

02/2022



Defende Nos



No. 87

Saint Michael's Priory SSPX

Our Founder's Word

Liberty as sought by those Who see it as an absolute good is a chimera. If it be true that it is often restricted in the moral order, how much more is this true in the order of intellectual choice? God has wonderfully provided for what our human nature lacks by the families with which he has surrounded us—the family which gave us birth and should give us our breeding, the country whose directors should further the normal development of families toward material, moral and spiritual perfection...To define liberty as the absence of constraint is to destroy all the authorities placed by God in the bosom of these families.

*Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre
— October 1964*

CATHOLIC FEMINISM?

Ever since the Second Vatican Council called for the adaptation of the Church to the modern world, the post-conciliar church has constantly shown a preoccupation with the emancipation of women and for their equality with men, excepting only the priesthood. But is this possible? Is Catholic feminism an oxymoron that is a figure of speech which is self-contradictory? Or are there any elements of truth that we can learn from the feminist movement? Is it possible to reconcile the traditional concept of a woman's role as a wife and mother with modern society's demands for equality, and if not why not?



The infiltration of feminist thought into the Catholic Church since Vatican II is evidenced in two clear ways. First of all it is the lack of opposition to its presuppositions, and the adoption of its own language concerning the liberation of women, or the obtaining equality never had in the past, or finally being regarded as fully human and not just as objects, or

having equal opportunities for employment and for positions of authority. The novel appointment of women to high positions in the Vatican hierarchy is further proof of this. Secondly is the actual denigration of the Church's attitude towards women in the past, as for example John Paul II's apology for how women have been humiliated and maltreated. (Cf. Amerio, *Iota Unum*, p.202).

FRANCIS & THE FEMINIST MOVEMENT

Listening to Pope Francis, one is led to believe that indeed we do have much to learn from the feminist movement and that the Church's teaching on the role of women can and must change accordingly. In the notorious and catastrophic post-synodal exhortation of 2016, *Amoris Laetitia*, opening the door to the sacrilegious reception of the Holy Eucharist by divorced and remarried persons, he also speaks of the feminist movement. He not only approves it, but considers it a work of the Holy Spirit, even if he does not accept all its conclusions.



“There are those who believe that many of today’s problems have arisen because of feminine emancipation. This argument, however, is not valid, “it is false, untrue, a form of male chauvinism”. The equal dignity of men and women makes us rejoice to see old forms of discrimination disappear, and within families there is a growing reciprocity. If certain forms of feminism have arisen which we must consider inadequate, we must nonetheless see in the women’s movement the working of the Spirit for a clearer recognition of the dignity and rights of women.” (§ 54).

Likewise, when speaking of the education of children, rather than emphasize

the complementarity of the different roles of father and mother, he prefers to warn against “rigidity” in such notions. By this, he clearly means that those who hold the traditional notions of father as an authority, and leader and provider for the family and the mother as a helpmate, assistant, and heart of the domestic life, must adapt their notions to the requirements of the feminist movement: Here is his text, from the same exhortation:

*“But it is also true that **masculinity and femininity are not rigid categories**. It is possible, for example, that a husband’s way of being masculine can be flexibly adapted to the wife’s work schedule. Taking on domestic chores or some aspects of raising children does not make him any less masculine or imply failure, irresponsibility or cause for shame. Children have to be helped to accept as normal such healthy “exchanges” which do not diminish the dignity of the father figure. **A rigid approach turns into an over accentuation of the masculine or feminine**, and does not help children and young people to appreciate the genuine reciprocity incarnate in the real conditions of matrimony. Such rigidity, in turn, can hinder the development of an individual’s abilities, to the point of leading him or her to think, for example, that it is not really masculine to cultivate art or dance, or not very feminine to exercise leadership. This, thank God, has changed, but in some places deficient notions still condition the legitimate freedom and hamper the authentic development of children’s specific identity and potential.” (§ 286).*

WHAT, PRECISELY IS FEMINISM?

One can only have a clear understanding of how to react to feminist propaganda when one has a clear notion of what feminism really is. It is a rejection of the natural order, as clearly described in the work of creation, in which Eve was created after and from Adam and to be *“a help like unto himself”* (Gen 2:18). The subordination of wife to husband is clearly apparent in the biological facts that surround the marriage act. However, it is not only physical. It is also a psychological subordination present in all cultures in which the woman attracts the man that he might take the active role in their relationship. It is this natural order that feminism rejects, in maintaining a complete equality between the sexes, denying their real differences.

Moreover, feminism is also directly opposed to divine revelation, which explicitly states the dependence of a wife upon her husband, and his authority over her. Amongst the many passages in Sacred Scripture is St. Paul’s statement to the Ephesians: *“Let women be subject to their husbands as to the Lord; because the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is head of the Church. He is the saviour of His body. Therefore as the Church is subject to Christ, so also let wives be to their husbands in all things”* (5:22-24).

Feminism is consequently in its essence a **rebellion against the principle of dependence**, written into human nature and divine revelation. It is consequently a form of liberalism that rejects man's dependence upon Almighty God, His Creator and Redeemer. Like every other form of liberalism, feminism is fanatical about its independence. Falsely opposing liberty to authority, it manufactures a false dignity of women, based upon the subjective freedom to do whatever she wants. It is essentially anti-authority and consequently not only anti-man but also anti-God.

Prof. Amerio points out that feminism would be more accurately labelled **masculinism**. For overlooking the special qualities and characteristics of women, it produces an absolute egalitarianism between man and woman based on the natural characteristics of man only. It is consequently woman imitating the masculine aspect of creation, and consequently far from exalting women, it leads "*to the obliteration of the feminine and its total reduction to the masculine*" (Ib. p. 205). It promotes women acting and living as men, denying the beauty of their femininity and taking masculinity as their model.

ARE THERE POSITIVE ELEMENTS OF FEMINISM?

But you might object: Surely feminism is right about many things. Women must function in modern society, and have work opportunities. Their dignity must be acknowledged as having rights as human beings. They have a right to participate in public and intellectual life, nor should they be considered inferior to men. Moreover, they must be protected from physical, emotional and sexual abuse.

Such considerations are due to a total ignorance of Catholic teaching. Who is it who is not aware that it was the Catholic Church, which freed women from the slavery of paganism, from the tyrannical control of their husbands, from subservience in society, and declared their equality as souls before God, open to the very same dignity as men in becoming children of God? It was St. Paul who declared that in Christ "*there is neither male nor female*" (Gal 3:28). It is the Church that ennobles marriage with a sacrament, and which declares that in the marriage "*there is a true equality between them, which is to be recognized in all that pertains to the person and dignity of a human being, and in all that is implied by the marriage contract*" (Pius XI. Ib.), consequently, infidelity is as much a sin for the husband as for the wife. It is the Church that declares that the submission of a wife to her husband is not a servile submission, but that of a companion. It is the Church that alone teaches that a woman is the Mother of God, the most perfect creature that could ever exist, and the model for all women. It is the Church that has acknowledged the sanctity of women in private and public life – such as St. Chlotild, St. Catherine of Siena, St. Joan of Arc, St. Theresa of Avila, St. Frances

Xavier Cabrini, just to name a few. It is the Church that has always honoured the state of consecrated virginity, and protected and granted the necessary authority of government to the superiors of communities of women.

It is a feminist lie to maintain that the Church has in any way suppressed women through her 2,000 year history. The Church has nothing to apologize for. For she has always acknowledged the equality of all of us with respect to our end, eternal salvation, but at the same time taught that in social and family life there is a complementarity and subordination.



These concern the means to that end, the salvation of

souls. Here lies the beauty of obedience - the voluntary submission of one's will to another, as taught by St. Paul: "*Being subject one to another in the fear of Christ.*" (Eph 5:21). This is the submission that the feminist, true liberal as she is, rejects. A husband is also subject to many obligations, for by marriage he gives up his independence, his money, his property, his work, all that he has, and his own will for the support of his wife and family.

FEMINISM – REJECTION OF THE FAMILY

It is certainly true that the differences by which man and woman complement one another are particularly apparent in domestic society, in the home and in the family. But the family is the building block of Catholic society, and it in turn is founded on the sacrament of matrimony. It is consequently fundamental to society that there be harmony in the family. If it is true that not every woman is called to be married, and that she can voluntarily give it up, nevertheless it is her natural state, for which she was endowed with so many feminine qualities. As Pope Pius XI points out in his encyclical on Christian marriage, it is precisely the assurance of the indissolubility of matrimony which maintains the dignity of both husband and wife. The Pope further adds that the subjection of wife to husband "*does not deny or take away the liberty which fully belongs to the woman both in view of her dignity as a human person, and in view of her most noble office as wife and mother*

and companion; nor does it bid her obey her husband's every request if not in harmony with right reason or with the dignity due to wife....but it forbids that exaggerated liberty which cares not for the good of the family" (Casti Connubii).

Moreover, this subjection leads to their mutual sanctification in the married state, in which husband and wife complement and perfect one another in performing their different roles with the spirit of self-sacrifice: *"The mutual inward moulding of husband and wife, this determined effort to perfect each other, can in a very real sense, as the Roman Catechism teaches, be said to be the chief reason and purpose of matrimony..."*



The Women's Retreat at St. Pius X Chapel Lagos, which ended on the 21st of January

Pope Pius XI in the above-mentioned encyclical rejects as a perversion and degradation the so-called emancipation of women promoted by the feminist movement. If only the post-conciliar Popes had repeated such clear and uncompromising words. *"This is not true emancipation of woman, nor is it the reasonable and exalted liberty which is due to the high office of a Christian woman and wife. On the contrary it is a degradation of the spirit of woman and of the dignity of a mother; it is a total perversion of family life, depriving the husband of his wife, the children of their mother, and the home and family of their ever watchful guardian."* (Dec. 31, 1930).

IS FEMINISM A NECESSARY PART OF MODERN LIFE?

But you might again object: surely the circumstances of modern life have changed the roles and relationships of men and women, such that we cannot be expected to follow the customs of former centuries. In response, a distinction must be made, namely between the principles that are essential to the Christian life, and the circumstantial modifications that are brought about by living in modern society. The Church has clearly defined what exactly is essential to the life of Faith in the different roles of men and women. But prudence must govern their application to the particular situations in which we find ourselves in a secular and godless world.

It is very clear for those who are married and who have children, namely that the husband must take responsibility and the authority that goes with it, whereas the wife must delight in making the domestic hearth the place of love, affection,

warmth, devotion and attention to detail. She must place her family that is her vocation as wife and mother before her profession. This is inseparable from the living of our Faith. The Church has clearly taught that a man's just salary is what enables him on his salary alone to support his family, so that the wife and mother need not work outside the home. It is an injustice against the family when this is not the case. But this justice, your response, is common place in our modern society, due to materialism, and lack of appreciation for the dignity of fatherhood, and of motherhood. Consequently, it is frequently impossible for the family to survive on one salary. Consequently, it is sometimes necessary, but not desirable, for a wife and mother to work outside the home. Flexibility in adapting to such circumstances does not take away from the principle, to be followed as closely as possible.

Single women now, as always, must support themselves by their work. However a woman who is not a feminist, and who retains her femininity, will rather chose a profession compatible with the special feminine qualities with which she has been endowed – nurturing, care of the sick, of the poor and of children, nursing, teaching, music, art. Moreover, in our modern society, a married woman must plan not only to support herself before marriage, but also to be in a position to help support the family, if needed, during difficult financial times. Consequently, women must not be discouraged from seeking a higher education, or following intellectual pursuits, research, medicine or law, or seeking a profession that can be fulfilled part time from the home, such as accounting, decorating, sewing, or from starting a business, such as catering, which is entirely compatible with her womanly qualities, desire to serve and attention to detail. This is not feminism, but adapting to the reality of life in the modern world, provided that the married woman regards the care of her home and family as her principal responsibility, and provided that she does not pretend to equality with men in the labour market, for she is not equal to a man who does not have her family responsibilities.

WOMEN ACTING AND DRESSING AS MEN

There is another aspect of feminism which cannot be ignored. It is that women, being no longer tied to a domestic vocation, consider that they have the right to act like men, to speak harshly and crudely just like men. This also concerns aggressive sports, like football, that are not appropriate for women, or going to places of entertainment, or ultimately indulging in the many vices against purity that are so common amongst men. Their masculinism turns them into moral libertines, more perverse yet than the men they wrongly imitate, because further removed from the natural order. Lesbianism, transvestitism, test tube babies and surrogate pregnancies are manifestly the long term consequences of the feminist movement and its attack on the family.

The question of women's dress is here of fundamental importance, for it is an expression of a woman's identity. Immodest dress, so as to display the flesh is a

betrayal of the woman's feminine dignity and vocation, and by so doing she effectively reduces herself to the level of a sex object. It is consequently not the traditional concept of a woman's role that destroys her dignity, but feminism itself. This is also clearly apparent in the desire of modern women to dress as men. The wearing of women's pants is likewise a direct attack on the nature of a woman.

Already in June 1960 Cardinal Giuseppe Siri of Genoa, issued a notification on women wearing men's dress, which is profound in its observations. He clearly describes the liberalism that drives women who wear trousers:

"In truth, the motive impelling women to wear men's dress is always that of imitating, nay, of competing with, the man who is considered stronger, less tied down, more independent. This motivation shows clearly that male dress is the visible aid to bringing about a mental attitude of being like a man. Secondly, ever since men have been men, the clothing a person wears, demands, imposes and modifies that person's gestures, attitudes and behaviour, such that from merely being worn outside, clothing comes to impose a particular frame of mind inside. Then let us add that woman wearing man's dress always more or less indicates her reacting to her femininity as though it is inferiority when in fact it is only diversity. The perversion of her psychology is clear to be seen....The changing of feminine psychology does fundamental and, in the long run, irreparable damage to the family, to conjugal fidelity, to human affections and to human society. True, the effects of wearing unsuitable dress are not all to be seen within a short time. But one must think of what is being slowly and insidiously worn down, torn apart, and perverted."

Consequently, no Catholic woman should wear trousers at any time, unless covered with an appropriate dress or skirt. She will lose her femininity if she goes along with the feminist propaganda in favour of pants for women – such as it is easier, more practical, more comfortable etc. If there are some circumstances in which women are obliged to wear pants for work, or for sports (e.g. horse riding), it is a practice that a Catholic woman must oppose and limit as much as she can. She must feel ill at ease, for if she starts to feel comfortable dressed as a man, she will lose the priceless beauty of her femininity. This applies not only to dress in public, but most particularly at home, and around her family, in which she is especially bound to maintain her dignity.

Finally let us not forget that the masculinization of women, which we call feminism, is ultimately a problem for men to deal with. If men took the leadership and responsibility that they ought to, if men insisted on the natural, unequal and complementary dignity of women, if men truly respected the beauty of the feminine soul, if men truly appreciated the wonderful qualities of the daughters of Eve and how much they depend upon them, then feminism would come to an end. Woman would be happy, delighted, fulfilled, and secure in her identity, with its natural and supernatural dignity. Women would see themselves as imitators not of men but of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the perfect woman, spouse of the Holy Ghost and companion of the Saviour of the world. Thus, feminism is entirely to be rejected, for the true dignity of women is guaranteed to them by the doctrine and wisdom of the one true Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ.



The Men's Retreat at St. Pius X Chapel Lagos, which ended on the 7th of January



Completed Altar at St. Pius X Chapel, Yaba Lagos



The Men's Retreat at Enugu Priory, which ended on the 8th of January



First Communicants at Port Harcourt Chapel on the 26th of December 2021



The Women's Retreat at Enugu Priory, which ended on the 22nd of January

OUR HEAVENLY FRIENDS

Between the years 1225 and 1227, seven young Florentines joined the Confraternity of the Blessed Virgin—popularly known as the "Laudesi" or Praisers. It was at a period when the prosperous city of Florence was being rent by political factions and distracted by the heresy of the Cathari: it was also a time of general relaxation of morals even where devotional practices were retained. These young men, had from their childhood been occupied more with spiritual than with temporal affairs and had taken no part in local feuds. All seven grew daily more detached from the world and more devoted to the service of the Blessed Virgin. The eldest of them was Buonfiglio Monaldo, who became their leader, and the others were Alexis Falconieri, Benedict dell' Antella, Bartholomew Amidei, Ricovero Ugucione, Gerardino Sostegni, and John Buonagiunta. They had as their spiritual director James of Poggibonsi, who was chaplain of the Laudesi, a man of great holiness and spiritual insight. All of them came to realize the call to a life of renunciation, and they determined to have recourse to our Lady. On the feast of the Assumption, as they were absorbed in prayer, they saw her in a vision, and were inspired by her to withdraw from the world into a solitary place and to live for God alone. There were difficulties, because, though three of them were celibates, four had been married and

had ties, although two had become widowers. It was necessary to make suitable provision for their dependants; but that was arranged, and with the approval of the bishop they withdrew from the world and betook themselves to a house called La Carmarzia, outside the gates of Florence. Their aim was to lead a life of penance and prayer, but before long they found themselves so much disturbed by constant visitors from Florence that they decided to withdraw to the wild and deserted slopes of Monte Senario, where they built a simple church and hermitage and lived a life of almost incredible austerity.

In spite of difficulties, visitors sometimes found their way to the hermits and many wished to join them, but they refused to accept recruits. So, they continued to live for several years, until they were visited by their bishop, Ardingo, and Cardinal Castiglione, who had heard much about their sanctity. He was greatly edified, but he made one adverse criticism. "Your mode of life", he said, "is too much like that of the wild creatures of the woods, so far as the care of the body is concerned. You treat yourselves in a manner bordering on barbarity: and you seem more desirous of dying to time than of living for eternity. Take heed: the enemy of souls often hides himself under the appearance of an angel of light.... Harken to the counsels of your superiors." They were impressed by

these words, and hastened to ask their bishop for a rule of life. He entreated them not to continue to refuse admittance to those who sought to join them. The solitaries

gave themselves up to prayer for light, and again they had a vision of our Lady, who bore in her hand a black habit while an angel held a scroll inscribed with the title of Servants of Mary.

She addressed them and said she had chosen them to be her servants, that she wished them to wear the black habit, and to follow the Rule of St Augustine. From that date, April 13, 1240, they were known as the Servants of Mary, or Servites. In accepting this rule, the Seven Founders found themselves called

upon to adopt a different kind of life -much to the satisfaction of their old friend the Bishop of Florence. The new order, which took a form more like that of the mendicant friars than that of the monastic orders, increased amazingly, and it soon became necessary to form fresh

houses. Many houses were established. Meanwhile, although the Servites had the approval of their immediate superiors, they had not

been recognized by the Holy See. Efforts were made to obtain recognition for them, but difficulties were raised by those who desired to see the new order abolished or absorbed in another.

'the Council of the Lateran had declared that no new orders should be founded, and later on the Council of Lyons had added further limitations, and therefore each time the petition of the Servites came before the pope it was set aside or ignored. It was only in 1259 that the order was practically recognized by

Alexander IV, and not till 1304-over sixty years after its foundation-that it received the explicit and formal approbation of Bd Benedict XI. The "Seven Holy Founders" of the Servites were canonized in 1887 by Pope Leo XIII. His feast day is 12 Febuary.



**The Seven Holy Founder of the
Servite Order
12TH FEBRUARY**

ANSWERS TO THE READERS

Question: Is it permissible for a Catholic wife and mother to take a job outside the home?

Answer: It has become so common place for Catholic wives to work outside the home that this question seems to be medieval, out of date and irrelevant to modern society. However, it is a fundamental question, for outside of real necessity, it cannot be accepted as something normal and approved by the Church for a wife and mother to be free to take employment outside the home, for as long as her children are still dependent upon her care.

The working of mothers outside the home for a salary is called by Pope Pius XI "economic emancipation" in his 1930 encyclical on Christian Marriage, *Casti Connubii*: *"This, however, is not the true emancipation of women, nor that rational and exalted liberty which belongs to the noble office of a Christian woman and wife; it is rather the debasing of the womanly character and the dignity of motherhood, and indeed of the whole family, as a result of which the husband suffers the loss of his wife, the children of their mother, and the home and the whole family of an ever watch guardian. More than this, this false liberty and unnatural equality with the husband is to the detriment of the woman herself, for if the woman descends from her truly regal throne to which she has been raised within the walls of the home by means of the Gospel, she will soon be reduced to the old state of slavery (if not in appearance, certainly in reality) and become as amongst the pagans the mere instrument of man"* (Pauline Books, p. 38).

Towards the end of the same encyclical the Pope is even more explicit. He talks about the evils and the injustices that discourage married couples, and compares the evil of mothers having to work with that of not being able to find a suitable home. "If families, particularly those in which there are many children, have not suitable dwellings; if the husband cannot find employment and means of livelihood; if the necessities of life cannot be purchased except at exorbitant prices; IF EVEN THE MOTHER OF THE FAMILY TO THE GREAT HARM OF THE HOME, IS COMPELLED TO GO FORTH AND SEEK A LIVING BY HER OWN LABOR...it is patent to all to what an extent married people may lose heart" (p. 64).

Clearly, we cannot judge the particular situation of mothers who experience the need to work outside the home. There can be many reasons that could make this a necessary evil, such as sickness and unemployment of the husband, or a husband not receiving a just salary, sufficient to support the family. There can also be psychological and professional reasons why a wife and mother might be obliged to stay in the workforce outside the home. However, the Church clearly teaches that for as long as she has dependent children at home, this is an evil. We cannot pretend that it is a good thing, or that it is indifferent, or that it is not going to do any harm to her children and family. Moreover

no woman can be liberated from the home in this manner without changing her very awareness of what it is to be a Catholic mother and wife.

Consequently, it can only be tolerated as an unavoidable and necessary evil, and provided that it be only considered a temporary, short term arrangement, and that the utmost effort is made by the working mother and her husband to minimize the negative effects. However, it would be very wrong to claim that this is a good thing, or approved and allowed by the Church. It is at best an unavoidable and necessary evil, that one ought to be apologetic for, and never brag about.

However, this does not apply to work done at home. A mother can easily take work home with her at the same time as she take responsibility for the family and the home. Such things as sewing, catering, music, and accounting are all possible at home, and with the advent of the internet more and more gainful activities can be done at a distance. If they are not full time and not all-engrossing they are not necessarily in contradiction with the wife and mother's principal vocation as homemaker.

Question: **Who is permitted to flirt?**

Answer: Flirtation is such a common practice in our modern society that we think nothing of it. For the boundaries of modesty and reserve which formerly controlled the relationships between men and women no long exist.

In order to answer this question, we have to have a clear idea of what we mean. Flirting takes place between a man and a woman who are in some way attracted to one another, who enjoy one another's company, but who are not preparing for marriage. Flirting is a game of pretend, of make believe. It is to play at courtship, which there is no serious intention of a permanent relationship. It is to say sweet nothings, not to mention the physical contact that follows. It is to treat human love as a trifle, to be played with for fun. It is a trivialization of the most sacred of human relationships that ought to be a preparation for marriage.

It is clear from the above that it is never permitted for anybody to flirt. But you might object, it is harmless fun. It might be fun for a while, but it ultimately leads to seriously hurt feelings. However, it most certainly is not harmless. The strings of concupiscence are never dead in the soul wounded by original sin, and such flirting is the frequent occasion for mortal sins against purity. It is a proximate occasion for mortal sin. But it is never permissible to place oneself in a proximate occasion of mortal sin. In fact, to do so is already to commit a mortal sin.

But you might object, can I not enjoy the company of persons of the opposite sex? Certainly, but in the right circumstances, that is together in a group, not alone, one with one, and not in a playful acting situation where false compliments, sweet words, inappropriate gestures bring about a disordered emotional attachment. In a family setting, or at a parish meeting, or with a group of friends, one can enjoy the company of others who share one's convictions, but nobody has the right to play at courting, or to use such situations to develop an attachment.

But is it not the same as courting? Courting is a serious matter. It is not for fun. It is a preparation for a life-long relationship. It is getting to know better one's future companion. It is a necessary occasion of sin. Flirting is not, for it has not goal to it. Moreover, when persons

court in preparation for marriage, they are bound to take precautions, such as not staying over at one another's apartment, or spending long periods of time together alone, without a chaperone. These precautions enable them to maintain their pure intention, and to avoid undue physical familiarity from developing. Pope Pius XI instructs those seeking to marry *"to fervently ask God's help to make their choice with Christian prudence...guided by a true and upright love and sincere affection towards their partner, and seeking in marriage the ends for which God instituted it"* (Casti Connubii).

Nothing could be more opposed to flirting. For with flirting, there is no pure intention, but rather a selfish intention, for pure fun, which so easily and so frequently becomes an impure intention. Allow me to quote what Pope Pius XI has to say about such flirting: *"Those who before marriage, were in all things self-seeking, and indulged their passions, will, it is to be feared, be the same in marriage as they were before it; they will reap what they have sown, and in their home will reign unhappiness, lamentation, mutual disdain, misunderstandings and boredom with each other's company..."* Therefore, do not flirt!

Fr Peter R Scott

LIFE OF THE PRIORY



**Candlemass Procession in Enugu;
February 2, 2022**



**Total Consecration to the
Blessed Virgin Mary accomplished in the St Michael's
Chapel Feb 2.**



**The Faithful at Candlemass
at St. Michael's Chapel**

UPCOMING EVENTS

February intention: For our parents and families

Eucharistic Crusade

Next meeting: **Saturday 12th February at 10am**
Treasure of November & December

No of Treasure Sheets received: 18

Daily Offerings: 499 Masses: 102 Communions: 67

Spiritual Communions: 297 Sacrifices: 219 Decades of the

Rosaries: 2315 Visits to the Blessed Sacrament: 76

Fifteen minute meditations: 119 Good Examples: 298

Our Lady of Good Success

Rosaries of November & December: 16135

Next meeting: **Sunday 20th February**

Holy Souls Society

Next meeting: **Sunday 27th February**

Legion of Mary

Next meetings: **Sunday 6th and 20th February**

Altar Boys Practice

Next meeting: **Saturday 12th February at 9am**

HOW TO HELP THE PRIORY

It is with many grains of rice that we are able to fill the bag. So any help is welcome!

Thank you for supporting our expenses by cash.

You also can help:

✘ By cheque: to **THE SOCIETY OF SAINT PIUS X**

✘ By Transfer - occasionally or monthly - to

Bank: **FIDELITY BANK**

Name: **THE SOCIETY OF SAINT PIUS X**

Number: **5080119933**

Your priests are very grateful for your support and they are praying in their daily Rosary for all the Benefactors of the Priory and the Chapels.

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH
SOCIETY OF SAINT PIUS X
(Latin Mass, Gregorian chant, Traditional Catechism, etc.)
SAINT MICHAEL'S MISSION

A question ?
Call the Prioxy
0909 0000 576

ENUGU

**ST. MICHAEL'S
PRIORY**

(Opposite NNPC Mega Fuel Station)
P.O. Box 371
0909 0000 576
smp.ng@fsspx.net

NAIRA TRIANGLE, JUNCTION OF THE
PORT HARCOURT & ABAKALIKI
EXPRESSWAYS

- ✘ **Sunday Mass** : 7am & 9am (*Sung Mass*)
- ✘ **Weekly Mass** : 7.15 am & 6.00 pm
- ✘ **Saturday Mass**: 7.15 am
- ✘ **Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament** :
Saturday at 8.00 am

- ✘ **Confessions and Priest's office**:
Sunday 6.30am & 8.15am
Mon—Sat 8.00 - 9.00 am and 4:30 - 5:30 pm
- ✘ **Adults' catechism** : Tuesday 6.30 - 7.30 pm
- ✘ **Children's catechism** : Sunday 10.30 - 11.30
- ✘ **Night adoration**: First Friday of the month 6pm
- ✘ **First Saturday Devotions at 6.45am**

ST. PIUS X CHAPEL

69 Queen Street
YABA- LAGOS
Contact : Mr Paul OKEKE
(0708 645 31 04)
(+2349099999274)

LAGOS
Every
Saturday
and
Sunday

- ✘ **Sunday Mass**: 7am & 9am (*Sung Mass*)
- ✘ **Saturday Mass** : 6.00pm (*Low Mass*)
- ✘ **Confessions and Priest's office** :
Sunday 6.00- 7.00am, Saturday 5.00-6.00pm
- ✘ **Catechism & Conference** : Sunday 10.30
- 11.30am

SACRED HEART CHAPEL

44 Khartoum St.
WUSE 5 - ABUJA
Contact : Mr Emmanuel
GILBERT (080 332 96 427)
(+2349075252520)

ABUJA
Every
Saturday
and
Sunday

- ✘ **Sunday Mass** : 9.00am (*Sung Mass*)
- ✘ **Saturday Mass** : 5.00pm (*Low Mass*)
- ✘ **Confessions and Priest's office** :
Sunday 8.00-9.00am, Saturday 4.00-5.00pm
- ✘ **Catechism & Conference** : Sunday 10.30-
11.30am

ST. PIUS V CHAPEL

34 Anyika Street
Beside Best Aluminium
Awada—Obosi ONITSHA
Contact : Mr Stan IZUCHI
(0703 05 44 862)
(+2349099999275)

ONITSHA
Every
Saturday
and
Sunday

- ✘ **Sunday Mass** : 9am (*Sung Mass*)
- ✘ **Confessions and Priest's office** :
Sunday 8.00am—9.00am
- ✘ **Catechism & Conference** : Sunday
10.30am--11.30 am

**IMMACULATE
HEART CHAPEL**

Wify Comprehen-
sive College, GU
Ake Road, Aligbo-
lu, Port-Harcourt
Contact : Mr Francis-Mary Nwadibia
(0813 590 5335)
(+2349099999275)

PORT-HARCOURT
1st & 3rd & 5th
Sundays
at 3:00 pm

- ✘ **Sunday Mass** : 3.00pm (*Sung Mass*)
- ✘ **Confessions and Priest's office** : 2.00pm
- ✘ **Catechism & Conference** : 5.00pm