

The Sodality of St. Edmund, King and Martyr

A Catholic Community of the Anglican Use, Diocese of Hamilton

www.stedmund.ca



November 20, 2012 - **St. Edmund, King and Martyr**

DECEMBER SCHEDULE

December 2	Sunday	The First Sunday in Advent
December 9	Sunday	The Second Sunday in Advent
December 16	Sunday	The Third Sunday in Advent
December 23	Sunday	The Fourth Sunday in Advent
December 30	Sunday	Holy Family

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) **THE MASS AS SACRIFICE** - 6 of 7 - this page.
- 2) **ROBERT'S RAMBLINGS - EATING OUT: PART THE SECOND** - page 3.
- 3) **THE CHURCH IS THE PLACE WHERE FAITH IS TRANSMITTED** - page 4.
- 4) **REASONS WHY WE SHOULD PRAY FOR THE HOLY SOULS** - page 5.
- 5) **DEFINING PERSONHOOD IS COMPLEX, BUT NOT BEYOND US** - page 6.
- 6) **PUBLIC WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CITIZENSHIP** - page 7.
- 7) **'LIFE OF ST. EDMUND'** - page 8.
- 8) **FROM HERE AND THERE** - page 9.

THE MASS AS SACRIFICE - 6 of 7

"One single sacrifice"

What Jesus accomplished on the Cross is clearly a sacrifice. There is the Eternal High Priest, Who is Himself the victim offered in obedient love. That offering is made to restore communion with God. Jesus Christ "is the sacrifice that takes our sins away".

So, is the Mass a sacrifice? Both the Second Vatican Council and the Catechism teach that it is: "The Eucharist is a sacrifice because it *re-presents* (makes present) the sacrifice of the Cross, because it is its *memorial* and because it *applies* its fruit."

But the Protestant Reformers explicitly rejected the notion of the Mass as sacrifice. Luther saw the Mass as the work of man, ineffective in advancing our salvation, which comes from God alone. For Protestants the Eucharist is primarily a fellowship meal. The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England still state: "Wherefore the sacrifice of Masses, in which it was commonly said, that the Priest did offer Christ for the [living] and the dead, were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits."

To support their interpretation Protestants tend to fall back on Hebrews Chapter 10, in which the author writes that Jesus "has offered one single sacrifice for sins". Any suggestion that a different sacrifice is required - that of the Mass, offered over and over again - is blasphemy, they would say. But so would we. There aren't lots of sacrifices. The Cross and the Mass are one and the same sacrifice, simply offered in a different manner. The same person offers the same sacrifice. By virtue of his ordination the priest offers the sacrifice *in persona Christi*, in the person of Christ. The Mass isn't the work of man, but the work of God.

At the Last Supper "Our Lord gave them the power to renew the sacrifice of the Eucharist with the command, 'Do this as a memorial of Me' as He

blessed the cup." Jesus expected frequent liturgical celebrations of the Eucharist.

And that's exactly what the first Christians did. Immediately after the Ascension, we read, "They devoted themselves to the apostles' teaching and fellowship, to the breaking of bread and prayers." The Eucharist is referred to, almost euphemistically, in this way, precisely because the first Christians believed it was so holy, that it was barely to be spoken of to anyone other than believers.

The understanding of the Mass as sacrifice was there, at least in embryonic form, from the beginning. Probably the earliest Christian document outside the Scriptures is the *Didache*, The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, dating back to before AD100. It tells Christians: "On the Lord's own day [Sunday], assemble in common to break bread and offer thanks [ie celebrate the Eucharist]; but first confess your sins so that *your sacrifice* may be pure."

The revised translation of the Mass makes clear that the Third Eucharistic Prayer is citing the prophet Malachi: "You never cease to gather a people to Yourself so that from the rising of the sun to its setting a *pure sacrifice* may be offered to Your Name." The early Church understood Malachi as prophesying the sacrifice of the Mass, which would supersede the Temple sacrifice and would be offered for all time across the whole world. In the words of St Justin Martyr: "God has, therefore, announced in advance that *all the sacrifices* offered in His Name, which Jesus commanded to be offered, that is, in the Eucharist of the Bread and of the Chalice, which are offered by us Christians in every part of the world, are pleasing to Him." St Irenaeus adds: "The oblation of the Church, which the Lord taught was to be offered in the whole world, has been regarded by God as a *pure sacrifice*, and is acceptable to Him."

Speaking to the Samaritan woman at the well, Jesus said: "But the hour is coming, and now is, when the

true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and in truth." This is the internalisation of sacrifice which the prophets had foretold. St Peter says Christians must "offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ." St Paul says the same: "Present your *bodies* as *living sacrifices*, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship." Christian worship must be spiritual. But Paul immediately notes that human beings are a unity of body and soul, and therefore our living sacrifices must be evident in the lives we live in and through our bodies. There should be external, visible sacrifice.

We can only offer our lives to God as a living sacrifice through the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross, in which we participate in the sacrifice of the Mass. We can't do it by ourselves. "The *Eucharist*, in which the Lord's obedience on the Cross embraces us all, purifies us, and draws us up to that perfect worship offered by Jesus Christ."

The Church Fathers knew this. St Gregory Nazianzus wrote: "No one is worthy of the great sacrifice and of the great High Priest of God, unless first he has made of himself a living and holy offering pleasing to God and offered to God a sacrifice of

praise and a contrite heart." The revised translation makes this much clearer. No longer "*our sacrifice*," but, "Pray, brethren, that *my sacrifice and yours*." There are two sacrifices, distinct but connected. The priest offers the sacrifice of the Mass. Thanks to our sharing in that sacrifice we can give God the offering of our lives.

The early Church believed the Mass was a sacrifice. In the fourth century St Ambrose wrote that the priest must "offer *sacrifice* for the people". St John Chrysostom clearly sets out the Catholic understanding that the Cross and the Mass "are one single sacrifice". "For Christ is everywhere one complete Body. Just as He is one Body and not many bodies, even though He is offered in many places, *so there is but one sacrifice*. It is our High Priest who offered the sacrifice which cleanses us. So we offer now that which was then offered, and which cannot be exhausted.

By **Father Mark Vickers** in the May and June 2012 issue of *faith* magazine (I have omitted the quote 'references' which are, of course, in the original. If you are not able to access the original, I will forward a copy, upon request.)

ROBERT'S RAMBLINGS

EATING OUT: PART THE SECOND

"Open thy mouth wide and I shall fill it" (Psalm 81,10)

At the invitation of Archbishop Selby Taylor of Cape Town the Community of the Resurrection became responsible for the parish of Stellenbosch and for the Anglican chaplaincy in that university. Four of us were in on the adventure. Afrikaans was the predominant language. Apartheid or separation was government policy. People of different races were to be kept apart. But reconciliation is the Christian ministry (*II Corinthians* 5,17 - 20). Inevitably there were frequent clashes between the state and Christian churches. We ourselves were deported after only two exciting years in the place. But we enjoyed excellent relations with clergy and people of different denominations, especially with the Dominicans of the Order of Preachers, whose work and lifestyle was comparable with ours, except that in addition they maintained a house of studies for themselves.

Among our number was Brother Michael Twine, a native of the Cape and a talented cook. Also of our number were Father Gerard Beaumont, raconteur and entertainer, and Father Bernard Chamberlain,

earnest student of theology. The public rooms of the priory/rectory were brightly and cheerfully furnished. Log fires roared away in the fireplace during the winter months. Good quality foodstuffs and wines were readily and cheaply available. Dinner parties were therefore a deliberate and important aspect of our ministry. Michael laid on marvellous meals. I remember one evening with seven courses and ancient Roman recipes. Gerard supplied the laughter, Bernard the serious tone. And though I say it myself, people loved coming to our parties. If we of CR were eating in, guests were certainly eating out. We brought them together, Dutch Reformed and Roman Catholic, black, brown and white (questionably legal), rich and poor, student and citizen, agnostic and atheist, Buddhist and Marxist, Dominican friar and Calvinist minister, farmer and townsman, academic and tradesman, to say nothing of Dr Danie Craven, famous rugby coach to the Springboks. What fun we had!

Such dinners were by invitation. But we also kept open house. Farm labourers, university under-

graduates, townfolk, were welcome to drop in and sit by the fire, fix coffee or tea, pour wine, make toast, chat with anybody else who might be there, strangers or one of the brethren. The secret police, of whom there was a branch specializing in students and clergymen, found all this suspicious. What's more, they kept watch on our services and sermons. A black priest in a white pulpit, a Catholic or a Presbyterian preacher in an Anglican pulpit, must be up to no good.

If I have enjoyed many a meal eating in, as when Brother Michael was cooking, now alas RIP, I remember meals eaten out. When I was at CR's priory in Cardiff, South Wales, the mother of one of my brethren there treated the two of us to a weekend in France. Hadrian said, "If you haven't tasted green beans as served in France, you haven't lived". So between trains in Paris we found a restaurant close to the station. We sat out on the sidewalk and found the beans delectable, lightly steamed I think, tender, sweetish, with just a touch of butter. But Chartres was our destination where we wanted to see the fabled medieval glass of the cathedral. We went to early service in the Lady chapel each morning, where the statue was black from centuries of candle soot, and each day we toured the windows three times a day, morning, early afternoon and evening. As the sun moved on its way so did it illumine different windows in different ways. But I still prefer modern glass, often made in Chartres, ultra chunky, so heavy that it's set in concrete rather than in lead. For example, I remember a smallish window in Cape Town cathedral where chipped, chiselled, pock marked, slashed glass of varying thicknesses captures and holds the light in brilliant colour for hours and hours. Is this window an abstract? No, as you watch it becomes a Virgin and Child, our Lady of Good Hope, then a chalice and paten, then a crucifix, then a map of the Cape, bright green peninsula against deep blue sea. How on earth does Gabriel Loire, the artist, achieve such effects?

Hadrian and I stayed in a posh hotel close to Chartres cathedral so that we could enjoy its spires by moonlight. The food in the hotel was unmemorable but expensive. What I remember forty something years later are two simpler meals. For a lunch we sat on a sidewalk with our feet in the gutter, a yard of bread, a basket of fresh apricots and a bottle of wine, gazing at fields of ripening wheat receding into the distance. For supper we ate in a bourgeois boarding house with oil cloth on its tables, full of Frenchmen not tourists. My meal was lettuce soup followed by creamed cucumber. Talking of lettuce, I remember a bitter variety in a piazza in Rome close by some fountains.

At home in Bulawayo churchwarden Michael Bullivant and his wife, near neighbours of *Komthawkazi*, the bishop's house, were wonderful hosts at their dinner parties. I remember a meal of twelve courses, mercifully all of them small. But I myself was not ideally suited to Matabele cuisine. Rural people are poor and live mostly on maize meal which I like well enough. But important occasions like confirmations or ordinations require the slaughter of an ox, or at least of a goat. As an honour the bishop is presented with the warm raw liver before it's cooked. Monica Boatwright, a wise and fluent missionary, put it out on the grapevine that this particular bishop was sick in the head. He didn't so much as want to watch raw liver quivering away. The Matabele met my needs with baked beans and maize, washed down with lots of tea, so brewed on an open fire that it had a smoky flavour which I much appreciated. In short, it was like lapsang suchong tea, to the fragrance of which it took me a long time to convert Heather Fellows in Ottawa.

"Better is a dinner of herbs where love is than a stalled ox and hatred therewith" (*Proverbs 15,17*).

Msgr. Robert Mercer CR

THE CHURCH IS THE PLACE WHERE FAITH IS TRANSMITTED

During his general audience this morning Benedict XVI, continuing his catecheses on the subject of Catholic faith, began by posing certain important questions: "Is the nature of faith merely personal and individual? . . . Do I live my faith alone?", he asked.

"Certainly, the act of faith is an eminently personal act", he told the faithful gathered in St. Peter's Square. "It is something which happens in the most intimate depths of my being and causes a change of

direction, a personal conversion. . . . But the fact that I believe is not the result of solitary reflection, . . . it is the fruit of a relationship, a dialogue . . . with Jesus which causes me to emerge from my 'I' . . . and to open myself to the love of God the Father. It is like a rebirth in which I discover that I am united not only to Jesus but also to all those who have walked and continue to walk along His path. And this new birth, which begins with Baptism, continues throughout the course of a person's life.

"I cannot construct my personal faith in a private dialogue with Jesus", the Pope added, "because faith is given to me by God through a believing community which is the Church. And faith makes me part of a multitude of believers bound by a communion which is not merely sociological, but rooted in the eternal love of God. . . . *The Catechism of the Catholic Church* states this very clearly: 'Believing is an ecclesial act. The Church's faith precedes, engenders, supports and nourishes our faith. The Church is the mother of all believers'".

At the beginning of Christian history, when the Holy Spirit descended upon the disciples on the Day of Pentecost, "the nascent Church received the strength to accomplish the mission entrusted to her by the risen Lord: that of spreading the Gospel, the good news of the Kingdom of God, to the ends of the earth, and thus leading all men and women to meet Him, to the faith which saves. . . . Thus began the journey of the Church, the community which carries this message through time and space, the community which is the People of God", whose members "do not belong to a particular social or ethnic group but are men and women from all nations and cultures. They are a 'catholic' people who speak new languages, who are open to welcoming everyone, beyond all confines, who break down all barriers".

"Ever since the beginning, then, the Church has been the place of faith, the place where faith is transmitted. . . . The life of the Church, the announcement of the Word of God and the celebration of the Sacraments form an unbroken

chain which has come down to us and which we call Tradition. This gives us the guarantee that what we believe is Christ's original message, as preached by the Apostles. . . . It is in the ecclesial community that personal faith grows and matures".

In this context the Pope explained how, in the New Testament, the word "saints" is used to refer to Christians as a whole. "Certainly", he said, "not all of them had the qualities necessary to be declared saints by the Church". The name "saint" meant that "those who had faith . . . in the risen Christ were called to become a point of reference for all the others, and to bring them into contact with the Person and Message of Jesus Who revealed the face of the living God. . . . This also holds true for us. A Christian who allows himself to be guided and moulded by the faith of the Church, despite his weaknesses, limitations and difficulties, becomes a window open to the light of the living God, receiving this light and transmitting it to the world".

"The tendency, so widespread today, to relegate the faith to the private sphere contradicts its very nature. . . . We need the Church in order for our faith to be confirmed and to experience the gifts of God together In a world in which individualism seems to regulate dealings between people, making them ever more fragile, the faith calls us to be People of God, to be Church, bearers of the love and communion of God for the entire human race", the Holy Father concluded.

Vatican Information Service - October 31, 2012

REASONS WHY WE SHOULD PRAY FOR THE HOLY SOULS

God, is supremely good, and is truth itself. His justice is not arbitrary but intimately bound up with the truth. If we sin against Him, it is impossible that we could be directly in His presence without first being forgiven our sins and purified of the damage that they have done to our soul. To see the beatific vision of God with the least stain of sin on our souls would be unbearable for us. God cannot change this any more than He can make a square circle or a good demon. It would be contrary to that reason and truth which He is.

In his mercy, God allows not only that we may be purified from our sins after we have died, but also that those on earth can help the holy souls in purgatory by their prayers. Offering such prayers is an important duty for us, not simply an optional extra devotion. We can classify three compelling reasons

why we should fulfil this duty.

First, since God wishes all the holy souls to be in heaven, we do Him honour by offering our prayers and sacrifices, indulgences and Masses for them. Every Holy Mass is offered for all the living and the dead. When we pray for the dead, we participate in this vital part of the Mass, our highest act of worship.

Secondly, praying for the Holy Souls, especially those who have been forgotten by others, is a great act of charity. There are many souls whose families were unbelievers or, even if Catholics, did not choose to pray for their relatives but merely remembered them. Our concern and honour for the dead is a good and civilised thing but, as St Augustine pointed out, it benefits us, not the deceased person. What benefits them is our prayers.

In the case of our own relatives, friends and benefactors, praying for them is an act of piety in the true sense of the virtue which was even cherished by the pagans of Rome, a due reverence for those who have gone before us, educated us and helped us.

Thirdly, praying for the Holy Souls also helps us in our spiritual life because Our Lord wishes us to offer such prayers and blesses us with His grace when we fulfil this office. We certainly do not lose anything by praying for the dead and by offering our indulgences for them.

Our Christian community is not limited to those who are alive now. The Communion of Saints includes all of us in the Church militant, the Holy Souls who

make up the Church suffering, and the saints in heaven who are the Church triumphant in eternal glory.

Praying for the dead reminds us of this extended communion. Although we are reminded of this practice during the month of November, it is something that we should do all year round by praying for the dead in our grace after meals, in our morning and night prayers, and as a part of our spiritual participation at the Mass when we join our prayers to Our Lady and all the Saints, hoping one day to be in their company.

By **Fr Tim Finigan**, November 3, 2012 on his blog *The hermeneutic of continuity*

DEFINING PERSONHOOD IS COMPLEX, BUT NOT BEYOND US

Alan Borovoy argues that the personhood of the pre-born child is irrelevant to the abortion discussion because, in his opinion, there is no rational way to decide when personhood begins ("Why personhood is beside the point," [on the *Letters* page of the *National Post* on October 29, 2012]). As such, he implies that Canada cannot establish any legislation that would regulate abortion. This stands in direct opposition to the reality in countless countries across the globe. Even China, the land of the One-Child Policy and the horrific forced abortions that have resulted from it, has laws against sex-selection. Personhood can be known, and even if it couldn't, we would still need to grapple with the critical matter at hand in every abortion, which is to ask at what point the pre-born child has value.

Mr. Borovoy implicitly acknowledges the distinction between identifying human life, a scientific fact, and granting personhood, a parliamentary recognition. Science and medicine recognize that human life begins at fertilization. In medical books, such as the *Biological Principles and Modern Practice of Obstetrics*, we find language like, "The zygote thus formed represents the beginning of a new life." What is being debated is when to protect or permit the killing of that human life, and for which reasons. Is it acceptable to abort pre-born children when they can live outside the womb? Should pre-born females be aborted because parents prefer a boy? If the child in the womb has a cleft palate, do we as a nation feel that's reason enough to extinguish human life? Currently abortion is legal for any and all of these reasons.

Canada and North Korea are alone in the developed world in having no abortion legislation whatsoever. That means that the rest have some laws and

regulations. Before we assume that our current legal *status quo* lines up with Canadian values, consider any number of recent polls that reveal Canadians are largely against sex-selection abortion (92%, Environics, 2011) and most think life should be protected at some point before birth (59%, Abacus Data, 2011). If we were to find agreement with Mr. Borovoy in dismissing personhood arguments, we could still consider outlawing some forms of abortion.

What would happen if we theoretically granted personhood rights to a child in the womb? What would that mean for the mother? Mr. Borovoy argues that a mother's child is like a person seeking sanctuary in the body of someone who doesn't want it there.

Mr. Borovoy's comparison is not morally relevant. He takes a stranger-to-stranger relationship to rationalize lethal force in a mother-to-child relationship. A child is not a stranger, trespassing onto a foreign property, to seek sanctuary from another stranger. The human life in the womb is the child of its pregnant mother. The child is not seeking safety in a foreign environment. Rather, its life was brought forth by its parents and it is growing in its natural environment. This is the only environment in which the child can grow. Granted, some will cry foul as there are rare exceptions to some of these statements, but for brevity's sake those considerations will be left to others.

The question is, despite the significant differences between stranger-to-stranger contact versus mother-to-child contact, should the mother use lethal force, such as poison or dismemberment, to expel the child from her body?

If we push Mr. Borovoy's argument further, that "there is no rational way to decide when personhood begins," there is no reason to grant personhood at birth. What is the moral difference between a child an hour, one week or one month before it is born and a moment, day or year after it is born?

Could it be the child's level of development? Or size? Its degree of dependency on another person? Could it be the child's increasing self-awareness? Pro-lifers argue very consistently that the key is the inherent dignity of the human life, not any one of these other extraneous factors. When we as a society choose any characteristic other than the dignity of human life, we find ourselves in murky moral ground, perhaps potentially agreeing with Princeton philosopher Peter Singer who states that, "[n]ewborn human babies have no sense of their

own existence over time. So killing a newborn baby is never equivalent to killing a person, that is, a being who wants to go on living."

Examining the issue of personhood for the pre-born child may be complex. As a society, we'll likely want to consider scientific evidence, medical facts, legal principles, philosophy and, for those of us who have them, religious beliefs. These areas of human study are in fact "rational" means by which we could determine when personhood begins. If much of the rest of the world is capable of doing so, why shouldn't Canadians?

By **Faye Sonier** - legal counsel with **The Evangelical Fellowship of Canada** on the *Letters* page of the *National Post*, November 5, 2012

PUBLIC WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CITIZENSHIP

Public witness on issues of public concern is natural for Catholics because we have a commitment to the common good and to the dignity of each human person. Those two pillars - the common good and the dignity of every human person - come right out of Scripture. They underpin all of Catholic social thought.

That includes politics. Politics is where the competing moral visions of a society meet and struggle. And since a large majority of American citizens are religious believers, it makes sense for people and communities of faith to bring their faith into the public square.

As a result, if we believe that a particular issue is gravely evil and damaging to society, then we have a duty, not just a religious duty but also a *democratic* duty, to hold accountable the candidates who want to allow that evil. Failing to do so is an abuse of responsibility on our part, because that's where we exercise our power as citizens most directly - in the voting booth.

The "separation of Church and state" can never mean that religious believers should be silent about legislative issues, the appointment of judges or public policy. It's not the job of the Church to sponsor political candidates. But it's *very much* the job of the Church to guide Catholics to think and act in accord with their faith.

So since this is an election year, here are a few simple points to remember as we move toward November.

1. "Catholic" is a word that has real meaning. We don't control or invent that meaning as individuals. We inherit it from the Gospel and the experience of the Church over the centuries. If we choose to call ourselves Catholic, then that word has consequences for what we believe and how we act. We can't truthfully call ourselves "Catholic" and then behave as if we're not.

2. Being a Catholic is a bit like being married. We have a relationship with the Church and with Jesus Christ that's similar to being a spouse. If a man says he loves his wife, his wife will want to see the evidence in his fidelity. The same applies to our relationship with God. If we say we're Catholic, we need to show that by our love for the Church and our fidelity to what she teaches and believes. Otherwise we're just fooling ourselves. God certainly *won't* be fooled.

3. The Church is not a political organism. She has no interest in partisanship because getting power or running governments is not what she's about, and the more closely she identifies herself with any single party, the fewer people she can effectively reach.

4. Scripture and Catholic teaching, however, *do* have public consequences because they guide us in how we should act in relation to one another. Again, Catholic social action, including political action, is a natural byproduct of the Church's moral message. We can't call ourselves Catholic, and then simply stand by while immigrants get mistreated, or the poor get robbed, or - even more fundamentally - unborn children get killed. If our faith is real, then it

will bear fruit in our public decisions and behaviors, including our political choices.

5. Each of us needs to follow his or her own conscience. But conscience doesn't emerge miraculously from a vacuum. The way we get a healthy conscience is by submitting it to God's will; and the way we find God's will is by listening to the counsel of the Church and trying honestly to live in accord with her guidance. If we find ourselves frequently disagreeing, as Catholics, with the teaching of our own Church on serious matters, then it's probably not the Church that's wrong. The

problem is much more likely with us. In the end, the heart of truly faithful citizenship is this: We're better citizens when we're more faithful Catholics. The more authentically Catholic we are in our lives, choices, actions and convictions, the more truly we will contribute to the moral and political life of our nation.

By **Archbishop Charles J. Chaput, O.F.M. Cap.** - October 18, 2012 on *Catholicphilly.com*, the website of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia.

A READING FROM THE 'LIFE OF SAINT EDMUND'

In King Aethelred's day a certain very learned monk named Abbo came over the sea from the south, from Saint Benedict's resting-place to Archbishop Dunstan, three years before Dunstan died. During their conversation Dunstan related the story of Saint Edmund just as Edmund's sword-bearer related it to King Ethelstan when Dunstan was a young man and the sword-bearer was an aged man. Abbo recorded the entire story in a single book, and when the book came to us, we translated it into English, just as it stands now. [. . .]

Edmund the Blessed, King of East Anglia, was wise and worthy, and exalted among the noble servants of the almighty God. He was humble and virtuous and remained so resolute that he would not turn to shameful vices, nor would he bend his morality in any way, but was ever-mindful of the true teaching: 'If you are installed as a ruler, do not puff yourself up, but be among them just like one of them'. He was charitable to poor folk and widows, just like a father, and with benevolence he guided his people always towards righteousness, and restrained the cruel, and lived happily in the faith.

Eventually it happened that the Danes came with a ship-army, harrying and slaying widely through the land, as is their custom. In the fleet were the foremost chieftains Ivar and Ubbi, united through the devil. They landed warships in Northumbria, and wasted that country and slew the people. Then Ivar went [south]-east with his ships and Halfdan remained in Northumbria gaining victory with slaughter. Ivar came rowing to East Anglia in the year in which prince Alfred - he who afterwards became the famous West Saxon king - was twenty-one. The aforementioned Ivar suddenly invaded the country, just like a wolf, and slew the people, men and women and innocent children, and ignominiously harassed innocent Christians. Soon afterward he sent to king Edmund a threatening message, that Edmund should submit to his

allegiance, if he cared for his life. The messenger came to king Edmund and boldly announced Ivar's message: 'Ivar, our king, bold and victorious on sea and on land, has dominion over many peoples, and has now come to this country with his army to take up winter-quarters with his men. He commands that you share your hidden gold-hoards and your ancestral possessions with him straightaway, and that you become his vassal-king, if you want to stay alive, since you now do not have the forces that you can resist him.'

Then king Edmund summoned a certain bishop with whom he was most intimate, and deliberated with him how he should answer the fierce Ivar. The bishop was afraid because of this emergency, and he feared for the king's life, and counselled him that he thought that Edmund should submit to what Ivar asked of him. [. . .] Then said king Edmund, since he was completely brave: 'This I heartily wish and desire, that I not be the only survivor after my beloved thegns are slain in their beds with their children and wives by these pirates. It was never my way to flee. I would rather die for my country if I need to. Almighty God knows that I will not ever turn from worship of him, nor from love of his truth. If I die, I live.'

After these words he turned to the messenger whom Ivar had sent him, and, undaunted, said to him, 'In truth, you deserve to be slain now, but I will not defile my clean hands with your vile blood, because I follow Christ who so instructed us by his example; and I happily will be slain by you if God so ordain it. Go now quickly and tell your fierce lord: 'Never in this life will Edmund submit to Ivar the heathen war-leader, unless he submit first to the belief in the Saviour Christ which exists in this country'. Then the messenger went quickly on his way, and met along the road the cruel Ivar with all his army hastening towards Edmund, and told the impious one how he had been answered. Ivar then arrogantly ordered

that the pirates should all look at once for the king who scorned his command, and seize him immediately.

King Edmund, against whom Ivar advanced, stood inside his hall, and mindful of the Saviour, threw out his weapons. He wanted to match the example of Christ, who forbade to win the cruel Jews with weapons. Lo! The impious one then bound Edmund and insulted him ignominiously, and beat him with rods, and afterwards led the devout king to a firm living tree, and tried him there with strong bonds, and beat him with whips. In between the whip lashes, Edmund called out with true belief in the Saviour Christ. Because of his belief, because he called to Christ to aid him, the heathens became furiously angry. They then shot spears at him. As if

it were a game, until he was entirely covered with their missiles, like the bristles of a hedgehog (just like Saint Sebastian was).

When Ivar the impious pirate saw that the noble king would not forsake Christ, but with resolute faith called after him, he ordered Edmund beheaded, and the heathens did so. While Edmund still called out to Christ, the heathen dragged the holy man to his death, and with one stroke struck off his head, and his soul journeyed happily to Christ. There was a man near at hand, kept hidden by God, who heard all this, and told of it afterward, just as we have told it here.

By **Abbo of Fleury** in the recently-published *Customary of Our Lady of Walsingham*

FROM HERE AND THERE

1) Finding balance within the Ordinariate

"Whenever something new comes along it takes time time for things to settle and find their equilibrium. The new car is returned to the garage for a tweak to the engine. New software requires a patch before it works smoothly. The same is true for Ordinariates!

We who have formed the first groups of former Anglicans reconciled to full communion with the Holy See are in our infancy. We are therefore still working out the delicate balance - seeking that equilibrium between maintaining our unique patrimony/distinctive character whilst settling into the wider family we have joined as equal members.

Focus too heavily on Anglican patrimony, that which makes us distinct, and we could so easily create a ghetto. An inward looking backwater away from mainstream life. This would be a disaster for we would not then witness to the unity at the heart of the Ordinariate vision. Thank God that there is no evidence of this happening at this time!

But forget that patrimony altogether and the reason for our existence dies. The purpose of our entering as groups not individuals is negated. It may be tempting to go native - after all the Catholic church is a comfortable place for us - but we must resist. Slipping away into the wider body, either as individuals or as groups, does not help the cause!

And that is the point. We have been called as groups to fulfil a visionary purpose. The Pope is asking us to witness to something which he passionately believes is important for the future. So

out of fidelity to him we must not vanish into long grass. A one-off experiment ushering in but one generation of Anglicans. No - the door which this Pope has built must be kept open for future generations. A witness to Catholic hope for the conversion of England and end to reformation divide."

From **Father Ed Tomlinson's Blog** - October 19, 2012

2) A decent provision for the poor is the true test of civilisation. **Samuel Johnson** (1709-1784)

3) Did you know . . .

Dolphins sleep with one eye open.

A flea can jump about 130 times its height.

Australia's fluctuating kangaroo population sometimes outnumbers its human population more than 2 to 1.

Bullfrogs do not sleep.

Black cats are considered bad luck in the U.S., but good luck in Japan.

Humans are born with 300 bones but since many fuse together, adults only have 206 bones.

There are more chickens than people in the world.

Whether you walk or run, you burn about 100 calories per mile.

The brain is only about 2% of the body's mass, but requires about 20% of its oxygen and calories.

A fully-loaded tanker travelling at normal speed takes 20 minutes to stop.

About 11% of the earth's land surface is used to grow crops.

Butterflies taste with their feet.

Lightning strikes earth about 8 million times a day.

4) The practice of **toleration** as we know it diminishes the authority and cohesion of virtually all groups - families, churches, schools, professional guilds - while ceding more power to the state. 'Tolerance as a modern doctrine . . . has little to do with the survival of minority groups and everything to do with the centralizing of power.' **Michael Walzer**

5) **Catholic Women who changed the world**

Mother Angelica

Mother Angelica grew up in 1920s Ohio, enduring poverty after her father abandoned the family and as her mother struggled with mental health problems during the Great Depression.

She became a nun when she was 30, but in those days was considered "a late vocation". By the 1970s Mother Angelica had written 50 booklets and recorded 150 cassette tapes. Realising that her messages on the importance of Catholic identity could reach millions, she formed a tiny start-up in Catholic television, and in a few years she became a strong presence on North American cable networks. Some argued that radio was dying, but Mother Angelica expanded with a shortwave radio presence, followed by wide distribution on AM radio stations.

Her start-up, EWTN, is credited with being the catalyst in the sudden increase in Catholic radio stations across America. Without EWTN, smaller networks could never have afforded to produce Catholic programming to fill a daily schedule. Mother Angelica's traditional habit of the *Poor Clares of Perpetual Adoration* has been a great advertisement for religious life and has resulted in a surge of vocations to her order, and EWTN is recognised as the inspiration for the growth of Adoration chapels in the States.

None of this would have happened without Mother Angelica's vision, drive, and fearlessness.

Mary O'Regan - May 31, 2012 - *The Catholic Herald*

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)