

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

OFFICIAL INTERDIOCESAN ORGAN

● THE PHILIPPINE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW ●

CHRISTMAS GREETINGS • THE "DAY OF PEACE" • PAPAL INFALLIBILITY IN THE TWO VATICANS • MIXED PRIESTLY TRAINING • DE COLORES — YOU AND YOUR SERVICE SHEET • HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN THE PHILIPPINES • THE RELIGIOUS OF THE ASSUMPTION.

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. JOSE TINOKO, O.P. JOHN D'AQUINO, 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, ₱15.00; Two Years, ₱26.00; Three Years, ₱40.00. Abroad, \$5.00 a year. Price per copy, ₱1.50. 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	
A Holy Christmas and a Year of Peace	2
THE POPE SPEAKS	
Message on the "Day of Peace"	3
LITURGICAL SECTION	
Liturgy and the Mystery of the Church	9
DOCTRINAL SECTION	
Papal Infallibility in the Two Vatican's	
• LEONARDO Z. LEGASPI, O.P.	13
NOTES AND COMMENTS	
Mixed Priestly Training (continued)	
• JESUS MA. CAVANNA, C.M.	23
PASTORAL SECTION	
Homiletics — Sexagesima, Quinquagesima, 1st and 2nd Sundays of Lent	
• DAVID TITHER, C.S.S.R.	33
De Colores — You and Your Service Sheet	
• GUILLERMO TEJON, O.P.	42
HISTORICAL SECTION	
History of the Church in the Philippines (1521-1898)	
• PABLO FERNANDEZ, O.P.	49
The Religious of the Assumption	61
LAYMAN'S VIEW	
The Parish Priest and the Parish Credit Union	
• ISMAEL B. MISOLAS	66
CASES AND QUERIES	
May the Pope Speak "Ex Cathedra" Independently of the College of Bishops?	
• QUINTIN MA. GARCIA, O.P.	72
THE CHURCH HERE AND THERE	82
BOOK REVIEW	85

EDITORIAL

To All:

A Holy Christmas...

"For today in the town of David a Savior has been born to you, who is Christ the Lord. And this shall be a sign to you: you will find an infant wrapped in swaddling clothes and lying in a manger." And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God and saying, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men of good will." — **Luke, 2:11-14.**

...And a Year of Peace!

Peace is not enjoyed: it is created. Peace is not a level that we have now reached: it is a higher level, to which each and every one of us must ever aspire. It is not a philosophy that lulls us to sleep; it is a philosophy of action, which makes us all responsible for the common good, and obliges us to dedicate all our efforts to its cause — the true cause of mankind. — **Paul VI.**

THE POPE SPEAKS

MESSAGE OF HIS HOLINESS

PAUL VI

FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE

"DAY OF PEACE"

January 1st, 1970

CITIZENS OF THE WORLD!

As you salute the dawn of this new year nineteen hundred and seventy, take thought for a moment: Whither is mankind's path leading? Today we can take an overall view, a prophetic view.

Mankind is travelling forward, that is, progressing towards an ever greater mastery of the world: thought, study and science are guiding it towards this conquest; work, tools and technology are making this wonderful conquest a reality. And how does this mastery help mankind? It helps it to live a better and fuller life. Mankind seeks fulness of life within the limits of time — and is attaining it. But it is aware that this fulness would not be such if it were not universal, that is, extended to all men. Mankind therefore seeks to extend the benefits of progress to all Peoples; it strives for that unity, justice, balance and perfection, which we call Peace.

Even when men work against Peace, mankind strives for Peace. "For the sake of Peace even wars are fought" (*De Civitate Dei*, XIX, ch. XII; *PL* 7, 637). Peace is the logical aim of the present world; it is the destiny of progress, the goal of the great strivings of modern civilization (cf. *Lumen Gentium*, No. 36).

Once more therefore today We proclaim Peace as our best wish for the coming year. Peace be with you, men of the year 1970. We pro-

claim Peace as the dominant idea in the conscious life of man, if he gazes at the prospect of his immediate and more distant journey. Once more We proclaim Peace, for Peace is, at one and the same time, under different aspects, both the beginning and the end of the normal and progressive development of human society. It is the beginning, that is, the necessary condition: just as a machine cannot work well unless all its parts correspond to the design according to which the machine was invented, so mankind cannot develop efficiently and harmoniously unless Peace first gives it its own equilibrium. Peace is the idea that reigns over human progress; it is the true and fertile concept from which spring the better life and ordered history of us men. Peace is also the end, that is, the crowning of the efforts, often hard and painful, by which we men seek to subdue the external world to our service, and to organize our society according to an order that reflects justice and well-being.

We insist: Peace is the true life and the ideal framework of the World of men. We note this: Peace is not really a static state which can be reached once and for all; it is not an immobile tranquillity. We would misunderstand St. Augustine's famous definition which calls Peace "the tranquillity of order" (*De Civitate Dei*, XIX, ch. XIII; *PL* 7, 640), if we had an abstract idea of order, if we did not realise that human order is an act, rather than a state; order depends on the circumstances that favour it; order, to be truly human, is ever perfectible, that is, it is unceasingly brought to being and developed; in other words, it lies in a progressive motion, just as the balance of flight must be continuously supported by a driving force.

Why do We say this? Because Our words are meant especially for the young. When we speak of Peace, friends, we do not put before you a state of repressive, selfish inertia. Peace is not enjoyed: it is created. Peace is not a level that we have now reached: it is a higher level, to which each and every one of us must ever aspire. It is not a philosophy that lulls us to sleep; it is a philosophy of action, which makes us all responsible for the common good, and obliges us to dedicate all our efforts to its cause — the true cause of mankind.

Those who wish to analyse this conviction for themselves will find out many things. They will find that there must be a radical change

of the ideas that govern the world. They will find that all these dominant ideas are at least in part false, because they are particular, restricted and selfish. They will find that only one idea is basically good and true: the idea of universal love; that is, the idea of Peace. And they will find that this idea is at the same time very simple and very hard; very simple in itself, for man is made for love, for peace; it is very hard; for how can one love? How can one raise love to the dignity of a universal principle? How can love find a place in the mind of modern man, so steeped in strife, selfishness and hate? Who can say of himself that he has love in his heart? Love for all mankind? Love for mankind still coming into being, the mankind of tomorrow, the mankind of the age of progress, that authentic mankind which cannot be such unless it is united — not by force, not by selfish, exploiting self-interest — but by loving brotherly concord?

Those who study the great idea of Peace will then discover that today, immediately, there is need of a new ideological education, education for Peace. Yes, Peace begins within hearts. We must first know, recognize, will and love Peace; then we shall express it, and impress it on the renewed morals of humanity; on its philosophy, its sociology, its politics.

Let us realize, Men, Our brothers, the greatness of this futuristic vision, and let us courageously undertake the first programme: to educate ourselves for Peace.

We are aware of the paradoxical appearance of this programme; it seems to find its affirmation outside of reality, outside of every instinctive reality of philosophy, sociology or history. Strife is the law. Strife is the force of success. And even, strife is justice. An inexorable law, this, reborn at every stage of human progress. Even today, after fearsome experiences of the last wars, it is strife, not Peace, that is thrust on us. Even violence finds followers and adulators. Revolution bestows renown and prestige on every indication of justice, on every renewal of progress. It is inevitable: Force alone clears the way for human destinies. Man, Our brothers, this is the great difficulty that we must consider and solve. That strife can be necessary, that it can be the arm of justice, that it can rise to a noblehearted, heroic duty, We do not deny. That strife can obtain successes, no one can contest. But We say that it cannot constitute

the illuminating idea of which mankind has need. We say that it is time for civilization to draw inspiration from a concept other than that of strife, of violence, of war, of oppression, to set the world on the way to true justice for all. We say that Peace is not cowardice, is not faint-hearted weakness. Peace must gradually, immediately if possible, substitute moral strength for brute force; it must substitute reason, speech and moral greatness for the fatal, and too often fallacious efficacy of arms, of violent means, and of material and economic power. Peace is Man, who has ceased to be a wolf to his fellow man, Man in his invincible moral power. This it is that must today prevail in the world.

And it does prevail. We enthusiastically greet the efforts of modern man to give affirmation, in the world and in present history, to Peace as a method, as an international institution, as sincere negotiation, as self-discipline in territorial and social disputes, as a question that is higher than the prestige of reprisal and revenge. Questions of importance for the victory of Peace are already under discussion: disarmament, first of all, limitation of nuclear weapons, the hypothesis of recourse to arbitration, the substitution of collaboration for competition, peaceful co-existence in diversity of ideologies and forms of government, the hope that a proportion of military expenditure will be devoted to aid to developing peoples. Thus We see a contribution to Peace in the now universal deploration of terrorism, of torture of prisoners, of retaliatory repression of innocent people, of concentration camps for civilian detainees, of killing of hostages, and so on. The world's conscience no longer tolerates such crimes, the fierce inhumanity of which turns back in dishonour on those who perform them.

It is not Our duty to pass judgment on the disputes still in progress between nations, races, tribes, and social classes. But it is Our mission to cast the word "Peace" into the midst of men at strife with one another. It is Our mission to remind men that they are brothers. It is Our mission to teach men to love one another, to be reconciled with each other, to educate themselves for Peace. Accordingly, We express Our approval, Our encouragement and our hopefulness to all who are promoters of this education for Peace. This year, also, We call on persons and organizations that hold responsibility on the organs of public opinion, on statesmen, teachers, artists and, especially, on youth, to walk resolutely

along this path of true and universal civilization. We must attain the actual celebration of the Bible prophecy: Justice and Peace have met and kissed each other.

And to you, Our Brothers and Sons in the same Christian Faith, We add a word more on the duty, which We have mentioned, to educate men to love each other, to be reconciled with one another and to forgive each other mutually. We have precise teachings on this from the Master, Jesus; we have His example, we have the obligation, which He hears from our lips when we recite the "Our Father," according to the well-known words: "Forgive us our trespasses, *as* we forgive those who trespass against us." The word "*as*" is a tremendous one; it establishes an equation, that, when put into practice, is for our good in the economy of salvation; when not put into practice, it can be for our damnation (cf. *Mt.* 18, 21-35).

To preach the Gospel of forgiveness seems absurd to human politics, because in the natural economy justice does not often permit forgiveness. But in the Christian economy, which is super-human, it is not absurd. Difficult, yes, but not absurd. How do conflicts in the secular world end? What kind of Peace do they finally attain? In the insidious and furious dialectic of our history, as men filled with passion, pride, and rancour, the Peace which puts an end to any conflict is usually an imposition, a suppression, a yoke; the weaker and more submissive party undergoes this with forced toleration, often equal to postponing revenge to the future; and accepts the treaty protocol which merely conceals hypocrisy in hearts which remain hostile. A Peace like this, too often feigned and unstable, misses the complete resolution of the conflict, which is in pardon, in the victor's renunciation of those advantages he has won but which humiliate the conquered and make him inexorably unhappy; and the conquered one is lacking in that strength of mind necessary for reconciliation.

If Peace is without clemency, how can it be called Peace? If Peace is imbued with the spirit of revenge, how can it be true Peace? What is necessary is that one side and the other both appeal to that superior justice, which is pardon, which cancels out insoluble questions of prestige, and makes friendship possible once again.

A hard lesson, this; but is it not a magnificent one? Is it not truly contemporary? Is it not truly Christian?

Let us educate ourselves, first of all, Christian sons and brothers, in this superior school of Peace; Let us read again the Sermon on the Mount (cf. *Mt.* 5, 21-26; 38-48; 6, 12, 14-15); and then let us strive, by our word and by our example, to announce this good news to the world

To each of you We impart Our Apostolic Blessing.

November 30, 1969.

Paulus Pp. VI

LITURGICAL SECTION

LITURGY AND THE MYSTERY OF THE CHURCH *

"That sound tradition may be retained, and yet the way remain open to legitimate progress, a careful investigation is always to be made into each part of the liturgy which is to be revised. This investigation should be theological, historical, and pastoral. Also the general laws governing the structure and meaning of the liturgy must be studied in conjunction with the experience derived from recent liturgical reforms and from the indults conceded to various places. Finally, there must be no innovations unless the good of the church genuinely and certainly requires them; and care must be taken that any new forms adopted should in some way grow organically from forms already existing.

As far as possible notable differences between the rites used in adjacent regions must be carefully avoided." (*Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy*, Art. 23)

If the fathers of the Council insist so emphatically that the episcopal conferences alone and exclusively — and they only in accord with the Holy See — are competent in matters liturgical, they are not laying a claim to a right they do not possess. It would be wrong to assume that those vested with authority in the Church can issue instructions concerning liturgical functions arbitrarily without being bound by higher laws and principles. Such an assumption is based on the idea that liturgy exhausts itself in external rites and altar decorations. Liturgy has been deflated and all that is left is a series of ceremonies. If some one is under the impression that liturgy is nothing else but some arbitrarily fixed devotional form, he overlooks two things: (1) That we find in the liturgy the most sublime expression of the most sacred realization of divine truth, and (2) that Apostolic authority which the bishops exercise, does not constitute a power in virtue of which bishops could

* A translation of an article by Louis Bouyer.

change or even abolish essential points which having been handed down to us from the time of the Apostles form part of tradition. If we interpret the Apostolic power of the bishops in this sense, the worst objections which Protestants have raised against the teaching of the Church on Apostolic succession would be justified. If we endorse it, they would be quite right in blaming the Church for having abandoned the gospel. Apostolic power has been imparted to the bishops not to destroy or even change the work begun by the Apostles but to preserve and keep it alive. They simply have no other right but to alter those things which were conditioned merely by the times in which they lived and which now or no longer express or accomplish any more what they the Apostles wanted them to convey and effect. Consequently most changes which have been introduced with the approval of the bishops go back to former liturgical usages which got lost in the course of time through neglect or ignorance. The few actual innovations, which have been made, aim but at one thing. They have been adopted in order to create something essentially equivalent for our times whenever and wherever the material forms employed by the Apostles are no longer meaningful for us.

The council does not characterize the activity of the bishops concerned with the reform or adaptation as an attack on tradition but as a more meaningful adherence to it. Tradition is a living principle of progress which necessarily must take place in accordance with the seed planted no matter how different the soil is from which it springs, blooms and bears fruit. In contrast to the false reforms, which have their origin in abstract ideas, the council is at pains to state clearly that tradition cannot be preserved if novelties are introduced without regard for continuity or if practices are revived merely because they are archaic. Sound progress and genuine renewal are the result of organic development. We cannot import totally foreign elements into the liturgy nor look upon phenomena of the past as ideals for all times.

At times the liturgy will have to be trimmed considerably, at times it has to be decked out as it were more fully but we should always be aware that it is a living organism that has come down to us from times past. As such it must be safeguarded and the laws of growth and the inner structure of the liturgy must be respected. There ought to be no

innovation for its own sake, simply because something ought to be different. It is however equally wrong to revive liturgical usages of the dead past because of some sentimental attachment to them. Ancient customs may be called to life again if they are eminently suitable even in our times to impart new vigor to the life of the mystical body. For liturgy is the life of the body of Christ here on earth. The bishops alone to whom the care and welfare of that body has been entrusted are consequently authorized to issue binding regulations in its behalf.

"The bishop is to be considered as the priest of his flock, from whom the life in Christ of his faithful is in some way derived and dependent.

Therefore all should hold in great esteem the liturgical life of the diocese centered around the bishop, especially in his cathedral church; they must be convinced that the pre-eminent manifestation of the Church consists in the full active participation of all God's holy people, in these liturgical celebrations, especially in the same Eucharist, in a single prayer, at one altar, at which there presides the bishop surrounded by the college of priests and by his ministers." (*Art.* 41)

A very important teaching often overlooked has been enunciated here. It concerns the bishop in the first place and then immediately the Eucharist in connection with the Church. It follows that being a bishop does not mean being a functionary of a dead anonymous bureaucracy. It is his office to deal with a community of men living together in genuine brotherhood who although perfectly human are in the highest degree holy because they take part in common in the eucharistic celebration "in a single prayer . . . at one altar."

It has been stated clearly enough that it is in the eucharistic celebration fundamentally that the Church becomes visible. The bishop therefore shows the real nature of his power as successor of the Apostles in the most eminent way in the celebration of the Eucharist with all that is comprised in it. It is here that the bishop continues the work of the Apostles to build up the Church, the mystical body of Christ, by proclaiming the paschal mystery and by enabling the faithful to share in this mystery by the common participation in the body of Christ, who died once but now lives for ever. From what has been said so far, we readily understand why the last two popes took pains to preach in their own

urban churches and there to celebrate the Eucharist. We cannot witness a bishop acting in his capacity as a bishop — above all not the bishop of Rome who is the head of the agape according to St. Ignatius of Antioch — unless he does so in the midst of his flock whom he feeds in a twofold manner by the Word and the Body of Christ and thus provides them with an opportunity for prayer in common and a manifestation of all-embracing charity.

At the same time we understand better that the liturgical mystery is not only presented as mystery which has been entrusted to the Church for the world but that it is precisely through this mystery that the Church is recruited from the world. In the last analysis neither administration nor legislation — however necessary they may be — are the building material of which the structure of the Church consists. The Church is found everywhere where two or three are gathered in Christ's name and where apostolic authority has officially gathered them in the reality of this name, i.e., by the proclamation of the gospel and the distribution of the bread of life. This is — in its deepest meaning — the life of the Church. The council clarifies this in the following statement:

“But because it is impossible for the bishop always and everywhere to preside over the whole flock in his Church, he cannot do otherwise than establish lesser groupings of the faithful. Among these the parishes, set up locally under a pastor who takes the place of the bishop, are the most important; for in some manner they present the visible Church constituted throughout the world.

And therefore the liturgical life of the parish and its relationship to the bishop must be fostered theoretically and practically among the faithful and clergy; efforts also must be made to encourage a sense of community within the parish, above all in common celebration of the Sunday Mass. (*Art. 42*)

Nothing is more decisive for the understanding of the Church than what has been stated here. The Church is eminently the community which is formed around the celebration of the Eucharist into a single body. In this sense, the mystery of the liturgy and that of the Church coincide. For in the liturgy the Church makes herself visible and receives life through it.

PAPAL INFALLIBILITY IN THE LIGHT OF TWO VATICANS

● **Leonardo Z. Legaspi, O.P.**

During the year (December 8, 1969 to 1970) set aside for us to commemorate the centenary of the First Vatican Council, a lot of good things are going to be brought forth, once again, into the open. One of them is the papal infallibility which will be discussed here in the light of the Two-Vaticans-But-One, so that the continuity, validity and stability of the doctrinal authority of the Roman Pontiff will be reaffirmed in a clearer perspective.

The mention of "Vatican Council I" recalls immediately to us two facts: (1) that it was the occasion of the definition of the doctrine popularly called the Papal Infallibility, and (2) that many of the bishops present were opposed to the definition. The more erudite add that their opposition was not to the doctrine itself — everybody admitted that — but to the policy of choosing the right time to proclaim it. These considerations are, indeed, important for a historian of the Council, but they are far from the full account of what the Council accomplished, and still farther from what the Pope actually had in mind when he called the bishops to Rome.

¹ His Excellency, the Most Rev. Carmine Rocco, the Apostolic Nuncio, in his communication dated November 7, 1969, enumerated what the faithful stand to gain from this commemoration: it will help to deepen the Catholic doctrine of Vatican I; it will also serve as the link to Vatican II which will surely reflect the validity and the stability of ecclesiastical authority; and finally, it will present a happy occasion to reinvigorate the faith and foment fidelity to the Church and to the Holy Father in the Filipino people who love devotedly the Holy Church of God and the Vicar of Christ on earth.

What Pope Pius IX had in mind in summoning the Council may be gathered from his Bull convoking it (*Aeterni Patris*, June 29, 1868): to restate the faith in certain matters where it had been attacked or misunderstood; to review the whole matter of clerical life and its needs; to provide new safeguards for Christian marriage and the Christian education of youth; and to take up in this new age the ancient problems of the relationship between Church and State and provide appropriate guidance, so as to promote peace and prosperity in the national life everywhere. These made up the Pope's bounden duty to take counsel with the entire body of his brethren, the bishops of the Catholic Church. Whence this summon to the General Council, which met at Rome in the Vatican Basilica (St. Peter's Church) on December 8, 1869.

VATICAN COUNCIL I

Strange as it may seem the question of Papal Infallibility did not figure in the Bull of convocation; it did not even figure in the agenda. If Vatican I was not convened to discuss the subject of infallibility, how did it ever come to take such a prominent place in the actual proceedings?

The discussion of infallibility came to be introduced into the agenda as the result of representations made by various bishops from different parts of the world, for example, the Archbishop of Baltimore. Besides, it was almost inevitable that the question should arise, for two opposite views revolving around the doctrinal authority of the pope were too prevalent in the ecclesiastical atmosphere in those days.

Gallicanism

In the second half of the nineteenth century, Gallicanism still exercised a considerable influence in the Church with their principle enshrined in Article 4 of the *Declaration of the Clergy of France about Ecclesiastical Authority* (General Assembly, March 19, 1682). Briefly, it runs as follows: "Also, in questions of belief the principal role is that of the pope, whose decrees are binding on all sees, but his judgments are not

irreformable unless (to them) there is added the general agreement of the Church."²

Ultramontanes

On the other hand, a new and active school of ultramontanes had come into existence, represented by Veuillot in the *Univers* and W. G. Ward in the *Dublin Review*. Reacting from Gallicanism, these writers appeared determined to exaggerate the privileges of the papacy at the expense of the bishops and general councils. They wanted even the casual utterances of the Holy Father to be invested with infallibility, for example, Ward is known to have expressed that he would like to have an infallible definition served up every morning with his breakfast.

These two schools were growing so violently apart that it would have been impossible to summon an ecumenical council without canvassing their differences.

Pastor Aeternus

On July 18, 1870, Monday, Vatican I spoke to end the strife amidst heavy showers of rain with the accompaniment of a wonderful July thunderstorm:

"The Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is to say when in the exercise of his office of pastor and teacher of all Christians he, in virtue of his supreme apostolic authority, defines

² In 1960, Pope Alexander VII reproved this Declaration, stating that oaths sworn to accept and observe it were null and void (*Denz.* 322-326). All those who signed it retracted their signatures in 1693, at the demand of Innocent XII, with an explicit and personal acknowledgement that the Assembly had no power to decide such questions. And Louis XIV revoked the edict which made the teaching of the Four Articles obligatory (see Pastor's *Lives of the Popes*, vl. 32, pp. 595-603).

These Gallican theories had their effective origin in the troubled times of the so-called Schism of the West (1378-1417), when theologians and canonists, driven desperate by the long crisis, were willing to consider any theory that would give the Church a means of ridding itself of the contending popes.

that a doctrine of faith and morals is to be held by the whole Church, by assistance of God promised to him in the person of Blessed Peter, has that infallibility with which it was the will of Our Divine Redeemer that His Church should be furnished in defining a doctrine on faith or morals; wherefore such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irrefragable in themselves and not in virtue of the consent of the Church."

Comments

CF

In the aforementioned text, three things are to be considered:

a) *Pontifical acts*, in which the Pope is acting as pastor and doctor of all Christians. Each Pope and not the Roman See has the authoritative and infallible magisterium; the authority is given to each person who succeeds Peter and not simply to the position as such.

b) The Pope's authority is engaged *solemnly (ex cathedra)*, *absolutely* and *irrevocably*.

c) To define a doctrine either speculative or practical in content. For his magisterium to be regarded as infallible, the Pope must have the manifest INTENTION of defining doctrine. The words "the will of defining" are the key; they refer to a solemn judgment or a statement which is clearly and directly meant to be held with the absolute certitude of faith.

Thus, the decree as drafted and approved struck against both the ultramontanes and the gallicans.

Against the first, the draft may more reasonably be considered as a defeat for the ultramontanes, since it refuses to extend the limits of infallibility precisely to where the ultramontanes wanted. The decree is couched in a very careful language, clearly designed to show that the Pope is not always infallible, but only in specific conditions — and those conditions are so elaborately expressed that there can be no doubt of the Council's general intention to limit the sphere of infallibility.

Against the second, the last phrase of the decree deals Gallicanism its *coup de grace*. It disposes of forever the unworkable idea that the authority of the Pope depends on the authority of the Council. The first chapter of the Constitution *Pastor Aeternus* condemns the error of

those who think "that the primacy of jurisdiction was given immediately and directly, not to Peter himself, but to the Church, so as thence to develop on Peter as representative of the Church" (Denz. 1822). The same error could be committed in respect to the infallibility. The latter does not pass from the Church to the Pope, who is the Vicar, not of Christians, but of Christ Himself. Consequently the definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, *ex sese*; they do not derive their infallibility from the majority of the Council Fathers nor from the popular will of the "People of God," *non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae* (Denz. 1839).

The Pope, indeed, can never be isolated from the episcopal college nor from the Church, but he is *not the delegate of the Church*; he is, as Peter was, the delegate of Christ and the head of the Church. He is no mere echo of a collective consciousness of the Church. Hence, it is the Sovereign Pontiff himself with whom the whole Council actively associates itself—*itaque nos... sacro approbante concilio, docemus... et definimus*. It is he who, in the Constitution *Pastor Aeternus*, solemnly defines his own infallibility.

VATICAN COUNCIL II

Our society is looking forward so much to the future that it is rattled when asked to look back to the past. Relevance is immediately demanded, and the definition of the papal infallibility is no exception.

If we project a light from behind the First Vatican's papal infallibility onto the screen of the Second Vatican, we will realize and discern that it corrects and answers many (if not all) of the current questions occasioned by the upheavals and crises of what is now known as the post-conciliar period.

Council of the Head only?

In the first place, it is said that while Vatican I was the council of the head, Vatican II is the council of the body. This statement is acceptable up to a certain point. If it is meant by this that it was Vatican I which declared, by defining, the infallibility of the Pope, and that it

was Vatican II which teaches without defining the infallibility of the Episcopal College, then, the remark is altogether valid.

Unfortunately, however, this is not the usual import of its position. What it tries to convey is that the Second Vatican Council *corrected* the vital question on papal infallibility. It is premised on the assumption that the First Vatican meant only the Pope was infallible; that its silence on the episcopal collegiality should be construed as a refusal to believe in the infallible magisterium of the Episcopal College.

This is gratuitous and unfounded. The proponents of this fantastic theory either had not read the history of the First Vatican or had opted to ignore that history completely. Anyone who has read the *Chapter IX* of the schema of the Church of the Second Vatican would have easily noticed that it bears the title: DE ECCLESIAE INFALLIBILITATE, the infallibility of the Church. Under this chapter the question of Episcopal College figures so clearly.

Why then the alleged "silence"? The reason is simply *historical*. The main issue was the papal magisterium and this topic dominated the whole of the latter part of discussion in the Council. The Fathers simply did not have the time or were not permitted by the Franco-Prussian war, which erupted untimely, to discuss the matter. Pius IX, being made a prisoner in his own territory, had to suspend the Council indefinitely.

Continuity of Teaching

Anyone who has read the document "Lumen Gentium" of the Second Vatican Council will know at once that far from contradicting the *Pastor Aeternus* of the First Vatican, the last Council re-states and re-affirms the position promulgated in it.

Number 25 of the decree on the Church reads:

"The Roman Pontiff, the head of the College of bishops, enjoys such infallibility in virtue of his office when, as the Supreme Shepherd and Teacher of all the faithful, he proclaims a doctrine of faith or morals by a definitive act. Therefore, his definitions, of themselves and not from the consent of the Church, are rightly called irreformable."

Two important doctrinal developments made in Vatican II on the infallible authority of the Pope should be mentioned here.

First, it will be noted that while the Second Vatican in *Lumen Gentium* (n. 25) repeats almost literally the dogmatic decree of the First Vatican, it introduces a new item when it says: "The Roman Pontiff, the head of the College of Bishops..." It is correctly added as a theological precision, since papal infallibility always has a collegial implication.

Secondly, while the First Vatican emphasizes the "ex cathedra" pronouncements to which we should give an assent of divine faith, the Second Vatican strengthens the Pope's doctrinal authority even more when it states:

"This loyal submission of the will and intellect must be given, in a special way, to the authentic teaching authority of the Roman Pontiff, even when he does not speak "ex cathedra," in such wise, indeed, that this supreme teaching authority be acknowledged with respect, and sincere assent be given to decisions made by him, conformably with his manifest mind and intention, which is made known principally either by the character of the documents in questions, or by the frequency with which a certain doctrine is proposed or by the manner in which the doctrine is formulated (n. 25)."

Briefly, the two Vatican Councils clearly express the Church's faith. The Second Vatican Council left its predecessor's teaching wholly as it was, which is to be expected; but it also took great care to affirm constantly the Roman Pontiff's supreme authority and at the same time to state the doctrine on the episcopate and collegiality more exactly. If we refer to the Second Vatican Council's texts in search of its spirit, we shall find there also that everything rests in the end on one single bishop, the rock set up by Christ — the Pope.

The Church not a Democracy

There is yet another pressing reason why a retrospection is necessary for a theological progression. A better understanding of the First Vatican's definition on papal infallibility can provide us with an adequate answer to a very actual problem being asked these days.

Some of the theologians, overly anxious to see the Church relevant to our times, do not hesitate in maintaining that the Church should become much more democratic on every level of its organization. Some even go as far as to assert that, since the Church is destined to fit into and inform human society as it finds it, the Church must perforce be democratic in a democratically structured human society and totalitarian in a totalitarian state. Thus to become all things to all men; even all things to all states!

In the first place, this theory implies a *radical change* in the government of the Church, and consequently a new and altogether different institution from the Church founded by Jesus Christ.

Secondly, in this scheme, the Pope will not be the Vicar of Christ but of the Church, of the Christian people. For in a democracy, the leader is elected by the people and governs on the mandate from the people.

And thirdly, in this democratic plan, the Pope will only be infallible if and when the Christian people accept his teachings. Papal definition then will no longer be irreformable by itself, as defined by the First Vatican, since such teachings are true not because they are revealed by Christ, contained in Sacred Scripture and in Tradition and proposed by the Church's magisterium, but because such teachings are accepted by the Church.

Last October 11, Pope Paul VI, in a homily delivered during the concebrated Mass in the Sistine Chapel for the opening of the Extraordinary Synod of Bishops, saw these dangers and stated in no uncertain terms:

"...that the government of the Church must not take the appearances and the norms of temporal regimes, which are today guided by democratic institutions that are sometimes irresponsible and going to excess, or by totalitarian forces that are contrary to the dignity of man, who is subject to them: the government of the Church has an original form of its own which aims to reflect in its expressions the wisdom and the will of the Founder."

These words of the Holy Father weigh heavily and should be pondered more carefully by all concerned.

What is true about a civil society does not necessarily follow to be true in the Church. If civil society chooses its own constitutions and thereby decides the condition of its head, the Church is in a different position.

To understand more easily why the Church's government cannot be democratic, one has only to look at her *beginnings*. She did not emerge from any collectivity or community whatever. She was formed around Jesus Christ her Head, her Ruler, from whom all her life, perfection and power come to her. "*You have not chosen me,*" He said, "*but I have chosen you.*" Thus from the birth of the Church her essential constitution distinctly appears. Authority does not reside in the community. It never passes, as in the civil order, from the community to one or to several heads. By its very nature, and from the very outset, it resides in a single recognizable prince.

Since this prince is the Lord Jesus, who is to live and to reign yesterday, today, and for ever, it results that in natural right it was for Him and not for the ecclesiastical community to choose for Himself a vicar, whose role would not be to represent the ecclesiastical community (born to obey, not to command), but to represent the Prince, the natural Lord of this community.

This, then, is what Our Lord Himself intended to establish when, having risen, before ascending to heaven, He chose, as St. John tells us, the Apostle Peter and none other for His Vicar. And just as in the natural right the Prince of the Church does not draw His authority from the Church, so neither does His Vicar, who depends upon Him and not upon the Church.³

The Unshaken Rock that is Peter

There have been great men, and good men, and honest men, all through the history of the Church, who have felt scruples one time or another about the exercise of the Papal Infallibility, from St. Cyprian down to the last of our so-called *avant garde* theologian.

³ CAJETAN, *Apologia de Comparata auctoritate Papae et Concilii*, cap. 1, nos. 450-452.

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. JOSE TINOKO, O.P. JOHN D'AQUINO, 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, ₱15.00; Two Years, ₱26.00; Three Years, ₱40.00. Abroad, \$5.00 a year. Price per copy, ₱1.50. 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

But in every age, the general sense of the faithful had resisted any suspicion of an attempt to democratize the constitution of the Church in defiance of Our Lord's promises. At the final sitting of the First Vatican Council, when the infallibility question was decided, a terrific thunderstorm broke over the city of Rome. It symbolized the Council itself which cleared the air of uncertainty and misinterpretations.

The Church has had her share of troubles to meet since 1870, and not a few difficulties to solve; but in time they have all passed into the regime of forgotten controversies. And the rock of Peter stands unshaken, only with a fresh definition as a fresh high water mark to show where the last flood reached.

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.

VI

Seminaries in the Post-Tridentine Era

When we elaborated on the establishment of Conciliar Seminaries in France it was already pointed out the strangely long procrastination — a delay of almost a century — with which the tridentine decree was implemented. This phenomenon was not exclusive of France. It took place practically in all the nations of Christendom. Its explanation is found in the multitude of difficulties involved in such a radical reform that came to eradicate inveterate, centuries-old ways and customs, more attractive, economical and comfortable. Such were the mixed priestly training in Universities and Colleges, and the easy admission to Holy Orders without the requisite of a previous segregation from the world, but rather with a full "openness" or "insertion" in the world (as advocated today), that made students enjoy all the liberties of the secular youth. Financial problems, on the other hand, and similar concomitant factors, were added to the heap of obstacles, at times insurmountable, that blocked the way for the erection of genuine Seminaries exclusively dedicated to the education of the clergy. Thus we could understand why even as late as in the XVIII century, Pope Benedict XIII, "not without great distress of spirit", declared that the decrees of Trent on Seminaries were not yet observed in many parts of Christendom.¹

¹ Const. Apost. CREDITAE NOBIS, 9 May 1725: cf. Cenacchi, *op. cit.*, p. 102; S.C. de Sem., *op. cit.*, p. 195.

True, there found here and there one or other zealous promoter of the authentic Conciliar Seminaries. In Italy, St. Charles Borromeo in the XVI century; in France, besides St. Vincent de Paul, there were in the XVII century Father Peter de Bérulle, founder of the Oratory, and his immediate successors Fathers Condren and Bourgoïn, with whom Father Adrian Bourdoise, Father John Jacob Olier, founder of the Sulpicians, and St. John Eudes, founder of the Congregation of the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary, deserve special mention;² in Germany, in the same XVII century, the Venerable Bartholomew Holzhauser,³ in Spain, in the XVIII century Father Francis Ferrer of the diocese of Barbastro, founder of the Society of *Sacerdotes Pios Operarios*; and later in the same century, in Italy St. Alphonsus Liguori, founder of the Redemptorist Fathers.⁴

But the strenuous labors of these few exceptional pioneers of the salutary Tridentine institution, though sometimes seconded by the societies founded by them to perpetuate their ideals (such as the Congregation of St. Sulpice, the Congregation of the Mission, the Institute of the Bartholomites, etc.), were necessarily circumscribed to quite limited fields of action, and could not reach other immense ecclesiastical territories. In the majority of dioceses, truly Conciliar Seminaries, either did not exist at all, or if some institutions were known under that name, they were mostly nothing else — at least inasmuch as minor seminaries are concerned — but mere College-Seminaries or Seminary-Colleges. In these the unfortunate mixture of seminarians with ordinary lay students continued, not only to hamper the flowering of priestly vocations, but as a persistent cancer slowly and fatally corroded the very core of the most vital tridentine decree for the reform of the clergy.

And this state of affairs remained practically for almost two centuries more. The degradation and corruption of the medieval clergy seemed to resurge in the XVIII century in all levels of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The abuses that ignited the Protestant revolution of the XVI century, were found again in almost identical forms, in many Catholic countries, in spite of the Tridentine reform. Not to mention those of the pontifical

² S.C. de Sem., *op. cit.*, pp. 114-124.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 124-126.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 127-130.

court, nor of the sacred College of Cardinals and even of the Episcopate where many disedifying examples were sadly noticed,⁵ the root of the evil that undermined the Church was really *the lack of a true vocation in a great part of the clergy*; and, in the last analysis, this could certainly be traced to the uncompliance with tridentine decree on Seminaries and on admission to Holy Orders.

"The custom among noble families of placing in the Church their younger sons, who could not inherit their father's property and had no taste for the army, still prevailed; the Tridentine decrees had proved incapable of preventing it. A boy was marked out for an ecclesiastical title, a girl was for the cloister, without the least attempt to learn whether or not the divine call had echoed in their souls. For some this forced vocation was a tragedy. Thus Charles-Maurice Talleyrand, obliged by his family to take Holy Orders because he was a younger son and lame, confided to one of his fellow students in the seminary: 'They compel me to become an ecclesiastic; they'll regret it.' Happy those who, like Turgot, had the courage to leave. One such was Chateaubriand; provided at the age of twenty with a commandery of the Knights of Malta and duly tonsured, he waited to regain his liberty no longer than it took his hair to grow. Others, 'victims of a state of affairs which drove them into the priesthood, and subject to social pressure which the better among them were ready to endure, were vowed at once to sacrilege and unhappiness.' Those of them who were resigned to their fate or merely cynical used the priesthood to further their careers, for the episcopate could lead to high office in the State. IN THE SEMINARIES ambitious young men prepared themselves 'NOT SO MUCH TO ADMINISTER THE SACRAMENTS AS TO ADMINISTER PROVINCES.'

"Worldly bishops, politician-bishops (Loménie de Brienne was their model) and even warrior-bishops, such as Mgr. von Gallen, Archbishop of Münster, who fought with distinction against the Dutch — and these types which were thought to have disappeared, were once more rampant. There was an even worse and hitherto unknown type of irreligious and even atheistic bishop: Jarante of Orléans, whose misconduct was notorious; Talleyrand of Autun, *who had kept a mistress ever SINCE HIS DAYS*

⁵ Henri Daniel-Rops, *The Church in the Eighteenth Century*, Image Book, New York 1966, pp. 323-326.

AS A SEMINARIAN; Loménie de Brienne, 'surrounded by a licentious and brilliant court', and so openly 'philosophical' that when he tried to obtain the See of Paris, Louis XVI rejected his application with the remark that 'the Archbishop of Paris must at least believe in God.'

"Numerous also were those who, *immediately after ordination*, arranged to live at court or to join the *entourage* of some great personage, often moving in disreputable circles. The Abbés Chateauneuf and Chaulieu wrote licentious verses in honour of Lisette and Phyllis, who were certainly not frequent visitors to the confessional, and the Italian Galiani was regarded as 'a champion clown.' Moreover, as we have seen, the 'philosophical' tribe produced another type of abbé, which unscrupulously paraded its irreligion. Such was the Abbé de Boufflers, who publicly declared himself an atheist and was unfrocked."⁶

"PRIESTS WITHOUT A VOCATION WERE TO BE FOUND ELSEWHERE than at court and in intellectual circles. At a lower level there were swarms of rectors, chaplains and non-beneficed clergymen...whose behaviour was often reprehensible. ROME WAS FULL OF SUCH PEOPLE, MORE SO THAN PARIS, MADRID AND VIENNA. ... THE PAROCHIAL CLERGY WERE NO MORE DESERVING OF PRAISE. In the first place THEIR NUMBERS WERE DECREASING NOTICEABLY, EVEN IN AUSTRIA, ITALY AND SPAIN. We read in the memoirs of a Breton parish priest these words, which might have been written today: 'People are always complaining about the scarcity of priests, and lamenting the fate of parishes almost deserted and abandoned.' (The situation of course was relative. There were still plenty of priests; any lack was relative to a still larger number). *Priests were indeed much better trained* (in the XVIII century) than at the beginning of the seventeenth century; in France *the parochial clergy formed the most reliable* element of the Church. WHETHER SEMINARIES HAD BEEN FOUNDED THEIR INFLUENCE HAD BEEN DECISIVE. BUT THERE WERE NOT SEMINARIES EVERYWHERE; even in France, *which was far ahead of other countries in that respect*, THIRTY-ONE DIOCESES WERE WITHOUT A SEMINARY IN 1789, AS WERE

⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 325-326.

MORE THAN HALF THOSE OF ITALY, *where thirty-two were opened in a hundred years. In Spain it was not until the last third of the century that ANY SERIOUS EFFORT WAS MADE.*

“Furthermore, IT SHOULD BE NOTED THAT ATTENDANCE AT SEMINARY WAS NOT YET OBLIGATORY FOR ORDINATION, and *the period of study was extremely varied, ranging FROM A FEW WEEKS TO THREE YEARS. Worse still, THE SEMINARIES THEMSELVES WERE PASSING THROUGH A CRISIS. Those houses, established for the training of first-rate priests, were themselves TOO FREQUENTLY PREY TO WORLDLY SEDUCTIONS.* When M. Emery was elected Superior-General of Saint-Sulpice in 1782 he found the seminary in a state that would have caused M. Olier to turn in his grave. *WORLDLINESS HAD REIGNED IN THE HOUSE EVER SINCE 1750, when Cardinal Fleury took rooms at Issy-les-Moulineaux, in the precincts of the seminary, and ministers, great lords and noble ladies made a habit of VISITING THE PLACE.* . . . When the new superior undertook to restore discipline he met with resistance that was almost a riot (NOTE: It seems that today’s “contestations” were already known way back in the XVIII century so that their blatantly violent expression cannot be justified as a positive sign of “maturity” and “responsibility” attributed to our modern youth and denied to the youth of past centuries — C.). One night THE SEMINARISTS let off fireworks at the four corners of the building; one of them (walking in his sleep, it was declared) drove a knife into M. Emery’s bed, but he was fortunately not there.”⁷

We have profusely quoted from the famous historian Daniel-Rops the lamentable features of the clergy in the XVIII century, especially in France, pointing out with marked stress a real cause of those evils, namely, the faulty implementation of the tridentine decree on Seminaries, particularly in what regards an *excessive* “opening” and “insertion” of seminarians in the world. But the dark shadows described above should not lead us to believe that such was the general rule. “There is nothing to justify the belief that the French clergy consisted (at that time) for the most part of worldly bishops, courier-abbés, immoral parish-priests

⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 327-328.

and religious neglectful of their vows. *The unworthy were a small though clamorous minority.*⁸ "The personal virtues of many bishops were undeniable; some are remembered as downright ascetics . . . As we come to know them better, we understand more clearly why most of those blue-blooded bishops showed such courage in face of revolutionary persecution . . . Side by side with clerics devoid of vocation, priestlings in search of prebends, and non-beneficed priests anxious for nothing but Mass stipends, there were many who fulfilled their sacerdotal task quietly, honestly and piously. They are little known . . . And yet what we do know of them second hand, through chronicles, memoirs and correspondence, is worthy of admiration. . . While remembering these little-known priests, we cannot refrain from quoting the tribute paid to them by Tocqueville (*L'Ancien Régime et la Revolution*, i. 169): 'All things considered and notwithstanding the vices of some of its members, I do not know whether the world has ever seen a body of clergy more remarkable than the Catholic clergy of France at the outbreak of the Revolution, more enlightened or better equipped with public virtues.'"⁹

However we should bear in mind that such precious fruits in the French clergy were the harvest of "a mighty effort during a period of one hundred years, an effort embodied chiefly in the foundation of SEMINARIES. These generations of priests, better instructed and more deeply spiritual, had been trained in houses established by many dioceses under the influence of Bérulle, St. Vincent de Paul, St. John Eudes, M. Olier and others. There were now one hundred and thirty dioceses, and one hundred and thirty seminaries — a world record. This, of course, does not mean that there was one in each diocese; some dioceses, e.g. Paris, had three, while thirty had none at all."¹⁰

"Nor does it mean that the situation was all that could have been desired; recruitment was often linked with money and was therefore not always beyond criticism. AN ADMIXTURE OF WORLDLY ELEMENTS — as we have seen at Saint-Sulpice- sometimes RESULTED IN DISORDERLY BEHAVIOUR; MOREOVER, SINCE RESIDENCE IN A SEMINARY WAS NOT AS YET EVERYWHERE

⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 350-355.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 352-355.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 355.

A *SINE QUA NON* OF ORDINATION, ITS HAPPY EFFECTS WERE BY NO MEANS UNIVERSAL.”¹¹ Are not these very old and pernicious flaws of the priestly education what some of our bold innovators nowadays are trying to revive in one way or other, under the specious slogans of “openness” and “insertion” in the world, which the Church admits *only* on condition that they should be (as Pius XII said) “GRADUAL AND PRUDENT”?....

Summing up our observations we ought to admit that, in general, it was only two centuries after Trent that Catholic nations began to realize seriously the urgent need to implement *as best as possible* the Church mind on Conciliar Seminaries, and these began to spread in a rather satisfactory way. The Age of Enlightenment, the Encyclopedists, Napoleon in France, the Bourbons in Spain and Emperor Joseph II in Austria, with the rationalism and deism proliferating everywhere, did exert a retarding influence in the effective progress of the XVIII century Seminaries; although under some aspects the intrusive action of the States proved, in certain aspects, beneficial to the incipient advancement of the same Seminaries.¹²

At last, however, all of a sudden the catastrophic explosion of the French Revolution came with its devastating impact, crimes and desecrations, which set a pattern for subsequent uprisings and virulent tumults against the Church in some other regions of Christendom. But amidst those smouldering ruins and truculent persecutions, in the dawn of the XIX century Divine Providence let the Church catch the first glimmers of a new era of hopeful restoration and renewal of her Seminaries, as we shall soon explain.

Still, it is true, at the beginning of the XIX century, under the Napoleonic regime, the mixed clerical education got a virulent apogee. It happened this way. During that time most of the educational centers were subject to State control, and only the *Seminaries* were allowed a certain degree of academic freedom. Forced by such circumstances the Jesuits decided to establish, under the name of *Minor Seminaries*, their Colleges where lay students were mixed with candidates to the priesthood.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, loc. cit.

¹² S.C. de Sem., *op. cit.*, pp. 130-136

The Bishops, however, by that time were quite aware of the havoc caused by a *mixed priestly training*. In order to prevent the untoward effects of such a system upon their future clergy, they strove to open authentic Tridentine Seminaries, exclusively intended for aspirants to the Priesthood.

Sad to say, neither the civil authorities nor the faithful heeded the earnest plea of the Episcopate requesting the necessary subvention to realize their noble project. The Seminary buildings were in ruins; professors and directors could not be found; financial means to support the students were lacking. Consequently, the Seminaries could not but offer a very deficient level of education.¹³ A historian of our own days remarks: "Even if we could not have other proofs, the picture presented by Cardinal Baudrillart, cited by Goyau in *Histoire de la Nation Française*, can give us an idea of how utterly deficient were the French Seminaries in those days of the XIX century."¹⁴ And the sad results of those needy Seminaries where the mixture of seminarians and lay students could not be entirely prevented, were manifested once more in the French clergy of the first half of the XIX century.¹⁵

God, however, knows to bring forth unexpected good from the very human errors and wrongdoings. With the rampant anticlerical liberalism and Statal laicism assuming the reins of public education, the Church found herself gradually freed from the noxious mixed priestly training. With the elimination of the Faculties of Theology in most of the State Universities and the suppression of the residential "Major Colleges" (as they were called) for clerical students annexed to the Universities, there remained no other choice for the candidates to the priesthood but to live and be properly trained in the *Seminaries*, segregated from lay students. While State-controlled lay Universities began to spread everywhere, the Seminaries turned out to become the unique educational center of clerical formation. Thus, even without purposely intending it, in the whole Church an end was practically put to the pest of mixed priestly

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 136

¹⁴ Manuel A. Gracia, C.M., *Los Seminarios de Filipinas*, in *Boletín Eclesiástico de Filipinas*, and in the review *Seminarium*, Manila, Julio 1936, pp. 14-15.

¹⁵ S.C. de Sem., *op. cit.*, p. 136

training which for three centuries had sapped the vitality and efficacy of the Seminaries.

The urgent and ever desirable segregation of seminarians and lay students was finally attained for the whole Church, at least in the Major Seminaries. In the XIX century the majority of Theology seminarians or clerics were educated in real Conciliar Seminaries, where they were segregated from lay students. For some groups of seminarians distinguished by their virtue and intellectual talents, the Church established in her own Universities, independent from State control, the Faculties of Theology and Canon Law; and close to those Universities or even within their precinct, a Boarding House exclusively reserved for ecclesiastics was usually founded for the seminarians attending the aforesaid Faculties. This residential College annexed to the University was actually a genuine Seminary, where authentic clerical discipline and spiritual formation were imparted to the students in order to infuse and preserve in them the spirit of their vocation.

Another positive element providentially introduced in most Seminaries of the XIX century was the well defined distinction — and as far as possible, separation — between Minor and Major Seminary departments. The specific function of *Minor Seminaries* for the careful selection and initial formation of prospective candidates to the priesthood was stressed.¹⁶ This was indeed a big step to foster ecclesiastical vocations. The only thing however to be lamented at was the fact that in these Minor Seminaries the pernicious factor of mixed clerical training was retained.

The Bishops, as we have already said, and still more the Seminary directors in immediate contact with the real situation, were quite aware of the inconveniences arising from a mixed education of seminarians and lay students, especially if these associated indistinctly with each other *everyday*, not only in the classrooms, recreations and other extra-curricular activities, but also lived together in the Seminary as in a Boarding House. And such was precisely the case in most Minor Seminaries even in the late XIX century: the so called “mixed Seminaries” then in vogue, were in reality mere College-Seminaries.

The explanation of this state of things is found in two causes. On one hand there was the financial motive: lay students, in general belonged

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p.13.8

to well-to-do families that could afford to pay well for the fine education offered in the Seminary, and earnestly desired or insistently begged for it; and with their pensions or tuition fees many poor seminarians could be supported, and the Seminary's economic problem as solved. On the other hand, neutral or non-sectarian public schools established by the State everywhere, introduced secularism and laicism, to counteract which the Bishops saw the urgent need to maintain a system of Catholic schools which might protect the youth from Godless education. Admitting lay students, even as interns, in the Seminary, both the financial difficulty in the maintenance of Seminaries and the apostolic need of providing Catholic education remained solved. Deprived of temporal means in those times to establish separately two institutions (the Minor Seminary and the Catholic School) so vital for the Church, it was deemed *practical*, though not really ideal, to fuse both institutions into one: the "mixed Seminary" or *College-Seminary*. The mixed clerical education which fortunately was already disappearing in Major Seminaries, seemed about to remain perpetuated in Minor Seminaries!

The above mentioned solution could not be altogether satisfactory. In reality it went against the dispositions of the Council of Trent where it was decreed: "Those who are received *in this College* (the SEMINARY or seedbed of priestly vocations) must be at least *twelve years old* (here the Council alludes, not precisely to the clerics of the Major Seminary, but to the boys — "*puerorum*" — of the Minor Seminary), . . . and by their good behavior and dispositions MUST SHOW THAT THEY WILL PROBABLY BE ABLE TO COMMIT THEMSELVES PERPETUALLY TO THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH." The mind of Trent was unconditionally adverse to all mixed clerical education at any stage of the Seminary training.¹⁷

It did not take long for the Church at the end of the XIX century to feel the pernicious effects of the "mixed Seminaries" or College-Seminaries. The *history of three centuries* was once again confirmed with the latest results: historically, the *final verdict* could not be but a *total disapproval or censure of mixed clerical education*.

(to be continued)

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 149-150.

PASTORAL SECTION

HOMILETICS

● **D. Tither, C.SS.R.**

February 1, IV Per Annum

A TEACHER WITH AUTHORITY

The Incarnation is God's way of making Himself available; it is also His way of making Himself known. We just heard Him say so by the lips of Moses: "I will raise up a Prophet, and place my words in His mouth" (*Deut. 18, 15:20*). When we hear the word "prophet" maybe we think of someone empowered by God to tell the future. That function is only a sideline for a prophet; a sign to establish his credentials. A prophet's primary duty is to instruct, to encourage, to rebuke in God's name. All through the Old Testament history, the people looked forward to this Prophet promised by God through Moses. He was, of course, Our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

We see Him fulfilling His function of Prophet or Preacher throughout His public life. A regular feature of Jewish life was to gather in the synagogue on the Sabbath day for a ritual like our Liturgy of the Word. Any notable person who happens to be in the synagogue can be invited to address the assembly. Jesus often used this opportunity to make His message known.

We have just heard St. Mark's account of one such occasion in his adopted town, Capharnaum (*Mk. 1:21-28*). The people were particularly impressed by the fact that He spoke as one having power, as a teacher qualified to speak and decide questions on His own authority. This aspect of His teaching never failed to astonish the people. When He spoke, again at a synagogue service, back in Nazareth, His town-

mates were astonished: "Where did He get all this? What is this wisdom given to Him? What mighty works are wrought by His hands!" (*Mk. 6:2*) Right till the triumphant procession of Palm Sunday, His preaching held them spellbound. "Never did man speak like this Man!"

No wonder! At His word, the sick got well, instantly and completely, and evil spirits fled in terror. We have just seen Him accompanying His teaching with a cure. An unfortunate wretch, possessed by the devil, was in the synagogue that day. The demon, recognizing Jesus' power, and realizing that he would overcome Satan, cried out: "I know Who You are, the Holy One of God." Forbidding any premature revelation of His identity (the people were just not ready for that yet), He cured the man, highlighting not the cure, but His teaching.

What is our attitude to Christ's teaching? We say at the end of the Gospel reading: "Praise to You O Christ," but do we mean it? Do we really recognize Him in His words, speaking to us now, just as He spoke in the synagogues? How often do we truly hear Him?

Whenever Jesus spoke, one of two possible attitudes resulted, and the same is true when He speaks today. There were the hardheaded, stubborn and obstinate, who came merely to look for something to object or to criticize. When His sermon was over, they retained nothing except maybe opposition to His doctrine.

Are we like that? Do we listen with complete openness to the Gospel and the homily that explains it? If we were asked about it after Mass would we recall anything? And yet, it was God revealing Himself to us. "He who hears you hears Me."

There were indeed sincere people in Jesus' time who listen to the Gospel and followed His instruction. They permitted themselves to be formed, even transformed by His words. His teaching acts powerfully on those of goodwill. It reveals who God is and who we are, how God loves us and how we treat Him. We discover His plan and what our cooperation should be. And we are stirred up to action, to loving service of Himself through our brethren.

We must have a clean heart to see God, in His words or anywhere else. "He who is of God hears the words of God." The Gospel is a revelation of God, but not just for those who stand there indifferent. We must be open, ready, submissive.

Have that clean heart, that generous openness to see ourselves as God sees us, and contrast it with what He wants to see. And then we shall see God, whatever the means He uses for communicating Himself to us — His words, His Son's activity in Mass and Sacraments, and the actual situations we find ourselves in our daily life. "Today, if you hear His voice, harden not your hearts."

February 8, V Per Annum

A SUFFERING MESSIAS

We all know the story of Job, the holy man who could not be shaken from patient resignation in spite of overwhelming trials. The Book of Job is written like a drama — his prosperity, a series of disasters, the wrongheaded advice of his friends and even his wife, that temptation to despair we have just heard (*Job. 7:1-7*) and the breakthrough to tremendous faith. 'I wish my words were written down... chiselled on brass, sculptured on a rock for posterity. I am sure that I have a Redeemer, eventually He will come to power. When I awake He will take me, and in my flesh I shall see the Almighty' (*Job. 19*).

This passing-over of Job from suffering to triumphant faith was a foreshadowing of Jesus Christ who came to teach us how to draw sense and meaning out of the frustrations and seeming futility of life. Do not pride ourselves in having the answer to the riddle of human existence. We did not learn it by our cleverness or talents. We received it as a gift. It comes from the example and teaching of Jesus Christ.

Today's Gospel extract shows us Jesus attracting the poor, the suffering, the neglected. One with God, He was also one with the people. He met them, talked to them on their own level. Again, as last Sunday (from now on the Gospel readings on "green vestment

Sundays" will continue from where the last Sunday's Gospel excerpt left off) we have St. Mark describing Jesus healing and casting out devils (*Mk.* 1:29-39).

As we saw last Sunday, He never permitted the devils who recognized Him to reveal who He was. Why? Because the people imagined and expected a Messiah and a Kingdom very different from what God planned. They wanted a victorious conqueror and material prosperity. This dangerous idea had to be gradually dispelled, lest the people, already excited to fever-pitch, ruin His work with an uprising. He gradually brought them to realize that His Kingdom was to be a *spiritual* one and that the Messiah foretold was to be a suffering Messiah (*Mk.* 2:13-17). Just how reluctant the Jews were to abandon their false idea can be seen at the very Ascension of the Risen Lord when the disciples He had trained so long still looked for national glory (*Acts.* 1:6).

His departure from Capharnaum (vv. 35-39) could well have been intended to create a cooling-off period, to allow the enthusiasm of the crowd to calm down. And of course, He wished to announce His Gospel in the other towns of Galilee. But always, He announced that He Himself must suffer (*Mk.* 8:31, *Lk.* 9:22) and that anyone who would follow Him must be prepared to take up his cross *daily*.

It is quite possible that the number of true Christians is not as large as we think. Many of us have had such a slight dose of Christianity that we have become more or less immune to the real thing. But the touchstone of an authentic Christian is a wholehearted readiness to accept unavoidable suffering in a Christian way. If we want to know whether we are genuine Christians, answer those questions honestly: "How do I face up to inescapable pain, or to disappointment, to trials? Am I indifferent to the sufferings of others or do I strive with utter unselfishness to take them on myself?"

Living out our Mass includes this, make no mistake about it: "He who does not take up his cross and follow Me, cannot be My disciple." Remember what our Baptism brought about — our identity with the Messiah who suffered and died and through that rose to ever-

lasting glory. As St. Peter puts it: "Rejoice in so far as you share Christ's suffering that you may also rejoice and be glad when His glory is revealed" (I *Pet.* 4:12-13). "Son though He was, He learned obedience in the school of suffering, and once perfected, became the source of eternal salvation for all who follow Him" (*Heb.* 5:7-8).

We are one with Him, our relation with Him is deeper and more real than to any other person. Like Him, and with Him living in us, we also go through cross to crown. "The sufferings of this life are not worthy to be compared with the glory that will be revealed in us," once we are completely one with Christ.

February 15, 1st Sunday of Lent

BAPTISM DEMANDS CONSTANT RENEWAL

Jesus told Nicodemus he would need to be born again of water and the Holy Spirit. Lent is a time for all of us to be born again, to have a real change of heart, to start to think differently, to accept Christ, to adopt His attitudes, His view of life. This entails a rebirth, a death to sin and selfishness, an awakening to the life of God, Who is Love. Only the person whose actions express love can stand the scrutiny of the light (*Jo.* 3:19-21).

This is why the Church, for the first Sunday of this year's Lent, recalls God's saving of Noe from the universal destruction of the flood to raise up a new people pleasing to God (*Gen.* 9:8-15). God's covenant with Noe is a sign (symbol) of our salvation in Christ, applied to us at our baptism. The rainbow has now a new significance—a sign that God will be faithful to His part of the covenant.

St. Peter (I *Pet.* 3:18-22) tells us that Baptism is like the Ark that saved Noe. Christ's descent to Limbo after His death (v. 19) was to announce salvation to the just of pre-christian times. Among them were some who, in Noe's time, persisted in their sinful state till the Ark

was afloat, but repented before they drowned. The water that destroyed a sinful race but carried the Ark aloft was a symbol of Baptism which destroyed our sinfulness and flooded us with the Divine Life. Noe, the father of a new race, was a reminder of what Christ would be and do.

Of all the Gospel accounts of Jesus' temptation, St. Mark's is the most summary (*Mk.* 2:11). Satan, during the 40 days of prayer and fasting that followed Jesus' Baptism, wished to find out if He were really the Messiah. If so, he would strive to lead him from the path of suffering which God had laid down as the course to be followed by the Messiah. That Jesus allowed Himself to be tempted is a sign of His complete identification with us, sin alone excepted, "for we have not a high priest, who is unable to sympathize with our weakness, but one who in every respect has been tempted as we are, yet without sinning" (*Heb.* 4:15).

The deepest meaning of temptation is our inclination to waver in our resolve and look for happiness elsewhere than in God, to go back on our baptismal promises. It is the tendency to compromise, to strive and serve two masters, to want the best of both worlds.

Noe was saved from the disaster of the Flood by the Ark. *But* he had to stay in the Ark. St. Peter compares the Ark to the Church. Now we entered the Church by way of our baptism and we stay in the Church by being faithful to our baptism, keeping the treasure that the water of baptism gave us when we were flooded with new life. The Holy Spirit was then poured into us. The same Spirit that dwelt in Christ Himself, the Spirit that led Him into the desert to be a model for us in handling the temptation to waver: "Begone, Satan!"

Thanks to our rebirth in water and the Holy Spirit, we share the present life of the Risen Savior. At His baptism, just before His 40 days' fast and temptation, He consecrated Himself to His life-work — preaching the Gospel of Life, and enduring death so that we might share in His risen life. Our baptism too is a commission to carry out God's work. It is a sacrament of decision, a lifelong decision, unceasingly renewed and intensified.

Lent used to be a time of intensive training for baptism. During Lent, at the "scrutinies," the life of a candidate for Baptism was examined to see if he showed reliable signs of sincerely wanting to give his life to Christ by serving others for His sake. A decision to renew our baptismal vows, as we will do on Holy Saturday night, is not to be lightly made; it calls for earnest thinking and soul-searching throughout Lent.

We know that Lent is a community preparation for Easter. We are not in isolation, we are supported by one another — our healthy relations with each other enable us to do what we could never do alone. "Through his dealings with others, through mutual projects and through brotherly discussion, a man develops his gifts and is able to rise to his destiny" (*Vat. II, Gaudium et Spes*). "A brother who is helped by his brother is like a strong city" (*Wisdom*).

February 22, 2nd Sunday of Lent

SHARING IN GOD'S LIFE

Tested and tried we all are. But surely none of us has ever faced up to a testing as severe as the one that tried Abraham. He had been assured that he would have descendants through his son Isaac. And now God commands him to sacrifice the boy (*Gen. 22*). The Church has always seen in this readiness of Abraham a figure of the Eternal Father delivering His Incarnate Son to be sacrificed for us.

St. Paul uses this readiness of the Father to sacrifice His Son as an assurance of His love for us in Christ. "He who did not spare His own Son, but delivered Him up for us all, will He not also give us all good things with Him?" (*Rom. 8:32*). Paul has been talking about our sharing in God's life, he feels the inadequacy of human words, that much has been left unsaid, so he gives us a key statement that can solve in advance all possible doubts and difficulties.

These become insignificant when we turn our attention where it ought always to be fixed — on the one great saving act of God Who

“so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son so that all who believe in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life” (*Jo.* 3:16). It is a general answer but it can never fail to reassure us. No one who believes this can ever doubt that God wishes us the very best in all circumstances, no matter how unlikely that may seem on our “Off days.”

The history of the Transfiguration of Jesus is the climax of St. Mark's Gospel (*Mk.* 9:1-9). In order to fortify His Apostles against the terrible testing their faith would undergo during His Passion, He let three of them see a glimpse of His Divinity and the glory that would be theirs. This radiant scene, coupled with the Father's declaration and the appearance of Moses (law) and Elias (prophets) was never to be forgotten, e.g. II Pet. 1:6, *Jo.* 1:16.

All that was implied could not be fully understood till after His resurrection — He enjoined silence till then, when it would be seen in its proper perspective. His glorious life, to be shared with us, explains what He had to endure to enter into His glory.

Christ, dead and risen, is the source of the divine life we share. He still lives and acts in His Church, through visible signs. The cloud from which the Father commended Christ at His baptism (*Mk.* 1:11) and now at His transfiguration had also been in Old Testament times an external manifestation of God's activity (*Ex.* 16:10, 19:9 and 16). These were signs of God's invisible help. We in the Church have similar signs in the sacraments.

For example, our Baptism made us one with Christ in His death and resurrection. For more than Isaac who is in a sense rose from the dead (his death was decreed and revoked at the last moment), we have been transported from the kingdom of darkness into the glorious light of His Son's life.

Abraham was ready to sacrifice his son, the only hope of his living on in his descendants, as a sign that he wished to share his life with

* Mt. Moriah, the site proposed for the sacrifice became centuries later the place of the Jewish temple and sacrifices (*Per.* 3:1) and later still the place from which Jesus set out for Calvary.

God. We, as a result of God's having sent His Son to die in our stead, share not just a token of Christ's risen life, but that very life.

We were radically changed by our baptism, not in outward appearance, but interiorly. There is less distance between us and a saint in Heaven than between an unbaptized person and ourselves. If you show a small child a tigbi seed and ask him if it is like a bead or a tree, he will laugh at you. But, he will be mistaken. The tigbi tree was once a seed, the seed can become a tree, but a bead has no life in itself. The baptized are completely different, we live on a divine plane.

This put serious obligations in us. Living with God's life, we must be changed also in our whole external life. For example, we must be ready to fight injustice and cruelty, no matter what their fancy names or who are guilty of them. This is living out our baptism. This is Christianity.

You and Your Service Sheet

— *Fourth of a Series* —

• Guillermo Tejon, O.P.

I. YOUR PIETY (*continued*)

5. — Your Visit to the Blessed Sacrament

You knew Christ before you went to the Cursillo House. Yet it can be said that you found Him there. You discovered — and accepted — Him as a friend.

What do you do with friends, *real* friends? — You visit them often, don't you? Why? — Because you love them. You enjoy their company, you like to talk to them, to listen to them...

Christ is your best friend. And He is there in the Tabernacle, waiting for you!

You don't need an appointment to visit Him. There is no secretary at the door asking you to fill up a form and state the purpose of the visit. He does not keep office hours. He is there all the time; day and night...

You don't have to dress up for the occasion. You don't have to bring a present...

On the contrary, He wants to shower you with presents, in exchange for the only present he expects from you: your love for Him attested to by your presence before His tabernacle.

Your friends cannot always help you. Sometimes they even refuse to. But Christ is always ready to help; and powerful enough to help in everything.

Why not visit Him?...

Just walk in, kneel, sit down, or stand before Him. And talk to Him with sincerity, with confidence, with love... As you did in the Cursillo House!

Tell Him that you love Him; that you believe in Him; that you are willing to sacrifice for Him. Tell Him about your family, your work, your problems...

And then listen to Him. Let His message reach the depth of your mind, of your heart...

If you don't feel like saying anything, just look at Him and love Him!

In general, visits are short. But they should be meaningful.

A visit is an act of piety in itself, different from Mass and Communion.

A visit is not an apostolic hour. It is just that, a visit; a few moments you spend in intimate conversation with your friend, Christ.

There is no need for the Blessed Sacrament to be exposed in order to pay Jesus a visit.

Of course, it is not exactly a sign of love to visit Jesus only when we need something from Him. Would you be happy if a "friend" of yours visited you only when he is in need of a favour?...

Visit Him often. If possible, daily.

You started the day with the Morning Offering, the Meditation, Mass and Communion. Then you got busy with your daily occupations. Noontime comes. How about visiting Jesus now? This would crown beautifully the first part of your day!

However, you can visit Jesus at any other time, at your convenience.

The "Visit" of your Guide Book is only a sample. You can use it or improvise your own. Just make sure that what you say are not mere words, and that your visit is no mere formality!

Perhaps on occasions you would like to visit Jesus, but you cannot do so. Don't let that deprive you of the benefits of Christ's companionship. Make a spiritual visit. Think of Him in a far away tabernacle and let your mind and your heart engage in a short conversation with Him.

6. — Your Rosary

If you love Jesus, you should love His Mother, Mary. She is also your Mother.

You should sing her praises, invoke her in your needs, and ask for her assistance in your apostolate.

There are many ways to honor Mary. The Rosary is one of them.

Your Guide Book tells you why the Rosary is a commendable devotion. That it is most acceptable to Mary she made this clear at Lourdes and Fatima when she repeatedly asked us to say the Rosary for the peace and salvation of the world.

The Rosary is composed of fifteen mysteries, commemorating fifteen events in the life of Jesus and Mary. For purposes of convenience, and to facilitate their recitation, these fifteen mysteries have been divided into three groups: Five *Joyful* (so called because they tell us of the good news of the Coming of Christ), five *Sorrowful* (they remind us of the Passion and Death of Christ), and five *Glorious* (which present Jesus and Mary in the glory of their resurrection and of heaven). Each of these three groups is known as one third of the Rosary.

"Rosary" in your Service Sheet means one third of the Rosary. Of course, if you want to say ten or fifteen mysteries, so much the better.

The Joyful Mysteries are said on Monday and Thursday; the Sorrowful on Tuesday and Friday; and the Glorious on Wednesday, Saturday and Sunday. This is a conventional division that has become tradi-

tional in the Church. When the Rosary is said in public, it is advisable to follow this division, in order to avoid confusion. But if you are reciting the Rosary in private, and for some reason you prefer to say the set of mysteries assigned to another day, you can do so.

Each mystery consists of one Our Father, ten Hail Marys and one Glory Be. On account of the ten Hail Marys a mystery is often called a decade.

The Litany is a beautiful chain of praises in honor of Our Lady; and it is a good custom to recite it. But it is not an essential part of the Rosary. Also non-essential are the Hail Holy Queen and other prayers that people sometimes add to the Rosary, as well as the passages from the Bible read in what is known as the "Scriptural Rosary."

The Rosary is not a mechanical recitation of Our Fathers and Hail Marys. The Rosary is at the same time a vocal and a mental prayer.

It is a vocal prayer because when you say the Rosary you pronounce the words of the Our Father and the Hail Mary with your lips. It is a mental prayer because, while your lips pronounce the words, your mind meditates on the life of Christ and His Mother.

For example. Let us suppose that you are reciting the third Joyful Mystery: the Birth of Our Lord. Your lips say the Our Father, the ten Hail Marys and the Glory Be. At the same time, your mind goes to Bethlehem, and recalls the events attendant on the Birth of Christ: Joseph and Mary reaching the town, their lodging at a cave, the nativity of the Lord, the angels announcing the good news to the shepherds, the shepherds rushing to pay homage to the new-born Baby, the Magi coming from far away lands to worship Him, the fact that Jesus came to this world to save you, how He was born in poverty, how He humbled Himself by becoming a man, how it is only through Him that you can be saved, etc.

Every mystery of the Rosary is a book from which we can learn something beneficial to our soul. Meditating on the first joyful mystery, your heart should be filled with joy at the thought of the wonderful blessings (of grace, merit and eternal happiness) brought to you by the Incarnation of Our Lord. When in the fifth sorrowful mystery you see Christ dying

on the Cross you should realize that, as His disciple, you have to suffer and die to sin. And when in the first glorious mystery you marvel at the splendor of the Risen Lord, a conviction should grow inside you that one day you will also rise and be glorified in the company of Jesus and Mary.

And so with all the other mysteries...

A Rosary said in this way is not boring. On the contrary, it becomes an interesting experience.

The Rosary is a mental prayer. However, it should not take the place of your meditation. They are two different acts of piety. But you can select a mystery of the Rosary as the subject of your meditation.

What people call Rosary "Cursillo Way" is not really Cursillo Way. It is true that in the Cursillo some mysteries of the Rosary are said with outstretched arms. This is done for the purpose of teaching us in a practical way that prayer is more effective if accompanied by mortification. But it does not mean that a cursillista must always say the Rosary that way.

Of course, you can say the Rosary with outstretched arms. When you do so, please keep in mind the following practical rules. In the first place, do not carry your mortification to such a point that your mind, on account of the uncomfortable position, cannot concentrate on the significance of the mystery you are reciting. Otherwise, you will defeat the purpose of your prayer. In the second place, do not force your family to follow your example. And finally, please do not do it when you are with non-cursillistas in a public place, like the Church. They might misinterpret your intentions, and think that you are trying to show off.

The beads of your Rosary have only one purpose: to help you count the Our Fathers and the Hail Marys. And, speaking of beads, do not pay any attention to those who insist that the beads and the crucifix have to be made of stone, or glass, or metal, or wood... It does not make any difference what kind of beads your Rosary has. However, for obvious reasons, they should be made of some material that is not easily breakable.

A Rosary is an instrument of prayer. It should be blessed. But one blessing is enough. There is no sense in asking every priest you meet to bless your rosary. Blessings are not collected like postage stamps.

And, by the way, if your rosary loses a few beads, just replace them with new ones; and do not bother about another blessing. Only when so many beads are replaced that almost a new rosary is made up is a new blessing needed.

There is nothing wrong with wearing your rosary around your neck or hanging it on the windshield of your car. However, it should not be displayed as if it were an amulet.

If you cannot pray the five mysteries of the Rosary at one time, you can separate them and say them at different times during the day. If for some reason, you want to say the Rosary and cannot count the beads with your fingers, go ahead with your Rosary and try to keep a mental record of the Hail Marys you say. And, if in the process, you say one too many in one mystery and one too few in the next, do not worry about that. What Our Lady wants is your love; and of that you have plenty in your heart.

Some people pay a lot of attention to the indulgences attached to the Rosary, and too little to the way they say it. Indulgences are good; but it is far more important to pray the Rosary properly. Besides, how can anyone expect to gain indulgences by saying the Rosary in a way that displeases Our Lady?

The Family Rosary is a wonderful custom. If every evening you, your wife and your children gather around the image of Our Lady and praise her with the recitation of the Rosary, she will no doubt bless you; and her material blessing will preserve and increase the love, unity and happiness of your family.

Summarizing, here are two very good reasons why you should say the Rosary daily. The first is that the Rosary will help you attain your personal sanctification. A continuous meditation on the mysteries of the life of Jesus and Mary will slowly make your life similar to theirs. The second is that the Rosary is a valuable instrument in your apostolate. Mary is called "Queen of Apostles." Since you are an apostle, you

should seek her assistance in your apostolic work. As a matter of fact, the history of the Cursillo is full of marvellous apostolic conquests accomplished through the Rosary. A Rosary is a powerful spiritual weapon in the hands of a cursillista. It should be a powerful spiritual weapon in your hands.

That is why the Rosary is said in the Cursillo. And that is why your Service Sheet invites you to say it in the Post-Cursillo.

"Invites" because, in spite of its excellence, the Rosary is not *necessary* in the life of a Christian. A Christian can be saved without the Rosary. But you can be a better Christian and therefore attain your salvation more easily if, through the Rosary, you commend yourself often to your Mother, the Blessed Virgin Mary.

HISTORICAL SECTION

Notes on

THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN THE PHILIPPINES * 1521-1898

● Pablo Fernandez, O.P.

Preface

The ecclesiastical history of the Philippines is divided into two periods. The first includes the years from the arrival of the Gospel in 1565 until Philippine Revolution in 1898; the second from the latter date to the present. We could characterize the first as a period of union between the Church and the State, the second as one of separation. This is the feature that stands out in both periods.

The subject is very vast. We have decided therefore to limit our present study to the vicissitudes of the Catholic Church in the Philippines during the Spanish colonial period, that is, from 1521 — to be more precise, 1565 — until 1898. This will be matter for some forty-two chapters; but the period which opens with the arrival of the North Americans to our own day, shorter in duration of time but equally rich in events, we shall leave it for another pen.

Once a complete study is finished, this could serve as a manual or class text for colleges and seminaries that want to introduce the subject in their courses in Religion or History. It could also be a manual of reference for priests and educated laymen interested in the history of the Church in the Philippines. We hope that our efforts would finally serve as a point of departure for a future scholarly ecclesiastical history of this country.

* An essay towards a history of the Church in the Philippines during the Spanish period, 1521-1898, translated by Jose Arcilla, S.J., faculty member of Ateneo University, Department of History.

A history of the Church in the Philippines is a work of much labor and research; we claim in this essay to be neither complete nor exhaustive. The reader, then, should not be surprised if he finds several lacunae which we are unable to fill. Our sole aim in the present work is to present a panorama of the Church in the Philippines during the period mentioned, without going into details or stopping to investigate all the aspects of our research. Nonetheless, the curious student will not fail to find here and there primary information from manuscripts preserved in archives, or from rare and out-of-print books. For this series of articles we have availed ourselves of the rich collections of documents existant in the archives of Santo Domingo Church (Quezon City) and of the University of Santo Tomas, besides many other printed works.

Without completely neglecting the chronological order, it seemed better to proceed according to subject matter, that is, to review the events and activities which have stood out in the ecclesiastical history of the Philippines. We shall treat, the following topics:

PART ONE — HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

1. Religious ideas and practices at the time of the arrival of the gospel.
2. Discovery, conquest and colonization of the Philippines.
3. Mission work of the Religious orders.
4. Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. The Diocese.
5. Missions and parishes.
6. The founding of seminaries and the growth of the native clergy.
7. The Apostolate of teaching: Schools and Colleges. The University of Santo Tomas.
8. Charitable Institutions.
9. Religious orders and congregations for women.
10. Third Orders. *Obras Pias*. Confraternities and Associations. Devotions. Sanctuaries.
11. Councils and Synods.
12. The Royal Patronage.
13. Diocesan Visitation.
14. The Secularization Movement.
15. Jurisdictional conflicts between the Church and Civil Authority.
16. Superstitions. Virtues and Vices.

17. Religious Practices and Rites.
18. Sanctity.
19. The services of the Church to the State and to the Filipino people.
20. The task of pacification by the Church in the Philippines.
21. Miscellaneous services.
22. The charitable and humanitarian role of the Church during the Moslem raids.
23. The Church in the Philippines during the British invasion.
24. The Church and the material welfare of the people.
25. The Church and the development of Agriculture.
26. Church Finances.
27. The Friar lands.
28. Foreign Missions.
29. Religious causes of the Revolution.
30. The Church during the Philippine Revolution — First Phase (1896-1897).
31. The Church During the Philippine Revolution — Second Phase (1898).
32. The Church During the Philippine Revolution — Third Phase (1899-1901.)
33. Readjustment after the Revolution

PART TWO — GROWTH IN CULTURE

34. The Press in the service of the apostolate.
35. Theology, Sacred Scripture, Liturgy and Canon law.
36. Catechisms, books of piety and devotion.
37. Philosophy and the exact sciences.
38. Natural sciences.
39. Geography, History and Ethnology.
40. Philology.
41. Engineering and Architecture. Fine Arts. Music.
42. Literature.

NOTE: Since forty-two chapters would be quite a lengthy series, the *Boletín Eclesiástico* undertakes to publish only the thirty-two chapters of Part One for the time being. These are now written almost completely, while the ten chapters of Part Two and the Appendix have been put aside for a later time, according as circumstances shall dictate.

Chapter One

RELIGIOUS IDEAS AND PRACTICES BEFORE THE ARRIVAL OF THE GOSPEL

Before the coming of the Gospel, the religious ideas and practices of the Filipinos were only vaguely conceived, variform and many. This was due to a minimal inter-island exchange among them, the diversity of dialects, and the ceaseless fighting among the different ethnic groups, as well as within the individual groups themselves. Here we shall mention only the more noteworthy of their religious tenets.¹

1. Belief in a Supreme Being

Before the arrival of the missionaries, the Filipinos already believed in a supreme being, which the Tagalogs called *Bathala Maykapal* (God, the Creator), the Visayans *Laon* (Old Man, or The Ancient), and the Ilocanos *Cabunian*.² Bathala dwelt in a place named *Languit* (sky) which the natives could describe only very vaguely and confusedly. They considered the supreme being as one without limits, creator of heaven and of earth, lawgiver, judge of the living and of the dead. In their way of thinking, he was so high above men, so far beyond their reach, so little concerned about their affairs. Thus, their god, in contrast to the true God, had no care for his creatures. Even if they had come to guess some of his attributes, they could not define, even vaguely, his essence.

¹ In our listing and description of the religious ideas and practices of the ancient Filipinos, we follow mainly the modern historians: Eufonio Alip, *Philippine Civilization Before the Spanish Conquest*. University of Santo Tomas Press, (Manila, 1936) 87-101; Evergisto Bazaco, O.P., "Life and Beliefs of the Early Filipinos," *The Letran News*, September-October, 1935.

² Colín, Francisco, S.J., *Labor Evangélica, Ministerios apostolicos de los obreros de la Compañía de Jesús*, Etc., Parte primera. (Madrid, 1663), 63 col. 1.

They dared not even pronounce his name. If they did, it was with some sign of reverence mixed with fear. They did not address prayers to him. They did not offer him the tribute of their worship, did not sacrifice to him.³

2. Polytheism: Secondary Deities

And so, in their needs, they turned their eyes to a cohort of secondary deities, equivalent to the mythological beings of Greece and Rome. These deities were quite numerous, since, in the manner of those nations, there was a god for each village. There were also gods for the mountains, rivers, reefs, the rainbow, the rocks and many other natural objects.⁴ The more principal ones were:

The god *Kaptan* who dwelt in the sky with Bathala. He was the god who planted the first bamboo from which human life sprang. He was lord of the thunder, the cause of men's diseases and of the plagues of nature. He had also the power to resurrect the dead.

Manguayen had some of the attributes of *Kaptan*. In addition, he was charged with ferrying in a boat the dead to hell. But the task of presenting these to the god of hell belonged to *Sumpoy*, who lived there. The lord of hell was *Sisiburanin*, who punished the souls presented to him, unless the living offered a sacrifice on their behalf. The Greco-Roman Ceres had her counterpart in Philippine mythology in the person of the goddess *Lalahon*. She presided over the good and the bad harvests. Another deity worth mentioning was *Varangao*. He lived in the rainbow and he carried the souls to heaven. The god *Sidapa* had the special power of deciding the length of men's lives.⁵

Like the gods of pagan mythology, these divinities were not pure spirits. More often they put on human and animal forms and they were

³ Loarca, Miguel, *Relación de las Islas Filipinas* apud Blair and Robertson, V, 172 ff.

⁴ Colín, *Ibid.*, 64, col. 1.

⁵ Alip, *op. cit.*, 88; Bazaco, *op. cit.*, 14, Cfr. Aduarte, Diego, O.P., *Historia de la Provincia del Santísimo Rosario de Filipinas*. (Zaragoza, 1693) 70; Loarca, *loc. cit.*, 131, 133, 135.

subject to human passions and weaknesses. They took part in the wars of men, were cruel and vindictive, and were appeased only by sacrificial gifts and offerings.

3. The Worship of Spirits

The natives also had faith in spirits which, according to the more accepted opinion, were nothing else but the souls of the dead. They believed in good spirits, which they called *anito* (*s*), and in bad spirits, called in Tagalog *mangalo* (*s*). Among the Visayans, the good spirits were named *diwata* (*s*). The good spirits, according to some, were the same as our angels, that is, the messengers of Bathala who sent them to the world to help men. The anitos carried on a ceaseless war with the mangalos.

In their honor the natives carved images of stone, wood, ivory, and bone. But the worship offered them seems rather selfish, motivated only by the desire to win favors from them.

The natives had neither temples nor special sites designated for worship. On the other hand, they busied themselves in continual offerings of their prayers and sacrifices to win the gods' favor. This was the role assumed by certain priestesses, generally old women, called *katalonan* (*s*). They offered to their gods with some frequency animal sacrifices, and, in a rare instance in Isabela and Nueva Vizcaya which the Dominican missionaries had witnessed, human sacrifice.⁶

4. Animism

In addition to all this, they believed in a whole world of spirits who animated the most varied objects of nature, as the sun, the moon, the stars, the rainbow, the sea, the lakes and river, the mountains, the trees, the birds and the animals. Thus, they adored the crow as the lord of

⁶ Colín, *op. cit.*, page 63, col. 2; Aduarte, *op. cit.*, page, 140, col. 2. "Instigated by this capital enemy of the human race, they are in the habit of buying some *indios* from other provinces, to offer them as sacrificial victims to the devil..." (Del Río, Manuel, O.P., *Relación de los sucesos de la misión de Santa Cruz de Ituy en la provincia de Paniqui*, etc. [1739, Manila] 10).

the earth, called *Maylupa*; the crocodile, an object of their reverence and awe, and invoked under the name of *NONO* (grandfather);⁷ the bamboo, which they dared not cut despite their great need of it to build houses; the rocks, the reefs and islands along the coasts.

5. Superstitions

They were much given to auguries and superstitions. We shall cite only two cases mentioned by Aduarte: "If, on leaving the house, they met someone sneezing, they returned to their houses, even if they had traveled a whole day, or even if they had just reached their destination, as if the sneezing was on the road. If this happened when they were about to start their work, they left off working immediately. If they heard a bird singing on any such occasions which seemed an ill omen to them they would return even if they had walked for many days. This was true even if it was an entire army that had marched off to war. They would fight under no circumstances, disregarding whatever advantages they had . . ."⁸

They likewise believed in the existence of ghosts, like the *aswang*, or a person who, when someone fell sick or suffered some pains, would put on at nightfall the form of an animal, as a pig, a horse, etc., and go in search of a victim which was ordinarily a sick person or a pregnant woman.

The *Magtatangal* was a nocturnal vagabond without head or members, but who, at sunrise, assumed a complete human form.

The *Mangagaway* had power to grant health or inflict sickness by means of herbs or medicinal plants.

There were several others of the kind.⁹

6. Soothsayers and Sorcerers

As so many other peoples, the Filipinos believed in seers, or certain individuals to whom they attributed the power to foretell the future.

⁷ Colín, *op. cit.*, 63, col. 2.

⁸ Aduarte, *op. cit.*, 140, col. 2; 141.

⁹ Alip, *op. cit.*, 91.

On the other hand, magi and quack doctors undertook to cure sickness by applying homemade medicines which ordinarily consisted of herbs or unguents, or by invoking the malignant spirits, or *Mangolo (s)*.¹⁰

7. Places of Worship

The Filipinos of pre-Hispanic times had no places of worship built of strong materials, as we have our churches. But they usually erected by the side of their houses some lean-to of light material, which they called *simbahan* or *sibi*. Sometimes, a room in the houses of the richer natives served as a place of worship. There they kept the images of their gods and anitos. In some places, they rendered cult to their deities in grottoes or in the thicknesses of their forests.¹¹

8. Priestesses

As in other religions, the Filipinos did not lack persons deputed to offer cult to their idols. Thus, they had some sort of a bishop whom they called *Sonat*; priests, or better, priestesses, named *Katalonan*, *Babaylan*, or simply *Bayban*; and seers, known by the name *Pangataohan*. The *Sonat* and the *Pangataohan* were not known in many parts of the islands, and their role was limited to that of presiding over the ceremonies, without taking active part in the religious act. However, the *Katalonan* occupied a prestigious social position, and during her actuation as priestess, she was believed under the influence of the spirits. Actually, there were instances when a supernatural being spoke through their medium. According to some chroniclers, this was the devil.¹² With regards to their training, suffice it to say that they were formed under the direction of an experienced *Katalonan*, whose priestly function they assumed upon her death.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 92; Delgado, J. Juan, *Historia general sacro-profana, politica y natural de las islas del poniente, llamadas Filipinas* (Manila: Imprenta del Eco de Filipinas de D. Juan Atayde, 1892) 368.

¹¹ Colín, *op. cit.*, '65, col. 1.

¹² "Indeed, to the embarrassment of the devil, he confessed to them one day this very month [March 1739] in a town called Gapat [today, Bagabat], through the medium of a witch or sorcerer who overpowered by the spirit of the demon and speaking with the looks and the gestures of one possessed,

9. Acts of Worship

Although the natives lacked a religious code like the Bible or the Koran, they followed set prayers which, together with their oaths, vows, offerings, sacrifices, penitential rites, dances and songs constituted their cult. The people prayed to the gods and the anitos in order that these might intercede on their behalf in Bathala's presence. For their part, the priestesses offered prayers in a language which the people did not understand, nor as is almost certain, the priestesses themselves. These prayers they recited anywhere the anito whom they invoked resided. And so, they prayed in their houses, in the field, at sea, in the rivers and the mountains.¹³

10. Oaths

Father Colin has this to say on the subject: "The oaths of these peoples were all execratory, in the form of dire curses. '*Matay!*' ('Drop dead!') '*Cagtin nang buaya!*' (The crocodile swallow you!') '*Maginato!*' (I be an ape!') The most used was '*Matay!*'"¹⁴

They seldom took oaths; but when they did, they could fulfill them with religious scrupulosity. They called the practice *pasambahan* whenever they took an oath with unusual solemnity.

11. Sacrifices

The lowland Filipinos did not offer human sacrifice to their gods, but in the provinces farther removed from civilization, one comes upon an isolated case, as we have already noted. On the other hand, they had the custom of burying slaves in the graves of their masters, believing doubtless that they would serve the latter even in the other world.

said: "What is this that is taking place in my land? What is this change in this people? What are these [men] of white teeth doing here? (Del Rio, *Op. cit.*, 21). And Aduarte says: "The devil used to talk with them several times in their language in such a way that they heard and understood that he was present, but they did not see him." (*op. cit.*, 141).

¹³ *Ibid*

¹⁴ Colin, *op. cit.*, 67, col. 1

There were two kinds of sacrifices: one, offered for the sick or the dead, called *magaanito*; the other, offered by the rich to make a show of their opulence. The Spaniards who witnessed this called it "the feast of the great god."¹⁵

12. The Genesis of the World

Concerning the origin of the world, the sea-coast and the mountain dwellers gave different versions. For the former, the earth and the sea had existed from all eternity; but for the mountaineers, there existed only the sea and a bird like a spirit flying through the sky. One day he became tired, for there was no place where he could alight or rest. In his anger, he took water from the sea and threw it furiously against the sky. The sky in turn gave vent to its wrath and cast down upon the sea boulders of rocks and earth, from which sprang the islands, the mountains and the valleys and hills of the continents.¹⁶

13. Origin of Man

The bird had now some spot where he could rest, and he did so at once by the seashore. A floating bamboo, launched by the waves and the winds, came to hurt his fragile feet. His wrath was aroused and in his anger he picked up the piece of bamboo so mightily that it broke in two, and from its nodes sprang the first man and the first woman.

The seacoast dwellers related the same story in a different way. Miguel de Loarca narrates it like this: "When the wind of the sea came in contact with the wind of the earth, the latter gave birth to a bamboo reed. The god Kaptan planted this reed, which, on maturing, broke in two, from which man and woman came. Now, the first man was called *Silalag* and the first woman *Sicauay*. This is the reason why all men are called *lalaké* and all woman *babaé*.

¹⁵ Alip, *op. cit.*, 96.

¹⁶ Bazaco, "Life and Beliefs of the Early Filipinos," *The Letran News* (September, 1935) 121.

Silalag sought the hand of Sicauiy in marriage. She refused him because he was her brother. They decided to consult the tunnies of the sea; then the dove; and finally the earthquake. The last said that it was convenient for them to get married; and they did. From this union several children were born."¹⁷

14. The Body After Death: Its Care

The dead body received the utmost care. The Jesuit Pedro Chirino narrated that the dead was washed with water, rubbed with the gum of the storax tree and other aromatic spices. They poured preservative juice into the mouth, ears and nostrils in such an effective manner that the corpse remained incorrupt for many years. Besides careful treatment, the dead body was dressed elegantly, keened and then buried.¹⁸

15. Burial

In the early days there was no common cemetery or burial grounds. The corpse was buried amidst great sorrow in any place for burial may either be near his house, in a cave, or in the headlands overlooking the sea and, at times, thrown with a gesture of finality into the sea, especially if the dead had been fishermen. The burying ground was also considered sacred by the natives. If somebody passed that place he was considered guilty of sacrilege and was meted the punishment of death, slavery, or a fine.

16. Mourning

The ancient Filipinos mourned before and after the funeral. Mourning before the funeral consisted in enclosing themselves within the house for several days, covering themselves with ragged, dirty clothing, keeping absolute silence, and abstaining from food but not from an occasional drink. After the funeral the relatives of the dead

¹⁷ Loarca, Miguel, *Relación de las islas Filipinas* apud Blair and Robertson, V, 123.

Relación de las islas Filipinas (Rome, 1046) apud Blair and Robertson, XII, 302 ff.

continued mourning, and this mourning consisted in wearing rattan bands around their necks, arms and legs, and in promising to abstain from meat, rice and drink.

Mourning among the nobility was stricter. No colored clothes were worn by the grieving people. All wars and quarrels were suspended, and all warriors carried their spears with the points down and their daggers with hilts reversed.¹⁹

17. Future Life

Likewise they believed in the spirituality and immortality of the soul, although on this matter their ideas were not too clear or precise. They also believed in a future life where the good would receive the reward of their goodness in the other life in heaven, and the bad their punishment in hell. They also believed in some kind of a risen life, for, according to Father Aduarte, the Cagayanos affirmed that their fathers would some day return to this world to rejoin their sons.²⁰ We have already said that, in their beliefs, the souls of the good would be changed at times into good spirits (*anitos*) and those of the bad into bad spirits (*mangalos*). In the future life, each one would have the same social rank and would exercise the same office as here below.²¹

18. Conclusion

We could say that the beliefs of the Filipinos before the arrival of the gospel were a reflection of the primitive revelation. But they were quite strongly modified by errors which naturally obscured human intelligence when the light of faith is absent and there is no authority, divinely constituted to watch over it lest it lose its direction towards eternity. The same thing happened to the other pagan peoples.

(to be continued)

¹⁹ Alip, *op. cit.*, 97-99; Bazaco, *op. cit.*, 225-226.

²⁰ Aduarte, *op. cit.*, 142.

²¹ Cfr. Santa Inéz, Francisco, *Crónica de la provincia de San Gregorio Magno*. (Manila: Tipo-litografía de Chofre Y Comp., 1892) Tomo I, 50.

THE RELIGIOUS OF THE ASSUMPTION

The Congregation of the Religious of the Assumption, founded in Paris in 1839 by Mother Marie Eugenie Milleret de Brou was invited by Marie Christine, Queen Regent of Spain to open a Normal School in Manila. In 1892, when the Normal School was founded, a boarding school which remained opened until the outbreak of the Philippine Revolution was also begun.

In 1904, at the request of Pope Pius X, an English speaking group of Religious, headed by Mother Helen Margaret Biggar arrived and the school was reopened, to be followed soon by the opening of a Free School for needy children. In 1940, the College Department was opened and because of expansion was transferred to a new foundation in San Lorenzo in 1958.

The enrollment in our school on the Manila campus is 1,450.

One of the chief characteristics of Assumption-Manila is openness to the needs of others. Practically every Saturday and Sunday, the school facilities, chapel, auditorium, playground and some classrooms are lent to different groups such as: the CWL, the Mother Butler Guild, YCW, the CWWA etc. The House in Baguio which serves as a summer Retreat and Rest House for the Novitiate and the Sisters of the Province has a small elementary school. This House has been used as the Diocesan Cursillo House for the past two years. The Community of Assumption-Manila feels that it is one of the ways it can practice "Ecumenism," taking the word in its broad sense of openness to all.

The Manila House has also guest quarters for visiting Religious. At present it houses two Vietnamese Sisters and one Maryknoll Sister. Sisters from abroad coming to study, attend Conventions or make a foundation are always welcomed.

The apostolate done in this House as in all Assumption Houses in the P.I. is chiefly that of Education. Other needs of the Church are answered in a form compatible to this great work of education in institutions administered according to the Gospel. We try to teach our students the meaning of real liberty which results into joy — the gift of self to God and our neighbor — the true concept of responsibility:

1. Catechetical work in Public schools and in Barrio Kapampangan, Pasig Line and Consolidated Mills.
2. Social Action in Punta Tenement, Tondo, etc.
3. Our Alumnae have initiated a social action project in Barrio Cristo Rey-Kapampangan.
 - a. nursery school
 - b. clinic
 - c. vocational training for teen-age boys

In 1910, a group of Assumption Religious opened the House in Iloilo at the request of Bishop Dennis Dougherty, D.D. then Bishop of Jaro. From the very beginning, a school was established and the Blessed Sacrament had been exposed in the Chapel without interruption. The school consists of the Elementary, High School and College departments with an enrollment of 800 including 150 resident students.

The Collegiates give weekly catechetical instructions to about 900 children in the local public school, with about 500 children receiving instructions on Sunday mornings from the High School students. The peaceful atmosphere of the quiet campus on the Iloilo River, overlooking the Antique mountains seems to nourish the many Religious vocations this House has given to the Church.

San José Antiqué was the scene of the next foundation on June 10, 1955 at the request of Archbishop Jose Ma. Cuenco, Archbishop of Jaro. Although a few schools existed in the province at the time of the request, none of them was under the care of religious. The Archbishop hoped that the presence of religious teachers in the province would influence, not only the students who would come directly under the care of the Sisters, but also the parents of the children — most of whom were non-Catholics or lukewarm members of the flock.

The school is open to children of all creeds and strata of society. Because of the poor economic condition of the Province, the school is practically a free one, supported mainly by the charity of the other Assumption schools of San Lorenzo, Manila and Iloilo. Thanks to the generosity of our Sister-schools, San Jose Academy is able to offer to the poorest children, the benefits of Christian education. A few children whose parents can afford it, pay a minimal fee.

Education remains the main apostolate of the House, giving an equal chance to everybody of profiting of the education given. This, the School helps in the training of future citizens and leaders of the province and diocese. Through the Holy Family Club, its parent-teachers' organization, it has also become an important factor in the formation of public opinion and attitudes in the diocese.

Because of the rapid increase of enrollment in the Manila College department, it was necessary to expand and the San Lorenzo foundation was made in 1958. The demands of the Alumnae and residents of Forbes Park and the Community of San Lorenzo Village made it necessary to open an Elementary and High School Department as well. The present enrollment of the 3 departments over 1,400 students.

In 1959, the House of San Lorenzo became the Provincialate for the Province of the Far East composed of Houses in the P.I. and Japan with Mother Marie Marthe the present Provincial, at the helm.

Conscious of the fact, that women exercise such an immense influence on the home and Philippine society, and on human aspects of civilization in general, the Religious and Lay Faculty offer a liberal Education based on spiritual and moral conviction. This, in time, will produce proper attitudes for Christian living in the home — the nation — the world.

Although a private school, Assumption-San Lorenzo offers a high percentage of free scholarships to worthy students both on High School and College level, the latter department including competitive academic and resident ones, as well. Public High School graduates have been successful recipients of the College scholarships. The House is open to all in the spirit of dialogue i.e. — friendship and service.

a. Free Adult in the College.

- b. Recollection Days for Public School teachers
- c. Diocesan group meetings
- d. Days of Recollection for House help in the San Lorenzo Village
- e. Saturday Catechetical Instruction for Catholic children attending the American School
- f. Monthly Religious seminar for Mothers of Children attending the American School
- g. Days of Recollection for Students in Public Schools.

The different foreign embassies recommend our school to the personnel in diplomatic and foreign service, for they know they will receive hospitality and possible enrollment. Consequently, there is an international Religious Faculty and student population.

Because of the dimension of service which is added to the Liberal Academic Education of the students, the following apostolic works are added to those above mentioned:

- 1. Catechetical Instruction in Public schools
- 2. S.C.A. social extension work in public schools.
- 3. Vocational instruction in Welfareville Training Center for girls.
- 4. Building of Sapang Palay School.
- 5. Vocational Center in Malibay.
- 6. Opening of 23 Summer Day Camps by Collegiates in different areas of P.I.

The Novitiate in the Philippines was declared valid because of war on June 4, 1941 and it was canonically erected on August 11, 1947.
Present Statistics:

Number of Postulants	12
Number of Novices	7
Number of Junior Sisters	10

The Junior Sisters receive a theological and Scriptural formation by attending courses at the Sister Formation Institute and in the Junior-

ate-Manila. They also take courses in Catechetics and Liturgy. After two years in the Juniorate, the Scholastics pursue their professional training by taking courses leading to Undergraduate or Graduate degrees.

At the time of this writing there are 106 Professed Religious in the Province of the Philippines.

Filipinas	90
Foreign	16

Foundations planned for the near future:

- July 1968 — Barrio Obrero (Iloilo) — Primary School and Clinic
 - Sibalon, Antique — Primary School
 - 1969 — Barrio San Simon — Pampanga
 - Malibay (Pasay) Primary School
-

THE PARISH PRIEST AND THE PARISH CREDIT UNION

● **Ismael B. Misolas**

Member, Philippine Credit Union
Volunteer Organizers, Inc. (PHILCUVO)

A parish credit union is no different from other credit unions. Like all credit unions, it fulfills a basic financial need: a place to borrow and place to save without a third party to skim off some of the profits. The *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World* encourages "the active participation of everyone in the running of an enterprise" (68) whose fundamental purpose is not mere multiplication of products. Neither must it be mere profit, nor domination. "Rather, it must be the service of man, and indeed of the whole man, viewed in terms of his material needs and the demands of his intellectual, moral, spiritual and religious life" (64).

Catholic churchmen have always been quick to identify credit unions with this kind of enterprise which Vatican II wants to promote. In the Philippines, the Catholic Bishops, through the National Congress for Rural Development, adopted the credit union movement as one of the major objectives toward the socio-economic upliftment of the country. They even proposed to make it a part of the program of formation of seminarians. The principal reason behind this special commendation is that the Church does not only see in the credit union movement the economic advantages, but also the spiritual gains for the members. Its activities are not just restricted to those of borrowing and lending. For a parish priest, a credit union helps him serve the people. And that for him is what makes a credit union a parish credit union.

Too often the parishioners have the impression that the priest is more interested in the material needs of the "church," than he is in the material needs of the people. The church-convent-school troika is oftentimes the only pre-occupation the priest can think of in his whole stay in the parish. Besides this most important task, however, the priest must also discover the social aspect of his priestly work. His priestly existence urges him to serve — to serve God and society in the best way he can. And "the best way he can serve," says the UST Rector Magnificus Fr. Jesus Diaz, "is to be relevant, to be pertinent, to be at the heart of things in the milieu in which he finds himself." He must see the real human needs of his parish, and must actually rub elbows with his parishioners grappling with community problems. Man's needs determine his interest, it is said. The parish priest should be able to articulate these needs to his people, and to propose the credit union idea as the answer, eventually helping them assimilate its meaning for their daily lives. Through this venture, he can give expression to his people of the interest he has in their temporal welfare.

The parish credit union fills the basic needs of parishioners.

The credit union idea is born out of a need — a basic need of an honest, hard-working citizen, who struggles year in and year out to keep his head above the economic maelstrom. He has to cope with the rigid financial demands for tuition fees as a means of continuing higher education for his children in the catholic school. He has to meet many heavy and sudden expenses. And the high cost of living! And yet he cannot control the urge to splurge his meager savings in fiestas with all the concomitant unwise spending. Eventually he can no longer afford to get any help from the usual money sources. His only alternative is to go to a loan shark who charges exorbitant rates. And he is put again into a kind of bondage in which he is forced to refinance over and over again to pay the costs of previous loans. Finally, he is bound to commit some immoralities which stem from despair and discouragement.

Confronted with this overburdened man, the priest introduces him into the cooperative world. The parish credit union, he knows, will teach him moral discipline which will make him the master of his money, rather than its servant. The parish credit union's heavy emphasis on savings

habit and cooperative thrift will build his character and will help him save systematically out of his present income. Gradually he will be inspired with new hopes, because now he has something which he never had before. Little by little, he keeps effective control of his finances, because he knows that credit demands from him moral and legal responsibility and repayment obligation, and the unwise use of it will merely produce "narcotic effect" that leads to greater money problems, since credit is not increased income, but the present use of unearned, future income.

Certainly, the parish credit union has picked him up and clothe him, as it were, in the mastery of his economic situation. It makes it possible for him now to increase his ability to provide education for his children, to acquire needed goods and services and to improve his standard of living. It pays off difficult medical bills, strengthens out debt problems. It enables him to assist friends and relatives and to face wedding expenses. Even in times of emergency such as accidents, sickness, funeral expenses, when he cannot meet the expenses with cash, the mere knowledge that the funds are there can help raise his morale and his spirit of self-confidence. Thus besides the ordinary benefits, the parish credit union will create an atmosphere of respect, gratitude, and devotion to a Church cognizant of her children's temporal needs. Moreover, if fostered and encouraged by the parish priest, it will cement the loyalty of its members to the parish.

The Parish credit union helps priest serve people.

There are many instances of parish credit unions succeeding without the understanding of the parish priest. The interest, however, of the priest is a capital need. If the parish credit union is to reach its full potentialities, he must take an interested and encouraging attitude towards it. And if the parish priest wants to be effective, and to have grass roots, in his sermons, teaching and pastoral leadership, the parish credit union gives him the opportunity.

It is, of course, hard to develop a successful credit union, because it involves cooperation. And cooperation, according to Shri Meta, "is a plant of slow growth." It demands certain moral qualities which are not too characteristic of rural people; it inculcates a willingness to

make sacrifices in behalf of others, to give one's self to service for the future advancement of the individual's own interest and that of the other members of the group. Hardworking as they are, these people are still imbued with individualistic spirit where economic matters are concerned. They have as yet to realize that "the more unselfishly a man works with his neighbors the better are his selfish interests served."

It is precisely at this point that the priest can best exercise his influence. It is a common experience that in every undertaking the main problem is how to maintain it, how to overcome the people's *ningas-cogon* attitude. Because of the strangeness of this cooperative undertaking, the people look for somebody for guidance. And the right man to guide them is the parish priest whom they consider as exponent of christian virtues, and who possesses a deliberate and avowed moral purpose to shatter the forces of destructive selfishness. People need time, much time to get themselves attuned to this movement. As inspirer for development of community, he will be expending well his efforts in working with the people, accompanying them with his encouragement and blessing to practice the christian ideals by which credit union live. Through the parish credit union, his work to change such attitudes and practices among his parishioners as are obstacles to social and economic development and to promote greater receptivity to beneficial change by casting off retrogressive habits and customs in favor of progressive one, is made much easier. It does not require a vivid imagination to see the value of all this in his mission. to save souls.

However busy the priest is, he has to know his people, his flock better; he should be more with and among them, say, by visiting the families at least once a year, a practice which is recommended as a basic function of the priest. But this is almost next to impossible with a big parish of a hundred thousand catholics. What is happening is that the people are the ones expected by the priest to come to him and to dialogue with him in meetings of catholic organizations, when they come to register for baptism, to seek marriage counsel, etc. But he cannot know them all only through these occasions. The majority of people are not members of any catholic organization. Still he has the obligation to bring them to a more active participation in their own Church as the people of God, and in their own human and christian development.

Given the parish credit union, he will be able to know the people he otherwise would not know. The people themselves who otherwise would not participate in parish activities would come together through credit union. They will become more conscious of their social obligations and will develop better social behavior through normal social contacts and example. Liturgy is the summit towards which the activity of the Church is directed. The parish credit union prepares the ground for the full, conscious, active participation of the faithful in liturgical celebrations.

The parish credit union applies some of the basic tenets of faith.

"It is the business of the credit union," writes Thomas Doig, "not only to accumulate savings and make loans but to insert a little bit of humanity and a little bit of christianity and a little bit of brotherly love into that effort." The parish credit union gives man the economic aid he needs. It is a "charitable" organization, but in the original, biblical sense: parish credit union recognizes that each man is his brother's keeper and they help that brother to help himself. The famous query: am I my brother's keeper? is now generally accepted as a keynote in the credit union philosophy; and the parish credit union is an economic manifestation of the existence of the brotherhood of men.

The parish credit union keeps before its members the ideal of mutual help and mutual service. The members know that no man is an island; they know that they are children of the same God and that they are members of a single family; they know that men could be free and secure, only if their neighbors are also free and secure, that every man is our neighbor regardless of his economic status. In fact, its primary purpose, according to R. Bergengren, "is to prove the practicality of the brotherhood of man. Man is his brother's keeper — we believe that — we just don't talk about it. We do it. We don't talk about institutions of, for and by the people. We make institutions that are literally of, for and by the people."

Moreover, money is a source of illusion for many people who make it a prop to social status and prestige. But a parish credit union seeks to slay this materialistic dragon which threatens the destruction of principles and practices of a christian attitude towards the dignity and worth of the individual as superior to that of money. Alphonse Desjardins

strongly reminds us: "Let it never be forgotten that the credit union is an association of persons, not of dollars." And as Rev. O'Rourke tersely puts it: "Credit is for money; money is for goods and services; goods and services are for people."

As a matter of principle, the parish priest should never run credit unions. But he should be the inspirer and promoter who will express clearly to the parishioners how their parish credit union puts into practice, in a modest measure, some of the basic tenets of their faith. By providing deeper religious conviction of making his parishioners do the thing they have to do, when it ought to be done; by strengthening and deepening their motivation; by explaining the beauty, dignity, joy and usefulness of being of service to the community, all through their parish credit union, he will be able to demonstrate in tangible reality his selfless concern for them. In parish credit union, the parish priest truly serves the people of God, and so much more effectively to bring his people closer to God. As Cardinal Santos once said: "The ability of a man to to attain his supernatural destiny is affected by the earthly conditions in which he lives."

While there is so much talk about social revolution in this age of social awareness, it is the credit union which sets an unassuming leadership in bringing down to earth a peaceful change in the socio-economic structure of our society. It is ambitious. It is depicted by hands struggling together, stretched upwards, reaching, as it were, for the unreachable, the utopia. It is a movement of a lifetime service with elusive goals for a "full and abundant life for everyone." "It may take ten years," says the late Pres. Kennedy, "maybe a hundred years, maybe a thousand years, but in God's name, let us begin."

The parish credit union has already begun.

**MAY THE POPE SPEAK "EX CATHEDRA"
INDEPENDENTLY OF THE COLLEGE
OF BISHOPS?**

Dear Father,

Be so kind as to prove or make clear to us the belief that our Holy Father can issue an INFALLIBLE decree (when teaching the whole world concerning faith and morals) INDEPENDENTLY of the College of Bishops or other 'college.'

A Priest.

P. S. Quite a number of priest even today deny this power of the Pope, whence the request for you to put a clear explanation in your Boletin whenever you can find the time.

1. Confusion in essential matters.

The answer to this question is a dogma of faith solemnly proclaimed in the First Vatican Council. Thus nothing should be easier to convince Catholics of this point than to transcribe the dogmatic definition and the *canon* which brands those who deny or question this particular point of the faith as heretics and opposed to Church's unity. But, with the confusion which has been created after Vatican II, it seems rather convenient to consider the Biblical data of this point and the steady tradition of the Church, a tradition that holds fast to St. Peter's primacy even before the day of Pentecost. This primacy of St. Peter refers to his supreme authority both as teacher of faith and as ruler of the Church. And, evidently, one who is *supreme* is subject to no one *under him*.

There is no denying that such a prerogative as Head of God's Church and infallibility of truth in matters far surpassing human mind and on other matters inextricably intertwined with *divine* truth, sounds so incredible when attributed to a man whose human limitations — perhaps even real defects and failures — are evident to all. Such claims, we do acknowledge, can hardly be acceptable. In fact, such claims, as the history of dogma clearly shows, have been strongly opposed through the centuries by what St. Paul calls *wisdom of the flesh*: "*For the wisdom of the flesh is hostile to God, for it is not subject to the law of God, nor can it be,*" Rom. 8:7.

Yet, precisely through the foolishness of a man — be it Montini, Roncalli, Sarto, Mastai Ferreti, — but a man whom Christ made his Vicar, God, with infallible hand, teaches us the unerring way to salvation: "*For since in God's wisdom, the world did not come to know God by 'wisdom,' it pleased God, by the foolishness of our preaching to save those who believe,*" 1 Cor. 1:21. Herein lies, in the last analysis, the crux of the inability of the children of men to grasp such spiritual finesse as the infallibility of truth in a mere man who happens to be the Pope. But impossible as it may be for human 'wisdom,' it is sweet, nay easy, to be believed by all who commit themselves to God, both learned and unlearned alike.

Here our questioner would, perhaps, be interested in a personal experience of this writer. One day, when talking about the attitude of some Fathers of the Second Vatican Council and about the discussions within the Aula, one of the Secretaries of the Council confided to this writer: "But you see, Father, notwithstanding so much discussion and even frank opposition of views, there has not been a single Father in the Council, who would even attempt to say a word that may so much as question the authority of the Holy Father over the Council or over all the bishops. At least in this matter the definition of the First Vatican Council of papal primacy and infallibility has rendered a definite service."

To these very days, after the second Synod of Bishops in Rome, the authentic reports that are reaching us on both the general sessions and the individual interventions of the synodal Fathers point, *with total*

unanimity, to this prerogative of the Pope. There are, it is true, different, even contrary, opinions on *how* the Holy Father should *actually* exercise his unique, personal, teaching and governing power; but not even one of the most vocal among the Fathers, has ever doubted the Pope's infallibility on his own authority without any need for any consensus of the bishops or of the faithful.

It is a fact, however, that the papal infallibility is being questioned only by dissenters, priests and other religious a *minority* in democratic jargon — who, in their dreams, call themselves “theologians.” The clamour was set in motion mainly after *Humanae Vitae*. Unfortunately, though, there were bishops who forgot their duty of teachers of the faith and, instead of leading, did allow themselves to be led by the fake “theologians,” a fact that contributed a great deal to the confusion. These self-appointed “theologians” demanded that the Church become democratized and that the Pope, when teaching or giving orders, should consult and follow the bishops and even the people of God. For our comfort, however we have the Fathers of the First and Second Vatican Councils and the Fathers of this recent Synod of Bishops who, *in faith*, have held to the original gospel and to the Church's tradition of twenty centuries.

2. What the Bible says.

Challenged by endless Orthodoxes and innumerable Protestant denominations, the subject of papal infallibility has filled volumes in innumerable libraries. Everyone, of course, has taken recourse to the Bible and to tradition in search for arguments. This too was the way followed by the Fathers of the First Vatican Council in the Dogmatic Constitution *Pastor Aeternus*. Briefly we may point to the salient moments of this revelation in the gospel and in the *Acts*.

a) *The prelude.*

God's designs for Peter were already revealed in his first encounter with Jesus:

Early next morning Andrew met his brother and said to him, 'We have found the Messiah' — what means the Christ — and he took

Simon to Jesus. Jesus looked hard at him and said, 'You are Simon son of John; you are to be called Cephas' — meaning Rock.

b) *Peter's insight.*

After the miracle of the loaves, Jesus promised the never-dreamt-of sacrament of his own flesh and blood, a true food and drink for His faithful. Nearly all, in protest, left him. But Jesus then, just as now, would not change an iota of his plan inspite of protests from His creatures. To the remaining Twelve he asked pointblank:

What about you, do you want to go away too? Simon Peter answered, 'Lord, whom shall we go to? You have the message of eternal life, and we believe; we know that you are the Holy One of God'. **Jo. 6:67-68.**

c) *The Rock and the Keys.*

The actual constitution of the Church that Jesus finished to build by His death and resurrection took place near Caesarea Philippi, north of the Lake. It came as a reward for Peter's confession:

'But you', he said, 'who do you say I am?' Then Simon Peter spoke up, 'You are the Christ,' he said, 'the Son of the Living God'. Jesus replied, 'Simon son of Jonah, you are a happy man! Because it was not flesh and blood that revealed this to you but my Father in heaven. So I now say to you: You are Peter and on this rock I will build my Church. And the gates of the underworld can never hold out against it. I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven: whatever you bind on earth shall be considered bound in heaven; whatever you loose on earth shall be considered loosed in heaven'. **Mt. 16: 15-19.**

Hence we have the Christian society built on the Rock which is Peter alone, with the keys of the building confided to him alone. He becomes the only Majordomo of Jesus' House. If he opens, one may enter; if he closes, one stays out. Peter's authority is truly supreme with absolutely no reference to the other apostles there present and independent too from them. In fact none of the apostles but one, Peter, answered Jesus' question. No one but Peter received the sublime revelation of the Father. No one other than Peter was promised to be the

Rock. To no one else were the Keys of the building given. Here we have, perhaps, at the same time the most human and the most divine fact in God's revelation: the Father reveals his mind to a man and the Son, Jesus, bestows all his salvific power on a man. And men are brought to heaven through the service of one of their brothers, a man who holds the very power of Jesus the Saviour! This is the mystery of the sacrament that for ages has "*been kept hidden in God, the Creator of everything*" (Eph.3:9). Here, as in all purely divine things, no rational evidence can be obtained but faith alone suffices.

Actually, it was the apostles, present at the occasion, who accepted Jesus' design and in fraternal love and collaboration submitted themselves to Peter. Thus, they transmitted to the Church this decree of Jesus.

d) "*But I have prayed for YOU, Simon.*"

This promise notwithstanding, the powers of evil, Hades, Satan — call him any name — did soon start his unremitting work of demolition. Again, in the struggle, the Rock, Peter, was called to be the strength that should sustain the building. Peter alone was singled out from among the Apostles and given not only the power but the duty as well of confirming and strengthening his fellow-apostles.

Simon, Simon, Satan, you must know, has got his wish to sift you all like wheat; but I have prayed for YOU, SIMON, that your faith may not fail, and once you have recovered, you in your turn must strengthen your brothers. **Luke, 22: 3-32.**

In fact all were sifted like the wheat and all scattered like the chaff. But, "*I have prayed for you, Simon.*"

Correspondingly, Peter is commanded to strengthen the other apostles. Not, as the event proved too soon that night, on his own strength did Peter confirm his brethren, but on the *infallibility of the prayer* of One who, when he prayed "*was heard*," *Hebr., 5:7*. In this passage it is clearly shown that Peter, in order to exert Jesus' command, had no need of any support or consensus from the other Apostles. It was they

who needed him. It was the other apostles who needed Peter's faith to support and sustain their own faith. Accordingly, the popes, Peter's successors, can never be conceived as receiving their authority from their fellow-bishops, but directly from Christ, and from Christ alone.

At this point, it is interesting to note how Pius IX — indeed all popes — after every successive expoliation from different tyrants, remained cheerful and full of confidence, just at the memory of Jesus' prayer for Peter. As for the end of that sorrowful event after Gethsemane, we know that the general fall was followed by Peter's tears and, no doubt, by the tears of his brothers too. But, again, on resurrection day the tears of Peter did reassure him of his primacy over his fellow-apostles and over Jesus' Church. Says St. Paul: "...he appeared first to *Cephas* and secondly to the *Twelve*...", 1 Cor. 15:5.

e.). "*Feed my Lambs... Feed my Sheep.*"

The final investiture of Peter as the unique Majordomo in Jesus' Church came about after the resurrection:

After the meal Jesus said to Simon Peter, 'Simon son of John do you love me more than these others do? He answered, 'Yes, Lord, you know I love you!'. Jesus said to him, 'Feed my lambs'. A second time he said to him, 'Simon son of John, do you love me? He replied, 'Yes, Lord, you know I love you'. Jesus said to him, 'Look after my sheep'. Then he said to him a third time, 'Simon son of John, do you love me?' Peter was upset that he asked him the third time, 'Do you love me?' and said, 'Lord you know everything; you know I love you'. Jesus said to him, 'Feed my sheep! Jn. 21: 15-17.

Quoting from Father Lagrange, the Biblical scholar:

Thus Peter was consecrated by Jesus as universal shepherd. To establish his authority, even over those who will also be shepherds of souls, there is no need to look for the faithful in the lambs, and bishops and priests in the sheep. Lambs and sheep are almost synonymous here: both categories form part of Christ's flock. It is this flock that is subject to Peter's pastoral care. This investiture by our Saviour is more explicit as regards Peter's universal authority, but does not show its perpetuity so plainly as the words already

spoken to him: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it'. But universality and perpetuity, two divine attributes, are easily reconciled. They are expressed by two symbols: Peter is the unshakeable Rock; he is the shepherd of the whole flock. So long as he is a rock he remains a shepherd. Now this shepherd could not always be Peter himself, just as the Church cannot always be composed of the same people. The Church continually changes yet remains the same, always governed by the same shepherd; and he too is represented by fresh individuals. Perpetuity is succession through a line of rulers. So long as they are the rock, each in his turn will be the universal shepherd of all the sheep. (*The Gospel of Jesus Christ* by Pere M. J. Lagrange, O.P. Ed. The Newman Press, Westminster, Md., 1958, Vol. II, p. 301-302.)

3. Peter's primacy in tradition.

a) *Creation of an Apostle.*

No sooner had Jesus ascended into heaven when Peter, on his own authority as the Head of them all, proceeded to appoint the first bishop or the twelfth apostle. Two were considered best qualified. And, by lots, Matthias "*was listed as one of the twelve apostles,*" *Acts, 1:15-26*. Here, even before Pentecost, we have Peter, the first Pope, in the active exercise of his supreme authority over the early community of the apostles and laymen together. And God in heaven did ratify Peter's orders at the creation of an apostle. From Pentecost on, the leading role of Peter in the incipient community has become paramount in *The Acts, chaps. 1-12*.

b) *Law or no Law?*

This was the truly crucial point of doctrine in the early Church. Should Judaism, namely circumcision and the law of Moses, be kept by the Christians as a necessity for salvation, or should it be forever dispensed with? The trouble that arose on account of this question is revealed by St. Luke in *The Acts*. Crucial for men's salvation as the question was, it asked for the celebration of the synod of Jerusalem, the first ecumenical council, if the expression be allowed.

The Apostles and elders met to look into the matter, and after the discussion had gone on a long time, Peter stood up and addressed them.

'My brothers, he said, 'you know perfectly well that in the early days God made his choice among you: the pagans were to learn the Good News from me and so became believers. ...It would only provoke God's anger now, surely, if you imposed on the disciples the very burden that neither we nor our ancestors were strong enough to support. Remember, we believe that we are saved in the same way as they are: through the grace of the Lord Jesus'.

This silenced the entire assembly... **Acts, 15: 6-12.**

The true essence of the Christ-given authority to solve the most arduous matters of *faith and conduct* is shown in a most solemn manner at this sort of universal council. Peter presided. All expressed their individual opinions. But only Peter, as the Master who possessed the keys of salvation in matters unsurpassingly divine, "*stood up and addressed to them* (v.7): not through circumcision or through the law of Moses as in the Old Testament's days, but "*through the grace of the Lord* (v. 11). Here Peter gave the first *ex cathedra* definition, one to be followed by many more from his successors. All accepted Peter's pronouncement, "*This silenced the entire assembly*" (v. 12).

c) *From Jerusalem to Vatican II.*

From the synod of Jerusalem to the Extraordinary Synod of Bishops on October 11-28, 1969, the doctrine of the pope's infallibility has always been at the root of every pronouncements on faith and morals for twenty centuries. Such prerogative of Peter's successor explains the unity in Christ's Church. Of course, Christ's promise and His prayer for Peter's faith, and His guiding Spirit do not dispense with prayer, study, discussion, perhaps even contradiction and opposition. These are ordinary means in order to arrive at clear understanding of truth and at an apt formulation of the faith. The history of every ecumenical council shows how serious study was required and, at times, how bitter were the discussions. For this reason no one who is conscious of history will marvel at our post-conciliar confusion.

4. The dogma of the infallibility.

Contested as it was by all dissenters, be they heretics or schismatics, this dogma has always been the real foundation of Catholic unity. The formulation of the dogma with its limitation to only the *ex cathedra* definitions when the Roman Pontiff speaks for the whole Church on matters of faith and morals is clearly shown in the chosen words of the definition at the First Vatican Council:

a) First, the definition declares that the Pope, as the successor of St. Peter, has *supreme, ordinary and immediate authority to teach, to sanctify and to govern "over all and every one of the Churches, over all and everyone of the Pastors and of the faithful,"* (super omnes et singulas ecclesias, super omnes et singulos Pastores et fideles). *Denz. 1831.* That is exactly the power that Christ had decreed for Peter, with NO exception either from anyone of the apostles or from whole apostolic college.

b) As for the *teaching authority in particular*, when teaching *ex cathedra*, the Pope is endowed "*with that infallibility that the Divine Redeemer wished his Church to be endowed in defining doctrine of faith and morals; and, therefore, that his definitions are irreformable because of their very nature, but not because of the consensus of the Church*" (ideoque eiusdem Romani Pontificis definitiones EX SESE, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae irreformabiles esse). *Denz. 1839.* To this definition, the matter being so vital, the following *canon* was added by the Fathers: "*But if anyone presumes to contradict this Our definition (God forbids that he do so): let him be anathema.*"

No one, therefore, may claim to be a Catholic who does not abide by this doctrine. Actually, no one in the Church did challenge the definition until the advent of the modernistic heresy and its resuscitation after Vatican II by the new ultra-modernistic "theologians." But the Church's Pastors are, of course, in no mood towards accepting the devious phantasies of their dreams. Note the words of Paul VI to the Synod's Fathers:

And it is in this respect that We must remember Our supreme responsibility, which Christ wished to entrust to Us when He gave Peter the keys of the kingdom and made him the foundation of

the edifice of the Church... A responsibility that Tradition and the Councils attribute to Our Specific ministry as Vicar of Christ, Head of the Apostolic College, Universal Pastor, and Servant of the servants of God, **and which cannot be conditional on the authority, supreme though it be, of the Episcopal-College**, which We are the first to wish to honour, defend and promote, **but which would not be such, were it to lack Our support.** (Homily in the Mass, at the opening of the Extraordinary Synod of Bishops, October 11, 1969. cfr. *L'Osservatore Romano*, English Ed. Oct. 16, 1969).

Likewise the unanimous Declaration of the Synod's Fathers in their final Session reads:

of the Sacred Synod, the fathers of the Synod wish to express their sincere devotion and love to the Supreme Pontiff, Christ's Vicar and Pastor of the Universal Church, deeply acknowledging the great manifestation of collegiate affection shown by him with his assiduous presence at the Synod's hall. The Fathers thank the Supreme Pontiff, as well, for the doctrine which he so steadfastly proclaims at a time when the faith of many is in danger. Hence, they plead to him not to cease in the free exercise of his duty as Teacher of the Universal Church, while on their part, they sincerely pledge and offer their collaboration in the accomplishment of this task. **(The complete text of the Declaration in ECCLESIA, Madrid. November 8, 1969, p. (1545) 29. Translation ours.)**

Quintin M. Garcia

THE CHURCH HERE AND THERE

APPOINTMENTS

Palo:

His Holiness Pope Paul VI has designated the Most Rev. Manuel Salvador as Bishop of the Diocese of Palo, according to the Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines.

Appointed auxiliary bishop of the Archdiocese of Cebu on December 3, 1966, Bishop Salvador was consecrated January 19, 1967. He will now administer the diocese of Palo which has been left vacant since July, 1969.

Born on January 7, 1952 in Dalaguete, Cebu, Bishop Salvador studied in the Archdiocesan San Carlos Seminary of Cebu and obtained his licentiates in Philosophy and Theology at U.S.T., Manila, summa cum laude. Ordained priest in 1953, he took up his doctorate in Canon Law at the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome.

Marbel:

His Holiness Pope Paul VI has appointed Very Rev. Reginald Arliss, C.P., as Titular Bishop of Cerbali and Prelate Ordinary of Marbel. He succeeds Msgr. Quentin Olwell, first Passionist bishop of Marbel who resigned recently.

Fr. Arliss is the present rector of the Pontificio Colegio-Seminario Filipino in Rome. He was born in New Jersey, U.S.A., and studied for the priesthood at the Passionist Seminary in Scranton, Pennsylvania. He received an honorary doctorate of laws from the Seton Hall University in Newark, New Jersey.

Father Arliss spent sixteen years in China as superior and rector of the Passionist seminaries in Hunan province. When he returned to the United States in 1951, he became Master of Novices of the Sons of Mary, a religious congregation in Framingham, Massachusetts. He was among the first Passionist missionaries who came to the Philippines in 1957 and became pastor of Dadiangas, Cotabato. He was named Rector of the Colegio-Seminario Filipino in Rome last 1961.

Tuguegarao:

Rev. Fr. Jose Lazo has been appointed Titular Bishop of Selja and Auxiliary Bishop of Tuguegarao, according to the announcement made last week by the Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines.

He will assist Bishop Teodulfo S. Domingo of Tuguegarao which comprises the provinces of Cagayan and Isabela.

Fr. Lazo was born in Faire, Cagayan on May 1, 1922. He studied for the priesthood at Christ the King Seminary in Quezon City and at the Archdiocesan Major Seminary in Vigan, Ilocos Sur.

After his ordination in March, 1947, he served in the parishes of Cagayan. He was also for a time rector of the Minor Seminary of San Jacinto. He was at the time of his episcopal appointment, parish priest of Lallo, Cagayan and director of the Lyceum of Lallo.

NUNS IN THE MODERN WORLD

Speaking to an international gathering of 500 religious superiors, the Pope dwelt on the need for "interior renewal" and "exterior updating", and warned against the wiles of the world which could lessen the value of a life of poverty and of obedience.

He further asked Religious women to be "totally holy". He explained that the renewal of which there is so much talk seeks to present to the world in the closest possible image, the very figure of the Saviour either contemplating on the mountainside or announcing God's Kingdom to the multitude. He, then, developed the idea of becoming the figure of Christ, invoking the Pauline image of Christian living: "Now, not I, but Christ lives in me."

He encouraged the superiors to welcome renewal but to be on guard lest there be a giving in to the "modern mentality" or an alignment with "transient and changeable attitudes and fashions to merge with the world..." Pointing to the dangers of secularization, Pope Paul mentioned specifically the peril in which a life of poverty is placed by the quest for "economic independence". He also warned that communities could be undermined and religious life levelled by "individualism" and the formation of "small fraternities".

"The Church needs you," the Pope concluded. "It relies on you not to disappoint the hopes of the Church but to respond beyond its very hopes. Being Religious does not deprive you of the true progress of the human person and does not estrange you from the necessities and the expectations of the earthly city, but indeed expressly gives you the mandate for building it."

ALL-FAITH TO VOCATION DRIVES

An all-faith drive to promote religious vocations has been launched near London by representatives of Catholic, Anglican and Protestant Churches.

The drive is aimed at students in the public secondary schools of the Sussex area. A joint letter to school officials announcing the services of a speakers' team was signed by Bishop David Cashman of Arundel and Brighton and two other church leaders.

Another step in the experimental programme is the publication of 10,000 copies of a brochure entitled "Not Just a Job".

Father Barry Wymes, the Catholic adviser in the programme, says that the various denominations will stay within their own memberships. If a Catholic boy expresses interest in a religious vocation to an Anglican or a Protestant clergyman, he will be referred to his parish priest, and vice versa.

RELIGION COURSE IN CANBERRA UNIVERSITY

If present plans are carried out the Australian National University in Canberra will be the first university in Australia to introduce a course in religion. The course expected to start in the 1971 academic year, will give undergraduates a systematic study of religion as a part of the overall scene.

BOOK REVIEW

HISTORIA DE LAS MISIONES DOMINICANAS DE CHINA. 1700-1800 Jose Maria Gonzales, O.P. Tomo II. Madrid 1964 pp. 670

Here is history in its most authentic form. Primary sources. Documents of all kinds. Manuscripts. Maps. Pictures. Bibliographies. Appendices. The author living his whole life for this monumental work. Visiting archives of different religious orders. Studying in specialized libraries both Asian and European. Another proof of the well-known Dominican tradition.

Here is inspiration based on realities. On the hardships and sufferings the Chinese Dominican Missionaries underwent — as well as their glories and triumphs. On the heroism of their saints. The successes and failures of their missionary tactics. Successes which brought them to the limelights of the highest tribunal of that yellow empire. Failures which, though inspired with the best of intentions, initiated seditions, treacheries and murders, causing wholesale persecutions—a stigma, not only to an individual ambassador, priest, bishop or cardinal, but also to the whole Christian world and to every Catholic nation of the time. A stigma to be erased only after much pain and hard work in a period of one hundred years, a period of rebuilding just like the period in which we live.

Here indeed is the struggle of Chinese Christianity within a century. The task of uniting Chinese, Spanish and Portuguese royalties under one Christian authority. The job of harmonizing Chinese and Christian traditions beginning with the still famous Dominican-versus-Jesuit controversy on the Chinese rites. All written in a matter-of-fact authoritative manner.

Here is recognition and revelation. Recognition—because of association with the other known and published facts of history. Revelation—because the book enjoys an abundance of unpublished detailed informations on the different aspects of Chinese history taken from the writings of early Dominican missionaries.

Here is a book both for the master and the pupil.

● WILFREDO C. PAGUIO

IN THE CHRISTIAN SPIRIT by Louis Evelyn, tr. Brian and Marie-Claude Thompson, London: Burns & Oates/Herder and Herder, 1969. pp. 108

This book is for the present. For the contemporary mind. For the up-to-date in theology. It is written for the disciples of the "Church of the poor" For the apostles of the "Church of the workers." It clarifies the position of those who question the virginity of the Virgin. Of those who advocate priestesses in the Church. Of those who believe in the morality of the use of artificial contraceptives as a means of birth control. It explains the evolution of French Catholic theology from the early days of Christianity to the present. Indeed, it offers much for the soul to reflect, and more for the body to live.

This book is for the past. For those who still believe in the future life. In the existence of a kind of bank account of invisible merits and silent prayers. It is for those who still renounce divorce. Experimental marriages. Husband-priests. It is for those who still hold Sunday masses as an obligation and still fast before communion. Reading this book will be for them an internal revolution. A cruel but delightful pain. A ruthless unmasking of the internal realities hidden by the emotional pietism of the middle ages. A confrontation with the truth.

This book is for the future. For visionaries who can already see and feel the time when man will choose *when* and *how* to die. When the choice between heaven and hell (if they exist) is left for man to decide without any intervention of God, of nature, of fate. Here, the author, one of the most widely read spiritual writers today, shares with us his fresh insights into the future when man shall have created for himself "the new heaven and the new earth."

This book is for everyone. For the priest. For the layman. For every Catholic who wants to know his rightful place in his Church as proven from history and from the exigencies of the times.

● WILFREDO C. PAGUIO