

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

OFFICIAL INTERDIOCESAN ORGAN

● THE PHILIPPINE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW ●

SCHISM? • NEW ORDO MISSAE •
CULT OR EVANGELIZATION? • ON
"CONSCIENCE AND THE PAPAL EN-
CYCLICAL" • LITURGY AND MUSIC
• JURISDICTION IN PERSONAL PA-
RISHES • RELIGIOUS CELIBACY •
MARYKNOLL SISTER •

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

EDITORIAL STAFF

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| EDITOR | LEONARDO Z. LEGASPI, O.P. |
| ASSISTANT EDITOR | FIDEL VILLAROEL, O.P. |
| ASSOCIATE EDITORS | FRANCISO DEL RIO, O.P. QUINTIN M. GARCIA, O.P. JESUS MERINO, O.P. EFREN RIVERA, O.P. PEDRO V. SALGADO, O.P. POMPEYO DE MESA, O.P. |
| BUSINESS MANAGER | FLORENCIO TESTERA, O.P. |

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS Official Interdiocesan Organ is published monthly by the University of Santo Tomas and is printed at U.S.T. Press, Manila, Philippines. Entered as Second Class Mail Matter at the Manila Post Office on June 21, 1946.

Subscription Rates: Yearly subscription in the Philippines, P15.00; Two Years, P26.00; Three Years, P40.00. Abroad, \$5.00 a year. Price per copy, P1.50. Subscriptions are paid in advance.

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

Address all communications to:

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS
Fathers' Residence
University of Santo Tomas
Manila D-403
Philippines



MOST REVEREND VICTORINO LIGOT, D.D.
Auxiliary Bishop of Nueva Segovia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| EDITORIAL | 466 |
| THE POPE SPEAKS | |
| Apostolic Constitution on the Roman Missal | 469 |
| DOCUMENTATION | |
| The New "Ordo Missae" | 475 |
| Introduction on the Dress, Titles and Coats-of-Arms of Cardinals, Bishops and Lesser Prelates | 478 |
| Declaration on Religious Celibacy | 484 |
| NOTES AND COMMENTS | |
| On "Conscience and the Papal Encyclical" | |
| • P. J. TALTY, C.S.S.R. | 488 |
| Liturgy and Sacred Music | 494 |
| • MARITO REBAMONTAN | 496 |
| Liturgical Notes | |
| PHILIPPINE HIERARCHY | |
| New Bishops and Dioceses | 498 |
| DOCTRINAL SECTION | |
| Cult or Evangelization? (Anent the Priestly Ministry) | |
| • JESUS MA. CAVANNA, C.M. | 502 |
| PASTORAL SECTION | |
| Homiletics — Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth, Thirteenth, and Fourteenth Sundays after Pentecost | |
| • DAVID TITHER, C.S.S.R. | 515 |
| LAYMAN'S VIEW | |
| Pastoral Role Expectations | |
| • ROBERTO LAZARO | 526 |
| CASES AND QUERIES | |
| Jurisdiction in Personal Parishes | |
| • AGAPIO SALVADOR, O.P. | 531 |
| The Bishops and the Advanced Fulfillment of Sunday Obligations | |
| • L. Z. LEGASPI, O.P. | 535 |
| HISTORICAL SECTION | |
| The Maryknoll Sisters | 538 |
| OPEN WINDOWS | 543 |
| THE CHURCH HERE AND THERE | 545 |
| SPECIAL REVIEW | 550 |

EDITORIAL

SCHISM?

Vatican II, was intended by Pope John to be a pastoral, not a doctrinal council. He made this clear in his opening address when he asserted that the doctrinal needs of the Church were still perfectly satisfied by the work of Trent and Vatican I. This pastoral aspect is evident in the texts of Vatican II. Yet, many a 'theologian', on the pretext of the so-called 'new theology', were able, through some 'periti', to introduce in the conciliar documents that most definite characteristic of their 'theology', *ambiguity*. A man on the know, Cardinal Heenan, in *The Tablet*, puts it thus: 'There are hundreds of papers in the Vatican archives which presumably will reveal to scholars of the future the proceedings in secret commission meetings. Clerical journalists have described the intrigues and quarrels which led to the acceptance or rejection of conciliar documents. The more significant activities within the commissions have not yet been fully revealed. The framing of amendments for the vote of the Fathers was the most delicate part of a commission's work. A determined group could wear down opposition and produce a formula patient of *both orthodox and modernistic interpretation*.'

The effect of this and other influences is the confusion created in almost every field of doctrine, and the relegation of the *magisterium*, most especially that of the Pope, to the voices that clamour in the dessert. Again quoting Cardinal Heenan: "...The ordinary magisterium of the Pope is exercised in his writings and allocutions. But today what the Pope says is by no means accepted as authoritative by all Catholic theologians. An article in the periodical *Concilium* is at least as likely to win their respect as a papal encyclical. The decline of the magisterium is one of the most significant developments in the post-conciliar Church."

That this lethal effect on the faith can in no way be attributed to the Council is clear from the words of Paul VI: "It will be said that the Council authorized such treatment of traditional teaching. Nothing is more false, if we are to accept the work of Pope John who launched that *aggiornamento* in whose name some dare to impose on Catholic dogma dangerous and sometimes reckless interpretations."

The voice of the universal Shepherd, further continues. In his Christmas address to the College of Cardinals and members of the Curia on Dec. 23, 1968 he stated: "Certainly We cannot remain silent about the sorrow it causes Us to see Our intentions and even Our words misunderstood or distorted at times; nor about Our fear that a certain number of Our sons — fortunately few, but still too many, as far as We are concerned — and through their efforts, others who are less firmly grounded and more vulnerable, will depart from the right path and, attracted by a love for novelty and change, will have the words of the Apostle addressed to them: "*A veritate quidem auditum avertent, ad fabulas autem convertentur*," "*They will turn away their hearing from the truth and turn aside rather to fables* (2 Tim. 4:4).

"This, and not any timid outlook on things, dictates Our insistence on themes which We regard as fundamental for doctrinal orthodoxy and the good order of the Church, and which seem to have lost their clarity or certainty for some people — including, unfortunately, priests and people dedicated to religious perfection. This is true both with regard to the teaching of the faith and to matters concerning the principles of so-called Church discipline, the latter is nothing more nor less than a free, voluntary and binding acceptance of the relations of mutual trust and respect between a divinely derived authority and obedience—relations that are absolutely necessary for anyone to enter into the mystery of Christ's obedience."

From the start the doctrine of faith has been the bond of union. Consequently, the bond, once broken, can no longer be *unam sanctam, one holy . . . Church*. Faith, once altered, means *schism* even to the *alterers* stubbornly continuing within the fold (to reform the Church from within, as they do say). From the beginning the alteration of faith meant "not belonging": *Ex nobis prodierunt, sed non erant ex nobis*"; "*those rivals of Christ came out of our own number, but they had never really belonged*" (1 John 2:10)

With these considerations, the following words of Pope Paul on Maundy Thursday this year can be well understood: "There is talk of renewal in the doctrine and in the conscience of the Church of God; but how can the living and true Church be authentic and persistent if the complex structure that forms it and defines it a spiritual and social "mystical body", is today so often and so gravely corroded by dissent and challenge and forgetfulness of its hierarchical structure, and is countered in its divine and indispensable constituent charism, its pastoral authority? How can it claim to be a Church, that is a united people even though locally

broken up and historically and legitimately diversified, when a practically schismatic ferment is dividing it, subdividing it and breaking it into groups which are more than anything else zealous for arbitrary and fundamentally egoistical autonomy, masked by Christian pluralism or liberty of conscience? How will it be able to be built up by activity that would like to be called apostolic, when this is deliberately led by centrifugal tendencies and when it develops, not the mentality of communitarian love, but rather that of partisan polemics, or when it prefers dangerous and equivocal sympathies, which need to be met with unyielding reserve, as against friendships founded on fundamental principles, marked by indulgence towards mutual defects and needing concurrence and collaboration?

"There is still talk of the Church, of the Catholic Church, our own: but can we say to ourselves that in her members, in her institutions and her work she is truly living by a sincere spirit of union and charity, which makes her worthy to celebrate our most holy daily Mass without hypocrisy and without the unfeelingness of habit? Have we not amongs us those "*schismatics*", those "*disensions*" sadly denounced in St. Paul's first letter to the Corinthians?"

The implications here are vital to all Christians, most especially to bishops and priests. Many, fortunately, have started to realize the ominous consequences for those who, in conscience, are responsible for such state of affairs in the Church. The newly created Cardinal Danielou for one has declared: "It is impossible that the Church be reduced to nothing less than a madhouse of subjective opinions. The Church is responsible before Christ for the authenticity of the deposit of faith, and when heretical opinions on the divinity of Christ, on the resurrection of the dead and on eternal life are uttered, when opinions are expressed contrary to the Christian faith, I believe that the Church is rigorously obliged to condemn them. . . . This does not mean to reprimand or limit someone's research. It means to exercise what is required by the Church's responsibility."

QUINTIN M. GARCÍA, O.P.

THE POPE SPEAKS

APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION
ON THE ROMAN MISSAL
WHICH PROMULGATES THE ROMAN MISSAL
RESTORED BY THE DECREE OF THE
SECOND VATICAN ECUMENICAL COUNCIL

PAUL, BISHOP
SERVANT OF THE SERVANTS OF GOD
FOR EVERLASTING MEMORY

The Roman Missal, promulgated in 1570 by our predecessor, St. Pius V, by decree of the Council of Trent, has been received by all as one of the numerous admirable fruits which the holy Council has spread throughout the entire Church of Christ. For four centuries, not only has it furnished the priests of the Latin Rite with the norms for the celebration of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but also the saintly heralds of the Gospel have carried it almost the entire world. Furthermore, innumerable holy men have abundantly nourished their piety towards God by its readings from Sacred Scripture or by its prayers, whose general arrangement goes back in essence, to St. Gregory the Great.

Since that time there has grown and spread among the Christian people the liturgical renewal which, according to Pius XII, our predecessor of venerable memory, seems to show the signs of God's pro-

¹ Cf. Apost. Const. *Quo primum*, July 13, 1570.

vidence in the present time, a salvific action of the holy Spirit in His Church.² This renewal has also shown clearly that the formulas of the Roman Missal ought to be revised and enriched. The beginning of this renewal was the work of our predecessor, this same Pius XII, in the restoration of the Paschal Vigil and of the Holy Week Rite,³ which formed the first stage of updating the Roman Missal for the present-day mentality.

The recent Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, in promulgating the Constitution *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, established the bases for the general revision of the Roman Missal; in declaring that "both texts and rites would be drawn up so that they express more clearly the holy things which they signify",⁴ in ordering that "the rite of the Mass is to be revised in such a way that the intrinsic nature and purpose of its several parts, as also the connection between them, can be more clearly manifested, and that devout and active participation by the faithful can be more easily accomplished",⁵ in prescribing that "the treasures of the Bible are to be opened up more lavishly, so that richer fare may be provided for the faithful at the table of God's Word",⁶ in ordering, finally, that "a new rite for concelebration is to be drawn up and incorporated into the Pontifical and into the Roman Missal".⁷

One ought not to think, however, that this revision of the Roman Missal has been improvident. The progress that the liturgical sciences have accomplished in the last four centuries has, without a doubt, prepared the way. After the Council of Trent, the study "of ancient manuscripts of the Vatican library and of others gathered elsewhere", as our predecessor St. Pius V indicates in the Apostolic Constitution *Quo*

² Cf. Pius XII, Discourse to the participants of the First International Congress of Pastoral Liturgy at Assisi, May 22, 1956: A.A.S. 48 (1956) 172.

³ Cf. Sacred Congregation of Rites, Decree *Dominicae resurrectionis*, February 9, 1951: A.A.S. 43 (1951) 128 ff; Decree *Maxima Redemptionis nostrae mysteria*, November 16, 1955: A.A.S. 47 (1955) 838 ff.

⁴ II Vatican Council Const. on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, art 21: A.A.S. 56 (1964) 106.

⁵ *Ibid.* art. 50: A.A.S. 56 (1964) 114.

⁶ *Ibid.* art. 51: A.A.S. 56 (1964) 114.

⁷ *Ibid.* art. 57: A.A.S. 56 (1964) 115.

primum, has greatly helped for the revision of the Roman Missal. Since then, however, more ancient liturgical sources have been discovered and published and at the same time liturgical formulas of the Oriental Church have become better known. Many wish that the riches, both doctrinal and spiritual, might not be hidden in the darkness of the libraries, but on the contrary might be brought into the light to illuminate and nourish the spirits and souls of Christians.

Let us show now, in broad lines, the new composition of the Roman Missal. First of all, in a *General Introduction*, which serves as a preface for the book, the new regulations are set forth for the celebration of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, concerning the rites and functions of such of the participants and sacred furnishings and places.

The major innovation concerns the Eucharistic Prayer. If in the Roman Rite, the first part of this Prayer, the Preface, has preserved diverse formulation in the course of the centuries, the second part on the contrary, called "Canon of the Action", took on an unchangeable form during the 4th and 5th centuries: conversely, the Eastern liturgies allowed for this variety in their anaphoras. In this matter, however, apart from the fact that the Eucharistic prayer is enriched by a great number of Prefaces, either derived from the ancient tradition of the Roman Church or composed recently, we have decided to add three new Canons to this Prayer. In this way the different aspects of the mystery of salvation will be emphasized and they will procure richer themes for the thanksgiving. However, for pastoral reasons, and in order to facilitate concelebration, we have ordered that the words of the Lord ought to be identical in each formulary of the Canon. Thus, in each Eucharistic Prayer, we wish the words be pronounced thus: over the bread: *Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes: hoc est enim Corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur*: over the chalice: *accipite et bibite ex eo omnes: hic est enim calix sanguinis mei novi et aeterni testamenti, qui pro vobis et pro multi effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*. The words of *Mysterium fidei*, taken from the context of the words of Christ the Lord, and said by the priest, serve as an introduction to the acclamation of the faithful.

Concerning the rite of the Mass, "the rites are to be simplified, while due care is taken to preserve their substances".⁸ Also to be eliminated are "elements which, with the passage of time, came to be duplicated, or were added with but little advantage",⁹ above all in the rites of offering the bread and wine, and in those of the bread and of communion.

Also, "other elements which have suffered injury through accidents of history are now to be restored to the earlier norm of the holy Fathers":¹⁰ for example the homily,¹¹ the "common prayer" or "prayer of the faithful",¹² the penitential rite or act of reconciliation with God and with the brothers, at the beginning of the Mass, where its proper emphasis is restored.

According to the prescription of the Second Vatican Council which prescribes that "a more representative portion of the Holy Scriptures will be read to the people over a set cycle of years",¹³ all of the readings for Sunday are divided into a cycle of three years. In addition, for Sundays and feasts, the readings of the Epistle and Gospel are preceded by a reading from the Old Testament or, during Paschaltide, from the Acts of the Apostles. In this way the dynamism of the mystery of salvation, shown by the text of the divine revelation is more clearly accentuated. These widely selected biblical readings, which give to the faithful on feast days, the most important part of Sacred Scripture, is completed by access to the other parts of the Holy Books read on other days.

All this is wisely ordered in such a way that there is developed more and more among the faithful a "hunger for the Word",¹⁴ under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, leads the people of the New Covenant to the perfect unity of the Church. We are fully confident that both priests and faithful will prepare their hearts more devoutly and toge-

⁸ *Ibid.* art. 50: A.A.S. 56 (1964) 114.

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ Cf. *Ibid.*

¹¹ Cf. *Ibid.* art. 52: A.A.S. 56 (1964) 114.

¹² Cf. *Ibid.* art. 53: A.A.S. 56 (1964) 114.

¹³ *Ibid.* art. 51: A.A.S. 56 (1964) 114.

ther at the Lord's supper, meditating more profoundly on Sacred Scripture, and at the same time they will nourish themselves more day by day with the words of the Lord. It will follow then that according to the wishes of the Second Vatican Council, Sacred Scripture will be at the same time a perpetual source of spiritual life, an instrument of prime value for transmitting Christian doctrine and finally the centre of all theology.

In this revision of the Roman Missal, in addition to the three changes mentioned above, namely, the Eucharistic Prayer, the Rite for the Mass and the Biblical readings, other parts also have been reviewed and considerably modified: the Proper of Seasons, the Proper of Saints, the Common of Saints, ritual Masses and votive Masses. In all of these changes, particular care has been taken with the prayers: not only has their numbers been increased, so that the new texts might better correspond to new needs, but also their text has been restored on the testimony of the most ancient evidence. For each ferial of the principal liturgical seasons, Advent, Christmas Lent and Easter, a proper prayer has been provided.

Even though the text of the Roman Gradual, at least that which concerns the singing has not been changed, still, for a better understanding, the responsorial psalm, which St. Augustine and St. Leo the Great often mention, has been restored, and the Introit and Communion antiphons have been adapted for read Masses.

In conclusion, we wish to give the force of law to all that we have set forth concerning the new Roman Missal. In promulgating the official edition of the Roman Missal, our predecessor St. Pius V presented it as an instrument of liturgical unity and as a witness to the purity of the worship in the Church. While leaving room in the new Missal, variations and adaptations",¹⁴ we hope nevertheless that the Missal will be received by the faithful as an instrument which bears witness to and which affirms the common unity of all. Thus, in the great diversity of languages, one unique prayer will rise as an acceptable offering

¹⁴ Cf. *Amos* 8, 11.

¹⁵ Cf. Conc. Vat. II Const. de Sacra Liturgia, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. nn. 38-40: A.A.S. 56 (1964) p. 110.

to Our Father in heaven, through our High Priest Jesus Christ, in the Holy Spirit.

We order that the prescriptions of this Constitution go into effect November 30th of this year, the first Sunday of Advent.

We wish that these our decrees and prescriptions may be firm and effective now and in the future, notwithstanding to the extent necessary, the apostolic constitutions and ordinances issued by our predecessors, and other prescriptions, even those deserving particular mention and derogation.

Given at Rome, at Saint Peter's, Holy Thursday, April 3, 1969, the sixth year of our pontificate.

PAUL VI, POPE

DOCUMENTATION

THE NEW "ORDO MISSAE"

By the Apostolic Constitution "Missale Romanum", dated Holy Thursday, April 3, 1969, the Holy Father has approved and commanded to be promulgated the new Missal revised on the basis of the directives of the Second Vatican Council.

Now, by a Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, dated April 6, 1969, there appears the volume which contains the *Ordo Missae* and the general norms, brought together into the document entitled "Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani". The *Ordo Missae* and the general norms come into force on the first Sunday of next Advent, November 30, 1969.

I

The *Ordo Missae* in its new form marks the goal of the reform of the Mass, after the intermediary stages reached with the Instructions of the Sacred Congregation of Rites of September 26, 1964, and of May 4, 1967.

The points that have been altered are the following:

1. *Introductory rites.* The prayers at the foot of the altar are suppressed in their present form, and the celebration opens with the singing of the introit, while the celebrant goes to the altar and then goes to the seat. Then, at the seat, the celebrant makes the sign of the cross together with the people, and greets the assembly. Certain formulae of greeting derived from St. Paul's Letters can be used (for instance, "The love of God the Father, the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you"), or the traditional "The Lord be with you" or "and also with you." In every case the people reply: "And with your spirit". Then comes the penitential act, which can take different forms, and before which the priest may speak some words to the faithful as an introduction to the celebration beginning. The rite then continues with the *Kyrie* and the *Gloria*.

2. *Offertory rites.* This part of the celebration, left completely untouched in the preceding reforms, is now rearranged to correspond better to its true meaning. The formulae accompanying the placing of the bread and wine on the altar have been changed, so as not to anticipate the true offering of the sacrifice, which will be done in the Canon. Use had been made of expressions of blessing traditional in the Bible, stressing the creative action of God and

man's participation in the offering of the elements that will serve for the sacrifice: "You are blessed, Lord God of the universe. From your generosity we have received the bread which we present to you. It is the fruit of the earth and of man's labour. And from it will come to us the bread of life." A similar formula, with the necessary changes, accompanied the placing of the chalice on the altar. The formula for pouring water in the wine has been shortened, and that of the washing of hands changed.

3. *The rite of the "Fractio" and of the "Pax".* The elements that constitute this part have been arranged in a clearer fashion. The *Our Father*, which begins the communion rites, is followed by the embolism ("Deliver us...") in a shortened form and without the names of the saints. This concludes with the memorial of the return of the Lord and the acclamation of the people "... we may be ever free from sin and safe from all disquiet, awaiting the blessed hope and the coming of our Saviour Jesus Christ. "R. Yours is the kingdom, yours the power for ever."

The rite of the kiss of peace has been arranged thus: first the priest asks of God the gift of peace for the Church and the world with the prayer "Lord Jesus Christ, who said to your Apostles: Peace I leave with you my peace I give to you..." Then he addresses this wish to the faithful "May the peace of the Lord be always with you" and the invitation "Give one another the kiss of peace". The faithful may exchange a greeting of peace by a suitable gesture to be determined by the Bishops Conferences.

Then come the breaking of the Eucharistic Bread for Communion, accompanied by the singing of the acclamation "Lamb of God". The Communion rites remain unchanged.

4. There are other minor changes throughout the *Ordo*. Of these we note two touching the Roman Canon. In it too the words of the Lord in the narration of the Last Supper have been made uniform with the reading adopted in the new eucharistic prayers: "This is my body which will be given up for you", for the consecration of the bread, and "This is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant. It will be shed for you and for all men so that sins may be forgiven." The first formula has received the addition of the phrase "which will be given up for you", and the second has had removed the words "the mystery of faith", which are said by the celebrant as an introduction to the acclamation of the people: "Christ has died, Christ is risen, Christ will come again."

Besides, the conclusions "Through Christ our Lord" recurring in the Canon are put between brackets and may be omitted. The same procedure is used for the names of the saints, in the *Communicantes* only the names of the Blessed Virgin, of St. Joseph and of the Apostles Peter Paul and An-

drew remain obligatory, in the *Nobis quoque* the names of the saints mentioned in the Bible are obligatory, namely John the Baptist, Stephen, Matthew and Barnabas. In this way the venerable Roman Canon acquires greater unity and ease of recitation on the lines of the new eucharistic prayers.

II

The *Institutio Generalis* of the Missal summarizes the Missal's present introductory documents: The General Rubrics, the "Ritus Servandus in Celebratione Missae", the "De Defectibus in Celebratione Missae Occurrentibus". Its style is of course pastoral rather than juridical and rubrical, so as to guide the celebrant not only in the exact performance of the rite, but also in understanding its spirit and significance.

The *Institutio Generalis* of the Missal summarizes the Missal's present doctrinal character. The second reviews the various elements of the celebration, giving the doctrinal and rubrical presentation of each. The third illustrates the roles of each of those participating in the celebration priest, people and ministers. The fourth sets forth the various forms of celebration: Mass with the people, private Mass, concelebrated Mass and contains also the norms for communion under both species. The fifth offers an ample set of directives on the arrangement of the church as the place of the celebration. The sixth reviews what is needed for the sacred action, the sacred furniture, vessels and vestments. The seventh gives guidance in choosing the formulary of the Mass and of its various parts readings, prayers and chants, offering also a whole series of possible adaptations and a number of different forms. The eighth summarizes in two pages the hitherto very wide and extremely complicated legislation on votive Masses and Masses for the dead.

As can be seen, this is a document with a clear, linear structure, inspired by pastoral principles, and aimed rather at illustrating and guiding than at presenting a whole series of taxative norms.

After these years of unavoidable fluidity, it is to be hoped that with the *Institutio* now published a clearer and more united outline will be found in the celebration of worship, particularly in the celebration of the Eucharist, as the Holy Father himself wishes in the Apostolic Constitution: "We trust that the new Missal will be accepted as an instrument that will show forth and strengthen the reciprocal unity of all, and that by its means, even in the diversity of tongues, a single prayer may ascend to the heavenly Father."

Shortly there will follow the publication of the Lectionary and of the part of the Missal containing the prayers and antiphons. Then one will have a complete picture of the new liturgical book and the material adaptation to the various situations of God's holy people.

INTRODUCTION ON THE DRESS, TITLES AND COATS-OF-ARMS OF CARDINALS, BISHOPS AND LESSER PRELATES

In the diligent exercise of His vigilance over the Church, and the observance of the indications and spirit of the Church, and the observance of the indications and spirit of the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, His Holiness Pope Paul VI has not failed to dedicate His attention also to certain exterior forms of ecclesiastical life, with the intention of bringing them into closer correspondence with the changing circumstances of the times, and of making them now accord better with higher spiritual values which they should express and promote.

This is well known to be a subject to which the modern mentality is particularly sensitive, one that demands the avoidance of possible extremes in one direction or the other, and an ability to bring correctness and decorum into harmony with simplicity, practicality, and the spirit of humility and poverty, which must always and preeminently shine forth in those who, by their investiture in ecclesiastical offices, have some special responsibility in the service of the People of God.

It is on the basis of such criteria that, in the course of the last two years, the Holy Father has given directions for the publication of certain rules on the dress and other prerogatives of Cardinals (Reference No. 3711 of the Sacred Congregation for Ceremonial, dated June 6, 1967), of a *Motu Proprio* on the Reorganization of the Pontifical Household ("*Pontificalis Domus*" of March 28, 1968), and of another *Motu Proprio*, complemented by an Instruction of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, on the use of pontifical insignia ("*Pontificalia Insignia*" of June 21, 1968; Instruction of the same date, Reference No. R. 32/968).

Wishing now to renew further and on a broader scale the discipline on dress, titles and coats-of-arms of Cardinals, Bishops and lesser Prelates, His Holiness charged a special Commission of Cardinals and His Secre-

tariat of State to study the matter with care, taking account, at the same time and in just measure, of tradition, modern needs, and the deeper values implicit in certain forms of living, exterior and contingent though they be.

The fruit of that labor is the present Instruction, which the Holy Father deigned to approve in the Audience granted to the undersigned Cardinal Secretary of State, on the twenty-eight of March, 1969, disposing likewise that it should come into force on the thirteenth day of April, Low Sunday, 1969.

PART I — THE DRESS FOR THE CARDINALS

1: The following continue in use: the cassock of red wool or similar material, with trimmings, lining, buttons and thread of red silk, and the mozzetta of the same material and colour as the cassock but without the small hood.

The mantelletta is abolished.

2. The use is also continued of the black cassock with trimmings, lining, buttonholes and buttons of red silk, but without the upper half-sleeves.

The elbow-length cape, trimmed in the same manner as this cassock, may be worn over it.

3. With both the red cassock and the red-rimmed black cassock there is worn the sash of red watered-silk ribbon, with silk fringes at the two ends.

The sash with tassels is abolished.

4. When the red cassock is worn, red hose are also worn. With the red-rimmed black cassock the wearing of red hose is optional.

5. The dress for ordinary use may be the black cassock without red trim. With this black cassock, red hose are not worn. The red "collare" (rabat or rabbi) and the red watered-silk skullcap may be worn, even with the black cassock without the red trim.

6. The red watered-silk beretta is to be worn only with choral dress, and not as common headdress.

7. The use of the red watered-silk cloak ("ferraiuolo") is no longer obligatory for Papal Audiences and ceremonies held in the presence of the Holy Father. Its use is optional in other cases also, but should always be restricted to circumstances of special solemnity.

8. The red cloak ("tabarro") is abolished. In its place a decorous black cloak, even with cape, can be used.

9. The red cardinalatial hat ("galero") and the red plush hat are abolished. The black plush hat is retained. When appropriate, it can be adorned with the red and gold cord and tassels.

10. The use of red shoes and of buckles, even the silver buckles on black shoes is suppressed.

11. The rochet of linen, or similar material, is retained. The surplice or cotta is never worn over the rochet.

12. The cappa magna, always without ermine, is no longer obligatory; it can be used only outside Rome, in circumstances of very special solemnity.

13. The use of the cord and of the chain for the pectoral cross is retained. The cord must be used only when the red cassock or sacred vestments are worn.

FOR THE BISHOPS

14. By analogy with what has been allowed for Cardinals, the purple cassock, the mozzetta without the small hood, and the black cassock with red trim are retained.

The mozzetta can be worn anywhere, even by Titular Bishops.

The mantelletta is abolished.

The red-trimmed black cassock is no longer obligatory as ordinary dress. The red-trimmed cape may be worn over it.

15. With regard to the sash, hose, ordinary dress, collare (rabat), skull-cap, biretta, "ferraiuolo", cloak (tabarro), buckles, rochet, the rules laid down in Nos. 3-8 and 10-13 above are to be followed.

16. The use of the black plush hat with green cord and tassels, the same for all Bishops, both residential and titular, is retained.

17. Bishops named from Religious Orders and Congregations will use the purple cassock, and the cassocks with red trim and without red trim, in all respects the same as other Bishops.

C) For lesser prelates:

18. For the Superior Prelates of the Offices of the Roman Curia who have not episcopal rank; for the Auditors of the Rota; for the Promoter General of the Justice and the Defender of the Bond of the Apostolic Signatura, for the Apostolic Protonotaries "de numero" and the four Clerics of the Camera, the purple cassock, the purple mantelletta, the rochet, the red-trimmed black cassock without cape, the purple sash with fringes of silk at the two ends, the purple "ferraiuolo" (non-obligatory), and the red tuft on the biretta are all retained.

The sash with tassels, coloured hose and shoe-buckles are abolished.

19. For the Apostolic Protonotaries Supernumerary, and for the Prelates of Honour of His Holiness, the purple mantelletta, the sash with tassels, coloured hose, shoe-buckles and the red tuft on the biretta are all abolished.

But, there are retained the purple cassock, the red-trimmed black cassock without cape, the sash with fringes. When appropriate, the unpleated surplice (cotta) can be worn over the purple cassock, instead of the rochet.

The purple "ferraiuolo", although both obligatory, is retained for the Supernumerary Apostolic Protonotaries, but not for the Prelates of Honour.

20. For the Chaplains of His Holiness the purple-trimmed black cassock with purple sash is retained, to be used also in sacred ceremonies.

The purple cassock, the "mantellone" of the same colour, the sash with tassels and the buckles on shoes are abolished.

PART TWO: TITLES AND COATS-OF-ARMS

21. The so-called titles of kinship used by the Supreme Pontiff with reference to Cardinals, Bishops and other ecclesiastics will be, respectively, only the following:

“Our Venerable Brother”

“Venerable Brother”

“Beloved son”

22. There may still be used, for Cardinals and Bishops respectively, the titles “Eminence” and “Excellency”, which may also be qualified by the adjectival phrase “Most Reverend”.

23. In addressing a Cardinal or a Bishop there may be used respectively the simple titles “Lord Cardinal” and “Monsignor”.

24. The title “Monsignor” used in addressing Bishops may be accompanied by the adjectival phrase “Most Reverend”.

25. For the Prelates enumerated in No. 18, the title of “Monsignor” may be accompanied Signatura, there may also be used the title “Excellency”, without the addition of “Most Reverend”.

26. For Supernumerary Apostolic Protonotaries, Prelates of Honour and Chaplains of His Holiness there may be used the title “Monsignor”, preceded, where appropriate, by “Reverend”.

27. In formal written address, the expressions “kissing the Sacred Purple”, “kissing the Sacred Ring” may be omitted.

28. The use of coats-of-arms by Cardinals and Bishops is permitted. The shield of the coat-of-arms must be simple and clear.

29. Cardinals may place their coats-of-arms on the exterior of the churches of their Title or Diaconate.

From these churches the portrait of the titular Cardinal shall be removed. In the interior, near the main door, the name of the titular Cardinal may be placed in a suitable frame which will harmonise with the sacred building.

ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

30. With regard to the dress and titles of Cardinals and Patriarchs of the Oriental Rite, the traditional usages of those Rites shall be followed.

31. Patriarchs of the Latin Rite who are not Cardinals will dress like other Bishops.

32. Pontifical Representatives, whether Bishops or not, will follow the rules laid down above for Bishops.

Nevertheless, in the area of their jurisdiction, they may use the sash, zucchetto, biretta and "ferraiuolo" of watered silk.

They will be accorded the title of "Venerable Brother", as mentioned in No. 21, only if they are Bishops.

33. Those Prelates and Abbots "Nullius", Apostolic Administrators, Vicars and Prelates Apostolic, who are not Bishops, may dress like Bishops.

34. In the matter of titles, Episcopal Conferences may lay down suitable rules which take into account local usages, while at the same time following the dispositions and criteria contained in the present Instruction.

35. Concerning the dress and titles of canons, holders of benefices and parish priests, suitable norms will be issued by the Sacred Congregation for the Clergy, following the criteria of simplification contained in the present document.

Major Religious Superiors of Men in the Netherlands

DECLARATION ON

RELIGIOUS CELIBACY

Discussions regarding the celibacy of the secular clergy imply the need for fresh thinking on the real sense of "wanting to remain unmarried for the sake of the kingdom of Heaven." It is a matter which affects religious in a special way.

The Major Religious Superiors of Men, who jointly form the Association of Religious Priests in the Netherlands, wish to give testimony concerning this matter, not as men constituted with authority, but rather from a sense of responsibility towards their confreres and towards the faithful who have indicated that they need such testimony.

THE MEANING OF CELIBACY

There may be a number of reasons why a person decides to remain unmarried: he may do so because he believes that he can give himself more readily and more freely to the service of his fellowmen; he may remain unmarried in order to retain that freedom which enables him to go wherever people have appealed to him for help. In such cases one may speak of remaining unmarried for the sake of the Kingdom of God. Nevertheless, in these instances the heart of the matter — to remain unmarried in the evangelical sense — has not yet been touched.

This heart of the matter, the deepest motivation, lies in a special mode of experiencing God. A man's choice of the celibate state is truly evangelical only if in some way he believes (at least implicitly) and really experiences that God bestows Himself upon him in such a way that it is worthwhile to live in celibacy. God has passed in front of him, and although he has only "seen the back of God" (Exodus 33, 23), a lasting impression has been made of him.

Perhaps this is a hazardous way to speak of God. Nevertheless, we think that evangelical celibacy is essentially determined by our faith in such a view of God's relationship with man. Rather than emphasizing the life which will appear only after this present one, or a God who dwells outside our present world, we stress the Living God, the Father of Jesus Christ, who comes to meet us in this life and in this world, so that He may take complete hold of us. "He who is to come" may so totally grasp a man that he sets aside the deeply human values of the married state.

When viewed in this light of faith, celibate life may differ from person to person. For one it will bring a certain mobility by which he is enabled to go wherever he is needed; for another it will involve the experience of poverty, that is, a deprivation suited to a more effective apostolate; for another, it is a more explicit dedication to values, an awareness of the limitations of material things, a rebellion against the establishment. But it is not from these that evangelical celibacy derives its ultimate meaning.

Its ultimate meaning is derived *from God* and refers back *to God*. The touchstone of evangelical celibacy is this: it serves as a constant reminder to all the faithful (including those who are married) that man's existence has meaning only in the ultimate mystery of God.

We think it advisable to draw attention to this latter motive in our choice of evangelical celibacy. Has it not become clear that our contemporaries have questioned every other motive for celibacy? Would not the uneasiness of many celibates originate in the fact that this motive of the ultimate mystery of God has never entered into their choice, or has become dimmed over the years?

Nevertheless, even if the choice of celibacy is well and deeply motivated, the celibate realizes that he is in an embattled position, because more than in past times, our faith is an embattled faith. Therefore, it is no surprise that in the present faith-situation, there has arisen the dual crisis of prayer and celibacy. These two are related to one another: in either case it is a question of attention to Him who has revealed Himself in our life. This explains why religious celibacy cannot endure without a life of prayer.

It ought to be quite clear that those who choose evangelical celibacy and who live it together in community, as religious do, are not for that reason more Christian or more evangelical than others who want to serve God in and through their marriage. It is not a question of being *more* or *less*, but of being *different*. Therefore, it is not a command, but an invitation.

Will such a life lead to movement in the Church, to social commitment, to protest against injustice? We hope it will. He who says he has seen the Lord cannot leave unjust the injustice he discovers about him. His ecclesial and social involvement can become the gauge of the sincerity and depth of his choice. It is because of this involvement that in a particular period of history some religious may feel called to work for the separation of the secular priesthood from enforced celibacy, both for the sake of the secular clergy and for the sake of the state of evangelical celibacy, which can be understood only in terms of freedom and voluntary preference.

But religious cannot apply to their own lives this separation of celibacy and priesthood, since their state is precisely characterized by the free and unconditional surrender to Him who has revealed Himself.

We have already stated that it is incorrect to equate the celibate state, chosen for the sake of the Kingdom of God, with the integral living of the Gospel message, for both married and unmarried persons can live the Gospel in a radical manner. Perhaps our present time is seeking — just as in the past — for modes of life in which married and unmarried people can orientate themselves together towards a concrete evangelical ideal.

We think that it does not make sense to bring together into one common life two such different ways of life, and to do this in a manner that is unsatisfactory to everyone.

This applies all the more to those who, after having belonged to a religious community, have subsequently decided to get married. It is our opinion that they ought to withdraw themselves from their former community life for a considerable period of time in order to search for

the "heart" of their new existence. Thence they ought to test the sincerity of an eventual choice of a radically evangelical life.

Some may argue against these views, that our testimony concerning the deeper basis of our mode of life does not sufficiently take into consideration the actual facts of contemporary life. Is this really so? Our testimony is a testimony of faith; faith always implies a certain ambiguity. It speaks of invisible things that have nevertheless been seen; it speaks of future things that have already begun.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

ON "CONSCIENCE AND THE PAPAL ENCYCLICAL"

● **P. J. Talty, C.S.S.R.**

May I be permitted to comment on the query and solution given in your January issue under the title: "Conscience and the Papal Encyclical"? I do not wish to contradict what Msgr. John V. Sheridan has written. He understands the circumstances of his own country. But I should like to put the matter in a simpler pastoral setting more suited, I think, to conditions here in the Philippines. I wish also to dismiss some of the irrelevancies that have caused so much confusion in this question in other places.

In his reply the monsignor evidently has in mind the line of action adopted by many bishops in various countries. Although they accepted the encyclical, some of the practical rules they gave for its implementation were very vague and ambiguous, to say the least. No doubt the bishops did this quite deliberately for pastoral reasons. Weakness of faith and confusion of mind in those countries might easily induce many to abandon the Church on this issue. To make matters worse, many priests had already been giving wrong advice to the laity on this question for some years. Happily this state of affairs does not exist in the Philippines, at least not to any notable extent. Here it would be bad pastoral practice to promote a climate of uncertainty. Rather we should do what the Pope has asked and speak without ambiguity on this subject.

The gynecologist whose case is given by the monsignor, is evidently an expert in his own field, but he does not understand well what the teaching authority of the Church really means and what it implies. He is suffering from an acute and perhaps agonizing emotional dis-

turbance, but it would be inaccurate to call it crisis of conscience. The point of conscience is clear. His conscience is simply erroneous and needs to be instructed and right. An experienced confessor will recognise the case at once. Such cases are not confined to the contraception issue. In these circumstances it is for the confessor to judge whether it is wiser to leave the mental emotional block as it is; time and prayer can remedy it. If he decides to give absolution, he should at least insist that the penitent keep his views to himself, so as not to injure the common good and undermine the law of God.

The gynecologist needs to be told that the main teaching of the encyclical and the reasons that accompany it are two distinct things. A competent person may consider that he is qualified to question and dispute these reasons; but this does not invalidate the central teaching of the document. That teaching does not ultimately depend on the accompanying reasons. It is an authentic interpretation of divine law that rests on the authoritative mandate given by Christ to His Vicar. This is a field in which scientists and theologians have no critical competence. Here they are no longer teachers but disciples, just like the rest of the faithful.

I do not mean to imply that the reasoning of the Pope is unsound or that his critics are necessarily right, because they happen to be eminent in their own fields. This is an open question that can be discussed like any other. I merely wish to point out, and to stress, that the central teaching of the encyclical is above and beyond all this. It claims our acceptance in its own right independently of such reasoning.

It has been the constant teaching of the Church that contraception is wrong and nothing can make it right. In re-affirming this traditional teaching, the Pope makes it plain that he is exercising the mandate given to him by Christ, that he is speaking with the special assistance of the Holy Spirit which attaches to that mandate, and that he is giving an authentic interpretation of divine law.

We know that there are medical cases which do not really involve direct and intentional contraception; cases of treatment for irregularity, treatment during the lactation period or at the menopause, etc. Such treatments may still be quite lawful. There can also be cases where only one party is guilty and the other may be free from sin; there can

be cases that are morally equivalent to rape. But all this pertains to the ordinary principles of theology and is not peculiar to the problem of contraception. It all leaves the central truth untouched: contraception is wrong and nothing can make it right.

The Vatican Council takes this Catholic attitude for granted. It says: "In the formation of their consciences, the Christian faithful ought carefully to attend to the sacred and certain doctrine of the Church. The Church is, by the will of Christ, the teacher of truth. It is her duty to give utterance to, and authoritatively to teach, that Truth which is Christ Himself, and also to declare and confirm by her authority those principles of the moral order which have their origin in human nature itself." (Declaration of Religious Freedom. no. 14.)

It tells married people that "they cannot proceed arbitrarily. They must always be governed according to a conscience dutifully conformed to the divine law itself, and should be submissive towards the Church's teaching office, which authentically interprets that law in the light of the Gospel." (Church in Modern World. no. 50.)

Again it says: "Sons of the Church", (and no exception is made for scientists), "may not undertake methods of regulating procreation that are found blameworthy by the teaching authority of the Church in its unfolding of the Divine law." (Church in Modern World. no. 51.)

Many irrelevancies have been introduced into this question that have served to make it doubly confusing for the laity and sometimes even for priests. I shall mention only three: conscience, infallibility and reformability.

We know that conscience is the immediate norm of moral conduct but it is not the ultimate authority. The final and real law is the Will of God. Conscience is only a mirror designed to reflect that Will by means of reason. Since the Fall of man that mirror has been notoriously unreliable. Often, in fact, it has reflected little more than the elementary principle that man should avoid evil and do good. Ignorance, passion, prejudice and self-interest have only too often blurred and distorted the image. They continue to do so even among Christians, who have the additional light provided by Revelation. Then there are always

more obscure areas where only the special guidance of the Holy Spirit can show us the right way. Hence the need we have of the moral magisterium of the Church. Who but God Himself can say what perfection He requires of our nature under the influence of grace? And what theologian would venture to claim that something is impossible, when grace is there to assist?

If we had to depend on reason alone, an impressive case could be made, at least in certain circumstances, for pre-marital sex, fornication, occasional adultery, divorce, suicide, euthanasia, abortion, sterilization and homosexuality. In practically all these cases we depend ultimately on the teaching authority of the Church to give us certain guidance. It is the same authority that is exercised in the case of contraception.

It is therefore quite irrelevant to invoke conscience in an area that transcends the ability of conscience to function securely, without aid from the teaching authority appointed by God for this precise purpose.

A second irrelevance in this question is the appeal to infallibility. Rarely, if ever, does the Church exercise infallibility in moral matters. The nature of the case does not call for it, and we have no right to expect it. All we need in moral matters is moral certainty and the magisterium guarantees us this; otherwise there would be no such thing as a magisterium. This moral certainty excludes all reasonable fear of error. No one will find a convincing reason against it. He may have doubts, even considerable ones; but he does not have certainty. As we have said already, from the very nature of the case his reason cannot move with certainty in this area. He solves his doubts in practice by accepting the authoritative ruling given in God's name.

On this precise point there has been something close to intellectual dishonesty on the part of certain writers. They have quoted alleged errors in other Papal Encyclicals and in various other papal pronouncements. Even if we were to admit such errors and to add more to their number from the two thousand year's history of the papacy, we must say in all honesty that none of the examples cited comes within hailing distance of the present case. It is one thing to have errors in a papal encyclical and quite another thing when the Pope goes out of his way, whether by encyclical or not, to give a moral decision on a thorny

question that has divided the world. And in giving such a decision, when he makes it plain that he is exercising Christ's mandate, that he is speaking with the special assistance of the Holy Spirit and is authentically interpreting the law of God, no one should speak of error, unless he wishes to overthrow the whole idea of a magisterium in morals.

A third irrelevance is the hope that this teaching may be changed. We know that an infallible statement is irreformable of its very nature. Any statement which is less than infallible is not irreformable in itself. But it may still be irreformable on others grounds. The Pope has indicated that this is the case here. When something has been so constantly and expressly condemned by the Church precisely because it is against the moral nature of man, we should not expect that this teaching will be changed. Let us transfer the question from the field of infallibility, where it does not belong, to the ordinary field of moral certainty, where it does belong. Then the question would be, not: "*Can* this teaching be changed?" but, rather: "*Will* it be changed?" And the answer is: "No."

It is a sobering thought for us priests, as well as for theologians and scientists, to recall that among Our Lord's greatest opponents were many of the theologians and scripture scholars of the day. Even Divine Wisdom could not convince them. He was compelled to say of such (and they knew He was referring to them and they actually would have arrested Him, only they feared the people): "Truly I say to you, the tax-gatherers and the harlots go into kingdom of heaven before you." (Matt. 21:31.). And to Nicodemus, one of the best of them, He had to say: "Are you teacher of Israel, and yet you do not understand this?" (John, 3:10.). He actually thanked His Father for having "hidden these things from the wise and understanding and revealed them to babes." (Luke, 10:21.). A truly great theologian is the humblest of men and the most docile to the voice of truth.

In his address to the Latin American bishops at Bogota in August, 1968, the Pope is reported as having said: "Sad to say, even some of our own theologians are not always on the right road. We greatly need and respect the work of good and capable theologians. They can be providential scholars and skilful expounders of the faith, if they themselves remain intelligent disciples of the Church's magisterium, which

Christ set up as the guardian and interpreter of His message of eternal truth, through the power of the Holy Spirit.

"But to-day some theologians have recourse to ambiguous doctrinal expressions. Others take the liberty to proclaim their own personal views, investing them with the authority which they more or less covertly question in him who possesses by divine right this awesome and carefully guarded charism."

In some English translations of the Encyclical, the following passage, addressed to priests, was somehow omitted; it reads: "Speak with confidence, beloved sons, fully convinced that the Spirit of God, while He assists the magisterium in proposing doctrine, illumines internally the hearts of the faithful, inviting them to give their assent." We have abundant evidence of this, thank God, in the hearts of our Filipino people.

Perhaps as a practical means of helping our people, we priests could do more to encourage among Catholic doctors a deeper study of this problem, so that distressing cases might be relieved. Perhaps, also, we might well counter the exaggerated "population explosion" propaganda by telling the full truth. This is that there is a greater "food explosion" and a greater "wealth explosion" in the world. The latter is the real problem. And the remedy has been indicated by Vatican II: "a worldwide charity explosion." It is for us priests to give the lead in promoting this.

LITURGY AND SACRED MUSIC

● Marito Rebamontan

As there are changes taking place in and affecting the different levels of reality, some phenomenal, others more quiet and gradual, little wonder then that there are changes too in the realm of the Sacred functions and their proper accompanying musical expressions by the people taking part in them. As we now realize the importance of respecting man and his cultural heritage from which he cannot be dissociated without separating him from the realities that held him in his existence, even so Liturgy should respect man in his forms of expression of his longing for and contact with God. Thus it is not without sense, neither just for changes sake, that changes too overflow our Churches. But in the situation we are actually in, we have still to find our way out with these changes and we also actively take part in shaping the future with regard to the search for the proper, desirable and equally appealing and presentable forms of Sacred Music.

The use of vernacular is actually an attempt to secure the proper appealing, and presentable forms of Sacred Music for man in his situation. It is just plain common sense. Vatican II wanted to accommodate this when it says: "The Sanctification of man is manifested by signs perceptible to the sense and is effected in a way which is proper to each of these signs."

Liturgy is a sacred act by which through the rites Christ's sacerdotal act of sanctification and glorification is always exercised and perpetuated in the Church. It is Christ's sacerdotal and personal act that is most essential, sanctifying and glorifying, by proclaiming the reign of the Father through the sacerdotal act of Christ. What is non-essential may be discarded.

Since there is the fact of the variety of forms of perception, even of Sacred signs, it should not be of great surprise that jazz masses are indeed appealing to the young for their vitality and impulsive rhythm but do not quite appeal to the taste of the more advanced in years.

The objection to the use of the jazz music arises not from the fact that it is jazz but from its melody and its taste. Because of this, others would prefer to adopt the real Pilipino music as the more proper form of Church music. There are some, however, who are not of the same opinion. In view of this diversity of opinion, a challenge is posed before composers of liturgical music.

Fr. Isidore Otazu, O.S.B. is of the opinion that liturgical compositions should include elements according to the personal taste of the composer. One may take from some of the richness of Gregorian music for even in some popular Beatle songs, one can detect the influence of Gregorian music. As far as the text is concerned, greater effort to utilize the word of God (Bible) must be made.

LITURGICAL NOTES

The following are points to keep from the document "Guidelines for a catechist of the faithful concerning the Eucharistic Prayers." It is hoped that they will prove helpful to those who have the task of instructing the faithful.

1. The liturgy of the Word and the liturgy of the Eucharist form a single unit, the Liturgy of the Word proclaims the love of God the Father who planned and brought about our salvation in Jesus Christ; the Liturgy of the Eucharist makes the redeeming death and resurrection of Christ present again.

2. The great Eucharistic Prayer is the central part of the Mass. This prayer begins with "The Lord be with you.... Let us lift up our hearts...." and ends with "Through Him, in Him, with Him... Amen." It is a prayer of joyful thanksgiving and praise to the Father.

The nucleus of this prayer is the narration-reactualization of what Jesus did at the last Supper.

3. Jesus took bread and proclaimed over it a prayer of thanksgiving and praise to the Father. Every Eucharistic Prayer is a hymn of thanksgiving and praise to the Father for His goodness to us and most of all for our redemption in Christ Jesus our Lord.

4. Jesus broke the bread and distributed it; this we do during the final part of the Mass.

5. Jesus said: Take and eat, this is my body given for you. During the Eucharistic Prayer we do not merely narrate what Jesus did in the past; we intend to make what Jesus did present and actual here and now. Consequently, there is a petition addressed to the Father to make this narration effective in our midst by sending His Spirit over the bread and wine, that is by making them become the body and blood of Christ, so that we who receive these gifts may be sanctified by them. This address to the Father to send the Spirit over the bread

and wine, is called the consecratory Epiclesis. It makes evident the work of the Holy Spirit in a liturgical celebration. Jesus our Lord sends His Spirit into the Church to complete His work on earth.

In the second invocation (Communion Epiclesis) addressed to the Father before the reception of Holy Communion, we ask the Father to send the Spirit upon the congregation. In this invocation, we pray that all those who share in the one body of Christ may be perfectly made once and accepted by the Father as spiritual victim together with the victim Jesus.

6. Jesus said: do this in memory of me... until I come.

The Eucharistic Prayer seeks to commemorate, to do in memory of Jesus; we engage in a celebration which remembers and contains what He is and what He has done for us. That He did for us refers above all to His Body given for us and to His Blood shed for our sins. The Eucharistic celebration, as a "memorial" which makes present the body given for us and the Blood shed for our sins, implies a sacrificial offering. For this reason, the Eucharistic Prayer includes a prayer offering holy gifts "in memory" of His passion, death and resurrection (practically speaking of the entire economy of Christ's redemption).

Jesus did likewise with the chalice.

The Eucharistic Prayer concludes with a doxology to which all the people respond Amen.

7. The Sanctus, the prayers of intercessions for those for whom the sacrifice is offered, the commemoration of the saints, which is a further development of the intercessions, are three elements which have been added to the central nucleus.

8. Since the Eucharistic Prayer plays such a central role in the Christian liturgy, a variety of texts is most appropriate; this will allow us to better understand what we are celebrating and to participate more fully in it.

9. The introductory dialogue between priests and faithful, and the concluding doxology, have been printed with their melodies, only in the II Eucharistic Prayer. They may be used in any Eucharistic Prayer.

PHILIPPINE HIERARCHY

PONTIFICAL DOCUMENTS

NEW BISHOPS AND DIOCESES

PAULUS EPISCOPUS SERVUS SERVORUM DEI dilecto filio *Victorino Ligot* adhuc Vicario Generali diocesis Laoagensis, electo Episcopo titulo Buduanensi renuntiatoque Auxiliari sacri Praesulis Novae Segobiae, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Verbis illis, spei plenissimus, quae Christus, adorandus Dei filius, apostolis habuit antequam in caelos ascendit: “Euntes in mundum universum praedicate Evangelium omni creaturae” — Mc. 16, 15-animus Noster usquequaque resonat, iisque quasi vivit: Vicarius enim Eius, qui venit in terras has imas, ut perditorum animas redimeret, nullum officium, nullum munus hoc maius umquam duximus, quam ut omnes homines atque nationes et Christum cognoscant, et sanctissimam Eius religionem colant. Quod sane ut in sua regione accomodatius fieret, censuit venerabilis frater Joannes C. Sison, Archiepiscopus Novae Segobiae, se posse maiore cum fructu animis, instare, si sibi negotiis agendis socius laboris daretur. Quam Nos sententiam probantes, post consilium a venerabilibus fratribus Nostris petitum S.R.E. Cardinalibus Sacrae Congregationi pro Episcopis praesidentibus, Te bene ad tale munus eligi posse duximus, qui non solum ingenio praestas, religione castissima in Deum in eiusque Matrem nites usuque rerum antecedis, sed etiam studio gloriae Dei procurandae. Qua re, Te dilecte fili, simul Episcopum nominamus Sedis titulo *Buduanensis*, simul Auxiliarem sacri Antistitis, quem diximus, Novae Segobiae, factis nempe iuribus quae cum tua hac dignitate iunguntur. Ad maiorem vero commoditatem tuam respicientes, facultatem facimus ut licite extra urbem Romam Episcopus consecreris, assistentibus duobus eiusdem amplitudinis viris, qui omnes sint cum Petri beatissima hac Sede fidei vinculis ac sincera caritate coniuncti. Ante vero quam haec a Te acta sint, oportet cum fidei professionem facias, tum ius iurandum fidelitatis erga Nos des ad leges ecclesiasticas, teste scilicet aliquo Praesule, qui et ipse sinceræ fidei ligamine, hic Cathedrae sanctae obligetur. Quae omnia cum perfeceris, formulas ad quas iurasti, tuo nomine subscripto sigilloque impresso,

item eius qui affuit iuranti Tibi, ad Sacram Congregationem pro Episcopis cito mittes. Ceterum, summo Deo, vota facimus, id' expostulantes ut qui ad maiora pro Christi gloria certamina, sic ut apostolus, benigne vocavit, idem divina in Te liberalitate paria auxilia ferat.

Datum Romae, apud S. Petrum, die duodecimo mensis Februarii, anno Domini millesimo nongentesimo sexagesimo nono, Pontificatus Nostri sexto.

Aloisius Card. Traglia
S.R.E. Cancellarius

Franciscus Tinello
Apostolicam Cancellariam Regens
Expedita die VIII Mar. a. Pontif. VI
Marius Orsini Plumbator

Josephus Rossi. Epús Palmyren, Proton. Apost.
Josephus Del Ton, Proton. Apost.
In Can. Ap. tab. vol. CXXX, n. 41

PAULUS EPISCOPUS SERVUS SERVORUM DEI dilecto filio *Felici Pérez*, archidiocesis Manilensis presbytero, adhuc pietatis magistro in studiorum Universitate Rationali in Insulis Philippinis, electo Episcopo Sedis Imusensis, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Qui divina voluntate omnia hisce in terris ad Dei regnum expectantia regimus, inter cetera maioris ponderis negotia id plurimi facimus, quo Nobis sacri Praesules eligendi sunt: quandoquidem enim nostri temporis homines et iteratis hostium incursibus peti et nova erroris caligine obrui videntur, talibus opus est ipsos donari Pastoribus, qui invicta constantia munus suum tuentes, firmissime et lupos arceant et oves foveant et summi Dei violata iura defendant. Quae cum ita sint, violentes diocessi Imusensi apte consulere, iam vacanti post translatum Artemium C. Casas ad Ecclesiam titulo Macrianensem maiorem, rati sumus Te, dilecte fili, magna cum fidelium utilitate ad eam regendam destinari posse, virum non solum: sinceræ pietatis ornamento insignem verum et religiones prudentis S.R.E. Cardinalium qui Sacrae Congregationi pro Episcopis praesunt, deque suprema Nostra potestate, Te Episcopum *Imusensem* nominamus et renuntiamus, dato regimini, administratione atque iuribus quae tanto muneri congruunt. Maiori autem commodo tuo consulentes, permittimus ut episcopalem ordinationem a

quolibet catholico Episcopo accipias, cui duo alii assint, ad normam legum liturgicarum, aequali dignitate viri, pacem et communionem cum Apostolica Sede habentes. Antea tamen tuum erit sive catholicae fidei professionem facere sive ius iurandum fidelitatis erga Nos et successores Nostros dare teste aliquo Praesule, et ipso hanc Petri cathedram sincere colente, iuxta statutas formulas quas de more signatas sigilloque impressas, ad Sacram Congregationem pro Episcopis cito mittes. Volumus insuper ut hae Litterae Nostrae sive clero sive sacrae plebi in cathedrali templo Imusensi perlegantur, cum primus post eas acceptas, dies festus de praecepto advenerit. Quos dilectos filios enixe hortamur ut non solum dilectionis et amoris Tibi obsequia exhibeant, sed etiam sedulae oboedientiae officia praestent. Ceterum, dilecte fili, paterno animo vota facimus ut creditum Tibi gregem intuens, eos tua virtute et pietate laetifices atque ad aeterna tabernacula et immortalis vitae praemia perducas. Datum Romae, apud S. Petrum, die vicesimo quinto mensis Februarii, anno Domini millesimo nongentesimo sexagesimo nono, Pontificatus Nostri sexto.

Aloisius Card. Traglia
S.R.E. Cancellarius

Franciscus Tinello
Apostolicam Cancellariam Regens
Expedita die XXIX Mar. a. Pontif. VI
Marius Orsini Plumbator

Joannes Calleri, Proton. Apost.
Josephus Del Ton, Proton Apost.
In Canc. Ap. tab. vol. CXXX n. 65

PAULUS EPISCOPUS SERVUS SERVORUM DEI dilecto filio *Amato Paulino*, adhuc curioni atque vicario foraneo pagi vulgo Baliwag appellati, in diocesi Malolosina, electo Episcopo titulo Carinolensi eidemque renuntiato Auxiliari sacri Praesulis Manilensis, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Quandoquidem sacra Nostra hic in terris Christi Vicarii, qua pollemus, potestas non solum id a Nobis requirit ut christifidelium coetibus omnimode consulamus, verum etiam eorum sacris Pastoribus, fit persape ut singularum Ecclesiarum Antistitibus, qui egeant, Auxiliares Episcopos assignemus, in laborando sodales. Quoniamque visum est huiusmodi subsidium dilecto quoque filio Nostro Rufino

S.R.E. Cardinali J. Santos, Archiepiscopo Manilensi, tribui oportere, censuimus te admodum idoneum esse, qui id muneris acciperas diligenterque expleres, vir sane necessariis dotibus abunde praeditus. De sententia ideo venerabilium fratrum Nostrorum S.R.E. Cardinalium Sacrae Congregationi pro Episcopis praepositorum, deque summa Nostra potestate Te, dilecte fili, simul nominamus Auxiliarem sacri Praesulis, quem diximus, simul Episcopum Sedis titulo *Carinolensis*, ad praesens vacantis, datis iuribus obligationibusque impositis congruis. Maiori autem commodo tuo studentes, facultatem permittimus ut consecrationem accipias a quolibet Episcopo, cui duo alii assint eiusdem ordinis viri consecratores, qui sint omnes sincera fide cum Apostolica hac Sede coniuncti. Antea tamen ritualement catholicam fidei professionem des oportet iusque iurandum iures fidelitatis erga Nos et Successores Nostros, teste quovis Antistite, et ipso cum Romana hac Sede sincera caritate coniuncto. Formulas vero adhibitas ad sacram Congregationem pro Episcopis quam primum mittas, de more signatas. Hortamur denique, dilecte fili, ut, ad maiora in sancta Ecclesia absolvenda opera vocatus, sic labores ut bonus miles Christi Jesu: 2 Tim., 2,3 — . Datum Romae, apud S. Petrum, die quinto et vicesimo mensis Februarii, anno Domini millesimo nongentesimo sexagesimo nono, Pontificatus Nostri sexto.

Aloisius Card. Traglia
S.R.E. Cancellarius

Franciscus Tinello
Apostolicam Cancellariam Regens
Expedita die XXIX Mar. anno
Pontif. VI
Marius Orsini Plumbator

Toannes Calleri, Proton. Apost.
Josephus Del Ton, Proton. Apost.
In Canc. Ap. tab. Vol.
CXXX N. 66

DOCTRINAL SECTION

CULT OR EVANGELIZATION?

(ANENT THE PRIESTLY MINISTRY)

● Jesus Ma. Cavanna, C.M

The priestly ministry is indeed one of the mooted themes in catholic circles nowadays. And among the various topics which many deem fashionable to take up, this question is often posed: "In the priesthood what is more important or essential, *cult* or *evangelization*?"¹—The problem is unfortunately open to deplorable confusions² because of a recurring tendency in our times to make use of "new, intruding forms of speech, a quibbling knowledge, which is not knowledge at all..."³ Let us try to bring things into the right focus. Our subject refers properly to the ministerial priesthood. Nevertheless it has a particular interest also for our Catholic laity, specially in our days when the common priesthood of all the faithful is very opportunely stressed, sometimes even exaggeratedly.

The office proper of a priest is to be "a mediator between God and the people."⁴ This mediation is perfectly and fully realized *only* in Christ, the Supreme and Eternal Priest, by virtue of His very human

¹ Cf. José Maria Burgos, *Tres Preguntas sobre el Presbiterado*, in *Incunable*, Madrid, Septiembre 1968, p. 19. With all our due respect merited by the distinguished author, it seems necessary however to clarify some of his expressions which to our judgment appear inaccurate and misleading; as for instance, when he says that "evangelization" should be raised "to the very level of cult." If these words were not defined with greater precision they could justify certain erroneous attitudes which unfortunately abound these times. We have a recent example in the deliberations of the "*Forum sacerdotale en Lyon*" (cf. *Roca Viva*, Madrid, Enero 1969, pp. 55-57).

² Cf. *Insegnamenti di Paolo VI*, IV (1966), p. 389: "*La XVI Settimana di aggiornamento pastorale*." (Tip. Poliglotta Vaticana)

³ I Tim. 6, 20-21

⁴ S. Thomas Aq., *Summa Theol.*, III, Q. 22, a. 1 c; Q. 22, a. 4, c; Q. 26, a. 1, ad 1.

nature subsisting in the Person of the Word of God.⁵ In all other priests the mediatory office is realized only through participation in the Priesthood of Christ, who is the "fountainhead of all priesthood"⁶ as the Angelic Doctor says with his characteristic luminous precision.

The faithful receive this participation of Christ's Priesthood with the sacramental "character" of Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Orders. This priestly "character differs in each of the three sacraments essentially,⁷ and not only in degree. "The characters of Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Orders are not simply three degrees of the same nature in direct prolongation, and as it were, quantitative one to the other. What unites them is a relationship of *analogy*, that is, a more and more similar resemblance, and a more and more real participation in the Priesthood of the Word Incarnate".⁸

Coming now to our topic we should note that this sacred "character" *always* implies "a certain consecration and deputation to DIVINE CULT".⁹ Through that "character" the faithful acquire "a certain power to receive or give to others whatever concerns the CULT OF GOD".¹⁰ By the baptismal "character", and still more by that of Confirmation, the faithful become members of Christ the Priest. "Christ has incorporated us in Himself, and that is why the (priestly) unction (which Baptism confers) touches all Christians",¹¹ and thus they obtain the capacity to participate *validly* in Christian CULT. But this consecration "even though it is real, does not confer upon them the right to represent Christ and the Church; it merely grants them the right to

⁵ Ibid., Q. 26, a. 2, c. Cf. Emmanuel Card. Suhard, *Dios, Iglesia, Sacerdocio*, Ed. Rialp, Madrid 1961, pp. 235-239.

⁶ S. Thomas Aq., *Summa Theol.*, III, Q. 22, a. 4, c.

⁷ Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum II, *Constitutiones, Decreta, Declarationes*, Libr. Editr. Vatic. 1966: "*Lumen Gentium*", n. 10, p. 110.

⁸ Clement Dillenschneider, C.S.S.R., *Christ the One Priest and We His Priests*, B. Herder Book Co. 1964, vol. I, p. 134

⁹ S. Thomas Aq., op. cit., III, Q. 63, a. 6, ad 2; Q. 63, a. 3, ad 2. Cf. Suhard, op. cit., pp. 251-252

¹⁰ S. Thomas Aq., op. cit., III, Q. 63, a. 2, a. 3; cf. cf. Suhard. op. cit. 1. c.

¹¹ S. Augustinus, *Enarratio in Psalmos*, PL. 35:200. Cf. Dillenschneider, op. cit., p. 89

be represented by Christ and the Church."¹² While "by the sacerdotal consecration priests are clothed with the very person of Jesus Christ";¹³ and "thus the priest is in the Church as a living Christ"¹⁴ and exercises the public CULT "*in persona Christi*";¹⁵ i.e., acts in the place of Christ¹⁶ and may well be called in some way "vicar of Christ".¹⁷

In any case, however, this is out of question. The Christian priesthood, by the very sacramental "character" through which it is acquired, is *essentially* and *preeminently* related to DIVINE CULT. And such was also the case with the priesthood of the Old Testament and even that of all other heathen nations: "the most general concept of priesthood is centered in the notion of sacrifice (*sacrum facere*)"¹⁸ and is preeminently, if not almost exclusively, manifested in an act of public CULT. "He who says priesthood, says sacrifice".¹⁹

Hence, CULT, and more specifically the eucharistic sacrifice is *essentially* and *preeminently* PRIMAL or PRIMORDIAL in the Catholic Priesthood. In saying this, however, we do not mean to imply in any way that it is the *only essential and primary* function. Let us clarify this apparently subtle distinction which nevertheless gives us the key for a correct evaluation of the priestly services.

"Like Christ and by virtue of the mission received from Him, the priest holds in his person the prerogatives and functions traditionally attributed to the Word Incarnate: Pontiff, King, Prophet. He ought "to offer", "to preside", "to teach". But these ministries are summed up in a function that assumes them all: that of Mediator."²⁰

¹² Dillenschneider, op. cit., p. 134

¹³ Francois Bourgoing, *Introduction aux oeuvres de Bérulle*, Paris 1956, Preface, p. 106

¹⁴ Jean-Jacques Olier, *Traité des Saints Ordres*, Paris 1953, p. 237.

¹⁵ cf. Dillenschneider, op. cit., p. 146

¹⁶ "*vice Christi fungitur*": S. Cyprianus, Epist. 63, 14, Cf. Dillenschneider, op. cit., p. 142

¹⁷ Ambrosiaster, In I Epist. ad Timoth. 5, 19, PL. 17:596b. Cf. Dillenschneider, loc. cit.

¹⁸ Dillenschneider, op. cit., p. 3

¹⁹ Jean Gible, *I presbiteri collaboratori dell'ordine episcopale*, in *La Chiesa del Vaticano II*, Vallecchi Editore Firenze 1965, p. 887

²⁰ Suhard, op. cit., p. 270

We have therefore three ministries, all of them ESSENTIAL, PRIMARY, and mutually complementary: the ministry of CULT, the ministry of pastoral regime, and the ministry of the Word. Let us examine more closely how these three functions are related to each other in category of values.

The Priesthood (*Mediation between God and the people*) imports or connotes obviously two correlative and complementary functions: one of "ascent" towards God, the other of "descent" towards men. The ministry of CULT involves these two functions, since it consists not only in offering to God the worship due to Him, but also in dispensing to men Christ's redemptive grace, specially through the sacraments. Thus such ministry of CULT by itself and in itself comprises all the aspects of the *mediatory* function: it is a *comprehensive* ministry of the *whole* priestly office.

On the other hand, the ministry of pastoral regime and that of the Word are both functions of the mediatory service in its "descent" aspect *only*, since they are directed *to the people* in order *to lead* them to God, beginning with the *proclamation of the Christian message*. Therefore these two functions are not totally *comprehensive*, but rather *expletive* or *completive* of the priestly mediatory office, and cannot therefore claim the same preeminence or primacy as the ministry of CULT possesses.

The three ministries, we repeat, are ESSENTIAL, PRIMARY, and mutually complementary in the Priesthood. But the CULTUAL function is certainly PREEMINENT, PRIMAL or PRIMORDIAL, specific, and *necessarily inherent* to the Priesthood. The ministry of the Word and that of pastoral regime, although complementary and essentially related to that of CULT, are however of *subordinate* value and *not necessarily inherent* to the Priesthood insofar as the CULTUAL function may not demand at least some of their modalities. Thus, for example, the ministry of the Word in its modality of "evangelization", and the pastoral regime in that of "care of souls" (*cura animarum*, e.g. the parochial ministry) are indeed required by the ministry of CULT as *necessarily inherent* to the Priesthood *in its fulness* (the Episcopate), and to a certain degree to the *diocesan presbyterate*. Not so, however,

in the *merely* presbyterial priesthood as that which may be possessed, say, by a monk of contemplative life.

While, on the other hand, the CULTUAL function of offering the Eucharistic Sacrifice, forgiving sins and administering certain sacraments is always so necessarily inherent to the ministerial priestly office, that it belongs as much to the Bishops as to any other presbyter either diocesan or a religious of contemplative life. It is neither an *exclusive* episcopal power, such as the pastoral jurisdiction (which in the *strict sense* belongs by *divine right* ONLY to the Bishops)²¹; nor can the same CULTUAL ministry be ever communicated to the lower ministers in the Church hierarchy, and still less to lay persons, contrary to the ministry of the Word which may be exercised by deacons, clerics, lay religious and even the faithful in general, provided they be duly invested with canonical mission.

In order to offer to God a perfect CULT, specially in the Eucharist, "source and apex of the whole work of evangelization"²² it is absolutely necessary to prepare the faithful through the ministry of the Word.²³ Let us note, in passing, that "evangelization", as commonly understood, is not synonymous to the ministry of the Word, but it refers only to that ministry when directed to the instruction and edification of the faithful. The ministry of the Word is indeed *essential* to the Priesthood; but the reason why it is thus essential lies precisely in its need and *subordination* to the ministry of CULT which therefore retains its *primacy* and *preeminence* among priestly functions. Similarly, the *raison d'être* of the ministry of pastoral regime consists, in the last analysis, in its necessity for an opportune and adequate exercise of

²¹ Suhard, op. cit., p. 270, note 63; p. 266, note 58

²² Vaticanum II, op. cit., "*Presbyterorum Ordinis*", n. 5, p. 631, where it is pointedly remarked: "In Sanctissima Eucharistia totum bonum spiritualis Ecclesiae continetur", i.e. "In the Most Holy Eucharist the whole spiritual good of the Church is contained"

²³ Through the *kerygmatic* preaching (announcement of the Christian mystery of salvation), the *mystagogic* homily (orientation toward the Eucharistic celebration), and the moral catechesis (proclamation of Christian morality). Vaticanum II, op. cit., "*Sacrosanctum Concilium*", n. 56, p. 31 declares: "The liturgy of the Word and the Eucharistic liturgy are so closely connected with each other that they form one single act of worship."

the CULTUAL function in the midst of the people of God. Because "the ministry of priests is directed and finds its summit in the sacrifice"²⁴ of the Eucharist.

Hence, "the celebration of the Mass is in reality the exercise of an essential priestly power without which priesthood does not exist; and the same cannot be truly affirmed with respect to other hierarchical powers".²⁵ Even in Christ's Priesthood, the *cultural* function²⁶ was exercised *during all His life from the first instant of His Incarnation*, although it was preeminently manifested in the Sacrifice of the Cross and gloriously consummated in His Resurrection and Ascension; while His *prophetic* ministry of the Word, and more particularly His "evangelization" as well as His *regal* ministry of "Shepherd and Bishop (overseer) of souls"²⁷ were not exerted but quite lately and occasionally. And His Apostles also were indeed sent to be trained in their future evangelical ministry before they actually became priests; but it was only after the Eucharistic ordination in the Last Supper and after they received the priestly unction on the evening of Easter²⁸ when they received mission to "preach the Gospel"²⁹ and to watch over all the flock "of which the Holy Spirit made them the overseers (Bishops) to feed the Church of God."³⁰

Our Bishops and presbyters are the heirs of the mission of the Apostles chosen to become the "foundation of a building that has Christ Himself for its main cornerstone"³¹. In the same way as those chosen Twelve were not only *Apostles* but also *High Priests* and *Shepherds*, so also our priests ought to exercise their ministry "as Teachers for doctrine, Priests for sacred CULT, and Ministers for

²⁴ Vaticanum II, op. cit., "*Presbyterorum Ordinis*", n. 2, p. 623

²⁵ "Contemplation et sacerdoce", en *Angelicum*, Roma, Oct.-Dec. 1965, p. 485

²⁶ Cf. Suhard, op. cit., pp. 235-239; Dillenschneider, op. cit., pp. 22-53; 73-80. Cf. also I Tim. 2, 5; Hebr. 3, 1; Hebr. 4, 14; Ps 109, 4.

²⁷ cf. I Petr. 2, 25

²⁸ cf. Dillenschneider, op. cit., p. 100

²⁹ Mk. 16, 15

³⁰ Acts 20, 28

³¹ cf. Ephes. 2, 20

governing.”³² Such is the doctrine of the Vatican II: “Teachers for doctrine” and “Ministers for governing” are concomitant functions to that of “Priests for sacred CULT”. But if to be an Apostle or evangelizer and a Shepherd or pastor may be *essential* and *primary* functions of a High Priest or Pontiff, still his PRIMAL or PRIMORDIAL ministry as a *Priest* is always *the sacred CULT*; and in the sacrament of the presbyterate the PRIMAL or PRIMORDIAL power is that of “offering the Sacrifice and forgiving sins”.³³

The traditional doctrine of the Church has always underscored the close relationship that links the priesthood to the Sacrifice of the Mass. And the Vatican II ratifies this doctrine making particular reference to the teaching of the Tridentine Council and of Pius XII.³⁴ The Bishop, declares the Vatican II, “is *the steward of the grace of the supreme priesthood* SPECIALLY (*“praesertim”*) in the Eucharist which he offers or causes to be offered, and by which the Church continually lives and grows”,³⁵ and the presbyters “partakers on their level of ministry, of the function of Christ, the sole Mediator (I Tim. 2, 5), exercise their sacred function ABOVE ALL (*“maxime”*) in the Eucharistic CULT”.³⁶

Having settled with precision the fundamental concepts, we are now ready for an accurate answer to the question: “In the Presbyterate, what is more important or essential, *cult* or *evangelization*?”

³² Vaticanum II, op. cit., “*Lumen Gentium*”, n. 20, p. 128

³³ Ibid., “*Presbyterorum Ordinis*”, n. 2, pp. 621-622. Cf. Concilium Tridentinum, Sess. XXIII. cap. 1 et can. 1: ap. Denz. 957 et 961 (1764 et 1771)

³⁴ Ibid., “*Lumen Gentium*”, n. 28, p. 146, footnote 67: Cf. Conc. Trid., Sess. 22: Denz. 940 (1743); Pius XII, Litt. Encycl. *Mediator Dei*, 20 nov. 1947: AAS 39 (1947), p. 553: Denz. 2300 (3850)

³⁵ Vaticanum II, op. cit., “*Lumen Gentium*”, n. 26, p. 141

³⁶ Ibid., “*Lumen Gentium*”, n. 28, p. 146. It is to be noted that Vatican II in speaking of the ministries of Bishops and presbyters, mentions in the “first” place the ministry of the Word (see e.g. “*Presbyterorum Ordinis*”, n. 4, p. 627 where it is said: “*primum habent officium evangelizandi*”). The reason is obvious: preaching or the proclamation of the evangelical message should come *first* with priority of time on account of its basic need as an *apostolic* function. But as a *priestly* function the ministry of CULT is given the PRIMARY by the same Vatican II, for instance, when in “*Lumen Gentium*”, n. 21, p. 130 it affirms that “episcopal consecration, TOGETHER

We should firstly remark that the question proposed in that way is laden with ambiguity. From the start we can notice that in the same breath two phrases are used, *what is more important* and *what is essential*, as if they were equivalent, when for sure they are not synonymous. *Cult* and *evangelization* may be *essential* functions of the Presbyterate, and nevertheless they do not actually have the same importance in the category of values, preeminence or preference. If it is asked what is more *essential* in a human being, *body* or *soul*, everybody will agree that both are equally *essential*, but no one will reasonably dare to contend that the *body* should be appraised or valued as highly as the *soul*; but on the contrary, all are bound to admit that the *body*, though not anything accidental, secondary or accessory to men, ought to be subject or subordinated to the *soul*. Similarly, we all agree that *faith*, *hope* and *charity* are essential virtues to any real Christian life. Still more, in certain sense, *faith* should be considered the *first* in order of time, since it is the basis of the other two virtues which cannot exist without faith: "It is faith that brings life to the just man",³⁷ and "it is impossible to please God without faith",³⁸ This notwithstanding, it is doubtless that *charity* holds the preminent, primal or primordial place in order of values, since the other virtues are in such a way subordinated to charity that without this they are not of much avail: "demons have belief and they tremble with fear";³⁹ "I may have faith in its fullness, yet if I lack charity I count for nothing";⁴⁰ "in short, these are three things that last, faith, hope and charity; but the GREATEST of them all is *charity*."⁴¹

On the other hand, to speak of "evangelization" in the question under our study, as if it were an *essential* function of the Presbyterate is to forget that in a Presbyter we can find two different realities that

WITH THE OFFICE OF SANCTIFYING, *also* confers the office of teaching and of governing."

³⁷ Rom. 1,17; Gal. 3,11; Heb. 10,38; Hab. 2,4.

³⁸ Hebr. 11,6

³⁹ Jas. 2,19

⁴⁰ I Cor. 13,2

⁴¹ I Cor. 13,13

ought not to be identified with each other, though usually they are confused with one another: the *Priest*-clergyman and the *Presbyter*-clergyman; in other words, the Presbyter qua Priest, and the Presbyter qua Minister: the former, i.e., the Presbyter insofar as *simply* a Priest, truly participating in Christ's Priesthood by virtue of the Holy Order he received—and nothing else; and the latter, i.e., the Presbyter insofar as a Priest "of second dignity" or "of lesser order" in relation to the Episcopate.⁴² In this last sense, the Presbyter does not only "participate—as any other priest does—in the grace of the Bishops' office, through Christ, the Eternal and Unique Mediator",⁴³ but is furthermore an immediate "provident cooperator with the episcopal order, its (direct) aid and instrument called to serve the people of God"⁴⁴ in the pastoral field.

In both senses, the Presbyters, "although they do not possess the highest degree of the Pontificate and although they are dependent on the Bishops in the exercise of their power, nevertheless are united with the Bishops in sacerdotal dignity. By the power of the sacrament of Holy Order they are consecrated to preach the Gospel and shepherd the faithful and *to celebrate divine cult* as true priests of the New Testament.... But they exercise their sacred ministry ABOVE ALL ("maxime") in the Eucharistic CULT".⁴⁵ In short, all Presbyters possess at least *radically* and exercise *essentially* the three *primary* services of the Catholic Priesthood: the ministry of the Word, that of pastoral regime, and ABOVE ALL, *primordially* and *preeminently* that of DIVINE CULT.

⁴² According to ancient Roman *Sacramentaries* presbyters are priests "*secundae dignitatis, minoris ordinis, secundi praedicatores*"; the presbyterate is "*secundi meriti munus*." In the first centuries of the Church, the presbyter was called "*sacerdos secundi ordinis*", while the Bishop was simply referred to as "*sacerdos*." (Cf. Clement Dillenschneider, *Christ the One Priest and We His Priests*, B. Herder Book Co., 1964, Vol. I, pp. 113; 107)

⁴³ Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum II, *Constitutiones, Decreta, Declamationes*, Libr. Editr. Vatic 1966: "*Lumen Gentium*" n. 41, pp. 167-168

⁴⁴ Ibid., loc. cit. n. 28, p. 147

⁴⁵ Ibid., loc. cit. n. 28, p. 146

This last, the ministry of CULT, as well as the other two *insofar as related and subordinated to the CULT*,⁴⁶ are essentially exercised by *any* *Presbyter* on account of his own priesthood, i.e., as a *priest* that he is—and nothing more—, as it happens in the case of a monk of contemplative life, say, a trappist or carthusian priest. On the other hand, the ministry of the Word *in its modality* of missionary preaching, and the ministry of pastoral regime insofar as involving the *care of souls*, that is, the ministries that could well be included under the name of “evangelization” (in the usual meaning of apostolate of “exterior” and “public” activities) are *essentially* exercised as a normal functions of their state of life, *only* by priests who are diocesan Presbyters or religious of active life; and NOT indeed by priests who are religious of contemplative life.

Putting it in another way: for a *Presbyter as a priest* that he is, and regardless of any other office he may have due to his particular vocation or hierarchical mission, the ministry of CULT is the **ONLY ONE ESSENTIAL**; the “evangelization” (in the usual sense of the word) is **NOT ESSENTIAL** at all. On the contrary, for the *Presbyter*, as a priest who is also a pastor of souls “partaker of the Bishop’s office”, the CULTUAL function and the EVANGELIZATION are *both* equally *essential* and *primary*, although the first holds still its **PRIMACY** of value and **PREEMINENCE** of importance over the second.

“Ordination, and this alone, makes the *priest*; the canonical mission (or provision of office) is what really makes the *presbyter*: canon 109 of the Code seems to point this out. The Presbyterate is organically rooted in the Priesthood, so that the Hierarchy presupposes and includes the priestly power; but the reality involved by the Hierarchy is more ample. The Council of Trent seems to authorize such a distinction between *priesthood* and *presbyterate*. If we examine attentively canons 1-2 of Sess. XXIII and compare them with the following canons 6-7, we may notice that when the Council speaks of the presbyter in his relation with the Eucharist—a fundamental relation, by the way, according

⁴⁶ The ministry of the Word by the liturgy of the Word in the Mass, administration of sacraments and Divine Office; and the ministry of governing by the priests’ office of *presiding* the Christian community in any liturgical function.

to the same Council—the name “priest” is used; while when the priest is placed in relation to the hierarchy, he is called “presbyter”.⁴⁷

In conclusion we must affirm that under whatever aspect we may consider the Presbyterate, the ministry of CULT remains *always*, not only an *essential* and *primary*, but its *preeminent*, *primal* or *primordial* function. And while EVANGELIZATION is *in most cases* an *essential* and *primary* function, nevertheless this function *never* holds the *primacy* over CULT. In some cases (as those mentioned above) of priests who by their vocation are totally removed from all pastoral functions, EVANGELIZATION is NOT even an ESSENTIAL, and still more a PRIMARY function.

Hence, by no means can we say that “evangelization” should be placed “at the same level as CULT” so that in the Presbyterate “the apostolic dimension should amount as much as the cultural function”, although we may admit that both demand an “identical obligatory commitment”.⁴⁸ As a matter of fact “the ministry of priests BEGINS with the evangelical proclamation, but *derives its force and efficacy* from Sacrifice of Christ which is offered through their hands in the name of the whole Church. It is to this Sacrifice that *is directed* and in it *is consummated* the ministry of Presbyters.”⁴⁹

In saying this we do not mean to depreciate in the least the apostolic mission of *every priest*. The most obscure and forgotten priest in the world must be essentially a first class apostle and missionary even if all he could do is to offer his Mass and pray his Office. More. Even when due to sickness, invalidism or other constraining predicaments of his state of life he may be deprived of the exercise of the ministry of public CULT and of evangelization, still even solely with the holiness of his priestly life, sacrifices and private prayers, through the priestly sacramental “character” he possesses, he may keep on exercising a veritable apostolate exceedingly superior to that of any other lay apostles.

⁴⁷ “*Contemplation et sacerdoce*” in *Angelicum*, Roma, Oct.-Dec. 1965, pp. 486-487, footnote 30. Cf. also Dillenschneider, op. cit., pp. 117-118, footnote 58.

⁴⁸ Cf. Jose Maria Burgos, *Tres Preguntas sobre el Presbiterado*, in *Incunabile*, Madrid, Septiembre 1968, p. 19.

⁴⁹ Vaticanum II, op. cit., “*Presbyterorum Ordinis*”, n. 2. p. 623.

We do not, then, underrate in any way the essential value and the imperative demands of a contemporary, bold and dynamic apostolic commitment which—let us not forget it—necessarily and spontaneously springs from a CULTUAL ministry performed with true piety and deep, solid interior life.⁵⁰ Vatican II has urgently insisted on the pastoral services so necessary to fulfill the mission of the Church in our modern world so far removed from God and so much engrossed and puffed up with its technology. But this pastoral outlook of Vatican II should never be taken as a pretext to justify in any way the “heresy of action”, so openly condemned by Pius XI and Pius XII.⁵¹ It should never be misinterpreted so as to belittle the preeminent value of the ministry of CULT over the exterior works of apostolate. It should never decry the authentic type of a “priestly priest”⁵² who never feels more deeply his own priesthood than when celebrating the Mass, administering the sacraments, praying the Office and preaching the Gospel in the church. It should never propose as the ideal to be followed in our days the fascinating type of a clergyman who tries to live out his priesthood better by devoting an unavoidable minimum to the cultural functions in order to engage in feverish activities undertaken at times with utter disregard of hierarchical coordination, and not rarely better left to lay apostles as more proper of their secular field.⁵³

If the sublime ideal of the cultural priestly function fades away, should we wonder at the alarming crisis of vocations among our youth? Indeed, they see in the priesthood nothing but an apostolic ministry or service which can be more efficaciously performed by laymen. Today it seems meaningless to become “Christ’s servants and stewards of God’s mysteries”,⁵⁴ “chosen from among men and made representatives of men

⁵⁰ Cf. Dom. J. B. Chautard, *L'Ame de tout Apostolat*

⁵¹ Cf. Encyclicals “*Ad Catholici Sacerdotii*” and “*Mente Nostrae*.”

⁵² This is an allusion to the article of Father John Groult, *The ‘Priestly’ Priest*, Persatl, published in *The Priest*, Our Sunday Visitor Inc. Huntington, Indiana, August 1967, vol. 23/No. 8, pp. 598-601. We beg to disagree with the author in many points.

⁵³ Cf. Jean Guittou, *The Priest of Tomorrow*, in *Christ to the World* Vol. XII (1967), No. 2, pp. 155-156.

⁵⁴ I Cor. 4,1

in their dealings with God to offer gifts and sacrifices in expiation of sins".⁵⁵ If the cultual ministry be regarded now as a hindrance to the effectivity of other humanitarian endeavors, we should not wonder at certain proposals advanced for a "part-time" priestly ministry that would allow more time for secular activities...and "necessary leisure"(!); we should not wonder at the sad fact that in some places churches are found "closed" and without cult during ordinary weekdays; and other similar aberrations.

Fourteen years ago Cardinal Montini (now Pope Paul VI) said to his priests of Milan: "To consecrate bread and wine, to offer the holy Eucharist to souls, to focus the piety of the faithful at the altar; to receive the humble confidences of penitent souls in order to return to them God's grace and peace; to foster prayer among the Christian people educating them in the sacred CULT: all that you could do to render the divine CULT worthy, meaningful, accurate and profound shall be wisely fruitful. Hence the careful attention and love for LITURGY (public worship) ought to be reckoned, not only as FUNDAMENTAL duties in your priestly life, but also as most efficacious and forceful means of approaching, winning and sanctifying men."⁵⁶

⁵⁵ Hebr. 5,1

⁵⁶ Cf. Giovanni B. Montini, *Sacerdocio Católico*, Ed. Sígueme, Salamanca 1965, p. 24.

PASTORAL SECTION

HOMILETICS

● D. Tither, C.S.S.R.

10TH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST (August 3)

GOD OUR FATHER

“Father, all life comes from You.” — Eucharistic Prayer III

The new Eucharistic prayer formulas remind us over again of the Fatherhood of God. The new Sunday Prefaces, too, recall the wonderful thing that happened when God, in His pure goodness, made us His children and became our Father, a real Father, the very best possible Father. St. Paul tells us that all the best qualities of the best fathers that ever live on earth are only a reflection of the goodness and kindness of God, Who became our Father when we were baptized. If all the tender love of all good fathers for their children were added together, it would not add up to the tiniest fraction of the goodness and kindness of our wonderful Father in Heaven towards us, His children.

The attitude we should have towards God, the attitude that Christ, our Elder Brother and Model, had is that of a small child to its Father, one of complete dependence and absolute trust. Our Saviour told us this: “Unless you become as little children, you shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven.” There was a ship at sea during a typhoon. Everyone was terrified, except one little child, only 7 years old. He seemed to be enjoying it. Someone asked him: “Aren’t you scared, son?” “No, he said, “I’m not scared. Why should I be scared? My daddy is the captain!”

When God calls Himself a father, it’s not just a name, it’s real, it’s true! We have to realize that He is a father and really loves us.

Sure, sometimes His love shows itself in ways hard for us to understand—for instance, His plan for the world included permitting the sufferings of His Eldest Son. Just as a child will only understand after he's grown up why his loving father gave him bitter medicine when he was ill, so will we only understand in Heaven why God permits us to suffer. When we look at the back of a tapestry we have a very vague idea of the picture — it is only when we see the front side that we realize what is really depicted. In a similar way, only in Heaven will we see why His Fatherly love sometimes takes the form of a cross.

The father of St. Therese was a very kind gentle person. After he died, she used her happy memories of him to give her a faint idea of the kindness of God the Father. We should do the same — thinking of the best qualities of the most ideal father and try to realize that God loves us infinitely more than that. Our lives will be really changed when we come to realize that He is a Father and loves us intensely.

Christ, the only-begotten Son of the Father, came to teach us about Him. The center of His teaching was that God is a loving Father. Every time He spoke of Him, He referred to Him as our Father. Every example He used to make us know God better was an example from the ways of an ideal Father.

Now, how is God a Father? First, by loving us intensely, immensely. Loving us so greatly that while we were still sinners and loathsome to God, He decided to share His life with us, which is the very idea of fatherhood. The Apostles had this problem: "Show us the Father" said Philip to Our Lord, "and it is sufficient for us." Listen to the answer: "He who sees Me, sees the Father also." All that is lovable in the character of Our Lord is a reflection of the loving fatherly heart of God.

God's fatherhood is also seen in His ambition for us His children. He has greater ambitions for us that's almost unbelievable — He wants us to be His children now and to sit enthroned with Christ at His right hand forever.

How does a good son treat his father? How should we act towards God? Christ, His Eldest Son and our Brother has told us: Do His will, be obedient, loving children of our wonderful Father.

A young man used to faithfully attend basketball practices. While not practising, he could be seen walking arm-in-arm with his father. One Saturday, he came without his father. He requested the coach to let him play on the team that day. The coach said: "You know you're not really ready for playing yet. I'll put you in at the beginning, since you want it so much, but I'll have to take you out later." He put the boy on the opening team, and he never did take him out. The boy played like a champion. After the game, the coach asked him: "What got into you today? You played magnificently." The boy answered: "You used to see my father with me at practice? Very few people know he was blind — that's why I guided him around. He was interested in all my interests and in my game. Well, he died last week. This afternoon was the first time he ever *saw* me play."

Let us remember our Loving Father, Who made us, Who gave us His own Life in Baptism, Who loves us and wants us to live with Him forever in His home. If we remember that He sees us and is most concerned about us, we'll surely live as good Christians, loving Him with our whole heart and prove that love by unselfish service of all His other children, our brother and sisters in Christ.

11TH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST (August 10)

BAPTISM

"By God's grace I am what I am" — Epistle

The most wonderful thing that ever happened to us in all our lives was when we were baptized. We don't remember it perhaps, but our parents do — they prepared a feast for the occasion. And God remembers it too — He can never forget that on that day we became His special child. "This is my beloved son," He said, "in whom I am well pleased." We were born as the child of our parents, sharing their life and love and their name. At Baptism we were reborn, this time as children of God, Sharing His life and love — princess and princesses with the right to use the Name of our new Father, God, the King. If one of these boys or young men here at Mass today were called to become a priest or a

bishop or even Pope in Rome, nothing more wonderful would ever happen to him than when he was baptized.

The first thing we must realize about our baptism is that we had absolutely nothing to do with its happening. It was a pure gift of God, not deserved by us at all. It was God Who called us in the beginning. If someone runs into a burning building to save a life, we say he must be a close friend. Why did God decide that Christ should die to share His life with us? St. Paul says: "Even for a good man one will scarcely die. In this we see the love of God, that while we were still sinners, Christ died for us." "Not as though we had first loved God, but God first loved us."

Only God's love for us makes us lovable. We would only be repulsive to God, except that His love first makes us worth loving at all. The prayers said when we were baptized stress this. Many, many times we were described as "His chosen one," "This called one" — the one whom God in His pure goodness and from no right of ours was called to share His Divine Life.

When did this love begin? Long before we were born, long before the first man existed, long before the world. If there was a line stretching from here to the sun representing Eternity, my life-time would not even be a particle of it. But, away at the beginning, God loves *me* and called me to share His life. "I have loved thee with an everlasting love, therefore have I drawn thee." God chose us first, decided (out of millions of possible beings) that we would exist. He decided that we would not just have natural life, but share His own Divine Life (rather than so many others, who perhaps would have appreciated it more.)

The day of our baptism is a far more important day than our birthday, because it was then that we were born to a divine life. A merchant called, Leonides was away from home when his son Origen was born. When he came home and learned he had a son, he asked if the son had been re-born in baptism. When he heard that Origen was not just his son but God's as well, he knelt and worshipped the Divine Life being lived in his child. All of you parents can say that to your child after

its baptism. "Until now you were only my child. But now, you are also God's own child."

Each one of us can say with St. Paul in today's Reading: "By the grace of God I am what I am, and His grace in me has not been in vain." How do we repay God's love? He told us Himself — by loving one another. "This is *My* commandment, that you love one another as I have loved you." Our love must be practical and effective, not merely a matter of words.

How will we do this? He will tell us. You know that the new Scripture readings for Mass are being published. In a very short time we'll be having them at Mass. We'll be having the *whole* of God's message. Let's open those ears of ours that were opened at Baptism (in a ceremony like the cure described in today's gospel) and *listen*. And our response will surely be a readiness to help each and all of our brothers in their spiritual and temporal needs. This is what Christianity is all about, this is what baptism implies. Thus will we thank our Father, God, for calling us to be His children, and giving us Christ for our Brother.

12TH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST (August 17)

GOD'S ORIGINAL PLAN FOR US

"Our sufficiency is from God." — Epistle

When our first parents were created, they were perfectly happy. There were indeed many things which we know now that they did not know. They know nothing about automobile or electricity or television. But one thing they did know and could never forget — that God had made them His children. In a similar way, over and above their natural life, Adam and Eve had a share in God's life.

God's plan was that the first people, and then all their descendants, should share in His Divine life. They had no right to this — it was an entirely free gift of God. Once we have been born, you and I have a right to natural and human life. But no one has a right to Divine Life — it is a purely free gift of God. It was because of God's goodness and love that He freely wished to share His life.

The first people were supremely happy, closely united with God in an easy and holy friendship. The Bible describes it in these words: "God walked with them." They were constantly aware of His presence and His love.

Let's take a look at this Divine Life that God shares with us out of Love. It's quite beyond our natural powers. If you heard of a plant that moved around to find better soil or more sunshine or water, you would say, "That's beyond its nature." If you heard of a dog that studied in school, read books, told stories and laughed at jokes, you would say, "That's beyond its nature." If you heard of a man who could live without breathing, you would say, "Beyond his nature." Our sharing in the divine life is like that — it's something we could never really get by ourselves — only God can give it.

It's something very real, even though we can't see it, or touch it, or measure it. After all, you don't use a tape-measure to estimate a man's ambition. You don't use thermometer to test your love for someone. But our ambition, our love are very real — so is our sharing in the Divine Life.

It's the most precious gift we have. So important that God sent His Son to restore it to us after our first parents lost it. He told us the essential things, He came to give us this share in His own life: "I am come," He said, "that they may have life, and have it in abundance," — not our natural life (man had that before He came) but a participation in His own Divine Life. He described it as living water, a spring of living water, continually flowing to give this new kind of life, a superior kind, a supernatural kind of life. The Bible describes it this way: "We were saved by His grace, God raised us up and enthroned us in the heavenly realm." We remain human beings, yes, we retain our human life, we don't become God, but over and above our human life, we do live a divine life, our human life has a participation in God's Life added to it. "I live," says St. Paul, "now not I, but Christ lives in me." Said Our Lord, "Abide in Me I will dwell in you. As the branch of itself cannot bear fruit unless it is joined to the vine, so neither can you, unless you abide in Me. I am the vine, you the branches. He who abides in Me and I in him, bears much fruit, for without Me you can do nothing." Another time he said: "Whoever

loves Me, obeys, My teaching, and he will be loved by My Father, and we will come to him and dwell in him." Ultimately it will flower into everlasting life.

You've all heard of the Cursillo. Maybe you know some Cursillistas. You know how making the Cursillo can change a man's life. I'll tell you the secret of the Cursillo. For three days, a Christian studies intensely the nature of the Divine Life that in the beginning God intended all of us to share, and that Christ came to restore to us. After three days of intensive studying of this Divine Life, a Cursillista is convinced that he possesses something of immense value, and is resolved to treasure it, and hand it on to others with deep heartfelt love.

Today's Gospel, with the well-known story of the good Samaritan spells it out. Love God all the way, and your neighbor as yourself. And who is our neighbor? Anyone, *everyone* in our home, in our neighborhood, at our place of work, be he friend or enemy, who needs our help, a kindly word, a generous action, a service that will show what Christianity is. "Bear one another's burden and so fulfill the Law of Christ."

13TH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST (August 23)

GOD'S REVISED PLAN

"The law was meant to be temporary, pending the arrival of the Descendant of the promise." — Epistle

We cannot dwell too long or too gratefully on the Divine Life by which God wants us to live, now and forever. Our first parents were not forced to enjoy the Divine Life. We can't be forced to love anyone, even God. The possibility remained, with Adam, of refusing to love God. Instead of responding with love, man could respond with ungrateful rebellion.

This is just what Adam did. Delighted with the Divine Life which he shared, he thought. "This is very wonderful. If only I could have it from myself, independently of God." And in a gesture of pride, he rejected God. At that moment, Adam's participation in the divine life

ceased. He became dead, really dead, to the only kind of life worthy of the name life. His mad act cut himself off from the flow of Divine Life. He could still move, he could still walk, he still had a natural life. But the Divine Life in him was cut off completely.

And all of us, at that moment, died to the divine life. We have to see this from God's point of view. We were not born till thousand of years after Adam. But he was our representative, the head of mankind, his decision affected us all — we all died, says St. Paul, in Adam. These are the words St. Paul used: "One man sinned, and it brought condemnation on all." "A multitude, through one man's sin, became guilty. It was through one man that guilt came into the world, and since death came owing to guilt, death was handed on to all mankind by one man." The dead referred to is spiritual death — loss of the Divine Life.

The situation was utterly hopeless, because man living with a purely natural life, can do nothing whatever to get a life altogether beyond his powers. No more than a plant can escape a flood by running away, or a sick animal escape death by arranging for surgery to be done by another animal.

But God our Father was not to be frustrated. There and then, He thought of a wonderful plan. He would give us another chance. He promised there and then to send a Redeemer. Through his Redeemer, those who lived before His coming could again share the Divine Life. But we who were born after His coming, could share an even better life. Wonderful as was Adam's sharing in God's life, ours would be still more wonderful — it would be Christ's life, His risen life, His life in God that we would share. When we passed through the water of Baptism, we were born to a new life, Christ's Life, we became God's children and Christ's brother. At Mass, at the blessing of the water, which will be mixed with the wine and become Christ along with the wine, this prayer is said: "O God, you created human nature wonderfully. May we share His Divinity, Who became a sharer in our humanity, Jesus Christ."

In today's Mass, we consider God's promises to Adam, and then to Abraham. We consider the part of God's plan where He sent His

Son to be our Redeemer. We remember that God so loved the world as to send His only-begotten Son to redeem the world. His offering of Himself in loving obedience to the cross made up for our sins, and His Resurrection enabled Him to give us a share in His risen life. "By His stripes we were healed. All we like sheep had gone astray, everyone had turned into his own path, and the Lord laid on Him the iniquity of us all. He was wounded for our iniquities, He was bruised for our offenses."

The Bible says: "Forget not the kindness of thy surety, for he has given his life for thee." Some years ago in Manila, a blood-donor named Emilio Benavides, died while donating his blood to someone in desperate need. (Usually, this could not happen, as Doctors are most careful to check blood-donors first. But this was an emergency.) Now, do you think that the one who was saved by that blood ever forget Benavides?

Let's show how our gratitude to Our Saviour everyday of our lives, by loving God and generously working for the betterment of the world. May our every action be a dying to ourselves, and a rising to live, ever more and more alive, with the life of the Risen Christ.

Rather than the 9 who so quickly forgot to even say: "Thank You," let us like the cured Samaritan, remember God's goodness to us, and make every Mass a thanksgiving, every going to the Communion Banquet table a grateful remembering.

14TH SUNDAY PENTECOST (August 31)

GOD LOVES US PERSONALLY

"Your Heavenly Father knows you need all these things" — Gospel

God loves each one of us personally. You parents will understand this. Your love for your first-born was unique. And yet, no matter how many children you have had since, you have the same love for each of them without lessening your love for the first-born. God is our Father — He made us His children in Baptism. He is most con-

cerned about each of us, and most anxiously ambitious for us — see the destiny He has in store for us. When Christ our brother told us about His Father and ours, He made this abundantly clear. “Are not five sparrows sold for three farthings? Yet not one of them falls to the ground without your Father. Fear not, you are worth more than many sparrows. Even the hairs of your head are numbered.” He used the example of God’s care for the birds and the flowers, then of a father giving food to his child to illustrate our heavenly Father’s concern for each one of us. In the prayer He officially taught us, Our Father, He stressed our Father’s interest, even in our daily food.

The Bible uses parallel love to illustrate this. God appeals to mother-love and says His love is much greater. “Shall a woman forget her infant, so as not to have pity on her child? Even so, I will not forget thee. I have graven thee in my hands.” The Prophet Osee puts these words in God’s lips: “When Israel was a child, I loved him. I it was Who taught him to walk, Who bound up his wounds, Who reached down to put food in his mouth, I it was Who took him up in My arms, even as one fondles an infant to his cheeks.” Think of that — the great God, Who is in need of no one, should describe Himself as treating us like small children, cuddling us to His cheeks.

The reason why some people stay away from Him is because they feel that God doesn’t care. There is a man down the street who will miss Mass today. He doesn’t realize that God wants him here, that God knows about himself, that God sees his very thoughts, and longs for his love.

Let us not think of God’s benefits to us as being divided or lessened by being given to many. God’s love is not like ours. He loves each one of us personally, as if there were no one else in the world. He sent his Son, not for me and a lot of other people taken together, but for me personally, individually, just as I am now. “He loved *me*,” says St. Paul, “and delivered Himself for me.” When we are all gathered here to join Christ our Brother in offering the Mass, each one of us is quite convinced that God is personally interested in our offering as He is in the offering of each of our brothers and sisters in Christ. Our impression here is correct — each of us does have all of God’s love, just as each of us achieves Communion with the whole Christ (Head

and members) at the Altar rail, no matter how many others communicate at the same time. Only then will we give God the full response of our love when we realize that His love for each one of us is a personal one, and that what He wants from me is the love that no one else can give Him.

God never ceases to care for us, provide for us, protect us. He did not just create things in the beginning and leave them to themselves. Creation is not just an act done once for all by God in the beginning. It is a constant act by which God continues to care for all that He had made, especially men. The great love of God is expressed in His Providence, the care He extends to all His creatures. The greatest sign of this love is this — He has given Himself to us. He has sent His own Divine Son, Christ, to transform the world. In each of the formulas of the Eucharistic Prayer words like this are said to God the Father: "Through Christ our Lord, through Whom You are continually creating, making holy, giving life to and blessing all these good things." What are those good things? Everything we use and value in life. In many places, at the offertory procession, not just bread and wine, but the things we use every day are brought to the sanctuary and piled up near the altar for this blessing and reminder of how much God loves us in giving us Christ and with Him, all good things.

How dull our lives would be if nobody cared: There would truly be nothing worth living for. Let's realize that God cares — exceedingly. He made us. He made the world and everything in it out of love for us. At our baptism, He did not only placed us in the world He has sanctified for our lifespan — 70, 50, 30 years — but He also called us back to Him. Everything in our life — our work, our recreation, eating, sleeping, suffering, should be a step back to God. Until in the end, the soul, having reached full stature, flings itself with a joyful cry into the arms of our loving Father, and is welcomed home.

Let's not stumble into, Eternity. Let's not go to a God we've never really known. Let's tell Him we love Him, and will prove it by constant, self-forgetting love of others.

LAYMAN'S VIEW

PASTORAL ROLE EXPECTATIONS

● Roberto Lazaro

"The priest has a role to play and people expect him to play that role."

In every organization, there are role expectations which the individual playing the role must live up to or suffer the loss of image. If this individual is a leader, his failure to fulfill his role expectations will cost him not only a loss of image but also the loss of subordinate acceptance.

The priest is the pastoral leader of his people. There is a leadership role he must fulfill according to a definite behavioral pattern his Catholic constituents expect. His effectiveness as a pastoral leader will depend on how well or how poorly he fulfills this role.

In the mind of the layman, the term *pastoral* does not only mean *spiritual*. The priest is the leader of the community called the parish, leading not only in prayers or in the celebration of the Mass. He is looked up to as a leader who sets the example in practical day to day life. What he does, and not what he preaches is what people observe. How he behaves, and not how fluently he expounds the Teachings and the Commandments, is what influences the thinking attitude and behavior of his parishioners.

It is an unfortunate fact and an unpleasant truth to face, that in the Philippines today Catholicism is not as soundly founded as it may perhaps be presumed. There is a need for a frank and open minded assessment of the situation and of the factors responsible for the general apathy behind the appearances of capacity church attendances and the overwhelming majority of Catholic membership in this country. For

certainly, it is one thing to have a big membership and quite another thing to have quality members. Church services may be well attended and processions may be overcrowded, but the big crowd can mean something else and not necessarily fervent catholicism. Tradition, social pressures and even superstitious fanaticism are factors one cannot overlook in Catholic behaviorism in the Philippines. The role of the church as a church is not necessarily well appreciated and this is felt in poor Sunday collections, the lack of interest in church affairs *per se*, and the general attitude towards the priest and the priesthood. Ridicules and depective jokes center on priest, made even by regular church goers.

We have a good number of practicing, God-fearing, priest-respecting Catholics. But the rest are nominal who either take the priest for granted or harbor reservations towards him.

When we hear unfavorable comments, innocently or ill-intently given, regarding the priest, say, his mahjong sessions or other table games, his luxurious living, his celibacy, etc., we have a typical picture of a Catholic searching for something ideal which he cannot find and whose disappointment is manifested in such criticisms.

People are people, constituting a human society in the parish and subject to human expectations. When the priest does not live up to their expectations, the pulpit (or the ambo) loses its pristine apostolic appeal as the tribunal of the world of God, and the oratorical fluency of the preacher fails to achieve his effectiveness as a change agent in the life of his flock.

Spiritual incentives and sanctions have their limits in directing human behavior and way of thinking. Environmental context and frustrating human experience can misdirect the human conscience and lead to the consequent behavior one notices among many Catholics of the present day. It thus becomes imperative for the priest to assert his role as the model of an environment, a reassurance in the waverings of human experience, an objectifying factor in the development of the subjective conscience of his people. He has to make his presence felt as a human being capable of rising above his human weaknesses and possessed of the strength to share the needs of his community, a leader whose authority rings with a human voice echoing the voice of God in terms under-

standable in practical language. People want to see him not as a fault-finder, but rather as a guiltless leader capable of hearing the guilt of others.

Such is the layman's expectations of the priestly role. He is a man above other men in virtues, but a man among his people in leadership. He does not stand between God and men. Rather, he stands among men to lead them in the service of God. As such, his place is not the ivory tower of his rectory where he presumes that the Spirit of God will operate for him among his people. He is the image of that Spirit, and it is his life that must dwell in his people if he expects the Spirit of God to operate effectively in them.

Nothing can substitute for the personal leadership of the priest. After all, our God is a personal God. So why can the priest not be a personal priest, a personal leader who belongs to the people.

This is where, to the layman's mind, many priest fail to achieve the full purpose of their priestly goal, a goal which the last Vatican Council seems to have taken cognizance of in instituting reforms to make liturgy pastorally effective and to enable the people to participate in it not only with devotion *but with action*. In other words, the church, through the pastoral work of the priest, must be a truly effective agent of change in the practical life of her people.

An agent of change cannot act among the elements he is destined to change if it remains apart from those elements. And as it is for the agent to act, not to be acted upon, the priest who is the agent in this case, is expected to initiate, positively and actively, the changes desired within his community.

Yet, how often has it been lamented that priests expect the people to come to them, rather than they exerting efforts to go to the people!

In these days when people's time and attention are divided and inclined more towards the search for material needs, the priest cannot remain passive and unresponsive without sacrificing the spiritual and moral health of his flock. The people's spiritual plight is a silent one, better manifested in the form of indifference rather than in vocal clamours for the things they want and need. The priest must be able to

feel this inner plight, concretize the problem and impose his personal presence as a leader and as a pastor. Everytime he fails to provide his personal influence, other influences will fill in the vacuum. And when this happens, as it is in fact happening, the priest cannot shift the responsibility away from himself.

A legionary who was working eight hours a day in a government office and devoting his free time after office hours to legion work by conducting house to house campaigns in a notorious urban district up to late in the evening once complained that when he brought several civilly married couples to the parish rectory for married validation one Saturday afternoon, the priest was sleeping and could not be disturbed. Here was a case of a layman sacrificing his own time and convenience for the sake of the service of the Church, only to meet with an uncooperative attitude of the priest whose function it was that the layman took upon himself to perform, while the priest was still at his nap at 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon.

In many remote areas of the country, it is a well known fact that after saying the morning mass and spending, if at all, an hour or so in giving catechetical instructions to parish children, the priest spends the rest of the day to himself. There is a widespread scandal in the public mind on the "relaxing moments" some priest spend in affairs which the Catholic laymen commonly talk about in hushes and blushes in embarrassment when mentioned in ridicule by those who attack the church. These are indications that there are idle hours misspent, which otherwise are better devoted to constructive leadership activities.

Makeshift public libraries with even delayed or old issues of newspapers and magazines, improvised health centers with donated medicines from the more flourishing areas, visits to the sick, or simple social calls to pep up morale, community meetings for adult education or farming methods — these or other activities may be launched by the priest to complement the spiritual guidance he gives to his rural parishioners. In the urban or more populated parishes, the priest can affectively lead in community activities of sports, civic action work and instructional programs.

Too much, perhaps, to expect of a priest who after all is only human and whose capacities and endurance are limited. True!

But is it not also true and with very good reasons that a priest who is only as human as anybody else, is expected to rise above human vices more than anybody else? It is all a matter of role expectations. People expect the priest to be a leader, a model, a pastor, with all the virtues and traits attached, by role expectations, to his height in the leadership rung of the organizational hierarchy. So does God expect the priest, as pastor, representative, *alter-Christus*, to be above other men to see, the salt that has not lost its savor to perk up the dull monotony of a materialistic world and to keep the fallen nature of men from total putrefaction.

In the same vein, the priest is expected, as the leader of his people, to surpass the limits of human endurance, not by a superhuman physical strength or prowess, but by the proper harnessing of his intellectual creativeness, his ingenuity to utilize all possible resources, human and material, within the parish to advantage.

After all, the priest has been trained in the theodiceal principles of cause and effect, of the moved and the mover. Translating these principles in practical terms in pastoral work, he can create a spread effect of chain reactions among his people both by his moral example and his active apostolate, training men to train others, developing apostles to develop other apostles, instituting centers to spread all over, planting trees to bear fruits and seeds and other trees — all the work of one man, the priest, but not as a man as an individual apart from the rest; rather, a man as a driving part of the whole, coordinating the parts towards a definite goal and inspired by a definite motive: God.

When we see around us non-Catholic denominations sprouting and spreading, we know that there is something wrong with our own system. Every individual who joins a non-Catholic sect is a hole in our wall which must be plugged. Every Catholic who fails to live upright as a Catholic is a weak strand in our fence which must be mended. How many such holes do we have in the wall and how many such weak strands do we have in our fence. And how efficiently does the yard keeper go about its upkeep?

CASES AND QUERIES

JURISDICTION IN PERSONAL PARISHES

In this city there is a Chinese parish; the church edifice is situated within the territory of parish A. The Chinese parish is purely personal, the jurisdiction of the parish priest is only to Chinese nationals, he has no territorial jurisdiction.

The question is this: suppose a filipino couple would like to get married in the Chinese parish church, although both belong, for example, to parish B. They approach the parish priest of the Chinese parish, who instructs them to get permission from me, the parish priest of parish B. If I grant them this permission, can the Parish priest of the Chinese parish solemnize the marriage validly?

In discussing this case with my confreres, I gave the opinion that, since a parish priest can not validly delegate another priest to solemnize a wedding outside of his own parish territory, neither can he grant a personal jurisdiction; the parish priest of the Chinese parish would still need authorization either from the Ordinary, or from the parish priest of A, within whose territory the Chinese parish church is situated otherwise the marriage would be invalid.

Please publish your solution to this case in the BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO at your earliest convenience.

A READER

I.—By reason of the faithful (can. 216), parishes are divided into territorial, national, familiar and personal. In general however, it is only with territorial parishes that the legislation of the Code of Canon Law is concerned. As T. Muniz declares: “Las parroquias personales no están sujetas al derecho comun en las relaciones que nacen del lugar en que sus feligreses habitan. Sin embargo, es frecuente que para gozar de esta parroquialidad privilegiada sea necesario hallarse en la ciudad, pueblo o territorio en que se halla establecida la parroquia, y que fuera de alli sus feligreses queden sometidos al derecho comun.”¹

The first paragraph of can. 216 is applicable only to merely familiar or simply personal parishes and the second paragraph to other personal parishes. And attending closely to the words of paragraph 3: “Las partes de la diócesis de las cuales se habla en el par. 1 son *parroquias*...” which can be called ordinary or common. They are not called *territorial parishes* even if they are such really and strictly. Concerning these which paragraph 4 of the same canon speaks: “Sin especial indulto apostólico, no pueden constituirse *parroquias* por razón de la diversidad de lengua o nacionalidad de los fieles que viven en una misma ciudad o territorio, ni parroquias meramente familiares o personales...”, such parishes can be called extraordinary, special or better still privileged bearing always in mind the observation of the author just cited. It is likewise true that each and everyone of these privileged parishes can be called “personal” although not in strictly the same sense for all of them. In this way, we can clear away from the various contradictory opinions prevalent among canonists concerning the nature of parishes and consequently of the diverse classes of personal parish-priests and their respective jurisdiction.

II.—This problem can also be clarified with reference to a similar case. In 1926 Fr. A. Santamaria, O.P. answered in the negative a similar problem concerning American and Chinese parishes in the city of Manila. His view runs: “Por el contrario, si los Parrocos de Americanos o Chinos solemnizan matrimonios dentro de Manila pero de los que no son subditos suyos, serian validos estos matrimonios? Lo serian los celebraran en la propia iglesia, es decir, el Parroco de

¹ T. Muniz, *Derecho Parroquial*, tom. I, n. 84 (Sevilla, 1923).

Americanos en la Catedral y el Parroco Chino en la iglesia de Binondo... Ad 3 um. Si los Parrocos de Americanos o Chinos solemnizan o dan delegacion para solemnizar los matrimonios de los que son subditos suyos, sin delegacion del propio Parroco, dentro de la Ciudad de Manila, y aunque si en la iglesia destinada a sus funciones parroquiales, dichos matrimonios serian nulos. El tener una iglesia destinada para las funciones parroquiales nada significa respecto del territorio de la parroquia."²

The reason for this allegation is based on the ff. citation: "Tambien es de notar que en esta materia elCodigo de Derecho Canonico nada ha cambiado en la legislacion del Decreto *Ne Temere* de 2 de Agosto de 1907 preparado precisamente por los codificadores del Derecho, y por tanto debemos aplicar las resoluciones dadas por la Santa Sede interpretando el mismo Decreto." The following resolutions of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, *Romana et aliarum*, ad 4um., dated February 1, 1908 is cited: "Ubinam et quomodo parochus, qui in territorio aliis parochis assignato nonnullas personas vel familias sibi subditas habet, matrimoniis adsistere valeat?" The answer was affirmative, *quoad suos subditos tantum*, ubique in dicto territorio, facto verbo cum Sanctissimo"³

Another canonist Fr. J. Noval, O.P. defends the validity of the matrimony in question. He asserts that the old law should be interpreted according to the norms of can. 6 of the Code, which principle Fr. Santamaria does not deny but uses in defending the same opinion. Thus, he writes: "Ad 3um respondet (P. Santamaria). negative; ex resolutione S.C.C.... Nos (P. Noval) existimamus rationem solutionis esse, ut in praecedentibus, desmendam non ex responsis S.C.C. datis ante promulgationem Codicis, utpote quae sunt fontes potius interpretationis iuris vigentis post Codicem, quam ipsius iuris (can. 6), sed ex praescripto can. 1095, par. 1... ubi nomine *parochus*, cum nulla fiat distinctio a legislatore, venit parochus tum territorialis tum personalis, et nomine territorii venit territorium nedum parochi territorialis, sed etiam parochi personalis quando ejus potestas coarctatur ad aliquod territorium, ut in casu."

² Cf. *Boletín Eclesiástico de Filipinas*, Vol. II, pp. 31-33.

³ Cf. *Codicis Luris Canonici Fontes*, Vol. VI, n. 4344.

Well then, we are now confronted with two conflicting opinions, the first which asserts that the marriage in question is null and void, and the second, which defends its validity.

There is however, even a third canonist who, seeing a positive and probable doubt (*dubium iuris*) in the interpretation of the same legislation of the common law concerning the power of jurisdiction of personal parish priests would defend the validity of the matrimony in question by virtue of the second juridical norm of can. 209 and the authentic interpretation of cans. 197-209.⁴

III.—What therefore can be said of the opinion of the consulting parish-priest after the foregoing discussion? The Chinese parish-priest in the present case can answer the consulting parish-priest in the ff.: “Nego suppositum. I have requested for the contracting parties both Filipinos and your parishioners, to ask the permission which can. 1097, par. 1 speaks, which as a personal parish-priest (not strictly territorial but semi-personal or semi-territorial) I need only *ad licitatem* to solemnize their marriage in my Church for Chinese. I’m not asking for permission or delegation of the power of jurisdiction to assist validly at the marriage which can. 1095, par. 2 speaks.”

Finally, I would advice both the consulting and Chinese parish-priests of the city to study well the terms in the document of erection of the privileged parish and see if really, jurisdiction has been limited to only Chinese faithful in the city excluding even indirectly, the use of the same to those who are not. Only in this way (possibly, but very improbably) can all the opinions described above be clarified and then we can affirm with certainty that the marriage in question solemnized by the Chinese parish-priest (with only delegated power) is null.

We confidently hope that the New Code of Canon Law will have a clearer and more determined legislation concerning personal parish-priests as we have at present with regards military chaplains whom not a few canonists consider simple or merely personal parish-priests.

● Fr. Agapio Salvador, O.P.

⁴ Cf. AAS, 44, 497.

THE BISHOPS AND THE ADVANCED FULFILLMENT OF SUNDAY OBLIGATION

With regard to the Indult to anticipate the fulfillment of the obligation of hearing Mass on Sundays and Holy Days on Saturdays and Vigil evenings, I wish to ask the following questions:

(1) *May the Bishop inhibit his faithful from fulfilling the Sunday and Holy Days precept if the latter hear Mass in the afternoon of the preceding feast day?*

(2) *May the Bishop oblige his priests to celebrate Mass on Saturdays and Vigil evenings, in order that the faithful could make use of the privilege?*

As to the first question, the answer is in the *negative*. Let me explain. The indult in its section on the petition reads: "*Qua de causa, Orator, nomine etiam Exc. morum Praesulum Conferentiae, a Sanctitate Vestra petit facultatem ut fideles adimplere possint obligationem de qua supra.*" In other words, what is being asked here is simply *a faculty that the faithful may comply with the above-mentioned obligation*. Once the petition was granted, the indult already exists and the faithful automatically enjoy the privilege, and may make use of this privilege where they can make use of it.

And here is where precisely the Bishop may nullify the privilege. Since one of the conditions of the anticipated Mass is a mass in the preceding *evening* of Sundays or feast days and since it is the local Ordinary who may allow evening Masses, it follows that ultimately the use of the privilege depends on the Bishop.

The answer to the second question is in the *affirmative*. There is a text from the *Decree on Bishops*, n. 11, which defines the diocese thus: "A diocese is that portion of God's people which is entrusted to a bishop to be shepherded by him with the cooperation of the presbytery."

There are two important teachings here which form the basis for our affirmative answer.

(1) The bishop is the one to whom is entrusted the diocese or portion of the People of God which is to be shepherded (DB. 16; LG, 23). He is the steward of the grace of the supreme priesthood especially in the Eucharist, which he offers or causes others to be offered... (LG. 26). The bishop is the one who has more properly the duty in justice and charity to procure and to promote the spiritual welfare of those entrusted to his care, which is more efficaciously accomplished by applying the fruits of the Mass for them.

(b) According to the Code, c. 451, # 1: "*Parochus* est sacerdos vel persona moralis cui parocchia collata est in titulum cum *cura animarum sub Ordinarii loci auctoritate exercenda*." With almost the same words, the Decree *Christus Dominus* says: "Pastors, however, cooperate with the bishops in a very special way, for as shepherds in their own right they are entrusted with the *care of souls* in a certain part of the diocese *under the bishop's authority*" (n. 30).

Attention is invited to two related things in both these texts: the *care of souls*, and *authority of the ordinary* of the place. The pastor in everything that pertains to the care of souls is under the authority of the Bishop.

The very same idea is easily seen even regarding the Religious. "In order that the works of the apostolate be carried out harmoniously in individual dioceses and that the unity of diocesan discipline be preserved intact, these principles are established as fundamental: 1) Religious should always attend upon bishops... whenever they are legitimately called upon to undertake works of the apostolate, they are obliged to discharge their duties in such a way that they may be available and docile helpers to bishops... Especially in view of the urgent need of souls and the scarcity of diocesan clergy, religious communities which are not dedicated exclusively to the contemplative life *can be called upon by the bishops* to assist in various pastoral ministries." (n. 35).

Accordingly we have the following points beyond doubt:

(1) The bishop is the head of the particular portion of the Universal Church called the diocese. He is the one ultimately responsible for the spiritual welfare of the faithful, and consequently the ultimate judge as to what spiritual means should be given them and when and how.

(2) The priests with care of souls are helpers to the bishops, co-operators, as the Decree says. In everything that pertains to the spiritual care of the faithful of the diocese, the pastors are *under the authority of the local Ordinary*.

(3) The religious, in as much as they share in the care of the souls and in carrying out works of apostolate within the diocese are, in a real sense, clergy of the diocese, and thereby, in what concerns the spiritual care of the faithful, under the local Ordinary.

Now it is obvious that the indult of anticipating Sunday or feast day obligation is very convenient to the faithful and pertains to their spiritual care. Consequently, if and when the Bishop orders that Anticipated Masses be said within his diocese, both pastors and religious are obliged to obey, and have the Mass said either *per se* vel *per alium*.

● L. Z. Legaspi, O.P.

HISTORICAL SECTION

THE MARYKNOLL SISTERS

NATURE, ROLE, and FUNCTION

The Congregation of the Maryknoll Sisters of St. Dominic exists as a corporate response to the transcultural dimension of the missionary vocation of all Christians. As a Pontifical Institute under the Sacred Congregation for the Evangelization of Peoples, it serves as a missionary instrument of the universal Church in the United States. It represents an effort of American women and those who freely join them to serve Christ and man in building up fraternal relationships among Churches in the family of nations.

The Congregation's response to fundamental life issues is characterized by an intense concern that Christ's love be known and experienced in the world. It is based on Gospel principles translated into terms of the man of today, the world of today. It anticipates continuous renewal in order to keep responding to the real needs of the people of God.

At all times the function of the Congregation is determined by the nature of missionary activity. It is further shaped by its own historical, evolutionary development as its present members strive to continue and develop what Mother Mary Joseph, their foundress, initiated. They attempt to do this in a world where the ordinary locus of man's encounter with God is the secular sphere. Within this context, the Congregation seeks to make creative response to today's challenges. With the Church, it claims "no other authority than that of ministering to men with the help of God in a spirit of charity and faithful service." (The Church's Missionary Activity, Decree No. 12)

Of necessity the task of the Congregation implies a two-fold activity. On the one hand, it helps the Church in the United States to

express tangibly its mission concern; on the other hand, it provides the Churches in developing countries with a channel for fraternal sharing and communication with one another. In the United States the Congregation's activity will ordinarily manifest itself in the form of mission education. Any other type of service will be undertaken only for the specific purpose of promoting missionary awareness. At a time when vast numbers of people have lost a sense of direction, the Congregation seeks to illumine the meaning of man, the oppressed and disadvantaged man, the man whose human development has been inhibited or impeded, the man whose life seems to be without purpose. The Congregation's concern extends to every man, and to the whole man, not only to his material welfare, but also to the spirit which abides within him and yearns for development.

The Congregation does not function as an isolated entity but acts within the Church as a collaborator with the world. This extends to all types of groups who attempt to promote the welfare and unity of mankind. In particular, the Congregation assumes co-responsibility for activity undertaken jointly with the Maryknoll Fathers.

As women dedicated to giving witness to the redeeming presence of God in the world and to revealing the Church as sign of salvation, the Maryknoll Sisters come together in community, sharing a common vision, inspiration and support. While the missionary vocation as such can be lived out in a variety of ways, the original group of women of Maryknoll adopted the religious life form as their means of responding to the challenge of mission. They attest to their belief in this form as dynamic, evolving expression of Christianity, a vital force and pattern of life for our own times.

BEGINNINGS

On January 6, 1921, the great feast of light and showing forth of Christ, three young women offered to help the young missionary Society, Maryknoll. One of the three was Miss Mary Josephine Rogers, Mother Mary Joseph, who was the leader of the group and later became the foundress. She was a teacher from Smith College, Boston, who had

been helping in the publication of a mission magazine during her spare time. From here the Sisters' community grew, American in spirit, World-wide in mission, a living tribute to their country's pioneering, sacrifice and generosity.

In 1920 the Maryknoll Sisters received canonical approbation from Rome, and in 1954 Rome further blessed the Congregation as a Pontifical Institute. Within the space of 49 years, the Maryknoll Sisters which began with three secretaries have multiplied, until now they number 1350. Their work for Christ covers the globe. In eighteen mission lands they help the people in countless ways—healing, comforting, feeding and teaching. Presently, there are 140 Maryknoll Sisters in the Philippines. The Congregation requires the highest religious and professional standards for their work.

MISSIONS IN THE PHILIPPINES

In 1926, a group of Sisters was assigned to open a Normal College in Malabon, Rizal. The need for Catholic-trained teachers in the Philippines was acute. By early June, twelve Sisters were ready to begin this work.

The Sisters' work in the Philippines has been educational for the most part. The Normal School became Maryknoll College, and now occupies a large complex in Quezon City with a total of 2,000 students.

A primary and high school of 1500 is now flourishing at the site of the original Normal School at Malabon. In 1938, a school was begun in Lucena, Quezon Province. The present enrollment is more than 1200. Also at Pakil in Central Luzon the Sisters staff a high school of 500 students.

In a wave of pioneering during the 1950's many Filipino families left their small farms to migrate either to the rich lands in northern Luzon or to the great undeveloped areas in southern Mindanao. Maryknoll Sisters went to both. At Santiago they work with the La Salette Fathers who conduct a complete plant of kindergarten, primary, secondary and college.

On the Island of Mindanao, the Maryknoll Sisters staff another complete educational plant at Jimenez, Misamis Occidental. High Schools have been set up in Panabo, Santo Tomas, Lupon and Cateel in Davao. All of them are separated by miles of difficult roads. At the request of Most Rev. Gerard Mongeau, the Sisters accepted a high school at Datu Piang, Cotabato, a Mohammedan stronghold. In 1968 they took over the primary and secondary school in Bislig, Surigao del Sur.

In all these schools there is a vigorous catechetical apostolate for public school youth and unfortunate children who do not attend school.

Medical work began early in the history of the Maryknoll Sisters in the Philippines. St. Paul's Hospital, 125 beds, in the crowded Intramuros section of Manila was staffed in 1927. This hospital also ministered to the poorest in the city—giving food, clothing, and housing as well as medical care. A nursing school was connected with the hospital and today many of their graduate nurses hold prominent positions in the medical field throughout the Islands. In 1945 during World War II, St. Paul's Hospital was completely destroyed. St. Joseph's Hospital in Manapla, Occidental Negros, was opened in 1948 to care for workers on sugar plantations.

A major step was taken in 1961 when a novitiate for women from Asia was set up in Quezon City. Here, candidates from the Philippines, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea and Ceylon receive their early formation as Maryknoll Sisters.

Social Service and Social Action are also part of the Maryknoll Sisters' missionary endeavors in the Philippines.

THE FUTURE

The world today encompasses a totality of new meanings, emerging problems and unique needs. This contemporary atmosphere as well as the wide range of cultural and geographical settings in which the Congregation finds itself call for equally diverse expressions of life and service. Attuned to a world of accelerating change and ever-widen-

ing choices, the Maryknoll Sisters acknowledge the importance of and the need for a variety of life styles within their Congregation. They respect and support continuing experimentation in order to discover how the mission of Jesus can best be accomplished in our times. They have already seen a variety of life styles within their Congregation—exemplified in a special way by the Maryknoll Cloister which was established in 1932 at Maryknoll, New York. At present, other expressions or ways of life are evolving which, it is hoped, will give to the contemporary world new and intelligible witness.

OPEN WINDOWS

Thorns and Roses

I don't miss to read or at least skim over documentary, casuistic and newsy sections and the book reviews of the BOLETIN. But I often skip the homilies, because there are no such stuff as standard or all-purpose or any-audience talks. The authors of the homilies should make better use of their effort, time and space by writing articles or pastoral topics such as — Catechetics, Methods of Conversion, The Priest vis-a-vis superstition, to speak or not to speak of Canon 1098 in Remote Barrios; and the like *ad infinitum*.

Your book reviews read often like the blurbs on the books' flap themselves. From the standpoint of your readers, the best way of reviewing any book is to make an objective condensation, though giving it a plug in stride. And you can't egg us on with such stale bromides as: "No library should fail to acquire this book"; or: "The priest should be ashamed of himself for not having read this book." Only the catechism deserves such fullsome compliments.

After this little fault-finding, may I extend kudos with orchids to the BOLETIN, for treading the safe middle way between ultra-conservatism and avant-gardism.

Fr. Benito Vargas, O.P.

Missionary at Camiguin
Babuyan Islands
P.O. Box 20, Aparri, Cagayan

Critique "Sing To the Lord"

May a footnote be added to the Critique "Sing To The Lord" (April 1969)?

Since the pipe organ and harmonium should be held in high esteem because they are traditional church instruments, surely in the Philippines the guitar is to be held in even higher esteem for the same reason. The vast majority of churches in the country are in barrios where, for centuries, the guitar and other string instruments have been the only music available for liturgical functions.

Only in the exceptional areas where pipe and reed instruments are common does the guitar seem to be an innovation. Throughout the greater part of the country it would be an innovation and a departure from tradition to downgrade the guitar, which is the traditional liturgical instrument. And, as Dr. Raymundo so well says, tradition has its permanent values which have to be preserved.

Personally, when I first heard the lively Spanish music of Aguinaldo Masses, rendered with guitars and other strings, tambourines, castanets and even cymbals, I considered it improper for the liturgy; but that was because I was unfamiliar with Filipino culture. Subsequent familiarity with the culture has taught me to appreciate the cultural heritage of the Philippines, strongly colored with

Spanish influence, in which the guitar and the liturgy have been closely associated for a long, long time.

(Rev.) Joseph I. Stoffel, S.J.,

Confraternity of Christian Doctrine
Malaybalay, Bukidnon

SPANISH AT LAST!

Mis felicitaciones cordiales al BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS" por la reaparición de la publicacion del lenguaje Español en sus páginas! Y con razon. Pues, segun la misma constitucion nueva de la nacion:... Hasta que otra cosa sea

provista por ley, el Ingles y el Español continuarán lenguajes oficiales ..." (Const. Filipina Cap. 14, Seccion 3.) En Ingles se dice:..."Until otherwise provided by law, English and Spanish shall continue as official languages." Donde y por quien o quienes? En Filipinas, y por los filipinos residentes en Filipinas, y por todos los servidores del Gobierno de toda Filipinas, segun la misma Constitucion.

P. Justo de los Reyes

Bolbok Parish, Lipa City
Diocesis de Lipa

THE CHURCH HERE AND THERE

ERECTION OF THE NEW PARISH OF DOLORES

His Excellency, Most Rev. Emilio A. Cinense, D.D., Bishop of San Fernando issued a decree last February 10 erecting the new parish of Dolores.

The boundaries of this new parish are defined by the following barrios whose inhabitants will henceforth constitute the parishioners of the new parish of Dolores:

From the parish of San Fernando are detached the barrios of Dolores, Dolores Homesite, Looban and Macabacale. From the parish of San Agustin is detached the barrio of Del Carmen.

The same decree includes the detachment of barrio Maimpis from the parish of Calulut and its subsequent annexation to the parish of San Agustin.

NEW SECRETARY OF STATE AND PREFECT OF THE CONGREGATION OF CLERGY

In the Consistory of April 30th, 1969, the Holy Father personally announced the resignation of His Eminence Amleto Giovanni Cicognani from the office of Secretary of State.

In accepting his renunciation, the Holy Father announced at the same time the appointment of His Eminence Cardinal Giovanni Villot (France) as Secretary of State and Prefect of the Council for the Public Affairs of the Church. He took up his duties May 5th.

Together with the above-mentioned offices, the Holy Father has entrusted to Cardinal Villot the following duties:

- President of the Administration of the Patrimony of the Apostolic See;
- President of the Pontifical Commission for the State of Vatican City.

His Holiness also announced the appointment of His Eminence John Joseph Wright as Prefect of the Sacred Congregation for the Clergy.

THEOLOGICAL COMMISSION SET UP

VATICAN CITY — The long-awaited Central Theological Commission of the Church has been named, almost a year and a half after the Church's first Synod of Bishops called for its creation.

Membership of the commission, by statute, may not exceed 30.

Some of the world's most celebrated theologians have been named: Fathers Henri de Lubac, S.J., of France; Karl Rahner, S.J., of Germany; Yves Congar, O.P., of France; Josef Ratzinger and Hans Urs von Balthasar of Germany. All these are most active in the field of dogma.

Another celebrated member is Father Bernard Lonergan, a Canadian Jesuit who has devoted years to the study of ideogenesis — the philosophical enquiry into the way ideas come into being.

Among the Scripture scholars is Father Barnabas Ahern, an American Passionist who helped draft the Second Vatican Council's documents on revelation, religious liberty and ecumenism.

In the field of liturgy there is Father Cipriano Vagaggini, an Italian Benedictine, and in the field of moral theology Father Stanislaus Olejnik, a Polish specialist on marriage.

Many of the members are active in ecumenical affairs. Several are consultants of the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity and some are members of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches.

Among the commission's prominent ecumenists is Father Walter Burghardt, an American Jesuit.

Among its 30 members are representatives of various currents of theological thought, as the Synod of Bishops had envisioned. Most are dogmatic theologians, but there is a substantial representation of Scripture scholars and some from the fields of moral theology and the liturgy.

Cardinal Seper is president of the commission by virtue of his past as prefect of the Doctrinal Congregation. The Doctrinal Congregation also proposes candidates for membership to the Pope, who does the actual appointing.

This appears to resolve the long-standing question of the commission's position in relation to the Doctrinal Congregation by placing the commission firmly within the ambit of that congregation. When the commission was proposed in the Bishops' Synod, some of the opposition to it was grounded on the presumption that its function — and therefore its competency and its juridical authority — would overlap that of the Doctrinal Congregation.

Other participants in the synod saw it as a buffer between less conventional theologians and the predominantly conservative Doctrinal Congregation, which had tended to judge theological research according to standards set by classical schools of theology.

ECUMENICAL INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED THEOLOGICAL
STUDIES AT JERUSALEM*The Program of Studies for 1970-72*

The general theme is *Mysterium Salutis*. A narrower range for the first two years is indicated by the topic "Diversity and Unity in The Christian Understandings of Salvation." This topic will serve not so much as a single theme to be developed systematically but as an index to a cluster of problems which may be explored from as many angles as the interests and abilities of the resident scholars permit. The first year's work (1970-71) may well focus upon the relation between the ceaseless changes in Christian ideas of salvation and their unchanging substance or structure. The focus of the second year (1971-72) may fall upon the relations between the human need for salvation today and the Christian message. Although the focus of attention may shift from one year to the next, it is intended that during both years the team of scholars should seek to relate Christian convictions regarding salvation to the outlook of non-Christian religions and of modern forms of atheism. They should also bring to bear upon this common task the resources of many academic disciplines — historical, theological, sociological, etc.

Although each resident scholar will be granted a high degree of independence in the selection and pursuit of his own research objectives, collaboration will be developed in at least the following ways:

- 1) Each year's work will be inaugurated by a meeting of the Academic Council in Jerusalem. Its members will participate in extended discussion of a theme relevant to that year's objective for the Institute. For example, in 1970 a symposium is being prepared to deal with the soteriological significance of the Holy City in selected Christian epochs and traditions. Some members of the Council will stay in Jerusalem for a more extended period to carry on their own research.
- 2) From time to time visiting lecturers will be invited to spend short periods at the Institute to contribute to the consideration of the general theme. For example, in 1970-71 it is recommended that three or four specialists should be invited to lecture on ideas of salvation embodied in non-Christian religions, both ancient and modern.
- 3) Each scholar will be expected to carry on research that is related to the specific theme of a particular year (e.g. one scholar in 1970-71 proposes to concentrate on the understanding of salvation in the Gospel of John), although great independence will be given in the selection of research problems and methodologies.
- 4) During the year the entire company of resident scholars will gather once a week for a seminar session which will draw upon research in progress and seek to increase the degree of fruitful collaboration.

The precise agenda for this seminar will naturally be determined by the scholars in residence and their various lines of research. It is now possible only to mention some of the possibilities. Early in the year 1970-71 several sessions might be devoted to continue the symposium on the soteriological significance of the Holy City. Biblical scholars might describe distinctive understandings of salvation on the part of selected canonical writings, followed by similar reports dealing with various patristic documents. These appraisals of biblical and Christian perspectives could be compared with those of other religions in the ancient world. Textual critics might wish to trace the influence of diverse cultural situations on the text-traditions of biblical manuscripts. Specialists in liturgical history might examine the developing notions of salvation which found expression in baptismal and Eucharistic liturgies. Visiting lecturers, both Christian and non-Christian, might provoke fruitful comparisons with Muslim or Buddhist soteriologies. The experience of the contemporary Christian mission should not be ignored, but nationals from various countries may analyze the impact of specific concepts of salvation upon different segments of society. Undoubtedly during this first year of operation many lessons will be learned concerning the best ways of achieving collaboration among the resident scholars.

As the work of the second year (1971-72) will focus more sharply on the correlation between contemporary human needs and the Christian message, other types of collaboration will probably be adopted for the weekly seminar. The annual sessions of the Academic Council might deal with the reactions to the Gospel on the part of university students in different parts of the world. Some resident scholars may choose to select as research projects the structure of modern forms of atheism. Visiting lecturers might deal with this same problematic. A special one-week conference might be arranged to deal, under expert guidance, with the understandings of salvation embodied in the work of selected novelists, dramatists and poets. In dialogue sessions, a biblical or patristic scholar might cooperate with an apologetic theologian, one presenting an ancient pattern of thought, the other suggesting the difficulties of expounding that same message today. The scholars in charge of guiding the seminars will seek to avoid both an inflexible pre-arranged agenda and unstructured casual conversations. They assure each resident fellow of his right to share in decisions concerning the forms of collaboration which will be most effective for the Institute as a whole.

NEW CARDINAL SAYS HERESY WIDESPREAD, URGES CHURCH TO CONDEMN IT

ROME — French theologian Jean Cardinal Danielou suggests that heresy abounds in the Roman Catholic world today and says it is the Church's job to pinpoint it and condemn it.

The spry Jesuit theologian was one of 33 prelates elevated to the purple by Pope Paul VI in the April 28 consistory. He made the comment on heresy in an interview with the theological review *Concilium*.

Danielou, once considered a fairly progressive theologian but moderate or somewhat conservative by today's standard, declared in the interview. "It is impossible that the Church be reduced to nothing less than a madhouse of subjective opinions. The Church is responsible before Christ for the authenticity of the deposit of faith, and when heretical opinions on the divinity of Christ, on the resurrection of the dead and on eternal life are uttered, when opinions are expressed contrary to the Christian faith, I believe that the Church is rigorously obliged to condemn them. This does not mean to reprimand or limit someone's research. It means to exercise what is required by the Church's responsibility," he added.

Cardinal Danielou stopped short of naming the penalty of excommunication, frequently used by the Vatican to punish heretics of other periods. But he seemed to hint a revival of this penalty. "It happens," he said "that many Christians might be scandalized if, when the faith is twisted in this manner, the Church did not take a stand."

Cardinal Danielous added that he didn't have much faith in the magazine that interviewed him because *Concilium*, from its very foundation has always refused to cooperate, and for this its orientation seems shaky to me."

On *Concilium's* board of directors is theologian Edward Schillebeeckx, who teaches in Holland and is co-author of the controversial Dutch catechism. Father Schillebeeckx's writings were recently the subject of special Vatican investigation. Some prelates in Rome have alleged that some of his positions are heretical.

SPECIAL REVIEW

APOCALYPSIS JESU CHRISTI, Commentarium Ecclesiologicum by Fr. Narciso Dominguez, O.P. Matriti: Libreria Palma, 1968. xxiii + 410 pp.

For the past years as professor of Exegesis at the Pontifical and Royal University of Sto. Tomas in Manila, Fr. Dominguez had always been requested by not a few professors and students alike to compile his notes in class and write a book from them. Unassuming as he always has been, the good father would demurely announce that he would burn all his notes before he dies. Naturally, everybody hoped he was only joking.

The appearance therefore, of this book is surely a surprise, especially to the undersigned who was privileged to be in his class on the subject of the Apocalypse precisely at the then Studium Generale in Sto. Domingo Priory in Quezon City. The same profound and searching insight with which he treated the subject in class is reflected in this book.

The treatise has an introduction which gives an extensive account of the Apocalypse's author, structure, scope, etc. The commentary proper is divided into two parts within which are interspersed the detailed study of the "seven-sevens".

Written in impeccable latin, the book will surely be welcomed not only by exegetes but also by students of the bible and theology as well, not only for its scholarly exposition but more so for its timeliness. Investigations concerning the true nature of the Church is one of the burning topics of the day; and the core of the book is precisely the ecclesiological dimension of the Apocalypse.

Jose B. Tinoko, O.P.

HISTORIA DE LAS MISIONES DOMINICANAS DE CHINA. 1632-1700 Jose Maria Gonzalez, O.P. Tomo 1. Madrid 1964 pp. 719

This book is the first of a four-volume work by a distinguished and consummate historian on Dominican missions in China. These missions, fathered by a select and choice Dominicans from various Provinces particularly those of Spain had their "res gestas" so intimately identified with the aims of the Order, catapulting the newly formed Province of the Most Holy Rosary into one of best show cases of the "primogenia inspiratio" of her founder. Father Gonzalez proves equal to the task with a life-time labor of research and travels bringing him to various centers and libraries including the personal manuscripts of the men who made history and succeeding in a tremendous synthesis from more than 6000 documents as primary sources.

This particular volume includes a list of the countless sources of information, pertinent indexes and bibliographies of the birth, growth and crisis which spiced the glorious missions; biographical sketches of the missionaries and their associates in the evangelization; pictures and reproductions of maps and striking documents which are a source of delight even to the uninitiated reader. The discussion on Fr. Navarrete which has triggered some amount of controversy today may well be compared with some modern works to juggle document and opinion.

The author's indisputable experience plus his knack for a critical grasp of the more important facts with a presentation polished by a score of past publication of books and articles on this matter exacts on the reader a profound confidence to dare anybody with a take-up-and-read invitation. After all the author is at the same time *the* authority.

Norberto Castillo, O.P.