

The Sodality of St. Edmund, King and Martyr

A Catholic Community of the Anglican Use, Diocese of Hamilton

www.stedmund.ca



January 31, 2012 - **St. John Bosco**

FEBRUARY SCHEDULE

February 5	Sunday	The Fifth Sunday after Epiphany
February 12	Sunday	The Sixth Sunday after Epiphany
February 19	Sunday	The Last Sunday after Epiphany
February 26	Sunday	The First Sunday in Lent

SERVICE TIMES AND LOCATION

- (1) On Sundays, an 'Anglican Use' Mass is celebrated at 1:00 p.m
- (2) All Services are held at our own altar in St. Patrick's Church, 53 Wellington Street, Cambridge, Ontario

NOTES AND COMMENTS

- 1) Many thanks to **Mrs. Shirley Braby** for books, religious hardware, and vestments. Shirley is the widow of **Father Franklin Braby** who said Mass for us many times 'in our early years'.
- 2) Our website - www.stedmund.ca - is being worked on 'as we speak!' Our Anglican Use mass booklet is, however, already available on the site. The booklet should be read in conjunction with the Sunday leaflet – all the 'variables' are in the leaflet.
- 3) **AN EGOCENTRIC UPDATE** - excerpts from a letter from 'Bishop' Mercer about his reception into the Catholic Church - this page.
- 4) **STATEMENT BY THE FIRST ORDINARY** - of the US Ordinariate, erected on January 1, 2012 - page 3.
- 5) **TOWARDS UNITY** - the purpose of *Anglicanorum coetibus* - page 3
- 6) **ROBERT'S RAMBLINGS - Assumption: Letchworth** - page 4.
- 7) **THE GIFT OF AUTHORITY - The Pope, the Church, and the Magisterium** - page 5 - the second of seven!
- 8) **THEOLOGIANs, APOLOGISTs. WHAT NEW BISHOPS HAVE TO BE!** - page 7.
- 9) **FROM HERE AND THERE** - page 8.

AN EGOCENTRIC UPDATE

From a letter by Robert Mercer on his reception into the Catholic Church on January 7, 2012

The chrismation was calm and peaceful. St Agatha's provided the vestments, vessels, servers, organist, singers and bunfight. I asked Dr John Newbury to be my sponsor, a parishioner of St A's who with his wife joined the Ordinariate some months ago without waiting for the rest of us, but they still attend (without now communicating) and help serve our tea. The music was *missa de angelis*, with the *kyries* in Greek and the Gloria, Sanctus and Agnus in Latin. Most of the service was in Prayer Book language. The mass was the Pastoral Provision rite from the USA. We sang two well known Epiphany hymns plus "Jesu good above all other". And a hymn about Walsingham, quite unknown to me and perhaps newly written, which went to the tune of "Brightest and best of the sons of the morning". Of course only the Roman Catholics and the Ordinariate Catholics could communicate, though there were C of E and TAC folk in the congregation, of perhaps 70 in all. The congregation knelt to receive. Four clergy concelebrated with the Ordinary. One concelebrant was RC, one was a former C of E bishop (Barnes) and two were former C of E priests. I was asked to start the Nicene creed in English, in which everybody joined (said). Then I knelt down and the Ordinary dressed as a bishop made the sign of the cross on my forehead with olive oil.

So now I am Brother Robert Mercer CR until such time as I am ordained, if I am, after which I shall be Deacon Robert and then Father Robert.

Objectively, I remain in baptismal unity in Christ with all Anglicans, remain with them, "a member of Christ, a child of God, an inheritor of the kingdom of Heaven" (*Prayer Book* catechism). Subjectively, I hope bonds of affection remain (*Romans* 12,10). "The parting of friends"* was a Victorian folly. I am more indebted to the Anglican church than I can appreciate or say: faith in Jesus Christ, the gift of His Spirit, the Holy Scriptures, the three Creeds, fellowship in Christ with all the saints. The mercies of God are indeed without number. "Catholics did not make us Catholic; Oxford made us Catholic" (Newman in a letter quoted by Dessain on p 131 of "*John Henry Newman*"). [Anglo Catholics are] "beyond a doubt as to doctrine, worship and devotion, though not ecclesial communion, a displaced portion of Catholic Christendom. It is as such that I shall be appearing to some of their lay spokesmen" (Aidan Nichols OP on p 61 of "*The Realm*").

Robert Mercer CR

* The title of a famous sermon by Newman.

STATEMENT BY THE FIRST ORDINARY

Personal Ordinariate of the Chair of St. Peter

On behalf of so many pilgrims of Catholic unity who have looked forward to this day, I wish to thank His Holiness, Pope Benedict XVI, for this priceless gift, the Personal Ordinariate of the Chair of St. Peter under the patronage of Our Lady of Walsingham. I pray that we who will come into full communion through this Ordinariate will bring the Holy Father much joy through our love and faithful service to the Catholic Church. To His Eminence Donald Cardinal Wuerl and His Excellencies Kevin Vann of Fort Worth and Robert McManus of Worcester: thank you for laying this good foundation for the Ordinariate. To His Eminence Daniel Cardinal DiNardo - thank you for your generous hospitality in providing for our principal church and a place in the University of St. Thomas and St. Mary's Seminary for the formation of our future clergy. And, personally, to His Excellency, Archbishop Michael Sheehan of Santa Fe, who brought me into the Church and ordained me: my wife and I love you dearly. You all represent so many people who have worked so hard to bring the Holy Father's vision to reality!

I ask for your prayers for me and for those who will become members of the Ordinariate. There is so much to learn, and it is a steep learning curve. Be patient with us as we embark on this journey. Pray that we may strive to learn the faith, laws, and culture of the Catholic Church with humility and good cheer. But pray too that we do not forget who we are and where we have come from, for we have been formed in the beautiful and noble Anglican tradition. The Holy Father has asked us to bring this patrimony with us: "to maintain the liturgical, spiritual and pastoral traditions of the Anglican Communion within the Catholic Church, as a precious gift nourishing the members of the Ordinariate and as a treasure to be shared" [*Anglicanorum coetibus* 3]. Here is one thing I earnestly desire to share with you from the outset: Anglican spirituality has always emphasized the need to be gentlemanly in all of our relationships. May you see in us always the virtue of courtesy!

The parishes and communities of the Ordinariate have been called, not to live in relative isolation, but to be fully engaged in the life of the local diocese; not to be assimilated, but to be integrated into the rich life of the Catholic Church. This Ordinariate of the Chair of St. Peter must be, above all else, an effective instrument for evangelization. But Jesus taught us that the unity of Christian people is the essential condition for evangelization (John 17:21). So this must be our hallmark: to build bridges, to be an instrument of peace and reconciliation, to be a sign of what Christian unity might look like. And *gaudete in Domino semper* (Philippians 4:4) to be joyful and happy Catholics!

The establishment of the Personal Ordinariate is an historic moment in the history of the Church. For perhaps the first time since the Reformation in the 16th century, a corporate structure has been given to assist those who in conscience seek to return to the fold of St. Peter and his successors. But I would like to go back a little further, to the end of the 6th century, to see that this is not such a new thing. Pope Gregory the Great writes to St. Augustine, the first Archbishop of Canterbury, recently arrived from Rome, to urge him always to be a gracious and patient pastor in the way he gathers his flock. Anglicans love to read these letters, preserved in the Venerable Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation*, for they are a great witness to how the Church gathers her people from many different cultures and lands. The decree which this day establishes the Ordinariate begins with these words: "The supreme law of the Church is the salvation of souls. As such, throughout its history, the Church has always found the pastoral and juridical means to care for the good of the people." In what Pope Benedict has given us today, I hear the voice of Pope Gregory the Great: "*For things are not to be loved for the sake of places, but places for the sake of good things*" (1.27). What a beautiful testimony to all that Catholic Christianity is!

Fr. Jeffrey Steenson, Houston, Texas, January 2, 2012

TOWARDS UNITY

"When all things were in quiet silence and night was in the midst of her swift course, thine Almighty Word, O Lord, leaped down from heaven out of thy royal throne . . ." and that Word took flesh untainted by sin

from the Virgin chosen from the beginning of time. It was done for the healing of that tragic rift between God and Man.

God created all things to be in perfect unity. He made the universe as a reflection of His own divine order. He created Man in His own image, to be in perfect communion with Him. But through the sin of our first parents, Adam and Eve, disorder entered into the world, and perfect communion was broken. And ever since that time, there has been a tendency in the natural order of things for there to be disintegration, the breakdown of things, a crumbling. Sadly, what should be unnatural has become all too normal in the world around us, and within us, and even within the Church.

Christ founded the Church to be One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic - and so it is. But our sin has caused division, and that's a clear contradiction to the Divine Will of our Lord. While there may well be an invisible spiritual communion deeper than we know, especially through the bonds of baptism, nonetheless there is to be a visible communion, too, because that's the Will of Christ, and the constant invitation from God is that we work and pray to build up both the spiritual and visible unity of Christ's Body.

It's this purpose - the building up of unity - which is outlined at the very beginning of Pope Benedict's Apostolic Constitution, *Anglicanorum coetibus*. In fact, this stated purpose is sometimes glossed over in our search for the particulars of the Personal Ordinariates. We tend to look at the details of how they'll be established, and of who can belong, and of what the liturgy will be like, and of who can be ordained - indeed, any number of other details.

But all that neglects the reason for the Holy Father's great generosity: and that is, to help bring about the

prayer of Christ "that they all may be one." It's not accidental that the first three paragraphs of the Apostolic Constitution speak of the Church as "a people gathered into the unity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit," and that the Church was instituted by Christ as "a sacrament . . . of communion with God and of unity among all people," and that this Church is governed by the successor of Peter and by the Bishops in communion with him. Then, recognizing that there are "many elements of sanctification and of truth [which] are found outside her visible confines," he says that these "are forces impelling towards Catholic unity."

What had been broken, the Holy Father is inviting us to repair. The communion that has been impaired, he asks us to restore. The fellowship which has been strained, he asks us to strengthen.

God's Incarnate Love came into this world by Our Lady's "yes," and it would gladden her heart for her children to be one again. She, who stood beside the Cross and saw her Son in agony, would be comforted by us taking away this pain of separation. There are few things that touch a mother's heart more, than to see her whole family together at one table. This is why the Holy Father has given us the Apostolic Constitution: so that we can put division behind us, and join together with one voice and one heart in "that most holy cause, the preaching of the Gospel" to the whole world.

"Lord Jesus, make us one, as you and the Father are one." Amen.

Father Christopher Phillips - December 22, 2010

ROBERT'S RAMBLINGS

Assumption: Letchworth

II Peter 1,4. "So that you may participate in the divine nature".

Assumption or Dormition or Falling Asleep, whichever you prefer to call it, is a reversal of Christmas, is almost the opposite of Christmas. God became man. At His conception in her womb He took human nature from His mother. Now at her death He makes her to partake of His divine nature. Partaker of the divine nature. The phrase is not mine but St Peter's. *II Peter 1,4.*

The early fathers of the church called this exchange, this swop, "If you give me yours, I'll give you Mine", they called it *THEOSIS*. And the fathers went on to give us some breath taking sayings, delightful,

dramatic, intoxicating, just verging on the edge of heresy. *St Irenaeus*: "Because of His immeasurable love He became what we are that we might become what He is". *St Athanasius*: "Christ was made man that we might be made God". *St Cyprian*: "What man is Christ willed to be, in order that man may be what God is".

I said verging on the edge. Of course the fathers were not heretics. But you and I easily slide into heresy. We must not misunderstand theosis. We must not distort the fathers. We never become persons of the Trinity. We never become God or

gods. We remain creatures. We stay human. But, the fathers went on to illustrate, if you plunge metal into a furnace, the metal takes on the appearance of fire, it glows, it radiates heat, it is burning hot, to the naked human eye it can look indistinguishable from fire. Yet it remains metal. Throw an empty glass into the sea. It is full of water surrounded by water, it ebbs and flows with the water but yet it remains glass.

When St Peter talks about partakers of the divine nature, when the fathers talk about theosis, they are talking about all Christians, about you and me. Assumption or Dormition celebrates the fact that theosis applies to Mary. But there's this vast difference between Mary and us. In our case there's no swap. From none of us did God take human nature. Her relationship with the Trinity is unique.

St John writes in his first letter, "Beloved we are now the children of God. It does not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is" (1 John 3,2). We shall not be Him but we shall be like Him. Assumption celebrates that Mary is like Christ, in Christ, part of His body, filled with His life, contained by Christ, sustained by Christ, surrounded by Christ, undergirded by Christ. Mary is with Christ in God the Trinity. Mary is transformed by Christ, transfigured in Christ. Exactly what we hope for ourselves. Assumption celebrates what is in store for us. However the difference remains. Once in time, for nine months to be exact, Mary was full of God in a quite different way.

The hymn writer and translator Father John Mason Neale, is part of our Anglican heritage or patrimony. For our benefit he translated a Latin hymn which has been attributed to Thomas a Kempis, "Light's abode,

celestial Salem" (*English Hymnal* 431, blue 628) The hymn can be sung equally well at Transfiguration, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, Assumption, or at any one of our baptisms or funerals. A stanza goes like this:

O how glorious and resplendent,
Fragile body, shalt thou be,
When endued with so much beauty,
Full of health, and strong and free,
Full of vigour full of pleasure
That shall last eternally.
And in everlasting glory
Thou with joy may be arrayed.

I like to think that the poet Gerard Manley Hopkins is also part of our Anglican patrimony. True, he was received into the Roman church by another ex Anglican, John Henry Newman. But Hopkins' upbringing was Anglican and the rest of his family remained loyal. One of his sisters became a nun in the Church of England. I once asked the retired Professor of English at Ottawa university if Hopkins' ear, his feel for the sound of words, was formed by the Book of Common Prayer and the Authorized Version of the Bible. He replied, "Oh yes". Hopkins has written some lines which go well with those of the hymn:

I am all at once what Christ is, since He is what I
am, and
This Jack, joke, poor potshard, patch,
matchwood, immortal diamond
Is immortal diamond.

Today we salute the Queen of diamonds.

Robert Mercer CR

THE GIFT OF AUTHORITY - 2 of 7

The Pope, the Church, and the Magisterium

A talk given by Matthew Teel to the Our Lady of Hope Society, meeting at St. Therese Little Flower Catholic Church, Kansas City, Missouri, on Sunday, September 14, 2008. The topic Fr. Ernie [Davis] gave me for today is really the heart of why I converted to the Catholic Church in the first place: namely, the role of authority in the Church. Mr. Teel, a former Episcopal priest, now teaches philosophy and religion at Crowder College, Webb City, Missouri.

What is Authority?

Sometimes, when people find out that I've converted, they will say to me, "You know, I would consider converting to the Catholic Church, but I could never do it."

And I'll say, "Why not?"

And they say, "All that *stuff* you have to believe in! Papal infallibility and contraception and miracles and the Virgin Mary . . ."

And then they go on with the whole litany of things

they assume they could never live with: priestly celibacy, a male-only ministry, transubstantiation, Purgatory, Limbo, prayers to saints, and on and on and on.

And there are always two things I want to say to this:

The first is a bit facetious, but it's true: how are those things any more or less difficult to believe in than the Resurrection?

I mean, you can believe that a dead man rose up on the third day and walked around and ate dinner with his friends, but you can't believe that a piece of stale bread and a sip of wine can become so suffused with the glory of God that it becomes, in actuality, the very Body and Blood of Christ? THAT'S somehow going too far?

You can believe that he walked through a door into the Upper Room and talked to his friends, but you can't make yourself believe that an old man in a white robe speaks the Truth every now and then?

You can believe that God became a baby and was laid in a manger, but you can't believe that he would take his Mama with him to heaven?

My question is always, why draw the line HERE but not THERE? As an orthodox Christian, you've already swallowed six impossible things before breakfast; why not a seventh?

Since leaving the ministry, I teach philosophy and religion at a little community college in the Ozarks. I have a student this semester who believes in (and worships) the Greek gods and goddesses. She's a lovely girl; I love to talk with her. But when I asked her once if she also believed in nymphs and dryads, she gave me a snide look and said, "Don't be ridiculous."

Ridiculous? I'm asking: where is the dividing line here? Believing in Artemis is logical, but believing in mermaids isn't? Did I miss something? How does she distinguish between one bizarre belief and another?

Well, I imagine she could put the same question to us: You believe that he rose again from the dead, but you just can't get yourself to believe that the saints pray for you? I'm sure she'd say, "Where's the dividing line here? How do you distinguish between one bizarre belief and another?" And she'd be right to ask, I think.

Now, for most Protestants, the dividing line is whether or not something is specifically mentioned

in the Bible. And that's a good point; we'll come back to that. But suffice it to say, there are all sorts of problems with pitting the Bible against the Church, not least of which because the Church itself is the basis for the Bible's authority.

But as I said, we'll return to this in a minute.

The second thing I think when people give me the list of things you HAVE to believe when you're a Catholic is this: at no point in the three years I have been Catholic have I woken in the morning to find one of the Swiss Guard standing over my bed - in his red and orange uniform, with the white gloves and the ruffled collar - holding a saber to my neck, wanting to know what I believe about the Immaculate Conception.

Not once.

The simple fact is, if you become Roman Catholic, there is still no one who is going to MAKE you believe anything. The Church has teachings, yes. She holds to those teachings; she expects her members to hold to those teachings. But she has no way of FORCING you to believe them. Because that is not what authority is. It's a sad statement on our culture when 95% of the people confuse the word 'authority' with 'power.'

Having authority is not the same thing as being able to command someone to do something. Having authority means that something is within your particular charge. Authority means something is your right and your duty. And sometimes - as with a military man or a police officer - that charge includes forcing people to do this or that. But that is not within the charge exercised by the Church, and so is not part of her authority. Her authority lies not in power, not in force, but in proclamation. Proclamation: she has a duty and a right, given to her by her Lord, to proclaim hard truths, even if - *especially* if! - no one wants to hear them.

I occasionally hear my students say that they could never become Catholic because they can't abide the Church's teaching on contraception. (Actually, knowing college students the way I do, it's probably the Church's teaching on fornication that they have a problem with, not contraception.) But I have to tell them, the pope has never climbed through my bedroom window at night to see what Kathy and I are doing. I didn't have to fill out any forms in triplicate and send them to Rome to certify that I was or wasn't doing something the Church says is moral or immoral. The Church's authority lies in its right and its duty to proclaim the Good News given to it by Jesus Christ.

So, understand this: if you become Catholic, the Church will not FORCE you to believe any of the doctrines you currently don't understand, or perhaps even find distasteful. That doesn't mean you don't, as a Catholic, have an obligation to try to understand why the Church believes as it does. It doesn't mean that you have the right to pass your own opinion off as legitimate Catholic teaching either (which is the beef the Church currently has with certain men and women who call themselves 'Catholic theologians' but who teach, in the Church's name, things contrary to the Church.).

But it does mean that the Church will not force you to believe something you can't yet believe. There really is no assumption on the part of the Church that you will apprehend the whole thing at the beginning. There is a sense in which we become Catholics, yes, but there is another sense in which

we are constantly in the process of becoming Catholic. The Church takes us as we are. She doesn't expect you to have a PhD in philosophy and theology, and she won't cross-examine you on your beliefs before you come in. The expectation is that, through the daily struggle of prayer and faithful living, we will become *more and more* Catholic, until - hopefully - we come to understand the larger picture of how this distasteful teaching we never really understood (or perhaps did understand and never really liked) fits in with everything else.

So, in answer to the question, "What is authority?" we must say, first, that authority does not mean 'power,' it means 'right' and 'duty.' The Church's authority lies primarily in its right and its duty to proclaim the message entrusted to it by its Founder, Jesus Christ.

THEOLOGIAN, APOLOGIST. WHAT NEW BISHOPS HAVE TO BE!

Rounding the turn of his first year as prefect of the congregation for bishops, Cardinal Marc Ouellet has surveyed the course in an interview with Gianni Cardinale for "Avvenire," the newspaper owned by the Italian episcopal conference.

In the interview, he revealed among other things that it often happens, "more than I could have expected," that the candidate chosen to be made a bishop does not accept the appointment.

He indicated the reasons for such refusals in the growing difficulty of fulfilling the role, in a society in which the bishops are under public attack, "in part as a result of the scandals and charges concerning sexual abuse."

As for career ambitions - the cardinal cautioned - if a priest or a bishop aspires and manoeuvres to be promoted to a prominent diocese, "it is better for him to stay where he is."

And he concluded the interview by sketching the profile of the bishop the Church needs most today. A bishop who is at the same time a theologian and an apologist, a public defender of the faith:

"Today, especially in the context of our secularized societies, we need bishops who are the first evangelizers, and not mere administrators of dioceses. Who are capable of proclaiming the Gospel. Who are not only theologically faithful to the magisterium and the pope, but are also capable of expounding and, if need be, of defending the faith

publicly."

This profile of the bishop as theologian and "defensor fidei" fits Cardinal Ouellet himself perfectly.

A Canadian from Québec, 67, a member of the Society of Saint-Sulpice, Ouellet was part of the circle of the international theology journal "Communio," founded by, among others, Joseph Ratzinger and Hans Urs von Balthasar, who were his intellectual mentors.

For many years, he shuttled back and forth between Canada and Colombia, as a seminary professor and educator. Then he moved to Rome, as a professor of systematic theology at the Pontifical Lateran University, when its rector was the future cardinal Angelo Scola, also part of the "Communio" circle.

In 2001, he was appointed secretary of the pontifical council for Christian unity. And the following year, archbishop of Québec and primate of Canada. He has been a cardinal since 2003.

In his Québec, Cardinal Ouellet was a direct witness of one of the most dizzying collapses of Catholicism in the past century. This region, which had a strong Catholic character until the middle of the twentieth century, is today one of the most secularized in the world.

As an archbishop, Ouellet fought energetically to give a voice and a body back to Christianity in his

land. And Benedict XVI appreciated this so much that he called him to Rome first as a speaker at the synod of bishops in 2008, and then permanently, since 2010, as prefect of the congregation for bishops.

Among the cardinals of the Roman curia, Ouellet is certainly the closest to pope Joseph Ratzinger, with whom he meets regularly, once a week. And he may be the only one in whom the pope confides without reservation.

The fact remains that since Ouellet has presided over the Vatican congregation that selects and proposes new bishops to the pope, the preference shown for theologians and defenders of the faith has been more and more evident.

Over the past five months alone, at least twelve appointments could be characterized this way.

By **Sandro Magister**, Rome, December 1, 2011

FROM HERE AND THERE

**1) "You must remember to love people and use things, rather than to love things and use people."
Bishop Sheen**

2) Let's tend this fragile plant

It was exciting to see Cardinal William Levada, prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, standing alongside Archbishop Vincent Nichols, Archbishop of Westminster, and Mgr Keith Newton, head of the Personal Ordinariate, at a reception to raise funds for the ordinariate at Archbishop's House last week.

Cardinal Levada and Mgr Newton both used the opportunity to produce memorable short descriptions of the ordinariate. The cardinal called it "an important new structure for the Church". The monsignor - until last year an Anglican bishop referred to it as a "small and fragile plant". Can they both be right? The answer is that, yes, they can. In creating an extra-territorial diocese with its own liturgy, Pope Benedict has invested his personal authority, as well as that of the papacy, in a daringly imaginative project to reconcile groups of ex-Anglicans and aspects of Anglican tradition with the Holy See. To describe this initiative as important is, if anything, an understatement. It has brought us to a turning point in the history of western Christianity. This structure will eventually be replicated in other countries, but it is in England, appropriately, that the design is being tested.

Yet Mgr Newton is also right to say that the Personal Ordinariate of Our Lady of Walsingham is still a fragile plant. It must be watered by the prayers and the money of the faithful. The brave clergy and their families who have joined the ordinariate, together with their still small congregations, are not ordinary converts who will be absorbed by established dioceses: they are a decisively new and enriching presence in our midst. We thank our readers for

supporting our new neighbours so generously.

The Church in England and Wales, too, must work hard to cultivate this plant so that it is no longer small and fragile. Many Anglicans are tempted to join the ordinariate, but they are mystified by the failure to provide it with a principal church that can serve as the equivalent of an episcopal seat for Mgr Newton. The ordinariate has the potential to flourish, inspiring the rest of our Catholic community as it does so; but these are early days, and first the ordinariate needs a home. This challenge of putting a suitably imposing roof over its head must be met without any further delay.

The Catholic Herald - October 7, 2011

3) We should never give in to moral relativism

*Whether one is Labour or Tory, believer or not,
you can't change the natural laws*

I happened to catch the repeat broadcast of Desert Island Discs last Friday. The castaway was Paul Johnson and as one would expect from a man of his age, someone who is also a very well-known journalist and writer, he had some fascinating anecdotes to recount, all told with panache. An Oxford contemporary of Margaret Thatcher's, he had actually asked her out - but she had turned him down; something to do with her new hair-do. Now they are old friends and when he invites her out to dinner he makes sure he tells her some of her late husband's jokes as she loves to hear them repeated.

Johnson also had the temerity to strike up conversation with Churchill when he bumped into him after the War, and asked him the secret of his success. The great man immediately replied, "Conservation of energy." He explained that he never stood up when he could sit down and he never sat down when he could lie down (I must

remember that.) Johnson mimicked him perfectly. As a boy he had had a crush on the child actress Shirley Temple and was delighted to meet her years later when she had become the US ambassador to Ghana.

Johnson admitted that he regretted some of the things he had written when he was young, such as his damning verdict on Anthony Eden. The chief influence on him seemed to be his mother, widowed when Johnson was 14 and who lived to 90. On her deathbed Johnson told her she would not spend long in Purgatory. She replied: "But I've often criticised the clergy."

These were her last words. The sudden death of his father, he said, when he was just beginning to get to know him, was the only tragic thing that had happened to him in his life. Asked by Kirsty Young, the interviewer, about his education he told her he had been born a Catholic and sent to Stonyhurst College; he approved of the Jesuit formation he had received there: "They teach you the difference between right and wrong."

It was an interesting interview and I enjoyed it - apart from one moment. Kirsty Young was probing Johnson slightly (though only in the light format of the programme; it wasn't a John Humphreys-type interrogation): in his earlier days had he not criticised the sexually permissive society? What did he think of David Cameron's brand of Conservatism and his support for gay marriage? Was Johnson now a man out of his time?

Johnson's response was urbane: "Time moves on." He added, "Cameron is entitled to his views" and "I don't want to stand in the way of progress". He had the perfect opportunity here to state the Christian teaching on marriage; instead, although he might not have intended to give this impression, he sounded entirely relativistic. What would his old Jesuit masters at Stonyhurst have made of it?

In his speech last September to the German parliament, the Bundestag, Pope Benedict gave a critique of moral relativism and defended the natural law tradition. He said: "The idea of natural law is today viewed as a specifically Catholic doctrine, not worth bringing into the discussion in a non-Catholic environment, so that one feels almost ashamed even to mention the term." If only Johnson could have simply said to Kirsty Young: "Whether you are Conservative or Labour, a believer or non-believer, you can't change the natural law; it doesn't change with the times." It would have been an awkward moment and it might have caused him some embarrassment to say it, but it would have been the

truth. An opportunity was lost.

By **Francis Phillips** - 23 January 2012

4) **Ogden Nash**

Some tortures are physical
And some are mental
But the one that is both
Is dental

5) **John Ruskin**

When a man is wrapped up in himself he makes a pretty small package.

6) On Patrimony Article 10 of the Complementary Norms attached to the Apostolic Constitution *Anglicanorum coetibus* discusses the formation of the clergy of the Ordinariate. Basically, this is divided in two parts, 1) joint formation with diocesan seminarians in accordance with local circumstances, and 2) particular formation in the Anglican patrimony. This drives home the point of co-operation on the one hand and also the distinctiveness that formation in Anglican patrimony, which is fully in harmony with the Catholic tradition, may bring to the Catholic household.

...

Here comes the important question of Anglican patrimony. The widespread opinions on this matter are as varied as those who proffer replies. The Anglican tradition is very different from one country to another, from a Province to another. However one can say that there are elements of Anglican patrimony that are not only compatible with the Catholic faith but worth offering to the whole Catholic family.

...

In any mention of Anglican patrimony there must also be the liturgical expression. Musically this will include Anglican composers who set to music catholic texts and in parish settings, where choral music is sadly many a times unaffordable, a great repertoire of catholic hymns translated into English by scholars like Mason Neale and also some of the Wesleyan hymns which are consonant with the *Catholica*. These hymns contain memorable words that aid the personal devotions and also convey theological principles which are sadly not so evident in all contemporary church music. More importantly is the dignity and careful planning of the liturgical celebration which I think stems from the end-ethic described above and tries to convey (maybe

incarnate?) the beauty of holiness. It is also expressed in the labour taken to give solid homilies that are catechetical and didactical.

From the article on **Sevenoaks Ordinariate blog** - September 27, 2011

8) On T-shirts

I'm confused, oh wait, maybe I'm not.

There is a fine line between numerator and denominator

The name Pavlov rings a bell.

Becoming a vegetarian is a big missed steak.

Anything unrelated to elephants is irrelephant.

I have not yet begun to procrastinate.

If you can't be a good example, be a warning.

Dyslexics are teople poo.

I give 100% at work: 13% Monday, 23% Tuesday, 27% Wednesday, 25% Thursday, 12% Friday

Yes, I have a truck. No, I will not help you move.

I never finish anyth

Save a cow, eat a vegan.

Rules of Grammar. 33) Double Negatives are a No. No.

The only thing we have to fear is fear itself, and spiders.

9) On evil, suffering and Reality

When we consider the evil, injustice, and misery existing in the world, how can we claim that the ultimate Reality at the heart of the universe is a Spirit of peace, harmony, and infinite love? What evidence can we bring to Support such a belief and

how can we adore a God whose creation is marred by cruelty, suffering and sin?

This is, of course, the problem of evil; the crucial problem for all realistic religion. It is no use to dodge this issue, and still less use to pretend that the Church has a solution of the problem up her sleeve. I would rather say with Baron von Hügel that Christian spirituality does not explain evil and suffering, which remain a mystery beyond the reach of the human mind, but does show us how to deal with them. It insists that something has gone wrong, and badly wrong, with the world. That world as we know it does not look like the work of the loving Father whom the Gospels call us to worship; but rather, like the work of selfish and undisciplined children who have been given wonderful material and a measure of freedom, and not used that freedom well. Yet we see in this muddled world a constant struggle for Truth, Goodness, Perfection; and all those who give themselves to that struggle - the struggle for the redemption of the world from greed, cruelty, injustice, selfish desire and their results - find themselves supported and reinforced by a spiritual power which enhances life, strengthens will, and purifies character. And they come to recognise more and more in that power the action of God. These facts are as real as the other facts, which distress and puzzle us; the apparent cruelty, injustice and futility of life. We have to account somehow for the existence of gentleness, purity, self-sacrifice, holiness, love; and how can we account for them, unless they are attributes of Reality?

Christianity shows us in the most august of all examples the violence of the clash between evil and the Holiness of God. It insists that the redemption of the world, defeating the evil that has infected it by the health-giving power of love - bringing in the Kingdom of God - is a spiritual task, in which we are all required to play a part. Once we realise this, we can accept - even though we cannot understand - the paradox that the world as we know it contains much that is evil; and yet, that its Creator is the one supreme Source and Object of the love that will triumph in the end.

Evelyn Underhill in *The Spiritual Life* (1936)

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)