

# The Sodality of St. Edmund, King and Martyr

A community of

The Personal Ordinariate of the Chair of St. Peter

[www.StEdmund.ca](http://www.StEdmund.ca)



# UPDATE

December 21, 2013 - **St. Peter Canisius, Priest and Doctor**

## *JANUARY SCHEDULE*

January 5	Sunday	The Epiphany of the Lord
January 12	Sunday	The First Sunday after the Epiphany - Baptism of the Lord
January 19	Sunday	The Second Sunday after the Epiphany
January 26	Sunday	The Third Sunday after the Epiphany

## *SERVICE TIMES AND LOCATION*

- (1) On Sundays, **The Holy Sacrifice of the Mass (Ordinariate Use)** is offered at 8:00 a.m.
- (2) Masses are at The Altar of Our Lady in **St. Patrick's Church**, 53 Wellington Street, Cambridge, Ontario

## INDEX (AND SOMETIMES, NOTES AND COMMENTS)

- 1) **THE ORDINARIATE LITURGY** - this page. ***be as beautiful as we can make it'*** - page 5.
- 2) **ROBERT'S RAMBLINGS - HOLY MATRIMONY - 3 of 3** - page 3. 4) **CHRIST'S CHURCH** - page 6.
- 3) **CELEBRATING THE SPIRIT OF THE LITURGY - 5 of 6** - '*everything in the sacred liturgy must*' 5) **SECULAR FEMINISM** - page 7.
- 6) **FROM HERE AND THERE** - page 9.

## THE ORDINARIATE LITURGY

***is even more splendid in action than it seemed on the page;  
the Church has absorbed elements of the Anglican patrimony I hadn't anticipated***

One or two people have asked me how it went: the Oxford ordinariate's first celebration of the newly authorised ordinariate liturgy in the Church of Our Lady of the Assumption and St Gregory, in October.

Well, it was wonderful. The prayers translated by Cranmer from the Sarum liturgy, and even two long prayers actually composed by him, together with important elements of the old Anglo-Catholic English Missal (a Cranmerised version of the Tridentine Mass), all celebrated with great care and devotion, and beautifully sung by a small but expert choir (not a voice in it below professional standards), together with the choice of plainchant settings for introit, gradual and alleluias, and the actual Mass setting itself, was at times breathtakingly beautiful. And it wasn't just a "sacred concert", as I have heard High Masses elsewhere described: it was all wonderfully conducive to prayer; truly all celebrated to the glory of God.

It wasn't all in English: the ordinary of the Mass was sung in Latin, but there's nothing un-Anglican about that: go to most Anglican cathedrals with a good choir, and you will see that this is common: quite simply, if you've got good singers, you want good settings, and they're nearly all in Latin. And this particular setting can certainly be described as part of the "Anglican patrimony" the ordinariate is bringing into the Catholic Church; it was by Parry, an Anglican composer par excellence, from whom it was commissioned for use in Westminster Cathedral.

I had never once felt, since my conversion, that I missed Anglicanism: the Church of England had become so awful, so impossible for anyone tending in a Catholic direction, that I was far more

conscious, when I made my submission nearly 25 years ago, of how wonderful it was to be a Catholic. But I had forgotten, after my youthful atheism, how wonderful I thought so much of Anglicanism was, after the dry, dry desert of actual unbelief. One thing I loved was the setting of the Ordinary of the Eucharist (as I always called it before I discovered the excitements of Anglo-Catholicism) by the composer John Merbecke. This was Cranmer's translation set to a kind of reformed plainchant (one note to a syllable), which though deriving from Gregorian chant eschewed its (I think wonderful) peripatetic longeurs. On Advent Sunday, I sang the creed to Merbecke for the first time in nearly 30 years: it all came back as though it was yesterday, and it was wonderfully moving. Another unexpectedly wonderful bonus I hadn't anticipated was the entire absence of the suppressed irritation I so often feel at the debased English of the readings in the Roman Missal from the Jerusalem Bible: the readings, of course, were from the Authorised version, the King James Bible, now authorised afresh for liturgical use by our dear Pope Benedict.

I could go on about how splendid it all was. It was not just a voyage of rediscovery, however: it was also a realisation anew of how lifegiving a thing it is to belong to a Church which determines and teaches with authority what theological meaning actually is. Cranmer's freshly composed prayers (as opposed to his translations from the Sarum rite, as with the Ordinary of the Mass and many of his collects) are sometimes written in deliberately ambiguous language, so as to be acceptable to a distinctly, even dangerously, various public, some members of it - then as now - radically Protestant but many of them still resentfully Catholic at heart. Again and again, you come across phrases which

can be read in either a Catholic or a Protestant way. The authorisation of the use of such prayers by the Congregation for Divine Worship, quite simply removes the ambiguities. Take the following, which we all said on Advent Sunday, a splendidly oratorical postcommunion prayer by Cranmer, said together by the whole congregation:

*ALMIGHTY and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee, for that thou hast vouchsafed to feed us, which have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy son our saviour Jesus Christ, and hast assured us thereby of thy favour and goodness towards us, and that we be very members incorporate in thy mystical body, which is the blessed company of all faithful people, and heirs, through hope, of thy everlasting kingdom, by the merits of the most precious death and Passion of thy dear son. We now most humbly beseech thee, O heavenly father, so to assist us with thy grace, that we may continue in that holy fellowship, and do all such good works, as thou hast prepared for us to walk in: through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom, with thee and the Holy Ghost, be all honour and glory, world without end. Amen.*

Now, there can be little doubt that when he wrote this, Cranmer had come to believe, under Zwinglian influence, that the central phrase in the Eucharistic prayer, "This is my body", was to be understood in a merely symbolic way, that transubstantiation (which under Henry VIII he had stoutly defended) was now to be understood as "a blasphemous deceit", and that Christ's spiritual presence in the sacrament was dependent on the faith of those receiving it. So when, in the postcommunion prayer I have just quoted, he gives thanks for "the spiritual food of the

most precious body and blood of thy son our saviour Jesus Christ", by the word "spiritual" he doesn't mean that His Eucharistic presence is real and objective. But he wanted those who still hankered after the faith in which they were brought up to be able to suppose that the prayer actually bore a Catholic meaning. It's all very slippery. The fact is, however, that it *can* indeed bear such a meaning: and the CDW has now implicitly defined that when used in the context of this authorised Catholic liturgy, it *does* bear it.

A word about the authority of that definition. As Newman unforgettably says in the *Apologia*: "People say that the doctrine of transubstantiation is difficult to believe; I did not believe the doctrine till I was a Catholic. I had no difficulty in believing it, as soon as I believed that the Catholic Roman Church was the oracle of God, and that she had declared this doctrine to be part of the original revelation. It is difficult, impossible, to imagine, I grant; but how is it difficult to believe? . . . for myself, I cannot indeed prove it, I cannot tell how it is; but I say, "Why should it not be? What's to hinder it? What do I know of substance or matter? just as much as the greatest philosophers, and that is nothing at all . . ."

We Anglo-Catholics, of course, managed to continue using many though not all of Cranmer's prayers by reading into them, as he had deviously intended us to be able to, a Catholic meaning. But we had no *right* to do anything of the sort. Now, however, since the Catholic Roman Church, the "oracle of God", has permitted it, we do have the right and indeed the obligation to do so.

By **William Oddie** - December 6, 2013 in *The Catholic Herald*

## ROBERT'S RAMBLINGS

### HOLY MATRIMONY - 3 of 3

In the relationship of grace with nature also is there a hermeneutic of continuity.\* Grace does not despise or obliterate nature, grace uses and sanctifies nature for eternal ends. The human person reborn in baptism is the same person who was born of his parents. St Paul the Christian is the same human person as Saul the Jew. The transubstantiated species of the eucharist have still their accidental properties. The Bread can still crumb, the Wine can still dry out. Our Lord's risen and ascended Body within the Trinity was born of Mary.

There is the same sacramental continuity with marriage. Matrimony was not first given at the incarnation or after Pentecost. It does not begin with Christ but goes all the way back to creation before there were Jews or Christians. The English Prayer Book of 1662 speaks of "the time of man's innocency". Yet grace makes of the marriage relationship and of the marriage act a sacrament which teaches us about Christ and the church, and which trains us up for heaven. "The marriage of the Lamb is come" (*Revelation* 19,7).

However, in the operation of grace there is occasional need for a hermeneutic of rupture. "The Lord said to Abram, Go from your country and your kindred and your fathers house to the land which I will show you" (*Genesis* 12,1). The human person being baptized must renounce the world, the flesh and the devil. The human person being married must forsake all other and keep only to the one. The Jew and the Christian can have no truck with other deities. "You shall have no other gods before Me . . . for I the Lord your God am a jealous God" (*Exodus* 20,3 - 5). "Choose this day whom you will serve" (*Joshua* 24,15). "Little children, keep yourselves from idols" (*1 John* 5,20).

I have no experience of matrilineal society such as can be found in Malawi, still less of polyandrous society such as can be found in Tibet. There may be economic and social reasons for such practices found in their respective societies, and which go back a long way. To their own adherents they feel reasonable. However, I do have slight acquaintance with polygamous society such as can be found in many parts of Africa.

In rural, agrarian nomadic society exposed to tropical diseases and to danger from wild animals and hostile tribes, there is safety in numbers. Life is short and brutal. Many women to do all the domestic and agricultural work benefit all. The Alpha male and the yet unmarried junior males are responsible for herding and defence. Such a grouping is a functioning co operative. The senior wife tired of relentless child bearing and work in the fields, is likely to advise the husband, "Don't you think it's time for you to take another wife?" The more junior wives she has under her the greater is her status, and the less labour has she to do. (In the early 19th century the Zulus and the Matabele changed the basic unit of society from being a large family to being a regiment. Every male was a soldier. Only the king decided when a regiment would marry. But then these two peoples lived by preying on their neighbours.)

When the Christian mission first met with traditional African religion and society there was much misunderstanding and rejection. Only one wife? Certainly not. In the case of the Zulus, stop killing and enslaving neighbours? Certainly not. Missionaries were clear that a hermeneutic of rupture was called for. The tribesmen had no intention of abandoning a whole way of life just because of white novelties. And Africans were and still are a "we people" rather than a "me people". Individuals did not make individual decisions which separated them from every other human person. Here was not only a clash of faiths but also a clash

of civilizations, and it was hard for everybody to distinguish between what was of the faith and what was of Western civilization. The Xhosa people of South Africa were among the first to succumb to the foreign invasion, but only because their own tribal cohesion had crumbled for other reasons. In the resultant misunderstanding in the late 19th century a Xhosa woman who wore a long Victorian dress and a hat was described as a Christian, whereas one who wore a blanket, beads and much face paint was described as a heathen. Superficial judgement indeed!

Polygamy was legal in Zimbabwe until Mugabe abolished it in the 1980's. What mostly caused its demise was urbanization, industrialization, the desire for Western possessions. Women who wanted to live in brick houses in town with hot and cold running water and pursue careers as nurses, teachers, lawyers, were clear that they would not be one wife among many. Such women owed their education to Christian missionaries. But under pre Mugabe colonial law a black man in Zimbabwe could as an individual choose whether he wanted a Christian marriage, ie monogamy, or whether he wanted traditional tribal marriage, ie the possibility of polygamy. (I do not know when polygamy legally ended in South Africa, nor do I know when it ended among the Jews. We still find it as late as Solomon.)

For two years I was chaplain of a residential high school in Zimbabwe run by the Community of the Resurrection. Its children were quite properly critical of grievous errors made by pioneering missionaries, and were still defensive about former polygamous practice. I asked them to imagine themselves as Christian missionaries to Tibet. Could they cope with butter in their tea? Certainly not, that was disgusting. But what if they gave the Tibetans the false impression that there was Christian tea as distinct from Buddhist tea? As for polyandry, one wife with several husbands, the very notion was unthinkable. They'd put a stop to it at once. But might that not lead to a break up of a whole society, culture and way of life?

One of my senior priests in Matabeleland was the grandson of the high shaman in that once tribal kingdom. He too was critical of missionaries. I arranged for him to spend three months as a missionary among the Dyaks of Borneo. He was appalled by their ancestral cannibalism, by their long houses, by their diet which he refused to eat. Later I heard back from the Anglican diocese of Borneo that this priest had difficulty in distinguishing between faith and Western civilization, and that he was more imperious than any of the early English

missionaries had been.

In Africa there is complete agreement among the Christian denominations about marriage. We know, because our Lord has revealed it to us, that Christians must be monogamous (*Matthew* 19,5. *Mark* 10,7 - 8. *Ephesians* 5,31). A baptized Christian may only have one wife. Africans are quick to retaliate by pointing out that Westerners practise serial polygamy by way of divorce! A traditional man cares for all his wives even if he only has sex with the youngest and prettiest. The denominations are agreed that a polygamist, an Alpha male seeking baptism, is still responsible for providing for all his wives, and living with them and their respective children in their commune, even though he only shares his bed with one of them. The denominations are agreed that the wife of a polygamist may be baptized.

The revelation which Christ brought has also brought a hermeneutic of rupture to many societies: gladiatorial combat eventually disappeared from the Roman empire, slavery eventually disappeared from the British empire, brutal working conditions

eventually disappeared from Victorian Britain. Hindu men might not burn widows on funeral pyres. Shona families might not kill one of new born twins. East Africans must not practise female "circumcision". But there is need for more rupture. The abortion industry flourishes even in flat economies. Divorce lawyers do well. Governments arrogate to themselves the right to reinvent marriage. All must, "Cease to do evil, learn to do good" (*Isaiah* 1,16). Repent is a common Jewish and Christian word.

To sum up: *Ecclesiastes* might express the situation thus, There is a time for inclusivity and a time for exclusivity (c/f 3,1 ff).

### **Monsignor Robert Mercer CR**

\* hermeneutic = way of interpreting

hermeneutic of continuity = a phrase coined by Pope Benedict XVI; there is consistency in God's attitude towards and in his dealing with mankind, though man himself must repent and change

## **CELEBRATING THE SPIRIT OF THE LITURGY – 5 of 6**

*Address by*

*His Excellency Archbishop Alexander King Sample  
Archbishop, Portland, Oregon*

*Delivered at the Church Music Association of America colloquium  
Salt Lake City, Utah  
June 19, 2013*

***It is my contention, and that of many others, that the renewal and reform of the sacred liturgy is absolutely key and essential to the work of the new evangelization.***

Okay, that is a lot of theology of the sacred liturgy. Perhaps it is quite a bit for us to absorb. In fact, we can never exhaust the depths of this mystery celebrated in the sacred liturgy. But what does that have to do with our purpose for gathering here and the promotion of sacred music for the liturgy?

I return to my central point. Once we understand and appreciate on a very profound level the inner meaning of the holy sacrifice of the Mass; once we understand what the sacred liturgy accomplishes; once we understand what we are doing (what Christ is doing) in the sacred liturgy, only then will we be able to properly celebrate and express that meaning and purpose of the liturgy itself.

So everything we do in the celebration of the Mass must draw out and reflect the essential meaning and purpose of the sacred liturgy itself. Everything in

the liturgy which touches us on the level of the senses must express the inner meaning of the holy mysteries we celebrate. Everything we see, hear, and even smell should draw us deeper into the profound mystery of God's love and mercy shown to us in his Son, Jesus Christ.

That is why everything in the sacred liturgy must be as beautiful as we can make it, drawing upon the gifts of the people of God, especially artists in the area of the sacred arts including, of course, sacred music. The architecture of the church building, the visual art and iconography adorning the temple, the decoration of the sanctuary, the vestments worn by the sacred ministers, the sacred vessels and other things used in the sacred liturgy, and the music which accompanies the liturgical action must all be beautiful, reflecting the infinite beauty and goodness of God, to whom our divine worship is directed.

But all of these things must not become ends in themselves - beauty for the sake of beauty - but must be seen as means to an end, drawing us in and making us profoundly aware of the awesome mystery we are celebrating. They must express and show forth the meaning of the Mass itself, for the glory of God and the sanctification of the faithful.

I apologize if I seem to be belaboring this point, but I believe it is critically important that we get this right in the Church. I believe not understanding this point has gotten us into the trouble we are in, resulting in less than worthy liturgies in far too many instances.

If we do not get this part of the discussion correct, we will continue to see the imposition of other meanings, purposes and "styles" on the sacred liturgy. We will continue to have the Polka Mass, the Folk Mass, the Rock Mass, the Contemporary Mass, the Traditional Mass, etc. . . .

Doing what the Church asks us to do in the celebration of the sacred liturgy, what some would surely call more traditional, cannot be seen as simply imposing another "style" on the sacred liturgy, i.e. one style in a list such as I have just given. Doing what the Church asks of us is meant

to draw out and express what the Mass is in and of itself.

Applying this to the area of sacred music, we see that the music that is used in the celebration of the sacred liturgy must also contribute to the fuller expression of the mystery being celebrated. This is especially true in the singing of the Mass texts themselves, especially the antiphons, whether in English or in Latin. It has been pointed out that, just as the Church gives us the selections from sacred scripture for a particular Sunday, weekday or feast, and just as she gives us other common and proper texts, such as the ordinary of the Mass and the prayers and preface, so too she gives us the texts for the antiphons, which harmonize and further express the particular celebration.

As I said in my recent pastoral letter on sacred music, only repeating what has been said by so many of you in the past, we must "sing the Mass," not "sing songs at Mass." This is at the heart of what must be recovered as it concerns music for the sacred liturgy. This is what will help draw out and express the inner meaning of the sacred liturgy as we have been discussing.

## CHRIST'S CHURCH:

### ***the Four Marks of the One True Church of Jesus Christ***

When we profess our belief in the Church Christ established, we proclaim that it is one, holy, catholic, and apostolic. These four marks must necessarily be present in the religion founded by the God-man. They distinguish false religions from the true one, and, once found in a particular religion, they guarantee the integrity of the doctrines it teaches.

The first mark of Christ's Church is that it must be "one." Many today consider themselves to be broadminded when they study various religions and then make a personal decision as to what to believe. Others, however, simply accept - and live according to - the latest creed of the current population. Both of these not only lack a firm foundation upon objective truth, but they are easily influenced by the transitory opinions of the mass media, political agendas, and new "religions."

But the faith upon which Christ established His Church must - of necessity - have the characteristic of an unending truth enduring throughout the centuries. Christ established His religion upon His own immutability; therefore, its teachings reflect His permanency. When falsity and sin are rampant,

Christ's Church serves as a beacon of light drawing scattered mankind home to unchanging and recognizable truth.

It was to be expected that some men would be bold enough to oppose the teachings of Christ when He walked the earth, but He showed by His example that His teachings would not be influenced by the transitory standards of such men. Similarly, the transient standards of society in the twenty-first century cannot be a reason to call into question the teachings of God. The truth taught two thousand years ago must also be true today.

For instance, consider how, less than a hundred years ago, nearly all the major religions taught that contraception was intrinsically wrong. Now the Catholic Church is virtually alone in upholding that doctrine, while others have changed their teachings in order to acquiesce to modern social thought or to cushion consciences which prefer an easier religion to practice.

True ecumenism, then, strives to build upon the sacred edifice which has Christ as the cornerstone.

It does not have a nonchalant attitude towards the proliferation of creeds nor does it ignore certain biblical passages to achieve a common agreement. Similarly, it does not water down the doctrine of Christ; rather, it confidently presents the teachings of Christ in an effort to gather the nations into the one flock.

The oneness of the faith of Christ is further rooted in the unity of God. Christ likens Himself to the good shepherd who watches over his flock. There is only one shepherd, and there is only one flock. Other sheep may be wandering outside the flock who can join the one flock when they attend to the shepherd's voice. But as Christ shows in the Gospel of St. John (6:67), He will not water down His teachings in order to keep attendance at a high number in His Church.

In His parables, Christ likens the Church to various things: a kingdom, a city, a field, and a vineyard. In every instance, it is a singular thing, not plural kingdoms, cities, fields, or vineyards. Furthermore, the Church is likened to the spouse of Christ (Eph. 5:24-29), but a husband is permitted only one wife. Thus, the Church founded by Christ is one and only one at any given time.

Christ instructed the Apostles to teach "all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Mt. 28:20). He did not give them permission to change His teachings. Even if the majority of people believed otherwise, or if the truths seemed difficult to believe to the possible converts, the Apostles were to "stand fast in the faith" (I Cor. 16:13) as there is only "one faith" (Eph. 4:5).

Knowing that the truth was in danger of being adulterated, St. Paul also warned of those who "would pervert the Gospel of Christ" (Gal. 1:7-8) for "if any one preach to you a gospel besides that which you have received, let him be anathema" (Gal. 1:9). And for those who attempt to pervert the truth, to "mark them who make dissensions and

offences contrary to the doctrine which you have learned, and avoid them" (Rom. 16:17).

Christ, too, warned that "there will rise up false christs and false prophets, and they shall show signs and wonders, to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect" (Mark 13:22), and these would be known by their refusal to submit to the Church. "If he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican" (Mt. 18:17). For Christ is the same today, yesterday, and forever (Heb. 13:8), and the faithful must be cautious to "be not led away with various and strange doctrines" (Heb. 13:9) for "no other foundation can a man lay, but that which is laid" (I Cor. 3:11).

The abomination of heresy and schism is rooted in the willing withdrawal from unity. But the person who has so withdrawn himself must not be allowed to pretend that he is still "unified." Hence, unity among the flock of Christ sometimes requires the severing of "dead" members so they do not sap energy from the body of the Church. Furthermore, the oneness of the Church is proclaimed every time it exposes such error or falsity.

Since the Church is one (has a unity) in its principle - God; one in its invisible head - Christ; one in its informing Spirit - the Holy Ghost; one in its aim - Heaven; and one in its communion among members; the unity cannot be broken. Thus, the essence of the Church, being founded upon the rock - Christ, must necessarily have unity.

Unity, then, is an external mark whereby the world can distinguish the false prophets and teachers from the Teacher of truth. This oneness of the Church will persist until the end of time, for even the gates of hell cannot overcome it by instigating division or a multiplicity of religions.

By **Father Eric Flood, FSSP** - from the December 2011 *Fraternity Newsletter*

## JOHN PAUL II'S DEFINITIVE ANSWER TO SECULAR FEMINISM

St. Paul wrote in his Letter to the Galatians (4:4): "When the time had fully come, God sent forth his son, born of woman"; "Only by the power of the Holy Spirit," added Pope John Paul II in the apostolic letter *Mulieris dignitatem*, (one of his very greatest teaching documents, the twenty-fifth anniversary of which Pope Francis marked on Saturday, October 12) . . . was Mary able to accept what is "impossible with men, but not with God." Thus the "fullness of

time" manifests the extraordinary dignity of the "woman."

Mary, he wrote, "is the representative and the archetype of the whole human race: she represents the humanity which belongs to all human beings, both men and women . . . the event at Nazareth highlights a form of union with the living God which can only belong to the "woman," Mary: the union

between mother and son. The Virgin of Nazareth truly becomes the Mother of God." (*Mulieris dignitatem* §§ 3 - 4)

Reading that again reminded me that when, a long time ago, I published my book on feminist theology - *What Will Happen to God?* - I chose as its official publication date the Solemnity of Mary, Mother of God. Thus, I shall be marking the thirtieth anniversary of my book on New Year's day, 2014. So I hope my readers will forgive me if, for two reasons, I remember that book here before returning finally to *Mulieris dignitatem*: firstly because in it I attempted an examination of questions on which Pope John Paul was to speak with such definitive authority a year or two later.

Secondly, because my book (which turned out to be at the time, so Fr. Fessio told me later, the only one by an Anglican ever published by *Ignatius Press*) was also of all my books the one which had the most effect on the course of my own life: in the short term, it led over the next year or so to speaking engagements in which I spoke in many cities in more than half the states of the American Union, from Boston, New York, Washington and Detroit in the East to Los Angeles and San Francisco in the West, from Houston on the Bay of Mexico to Anchorage, Alaska in the far, far North. More importantly for me, the process of writing the book led me in the end to one of the most important days of my life - the day on which I was received into the Catholic Church.

Finding out about feminist theology - a theology which was and still is intended, as one of its most famous book titles, Mary Daly's *Beyond God the Father*, indicates, to change the message of Christianity itself - was for me at the time all part of an Anglican struggle, of the great battle between those like we Anglo-Catholics who wanted to prevent, and those who wanted to bring about, the ordination of women to that Church's "priesthood" (I put the word in quotes because one of the things I discovered was that the Anglican and Catholic understandings of its meaning are simply not the same, though I had always assumed they were). My book led me to ask questions to which, I found, only the Catholic Church had the answers.

C. S. Lewis had already asked part of the book's fundamental question, in an essay entitled "*Priestesses in the Church*" explaining why the Church of England would never ordain women (he was right about many things, but not about that). "Suppose," he asked, "the reformer . . . begins saying that we might just as well pray to 'Our Mother which art in heaven' as to 'Our Father.'"

Suppose he suggests that the Incarnation might just as well have taken a female as a male form, and the second person of the Trinity be as well called the Daughter as the Son. . . . Now it is surely the case that if all these supposals were ever carried into effect we should be embarked on a different religion. Goddesses have, of course, been worshipped; many religions have had priestesses. But they are religions quite different in character from Christianity."

But why? That is one fundamental question I asked, which so far as I could see had never really been asked before. Why, for Christians, was God "Father" RATHER THAN "Mother"? It was clear to me that this was no mere metaphor as in "God is LIKE a Father." "Father" was Jesus' NAME for God: only once (in the words of dereliction from the cross - a quotation, of course) is he ever recorded as calling him anything else (he uses it in the gospels over 170 times: it only occurs 11 times in the whole of the Old Testament). If I may quote from myself, "we can almost go so far as to say that if we only understand the Fatherhood of God metaphorically, our understanding is less than a fully Christian one: the new element, of course, is Jesus' own use of the term. For at no point does Jesus imply that God is merely *like* a father to him: his message is that in very truth *God actually is his father.*" He is begotten not made. And He becomes Son rather than daughter, briefly, because the relationship of father and son was seen as fundamentally different from that of father and daughter: the son could represent and continue the identity of the father in a way no daughter could.

The essential thing to note is that from the very earliest days of the Church, despite what the feminists say, calling God "Father" was understood to include women as his children in the same way that it included men: the word "Father" was, to employ a loaded word, literally "inclusive." *Mulieris dignitatem* (with which I end) goes out of its way, both to emphasize the representative nature of sacraments mediated by a uniquely male priesthood (representative precisely because God was Son and not daughter), and to insist at the same time on the role of the greatest of all women as the archetypal representative of the whole of the human race. (It's worth interjecting here that religions based on the worship of Goddesses are all reflected by a much lower social status for women than Christianity, and particularly than Catholicism; that's in my book too). Here's Pope John Paul:

§2 Since "the Church is in Christ as a sacrament . . . of intimate union with God and of the unity of the whole human race," the



special presence of the Mother of God in the mystery of the Church makes us think of the exceptional link between this "woman" and the whole human family. It is a question here of every man and woman, all the sons and daughters of the human race, in whom from generation to generation a fundamental inheritance is realized, the inheritance that belongs to all humanity and that is linked with the mystery of the biblical "beginning": "God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them" (Gen 1: 27).

§26 In calling only men as his Apostles, Christ acted in a completely free and sovereign manner. In doing so, he exercised the same freedom with which, in all his behavior, he emphasized the dignity and the vocation of women, without conforming to the prevailing customs and to the traditions sanctioned by the legislation of the time. . . . Here one also finds an explanation for the calling of the "Twelve." They are with Christ at the Last Supper. They alone receive the sacramental charge, "Do this in remembrance of me" (Lk 22:19; 1 Cor 11:24), which is joined to the institution of the Eucharist. On Easter Sunday night they receive the Holy Spirit for

the forgiveness of sins: "Whose sins you forgive are forgiven them, and whose sins you retain are retained" (Jn 20:23).

§4 The particular union of the "Theotókos" with God - which fulfills in the most eminent manner the supernatural predestination to union with the Father which is granted to every human being (*filii in Filio* [sons in the Son]) is a pure grace and, as such, a gift of the Spirit. . . . With her "fiat," Mary becomes the authentic subject of that union with God which was realized in the mystery of the Incarnation of the Word, who is of one substance with the Father.

What Pope John Paul showed in *Mulieris dignitatem* was that we have nothing to learn from the feminism of our own day; we've always had an authentic feminism at the heart of the Catholic faith. It's when you take Mary out of the equation - as first Protestantism and then modern secularism did - that the debased secular feminism of our own day inevitably arose. John Paul didn't say *that* of course. He didn't need to.

By **William Oddie** - October 16, 2013 in *The Catholic Herald*

## FROM HERE AND THERE

**1) Peter Canisius, S.J.** (Dutch: Pieter Kanis), (May 8, 1521 - December 21, 1597) was an important Jesuit Catholic priest who helped people understand the Catholic faith during the Protestant Reformation in Germany, Austria, Bohemia, Moravia, and Switzerland. Canisius became the first Dutchman to join the newly founded Society of Jesus in 1543. The restoration of the Catholic Church in Germany after the Protestant Reformation is largely attributed to the work there of the Society of Jesus, which he led.

### **2) Two nuns honored for hiding Jewish families in WWII**

Reaching out to the marginalized was and is one of the great charisms of the Bridgettine Order, as evidenced by an event at Rome's Casa di Santa Brigida on November 14, 2013, when the Los Angeles-based Simon Wiesenthal Institute gave two medals to the present abbess general of the order, Mother Tekla Famiglietti, in memory of Blessed Mother M. Elisabeth Hesselblad and Servant of God Mother M. Ricarda Beauchamp Hambrough. The

medals were in recognition of what the two sisters did for two Jewish families during World War II. Cardinal Kurt Koch, president of the *Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity*, and Dr. Piero Piperno, representing the families, were also in attendance.

During the Nazi occupation, the nuns hid 12 members of two Jewish families in their convent in Rome for many months. In addition to their profound humanity and courage, it was noted that the nuns never exerted any pressure on their Jewish guests to convert, allowing them to live their Jewish faith without any difficulty.

The ceremony presenting the two medals closed a circle of sorts which began in 2005 with the inscription of the name of Mother Hesselblad in the register of the Righteous Among the Nations and which continued this summer with a gala event in Los Angeles honoring the sisters' heroism.

"Beyond social and religious affiliations, this honorable recognition reflects awareness for the

centrality of the person, the high and inescapable value of every human being and his life as a right and duty to defend, promote, and develop," Abbess Tekla Famiglietti said as she accepted the medals on behalf of the two nuns.

Blessed Mary Elisabeth Hesselblad, a Swede who converted to Catholicism from Lutheranism, is credited with the revitalization of the Order of the Most Holy Savior of Saint Bridget in 1911. Today the order is present on three continents. In April 2000 she was beatified. During the German occupation of Italy, she was abbess of the religious community she founded at Casa di Santa Brigida in Piazza Farnese in Rome. Mother Ricarda, her assistant, was born in London and in 1914 joined the newly re-established Bridgettine Order. The Pipernos and Seds, Jewish families from Rome, wandered from one place to another to evade the Nazis, finally returning to Rome, where they found refuge in the Convent of St. Bridget.

"Our family was fortunate to find many people who had helped, but none like Blessed Mother Elizabeth and [Mother] Ricarda, who have saved our lives and restored our dignity," Piero Piperno was quoted as saying in the Italian bishops conference daily *Avvenire* in September. "For the first time since the promulgation of the racist laws in 1938, we could again feel as human beings."

By **Alberto Carosa** - December 6, 2013 in *The Catholic World Report*

**3) Truth does not change according to our ability to stomach it. Flannery O'Connor**

#### **4) A bit of wisdom:**

We are not human beings having a spiritual experience. We are spiritual beings having a human experience.

When nothing goes right . . . go left.

Always remember that your present situation is not your final destination. The best is yet to come.

Be thankful for the bad things in life. For they opened your eyes to the good things you weren't paying attention to before.

If a cluttered desk is a sign of a cluttered mind, of what, then, is an empty desk a sign? **Albert Einstein**

One of the hardest decisions you'll ever face in life is choosing whether to walk away or try harder.

You can not hang out with negative people and expect to live a positive life.

Never lose hope. You never know what tomorrow may bring.

It's better to walk alone, than with a crowd going in the wrong direction. **Diane Grant**

Thanks to **Norm Freeman**

**Gary S. Freeman**  
102 Frederick Banting Place  
WATERLOO Ontario N2T 1C4  
519-886-3635 (Home)  
519-747-5323 (Fax)  
gfreeman@pwi-insurance.ca  
800-265-2178 or 519-747-3324 (Office)