

NOVATE
VOBIS
NOVALE

FURROW

The

A JOURNAL FOR THE
CONTEMPORARY CHURCH

Michael A. Conway

Changing
Foundations:
Identity, Church
and Culture

February 2018

Changing Foundations: Identity, Church and Culture

Michael A. Conway

I'd like to share some ideas that might help in understanding what is happening around religion and faith in our culture.¹ This is not an exact science, which means that what's at play cannot be grasped in clear black and white terms. Rather, it is about understanding a transition that is taking place between overlapping worldviews, where the new emerges against the background of the old. Because of this admixture of the old and the new, it requires a process of discernment that draws not only on study and reflection, but also on a kind of sensitivity to the culture that is much closer to direct intuition than to scientific observation. It is a matter of being attentive to the pneumatic moment in culture or of being in tune with the times. What I have to say is only a partial view into the complexity; but it is, I believe, important enough to be worth exploring and reflecting upon for its own sake.

CHURCH AND THE AMBIENT CULTURE

The Church's reason for being is missionary. We are here to preach the gospel, to bring the good news of redemption to the wider world, and to facilitate a life of faith. And this life of faith is lived in liturgy with our creator and in unison with others. If these statements are true, then it follows that the Church is not fundamentally self-referential. The Church is never just about the Church; and I cannot speak about the Church as a reality in our culture in any real way if I do so as a place apart, a special

1 Material from this paper was presented at the Tuam Diocesan In-service, *Seeds for a New Harvest: Resources for and from Contemporary Culture*, Hotel Westport, Westport, Co. Mayo, 18 October 2017; and at the Raphoe Diocesan Clergy Gathering, *Rediscovering Ourselves in God*, Manor House Country Hotel, Killadeas, Enniskillen, 24 October 2017.

Michael A. Conway is a priest of the diocese of Galway. He is professor of Faith and Culture at St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, Co. Kildare.

group, or a privileged instance in history.² To understand what the Church is, what it is about, what we're about, the direction that we might need to take, the people with whom we might need to be in conversation, and so on, requires at the very least that we look in two directions: yes, certainly, inwards to the Church's tradition and self-understanding; but also, crucially, outwards to the ambient world and culture. If you do not look in both directions, and take seriously what you hear, see, and find there; then, gradually, you will loose touch, fold in on yourself, and cease to contribute to the common life of society. You will suffocate in terms of the wider world because life will have moved on without you. Connection to the surrounding culture is literally vital. To discover its future, the Church cannot look simply at itself, its structures, its personnel, its ways of doing things, and so on. *It must see itself in and with the world in which it finds itself.* If the Church looks only to itself and its own internal world in terms of seeking its way in time and history, inevitably, it will lead to a distorted image of its very self in terms of its calling and in terms of its identity. To be Church is to be Church in a culture; to proclaim the good news is to proclaim the good news in a culture. And when the culture changes, so too must Church (if it is to be faithful to itself). And, clearly, these dynamics cannot be controlled or known in advance; it is each generation's task, so to speak, to discover the life of faith anew, to live it, and to pass on something of what it has learned in this process.

The point that I would like to underline clearly is that the Church is not outside of, or over against, the culture; it is, rather, within it; and this has a huge bearing on its future form and its future activity (pastoral and otherwise). To place the wider culture over against the Church and, then, designate it, for example, as a place of darkness, despair, and disaster is an ideology, which, ironically, only masks the role of culture in the life of the Church. This is so at a most basic level in that in resisting a world-view you necessarily take on something of that world-view in order to facilitate the resistance. All of this means that the process of communal discernment is not just about us; it is not just about priests; it is also about the other. It is not just about those who go to Mass and practice faith in that more obvious sense, but it is also about the others, *all of the others.*

At the second Vatican council an initial step was taken in terms of recognizing the implications of being embedded in a changing culture. There is for the first time a clear appreciation that there

2 In *Lumen gentium*, for example, the Church is described as 'a sacrament, as a sign or an instrument of the intimate union with God and of the unity of the whole human race (sacramentum seu signum et instrumentum intimae cum Deo unionis totiusque generis humani unitatis)' (no. 1, emphasis added).

THE FURROW

is something vital to be had from the ambient culture.³ There is a significant change from a view of Church that understood itself as being against the world, against other Christians, against the culture, against politics, against the individual, and against personal freedom to a vision that acknowledged an appreciation for the world, that recognized the imperative of engaging with other Christians, that ratified the autonomy of the political order, that saw real value in the ambient culture, that acknowledged the legitimacy of personal freedom, and that realized that in its own journey the Church shared in the journey of all peoples.

I can summarize all this by saying that the Second Vatican Council unequivocally opened the door to valuing and appreciating *the other*. The pre-council contempt for the other had devastating consequences both in terms of evangelisation and in terms of that renewal that is vital to Church life itself.⁴ Whereas the pre-conciliar Church sought to achieve and maintain identity over against the other, the Second Vatican Council definitively rejected the pathological path that rejects the other in the name of a putative identity. I say all this chiefly to remind you of how momentous the Second Vatican Council is in terms not only of a paradigm shift as regards the Church's self understanding since the Council of Trent, but also to underline how prophetic it is in terms of the possibility of being able to meet the changing perspectives in our European culture. John Paul II described the Council 'as the fundamental event of the life of the contemporary Church.'⁵ God communicates not only through Scripture and tradition, but also through what the Council termed 'the signs of the times.'⁶ As Church we are embedded in a culture and deeply connected to it; and this means that we need to take our culture seriously and be prepared to learn from it.

3 See, for example, *Gaudium et spes*, no. 44. The Second Vatican Council brought together a concern, on the one hand, with *ressourcement*, which aimed to retrieve a more wholesome understanding of the tradition of the Church, and, on the other, *aggiornamento*, which involved a reconnection and engagement with contemporary culture.

4 For a discussion of the pre-conciliar contemptus mundi, see, for example, Claude Geffré, *Le Christianisme comme religion de l'Évangile* (Paris: Du Cerf, 2012), 241-47.

5 John Paul II, 'Discours du Pape Jean-Paul II aux participants au colloque international promu par l'"école française" de Rome,' 30 May 1986. And he points out that it is fundamental on two accounts: first, because it has deepened the riches of what was conferred on the Church by Christ; and secondly, in promoting 'a rich contact with the contemporary world with an aim at evangelisation and dialogue at all levels and with all [people] of good will (la conscience droite)' (no. 5). See https://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/fr/speeches/1986/may/documents/hf_jp-ii_spe_19860530_ecole-francaise.html, accessed 6 December 2017.

6 See *Lumen gentium*, no. 16.

In the context of our European culture we are witnessing the death of a certain institutional form of Church: this is not necessarily the end of the life of faith; but it is, you might say, the end of the life of faith as we know it. And in that sense, there is, indeed, a dying taking place. Elizabeth Kübler-Ross, you will know, speaks of several stages that a person goes through in having to deal with death and loss; they include denial, bargaining, anger, depression, and, ultimately, acceptance. Not everyone goes through all these stages and in this order; and not everyone reaches acceptance. These same dynamics are recognizable too in Church circles as we now face the loss of a form of Church that at one point was so full of vitality and so powerful. It is dying in our culture; and the challenge is to come to accept this graciously and with dignity; and then begin again to put in place new forms of the life of faith that will witness to the Gospel in more appropriate ways in our culture.

THE MONOPOLY OF PUBLIC SPACE

Over the last thirty years or so there has been an enormous shift in our culture, where religion has gone from being centre stage to being a marginal or at least a limited player in terms of society at large. When I say marginal and limited, I do not so much mean that it is only a matter of concern for a small number of persons, but, rather, that it is no longer a significant voice in the ordering and structuring of society. You could say that 'religion' has largely lost its public voice. This does not mean that it is not important for a great number of people, but its place in the public forum of discussion is greatly diminished, and this is an on-going process. The social, cultural, political, educational, and medical competencies increasingly function without any religious substructure, and, in some cases, without any contact at all with religion per se. It is important to acknowledge that almost all of those instances that in the past were directly connected to the institutional Church now function, and function well, as independent spheres of activity. In some cases they function much better than when they were under more explicit Church direction. In this major shift in the ordering of society and because of a certain resistance to change from the side of the institutional Church, religion was often presented as the enemy of modernity so that many believed that the quicker that we could throw off its shackles the better.⁷

We are now in a highly developed culture, where the different spheres of human activity maintain a relative independence. Where

7 In a general way it was believed that religion would all but disappear as society advanced in terms of its rationality and the reordering of its complex functioning.

THE FURROW

possible, we keep apart, for example, our private lives from our work lives, medical practice from Church control, politics from religion, and so on. This is part of what it is to be in a modern Western democratic culture. There is a clear separation and differentiation of domains. And the various spheres of activity have developed their own autonomous rules of functioning. Some areas are still to some degree embattled such as education and health; but the tendency is to separate out the competencies, at least formally, and in terms of public practice. This multiplicity of the spheres of activity means that a particular religion can no longer claim to explain the world totally. Neither can it presume to present a single, homogenous worldview that would demand submission from everyone as if it were in possession of some divine order from on high. Individual persons now freely choose and construct the norm that will guide life, relationship, and religiosity. And there are numerous influences that contribute to establishing each person's worldview. Religion has become a discrete sphere in life, a specific activity that is set within a wider context of other voices, values, and variants on living and life.

The large-scale institution is gradually disappearing from people's lives as an all-powerful, overbearing presence. They are, increasingly, living outside of it, or alongside it, but less and less from within it. This does not mean that it is not still important for many; but even for those for whom it is important, they do not live entirely from within its confines. They keep one foot in and one foot out, so to speak. It is at most a part of life, an important part, indeed; but it is not the all-determining factor that it might have been for earlier generations. In particular, it is not above other instances of order that in certain circumstances are given greater priority. This is a remarkable change.

It means, for example, that Church leadership can no longer dictate political, educational, or social policy, as would have been the case, say, fifty years ago. Now, Church leadership is expected to respect boundaries of competence and limits of intrusion. When these are violated, apart from it being an embarrassment for many from within the Church community, it shows an utter contempt for the professional competence and, indeed, dignity of others. There is undoubtedly a dis-empowering at play in all these dynamics. The invective that you sometimes hear against 'relativism' is very often a rage against this loss by those, who can no longer direct, control, and even manipulate others in the name of a moral and religious good. The contradiction is usually lost or unobserved in the heat of the discourse; there is nothing more subjective than

objective truth!⁸ Of course, there are connections and interactions between the various spheres in life; but we leave it more and more to each person to negotiate the crossovers, which means that there are degrees of investment according to desire, need, and character. Importantly, in this, no particular sphere can dominate the others. In the past there were two major instances that dominated all of life: the Church and the State (and these two instances often colluded with each other). Now, there are multiple voices at play in the public conversation that include traditional media, social media, the arts, politics, the State, the Church, advocacy groups, special interest groups, and so on; and this means that it is much more difficult for a single voice to dominate.⁹ Everyone is being forced, if you like, to enter into dialogue with others if they wish to contribute to the kind of public conversation that shapes common life.

RELIGIOUS IDENTITY AND THE PUBLIC SPHERE

In terms of the public sphere, religious life has moved more and more to a second level, where its influence, while still important, is now indirect, diffuse, and personal. The division of spheres of activity that I just spoke of means that, at the level of the wider society, our choices *vis-à-vis* religion no longer dictate our communal, social, or public identity. Increasingly, in our European culture religious affiliation is a personal matter with no overt bearing on life in the public square. This does not mean that our religious commitments are not important for us; but how we express this and live it out has changed, and it continues to change. You can take, for example, a group of say mothers, or cyclists, or workers, or whomever, and all the members may now have totally different religious commitments or none.

This is not a problem; and is less and less a point of contention or even discussion. Religious identity in the public square no longer embraces all other aspects of one's identity. And, perhaps, more importantly, religious affiliation is no longer the only, or even major, determining factor for one's public identity. Freedom, choice, and respect for the other are some of the values that have come to the fore as a result of this change. This element of choice, which is such a central feature of modern culture, is reflected back on the religious sphere, where one chooses not only one's religion,

8 Paul Ricœur, for example, correlates varieties of objectivity with the corresponding subjacent elements of subjectivity (see Paul Ricoeur, *Histoire et vérité* [Paris: Du Seuil, 1967]).

9 This is one reason why in terms of the stability of contemporary society there needs to be a clear valuation of respect for otherness, the ability to dialogue, etc. The era of the monologue in every sphere of life is over.

THE FURROW

but also the very expression of one's religiosity. From about the early 1970s the monolithic institutional form of Church went into serious crisis in European culture and a definite pattern of loss continues to be the reality. The once powerful institutional Church is being deconstructed in the cauldron of our culture; there is no doubt about that. This is usually crudely characterised under the umbrella term of secularisation; and it was believed, initially, that it signalled the practical end of religious life per se. But this was not to be the case. Nothing in what is happening heralds the end of religion, interest in spirituality, and commitment to a faith-led life; quite the contrary. It is interesting, for example, that 78.3% of respondents described themselves as Catholic in the recent census: although, this is still a very high percentage, it certainly does not reflect the numbers of those who attend Church regularly (which, I would wager, is considerably less). In spite of the crisis as regards the institutional form of religion, interest in religion, faith, and spirituality has survived and even flourishes remarkably well. However, this survival is evident mostly in a blossoming of the religious spirit on the margins or even outside of the institutional form of Church. This, too, is new. What all this means is that in our culture, at present, religion and religious commitment are extremely diffuse and varied. Surprisingly, more and more people are now quite happy to voice a range of expressions. To declare oneself to be a born-again-Christian, or a Buddhist, or a convert to Islam, or to have joined an evangelical Church, or to be traditionalist Catholic, or to have no religion at all, is more often than not flaunted, with not an unremarkable element of pride. This is quite shocking in a country like France, where religion is considered to be a private matter and any public expression is frowned upon; here in Ireland it can still raise a few eyebrows if it deviates from a more traditional stance! But this simply mirrors the reality of freedom, and choice, and respect for the other that now take centre stage in our culture.

LIVING A MEANINGFUL LIFE

In a changing cultural environment it is worth asking the question: Why would one bother with religion at all in our culture? I suspect that a significant change has taken place here and continues to take place in the reasoning behind engaging with religion and seeking out an appropriate expression for the spiritual self. And I think that it might be helpful to reflect on this as it has an impact on pastoral practice, both in terms of understanding something of what is happening around us, and in terms of what one might be attentive to in pastoral practice. In our culture new questions are emerging that are equally new challenges for ministry.

We have moved from being concerned in a major way with *the next life* to a whole new concentration on the quality of *this life*. Although new, it has its origin in the affirmation of ordinary life (as opposed to clerical, religious, or monastic life) that goes back in particular to the Reformation. Up to relevantly recently a very important concern was what would happen to you after you died: Where would you go? Would you make it to heaven? What about the possibility of hell? Or would you at the very least make it to purgatory? This weighed heavily on people and was a significant factor in determining how and why they were concerned about religion and the practice of religion. There was a real fear behind these questions. And the God that was operative in this fear was not to be taken lightly!

This way of thinking has practically disappeared for younger generations. It is frankly getting more and more difficult to ignite any great interest in such questions, beyond, perhaps, the confines of a few evangelical-minded groups for whom this language can still ignite passionate reaction and debate. Gay Byrne, for example, reflecting back on the series *The Meaning of Life* on RTE says that what amazes him is that ‘in the end, how little thought people had given to this question of “what happens when you die?”’¹⁰ Most people have decided that any such speculation is highly hypothetical; and they have a suspicion that things may be altogether different in any case. It is also not considered to be particularly relevant.

The basic attitude is that if I live a good life in which I am true to myself, then, the afterlife will take care of itself, and I have nothing to be worried about. Metaphysical questions in general no longer cut to the quick, as they would have done, say, a half century ago. *This means that a whole foundation that for many made sense of religious practice has simply disappeared.* There was a very close connection between attending mass and being aware of the dead and of dying. You still see remnants of this worldview in people’s commitment to turning up to an anniversary mass for someone that they knew or to whom they are related. This is still quite strong in more traditional communities. Increasingly, however, anniversary masses, intentions, and stipends make little sense to more and more people.

These questions about death and life-after-death have been replaced by another series of questions of an equivalent weight and bearing in our culture. And these are centred on the meaning and the meaningfulness of life. Questions such as: Am I living a meaningful life? How do I find meaning?

10 <http://www.independent.ie/entertainment/books/i-know-what-id-say-to-god-youve-been-too-good-to-me-kathleen-and-gay-36225263.html>, accessed 6 December 2017.

THE FURROW

Have I achieved what's termed a quality of life? And so on. Such questions of meaning now plague our culture; everyone wants to live a meaningful life: but finding this life is not always that easy. Many, for a time at least, find their meaning in travel, by getting involved in charity work, by fundraising for a worthy cause, through their own family life, in community work, in adventure sport, in many different forms of religion, and so on. All of these activities have the potential of nurturing and energising life in a real and tangible way. *And, more than anywhere else, it is here that the question of religion and religious practice now takes root.* It is, if you like, a new foundation, that is anchored in this life and that replaces an older foundation, which was anchored in the next life.

In fact, I don't believe that these two foundations are as far apart as they might first appear. You could say, for example, that to live a meaningful life now is already to experience heaven-on-earth in that eschatological sense of the Kingdom of God being already present; and to live a life that is utterly devoid of purpose is in some sense already to experience something of whatever 'hell' might be. The two foundations are not disconnected (at least in the terms of theology), and they are equally powerful in terms of what it is that they represent.

There is, in addition, a sort of hierarchy of meaningfulness that is operative throughout life; what, for example, makes life meaningful for someone, who is twenty-one may not be so for that same person when he or she is forty or fifty. And even for different persons there is a range of possibilities in what might enable one in discovering what is meaningful in life. The reason why many older people attend mass is not just because they are connecting to the faith of their earlier lives in that diachronic sense (as is usually assumed); there is the important element of being at a stage of life, where what is meaningful includes a greater commitment to faith in a synchronic sense. When you take this hierarchy into account, you realize that there is a whole new challenge to this question of meaning, as it is, increasingly, being recognized to be a lifelong endeavour. It is full of risk, adventure, trial, possibility, hope, disappointment, and, indeed, tragedy.

To some degree, everyone in our culture is now confronted with the question of meaning, and it is not always easy to find the wherewithal, the whereabouts, and the whereto in finding what is a life-giving response; or rather the series of responses that maintain the energy of a meaningful life. It is, however, here, more than anywhere else that the question of religion, spirituality, and faith emerges as a real concern for our contemporaries. The older questions have disappeared or are disappearing; but new ones have

emerged and are emerging, and the good news of the gospel has a vital role to play in responding.

MEANING AND THE SELF

The question of meaning is now posed against a complex background. There can be no doubt that we live in a highly sophisticated culture at the level of social interaction, mobility, and communication; at the level of science and technology; at the level of expectation in relationship in terms of emotional, sexual, or psychological need; at the level of social status, expressed, for example, in earning power or in wealth, and so on. Against this all-pervasive background of expectations, each person is tasked with becoming an autonomous self, who can meet these demands and achieve a meaningful life. This is no minor task; and it is important to be aware of this complexity and understand the scale of this challenge.

Becoming an autonomous self is set against the defining characteristic of modernity, which is that of progress and change. No one is immune to this; and, to some degree, it weighs on everyone, even those in relatively secure positions in society. It is something that we have to face all the time; it is a constant, always there, always expected, and always commanded by the culture. It keeps us directed to the future; and, implicitly, counsels us to move on from the past and even from the present. We are carried along mercilessly in this powerful current of change, growth, and progress; and each one of us must learn to navigate this precarious situation. This raises a whole series of new uncertainties: about stability, about meaning, about the future, about identity, etc. In a culture that promotes change as a primary directive, it can be difficult to achieve a sense of who one is, why one is here, and what one ought to do in terms of leading a fulfilling life. *Never before have questions of identity been so pertinent, so problematic, and so all pervasive for the individual person.*

Not only that, but just as there are activities such as community engagement or religious practice that help in finding a response to this question of meaning, there are tactics too of suppressing the question, of masking it, or, even, of preventing its emergence in our culture. Shallow entertainment, soft drugs (including alcohol), the inflated promotion of sport, the passive use of technology (social media, instagram, twitter, and so on) can all, for example, be turned into strategies of limitation for the human spirit that keep it trapped in a small cage of compulsion, collusion and, even, exploitation. There is an enormous financial gain to be had for those who would manipulate this need for meaning that is built into the human

THE FURROW

spirit at every level. The cultural space is literally littered with false promises. There is a full range of products, procedures, and philosophies that promise what they could never deliver. And this, in turn, has an impact on religious needs and on the life of faith. An entrapped human spirit will find it very difficult to approach the question of meaning and recognize a possible avenue of response in the life of faith. Many are distracted by the superficial and find it very difficult to penetrate the depths of their own lives. Interiority is in serious crisis in our culture, and with it the quality of human presence.

Not everyone is up to this task. Society is itself far too varied to be capable of offering a uniform, consistent, non-contradictory form of validation. Many fall by the wayside on the path to themselves; they do not blossom as human beings, emotionally, relationally, or in terms of living a fulfilling life. This is true of every walk in life, including priesthood. That is part of the tragic side of contemporary social structures. Sometimes, too much is expected of the individual; and not everyone has the resources (economic, psychological, emotional, and even spiritual) required to master the challenges of living and structuring life in this new socio-cultural order that is ours. The full impact of this situation has not yet hit us fully in Ireland, as there is a sizable remnant of the older world order that buffers individuals in this challenging task.

AUTHENTICITY BEFORE CONFORMITY

There is a kind of irony in all of this in that it is Christianity itself that is at the origin of this dynamic in that it has always underlined that persons are answerable before God for their own lives. People have always been enjoined to take responsibility for their own faith-lives. Everything is done to promote this idea that faith ought to be lived out in its integrity. It is not meant to be a sham action that merely mimics religious gesture without being a real reflection of an interior disposition. This emphasis on individual responsibility for the self has led with time to powerful sense of *the self as an autonomous agent that ought to live with integrity*.

Now, for this autonomous self there has been a sort of turnaround in the relationship between the interior and the exterior. And it has to do with integrity. Whereas in the past the interior might be sacrificed for the sake of conformity to an exterior expression; now it is the exterior expression that is abandoned for the sake of interior integrity. There is a whole new concern in our culture with being true to who you are or with being authentic that powerfully resonates with these dynamics. It is no longer necessary and less

and less acceptable to hide one's interior disposition (however one might understand it) for the sake of conformity to an external and imposed ideal. In more religious language the charge would be that of hypocrisy! This, for example, was at the heart of the marriage referendum: we ought to have social structures in place that permit people to live with integrity.

The institutional Church was that space within which life had its meaning, where one knew and had one's place in a relatively stable world, whose horizon was the transcendent, and that nurtured a very powerful sense of belonging. *In such a world the question of identity in a creative sense was never really an issue.* The significant frameworks of meaning that were operative in the past are in decline. The machine that delivered religion is broken. The great narratives of meaning (including philosophical ones) have lost their universal extension. The concomitant structures of meaning are collapsing, largely because the mode of imposition is no longer acceptable in our culture. The idea of a given reality – be it a social structure or a thought system – that has been put in place by others and within which you are expected to live no longer functions. Received ideas can no longer be imposed from on high, and received structures are accepted only on the condition of being subject to change as might be required. It is no longer possible in European culture to impose a world-view, a theology, a philosophy, or a structure against freedom or through a principle of authority, something, which was relatively easy to do in the past. And it is, of course, clear that if you have a culture that is governed by an imperative of change; and a Church within that culture that is not open to moving with, and accompanying, that change; it will simply be left behind or abandoned in an intellectual and social ghetto.

Of course, in practice the movement to taking full responsibility for oneself, of finding and living one's authentic self, is not outside of the boundaries of the Church. It is internal to Christian community life, and it will continue to become more and more important. This means that for the foreseeable future at least, the drive to authenticity will be much more powerful than the drive to conformity. Here again it is not a matter of the Church or religion, on one side, and the surrounding culture on the other; one demanding conformity; the other claiming freedom. That is far too simplistic a way of understanding and meeting the changing dynamics, which mark both contemporary culture and Church life. There is a deep-seated re-configuring of all institutional dynamics at play that necessarily impacts on how Church life will be structured in the future. What it is to be an institution, any institution, is being

THE FURROW

radically re-configured with implications for community structures, leadership, and decision making.

People are no longer born, live, and die within the framework of the Church. Individual persons are sheltered no longer by an institution that directs, and guides, and in some cases even controls them. Rather, the whole Christian tradition is increasingly becoming a kind of storehouse of ideas and practices, into which they delve to find what resonates and works for them as they search to respond to their immediate needs. And in doing so, the storehouse itself and its place in culture are changing. This process has not led to a loss of sensitivity to, and an interest in, religion, faith, and spirituality; on the contrary, it has led to a sort of de-regulation, whereby the *homo religiosus* now seeks to meet his or her religious needs in a free and open setting. This corresponds to a properly modern perspective on belonging.

Translation. Before I die, I would be delighted to celebrate once again the Eucharist in my native language. Hence I welcomed with delight the decision Pope Francis took just before Christmas 2016. He has appointed a commission to revisit the guidelines for translation, called *Liturgiam Authenticam* (“Authentic Liturgy”), which stood behind and “justified” the Latin words transposed into the so-called English of the present Missal. May that commission quickly propose repealing *Liturgiam Authenticam*!

– GERALD COLLINS, *Lost in Translation*, Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2017, p.viii.