectionary would actually put before the eyes of the faithful the parable of the sower and the seed, but would deprive them (if the priest chooses the short form) of Our Lord's Divine explanation of the parable! Perhaps the reason can be found in this, that as He explains it to His disciples, He also condemns His Jewish audience by saying, "To you has been given the secret of the kingdom of God, but for those outside

everything is in parables; so that they may indeed see but not perceive, and may indeed hear but not understand; lest they should turn again, and be forgiven.”

Of course, the reason for omitting the explanation of the parable may also be that, in this explanation, Our Lord speaks of “tribulation” and “persecution” for the Christian, and the “cares of the world, and the delight in riches” that may “enter in and choke the word.”

5:1-20

The story of Jesus casting out the unclean spirits from the demoniac was also removed from St. Matthew’s Gospel. These verses remind us why: “And Jesus asked him, ‘What is your name?’ He replied, ‘My name is Legion; for we are many.’ And he begged him eagerly not to send them out of the country. Now a great herd of swine was feeding there on the hillside; and they begged him, ‘Send us to the swine, let us enter them.’ So he gave them leave. And the unclean spirits came out, and entered the swine; and the herd, numbering about two thousand, rushed down the steep bank into the sea, and were drowned in the sea.” While we may speculate whether the truly offensive content here is the talking demons or the cruelty to animals, the fact remains that this story has been cut from of the Lectionary.

5:25-34

Again, the story of the woman whom Jesus healed from a 12-year hemorrhage is quietly stripped away from the readings. St. Mark’s account is particularly offensive, because he makes it clear that no natural causes were able to help this woman. He tells us she “had suffered much under many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was no better but rather grew worse.”

The story further records that the healing was truly the result of miraculous and divine power: “And Jesus, perceiving in himself that power had gone forth from him, immediately turned about in the crowd, and said, ‘Who touched my garments?’” Notice that St. Mark says Jesus actually felt power go out from Him. No liberal priest with any self-respect would give voice to such sentiments.

6:35-56

This is the first of two accounts in St. Mark wherein Our Lord feeds a large multitude with only a few loaves and some fish, and then walks on the water. In the first account, Jesus feeds 5,000, and in the second account, He feeds 4,000. The former is found in the Lectionary under St. Matthew’s Gospel, but the latter account has been removed completely.

What is also included in this account, which is excluded from the Lectionary entirely, is the fact that Our Lord performed many miracles of healing at Gennesaret. I can only imagine that it was because of the “superstitious” nature of this account that it was deleted: “And wherever he came, in villages, cities, or country, they laid the sick in the

market places, and besought him that they might touch even the fringe of his garment; and as many as touched it were made well.”

7:9-13

In this passage, we find yet another instance of Jesus’ continuing confrontation with the Jewish leaders: “And he said to them, ‘You have a fine way of rejecting the commandment of God, in order to keep your tradition ... thus making void the word of God through your tradition which you hand on. And many such things you do.’”

8:1-26

This is the second account of Jesus’ miraculous feeding of the multitudes. This account was stricken from the record because Jesus again takes the opportunity to say, “Take heed, beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod.”

We may only speculate why the Lectionary would include the miracle of feeding the 5,000 (as it is included in St. Matthew’s Gospel), but would not include the feeding of the 4,000. I might suggest that the reason lies in the fact that many liberal priests believe that the feeding of the multitude only happened once, not twice, at St. Mark records it.

8:36-38

Mark 8:27-35 is included in the Lectionary, but this passage warrants a special examination, because it omits the conclusion of Jesus’ discourse contained in 36-38. Up until this point, Our Lord had been saying that one must “lay down his life” if he wished to save it, but He had not - until verse 38 - drawn the contrast between gaining “the whole world” and losing “his life.”

What is more interesting is that the Lectionary translation translates the word “soul” as “life.” The traditional reading of the passage, taken from the Douay-Rheims, would read as follows:

“For what shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?”

Verse 38 is stricken from the Lectionary for another reason as well, most likely because Our Lord refers to the Jews of His day as “this adulterous and sinful generation.”

9:1

As noted before, this passage, which simply reads, “And he said to them, ‘Truly, I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see that the kingdom of God has come with power,’” was most likely left out because liberal priests believe that Jesus was mistaken about when His Second Coming would take place.

9:20-29

Here we come across yet another example of the revolutionaries' aversion to the miraculous. In this passage, Jesus casts out a demon that His disciples were unsuccessful in casting out. When they ask Him why they could not cast out the demon, Jesus says, "This kind cannot be driven out by anything but prayer and fasting."

In the modern mind, fasting has no power to effect spiritual good.

10:13-16

As the crowds of people begin to bring their children to Jesus, the disciples rebuke them. Jesus, however, tells them, "Let the children come to me, do not hinder them; for to such belongs the kingdom of God."

Why would such a lovely verse about innocent children be deleted? Perhaps because of Jesus' concluding remarks: "Truly, I say to you, whoever does not receive the kingdom of God like a child shall not enter it."

11:11-33

This section of verses contains a repeat of what we saw in St. Matthew's Gospel: "On the following day, when they came from Bethany, he was hungry. And seeing in the distance a fig tree in leaf, he went to see if he could find anything on it. When he came to it, he found nothing but leaves, for it was not the season for figs. And he said to it, 'May no one ever eat fruit from you again.'" As mentioned before, this is an implicit condemnation of Jerusalem and the Old Covenant.

The above passage also includes this account: "And he entered the temple and began to drive out those who sold and those who bought in the temple, and he overturned the tables of the money-changers and the seats of those who sold pigeons; and he would not allow any one to carry anything through the temple."

Obviously, the liberal portrait of the mild and gentle Jesus, who loves everyone and condemns no one, is incompatible with the Jesus shown to us by these verses, since here we see Jesus becoming angry with the Jews of the temple, and violently driving them out of the temple courts.

Later in this passage we also find the politically-incorrect statement that, "the chief priests and the scribes heard it and sought a way to destroy him."

12:1-27

In this rather lengthy set of verses we find the parable of the vineyard and the tenants, Our Lord's teaching on paying taxes, and the question of marriage in the resurrection.

Much of this is included in the Lectionary under the other Gospels, but a few key elements are left out.

In the parable, the passage is deleted which tells us that the Jewish leaders “they tried to arrest him, but feared the multitude, for they perceived that he had told the parable against them; so they left him and went away.”

When the Sadducees test Our Lord with the question of marriage at the resurrection, this passage is removed: “Jesus said to them, ‘Is not this why you are wrong, that you know neither the scriptures nor the power of God?’”

Likewise, this italicized section has also been excised: “He is not God of the dead, but of the living; *you are quite wrong.*”

Apparently we can’t have Jesus doing something non-ecumenical, like telling the Jewish leaders that they don’t understand Scripture, and that their opinions are “wrong.”

12:38-40

This excised passage hardly needs any commentary as to why it was removed: “Beware of the scribes, who like to go about in long robes, and to have salutations in the market places and the best seats in the synagogues and the places of honor at feasts, who devour widows’ houses and for a pretense make long prayers. They will receive the greater condemnation.”

Such sentiments don’t make for good Jewish relations.

12:41-44

Holy poverty and contributing to the support of the Church are both given the heave-ho in this short passage: “And a poor widow came, and put in two copper coins ... And he called his disciples to him, and said to them, ‘Truly, I say to you, this poor widow has put in more than all those who are contributing to the treasury. For they all contributed out of their abundance; but she out of her poverty has put in everything she had, her whole living.’”

14:1-11

Portions of this passage are found in the other Gospel readings, but the usual suspects have been carefully removed, such as, “And the chief priests and the scribes were seeking how to arrest him by stealth, and kill him.”

Also removed is this verse, which speaks of Judas’ traitorous role: “Then Judas Iscariot, who was one of the twelve, went to the chief priests in order to betray him to them. And when they heard it they were glad, and promised to give him money. And he sought an opportunity to betray him.”

14:17-21

Here again, the wicked act of Judas is carefully expunged from the readings, lest anyone remember Judas' fate and think that Hell might actually have a few souls in it: "And as they were at table eating, Jesus said, 'Truly, I say to you, one of you will betray me, one who is eating with me ... It is one of the twelve, one who is dipping bread into the dish with me. For the Son of man goes as it is written of him, but woe to that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! It would have been better for that man if he had not been born.'"

14:27-72

All of these verses are part of the longer form of the Passion, and all of these verses may be licitly omitted from the reading if the presiding priest so chooses. Some of the obvious verses are these: "Judas came, one of the twelve, and with him a crowd with swords and clubs, from the chief priests and the scribes and the elders. Now the betrayer had given them a sign, saying, 'The one I shall kiss is the man; seize him and lead him away under guard,'" "And they led Jesus to the high priest; and all the chief priests and the elders and the scribes were assembled," and "the chief priests and the whole council sought testimony against Jesus to put him to death; but they found none. For many bore false witness against him."

16:9-14

As with St. Matthew's Gospel, so also St. Mark's account of the resurrection has been slightly altered to exclude these verses: "he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, from whom he had cast out seven demons," and "he appeared to the eleven themselves as they sat at table; and he upbraided them for their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they had not believed those who saw him after he had risen."

In the modern church, there are no demons, and there is no such thing as being chastised for unbelief and lack of faith.

Laundering St. Luke

6:1-16

Much of this section of St. Luke's Gospel is included in the readings for St. Mark's Gospel, but as usual, some rather notable exclusions can be noted.

The account of Jesus healing a man with a withered hand has been left out, partially because it is a passage that attests to Jesus' miraculous power, but mostly because "the scribes and the Pharisees watched him, to see whether he would heal on the sabbath, so that they might find an accusation against him ... they were filled with fury and discussed with one another what they might do to Jesus."

Additionally, the story of Jesus calling the 12 disciples is left out, including the calling of "Judas Iscariot, who became a traitor."

6:18-19

As with St. Mark's Gospel, so with St. Luke's: the testimony to a miraculous power that actually flowed out of Jesus is done away with. We read: "and those who were troubled with unclean spirits were cured. And all the crowd sought to touch him, for power came forth from him and healed them all."

8:1-56

The entirety of Luke 8 has been left out of the Lectionary, along with the parable of the sower, the healing of the man possessed by a legion of demons, and the healing of the woman who suffered from a hemorrhage.

The parable of the sower, as mentioned before, includes such statements as, “the devil comes and takes away the word from their hearts, that they may not believe and be saved,” and “as they go on their way they are choked by the cares and riches and pleasures of life, and their fruit does not mature.”

The account of the healing of the woman emphasizes that “could not be healed by any one,” and Jesus’ words, “some one touched me; for I perceive that power has gone forth from me,” thus proving that her healing was truly a supernatural miracle.

9:25-27

This section of verses includes two troublesome sayings of Our Lord, also excised from the other Gospel accounts: “whoever is ashamed of me and of my words, of him will the Son of man be ashamed when he comes in his glory and the glory of the Father and of the holy angels. But I tell you truly, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the kingdom of God.”

10:13-16

This passage contains more judgments of Jesus against the Jews of His day: “it shall be more tolerable in the judgment for Tyre and Sidon than for you. And you, Capernaum, will you be exalted to heaven? You shall be brought down to Hades.”

11:14-26

We find in this passage a rather detailed teaching on demons and blasphemy, including the rather un-ecumenical statement that “he who is not with me is against me, and he who does not gather with me scatters.”

We also hear Our Lord say, “when the unclean spirit has gone out of a man, he passes through waterless places seeking rest; and finding none he says, ‘I will return to my house from which I came.’ And when he comes he finds it swept and put in order. Then he goes and brings seven other spirits more evil than himself, and they enter and dwell there; and the last state of that man becomes worse than the first.”

The modern mind does not like to be reminded of the possibility of damnation.

11:29-54

The number of offensive statements in this long passage made it an obvious candidate for the chopping block.

We can begin with the words of Our Lord, noted earlier, giving historical credibility to the story of Jonah and a curse upon the faithless Jews: “This generation is an evil generation; it seeks a sign, but no sign shall be given to it except the sign of Jonah. For as Jonah became a sign to the men of Nineveh, so will the Son of man be to this generation ... The men of Nineveh will arise at the judgment with this generation and condemn it; for they repented at the preaching of Jonah.”

He follows this with the teaching that our eyes are the “lamp of the body,” warning us, “be careful lest the light in you be darkness.”

After this we are treated to another sustained condemnation of the Pharisees: “you Pharisees cleanse the outside of the cup and of the dish, but inside you are full of extortion and wickedness ... you neglect justice and the love of God ... the blood of all the prophets, shed from the foundation of the world, may be required of this generation ... yes, I tell you, it shall be required of this generation.”

Finally, we see more hostility on the part of the Pharisees: “the scribes and the Pharisees began to press him hard, and to provoke him to speak of many things, lying in wait for him, to catch at something he might say.”

12:1-12

The attack on the Pharisees continues in these verses, with Our Lord saying, “beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy.”

This is followed by a reminder of the possibility of damnation: “I will warn you whom to fear: fear him who, after he has killed, has power to cast into hell; yes, I tell you, fear him!” Can you imagine hearing this at the NOM, followed by the acclamation, “Thanks be to God?”

Our Lord continues by speaking of the unpardonable sin (not a favorite topic in the NOM): “he who blasphemes against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven.”

12:32-34

This passage highlights the aversion of the NOM culture to teachings that emphasize the uselessness of worldly possessions. This same teaching was excluded from the other Gospels, but here in St. Luke it is even more specific and pronounced: “Sell your possessions, and give alms; provide yourselves with purses that do not grow old, with a treasure in the heavens that does not fail, where no thief approaches and no moth destroys.”

12:41-48

In these passages, Our Lord tells the parable of the master and the servants, reminding us once again that the possibility of eternal punishment is real: “the master of that servant

will come on a day when he does not expect him and at an hour he does not know, and will punish him, and put him with the unfaithful. And that servant who knew his master's will, but did not make ready or act according to his will, shall receive a severe beating. But he who did not know, and did what deserved a beating, shall receive a light beating.”

12:54-59

These verses are a repeat of the teaching found in the Sermon on the Mount on the subject of Purgatory – something rarely even mentioned in the NOM: “As you go with your accuser before the magistrate, make an effort to settle with him on the way, lest he drag you to the judge, and the judge hand you over to the officer, and the officer put you in prison. I tell you, you will never get out till you have paid the very last copper.”

13:10-21

Our Lord heals a woman from a “spirit of infirmity” in this passage, teaching that the supernatural world does interact with the natural world, and some infirmities can be attributed to evil spirits. He says explicitly that this woman was “a daughter of Abraham whom Satan bound for eighteen years.”

St. Luke gives us this anti-Semitic detail: “As he said this, all his adversaries were put to shame; and all the people rejoiced at all the glorious things that were done by him.”

13:31-35

Our Lord chastises Jerusalem again in these verses, saying, “it cannot be that a prophet should perish away from Jerusalem. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, killing the prophets and stoning those who are sent to you! How often would I have gathered your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, and you would not! Behold, your house is forsaken.”

This kind of condemnation, not only of the Jews but also of Judaism (“your house is forsaken” is a reference to the coming end of the Old Covenant and the desolation of the temple), does not at all fit with the liberal teaching that the Jews still possess a valid and saving covenant with God.

14:15-24

In these passages, Our Lord tells the parable of the wedding banquet (which is symbolic of heaven), but His words remind us that some souls will simply reject His grace and not make it to heaven. He also reminds the Jews that they, by rejecting Him, were forfeiting their place at this banquet: “I tell you, none of those men who were invited shall taste my banquet.”

16:14-18

Jesus again rebukes the Pharisees in this passage: “The Pharisees, who were lovers of money, heard all this, and they scoffed at him. But he said to them, ‘You are those who justify yourselves before men, but God knows your hearts; for what is exalted among men is an abomination in the sight of God ... the kingdom of God is preached, and every one enters it violently.’”

He ends by teaching what we saw earlier that had been excised from St. Matthew’s Gospel: “Every one who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery, and he who marries a woman divorced from her husband commits adultery.”

17:1-4

Given the recent scandal caused by the recent revelation of rampant pedophilia among the clergy, this deleted passage is rather timely: “Temptations to sin are sure to come; but woe to him by whom they come! It would be better for him if a millstone were hung round his neck and he were cast into the sea, than that he should cause one of these little ones to sin.”

Once again, a reference to sin and damnation is summarily rejected from the New Lectionary.

17:20-37

The only explanation that I can find for why this passage was deleted is that Our Lord lends historical credibility to the story of Sodom and Gomorrah. Additionally, He tells us that our culture will parallel and mimic the sins of Sodom in the last days – a rather damning judgment of our modern age: “as it was in the days of Lot – they ate, they drank, they bought, they sold, they planted, they built, but on the day when Lot went out from Sodom fire and sulphur rained from heaven and destroyed them all – so will it be on the day when the Son of man is revealed.”

19:11-27

This passage recounts again (as we saw in St. Matthew’s Gospel) the parable of the servants and the talents. These verses were not deemed useful for the laity to hear: “I will condemn you out of your own mouth, you wicked servant ... I tell you, that to every one who has will more be given; but from him who has not, even what he has will be taken away. But as for these enemies of mine, who did not want me to reign over them, bring them here and slay them before me.”

19:41-48

As St. Luke’s Gospel brings us closer to the account of Christ’s Passion, Jesus’ condemnations of the Jews and Jerusalem grow more frequent – as do the number of passages that are left on the editing floor.

Here, we read that as Jesus came near to Jerusalem, He said “would that even today you knew the things that make for peace! But now they are hid from your eyes. For the days shall come upon you, when your enemies will cast up a bank about you and surround you, and hem you in on every side, and dash you to the ground, you and your children within you.”

Again we see a more “violent” side of Jesus coming out: “And he entered the temple and began to drive out those who sold.”

Finally, the Jewish leaders are condemned again: “The chief priests and the scribes and the principal men of the people sought to destroy him.”

20:1-16

Another condemnation of the Jewish leaders and of Jerusalem is found in this parable of the tenants and the vineyard. The tenants represent the Jewish leaders, and we read, “the owner of the vineyard said, ‘What shall I do? I will send my beloved son; it may be they will respect him.’ But when the tenants saw him, they said to themselves, ‘This is the heir; let us kill him, that the inheritance may be ours.’ And they cast him out of the vineyard and killed him.”

This, of course, refers to the Jewish leaders’ role in the crucifixion of Christ – another subject that gets no exposure in the NOM.

The parable concludes: “What then will the owner of the vineyard do to them? He will come and destroy those tenants, and give the vineyard to others.”

20:39-47

This passage includes still yet another condemnation of the Jewish leaders, repeated elsewhere in the Gospels (but also excluded elsewhere in the Lectionary): “Beware of the scribes, who like to go about in long robes, and love salutations in the market places and the best seats in the synagogues and the places of honor at feasts, who devour widows’ houses and for a pretense make long prayers. They will receive the greater condemnation.”

21:29-33

The elimination of this passage completes a full trilogy of similar eliminations. This passage was found in St. Matthew and St. Mark, but was excised from both accounts. We read: “So also, when you see these things taking place, you know that the kingdom of God is near. Truly, I say to you, this generation will not pass away till all has taken place.”

23:50-56

One final judgment against the Jewish leaders is excised from St. Luke, this time in the form of a narration. After Jesus' crucifixion, we read of how Joseph of Arimathea asked Pilate for the body of Jesus: "Now there was a man named Joseph from the Jewish town of Arimathea. He was a member of the council, a good and righteous man, who had not consented to their purpose and deed, and he was looking for the kingdom of God."

Note the implicit condemnation of the Jewish council, whose "purpose and deed" Joseph "had not consented to."

Gagging the Gospel of St. John

1:15-18

In the midst of the reading of the opening chapter of St. John's Gospel, the New Lectionary makes verses 15-18 optional. Why stop short at verse 14? What is in verses 15-18 that would be considered offensive? I suggest it is this phrase: "For the law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ."

This verse pits the Old Covenant against the New by declaring – albeit implicitly – the deficiency of the Old. The Old Covenant gave us the law, but no grace; but the New Covenant brings us grace.

3:1-12

It is rather amazing that this text should be removed, for it contains Our Lord's discourse with Nicodemus, one of the Jewish teachers. In this discourse, Our Lord utters the famous words, "Truly, truly, I say to you, unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." This verse affirms the necessity of water baptism for salvation – not the something the modern church is keen on affirming.

This passage also highlights Our Lord's confrontation with the Jewish leaders. He chastises Nicodemus – who, it must be pointed out again, was a Pharisee – and says, "Are you a teacher of Israel, and yet you do not understand this? Truly, truly, I say to you, we speak of what we know, and bear witness to what we have seen; but you do not receive

our testimony.” That last line, “you do not receive our testimony,” is a condemnation of the Pharisees for rejecting the Messiah.

3:21-36

The New Lectionary does include the rather tame words of Our Lord in John 3:16, which affirms that “God so loved the world,” but it cuts out these verses, which highlight the opposite side of the Gospel coin: “He who believes in the Son has eternal life; he who does not obey the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God rests upon him.”

Again we see how the modern church carefully avoids any hint of damnation and the “wrath of God.”

4:16-19a

The New Lectionary once again interrupts the flow of a discourse of Our Lord (this time, with the woman at the well) by making certain verses in the middle of the discourse optional. Which verses? We read: “Jesus said to her, ‘Go, call your husband, and come here.’ The woman answered him, ‘I have no husband.’ Jesus said to her, ‘You are right in saying, “I have no husband”; for you have had five husbands, and he whom you now have is not your husband; this you said truly.’”

I can only speculate that these verses might be deemed offensive because they highlight the immorality of, for lack of a better term, “shacking up” with someone who is not your spouse. Unfortunately, however, there are many “Novus Ordo Catholics” who are doing this very thing, and the liberal priests in those parishes are loath to say anything about it.

We will see this pattern of excising condemnations of immoral living become even clearer in the next volume, when we examine the New Lectionary’s version of St. Paul’s epistles.

4:40-54

This short section of verses contains the story of Jesus healing the official’s son, who was near death. This account is, perhaps, a little too miraculous for modern ears, for in this case, Our Lord heals the afflicted son with a mere word: “Jesus said to him, ‘Go; your son will live.’ The man believed the word that Jesus spoke to him and went his way. As he was going down, his servants met him and told him that his son was living. So he asked them the hour when he began to mend, and they said to him, ‘Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him.’ The father knew that was the hour when Jesus had said to him, ‘Your son will live’; and he himself believed, and all his household.”

In this story we see that the very words of Our Lord had miraculous power: He speaks the word, and the son is healed at that very instant, even though Our Lord is physically miles away from the boy.

5:1-47

There is little wonder why this entire chapter was removed. In it, we read of Our Lord healing the lame man who sat by the pool of Beth-zatha. Not only is this story another account of the miraculous and supernatural, but it contains yet another confrontation between Our Lord and the Pharisees, who were angry that Our Lord healed the man on the Sabbath. St. John tells us, “And this was why the Jews persecuted Jesus, because he did this on the sabbath.”

St. John further tells us, “This was why the Jews sought all the more to kill him, because he not only broke the sabbath but also called God his Father, making himself equal with God.”

Our Lord responds with very harsh words, words that still ring out as a condemnation of the Jews of our day who do not accept Christ: “He who does not honor the Son does not honor the Father who sent him.” He continues with such words as, “His voice you have never heard ... you do not have his word abiding in you, for you do not believe him whom he has sent. You search the scriptures, because you think that in them you have eternal life ... yet you refuse to come to me that you may have life ... I know that you have not the love of God within you. I have come in my Father's name, and you do not receive me ... Do not think that I shall accuse you to the Father; it is Moses who accuses you, on whom you set your hope. If you believed Moses, you would believe me, for he wrote of me.”

Our Lord also speaks of the possibility of damnation: “the hour is coming when all who are in the tombs will hear his voice and come forth, those who have done good, to the resurrection of life, and those who have done evil, to the resurrection of judgment.”

Miracles, anti-Semitism, and damnation: three very good reasons to remove this chapter in its entirety.

6:36 & 6:70-71

In the middle of Our Lord's discourse on the “Bread of Life,” we find these three verses removed completely – they are not even optional in the reading. The deliberate refusal to let Our Lord speak of damnation becomes shockingly clear when we read the context.

In the Lectionary's reading, you will find these verses: “Jesus said to them, ‘I am the bread of life; he who comes to me shall not hunger, and he who believes in me shall never thirst,’ followed by, “All that the Father gives me will come to me; and him who comes to me I will not cast out.”

These are very inspiring and comforting verses are they not? So full of hope ... but what comes in between those two verses? Just this small reminder, “But I said to you that you have seen me and yet do not believe.”

Similarly, the end of the discourse in the New Lectionary ends with these uplifting words: “Simon Peter answered him, ‘Lord, to whom shall we go? You have the words of eternal life; and we have believed, and have come to know, that you are the Holy One of God.’” All well and good. However, the Lectionary leaves out the next two verses: “Jesus answered them, ‘Did I not choose you, the twelve, and one of you is a devil?’ He spoke of Judas the son of Simon Iscariot, for he, one of the twelve, was to betray him.”

Damnation in the first instance, and the particular damnation of Judas in the second instance. No, we cannot remind the faithful of that! Remember, Hell is probably empty, and as John Paul II has stated in writing, we are not even certain the Judas is in Hell.

7:1-36 & 7:40-53

Nearly the entirety of chapter 7 has been given the axe. Of the 53 verses in this chapter, the revolutionaries saw fit to only include three, and they are, of course, nothing but joy and bliss: “Jesus stood up and proclaimed, ‘If any one thirst, let him come to me and drink. He who believes in me, as the scripture has said, “Out of his heart shall flow rivers of living water.””

What is missing here is the entire account of the confrontation that Jesus has with the Jews during the feast at which He spoke the above words. St. John tells us that Jesus “would not go about in Judea, because the Jews sought to kill him.”

Our Lord later says, “The world cannot hate you, but it hates me because I testify of it that its works are evil.” So much for the misplaced optimism about the world expressed in some of the conciliar documents of Vatican II!

St. John informs us that some of the people were beginning to believe in Jesus, but “for fear of the Jews no one spoke openly of him.” Note well: for fear of the Jews. This is more anti-Semitism from St. John, the most openly anti-Semitic of all the Gospel writers.

While Our Lord is speaking to the crowd, some of them implicitly damn the Jewish leaders by saying, “Is not this the man whom they seek to kill? And here he is, speaking openly, and they say nothing to him! Can it be that the authorities really know that this is the Christ?”

While the New Lectionary gives us Our Lord’s words of comfort, they exclude the response of the Jews to those words: “Some of them wanted to arrest him, but no one laid hands on him. The officers then went back to the chief priests and Pharisees, who said to them, ‘Why did you not bring him?’”

8:12-59

Here again we see the majority of a chapter in St. John’s Gospel is left in the trash. The first eleven verses, the story of the woman caught in adultery but acquitted by Our Lord, is left intact. The rest of the chapter, however, is a different story.

Our Lord continues in the rest of the chapter to chastise the Pharisees in these words: “You know neither me nor my Father; if you knew me, you would know my Father also.”

His words get even stronger as the chapter continues: “I go away, and you will seek me and die in your sin,” “I told you that you would die in your sins, for you will die in your sins unless you believe that I am he,” “you seek to kill me, because my word finds no place in you,” and finally, the *coupe de grace*, “You are of your father the devil, and your will is to do your father's desires. He was a murderer from the beginning, and has nothing to do with the truth, because there is no truth in him.”

Thanks be to God?

9:2-5, 9:10-12, 9:18-33 & 9:39-41

The story of the healing of the blind man by the pool of Siloam did make it into the New Lectionary, but only after some heavy editing. Some key elements that are left out including the fact that the Jews opposed Jesus and threatened the parents of the blind man.

We read, after the miracle, that “the Jews did not believe that he had been blind and had received his sight.” When the Jews approach the parents of the blind man to ask how he was cured, they respond, “Ask him; he is of age, he will speak for himself,” and St. John tells us “His parents said this because they feared the Jews, for the Jews had already agreed that if any one should confess him to be Christ, he was to be put out of the synagogue.” Once again, St. John paints the Jews as a hostile enemy of the work of Christ, using the phrase “because they feared the Jews.” We saw this same thing in chapter 7.

The New Lectionary leaves out the end of the story as well, which runs as follows: “Some of the Pharisees near him heard this, and they said to him, ‘Are we also blind?’ Jesus said to them, ‘If you were blind, you would have no guilt; but now that you say, ‘We see,’ your guilt remains.’”

10:19-26 & 10:31-42

Many of the teachings of Jesus contained in John 10 were left alone, but only those teachings that are pleasant to the ears: “I am the door; if any one enters by me, he will be saved, and will go in and out and find pasture,” “I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep,” “I have other sheep, that are not of this fold; I must bring them also, and they will heed my voice. So there shall be one flock, one shepherd,” “My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give them eternal life, and they shall never perish, and no one shall snatch them out of my hand.” Just the kind of peace, love, and unity that you’d expect to hear in the NOM.

What do not hear are words like these: “The Jews took up stones again to stone him,” and “Many of them said, ‘He has a demon, and he is mad; why listen to him?’” Of course, the most obvious teaching that we do not hear, in the midst of all this talk of the Good Shepherd and the united sheepfold, is this saying of Our Lord, spoken to the Jews: “you do not believe, because you do not belong to my sheep.”

11:8-16, 11:28-32 & 11:33-57

We come, finally, to perhaps one of the most dastardly examples of modernistic editing in the New Lectionary. The eleventh chapter of St. John’s Gospel has 57 verses in it – only 18 of them are in the New Lectionary. The story contained in this chapter is, of course, the raising of Lazarus from the dead.

We follow the story in the Lectionary to the point where Jesus hears from Lazarus’ sisters, “Lord, he whom you love is ill,” to which Our Lord responds, “This illness is not unto death; it is for the glory of God.” The New Lectionary tells us that Jesus then proposed to go into Judea, and then we are met with nine verses which are optional.

In these nine verses, we read such words as, “Rabbi, the Jews were but now seeking to stone you, and are you going there again?” We also read, “Thus he spoke, and then he said to them, ‘Our friend Lazarus has fallen asleep, but I go to awake him out of sleep.’ The disciples said to him, ‘Lord, if he has fallen asleep, he will recover.’ Now Jesus had spoken of his death, but they thought that he meant taking rest in sleep. Then Jesus told them plainly, ‘Lazarus is dead.’”

Is it not odd that the Lectionary should remove the verses that inform us, clearly and precisely, that Lazarus was dead?

The story in the Lectionary does, admittedly, hint at the fact that Lazarus was dead, but with these above verses removed, the matter is open for debate. We read in the Lectionary, “Now when Jesus came, he found that Lazarus had already been in the tomb four days ... Martha said to Jesus, ‘Lord, if you had been here, my brother would not have died’ ... Jesus said to her, ‘Your brother will rise again.’ Martha said to him, ‘I know that he will rise again in the resurrection at the last day.’”

What are we to make of this? Lazarus was in the tomb, so we should suspect he was dead. However, maybe he was just comatose and mistaken for dead – after all, the last thing we heard from Jesus (according to the Lectionary) was that “this illness is *not unto death*.” Still, the text of the Lectionary has Martha saying “my brother would not have *died*.” Perhaps he is dead after all.

The odd thing is this: the Lectionary’s version of the story ends with the words, “Martha said to him, ‘I know that he will rise again in the resurrection at the last day.’ Jesus said to her, ‘I am the resurrection and the life; he who believes in me, though he die, yet shall he live, and whoever lives and believes in me shall never die. Do you believe this?’ She

said to him, ‘Yes, Lord; I believe that you are the Christ, the Son of God, he who is coming into the world.’”

That’s it. The rest of the reading is optional. So we’re left with Lazarus in the tomb, maybe dead, maybe just comatose, with Jesus proclaiming that He is the resurrection and the life.

Does it not strike you as strange that the Lectionary should, in recounting the story of the raising of Lazarus, leave out the part of the text that *actually tells us that Jesus raised Lazarus from the dead?*

Well, the revolutionaries had no choice. The rest of the text says things like, “Martha, the sister of the dead man, said to him, ‘Lord, by this time there will be an odor, for he has been dead four days.’” Here is a major affirmation that Lazarus was dead indeed!

The text goes on to tell us that Our Lord “cried with a loud voice, ‘Lazarus, come out.’ The dead man came out, his hands and feet bound with bandages, and his face wrapped with a cloth.” Note: the “dead man” came out.

The story ends in a manner utterly unfitting for the NOM mindset: “So from that day on [the Jews] took counsel how to put him to death.”

12:1-11

The account of Mary anointing the feet of Our Lord has been excised from the Lectionary, it seems, for a few reasons. The first is that it affirms again what the previous chapter affirmed about Lazarus: “Jesus came to Bethany, where Lazarus was, whom Jesus had raised from the dead.”

Then we read of Judas’ response to this anointing: “Judas Iscariot, one of his disciples (he who was to betray him), said, ‘Why was this ointment not sold for three hundred denarii and given to the poor?’ This he said, not that he cared for the poor but because he was a thief, and as he had the money box he used to take what was put into it.” More damnation for Judas, it seems, for not only was he a betrayer, but also a thief.

Finally, the text ends by affirming the miracle of Lazarus again, and also condemning the Jews: “When the great crowd of the Jews learned that he was there, they came, not only on account of Jesus but also to see Lazarus, whom he had raised from the dead. So the chief priests planned to put Lazarus also to death, because on account of him many of the Jews were going away and believing in Jesus.”

12:17-19

I had wondered at first if I might not have been reading too much into the fact that Lazarus’ resurrection seems to have been stricken from the record. As we examine this next set of verses, however, it seems that my initial instincts are justified: “The crowd

that had been with him when he called Lazarus out of the tomb and raised him from the dead bore witness. The reason why the crowd went to meet him was that they heard he had done this sign. The Pharisees then said to one another, ‘You see that you can do nothing; look, the world has gone after him.’”

What was so offensive in these verses? True, the Pharisees are painted in a somewhat less-than-flattering light. If this is the reason, however, why not just excise that one verses? Notice that the other verses once again speak of “Lazarus” who had been called “out of the tomb” and that Jesus had “raised him from the dead.”

Incomprehensible as it may seem, it certainly does appear that the revolutionaries were intent on purging the Lectionary of the miracle of Lazarus!

12:34-50

At first glance, it seems strange that this passage should be removed. After all, it is one of the rare occasions that St. John gives us a decent portrayal of the Jews: “many even of the authorities believed in him.” Ah, but what follows this immediately? “[B]ut for fear of the Pharisees they did not confess it, lest they should be put out of the synagogue: for they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God.”

Jesus tells them, “Walk while you have the light, lest the darkness overtake you; he who walks in the darkness does not know where he goes.” The possibility of people walking in darkness, truly not knowing where they are going, does not fit well with the new ecumenical orientations. These suggest that even those who are not “in the light” are still on their way, albeit unwittingly, towards God.

13:16-30

The reason for excising these verses becomes quite clear immediately: “When Jesus had thus spoken, he was troubled in spirit, and testified, ‘Truly, truly, I say to you, one of you will betray me.’ ... Simon Peter ... said, ‘Tell us who it is of whom he speaks.’ ... Jesus answered, ‘It is he to whom I shall give this morsel when I have dipped it.’ So when he had dipped the morsel, he gave it to Judas, the son of Simon Iscariot.”

As if this weren’t bad enough, St. John goes on to remove all doubt as to Judas’ state of being: “Then after the morsel, Satan entered into him.” Of course, if we knew this bit of information, we might not be so inclined to believe that Judas, now possessed by Satan himself, ended up in heaven.

15:18-25

This very short set of verses contains Our Lord’s condemnation of the world in general, again putting the lie to any sort of false optimism about Modern Man: “If the world hates you, know that it has hated me before it hated you. If you were of the world, the world would love its own; but because you are not of the world ... therefore the world hates you

... If they persecuted me, they will persecute you ... all this they will do to you on my account, because they do not know him who sent me. If I had not come and spoken to them, they would not have sin; but now they have no excuse for their sin. He who hates me hates my Father also. If I had not done among them the works which no one else did, they would not have sin; but now they have seen and hated both me and my Father.”

Gaudium et Spes, anyone?

16:1-11

This passage contains very similar teachings to the ones seen above: “They will put you out of the synagogues ... they will do this because they have not known the Father, nor me. ... And when [the Holy Ghost] comes, he will convince the world concerning sin and righteousness and judgment: concerning sin, because they do not believe in me; concerning righteousness, because I go to the Father, and you will see me no more; concerning judgment, because the ruler of this world is judged.”

Conclusion

This concludes our very brief examination of how the revolutionaries carefully sanitized the New Lectionary to exclude many of the teachings and “hard sayings” that were deemed a little too Catholic.

There were many other passages that were excised which I did not examine in this short study. I chose to ignore many of them, lest I be perceived as “nit-picking.” I understand that some passages may have been left out simply for the sake of brevity, which is quite reasonable. Not even our beloved traditional lectionary necessarily contains *all* of the passages of Holy Scripture.

The examples I chose in this study were only the ones that I felt were the most blatant examples of a deliberate de-Catholicizing – or rather, over-Modernizing – of the Gospel texts. One or two such examples would have sufficed to raise our eyebrows; but, as mentioned before, when you have dozens of examples, and they all appear to be eliminating the same type of information, you have good reason to suspect that a discernible pattern is not coincidental.

Patterns are very deliberate things. They don’t happen by accident. Thus, I submit to you that the patterns we have seen here, in what sorts of texts were expunged from the Gospel readings, were very much deliberate and planned.

This gives us a slightly different picture of the New Lectionary than the one that has been presented to us by the promoters of the revolution. They have said time and again that the new three-year cycle served to put *more* Scripture before the eyes of the faithful. The reality, however, is that *less* Scripture – qualitatively speaking – has been preserved.

Finally, I also realize that many of the “missing texts” that we have looked at may (and do) appear in some cases (but not all) in the Lectionary for the weekday Masses. This is quite beside the point, however. The majority of Catholics attends the Sunday liturgy, and never gets to hear what is read during the week. The architects of the New Lectionary certainly knew this, and that is why I believe the most drastic changes were made to the Sunday readings.

I have not even begun to touch upon the readings that *are* included, but are presented under the cloak of bastardized vernacular translations which only further obscure Catholic doctrine. There are only so many hours in a day!

In conclusion, I wish to commend this work to the intercession of Our Lady of Fatima in the hopes that it will, in some small way at least, play a role in the restoration of the Traditional Mass and the traditional Catholic culture. Once again, I dedicate this work to St. Jerome, doctor of Holy Scripture and faithful guardian of the written word.

Our Lady of Fatima, pray for us. St. Jerome, pray for us.