

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

OFFICIAL INTERDIOCESAN ORGAN

● THE PHILIPPINE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW ●

NAMUGONGO • THE REFORMED
"ORDO MISSAE" • MIXED PRIEST-
LY TRAINING • IS SELF-ABUSE
GRIEVOUSLY SINFUL? • 1966 —
THE YEAR OF THE DEATH OF
GOD • IS THE SAFE PERIOD SAFE?

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL	554
THE POPE SPEAKS Apostolic Constitution on the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Congregation for the Causes of Saints	556
DOCUMENTATION The Reformed "Ordo Missae" • H. J. GRAF, S.V.D. The Reformed Ordination Rite for Bishops • H. J. GRAF, S.V.D.	565 576
NOTES AND COMMENTS Mixed Priestly Training • JESUS MA. CAVANNA, C.M.	588
DOCTRINAL SECTION Is Self-Abuse Grievously Sinful? • PEDRO LUMBRERAS, O.P.	606
PASTORAL SECTION Homiletics — Fifteenth, Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Sundays after Pentecost • DAVID TITHER, C.S.S.R.	614
LAYMAN'S VIEW 1966 — The Year of the Death of God	620
CASES AND QUERIES Is the Safe Period Safe? • QUENTIN MA. GARCIA, O.P.	628
THE CHURCH HERE AND THERE	633

EDITORIAL

NAMUGONGO

If not barbaric, the word sounds primitive, and in the Philippines perhaps strange. In the future, however, Namugongo, Uganda will become familiar throughout the world, since, in the new calendar, the feast of the Martyrs of this place will be celebrated in the universal Church. Namugongo is where the largest number of noble martyrs died on June 3, 1886, burned over slow fire. Namugongo will climax Paul VI's visit to Uganda on August 2 for the consecration of the newly erected Basilica in honor of the martyrs. Thus, Namugongo, for centuries a place for ritual executions in a pagan nation, will become a sacred shrine for all Christian Africa.

Its history is second to none in Christian annals. It runs parallel to Nagasaki, Nanking, and other place of martyrdom like the Catacombs and Vatican Hill. For the glory that those noble African souls added to history even surpasses in many ways the deeds of the early Christian martyrs.

All the martyrs, of pure African extract, offered their unmixed African blood to the One, they, in faith, have most happily encountered. Of the twenty-two Catholic martyrs, all new converts in a mission of only five-years existence, four had been baptized by missionaries only three years before. The thirteen others, likewise baptized by their missionary pastors, had been Christians for only a year; and four, all teen-aged pages at the court of the Kabaka or king Mwanga, had to be hurriedly baptized by their companion Charles Lwanga, 25, head page in the court, the night before their king ordered them put in stocks to be sent to the ritual place of execution at Namugongo. One of them (Mukasa Kiriwawanvu) could not be baptized by water — the hands of his companions being in stocks — but having endured all the torments of his executioners died purified in the baptism of fire.

The youthfulness of the martyrs is significant. Only five of the martyrs were over thirty; eight over twenty; while the rest were all teen-agers the youngest being fourteen.

Noteworthy too, in these days of rampant hedonism was the motive of their execution ordered by a perverted young monarch. All were martyrs of chastity, a virtue which, in the Lord's expression, is rewarded by a mysterious vision of God. The virtue of

chastity requiring *cleanness* of heart was manifested by all these holy youngsters.

Likewise significant, especially to all lay Christian workers of today, was the fact that when the foreign missionaries left their mission after three years of Christian labor, the new converts and catechumens kept their faith alive and carried on the instruction of their mentors so much so that when the missionaries returned, they found huge numbers awaiting baptism, and, as from a cruel twist of faith, consequently, martyrdom. Cruel indeed, because of the mownner they died—fourteen of the martyrs were burned, while the rest were beheaded, hacked to pieces, speared, ravaged by dogs, and so forth.

The solemn canonization of these heavenly heroes took place amidst the splendor of St. Peter's, during the period of the II Vatican Council, with almost all of the bishops of the world and the representatives of the different non-Catholic denominations of separated brethren present during the Council as observers, attending. For the martyrs, so to say, were an ecumenical group since not only Catholics were burned in the pyre. Eleven of those who were ordered killed among the pages of the court of the young Kabaka were neophytes of the Protestant mission, and some recently-baptized Anglicans. Prompted by their faith in Christ, they valiantly joined their Catholic brothers when the enraged young king, pointing to one place in the hall, asked those who were Christians to cross the line. These brave young men, unaware of the centuries of religious rift in Europe, considered themselves real members of the true Church of Christ, and together with their Catholic friends treaded the same path leading to the same jail in Namugongo. Thus, the innocent blood of two Christian groups were mixed in a common holocaust burned by a common fire. It is for this reason that on the Pope's journey to Uganda, a special visit to the Shrine erected by our separated brethren to their own martyrs is in order.

The story of the these martyrs has raised great admiration all over the world. Understandably, in no place has the enthusiasm and excitement risen to a considerable degree as it has in Africa, the new Continent that Christ is lovingly attracting to Him.

The visit of the Holy Father, we hope, will accelerate the pace towards the full realization of a "one fold, under one Shepherd" state in Africa. The story of these martyrs, we too hope, will serve as an inspiration for all in the Philippines, most especially to the members of the young generation and all lay workers in the vineyard of the Lord.

QUINTIN M. GARCÍA, O.P.

THE POPE SPEAKS

APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTION

of

PAUL VI

Supreme Pontiff

The Sacred Congregation

of Rites

divided into two Congregation,

one for Divine Worship, the other for the

Causes of Saints

PAUL PP. VI

Servant of the servants

of God

In perpetual memory

Since its establishment by Our Predecessor of happy memory, Sixtus V in the year 1588,¹ the Sacred Congregation of Rites has had a twofold function. First: it controlled and regulated the sacred rites of the Latin Church. Second: it was vested with responsibility for all matters concerning the canonization of Saints throughout the whole Church. It is believed that this second function was assigned to the Sacred Congregation Rites precisely because the purpose of canonization is that the Servants of God, enrolled in the calendar of the Saints, should be honoured with public cult by the universal Church.

¹ Cfr. Const. Apost. in the form of a Bull, *Immensa æterni Dei*: in the *Bullarium Romanum*, VIII, Turin, ed. p. 989.

So prudently has the Sacred Congregation of Rites discharged this twofold office during the course of four centuries that it has won for itself outstanding acclaim. As regards the sacred liturgy, let it suffice to mention that—after St. Pius had published the reformed Roman Breviary and Missal²—the Sacred Congregation of Rites, in obedience to the decrees of the sacred Council of Trent,³ revised and published the other liturgical books. The Congregation likewise condensed and restored to their original purity the liturgical formulas and rites which had been corrupted in part during the so-called middle ages; and it cut down their excessive variety and brought about a certain liturgical uniformity which was firmly preserved intact thereafter.⁴

In our own time the same Congregation, acting under the instructions of Our Predecessor, St. Pius X, opened the way to a general reform of the Liturgy with the revision of the Breviary,⁵ which was named after that same Holy Pontiff. Later this was followed, at the behest of Our Predecessor of venerable memory, Pius XII, by the reformed Easter Vigil in 1951,⁶ and by the new Order of Holy Week in 1955.⁷ From these and many other initiatives there has been derived, to a certain extent, the Constitution approved by the Second Vatican Ecumenical Council.⁸

Of no less importance is the work of the said Congregation in preparing and expediting the Causes of Saints. This is clearly evident from the list of Saints who, from the year 1588 to the present day, have been enrolled in the calendar of the Saints after a detailed examination of their martyrdom or of the heroic degree of their virtues.

² Cfr. Const. Apost. *Quo primum*. 13th July, 1570.

³ Cfr. *Canones et Decreta Sacrosancti Oecumenici et Generalis Concilii Tridentini*. Sessiones XXII., XXIV., XXV.

⁴ The five volumes of *Authentic Decrees*, published by the Sacred Council of the Liturgy are an eloquent testimony to the work which it has accomplished.

⁵ Cfr. Const. Apost. *Divine afflatu*, 1st Nov. 1911: A.A.S., 3, 1911, pp. 633-638.

⁶ Cfr. S. Congr. Rituum, Decr. *Dominicae Resurrectionis*: A.A.S., 43, 1951, pp. 128 ss.

⁷ Cfr. S. Congr. Rituum, Decr. *Maxima Redemptionis nostrae mysteria*: A.A.S., 47, 1955, pp. 838 ss.

⁸ Cfr. Const. *Sacrosanctum Concilium*: A.A.S., 56, 1964, pp. 97-138.

Nowadays, however, both the general reform of the liturgy decreed by the Second Vatican Council, and the revision of the laws governing the Causes of Saints, in line with the mentality of the present age, appear to demand new studies, attention and care in the treatment of these matters.

Furthermore, careful consideration of the matter clearly reveals that the liturgy is quite distinct from the Causes of Saints. Each requires different study and training, together with a different method of approach. On this account We Ourselves, in the section of the Apostolic Constitution, *Regimini Apostolicae*⁹ dealing with the Sacred Congregation of Rites, ordered that it be divided into two parts or Sections, one to deal with Divine Worship, the other with the Causes of Saints.

Now, however, after further careful reflection, and having obtained the advice of experts, We have decided to separate the two Sections in such wise as to render each of them completely independent.

Wherefore, by Our present Apostolic Constitution, the existing Sacred Congregation of Rites, is replaced by two new Congregations, the first to be known as the Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship, and the other, the Sacred Congregation for the Causes of Saints.

The Congregation for Divine Worship, besides its own proper . . . duties shortly to be defined, will take over the functions of the Council for the implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. The latter will thus cease to be an independent body, but it will continue as a special commission in the said Congregation until it has completed the reform of the liturgical books.

We, therefore, abrogate the provisions of the Apostolic Constitution *Regimini Ecclesiae*,¹⁰ and decree the following.

Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship

1. This Sacred Congregation, presided over by a Cardinal Prefect, assisted by a Secretary and Undersecretary, has competence in all matters directly and proximately concerning the Roman Rite and the other

⁹ Cfr. nn. 58-64: A.A.S., 59, 1967, pp. 904-908.

¹⁰ Cfr. *ibid.*

Latin Rites, without prejudice to the rights of other Departments in matters respecting the doctrine of the faith or ecclesiastical discipline, or in cases requiring judicial process.

2. This Sacred Congregation is divided into three offices:

§ 1. The *first office* has for its scope the liturgical worship of God, both ritual and pastoral; the revision and compilation of liturgical texts; the approval of particular calendars, and the proper of Masses and Offices, for dioceses and Religious Orders; the granting of dispensations in the aforesaid matters when deemed opportune; the correct and lawful interpretation of norms and rubrics in liturgical books; the cult of sacred relics, the approval of heavenly patrons, and the granting of the title of minor basilica.

§ 2. The *second office* maintains relations with the Episcopal Conferences, whose liturgical Acts, as provided for in art. 36 § 3 of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy,¹¹ it examines, approves or confirms; it weighs carefully adaptations proposed by Episcopal Conferences in accordance with art. 40 of the said Constitution,¹² while bearing in mind the general liturgical laws, and the needs, traditions and genius of individual peoples. Finally, it treats of extraliturgical worship, that is to say, the devotional practices of the Christian people, without prejudice, however, to the competence of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.

§ 3. The *third office* concerns itself with the so-called liturgical Commissions, the Institutes of liturgical apostolate, music, chant and sacred art. It collects information and publications about liturgical life of the Church to be used for the compilation of statistics. It considers how the means of social communication may be used for the promotion of divine worship. Finally, it lends its support to pastoral initiatives, international Associations and congresses of the liturgical apostolate.

3. This Sacred Congregation is assisted both by a group of Consultors comprising liturgical experts chosen by the Supreme Pontiff

¹¹ Cfr. Concil. Vat. II, Const. *Sacrosanctum Concilium*: A.A.S., 56, 1964, p. 109 s.

¹² Cfr. *ibid.* n. 40: 1. c., 111.

from the whole world, as well as by Commissions established to study questions of greater difficulty.¹³

4. To complete the work of liturgical reform this Sacred Congregation can, for the time being, avail itself of the services of the members and experts of the Council for the implementation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy in the manner set out as follows:

§ 1) Cardinals who were Members of the Council, become *ipso facto* Members of the Congregation for Divine Worship. To these, other Cardinals may be added, if deemed opportune.

§ 2) Diocesan Bishops who should be assigned to this Congregation in accordance with the terms of the Apostolic Letter, *Pro comperto sane*,¹⁴ shall, on this occasion, be elected by those who are already Members of the Council, and from among their own members.

§ 3) Meetings, at which final decisions are to be taken on the publication of liturgical books, will be attended both by the members of the special Commission which replaces the former Council now dissolved, and also by the Members of this Sacred Congregation.

The Sacred Congregation for the Causes of Saints

5. The Sacred Congregation for the Causes of Saints, presided over by a Cardinal, with the assistance of a Secretary and an Undersecretary, is competent in all matters which in any way pertain to the Beatification of Servants of God, or to the canonization of the Blessed, or to the preservation of Relics.¹⁵

6. The Sacred Congregation deals with Causes by judicial process, and comprises three Offices, as follows: first, the judicial Office headed by the Secretary, assisted by the Undersecretary, and a suitable number of officials; the second Office presided over by the Promoter General of the Faith, assisted by the Sub-promoter General of the Faith and

¹³ Cfr. Const. Apost. *Regimini Ecclesiae*, n. 61 § 3; A.A.S., 59, 1967, p. 905.

¹⁴ Cfr. A.A.S., 59, 1967, pp. 881-884.

¹⁵ Cfr. can. 253 § 3; and Const. Apost. *Regimini Ecclesiae*, n. 59; A.A.S., 59, 1967, p. 904.

a sufficient number of Officials; the third is the Historico-Hagiographical Office directed by the Relator General.

7. The *first office* has as its functions:

§ 1) It examines requests submitted for the introduction of Causes or for enquiry into alleged miracles; it reviews the documentation presented in support of such requests; it decides whether the Cause should be introduced, or whether a specific miracle should be investigated. Besides, it lays down norms for the procedure to be followed; it judges the validity of these procedures, either directly or through the local Bishop, as the case may require, it completes or supplies the acts necessary for the investigation and it rules on objections raised.¹⁶

In these matters it proceeds as follows:

1o) A doubt as to whether there exists an obstacle to the introduction of a cause is proposed in a particular Congress. After an examination of the relative statement of the position—made up of the documents sent by the Bishop, the opinions submitted by the Promoter General of the Faith—the issue is resolved by the votes of the Secretary, the Undersecretary, the Promoter General of the Faith, The Relator General, the Sub-promoter General of the Faith, and three Consulators other than those who had submitted their opinions in writing on the given case. A final report of this examination is then compiled and signed by all.¹⁷

2o) Sentence is given by a particular Congregation, comprising the Cardinal Prefect, the Cardinal *Ponens*, and at least three other Cardinals. To these are submitted, together with the previous statement of the position, the votes expressed in the particular Congress and the final report. This particular Congregation is attended by the Secretary.¹⁸

3o) Judgment on the validity of the procedures is given in the

¹⁶ Cfr. Const. Apost. *Regimini Ecclesiae*, no. 62, § 2, 1o: l.c., p. 906; cfr. Litt. Apost. *Sanctitas clarior*, given motu proprio, 19th March, 1969, n. 7: A.A.S., 61, 1969, p. 152.

¹⁷ Cfr. Const. Apost. *Regimini Ecclesiae*, n. 62 § 2, 1o: l.c., p. 906.

¹⁸ Cfr. *ibid*.

ordinary Congress of the Congregation, after having heard the opinion of the Promoter General of the Faith.

4o) The same ordinary Congress is competent to rule on objections which may arise.¹⁹

§ 2) It treats of the writings of Servants of God, of martyrdom, of heroic virtues, of the confirmation of ancient cult and of the attribution to Saints of the title of Doctor. In these matters it proceeds as follows:

1o) The writings are examined in the ordinary Congress, after the vote given by two theologian censors. Should special difficulties arise, the question is referred to the plenary Congregation.

2o) The discussion of martyrdom or of heroic virtues — based on a statement of the position comprising the Summary, the information supplied by the Advocate, the opinions of three Consultors, the animadversions of the Promoter General of the Faith, and the Advocate's reply — is held in a particular Congress which is attended by the same persons mentioned above in no. 7 § 1, 1o. They give their votes as though acting as judges, thereby deciding the issue²⁰ A final report of the discussion is drawn up, and signed by all the voters.²¹

3o) Sentence is pronounced in the plenary Congregation of the Cardinals. They are supplied, not only with the previous statement of the the position, but also with the votes expressed in the particular Congress, and the final report. The Congregation is attended by the Secretary.²²

4o) For the discussion of the question of the confirmation of ancient cult or the attribution to a Saint of the title of Doctor, a statement of the position is drawn up. This is made up of the Summary, the information supplied by the Advocate, the opinions of three Consultors and the exposition or declaration of the Promoter General of the Faith. The matter is first discussed in the particular Congress, and

¹⁹ Cfr. *ibid.*

²⁰ Cfr. *ibid.* n. 62, § 2, 2o; l.c.

²¹ Cfr. *ibid.*

²² Cfr. *ibid.*

then in the plenary Congregation of the Cardinals, as already indicated in this present paragraph, at nn. 20 and 30.

§ 3) It examines in the following manner alleged miracles attributed to the intercession of a Servant of God:²³

10) Alleged miracles, on which two experts have expressed their medico-legal judgment, are examined by the consultative body of doctors, and their conclusions are accurately recorded in a report.

20) Thereafter, a statement of the position is drafted, made up of the Summary, the medico-legal judgments of the experts, the report of the consultative body of doctors, the information supplied by the Advocate, the opinions of three Consultors, the animadversins of the Promoter General of the Faith, and the reply of the Advocate. This statement of the position is first discussed in the particular Congress, and then in the plenary Congregation of the Cardinals, as set out in n. 7 § 2, and 30.²⁴

8. § 1) The sentences of the Cardinals dealt with in n. 7 § 1, 20; § 2, 30 and 40; § 3, 20, are referred to the Supreme Pontiff in accordance with canons 2013 §§ 1, 2; 2107; 2133.²⁵

§ 2) If the Supreme Pontiff decides that the case may proceed further, the cause will continue its course.

§ 3) If, however, the Supreme Pontiff decides that the question is to be again submitted to the Congregation of Cardinals, a statement of the case is to be prepared, in which there are set out the difficulties not yet solved, the reply of the Advocate, and any new documents, if there be such.

§ 4) Finally, if the Supreme Pontiff decides that the Cause is to be consigned to the archives, it is not permitted to re-open it, except in the case where new and weighty documents come to light, and permission is granted by the Supreme Pontiff.

9. The second office is that of the Promoter General of the Faith.

²³ Cfr. *ibid.*, n. 62, § 2, 30: l.c., p. 907.

²⁴ Cfr. *ibid.*

²⁵ Cfr. *ibid.*, n. 62, § 3: l.c.

Its function is to uphold the law, to supply detailed expositions, to express votes, as laid down in each individual case.²⁶

10. The *Historico-Hagiographical Office*, dealing with historical or ancient Causes, is governed by special legislation issued by Our Predecessor of happy memory, Pius XI, in his Apostolic Letter, *Gia da qualche tempo*, given motu proprio on February 6th, 1930.²⁷

11. This Sacred Congregation has its own Chancellery which is governed by its own statute.

12. Likewise the Congregation has at hand a list of Advocates and Procurators, endowed with the qualities and titles required by law,²⁹ and a college of medical specialists chosen on the grounds of knowledge and integrity.³⁰

13. The rites and solemnities traditionally followed in the Roman Curia are to be observed for the Beautification of Servants of God and the Canonization of the Blessed, after this has been decreed in Consistory.³¹

14. What We have decreed in Our present Constitution comes into force on the date of issue.

We will that what We have here ordered and decreed shall be firm and binding both now and the future, notwithstanding — as far as necessary — the Apostolic Constitutions and Ordinations issued by Our Predecessors, and other decrees requiring special mention and derogation.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, the 8th day of May 1969, the Sixth year of Our Pontificate.

PAULUS PP. VI

²⁶ Cfr. cann. 2079; 2080; 2106, 3, 4; 2109, l. 2; 2010, § 1, and Const. Apost. *Regimini Ecclesiae*, n. 62 § 5: l.c., p. 907.

²⁷ Cfr. A.A.S., 22, 1930, pp. 87-88; and Const. Apost. *Regimini Ecclesiae*, n. 63: A.A.S., 59, 1967, p. 8.

²⁸ Cfr. *ibid.*, n. 62, § 6: l.c., p. 907.

²⁹ Cfr. can. 2018.

³⁰ Cfr. Const. Apost. *Regimini Ecclesiae*, n. 62, § 7: l.c., p. 907.

³¹ Cfr. Can. 2111; and Const. Apost. *Regimini Ecclesiae*, n. 62, § 4: l.c. p. 907.

DOCUMENTATION

† The Reformed "Ordo Missae" †

H. J. GRAF, S.V.D.

On May 3, 1969 the Holy Father issued the Apostolic Constitution "Missale Romanum." In addition to lengthy, introductory guidelines it gives us the new "Ordo Missae" of the reformed Roman Missal. Beginning with the first Sunday of Advent 1969, all have to observe the new Mass rite. Besides the rite of Mass with the people, there is a second one for Masses that are said with a server only, without a congregation.

During the months of the "vacatio legis" the clergy has to study the new rite in order to get a thorough understanding. It would be tragic if priests would only change the rites, but fail to offer their people a meaningful introduction that leads to a full and conscious participation in holy Mass, the center of our holy religion.

Here follows now an attempt to explain the rites and texts, as far as this can be done on a few pages.

A. Prerequisites for holy Mass

The "Institutio generalis" of the Missal replaces the present Missal's introductory documents, especially the "Ritus servandus." These guidelines are arranged in eight chapters of which the fifth contains a set of directives for the arrangement of the church, and especially the sanctuary, as the place of celebration. Chapter six reviews what is needed for the sacred action, the furniture, the sacred vessels and vestments.

I. Layout of the Sanctuary and the Nave of the Church

For the faithful and the choir (schola cantorum) places should be arranged in such a way that they can more easily and actively participate in holy Mass; the latter should have easy access to holy Com-

munion. In order to show his position in the hierarchy of the Church, the priest takes his place in the sanctuary. There he presides over the prayers, announces the word of God and serves the altar. It is advisable that the sanctuary be distinguished from the nave of the church. This can be achieved by a certain elevation of the sanctuary, by its special structure and adornment. A separating rail is not necessary and not even advisable. The sanctuary should be large enough that the sacred rites can be performed worthily and conveniently.

New rules have been given for the construction of altars. Natural stones are not necessary, even for fixed altars, nor do they need one single slab as mensa. A movable altar does not need any more an altar stone. Much liberalized are the conditions for the consecration of an altar. Only if relics, i.e., authentic ones—which may be of martyrs or any other saints—are available, they are to be included into the altar that is being consecrated. If no relics can be had, the altar may be consecrated notwithstanding.

In addition to the corporal there should be at least *one* cloth on the altar for the celebration of holy Mass. Not only linen (or in the Philippines ramie) may be used for altar cloths and sacred vestments, etc.; according to a decision of the respective episcopal conference also other fibers, natural, or artificial, may be used for the liturgical services.

The candlesticks for holy Mass may be placed *on* the altar or also *next to* it. They should be arranged in such a way that the sanctuary appears to be well-ordered and beautiful; the people's view should not be obstructed by them. The place for the crucifix is to be selected according to the same principle. Only one crucifix is needed; it may be placed *on* the altar, *above* the altar (hanging), on the *side* of the altar or on the *rear wall* of the sanctuary. No second crucifix is needed on the altar for the priest to look at during the celebration of holy Mass. No reference is made in the new guidelines to the altarcards so that their use is in future optional.

During the first part of the Mass, up to the preparation of the gifts, the celebrant's place is at his seat. His task to preside over the entire community of the faithful must be made manifest in the position of the seat. It should be so placed that the priest faces the congregation

(not the side wall of the sanctuary) and can be easily seen and heard by all. As a consequence, the ideal place of the presidential seat will be frequently the center of the apse of the church. But if this place would separate the priest too much from the people so that a real communication between them would become difficult—as in the case of a large church—another location should be sought for the seat which would facilitate the active participation of the people, eventually at the side of the altar, closer to the people, in about the position, formerly the faldstool had when the bishop celebrated Mass at the faldstool.

Both the seat of the priest and the cathedra of the bishop should avoid the form of a throne. At the seat the priest has, during the first part of the Mass, the Missal, which will most probably take the form of an orationale or sacramentary. Except for the candles, eventually placed on the altar, there should be nothing on the altar during the first part of the Mass. Only the Gospel book, of which we come to speak soon, may be allowed on the altar.

For the proclamation of the word of God in the readings and the homilies there should be a permanent ambo in the church, and not a simple and movable lectern. From the ambo the lessons are to be proclaimed, the responsorial psalm is to be recited or sung, the homily preached and the Prayer of the Faithful to be led. Therefore, it should have such a location that the ministers can be seen and heard well, preferably close to the end of the sanctuary area. The ambo should not be used as the place for the commentator, for the chanter or the choir leader.

It is not advisable to have the eucharistic tabernacle on an altar where holy Mass is celebrated habitually for a congregation. It is strongly recommended that the tabernacle be placed in a chapel distinct from the middle or central part of the church. If this should be impossible because of the general structure of the church, it should find its place on a side altar or outside an altar in some other part of the church, which, however, should be really worthy and properly equipped.

II. Sacred Vessels and Vestments

Sacred vestments serve a double purpose: they indicate the position of the different ministers in the hierarchy during the liturgical cele-

brations and contribute to the beauty of the sacred rites. Common for all ministers, from the lowest (i.e., also the simple servers) to the highest (i.e., the bishop) is the alb. Only if the form of the alb makes it in future, necessary the priest needs the amice and the cincture. If the length of the alb will demand that it needs to be fastened up, the cincture is to be used to adjust the length of the alb. If the neck of the alb is rather low it may also in future be better to use the amice. The reference to shows and cassock ("*calceatus pedibus*" and "*indutus vestibus... quarum exteriora saltem talem pedis attingat*") disappeared from the rubrics. Consequently, there is no need for the priest, when he vests for Mass, to have a cassock beneath. But if the alb is transparent, especially in its lower part, it would be advisable that the priest continue wearing the cassock underneath. When wearing the alb (not only when he uses the surplice) the priest does not cross the stole over his breast.

The color code also has been changed for the sacred vestments on some occasions of which the concessions seems to be worth mentioning; that on more solemn liturgical days one may use, without any special permission, the best vestments one has, even if they are not in the color of the day.

Radical changes have been introduced concerning the form and the material of the sacred vessels, thus implementing the statement of the Constitution on the Liturgy: "The Church has not adopted any particular style of art as her very own. She has admitted styles from every period according to the natural dispositions and circumstances of her peoples, and the needs of the various times" (art. 123).

The "cuppa" of the chalice need not be gold-plated; its material need not be even of metal: precious wood (covered eventually with laquer on the inside), ivory or a modern kind of more noble plastic will do; one should, however, adopt material that does not absorb liquid and does not easily break. This condition would usually rule out simple glass.

If a priest consecrates host for the communion of the people — which should be done in each Mass with a congregation — he does not need any more a paten of his own. He may place his own host with those destined for the people in the ciborium, now called "patena"

by the rubrics, an indication, that it does not need have the form of a chalice. Artists are free in choosing the form of the sacred vessels. They should only ask themselves whether the vessels they create are serviceable ("sint apta").

Right from the beginning of the Mass the chalice has its place on the credence table in the sanctuary. It should be covered with a veil, which, however, may always be white. The use of the palla for the chalice is optional.

B. The Mass Rites

I. Introductory Rites

1. **When the people are assembled, the priest and the ministers go to the altar while the entrance song is being sung.**

The first words of the new "Ordo Missae" refer purposely to the people assembled for holy Mass, and not to the priest, as did the former "Ritus servandus" that started with the words "Sacerdos celebraturus Missam . . ."

While priest and servers are on their way to the altar, the entrance song is to be sung. This statement contains two points worth mentioning: the new prefers definitely the sung Mass. As much as possible the Mass with the people should be sung. In a sung Mass of this type not everything that had to be sung in the former "Missa cantata" must now be rendered by the choir or people by singing, because different degrees are to be distinguished in a sung Mass, as stated by the Instruction on Sacred Music of March 5, 1967.

Instead of the Introit of the old Roman Missal one may now freely sing the antiphon and psalm of the Graduale Simplex, both in Latin or in the vernacular. Any popular hymn suited either to the part of the Mass, the feast or the liturgical season may also take the place of the Introit of the Missal so that this part of the Missal may be simply omitted. But *one* condition must be fulfilled concerning these hymns: their texts (not melodies) must have the approval of the episcopal conference.

People are not able to sing at Mass everywhere. In these cases, if no chant accompanies the entrance of the priest, the Introit of the

Missal must be recited: either by the faithful in common, or by a prayer leader, or, in the case of need, by the celebrant himself, after he has greeted the people. The Introit of the new Missal will not be the one found in the present Roman Missal; it will be a word of introduction to the Mass, most often taken from sacred Scripture, a kind of motto for the Mass of the day or occasion.

2. **As goes up to the altar, priest and minister make the customary reverence. The celebrant kisses the altar, and (if incense is being used) incenses it. Then, with the ministers, he goes to his seat. When the entrance chant is ended, the priest and the faithful stand and cross themselves as the priest says:**
“In the name of the Father, and of the Son ✠ and of the Holy Spirit.”

On arrival at the altar the celebrant and the servers make the customary reverence, i.e., if the Bl. Sacrament is in the sanctuary, a genuflection, if not, a deep bow of the body. If the priest entered in a more solemn procession with processional cross, candle sticks and lector carrying the Gospel book, the processional cross may be used as altar cross, to be placed near the altar; the candle sticks may also find their place near the altar and thus serve as altar candles; but they may also be placed on the credence table. The Gospel book is then placed on the altar, to be taken away only for the reading of the Gospel at the ambo.

According to an ancient liturgical usage the veneration shown to the altar (and the Gospel book) is performed with a kiss. However, it is everywhere that a kiss is understood and accepted by the people. In these regions the episcopal conference may decide on another sign of veneration, and inform the Apostolic See of the decision taken. Some countries of asia use as substitute for the genuflection a deep bow of the body. Instead of kissing the Missal or Gospel book the minister (priest or deacon) in Japan raises the sacred book to his forehead, in the style of the Filipino *mano po*.

According to the rules laid down, incense may be used in any Mass with the people; its use is therefore not restricted to a more solemn form of the Mass.

After these preliminary rites the priest goes with the ministers to his seat. There he will stay until the rites, connected with the preparation of the gifts, except when he has to read the Gospel himself. There should be a clear separation, also in the location, between the two parts of which the Mass consists: the Liturgy of the Word is to be performed at the presidential seat and at the ambo; the proper place for the Eucharistic celebration is the altar.

When the chant of the Introit has come to an end the celebrant (at his seat) makes the sign of the cross together with the people. All give their answer with "Amen." Mass is offered to the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit; hence it begins fittingly in the name of the Blessed Trinity.

Then the priest faces the people, extends his hands and greets them, saying:

"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all."

The people answer:

"And with your spirit."

This greeting at the beginning of the Mass is something new in the Roman rite; heretofore, in a solemn Mass the first word which the congregation usually heard of the celebrant, was the beginning of the Gloria, or otherwise the "Dominus vobiscum" before the collect which marked the end of all the introductory rites.

Certain formularies of greetings, derived from St. Paul's letters can be used. In addition to the formula mentioned above (2 Cor 13, 13) the appendix of the new "Ordo Missae" contains two optional texts for greeting the people, among them also the customary "Dominus vobiscum." The answer of the people may always be "Et cum spiritu tuo." As was his privilege before, the bishop may continue to use "Pax vobis," which however is not restricted any more to Masses with Gloria.

- 3. The priest or the deacon or some other suitable minister may comment in a very few words on the Mass of the day.**

It has been said frequently, especially during recent years while the reform of the Mass rite was under way, that everything in the Mass

was stereo-typed and nothing left to the personal initiative of the priest. Now things have changed, as we shall see in the course of this commentary of the Mass rite. One of the first occasions when priests may give something of their own, is after the greeting of the people when the priest may say a few words to the faithful by way of introduction to the Mass of the day. These few words will vary according to the season of the liturgical year, the feast or the special occasion, as e.g., in a wedding Mass). A priest can give this introduction only if he has prepared himself by going through the different texts of the prayers, by meditating on the readings of the Mass. If he wants to make the celebration of holy Mass more meaningful for his parishioners, he has to look into the liturgical books beforehand. This is actually not a few burden placed on the shoulders of the priest, because also the old rubrics contained a similar exhortation for the priest saying Mass.

There are more occasions when the priest may address the people during the Mass, e.g., before the readings begin, after the prayer over the gifts and before the Eucharistic Prayer. The principal place for addressing the people is and remains, however, the homily after the Gospel. If announcements cannot be avoided during the Mass, they should not be made during the time set aside for the homily. Their proper place is now after the postcommunion and before the dismissal of the congregation. As priests we should take advantage of these opportunities to speak to the people in a prudent and wise manner.

Then follows the act of penance. The priest invites the people to repent:

"My brothers and sisters, to fit ourselves to celebrate the sacred mysteries let us confess our sins."

A short silence follows. Then all make their confession together:

**"I confess to almighty God,
and to you, my brothers and sisters,
that I have sinned all too often
in my thoughts and in my words,
in what I have done
and in what I have left undone."**

They strike their breasts and continue:

**I blame myself
by my fault, by my fault, by my great fault.**

**And I ask the Blessed Mary, ever Virgin,
all the Angels and saints
and you, by brothers and sisters
to pray Lord our God."**

The priest's absolution follows:

**"May almighty God have mercy on us
forgive us our sins,
and bring us to everlasting life."**

The people respond:

"Amen."

After the short introduction into the general theme of the day or the Mass, there follows the act of penance. We are all sinners and need to be reconciled with God and one another. In a short recollection and examination of conscience we may first reflect on our sins. Following the words of St. James (5, 16) we then confess our faults before one another. The same was already done by the Church of the post-apostolic age. The Didache, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles prescribed: "On Sundays come together, break the bread and give thanks, after you have confessed your sins" (14. 1). This is the most fitting way to get ready to celebrate the sacred mysteries.

The public confession, the Confiteor, has been shortened considerably. It is now said only once, by priest and people together. Among the sins confessed are now also the "peccata omissionis," those committed negligence and carelessness. Absolution is then given by the celebrant. Its role in this context, especially in view of the recent discussion on general absolution, remains unclear.

Other forms for the act of penance are offered in the appendix of the new Missal.

- 4. The invocations— Lord, have — follow, unless they have already been used in one of the forms of the act of penance.**

Lord, have mercy.

Christ, have mercy.

Lord, have mercy.

Lord, have mercy.

Christ, have mercy.

Lord, have mercy.

The Kyrie is consequently sung or recited in a double, and not, as we were used to, in a triple form. But because we possess a wealth of

melodies wherein the Kyrie is used in a triple form, permission is given continue in these cases the triple form.

Into certain parts of the Mass and also into the Kyrie the Middle Ages inserted "tropes", or phrases of which we find still remnants in the titles given to the Gregorian Masses of the Kyriale, e.g., "Lux et origo," or "Fons bonitatis." A similar practice may now be revived, both in Latin and in the vernacular, i.e., in hymns which paraphrase the Kyrie.

If the Kyrie has been inserted into the penitential rite, it is not repeated afterwards in its proper place but simply omitted, because according to a principle established in the Constitution on the Liturgy, useless repetition are to be avoided (art. 34).

- 5. Then, when it is prescribed, is said or sung:**
"Glory to God in the highest ..."

On Sundays, outside Advent and Lent, on solemnities and feasts, i.e., on the former feasts of first and second class, and on the occasion of some other more solemn celebrations, the Gloria is sung or said. Memoriae, both obligatory and optional ones, i.e., the present third class feast of saints, have no Gloria any more. This means a considerable reduction of the occasions when this great doxology is to be said or sung.

According to the rubrics, hitherto valid, the priest had to say or sing the first words of this hymn. Now, however, the Gloria may be begun by the priest, by the whole congregation together, by the choir or by a single cantor. This is a real help for the priest who found it difficult to hit the right tune.

- 6. When the "Glory to God" is ended, the priest, with hands joined, says:**
"Let us pray."

All with the priest pray silently for a while. Then the priest extends his hands and says the Prayer; at the end of which the people respond:

"Amen."

The collect of the Mass is now introduced by a simple "Let us pray." During the Mass the use of the "Dominus vobiscum" has been reduced considerably; it need only be said before the Gospel, before

the preface and before the blessing. As was mentioned earlier, it *may* be used a fourth time, for greeting the people at the beginning of Mass.

After the invitation to pray, all pray first in silence, recollecting themselves and becoming aware that they stand in the presence, of God. Then the priest sums up these prayers in the "collect", directing it to the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit. In the "Amen" the people give their assent.

Every Mass has only *one single* oration; even the prayers to be said "under one conclusion" have been abolished. Normally the prayers proper to the respective Mass are to be said. At the Masses of "memoriae" however, one may freely select either the proper collect of the Mass or that of the Common. The prayer over the gifts and the postcommunion (if they are not proper) may either be taken from the Common or from the ferial day, that is to say, most often from the Mass of the previous Sunday.

On ferial days throughout the year one may take the prayers of the previous Sunday or those of any other Sunday throughout the year. A set from among the "orationes ad diversa" may also be used on these days. One may take the collect alone from a set of "orationes ad diversa" and retain the prayer over the gifts and the postcommunion of the previous Sunday.

This freedom of selection has been granted only for the days mentioned. Those liturgical seasons of the year which have prayers of their own for every day, oblige the celebrant to say these prayers.

Only the collect in the future will be concluded with the lengthy trinitarian conclusion "Through Jesus Christ your Son, our Lord, who lives and reigns with you in the unity of the Holy Spirits, God, for ever and ever." The prayer over the gifts and the postcommunion are concluded with the short conclusion "Through Christ our Lord. — Amen."

Throughout these introductory rites, which come to a close with the collect, the people are supposed to stand. Only at the beginning of the Service of the Word are we allowed to sit down.

"...the ordination rites for bishops had become longer and longer in the course of time, and at the same time more complicated. Thus a simplification of these ceremonies was overdue."

THE REFORMED ORDINATION RITE FOR BISHOPS

• H. J. GRAF, S. V. D.

I. Introduction

In order to demonstrate the dignity of the episcopal office, the ordination rites for bishops had become longer and longer in the course of time, and at the same time ever more complicated. Thus a simplification of these ceremonies was overdue. After Vatican II gave us a true theology of the episcopate this aim could be more easily achieved.

Anticipating the doctrine of collegiality the Constitution on the Liturgy decided that the ordination of a bishop should become a true manifestation of this doctrine (art. 76). Not only the two co-consecrators were in future to place their hands on the head of the bishop-elect, but all bishops present at the celebration. The Rite to be observed in the Concelebration of Mass of March 7, 1965 contained already a section with detailed prescriptions for the concelebration of holy Mass when a bishop is ordained: no special chapel was to be prepared for the bishop-elect; the prescriptions concerning the oath had been adapted; the postulation and the reading of the apostolic mandate were transferred to the beginning of the ordination rites,¹ and rules for the vesting of the candidate and the co-consecrators were given. Further adaptations of this ordination rite were issued by the Congregation

¹ Ibid., art. 122-125.

of Rites on July 17, 1965. All these regulations were already incorporated into the book "The Rites of Ordination and Episcopal Consecration."² This was a first official text; it had the confirmation of the Apostolic See (July 14, 1967) and has been used subsequently also in the Philippines. These changes anticipated a number of the reforms of the new ordination rite for bishops, published by the Vatican in December 1968.

Only after the Gospel of the Mass the ordination begins; it is concluded before offertory. This avoids the former fragmentation of rites. In order to stress the unity of the sacrament of holy Orders the whole celebration is called "ordination". Also the structure of the ceremonies is much like that of the ordination of priests and deacons, however with appropriate changes.

As bishops, the two co-consecrators are now mere assistants of the bishop-elect who is still a simple priest. Two priests are in future to fulfil this task, preferably two of the diocesan presbyterium of the future bishop.³ They should be at the side of the bishop-elect during the ordination rites and should afterwards concelebrate during the Eucharistic celebration, so that the new bishop is surrounded during this Mass not only by the bishops with whom he forms the "ordo Episcoporum," but also by his co-workers, the priests. In this way bishops and priests manifest together before all the faithful that "they share in one and the same priesthood and ministry of Christ."⁴ Also the simple priests "participate in and exercise with the bishop the *one* priesthood of Christ and are thereby meant to be prudent cooperators of the episcopal order."⁵

If the episcopal ordination takes place in a church that belongs to the diocese of the bishop-elect (not necessarily his future cathedral, but any church within the territory of his jurisdiction), the principal consecrator can invite the new bishop to act as main celebrant in the Eucharistic celebration from the offertory on. This is an extension of

² Washington 1967. 78 pp.

³ Cf. Decree on the Priestly Ministry and Life, art. 8.

⁴ Ibid., art. 7.

⁵ Decree on the Bishops' Pastoral Office, art. 28.

The principal consecrator asks in turn:

Do you have the apostolic mandate?

The priest who made the request, replies:

We have it.

The principal consecrator, wanting the document to be made known to all present, answers:

¡Then let it be read!

It is the Church, the holy people of God, that asks for a shepherd. The pastoral need, the service of the people was the reason why Christ instituted the hierarchy in the Church. The people hear now this document and when it has been read they give in their reply (Thanks be to God) or in some other way, according to local customs, their assent to the choice made by the Pope. If this consent is to mean something, then the document should be read in the vernacular, so that everybody present can also understand.

2. Instruction

Instead of the usual homily of the Mass the principal consecrator addresses now the people and the clergy, and in the second part of his sermon, the bishop-elect. First he explains the position and the role of the bishop in the Catholic Church; then he speaks to the candidate on his future duties.

The consecrating prelate may use the new model address of the Pontifical, or may also (preferably) speak freely, out of the fullness of his heart on the same topics. Once again we see that the text, provided for in the new Pontifical, is strongly influenced by the Constitution on the Church of Vatican II, following in general articles 19-21, but also by the Degree on the Bishops' Pastoral Office, the Decree on the Missionary Activity of the Church, and occasionally by the Decree on the Priestly Ministry and Life and the Constitution on the Church in the Modern World. There was certainly no Council before Vatican II that spoke so extensively on the role and the office of the bishop.

by the concelebrating bishops and last of all comes the principal consecrator, proceeding between two deacons.

The first part of the Mass is as usual. The lessons may be freely chosen, in part or in whole from the Mass of the day or from among the readings of the Appendix of the new Pontifical. No Creed is said nor a Prayer of the Faithful.

During the liturgy of the word and the ordination rites the consecrating prelate takes the episcopal cathedra. The co-consecrators sit next to the cathedra, on either side. The bishop-elect has a place in the sanctuary, so that he can easily be seen by all, but also in such a way that he and his assistants do not obstruct the view of the people.

The ordination should be held at the cathedra; pastoral reasons, however, especially the active participation of the people will frequently suggest another place: in front of the altar or some other suitable place.

III. The Ordination Rites

The singing of the "Veni creator Spiritus" (standing throughout) or of any other suitable hymn, also in the vernacular, marks the beginning of the ordination proper after the Gospel. The consecrator and his two assistants take their seats, prepared for the ordination rites.

1. Presentation of the Bishop-elect

One of the priests, as the representative of the presbyterium from which the elect has been chosen, and whose head he is to be in the future, addresses the principal consecrator:

Most Reverend Father, the Church of N. requests that you ordain the priest N.N. for the office of bishop.

If the candidate is not to be a residential bishop, but an auxiliary, vicar apostolic, prelate ordinary, etc., the question is the following:

Most Reverend Father, our holy mother the Catholic Church requests that you ordain the priest N.N. for the office of bishop.

the rule laid down in the Instruction of the Congregation of Rites of June 21, 1968⁶ which states that if a bishop only assists at the Mass of a simple priest, he has to lead the liturgy of the word; from the offertory on the simple priest may take over as celebrant of the Mass. The reason for this way of celebrating Mass is the fact that that bishops are "authentic teachers;" the preaching of the Gospel occupies an eminent place among their duties.⁷

Outside his own territory the newly-ordained bishop is to remain one of the concelebrants of the subsequent Mass; the consecrating prelate is also the principal celebrant of the whole Mass. But in this case the new bishop is to get the place of honor at the right side of the principal celebrant. This is the revival of an ancient practice at the Church of Rome. The *Ordo romanus* 34 says that after the ordination "jubet eum dominus apostolicus super omnes episcopos sedere."⁸

II. The Liturgy of the Word

Fully vested for the celebration of holy Mass the consecrating prelate, the concelebrating bishops and priests enter the church in procession. The bishop-elect wears already the pectoral cross and under his chasuble the dalmatic. But he may, for a "*rationabilis causa*" refrain from using the dalmatic. The reason may be the hot or damp climate or poor health.⁹

If one of the co-consecrating bishops does not want to concelebrate in the subsequent Mass he takes only the rochet, amice, pectoral cross, stole, cope and mitre. If the priests who assist the bishop-elect do not concelebrate they are to wear a cope.

The entrance procession proceeds as usual; after the subdeacon carrying the Gospel book come the priests as representatives of the presbyterium, who concelebrate in the ordination Mass. They are followed by the bishop-elect flanked by his assistants. The next place is taken

⁶ Instr. "Pontificales ritus", n. 24.

⁷ Const. on the Church, art. 25; Decree on the Bishops' Pastoral Office, art. 12.

⁸ M. Andrieu, *Las Ordines romani du haut moyen—age*. Vol. III, p. 613, n. 42.

⁹ Instruction "Pontificales ritus", n. 17.

The text, newly formulated, is a real improvement, compared with the allocution of the former consecration ritual for a bishop:

Dearly beloved people!

Consider carefully the position in the Church to which our brother is about to be promoted. Our Lord Jesus Christ, who was sent by the Father to redeem the human race, sent in turn twelve apostles into the world (Jn 20, 21). These men were filled with the power of the Holy Spirit (cf. Lk 24, 49; Acts 1, 4; 2, 16 f) so that they might preach the word of God and gather every race and people into a single flock to be guided and governed in the way of holiness. But their role was to continue to the end of time. So the apostles selected helpers for themselves and passed on to them the gift of the Holy Spirit they had received from Christ, by an imposition of hands which confers the sacrament of orders in its fullness. In that way by a succession of bishops unbroken from one generation to the next, the powers conferred in the beginning were handed down and the work of the Savior lives and grows in our own time.¹⁰

In the person of the bishop surrounded by his priests, our Lord Jesus Christ, who is High Priest for ever, is present among you. In the ministry of the bishop, Christ himself continues to proclaim the word of God and to unfold the mysteries of faith to those who believe. In the paternal functions of the bishop, Christ adds to his body and incorporates new members in it. In the bishop's wisdom and prudence Christ guides you in your earthly pilgrimage toward eternal happiness.¹¹

Take to yourselves therefore in a thankful and happy spirit our brother whom we bishops make a colleague in our order by laying hand on him. Respect him as a minister of Christ and a steward entrusted with the mysteries of God (1 Cor. 4, 1). He has been assigned to bear witness to the truth of the Gospel (cf. Col 1, 5), as well as to minister the Spirit and God's power to make men just (2 Cor. 3, 8 f). Remember the word of Christ which he addressed

¹⁰ Const. on the Church, art. 19 and 20.

¹¹ Ibid., art. 21.

to the apostles: "Whoever listens to you listens to me; and those who reject me; reject the one who sent me" (Lk 10, 16).¹²

You, beloved brother,

have been chosen by the Lord. Reflect on the fact that you have been taken from among men and appointed to act for men in their relations with God (Hb 5, 1). The title of bishop derives not from his rank but from his duty, and it is the part of the bishop to serve rather than to rule. Such is the counsel of the Master that the most important should behave as if he were the least, and the leader as if he were the one who serves (Lk 22, 26). Proclaim the message whether it be welcome or unwelcome; correct error with the greatest patience and in a spirit of teaching (2 Tim 4, 2). Make it your business to pray and offer sacrifices for the people committed to your care and so draw every kind of grace for them from the overflowing holiness of Christ.¹³

As a steward of the mysteries of Christ (1 Cor 4, 1) in the Church assigned to you, be a faithful supervisor and guardian. Since you are chosen by the Father to rule over his family, be mindful always of the Good Shepherd who knows his sheep and is known by them (Jn 10, 14) and who did not hesitate to lay off his life for his sheep (Jn 10, 15).

Love with a charity of a father and brother all those whom God places in your care, the priests and deacons who are partners with you in the ministry of Christ, the poor and the infirm as well, and also strangers and aliens.¹⁴ Encourage the faithful to work with you in your apostolic task and do not refuse to listen to them willingly. Never relax in your concern for those who do not belong as yet to the one fold of Christ (cf. Jn 10, 16), since they are commended to you in the Lord. Never forget that the Catholic Church is made

¹² Ibid., art. 21, second part.

¹³ On this last sentence cf. Const. on the Church, art. 26.

¹⁴ Cf. Decree on the Priestly Ministry and Life, art. 17; Decree on the Bishops' Pastoral Office, art. 16 and 18.—Since the same references come up once again in the subsequent examination, they will be mentioned there in full.

one by the bond of charity and that you are joined to the collegiate body of bishops. You will consequently maintain a deep concern for all the churches (cf. 2 Cor 11, 28) and gladly come to the aid and support of churches in need. Give your attention therefore to the whole flock in which the Holy Spirit appoints you an overseer of the assembly of God (cf. Acts 20, 28) — in the name of the Father whose image you personify in the Church¹⁵ — and in the name of the Son Jesus Christ whose triple role of Teacher, Priest and Pastor you undertake¹⁶ — and in the name of the Holy Spirit who gives life to the Church of Christ¹⁷ and supports our weakness with his power (cf. Rom 8, 26).

3. Examination

In the former consecration rite for bishops the examination of the bishop-elect had its place before the Mass, where it was the dominant part of the celebration. Now it has been shortened considerably. No questions about the faith of the bishop are asked; he is now nearly exclusively questioned about his willingness to fulfill the duties of his future office. The introduction alludes in the first words to the former text "*Antiqua sanctorum Patrum*"; its content, however, is entirely different. The people, so the consecrating prelate states, have a right to know about the candidate's willingness to keep the faith and to discharge his duties. For the questioning the bishop-elect rises and stands before the principal consecrator who questions him. The former prescription about the awkward rising and sitting, and the removal of the biretta has been dropped in the rite.

An age-old custom of the Fathers decrees that bishop-elect is to be questioned before the people on his resolve to keep the faith and to discharge his duties.

Beloved brother,
are you resolved by the grace of the Holy Spirit to discharge to

¹⁵ S. Ignatius of Ant., ep. to the Trallians 3, 1.

¹⁶ Const. on the Church, art. 21 (end).

¹⁷ Const. on the Church, art. 48.

the end of your life the office entrusted to us by the apostles which is about to be passed on to you by imposition of our hands?

The candidate answers:

I am.

Vatican II declared that "among the principal duties of bishops the preaching of the Gospel occupies an eminent place. For bishops are preachers of the faith who lead new disciples to Christ. They are authentic teachers."¹⁸ The Decree on the Bishops' Pastoral Office finds it necessary to repeat this statement.¹⁹ In view of this insistence we understand more easily the next question:

Are you resolved to be faithful and constant in proclaiming the Gospel of Christ?

The candidate replies:

I am.

As successors of the Apostle who stand in direct line of the apostolic succession the bishops have to take care of preserving the content of faith. St. Irenaeus testified to this already at the end of the second century: "Through those who were appointed bishops by the Apostles, and through their successors down to our time the apostolic tradition is manifested and preserved throughout the world."²⁰ The bishop-elect declares his readiness to take his place in this line of bishops and to be faithful in the task it involves:

Are you resolved to maintain the content of faith, entire and uncorrupted, as handed down by the Apostles and professed by the Church at all times and places?

I am.

Even to simple priests Vatican II attributed the task "to make the universal Church visible in their own locality and lend their full assistance

¹⁸ Const. on the Church, art. 25.

¹⁹ Art. 12.—The same is stressed in the Const. on the Church, art. 21, 24 and 27.

²⁰ Const. on the Church, art. 20.

to the upbuilding of the whole body of Christ (cf. Eph 4, 12).” In doing so they take upon themselves actually the bishop’s “duties and concerned.”²¹ In view of this fact we understand better the question:

Are you resolved to build up the Church as the body of Christ and to remain united to it by your link with the order of bishops under the authority of the successor of Saint Peter the Apostle?

I am.

The second half of the previous question is based on the fact of collegiality of bishops and the primacy of Bishop of Rome. It is true that a man becomes bishop by the ordination rite; but he is allowed to exercise his episcopal office only “in hierarchical communion with the head and the members of the (episcopal) college.”²² The role of the successor of Peter is unique in the “ordo Episcoporum” which is stressed in the following question:

Are you resolved to be loyal in your obedience to the successor of Saint Peter the Apostle?

I am.

The up-building of the local church of which the bishop is the visible principle and foundation of unity,²³ cannot be achieved by the bishop alone. The service of the Christian community must be undertaken by the bishop together with his helpers, the priests and deacons.²⁴ Together, bishop, priests and deacons serve the holy people of God. Deacons and priests are the bishop’s co-workers. Consequently, he should consider the priests who share with him “in one and the same priesthood and ministry of Christ,”²⁵ “as sons and friends, just as Christ called his disciples no longer servants but friends (cf. Jn 15, 15).”²⁶

²¹ Const. on the Church, art. 28.

²² Ibid., art. 21.

²³ Ibid., art. 23.

²⁴ Ibid., art. 20.—Decree on the Bishops’ Pastoral Office, art. 15.

²⁵ Decree on the Priestly Ministry and Life, art. 7.

²⁶ Const. on the Church, art. 28.

There are serious reasons for this attitude because the priests "assume in part the bishop's duties and cares and carry the weight of them day by day with all zeal."²⁷ In an atmosphere of trusting familiarity with his priests, in genuine wisdom and prudence the bishop is "to direct and guide the people of the New Testament in its pilgrimage toward eternal happiness."²⁸ These thoughts find expression in the question:

Are you resolved as a devoted father to sustain the people of God in cooperation with the priests and deacons who share your ministry and to guide them in their way to salvation?

I am.

The following question shows that the tasks of the bishop are a *service* to all men, particularly to the poor. The aspect of service is frequently stressed in the Council documents.²⁹ Especially those who need help most, are recommended to the bishop's care. "Both priests and bishops will avoid all those things which can offend the poor in any way."³⁰ The bishop "should manifest his concern for all, no matter what their age, condition or nationality, be they natives, strangers or foreigners."³¹ He should show special concern "for those among the faithful who, on account of their way or condition of life, cannot sufficiently make use of the common and ordinary pastoral services of parish priests or are quite cut off from them. Among this group are the very many migrants, exiles and refugees, seamen, airplane personnel, gypsies and others of this kind."³² A bishop must not be content to name a priest for these tasks. He ought to take a personal interest. All these obligations are called to the candidate's attention when he is asked:

Are you resolved to show kindness and compassion in the name of the Lord to the poor and to strangers and to all who are in need?

I am.

²⁷ Decree on the Bishops' Pastoral Office, art. 16.

²⁸ Const. on the Church, art. 21.

²⁹ Ibid., art. 20, 21 and 24.—Decree on the Bishops' Pastoral Office, art. 16.

³⁰ Decree on the Priestly Ministry and Life, art. 17.

³¹ Decree on the Bishops' Pastoral Office, art. 16.

³² Ibid., art. 18.

In an unmistakable way the last Council showed that a bishop has an obligation toward the *whole* Church, even the whole of mankind, i.e. for the evangelization of those who do not yet know Christ.³³ He has also to be concerned of those who, though knowing Christ, are not members of the Church in the full sense. He should "deal lovingly with the separated brethren, urging the faithful also to conduct themselves with great kindness and charity in their regard, and fostering ecumenism as it is understood by the Church."³⁴ This prescription inspired the following question:

Are you resolved as a good shepherd to seek out the sheep who stray and to gather them into the fold of the Lord?

I am.

A bishop's lot is work; but he must also, according to the word of the Lord "always pray" (Lk 18, 1). In doing he only imitates our High Priest in heaven "who lives forever to plead with God" (Hb 7, 25). "By thus praying and laboring for the people, bishops channel the fullness of Christ's holiness in many ways and abundantly" upon their flocks.³⁵ The bishop-elect declares his readiness to do this when he is asked:

Are you resolved to pray without ceasing for the people of God and to carry out the duties of the high priesthood in such a way as to afford no ground for reproof?

I am.

The principal consecrator, knowing from his own life as bishop, how difficult it is to put these good resolutions into practice, concludes the questioning with the good wish:

May God who began the good work in you bring it to fulfillment.

To be continued

³³ Const. on the Church, art. 23.—Decree on the Bishops' Pastoral Office, art. 6 and 17.—Decree on the Missions, art. 38.

³⁴ Decree on the Bishops' Pastoral Office, art. 16.

³⁵ Const. on the Church, art. 26.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

MIXED PRIESTLY TRAINING

IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY AND THE MAGISTERIUM

An appraisal of certain disastrous reforms in Seminary education which boast of "inventing" today experiences that have failed yesterday.

• **JESUS MA. CAVANNA, C. M.**

I

INTRODUCTION

Vatican II in one of its major documents solemnly affirms the "supreme importance of priestly formation" in order to bring about "the desired renewal of the whole Church".¹ In the said document the Council lays down "certain fundamental principles, wherein laws already tested by the experience of centuries are reaffirmed, and new regulations are introduced in harmony with the Constitutions and Decrees of the Sacred Council and the changed conditions of the times."² And it is curious to note that both in the Decree on Priestly Training³ and in that on the Ministry and Life of the Priests,⁴ Vatican II refers to the masterly documents of the last Popes, St. Pius X, Pius XI, Pius XII, John XXIII, and specifically, insofar as Seminaries are concerned, to SUMMI DEI VERBUM of Paul VI.⁵

¹ Sacrosanctum Oecumenicum Concilium Vaticanum II, *Constitutiones, Decreta, Declarationes*, Libr. Editr. Vatic., 1966, "*Optatam Totius*" Prooemium; pp. 357-358.

² Ibid., l.c.

³ Ibid., l.c., nota 1.

⁴ Vaticanum II, op. cit., "*Presbyterorum Ordinis*", n. 12, nota 7; p. 654..

⁵ S. Pius X, Exhort. ad Clerum, HAERENT ANIMO, 4 aug. 1908: S. Pii X Acta IV, pp. 237-264; Pius XI, Litt. Encycl., AD CATHOLICI SA-

It is not therefore in the mind of Vatican II to reject or contradict in its basic principles the traditional teaching of the Church down the ages, concerning the purpose, nature and essential marks of the Seminaries. This legacy of the Council of Trent, which by itself alone would have justified its gigantic work of reform,⁶ has been transmitted to us in the span of four centuries, not as a dead letter, but as a living form, improving itself slowly and gradually with the experience of facts, perfecting itself in its details, and moving forward with prudent innovations in all levels, as demanded or permitted by the times. To continue this work of "renewal"—and not of "demolition"—is the aim of Vatican II. This is clear from the words quoted above.

The educational value of the Tridentine Seminaries has been tested and has been found effective in producing an excellent and exemplary clergy. It is true that our Seminaries, like any other human institution, need up-dating, need reforms in all their accidental structures in order to be relevant and responsive to the times in which we live. But such reforms must not mean a step backwards, a return to methods which have failed in the past. Let us not turn back the clock of history.

Unfortunately the desire to "invent" profane novelties is spreading. And it is dragging many well-meaning but short-sighted reformers who boldly advocate, not an authentic and legitimate Seminary renewal, but an outdated and outmoded *deformation* of its most basic and essential marks.

The idea is becoming more current that our Seminaries are outdated; that they are no longer adequate for our times; that in our days, by a sort of hocus-pocus, all people, including the youth in the process of formation, have reached the "age of maturity"; so that what formerly we used to call "discipline, character formation, spiritual direction, scholastic rigor, priestly spirit, *segregation* (which indeed does not mean

CERDOTII, 20 dec. 1935, AAS 28 (1936), p. 5 ss; Pius XII, Adhort. Apost., MENTI NOSTRAE, 23 sept. 1950, AAS. 42 (1950), pp. 657-702; Ioannes XXIII, Litt. Encycl., SACERDOTII NOSTRI PRIMORDIA, 1 aug. 1959, AAS. 51 (1959), pp. 545-579; Paulus VI, Epist. Apost., SUMMI DEI VERBUM, 4 nov. 1963, AAS. 55 (1963), pp. 979-995.

⁶ Cf. P. Sforza Pallavicino, *Istoria del Concilio di Trento*, ed. di A. M. Zaccaria, Tom. IV, Roma 1833, p. 344.

separation from, and much less *disregard of the world*)” are useless and harmful to the growth of human personality, the spirit of initiative and self-determination. All this, they say, smells of Trent. And Trent is outdated (!). And so our Tridentine Seminaries are on the way out. But what proposal do they offer to replace them?

And here comes the big proposal! A new “discovery”, yea, but of an antique. A magic formula, yes; but which has been tried in the past and has been found wanting. Under the guise of psychology in depth, the new breed of Seminary educators disregard the time-tested teaching of the Church and the clear lessons of history, and propose experimentations in priestly training which existed hundred of years before and after Trent...; experimentation that brought distress upon the priesthood and disaster upon the Church.

The much talked-of refers to which we refer can be summarized as follows. The Tridentine Seminaries until now had been “close gardens” of “monastic” type, where future diocesan priests were formed in an “abnormal” environment, under a “gregarious” discipline, destructive of all personal initiative, and harmful to the acquisition of full maturity and a sense of responsibility so necessary for the prospective ministers of the Church. And root-cause of this—it is alleged—is in training seminarians separated from the world, unaware of the burning problems of the social milieu in which they will be called upon to work and of the men whom they will have to serve.

Hence the reform—true, necessary, urgent, radical—must consist in “openness to the world”, “insertion into the world”; train the seminarians in the midst of the world, in constant and close contact with society. Let them study together with laymen who do not aspire to the priesthood. Let them freely mingle with laymen in social and family circles. In this way the seminarians shall be formed without inhibitions and clerical complexes. By personal experience they will know the world they are to save and the problems they are to meet in their priestly ministry.

We admit that in this diagnosis about the present condition of our Seminaries there is a grain of truth, but on a heap of exaggeration. And a half-truth is worse than a glaring error. That is why in no way

can we admit the proposed solution, above all in its boldest forms, of a "mixed" training of seminarians and lay students, on equal footing, habitually together in school and social activities.

And we reject renewal along lines of *excessive* "openness to the world", "insertion into the world" consequent upon a *mixed priestly training*. We reject it, firstly, because the history of many centuries has proved that such a system of Seminary education, specially in its most advanced forms, has given to the Church a corrupt, vicious and scandalous clergy; and even in its more moderate forms (Seminary-Colleges, College-Seminaries, etc.) it fell short of the ideal Seminary as envisioned by the Council of Trent. And in either way it has ended in lowering down the number and quality of priestly vocations.

Above all we reject *mixed priestly training* because it is openly against the repeated and explicit teachings of the Magisterium of the Church. At all times, even until the days of Vatican II,⁷ the Church, faithful to the Gospel,⁸ has always proposed *segregation* (which, we repeat, does not mean separation or estrangement) from the world, as a necessary condition for all priests, and consequently, still more, for all those who aspire to the priesthood. The Supreme Magisterium of the Church has firmly disapproved and proscribed "mixed" Seminaries. It is true that in some countries she allows, because of special circumstances, that seminarians attend classes outside the Seminary proper (in Colleges or Universities); but this is done always with the guaranty of a solid spiritual and ecclesiastical discipline imparted to the candidates for the priesthood in order to neutralize the negative factors involved in such a system.

In subsequent articles we shall speak of the testimony of history and the clean-out teachings of the Magisterium. The proofs abound, and it is opportune to bring them to the attention of those who might not be aware of them. The topic burns with actuality. Under the guise of "new experiments", certain practices are gaining ground in many countries. They are experiments that have failed a hundred times in the past, and today are presented as the authentic *renewal* demanded by

⁷ Vaticanum II, op. cit., "*Presbyterorum Ordinis*", n. 3; pp. 625-626.

⁸ Mt. 19, 27; Jo. 15, 19; 17, 14-16; Acts 13, 2; Rom. 1, 1.

Vatican II: "openness to the world", "insertion into the world" of our young seminarians, by means of a *mixed* or, for want of a better term, a *secularized* priestly training.

For the sake of precision, may I be allowed here a clarification. Vatican II does not even mention such solution. Long before Vatican II, Pope Pius XII in *MENTI NOSTRAE*⁹ of September 23, 1950 said NOT IN FAVOR OF A MIXED OR SECULARIZED PRIESTLY TRAINING, nor of throwing the seminarians into the world, nor of bringing the world into the Seminary, but of "decreasing *gradually* and *prudently* the separation between the people and the future priest", avoiding "an environment *too withdrawn* from the world." This certainly is quite different from the rash and bold reforms that are being advocated today.

Unfortunately in some countries or dioceses fatal experiments have been introduced and are being introduced at all cost. In the near future their negative and bitter results will confirm once again—although too late then to repair the harm done to the Church—that as Leo XIII said, and with him Pius XII and recently Paul VI repeated: "the fate of the Church depends mainly on the condition of the Seminaries."¹⁰

If experiments are wanted, let there be . . . , but with rats and rabbits *when those experiments most probably may fail and prove fatal*; but never with young seminarians who are the hope of the Church. It seems to me that some experiments which nowadays are proposed and tried in favor of Seminary renewal are irresponsible attempts against the very heart of the Church. Vatican II,¹¹ with the same words of Pope Benedict XV,¹² declared: "the Seminary is the heart of the Diocese."

⁹ Cf. AAS. 42 (1950), pp. 686-687.

¹⁰ Leo XIII, Epist. *PATERNAE PROVIDAEQUE*, Acta Leonis XIII (1899), p. 194; cf. Pius XII, Epist. ad. Ep. Poloniae, *PER HOS POSTREMOS ANNOS*, ASS. 37 (1945), p. 207; Paulus VI, Epist. Apost. *SUMMI DEI VERBUM*, Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1963, p. 16.

¹¹ Vaticanum II, op. cit., "*Optatam Totius*", n. 5; p. 365.

¹² Benedictus XV, Epist. *SAEPE NOBIS*, 30 nov. 1921, where he affirms that the Seminary "est . . . Dioecesis cor, unde in omnes Ecclesiae venas spiritalis vitae diffunditur" (cf. S. C. de Seminariis, *Seminaria Ecclesiae Catholicae*, Typ. Pol. Vat., 1963, p. 246).

II

Pre-tridentine Seminaries: episcopal schools
(I-IX Centuries)

The advocates of "openness to the world", "insertion into the world" for our youths who aspire to the priesthood, want to bring this about by means of a *mixed priestly training*, in constant and close contact with laymen. They ought to know, however, that in spite of their nice theories, historical facts argue:

- a) that they are not inventing something new, for that kind of priestly formation, outside the Seminary, in the midst of the world, is — as we shall see later — so old that it is traceable to the Middle Ages, and in one way or other has been practiced for more than ten centuries, almost up to our days: certainly, at least until the beginning of the 20th century;
- b) that the experience of all these centuries has demonstrated that such kind of training has produced ordinarily the most disastrous results.

It was precisely the sad experience of the failure of that system in the priestly training that moved the true reformers of the XVI century to work out the Tridentine Decree which ordered the establishment of colleges exclusively destined to promote and discern ecclesiastical vocations, in a "special" — not "abnormal", as some say today— environment, different from the ordinary, and characterized, among other things, by *segregating* the seminarians from other young people who aim to pursue civic or secular careers.

The history of the institutions for priestly training through twenty centuries will provide us in the present and following chapters with very interesting facts to help us realize the lasting value of Tridentine Seminaries, and at the same time to evaluate properly the deformation that mixed priestly training implies.

During the first three centuries of Christianity which were centuries of bloody persecution, it was not possible to think of putting up schools exclusively for the formation of the clergy. Following the example of the Apostles, the Bishops of those times, personally or by their vicars, taught and trained in their own homes those whom they considered fit to become future helpers in the priestly ministry.¹ The catechetical schools which were founded in Rome, Alexandria, Carthage, Antioch, and Cesarea of Palestine, contributed in some way to a more solid doctrinal formation of the candidates for the priesthood. But those schools were not *exclusively* intended for priestly training, hence, they can not be considered as the pattern of Seminaries.

In the infant Church of those days with her small communities of christians, the number of priests was necessarily few. These few however were formed personally under the supervision of the Bishop or his vicar in an environment of sincere piety and heroic sanctity. And thus they remained true to their high calling.² Two things we should note here:

- a) If we do not find Seminaries or schools exclusive for the training of the clergy in the first centuries of the Church, it is because the circumstances of those times of persecution did not allow it, nor the small number of the faithful in the new christian communities demanded it;
- b) Because of the special formation that the candidates to the priesthood received under the personal supervision of the Bishop or his vicar, those first few priests were worthy of the era of martyrs and catacombs.

Then came the peace of Constantine (a. 313). With the freedom of the Church so favorable to the spread of Christianity, priestly vocations increased in such number that the episcopal residences became too small to receive all those who aspired for the Holy Orders. Many of

¹ Dr. Laurentino García García, *El Aspirante al Sacerdocio y su Formación*, Ed. "Sigueme", Salamanca 1947, 3 vols., II, pp. 9-10.

² S. C. de Sem., *Seminaria Ecclesiae Catholicae*, Typ. Pol. Vat., 1963, pp. 29-32.

them were forced to attend the *public* schools in order to receive the necessary cultural education. These schools were open to all young men—whatever their call of life could have been—and not only christians but also pagans. There were again pagans even among the teachers. On the other hand, the diocesan administration became more complex and the Bishop or his vicar could no longer supervise the training of candidates for the ministry as closely and as effectively as before. Both factors caused great evils to the clergy. Heresies, false doctrines, immorality began to creep into the ranks of the priesthood. The many Church laws promulgated at that time were impotent to check the evil. *Mixed priestly training* began to bear bad fruits. It was felt imperative that the clergy be given a “special” education. St. Augustine, the Bishop of Hippo, was the first to discover a formula which could be considered as the first blueprint of the Seminaries of Church.³

St. Augustine by personal experience knew the deleterious influence of a *mixed* education received in close contact with the frivolous youth of his time.⁴ This explains why as soon as he was consecrated Bishop, he put up in his own residence what he called “monastery of clerics”, to distinguish it from a “monastery” in the strict sense, i.e. for monks who lead a cenobitic life. In this institution which the Saint, with more propriety calls also “Bishop’s House” or “House of the Church”, the aim was not to train priests in the “monastic” mould, solitary and totally separated from the world. St. Augustine knew full well that the life of a Bishop is not to be alone in solitude, but to be at the service of the people: so too, in his mind, should the life of priests be: not solitary nor monastic, but within the context of a community, following a set of rules and regulations, which is quite different from the austere solitude of monks and hermits.⁵

St. Augustine wanted to form clerics in a type of *communitarian* life, very much like the way the first christians lived, as described in

³ L. G. García, op cit., p. 10, footnote 4; S. C. de Sem., op. cit., p. 37, footnote 80.

⁴ S. C. de Sem., op. cit., p. 32, footnote 47.

⁵ Ibid., p. 36.

the Acts of the Apostles. He introduced furthermore some ascetical practices adopted from monasteries he knew in Rome and Milan. And the whole atmosphere was one of recollection and community work for the purpose of acquiring the science and virtue necessary to the ministers of the Gospel.

It is therefore worth-noting that in this first Seminary created around the year 396, the great African Doctor of the Church laid out already the basic rules for the formation of the clergy, namely, recollection, silence, discipline of community life and work, and *segregation* from the world similar to that of the monasteries, but different from these, because a needed and timely "openness to the world" was allowed as something convenient for those who were called to be the "salt of the earth".

"Openness to the world" is therefore not a new discovery of our age. If taken as it should be, according to the spirit of the Gospel and the formula of Vatican II: "not separation, much less estrangement from the world, but segregation from it": in that way it was already understood and practiced by St. Augustine in the 4th century.

In this first "episcopal school" founded by the Bishop of Hippo not only did clerics desirous of keeping the augustinian rule live in community, but youths also were received who were brought up according to the said rule duly adapted to their condition. Under the direction of the holy Founder discipline flourished and soon clerics were ordained and from among them Bishops were chosen who edified with their virtues the regions they governed, most specially in Christian Africa.⁶

The example of this College exclusively intended for the formation of saintly and cultured priests, and the excellent fruits that it produced, aroused in many prelates the idea of imitating it. This can be seen in the legislation of Popes and Councils of those times.⁷ And so in the episcopal cities there appeared *episcopal schools*, forerunners of the future

⁶ L. G. García, op. cit., p. 11.

⁷ S. C. de Sem., op. cit., pp. 34-35, footnotes 61, 62, 63, 64, 65; L. G. García op. cit., p. 16, footnote 24.

Tridentine Seminaries. Those schools were training centers for clerics, segregated though not separated from the world, under the supervision of the Bishop. Later on, with the structuration of parishes, *parochial schools* were established under the supervision of the parish priests. This set-up actually produced excellent fruits for the good of the Church and of souls.⁸

After the barbarian invasion the Church tried to continue her cultural work, at least in the schools which were preserved in churches and monasteries. But in many parts these schools lost their *exclusively* clerical scope, and by force of the prevailing circumstances they were opened to both clerics and laymen. This mixed education, revived over again, could not but influence unfavorably the priestly formation.⁹ With the conversion of the barbarians and the pacification of Europe, there followed fortunately the revival of the episcopal and parochial schools which reassumed the augustinian tradition, preserving their nature special educational centers exclusively training future pastors of souls.¹⁰

The episcopal schools begun by St. Augustine found their way into Church legislation, most explicitly in the II and IV Councils of Toledo (Spain), in the year 527 and 633 respectively, where reference was made to an ecclesiastical training which should begin, as far as possible, from the first years of boyhood or adolescence, within a community life *segregated* from the world, and under the supervision of experienced superiors: "that they may spend the years of youth or critical age, not in lust, but in Church discipline... (because) adolescence is inclined to evil, and there is nothing so unstable as the life of the youth."¹¹ It must be noted that the reason alleged by the IV Provincial Council of Toledo (a.633) was repeated almost textually by the Council of Trent some *ten centuries later*¹² It is astounding that in

⁸ S. C. de Sem., op. cit., pp. 43-44.

⁹ Ibid., p. 42

¹⁰ The so-called "*Patriarquo*" or "episcopal school" of St. John at the Lateran in Rome became famous for its antiquity and well-deserved prestige: cf. L.G. Garcia, op. cit., pp. 13-14.

¹¹ cf. L.G. Garcia, op. cit., p. 17, footnote 27.

¹² cf. S.C. de Sem., op. cit., pp. 49 and 97.

our days, *four centuries* only after Trent, a sophisticated literature should strive to convince us that the introductory words of the cardinal Tridentine Decree of July 15, 1563 are no longer valid: "Since youth is inclined to worldly pleasures, unless it is rightly guided; and inasmuch as it can hardly persevere in the perfect observance of ecclesiastical discipline, without an extraordinary and singular help of God, unless it be educated in piety and religion from its most tender years and before vicious habits come to dominate it completely..."¹³

Aside' from the "episcopal" and "parochial" schools, there existed in those centuries that preluded the Middle Ages, other schools that contributed also in some way to the education of the young candidates for the priesthood: the schools founded in the monasteries. In them (as, up to a certain extent, in the episcopal schools also) together with life with laymen, to the extreme however of preventing even a moderate a community life segregated from the world, the boys who aspired to the priesthood were subjected to rules and regulations which indeed were different from, but most often very similar to those that are strictly monastic.¹⁴ This was indeed a mistake which could create some undesirable effects in the formation of the secular clergy. Sometimes it went so far as to confuse the necessary "segregation" from the world which clerics have to profess, with the total "separation" from the world which characterizes monastic life.

But let us not raise our eyebrows, nor cry to high heavens in protest, when he discover defects in an institution that was still in its initial stage. No human enterprise is perfect and accomplished from the very start. However, the mistake just mentioned was not so serious as to darken or devalue the excellence of that solid specialized training which was given *exclusively* to clerics by avoiding, *as it should*, communitarian and necessary contact with the world, *as it should have done*. And the best proof that the defect was not so serious as it is being presented today, is that it has passed on, so to speak, under cover for centuries. Its disadvantages, in some way counterbalanced by the many advantages

¹³ Concilium Tridentinum, Sess. XXIII, can. 18: "*Cum adolescentium aetas . . .*" (Full text, ap. S.C. de Sem., op. cit., p. 97).

¹⁴ cf. L.G. Garcia, op. cit., p. 23; S.C. de Sem., op. cit., p. 37. footnote 80.

of the classic traditional priestly training, have remained unchallenged until in our time Pope Pius XII brought them out into the open and ordered that the defect be remedied by a "GRADUAL and PRUDENT" contact of seminarians with the world.¹⁵

To educate candidates for the diocesan priesthood in an atmosphere of "segregation" from the world, as our Seminaries require, has been attacked as "abnormal". That this attack is groundless and fallacious can be easily deduced from what we have thus far said and from what we shall see more clearly in the course of this study. Priestly vocation implies "segregation" from the world. This is undeniable. Said "segregation" is extraordinary for the rest of the faithful, and certainly difficult for human nature. It seems therefore natural (or "normal") to educate the candidates to the priesthood from their earliest years, in a *special* way (not "abnormal", as some foundlessly say), different from the rest. They should be trained and moulded in the special manner of life that they are to embrace. They must know on time whether they are fit for the renouncements and exigencies that the Lord demands from those who are to commit themselves unreservedly to His service in the ministry of salvation in the midst of the world.¹⁶

It is true that by this "segregation" at an early age, the youths are taken out of the family circle where *normally* they grow and are brought up. This certainly can hinder the growth of psychic maturity in the affective life of the young. But such inconvenience is easily remedied by creating in the Seminary a family atmosphere of joy and love, of mutual trust and understanding, of peace and serenity in the cheerful companionship and habitual relations among the members of the community. This is true even in the Houses of formation in monasteries and religious convents. Their separation from the world and the family, is much more demanding. And yet the young novices or scholastics are not being brought up "abnormally". Soon most of them succeed in attaining emotional and spiritual maturity and in developing strength

¹⁵ cf. AAS. 42 (1950), pp. 686-687. At the end of the XIX century the famous Micheletti in his lectures given upon orders of Pope Leo XIII spoke already on this matter: cf. A. M. Micheletti, *De Regimine Ecclesiastico Religiosorum necnon Seminariorum*, Romae 1909, pp. 126-127.

¹⁶ Mt. 8,19-22; 10,34-39; 16-24-26; 19,16-30.

of character which the youths that are educated in the din and strife of the world hardly achieve.

After these parenthetic remarks which we consider important for the rest of our study, we bring to a close this article on "episcopal schools" with the observation that such forerunners of our Seminaries flourished with excellent fruits for the formation of the clergy until the IX century, when decadence began because of historical circumstances; a decadence "which continued on account of those turbulent times, specially in the X and following centuries. Community life was lost, and with it, the love of study and piety, causing thus a great harm to Church discipline."¹⁷

Again, may we be allowed to observe that the decline of the primitive Seminaries coincides with the loss of community life among the candidate for the priesthood, and with the increasing contact and *mixed* education of those candidates with the laymen. Already in the year 845 the *Concilium Meldense* prescribed that no cleric should be ordained unless he lived at least FOR ONE YEAR (too short, is it not?) among clerics or religious, or at least in a place where his moral and doctrinal fitness could be tried and tested.¹⁸

Obviously, the decadence of the primitive Seminaries (episcopal schools) coincided with a misunderstood "openness to the world", very much like that which is strongly advocated in some sectors of the Church today.

III

Seminarists replaced by mixed education (IX-XVI Centuries)

The episcopal schools or pre-tridentine Seminaries, as we have already said, flourished from the VII to the IX century. In some way they continued to prosper even until the XII century. But from the IX century a new avenue was opened step forward insofar as intellectual form-

¹⁷ L. G. Garcia, op. cit., p. 25.

¹⁸ S. C. de Sem., op. cit., p. 54.

ation was concerned. The public schools established in the time of Charlemagne for the promotion of arts and sciences offered, with the study of Grammar and Dialectic, a scientific basis for the study of Theology.

"The III Lateran Ecumenical Council (a. 1179), in order that the sons of poor families could be easily admitted to the priesthood, prescribed that in each cathedral and in other churches and monasteries there should be a teacher of Grammar who should instruct free of charge the clerics and the poor students. The programs was as follows: first, the TRIVIUM, a kind of Secondary Course (or High School) which included Grammar, Rhetoric and Dialect next, the QUATRIVIUM, a sort of College Course which included Arithmetic, Music, Geometry and Astronomy. Then, the ecclesiastical course proper (Philosophy and Theology)."¹

It appears that the study of the TRIVIUM and QUATRIVIUM was necessary for the general culture of all the youths, whether they would aspire to the clerical state, or pursue secular professions. In this set-up an undesirable habitual contact of candidates for the priesthood with the laymen was inevitable. Segregation from the world, which characterized the priestly training of the episcopal schools in the preceding centuries, ceased to be the norm. The period of decadence began.

"These schools and those that were established beside them gave birth later to the celebrated Universities of the Middle Ages"² which became so famous that they gradually replaced the old episcopal schools insofar as the training of the clergy was concerned. These Universities (or *General Studies*, as at times they were called) became the training centers of clerics and candidates to the priesthood, who lived in the midst of the world, mingled freely with laymen, without receiving any formal priestly discipline.

The oldest Universities trace their origin back to the XII century. With the gradual vanishing of episcopal schools, the decadence of the clergy became more and more noticeable. It was evidently due to a lack

¹ L. G. García, op. cit., pp. 24-25.

² Ibid., p. 25.

³ S. C. de Sem., op. cit., p. 66; L. G. García, op. cit., p. 25, footnote 55

of adequate special training.⁴ And when priestly training began to consist merely in attending classes in the Universities, an acute crisis in priestly vocations and an alarming decline in clerical life was felt.⁵ In the XIII century most of the episcopal schools were closed down; "the Universities rapidly spread, and to them the clerical students flocked for their Theology and Canon Law, *together with the youths who were taking also University courses to pursue secular professions*; youths who were not always paragons of virtue and morality.

"These centers as a whole taught all the sciences, ecclesiastical as well as civic. It is true they dispelled the ignorance of the clergy (at least partially, since as a matter of fact not all clerics did attend University classes —C.); but it is also true that they failed to come up to the expectations of the Popes with regards to moral formation, since, right after their foundation, these Universities gave preference to, and put emphasis on, intellectual works. They did not show much concern with the piety and moral character of their students. They outpaced the episcopal schools in arts and sciences, but lagged behind in morality and good manners.

"The laxity of ecclesiastical discipline was accelerated by the *constant and close communication of clerics with laymen*. In order to check the evil, Major Colleges (residences or houses for ecclesiastics, with some sort of clerical discipline —C.) were founded within or near the University campus. But many of the Theology students did not like to live within under any kind of restraints.⁶ They preferred to stay out in complete freedom, free to do as they wished, and free to create scandals by their gluttony and drunkenness, their frivolous and lascivious behavior, profligate speech, etc., to such an extent that a contemporary author wrote: "The clerics of our time attend the school of Anti-Christ rather than that of Christ."⁷

⁴ S. C. de Sem., op. cit., p. 56.

⁵ Ibid., pp. 68-69, footnotes 197-198.

⁶ L. G. García, op. cit., p. 26.

⁷ S. C. de Sem., op. cit., p. 69, footnote 198; Giuseppe Cenacchi, *La Pedagogia Seminaristica nei Documenti del Magistero Ecclesiastico*, Casa Editrice Istituto Padano di Arti Grafiche, Rovigo 1966, p. 85; in this scholarly work may be found quoted the eloquent texts of the Council of Salisburg (a. 1291) and of Alanus de Insulis in his *Summa de arte praedicatoria*, c. 36.

The episcopal schools had been closed. The candidates to the priesthood were enjoying complete freedom in the midst of the world. Intellectual formation in the University was not obligatory. Residence subject to discipline in a Major College was not required. Result? Very often persons, poor in virtue but rich in vices dared to present themselves for ordination. And not rarely priests were ordained who were shamelessly ignorant of the rudiments of grammar and of Church discipline. The practice of simoniacal ordinations became rampant, and thus a good number of vicious and ignorant priests rocked the Church with shame and ignominy. They were the rotten fruits of a *mixed priestly training*, or of an absolute lack of training, for if some were instructed in the cathedral or parish churches, and others in the Universities, still there were many more who had no education at all: and all, as a general rule, lived in organic insertion into the world and were contaminated—save a few providential exceptions—by the spirit of the world.

The Council of Palencia (in Valladolid, Spain, a. 1321) observes that the ignorance of the clerics is great that the Popes and Councils were concerned with raising the cultural standards of the clergy in the Middle Ages,⁸ by providing the College-Seminaries and the Universities with professors and academic programs. The trouble was in the failure to diagnose the real cause of the evil: the lack of strict priestly formation and the disastrous habitual mingling of clerics with worldly laymen. The depraved condition of the clergy even in XVI century, on the eve of Trent, was painfully alarming.¹⁰

Even in Rome, the "Studium Urbis" or "Sapientia Romana"—that began in the year 1265, — was not actually a real Seminary, but just another University, the majority of whose students were candidates to the priesthood, but where laymen without any priestly vocation were also admitted. The "Colegio Capranica" of Rome was an attempt to revive the old Seminaries exclusively designed for clerics; but the discipline prevailing therein was quite deficient, and its students were attending

⁸ G. Cenacchi, *op cit.*, p. 85.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 82-84.

¹⁰ G. Pellicia, *La Preparazione ed ammissione dei chierici ai santi ordini nella Roma del secolo XVI*, Roma 1946, *passim*.

classes in the University "Studium Urbis". The "Collegio Capranica" was considered "rather as a residence or lodging house, than a cenacle of community life for the purpose of priestly formation."¹¹ The students quite often in their own rooms held social gatherings with lay people. Among themselves they squandered time by playing cards with money. They introduced into rooms relatives and friends without any permission from the Rector. Laundrywomen, not in any way selected, and sometimes young ladies of all reputation, were admitted into the rooms of the students. The "Collegio Nardini", also in Rome, was similar to the "Capranica". Originally founded only for candidates to the priesthood, soon it admitted youths who had not even the least intention or thought to taking Holy Orders.

In the face of this deplorable condition of the medieval clergy, a historical conclusion is imperative. If the priests were not conspicuous for their spirituality, culture, priestly formation had been radically defective or even null. In fact many candidates for ordination tried to shake off all forms of priestly discipline, and almost no one believed any longer in a life segregated from the world, characteristic of a true Seminary, as the best and most adequate form of priestly training.¹² With the paganizing influence of the Renaissance, the evil became more and more devastating. Not a few holy and illustrious men realized that the root of the evil was in the *mixed priestly training* then in vogue. The absence of virtue and ecclesiastical discipline was due to the fact that, even the clerics scientifically trained in Colleges and Universities, living as they did immersed in the world, could hardly remain unaffected and untarnished by the frivolity and worldliness that surrounded them.

For this reason the authentic pioneers of the most urgently needed reform on priestly training, made efforts in putting up schools exclusively destined to the formation of the clergy, similar to the old episcopal schools, prelude and dawn of the Tridentine Seminaries. Among these farsighted pioneers we should recall the names of John Standonck (1453-1504), Blessed John of Avila (1500-1569), St. Ignatius of Loyola (1491-

¹¹ G. Pellicia, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

¹² G. Cenacchi, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

1556), St. Cajetan (1480-1547), and specially Cardinal Reginald Pole (1500-1558) in the Council of London (a. 1556).¹³

But the evil that undermined authentic priestly training was already very deeply entrenched. The harm done by the scandals of the clergy in general ignited in the XVI century the explosion of the Protestant reform. The Church was impelled to countermove: and true Catholic reform was elaborated in the Council of Trent, mainly with through the famous Decree on the Seminaries.

To be continued

¹³ Ibid., loc. cit.

DOCTRINAL SECTION

IS SELF-ABUSE GRIEVOUSLY SINFUL?

● **PEDRO LUMBRERAS, O. P.**

To commit a grievous sin against natural law three things must be considered: grave matter, full knowledge, and perfect consent.

Full knowledge supposes that a man has sound judgment and is aware of the grave malice of an act. It means he knows this act is incompatible with the ultimate end, either because it is indecent, or because it is strictly forbidden, or because it is vulgarly against good customs.

But it does not set precisely that he should be aware of the whole malice of the act, or that he is offending God if he does it; or that he would be sinning against this virtue rather than against another. Neither does it require precisely an actual knowledge in the moment of doing the act. Virtual knowledge suffices. Virtual knowledge is acquired when foreseeing the future absence of knowledge the cause was placed without justifiable reason.

Lastly, neither does it require precisely a clear and distinct knowledge. It suffices that there lurks a suspicion with foundation about the gravity of the act, or that there is a doubt that the act may be a mortal sin. For then there is an awareness of the danger of sinning grievously.

Perfect consent includes, besides full knowledge, a free will having a dominion over its acts. It is therefore capable of resisting innate or acquired tendencies and internal or external incitements of sin.

Therefore, a man who is unconscious or semi-conscious or a pathological case with slight or no dominion over his acts, cannot be guilty grievously of self-abuse. But these cases are obviously not ordinary, so we omit them here.

“Reason, according to St. Thomas, directs human acts in accordance with a two-fold knowledge, universal and particular: because in conferring about what is to be done, it employs a syllogism, the conclusion of which is an act of judgment or of choice or an operation. Now actions are about singulars: wherefore, the conclusion of a practical syllogism is a singular proposition. But a singular proposition does not follow from a universal proposition except through the medium of a particular proposition.” (*I-II*, 76, 1.)

Thus, in the face of a temptation of fornication for example, we ask ourselves: "Shall I do it or avoid it? Evidently we seek what is good and avoid what is evil: but pleasure or delight is among the good, and sin among evil. To make a reply, reason considers the act in question under one of these formalities. For example: Sin must be avoided, but this act is sinful; therefore, I must avoid this act. On the other hand, reason may proceed thus: Delight must be enjoyed, but this act is delightful; therefore I must do it.

The effect of a double cause can be impeded by suppressing one of these two. If the major premise or universal proposition is missing or if the minor particular proposition is absent, then the mentioned consequence will not take place.

Now, the knowledge of a universal proposition may be absent habitually through inadvertence. However, since the human acts which reason directs, are singular—human acts which should be executed or omitted here and now and in these circumstances and which should presently be considered good or evil,—the mere absence of awareness or advertence suffices to impede the mentioned conclusion.

This inadvertence is brought about by lack of consideration, because we don't pay attention, or we don't reflect; or by something incompatible with this consideration, which hinders us from paying attention or from reflecting. In the first case, we don't compare the two terms: fornication and sin; in the second, the comparison disturbs us. In both cases, the result is that reason does not judge or conclude that this act should be avoided; without which therefore, it may judge or conclude that the act should be performed.

As regards ignorance of the universal proposition or as in this case, of the natural law, St. Thomas insisted that, if the most general precepts, being self evident and not demanding discourse, cannot be ignored or forgotten by any man with the use of reason, the other secondary precepts necessarily linked to the first principles, already suppose a discourse or reasoning, which is not a universal patrimony; although some, by reason of their being proximate or immediate conclusions come to the knowledge of man with marked facility. Other precepts however, which are remote or mediate conclusions demand attention and study to which not all men can possibly dedicate themselves. (*I-II*, 94, 46).

Among the precepts which come to man's notice with the least effort, St. Thomas includes the ten commandments which "as they were given for all men, so they are offered for the appraisal of all, as pertaining to natural reason. (*II-II* 56, 1).

But every precept involves an idea of something which should be performed or omitted, the concept of an obligation or a debt; and these precepts deal with those acts whose commission or omission is more manifestly an obligation. (*II-II*, 122, a.1 ad 1).

Now, St. Tomas reminds us that the reason of obligation due to a precept appears more clearly in justice which deals with our relationship with others. Consequently, in that which pertains to others, it is evident that man is obliged to give what is due to them. (*Ibidem*). Hence, the precepts of the Ten Commandments are exclusively precepts of justice. As in the Mosaic law, adultery was so prohibited inasmuch as it appropriates what belongs to another: an illicit relation with the wife of another. (*Ibid.*, q. 170, a.1).

But simple fornication was not forbidden in this law, because it supposes the mutual consent of two persons who are free and it appears at first glance that man is master of his own self and is free to do what he pleases. (*Ibid.*, q. 122, a.1.). The malice, therefore, of a simple fornication is not discovered at first glance.

If in spite of the fact that robbery is against justice, there were yet some people who believed in its lawfulness. It should not be surprising then that a man in certain period of his life may be ignorant of the unlawfulness of fornication. (*ibid.*, q. 122, a.1).

While, in this case or other similar cases, the knowledge of universal proposition is hindered by bad training, or hindered by the environment in which one lives or by other causes, the absence of actual consideration of a particular proposition finds its inculpability in antecedent passion. (To this passion, which is previous to the movement of the rational appetite and incites what moves in the identical direction or towards what it has for its object, it is easy to reduce those habits called involuntary, the tendencies due to one's temperament, and including the dynamic unconscious so much used by certain modern writers.)

Even knowing that fornication is evil or sinful, yet the passion can drag us to judge this fornication as something for our own good.

Concerning this aspect, Cardinal Cajetan (*Commentary to I-II*, 77, 1.) reminds us that the animal appetite goes primarily after what is convenient to a composite and at a pace that by natural appetite every faculty follows its own convenience.

Hence, when a passion is strongly incited, it is not only the sensitive appetite that is impressed or moved, but the whole man is changed and diversely disposed to what he was before: And disposed thus: what was not convenient to him before, is convenient to him now.

Finding it convenient in these circumstances, the estimative power or particular reason judges its convenience to him effectively. And this judgment is ratified by the universal reason which, in dealing with singular cases, gives much importance to the estimative or cogitative power.

It is useless to argue with one embroiled in a fight to death, that justice will overtake him, that he will be put in prison, that he will probably die at

the hands of an executioner. In vain is the wife's supplication at his feet, expressing the children's sad plight: poverty, ostracism, and the infamy which will be the future of the family.

The savage call of vengeance must be deflected by a stronger force; so that the soothing voice of prudence can dominate the man.

Passion hinders the act, e.g. of fornication from being considered by reason in its aspect as sin; thus, it disturbs reason from arriving at the right conclusion: namely; this act must be avoided.

While that consideration or comparison of the act with sin hinders him temporarily from making a sinful act, it at the same time, induces him to consider the act as delightful. And when delight, which is the good of man, overcome by passion, gains over reason, it suggests another universal proposition fitted to a man disposed thus. And reason makes this syllogism: What is delightful should be sought. But this act is delightful therefore...

And so, reason imitates a judge who listens carefully with avidity, to what one party claims; but listens weakly and negligently to the arguments of the other then pronounces his sentence when in reality he ought to have given a sentence based on given proofs and allegations.

Through an impartial consideration, reason would have judged thus: this act, though delightful, should be avoided. Instead, it precipitates a solution: this act, though sinful, should be performed.

It was the will which detained reason in the almost exclusive consideration of delight; then sent it to its rash judgement: And finally the will pushed reason to its proper choice; when it should have denied the choice, or at least postponed it. It should have imposed upon reason a calmer examination of the case.

Over provoking the inadvertence of intelligence, passion weakens the energy or resistance of the will.

"Since all the soul's powers are rooted in the one essence of the soul, it follows of necessity that, when the power is intent in its act, another power becomes remiss or is even altogether impeded in its act, both because all energy is weakened through being divided, so that, on the contrary, thought being centered on one thing, it is less able to be directed to several. And because, in the operations of the soul, a certain attention is required, if this be closely fixed in one thing, less attention is given to another. In this way, by a kind of distraction, when the movement of the sensitive appetite is enforced with respect to any passion whatever, the proper movement of the rational appetite or will must of necessity become remiss and altogether impeded." (*I-II*, 77, 1).

In short, the powers of the soul are limited, so the more powers there are utilized by passion, the less there remain at the service of the will.

However, as long as there remains the use of reason which allows a man to notice the malice of an act, then a certain freedom exists.

The question now is whether the weakening of the will as well as that of the advertence provoked by Passion, affects knowledge and consent which are necessary with respect to sin.

St. Thomas answers the query when after showing the influence of passion over the will and the intelligence, he asks if passion excuses from sin or at least from grievous sin.

He answers the first: "A passion is sometimes so strong as to take away, the use of reason altogether, as in the case of those who are madly in love or angry... Sometimes, however, the passion is not such as to take away the use of reason altogether, and then reason can drive the passion away, turning to other thoughts, or it can prevent it from having its full effect since the members are not put to work, except by the consent of reason. Wherefore such a passion does not excuse from sin altogether." (*I-II*, 77, a. 7).

To the second he offers an analogous answers: "Mortal sin consists in turning away from our last end which is God; which turning away pertains to the deliberating reason, whose function is also to direct towards the end. Therefore that which is contrary to the last end can happen not to be a mortal sin, only when the deliberating reason is unable to come to the rescue which is the case in sudden movements.

"Now when anyone proceeds from passion to a sinful act or to a deliberate consent, this does not happen suddenly; and so the deliberating reason can come to the rescue here, since it can drive the passion away or at least prevent it from having its effect; wherefore if it does not come to the rescue; there is mortal sin; and it is thus, as we see that many murders and adulteries are committed through passion." (*I-II*, 77, a8). It is evident to St. Thomas that as long as reason is capable of deliberating before arriving at the performance of the sinful act provoked by passion, the will sins grievously by not resisting the passion, although the non-resistance is due to failure of deliberation. The will finds itself in the place of a superior judge, who, conscious of the unjust sentence given by a subaltern judge, still confirms it and does not stop its execution.

Against the tendency of a few who like to limit grievous sin to the ordinary perverse attitude of a sinner, and do not see gravity in an isolated sin motivated by passion but only in a more or less firm habit of sin, we have the traditional definition of sin as an inordinate act. We also have the common doctrine which states that sinful acts and not the depraved habits are the necessary matter of the sacrament of Penance.

Likewise, we have the classical distinction given by Aristotle (cfr. St. Thomas, *In 7 Ethicorum*, lect. 7) between incontinent and immoderate sin-

ners. The habitual disposition of the former is to resist inordinate passions. If they succumb once or more times it happens momentarily. Hence repentance is easy and almost immediate to them. Hence when St. Peter denied Christ, he did not apostatize from Christ. Neither did the merchant board the boat with that idea, when forced by the storm, he threw his merchandise overboard. But "in fear the will consents to the act though not for its own sake, but to avoid the evil which is feared. This satisfies the condition of a voluntary act, since the voluntary is not only what we wish for its own end, but also what we wish for the sake of something else as an end." (*II-II*, 6, 6 ad 1).

In the same way, in the case of another circumstances, a man in the height of passion does what he may not like to do when not under its influence. Yet, passion makes him like to do it.

After giving the preceding explanations, it is easy to give a solution to the problem expressed by the title of this article.

In the first place, the designated act: "Self-abuse," also called voluntary pollution, masturbation, onanism, and solitary vice, is considered objectively as a grievous sin. This is one of the points in which Catholic theologians agree.

And figuring among the errors condemned by Pope Innocent V is this statement: Self abuse is not prohibited by natural law. Hence, if it is not forbidden by God, then it should be good to do it frequently, and in some cases obligatory. (*Denz.* 1199).

Likewise on August 2, 1929, The Holy Office answered in the negative the question whether masturbation procured directly to obtain sperm by means of which the contagious disease blemorrhagia may be detected and possibly cured. (*Denz.* 1199).

Pope Pius XI in his encyclical: "*On Christian Marriage*" said: "By natural and divine law, the use of the generative faculty is allowed only to married couples and within the just bounds of Matrimony." (*Denz.* 2230).

That lust admits of no parvity in matter, is a principle universally accepted in Catholic Theology.

Now, we proceed to another question. Does self-abuse cease to be sinful or grievously sinful due to imperfection or lack of knowledge or of consent?

First, total ignorance of its malice is possible. Because, if men could be ignorant of the Ten Commandments, conclusions close to the first principles of natural law at least for certain period of time, the more he can be when some very particular circumstances intervene. Some example, are the malice of stealing to help the poor, the malice of homicide in mercy killing to relieve the dying of intense pain, the malice of perjury to save an innocent man

from death. There are other precepts of the natural law, proximate or remote conclusions such as the prohibition of fornication, analogous to onanism which man could easily and persistently be ignorant of.

This total ignorance is due to negative causes, such as when a man has not reasoned out to heap it upon himself; or when he has not received necessary instructions to expel it by means of an opposite knowledge.

This ignorance is also due to positive causes in many occasions, such as prejudices either personal, collective or historical; social or domestic atmosphere, passions, visions, customs and evil persuasions, mentioned by St. Thomas. (*Summa Theologica*, I-II, 94, 4 & 6)

These evil persuasions are becoming rampant today in magazines, books and newspapers which defend in disguised or clear arguments, the lawfulness or even the necessity of self-abuse to relieve or satisfy one's self.

It is evident then that when this total and invincible ignorance exists, there is no ground for talking of sin or at least of mortal sin. Because, there the malice or grave malice of self-abuse is involuntary.

Where such total ignorance is absent, can we say: Passion suffices to impede awareness and consent necessary for an act to be a grievous sin?

Pius XII answers: We reject as erroneous the assertion of those who regard lapses as inevitable in adolescence, and therefore as not worthy of serious notice, as though they were not grave faults, because, they as a general rule destroy the freedom needed for an act to be morally imputable." (*AAS*, 44, 1952, page 275).

As expressly stated, it deals of general rules, not of ordinary happenings. No one doubts that in some cases the impetus of passion can be so strong as to deprive a man of the use of reason.

The Holy Father spoke of adolescence in which, according to some statistics, self-abuse is the most ordinary occurrence all over the world.

How about Masturbation from the time of the use of reason up to puberty?

First, note that during this period the sexual instinct is not ordinarily well developed. If in some cases, it is effectively so, there is room for mitigation of responsibility. But by this, it does not mean these acts are just venial sins even if provoked by passion because they are not always venial, nor with such frequency as among pubescents.

In fact the Church considers them as gifted with sufficient freedom as to allow them to make private vows and even to ask for baptism, which in many cases means changing their religion.

And since they are obliged to go to confession at least once a year, this pre-supposes that they are capable of grievous sins.

I like to end this article with the brief observation of a serene and well thought study of the most recent writings of the topic in question.

"The results of our investigation into the problem of the imputability of acts of masturbation seem to leave little doubt that the normal male engaged in such activity cannot ordinarily be excused from the stigma of serious formal sin. This general rule, we believe, holds true for all stages of development in which these acts occur. To be sure, there is a graduation of guilt to be observed according as the individual progresses in intellectual and moral maturity. It is true that the child and early adolescent cannot, as a rule, be held equally responsible for these acts on the same level with the late adolescent and adult. Ordinarily, however, this graduation of guilt will mean a lesser degree of mortal sin rather than a reduction of guilt to the point of venial sin. At all stages, such factors as ignorance, passion, habit, the dynamic unconscious, or abnormal psychic conditions will occasionally reach such proportions as to prevent the *full advertence* and *perfect consent* required for serious subjective sin, but these instances cannot be regarded as representing the ordinary situation. The more usual effect of these factors will be to reduce personal responsibility, without, however destroying the minimum advertence and consent required for mortal sin." (Kosnik, *The Imputability of Acts of Masturbation among Males*, Rome, 1961, p. 103).

CORRIGENDUM

INTRODUCTION on Index and page 478 of the
July 1969 issue should read INSTRUCTION.

PASTORAL SECTION

HOMILETICS

September 7

15th SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

Since New Year, you have been hearing, from time to time, that there is to be a new and (for our lifetime surely) final form of Mass. Well, it begins on the first Sunday of Advent — 30th of November — less than three months from now. So today, let's consider some aspects of the new Mass.

THE NEW MASS

After November 30, the Mass will be what the Church has been gradually working up to in the various reforms recently. Mass facing the people, then more and more in the vernacular, and the progressive simplifying of the ceremonies have been leading up to this. Maybe you felt dissatisfied, at times, that the Mass was neither here nor there, but it helped us to endure the hardships of the journey if we know where we are going.

Mass can be described as an encounter with God in Christ. Now, we come to know a person in several ways. First of all, by listening to him, really attentively listening to what he has to say to us. To be thinking about something else while he is speaking to us (even if it is something in some way connected with him) will surely prevent our ever knowing him properly.

Mass is a dialogue, a sacred conversation between God and His people. He speaks to us, really speaks to us, in the first part of the Mass. And, beginning November 30, more so than ever before — we'll hear a much more complete selection of His words. A course covering three years, with three short readings every Sunday — first, His message from the Old Covenant; then, from the inspired writers of the New Covenant; and lastly, from His own Son, the Word Incarnate, speaking to us now. "At this time, Jesus *says*".

Now, in a dialogue or conversation, we listen when the other person is speaking. We don't read while someone we love is talking to us (that would be the height of bad manners). We *listen*. More than that, when we are united by mutual affection for a common friend, we listen *together* to what he has to say. Suppose a group go to a meet a friend at the airport, don't they all listen together? How else can we explain why so many go to the airport to hear the message of the President when he returns from overseas? We could read what he had to say in the newspapers, but somehow it's more personal, more intimate, to listen together than to read alone.

The boy, Samuel, asleep in the temple, was awakened by God's call. The first two times, he didn't realize Who was calling him, and ran to the high priest, Heli. Heli advised him to calmly listen to God's message. At the third call, "Samuel, Samuel", he answered, "Speak, Lord, your servant is listening". (1 Sam. 3,10.) We could have no better disposition at the time of the readings at Mass. "Teach me the way I should go". (Ps. 142, 8.)

Now, we don't just listen to a human friend, we respond to what he says. If he suggests an action in common, we eagerly join him in it. Just the same at Mass — we welcome God's word with faith, and we respond to Our Lord's invitation to join Him in His great act of worship. And that means that we commit ourselves, along with Him, to making our whole lives an act of praise to God our Father, and a loving service of our brothers and sisters in Christ.

This will be a result of the new Mass, an intensifying of the life Christ came to give us: "I am come that they may live, and live more intensely". Today's prayer after the Sacred Meal sums it up: "Father, may the working of Holy Communion take hold of us, mind and body, so that what prevails in us will not be our notions and wishes, but *its* effectiveness. Amen."

September 14

16th SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

TRIUMPH OF THE HOLY CROSS

"And I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to Myself."
(Gospel)

One day, during His lifetime, Our Lord Jesus Christ summed up in one sentence His program of Christian living. "I always do the things that please My Father," He said. (Jn. 8, 29.) Let us not be vague about what this means. It means doing the Father's will, accepting the crosses and trials of life, i.e. not dragging the cross unwillingly or bitterly, but "filling up what is wanting in the sufferings of Christ for the sake of His Body, the Church".

This does not mean that we just accept the ills and injustices of life without doing anything about them. Communists sometimes taunt Christians with having "pie in the sky when you die" attitude. (Pay now, fly later). Christians are sometimes accused of being so interested in the next world that they do nothing about making this one better. The correct attitude is seen in his prayer of a famous theologian; "Give us, Lord, the patience to accept the things we cannot change, the courage to change the things we should, and the wisdom to know the difference."

In the spirit of today's celebration, we realize that there can be no resurrection without a cross, and we resolve to live out our Mass by Christ—like patience in unavoidable crosses. But, at the same time, we recall that the cross was the culminating point of a lifetime of

service of man, of "going good". He presented Himself as servant to the world's needs, "I have stood among you as a servant". It was not only by His death on the cross that He redeemed us; His whole life of service saved us. And we, baptized into His death at baptism, continue that work.

So, while patiently carrying unavoidable crosses, we strive might and main to remove suffering and misery, hatred and injustice, from the world. Our union with Christ demands that we be concerned and forces us to be actively concerned. Here is the main fruit to be expected from the form of Mass coming up in November.

If we enter wholeheartedly into this new way of celebrating, we will just have to leave selfishness and self-centered individualism behind. We will become more and more aware that "we are a family—children of a common rather, brothers and sisters in Christ. The togetherness we feel at a successful family re-union, realizing that all present are united in mutual love and ready to work for the good of the family; that and much more, is what we should carry from Sunday Mass in the future.

But, remember, none of these things will happen unless we are enthusiastically open to this important development. To say, "I'll just wait and see how the new Mass affects me" would not be nearly enough; still less to say, "If it's coming I'll have to accept it, but don't expect me to get involved." We've been passive too long. We've regarded Mass as a private affair far too long. The Eucharist has infinite power to bring us closer to one another because it brings us closer to Christ; to form into "one body, all who partake of the one bread". This power is frustrated if we deliberately cut ourselves off from one another and refuse to take an active part in the Mass.

By getting right into this holiest of all activities, singing with the voices God gave us, listening eagerly with open hearts to God's plans for us, responding generously by joining Christ's sacrifice, striving to have His attitude as described in today's Epistle, and making our life an extension, a living out of one Mass, then we'll see results.

We'll come from Mass renewed and refreshed, (we could even say 'recreated'), for another week of Christian living; loving and serving God by striving to make His world a better place.

September 21

17th SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

LOVE IS THE FULFILLMENT OF THE LAW

"On these two commandments hang the whole law and the prophets."
(Gospel)

The first Council of the Church was held in Jerusalem in the time of the Apostles. Its purpose was to preserve unity in the Church, to make sure that converts from the Jewish religion and those from paganism would

live in peace and harmony together. (Acts 15). The very same purpose inspired the most recent of the Councils — Vatican II. And we'll see one of the most important means the Council availed itself of once we have the finalized form of Mass next November. Its chief purpose could well be described as the forming and deepening of our awareness that we are a family, not just the human family, because of sharing the same nature, but God's family, because in and through Christ we share Him life so intimately and marvelously that we become one with Christ and one with each other.

We are really one at Mass—one in and with Christ. The Mass is the source of unity. We take part as brothers and equals in the celebration. We share the Divine Source of life with one another at Communion. If we don't see our oneness at the time of Mass, when else shall we possibly see it?

In the past, maybe, there was some excuse for rugged individualism. Nothing more, we thought, was expected of us than to put in an appearance at Mass, busy ourselves with anything pious, no matter how remotely connected with the sacred action going on. Even if we couldn't see the altar or hear anything at all, we fulfilled our obligation, we need not be afraid of going to Hell, at least on that score.

But now, its different. If taking part in the Mass is to be a living force in our lives, connected with our daily living, we just must use our human powers at Mass. Sunday Mass is meant to be the focus of our lives, not something apart, cut off from life. The whole week should be a follow up of the last Sunday's Mass, and a lead up to the next.

So we're not to turn off our listening powers during the readings and the sermon. The new Mass will help us here, because the three-year cycle of readings and the inclusion of Old Testament selections, will remove the impression: "We heard all that last year, and the year before, and the year before that". But it's not just to relieve boredom—it's to give us God's complete message. If we stir up our faith, realize that it is Christ speaking and that He is speaking to us—"He that has ears to hear, let him hear". Then we will be wholehearted in answering the responses, and especially the singing. We all know from experience how joining in community singing removes loneliness and isolation. We will realize we are a community, and are on our way to building up that community spirit which is at the heart of our religion, if we force ourselves out of our shells, and clear the air with song. Singing unites persons in action, action involving their whole selves. Community singing has a very large place in the new Mass. Let us see to it that it is not ragged. One need not be a Mario Lanza—use the voice God gave you. "Sing to the Lord a new canticle, for He has some wonderful things."

Our Lord's whole moral teaching is summed up in the command to love, to preserve unity. Love God as much as we possibly can and our neighbour as ourself. All our duties to one another are covered by this. The prohibitions against murder, adultery, theft, etc., are all included in the single command to love our neighbour—to preserve unity.

More is asked of us than to refrain from hurting others—we must show positive love for all people. There will be no holding back once the meaning of the Mass is so clear that we cannot help seeing it.

Either we give up Mass, or become more involved in an active concern for our brothers.

The Mass is the great means God uses to help us to love more. Everything He has done for us is contained in the Mass. Recalling and making present the death and resurrection of Our Lord, it sums up all the love God has for man. And, when it's meaning is so obvious as to need no explanation, we will return love for love. From the special outpouring of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of unity, that occurs during the Mass, we'll love our Father and each one of our brothers with the very Love of God Himself. "He that loves the brotherhood, the love of God has come to complete growth in him." (1 Jn. 2, 16.)

September 28

18th SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST

COMMUNAL ADMISSION OF SINFULNESS

"Courage, son, your sins are forgiven" (Gospel)

We associate this gospel story with the sacrament of forgiveness, where we lay our sins and burdens at the feet of the merciful Christ, and are reconciled with Him and the Church, which our sinfulness has harmed. Our meeting with Christ is as real and as personal as that of the paralytic carried in on his bed. He is as 'simpatico', as approachable and forgiving now as He was then. And our wondering amazement that God "has given such power to men" should make us as grateful as Jesus' contemporaries.

But it is not only in connection with the Sacrament of repentance that this lesson applies. A Christian's life should be one of continual repentance. Our sinfulness, our selfish coldness and heartless indifference to others, our apathy and refusal to do what we can to alleviate human misery — these do not affect me alone, they harm the whole Christ, Jesus and all those joined to Him, the community of the baptized. Our life of friendship with Him is not somehow separated from His brothers and ours. He needs us to reach out to others, and our refusal to let Him do so calls for constant and *communal repentance*.

So, do not be surprised to hear that a feature of the new Mass is a penitential act done together by priest and laity. We are already accustomed to the idea from the prayers at the foot of the altar. They will no longer be said, but communal repentance will have a place. Mass will begin with a procession, and during it there will hymn greeting Christ, our invisible Priest, and telling God how glad we are to be at Mass. He has gathered us together and He is in our midst. After greeting the altar and the congregation the priest will call on us all publicly — at the same time, along with himself — to acknowledge our sinfulness, our failure to show all the love that God and our brothers deserve.

The chief reason for this silent reflection on our shortcomings, and public admission that they have lessened Christ's effectiveness in the Community, is to seek public reconciliation in a community setting. We admit our failure in love, and our desire to be reconciled to the whole

Christ. With heads bowed, and in a deep common silence where one could hear a pin drop, it's easier to pray and to face up honestly to our sinfulness, and then with one heart to ask God for forgiveness, and sincerely promise to strive harder to see and serve Christ in our neighbour, to love to serve others as Christ did.

A helpful by-product of this feature of the new Mass will be a more mature and grown-up approach to our sacramental meeting with Christ. We will not think of it as a kind of magic wash-cloth for wiping sins away. We will really examine our conscience, not just to see if we have broken any of the ten commandments, or neglected some obligation, (religion is a lot more than doing certain things or avoiding certain things — it is striving to be perfect in love, as our heavenly Father is perfect). No, we will get down to the selfishness and pride at the root of our sins. And we'll resolve that others will no longer suffer, nor will the Church be the loser, from anything we have done or neglected to do.

Best of all, we will see our confessor as the representative of the Christian community which we have harmed, and as the representative of Jesus, the Head of the community to God directly — the only way God ever contacts us is through other men, or through things that can be seen like a burning bush, a pillar of cloud or fire.

One last remark — this penitential act at the beginning of Mass is a sacramental, and will itself be quite sufficient for forgiving venial sins, or doubtful mortal sins. Sacramental confession is only necessary before Communion if we are quite certain that we have been so wicked as to deserve Hell. then, will the Eucharist be our daily bread, and the Mass that begun with a common admission of sinfulness will be rounded off by all of us partaking of the "one bread that makes us one body."

LAYMAN'S VIEW

1966 — THE YEAR OF THE DEATH OF GOD

The year 1966 called the attention of the public and those in academic circles, believers and non-believers alike, to the presence in America of a group of radical thinkers who styled themselves the death-of-God theologians. Although their number is insignificant (in fact most writers seem to be agreed that only three are worth really noticing — they are Thomas Altizer of Atlanta's Emory University, William Hamilton of Colgate Rochester Divinity School, and Paul van Buren of Temple University)¹, nevertheless they achieved national prominence and stature because of the wide coverage of their views afforded them by leading weeklies and magazines. The *Time* magazine of April 8, 1966 (Asia Edition), for instance, featured a cover article entitled "Is God Dead?". It was expected as a matter of course that Catholics should react, and so the deluge of literature in Catholic magazines on the subject that same year came as no surprise. The death-of-God theologians welcomed heartily the national and international attention directed to them and they had, in fact, an explanation to justify it. Thomas W. Ogletree who wrote a book appraising the new "leftist" theology quotes Hamilton and Altizer as claiming that the sensationalism and publicity surrounding the death-of-God theology forms the "journalistic phase" necessary in the develop-

¹ Paul van Buren and the American sociologist Gabriel Vahannian are at times not regarded strictly as death-of-God theologians because the former seems to approach the question of God merely from the viewpoint of linguistic analysis, whereas the latter approaches it as a cultural historian describing the temper of the age. For a delightful treatment of Vahannian's views, see John L'Heureux's "On the Eight Day: The Death of God in Contemporary Literature", *The Critic*, June-July, 1966. For a short discussion of van Buren, see Boniface A. Willems, O.P. "The Death of God Phenomenon", *The Catholic World*, October, 1966. See also: E. L. Mascall, "Reflections on the 'Honest to God' Debate", *Thought*, XLI (Summer, 1966).

ment of this radical theology.² And now that preliminary tussels have occurred between these ultra-radical theologians and the zealous guardians of the Christian faith, both camps will naturally look and attend to their defenses, and one will expect more records of their theological skirmishes in the future.

The tenets of the death-of-God group (or groups, because apparently the leaders also maintain theological differences with one another) might strike one as surprising, to say the least. What is not surprising, however, is the fact that this group grew its roots in America, not anywhere else. One might even expect it of America. Someone could point a finger at Europe which has already produced a Bultmann and a Bonhoeffer as a natural breeding-place of this new theology. But then one could just as easily point out the social and economic situations in America as pre-disposing elements to such a revolutionary theological perspective. American social life is characterized by mobility and anonymity, the necessary off-shoots of urban life. The hustle and bustle of city life and the attendant strains on persons that it entails—all these have contributed to the breakdown of *personal Communication*, an element so vital in any relationship, and perhaps, more so in the case of a relationship with God. The economic situation, on the other hand, seems to demand only efficiency, and therefore, technology is oriented towards speed and precision, practicability, maximum output at minimum input. This fixation has given rise to the distinctly American brand of philosophy known as *pragmatism*, whether found in its cultivated and refined form as in the philosophy of William James and John Dewey, or in any of its bourgeois forms like moonlighting, get-rich-quick-schemes or plain whatever-works-attitude. I think that from pragmatism the death-of God theology is not too far removed. I do not mean to say that anyone who is an avowed pragmatist necessarily slides on to death-of-God theology. But there are indications that the proponents of the death-of-God theology suffer from a lack of *living experience* of God, and it is this empty feeling that has

² *The Death of God Controversy* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), p. 12.

Some of the leading Catholic magazines in the US that featured articles on the controversy are: *America*, *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, *The Critic*, *The Catholic World*, *The Catholic Mind*, *Ave Maria*, and *Jubilee*.

led them to explain God away. One then wonders whether this lack of experience of God is in turn precipitated by the pragmatic outlook of the individual as well as that of society. So much is hinted at when they claim, for instance, that it is the "recognition of common ends and values, not religious belief, which holds society together".³ Robert M. Hutchins, a former president of the University of Chicago, has summed up the situation very well by arguing in his book *The Learning Society* that Americans have failed in making a distinction between *training* and *education*, and that they have also made the mistake of setting as their goal "the exaltation of manpower over mankind, and the relegation of men to the status of servants of their culture".⁴

I will confine myself in this discussion to a treatment of William Hamilton and Thomas Altizer, in whose writings the experience of the absence of God seems to be more pronounced than in any of the other advocates of death-of-God theology.

William Hamilton is not a classical atheist, if by classical atheist one understands someone who says God never was, is not, and never will be. He admits that God *existed*—a transcendent being who deserved praise and adoration. He was, however, incarnated in the person of Jesus Christ, and since Christ suffered, died on a cross and buried, never to resurrect, God is therefore dead.⁵ That is in short the crux

³ Frederick Copleston, "Man, Transcendence and God", *Thought*, XLIII (Spring, 1968), p. 25.

In an article, Father James V. Schall claims that the death-of-God theology stems from the rejection of Aristotle and reveals the Classic Protestant dilemma: a conflict between loyalty to God and loyalty to the world. I do not see an essential conflict between Father Schall's statement and my own view as developed later. I find in fact in Father Schall's view a confirmation. When in a person the experience of the world becomes too real and begins to overshadow the experience of the transcendent, then one can understand how such a conflict is resolved by the pronouncement "God is dead". See "The Secular City and God", *The Catholic World*, October, 1966.

⁴ *Time* (Asia Edition), August 2, 1968, p. 46.

⁵ Walter Bado, "Is God Dead?", *The Homiletic and Pastoral Review*, June, 1966, p. 731. This article contains a short summary of distinctions be-

of his theology. The confirmation of this speculative aspect of his theology lies in an existential condition, that of "a very real experience, a feeling that God is not there".⁶ Hamilton himself expresses it thus: "But it is not a simple not-having, for there is an experience of loss. Painful for some, not so for others, it is loss nonetheless. The loss is not of the idols, or of the God of theism, but of the God of the Christian tradition".⁷ This experience is not founded on the individual level alone, but on the level of world society as well. Again Hamilton says in "The Death of God Theologies Today" published in the Spring 1965 issue of the *Christian Scholar*: "It is not just that a capacity has dried up within us; we do not take all this as merely a statement about our frail psyches, we take it as a statement about the nature of the world and we try to convince others. God is dead. We are not talking about the absence of the experience of God, but about the experience of the absence of God".⁸ The lack of experience of God (or the experience of the absence of God, as he chooses to call it) in world society is attested to by revolutions and wars, occurring in such rapid succession since the French revolution. This fact, according to Hamilton, cannot be reconciled with the idea of a transcendent God, who, with power, wisdom, justice, and love, directs the destinies of men. Father Robert Adolfs quotes Hamilton as having remarked, as early as 1961, in his book *The New Essence of Christianity*, that "when we speak of the death of God we speak not only of the death of idols or of the falsely objectivized Being in Heaven: we also speak of our own vanished capacity to "fasten onto any traditional image of God... and we wonder if God himself has not vanished".⁹

tween the death-of-God theologians, the classic atheists, and the *secularists*.

For the differences between the death-of-God group and the so-called "process theologians", see Richard E. Weingert's "Process or Decide?", *Encounter*, XXIX (Spring, 1968).

⁶ Anthony T. Padovano, "The Death of God and the Life of Man", *Ave Maria*, October 1, 1966, p. 16.

⁷ "American Theology, Radicalism, and the Death of God", in *Radical Theology and Death of God*, with Dr. Thomas Altizer (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1966), p. 6. I shall refer to this work in succeeding citations simply as *Radical Theology*.

⁸ *Radical Theology*, p. 28.

⁹ "Is God Dead?", *Jubilee*, July, 1966, p. 34.

The view I have expressed, namely, that it is only his inability to come to a live experience of God that has moved Hamilton to declare God is dead, is further bolstered by the fact that he does not completely close the door on God but leaves it slightly ajar. Father Bado says that Hamilton "leaves open the possibility that further questioning on his part will lead him personally to the re-affirmation of the transcendent God—but only on condition that this transcendence play a meaningful role in his experience".¹⁰ If Father Bado is right when he points out, too, that Hamilton, in proposing his *Christian atheism*, demands that one of man's important tasks is to *rethink* man and human culture not so much in terms of sin as in terms of man's confidence and prospects of facing the worsening future, then one can detect in his preoccupation with the reality of sin the dried up oasis within the soul from which his theological speculations originate. The Broadway playwright William Alfred expresses it thus: "People who tell me there is no God are like a six-year-old boy saying there is no such thing as passionate love—they just haven't experienced it".¹¹

Now let us turn our attention to Dr. Thomas Altizer. He agrees basically with Hamilton in saying that God "emptied Himself" in Christ, and since Christ no longer rose from the dead, God did not "jump back to heaven". He claims that this truth had been received by him in a vision.¹² This revelation is right from the start suspect and subject to doubt; even his colleagues in the death-of-God theology have a few words of criticism which are rather damaging. William Hamilton describes Altizer's views as "logically imprecise"; he further thinks that Altizer "finds it a painful thing to have to affirm the death of God, and it is clear he wishes things were otherwise".¹³ Paul van Buren confesses that he simply does not understand him.¹⁴ On the Catholic side, Paul Hallinan, bishop of Atlanta where Dr. Altizer teaches, presents him as "an evangelist, appalled and dismayed at the heartless-

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 732.

¹¹ *Time* (Asia Edition), April 8, 1966, p. 49.

¹² Walter Bado, *Ibid.*, p. 731.

¹³ "Death of God Theologies Today", in *Radical Theology*, pp. 29-31.

¹⁴ Paul J. Hellinan, "God is Dead But Jesus Christ Lives?", *The Catholic Mind*, October, 1966, pp. 2-3.

ness of men.¹⁵ From an article entitled "*Theology and the Death of God*" comes Altizer's claim that man can no longer know "the reality of God's presence nor understand the world as his creation; or, at least, he can no longer respond—either interiorly or cognitively—to the classical images of the Creator and the creation".¹⁶ Translated into the layman's terms, what Altizer means would amount to this: "I feel that man is cold and heartless, and this indicates God is dead". We discern that in this instance, too, the cry "God is dead" springs from the inability to experience God not only within oneself, but also in others or through others. It seems to stem from an arid soul, empty of the dewdrops of God's grace; and becoming aware of the darkness within him, he projects it into the world as the darkness of contemporary man and then calls it "the body of the dead God". God's death, he goes on to proclaim, means liberation from the threat of some unknown and uncertain world, liberation from the threat of mystery.¹⁷ If these are the essential elements in his *radical immanence*, then he has drawn an excellent portrait of himself as a worthy successor to Schopenhauer's title as "The Pessimist".

In an article originally published in September, 1963, entitled "*America and the Future of Theology*", Dr. Thomas Altizer said: "A theology that chooses to meet our time, a theology that accepts the destiny of history, must first assess the theological significance of the death of God. We must realize that the death of God in an historical event, that God has died in our cosmos, in our history, and in our *Existenz*."¹⁸ Two years after this pronouncement, the Lou Harris poll

¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁶ *Radical Theology*, p. 95.

¹⁷ Walter Bado, *Ibid.*

Dr. Altizer says: "Surely it is not possible for any responsible person to think that we can any longer know or experience God in nature, in history, in economic or political arenas, in the laboratory, or in anything which is genuinely modern, whether in thought or experience. Wherever we turn in our experience, we experience the eclipse or silence of God. To refuse to accept the death of God is to evade our actual condition." *Journal of Religion*, April, 1963, pp. 106-107. Quoted by James J. Schall, S., *op. cit.*, p. 21.

¹⁸ *Radical Theology*, p. 11. Cf. James V. Schall, *Ibid.*

showed that 97 per cent of Americans maintained a belief in God.¹⁹ One of course may question the validity or accuracy of such a survey, and we are quite willing to give allowances. But the survey does show that God has not died, in the judgment of a great majority of Altizer's countrymen. There is no need then for a watered down version of Christianity as these death-of-God prophets have been proposing. As far as Christians and believers are concerned, God is dead in Altizer's cosmos, in *his* history, and *his* existence. If deicide or secularization or what-have-you must come, then it will come, as Richard Clancey says,²⁰ "only over the bodies of aroused faithful and religious, only after battling the ghosts" of the millions of Christian believers and deists who have made this world what it is—still fit to live in.

What we have said of Hamilton, namely, that the awareness of sin and evil in his experience has driven him to shout "God is dead" from the rooftops, can also be said of Altizer. Otherwise what leads him to conceive of the Christian God as "the God who in his transcendence stands over against man, and before whom man is reduced to an abject condition of guilt and dread"?²¹ Since God's death lies in a subjective experience, then as Richard Weingart says, the movement's emphasis falls on multiplicity and individualism and does not provide a unified field of experience, thus vitiating its import.²² A theology

¹⁹ *The Sign*, "Current Fact and Comment", June, 1966, p. 33.

²⁰ "The Death of God in the American Catholic College", *Thought*, XLIII (Spring, 1968), p. 40.

²¹ *The Gospel of Christian Atheism* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), p. 92.

²² "Process or Deicide?", *Encounter*, XXIX (Spring, 1968), pp. 153-157.

In an article, Robert L. Richard made an appraisal of the death-of-God theology, and finding that its generalization is founded on non-exegetical and non-historical grounds, called it "reductionist". Perhaps we could borrow his term "subjective projection" to apply what we have been trying to describe as the root cause of this theology without *theos*. See "The Challenge of 'God is Dead'", *America*, August 20, 1966.

In a similar manner, Professor van Buren has also been branded with the charge of letting "his own *secular* cast of mind become normative for judging theological validity". Martin E. Marty, "American Protestant Theology Today", *Thought*, XII (Summer, 1966), p. 175.

that has its origins in inner "feelings" overlooks the real nature of faith wherein the believer must *seize* the truth by an act of firm assent and personal commitment, and not wait rather passively to be seized by the truth. We cannot, therefore, agree with Hamilton that a theologian today is "a passive man, trusting in waiting, silence, and in a kind of prayer for the losses to be returned".²³ Above all, the affective motions of the soul must not be permitted to lord it over the rational, or this will result in mass hysteria and not *koinonia*, that fellowship of a community characterized by the virtue of charity and unity under the same conviction of one Yahweh, wise and true.

²³ "Thursday's Child", in *Radical Theology*, p. 92.

CASES AND QUERIES

IS THE SAFE PERIOD *SAFE*?

My husband and I have seven living children. We feel that in fairness to them, we should not have a new baby any more. For the past five years, after the birth of our last child, we have had no intimate relations. For us, rhythm does not work and the only way we can avoid the risk of pregnancy is by complete abstinence. At first, it seemed all right, but lately, I have noticed that our marriage is starting to "head for the rocks." I am not trying to over-emphasize the role of sex, but I believe it does have an important part in a happy marriage. Although I believe one cannot reject the teaching of the recent encyclical on birth control and still remain a good Catholic, I nevertheless find it least to accept its doctrine knowing its effect on a marriage such as ours. What shall I do?

ANSWER

Before we answer this query, it is necessary to make the following observations on this particular case.

1. We have here an example of a true Christian conscience. The wife speaks for herself alone, but we can clearly infer from her statement what kind of a Christian her husband is. The very words of the questioner itself is an evidence that this couple has entered the state of matrimony fully convinced of the Christian principles that should guide each partner's conduct with regard to the main purpose of this sacrament, its essential end which is procreation, and of the limitations, and sacrifices that the rearing of children demand. Sacrifice demands heroism and a conduct of patience that should spring from the genuine love of husband and wife for their children. The noble role likewise of marital love in matrimony is a motive that cannot be overemphasized, therefore to conform with it is a manifestation of a truly Christian conscience.

2. Although our inquirer confesses her acceptance of the papal letter *Humanae vitae*, the encyclical however, issued on the 25 of July 1968, could not have possibly inspired such conduct. The couple was already practicing continence for years before the Papal document. Only God through faith, only the Holy Spirit through the gifts of understanding and fear of the Lord, could have infused this remarkable regard for Christian values in their minds and lent support in more trying moments of their married life. To be able to explain such conduct, one should consider the life of prayer and the sacraments and, perhaps, the guiding hand of a priest or confessor since, these are the ordinary means of enlightenment and fortitude that God is wont to use. Thus, during all the years when all Catholics were impatiently awaiting the Pope's decision on the matter of periodic continence and birth control, when so many took as excuse a *dubious doubt* to turn to the pill in defiance of Church's teaching, this couple found light and strength in their faith and Christian commitment.

Let us now answer the anxious query. *What shall I do?*

The proper action to take here, we believe, without prejudice to your life of faith, prayer, and sacraments, is a reassessment of your present marital state. You should go back to your doctor, or engage a specialist for a start. One thing, nevertheless stands out — five years of complete continence, apart from the moderate advance in age, could signify a certain steadiness in your own physical set-up. However, it is not rare to hear complaints that rhythm does not work among certain couples. But a closer study afterwards reveals that rhythm in such instance, has been either wrongly understood or inadequately applied. It is hence, of no little wonder if it did not seem to work.

Although medical science has still a long way to go before perfecting the rhythm method, continuous research on the matter has yielded substantial rewards. Now, the modern methods of periodic continence rarely require a couple to abstain for more than two weeks in order to obtain the necessary security. The length of days of abstention still vary according to each person, but the essential fact remains that rhythm does offer the *safe period*. And this spells the difference between total abstention for years and periodic continence for a number of days in every cycle.

The competent authority in this field is not the priest but the doctor familiar with the latest researches in this matter and a Christian man of conscience. A genuine Christian conscience, is essential and necessary in this matter since rhythm requires a careful study and handling in each individual case. The doctor should always be on guard handling in each individual case. The doctor should always be on guard against all temptations to resort to the pill and other unapproved devices. Then again, it is now common knowledge that the old calendar method has been reliably perfected by researchs done in different parts of the world. More accurate means of recognizing when ovulation is likely to occur have been discovered. One of these methods, based on the "oestrogen symptoms in the women's cycle" was carried out in Melbourne, Australia, by Drs. John and Lyn Billings. You may find the report on these findings in the Boletin Ecclesiastico, May-June 1969, pp. 451-453.

A better tested and widely used method by several couples is the so-called *basal temperature system*. The following quotation would, perhaps, be useful to enlighten you in advance when you approach your doctor. It is quoted from the article *Scientific Basis of the Infertile Period* by Dr. John Marshall, a well-known authority on the matter. Dr. Marshall is chairman of the General Medical Committee of the Catholic Marriage Council, London. His article was reprinted in the Medical Forum on October-December 1965.

Ovulation and the Basal Temperature.

"When ovulation occurs the basal temperature rises by about half a degree Fahrenheit and persists at the higher level until the onset of the next menstrual period. By recording her temperature each morning before rising (the time required being three minutes) and marking it on a chart with a suitable scale, a woman can tell that she has ovulated. The life of the ovum as mentioned above is less than two days, so that by waiting until she has recorded the temperatures at the higher level a woman can be certain that she is infertile from that point until the onset of her next period, a span of 10 or 11 days in the average cycle. By this means prediction is eliminated; calculations are based, not upon the estimated date of the next period, but upon a fact that has already been recorded, namely the rise of temperature. The time of ovulation even in irregular cycles

can thus be determined. For this reason restriction of marital relations to the phase of the cycle after the third temperature at the higher level gives a pregnancy rate of less than one per 100 women per year which is better than conventional contraceptives and as good as intra-uterine contraceptives and 'the pill'. The evidence of this figure is given by Palmer, a distinguished French non-Catholic gynecologist in his communication to the National Society for the Study of Sterility and Fertility published in "La Contraception," Masson & Cie, Paris 1963.

"Intercourse before ovulation"

"The use of the time before the rise of temperature immediately re-introduces the element of prediction, for an estimate must be made in the light of past experience of how early in the cycle the temperature may rise. These brings in the inevitable possibility of error which in the report of Palmers is given as causing about 10 pregnancies per 100 women per year. Unfortunately the essential difference between the time before and after the rise of temperature is not always made clear to couples. Calculation of the infertile phase before the rise of temperature depends upon a prediction, hence must always carry some possibility of error; the time after the rise of temperature depends upon an observed fact and so is virtually free from error.

"The figure of 10 pregnancies per 100 women per year following use of the infertile phase before the rise of temperature is an overall figure for all types of cycle. The risk is highest in people with short cycles but as the phase after the rise of temperature constitutes almost 50 per cent of the total cycle, most couples find that restricting intercourse to the time after the rise of temperature is not too difficult. In people with long cycles the risks of using the phase before the rise of temperature is very much less, hence the difficulty of a long period of abstinence can be alleviated by use of a properly calculated pre-ovulatory phase.

"Common objections"

"It is often alleged that the safety of the phase after the temperature has risen may be jeopardised by a second ovulation of the kind which may result in dissimilar twins. Such an ovulation occurs within a few hours of the first and evidence that it may occur later has been assiduously sought by several authorities including Dr. Rock with negative results. This evidence is reviewed in the book by Hartman already quoted.

"It is also said that illness renders the chart useless, but the rise of temperature due to illness is quite different in degree from that due to ovulation and can readily be distinguished.

"Lack of intelligence is also advanced as an objection. Dr. Moore working in Mauritius with the Government medical service, Dr. and Mme. Guy working in the same island with Action Familial and Dr. Mme. Rendu working in the island of Réunion all found that even people who could not read or write could be taught to record their temperature. Dr. Rendu devised a chart with vertical columns only to fit a special thermometer. The woman laid the thermometer on the chart and put a mark opposite the mercury. In this way she obtained a curve without the necessity of reading figures.

"Following a statement of Lady Summerskill in the House of Lords it is frequently stated that it is at the time of ovulation that a woman most desires intercourse. The study of Hart (*British Medical Journal*, 1960, p. 1023) shows this to be untrue, the time of maximum desire being around the time of the period."

"So scanty is the regard for scientific criteria that the experience of an individual case is often quoted as proof positive that the safe period does not work: for instance the case of the couple is often advanced who had relations only once on the day before the period and yet conceived. When it is pointed out that if conception occurred surely the period not come, the statement is hastily amended to the day before the period was expected. The simple explanation is that because of neglect to use the temperature curve the occurrence of delay in ovulation was not recognised."

"Finally the impossibility of the mother of a large family recording her temperature is often asserted. A person better qualified than I to answer this objection is the mother of nine children living in two rooms who does record her temperature successfully. The influx of small children into the bedroom in the morning need not upset things for when they have finally been shooed away to get dressed the temperature can be recorded. One woman who records her temperature by mouth tells me that her small daughter solemnly hands her the thermometer each morning because she likes "being nurse. Distractions of this kind may worry the inexperienced, though they need not do so. For this reason a girl who is engaged should learn to keep her chart and study her cycle so that any difficulties can be ironed out before she marries. This is the kind of practical step which is demanded by the current phrase "responsible parenthood'."

QUINTIN MA. GARCIA, O.P.

THE CHURCH HERE AND THERE

APPOINTMENTS

On May 31, the Holy Father has transferred to the Episcopal See of Legazpi His Excellency Most Rev. Teotimo Pacis, Bishop of Palo.

The Pope has also appointed Father Francisco F. Claver, S.J., first bishop of the prelature of Malay-balay and the entire province of Bukidnon. Born on January 20, 1929, Father Claver studied at the Diocesan Seminary in Baguio City, before he entered the Jesuit Novitiate. He was ordained priest on June 19, 1961.

A FRIEND TO THE GREAT CAUSE OF ILO

On June 10, the Pope went to Geneva to honour the golden jubilee of the International Labour Organization and so to manifest his own deep concern and that of the entire Church for the rights of working men all over the world.

The ILO is an autonomous institution established in 1919 by the Peace Treaty of Versailles and is associated with the League of Nations to improve labour conditions, raise standards of living and promote economic and social stability through international action. The delegations to its main governing or guiding organs represent not only governments but also, in equal numbers, workers and employers. It has no coercive powers and works mainly through the force of good sense and public opinion.

The Pope associated himself with the work of this great institution by making a powerful appeal for peace through justice. He affirmed that "all human beings, no matter what their race, their belief, or their sex, have the right to pursue their material progress and spiritual development in freedom and dignity, in economic security and with equal opportunity". He paid tribute to pioneers of social justice such as Bishop Mermillod and the Union of Fribourg, the admirable example given by the Protestant industrialist Daniel le Grand, and the fruitful initiatives of the Catholic, Gaspard Decurtins, and praised the imposing achievements and merits of the fifty-year old world institution.

A COURTESY CALL AT WCC

On the same day, the Pope took the opportunity of paying a call of friendly and prayerful courtesy at the headquarters of the World Council of Churches which are in the same city.

He expressed his profound appreciation for the development of current relations between the World Council and the Catholic Church, two bodies very different in nature but whose collaboration has proved to be fruitful. "In common accord with Our Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, competent Catholics have been invited to participate in your activities in various ways. The theological reflection on the unity of the Church, the search for a better understanding of christian worship, the deep formation of the laity, the consciousness of our common responsibilities and the coordination of our efforts for social and economic development and for peace among the nations — these are some examples of areas where this cooperation has taken shape. There are plans also to find the possibilities of a common christian approach to the phenomenon of unbelief, to the tensions between the generations, and to relations with the non-christian religions."

On the delicate question of whether the Catholic Church should become a member of the World Council, the Pope had this to say: "What can We answer at this moment? In fraternal frankness, We do not consider that the question of the membership of the Catholic Church in the World Council is so mature that a positive answer could or should be given. The question still remains an hypothesis. It contains serious theological and pastoral implications. It thus requires profound study and commits us to a way that honesty recognizes could be long and difficult. But this does not prevent Us from assuring you of Our great respect and deep affection. The determination which animates Us and the principle which guides Us will always be the search, filled with hope and pastoral realism for the unity willed by Christ."

SOME PRESS COMMENTS ON THE POPE'S VISIT TO GENEVA

The Holy Father's journey to Geneva was commented on and analyzed in many quarters and in many ways. The Swiss newspaper *La Liberté* (Fribourg, June 11) said that "It would be difficult to find another occasion on which a few hours concentrated such an amount of history and involved consequences of such importance for the future."

The French newspaper *La Croix* (June 11) printed an article by Felix Lacambre, who began with an opinion expressed by Cardinal Koenig: "This is more important than the Pope's visit to the United Nations Organization." The Archbishop of Vienna added, "John XXIII might perhaps have hesitated to act with such courage." And on the Pope's visit to ILO: "Never again will work be superior to the worker, never again will work be against the worker; but always work will be for the worker, work will be in the service of man, of every man and of all of man."

The Protestant pastor, G. Richard-Moland, wrote in *Le Figaro* of June 16: "The open-air Mass in the Parc de La Grange was certainly a Catholic

manifestation, but the visit to the ILO and, above all, the hour spent at the headquarters of the WCC were events that concerned everybody." "At Geneva Pope Paul VI did not speak of power, of divine right or rights, but of duties and service... Far from rejecting the idea of the Roman Church entering the World Council of Churches, he rejected neither the hypothesis nor the eventual possibility. He wisely stressed the difficulties involved above all the theological difficulties."

The *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* wrote on June 11 that the decisive stage in Pope Paul's 12-hour visit to Geneva was his visit to the World Council of Churches. "His visit and his participation in common prayers were more than a symbol. They were felt as an irreversible step. Rome laid public stress upon her collaboration with the ecumenical movement. This Pope — in spite of certain things that are said about him — has actually opened more doors than his predecessor. His sober evaluation of the possibility of the Catholic Church entering the World Council of Churches agrees with the Council's own opinion."

HALO NOT TAKEN FROM ANY OF THE SAINTS

The Vatican City weekly, rising to meet a storm of protest over the dropping of time-honoured saints from the new liturgical calendar, has reassured Catholics that the Church "has not taken the halo away from any of her saints."

The weekly, *L'Osservatore della Domenica*, said: "In general, the removal of a name from the calendar does not imply a judgment that the person never existed or lacked holiness."

"Many have been removed because all that remains certain about them is their name, and this would say too little to the faithful in comparison with many others who, through the mere historical documentation of their life, can become more powerful teachers of how to live," the weekly said.

The Holy See's anxiety to smooth feathers that have been ruffled over the removal of various saints from the new calendar was mirrored in the fact that this article was released to the press several days before the publication of the magazine itself.

As released, the article was unsigned, but it was reliably attributed to an official of the Congregation for Saints' Causes, Father Carlo Bragga, C.M.

On the removal of patron saints such as St. Christopher, the patron of travelers, and St. George, patron or protector of several nations, the magazine said: "The saint may always be invoked by those who are devoted to him."

It concluded: "The Church has not taken the halo away from any of her saints. At most, she has judged the greater or lesser importance which a

figure should have in the spiritual life of her faithful. But every saint, even those who do not figure in the liturgical calendar, can always be invoked. Mass can always be offered in their honor."

Their feasts have not been abolished.

As well as the early saints who lived in the Mediterranean area, the calendar now includes more recent saints and saints from other parts of the world.

Among the new feasts are the Martyrs of Nagasaki (for the Far East), the Martyrs of Uganda (Central and Southern Africa), St. Pierre Chanel (Oceania), St. Martin de Porres (South America) and Sts. Columbanus and Ansgar (Northern Europe).

POPE ASK YOUTH TO DARE ADVENTURE OF VOCATION

Pope Paul has called on the world's young people "to dare the great adventure of following the Master all the way." He was speaking of vocations to the priesthood and religious life."

"Vocations are needed," he said in a speech to thousands in St. Peter's Square.

What is needed are souls that are strong and generous, men and women who will consecrate life completely, full time (the Pope used the English term, "full time") to the kingdom of God, to the cause of the Gospel, to the service of faith and charity."

Pope Paul appealed to all Catholics "to reflect on the question of finding new and apt persons, generally the young, who will today leave everything to put themselves at Christ's total and exclusive disposition."

Although this question boils down to "the commitment of a few," it is of general interest, the Pope said, because it bears on the "salvation of the modern world."

NEW RITE FOR INFANT BAPTISM PUBLISHED

The new baptismal rite of infants was published on June and will go into effect on September 8.

Parents are given a more active role to play; godparents continue to have an important part. The responsibilities of both are made clear.

The child's incorporation through Baptism in the people of God is given greater emphasis, and the rite is oriented towards the participation of the parish community.

The new text, in the words of Father Annibale Bugnini, C.M., secretary of the Congregation for Divine Worship, is "much gentler." It understands the infant's "real condition."

Gone are the long interrogations to which the baby — cooing or crying or sleeping — has been subjected “as if he should or could reply” (again to quote Father Bugnini). Gone is the hair-raising exorcism. And though the book of the ritual still allows the traditional renunciation of Satan, his pomp and his work — there is an alternate choice, “more in harmony with the modern mind,” Father Bugnini says, which centres around Christian aversion to evil.

Warnings by the minister are directed at the parents and godparents and congregation, to accept their responsibility. With regard to the child, the minister emphasizes that grace is a sheer gift. Yet he addresses the child directly when this seems fitting.

The rite begins with the ceremonial welcome of the infant or infants and their family at the door of the Church.

There follows the liturgy of the word, which sheds light on the meaning of Baptism. That finishes with a common prayer of intercession for the child or children to be baptized.

The core of the ceremony, consisting of the administration of the sacrament itself, is immediately preceded by the blessing of the baptismal water and by the renunciation and profession of faith (uttered on behalf of the child by the parents, godparents and the entire congregation). It is followed by the anointing and the giving of the white garment and a candle lighted from the paschal candle.

The rite is concluded before the altar with the Our Father and the blessing of the priest, bestowed separately upon the newly baptized, the parents and all present.

Father Bugnini, writing in *L'Osservatore Romano*, has urged bishops' conferences and liturgical commissions to “do their best — is it necessary to repeat this? — to prepare editions in the national tongues.” Provisional translations should be available until definitive versions can be polished and approved.

“In that way, on September 8 next, the clergy can have in hand a valid and seemly text for the administration of this sacrament, forestalling individual initiatives that are offbeat as well as offhand.”

The new baptismal rite was drawn up through the work of two study groups directed by Father Balthasar Fischer, head of the Liturgical Institute in Trier, Germany.

Father Bugnini noted that the baptismal ritual was the first book issued by the newly founded Congregation for Divine Worship. “A circumstance of good augury for a long, blessed and fruitful life of work.”

NEW SAINT CANONIZED

Julie Billiard, foundress of the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur, was canonized on June 22 with a substantially shortened ceremonies — an hour and a half instead of a whole morning.

The Holy See announced that the ceremonies had been "reviewed and simplified according to the criteria governing the entire liturgical reform."

One of the most notable changes was that the Pope walked in procession into St. Peter's basilica instead of being carried on a chair. He was accompanied by about 50 persons.

The customary tapestry of the new saint was deleted in the new regulations, as were the tapestries depicting miracles, and the red silk draperies that usually hang from the ceiling of the basilica.

St. Julie was the daughter of peasant farmers who also ran a little shop at Cuvilly, France, where she was born on July 12, 1751. She received her basic education from her uncle, the village schoolmaster.

She contracted a mysterious illness which gradually deprived her of the use of her limbs. From her bed she would often teach catechism to children, although she was unable to walk for 22 years.

During the French Revolution she aided fugitive priests. Her activities so incensed the ruling revolutionaries that they threatened to burn her alive.

Smuggled out of her house and hidden in a hay cart, she was taken to Compiègne. A hunt continued for several months, and she had to be removed from house to house to avoid being captured. After taking refuge in Amiens, she met Franciose Blin de Bourdon, later Mother St. Joseph, who was to become her close friend and associate in all her work.

Saints should be venerated and imitated, the Pope said in his sermon.

"The cult or veneration of the new saint is not only universally permitted but recommended as a way of honouring God in his works.

"No one may think that in honouring the saints the Catholic Church detracts from the honour owed to God alone and to Christ.

"No one may call the cult of the saints superstition when in them the Church seeks out and celebrates the source of holiness."

The life of Julie Billiard reflected "a splendour of grace and an example of Christian virtue."
