

# BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

VOL. XL

AUGUST, 1966

NUMBER 451

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI

PAULI

DIVINA PROVIDENTIA

PAPAE VI

LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE

MOTU PROPRIO DATAE

QUIBUS VACATIO LEGIS PROROGATUR QUORUNDAM

DECRETORUM CONCILII OECUMENICI VATICANI II

PAULUS PP. VI

MUNUS APOSTOLICUM, quo uti omnium Pastor fungimur, quemadmodum inter Concilium Oecumenicum Vaticanum II, die VII mensis Decembris superioris anni, auspice Deipara Maria ab origine omnis labis experte, clausum, Nos sollicitos fecit de sanctae Christi Ecclesiae decore, ita Nos nunc movet atque stimulat ut quae in eodem Concilio decreta sunt, et diligenter et sincera fide efficiantur.

Iamvero quod ad multa huius Concilii Decreta attinet, suo tempore statuimus ea legitime vacare usque ad diem XXIX huius mensis, memoriae sanctorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli sacrum.

Per idem vero tempus operam dedimus, ut normae pararentur iuxta quas Decreta ad effectum adducerentur. Cuius rei causa, Litteris Apostolicis, quibus a verbis *Finis Concilio* initium, die III mensis Ianuarii hoc anno datis, Commissiones, quas vocant, Postconciliares condidimus *De Episcopis et dioecesium regimine, De Religiosis, De Missionibus, De educatione christiana, De apostolatu laicorum*; quibus scilicet proposuimus ut, Commissione Centrali, quam appellant, praeunte omniumque labores disponente, eas, quas diximus, normas expenderent et conficerent.

Ac re vera cum unaquaeque harum Commissionum Postconciliarium in creditam sibi provinciam impendisset operam sedulam et accuratam, omnes statuto tempore potuerunt summam suorum actorum Commissioni Centrali tradere. Quae, rebus mature perpensis, de ipsis aliquid adnotavit, aliquid admonuit; ac denique quae ex iisdem actis concludendo collegerat, Nobis ad considerandum detulit. Simul autem eadem Nobis subiecit id sibi ipsisque Commissionibus Postconciliaribus opportunum videri, si decreta executionem legum Concilii respicientia in vulgus gradibus ederentur.

Quapropter dum diligentiam et studia laudamus in eo ab iisdem Commissionibus collocata, ut quas pararent normas cum sensu celebrati Concilii quam aptissime cohaererent, laeto animo nuntiamus brevi omnia exsecutoria, uti vocant, decreta vulgatum iri.

Attamen hoc gradatim fiet; non modo ut certa sententia **Commissionis Centralis** teneatur, sed ut etiam magis commode et ordinate Concilii Decreta in rem adducantur; eo magis quod non nullae normae constitutivae, non nullique coetus postconciliares, in praescriptis Concilii Oecumenici nitentes, cum proposita Romanae Curiae reformatione, cuius initium iam introduximus, coniunguntur.

Has ob causas decernimus, ut vacatio legis, quae ad diem XXIX huius mensis pertinebat, aliquatenus differatur, atque eo die cesset, in singulis decretis exsecutoriis indicato, quae, ut Nobis animus est, quam primum promulgabuntur.

Quod dum iubemus, magnopere confidimus fore ut huiusmodi normae exsecutoriae, eo spectantes ut e sacris Concilii Decretis uberiores percipiantur fructus, ab omnibus christifidelibus prompto et alacri animo accipiantur; atque adeo sancta Dei Ecclesia novo splendore fulgeat, tamquam signum in monte levatum, ad totius humani generis salutem.

Quaecumque vero a Nobis hisce Apostolicis Litteris motu proprio datis decreta sunt, ea omnia firma ac rata esse iubemus, contrariis quibuslibet non obstantibus.

Datum Romae, apud Sanctum Petrum, die X mensis Iunii, anno MDCCCCLXVI, Pontificatus Nostri tertio.

PAULUS PP. VI

(L'OSSERVATORE ROMANO, 12 GIUGNO, 1966)

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI  
 PAULI  
 DIVINA PROVIDENTIA  
 PPAE VI  
 LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE  
 MOTU PROPRIO DATAE  
 QUIBUS NORMAE EPISCOPIS IMPERTIUNTUR  
 AD FACULTATEM DISPENSANDI SPECTANTES

DE EPISCOPORUM MUNERIBUS doctrina, quam Nobis feliciter contigit in Concilio Oecumenico Vaticano II sollemni ritu promulgare, perspicue tradit, Ecclesias particulares ab Episcopis, quibus tamquam Christi legatis concreditae sunt, auctoritate et sacra potestate regi; iisdemque pastorale officium — hoc est constantem et cotidianam ovium curationem — plene committi cum potestate propria, ordinaria et immediata, propter quam *sacrum ius et coram Domino officium habent in suos subditos leges ferendi, iudicium faciendi, atque omnia quae ad cultum apostolatusque ordinem pertinent, moderandi* (cfr. Const. dogmatica *Lumen Gentium*, n. 27). Quae quidem potestas — quemadmodum idem Concilium Vaticanum II docet — cum munera secum ferat a pluribus obeunda, ex Christi voluntate in Mystico



eius Corpore secundum sacrae Hierarchiae ordinem una operantibus, tum demum ad actum adducitur *cum canonica seu iuridica determinatio per auctoritatem hierarchicam accesserit*, quae iuxta normas datur, a suprema Ecclesiae auctoritate approbatas (cfr. *Nota explicativa praevia*, n. 2).

Quae principia in Decreto, a verbis *Christus Dominus* incipiente, sacrum idem Concilium asseverat, quod, dum affirmat Episcopis in dioecesibus ipsis concreditis per se omnem competere potestatem, ea scilicet ratione *quae ad exercitium eorum muneris pastoralis requiritur*, simul Nostram iterum profitetur in singulas Ecclesias immediatam potestatem ad bonum totius Dominici gregis reservandi causas, iure nativo Petri successoris propriam (cfr. *Decretum Christus Dominus*, n. 8,a).

Nobis autem summo gaudio fuit, potuisse Nos Episcoporum dignitatem apertet declarare, celebrare munera, agnoscere potestatem: quae profecto omnia totidem sunt habenda mutuae sollicitudinis vincula, Nos cum venerabilibus Fratribus astringentia.

His praeterea principiis in sua luce collocatis, Ecclesia splendidior affulget, in solidam corporis unitatem concordiae compage copulata; quoniam Episcopi, cum Summo Pontifice coniuncti, sunt divini consilii effectores, ab eoque robur et moderationem accipiunt, ad sacrum christianae doctrinae depositum efficaciore ratione custodiendum atque proponendum.

Cum vero brevi normae sint edendae Decretorum Conciliarium executoriae, singulari studio considerantes cum nuper exhibitam doctrinam, tum potissimum Episcoporum munia et iura, Nostrum esse consemus normas in Decreto *Christus Dominus* editas, sive perficere, ubi complemento indigeant, sive enucleare, ubi interpretationem desiderent; ut fructus omnes, qui inde exspectantur, plane percipiantur.

Quemadmodum est in comperto, Concilium Oecumenicum, ut promptiora religionis solacia hominibus, nostris hisce diebus nova singularique incitatione viventibus, praebeantur, hanc inter alias Episcopis dioecesanis facultatem facit: *dispensandi a lege generali Ecclesiae in casu particulari fideles, in quos ad normam*

*iuris exercent auctoritatem, quoties id ad eorum bonum spirituale conferre iudicent, nisi a Suprema Auctoritate specialis reservatio facta fuerit (ibid. n. 8, b).*

Hoc igitur praescriptum exsequentes, ut in tota Ecclesia Latina una habeatur norma et ratio agendi, oportere existimamus indicem statuere legum generalium, quarum relaxationis onus Nobis reservandum sit; hoc est, legum, a quibus dispensandis Apostolica Sedes se numquam non continuit, vel a quibus non-nisi perraro, ob res quae in humana consortione momentum obtinent, dispensare consuevit.

Itaque, Officiis Romanae Curiae, Commissionibus Postconciiliaribus, atque Secretariatibus auditis, eorumque sententiis mature perpensis, certa scientia, Suprema et Apostolica auctoritate Nostra, haec quae sequuntur — donec novus Codex Iuris Canonici promulgetur valitura — pro universa Ecclesia Latina sive declaramus sive decernimus.

I. Quas leges providentissima Mater Ecclesia Codice Iuris Canonici sanxit atque aliis deinceps editis documentis statuit nec revocavit, integras ac sanctas declaramus, nisi eas Concilium Oecumenicum Vaticanum II aperte abrogaverit aut iis in quibusdam obrogaverit vel derogaverit.

II. Praescripto Decreti Conciliaris *Christus Dominus*, n. 8 b) canonis 81 C.I.C. tantummodo derogatur.

III. Episcopi dioecesani intelleguntur non solum Episcopi residentiales, sed etiam alii ipsis in iure aequiparati (*ibid.* n. 21). Id postulat paritas iurium, quibus Episcopi dioecesani et alii fruuntur, communisque eorundem iurium ratio, necnon necessitas providendi bono spirituali fidelium. Quare hac dispensandi facultate gaudent etiam Vicarii et Praefecti Apostolici (cfr. can. 294 § 1), Administratores Apostolici permanentiter constituti (cfr. can. 315 § 1), Abbates et Praelati nullius (cfr. can. 323 § 1).

IV. Ad normam can. 80, dispensatio intellegitur *relaxatio legis in casu speciali*. Facultas autem dispensandi exercetur circa *leges praecipientes vel prohibentes*, non autem circa *leges constitutivas*.

In notione dispensationis minime continetur concessio licentiae, facultatis, indulti et absolutionis.

Leges ad processus spectantes, cum ad iurium defensionem sint constitutae, et dispensatio ab iis bonum spirituale fidelium directe non respicit, non sunt obiectum facultatis, de qua agitur in Decreto *Christus Dominus*, n. 8 b).

V. Nomine legis generalis Ecclesiae veniunt leges dumtaxat disciplinares, a Suprema Auctoritate ecclesiastica constitutae, quibus tenentur ubique terrarum omnes pro quibus latae sunt, ad normam can. 13 § 1; minime vero eae leges divinae, cum naturales tum positivae, a quibus unus Summus Pontifex — ubi potestate vicaria utitur — dispensare valet; sicuti accidit in dispensatione a matrimonio rato et non consummato, ab iis quae circa privilegium fidei versantur, et ab aliis.

VI. Casus particularis spectat non tantum singulos fideles, sed etiam plures personas physicas, communitatem sensu stricto constituentes.

VII. Fideles, in quos ad normam iuris auctoritas dispensandi exercetur, sunt ii omnes qui ratione domicilii (cfr. can. 94) vel alius tituli Episcopo subiciuntur.

VIII. Ad normam can. 84 § 1, ad dispensationem concedendam requiritur iusta et rationabilis causa, habita etiam ratione gravitatis legis, a qua dispensatur. Causa vero legitima dispensationis est spirituale fidelium bonum (cfr. Decretum *Christus Dominus* n. 8, b).

IX. Salvis facultatibus Legatis Romani Pontificis et Ordinariis specialiter tributis, Nobis expresse reservamus dispensationes quae sequuntur:

1) Ab obligatione caelibatus seu a prohibitione matrimonii contrahendi, qua diaconi et presbyteri astringuntur, etiam si ad statum laicalem legitime redacti aut regressi sint (cfr. can. 213 § 2).

2) A prohibitionē exercendi ordinem presbyteratus facta coniugatis, qui eundem ordinem sine dispensatione Apostolicae Sedis receperint.

3) A vetito, quod in clericos in sacro Ordine constitutos cadit:

- a) exercendi medicinam vel chirurgiam;
- b) assumendi officia publica, quae exercitium laicalis iurisdictionis vel administrationis secum ferant;
- c) exquirendi vel assumendi munus senatoris vel legiferi deputati, in locis ubi pontificia prohibitio intercesserit;
- d) exercendi per se vel per alios negotiationem aut mercaturam, sive in propriam sive in aliorum utilitatem.

4) A legibus generalibus, quae afficiunt religiosos qua tales, non autem quatenus iidem Ordinariis locorum ad normam iuris communis et praesertim Decreti Conciliaris *Christus Dominus* (nn. 33-35) subsunt, firma semper manente religiosa disciplina et salvo iure proprii Superioris.

A ceteris legibus generalibus, tantum si agatur de sodalibus Religionis clericalis exemptae.

5) Ab obligatione denuntiandi sacerdotem reum delicti sollicitationis in confessione, de qua in can. 904.

6) Ab ordinandorum defectu aetatis, qui annum excedat (*Meminerint Episcopi, in perpendendis causis propter quas ab ordinandorum aetatis defectu dispensare valent, gravitatem eorum quae Decreto Conciliari Optatam totius, n. 12, statuuntur*).

7) A ratione studiorum cursus philosophiae rationalis et theologiae, tum ad legitimum temporis spatium, tum ad primarias disciplinas quod attinet (cfr. Decr. *Optatam totius*, n. 12).

8) Ab omnibus irregularitatibus ad forum iudiciale deductis.

9) Ab irregularitatibus et impedimentis ad ordines suscipiendos:

- a) ab irregularitate ex defectu, si agatur de filiis adul-



terinis vel sacrilegis, de corpore vitiatis, de epilepticis et amentibus;

b) ab irregularitate ex delicto publico eorum, qui apostasiam a fide consummaverint, aut ad haeresim vel schisma transierint;

c) ab irregularitate ex delicto publico eorum qui matrimonium attentare, aut civilem tantum actum ponere ausi sint, vel ipsimet vinculo matrimoniali aut ordine sacro aut votis religiosis etiam simplicibus ac temporariis ligati, vel cum muliere iisdem votis adstricta aut matrimonio valido coniuncta (can. 985, 3°);

d) ab irregularitate ex delicto sive publico sive occulto eorum qui voluntarium homicidium perpetrarint, aut fetus humani abortum procuraverint, effectu secuto, omnesque cooperatores (can. 985, 4°);

e) ab impedimento quo viri uxorem habentes prohibentur sacrum ordinem presbyteratus recipere.

10) *Ad exercitium ordinis iam suscepti*, quod attinet, ab irregularitatibus de quibus in can. 985, 3, in casibus tantum publicis; et 4, etiam in casibus occultis, nisi recursus ad S. Poenitentiarium sit impossibilis, firmo tamen onere in ipso dispensato recurrendi quam primum ad eandem S. Poenitentiarium.

11) Ab impedimento aetatis ad matrimonium validum contrahendum, quoties aetatis defectus annum excedat.

12) Ab impedimento matrimoniali orto ex diaconatu, vel sacro ordine presbyteratus, vel ex sollemni professione religiosa.

13) Ab impedimento criminis, de quo in can. 1075, 2° et 3°.

14) Ab impedimento consanguinitatis in linea recta et in linea collateralis usque ad secundum gradum mixtum cum primo.

15) Ab impedimento orto ex affinitate in linea recta.

16) Ab omnibus impedimentis matrimonialibus, si agatur de matrimoniis mixtis, quotiescumque servari nequeunt condiciones requisitae in n. I Instructionis *Matrimonii Sacramentum* a



S. Congregatione pro Doctrina fidei, die 18 martii 1966 editae (cfr. A.A.S. LVIII [1966] p. 237).

17) A forma iure praescripta ad valide contrahendum matrimonium.

18) A lege renovandi consensum matrimonialem in sanatione in radice, quoties:

a) requiritur dispensatio super impedimento Sedi Apostolicae reservato;

b) agitur de impedimento iuris naturalis vel divini, quod iam cessaverit;

c) agitur de matrimoniis mixtis, cum servatae non fuerint condiciones praescriptae in commemorata Instructione S. Congregationis pro Doctrina fidei, n. I.

19) A poena vindicativa iure communi statuta, quae ab ipsa Sede Apostolica declarata vel inflicta fuerit.

20) A tempore statuto pro ieiunio eucharistico.

Normae de facultatibus dispensandi, Episcopis iuxta Conciliare Decretum *Christus Dominus* tributis, valere incipient a die XV mensis Augusti huius anni.

Quaecumque vero a Nobis hisce Litteris motu proprio datis statuta sunt, ea omnia firma ac rata esse iubemus, contrariis quibuslibet non obstantibus.

Datum Romae, apud Sanctum Petrum, die XV mensis Iunii, anno MDCCCCLXVI, Pontificatus Nostri tertio.

PAULUS PP. VI

(L'OSSERVATORE ROMANO, 16 GIUGNO, 1966)

## SACRA CONGREGATIO PRO DOCTRINA FIDEI

### NOTIFICATIO

Post Litteras Apostolicas, a verbis incipientes «*Integrae servandae*» Motu Proprio datas die VII mensis decembris anno 1965, non paucae pervenerunt ad S. Sedem percontationes de Indicis librorum prohibitorum conditione, quo Ecclesia ad integritatem fidei et morum, iuxta divinum mandatum, tuendam hucusque usa est.

Ut memoratis petitionibus respondeatur, haec S. Congregatio pro Doctrina Fidei, facto verbo cum Beatissimo Patre, nuntiat Indicem suum vigorem moralem servare, quatenus Christifidelium conscientiam docet, ut ab illis scriptis, ipso iure naturali exigente, caveant, quae fidem ac bonos mores in discrimen adducere possint; eundem tamen non amplius vim legis ecclesiasticae habere cum adiectis censuris.

Quam ob rem Ecclesia fidelium maturae conscientiae confidit, praesertim auctorum et editorum catholicorum atque eorum qui iuvenibus instituendis operam navant. Firmissimam autem spem collocat in vigili sollicitudine et singulorum Ordinariorum et Conferentiarum Episcopaliurn, quorum ius et officium est libros noxios tum inspiciendi tum praeveniendi atque, si res tulerit, reprehendendi et improbandi.

S. Congregatio pro Doctrina Fidei, ad mentem Litterarum Apostolicarum «*Integrae servandae*» ac Concilii Vaticani II decre-

torum, communicare sataget, si opus est, cum orbis catholici Ordinariis ut eorum sedulitatem adiuvet, in diiudicandis operibus editis, in sana contra insidiosam promovenda cultura, collatis etiam viribus cum Institutis et studiorum Universitatibus.

Si autem doctrinae et opiniones quovis modo evulgatae prodierint, quae fidei ac morum principiis adversentur, et eorum auctores ad errores corrigendos humaniter invitati id facere noluerint, S. Sedes iure et officio suo utetur ad talia scripta etiam publice reprobanda, ut animorum bono ea qua par est firmitate consulat.

Apte denique providebitur, ut Ecclesiae iudicium de editis operibus in Christifidelium notitiam perveniat.

*Datum Romae, ex Aedibus S. Officii, d. XIV iunii, a. MCMLXVI.*

A. Card. OTTAVIANI  
Pro-Praefectus S. C.  
pro Doctrina Fidei

P. PARENTE  
a Secretis

(L'OSSERVATORE ROMANO, 15 GIUGNO, 1966)

## SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

### DECRETUM

#### *De editionibus librorum liturgicorum*

Cum, nostra aetate, novae librorum liturgicorum editiones, praesertim cum textu populari, ubique fere parentur, opportunum videtur sequentes praebere normas, quibus in tuto ponatur dignitas et decus librorum liturgicorum, ita, ut, iuxta pervetustam Ecclesiae traditionem, cultui divino perfectiora ingenii humani opera offerantur, et exinde fideles ad debitam sacrarum rerum venerationem excitentur.

1. Librorum liturgicorum, unum textum latinum referentium, ea dicitur «editio typica», quae Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis ex decreto S. Rituum Congregationis edita fuerit.

Librorum vero liturgicorum editio, quibus popularis interpretatio, aut cum textu latino vel sola continetur, pariter dicitur «editio typica» quae, cura Coetus Episcoporum, in qualibet Natione evulgatur. Decretum autem quo huiusmodi editio «typica» declaratur, datur a Praeside Coetus Episcoporum aut, de eius mandato, a Praeside Commissionis liturgicae nationalis. In eodem decreto mentio fiat de confirmatione textus ab Apostolica Sede concessa.

2. Ad ius quod attinet editiones «iuxta typicam» apparandi:

a) id ad libros excudendos, qui unum textum latinum referunt, iis reservatur Editoribus, qui diplomate Pontificio gaudent;

- b) ad libros vero edendos, qui simul textum latinum et popularem, aut unum textum popularem continent, idem ius a Coetu Episcoporum cuiusque Nationis iis Editoribus, quos ipse Coetus maluerit, tribui potest.

3. Praestat ut in qualibet Natione Coetus Episcoporum, ratione habita tum praescriptorum legis civilis tum consuetudinum in Natione vigentium pro libris edendis, statuatur quinam sint Editores, quibus munus committatur edendi libros cum textu populari, usui liturgico destinandos.

4. Librorum, qui usui liturgico destinantur, mensura, ornatu et universa imprimendi ratio ea sint, quae in decorem et reverentiam, libris liturgicis debita, cedant.

5. Editiones Missalis et Breviarii, quae usui liturgico inseriunt, et interpretationem popularem exhibent, ad normam nn. 57 et 89 Instructionis huius S. R. C. diei 26 sept. 1964, textum quoque latinum contineant oportet.

Eadem norma servetur ad Pontificalis romani editiones quod attinet.

6. Popularis interpretatio textui latino apponatur iis tantum partibus, quae, ex decreto Coetus Episcoporum, lingua vernacula proferri possunt.

7. Breves admonitiones, a sacerdote vel competenti ministro dicendae (cf. *Const. de sacra Liturgia*, art. 35, 3), quae aliquando nonnullis partibus sacrorum rituum opportune praemittuntur, bene a textu liturgico distinguantur.

8. Ut Editor ad libros usui liturgico destinatos imprimendos procedere possit, debet:

- a) si agitur de libris unum textum latinum praebentibus, singulis vicibus licentiam obtinere ab hac S. Rituum Congregatione, simulque cum Administratione Bonorum S. Sedis conventionem inire de condicionibus ad publicam horum librorum divulgationem spectantibus;
- b) si agitur de libris textum latinum simul cum textu populari, aut unum textum popularem, referentibus, licentiam obtinere a Praeside Coetus Episcoporum, simulque cum eo de condicionibus pro publica horum librorum divulgatione conventionem inire, tum pro parte quae ad Administrationem Bonorum S. Sedis, pro textu latino, spectat, tum pro parte quae ad ipsum Coetum Episcoporum, pro textu populari, pertinet.



9. Concordantia cum editione typica, tum pro textu latino tum pro textu populari, ab Ordinario loci, iuxta can. 1390 C. I. C., concedenda, ne subscribatur nisi post diligentem atque accuratam revisionem.

10. Normae huius decreti, salvis iis quae n. 5 dicuntur, respiciunt editiones usui liturgico destinatas Breviarii romani, Missalis romani, Ritualis romani, Pontificalis romani, Martyrologii romani et Caeremonialis, Episcoporum necnon libros cantus gregoriani, sive de integro libro, sive de eius tantum parte agatur.

11. Ut autem centrum habeatur, apud quod possibile sit plenam seriem invenire omnium textuum liturgicorum, qui in universo orbe usu veniunt, E.mi Coetuum Episcoporum Praesides:

- a) Consilio ad exsequendam Constitutionem de sacra Liturgia significant nomina Editorum, quibus munus commissum fuerit liturgicas editiones apparandi;
- b) curent autem ut editionum liturgicarum, quae in eorum ditione evulgantur, duo exemplaria ad Secretariam eiusdem Consilii mittantur.

Praesens Decretum, a S. Rituum Congregatione et a Consilio ad exsequendam Constitutionem de sacra Liturgia paratum, Summus Pontifex in Audientia die 27 ianuarii 1966 Emo Card. Arcadio M. Larraona, S. R. C. Praefecto, concessa, approbavit et auctoritate Sua confirmavit et publici iuris fieri iussit, ab iis ad quos spectat fideliter servandum.

Contrariis quibuslibet minime obstantibus.

Romae, die 27 ianuarii 1966.

IACOBUS Cad. LERCARO  
*Archiepiscopus Bononiensis*  
*Praeses Consilii ad exsequendam*  
*Constitutionem de sacra Liturgia*

ARCADIUS M. Card. LARRAONA  
*S. R. C. Praefectus*

Ferdinandus Antonelli  
*S. R. C. a Secretis*

## SACRA PAENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA

(SECTIO DE INDULGENTIIS)

### DECRETUM

*Oratio Officii recitationi praemittenda Indulgentiis ditatur*

Maiestati tuae, Domine Deus, hoc sacrificium laudis offerimus: et, cum famulo tuo Pontifice Nostro Paulo devoto mentis obsequio coniuncti, immensam tuam exoramus misericordiam, ut qui celebratione Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani secundi Ecclesiam tuam laetificare voluisti, salutares eius fructus in universo mundo multiplicare digneris. Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

*Die 13 Ianuarii 1966*

*Ssmus D. N. Paulus div. Prov. Pp. VI tum clericis tum religiosis viris ac mulieribus, si ante Divinum Officium vel Parvum Officium B. M. V. aut quodlibet Officium, secundum proprias constitutiones persoivendum, supra relatam orationem devote recitaverint, Indulgentias quae sequuntur benigne dilargiri dignatus est: 1. partialem quingentorum dierum saltem corde contrito acquirendam; 2. plenariam, suetis conditionibus, semel in mense adipiscendam, si quotidie per integrum mensem eandem recitationem iteraverint. Praesenti in perpetuum ab hac ipsa die valituro.*

*Contrariis quibuslibet minime obstantibus.*

✠ F. Card. CENTO, Paenitentiarius Maior

L. ✠ S.

I. Sessolo, Regens

## **DIOCESAN CURIAE**

### **BISHOP'S RESIDENCE**

Tuguegarao, Cagayan

June 23, 1966

**On Seminars about Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity**

**REVEREND AND DEAR FATHER:**

The National Secretariate of Catholic Action of the Philippines informed us that at the Seminar on the Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity held at San Beda College last May 7 & 8, one of the resolutions passed was the following:

“That the Seminar and Forms on the Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity be held in Dioceses for the purpose of disseminating the letter and spirit of the Decree all over the country.”

For this reason, the Diocesan Central Committee of Catholic Action will conduct the suggested seminar according to this schedule:

- a) July 31, 1966—in PAMPLONA—for all parishes in the Vicariate of Pamplona;
- b) August 7—in APARRI—for the parishes in the Vicariates of Aparri, Sta. Ana and Gattaran;
- c) August 21—in ILAGAN—for the parishes in the Vicariates of Ilagan, Tumauni and Cauayan;

- d) September 4—in BAYOMBONG—for the parishes in the Vicariate of Bayombong;
- e) September 18—in AMULUNG—for the parishes in the Vicariate of Tuguegarao;
- f) October 2—in SANTIAGO—for the parishes in the Vicariate of Santiago;
- g) October 16—in PIAT—for the parishes of the Vicariates of Piat and Solana.

In this connection, the Reverend Parish Priests of the towns where the Seminar will be held are hereby requested to follow up this communication by giving reminders to the different parishes supposed to attend and also by coordinating the activities.

Permit me to state further:

- a) The Seminar will last just for one day, starting if possible at 8 A.M.—to culminate with a Dialogue Mass at around 4 P.M.
- b) To save the parish where the Seminar is held from further trouble, meals and snacks should be taken care of by those attending the Seminar. A packed lunch would be handy as well as time-saving.
- c) NO REGISTRATION FEE will be charged.

Reverend and dear Father: The Church has pinned her hope in the Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity. Let us all work for its implementation. Convince as many as possible of your Catholic Actionists to attend this Seminar.

Thanking your Reverence for your kind cooperation and with every best wish, I remain,

Devotedly yours in Christ,

✠ TEODULFO S. DOMINGO  
Bishop of Tuguegarao

## DOCTRINAL SECTION

### THE POST-COUNCIL AND TODAY'S CHRISTIAN

Truly enough, the real historical significance of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council will not be known for years, even for decades. Yet, its vital impact and religious influence are beginning to pervade the life of the Church and the lives of the Christians. In some places of the Christian world, "little councils" are being held to study and assimilate Vatican II's call for renewal to the diverse spheres of Christian commitment and the different national or local needs. In some others, advisory conferences of laymen, religious and priests are being set up to implement the Council's directives and norms. Aimed at shaping a new attitude of respect, esteem, and love among all Christians, interfaith discussions and biblical services have started to blossom in distinct parts of the globe, as fruitful results of the conciliar teachings.

Here in the Philippines, the only Christian country of the Far East, "dialogues of the Church" are being planned in many dioceses and archdioceses. The archdiocese of Manila, following closely the Jubilee Year proclaimed by Pope Paul VI on his Apostolic Constitution *Mirificus Eventus* — of December 7, 1965 —, is carrying out a well-thought-out program of religious services and conferences for the Extraordinary Jubilee Celebrations. Rufino J. Cardinal Santos, in his Circular to the faithful, of February 2, 1966, clearly expressed the goal of these celebrations — which is the goal of the Post-council—: "The Jubilee is then the great means of preparing our souls for the understanding of these salutary doctrines, the great means of preparing our minds to undertake a wholesome renewal of our whole Christian life according to the spirit of the Council and the Church." On a higher level, the archdiocese of the Cardinal is organizing a series of familiar dialogues between the clergy and the faithful; the first of these promising dialogues was held from April 29



to May 1, 1966, to discuss the Constitution on the Church. Also in Manila, two leading Catholic Schools—the University of Santo Tomas and the Ateneo de Manila University—set up a Series of Conferences, held throughout March, on the religious meaningfulness and relevance of Vatican II for today's Christian and modern man.

Of what significance are these flowering post-conciliar celebrations and programs? Why this almost feverish interest in Vatican II, which is already a historic reality in the life of the Church? The answer to these and similar questions is simple enough: *the Church is in the post-conciliar period*. And so is the Christian. Although the XXI Ecumenical Council was solemnly closed on December 8, 1965, after a four-year-meeting of intensive and impressive work, truly speaking, it is not yet finished: the Christian will encounter it on his path for a long time to come.

Vatican II is already an extraordinary, unparalleled historic reality, most probably the religious event of the twentieth century. However, it is not yet—as it aims at being—a living reality in the life of the Church and in the lives of the Christians. The Post-council is charged with the urgent responsibility of making Vatican II a living reality! So important is the post-conciliar period that the real success or failure of the Council depends fundamentally on the real success or failure of the Post-council. In this regard, the timely words of Pope Paul VI are unequivocally clear: "In fact, the successful outcome of the Council and its salutary fruit in the life of the Church depend not so much on the multiplicity of norms as upon the seriousness and commitment with which the conciliar deliberations are molded into practical daily living in future years" (*Apostolic Exhortation*: November 4, 1965).

What is the Post-council? What is the duty, the responsibility of the Christian in this period following the historic celebration of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council? These two relevant questions we intend to answer here.

## 1. VATICAN II

The Post-council, the period following the celebration of the Council, aims at carrying out the program of wholesome renewal threshed out inside St. Peter's walls during the four-session gath-

ering. How many years will be needed to implement the directives of Vatican II? It is difficult — not to say impossible — to answer this question now with precision; definitely, it will take some years before the promises of the Council become realities: it took 30 years or more for the Council of Trent to become a living reality in the life of the Church.

The post-conciliar period began after the official closure of Vatican II on December 8, 1965. Perhaps we should say with "La Croix," that it started before, on November 18, 1965, with the moving speech of Pope Paul VI to the General Session. In this wonderful speech, the Holy Father distinguished three different complementary stages of Vatican II: first, the stage of hopeful preparation; second, the stage of effective celebration, and third, the stage of implementation of the conciliar decisions. To understand more accurately what is the Post-council, we shall have to recall, in broad lines, the purpose of the first two stages.

*The first stage of Vatican II*, the period of surprising, hopeful, and joyful enthusiasm, began on January 25, 1959, the day when Pope John XXIII gladly announced to a group of eighteen Cardinals his inspired intention to convene the XXI Ecumenical Council. What for? What kind of Ecumenical Council? The fatherly Pope explained that Vatican II would be an *ecumenical* council in a twofold way — ecumenical, because it would be a formal gathering of the whole hierarchy of the Catholic Church, and, also because it would strive towards the attainment of Christian Unity. On the evening of the 25 of January, the Vatican issued a communiqué which averred: "The Holy Father does not envisage that the aim of the Council is only to procure the spiritual good of the Christian people; it is also to be an invitation to the separated communities to join in the search for unity." The Council's watchwords would be "aggiornamento," updating, renewal. When someone asked Pope John the meaning of "aggiornamento" he answered: "To open the windows of the Church and let in the fresh air."

*The second stage of Vatican II*, the period of effective development and work in Rome, was inaugurated on October 11, 1962, with the opening of the Council by Pope John XXIII. In his Opening Speech of the First Session, Pope John declared that "aggiornamento" — or updating — of the Church would have two well defined dimensions: first, the internal renewal of the Church, and, second, the revitalization of the Church's approach to the modern world. He said: "The Council's chief objective is

this: that the sacred deposit of Christian doctrine shall be maintained and taught in a more effective form." Vatican II would care not merely — to use the enlightening distinction of theologian E. H. Schillebeeckx — *de fide pure custodienda*, but *de fide vitaliter custodienda*: how can we keep the true faith *alive* in our modern world? Accordingly, Vatican II hopefully opened as a *pastoral Council*.

The historic second stage developed through Four conciliar Sessions, throughout the fall of 1962, 1963, 1964, and 1965. In 281 days of thoughtful debates and serious deliberations, and under the assistance of the Holy Spirit, more than 2,400 Fathers, backed by 400 theologians, discussed, debated, and approved sixteen important Documents, the doctrinal heritage of Vatican II.

Did Vatican II end after its stage of celebration in Rome? Certainly not. For as the period of preparation was extended to the stage of celebration, so also, the stage of celebration was continued to the period of implementation: *the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council* — as the XX preceding Ecumenical Councils of the Church — *is for the Post-council*.

## 2. AFTER VATICAN II

We are now in the third stage of the Council, the period of the implementation and application of the conciliar Documents: *the Post-council*. What is the duty of the Christian in this period? What is the role he is to play? In the post-conciliar period, the Christian has an active role to play: he is asked to participate in this stage, and to participate actively — not only through prayers and sacrifices, as he was asked to do by Pope John, and, afterwards, by Pope Paul, during the Council's stages of preparation and celebration; but, also and specially, through the faithful acceptance and application of the conciliar directives to his Christian life. For the Christian, we may truly say, *the Post-council is the most important period*, for — as the Catholic weekly *Ecclesia* of Spain rightly editorialized (March 12, 1966) — "the history of the Councils shows that their greater or lesser efficacy is decided, almost always, in the post-conciliar period; hence the transcendence of the moment in which we live."

Because of the unparalleled relevance of the present time, the Christian should adequately realize the purpose and goal of the Post-council. No one better than the Popes of Vatican II

have pointed out authoritatively these purpose and goal. Pope John XXIII in his Closing Speech at the First Session, on December 8, 1962 affirmed: "The thing to do then will be to extend to every sphere of the Church's life, including those bearing upon social questions, the directives of the Council, and of applying them with 'generous, sincere, and assiduous determination' (prayer for the Ecumenical Council). *This most important stage* will see the pastors united in a gigantic task of preaching sound doctrine and of applying the laws they themselves will have made; and for this work the collaboration of the diocesan and regular clergy, religious orders, and of the Catholic laity in every sphere and to their full capability, will be needed, so that *what the Fathers have done may be seconded by the most joyful and loyal response.*"

Pope Paul VI expressed clearly and urgently the same Johannine thoughts in his aforementioned speech of November 18, 1965: "It seems to us very important to realize what our attitude must be during the post-conciliar period. . . , the time of the resolutions, acceptance, and execution of the conciliar Documents. For this moment each one of us should always be prepared. The time of discussion is closed and the period of understanding begins. *This is the moment of true 'aggiornamento,'* augured by our venerated predecessor John XXIII. . . . For all of us 'aggiornamento' shall mean, from now on, clear understanding of the spirit of the Council, and faithful application of the directives outlined by the Council in a felicitous and holy manner. . . . Clergy and faithful will encounter a magnificent spiritual work to pursue for the renewal of their lives and their activity according to Christ. To this work we invite all our brethren and children."

The Post-council, then, is the moment of true 'aggiornamento.' The urgent moment for the Christian to renew his life according to the pastoral and ecumenical tides of the XXI Ecumenical Council. The Christian is earnestly called to renewal. All Christians, all the people of God. Pope Paul VI made this unerringly clear to the visiting pilgrims of January 26, 1966: "We have confidence that it will not be only the theologians and the preachers, not only the pastors of souls and the specialists of the spiritual sciences, but equally the people plunged in the profane life, the intelligent men and women, who will try to receive from the great event which was the Council a certain teaching properly religious, a certain impression, a certain stimulant, a certain ray of light and comfort."



### 3. THE RIGHT CHRISTIAN ATTITUDE

The Post-council, then, is the time of conciliar renewal. The attainment of this renewal is a difficult and dangerous undertaking. For there are wrong and right renewals. The Christian is burdened with the grave responsibility of achieving the true Christian renewal of Vatican II. What is true Christian renewal? What is the right attitude of the Christian in carrying out properly this conciliar renewal?

Jean Guitton, a famed lay theologian and Auditor at Vatican II, in an article published in *la France Catholique* (February, 1966) warned all Christians of two wrong attitudes towards renewal. The French writer said that there is, in the first place, the "danger d'inertie," meaning the obstinate interior resistance to the program of reform called for by Vatican II. Pope Paul VI had previously condemned this attitude, in his Address to the General Audience of December 15, 1965, thus: "the attitude of those who, now that the Council is over, would go back to what they were before. . . . They would go back to the religious and moral habits they had before the Council, and probably not because of the value of those habits . . . ; no, they would go back out of inertia, out of laziness, out of comfort which those previously acquired habits seemed to give and to guarantee." It is a wrong attitude for — Pope Paul VI continues in the same speech — it "would not be in accord with the Council's spirit of renewal and would not be worthy of devout and alert children of the Church. And so that is not to be our attitude."

This first wrong attitude of renewal of the too-narrowminded Christians of the Church is not the worst: "It is not the more grave danger that threatens the faith," Jean Guitton wrote in the aforementioned article. And he continued: "The second danger is more real: this is the attitude of those who want to see the Council not as a 'development of doctrine,' which remains equal to that of its origin in its adaptations throughout the centuries, but as a 'break' with the past, a 'rediscovery,' after fifteen centuries, of the evangelical truth" (Cited by L'OSSERVATORE ROMANO, February 11, French Edition, p. 3). In his previously mentioned speech, the Holy Father also referred to this wrong attitude of the too-openminded Christians; and Pope Paul VI condemned it also: "The attitude of 'conciliarism,' which is the opposite of the above and would want a permanent Council . . . , the attitude of those who would subject clear and long established truths and laws to a permanent 'debate.' They would



continue the dialectical processes of the Council, attributing to themselves the competence and authority to introduce their own innovating or destructive criteria in the analysis of dogmas, statutes, rites, and the spirituality of the Catholic Church, in order to conform Her thought and her life to the spirit of the times."

The right attitude of the Christian of the Post-council is to sail courageously between the destructive waves of those two wrong attitudes. It should avoid, on one hand, the unmovable and lazy inertia of those Christians who dreadfully frown at the very word reform, and, on the other, the guideless post-conciliar changes of those who seem to forget that before Vatican II, twenty Ecumenical Councils were held. The right attitude of renewal faithfully guards the 'deposit of faith,' and fearlessly adapts it to the situation and needs of the age, without compromising that sacred deposit.

Where can the Christian find the principles of renewal to attain the right attitude? In the authoritative teachings of Vatican II. That is, in the Documents issued by the Council. How can he Christian make the conciliar renewal part and parcel of his life? By faithfully accepting and willingly practicing the directives of these Documents. The right Christian attitude of renewal consists precisely in carrying out the program of reform thoughtfully outlined in the Documents: "Therefore, the right attitude, the attitude which the faithful of the Church should take today with regard to the Council is not that of 'debating,' that is, of subjecting to doubt and questioning the things that the Council has taught us. The right attitude is that of putting into practice, studying and understanding the conciliar teachings and applying them in the actual context of Christian life." After these enlightening words of Pope Paul VI to the General Audience of December 15, 1965, the Holy Father asked meditatively: "If this be lacking, what good would the Council have done?"

#### 4. THE DOCUMENTS OF VATICAN II

Sixteen conciliar Documents constitute the promising heritage of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council. They form a body of doctrines and laws which must give the Christian that renewal for which the Council was convoked. But to conclude that these Documents form a *complete* body of Christian doc-

trine would be wrong and greatly hazardous: it would be tantamount to the taking of the second attitude of renewal, the attitude of those Christians who want to see the Council as a "break" in the Church's teaching and not as a continuation and adaptation of that ecclesiastical teaching. By its very nature, the teachings of a particular Council take their place in the context and continuity of all the precedent Councils. Again, the authoritative words of Pope Paul adequately illustrate what we are saying: "Let us keep this in mind: the teachings of the Council do not form an organic and complete body of Catholic doctrine. As everyone knows, that doctrine is much wider and it has not been questioned nor substantially modified by the Council. . . . We must not separate the teachings of the Council from the doctrinal patrimony of the Church. We should see how they are inserted into it, how they give it witness, growth, explanation, and application. Then even the doctrinal or normative 'novelties' of the Council take on their just proportions and do not create objections against the faithfulness of the Church to her teaching function" (Address of Pope Paul to the General Audience, January 12, 1966).

The teachings of Vatican II should be considered as the great act of the ecclesiastical magisterium, and the Christian is obliged to docilely accept them as ripened fruit of this magisterium. However, should they be taken as infallible magisterium? This question is often asked by some Christians. *Are the sixteen Documents*, the impressive work of 2,212 oral interventions, and 4,361 written interventions of the conciliar Fathers, *infallible in nature*? They are not: although all of them were approved by an overwhelming majority of the Fathers, and, afterwards, promulgated by Pope Paul VI, none of the Documents possess the note of infallibility. In his Address to the General Audience of January 12, 1966, Pope Paul clearly confirmed this: "Given the pastoral character of the Council, the proclamation in extraordinary form of dogmas attached with the note of infallibility has been avoided."

In these Documents, then, nothing should be regarded as infallible, because nothing was specifically proposed as such. They propose to the Christian the authentic teaching of the Church in a *supreme ordinary magisterium*. The Documents are truly authoritative: they are not infallible, that is, their doctrines and norms are not irrevocable and definitive; they cannot ask acts of faith from the Christian. They are — as final product of an Ecumenical Council — an exercise of the highest

magisterium of the Church. Consequently, their teachings cannot be questioned by the Christian. They must be accepted by him, with sincere and docile acceptance. They ask of all Catholics what is called in theology "religious assent," "obedience of the mind."

Regarding the teaching authority of these Documents, Fr. Gregory Baum, theologian adviser to the Council, expertly wrote in *the Ecumenist* (Sept.-Oct., 1965, p. 93): "The authority of the conciliar teaching is not infallible. It is an exercise of the highest magisterium of the Catholic Church and hence will be received by all Catholics, from the Pope to the least of the faithful, with religious assent. Catholics everywhere will sincerely try to enter into this teaching, possess it, make it their own. They will gladly let their attitudes and actions be influenced by it."

Vatican II did not define infallibly any new dogma or truth, because it was, primarily, not a doctrinal Council (as most of the previous Ecumenical Councils), but a *pastoral Council*. Pastoral, that is, its teachings are pastorally oriented. The outstanding pastoral character of Vatican II was clearly manifested in all the debates in St. Peter's aula; accordingly it runs deeply in all the sixteen conciliar Documents. After all, the conciliar Fathers were faithfully seconding the intention of Pope John XXIII who, in his Opening Address at the First Session said: "(The authentic doctrine) of the Church needs to be studied and expounded according to modern disciplines of research and presentation. The substance of the ancient doctrine, contained in the 'deposit of faith,' is one thing: its formulation is quite another; *that* depends, for its structure and harmony, upon the needs of the magisterium, of which the main function is that of the *pastoral ministry*."

The pastoral teaching of Vatican II should be understood — again we borrow the words of Fr. Gregory Baum, in the above cited article — "not as the teaching of new truths, but, rather, as a deeper penetration of the Gospel, explained in the language of contemporary man, with a view to solving his religious problems" (*The Ecumenist*, *ibid.*, pp. 89-90). It underlines — as Fr. Schillebeeckx points out in his booklet "Vatican II, a Struggle of Minds," p. 22 — "the re-affirmation of ancient truths in such a way that they appeal once more to the people of today."

A second common note, besides their markedly pastoral nature, characterizes the sixteen conciliar Documents: their *positive approach* to the problems and questions dealt with. They

do not condemn errors or heresies, but defend religious and human values. They are not intended to sow divisions and barriers in the Christian's soul, but to plant seeds of unity and build bridges of understanding with all men. They are courteous invitations to dialogue, and not to polemics; invitations to universal dialogue based on the dignity of man and the demands of Christian love. Pope Paul VI referred to this unmistakable spirit of openness and dialogue in his Christmas Message of 1965: "The Church comes to you (to all men) without any pride; without claiming any particular privilege. . . . She has no ambitions at all either to dominate or to enrich herself. She offers a Christian service, a positive and selfless service, for the peace of humanity, for its prosperity, for its hope in the transcendent destiny of salvation and goodness, made accessible to men by Christ. . . ."

The secular press, throughout its many reports on the Council, has highly praised this positive approach of the conciliar Documents. *TIME* magazine — in its evaluating essay of Vatican II: December 17, 1965, p. 18 — commented: "Vatican II was strikingly different from the 20 other ecclesiastical assemblies that Roman Catholicism ranks as ecumenical. It is the first Council that did not face, or leave in its wake, heresy or schism. . . . The essentials of Catholic dogma stand, of course, as does Rome's claim of universality. What has changed drastically is atmosphere and attitudes. . . . The Council indicates a new attitude toward a complex, pluralistic world."

## 5. THREE KINDS OF CONCILIAR DOCUMENTS

Vatican II was a pastoral Council aimed at approaching the other Christian Churches and the world in a spirit of understanding and dialogue. And yet, although it was not a doctrinal council — in the sense explained above — it has been hailed as the Council of *doctrinal renewal*. Of a twofold renewal, as clearly stated in the teachings of the conciliar Documents: the *internal renewal* of the Church — renewal within the Church —, and *external renewal* — renewal of the Church in her relationship with other Churches and the world—; a renewal *ad intra* and *ad extra*, as Fr. Congar puts it.

In the Post-council, the Christian is obliged to assimilate the principles of the twofold renewal outlined in the Documents. And to accept the conciliar decisions with the "theological quali-



fication" proper to each Document—for not all the Documents possess the same nature and tone.

The conciliar Documents are divided into three different kinds: *Constitutions* (Documents with a heavier doctrinal nature); *Decrees* (with a more practical and normative character); and *Declarations* (pronouncements or statements in a given matter).

The *Constitutions* are the most fundamental Documents on the doctrinal renewal of Vatican II. They are four: *On the Liturgy* (second session: promulgated on December 4, 1963); *On the Church* (third session: November 21, 1964); *On Divine Revelation* (November 18, 1964); *On the Church in the Modern World* (fourth session: December 7, 1965).

The *Decrees* are nine: *On the Media of Social Communication* (December 4, 1963); *On Ecumenism* (November 21, 1964); *On the Catholic Oriental Churches* (November 21, 1964); *On the Pastoral Office of the Bishops* (October 28, 1965); *On the Renewal and Adaptation of the Religious Life* (October 28, 1965); *On Priestly Training* (October 28, 1965); *On the Apostolate of the Laity* (November 18, 1965); *On the Missionary Activity of the Church* (December 7, 1965); *On the Life and the Ministry of the Priests* (December 7, 1965).

The *Declarations* are three: *On the Relations of the Church with Non-Christian Religions* (October 28, 1965); *On Christian Education* (October 28, 1965); *On Religious Freedom* (December 7, 1965).

Of the sixteen Documents — the tremendous crowning result of 544 ballotings of almost 2,500 Fathers—, twelve present the program of *renewal within the Church*. A program of wholesome renewal, in the worship of the people of God, and in the apostolate of the people of God — in the hierarchy, in the religious life, in the laity. All the people of God of the Church of Christ must sail on the hopeful waves of internal renewal. *The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church*, which is considered as the heart of the Council's work, should be the heart of this inside-the-Church renewal: in the words of Pope Paul VI, this most relevant Document may come "to be considered the crowning achievement that will distinguish this solemn and sacred synod in the memory of future ages" (Closing Address at the Second Session, December 4, 1963).



Four conciliar Documents refer, specially, to the external renewal of the Church of Christ and the Christian, renewal in universal dialogue. *The Decree on Ecumenism* enunciates the principles and norms for a Christian dialogue with all Christians; *the Declaration on the Relations of the Church with Non-Christian Religions* speaks of the dialogue of the Christian with Non-Christian believers; *the Declaration on Religious Freedom*, a dialogue with all men, based on the dignity of man. (Concerning this universal dialogue these timely words of Pope Paul VI in his first encyclical should be remembered: "our own dialogue should be potentially universal, i.e., all-embracing and capable of including all, excepting only one who would either absolutely reject it or insincerely pretend to accept it," *Ecclesiam Suam*, No. 64).

*The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*, the longest and, perhaps, the most original conciliar Document, should be singled out as the most relevant Document to guide the Christian in his earthly tasks and dialogue with all men. Pope Paul advised that "all intelligent men, all honest souls must know these pages" (Christmas Message: December 24, 1965).

## 6. CHRISTIAN RENEWAL

The role of the Christian, then, his post-conciliar responsibility consists in his serious study, accurate understanding, and uncompromising execution of the Documents of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council; in accepting them sincerely and docilely; in digesting them, so their imperative guidelines for Christian renewal become part and parcel of his life in pilgrimage.

The Documents are, before all else, "charters of renewal," as Presbyterian theologian and observer to Vatican II Robert McAfee Brown adequately labeled them. They attempt at generating in the Christian a true attitude of renewal. This attitude — we repeat — means not comfortable ways, but change, reform. And being grounded upon the authoritative teachings of the Council, this change and reform will accurately distinguish what is constant and what is changeable, what is eternal and what is temporal, what is absolute and what is relative, in the 'deposit of faith.' This change and reform will certainly not be an appeasing concession to the ways and tides of the age.

Christian renewal is the task and goal of the Post-council. It should water the whole life of the Christian: the worship of the people of God, as well as their temporal commitments in the world of man. It should nourish the personal, family and social life of the Christian.

A wholesome Christian renewal: *exterior* — some rites and laws and customs are to be reformed—, and *interior renewal*. However, it must be, primarily, an interior renewal. Pope Paul VI has said: "The conciliar renewal is not measured so much by changes in outward norms and customs, as it is by a change in certain mental attitudes, a change in a certain interior inertia, a change in a certain resistance of the heart to the truly Christian spirit. The first change, and the most important, is what we ordinarily call the 'conversion' of the heart. We must, as St. Paul says, 'be renewed in the spirit of your mind' (Eph. 4, 23). We must think in a new way. Here the reform begins, here is the 'aggiornamento'" (Address to the General Audience of December 15, 1965).

The Christian renewal called for by Vatican II is, most of all, a *spiritual renewal*. A renewal which for the Christian fundamentally consists in a renewed faithfulness to Christ and his Church. The genuineness of this spiritual transformation in the heart of the Christian will be proved by the living fire of *the spirit of poverty* and *the spirit of charity*, the two essential characteristics of this spiritual renewal, as unequivocally expressed by Pope Paul VI in his masterly *Ecclesiam Suam*.

The bell of renewal is ringing throughout the Church of Christ. It is calling all Christians to post-conciliar renewal. The call is loud and clear. The Christian cannot but answer it! Answer it, after John XXIII, the fatherly Pope who set the pace of true Christian renewal, by writing the first encyclical in the history of the Church to all men of good will, by opening the Council and "opening the windows of the Church, letting in the fresh air," by his unique attitude of understanding and love. Pattern it after Pope Paul VI, who has given the Christian so many practical gestures of Christian renewal: as his United Nations plea for peace, his effective use of the liturgical changes, his unprecedented participation in an interfaith Bible service with our separated brethren at the end of Vatican II, his historical annulment of the 1054 excommunication of the Patriarch of Constantinople, on the 7th of December of 1965, his recent and

symbolic encounter, on March 23, 1966, with His Grace Michael Ramsey, Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of the Anglican Church.

The bell of renewal is ringing loud and clear. It is the Post-council. The time of true 'aggiornamento.' The time to study and apply the doctrines and norms of renewal of the conciliar Documents. The time for each Christian to answer these fundamental questions: "What help has the Council given to my faith? To my prayer? To my inquiry about God? To my spiritual life?" Pope Paul councils each Christian: "Meditate on the religious spirit of the Council and answer to yourselves if the wind — mild or impetuous — of Pentecost does not come to pervade your souls."

FR. FAUSTO B. GOMEZ, O.P.

## DE PROTOEVANGELIO (Gen. III, 15)

Quicumque vult tractare de Redemptione, de salute aeterna recuperata per merita Christi, debet recurrere ad Protoevangelium. Genesis enim 3,15 non est simplex narratio, est etiam prophetia continens divinam promissionem de liberatione hominum a potestate diaboli. Promissio illa non fuit impleta nisi in Jesu Nazareno. Mater Jesu est Maria. Propterea multi auctores applicant vocabulum "Mulier" Protoevangelii ad Mariam. Quaestio haec est valde agitata. In hoc articulo intendimus explanare solum textum Protoevangelii in eius contextu, et textu originali. Et ad clariorem lucem habendam investigamus quid vel quis est illud "Semen" Genesis 3,15.

*Contextus.* — Textus noster inseritur in sectione biblica ubi hagiographus vult problema solvere de origine mali physici et moralis. Auctor sacer respicit principaliter ad aspectum theologicum quaestionis, i.e. malum sive physicum sive morale non creatur a Deo, quia hoc incompatible est cum Illo, qui est ipsa Bonitas. Post affirmationem solemnem et generalem: Deus omnia bona creavit (1,1), auctor tractat de ornatu terrae (1, 11-3). Inter diversa genera quibus Deus terram ornavit, homo primum locum tenet, quia ad similitudinem et imaginem Dei creatus est ut praesit piscibus maris et volatilibus caeli et bestiis universae terrae omnique reptili, quod movetur in terra (1, 26).

Primi Parentes vivunt feliciter in Paradiso. Serpens autem, i.e. principium malignum, intervenit et tentat eos. Tentationi consentiens, Eva tulit fructum, et de eo comedit deditque viro suo qui etiam similiter fecit. Sic igitur homo peccavit, et ex peccato ortae sunt omnis generis consequentiae lamentabiles. Protoparentes inordinationes passionum statim sentierunt. Concupiscentiam carnis, quae exprimitur per illud "cognoscere se esse nudos", statim experti sunt. Sciverunt se bonum perdidisse et malum incurrisse.

Post peccatum, auctor narrat interventionem divinam. In responsione, Adam inculpat directe Evam et indirecte ipsum Deum. Non enim ait: "Mulier didit mihi" sed addit: "Mulier quam dedisti mihi." Dixit Sanctus Augustinus: "Nihil est tam familiare peccantibus quam tribuere Deo velle, undecumque accusantur, vel potius Illum volunt ostendere pecasse, se autem esse innocentes. Eia superbia! Numquid dixit: Peccavi! Habet confusionis difformitatem et non habet confessionis humilitatem."<sup>1</sup>

Interrogata a Deo, Eva tribuit peccatum diabolo: "Serpens decipit me." Deus bene scit deceptionem istam, sed non propter deceptionem Eva sese eximit a peccato, quia concupivit esse aequalis Deo: "eritis sicut dii" (v. 5). Eva consentit tentationi, ideo peccavit graviter, inobedientem in re graviter prohibita sese exhibens.

Deus non interrogat serpentem, seu diabolum, qui nullam excusationem habet. Etenim in malo est firmatus, et semper agit contra Deum et contra homines propter invidiam, ut legitur in Sapientia: "Invidiâ diaboli mors intravit in orbem" (2, 24).

Post investigationem, Deus profert sententiam, et quidem secundum ordinem transgressorum, primo scilicet contra diabolum, deinde contra Evam et finaliter contra Adam. In secunda parte sententiae contra serpentem habetur promissio divina de liberatione hominum a diaboli potestate, quae manifestatur praesertim in morte inflicta humanitati propter peccatum (Gen. 3, 19). Sed ista mors annihilatur per mortem et resurrectionem Christi, qui nobis restituit resurrectionem etiam corporis, ut docet S. Paulus in I Cor. 15, 51-57.

*Textus Protoevangelii.*—Protoevangelium differenter habetur in textu hebraico, graeco et latino. Videamus nunc textum magis cognitum, scilicet Vulgatam, postea hunc textum comparabimus cum originali ad clariorem habendam lucem.

In Vulgata sic legitur:

- a) Inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem
- b) Et semen tuum et semen illius
- c) *Ipsa conteret caput tuum et tu insidiaberis calcaneo eius.*

---

<sup>1</sup> S. AUGUSTINUS De Genesi contra Manichaeos, 1. II c. 17. De Genesi ad litt. XI c. 34 P.L. 34, 449.



Quoad duas primas partes versiculi, nempe a et b, datur uniformitas apud omnes textus. Quoad tertiam, seu c, datur magna differentia inter Vulgatam et alios textus. Ex hac differentia oritur magna diversitas quoad applicationem textus ad personam quae praesentatur in illo versiculo.

*Ipsa.* Ante omnia, pronomen IPSA non legitur nisi in Vulgata et in derivatis ab ea. Cur Vulgata talem translationem habet? Forsitan quia confusionem habet circa pronomen hebraicum primitivum, quod non semel scribitur absque "matre lectionis," vel confuse scribitur. Et hoc in casu, pronomen potest legi ut HU vel HI. De facto, in Genesi habentur undecim loca ubi legitur HU (ille), quod textus Masoreticus corrigit in HI (illa), e.g. Genesis 18, 1.<sup>2</sup> In casu nostro, pronomen HI (ipsa) adaptatur in Vulgata, forsitan propter praeoccupationem mario-logicam fidelium primorum saeculorum. Sanctus Hieronymus similiter putavit, propterea in Commentarium in Gen. 3,15 sic vertit, secutus Septuaginta: "*Ipsa servabit caput tuum . . . melius habet hebreo: *Ipsa conteret caput tuum, et tu conteres eius calcaneum . . . quia Dominus conteret Satanam sub pedibus nostris velociter.*"*"<sup>3</sup>

IPSE exigi videtur ex contextu. Nam iuxta formam verbi hebraici, habetur hic tertia persona masculini generis YESHU--FKHA (non vero TESHU--FKHA). Praeterea, affixum NU post secundum verbum SHUP (insidiaberis, conteres) indicat etiam subiectum primi verbi SHUF esse non feminineum. Ideo grammaticae loquendo, non potest verti HU in IPSA.

Remanet tamen ut cognoscatur utrum HU debeat verti in IPSE masculinum vel IPSUM neutrum? In hebraeo non datur pronomen personale indicans genus neutrum. Propterea, in translatione ad alias linguas, attendere debemus non ad formam, sed ad contextum. Contextus clare indicat Semen esse subiectum verbi. Grammaticae igitur loquendo, pronomen HU concordari debet cum substantivo quod repraesentat, quoad genus et numerum. Et de facto, textus Masoreticus, sicut et Pentateuchus Samaritanus et Peshitta referunt pronomen HU (masculinum vel neutrum) ad Semen. Similiter faciunt omnes versiones antiquae.

Septuaginta autem per aliam viam graditur. Vertit enim non in AUTO (quod est neutrum), sed in AUTOS quod est mas-

<sup>2</sup> Cf. F. ZORELL, Lexicon hebraicum, voc. HU p. 186.

<sup>3</sup> S. HIERONYMUS, Comment. in Gen. 3, 15, P.L. 23, 991.

culinum). Grammaticae AUTO praefendum est, quia SPERMA cum quo concordatur est neutrum. Septuaginta litteraliter vertit in AUTOS, non sequens grammaticam, sed sensum et quidem messianicum. Revera ipse Messias definitive conteret caput inimici hominum. Quidquid sit, iuxta contextum et critice loquendo, Semen Mulieris est quod vel qui victoriam habebit super serpentem tentatorem et sequaces eius.

*Conterere.* In textu hebraeo non legitur nisi forma verbi SHUF quod Septuaginta vertit bis in TERESEI, quod non significat CONTERERE, sed Custodire diligenter, vel Insidiari. Sanctus Hieronymus, e contra, ambo vertit in Conterere: "Ipse conteret caput tuum et tu conteres eius calcaneum"<sup>4</sup>. Versio Aquila habet PROSTRIPSEI quod significare potest: Infligere plagas alicui. Symmachus autem vertit ambo in THLIPSEI quod significat Comprimere, Pressurare, Resserere.

Cur Vulgata vertit diversimode: Conterere et Insidiari? — Bonum est recordari quod verbum SHUF, praeter hunc locum, bis tantum invenitur in S. Scriptura, i.e. in Iob 9,17, quod Septuaginta vertit in EXTRIBO: Triturare, et in Psalmo 139,11, quod vertitur in KATAPATEO: Conterere.

Conterere caput serpentis est quid intelligibile, sed contere calcaneum mulieris factum a serpente est inauditum. Propterea translator quaerere debet aliud verbum aptum ad indicandum actionem serpentis.

Habentur in lingua hebraica duo verba SHUF et SHAAF. Verbum SHUF certe significat "Conterere," quia similia habentur in lingua accadica SAPU, et in iudaeo-aramaica, et assyriaca SHUF, et assyriaca SEPU (pedes). E contra SHAAF est evidenter aliud verbum quod significat: Hostiliter impetivit, Calcavit, consequenter Insidiatus est. Est possibile quod auctor sacer utitur verbo SHAAF, sed illud scribit sub forma verbi SHUF ad luxum verborum obtinendum. Verbum SHAAF enim potest scribi absque Alef in imperfecto, eo quod secunda radicalis Alef est gutturalis, quae coalescit in Shureq, loco Shureq plus Alef, ut matres lectionis.

Ideo duplex versio possibilis est et bona:

- 1) Ipsum insidiabitur capiti tuo, et tu insidiaberis calcaneo eius. (Ita Ceuppens, Clamer et multi alii catholici).
- 2) Ipsum conteret caput tuum et tu insidiaberis calcaneo

<sup>4</sup> S. HIERONYMUS, op. cit. ibidem.

eius. (Sed hoc in casu, secundum verbum supponitur esse SHAAF. Ita De Vaux, Vaccari et alii).

His praenotatis, textus Protoevangelii potest legi sub triplici aspectu:

- 1) Inimicitiae inter Mulierem et serpentem, seu inter Evam et daemonem: "Inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem."
- 2) Inimicitiae inter semen mulieris et semen serpentis, i.e. omnes homines et omnes daemones eorumque sequaces: "Inter semen tuum et semen illius." (Aliqui negant hanc secundam divisionem, eo quod concipiunt ET non ut copulativum, sed ut epexegeticum).
- 3) Victoria seminis mulieris super serpentem: "Ipsum conteret caput tuum, et tu insidiaberis calcaneo eius."<sup>5</sup>

Restat ad investigandum quid vel quis est illud "Semen" Gen. 3,15.

*Semen.* In lingua hebraica, ZERA significat semen. ZERA sensu proprio significat semen plantae, ut e.g. in Genesi 1,11 et Exodo 16,31; praesertim frugum agri, frumenti semen quod in magna copia asservari solet. Evidenter in casu nostro non tractatur de semine plantae vel frugum, sed de semine in sensu metaphorico. Semen metaphorice significat semen virile (Lev. 15, 16), deinde prolem habitam vel de una, vel de pluribus; aliquando etiam significat proavum.<sup>6</sup> In nostro casu certe significat problem. Dubium vero movetur circa sensum collectivum vel individualem vocis.

*Semen individuale.* Secundum multos Exegetas, Christus solus intenditur significari in hoc textu, et hoc probatur:

1) Quia si ex una parte habetur serpens individuum: "Tu insidiaberis calcaneo eius," ob parallelismum, semen Mulieris debet intelligi etiam individualiter.

2) Semen collectivum non bene intelligitur, quia non totum genus humanum est inimicum diaboli, cum multi sequantur eum.

3) Habetur antiquissima traditio, sed scripta versus saeculum IX ante Christum, in qua mentionem fecit auctor de Semine promisso in Protoevangelio, sed in sensu individuali: "Veniat qui mittendus est, ipse erit expectatio gentium" (Gen. 49, 10).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. M. NIETO, Rev. Cultura Biblica, Jul.-Dec. 1954, p. 277.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. F. ZORELL, Lexicon Hebraicum, voc. ZERA, p. 218.

4) Item versio LXX intelligit Semen in sensu individuali dum scripsit: "Ipse conteret caput tuum."

5) Ista interpretatio apparet etiam in Targum Pseudo-Ionathan: "Et inimicitiam ponam inter te et inter mulierem, inter semen filii tui et inter semen filiorum eius; et erit quando erunt filii mulieris servantes praecepta, erunt conantes percutere te caput; quando autem derelinquent praescripta legis, tu conaberis mordere eos in calcaneis eorum; verumtamen eis erit remedium, et tamen tibi non erit remedium; et parati sunt ipsi ad adhibendum in calcaneo in diebus regis Messiae." Similiter scripsit Targum Hierosolymitanum.

6) Targum Onkulos clarius dicit: "Et inimicitiam ponam inter te et inter mulierem et inter filium tuum et inter filium eius (aliqua manuscripta habent: filios), ipse erit reminiscens tui quod fecisti ei a principio, et tu eris observans eum in finem."<sup>7</sup>

*Semen collectivum.* Iuxta alios auctores, ut P. Colunga et P. Orbiso,<sup>8</sup> sensus collectivus seminis, includens vero sensum pleniorum de Messia defenditur. Rationes eorum sunt:

1) Quia in contextu contraponitur posteritas serpentis posteritati Mulieris. Nunc vero, opinione communiori, posteritas serpentis hoc in loco intelligi debet in sensu colectivo, scilicet de tota potestate diabolica, seu daemonum et eorum sequacium, ut scribitur in I Ioan. 2,8-9: "Qui facit peccatum ex diabolo est, quoniam ab initio diabolus peccat. Omnis qui natus est ex Deo peccatum non facit, quoniam semen ipsius in eo manet." Similiter in Ioan 8,44: "Vos ex patre diabolo estis, et desideria patris vestri vultis facere." Consequenter Semen Mulieris, per parallelismum, intelligendum est etiam in sensu colectivo. Secus quomodo potest explicari Mariam et Sanctos victoriam etiam habere super diabolos?

2) Victoria finalis, definitiva et absoluta erit opus Redemptoris. Iamvero Christus est caput Corporis Mystici, ut explicatur in Sancto Paulo;<sup>9</sup> et omnes Sancti, participantem virtutem Redemptoris, pugnant contra diabolum et regnum eius. Igitur

<sup>7</sup> Cf. A. COLUNGA, Biblia Comentada, Pent., BAC, 1962, p. 97 Nota.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. A. COLUNGA, op. cit. Ibidem.

Cf. T. ORBISO, La Mujer del Protoevangelio, Rev. Estudios Biblicos I (1941) p. 201-203.

<sup>9</sup> Cfr. I. Cor. 15, 21-22; Eph. 1, 20-22; 2, 14-16 etc.



melior est sensus collectivus primae promissionis de victoria super serpentem antiquum seu diabolum.

3) Si obiicitur quod mali pertinent ad genus humanum et non habent victoriam super diabolum, talis difficultas non obstat huic sensui colectivo. Victoria totalis consideratur non in principio, nec in medio sed in momento finali; nec praecise computatur ex merito et demerito alicuius individui, sed ipsius collectivitatis, ut patet, e.g. ex bello. Christus vincit diabolum, et cum Christo, totum etiam genus humanum hanc victoriam participat. Si quae individua devicta manent, hoc contingit non quia non habent potentiam, sed quia nolunt uti mediis ad finem. Liberi enim sunt homines quoad electionem mediorum. Qui cooperatur cum gratia divina victoriam habebit.<sup>10</sup>

4) Inde ab Adam usque ad Iacob sunt aliae quattuor promissiones de Messia: Gen. 12,2; 22,18; 26,4; 28,14. In istis locis exprimitur stirps Noe, Abraham et Iacob, ex qua nasciturus esset Messias, nondum vero de persona individuali Messiae est sermo. Consequenter textus noster intelligi debet sensu colectivo.

Nobis quoque videtur sensum collectivum exigi. Exigitur etiam ab oeconomia Revelationis. Prima revelatio fit generaliter, paulatim, sensim sine sensu, concrete exprimitur. Prima concreta promissio Messiae personalis est illa, quae continetur in benedictione Iacob: "Non auferetur sceptrum de Iuda, et dux de femore eius, donec veniat qui mittendus est, et ipse erit exspectatio gentium" (Gen. 49, 10). Propheta Nathan, persecutus istam primam specificationem de Messia, indicat quis est ille rex Iudae qui praecedit Messiam: "Suscitabo semen tuum post te, quod egredietur de utero tuo et firmabo regnum eius . . . et fidelis erit domus tua et regnum tuum usque in aeternum" (2 Sam. 7,12-16). Ista indicatio personae Messiae magis ac magis specificatur in Prophetis, e.g. in Isaia 9,6 ss; in Michea 4,7; in Daniele 7,14, et completur in annuntiatione Incarnationis Verbi, in Luca 1,32-33.

In progressu revelationis messianicae, Spiritus Sanctus loquitur de origine Messiae e prima Muliere, deinde e posteritate Patriarcharum, postea ex uno inter filios Iudae, e familia Iesse, e domo David ad quam pertinent Maria et Ioseph parentes Jesu.<sup>11</sup>

Fr. JOSEPH NGUYEN CONG LY, O.P.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Os. 13, 14; Hebr. 2, 14; I Cor. 15, 55-57; I Ioan 5, 4.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. A. COLUNGA, La Promesa Mesianica, Rev. Ciencia Tom. 77 (1950) p. 73-74.



## CATHOLIC SCHOOLS AND THE EDUCATION OF THE CHRISTIAN\*

At the outset it might be opportune to define or describe what we mean by a Catholic School in order to discover its role in the education of the Christian. In this regard, it would be best to adopt the course laid out by Fr. Neil McCluskey, S.J. in his book *"Catholic Viewpoint on Education."*

"To some observers," Fr. McCluskey begins, "the Catholic school may well appear to be a carbon copy of the neighboring public or private secular school. The basic objectives, organization, curriculum, standards, activities, and educational results, at a casual glance, seem pretty much the same. They know, of course, that some provision is made in the Catholic school for religious instruction. They know that there is different ownership and control. But apart from these obvious differences they fail to see anything essential that distinguishes the Catholic school from other schools. Accordingly they are hard put to account for the enormous sacrifice on the part of Catholic parents, pastors and teachers in building and operating a Catholic School system and they cannot understand why Catholics, generally regard public or non-Sectarian schools as unsuitable for the education of their children."

There are others who explain the purpose of the Catholic School as teaching catechism. Fr. McCluskey, however, argues to the contrary. "Paradoxically, if this were true, there would be no need for separate Catholic schools and there would be no convincing reason why Catholic children should not attend secu-

---

\* Address delivered at the Series of Conferences on THE DOCUMENTS OF VATICAN II AND TODAY'S CHRISTIAN at Santo Tomas University on March 12, 1966.

lar schools. One could rightly claim this as the principal task of the school, if there were no other way of formally presenting religious doctrine to children. But there have always been other ways of supplementing secular education with religious instruction: by classes in the Church before or after schools, by parental instruction, by home visits of a special teacher, by instruction at daily Mass, etc. Almost any of these substitutes or a combination, could be a sufficient and certainly less costly method of formally teaching religion. The teaching of the formulas of the Catholic faith, therefore, cannot be either the exclusive or even the primary function of the Catholic school, let alone its reason for existence."

Do Catholic schools exist to produce better Catholics while secular schools exist to produce better citizens? Fr. McCluskey reconciles. "The traditional Christian philosophy of education sees no antagonism between the two ideals of dedicated citizenry and religious allegiance but conceives them as perfectly compatible and complementary. Why? Because strictly speaking, the primary purpose of the school is neither one. The school as such has its own *raison d'être*: it exists primarily to develop the morally intelligent person."

Pius XI in his encyclical letter "*The Christian Education of Youth*" written thirty five years ago, expounded at length on the purpose and scope of Catholic education. This letter is one of the clearest statements on the Church's role, rights and responsibility in the field of education. A few passages from this authoritative statement will bring into sharper focus the role of Catholic schools in the education of the Christian.

"Since education consists essentially in preparing man for what he must be and for what he must do here below, in order to attain the sublime end for which he was created, it is clear that there can be no true education which is not wholly directed to man's last end."

"In the present order of providence, since God has revealed Himself to us in the Person of His only begotten Son, who alone is 'the way, the truth and the life,' there can be no ideally perfect education which is not Christian education."

"The proper and immediate end of Christian education is to cooperate with divine grace in forming the true and perfect Christian, the supernatural man who thinks, judges and acts constantly and consistently in accordance with right reason and grace."

"Christian education takes in the whole aggregate of human life, physical and spiritual, intellectual and moral, individual, domestic and social not with a view of reducing it in any way but in order to elevate, regulate and perfect it, in accordance with the example and teaching of Christ."

In the words of Fr. McClusky, "the starting point in the Catholic philosophy of education is the reality of the supernatural as revealed through and in Jesus Christ. The Catholic belief that man is a creature of God destined to share in the divine life answers the two questions upon which every philosophy of education is built: What is man? What is his purpose?" After stressing the ultimate end of education, we can ask with Fr. McCluskey, "Is it any wonder then, that this uncompromising supernatural bias in Catholic education has always been a scandal and an affront to humanists and secularists?"

In his book *"The Philosophy of Catholic Education,"* the late Fr. William J. McGucken, S.J. writes "nothing is more irritating to the modern than this dogma of the supernatural, a dogma that cannot be proved by anthropology, history, psychology or any other human science. Yet nothing is more certain than this, that all traditional historic Christianity is inextricably bound up with it. It cannot be demonstrated by human reason; it requires God's revelation to bring to our knowledge this fact that man is super-naturalized."

"The Catholic concept of education situates man against the backdrop of the total society in which he lives and develops. The involved process by which man arrives at adult perfection in society is education. Since education is as extensive as human life itself, different agencies in society share rights and responsibilities in this broad field. For man is born into three societies of the large society, the family, civil society (including the state), and the Church. Each has distinct rights, yet all are properly ordered to ensure balance and harmony within the total educational process." Thus does Fr. McCluskey draw the specific roles of family, state and Church in education from the thorough-going comprehensiveness of the Catholic concept of education.

To say that the Catholic school is the sole agency in the education of the Christian would certainly be inaccurate. For the Catholic school continues the educational process already begun in the home or presumed to have been, and which the Church continues to do in its parish life. A Catholic school therefore which does not orient its students towards parish conscious-

ness and parish activity is neglecting a vital aspect in the education of the Christian. For the Catholic school and in particular the Catholic university must be the right hand of the Church, the training ground of her intelligentia, the creators of Christian philosophy and the defenders of the Catholic faith. In the world today there is vital struggle between Christian and secular humanism, the really fundamental rivals for the soul of men and victory will go to the side which can appeal most successfully to the deep fundamental needs of human nature.

That is the challenge of our age and the challenge to our faith. Unfortunately at the present time Catholics as a body are still woefully inadequate for their task. So often they indulge in the mental suicide of the self-imposed ghetto. They keep their thoughts and their faith to themselves; they hide their lamps under mountains of ignorance, a vast inferiority complex or worse still while possessing the theoretical knowledge of their faith, they lack the ability to speak about it intelligently and with conviction. The basic trouble is lack of vision and lack of imagination among the leaders of the Catholic community. Over and over again things are not done because of the fear of real or imagined risks, but a Church on the defensive and a community paralyzed by self-doubts and human respect, have surrendered the creative possibilities inherent in every generation.

Today the faith as an intellectual force lies dormant in many places and in the lives of far too many Catholics, sad to say even in the lives of graduates of Catholic schools. Catholicism as an intellectual challenge is suffering from a sickness but the sickness is not fatal. The fundamental character of many is too sound, too strong and in due time will and must come into her own, but the rapidity of recovery depends largely upon her Catholic Schools and perhaps above all on the creation of a strong, vigorous, intellectual, university-trained elite. For this to take place, two things are essential: first, an understanding of the width, scope and necessity of a real Christian humanism based upon an appreciation of the problems and potentialities of the modern world; secondly, a realization that a Catholic graduate requires a corresponding depth of understanding of his faith. In such a situation, piety although essential, is not enough. Too often we hear the complaint from graduates of Catholic schools that religion is presented to them divorced from reality. Catholics must be educated to face reality not condemning the world as totally evil. Likewise our Catholic students are not to be an esoteric exotic group of cotton wool and perfume Catholics, care-



fully wrapped and posted through life to heaven. They must be trained to see life and the world with the vision of Catholics.

Today it is not enough for a Catholic to be anti-Communist or anti-materialist or anti-secular. He or she must be for something, something large enough and deep enough to make Communism or Secularism or Materialism even at their very best seem inadequate. The intelligent Catholic must not create or accept myths about the men and movements who direct the modern world. He must know them as they are. He must learn the strong points as well as their weakness, their virtues as well as their vices and not be afraid to admit that such virtues exist. We must surmount the fear that knowledge of what others believe and teach as presented by their best apologists is somehow a menace to faith. Faith cannot be defended by building walls around it. It can thrive only as it has always succeeded, when it goes out to conquer in the strength of the Holy Spirit, for the faith was not given to defend old ideologies but to conquer the world. Too long, even in universities the idea of defending the faith rather than expanding it, has been the basic outlook of many. That attitude in our time must be destroyed.

However, this attitude is justified to some degree, as long as we fail to produce an educated laity with a deep responsibility regarding its role in the contemporary world and here again we return to the place of the Catholic student and teacher in the Catholic school. Only through the Catholic school, particularly the Catholic College or University, can the faith be made really strong in contemporary Philippines and only through a partnership between the Church and the Schools can the Church's message be really effective in the world of tomorrow. The real enemies of the faith are not science or even secularism, but ignorance, fear, superficiality of feeling and knowledge and the refusal to accept the challenge of today and tomorrow and rid oneself of the shackles of old glories and old failures. The teaching of the Church cannot change; human nature will not change but the human situation is continuously changing and the Church must carry out her ancient ageless task by teaching the truth to all men in all ages and in every situation. This is the challenge to the Catholic school in educating the Christian for the vital task of being the Church wherever he finds himself. For through her Catholic trained elite, the Church will never allow herself to be labelled as reactionary, as conservative, liberal or progressive but only as one, holy and Catholic, universal and eternal, contemporary and ageless, changeless and forever new.



Her message, through the instrumentality of her schools, must be equally applicable to peasant, workman, poet and politician, to the child in the home and the winner of the Nobel Prize. In our time one of the vital testing places of her adequacy is in the Catholic School. Failure here could mean, humanly speaking, the greatest tragedy of our time.

Dr. TEODORO EVANGELISTA

*President of Far Eastern University*

## HISTORICAL SECTION

# THE FILIPINO CLERGY DURING THE SPANISH REGIME

### CHAPTER V

#### GENERAL HISTORICAL CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH INFLUENCED IN THE SLOW FORMATION OF A FILIPINO CLERGY

More than once comparisons are made on the quick and rapid formation of a native clergy in the times of the Apostles and early age of the Church, in the Christianization of European countries as well as in our modern mission lands with the tardy and slow establishment of a native priesthood in the newly discovered territories of the so-called East and West Indies evangelized during the 16th down to the 19th centuries by European colonial powers. The blame of such procrastination in the creation of a native hierarchy is apparently placed on wrong missionary policies followed in those times of colonialism by the heralds of the Gospel, as if they were really opposed to this *ultimate goal* of any mission enterprise, due to a mistaken superiority complex, or what is worse, out of certain petty jealousy with relation to the people they evangelized. Nay, it is often implied if not openly said that the missionaries working under colonial regimes, and specially the Spanish missionaries, were really against a native clergy out of "race discrimination"; because they considered the "indigenous races," though perhaps truly "human beings," still certainly "of an *inferior type*," incapable by their own nature to attain the heights of culture, science, refinement and civilization of the Europeans, and consequently, unable forever worthily to perform the lofty functions of the priesthood, to assume the responsibilities of the pastoral ministry, or to reach the summits of religious and Christian perfection.

A closer view of the historical circumstances in the missions of this colonial period will however lead us to a quite different conclusion and a much fairer explanation of the causes that affected the rather slow pace noticeable in the formation of a native clergy. In a preceding chapter we have already mentioned one important factor which ought not to be forgotten: the evolution of the Church doctrine on the aims of Catholic missions and on the need and urgency of forming a native clergy. Now we will point out other historical factors which satisfactorily explain the tardy formation of a native clergy, discarding as groundless and unjust the harsh and rash judgment passed, as we said above, against the missionaries working under colonial regimes.

In the first place let us remark that comparisons made on missionary methods in different periods of the Church history are often deceitful, misleading and faulty, because the peculiar circumstances of each period are often disregarded; and, it is simply common sense to say in the tenor of an old juridical adage: "*distingue tempora et concordabis . . . facta*," "take heed of the differences of times, and you will easily explain and understand the different ways of acting."

In the history of missions we can distinguish three main periods:

- I) Evangelization before the Middle Ages;
- II) Evangelization in the Middle Ages; and
- III) Evangelization in the modern age of geographical discoveries and colonialism.

The first period (from the 1st to the 5th centuries) we can notice a certain homogeneity of cultural levels and ethnological background between the pagans and their missionaries; nay, at times the pagans, in spite of their low moral standards and absurd or corrupted moral and religious background, presented a higher cultural level and civilization than that of the countries from where the missionaries came (such was the case of the Roman pagans and the Jewish Christians and evangelizers). Furthermore, after the short apostolic age when the evangelization was undertaken more or less under the direction of the Apostles, during the rest of this period, there was no definite *visible direction* for the missionary endeavour; rather, this was accomplished simply through a progressive irradiation out of individual contacts of the new Christians with the pagans. There

was not properly speaking a real "mission," that is, evangelical laborers "sent" and "directed" by the successors of the Apostles.

In the second period, that is, during the Middle Ages (5th to 15th centuries) in the conversion of the barbarians (german-slav nations) of Europe, we can notice that although the missionaries were generally coming from a higher cultural level than that of the countries they evangelized, and although there was already a definite, particular *direction* for the missionary endeavour, emanating principally from the Roman Pontiffs, still: 1) the cultural differences between the evangelizers and the evangelized were easily overcome or eliminated because of a certain homogeneous ethnological, or social and civic background; and 2) the missionaries "sent" to pagan countries were generally acting and moved by "personal initiative" without any official or guaranteed support from the Church or the State. This last element or characteristic left the missionaries without any possibility of counting with *successors* of their labors, unless they would care to form and build up a "local" clergy, i.e. priests, Bishops, religious recruited from the very places they were tilling for the Church. As in the apostolic times, the very fact of their "transitory" missionary effort urgently demanded, — and left not other alternative, — that a local or native clergy be formed as soon as possible. And so they did. And we should not forget that the demands of the Church, at this early period of her historical development somewhat as during the first period of the apostolic or post-apostolic era, were not so exacting for the admission to the Holy Orders, priestly office and pastoral ministry or religious life, as they became later in the course of times.

In the third period (age of geographical discoveries and colonization in the New World and in the Far East, 16th to 19th centuries) the scene of the missionary field changed entirely. New situations, puzzling problems, unknown in the past, were posed. It is precisely in this period (in the 16th century) that the word "mission" began to be used in the sense of an "official sending forth of men with authority to preach the Gospel and administer the sacraments in lands of infidels" (cf. Ludwig Hertling, *Historia de la Iglesia*, Herder, 1964, p. 509; Angel Santos Hernandez, *Misionología-Problemas Introductorios y Ciencias Auxiliares*, Sal Terrae, Santander, 1961, pp. 12-13; Francisco Javier Montalbán, *Manual de Historia de las Misiones*, Bilbao, 1952, 2a. ed. por León Lopetegui); and then also appears for the first time the problem of the "native" or "indigenous"

clergy. This problem was not really known in the previous periods. All the Church documents of former ages speak of or refer to a "local" clergy, in contradistinction to a "foreign" clergy, as we have already shown in a previous chapter.

In this third period we have to distinguish the missionary situation of countries colonized by Catholic nations with apostolic ideals as Spain and Portugal, from those colonized by nations which did not entertain any evangelical aim but looked only for commercial expansion and financial gains; and still more, from those mission lands which did not fall under any colonial regime at all. In these last, the situation was almost the same as in the second period mentioned above; the missionaries saw evidently the need of forming as soon as possible a native or indigenous clergy, and they actively and strenuously worked for it. The same was the case with colonies ruled by nations that had no interest in spreading the Gospel and christianizing their subject peoples.

In countries however colonized by Catholic Spain and Portugal the situation was absolutely new. *Firstly*, two entirely different worlds not only with very wide differences of culture and civilization but specially with absolutely heterogenous ethnological background met together. It was not anymore a question of a more or less higher or lower degree of culture and civilization as when the barbarian nations invaded the Roman empire. The differences went deeper; it was a matter of two *races*, each one with ethnic traits, customs, traditions, languages, ideals, and characteristics which have developed for centuries, and which now were, not only to be evangelized or christianized, but colonized and, as if it were, fused into one empire. *Secondly*, as we have just indicated, the evangelization now was to go side by side with the colonization, differently from the second period when the evangelization was not to be undertaken by any State but by individual missionaries. The natives or the indigenous peoples were not only to be christianized, but also to be fused and integrated with the colonizers — this, certainly, in the Spanish colonies — so closely as to become with them one people and one empire, *without any race discrimination* as unfortunately practiced and officially sanctioned in other colonies.

This otherwise so praiseworthy and humanitarian colonial policy of Spain, born from the Christian ideal of the equality of all races before God; this colonial aim which could well be accepted in our 20th century charters of human rights, carried



however an almost unavoidable and inherent defect. The metropolis expected the natives to rise up to the cultural, social, moral and religious standards of life of their European colonizers, before considering those natives able to occupy posts of leadership in the Church or in the State. The natives were expected to assimilate and adopt as their own a foreign culture, language, civilization and customs acquired by the colonizers in the course of long centuries in an entirely different environment, totally strange to the indigenous races. As long as the natives could not equal or surpass their colonizers in these matters they could not be considered worthy or fitted to assume offices of honor and responsibility such as the Catholic priesthood or the religious life imply. The science of missionology was not yet developed then as it is now, nor the doctrine of missionary adaptation has reached by that time the clear understanding attained in our days.

Furthermore, we should remember that in this third period of the history of missions, as already indicated above, the formation for the priesthood was not as simple and easy as it was in the apostolic times and during the Christianization of Europe: in the course of centuries the Church has grown and developed; and with the growth and development the requirements of the priesthood were also raised and perfected as circumstances demanded. For instance, let us just recall, in the passing, the development of ecclesiastical sciences (scholastic philosophy and theology) and the clerical discipline (remember that at the beginnings of the Church the celibacy of the clergy was not yet a law or absolute requirement for the Holy Orders). The Tridentine decree on Conciliar Seminaries which came just at the beginning of this third period of *evangelization-combined-with-colonization*, was a wonderful stride towards a total elevation of the decadent clergy of the Middle Ages; but certainly, it made still more difficult for the aspirants to the priestly office the attainment of that noble vocation. The missionaries were bound, on the other hand, to demand from all, i.e. from the *natives* of the colonies as well as from the Europeans, the same heights of cultural and religious level brought from the Old Continent to the new lands recently discovered; and if they made the same demands from the natives as from the Europeans is a further proof that the natives were not considered as an "inferior race," but as a race "equal" in capacity, as well as in rights and duties as the foreigners that colonized them.

But this exacting demand could not be attained easily by the natives in a short time; they could not easily be "european-

ized." And this explains the difficulty found in bringing them, as quickly as we would expect nowadays, to the ranks of the clergy. Besides, the means that could be offered them in the colonies themselves, in order to attain the European standards demanded by the Church were quite inferior to those which the foreign missionaries were able to get in their ecclesiastical formation in Europe. Hence, notwithstanding the efforts to educate the natives and help them attain the same cultural and religious levels of the missionaries, it was hardly possible for the natives to meet with such demands; and when placed, side by side with the religious missionaries from Europe, the secular native clergy more than often was found necessarily, by force of the historical circumstances of those times, in a lower level than the foreign religious clergy.

If we take in consideration the above mentioned factors which are of general character (those peculiar to the Spanish colonies, as the Philippines, will be taken up in the next chapter) it will become easier to understand the true reasons which may satisfactorily explain, partially at least, the apparent slow pace in the formation of a Filipino native clergy, in past centuries.

JESUS MA. CAVANNA, C.M.

Collegio Filippino, Rome.

## PASTORAL SECTION

### HOMILETICS

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST (September 4)

#### DO NOT WORRY

Look around your little community and you will find there a number of worried people. A father worries about losing his job and not being able to pay his monthly premium. A mother worries about the children getting lost in the school picnic. A young man fears he is not getting the right girl. The bride dreads losing her husband. Miss So-and-so is terrifically disturbed by the white hair that has started to appear on her head. One worries about her dress, the other worries about his food and tuition fees, etc. "Why are you anxious?... Do not be anxious..."

#### *Do not worry*

We ourselves may be afflicted with worries. It is time then to sit down to a spell of straight thinking.

First of all, get your mind fixed on the providence of God. Worry is a sign of lack of spiritual outlook, lack of awareness of God's relation to our lives. "If God so clothes the grass of the field, which flourishes today but tomorrow is thrown into the oven, how much more you, O you of little faith" (Mt. 6, 30). This means that God knows what is best for you and me. And He right this very minute is at work at the heart of our problems. He cares intensely about what happens to us.

Second, get your mind off future possible burdens and sufferings. It is unprofitable to worry about things not sure to come. The important thing is: live one day at a time in loyalty to God. If we can honestly say that we are doing the best we can under this present situation, then we can be sure that God is satisfied. And nothing on earth will make us miss heaven. Let us do what we are supposed to do now. And

let us remember that our best may be a very poor best. But if it is our best, we need not worry about the mistakes and the undone parts. God Himself is going to take care of them.

*Do not give others worry*

Another means of overcoming worries is to get our mind fixed on the needs of our neighbor. I think of what people owe me, how badly I am mistreated, how I deserve to be treated, what rights I have. This is self-centeredness, selfishness.

We have to develop a sincere interest in others, and a desire for their betterment. We have a part to play in the lives of those about us. This is the admonition we read from the *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*: "Since they have an active role to play in the whole life of the Church, Laymen are not only bound to penetrate the world with a Christian spirit, but are also called to be witnesses to Christ in all things in the midst of human society" (nu. 43). Our Lord says in the Gospel for today: "Seek first the kingdom of God and his justice, and all these things shall be given you besides" (Mt. 6, 33).

Do not think that what the Constitution is telling us about penetrating the world with a Christian Spirit is only good for the record. You are actually penetrating your neighbor with a Christian Spirit when you pay all your bills promptly; for in this way you help others to live according to their budget, without having to borrow. That is an example of taking an active interest in other people's need. And you actually save them from being anxious about tomorrow, what they shall eat, what they shall put on.

The catch is this: you save yourself from worrying, by not giving others worry. Charity covereth a multitude of worries.

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST (September 11)

THINK ABOUT DEATH

The incident of the raising of the widow's son already suggests the topic about which we are going to talk. Death. We are afraid of dying. And that is our deepest fear of all: the fear of leaving behind what we know as life, of losing the love that seems inseparable from this life, the fear of leaping into the unknown.

*Certain facts about death*

We are afraid of death. But let this not hinder us from thinking about it. There are certain facts about death which we cannot ignore.

First, death is inevitable; it must come some time. You and I are, by nature, mortal. "You will return to earth," God said in Genesis (3, 19) because it is from the earth that you have been taken." That means our bodies. Our bodies will die and will be separated from our souls and will decay. It is true that God, in the beginning, promised to give us immortality of the body on condition that our first parents would keep away from sin. Had they not fallen, doubtless we should be living, and fitted to live, an earthy life which would last much longer. But the wages of sin is death, says St. Paul. And that is another reason why we have to die.

The second fact about death is that it may come anytime. It is useless to ask the fortune-teller about the time and the place and the manner of our death. For only God knows the time and the place and the manner of our death. This can make us very anxious. — A good deal of fighting is now going on in Vietnam. A story is told about a soldier who received a cablegram from his wife which said: "Where are you? I am worried about you." The soldier cabled back: "In Da Nang, South Vietnam. I am worried about myself".—We ought to think more about death. But this thought must make us live more in God's presence and receive the sacraments regularly. Death may come any time. In what state of soul is it going to find us?

*Death leads to God*

Death teaches us who God is: the ruler of life. He is Power, He gives life, He takes away life, He gives back life, as in the case of the Widow's only son. The world lies in His hands. He acts, and the world obeys. He reveals Himself in death as well as in the creation of life. And we only cease to be afraid of dying when we allow the full power of God to break into our soul in love.

This power of God, just as in the case of the youth in the Gospel, is calling us to life: to the joy, that is, of living in grace, of knowing we are the temples of the Trinity. A life of prayer, of confession, a life of Mass and of frequent communion, a life of loyalty to God's precepts, which is the one condition for remaining united to the very source of life.

Death must come some time. Death may come any time. But if we realize this is God's way of revealing Himself to us, of calling us to life in this world and in the next, we would die as Christians ought to die.



## SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST (September 18)

## CHRIST'S SICK BRETHREN

Our Lord had a very special love for the sick. He went out to them and healed them even on the Sabbath. We have several instances of this healing on the Sabbath: in today's Gospel, the infirm woman (Lk. 13, 11), the man sick for thirty-eight years (Jo. 5, 1), the man born blind (Jo. 9, 1), the man with the withered hand (Lk. 6, 6). We can have a long list of sick people whom Christ cured.

You, too, must be concerned about the sick in your neighborhood. And they include not only the infirm but also the distressed, the retarded, the infirm aged, the physically handicapped, the bedridden from every and all descriptions of suffering.

*The Church's interest*

The Church has always shown great interest in her sick members. Her ritual contains remarkable instructions to parish priests on what they should do for the sick members of their parishes. On the feast of St. Blase (Feb. 3), for example, the priest applies blessed candles crosswise to the throat for deliverance from all sickness affecting that part. Hospitals, clinics, ambulance, medicine receive special blessing from the Church so that they may be effective means of restoring the faithful in body and soul.

Think of the many religious orders and congregations that are dedicated to the care of the sick: the Medical Missionaries, the Sisters of Charity, to mention some. Numerous other groups help the sick in some way. The Legion of Mary, the St. Vincent de Paul Society, the Knights of Columbus, etc., take pride in sending groups to visit the sick in the hospitals, homes and sanitariums.

*Visiting God's sick*

You, too, must make an effort to visit and help the sick in your community. Do not readily excuse yourself by thinking that you are very busy. The few moments you spend with them, the few cheerful words you give, these can mean a lot to them.

Right in your neighborhood there may be someone who need your company. Drop in even for a few minutes. Do not tire the sick by staying too long. Little gifts, like a box of biscuit, a cluster of grapes, are always appreciated by the sick. Your substantial help may be needed by some, let your charity, then, be prudently exercised in this case.

The sick you visit need not be your relatives or Catholics. When it comes to visiting the sick, there should be no distinction of persons. We are all brothers in Christ and we must see Christ in everybody. With Catholics, you might suggest that they have the priest bring them Holy Communion. That is more than visiting. You are actually bringing Christ with you to the sick.

Lastly, you must remember that Christ has identified himself with the sick. On the Last Day, our Lord will say: "I was sick and you visited Me.... Believe Me, whatever you did to one of the least of My brethren here, you did it to Me" (Mt. 25, 36, 40).

Let us all thank God for our good health and share this blessing with our less fortunate brethren.

## SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST (September 25)

### THE WAY OF LOVE

God wants us to be loved so that we may in turn love Him and lead others to love Him. A great amount of our unhappiness stems from our desire to be loved for our own sake. We want to be loved without referring this love to God.

*God wants us to be loved*

God has a very definite purpose in wanting us to be loved by our family and friends and neighbors. And that is in order that we may be instruments in spreading His Kingdom of love and peace, in order that through us He may enter into the hearts of many more people.

A child will obey his father; but unless the child loves his father, his obedience will not be filial. A young woman may agree to marry a man; but if she can't guarantee the love of the man for her, that marriage is bound to be a failure.

How can a father lead his child to the love of the Heavenly Father, if he is not loved by his child. How can a man raise a Christian family, if he is not loved by his wife and children. In order to influence people, one must first win them. Unless you tame the tiger, it would be difficult to make it perform in the circus.

And that is the way of God. God first tries to win our love; and only after He has won our love does He work in us.

*How to be loved*

In order, then, to be really effective instruments of God, we must be loved. And here are some practical means.

One. Do not expect others to be as perfect as you are or always perfect. You know that you, too, have not got all the talents you want to have. Instead of being irritated by the mistakes or failures or faults of others, be compassionate and patient with them.

Two. Be more positive. Look for the good points in others. Praise the well prepared speech or the delicious "adobo". Keep silent about the burnt rice. Be always ready to give commendations without appearing to give dishonest flattery.

Three. Listen to others' suggestions. You are not all-wise. You don't see the problem from every angle of it. Hence, you must be amenable to suggestions and counsels of other people. And try to see their arguments from their point of view. Do not readily condemn suggestions just because you were not the first to think about them.

These are just a few of the many, many ways of making ourselves loveable for the sake of God. The way really to make ourselves loveable is to love. Unless we love, we won't be loved. If those who already love are sometimes not loved, how much more those who do not love.

With God's grace we can live without being loved by the world—but that is with God's grace. In any case we must love, love our neighbor for the love of God.

REV. ANGEL N. LAGDAMEO

## CASES & QUERIES

### FAST AND ABSTINENCE ON THE ASSUMPTION EVE

*Will you please publish in the Boletín Eclesiástico whether according to the New Indult on Fast and Abstinence published in the last issue (July, page 422) it is compulsory to observe the law on fast and abstinence on August 1<sup>st</sup>, Eve of the Assumption, or on December 7, Eve of the Immaculate Conception.*

A PRIEST.

The last Indult on fast and abstinence granted, *per quinquennium*, by the Holy See to the Philippines was that of April 25th, 1962, "transferendi obligationem abstinentiam et ieiunium servandi in pervigilio festivitatis Immaculatae Conceptionis B. Mariae Virginis ad pervigilium solemnitatis B. Mariae Virginis ad Coelum Assumptae" (*Bol. Eccl.*, 1962, p. 469).

Hence, the day for the fulfillment of fast and abstinence in the Philippines is not December 7th, Eve of the Immaculate Conception, but August 14th, Eve of the Assumption.

On the other hand, canon 1252, § 4 says: "Diebus Dominicis vel festis de praecepto lex abstinentiae, vel abstinentiae et ieiunii, vel ieiunii tantum cessat, excepto tempore Quadragesimae, nec pervigiliae anticipantur". Since this year of 1966 the Eve of the Assumption, to which the law of fast and abstinence has been transferred, is a Sunday, there is no obligation to fast or observe abstinence on it.

FR. E. GARCIA, O.P.

## GRAVE MATTER IN THE TENANCY CONTRACT

1. Taking into account the actual value of the Philippine peso,
  - (a) What amount would constitute grave absolute matter
  - (b) What would constitute grave relative matter in acts of injustice.
2. (a) Does the 30-70 crop sharing scheme as provided in the tenancy law bind in conscience?
  - (b) On the premise that it binds in conscience, suppose the tenant agrees with the landlord to a lesser share because a lesser has been traditional in the place, does the agreement free the landowner of moral responsibility?
  - (c) What would constitute a grave matter in this regard?

### INQUIRER

I. Before giving the proper solution to each point, let us recall some moral principles concerning the grave matter in thefts and rapiness.

The gravity of external sin in the violation of another's right must be measured by the actual injustice done. But the gravity of injustice is determined also by the harm done to society; not only the rights of individual are to be respected, but the peace, security and stability of society ought to be upheld by the citizens.

Theft is not only against a Commandment of God, but it is also opposed to Natural Law; for if the goods of others could be taken without moral fault, there would be an end to social peace, stability and progress. It is necessary, therefore, to suggest some standards to determine when theft is a serious injustice and when it is not.

The standard must be determined by the harm actually done, for we must speak of objective, concrete and actual injustice,



disregarding the personal annoyance of the victim and the subjective conscience of the thief. We must speak of standards that affect both the individual and society. The standard regarding the individual is *relative*; the one affecting society is *absolute*.

The standard that applies to the individual robbed, is determined by the injustice done to him, and it is measured in terms of the living conditions of the person. Being something relative varies considerably according to the surrounding circumstances. The same amount stolen will not equally affect rich and poor. What constitutes a grave loss to the poor, could possibly be overlooked by the rich.

The standard which refers to society is absolute and applies to a particular country at a particular time, on the supposition that the exchange — value of the money is uniform throughout the place. It implies a sum of money which, if taken without grave violation or mortal fault, would tend to make property insecure, and render men generally unwilling to undertake the labour necessary to advance their own welfare and that of the State. It is right to say therefore, that there is an absolute sum (for instance \$100.00), the unjust taking of which is certainly and always against a serious precept of the Natural Law. This is the *absolute* standard.

The world has changed and it is actually in a constant process of evolution. The purchasing power of gold is not constant, and, in particular, the sharing of the national income by the different classes varies on account of the great effort of industrial workers to improve their living conditions, by means of higher rewards and less work or labor. All these circumstances make it difficult to determine what amount is "grave matter" in theft.

The inquirer is referring in the second paragraph to the "share tenancy contract," about the production of rice. It will be very useful to re-state here the meaning of "Landlord or Landholder," and of "Tenant" as it appears in the Civil Law of the Philippines:

"A Landlord shall mean a person, natural or juridical, who, either as owner, lessee, usufructuary, or legal possessor, lets or grants to another the use of cultivation of his land for a consideration either shares under the share tenancy system, or a price certain or ascertainable under the leasehold tenancy system."

"A tenant shall mean a person who, himself, and with the aid available from within is immediate farm household cultivates the land belonging to, or possessed by another, with the latter's consent for purposes of production, sharing the produce with the landholder under the share tenancy system, or paying to the landholder a price certain or ascertainable in produce or in money or both, under the leasehold tenancy system" (Sec. 5 RA 1199; Cfr. Sec. 2, Act. 4045, as amended).

II. In reply to questions in n. 1, a) The common opinion fixes the *absolute amount*, which is "grave matter" even when the theft is from the wealthiest person or institution, *above the daily earning of a highly paid worker*, but *below* the daily income of a very wealthy person. The figures given by the moralists for *absolute* grave matter are *averages*, and hence cannot be expected to suit each individual *locality*, or *given time*. But when based on actual conditions, they are serviceable. They afford a basis for a sound probable opinion here and now.

In particular, the amount constituting grave *absolute matter* cannot be exactly fixed in the Philippines now, because everybody knows how different is the value of the Philippine *peso* in this year of 1966 in comparison with its value in 1961, which value still is not permanent; besides the grave absolute matter will be also appreciated keeping in consideration the abundancy of money and articles in the market, the harm done to society and the common opinion proposed by business men who are able to determine the price of the things.

b) It is not easy to fix the quantity required to constitute grave *relative* matter because the wealth, social status and needs of each private person have to be known well in order to determine the grave matter for a particular person, even when the stolen object is not of considerable value. Theologians do not agree in assigning a standard to appreciate the grave relative matter.<sup>1</sup> As a general rule, grave relative matter is that which

---

<sup>1</sup> "Quantitas relative gravis ad variam personae fortunam et necessitatem, est *damnum de se notabile*, licet res non sit valde notabilis; scilicet id quod data conditione domini, *per se* grave nocumentum affert. Hoc generatim censetur id quod una die alicui sufficit ad sui vel suorum sustentationem; unde pro operario est valor aliquatenus minor salario diurno, et pro vere paupere adhuc paulo minus. Differt itaque multum pro variis gentibus atque diversis hominum conditionibus, pro magnis urbibus et ruralibus regionibus dissitis" (MERKELBACH, *Summa Theologiae Moralis*, II, n. 403, a).

causes *per se* grave or considerable harm to the person in proportion to his living and social conditions.

III. In reply to the questions n. 2: a) Yes, for as most theologians maintain such sharing scheme is obligatory in conscience because it aims to determine the right of property about things whose owner has not been decreed by Natural Law; and it is precisely at this point where Civil Law takes over just to protect the common good of society and makes up for nature's deficiencies. Besides both parties have peacefully agreed to abide by the provision of the Civil Law on this aspect.<sup>2</sup>

b) On the premises and conditions given by the inquirer, the agreement frees the landowner of moral responsibility, because the lesser share seems to be allowed or permitted by the government at least implicitly, since despite being traditionally practiced in the place, it was never prohibited.<sup>3</sup>

c) To determine the grave matter in this regard various principles will have to be considered governing the different kinds of grave matter in thefts and rapines, mentioned by all the theologians. To violate the "share tenancy contract" by the landlord or by the tenants constitutes a real injustice as it means violation of another's right by taking unjustly his property. Consequently, it will be a case of theft or rapine which requires the reparation or restitution of the violated right under grave or light obligation according to the grave or slight harm deliberately done.

FR. V. VICENTE, O.P.

---

<sup>2</sup> We like to bring here the definition of "Share Tenancy Contract" in Act. 4045, as amended by CA 178 and RA 34: "A contract of share tenancy is one whereby a partnership between a landlord and a tenant is entered into, for a joint pursuit of rice agricultural work with common interest in which both parties divide between them the resulting profits as well as losses" (AN ACT TO PROMOTE THE WELL-BEING OF TENANT (APARCEROS) IN AGRICULTURAL LAND DEVOTED TO THE PRODUCTION OF RICE AND TO REGULATE THE RELATIONS BETWEEN THEM AND LANDLORDS OF SAID LAND, AND FOR THE OTHER PURPOSES").

<sup>3</sup> The Act 4045 above cited, is: "The contract on share tenancy, in order to be valid and binding shall be drawn in triplicate in the language or dialect known to all the parties thereto, to be signed or thumbmarked both by the landlord or his authorized representative and by the tenant, before two witnesses, one to be chosen by each party..."

"The forms of contract shall be uniform and shall be prepared and furnished by the Department of Justice. Oath or affirmation by the contracting parties before the municipal treasurer concerned shall be sufficient for the purpose of acknowledgment. No fees or stamps of any kind shall be paid or required" (As amended by RA N. 34, Sec. 2, par. 2).

## NECROLOGY

---

### FATHER GEORGE VROMANT PASSES AWAY

---

Father George Vromant was baptized at the very moment of his birth on July 7, 1879 and later rebaptized, so that he has ever been a citizen of heaven rather than a citizen of this earth.

Born at Courtray, a city of Flanders dedicated to Saint Martin, educated at the local College under the patronage of Saint Amandus, these two Apostles of his native country undoubtedly exerted a great influence on his receptive mind, that was turned very soon towards the missionary adventure. He entered the Novitiate of the Congregation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary on September 7, 1899 and made his first religious profession on September 8, 1900. All the time of his scholasticate he was so much absorbed in study and prayer, that his admiring confreres fondly called him "Our Thomasinus". After his ordination to the holy Priesthood, on July 16, 1905, he was retained at Louvain as prefect of discipline, and two years later, he was assigned as socius to the Master of Novices, with special care of the Brothers.

In the meantime, the Congregation had accepted a new mission field in the Philippines, and very soon came an offer to open a seminary. This brought Father Vromant to the Philippines, in company of a group of selected professors, in order to tackle a project, that before long proved to be abortive.

Father Vromant left the mother-house of Scheut for the mission of the Philippines on February 25, 1909 and the following month, on Palm Sunday, set foot on Philippine soil, where he should spend the rest of his life, with the exception of a relatively short interval of fourteen years at the Congregation's theologicum of Louvain, where he occupied the chair of Canon Law and Liturgy. In the former capacity, Father Vromant conceived the plan of a most meritorious work, that eventually drew upon him the attention of the ecclesiastical world. The recently issued Codex of Canon Law did not cover several cases that were in need of practical solutions in mission territories. The learned Father decided to try something about it, and with tireless patience he rummaged through papal pronouncements and decisions of Roman Congregations, within his reach, having any relation with the missions. His perseverant research work gave birth to a treatise in six volumes, entitled "Jus missionariorum". This first attempt of gathering under their respective titles and chapters, existing regulations for the solution of many cases peculiar to the missions, has deserved the praise and gratitude of all missionaries concerned. Others have followed him in this line and eventually improved and



amplified his work, but Father Vromant may be rightly called a pioneer who blazed a trail towards the formation of what he baptized "Jus missionariorum".

Other works have flowed from his prolific pen: treatises of Christian Doctrine, about Faith, the Commandments, Sacrifice and Sacraments, for the use of High Schools and Colleges, as well as for more advanced members of Catholic organizations. He wrote also textbooks of Sacred History and a lot of articles published in sundry periodicals in the Philippines and in his native Belgium.

Next to this remarkable literary activity, Father Vromant took up many spiritual ministrations, in the course of his long and fruitful career. He has ever been an able teacher of Religion, a beloved Confessor, a sure spiritual guide and a retreat master in demand of religious communities and also of priests. Several members of the Hierarchy availed themselves of his enlightened advices for the guidance of their respective flocks and even for the direction of their individual conscience.

After World War II, Father Vromant became professor and spiritual director of the seminarians at St. Francis de Sales Seminary of Lipa, and later transferred, in the same capacity, to San Carlos Seminary of Manila, where he filled the chair of Canon Law. He was also for many years the active and indomitable officialis of the Matrimonial tribunal of the ecclesiastical province of Manila. When time came that his shoulders gave way to the burden of this task, he graciously stepped down, but asked as a favor to remain attached to same tribunal in the capacity of a judge. Working was in his blood: it was for him as natural as breathing. He had been relieved as spiritual director, but his door remained always open for all who came to him for advice and encouragement. He became too weak to be any more a professor: but he pleaded with His Eminence to be an assistant chaplain at San Juan de Dios hospital, and during the last months of his life, he rode every morning to the hospital, and went around visiting the patients giving them comfort and consolation.

Such an indefatigable activity gave his confreres the impression that Father Vromant was immortal, and it was not without a feeling of dismay that they learned that their venerable confrere had been brought to the hospital. A few days later came the news that he had received the Sacrament of the sick. The end was visibly approaching; he kept all his lucidity of mind until he slumbered and fell into unconsciousness a couple of days before his peaceful demise, at 9:30 in the morning of July 12, 1966. He was 87 years and 5 days old.

May his worn out body remain peacefully in his grave until the day of the glorious resurrection, while his rejuvenated soul may have received already the reward of an extraordinary active life entirely dedicated to the service of God and the souls.

REV. CARLOS DESMET, CICM