

The Sodality of St. Edmund, King and Martyr

A community of
The Personal Ordinariate of the Chair of St. Peter

www.StEdmund.ca



UPDATE

January 21, 2014 - **St. Agnes, Virgin and Martyr**

FEBRUARY SCHEDULE

February 2	Sunday	The Presentation of Christ in the Temple
February 9	Sunday	The Fifth Sunday after the Epiphany
February 16	Sunday	Septuagesima
February 23	Sunday	Sexagesima

SERVICE TIME 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 LITURGY AND THE ANGLICAN ORDINARIATES** - this page.
- 2) **ROBERT'S RAMBLINGS - ITE MISSA EST** - page 3.
- 3) **CELEBRATING THE SPIRIT OF THE LITURGY - 6 of 6** - '*We are not at Mass to be entertained but to render glory to God and to be sanctified by the sacred mysteries.*' - page 4.
- 4) **SACROSANCTUM CONCILIIUM AND THE 'REFORM OF THE REFORM'** - page 6.
- 5) **YouTube HERESIES** - page 8.
- 6) **FROM HERE AND THERE** - page 9.

THE LITURGY AND THE ANGLICAN ORDINARIATES

An Evangelical Opportunity

As previous posts here [*Symposium* blog] will have made clear, although my spiritual home is in the Byzantine East, I am not disinterested in the life of the Western Church. In fact, quite the opposite is true. This is because over the course of Christian history, faithfulness in all things was of interest to the whole Church, and not limited to those who happened to live in particular regions. Furthermore, in a cosmopolitan world such as ours, wherein Greeks brush up against Slavs, Copts against Germans, and Syrians against Celts on a daily basis, it is hardly becoming of any Churchman to take shelter in their own corner, and ignore the affairs of those in another just because their rite is different, and their traditions lie outside his own. And as a former Anglican who was much concerned with the theological and spiritual rationale of what we did as traditional 'Anglo-Catholics', my interest in the current question is significant.

I feel compelled to address the issue of the Ordinate liturgies because I have heard from certain quarters - both former Anglican and cradle Roman - that there is some dissatisfaction in England and Wales with the idea that Ordinate Catholics should use what they regard as the 'old' services. This means, in terms of Anglican patrimony, that there is consternation on the part of some that the services of the Ordinate in Britain should be based on the traditional Book of Common Prayer.

To be fair, Anglo-Catholics in England never did benefit from the 20th century revisions that made the American and Canadian Books of Common Prayer (for example) much more conducive to Catholic interpretation than the 1662 Book. By this, I am NOT referring to the 1979 American book (also called the Book of Common Prayer) or the 1985

Canadian Book of Alternative Services; I am, rather, referring to the 1928 and 1962 books proper to each country. In any case, it is almost certain that the failure of the Proposed Book of Common Prayer in England to gain Parliamentary approval in 1928 set the Anglo-Catholic movement in the Anglican 'mother country' on a very different path to that of the United States and Canada.

The nature of this different path, I would argue, was most unfortunate. Whereas in Canada, Anglican Ritualists could draw on the 1962 book with pleasure, celebrating the Service of Holy Communion as if it was simply an Elizabethan English translation of the Sarum Rite, the like-minded brethren in England (at least after 1969) seemed to have little choice but to go down a path of surreptitious use of the Roman Missal. My own experience manifests this precisely. My penultimate service as a Canadian Anglican was taken at St John the Evangelist in Montreal, celebrated using nothing but the Canadian Book of Common Prayer, but done in a fashion that I can imagine our Medieval forbears would have recognised. Within weeks of moving to England, by contrast, I was using the Roman Missal for all services, while only the laity 'in the know' were aware that we weren't simply giving them a permissible variant of the 1980 Alternative Services Book. I observed that from parish to parish, Anglo-Catholics in England had largely lost sight of the historically-rooted Catholic aspirations of such figures as the Caroline Divines and the Oxford Fathers, and had rather come to emulate (albeit with better taste!) much of the English-speaking post-Vatican II Roman Catholic world (in either its Irish or its faux-Mediterranean form). For the most part, it seems, what became known in England (and Wales) as Anglo-Catholicism, was really a post-Anglican imitation of

the most unfortunate post-Conciliar Roman Catholic liturgical experimentation, which, other than being done with dignity, was and is both ahistorical and counter-rubrical.

I have been of the opinion for some time that one of the great weaknesses of the Roman Catholic Church in Britain is that her contemporary incarnation can appear as less than sympathetic to the indigenous spirit. It might be argued that, since the Reformation and the systematic dismantling of monasteries on these shores, together with the suppression of native rites (such as those of Sarum) by Trent, the indigenous British Catholic tradition has been, however residually, stewarded by the Protestant Church of England. This is because, in spite of the breath-taking witness of Recusants, the Roman Catholic Church has looked, in some instances, like the Italian Mission on the one hand, and the restricted spiritual domain of Irish immigrants on the other. Yet, if a country and a people need one thing in order to hear the Gospel, it is to be spoken to in a language of their own.

Whatever Thomas Cranmer became, at the time that he first translated the Latin Mass into English, drawing from Eastern sources as he did, he was a liturgical and linguistic genius. His pioneering creation, the 1549 Book of Common Prayer, was a work of beauty, and even subject to close analysis, Catholic understanding. His principal source for this work was, of course, the Sarum Rite, combined with a Benedictine spiritual worldview that he drew from the landscape of England itself. In saying so, I am in no way apologising for the theological, political, and historical travesty that led to the Prayer Book in the first place; I am only saying that, in spite of things, the resulting work could hardly have been surpassed. And it is this Book, together with its deeply flawed and wholly inadequate successor books that - for better or worse - spoke to, and for, the British people until at least the early twentieth century: from England to Wales and, to a lesser extent, Scotland.

When Pope Benedict graciously raised up the Ordinariates in countries with substantial numbers of Anglicans wishing to enter communion with the Catholic Church, he presented them with an opportunity to consider who they were and what they brought to the Catholic table as Anglicans. I would argue that Anglicans in the United States and Canada have been more successful in undertaking this opportunity than Anglicans in Britain, by reason of their stronger attachment to the liturgies of the Prayer Book tradition than their English counterparts, and because of the fact that theirs was always a highly reflective theological position as compared to an emotional, ritual one.

It seems to me that, at this early juncture in the history of *Anglicanorum coetibus*, it is incumbent on Anglicans who have entered communion with the Catholic Church to reflect on their identity as Catholic Anglicans, and to understand what distinguishes them from their more numerically significant Roman brethren. I, for one, would argue that the answer to this must be the liturgy above all: not only that it is celebrated with a certain Anglican dignity, but that it also draws on the legitimate heritage that Pope Benedict himself identified, and which resides in the services derived directly from the Book of Common Prayer. I believe that in deciding thus, the Ordinariates - but especially the Ordinariate of Our Lady of Walsingham - have an unsurpassed opportunity to meet the people where they are, and represent something that truly speaks to them. The legitimate heritage of Anglicanism has been doing so on some level for generations, and that heritage has now been recognised and taken up by the Church of Rome. I pray that we may all benefit from it.

By an **Ukrainian Greek Catholic Priest** in the UK on his blog *Symposium*. Thanks to Steve Cavanaugh on his blog *The Anglican Use of the Roman Rite*.

ROBERT'S RAMBLINGS

ITE MISSA EST

A sermon preached at the funeral mass of Father Penfold, formerly assistant of St Agatha's, Portsmouth, and then assistant of St Agnes, Eastbourne; formerly of the TAC and then of the Ordinariate. He died of cancer five days after his second priesting.

My text is one word, "Accomplished". *St John's* gospel chapter 19 verse 30: "When Jesus had received the vinegar He said, "It is accomplished - and died". The evening before, he prayed what is

nicknamed His high priestly prayer, and in that prayer He anticipated next day's thought. He prayed, "Father, I have accomplished the work Thou gavest Me to do." Had Jesus been speaking

modern jargon He might have said, "Mission accomplished". You may remember that the older form of mass ends with the words, "*Ite missa est*," "Go, mission accomplished", words which Philip sang often enough at St Agatha's in Portsmouth.

When a servant has accomplished a task he doesn't then do nothing. Further work may lie ahead. Jesus' work on earth may be done but He has passed from us to an heavenly ministry. The *Letter to the Hebrews* tells us that "Jesus ever liveth to make intercession for us" (7.26) Jesus is, not was, our great High Priest on high.

And Jesus shares His priesthood with those whom He ordains. With Christ, through Christ, as part of Christ, in Christ, Philip now participates in the intercession of Christ. Or put another way, Christ now expresses His ministry through Philip, makes present His ministry in Philip. Philip's ordination on Saturday the 7th, Philip's death of Thursday the 12th, were accomplishments. He did, he was, what the Father asked of him. But Philip doesn't now do nothing. Further work lies ahead. As a priest in the Great High Priest, as one in whom the Great High Priest now expresses Himself, Philip prays for us.

It goes without saying that we are disappointed that God gave Philip no miracle of healing. Jenny and

Philip went to Walsingham. They prayed. We all prayed. Doctors and nurses did everything they could. But if there are times when God works miracles, there are even more times when He doesn't. Jesus may have healed many but there are even more whom He did not heal. God did not intervene to save Jesus from the cross, or St Paul from the sword, or St Peter from crucifixion.

Philip has been offering himself to God throughout his life. At his confirmation, when he married Jenny, when he brought their children to the font, when he went up to Oxford to read theology, at his two Anglican ordinations, at his two Catholic ordinations. And God has been accepting Philip throughout his life. And in this time of our confused emotions God is in effect saying to us, "Thanks for your suggestion about a miracle, but no thanks. I have a better plan. I am accepting Philip for future ministry."

We are here to celebrate mission accomplished. By Jesus first and foremost of course. But mission accomplished by others too, in a wide variety of ways. Peter, Paul, Agatha, Agnes. And our Philip too, to whom we sing:

Ite missa est. Deo gratias.

Monsignor Robert Mercer CR

CELEBRATING THE SPIRIT OF THE LITURGY – 6 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.

Finally, I would like to touch briefly on those qualities of music that are necessary in order for it to be considered suitable for the sacred liturgy. What is sacred music?

The three essential qualities are known to all of you. They are universality, artistic quality (beauty) and sacredness. What has sadly happened in recent time is that, as long as the words of the songs talk about God or us and our relationship to God, then the music has been considered "sacred" and therefore acceptable for the liturgy. This is how we get to admitting music to the sacred liturgy that is not appropriate and, far from expressing the essential mystery being celebrated, distract from

that purpose and even impose other intentions on the liturgy.

There is a difference between religious songs and music and "sacred music" in the Church's tradition. What might be appropriate for a religious youth rally or a charismatic prayer meeting may not be suitable for divine worship in the holy sacrifice of the Mass.

So, let us look at these essential qualities. The sanctity of sacred music:

Turning to the teaching of Pope St. Pius X, which has had a significant impact on the teaching of the Second Vatican Council in this regard, we read:

Sacred music must be holy, and must, therefore, exclude all profanity not only in itself, but in the manner in which it is presented by those who execute it.

Vatican II emphasized the sanctity of sacred music in these terms:

(S)acred music is to be considered the more holy in proportion as it is more closely connected with the liturgical action, whether it adds delight to prayer, fosters unity of minds, or confers greater solemnity upon the sacred rites.

The intrinsic beauty (artistic goodness) of sacred music.

Since everything associated with the Mass must be beautiful, reflecting the infinite beauty and goodness of the God we worship, this applies in a special way to the music which forms an essential and integral part of our divine worship. In the words of Pope Benedict XVI:

Certainly, the beauty of our celebrations can never be sufficiently cultivated, fostered and refined, for nothing can be too beautiful for God, Who is Himself infinite Beauty. Yet our earthly liturgies will never be more than a pale reflection of the liturgy celebrated in the Jerusalem on high, the goal of our pilgrimage on earth. May our own celebrations nonetheless resemble that liturgy as closely as possible and grant us a foretaste of it!

Pope St. Pius X spoke of the artistic value of sacred music, another way of considering its intrinsic beauty:

Sacred music must be true art, for otherwise it will be impossible for it to exercise on the minds of those who listen to it that efficacy which the Church aims at obtaining in admitting into her liturgy the art of musical sounds.

The universality of sacred music

Finally, the third essential quality of sacred music must be considered, i.e. its universality. This quality means that any composition of sacred music, even one which reflects the unique culture of a particular region, would still be easily recognized as having a sacred character. The quality of holiness, in other words, is a universal principle that transcends culture.

While every nation is permitted to admit into its

ecclesiastical compositions those special forms which may be said to constitute its native music, still these forms must be subordinate in such a manner to the general character of sacred music, that nobody of any nation may receive an impression other than good on hearing them.

This articulation of the essential qualities of sacred music is necessary because there is often a lack of understanding or confusion as to what music is proper to the Mass and worthy of its inclusion in divine worship. As I have said, not every form or style of music is capable of being rendered suitable for the Mass.

That is why the *Gloria* of the Mass set to a Polka beat or in the style of rock music is not sacred music. Why not? Because such styles of music, as delightful as they might be for the dance hall or a concert, do not possess all three of the intrinsic qualities of sanctity, artistic goodness (beauty) and universality proper to sacred music. We are not at Mass to be entertained but to render glory to God and to be sanctified by the sacred mysteries.

Going back to what we looked at earlier about what the essential meaning and inner mystery of the Mass actually is, we can see that these styles of music, and others as well, are not capable of expressing the awesome mystery of the sacred liturgy and therefore cannot be rendered suitable. Knowing that at every Mass we stand at the foot of the cross and make present the sacrifice of Christ for our salvation, could you imagine singing a Polka or having rock drums or electric guitars there before this tremendous mystery?

In conclusion, then, we have seen that the *ars celebrandi*, the art of celebrating the sacred liturgy must always draw out, express and show forth the mystery being celebrated. The true spirit of the liturgy must be communicated in everything that we do in the celebration of holy Mass. This is a tangible example of the functional principle of the sacred liturgy: *lex orandi, lex credenda* - the law of praying is the law of believing. What we pray and do in the sacred liturgy and how we do it must always express what we believe about what Christ is doing in the liturgy.

Just as important is that what we pray and how we pray also forms us and catechizes us about these same realities. That is why we need to get this right for the formation and catechesis of the future generations in the work of the new evangelization.

Sacred music plays a critical and irreplaceable role in this ongoing effort at liturgical reform and

renewal. I thank the members of the Church Music Association of America for your tireless perseverance in this great effort. Never grow weary or become discouraged. We are on the brink of a

profound renewal of divine worship, and you are helping lead the way. God bless you and may he prosper the work of your hands, hearts and voices!

SACROSANCTUM CONCILIUM AND THE 'REFORM OF THE REFORM'

For the 50th anniversary of Vatican II's Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, Australian Bishop Peter Elliott reflects on its authentic interpretation.

As a former Anglican, Auxiliary Bishop Peter Elliott of the Archdiocese of Melbourne, Australia, brings a unique perspective to the liturgical reforms that have taken place in the Catholic Church since the promulgation of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, the Second Vatican Council's Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy.

Bishop Elliott is the author of *Ceremonies of the Liturgical Year* and *Ceremonies of the Modern Roman Rite*, both published by Ignatius Press, and he will be presenting a workshop on *Sacrosanctum Concilium* in January 2014, at Australia's national liturgical conference. He responds here to questions from *Register* correspondent Judy Roberts on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*.

Who is paying attention to Sacrosanctum Concilium a half century after its promulgation?

Today, I believe *Sacrosanctum Concilium* is often regarded as a superseded document.

The liberal liturgical establishments in various countries are celebrating the jubilee of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. To me, some of what they are publishing seems condescending. Much of it has nothing to do with the doctrinal richness and vision of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, just a rehash of old causes, such as feminist language, and other dated theories.

On the other hand, the "New Liturgical Movement" people and other younger Catholics inspired by Benedict XVI pay respectful attention to *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. Some say we need to go back to *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, not just as a first step in a process, but as the authoritative source for a thorough "reform of the reform."

With the official recovery of the pre-conciliar liturgy, some traditionalists are re-examining *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. I hope they can recognize its continuity with the encyclical of Pope Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, and with all that was best in the pre-Vatican II liturgical movement. In other words, they should not

blame *Sacrosanctum Concilium* for all that followed in the years after the Council.

How would you summarize the message of Sacrosanctum Concilium, and how well was it communicated to the Church in 1963?

The heart of the liturgy is the paschal mystery of Jesus Christ, his cross and resurrection made present in the "summit and source," the holy Eucharist, and in the sacraments. Christian worship on earth, as the exercise of the priestly office of Jesus Christ, gives us a share and foretaste of the eternal worship of the Holy Trinity in heaven.

I am not sure how far these great principles in the doctrinal introduction to *Sacrosanctum Concilium* were communicated well.

But Catholics did learn that many lost or obscured traditions from the "age of the fathers" would be restored, that they would be able to worship in their own language and that they would have access to a wider range of scriptural readings. Clergy welcomed the prospect of a revision of the Divine Office to meet pastoral conditions; and soon after *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, they were introduced to concelebration.

One message did come across clearly: that everyone should participate in the liturgy in a full, active and conscious way and that various roles and ministries would be restored. At the request of missionary bishops, the enculturation of worship was taken forward.

What reforms did we see that were never intended by the document or were taken too far?

What was never intended, or imagined, by the Council Fathers was Communion in the hand and receiving Communion standing. These practices began in the Netherlands soon after the Council, and, later, they were authorized, a shameful episode when breaking law led to making law. Can anyone seriously argue that these practices have deepened

reverence for the blessed Eucharist?

Then we come to what was never mentioned in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, but soon spread everywhere after the Council - Mass facing the people. I eagerly supported that change, and I celebrate most Masses that way.

But now, after much reflection, I have second thoughts. Has this overemphasized the priest? Does it rest on the erroneous opinion that the Mass is a meal? Have we lost something? The mystery? So what was gained by all that expensive renovation of sanctuaries? We moved altars - but did we move hearts?

In a broader perspective, what really set in was the *secularization* of the liturgy. That led to the degradation of language, rituals, vessels and vestments, design, architecture and music.

The Mass became a dialogue across a table, and Communion became a queue when people go and get something. Please do not tell me that a queue is a "Communion procession."

Now, we face the urgent need to recover the sacred because *Sacrosanctum Concilium* never intended to secularize Christian worship, with all that dull ugliness and cold functionalism. As Pope Benedict taught, beauty is essential in all that pertains to the worship of the God, who is Beautiful, and that rests on Chapter 7 of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*.

Sacrosanctum Concilium says, "Before men can come to the liturgy, they must be called to faith and to conversion."

It also talks about the faithful coming to the liturgy with "proper dispositions, that their minds should be attuned to their voices, and that they should cooperate with Divine grace, lest they receive it in vain."

Did some of the failures of the reform occur because these were not addressed before liturgical changes were implemented?

Faith is at the heart of the matter, but let us not simplify this in some Western rationalist way. It is not a question of first we catechize and convert

people and then they can participate in worship. If you look at the Rite of Christian Initiation of Adults (RCIA), you see a gradual interaction between faith and worship running through the catechumenal process. Moreover, the liturgy, especially in the new, richer English translation, has an innate capacity to call people to conversion. My own conversion to Catholicism was partly shaped by the liturgy, Catholic and Anglican.

What do you see being recovered today that was lost in the reform, yet specified in Sacrosanctum Concilium?

The obvious recovery is the celebration of the classical Latin Mass or "extraordinary form." For this, we thank Pope Benedict, and, note, we have been assured that Pope Francis has no problem with the old rite.

But when I was a young priest, we were led to believe that the pre-conciliar rite was forbidden, and I fell for that deceitful line. When I commenced service in the Vatican, the famous lay canonist Count [Neri] Capponi soon set me straight about the legality issue, later confirmed by Pope Benedict in *Summorum Pontificum*.

I learnt how to celebrate the *usus antiquior* (older use), and now I find it consoling, so prayerful. This struck me recently when I celebrated a solemn pontifical Mass to conclude the *Christus Rex* pilgrimage, an annual event in the state of Victoria involving many families and young people. As polyphony and chant soared to the vaults of the magnificent Gothic Cathedral of the Sacred Heart in the city of Bendigo, I kept thinking, "But this is all about prayer . . . this is one big prayer . . ."

Nevertheless, I cannot claim to be "deeply attached" to the old rite. Yes, I love it, just as I love the *Novus Ordo* (celebrated properly) and the rite I helped prepare for the ordinariates for former Anglicans. I also love the venerable rites of the Christian East, particularly the Byzantine Rite.

Love of the sacred liturgy of our Church is not like being married to one person!

By **Judy Roberts** - December 5, 2013 in the *National Catholic Register*

YouTube HERESIES

A year ago I began posting brief reflections on movies, music and culture on YouTube, probably the most watched Web site in the world. This exercise

has resembled St. Paul's venture onto the Areopagus in Athens, preaching the Gospel amid a jumble of competing ideas. YouTube is a virtual

Areopagus, where every viewpoint - from the sublime to the deeply disturbing - is on display. Never as a Catholic teacher or preacher have I addressed less of the "choir." The most numerous responses have come to my pieces on atheism and belief. I have made a video called "Why It Makes Sense to Believe in God," three others answering Christopher Hitchens and, the most popular, a response to Bill Maher's film "Religulous."

YouTube viewers can post comments. The hundreds I've received have been overwhelmingly negative. Some are emotionally driven and rude, but others are thoughtful and have given rise to serious exchanges. As I debate with these mostly young opponents of religion, and Catholicism in particular, I have discerned four basic patterns of opposition that block the reception of the faith. In the second century, St. Irenaeus wrote his classic *Adversus Haereses (Against the Heresies)* if a contemporary apologist would like to know the heresies of our time, she might consult these YouTube objections. I have identified four: **scientism**, **ecclesial angelism**, **biblical fundamentalism** and **Marcionism**.

Scientism. In the videos, I have appealed to classical and contemporary arguments for the existence of God, demonstrating that there must be a stable ground for the contingency of the world and an intelligent source for the intelligibility of the world. I am met with some version of the following assertion: Matter, or the universe as a totality, or the big bang, or "energy" is an adequate explanation of all that is. When I counter that the big bang is itself the clearest indication that the entire universe - including matter and energy - radically contingent and in need of a cause extrinsic to itself, they say that I am speaking nonsense, that science gives no evidence of God's existence. I agree, insisting that the sciences deal with realities and relationships within the world but that the Creator is, by definition, not an ingredient in the world he made.

What I am up against here is not science, but the philosophical position that reality is restricted to what the empirical sciences can measure. When one of my opponents asserted that science alone deals with reality, I informed him that he was involved in an operational self-contradiction, for he was making an unscientific remark in support of his claim. I am struck by how philosophically impoverished my YouTube interlocutors are. Though many can speak rather ably of physics or chemistry or astronomy, they are at a loss when the mode of analysis turns philosophical or metaphysical.

The second heresy I call **ecclesial angelism**. Repeatedly my conversation partners say: "Who are you, a Catholic priest, to be making truth claims, when your church has been guilty of so many moral outrages against the human race: the Crusades, the Inquisition, witch hunts, support of slavery and the clerical sex abuse scandal?" My arguments in favor of religious belief are not so much refuted as ignored, with a "consider the source" wave of the hand.

I respond by insisting that the existence of bad Catholics does not in itself demonstrate that Catholicism is a bad thing. A rare ally on a YouTube forum observed that the use of Einsteinian physics in the production of the nuclear weapons that killed hundreds of thousands of innocents does not amount to an argument against Einstein. As the old dictum has it, bad practice does not preclude good practice.

I do not deny the major premise of their argument. I've told them I stand with John Paul II, who spent years apologizing for the misbehavior of Catholics over the centuries. But Christians have known always that the church, as Paul put it, "holds a treasure in earthen vessels." In its sacraments, especially the Eucharist, in its essential teachings, in its liturgy and in the lives of its saints, the church participates in the very holiness of God. But in its human dimension, it is fragile. Ecclesial angelism blurs this distinction and allows any fault of church people to undermine the church's claim to speak the truth.

A third heresy is **biblical fundamentalism**. I hear from my YouTube opponents that the Bible is a mishmash of "bronze-age myths" (Christopher Hitchens) and childish nonsense about talking snakes, a 5,000-year-old universe and a man living three days inside of a fish. I observe in reply that the Bible is not so much a book as a library, made up of texts from a wide variety of genres and written at different times for varying audiences. Just as one would not take "the library" literally, one should not interpret the whole Bible with one set of lenses.

My YouTube conversation partners typically fire back that I am proposing a novelty in order to respond to the attacks of modern critics. I try to steer them to Irenaeus (second c.), Origen (third c.) and Augustine (fourth c.), all of whom dealt with the complexity of the Bible through the exercise of a deft hermeneutic. Some of those who appreciate the library analogy wonder how one would decide which kind of text one is dealing with and hence which set of interpretive lenses to wear. I respond that their good question proves the legitimacy of the Catholic Church's assumption that the church - that

variegated community of interpretation stretching over 20 centuries - required for effective biblical reading today. I ask, How do you know the difference between *Winnie the Pooh*, *The Brothers Kara-mazov*, the *Divine Comedy*, Carl Sandburg's *Lincoln* and Gore Vidal's *Lincoln*? Then I answer my own question: You have been taught by a long and disciplined tradition of interpretation. Something similar is at play in authentic biblical reading.

The fourth YouTube heresy is **Marcionism**, which brings us back to one of Irenaeus' principal opponents, Marcion. He held that the New Testament represented the revelation of the true God, but that the Old Testament was the revelation of a pathetic demigod marked by pettiness, jealousy and violence. This ancient heresy reappears practically intact on the YouTube forums. My interlocutors complain about the morally offensive, vain, psychotic and violent God of the Old Testament, who commands that a ban be put on cities, who orders genocide so that his people can take possession of the Promised Land, who commands that children's heads be dashed against stones. In the wake of the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, this complaint becomes more pointed. If I gesture toward the wisdom of the

biblical tradition, I am met with this objection.

I urge my respondents to read the entire Bible in the light of Christ crucified and risen from the dead. I tell them of an image in the Book of Revelation of a lamb standing as though slain. When no one else in the heavenly court is able to open the scroll that symbolizes all of salvation history, the lamb alone succeeds. This indicates that the nonviolent Christ, who took upon himself the sin of the world and returned in forgiving love, is the interpretive key to the Bible. It was in this light that Origen, for example, read the texts concerning the Old Testament ban as an allegory about the struggle against sin. The bottom line is this: One should never drive a wedge between the two testaments instead, one should allow Christ to be the structuring logic of the entire Scripture.

What is blocking the preaching of the faith, especially to younger people? Many things. But I would suggest that preachers, teachers, evangelists and catechists might attend with some care to these four.

By **Fr. Robert Barron** in *America*, *The National Catholic Review*, May 25, 2009

FROM HERE AND THERE

1) **St. Agnes** was a Roman girl who was only thirteen years old when she suffered martyrdom for her Faith. Agnes had made a promise, a promise to God never to stain her purity. Her love for the Lord was very great and she hated sin even more than death! Since she was very beautiful, many young men wished to marry Agnes, but she would always say, "Jesus Christ is my only Spouse."

Procop, the Governor's son, became very angry when she refused him. He had tried to win her for his wife with rich gifts and promises, but the beautiful young girl kept saying, "I am already promised to the Lord of the Universe. He is more splendid than the sun and the stars, and He has said He will never leave me!" In great anger, Procop accused her of being a Christian and brought her to his father, the Governor. The Governor promised Agnes wonderful gifts if she

would only deny God, but Agnes refused. He tried to change her mind by putting her in chains, but her lovely face shone with joy. Next he sent her to a place of sin, but an Angel protected her. At last, she

was condemned to death. Even the pagans cried to see such a young and beautiful girl going to death. Yet, Agnes was as happy as a bride on her wedding day. She did not pay attention to those who begged her to save herself. "I would offend my Spouse," she said, "if I were to try to please you. He chose me first and He shall have me!" Then she prayed and bowed her head for the death-stroke of the sword.

Agnes of Rome (c. 291 - c. 304) is a virgin-martyr, venerated as a saint in the Catholic Church, Eastern Orthodox Church, the Anglican Communion, and Lutheranism. She is one of seven women, excluding the Blessed Virgin, commemorated by name in the Canon of the Mass. She is the patron saint of chastity, gardeners, girls, engaged couples, rape victims, and virgins.

2) Never, never be afraid to do what's right, especially if the well-being of a person or animal is at stake. Society's punishments are small compared to the wounds we inflict on our soul when we look the other way. **Martin Luther King Jr.**

3) When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice; but when the wicked rule, the people mourn.
Proverbs 29:2

4) Unfit for print

the bomb was diffused before it exploded

the bank robber was arrested before he made his getaway

a hypothetical assumption

aboriginal murder

falling between the cracks

5) ***Lex Orandi, Lex Credendi, Lex Vivendi*** (as we pray, so we believe, so we live)

6) If one understands what the Mass truly is – Christ Himself coming down from Heaven to renew the sacrifice of Calvary – how could you possibly not be there on Sunday?

7) The voice of conscience is so delicate that it is easy to stifle it; but it is also so clear that it is impossible to mistake it. **Madame De Stael**

8) A second take!

grammar police – to correct and to serve

keep clam and proofread

mathematicians wear glasses because they improve division

another day with no plans to use calculus

I dream of a society where a chicken can cross the road without its motives questioned

don't grow up – it's a trick

listen and silent have the same letters

home of the free because of the brave

a wise man once said – 'I should ask my wife'

the only thing we have to fear is fear itself – and spiders

7 days without a pun makes one weak

to save time, let's assume I know everything

9) The Altar of Our Lady in St. Patrick's Church:



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)