

The Evangelization Station

“Service of and witness to the faith are necessary for salvation”

CCC §1816



Newsletter



Vol. 1, Issue 4, © November 2010

Editor: Victor R. Claveau, MJ — Website: www.evangelizationstation.com

Tel: (209) 728-5598 — E-mail: claveau@earthlink.net

The Colony That Failed

In 2002, the Diocese of Richmond opened the cause for the canonization of the Spanish Jesuit Martyrs of Virginia. This has renewed interest in the fascinating tale of a lost Spanish colony in Virginia and the men who died trying to convert the Ajacan Indians.

JUAN BAUTISTA DE SEGURA AND SEVEN COMPANIONS FROM THE JESUIT MISSIONS OF VIRGINIA



In 1561 a Spanish ship commanded by Pedro Menéndez de Aviles journeyed into the Chesapeake Bay and seized an adolescent boy. The Spanish named the boy Don Luis, and he stayed under the care of Menéndez, who became commander of Spanish Florida in 1565. Don Luis viewed Spanish colonial society firsthand for nine years. He was taught the Spanish language and the intricacies of Catholicism. Menéndez hoped to use Don Luis as an interpreter and missionary

for a Spanish colony to be established in the Chesapeake region. Since Don Luis was related to a Powhatan chief, Menéndez treated him well; he lived in Cuba, Mexico, and Spain at different times and even met King Philip II.

Return to the Chesapeake.

In 1570 Don Luis returned home accompanied by two Jesuit priests and seven assistants, but with no military support. Don Luis directed the Jesuits to settle in an area away from any native village, and he then left them to rejoin his people. Quickly he asserted his elite status and took several wives, in direct repudiation of his Christian education. After six months the Jesuits pestered Don Luis and his people incessantly for food, and Powhatan religious leaders viewed the missionaries as a threat. Having reached the end of his patience, Don Luis led a war party that killed all of the Jesuits except for one boy.

Aftermath.

Menéndez soon learned what happened to the Jesuits he had helped finance, and he dispatched a punitive expedition to the Chesapeake. The Spanish rescued the boy and killed several Powhatans, but Don Luis refused to deliver himself over to them. In retaliation for the killing of the Jesuits and Don Luis's refusal to cooperate, the Spanish hanged some Powhatan captives from the yardarms of their ship and let them die of starvation and exposure. "After seeing the opposite of what the fathers were, they tremble," wrote a member of the punitive force, "this chastisement has become famous throughout the land." The fate of Don Luis is uncertain. It is possible that he was related to the Powhatan leaders Wahunsonacock and Opechancanough, who confronted John Smith and the English after 1607. Some speculate that Don Luis and Opechancanough may have been the

same person. Regardless, Don Luis certainly shaped his people's perceptions of Europeans by telling them of all the things he had seen in Europe, Cuba, and Mexico.

Source: Clifford M. Lewis and Albert J. Loomie, *The Spanish Jesuit Mission in Virginia: 1570–1572* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953).

One interesting speculation is this: What would the future of our country have been if the Spanish attempt to set up a colony in Virginia had succeeded? Virginia became the mother colony for the English. But if the area had been in possession of the Spanish, our country's history would have probably been vastly different.

The Cycles of Bigotry

Father Albert J. Nevins, M.M.

It is an over-simplification to state that the American colonies were founded by people who came to the New World seeking religious freedom. It is true that the early settlers in the Northeast did seek freedom to worship in their own way—but it was a freedom that they were not prepared to give to others who might differ in belief. Religious prejudice existed between sects, and was responsible for driving Roger Williams from Massachusetts to Rhode Island, the Puritans from Virginia to Maryland, but it was particularly virulent in the case of Catholics.

The prejudice against Catholics was conceived mainly in the anti-Papal passion of Queen Elizabeth. Prejudice became a fixed state of mind, a fanatical compulsion, against which logic and reason had no effect. The Christian doctrine of love was implicitly amended to exclude Catholics. Separation of Church and State was interpreted to mean that Catholics should have no influence on civil government. The colonists, the vast majority of whom were Protestant, made provisions for the union of Church and State in all colonies except Pennsylvania and Rhode Island. Maryland was founded as a place of religious freedom; but when Protestants gained control, Catholics faced discrimination.

The coming of the Revolution did little to alter anti-Catholic sentiment. George Washington had to rebuke the Boston patriots for their anti-Catholicism. It is an arguable opinion that, except for the Americans' anti-Catholicism, Canada would have joined the colonies in breaking away from England. In 1788, Massachusetts put through a Puritan-inspired law that excluded Catholics from public office. In the following year, the Massachusetts Constitution was adopted, and it provided for public support of Protestant teachers of "piety, religion, and morality."

This union of Church and State was not confined to Massachusetts. In 1784, the New Hampshire Constitution was approved, and it included a religious test that barred Catholics from public office, and the provision for public support of Protestant teachers of religion. The State Constitution of North Carolina, adopted in 1776 and in force until 1835, denied office to all but Protestants. New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and Georgia limited their officials to others than "Papists." When President Andrew Jackson appointed a Catholic, the competent Roger Brooks Taney, first as Attorney General and then as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, he provoked political storms. When President Franklin Pierce appointed a Catholic, William Campbell, to his Cabinet as Postmaster General, another brouhaha resulted—the accusation was even hurled that the act was a plot for the Pope to get access to the mails and read United States Government correspondence.

In 1852, the [Know Nothing Party](#) was founded, and it spread like wildfire throughout the country. "Americans must rule America!" was the rallying cry. Under the Know Nothings, religious bigotry reached a high point not previously attained. The party elected officials to office, and for a time held considerable power; it was anti-Catholic, anti-immigration, terroristic and brutal. The Know Nothings provoked riots in many sections of the country, each riot aimed at Catholic immigrants.

The undoing of the Know Nothing movement resulted from mob violence, plus the incompetence of persons the members of the movement elected to office. Gradually sensible Protestants worked against the Know Nothing Party, and it disappeared beneath the weighty problems facing America in pre-Civil War days. While there was a basic mistrust and suspicion of Catholics, the root of the problem was fundamentally economic. There was a fear that Catholic immigrants would depress wages and take "Protestants'" jobs. There was also the threat of political control by the growing number of urban Catholics. The situation was repeated by the Negro emigration to the North after the Civil War/

The next anti-Catholic movement, springing from the same causes, appeared in 1887: it was stimulated by the American Protective Association—popularly known as the A.P.A. The Association sought to repeal naturalization laws, to forbid teaching any foreign languages in public schools, and to tax Church property. Its forays into politics became its undoing, because politicians used the organization for their own ends.

Some years later—on Thanksgiving night, 1915—thirty-four men gathered on a mountain top near Atlanta, Georgia. There, under a blazing cross, they pledged loyalty to the Invisible Empire, the revived Knights of

the Ku Klux Klan. That movement, which used murder, whippings, and Tar-and-feathers as weapons, was anti-Catholic, anti-Negro, anti-Semitic, anti-alien. Father James Gillis, the celebrated Paulist orator and writer, called the Klan, “the most curious combination of comedy and tragedy, of buffoonery and villainy,” ever to appear on the American scene.

The Ku Klux Klan had considerable strength inside the Democratic Party; and in 1924, it was influential in blocking Governor Alfred E. Smith, a New York Catholic from the nomination for President. The Klan attempted to keep Governor Smith from the 1928 nomination. Tactics failed and Smith won the nomination.

The bigotry that was released by the 1928 Presidential campaign rocked the United States. Scurrilous literature, wild accusations, anti-Catholic sermons, were the order of the day. One of the most effective weapons used against Smith was a fraudulent document that purported to be the secret Knights of Columbus oath. The “Oath” first appeared in a congressional campaign in 1912, and an investigation by the House Elections Committee proved it a fraud. The Klan and other bigoted groups circulated almost countless copies of the “oath.” The Knights of Columbus prosecuted when evidence could be obtained, and they gained many convictions.

The Presidential campaign of 1960 gave ample evidence that bigotry was far from dead. The same type of literature that appeared in 1928 was present again; the bogus Knights of Columbus oath reappeared; and sermons rang out to tell why a Catholic could not be President. But is bigotry is not dead, neither is it as vigorous as it once was. The majority of Americans voted for John F. Kennedy, because that considered him to be the best qualified. The Constitutional provision that “no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust of the United States” was finally applied, if not by all Americans at least by a majority, to the highest office in the land.

From: *Our American Heritage*, Our Sunday Visitor, 1972.

See also, Evangelization Station pamphlets:

[Accusations Against the Church, Victor R. Claveau, MJ](#)

[Anti-Catholic Prejudice, Martin J. Scott, S.J.](#)

[Catholic League for religious and Civil Rights](#)

[The Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk](#)

[The Jesuit Oath Debunked](#)

[The Know Nothing Party](#)

[The New Anti-Catholic Bigotry \(Chuck Colson\)](#)

[The New Anti-Catholicism \(Dwight Longenecker\)](#)

In 1928, The Knights of Columbus published an editorial in the New Your Sun, wherein the actual 4th degree oath was made available:

“I swear to support the Constitution of the United States. I pledge myself, as a Catholic citizen and Knight of Columbus to enlighten myself fully upon my duties as a citizen and to conscientiously perform such duties entirely in the interest of my country and regardless of all personal consequences. I pledge myself to do all in my power to preserve the integrity and purity of the ballot, and to promote reverence and respect for law and order. I promise to practice my religion openly and consistently, but without ostentation, and to so conduct myself in public affairs, and in the exercise of public virtue, as to reflect nothing but credit upon our Holy Church, to the end that she may flourish and our country prosper to the greater honor and glory of God.”

A History of Thanksgiving



The first day of thanks in America was celebrated in Virginia at Cape Henry in 1607, but it was the Pilgrims' three-day feast celebrated in early November of 1621, which we now popularly regard as the "First Thanksgiving." The first real Thanksgiving to God in the Plymouth Colony was actually celebrated during the summer of 1623 when the colonists declared a Thanksgiving holiday after their crops were saved by much needed rainfall. The Pilgrims left Plymouth, England on September 6, 1620. They sailed for a new world with the promise of both civil and religious liberty. For almost three months, 102 seafarers braved harsh elements to arrive off the coast of what is now Massachusetts, in late November of 1620. On December 11, prior to disembarking at Plymouth Rock, they signed the "Mayflower Compact," America's original document of civil government and the first to introduce self-government.

Most of what we know about the Pilgrim Thanksgiving of 1621 comes from original accounts of the young colony's leaders, Governor William Bradford and Master Edward Winslow, in their own hand:

"They begane now to gather in ye small harvest they had, and to fitte up their houses and dwellings against winter, being well recovered in health & strength, and had all things in good plenty; for some

were thus employed in affairs abroad, others were excersised in fishing, aboute codd, & bass, & other fish, of which yey tooke good store, of which every family had their portion. All ye somer ther was no wante. And now begane to come in store of foule, as winter approached, of which this place did abound when they came first (but afterward decreased by degree). And besids water foule, ther was great store of wild Turkies, of which they took many, besids venison, &c. Besids they had aboute a peck a meale a weeke to a person, or now since harvest, Indean corne to yt proportion. Which made many afterwards write so largely of their plenty hear to their freinds in England, which were not fained, but true reports." -W.B. (William Bradford)

"Our Corne did proue well, & God be prayed, we had a good increase of Indian Corne, and our Barly indifferent good, but our Pease not worth the gathering, for we feared they were too late sowne, they came vp very well, and blossomed, but the Sunne parched them in the blossome; our harvest being gotten in, our Governour sent foure men on fowling, that so we might after a more speciall manner reioyce together, after we had gathered the fruit of our labors; they foure in one day killed as much fowle, as with a little helpe beside, served the Company almost a weeke, at which time amongst other Recreations, we exercised our Armes, many of the Indians coming amongst vs, and among the rest their greatest King Massasoyt, with some nintie men, whom for three dayes we entertained and feasted, and they went out and killed fiue Deere, which they brought to the Plantation and bestowed upon our Governour, and upon the Captaine, and others. And although it be not alwayes so plentifull, as it was at this time with vs, yet by the goodnes of God, we are so farre from want, that we often wish you partakers of our plenty."

-E.W. (Edward Winslow) Plymouth, in New England, his 11th of December, 1621.

A Thanksgiving Day Homily

Father Vincent Gilmore O. Praem.

Thanksgiving Day is like a national liturgy. It happens at the same time every year with the same rites. The rites: a turkey dinner with family. In our home, my home growing up, it was always the

same. We ate in the formal dining room with the good silverware and china. Served was turkey, mashed potatoes with gravy, cranberry sauce, and Mom's special fruit salad, which we all loved, and pumpkin pie with whipped cream.

It was a happy time with most of the family home and sitting around the fireplace; and the guys going outside to throw a football around or have a snowball fight, if it was snowing. I grew up in Washington State. Family liturgy, it is what memories are made of; Christmas is the same way.

It is only when one gets older that one begins to reflect upon the meaning of these family liturgies, the context for these feasts and holidays. This national feast of Thanksgiving has worthy and fitting origins. It is situated in the fall after the harvest to give thanks to God for his bounty-thus Thanksgiving. It is a feast of gratitude. As Catholics we can readily relate to Thanksgiving because it is a fundamental element of our worship: Eucharist means Thanksgiving.

And now, a few words on gratitude-thanksgiving. Gratitude is the fundamental disposition of being a creature. Being humans created by God there is nothing we have, possess, own, enjoy, or love, that has not been given to us. If we ourselves give anything, whether it be time, gifts, love, knowledge, or prayer, it is because it has already been given.

A mistaken idea of man in our secular materialistic age is that we actually make things; by making, acting, and doing we define who we are and our destiny. We become gods; we think we are gods and we think we are in control. Technology has given us this illusion that we can control anything and everything by our activity. And so we have created a society of doing. The only value has become doing, working, making, buying, selling, and having more. The motto is do more, make more, have more, and everyone is busy, busy, busy; doing more, making more, and having more. And then, sadly, at the end of the day we are empty; one's value and worth is judged by how much stuff one has.

All of this frantic activity is totally missing the point of the essence of what it means to be human. The essence of being human is not doing, but being, not activity, but resting, giving, yes, but first receiving.

To be fully human and to truly give one must first receive. This is the fundamental quality of being human: receptivity.

We stand in need of the gift. The gift that makes us whole, gives us life, and gives us our true identity and meaning. We come to the most profound sense of ourselves, not through what we do, but through what we accept.

We must wait for the gift of love, and love can only be received as a gift. It cannot be "made" on one's own, without anyone else; one must wait for it, let it be given. We cannot become fully and wholly human in any other way than by being loved, by letting oneself be loved. This love represents simultaneously, both man's highest possibility and his deepest need. This necessary thing, receiving love, depends on our happiness and salvation. If we decline ourselves from being presented with this gift, we destroy ourselves. We will live in misery and unhappiness.

Salvation history is nothing other than God trying to give mankind this gift of love, and unfortunately much of God's efforts are thwarted by man's refusing the gift.

The primacy of acceptance is not intended to condemn man to passivity. On the contrary, it alone makes it possible to do the things of this world in a spirit of service, putting all our actions at the service of redemptive love. This is the meaning of the apostolate, this is what every Christian is called to be, a builder of the Kingdom.

So on this Thanksgiving Day let each of us know and reflect upon where we stand with God. Do we stand as receivers of the gift of his love? And once we are good receivers then we can be givers.

We have already received a great deal - too much to comprehend, really - there is much more to receive starting now at this Eucharist. And what is the only appropriate response? Gratitude, gratitude is the only appropriate response. It is truly a day to give thanks; every day should be Thanksgiving Day. Happy Thanksgiving!

November 25 - Thanksgiving Day

© 2010 – Victor R. Claveau

For what do we have to be thankful?

During the tense days of the Second World War many of our Hollywood stars, both men and women, gave generously of their time and talent to assist and to entertain our servicemen here and abroad. We know, for one, that Elsa Lanchester, British-born actress, frequently gave informal parties for servicemen in her Los Angeles apartment. As each of her guests was about to leave, she asked him to write his name and address in her Servicemen's Book, as she called it.

Toward the end of each party this charming lady of the screen would address her guests in a tone that showed unquestioning trust in God. She assured them: "I promise each one of you who will write his name in my book that I will pray constantly for your safe return. God will watch over you."

As the months rolled into years, a number of these soldiers, sailors, and marines returned. Many made it a point to stop and say sincerely, "Thank you, Miss Lanchester," before they took train for home. After their departure the actress would take out her Servicemen's Book, find the name of the one who had returned safe, and check it by writing beneath the boy's name the words, "Thank you, God."

She wanted to thank God for each safe return. She did it thoroughly and efficiently. She wanted to be sure that thanks were rendered in every case. She even wrote it down.

It would be a fine idea for every one of us to have a book like that, a book in which we could write the countless blessings we have received, a book where we could write beside each blessing, "Thank You, God."

Such a procedure may seem prosaic and mechanical, yet it is much better than the opposite-never thanking God at all. If the plan would help us to be more grateful-let's try it. Try writing down the gifts God has bestowed on you today, yesterday, all last year. And then say, "Thank You, God," or write it down beside each benefit for which you should be grateful.

Let's make a start:

Thank You, God that I can see. There are thousands who cannot see. For them there is no sunrise or sunset; no autumn colors, no rainbow tinted flowers, no movies, no delights of the eye.

Thank You, God that I can hear. There are thousands who cannot hear the voice of their own

mother, nor the singing of the birds, nor a symphony, nor the laughter of children.

Thank You, God that I can walk. I know thousands who can't take a single step, thousands who are confined to a bed or wheel chair, other thousands of men who lost their legs in a war-who spend their years in I helpless dependence on the wavering kindness of others.

Thank You, God that I can work. Look at the many who can do nothing with brain or brawn or hands.

Thank You, God that I have something to eat. Millions as good as I, maybe better, have little or nothing to eat. Thousands are dying of hunger while I sit down to a Thanksgiving feast. Thank You, God, for the bumper crops of 2003. Our vast country could feed the world. In the breadbasket of America-Kansas, Iowa, and Nebraska, there are mountains of golden wheat and pyramids of golden corn, Your gifts. Help us, O God to get this food, Your food, to Your hungry children.

Thank You, God, for my Catholic Faith, which teaches me to be thankful. Thank You, God, for freedom to worship You as You wish to be worshipped. Thank You for our beautiful churches, our faithful priests, our comfortable Catholic homes.

Thank You, God, for the privilege of attending Holy Mass and receiving Holy Communion. Thank You for all the sacraments and for the life of grace in my soul.

Thanks for the trees and thanks for the birds; thanks for a drink of refreshing water; thanks for the open roads and thanks for our Churches where I can stop and visit You; thanks for that meal and thanks for that restful sleep; thanks for friends and thanks for the roof over my head; thanks for the chance to do Your work and thanks for Your generous rewards; thanks for the wine and thanks for the wheat and thanks for the Body and Blood of Your Son; thanks for the urge and chance to pray and thanks for the pains You permit; thanks for the opportunity to learn all about You, from our Catholic papers, from pamphlets, from magazines and books.

No book or library of books is large enough to record Your blessings and Your gifts. Where can I find the pen or the power or the eloquence or the words or the endurance to thank You, God, for all Your gifts? They are without limit.

Every leaf and every star is a gift. Every kernel of corn and every shaft of wheat and every drop of rain and every blade of grass is a gift. How can I ever thank You for it all?

Your gifts are without limit. My thanks must be without limit. How can I render infinite, limitless thanks?

Holy Mass is an infinite prayer and sacrifice of thanks, a limitless act of gratitude. I will offer Holy Mass; I will attend Holy Mass, especially on Thanksgiving Day. That is how I will say again and again:

"Thank You, God, thank You." Amen.

"One act of thanksgiving,
when things go wrong with us,
is worth a thousand thanks when
things are agreeable to our inclinations."
Bl. John of Avila. (16th cent.)

Mass Quiz

Break out a pen and paper and take this True/False quiz about the Mass.

Answers and their sources will be found on the last page of the newsletter.

1. It is permissible for the priest to change the word 'brethren' to 'brothers and sisters' in the Mass.
2. A lector may have the liberty to change the words of the Scripture Readings by eliminating all male references.
3. A parish may change and revise words in the Creed during Mass, as long as they make note of the changes and show these changes in the Sunday missal which the public uses.
4. At the conclusion of Mass, the lector or priest may make general announcements for the information of the parish.
5. A priest may give a 'general absolution' during the penitential rite of the Mass or during a communal penance service if he chooses to do so.
6. If the priest chooses to use the rite of blessing and sprinkling, he must omit the "Lord have Mercy" and the penitential rite.

7. A Lector may use the NRSV version during U.S. Masses.
8. The priest may not omit the homily on Sundays or holy days of obligation.
9. The priest may not omit the homily at any Mass.
10. An individual who is not a priest, deacon or bishop may not give the homily at Mass.

Questions from our friends

I would like to know the reason why the priest pours water into wine during the preparation of the gifts.

The brief rite of pouring water into the wine used for consecration is very ancient. Indeed, it is believed that Our Lord himself used wine tempered with water at the Last Supper as this was the common practice among the Jews and in Mediterranean culture in general.

Some form of this is found in practically every rite of the Church both Western and Eastern, except for a group of Armenian Monophysites.

Although the water is not essential for the validity of the sacrament, the Church holds it in great importance and it must never be omitted. The Council of Trent even went so far as to excommunicate whoever denied the need for this mixture (see Canon 9, Session XXII).

Historically, St. Justin Martyr already mentions this practice in his Apology around the year 150. About a century later St. Cyprian wrote on this theme in an epistle against a splinter group that used only water in their celebrations, and this has become the accepted interpretation:

"For because Christ bore us all, in that He also bore our sins, we see that in the water is understood the people, but in the wine is showed the blood of Christ. But when the water is mingled in the cup with wine, the people [are] made one with Christ, and the assembly of believers is associated and conjoined with Him on whom it believes; which association and conjunction of water and wine is so mingled in the Lord's cup, that that mixture cannot any more be separated.

"Whence, moreover, nothing can separate the Church -- that is, the people established in the

Church, faithfully and firmly persevering in that which they have believed -- from Christ, in such a way as to prevent their undivided love from always abiding and adhering. Thus, therefore, in consecrating the cup of the Lord, water alone cannot be offered, even as wine alone cannot be offered. For if any one offer wine only, the blood of Christ is dissociated from us; but if the water be alone, the people are dissociated from Christ; but when both are mingled, and are joined with one another by a close union, there is completed a spiritual and heavenly sacrament.

"Thus the cup of the Lord is not indeed water alone, nor wine alone, unless each be mingled with the other; just as, on the other hand, the body of the Lord cannot be flour alone or water alone, unless both should be united and joined together and compacted in the mass of one bread; in which very sacrament our people are shown to be made one, so that in like manner as many grains, collected, and ground, and mixed together into one mass, make one bread; so in Christ, who is the heavenly bread, we may know that there is one body, with which our number is joined and united" ("On the Sacrament of the Cup of the Lord," No 13).

Another important symbolic explanation for this rite is given in St. Thomas Aquinas, in his *Summa Theologiae*, III pars q 74, 6-8:

"Water ought to be mingled with the wine which is offered in this sacrament.

"First of all, on account of its institution: for it is believed with probability that our Lord instituted this sacrament in wine tempered with water according to the custom of that country: hence it is written (Proverbs 9:5): 'Drink the wine which I have mixed for you.'

"Secondly, because it harmonizes with the representation of our Lord's Passion: hence Pope Alexander I says (Ep. 1 ad omnes orth.): 'In the Lord's chalice neither wine only nor water only ought to be offered, but both mixed because we read that both flowed from His side in the Passion.'

"Thirdly, because this is adapted for signifying the effect of this sacrament, since as Pope Julius says (Concil. Bracaraens iii, Can. 1): 'We see that the people are signified by the water, but Christ's blood by the wine. Therefore when water is mixed with the wine in the chalice, the people [are] made one with Christ.'

"Fourthly, because this is appropriate to the fourth effect of this sacrament, which is the entering into everlasting life: hence Ambrose says (De Sacram. v): 'The water flows into the chalice, and springs forth unto everlasting life.'"

These different explanations form the basis for the Church's understanding of the importance of this rite. This understanding is at the root of the sentiment expressed by the prayer which the priest recites in a low voice as he pours the water into the chalice:

"By the mystery of this water and wine may we come to share in the divinity of Christ, who humbled himself to share in our humanity."

Answered by Father Edward McNamara, professor of liturgy at the Regina Apostolorum Pontifical University.

Can Extraordinary Ministers of Holy Communion make the sign of the Cross over those not receiving Holy Communion?

There is no question of a layperson blessing people in the manner of the priest. The layperson must never make the sign of the Cross over anyone in the manner of the priest. If a person is in the Communion line and comes to a Extraordinary Minister of Holy Communion, the lay person cannot make the sign of the Cross over the non-Communicant in the manner of the priest.

I am recently divorced. Does this mean that I can no longer receive Communion? What if I remarry?

In order to be eligible to receive Holy Communion in the Catholic Church, one must be a member. Those who divorce (separate) *do not* cease to be members of the Church. The Church does not recognize a secular divorce. As far as God is concerned, when two people come before Him and pledge to be with each other "until death do us part," that is a valid marriage and cannot be broken. A "decree of Nullity" (annulment) declares that there was some defect at the time of marriage, i.e., coercion, mental instability, etc.

If one divorces and marries another, without the benefit of a Decree of Nullity, they are violating God's law, as promulgated by the Catholic Church. Scripture clearly states that when a person divorces and marries another they commit adultery. Adultery

is considered to be a very serious sin, which separates one from the Catholic Church. If a person is not a member of the Catholic Church they should not receive Holy Communion. St. Paul said, "Whoever, therefore, eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty of profaning the body and blood of the Lord" (1 Cor. 11:27).

It is a common misconception that people who have divorced are not eligible to receive Holy Communion. This is simply not the case. As far as God and the Church is concerned, they are still married and have not cut themselves off from the Church.

If a person does not accept the teachings of Christ as promulgated by His Church, they are not members of the Catholic Church. It is not the Church who rejects them, it is they who reject the Church.

Answers to True/False Quiz

The source for most answers are in parenthesis - see source abbreviations below:

1. True - the priest is permitted to change the word "brethren" to "brothers and sisters". (GIRM 86, GIRM II).
2. False - No one is permitted to change gender-related language or eliminate male references while reading Scripture. (CIC 838, 846)
3. False - No words of the Creed are ever permitted to be changed or revised for any reason or under any circumstances. (CIC 838, 846)
4. True - general announcements may be made during the concluding rites. (GIRM 139)
5. False - a priest may never give 'general absolution' as a substitution for individual confession during an ordinary Mass or under non-emergency circumstances. (CIC 961)
6. True - the rite of blessing and sprinkling takes the place of the "Lord have Mercy" and penitential rite.
7. False - no lector (or anyone else) may use the NRSV of Scripture during any Mass, as it has not been approved by Rome for liturgical use. (CIC 826, CIC 838).
8. True - a priest may not omit the homily on Sundays or Holy Days. (CIC 767)
9. False - a priest may omit the homily on weekday Masses if they are not a Holy Day.
10. True - only an ordained minister (priest, deacon or bishop) may give the homily at Mass. (CIC 766)

Source Abbreviations: - GIRM = "General Instruction of the Roman Missal", CIC = Code of Canon Law, ID= "*Inaestimabile Donum*", DOL = "Documents on the Liturgy", IC = "*Immensae Caritatis*", AGI = Appendix to the Sacramentary, HLS = U.S. Bishop's Directory on Communion under both Species, QS = *Quam Singulari*, CMRR- "Ceremonies of the Modern Roman Rite", PS = "*Paschales Solemnitatis*"