

The Lord's Prayer Bridge or Wedge?

Will translating the Mass from Latin into English perhaps drive a deeper wedge between Christians — precisely at a time when efforts are being made to bridge the chasm of their centuries-long separation?

The possible wedge is the prayer which all Christians, despite their divisions, have kept at least a tenuous bond of their former unity — the prayer our Lord Himself taught His disciples to say, "Our Father . . ."

Even now Christians of different denominations have slightly differing translations.

But what further chaos will result if each denomination comes out with a new and quite different translation? The possibilities are clear from some recent translations of the Bible —

Our Father in heaven!
May you be known and glorified,
your kingdom come,
your will be done,
on earth as well as in heaven;
give us this day
our daily bread;
forgive us our debts
as we also forgive our debtors;
and do not expose us to temptation,
but deliver us from evil.

That is the way Jesuit Father James A. Kleist translates the Lord's Prayer in what is rapidly becoming a widely used translation of the New Testament.

Britain's Protestant Churches last year produced a mutually agreed on new translation also of the New Testament as the first part of what is officially called The New English Bible. They kept to a more familiar form of the prayer:

Our Father in heaven,
Thy name be hallowed;
Thy kingdom come,
Thy will be done,
On earth as in heaven.
Give us today our daily bread.
Forgive us the wrong we have done,
As we have forgiven those who have wronged us.
And do not bring us to the test,
But save us from the evil one.

Episcopalians in the United States as well as many Orthodox Churches are currently studying possible new translations for their services.

What a tragedy if the prayer by which we call God "Our Father" ends up more like a Tower of Babel rather than as a bridge to ultimate unity.

Many churchmen in recent years have voiced the hope that Catholics, Protestants and Orthodox might have a common Bible as a step toward Pope John's great goal — to "restore the unity we have lost."

Cardinal Frings of Cologne and the bishops of Germany have authorized Catholic Scripture scholars to work with Protestant Biblical experts to prepare a standard German translation for that country. Cardinal Alfrink of Utrecht and the bishops of Holland have already accepted a Dutch translation prepared by both Catholic and Protestant experts. Archbishop John Murphy of Cardiff, Wales, said "work may proceed" on a Catholic-Protestant Welsh translation. And on May 25 of this past spring, Ceylon's Catholic bishops approved a project in which Catholic and Protestant scholars will produce a new translation of the Bible in the country's official language Sinhalese.

This week it was reported Catholics in England will soon use a slightly modified edition of the Protestant Revised Standard Version of the Bible.

Several American bishops have expressed hopes for a common Bible in this country — Bishop Wright of Pittsburgh, Archbishop John P. Cody of New Orleans, Auxiliary Bishop Philip M. Hannan of Washington, Bishop Peter W. Bartholome of St. Cloud, Minnesota, and Cardinal Cushing of Boston.

Even the most enthusiastic promoters of the common Bible idea, however, admit its realization is still quite a ways in the future.

Is there, however, a possibility for a preliminary agreement on an up-to-date English translation of the Lord's Prayer?

St. Augustine long ago reminded Christians, divided even then into competing sects, that all Christians "are our brothers and they will not cease to be our brothers until they cease saying Our Father."

We can hope that current projects for liturgical revision in the various religious groups will help rather than hinder unity in saying the Lord's Prayer as a prelude to that distant day when we will fulfill far more perfectly than we do today His other prayer for His disciples "that they may be one."

—Faith Henry Atwell

Canoe Upset, Sister Not

Dava, Philippines — Once again, Sisters have proven their ability to remain unruffled even in a time of disaster.

Returning from a mission trip, Father Leo McCarthy, M.M. of Millis, Mass., together with Sister Blase and eight passengers were suddenly dumped into the water when

their dugout canoe hit a submerged log and turned over.

All were able to hold on to the overturned boat, until it drifted to shore. "The result of the ordeal," reports the veteran Maryknoller, "was that most people lost everything they were carrying. And Sister Blase? Her bonnet wasn't even wet!"

Bishop Casey's Sermon about The Vatican Council

This is the text of Bishop Casey's talk at all Masses at Sacred Heart Cathedral last Sunday in which he describes his two months in Rome for the Vatican Council.

First of all, let me say a word of heartfelt thanks for your prayers and your letters, and there were many of them from groups and children, during my stay in Rome. Those of you who have been stationed in far away places know how much news from home means. So I appreciate your thoughtfulness.

I'm also deeply in debt to the parish staff for keeping things running efficiently during my absence. It makes me feel like a fifth wheel to realize that whether I'm here or not, everything goes along smoothly. But it is a comforting thought for the pastor to know that he has competent and dedicated co-workers, plus generous and cooperative parishioners.

On my desk are all the documents, papers, and personal notes relating to the Second Session of Vatican II. They make a stack eighteen inches high. You take a look at that material and see how impossible it is to compress the results of this session within the limits of a brief talk. It would be rash and premature to assess at this time the significance of the momentous session just ended.

Faster Pace

I shall make a few general observations today. On Sunday evening, January 19, there will be a talk on the Council in Sacred Heart Cathedral school hall open to the public and we shall go into more detail and answer your questions there.

The pace of the second ses-

sion was faster than the first and we got more done. No new doctrines were introduced, but we did expect new definitions, for this is a pastoral Council, not a doctrinal one.

However, the nature and purpose of the Council of ours were put into sharper focus. The first step in modernizing and streamlining the administrative machinery of the Church were made, and the preliminary stages in effecting a closer dialogue and more friendly relations between Catholics and our separated brethren were also made.

In the words of one Council expert, this second session "exercised a dynamic push which would make itself felt strongly in the Church's future." To listen to the Holy Father is to listen to the truth. What does Pope Paul think about the last session?

On Wednesday, Dec. 4, at the final meeting, the Pope said this: "This session of the Council is a great achievement, a great gift of God to His Church. The Council has worked hard, it has completed some chapters of its enormous task, and it has made a good beginning on many chapters of importance."

"The Council has shown how divergent opinions can be freely expressed, it has demonstrated the desirability of com-

ing to agreement on fundamental questions by discussion and compromise. How all the Council Fathers have sincerely and firmly to all the domestic truths that make up the Church's deposit of faith." So says Pope Paul last Wednesday, and all the bishops there agreed that the time spent at the Council was time well spent. Much good will come from the session.

The Council received much better coverage in the press than last year. You have read many articles about it. Some praised what was done; others criticized. It is easy enough to do that.

U.S. Can Learn

You know, we Americans sometimes think we have all the answers on how to run everything the Church included. It is not that simple. We don't have all the answers, by far. The Catholic Church in this country is strong and vital, and we can be proud of it, but it is relatively youthful.

It has been an inspiring and a challenging experience, to sit in the Council for over seventy sessions, to brush elbows with some giants in the spiritual world, to listen to the representatives of all the nations, some speaking with the traditions of

long centuries behind them, some who had been in prison for their faith, others the spokesmen for nations which were not in existence twenty years ago, men from Bangalore, Tanganyika, Brussels, Rio de Janeiro, Antioch, Oceania, Stockholm, Chicago — tell how they thought the spiritual revival of the Church should be brought about.

These bishops did not all agree on the way it was to be done. This is understandable. Their national traditions differ sharply. There were strong differences of opinion, often blown up out of all proportion by the public press. But, as Pope Paul stated, there was freedom of expression, and it was a democratic gathering. The minority went along with the will of the majority and the decisions made in Rome this fall will profoundly affect the future of the Church and its people for the next century to come.

Most of the work on Sacred Liturgy, public worship, was done last year. The Council Fathers spoke their piece this fall, and many changes were inserted in the original text of 1962. We voted on these changes and most of them were approved. Last Wednesday, Pope Paul solemnly promulgated the decree on Sacred Liturgy.

English at Mass

You are particularly interested in the part regarding the vernacular, the English in the Mass. Right now, the United States Liturgy Commission is working on an interim text which will be uniform for the

entire country. For example, here at Sacred Heart, the people are asked to receive different kinds of hosts. We need a uniform text so that all can say the same kind of words.

I was misquoted in the "Times Union" last Thursday as saying that the Diocese of Rochester is "united" about the use of English in the Mass. This is not correct. The bishops of the United States will meet in Washington next spring to approve an English text for the Mass and, as soon as possible, after the meeting, English will be used in certain parts of the Mass in the Diocese of Rochester.

This will make your daily or weekly encounter with God at the Holy Sacrifice much more personal and help you to bring about that inner renewal of the spirit which Pope John had in mind when he called the Council.

When Pope Paul visits the Holy Land in January, you can imagine the warm welcome he will receive from the Christians at the holy shrines. In a real sense, Pope Paul visits the Cathedral and the other parishes of the diocese today. On Nov. 13, at the close of the audience the United States bishops had with the Holy Father, he gave us and our priests the faculty to impart his personal blessing to our people, a rare privilege. It is as if Pope Paul were in this audit blessing you. Those who went to confession last week, or who will go this week, may gain the Plenary Indulgence attached to this blessing.

What Parts of Mass in English?

English will replace Latin in almost all portions of the Mass which are spoken aloud, Bishop Casey said in an interview this week.

He said the United States Catholic bishops have scheduled a meeting for the spring of 1964 to decide on a nationwide uniform English text for the following prayers of the Mass — Introit, Kyrie, Gloria, Epistle, Gradual, Gospel, Creed, Offertory antiphon, Sanctus, Pater noster, Agnus Dei, Dominus non sum dignus at the people's Communion and the Communion antiphon.

The Collect, Preface and Postcommunion, though spoken aloud, will remain Latin.

English will also replace Latin in all the sacraments and sacramentals.

The U.S. Bishops' Commission on the Liturgical Apostolate is currently at work on a proposed text for final review by the nation's bishops at their spring meeting. Their formal decrees will then be sent to the Vatican for confirmation and approval of the translated texts. A date will then be set for the actual change-over from Latin to English.

State Aid for Birth Control?

(The issue of birth control and public policy is a burning question throughout the nation. In an effort to determine the dimensions of the problem, N.C.W.C. News Service sought information from sources in the 50 state capitals and Washington, D.C. Facts thus obtained are presented here in the first of three articles.)

By RUSSELL SHAW
N.C.W.C. News Service

A little over a year ago the lid blew off in Illinois.

At the urging of its chairman, Arnold H. Maremont, the Illinois Public Aid Commission on Dec. 3, 1962, voted 6-4 to push ahead with a controversial taxpayer birth control program.

The plan called for state funds to be spent to provide birth control information and devices upon request to any public welfare recipient with a spouse or child.

The program had for some time been the focal point of one of the hottest domestic controversies of the year, and the December vote brought the issue to a head. In the melee that followed, both sides trundled out arguments of morality and public policy to buttress their positions.

When the dust had cleared, Maremont was out as IPAC chairman and Illinois had a taxpayer birth control program significantly limited by comparison with the one originally envisioned. In its version the program was restricted to married women on relief living with their husbands, whereas the original plan would have extended also to unmarried women and married women not living with their husbands.

This was the sort of compromise that leaves no one entirely satisfied. But what the controversy in Illinois did, and with a vengeance, was to focus public attention on the whole question of birth control and the law.

Though easily the most highly publicized confrontation over the birth control issue in recent years, the Illinois experience was far from unique. In many respects it was a microcosm of what has happened, is happening or soon may happen in many other parts of the country. The issue of birth control and the law has laid bare what Father John Courtney Murray, S.J., calls the "structure of war" underlying the apparently calm surface of American pluralism.

Nationwide, what is the law on birth control? Where else besides Illinois are there taxpayer birth control programs?

Where has there been or is there likely soon to be agitation for spending public funds for contraceptive purposes?

Seeking answers to these questions, the N.C.W.C. News Service took soundings throughout the nation from its correspondents and other sources. Results of this survey to be discussed in this and subsequent reports, paint a picture which, while far from uniform, does show certain broad patterns of similarity in many regions.

On the federal level, the legal picture is deceptively simple. Federal law bans distribution of contraceptives and birth control literature through the mails and by common carrier. It also prohibits import of such material.

But court rulings have effectively altered the impact of these laws. The result, in the words of British author and political scientist Norman St. John-Stevas, is that "to secure a conviction under the statutes an intention to use the materials illegally must be established by the prosecution."

In other respects the federal government's role is a subject of controversy. While some urge large-scale government sponsorship of research on birth control and the implementation of birth control programs through foreign aid, others violently oppose any such involvement by the government.

Advocates of an activist approach won a significant success this year when the Senate approved a foreign aid bill that carried for the first time a provision authorizing use of public funds for birth control purposes in aid-receiving countries.

The House version, however, lacked such a provision. In hammering out agreement Dec. 5 on a \$3.6 billion aid authorization bill, Senate and House conferees compromised by accepting language that authorized spending money for "research into the problems of population growth" but does not mention birth control.

ON THE STATE level, birth control services are available at public expense in nearly a dozen states. In other places, such as Maryland, state welfare agencies make it a policy to refer welfare recipients to private sources for such services. Elsewhere, public facilities are made available to groups such as Planned Parenthood. In Delaware, for example, the State Board of Health allows the state League for Planned Parenthood to use state facilities in two of the state's three counties.

Within the last year, legislation providing for tax-paid birth control has been introduced and defeated or sidetracked in the legislatures of at least five states.

In the last two years, three states by court action or repeal have dropped laws which banned or restricted the sale or advertising of contraceptives.

About the only restrictive statute that has been doing well are those that ban sending machines (such as contraceptives) by mail for this purpose have recently been upheld by courts in New Jersey and Arkansas.

Some of the recent proposals in this field have had a decidedly bizarre ring. In North Carolina, bills have been introduced (and defeated) in the last two sessions of the legislature providing for sterilization of unwed mothers. A bill to make birth of children out of wedlock a criminal offense was introduced and defeated in the 1963 legislature.

Even the briefest survey spotlights the fact that the question of birth control and public policy involves not just one but two basic issues. The first is whether the public authority should prohibit or regulate contraception. The second is whether the state should positively promote birth control through taxpayer programs.

On the first point there exists a significant difference of opinion among Catholics. All would agree that state legislation mandating sterilization is distasteful, and in this they would probably be joined by Non-Catholics. A case in point are laws which bar vending machines sales of contraceptives or require birth control non-refundable to be carried and non-refundable to be carried.

The difference of opinion extends, however, when it comes to a question of banning the sale of contraceptives or (as is the case in Connecticut) the practice of artificial birth control.

Many Catholic thinkers have argued against such laws. Their arguments have a twofold thrust: First, that such statutes bring the state into an area of human life where it has no competence or right to intervene; second, that because such laws are widely disregarded even where they exist ("frankly violated") was the way an official Minnesota report put it shortly before that state's restrictive laws passed out of existence last spring in a revision of the criminal code.



Despite a desk piled with work, Bishop Casey is glad to be home after two months in Rome for the Vatican Council. In this article he describes the Council's accomplishments.

Statement

On Jews

Not Shelved

Vatican City — (RNS) — An American consultant to the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity said the Second Vatican Council decision to postpone discussion of chapters four and five of the schema on ecumenism should "not be seen as an attempt to shelve them."

The chapters deal, respectively, with Catholic-Jewish relations and religious liberty.

Msgr. John M. Oesterreicher, director of the Seton Hall University Institute of Judaean-Christian Relations in South Orange, N.J., stressed that the chapters "just cannot be shelved."

"Not only is the Council committed in the world's eyes, but what is more important, Catholic theology is on the move and cannot be stopped," he said.

"Actually," he added, "the postponement may serve the cause. During the intermission, the content of the chapters will be kept alive and will penetrate the minds of those who have not shown great interest in them."

they contribute to an atmosphere of disrespect for all laws.

But on the second point—positive state action to promote taxpayer birth control—there is general Catholic agreement that such programs should be opposed. Father Richard J. Regan, S.J., summed it up this way in his recent book "American Pluralism and the Catholic Conscience":

"Catholics cannot endorse public [financial] support of a practice which they regard as immoral. . . . In a pluralistic society, public funds should not be employed to sponsor or support programs which are morally unacceptable to one religious group if this is at all compatible with the goals of organized society."

Father Regan also said: "Catholics may wonder at the logic by which Non-Catholics object to the prohibition of contraception by the public authority on the grounds of religious pluralism but demand the prescription and supply of contraceptives by public institutions without regard for the moral susceptibilities of Catholics."

Gov. Richard Hughes of New Jersey presented the argument cogently last May when, in reply to a minister acting as spokesman for a county Planned Parenthood group, he commented:

"In the area of public policy, the requirements of civic harmony would suggest an accommodation which protects . . . the conscience of its citizens of different convictions."

THE CATHOLIC
Courier Journal
OFFICIAL NEWSPAPER OF THE ROCHESTER DIOCESE

Vol. 75 No. 11 Friday, December 13, 1963

MOST REV. JAMES E. KEARNEY, D.D., President
MAIN OFFICE 55 Seneca St. — Baker 4-4310 — Rochester 4, N. Y.
ALBANY OFFICE 317 Robinson Bldg., Lake St. — RE 1-4411 or RE 2-4423
AUBURN OFFICE 16 Capitol — AL 2-6223

Second class postage paid at Rochester, N. Y.
As required under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.
Single copy 10¢; 1 year subscription in U. S., \$4.50
Canada \$5.00; Foreign Countries \$5.25