

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

Vol. XXXVIII

No. 430



AUGUST

1964

**OFFICIAL INTERDIOCESAN ORGAN
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE UNIVERSITY OF SANTO TOMAS
MANILA, PHILIPPINES**

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO de FILIPINAS

OFFICIAL INTERDIOCESAN ORGAN
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE UNIVERSITY OF SANTO TOMAS
MANILA, PHILIPPINES

Editor Rev. EXCELSO GARCIA
Acting Editor & Bus. Manager Rev. FLORENCIO TESTERA, O.P.
Assistant Editor Rev. FREDERIC FERMIN, O.P.

AUGUST, 1964

EDITORIAL

- We Want Rome..., by Rev. J. Ma. MERINO 454

THE POPE SPEAKS

- The Universality of the Church; The Holy Eucharist; The Religious Life; Mary and the Church; The Jewish Problem, by Rev. F. FERMIN, O.P. 455

DOCTRINAL SECTION

- The Filipino Clergy during the Spanish Regime, by Rev. J. Ma. CAVANNA, C.M. 465
- New Churches for Old, by L. WRIGHT 477
- A House-going Priest makes a Church going People, by Rev. G. VROMANT, C.I.C.M. 480

NOTES AND COMMENTS

- Psychological Tests for Candidates for Priesthood; Impossible to forecast Length of Council; Electronic Organ versus Pipe Organ; Human Generation and Original Sin 485

ROMAN CURIA

- Indulgentiae lucrandae a fidelibus occasione Quatercentessimi Anniversarii ab Evangelizatione Insularum Philippinarum 489

PASTORAL SECTION

- Twelfth Sunday after Pentecost; Assumption Day; Thirteenth, Fourteenth, Fifteenth, Sixteenth Sundays after Pentecost, by Rev. T. LOPEZ, O.P. 491
- Lex abstinentiae diei 14 augusti relaxatur 500
- Seminarians' Mission Camp, by Sem. I. B. POBLETE, Jr. 501

CASES AND QUERIES

- Validation of Wartime Marriages, by Rev. F. TESTERA, O.P. .. 505
- Repetition of the General Absolution, by Rev. L. LEGAZPI, O.P. 507
- What to do after an invalid Civil Marriage, by Rev. Q. Ma. GARCIA 509

NEWS 512

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Comentarios alCodigo de Derecho Canónico, (BAC); Visions and Prophecies (K. Rahner) 516

BOLETIN ECCLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS, is printed at U.S.T. Press, Manila, Philippines. Entered as Second-Class Mail Matter at the Manila Post Office on June 21, 1946.
Subscription Rates: Yearly subscription in the Philippines, ₱10.00; Abroad, \$4.00.
Price per copy, ₱1.00. Subscriptions are paid in advance.

Communications of an editorial nature, concerning articles, cases and reviews should be addressed to the EDITOR. Advertising and subscription enquiries should be addressed to the BUSINESS MANAGER. Orders for renewals or changes of address should include both the old and the new address, and will go into effect fifteen days after notification.

Address all communications to:

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO,
FATHERS' RESIDENCE,
UNIVERSITY OF SANTO TOMAS,
MANILA, PHILIPPINES.

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

VOL. XXXVIII

AUGUST, 1964

NUMBER 430

Editorial

WE WANT ROME ...

The Theology of our times seems to be sick. Great problems vital and urgent, such as the nature and the extent of morality, the integrity and truth of the divine revelation, the very essence of Christianity, are on the carpet, and our theologians either remain dumb or split into a diversity of opinions which is disconcerting to say the least. After much argument they . . . wait for Rome to speak and solve the problem.

The contrast between this dilly-dallying way of scholarly Theology and the firm stand or keen sense of truth in the faithful is striking. Lourdes saw a good sample of it in 1958, when over four hundred theologians declared themselves unable to offer to Pius XII a single good conclusion of their Mariological Congress; while the faithful and their pastors arrived at a nice full set of resolutions in their Marian Congress, and lived for a week or so the best and deepest love for Mary.

Yes! The Holy Ghost is living in the Catholic Church. Now, something must be wrong somewhere. Otherwise our theologians should be more alive with His divine wisdom.

Rome is the column and the foundation of truth. The Roman Pontiff, acting as the Vicar of Christ in matters of faith and mo-

als, is infallible. He is the keeper of the keys, the Pastor of the whole flock of Christ. Whenever He speaks, commands to speak, or forbids to speak on something, He must be listened to and obeyed. But is He the only doctor in the Church of God?

To us all, who are bishops, priests, doctors in theology, etc., etc., etc., our Lord Jesus Christ said once, and the Church is repeating insistently: "As the Father sent me, so I send you", "Go and preach the gospel, teaching them whatever I have said to you", "I have chosen you and put you, so that you give fruit and your fruit may last".

The wrong lies here. We, the ministers of God, seem to have lost consciousness of our being teachers of the divine truth. We seem to have forgotten that we must know the exact truth of the faith divine, and that we must tell it in our classrooms, books, papers, pulpits, confessionals, conversations and everywhere. We seem to be satisfied, and gratified, with our sounding erudite to the latest according to theories prevailing now in France, Germany or India.

Now is the time to remember that. We are going to say the greatest part of the Mass, and recite the whole Divine Office, and administer the Sacraments in any one of the ten thousand vernacular tongues spoken in the world. Latin is already absent almost completely from the classrooms of our Major Seminaries; Greek . . . well! We are headed towards losing direct contact with the channels of good ecclesiastical and theological tradition, both in the technical and in the pastoral field, and so with the kern of doctrinal Divinity. We must not break the chain of tradition. We must work hard at knowing the real heavenly revelation in all its richness and development and applications. The reason is because we all are the continuation of Christ, our Master.

We want Rome to study for us, to learn for us, to speak for us.

We are wrong.

Rome has too many other things to do for our sake. Besides, Rome is not living in the poles, nor in the tropics, nor in China, nor in the Philippines. Our Christian life is our vital concern. Let Rome be our light and our Mother! But let us do our part!

Fr. Jesús Ma. Merino Antolinez, O.P.

THE POPE SPEAKS

THE UNIVERSALITY OF THE CHURCH

During the pontifical Mass which the Pope celebrated on the feast of Pentecost, the Holy Father pronounced a homily in which he dwelt in particular on the universality of the Church.

Catholicity. The Church is catholic by birth. Catholicity, that means universality. The word expresses being destined for all men; it says openness to all souls, readiness to speak all languages. The word is an invitation to all civilisations, and stands for presence to all the world and coexistence with the whole of history.

Modern usage. The facility with which we use the word catholic, has taken away some of the force and marvel of its meaning. We hardly think of the plenitude to which the word refers, of the dynamism which it irradiates, nor of the beauty which it represents or of the duty which it imposes. In everyday use the word has often become a term to define, i.e. to delimit, the true and only Church in order to distinguish her from other factions, worthy, no doubt, and still endowed with immense christian treasures, but yet separated from catholic plenitude. We therefore sometimes resort to the word christian in preference to the word catholic, as if forgetting that in the order of concepts and of reality the latter contains the former while the reverse is not always true.

True appreciation of the word. We ought to treasure the word catholic, and have a clear understanding of its meaning. The word signifies the transcendency of the Kingdom of God.

We should hear in the word the resonance of the mysterious and loving call of God, who calls all men without exception to accept his mercy, and who, by means of this vocation, forms the new people, his people, by definition the assembled people, the *congregatio fidelium*, the Church. Taking away from the Church the qualification of catholic, amounts to changing her face as the Lord wants to see it and loves it; it amounts to offending the intention of God, who wants the Church to be the expression of his boundless love for mankind.

A catholic heart. When received in the hearts of men, the word catholic finds there, it is true, a natural capacity for expansion, a profound, though vague, instinct of universal dilatation. But, above all, it meets with a terrible narrowness that resists its penetration. The heart of man is small, egoistic, and has no place but for himself and for some people of his family and caste. Even modern man has difficulty in overcoming those interior barriers. Progress in the social field addresses to him an invitation to widen his capacity for love towards the world, but he responds as an egoist, and continues to seek his own advantage.

When, however, the word catholic really penetrates in the human heart, then all egotism is overcome, class consciousness rises to full social solidarity, patriotism is integrated in the good of the world community, racism is condemned, and the inhumanity of totalitarianism exposed. A catholic heart is a magnanimous heart, an oecumenical heart, a heart that is capable of receiving the whole world in itself.

This does not make it a heart that is indifferent to the truth of things or to the true meaning of words. This does not cause it to confound weakness with goodness, or to seek peace through cowardice and apathy. A catholic heart knows how to respond to the admirable synthesis of St. Paul: *Veritatem facientes in caritate*.

Catholicity a task. Although catholicity is already in act in the intrinsic structure of the Church, as far as extrinsic reality is concerned, the Church is far from having attained universality.

Her catholicity is always *in fieri*, attempting to attain concrete expansion in history. In the concrete the universality of the Church is still enormously deficient. Numerous nations, entire continents have not been evangelized; the greater part of mankind has not yet received the message of Pentecost; the world is not yet catholic. This hurts a truly catholic heart.

The world has need of people to bring it the Gospel. Exactly from the potential catholicity of the Church it is, that missionary dynamism is born; it is born from the investiture of Pentecost, which was given to the small church assembled in Jerusalem in order to become the universal Church.

The force of catholicity. The Church is animated by the urge to respond to the duty of catholicity. One needs to think only of the apostolate of clergy and laity, of the missions and of the oecumenical council; or of the eagerness with which the Church seeks the dialogue with all souls, with all forms of modern life, and with all social and political expressions which consent to a meeting on a basis of absolute sincerity and true humanity.

Two conclusions. After having announced the establishment of the Secretariate for the non-Christians, the Holy Father ended his homily with two conclusions: first, that there is no true catholicity which is not correlative to the unity and unicity of the Church; second, that there can be no operative and constructive catholicity which does not come forth from the interior, spiritual life of the Church, a life nurtured by silence, prayer, love and grace.

(Cf. "*L'Osservatore Romano*" ed. hebdomadaire en langue française, 29 May 1964)

THE H. EUCHARIST

The feast of Corpus Domini was celebrated in Rome with the customary procession, which ended this year at the esplanade of the Circus Maximus. It was the longest and most impressive procession seen in Rome since the remains of Pope Pius XII

were borne through the city in 1958. A happy innovation was that the singing of hymns was alternated with the reading of parts from S. Scripture. The texts of the hymns had been distributed among the people in order to secure their active participation in the liturgical function. Before giving the blessing with the Bl. Sacrament, the Holy Father, who personally officiated, pronounced a short exhortation.

Convergence of two lines. The Pope briefly explained the central fact of God's wishing to approach man and to enter into communion with us. The history of mankind is marked by the stages of this mysterious going of God to man and of man to God. Religion — that is, the relation between heaven and earth, between the infinite Life of God and our feeble human life — resembles the convergence of two lines meeting in one point, which is plenitude, divine Life communicated to human life, which is the Eucharist: bread from heaven for the terrestrial pilgrim, divine food for human hunger.

A luminous truth. If understood in this manner, the Eucharist is no longer the difficult dogma at the pinnacle of our religious life. It becomes a luminous truth, which lights up the whole panorama of the Bible and of the vicissitudes of life. It becomes a focal point that projects rays of life, not only on theology and on the history and destiny of the world, but also on our own individual selves and, above all, on our individual souls. It is no longer incomprehensible that love gives itself, multiplies itself, and seeks to penetrate into men's hearts as an interior and vital food. The Eucharist: it is thus that God loves us, thus that Christ loves us. He loves us in our smallness, and comes down to our level. He makes himself visible as he is: *infinite* love, when he makes himself accessible for all.

The hidden presence. If the Lord has done so much to come and converse with us, coming even within us, why does he not give us the joy of seeing him in person and possessing him in a sensible manner? The answer lies in the fact that our religious history, which has reached this sacramental embrace with Christ, does not end there. We are still in a period of preparation,

a period of promise. Christ is present for us in the Eucharist, but by way of a beginning, as a pledge: *nobis pignus datur*, as a teacher and educator. Christ is at the same time present and hidden, because he wants to stir up in us those acts, virtues and merits which will make us one day worthy of seeing him and enjoying him in the fulness of light and life. Jesus is present and hidden to teach us to believe, to hope and to love. Jesus draws us to practice faith, hope and charity, the theological virtues which are the way permitted to us in this life of coming to the last station of our religion, the possession of God.

A message for all. The Pope explained that he had chosen to speak in public of those and high and delicate truths, because he wants the sublime doctrine to be announced to all. They are not meant to remain reserved for the initiated, but are a message of spiritual, true, consoling and transforming life intended for all men.

(Cf. "*L'Osservatore Romano*", éd. hebd. en langue française, 5 Juin 1964)

THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

During an audience for the general chapters of various religious orders and congregations the Pope developed his views on the religious life in our days.

Importance of religious institutions. Although the universal vocation to sanctity of all the faithful is rightly stressed nowadays, this should not obscure a correct understanding of the religious life as it has always been lived in the Church. The Church of our times has a great need of the public and social testimony which the religious life gives. It is the part of the laity to lead a christian life in the world; those who renounce the world, must give a shining example of the truth that Christ's Kingdom is not, however, of this world. Thus the profession of the evangelical vows is a complement to the consecration of baptism.

The religious vows. The religious vows and their practice should be held in high esteem. No other means lead to a life that is in harmonious conformity with the religious state. Even though the conditions of our life have greatly changed in a recent past — and the religious must necessarily adapt themselves to those changes — that what follows from the nature of the evangelical counsels keeps all its value and must at no price be changed.

Obedience. Religious obedience must remain the holocaust of the will offered to God. This sacrifice brings with it the humble submission to the legitimate Superiors, who on their part, should take care to exercise their authority within the limits of charity and of respect for the human person.

Poverty. Poverty is much discussed in the Church at the moment. The religious must offer to all a shining example of true evangelical poverty, loving the poverty to which they have bound themselves. It is not sufficient that they depend on the decision of their Superiors in the use of material things: they must themselves be contented with what is needed for their existence, and fly from comforts and luxury that weaken the religious life.

Apart from individual poverty, the poverty of the religious family as such, and of the collective body of religious, should not be neglected. Religious institutions must avoid in their buildings and undertakings all that smacks of elegance, excessive ornamentation and luxury. They must also be mindful of the social condition of the people among whom they live.

An exaggerated preoccupation with profit should be avoided. If Providence gives a religious institution material resources, it would be proper to come to the aid of indigent brothers, whether those who live nearby or those who live in other regions of the world.

Chastity. Prevailing conditions in the world do not make the practice of perfect chastity any easier. We must therefore increase our faith, and believe in the words of Christ, who proclaimed the supernatural value of chastity, embraced for the

kingdom of heaven. It is necessary to practice ardently christian mortification, and to keep a diligent watch over the senses. Improper or vulgar books, periodicals and shows should not be tolerated, not even when motivated with an apparent desire to acquire useful knowledge or cultural gain. Only in case of a genuine necessity for the purpose of study can Superiors make an exception.

Discipline. The general chapters have in particular the task to uphold the norms laid down by the Founders. They must be on their guard against all practices that undermine discipline, as customs which are contrary to the religious life, unnecessary exemptions and unacceptable privileges. They must take care that discipline be not diminished because of presumption, reluctance to obey, or love of the world. For this same reason no new activities should be undertaken which do not correspond to the principal task of the Institution or to the spirit of its Founder.

Adaptation. Adaptation of the constitutions of religious institutions to present conditions must be done in such a manner as to keep the proper nature and discipline of the institution intact, for each religious family has its proper function in the Church to which it must by all means remain faithful.

The apostolic activity of the religious institutions ought to be carefully adapted to the conditions and circumstances of our days. This should be kept in mind in the formation of the younger generation. The apostolic zeal, with which the young religious will be inflamed, is not to be restricted to their own order, but should be opened up to the immense spiritual needs of our times. They must be made aware of their duties, so that they will in all circumstances show themselves true ministers of God.

Aid to the Hierarchy. The exemption of the religious Orders does not prevent them to exercise their activities in conformity with the norms laid down by the Hierarchy. In fact, religious

depend always and in his disposition for the undertaking of works that promote the good of the universal Church. But as regards the sacred apostolate which is exercised in the different dioceses, the religious are also subject to the jurisdiction of the Bishops, whom they owe assistance, while all the time safeguarding the proper nature of their apostolate and the needs of the religious life.

The Holy Father is aware that the way which he has indicated is demanding a constant effort, but the religious can lift up their hearts in hope, for the cause concerned is the cause of Jesus Christ.

(Cf. "*L'Osservatore Romano*", éd. hebdomadaire en langue française, 5 Juin 1964)

MARY AND THE CHURCH

At one of his general audiences the Pope has called the attention of his audience to the relation between Mary and the Church.

In God's plan, human cooperation has been willed in the accomplishment of the Redemption: the cooperation of Mary and the cooperation of the Church. In the centuries' old tradition of theology and of the liturgy the same symbols have therefore been used for Mary and the Church. Mary is the *typus Ecclesiae*, the model of the Church, as St. Ambrose says. In Mary, full of grace, we find all the riches which the Church represents, possesses and dispenses. In Mary we have, above all, the virginal Mother of Christ, and in the Church the virginal Mother of the Christians, of which maternities the former is natural, the latter mystical. Mary gave physically birth to the head of the Mystical Body; the Church gives birth spiritually to the members of the head, which is Christ.

Not only can we contemplate in Mary the figure of the Church; numerous other relations can be found to show that the

election of Mary is connected with the election of redeemed humanity. One need only to think of Our Lady's presence in the Cenacle on the day of Pentecost. We find with admiration that day, which brought Mary a new and final effusion of grace, was for the Church the beginning of grace, and her birth, as it were, to the life of the H. Spirit. On that account also Our Lady can therefore be considered Mother of the Church, herself adorned by the sweet and sublime title of mother. The prerogatives of Mary are communicated to the Church. Mary possesses and resumes in her person all the perfections and graces which Christ bestowes on the Church, but in an eminent and perfect manner.

(Cf. "*L'Osservatore Romano*," éd. hebdomadaire en langue française, 5 Juin 1964)

THE JEWISH PROBLEM

At an audience given to Jewish leaders from the United States, the Pope stated again the position of the Church with regard to the Jews, in particular as to the racial issue, the political problem and the religious question.

The racial issue. As to the race problem the Pope reiterated the wish that the Jews, or any other ethnic group for that matter, would ever be wronged in their human rights, rights which no civilization worthy of that name can ignore.

The political problem. It does not pertain to the Pope, especially not at the present moment, to make a statement with regard to the political question, but the Holy Father is always anxious for a just and peaceful solution, for the sake of the populations, which have already been subjected to so many trials and sufferings, but also in view of the interests of the Catholic Church and the other Christian Churches, which should not be disregarded.

The religious question. The religious aspect has the Pope's profound interest, and motivates his particular consideration for the Jewish religious tradition, with which Christianity is so intimately linked, and from which it derives the hope for trusting relations in a happy future.

At the end of his short address the Pope deplored once more the terrible trials of which the Jews have been the victims in recent years.

(Cf. "*L'Osservatore Romano*," éd. hebdomadaire en langue française, 5 Juin 1964)

F. FERMIN, O.P.

CHURCH AND CIVIL LAW ON MARRIAGE SEPARATION IN THE PHILIPPINES.

By Rev. Emilio Sta. Rita (Novel Publishing Co., Inc. P. Noval, España, Manila, 1963), pp. viii + 109. P2.00.

A PROPOSED FORM OF CIVIL MARRIAGE FOR CATHOLICS AND OTHER RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS IN THE PHILIPPINES.

By Rev. Emilio Sta. Rita (Novel Publishing Co., Inc. P. Noval, España, Manila, 1964), pp. viii + 210. P5.00.

While the first book deals with grounds authorized by civil and church law for legal separation in the Philippines, the second book by the same author treats of the following points:

* Can one marry another person before a priest or any minister of religion while bound to a previous partner by the bond of civil marriage?

** What can the priest, or minister of religion do about couples contemplating remarriages while bound by ties of a previous civil marriage?

*** What can the lawmakers do by way of offering a permanent solution to this problem?

Both books are available at the following bookstores:
ALEMARS, BOOKMARK, CATHOLIC TRADE SCHOOL.

DOCTRINAL SECTION

THE FILIPINO CLERGY

DURING THE SPANISH REGIME

II. SPANISH COLONIAL POLICY, FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE EVANGELIZATION OF THE PHILIPPINES, FOSTERED PRIESTLY VOCATIONS AMONG FILIPINO BOYS

1. WHAT SHOULD BE UNDERSTOOD BY A NATIVE CLERGY IN THE PHILIPPINES: A NECESSARY AND IMPORTANT CLARIFICATION.

"On 28th June, 1586, Father Alonso Sanchez, S.J., left Cavite bound for Madrid where he was being sent by the Archbishop and the Manila Government... He was accompanied by a young Pampango, Martin Sancho. This Filipino was taken along by Father Sanchez to impress the Spanish Court with the enviable natural qualities of the people of our race and, at the same time, to serve as evidence of the marked advancement of our people in the ways of Christian culture and civilization.

"In Madrid he was personally introduced to King Philip II — the only Filipino to have been so introduced. — The monarch engaged him in conversation and was highly pleased with the attainments of young Martin.

"When Martin Sancho went with Father Sanchez to Rome, he applied for admission into the Society of Jesus. He was immediately accepted."¹ He thus had the privilege "of being the first Filipino to be admitted to the Society of Jesus. This took place in 1593 at Rome. He

¹ Antonio M. Molina, *The Philippines through the Centuries*, Manila, U.S.T. Press, 1960, Vol. I, p. 88

was attached to the province of Toledo and spent some time in the college of Murcia whence he returned to Mexico in 1599",² "in the company of the Father Procurator."³ "He sailed for home in the group of Jesuit missionaries headed by Gregorio Lopez in 1601, but died that same year after setting foot once more on his native land. He was twenty-five years old at the time of his death and a Jesuit eight years."⁴

This case of Martin Sancho, S.J. shows that from the early days of the Philippine evangelization the Spanish missionaries without any hesitation or race prejudice admitted at once into their religious Orders the Filipino boys found gifted with the talent and virtue required for the religious life or for a priestly vocation.

That such was the mind and policy of those missionaries is explicitly asserted by the same Father Alonso Sanchez when some five years before, towards 1588, he wrote to the Jesuit General Claudio Acquaviva that "by far the most important contribution the Society (of Jesus) could make in the Philippines would be the establishment of a *seminary* or boarding school for *native* boys and a college for Spanish students,

"...for the children are...well affected towards us, lively and very *intelligent*... some of them can serve as companions to our fathers on missionary expeditions; in fact, *many of them could be missionaries and catechists themselves*... and almost the whole charge and care of the boarding school could be transferred to them, for the work that they are now doing for the other religious communities and in our own house proves that *they are quite capable of all these things*."⁵ (Underscore ours)

These words confirmed what the Dominican Bishop Fray Domingo Salazar said five years before, in 1583. The trust and esteem that the missionaries had for well gifted Filipino boys with good signs of a priestly vocation have prompted them to proceed rather hastily in the ecclesiastical training of some candidates. "The religious orders—remarked Bishop Salazar—*had* (before 1583) *admitted a number of applicants* (to the priest-

² H. de la Costa, S.J., *The Jesuits in the Philippines, 1581-1768* Harvard University Press, Cambridge-Massachusetts, 1961, pp. 84, 191

³ Molina, op. cit., p. 89

⁴ Costa, op. cit., l.c.

⁵ Ibid. p. 119

hood) whom he, Salazar, was reluctant to ordain because (due to the lack of a Seminary proper) they had little or no theological training.”⁶ (UnderSCORE ours)

The Bishop here was speaking, not of Spaniards as those twenty-four “clerics he himself (Salazar) had brought in his entourage” and of whom “upon his arrival in Manila, he ordained 4 priests and 3 subdeacons” in 1582; but of Filipinos, sc. of those “who received their vocation to the priesthood and were trained for it in the Philippines, were already familiar with the country, knew the language and customs of the people”;⁷ that is, he was speaking of *native vocations*: vocations among the *native-born* inhabitants of the country, among people born and permanently residing in the country, irrespectively of their blood, parentage or skin color. Maybe most of those *applicants* to the priesthood were not *natural-born* Filipinos, that is, they may not have been *natives* in the restrictive or specific sense of the word as referring only to the *indigenous* race; but if they were *native-born* residents of the Philippines, they ought to be called real *Filipino natives* in the obvious and true meaning of the word, as we will soon explain.

Of such *native* vocations the Bishop says that “the religious orders in the Philippines had admitted a number of applicants (before 1583)” and that these Filipino candidates to the priesthood “were trained for it in the Philippines (before 1583)”; and if the training was quite deficient and the Bishop “was reluctant to ordain (*some*) a number of applicants (the Bishop does not say that these were *all* of those admitted in the religious orders) because they had little or no theological training”, this was due to the lack of a seminary training proper; and that is why the Bishop advocated for its immediate foundation.⁸ From these facts we may conclude that, though it may be true that during those early years most, if not all, of the priests ordained in the Philippines were clerics from Spain or from Mexico, who made their University studies *abroad*,⁹ it is not entirely improbable that some *native* Filipino priest might have been ordained with them. However, we need not insist on this possibility. Even taking for granted that no Filipino priest was ordained during those

⁶ Ibid. p. 64

⁷ Ibid. l.c.

⁸ Ibid. pp. 63-64

⁹ Fermin Campo, C.M., *El Seminario Conciliar de Manila—Guión Histórico Seminario de San Carlos, Mandaluyong, Rizal*, 8-x-1950, n. 4

years, the mere fact that "the religious orders were admitting a number of (Filipino) applicants," is enough to prove that *from those early days there was no systematic policy of precluding Filipino natives from Holy Orders*; nay, the fact that some of them "were (actually, according to Bishop Salazar) trained for the priesthood in the Philippines"¹⁰ shows that in the 6th century, from the beginning of the Philippine evangelization, the Spanish missionaries did actually work to foster priestly vocations among Filipino natives. If they did not succeed, due to the circumstances of time and place, lack of a seminary proper, etc., that seems beyond the question.

One thing, hence, appears with meridian light: in the Philippines there was no race discrimination or prejudice. We know *positively* that the religious orders from the beginning admitted Filipinos to the religious profession and even to aspire to the sacred priesthood. The first Filipino friar was Fray Martin Lakandola of the Augustinian Order,¹¹ who is said to be a son of Rajah Lakandola, last king of Tondo (three of whose sons were baptized¹²). According to Augustinian records Brother Lakandola died in 1590 shortly after taking his habit. Another similar case is that already mentioned of Martin Sancho, S.J., in 1593. I feel inclined to believe that this first Filipino Jesuit was probably admitted as a possible candidate to the priesthood, though later, for reasons of failing health he may have remained simply as a lay brother. The fact that he was made to accompany Father Sanchez to Spain and Rome as an exceptionally gifted boy, and that for six long years he was retained in Europe and spent some

¹⁰ Costa, op. cit., p. 64. With respect to the Jesuits it seems not improbable, nay, we can take it for sure that they admitted to the priesthood in the Society, "many years" before 1615 some, at least, "among those born in this country (*naturales de la tierra*), otherwise known as *criollos*", since Francisco Gutierrez, S.J. writing to the General Acquaviva in 1615 says "for many years now no one has been admitted" and seems to allude to "some" Jesuit creoles living then "who lead model lives". And from Angelo Armano's letter to the same Acquaviva in 1606 we conclude that creoles had been admitted in good number much before 1606 since he speaks of "older men among the *criollos*, who are excellent religious and many of them professed", and "younger ones" living in the Society by that time, and he makes reference to other "*criollo* Jesuits" who "were dismissed from the Society;...lacked perseverance". (cf. Costa, op. cit., pp. 236, 245.) As a matter of fact, we know that the Philippine vice-provincial Diego Garcia, S.J. in 1603 received some *criollos* into the Society; and most probably others had been received even in the 16th century, since 1583 (cf. Costa, op. cit., p. 235).

¹¹ Gregorio F. Zaide, *Philippine History and Civilization*, Manila, Philippine Associated Publishers, 1939, pp. 318-319

¹² Molina, op. cit., p. 70

time in the college of Murcia, seems to indicate that the superiors planned to give him a chance to be something more than a temporal coadjutor. His prolonged permanence in Spain, notwithstanding the harmful effect of the climate upon his health, could not be due to the plan of providing him at all costs with a better ecclesiastical training than what he could find in the Philippines? If he was to be a lay brother only, was it not enough two or three years in Europe? If this our surmise were true, then we could say that Martin Sancho, S.J. may well claim the honor of being the first known native Filipino aspirant to the priesthood, at least the first known by name. However, let us not insist on this point either, since the indisputable authority of the Jesuit historian H. de la Costa states (most probably from authoritative sources) that "Alonso (—obviously this should read *Martin*—) Sancho was received as a lay brother."¹³

Perhaps some might object to the documentary evidence presented above from Bishop Salazar's own words, that those "who received their vocation to the priesthood and were trained for it in the Philippines", as well as the "number of applicants admitted by the religious orders" for the priesthood, were not Filipinos, but *mestizos* (persons of mixed European and Asian parentage) or *creoles* ("criollos", persons born in the Philippines of European parents), or even simply *Europeans* who had *emigrated* to the colony.

We cannot admit the last supposition, namely, that the Bishop could have alluded to *emigrated Europeans*, since of these he could have not said, as he did, that "they were already familiar with the country, knew the language and customs of the people, got along better (than the Spanish missionaries) with them, and would probably make better missionaries (than those coming from Spain)".¹⁴ But we admit that probably the

¹³ Costa, op.cit., pp. 234; 617; 84; 191. A further ground to support the surmise that Martin Sancho may have been admitted in the Society with a view to aspire to the priesthood, is the petition that the vice-provincial Prat of the Philippines sent to the General Acquaviva through his procurator Francisco de Vera, 1598, asking "permission to institute courses in arts and theology in the College of Manila, both for Jesuits and extern students"—which seems to indicate the reason why Sancho was retained by that time in Europe—, and proposing "that the candidates for the lay brotherhood received in the Philippines be allowed to learn how to read and write and do sums"—which seems to indicate that candidates for the lay brotherhood in the Society, as in other congregations of those days, were generally recruited from unlettered or less gifted candidates than what Martin Sancho is shown to have been. (cf. Costa, op.cit., pp. 177-178)

¹⁴Ibid., p. 64

Bishop was referring in those words, not precisely to *full-blooded indigenous Filipino natives*, but rather to *mestizos* and *creoles*, all of whom—as we shall presently explain—have also the right to be called *Filipinos*, since they are true *Filipino natives*, i.e., *native-born* inhabitants of the Philippines.

The objection comes from a narrow concept of the word *natives* taken restrictively in its specific sense of “indigenous”, “one of a race inhabiting a country when it was discovered, colonized.” Webster’s New Collegiate Dictionary¹⁵ gives instead the following obvious meanings: “1. *One born in a place or country* referred to; 2. *An inhabitant*, as distinguished from a visitor or temporary resident.” And the same Dictionary explains the difference between “native” and “indigenous”: “*Native*, said of individuals, implies birth or origin there (at the locality in question). *Indigenous*, said of species and races, adds to *native* the implication of not having been introduced.” “*Indigenous*” means “produced, growing, living naturally in a country or climate.”

The American College Encyclopedic Dictionary¹⁶ defines: “*Native-born*: born in a place or country indicated.” On the other hand, “*natural-born*”, as we know, is a person who belongs to a country by *jus soli* (i.e., by birth within the country) and by *jus sanguinis* (i.e., by right of blood or parentage).

The American Peoples Encyclopedia¹⁷ explains: “Originally a citizen was a member of a city (*civitas*) to which he owed allegiance, enjoying rights and privileges generally denied to foreigners. Citizenship, acquired *at birth* or *after birth*, is determined by the national laws of each state. Citizenship *at birth* is acquired either by *jus soli* (birth within the country) or by *jus sanguinis* (right of blood or parentage). Citizenship *after birth*, generally called *naturalization*, may be acquired by marriage, adoption, change in territory, special legislation, or naturalization proper.” A *naturalized* person becomes a citizen, a national; but he is *not* a native of the country. *Natives* are only either the *native-born* or the *natural-born* inhabitants of the country. The *natural-born* inhabitants are the *indigenous natives* of the country.

¹⁵ Based on Webster’s New International Dictionary, 2nd. ed., G. & C. Merriam Co., Publishers, Springfield, Mass., U.S.A.

¹⁶ The American College Encyclopedic Dictionary, ed. by Clarence L. Barnhart, Chicago, Spencer Press, Inc., 1960.

¹⁷ The American Peoples Encyclopedia, Grolier Incorporated, New York, 1962, Vol. 5

In the Philippines of the Spanish times we cannot strictly speak of Filipino citizenship or nationality, because the Philippines were not yet then a sovereign state; in those days our country was politically an integral part of the Spanish empire, and as the rest of Spain's overseas possessions in both hemispheres we formed with the Peninsula, as the Spanish Cortes declared, but "one kingdom, one and the same nation, and one family, and accordingly the *natives* of said places enjoyed equal rights with those born in the Peninsula".¹⁸ Hence, to ascertain who ought to be called *Filipino natives* in those times we should disregard any legal consideration of Filipino citizenship, which would be out of the point; we should consider the Philippines of those days, not as a sovereign state or independent nation, but as a country, a people, a father, and thus apply the concept of *natives* to the population that inhabited then our country.

Among the inhabitants of the Philippines during the Spanish regime we could distinguish: a) foreigners (mostly Spanish immigrants), some of them visitors or temporary residents, others, the majority, settlers with permanent residence in the colony; (b) the children of these settlers, born in the country (the *creoles* or "criollos" of Spanish parentage, and the *mestizos* of mixed parentage, either Spanish and Malay, or Chinese and Malay); c) the *indigenous natives* (called in Spanish *indigenas* or *indios*), that is, the *natural-born* inhabitants. Who among these various classes of people should be properly called *Filipino natives*, *Filipinos*? Who were actually called and recognized as such in those days?

There is no doubt that *transient foreigners* were not *Filipinos*; as it is obviously evident that the *indigenous natives* were full-blooded *Filipinos*, *Filipinos* in the strict and specific sense of the word. On these points there is no question. With respect to Spanish immigrants who have settled in the country, though in some way they might be regarded as *naturalized* Filipinos (in America and the West Indies such Spanish colonists were called *indianos*), nevertheless it seems also out of question that they remained and were considered as Spaniards, and not Filipinos: they were called Peninsular Spanish citizens, to distinguish them from the *natives* of the Philippines who were also in those times *Spanish citizens*—but not from Spain, not of the Peninsula. The Spanish settlers in the Philippines were not natural-born nor even native-born Filipinos; hence, they were not in any sense *natives* of the country.

¹⁸ Decree of Spanish Cortes, 15 October 1810; cf. Molina, op.cit., p. 238

On the contrary, the *children* of those settlers, *born and permanently residing* in the country, were indisputably *native-born*—the *mestizos*, even to a certain extent, *natural-born*—inhabitants of the Philippines, and hence, real *Filipino natives*, true *Filipinos*; and thus they were considered and called in those days. Francisco Gutierrez, S.J., and Andrea Caro, S.J., in 1615 reckoned the *creoles* “among the *natives* of the country” (*naturales de la tierra*), and *not* among the *Europeans* or *Spaniards*;¹⁹ in the same way spoke in 1606 Angelo Armano, S.J.²⁰ Still, to distinguish these *Creole children* from the *natural-born* Filipinos, they were at times called *Spanish boys*²¹ on account of their blood and parentage, although they were “*natives of the country*” (*naturales de la tierra*). Not so, however, with the *mestizos* (of Spanish blood) who were explicitly discerned from the Spanish boys, and grouped together with the *indigenous natives* and even reckoned among these, since with a greater reason than the *creoles* they were “*natives of the country*” (*naturales de la tierra*).²² The decree of the Spanish Cortes in 1810, cited above, distinguishes among the Spanish citizens of the Philippines, the *Filipino natives* from the *Spaniards* “born in the Peninsula”: the implication evidently is that under the word “*natives*” of the Philippines were included, not those of the *indigenous*

¹⁹ Costa, op. cit., p. 236

²⁰ Ibid., p. 245

²¹ Ibid., pp. 63, 75, 172, 236, 245, 571. The *creoles* were not Europeans or *Spaniards*, but were properly called “*natives of the country*” (pp. 236, 245). However, on account of their racial traits they were at times called “*Spanish boys*” to distinguish them from the *mestizos* and *indigenous natives* who on account of their blood and parentage belonged to the *indigenous* race, totally or partially.

²² The *mestizos* were not included under the denomination of “*Spanish boys*”: thus Bishop Salazar wrote to the king of Spain on 18 June 1583 saying that the Jesuits “could teach not only Spanish boys but also *mestizos* and sons of the ruling (i.e. *indigenous-C*) native families” (Costa, op. cit., p. 63). Similarly Prat and Suarez wrote Acquaviva on 5 June 1586, and 25-26 June 1586 respectively, saying that “the proposed college (of Manila) be not only a school for Spanish boys but also a *seminario* or boarding school for (*indigenous-C*) natives and *mestizos*” (Ibid., pp. 75; 236, 145, 571). The *mestizos* were included among the *natives*, otherwise Prat would have excluded them (which cannot be admitted) from the project he proposed to Governor Dasmariñas (in 1595-C) “to transfer the government subsidy (assigned for a residential college for Spanish scholars-C) from the proposed college for *Spaniards* to a college of natives” (Ibid., p. 172). Furthermore, if the *creoles* were called “*natives of the country*” (*naturales de la tierra*, Ibid., p. 236), with greater reason the *mestizos* were to be called so.

Hence among the *Filipino native boys* (*creoles*, *mestizos*, and *indigenous natives*) there were two classes: Spanish boys (the *creoles*), and *Filipino boys* (*mestizos* and full-blooded natives)

race, but also any other Spanish citizens "born and permanently residing" in the Islands, as the *creoles* and *mestizos* were. In our days and according to our present Constitution this would not be always true, except on some particular circumstances specified by the basic law of the country; but obviously such was not the condition of the historical period we are studying. This difference, perhaps, may explain the confusion of terms and pointless controversies that arise once and again when studying questions related to the Filipino clergy. We hope these clarifications may set things aright and obviate in the future useless discussions and apparent—not real—discrepancies among historians.

The Apostle of the Gentiles, Saint Paul, was a Jew, hundred per cent, by blood; but none the less he was a Roman citizen, belonging to Rome and enjoying the full civil rights of any other Roman, *by birth*, as he himself remarked,²³ and not only a *naturalized* Roman as the captain of the Roman garrison in Jerusalem who paid "a heavy sum to win this privilege".²⁴ Among our Filipino heroes we have the case of Fathers José Burgos, Jacinto Zamora and Mariano Gómez. According to the former archivist of the Manila archdiocese, Manuel A. Garcia, C.M. who had the chance to examine pertinent official documents, extant before the last war, relative to those Filipino diocesan priests, it seems certain that Fr. Burgos was a creole, Fr. Zamora a mestizo, and Fr. Gómez an indigenous native. Dr. Antonio Molina states that Fr. Burgos was born in Vigan of a Spanish father and a Filipino mother; and Fr. Gómez was born in Manila, probably a descendant of some early Japanese settlers.²⁵ Hence, there is no doubt that they were not all full-blooded Filipino natives. And nevertheless who would dare to deny that the three of them ought to be honored as outstanding Filipino patriots who knew no other fatherland than the Philippines where they were born and lived and for which they died? Creoles and mestizos of those days could not acknowledge other true fatherland than the land of their birth and of their home: they were *Filipino natives* and could not help but to feel themselves *Filipinos*, and nothing else. That is why in our national history we often see them side by side with the full-blooded Filipino indigenous natives, and even at times leading them, in the patriotic movements. Dr. Jose Rizal speaking of the patriotic leaders who labored with him in Spain to spread the Propaganda

²³ Acts. 22, 27-28

²⁴ *Ibid.*, l.c.

²⁵ Molina, *op. cit.*, p. 328

ideas of reform, said: "they are young men, *creoles* of Spanish parentage, *mestizos* of Chinese and of Malay blood, but we call ourselves Filipinos only" (*son jóvenes criollos de ascendencia española, mestizos, sangleyes y malayos, pero nos llamamos sólo filipinos*),²⁶ that is, he meant to say, we are not all full-blooded Filipinos, and we could distinguish one from another with some specific name to denote our parentage and racial traits, but we prefer to call ourselves with the single name that properly defines us all: *Filipinos*, and nothing else; *Filipinos*, and that is enough! In the same way he speaks again and again in his letters,²⁷ sometimes even including among the *Filipinos* some friend and schoolmate who, though born in Spain, came to the Philippines when still quite young, and was reared and settled in our country, identifying himself with the patriotic leaders who labored for reforms.²⁸

And, indeed, if we were to limit the word *Filipino*, *native*, exclusively, to the indigenous race of our country, we should have first to define which is that particular race in the Philippines that have known at least three or four migrations of different peoples before the coming of the Spaniards; and then before writing any book of history we would have to apply a "blood test" to all the great figures of our past—and even of our present—delving into the roots of their genealogical trees or ancestral pedigrees, to discover at the end that we could not claim as Filipinos, because of their lineage or ancestry, such glorious figures as Dr. Jose Rizal, Father Jose Burgos, President Manuel L. Quezon, Justice Cayetano Arellano, Attorney Felipe G. Calderón, Secretary of Foreign Affairs Joaquin Elizalde, Cabinet Secretary Andres Soriano, and many others;²⁹ nay, we might be practically forced to accept only as true Filipinos, the primitive people who remained isolated in our mountains and forests!

²⁶ *Epistolario Rizalino*, ed. Biblioteca Nacional de Filipinas, Manila, Bureau of Printing, 1938, tomo V, letter 19, p. 115.

²⁷ *One Hundred Letters of Jose Rizal*, ed. Philippine National Historical Society, Manila, June 19, 1959; letters dated January 17, 1883, and October 1, 1885, pp. 66, 242.

²⁸ Rizal's friend and schoolmate in the University of Santo Tomas, Manila, and in Universidad Central, Madrid, the father of Federico Calero, was a Spaniard who came to the Philippines when still quite young, and became a close friend and companion of Rizal in the universities of Manila and Madrid, and one of the student group that worked for the good of the Philippines. cf. Federico Calero's article in *Voz de Manila*, daily, June 1952, "Por qué soy filipino".

²⁹ cf. "Dilucidando la cuestion: Sobre los Arzobispos Filipinos", in VERITAS, weekly, 23 November 1952.

If the word *natives* were to be understood only in the sense of *indigenous* inhabitants of a country, we would have to say that in the United States of America there is no *native clergy*, and never has anything been done to form and develop it, since the indigenous race, the red Indian Americans have not been trained for the priesthood: nay, we should say that most of those whom we call Americans are not true Americans, but Europeans of French, German, Italian, British or Spanish descent and ancestry. However, who will not smile at such incongruous statements? Native-born Americans are true American *natives*, true Americans, though they may not be of the indigenous race, in the same way as to be a Spaniard, a German, a French, etc. one needs not to be of the Iberian, Teutonic, Gaulish, etc. race, but simply a native inhabitant or citizen of Spain, Germany, France, etc.

It is true that when the Church speaks of a *native clergy* in mission lands, reference is made specifically to the *indigenous clergy*. We have already seen that, as a matter of fact, the word *native* has the specific connotation of *indigenous*. And, since in most mission lands, except in those colonized with the Christian ideals of equality of races which Spain brought and upheld in her overseas possessions, practically there are no other natives than indigenous race, hence it is but natural to take one for the other when speaking in general of mission countries. But it is altogether obvious that the mind of the Church, so alien always to any racial considerations or blood and skin color preferences, is not to restrict the word *native* exclusively to its specific meaning of *indigenous*. The Church speaks of a *native clergy* in contradistinction to a *foreign clergy*, to a clergy not belonging to the country or to the people it evangelizes. Otherwise the Church would have to raise her voice against America, for instance, because it has not formed nor actually is in any way developing an indigenous clergy. However, America has a *native clergy*; and since the majority of Americans are *natives*, not of the indigenous race, hence the native clergy, and not an indigenous clergy, is what is needed there.

Certainly, for a historian it may be of interest to distinguish adequately the indigenous natives from other natives of the country. It may be, for instance, worth noticing when were the first *indigenous* native priests ordained, or when the first *indigenous* native Bishop consecrated; but it may be of interest as well to know when other *natives*, though not of the indigenous race, were ordained priests or consecrated Bishops. This should be done, without foregoing the other. We intend in this study

to pay attention to both things, and make it clear, without confusions and misleading terms, when our word *Filipino* refers to a native-born Filipino (either by birth only as the creoles, or by birth and partly by parentage, as the mestizos) and when to a natural-born Filipino, an *indigenous native* and full-blooded Filipino. Thus the apparent discrepancies found in the contentions of some of our historians will vanish away. But, let it be clear, we intend to speak of the *Filipino clergy* as anyone might speak of the French, German, Italian, etc. clergy, taking the word *Filipino* as accepted usage takes the words French, German, Italian, etc. in the connotation of a *native* or *one of the people*—and not necessarily of the indigenous race—of France, Germany, Italy, etc.

I have dwelt at large on this matter because more than once we hear the distinction made, especially in this subject of the native clergy in the Philippines, between Filipino natives and mestizos or creoles, as if these were not also Filipinos. For instance, when we read of those “applicants (to the priesthood)” whom, according to Bishop Salazar, “the religious orders in the Philippines admitted” in the early days of the evangelization, in the 16th century, and of whom the same Bishop says that they “received their vocation to the priesthood and were trained for it in the Philippines”, we feel inclined to believe with good reason that many, if not most, of them were not indigenous natives, were not full-blooded Filipinos, but mestizos or creoles. And nevertheless, we ask, were not these last, real Filipino natives, true Filipinos? And can it be proved that there were not among those applicants to the priesthood some indigenous native?

I may even willingly believe that, in all probability, at the beginning, *most*, if not *all*, of those candidates to the priesthood were creoles and mestizos, not indigenous natives or full-blooded Filipinos. But, that was *at the beginning*, and quite understandably at that. However, we ask again, are there any proofs that the same was true for the following years after the first half-century of the Philippine evangelization? If it can be proved, let it be proved, but not gratuitously affirmed.

(To be continued)

J. MA. CAVANNA, C.M.
Collegio Filipino. Rome.

NEW CHURCHES FOR OLD

The Architectural Implications of the Liturgy Decree

The constitution on the sacred liturgy brings into near focus the prospect of the congregation sharing actively in the liturgy of the Mass. However gentle the first stages of this fulfillment may be, it is important to realise now that the ultimate change is fundamental, implying a recasting both of our devotional habits at Mass and of the physical environment in which the Mass takes place.

It is particularly important to realise this when thinking of building new churches, because any church built now must not only be designed to meet the needs of the modest tinkering with the liturgy at present envisaged in this country, but must also be certain not to hinder the final achievement of full participation.

The physical form of our churches is a much more significant factor in liturgy than many think. It is reasonable to assume that at no time has the Church actively wanted the faithful *not* to participate in the Mass. This non-participation was forced on her and on them in the year A.D. 323 when the Church emerged from the cosy, manageable spaces of the catacombs into the echoing voids of the basilicas. By the same token the factor which is going to slow down most surely the full realisation of liturgical reform is not the reputed conservatism of the faithful and their ordinaries, but the physical difficulty of taking more than a few steps towards the goal of lay participation in the sort of churches that we now have.

We cannot foretell accurately the final form the Mass will take as a consequence of the decisions of the Second Vatican Council, for only the combined experience of clergy and congregations can find this out; but some points can be made *a priori* on the strictly architectural side of the problem.

The idea that the congregation in church should be able to take part in what goes on at the altar has three main components. The first is that they should be able to see the whole of the area round the altar from a favourable angle and should not be too far from it. There is no great *difficulty about this*. *Second, that they should be able to hear not only*

the words of the celebrant but their own words, when spoken at reasonable speed in unison. This, as we shall see, is very difficult. The third is that each member of the congregation should have freedom of individual movement, of the kind required by a participant in an action, as distinct from a spectator. This presents no inherent difficulty, but is troublesome when considered with other things.

Little need be said about the first of these components, except perhaps that it brings us face to face with the profound psychological change that all congregations must undergo. In order to fulfil the requirement in a church of any size it is necessary to put part of the congregation at the sides of the altar straight into the faces of those on the other side. To people long accustomed (as are we all) to the idea that attendance at Mass is a private and passive business, this seems a distraction. But in fact it is normal for those who are "participating" in an action to face one another, and therefore this arrangement may be said to symbolise the very thing we are trying to achieve.

The second component is much more difficult. The trouble consists mainly in the reverberation time—that is, in the time it takes for a sound to die away. The problem is how to make this reverberation short enough to enable a congregation to speak rapidly in unison without a hopeless blurring of their words. Two factors affect this. One is volume: the larger the volume of a building, the more difficult it is to keep the reverberation time short. The second is the nature of enclosing surfaces: if these are hard (as those of a church usually are) the reverberation time will be longer than if they are soft. It must be said at once that if our churches are kept small (that is, limited to between two and three hundred people) there is no problem. But with increasing size you rapidly reach a point at which intelligibility can only be bought at the price of making the interior unnaturally "dead." The Reformers came up against this problem, though in a less acute form, when they built their preachers' churches in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; and they sought to get a larger number of people into a given volume by using galleries. But this conflicts with participation as we envisage it because those in the gallery cannot move on to the main floor without an unspeakable clatter and interruption.

It must be noted at this point that the requirements of singing conflict absolutely with those of intelligibility and participation, and that we owe our tradition of church singing to these very factors which have always made participation in the Mass impossible. It seems therefore that if we are

to continue to build large churches we might have to consider two spaces in a church: one of restrained dimensions for the Mass and the other a large processional space for singing.

The third component is freedom of movement for the individual church-goer. This is a less obvious requirement at this stage, but in the long run is no less real. The design of church seating has always been subject to the desire to fit as many people into a given space as possible. The passivity of congregations has aided this and, as a result, the church-goer is more wedged, less free to move, less comfortable when sitting (and *a fortiori* when praying) than at any other time in his daily life. Participation requires that the participator should be not only in the right relationship to the things going on, but should be in the right posture and free to take part with dignity. This implies more space per churchgoer, a requirement which is in competition with the need to keep people as close to the altar as possible and to keep down the total volume.

This, then, is the "problem" of designing churches for the new liturgy. It could, in theory, be left to "solve itself" by trial and error over several generations. But, since Catholic churchgoers are probably the most uncritical and uncomplaining building users in the world, it will take a very long time this way and engender much secret disgruntlement. There is no doubt that the right course is to seek the right solutions more rapidly by using the method of research. This itself raises a number of points. The problem of churchbuilding can only be resolved if it is considered in a very wide context. It cannot, for instance, be altogether divorced from the size of parishes. It concerns, therefore, not only priests and architects, but religious sociologists and many others. Therefore, though the field work must be done in the parishes, it requires some form of research organisation at the national level.

Then again, though we must not underestimate the part which must be played by expertise, we must not forget the part which congregations themselves must play. Liturgical reform implies a major change in Catholic devotional life. The concurrence of congregations is necessary, not merely to avoid unnecessary tension, but because they themselves must be contributors. Beneath the superficial prejudice and apparent disinterest of the average Catholic churchgoer are a number of legitimate preferences which must be brought to the surface and met before the reform is complete.

L. WRIGHT

A HOUSE-GOING PRIEST MAKES A CHURCH-GOING PEOPLE

This is a translated article which appeared recently in a European magazine.* It is written by a parish priest. It may be an eye-opener for our parish priests in the Philippines, although, because of the great scarcity of priests in this country, it is possible that the priest may have to call on the help of the members of the Legion of Mary or some other group of coadjutors of the parish priest. This is the article.

"In 1938 I talked to a parish priest who told me it was impossible for him to visit his parishioners in their homes. In fact, he said it was not to be thought of, since the greater number of people were occupied with their business during the day, and it was not fitting for him to call on them at night.

In 1959 I myself was appointed to a parish—rather a large one, for I had two assistant priests. I was not too enthusiastic about my appointment, for I was aware of the rather sad condition of my parish with regard to religion, although I had been told there was an 'elite'.

I entered upon my duties with this project in mind: I would visit every single family in the parish or die in the attempt. I began by inquiring about this supposed 'elite' but failed to contact any of them; I also failed to find what we call a 'Liber animarum' in the place, that could have given me some information on the state of the souls under my care.

I started out by visiting some sick and old people, the names of whom my assistants had supplied, and then began visiting the homes systematically. By September 1962 I had practically accomplished my self-imposed assignment. I had visited almost 2000 families and collected the necessary data about them for my 'Liber animarum'. In addition, I had regularly

* PASTOR BONUS, March 1964.

visited the sick, paid visits of condolence and of congratulations on the arrival of a new child in the family, for instance. The work had been taxing, especially as I had only 5 visiting days a week, Sundays and Saturdays being excluded.

Hard work, yet very encouraging.

I admit it is hard work. It would be ever so much more pleasurable to spend the free half-hour at home, reading the newspaper, some interesting magazine, or a chapter in a popular book of the day. But I learned to find real happiness in taking to the streets. Of the 2,000 homes I visited, there were not twenty where I was not welcome. It did happen once that the lady of the house, seeing me on her doorstep, snapped 'I have no time, Sir,' and shut the door in my face. But on my next round she did receive me. On another occasion after I had rung the bell, I spied an angry face at the window. I passed on naturally, intending to try again on some more auspicious occasion. At still other times I got no farther than the doorstep, but managed to have a hearty chat. There were a few cases where, when I said I was the parish priest and I wanted to get acquainted, I was told 'there is no need, Sir. We don't hold the same beliefs.' However, even unbaptized and unbelievers, as a rule, did tell me quite frankly and courteously who and what they were, conscious that here was a shepherd visiting his flock.

I do ask myself whether home-visitation was really as impossible 20 years ago as that parish priest I mentioned seemed to believe. I sincerely doubt it, but one thing is certain: there was little or no house-visiting in those days even though the parishioners were desirous of it. On many of my visits the people said: 'Father, we have lived here since 10, 20, 30 years or more, and the parish priest has never crossed the threshold of our home.' I'm sure these people would have been as pleased with the priest's visit then as they are now.

Home-visitation is not only possible, but *strictly necessary*. Since the parish priest is obliged by divine law to know his parishioners, (Conc. Trid. Sess. XXIII de ref. cap. I; — can 467, §1, C.J.C.) it is by far the easiest and the most practical way to learn to know them. How could he know them otherwise? In the church? But there are many who never enter the church or who hear mass in other churches. In the meetings of Sodalists, Legionaries of Mary or Catholic Actionists? These are but a

handful, and certainly least in need of being visited. In large parishes, how many people there are who never come in any contact with their priests!

I think, therefore, that home-visitation is, for the parish priest, the apostolate *par excellence*. It is a task demanding much time and energy and occasionally a little boldness and courage, but I don't think the priest is allowed to ask from any apostles what he himself dares not do. It is true laymen can go, at times, where the priest can not, but whenever there is question of establishing or propagating the Kingdom of Almighty God, the priest has no right to shirk his obligations and shift the burden unto the shoulders of the layman.

NOTHING CAN TAKE THE PLACE OF HOME-VISITATION

I believe that in our day, home-visitation is the only way for the parish priest to know and influence his people. In my visits I gathered the data for my 'Liber Animarum.' I recorded on prepared cards: the name, the place and date of birth of the father and mother, of the children and of other members of the family. Also when and where they were married, (the parents) and whether and where the children were going to school. The innocent questions on their marriage were often occasion for great revelations. Those who were regularly married in a Catholic Church gave the information readily enough, but a certain hesitation often started the ball rolling. 'Father,' they'd blurt out, 'I will tell you frankly how things are. I have nothing to hide. I am not married in the church.' Then the whole story would follow if I had but time to listen. And I did listen, for frequently it made them happy to have an occasion to unburden themselves.

On one occasion a lady lied about her marriage. She mentioned the church where she had been lawfully married, but failed to add that at present she was living in sin with another man. That I found out later; but as a rule, they tell their stories just as they are. They know that before God and the Church, they are not married, and their conscience troubles them, for now they no longer practice their religion except for some quasi-superstitions. It is, therefore, a duty for the priest to listen to their distress and to encourage them at least to pray, so that they may renew contact, dialogue, with our Lord who knows everything and who alone can judge them.

The parents love to have the priest bless their children. When I mark their forehead with the sign of our salvation I feel I'm doing what our Lord did.

The school the children attend is also often a problem. The parents claim they send them to the best school they can afford. If it is not a Catholic School, I strive to tell them the children should receive catechetical instruction; for, unless they know and love God, how can they ever become the pride and joy of their parents?

Someone might object that it is not polite to ask a lady how old she is. I believe this can be done without lacking in etiquette.

THE FILING CARDS FOR THE BOOK OF THE 'STATUS ANIMARUM.'

On many of my visits I was asked by non practising catholics and also by good catholics for what purpose I was getting the information from them. I explained with a comparison which, ordinarily was very well accepted. This is the comparison: when you go to see the doctor, especially a specialist, he begins by making your record, and he keeps in his file what-ever is necessary or useful for any possible future consultation. You acquaint him at once with any complication of the case in order to save time. A parish priest is more or less like a doctor. When he has a list of his parishioners, a file for each person, he can help them better and faster. To regulate the work in the parish he must know more than just the names. Supposing he should plan to establish a charitable association. He must know the persons he needs, and his file will reveal to him just who can help him and how. The 'Liber Animarum' imposed upon the priest by the Code of Canon Law, helps him to save much time. A parish priest learns the value of such a file only when he needs it and does not have it. When the people realize how reasonable it is for the priest to ask the questions, and how useful the information is for the present parish priest and later for his successors, they are quite satisfied. And if he asks his questions intelligently, already from the first visit he will know more than should be written on the filing card, but he will, at this first visit at least, write down only the necessary and general information to give the impression of discretion. However, he will complete his record afterward.

Sometimes a priest may be inclined to record as many details as possible. This is not advisable since those cards might fall into the hands of lay persons. I remember when I was a young priest and acting parish priest for some weeks, lay people requested to see the parish book. Only later did I understand that they wanted to know whether a certain important person in the town was a legitimate child or not.

In conclusion, I want to say that my 'Liber Animarum' increases slowly. In my visitation in the future I will have to complete the records, and at times change them, for there will be births and deaths and this or that family will have moved to another place. It is true a house-going priest must work hard, but his apostolate is both important and necessary. He gets to know the people and to bring them prudently to the fulfilment of their christian duties. Therefore I believe that **A HOUSE-GOING PRIEST MAKES A CHURCH-GOING PEOPLE.**"

I fully endorse the slogan of the writer of this article. May this same apostolate take root in the Philippines and have for effect to regularize many marriages and foster the catholic education of many children. May it also make many priests enjoy a good name in their parishes, and be loved by their people while it increases the prosperity of the Church in the Islands.

GEORGE VROMANT, C.I.C.M.

San Carlos Seminary

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Psychological Tests for Candidates for Priesthood?

One tool for evaluating the effects of environment on the temperament and personality of a youth is the psychological test. Since World War II more and more dioceses and religious institutes have been attempting, like their governmental and military counterparts, to subject potential candidates to psychological tests to determine their temperamental and emotional fitness for the priestly or religious life. The assumption is that if youths are psychologically suitable for the priesthood or religious life they are more likely to persevere.

Now the question in the minds of some of the bishops and major superiors is this: Should such tests be optional, or compulsory? Or should they be ignored altogether? Those who have already spoken out on the matter recommend caution and reserve.

They do admit that these tests can and do supply important data about questionable applicants. However, they hold that all of the tests need perfecting and those already available should be administered and interpreted only by trained clinical psychologists.

The purpose of these tests is not to determine the presence or absence of a vocation. It is simply to magnify those components in a youth's temperament, attitude and personality which may be obscure. Once all the factors are evident, it is easier for the bishop or religious superior to judge whether or not an individual is suitable for the priesthood or religious life.

Where one's personal observations of a candidate are adequate, these tests are not needed. This explains how the Church has managed for 20 centuries without such helps. But just as we now avail ourselves of the advances of medical science to prove a person's physical fitness, so many of the Council Fathers feel that the findings of psychology and psychiatry will help to evaluate a person's mental fitness and emotional balance.

All acknowledge that a successful religious vocation is the work of the Holy Spirit and the acceptance of the Spirit's goad by the individual. The goal of the Church today, as always, is to help the Christian to be able to know it when he has such a vocation, and to foster it.

'Impossible to Forecast Length of Council' — Pope Paul:

Fears that he might be pressing for the Council to end with the third session were allayed by Pope Paul in the address he gave to the Italian bishops who had met for the first plenary assembly of the Italian episcopate outside Council sessions.

"You see what a great event it is," the Pope said, "you recognise the gravity and the complexity which it presents and which it arouses to an increasing extent as the Council proceeds. The very fact of its slowness in reaching reasonable conclusions generates a certain fatigue, a certain impatience, and some arbitrary forecasts. We are therefore glad to see that the Italian episcopate is preparing itself for the third session of the Council, thus imitating the episcopates of other countries, some of which have devoted surveys, discussions, and publications of great importance to the study of the subjects before the Council. We shall purposely abstain from intervening in this phase of the Council's work to discuss the merits of the doctrines and the decrees that will be debated when the Council reopens. In this we have wanted to continue on the practical line we have set ourselves: to leave the Fathers of the Council, and together with them the various episcopal conferences and the commissions of the Council, free and full possibility of inquiry, discussion and expression. This has been a dominant note of this great Council: we wish to remain loyal to it. We have only been concerned to see to it that the preparatory work of the commissions and the secretariat should proceed with alacrity, with the dual aim of reviewing, in this intermediate period between the second and third sessions, the schemata in the light of the observations made by the Fathers during the preceding sessions, so as to present them at once for examination by the Fathers themselves; and to have their observations and suggestions collected by the commissions, according to their respective competence, trust-

ing that, after a little final discussion, they would be able more quickly to reach the conclusive decisions, in one sense or the other, of the conciliar assembly, without this prejudicing the length of the Council, about which it is not, at this moment, possible to make forecasts. The aim has been to facilitate the Council's efficiency and promptness, not to impose limits and decisions upon it."

Electronic Organ versus Pipe Organ:

In the historic Minster of Heilsbronn recently an interesting contest was held: an electronic organ which was set up for that purpose was to compete with a large pipe organ. Landeskirchenmusikdirektor Professor Friedrich Hoegner of Munich had invited sixty Bavarian church musicians as a critical jury for this experiment. In two concerts of the two instruments, the electronic organ, according to the general view of the church musicians, revealed results worse than the pipe organ. "I wanted to give the manufacturers of electronic organs a chance to demonstrate what their instruments can do", Professor Hoegner said.

Also after the Heilsbronn contest the electronic organ, in contrast to Catholic views, will not be acceptable for Protestant churches. In the electronic organs all sounds are produced by electric oscillations of electronic tubes. This sound is electrically amplified, filtered and then transmitted through large loudspeakers. Klaus Beissbarth (Stuttgart), who is a producer of electronic organs, outlined the advantages of the new instrument: It is cheaper, needs less space and is insusceptible to moisture and temperature influences.

In spite of these advantages the shortcomings of the electronic organ became quite clear in the Heilsbronn organ contest: The sound of the electronic organ was lifeless, its basses sound unclear, the commencement of the individual tones is sharp and cold. What is lacking is the abundance, fullness and swell of real organ sounds. The new instrument does by no means reach the great liveliness of the pipe organs developed in recent times.

Diplom Physicist Dr. Karl Theodor Kuehn of Berlin stated that up to now no real imitation of the sound of the regular pipe organ had been achieved by means of electronic tubes. The electronic organ is an absolutely

different instrument able to produce sound effects unimaginable before. Professor Hoegner, too, is of the view that the electronic organ does not fit into churches but has great future chances as a new instrument in the temporal sphere; but he recommends that devices of this kind should not be referred to as electronic organ but electronium. (*The German Tribune*, ap. 25th, 1964)

Human Generation and Original Sin:

An attempt to develop a theory of original sin, based on the key idea of a "supernatural existential" as envisaged by EMILE MERSCH and KARL RAHNER, has been lately made by a jesuit theologian. Accepting the more common theological opinion of original sin as a privation of sanctifying grace, the author suggests that without the supernatural existential there can be no exigency for grace in human nature and therefore no privation of grace due to the frustration of this exigency. However, the supernatural existential ordains man to a supernatural life which is essentially social. One of the gifts of intimate union with his fellows in knowledge and love of God. Because of the loss of this gift the human collectivity is now in a state of privation, individual as well as collective. Man's present state is not only evil and in opposition to God's plan, but it is voluntarily so in consequence of Adam's sin. In God's original plan, man would have been conformed and submissive to supernaturalized reason. In the present order, man is without sanctifying grace until he is baptized and without the ability to understand moral imperatives until he gains the use of reason. His sense faculties and the voluntary acts of the will in his early life lack the degree of perfection demanded by the love of God. Because this command to love God is implanted in human nature by the supernatural existential, man is always bound by it and suffers if he fails to obey it, even though it be through no fault of his own. Thus man's early development is a sinful one not only because he lacks something he ought to have, but also because he does (though not freely) what he should not do. Thus results the deformation of human nature and the implanting of tendencies which remain even after justification, and furnish an occasion for personal sin.

ROMAN CURIA

SACRA PAENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA Officium De Indulgentiis

BEATISSIME PATER,

IULIUS ROSALES, Archiepiscopus Caebuanus, occasione sacrorum sollemnium quae ob quater centessimum anniversarium ab Evangelizatione Insularum Philippinarum per integrum annum 1965 in praedicta Ditione celebrabuntur, humiliter petit Indulgentias quae sequuntur: I. *Plenariam* a christifidelibus confessis, sacra Synaxi reffectis et ad mentem Sanctitatis Tuae orantibus semel lucrandam: 1) singulis eiusdem anni diebus, ad normam tamen can. 921 §3 C.I.C., si sanctuarium Infantis Iesu in urbe archiepiscopali Caebuana devote visitaverint; 2) quolibet anni die, si ad memoratum sanctuarium pietatis causa invisendum *turmatim* peregrinati fuerint; 3) si ad sacrum Convivium frequenti populo in qualibet paroeciali ecclesia datum accesserint; 4) si Nationalem Actionis Catholicae Conventum participaverint et devote aliquam ecclesiam visitaverint; II. *Partialem septem annorum* saltem corde contrito a christifidelibus acquirendam, 1) si sacris memorati Conventus functionibus aut sessionibus adstiterint; 2) si cuilibet coetui, in quo pietatis vel caritatis argumenta pertractantur, interfuerint.

Et Deus, etc.

Die 17 Iunii 1964

SACRA PAENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA benigne annuit pro gratia iuxta preces. Praesenti anno iubilari tantum valituro. Contrariis quibuslibet minime obstantibus.

de mandato Eminentissimi

(Sgd.) J. SESSOLO
Regens

(sigillum)

(Sgd.) M. SCHIERANO
a Secretis

PROVISUM PER CONCESSIONES GENERALES

(Cfr. *Enchiridion Indulgentiarum*, ed. 1952) .

- n.150 — *quoad processiones eucharisticas* 1—Indulgentia quinque annorum; 2—Indulgentia plenaria, suetis conditionibus.
- n.151 — *quoad caeremonias primae Communionis*: Fidelibus qui sive prima vice accesserint sive caeremoniis adstiterint, conceditur Indulgentia plenaria, suetis conditionibus.
- n.168 — *quoad Horam Sanctam*: 1—Indulgentia decem annorum; 2—Indulgentia plenaria, suetis conditionibus.
- n.602-3 — *quoad Conventus eucharisticos nationales, dioecesanos et paroeciales*: a) *In loco ubi Conventus agitur, quandiu idem duraverit*: 1—Indulgentia quindecim annorum, si Sacramentum, ad adorandum publice propositum, visitaverint, recitando 6 Pater, ave et gloria; 2—Indulgentia septem annorum, si cuilibet sacrae functioni interfuerint, vel cuivis Conventus coetui seu sessioni adfuerint; 3—Indulgentia centum dierum, si aliquod religionis opus in spiritu paenitentiae peregerint; 4—Indulgentia plenaria, semel durante Conventu, suetis conditionibus; 5—Indulgentia plenaria, si sollemnem Eucharisticam pompam participaverint; 6—Indulgentia plenaria, si devote acceperint benedictionem papalem.
- b) *Extra locum Conventus*: 1—Indulgentia trecentorum dierum, si preces in favorem Conventus fuderint, vel bonum opus fecerint vel stipem aliquam obtulerint; 2—Indulgentia plenaria, a die publice indicti Conventus ad extremum diem ipsius Conventus, semel tantum lucranda, suetis conditionibus et addita oratione pro felici exitu Conventus in quavis ecclesia vel publico oratorio.
- n.689 — *quoad Exercitia Spiritualia*: 1—Indulgentia septem annorum pro qualibet sacra concione; 2—Indulgentia plenaria, suetis conditionibus, si tertiam saltem partem concionum audierint.
- n.692 c) *quoad sacras Missiones ad populum*:
 1—Indulgentia septem annorum pro qualibet sacra concione;
 2—Indulgentia plenaria, suetis conditionibus, si tertiam saltem partem concionum audierint.

PASTORAL SECTION

HOMILETICS

TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST (Aug. 9)

ACTIVE CHARITY:

The charity manifests itself in works and considers all men as brothers, even those of other nations and beliefs. Every man is a creature of God and our brother; for him also Our Lord Jesus Christ died. It is our duty therefore to love him and help him according to our means. Doing this, we comply fully with the only requisite for eternal life: to love God with our whole soul, with all our mind, with all our strength and to love our neighbour.

The good Samaritan, in today's Gospel, did not stop to inquire who the wounded man was, where he was from or what was his religion. He only saw in him his neighbour, his brother, and he gave him generous assistance.

NOT OFTEN SEEN:

How is it, dear brethren, that this active charity is not often seen nowadays? Ah! pride has much to say here. Some people, because they are rich or belong to some high-class society, despise the poor and the sick. But if some well-to-do persons ask them a favor, how speedily do they extend their help. So much pride, self-centredness and lack of faith cannot but stifle charity. Are not the poor and the infirm, whoever they are, children of God, suffering members of Christ?

To help the poor and the sick efficaciously we certainly need to make some sacrifice of time or money, or both. Ah, how well known are the excuses usually given: I am so busy with other duties, my weak health demands my entire attention, the future of my children costs all that I can possibly give. And yet, when it is a question of certain amusements, of certain company and places, of superfluities, there is plenty of time, health, and money.

TRUE CHARITY:

Oh, if we only had faith, we would see Jesus Christ Himself in our less fortunate brethren. We would practice charity according to the example given by the good Samaritan. This good soul did not bother with distinctions of race and religion. He saw that wounded man one of his brothers needing help. True charity excludes no one, makes no distinction, no privileges, no favoritisms.

The good Samaritan spent time and money to ease the sufferings of that man. Not many of us behave thus nowadays, in spite of what St. John tells us: My dear children, let us not love in word, neither with the tongue, but in deed and in truth. And St. James says: If a brother or sister be naked and in want of daily food and one of you say to them, 'Go in peace, be warmed and filled', yet you do not give them what is necessary for the body, what does it profit?

Finally, the good Samaritan said to the innkeeper: Take care of him; and whatever more thou spendest, I, on my way back, will repay thee. A single, passing act of charity is not enough. Our charity should extend, according to our possibilities and means, to the future of that certain poor family, that poor sick man, as long as the necessity lasts.

We have seen this example of the good Samaritan. How is our charity actually? Is there among us who has a heart so cold and hard, like those people who preceded the Samaritan? Remember, the judgment of God depends on the charity we show our neighbour. There is never lacking an occasion to practice charity, for the poor and sick we have always with us. Let us always remember this Gospel; it is to all of us that Our Lord directs His words: Go and do the same as the Samaritan. You will, in this manner, show that you love.

FEAST OF THE ASSUMPTION (Aug. 15)

CROWN OF HER LIFE:

"My soul magnifies the Lord, and my spirit rejoices in God my Saviour; because He has regarded the lowliness of his handmaid; for behold, henceforth all generations shall call me blessed." With these same words, dear brethren, Mary joyfully announces on this blessed day the close of a long and painful period of waiting and the opening of a glorious and eternal history of possession. The Assumption—or taking up—of Mary, body and soul, into heaven forms the crowning point of her wonderful

life. Hers is a cry of happiness and gratitude, a shout of triumph announcing the way to heaven.

Some seventy years Mary spent on this earth in the practice of the most sublime virtues and leading a life more divine than human. Now, at last, as a fitting reward, she sees the day that will reunite her with her Divine Son, the sole object of her love and desires, this time never more to be separated.

DEATH NO FEARFUL THING:

But should Mary have passed through death, as the rest of the children of Adam? It would seem no, if we consider that death is only the penalty of sin, and we know that Mary is totally exempted from the least stain of sin, even in her conception. Nevertheless, she willingly accepted to die in order to have this mark of similarity with her Divine Son Who gave up His life that all men might live.

Now, why is it that so many of us fear death? Because for us death is the wages of sin, and we, sinners, are in fear of the judgment that is to come. It is because we are too attached to the things of this world. We forget our real condition of strangers, of pilgrims passing through this earth, of exiles who should aspire for a return to our homeland, heaven.

Yet, we wish to die as Mary did, that is, without fear of death. Well, this wish she grants us today—nothing is more dear to her motherly heart—but on condition that we live as she did. That we love Jesus Christ with our whole heart and soul, put our entire trust in Him and live all for Him. That we observe His commandments and practice true humility, charity, purity, justice and detach ourselves from anything perishable in this world. That we look unceasingly up to heaven, where we will soon follow Our Blessed Saviour and His glorious Mother.

Ah, brethren, if we live as Mary did, if we put to practice these advices of our Mother, what have we to fear of death? For death will free us from this world, will open for us the gates of heaven and enable us to enter it, as exiles enter with joy their homeland. Would to God that we all, on our deathbed, have these sentiments.

ASSUMPTION AND OUR RESURRECTION:

Mary accepted to die, as Our Lord did, but God decreed that she be risen at once, as He. Our Lord could not permit that virginal flesh, from which He had received His sacred humanity and which He sanctified with His presence, be a captive of corruption and of worms. So He willed on this day to take her up, body and soul, glorious and immortal as He,

into heaven. Behold in this, dear brethren, the wisdom, the power and the goodness of such a Son in favor of His most holy and beloved Mother.

On this glorious feast of the Assumption and glorification of Mary, our Queen and Mother, let us remember that, exiled upon this valley of tears, we have been created for heaven. Therefore our hearts should be lifted up there always, for there is our true and only treasure, there is the united object of our love, Jesus and Mary. There we shall be with them in the very near future. In our trials and temptations, let us lift our eyes to heaven, to Mary, our good Mother who opens her arms to us, consoles and strengthens us, and offers us her sustaining love and powerful, unceasing aid.

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST (Aug. 16)

SPIRITUAL LEPROSY:

The ten lepers of today's Gospel, aware of their miserable condition, had only one immense desire—to be cured. Full of faith in the power and goodness of the Saviour, they cry out to Him: Jesus, master, have mercy on us.

Perhaps even among us, dear brethren, are many who are struck with the horrible leprosy of sin. This is much more lamentable than the state of those ten lepers. After all, the leprosy of the body can become an instrument of atonement for sin, for sanctification, of merits. But sin, which is the leprosy of the soul, is an infinite evil, an almost irreparable damage which becomes eternal if death comes upon such a state. What is worse is that many who are afflicted with it do not want to be cured. They love their leprosy, they take pleasure in remaining in their sinful state.

Your, dear brethren, if you are in this state of spiritual leprosy, do you want to be cured? Detest, then, your sins, flee from dangerous occasions, come trustingly to the heart of Jesus, cry out to Him: Jesus, master, have mercy on us. Our Lord does not cure the sick against their will. We should therefore want it and ask for it, we should throw ourselves at the feet of the Divine Doctor with confidence and fervour.

CONFESSION:

Our Lord could have cured the ten lepers at once, but to prove their faith and obedience He sent them to the priests of the temple. In much the same manner He orders all those afflicted with spiritual leprosy to

go to His priests, that is, to the holy tribunal of Penance, to Confession. To His priests He has given the marvelous, divine power to forgive sins in His name. To anyone who desires to be cured and purified He says: Go, show yourself to the priest. Open up to my minister the wounds of your soul with confidence and sincerity and he will tell you in my name: Go in peace, your sins are forgiven. So easy and sure a remedy, which is given as often as one approaches with sincerity and love. And yet, how few there are who have the faith and the obedience of those ten lepers. Pride, malice, negligence prompts many to refuse this remedy and to prefer to live with their leprosy. In their sin they will die.

THANKSGIVING:

Of the ten lepers cured by Our Lord, only one returned to thank Him. The rest did not bother. Oh, how much ingratitude, indeed, is shown by some who, cured and purified by Our Lord in Confession, do not remember to thank Him, but soon fall away from Him, to embrace sin anew. Quite natural, because ingratitude deprives the soul of His precious graces, without which it is impossible to persevere in good stead and be saved. Let alone the bad Confessions, made without sorrow or purpose of amendment, which are no Confessions at all.

Let us be immensely thankful each time we receive the pardon of our sins. Prostrate at the feet of our Saviour, manifest to Him our undying gratitude, renew our sorrow and our firm purpose of sinning no more, and ask Him for the grace to be faithful until death.

No matter how many or how great are our sins, we have great confidence in the goodness of our merciful Saviour. We want to be cured, and we ask for it. We confess our sins with worthy dispositions, as He orders, and we make our whole life henceforth a continuous and practical act of thanksgiving and praise Him. In this way, we have assured the cure and the salvation of our souls. Our Lord tells us: Arise, go thy way, for thy faith has saved thee.

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST (Aug. 23)

ONLY ONE MASTER:

Our Lord says: No man can serve two masters at the same time, that is, two masters who are opposed to each other. Yet, is not this the attitude of some people? They perform some acts of religion and say that they love God. But they break without fear His commandments.

They go to church in the morning, and at night they go to gambling houses and other questionable places. They say long prayers and carry rosaries and scapulars, and live quite a wild life.

The fact is, God and Satan, virtue and vice are two masters diametrically opposed to each other, absolutely incompatible. God is a master who does not want a divided heart. St. Paul says: What fellowship has light with darkness. What harmony is there between Christ and Belial?

GOD ALONE:

Proceeding further, Our Lord says: You cannot serve God and mammon, that is, money or riches. What He means is that you cannot serve, at the same time, God and the riches of this world. He does not say: You cannot possess riches and goods and money, or make us of them, or increase them. But He says: You cannot serve God and serve, at the same time, those things, making them equal to God in your love and attention. The moment you strive to do this, you are no longer masters of your wealth, but you shamefully make yourselves its slaves.

Are we not witnesses in our times to the rabid hunger and thirst for money and riches in so many men? For a handful of gold, for a miserable wad of money bills they stifle the voice of their conscience, they disregard of their body which they otherwise love so ardently.

No wonder, then, that Our Lord Jesus Christ, infallible scrutinizer of the human heart, warns us against this passion which little by little has put itself on the same level with God and dares to divide with Him the empire of our souls: You cannot serve God and money.

HONEST WORK AND PROVIDENCE:

Excuses we ordinarily give in this respect. We need money for ourselves and our children, we must live, we need bread, clothing and so many other things. How can we provide for all these without money? *Lame excuse.* Our Lord did not say that we cannot work for money to provide for our needs; he did not say that we should not work, nor think at all on food or drink or clothing or house and the other necessities of life. What He condemns is the immoderate desire, the overeager care, the feverish work to accumulate riches and money, — which is quite different from the necessary honest work leading to provide the needs and even the conveniences of life, but never the superfluous.

Let us work, then, honestly and diligently to support ourselves and our families, to provide for the uncertainties of the future, but never to serve the unsatiable desire to accumulate riches. Let us work according to our condition and our strength, and with serene confidence and filial trust

ask God to bless our efforts in the way He knows is best for us. Our good Father in heaven Who feeds the birds of the air and clothes the lilies of the field will feed and clothe us and care for us unfailingly and in the best possible manner.

We shall serve God always, and never be slaves of money. We shall have strongly engraved in our memory and put to practice the precious lesson Our Lord gives us in today's Gospel: Seek first the kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things shall be added to you.

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST (Aug. 30)

DIVINE COMPASSION:

The dead young man in today's Gospel is the image of the sinner. But the death of the soul is a misfortune incomparably greater than the death of the body, because whereas this can bring to heaven, the death of the soul leads to hell. Now what moved the compassionate heart of the Saviour to work the great miracle of raising the young man to life was the sight of the tears and affliction of that poor widowed mother.

This, too, happens in spiritual resurrections. The goodness and compassion of Our Lord move Him to work miracles of conversion in the poor souls fallen in the abyss of sin. He does not cease ever to love them, sinners though they are, because He has saved them at the price of His most precious blood. But it pleases Him to work these conversions through the supplications of His Church.

ON THE SINNER:

In truth, the widow of Naim represents the Church which bewails the loss of her children in sin. She unceasingly manifests to Christ her pain and sorrow. She pleads for their resurrection, and to obtain it she offers Him the prayers and pleas of her saints, her priests, her good pastors, the prayers of all pious souls, the alms distributed by the just to the poor, the penances and sacrifices of souls that offer themselves up as victims inside convent walls. Only Our Lord knows the number of conversions thus obtained.

Nor can we know the innumerable occasions that Our Lord lets Himself be moved by the tears and prayers mothers who recommend to Him their wayward children, of wives who have thus obtained the conversion of their erring husbands, of children who have thus obtained the conversion of their parents who had forgotten their duty.

SINNER RETURNS TO LIFE:

The Gospels tell us that Jesus approached and touched the stretcher; and the bearers stood still. Then He said: Young man, I say to thee, arise. In the same manner, with His grace, the good Saviour approaches the soul dead in sin. He touches it diverse ways: a terrible happening, an accident, a sickness, an advice or impressive example, a sermon, and some other means which makes the soul enter into itself and think and, eventually, break out in sentiments of remorse, sorrow and penance. Our Lord thus stops the course of its evil inclinations and passions and deprives it of the occasions and means of sinning. And He says to it: Young man, I say to thee, arise.

Many sinners have risen thus at the voice of the Saviour. This is specially true in the Confessional where Our Lord speaks by mouth of His priests: I absolve you. Stupendous spiritual resurrections these are, and many they are, that console Holy Mother the Church and are the joy and wonderment of the angels of heaven.

And he who was dead, sat up, and began to speak. And Jesus gave him to his mother. The sinner, converted, arises from the infection of his vices, departs from the occasions of sin and shows by his words and deeds that he is truly risen. He opens his lips in Confession, prays to God and renders Him acts of thanksgiving, love and glory.

Our Lord finally returns the sinner to his mother, the Church, in order that he may console her, regale her with his love, his faithfulness, his pure and edifying life and his zeal to serve her.

Brethren, have you been resurrected by Our Lord Jesus Christ? May your gratitude, your faithfulness, your new and holy life, and your zeal for His glory and for His Church be never-ending.

*SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST (Sept. 6)**ILL-BRED GUESTS:*

In the Gospel of the day, Our Lord, observing how some guests at a feast were choosing first places at table, said to them: When thou art invited to a wedding feast, do recline in the first place.

Surely no one among us, dear brethren, is so ill-educated as to choose first places, as those proud pharisees did. Still, even among us, how many do have the same spirit of pride and ambition, are filled with self-esteem

and strive to elevate themselves above others. To these, too, is directed the lesson of our Divine Saviour.

FIRST-PLACE SEEKERS:

To choose first places, to elevate oneself above others is to have the ridiculous pretension of believing oneself better than the rest, in wisdom, in ability, in virtue and so on. Now this is utterly senseless, for what have we that we have not received? Of ourselves, we are misery, nothing, sin. What right have we to put ourselves over or before others? Rash as this is, it is highly dangerous too, because it ordinarily makes us lose peace of soul. It rains upon our heads the contempt and ridicules of men, but, above all, the anger of God Who abhors the proud.

To choose first places is to work, like the pharisees, for mere appearance in order to garner praises from others and to wish to be honoured and esteemed above the rest of the crowd. Ah, but the proud actually, more often than not, reap contempts and ignominies. Even should they manage to win the high regard of men, will this make them any better and or bestow upon the qualities they do not have? This, besides losing all merit before God for any good done, for God has nothing but contempt for these people.

Then there are some people who go hunting for dignities and honorific positions or employments, just for the honours they bring. This is sheer vanity and madness, because they thus expose themselves to a thousand inconveniences, cares and worries. They open their doors to all kinds of disillusionments, to criticisms and enmities from others and, above all, they bring upon themselves a terrible responsibility before God, for if they do not have the necessary qualifications to fill that post, do you think they will have them merely by filling it? Assuredly, no. Let them know, then, that the terrible judgment of God is upon them, who presume to take that position.

HUMILITY:

And so, Our Lord bids us take the last place at table, which is the best place for all. For, He says: He who humbles himself shall be exalted. The more one humbles himself, the more will God raise him up and increase his crown of glory in heaven. This same humility Our Lord Himself practiced in the stable of Bethlehem, in the workshop of Nazareth, in His passion where He was made obedient even unto the death of the cross. Behold the reward: therefore God also has exalted him and has given him a name above every other name.

In this life, we should consider ourselves the least of all. The memory of sins committed and ungratefulness so oft-repeated will help considerably in this direction. If people praise us, we repeat with St. Paul: We are unprofitable servants; we have done what it was our duty to do. This is the best means to obtain peace. With ourselves, because not wishing anything, though big things may come our way, we are not preoccupied or disturbed for not obtaining what is sought. With our neighbor, because no one envies us, and men, on the other hand, naturally are inclined to love those who are meek, modest and peaceful. With God, finally, Who loves and blesses the humble and is pleased to reward the true simplicity and humility of spirit with supernatural lights and graces.

Brethren, you have seen the dangers of pride and the advantages and imperativeness of humility. Do you wish to be happy here on earth and at the same time be assured of your glory in heaven? Love and practice a humble life.

T. LOPEZ, O.P.

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONCILII

D E C R E T U M

Cum plures locorum Ordinarii e variis Nationibus petierint ut proxima die 14 augusti, quae hoc anno in feriam sextam incidit, abstinentiae lex relaxetur; haec Sacra Concilii Congregatio, de speciali Summi Pontificis mandato, locorum Ordinariis ubique terrarum facultatem tribuit fideles praefata feria sexta a dicta lege dispensandi.

Datum Romae, die 22 iulii 1964.

P. Card. CIRIACI
Praefectus

P. PALAZZINI
a Secretis

Seminarians' Mission Camp

The beginning of the school year makes everybody daydream of the happy vacation days. But seminarians of San Carlos Seminary, Makati, Rizal not only daydream of their vacation; they look forward to it, because it brings a lot of experience and fun, especially their annual ten-day Mission Camp. Before they go home for summer vacation, they go to a remote parish to make some apostolate which may consist in making house-to-house visitation or taking the parish census and teaching catechism. What a fruitful way of spending vacation!

O R I G I N

Six years ago, the seminarians of Our Lady of Guadalupe Minor Seminary of the Archdiocese of Manila started camping¹ like the boy-scouts to keep themselves busy during the weeks they had to spend in the Seminary before they go home for summer vacation. San Carlos Seminary took the same idea and put in it the aspect of active apostolate.² There and then Mission Camping was born.³

P R E P A R A T I O N S

PLACE

To be successful, the Mission Camp requires preparation. Three seminarians with a professor compose the group responsible for the Mission Camp. Their first job is to look for a suitable place. Somewhere there is a group of easily accessible barrios with a population

¹ Under the guidance of Rev. Fr. Jorge Piron, C.I.C.M., then moderator of hiking activities, the first seminarians' camping was held in Kabulusan, Pakil, Laguna in 1959; then in Sibul, San Miguel, Bulacan in 1960; in Ipo Dam, Bulacan in 1963 and Orani, Bataan in 1961, 1962 and last summer.

² Rev. Fr. Leon Cornerotte, C.I.C.M., then Prefect of Discipline for the Philosophers, saw in camping an opportunity to train seminarians in apostolic work like what French seminarians are doing during vacation.

³ The first Mission Camp was launched in 1962 in Gabaldon, Nueva Ecija, a remote town at the edge of the Sierra Madre Mountains without a resident parish priest: then in Kabulusan, Pakil, Laguna (1963) and in 1964 in three groups, namely, in Botocan, Majayjay, Laguna; Luisiana, Laguna and Teresa, Rizal.

of about 1,000 inhabitants, hardly visited by the parish priest. Any place in the country suits this requirement. However, besides apostolate, the seminarians are looking for relaxation and enjoyment since it is vacation time. Any rigid apostolate can be done anywhere. But an apostolate mixed with vacation can be done only somewhere. Thus it should be done in a cool, peaceful and scenic place⁴ that is at least three hours ride from the Seminary. There should be an adequate water supply. Transportation to the nearest market should not be difficult.

INFORMING THE PROPER AUTHORITIES

When those responsible have surveyed and chosen a place for the Mission Camp, both ecclesiastical and civil authorities are informed. Permission for apostolate in the region is sought from the Bishop of the diocese and the parish priest of the town. The barrio captains are notified of the coming seminarians' Mission Camp. The principal or head teacher of the barrio school is requested to let the seminarians use the school building and its facilities as temporary quarters.

SEMINARY PREPARATIONS

Twenty-five is the maximum number of seminarians in a camp. If there are more seminarians who like to go camping, they should be divided in several groups that will camp either in the same place as that of the first group if there is still work to be done, or in another place. The group is subdivided into smaller groups of five with their respective group leaders. Some seminarians are assigned over-all chief of camp, secretary, treasurer, chief cook, and sacristan.⁵

ADVANCE PARTY

If necessary a group goes ahead to the camping place to inform the people of the coming seminarians' apostolate and to make a map of the place indicating in small circles or squares the houses, stores and useful landmarks for an orderly house-to-house visitation. Otherwise, everyone goes with the general party.

⁴ Concerning the place for the Mission Camp, the following should be taken in consideration: prospect for apostolate, climate, distance, food and lodging.

So far, Mission Camps had been held in places near mountainous areas.

⁵ The chief of camp acts like the beadle in the Seminary. He gives assignments at the approval of the Father in charge of the camp.

The secretary informs the groups of assignments and other activities and keeps the reports.

The treasurer does the marketing. Beforehand he buys food and groceries that may be difficult to procure in the camping place.

The chief cook takes care of the cooking and eating utensils to be brought to camp and the daily menu.

The sacristan is in charge of the Mass kit and the altar preparation every morning before Mass.

DAILY SCHEDULE AND ACTIVITIES OF THE MISSION CAMP

COMMUNITY MASS

Seminarians rise an hour before Mass to say their private morning prayers and to make their meditation. Mass is celebrated at a time convenient for the people to attend. During the Mass, a commentator explains the liturgical prayers, readings and actions; alternately the congregation joins in the community singing led by the seminarians. When occasion demands, the celebrant gives a homily.

COOKING

While these are going on, the group assigned for the day prepares breakfast. They do the same for dinner and supper. They wash the dishes and fetch water. On account of these, they have no other assignment during the day.

ASSIGNMENTS

After breakfast, the seminarians begin their work. They see the bulletin board of their assignments. They work two by two. Catechists have permanent partners; house visitators are shuffled everyday. If the morning is free, seminarians may begin their assignments or they may go around the place, hike, play or swim.

REPORTS

When house visitators return from their mission, they cross out in the map on the bulletin board the houses they visited. After the community rosary, the head of the camp opens and presides over the meeting where everyone gives a brief report of the day's activities and experiences. Written reports of any irregular marriage or baptism are submitted to the secretary who compiles them for the parish priest. After the meeting, evening prayers are said in common. At 10 o'clock, everybody goes to bed.

SPIRITUAL EXERCISES

Except for Holy Mass, rosary and evening prayers, all other spiritual exercises are said privately. Each seminarian makes his own schedule in order to be faithful to them.

APPRECIATION

Brief as it is, the Mission Camp cannot accomplish much. Nevertheless, it opens the way for a revitalization of the parish. It supplies valuable information about the parishioners. It collects data that can be used by the parish priest and his Catholic actionists in following up cases and settling them.

The Mission Camp makes everyone happy and closer to God. People feel very happy that "priests" visit them. Their contact with seminarians corrects childhood prejudices about the Church and her priests. Their children often return home happier and better on account of their catechism classes and the games they play thereafter. On the other hand, seminarians treasure memories of their experiences during the camp. Their apostolic zeal is kindled; their generosity and goodwill are tapped. They come to a greater realization of the need for zealous priest to lead men to God. In short, they come out better future priests.

CONCLUSION

The Mission Camp trains the future priest in active apostolate. Gone are the days when a priest should stay in the parish house awaiting the parishioners to come when they need something. Time has changed. Many places have been dechristianized. People have stopped going to church. They have ceased fulfilling their obligations. Thus, more and more are going through life without the benefits of the sacraments.

The scarcity of priests calls for the chosen few to be zealous in their commitment. If the people do not go to the priest, the priest should go to them. But to do this, he must receive some training in active apostolate during his seminary life. The Mission Camp is one of the means along this line. A seminarian can do a lot of good for the people at this stage of life. He can do some apostolate with his fellow future priests in a Mission Camp. In this way, he will gird himself for the future *ad maiorem Dei gloriam* in this part of the globe.*

SEM. INOCENCIO B. POBLETE, JR.

* If you know any place in the Tagalog region where seminarians can make a Mission Camp, please inform: Rev. Fr. Joachim Queé, C.I.C.M., Prefect, Philosophy Department, San Carlos Seminary, Epifanio de los Santos Avenue, Makati, Rizal.

CASES AND QUERIES

VALIDATION OF WAR TIME MARRIAGES

During the last war a priest drifting from one evacuation place to another in the mountains, married some couples outside his parish, sincerely believing he could do so during the war crisis and in such circumstances.

After the war, the bishop inquired whether or not there were cases of marriage for the "sanatio in radice". The said priest told nothing, still believing he did nothing wrong.

Now, after the lapse of so many years, the above priest reviewing his texts on the matter, realize with regrets and shamefulness the gravity of his mistake. The priest thinks of asking for a "sanatio" through his bishop, but he is now utterly ashamed.

Is the "sanatio" necessary or not? If it is, can the priest ask for it in an unsigned letter? What is your advice?

* * *

The clue to the solution of the problem lies in the answer to a second question: were the marriages contracted under such circumstances juridically valid or invalid? If they were valid there is no need of a "sanatio". The problem will arise only the moment the nullity of the contracts has been definitely established.

Were said marriages really valid? The Church acknowledges two forms of solemnizing marriages; one applicable to ordinary cases (c. 1094), and another extraordinary in character covering exceptional situations, (c. 1098). It is obvious that as to the former the marriages solemnized by our consultant were invalid since he himself declares to have assisted at the marriages outside his territory, (c. 1095), § 1, 2). But do the exceptional circumstances under which the marriages were

solemnized warrant the application of the extraordinary form as prescribed by c. 1098? It is imperative that our correspondent should answer these questions first as a "*conditio sine qua non*" to the solution of his problem. Was there at the time any other priest authorized by law to assist at the marriages? And if there was none, was it prudently foreseen that such qualified priest would not be available for at least one month? If our consultant's answer is in the negative, and further assuming that the exchange of matrimonial consent took place in the presence of two witnesses, the marriages mentioned were juridically valid, thereby excluding the need of a "*sanatio in radice*", c. 1098).

We firmly believe that the state of perplexity of our correspondent stems from his very attitude of considering himself necessary at such ceremonies. Given that the marriages were performed following the extraordinary form, his presence was not asked for validity but rather to lend dignity to the ceremony, to contribute a religious note of reverence to the celebration, to offer the parties the opportunity of receiving a blessing, . . . It is true that in the absence of a qualified priest the law calls for any priest at hand, but to avoid a possible misunderstanding, the legislator hastens to add that this presence is not necessary for validity, (c. 1098, 2).

The fact that the priest erred in considering himself duly qualified to perform the ceremony did not in any way affect the validity of the contract. The priest here is just a "special witness", the ministers being the parties themselves. They are the ones who give stability to the contract through a naturally valid matrimonial consent, in this case juridically efficacious by operation of the law.

Once more, the circumstances that the priest assisted actively in such marriages by asking and receiving the consent of the parties has absolutely no bearing as to their validity. The law does not demand the active participation of the priest in this case, though it would be advisable for him to do so to safeguard the validity of the contract.

SOLUTION

In accordance with the doctrinal explanation and legal principles set down in the foregoing lines the following solution seems logical:

1. If the circumstances surrounding the celebration of the marriages were such as to warrant their solemnization according to the extraordinary form of c. 1098, then the priest needs not worry about the validity, though he should feel disturbed for having overlooked a practical and fundamental law as the extraordinary form of marriage. Good faith and the circumstances will perhaps excuse him of any responsibility.

2. On the contrary, if the extraordinary form had no application to those marriages due to the presence of a qualified priest readily available to render his services, the marriages solemnized were invalid and need to be validated through "sanatio in radice". The petition prepared and signed by the parish priest, should be sent to the Ordinary, who by virtue of the Apostolic Faculties, has the power to grant "sanatio in radice" in cases of invalid marriages for defect of form, (Cfr. *Boletín Eclesiástico*, May-June, 1964, p. 328).

F. TESTERA, O.P.

REPETITION OF THE GENERAL ABSOLUTION

When Extreme Unction is administered a second time, must the General Absolution be repeated also? since its efficacy is only realized at the moment of death.

* * *

10.—When Extreme Unction is administered a second time, it does not follow that the last Blessing should also be repeated: "Licetne aut saltem convenitne iterum applicare indulgentiam in articulo mortis. . . quando post applicationem (aegrotus) diuturna laborat aegritudine, uno verbo, quando Rituale permittit, aut praecipit iterationem Extremae Unctionis, aut confessarius iudicat iterandam esse absolutionem? *Resp.* Prout iacet, negative in omnibus. (S.C. Indulg., 20 Iunii, 1836; *Fontes*, n. 5005.)

The reason for this is because Extreme Unction may be repeated when a fresh danger of death intervenes, even though the person has not ceased to be in danger, but the last blessing may be repeated only when the person has recovered and is

again in danger. This is very clear in another decree of the S.C. Indulg., September 24, 1838, ad 2um. This question was proposed to the S.C. of Indulgences: "Utrum Benedictio Apostolica pluries impertiri possit infirmis, novo mortis periculo redeunte? And the answer was: "*Negative*, eadem permanente infirmitate etsi diuturna; *affirmative*, si infirmus convalescerit, ac deinde quacumque de causa in novum mortis periculo redeat (*Fontes*, no. 5008).

20.—Up to this point the question is clear and sure. But how about the observation advanced by our correspondent? The basis of the distinction we have given as to why the repetition of the Extreme Unction does not imply a similar one for the last blessing lies in this: the sacrament has its effect when administered *servatis servandis*; but the plenary indulgence is obtained not when the blessing is given but at the moment of death, as our correspondent clearly indicated. The logical conclusion is that the last blessing once given should never be repeated, even when the person has fully recovered, and no matter what length of time separates its first reception from a subsequent danger of death.

30.—And yet we have the clear words of the decree we have just mentioned above, permitting the repetition of the last blessing, whenever the person has recovered and is again in a new danger of death. What is the reason? I must confess that I can not offer any satisfactory answer. Many were advanced, but not one really was adequate. There are those who say that it is because of the common presumption that there is always some doubt in such cases of whether the blessing had been received. MAHONEY (*Priests' Problems*, p. 206) offers this explanation: in the papal blessing there is another blessing distinct from the plenary indulgence which the Church permits to be repeated, not whenever Extreme Unction is repeated, but in the contingencies determined by the positive law as stated in the decree quoted above.

What remains true is this: the Church permits the reiteration of the last blessing whenever the person has recovered and is again in danger.

WHAT TO DO AFTER AN INVALID CIVIL MARRIAGE

John and Helen were engaged to be married. Through circumstances Helen was forced to spend several nights in the same house as John, whereupon Helen's parents have forced them to a civil marriage. John and Helen understand that they should also get married in church, but Helen's parents object to this since the two are still studying. Although John and Helen have had intercourse at three occasions, they are decided not to live as man and wife until they will be married in church. Their difficulty is, however, that for the moment Helen has no place to live, and is still staying in the same house as John.

Questions:

1. *What would you advise.*
2. *Was I right in absolving John on the promise that he would abstain from illicit intimacies with Helen, and that he would seek other lodgings for Helen.*
3. *Was I right in permitting John to receive H. Communion, considering that only Helen's parents know of the civil marriage.*

* * *

OBSERVATIONS

1.—Although our questioner is silent about it, we presume that John and Helen are already of age, as required for civil marriage, and also that the above mentioned intimacies, at least in part, took place after their civil marriage. These two points are pertinent here because, in this supposition, their civil marriage is definitely consistent with the law courts with no option otherwise (Civil Code of the Philippines, Art. 85, (5)).

2.—Hence John and Helen's understanding that they should also get married in church is only very exact. Truly, Helen's parents have been guilty of a very serious offense both when they forced the civil marriage, and now that they prevent their daughter from marrying in church. Notwithstanding their irrational opposition, John and Helen must still marry in Church.

They should of course try first the manifold ways of personal insistence, as well as the good offices of relatives or friends to break their reluctance to this effect.

3.—Yet, in case of a stubborn persistence on the part of Helen's parents, she and John should disregard their opposition and proceed to the religious celebration of matrimony. This course of action is imperative so that John and Helen could be duly admitted to the Sacraments. The reason for this obligation come from the danger of sin for themselves, and from the scandal for others.

4.—The danger of sin is ever present, by reason of the fact that Helen for the moment has no place to live and is still staying in the same house with John. Evidently this situation constitutes a proximate, continuous occasion of sin. This statement of ours in no way implies that John's confession and absolution would have been vitiated. John could very well realize his guilt and have true contrition at the time of his confession. That such was the fact is clearly shown by his promise to abstain from illicit intimacies with Helen and to seek another lodgings for her. Yet, the fact remains that, for reasons unknown to us, no separate lodgings had been found and that they have to live together in the same house, and, as the past experience allows us to surmise, specially now that they are civilly married, they are to be considered as living in a proximate, continuous occasion of sin. They should, therefore, remove the occasion by a Catholic valid marriage.

5.—The same conclusion is forced upon John and Helen on account of their actually contracted civil, though invalid, marriage. Such enormous transgression can be nothing but a serious scandal, that they have to remove. They should in no wise try to restrict the actual knowledge of their civil performance to Helen's parents. Actually there are, at least, six or seven persons who are perfectly aware of the fact: John and Helen themselves, her parents, the two witnesses and the judge or mayor. And all people know well, specially when the affair is one of love, how true are the words, though ludicrous, of the proverb.

*Secreto de seis
lo sabréis.*

*Secreto de siete
compromete*

It is, of course, too much to think of a true secret in this case.

SOLUTION

1.—For the reasons given above, our advise is that John and Helen marry in church as soon as possible. A kind hand extended to them by an understanding confessor or adviser will help them to understand their plight and the practical course they should take. The sympathetic confessor will encourage them to approach their parish priest who will have them married without fanfare and with the minimum of expenses or none at all. The same two witnesses at their civil contract, or two other friends will be happy to do them this favor in church. After their religious matrimony, no doubt, they will find advocates to reason out with Helen's parents on their behalf.

2.—Yes, the confessor was right in absolving John under those premises, on the grounds of the safeguards given by him. We must believe in John's sincerity. The fact that later on John could not find a separate place for Helen does not exclude his good disposition at the time he was absolved.

3.—Yes, the confessor was right too in permitting John to receive H. Communion under those same premises. Yet, if, on account of his condition, any scandal would arise in any of the persons who know of his civil contract, John would remove it by explaining to them under what conditions he was acting and under what promises he have been allowed by his confessor.

FR. QUINTIN M. GARCÍA, O.P.

NEWS

FOREIGN

Secretariate for non-Christians. — The first task of the new secretariate for non-Christians will be to bring about an exchange of points of view, to strive to learn what non-Christian religions really teach, and to let them know what the Catholic religion really teaches, Cardinal Marella said in an interview for *La Croix*. The new Secretariate will not be a new congregation for the propagation of the Faith, nor a new organ of the Second Vatican Council on the lines of the Secretariate for Promoting Christian Unity. The institution will largely depend on the bishops and competent laymen of the predominantly non-Christian continents and nations to perform its task.

Cardinal Protectorship to be eliminated. — It is understood from Vatican sources that the Pope has decided not to appoint cardinal protectors of religious orders and congregations any longer.

Liturgical reforms. — In the U.S.A. English will replace Latin in the Mass with the exception of the initial prayers at the foot of the altar, the Collect, the Preface and the Canon of the Mass. The use of

English is also provided for in all the rites for the administration of the sacraments, except Holy Orders. The same holds true for sacramentals.

In the archdiocese of *Malines-Bruxelles* instructions have been given that the reading of the Epistle and other Scriptural lessons at Mass should ordinarily be done by a lay lector.

In the diocese of *Liege*, Belgium, priests have been instructed to celebrate Mass at altars facing the people. In churches where the existing altars cannot easily be adapted, altar tables should be erected. Old altars, however, are not to be displaced for two years, and then not without approval of the Ordinary.

In the archdiocese of *Santiago*, Chile, Spanish has replaced Latin in all parts of the Mass which pertain to the people or are recited in a loud voice, including the initial prayers at the foot of the altar. It is understood that the Bishops of Chile hope to have the whole Mass in Spanish in order to further intensify the participation of the faithful and to avoid confusion of language within the same service.

The new Archbishop of *Panama* has ordered the simplification of wedding and funeral ceremonies and the elimination of class distinctions. In weddings, everything not concerned with the liturgy is to be eliminated. Bridesmaids, ushers, pages, special carpeting, and special lights, are all to go. These rules will be obligatory as from January 1, 1965.

Joint Bible. — A New Testament that combines Catholic and Protestant scholarship moved close to publication in Scotland with the issuance of the imprimatur by the Archbishop of St. Andrew's and Edinburgh. The new work will be a Catholic edition of the American Protestant Revised Standard Version of the New Testament. It was announced that the Congregation of the Holy Office has given its approval in principle to an entire Catholic Bible, including the Old and New Testaments, based on the Revised Standard Version.

First Communion before Confession. — Children in the diocese of Roermond, The Netherlands, are henceforth to make their first Holy Communion at the age of seven or eight, and to make their first confession a year or two later. Preparation for the sacrament of Penance will begin in the third grade. The Bishop, who acted on the recommendation of a 10-member committee composed of a mother, a father, two lay teachers, one religious teacher and five priests, wishes that stress be laid on the social nature of confession,

as well as on the essential attitude of inward change.

Catholic Seminarians attend Protestant seminar. — Catholic students of theology were invited to attend an annual seminar organized in Vaumarcus, Switzerland, by the various Swiss reformed Protestant theological faculties. Students from the Catholic seminary in Fribourg accepted the invitation with the authorization of their Bishop. The seminar discussed church unity, modern substitutes for religion, religious anxiety, church services, liturgy, spirituality, and theological problems. The Catholic seminarians said afterward that they had discovered for the first time the real ecumenical problems, and that they had tasted the joy of honest fraternal ecumenical dialogue.

University apostolate in Mexico. — In the three and one-half years since fr. Desobry, O.P., came to Mexico City and founded his university parish, 9,000 of the 82,000 students at the University of Mexico have been instructed in their Faith and now practise it openly. Before that, few of them dared admit they were Catholics "for fear of mockery". There are conversions in good number and vocations to the priesthood are beginning to sprout. The parish's handful of priests and apostolic young men work day and night, organizing daily Masses, spiritual retreats, lectures, social activities, and study clubs at the University Centre, and carrying on debates with extremists of the right and left. There are

frequent confessions and Communion, and private sessions of spiritual direction attended by hundreds. In the afternoons and evenings, special courses are given on the Bible, the papal encyclicals, on Christian orientation in economics and society, and on family life and love.

Help downtrodden workers to organize. — Cardinal Lienart of Lille, speaking to a labour group in Hainbourdin, urged Workers' Catholic Action to concentrate on helping the most underprivileged sector of the working community to organize labour unions.

"What must be your first concern is," he said, "the plight of the poor, of those men who despite having jobs do not earn a living wage, and are forced either to find supplementary work or have their wives get jobs. You should therefore pay particular attention to these impoverished sectors of society from which men are unable to escape by themselves. In the name of your

Christian Faith, you must help them to organize themselves.

"The Church as you know approves and encourages family rights and also independent labour unions and union action. This is not sufficiently well known. I hope that you who are convinced of it will continue in your secular activity despite the risks and dangers you meet."

Sisters run a parish. — For the past year a group of four Brazilian nuns has been in charge of a parish in the interior of Brazil, at Nisia Floresta. The parish had long been without resident parish priest. The Archbishop of Natal therefore entrusted the parish to the sisters, who hold two daily prayer services in the church, teach catechism, and in emergencies administer Baptism. A priest from Natal visits the parish once a week to say Mass and administer the sacraments. The experiment so far appears to have been a great success, and has been favorably commented upon by the *Osservatore Romano*.

LOCAL

Summer projects of Medical Missions, Inc. — Medical Missions, Inc. of the University of Santo Tomas has recently announced the result of its summer projects. From the end of April to the middle of June medical mission teams were sent to the following places: Bangued (Abra), San Jose and Culasi (An-

tique), Calapan (Oriental Mindoro), Sabangan (Bontoc-Mountain Province), Salegseg (Kalinga-Mountain Province), Kiangao (Ifugao-Mountain Province), Kabugao (Apayao-Mountain Province), Coron (Palawan) and Maasin (Southern Leyte). Sixty five medical and surgical specialists, Dental

Doctor, sixteen graduate nurses, thirty three senior medical students, two medical technologists and six Dominican priests served in these missions.

The work done by the medical missionaries for the benefit of indigent patients includes the following: 1,462 medical consultations (patients examined, diagnosed and given medicines), 120 dental treatments (extractions, fillings, etc.), 318 surgical operations (177 minor and 141 major).

Medical Missions, Inc. wants to express its gratitude to the local hospitals and religious and civil authorities for their enthusiastic cooperation and to the following entities for their generous donations: United Pharmaceuticals, Inc., Biomedis Drug Co., Westmont Drug Co., Theraparma Drug Co., Metro Drug Co., Lederle Drug Co., Pfizer Drug Co., The Catholic Relief Services and the Philippine Charity Sweepstakes.

Since its establishment in 1961, Medical Missions, Inc. has sent 44 teams to rural areas all throughout the Philippines. A total of 40,901 medical consultations have been held and 1,222 surgical operations performed.

Medical Missions, Inc. is a purely charitable association. Its purpose is to render free service to indigent patients who cannot provide themselves with adequate medical care. The members of the association are all volunteers who do not receive any compensation for their work in the Missions.

Cardinal Hails Biblical Group. —

His Eminence, Rufino J. Cardinal Santos called the Catholic Biblical and Theological Association of the Philippines the answer to a real need of the Church here, and it is the fulfillment of the wish of the Holy See for such an association in this country.

The cardinal spoke at the first annual convention (July 16-17) of the association at the Central Seminary, University of Santo Tomas.

The convention was the first annual meeting of the CBTA after its constitutional convention held in May, 1963 at which the association's constitution and by-laws were discussed and formally ratified and at which time the CBTA was established as a permanent society.

Officers for the coming year (1964-65) were elected at the convention. Chosen to head the CBTA was Rev. Bernard J. Le Frois, SVD, internationally known New Testament scholar and author, at present professor of Sacred Scripture at the Vigan Archdiocesan Seminary, Ilocos Sur. Fr. Le Frois succeeds the CBTA's first president, Very Rev. Jesus Diaz, O.P.

Elected Vice-President was Fr. Frederick S. Fermin OP, *docens* of Moral Theology also at UST and co-editor of the UST publication for the clergy, *Boletín Eclesiástico*. Fr. C. G. Arevalo, SJ of San Jose Major Seminary, Quezon City, and Father Silvestre Lacson OSB, Prior of the Benedictine community of San Beda College, remain as Secretary and Treasurer, respectively, of the association.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

COMMENTARIOS AL CÓDIGO DE DERECHO CANÓNICO.—Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, Madrid. 1963.

El público culto que conoce la edición bilingüe del Código de Derecho Canónico preparado por BAC puede formarse al menos una idea de la importancia de la obra que recensamos. Es verdad, que no se trata de unas notas explicativas con el objeto de ilustrar la doctrina jurídica de la Iglesia sino de un tratado sistemático y completo, aunque en parte limitado por el mismo plan de los autores. Son cuatro volúmenes de doctrina sólida y profunda donde se discuten con claridad y método los problemas más importantes de la legislación canónica vigente. El comentario va precedido del texto legal en latín y castellano que sirve de base para la discusión ordenada y científica requerida en una obra de esta clase.

Creemos que BAC vuelve una vez mas a prestar un servicio incalculable a sacerdotes y seminaristas, e incluso a muchos seglares cuya profesión les exige a veces un conocimiento claro y exacto de aquellos tratados íntimamente relacionados con ambos derechos. Sin duda alguna resulta ideal por su claridad, método y concisión para libro de texto en los seminarios. Los autores, todos de nota y con una larga experiencia en la enseñanza comentan aquellas partes del Código que han constituido por muchos años la base de su especialización.

En suma, "Los Comentarios al Código de Derecho Canónico" que presentamos a los lectores no necesitan de recomendación. El mismo título del libro, el nombre de sus preclaros autores y la editorial que patrocina la publicación son ya una garantía de éxito.

F. T. I.

VISIONS AND PROPHECIES.—By Karl Rahner, Herder, Freiburg; Burns & Oates, Londo 1964.

Karl Rahner's concern in this occasion is the theological and psychological phenomena which, despite the Church's care in establishing their authentic character, have been left too often and too readily to human credulity. He offers what is in effect a general theory that "genuine" private revelations are to be judged as an overflow into the sensibility of a primarily spiritual impulse and, consequently, combine "subjective" with "objective" elements. Mystical visions deserve the respect due to the spiritual life of sane and devout people, but the supernatural agency is not supposed to be presupposed but must be proved. As regards prophetic visions, their only absolute criterion is a miracle performed in connection with the prophecy so as to be understood as its confirmation.

This is a bold application of theological principles to a subject beset by devotional prejudices and preconceptions.