

# BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

OFFICIAL INTERDIOCESAN ORGAN

● THE PHILIPPINE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW ●

FOREIGN AID AND BIRTH CONTROL  
• NON-PARTISAN CONSTITUTIONAL  
CONVENTION • REFORMED FUNE-  
RAL RITES • SPECIAL REVIEW ON  
STUDIES IN PHILIPPINE CHURCH  
HISTORY • 7 QUESTIONS ON ARTIFI-  
CIAL BIRTH CONTROL

# BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

## EDITORIAL STAFF

EDITOR	LEONARDO Z. LEGAZPI, O.P.
ASSISTANT EDITOR	FIDEL VILLARROEL, O.P.
ASSOCIATE EDITORS	FRANCISCO 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



His Excellency  
**MOST REVEREND SALVADOR L. LAZO, D.D.**  
Titular Bishop of Selja  
and  
Auxiliary Bishop of Tuguegarao

**Vol. XLIV • No. 491**

**March, 1970**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>EDITORIAL</b> Foreign Aid and Birth Control	170
<b>THE POPE SPEAKS</b> On Priestly Celibacy Brief Messages and Excerpts	172 177
<b>DOCUMENTATION</b> Pontifical Bulls, etc. Non-Partisan Constitutional Convention	180 185
<b>LITURGICAL SECTION</b> Applying and Adapting the Reformed Funeral Rites by H. J. GRAEF, S.V.D.	187
<b>NOTES AND COMMENTS</b> Mixed Priestly Training (continued) by JESUS MA. CAVANNA, C.M.	196
<b>PASTORAL SECTION</b> Homiletics — 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th Sundays of Eastertide by D. TITHER, C.S.S.R.	208
<b>HISTORICAL SECTION</b> History of the Church in the Philippines 1521-1898 (continued) by PABLO FERNANDEZ, O.P.	218
<b>CASES AND QUERIES</b> 7 Questions on Artificial Birth Control by QUINTIN M. GARCIA, O.P. Holy Week 1970 by H. J. GRAEF, S.V.D.	227 238
<b>SPECIAL REVIEW</b> Studies in Philippine Church History by LEONARDO Z. LEGASPI, O.P.	242
<b>THE CHURCH HERE AND THERE</b>	254



## EDITORIAL

# Foreign Aid And Birth Control

For the past months a campaign of propaganda has been gaining momentum to influence national and personal opinions in favor of birth prevention programs.

"Population explosion" is fast becoming the battle cry of this propaganda, apparently to pressure attentions to the population problems which indeed loom large in the horizon. Unfortunately, this terror-technique tends also to provide a convenient and effective smoke-screen behind which a moral danger waits contentedly hidden, namely, the birth control programs as a *conditio sine qua non* for receiving financial assistance from another government.

Our bishops pin-pointed this danger in its July 19, 1969 statement on the *Issue of Population*:

External aid represents a peculiar difficulty. It arises from the right of those who grant aid to determine the purposes of such aid. Thus, aid may be granted selectively to promote family planning as a principal instrument for population control. In a matter that affects their lives so intimately, our people have the right to be informed of the terms under which aid is offered to our country.

Furthermore, due to the inherent restrictive character of external aid, it is part of wise administration to exclude representatives of grantors from active participation in the formulation of population policies and programs. **To accept aid for the sake of the aid, far from promoting, actually arrests the development of a people.**

International programs of aid find its basis in the Divine Law which clearly states that the goods of the earth are destined for the well-being of all the human race, not only of a few nations or peoples. Well-developed countries should assist underdeveloped countries. They should embark upon a program of aid through imaginative, constructive and unselfish efforts. The beneficiary nations in return should offer an adequate evidence and pledge to develop their own natural resources by using the aid equitably and reasonably.

But it is against this very Law to condition the granting of desperately needed assistance upon the acceptance of birth control programs by the beneficiary nations. For no nation can claim the liberty of imposing its judgment upon another, either as to the growth of the latter or as to the size of its families. It is more in keeping with the moral law and the concept of constructive assistance to strive above all to bring about those economic and social advances, such as increasing the acreage or the acreage yield to meet the food demands of an increasing population, which will make possible for spouses a conscientious family planning without resorting to contraceptive procedures.

Our government should take great care in not committing our country to a program of progressive destruction under the guise of curing the ills of the present. After all, the sobering lessons of history clearly teach that "only those nations remain stable and vigorous whose citizens have and are encouraged to keep high regard for the sanctity and autonomy of family life".

## **THE POPE SPEAKS**

### **ON PRIESTLY CELIBACY**

*Letter of Pope Paul VI to the  
Cardinal Secretary of State.*

The declarations about ecclesiastical celibacy which were published in Holland recently have profoundly saddened Us and raised many questions in Our mind: because of the reasons for such a grave stand, which is contrary to the sacrosanct norm in force in our Latin Church, because of the repercussions upon the whole People of God, especially on the clergy and young men preparing for the priesthood, because of the disturbing consequences in life of the entire Church, and the echoes which it is arousing among all Christians, also among other members of the human family.

In view of these queries, We feel the need to open Our mind to you, Lord Cardinal, who so closely share the cares of Our Apostolic Office.

First of all We ask Ourselves with humble and absolute interior sincerity whether there was any responsibility on Our part in regard to those unfortunate resolutions, which are so out of keeping with Our attitude and, We believe, with that of the whole Church.

The Lord is Our witness of the feelings of esteem, affection and trust which We have always had for Holland which is such a well-deserving part of Christ's Mystical Body. You, Lord Cardinal, well know how deferential and friendly We were in Our personal conversation and letters and in the action taken by the Organs of this Apostolic See to ward off the declarations in question.

Those declarations gave rise to much uncertainty and confusion. Consequently, it is a grave and compelling duty for Us to state Our attitude with all clarity: the attitude of him to whom a mysterious design of divine providence has in this difficult hour entrusted the care of all the Churches (cf. 2 Cor. 11, 28).

The reasons adopted to justify such a radical change in the centuries-old norm of the Latin Church, which has been means of so many fruits of grace, holiness and missionary apostolate, are well known. But We must say without equivocation that they do not appear convincing to Us. They seem to overlook a fundamental and essential consideration which must never be forgotten and which belongs to the supernatural order. That is to say, they represent a breakdown of the genuine concept of the priesthood.

The only perspective to be kept in mind is that of the mission of the Gospel, of which we are the heralds and witnesses, with faith and in hope of the Kingdom. The Bishop and the priest have the mission of announcing the Gospel of grace and truth (sf. Jn. 1, 14), to bring the message of salvation to the world, to make it aware of its sin and at the same time of its redemption, to call it to hope, to win it away from idols which are always reappearing, and convert to Christ the Saviour. The evangelical values cannot be understood and lived except in faith, in prayer, in penance, in charity, not without struggle and mortification, not without arousing at times the scorn, incomprehension and even persecution of the world, as in the case of Christ and the Apostles.

It is the ever deeper understanding of these considerations which has led the Latin Church to make renunciation of the right to found a family a condition for admission to the priesthood. That understanding has been matured in a providential way during the course of history which has known many efforts and many struggles to affirm the Christian ideal; and that renunciation has been spontaneously made by many servants of the Gospel. The considerations mentioned are still valid, perhaps more today than at any time. Are we, who have been called to follow Jesus, incapable of accepting a law which has been tried and proved by such long experience, and of abandoning all, family, nets, to follow Him and bring the Good News of the Saviour (cf. Mk. 1). Considering everything before God, before Christ and the Church, and before the World, We therefore feel it is Our duty clearly to reaffirm what We have already declared and several times repeated: that the link between priesthood and celibacy, as established for centuries by the Latin Church, constitutes for it a supremely precious



and irreplaceable good. It would be extremely rash to undervalue it or even to let it fall into disuse. It has been consecrated by tradition and is an incomparable sign of total dedication to the love of Christ (cf. Mt. 12, 29). It is a bright demonstration of the missionary demand which is essential in every priestly life, in service of the risen Christ, who lives for ever and to whom the priest has consecrated himself in total readiness for the sake of the Kingdom of God.

There are priests who, for reasons recognized as valid, have unfortunately found themselves radically unable to persevere. We know they are only a small number, whereas the great majority wishes, with the help of grace, to remain faithful to the sacred pledges made before God and the Church. It is with great sorrow that We agree to accept their insistent requests to be released from their promises and dispensed from their obligations. We do this only after careful examination of every single case. However, the profound understanding which We have for persons, in a spirit of paternal charity, must not hinder Us from deploring an attitude which is so little in accord with what the Church rightfully expects from those who have definitely consecrated themselves to its exclusive service.

The Church will therefore continue in the future as in the past to entrust the divine ministry of the word, of the faith and of the sacraments of grace only to priests who remain faithful to their obligations.

The same many-sided contestation today against such a holy institution as sacred celibacy, makes more imperious than ever Our duty to sustain and encourage in every way the innumerable ranks of priests who have remained loyal to their pledge. Our thoughts and blessing go out to them with most special affection.

For this reason, after mature examination of the matter, We clearly affirm it Our duty not to permit the priestly ministry to be exercised by those who have turned back after having put their hand to the plough (cf. Lk. 9, 62).

In any case, is not this the constant tradition of the venerable Oriental Churches, to which reference is so often made in this regard?

At all events, We hardly dare to think of the incalculable consequences which a different decision would entail for the People of God on the spiritual and pastoral planes.

While We feel it Our duty to reaffirm the norm of sacred celibacy in this way with so much clarity, We are not forgetting a question which has been insistently raised with Us by some Bishops, whose zeal, attachment to the venerable tradition of the priesthood in the Latin Church and the very eminent values which it expresses, are known to Us. We also know their pastoral anxieties in view of certain quite special needs of their apostolic ministry. They ask Us whether it might not be possible to consider ordaining to the priesthood men of advanced age who have given proof of exemplary family and professional life in their social circumstances, in a situation of extreme shortage of priests, and limited to regions in such a situation.

We cannot conceal that such an eventuality arouses grave reservations on Our part. Would it not be, amongst other things, a very dangerous illusion to believe that such a change in traditional discipline could be restricted in practice to local cases of true and extreme necessity? And would it not also be a temptation to others to look to it for an apparently easier answer to the present lack of sufficient vocations?

In any case, the consequences would be so grave and would pose such new questions for the Church's life, that they would, if considered, need to be given attentive previous examination, by Our Brothers in the Episcopate in union with Us. Account would have to be taken before God of the good of the universal Church, which could not be separated from that of the local Churches.

These problems which come under Our pastoral responsibility are truly grave, and, Lord Cardinal, We have wished to confide them to you.

You together with Us are witness of the appeals which come to Us from all sides. Many of Our Brothers and Children implore Us not to make any change in such a venerable tradition. They, together with Us hope that Our Venerable Brothers, the Bishops of Holland, will reflect further about the matter with the Apostolic See, through trusting and fraternal contacts. Such further reflection will need to

be matured in prayer and charity. We for Our part desire more than ever to seek together with the Pastors of the dioceses of the Netherlands for means of solving their problems in a suitable way, in common consideration for the good of the whole Church. We therefore believe it to be above all necessary to assure the Bishops, the priests and all the members of the Dutch Catholic Community of Our constant affection, but at the same time to assure them that it is Our conviction that it is indispensable to reconsider the desire expressed and the stand taken in a question of such grave importance and scope for the universal Church. These ought to be reconsidered in the light of the reflections stated above and in a spirit of authentic ecclesial communion.

We count particularly, Lord Cardinal, on your valuable collaboration in the work which the Holy See will have to do in this connection.

Your aid will also be valuable for the contacts which will have to be made with the Bishops of the entire world, in order that all Episcopal Conferences, maintaining perfect communion with Us and the universal Church in absolute respect for its laws, may assure their priests, Our fellow workers, that We are following and will continue to follow with Our paternal affection their anxieties in the apostolate and their problems; that the Episcopal Conferences may remind them at the same time of the beauty of the grace which the Lord has granted them, also of their sacred pledges and the missionary demand of their ministry. In these circumstances Our thoughts cannot but go out most cordially to those young men who are preparing themselves with the generosity of their apostolic drive to serve Christ and their fellows in the priesthood with all their hearts. They are really the Church's hope for the evangelization of the world: always provided that they commit themselves irrevocably and without reserve to the form of life which the Church puts before them.

Finally, Lord Cardinal, it will be necessary to make insistent calls to the multitude of faithful souls, who are still silent but do not therefore suffer less in this time of trial, and ask them for generous prayers.

May the Lord grant all, Pastors and faithful, the power of hope and the ardour of charity: "may grace be with all those who love Our Lord Jesus Christ with unchanging love" (Eph. 6, 24).

## **Brief Messages and Excerpts**

### **UPDATING METHODS IN CATHOLIC EDUCATION**

To 500 participants in the XXIII General Assembly of the Federation of Institutes under Ecclesiastical Authority (FIDAE) held at the St. Leo High School in Rome.

#### **The Catholic school must continue**

We think that you expect Us to say something on this occasion above and beyond technical and specific matters concerning your professional problems. You are looking for words of encouragement, perhaps words spoken by other lips — the most authoritative lips of the Ecumenical Council. What it had to say in its celebrated and basic Declaration on Christian Education is sufficient in itself. What did the Council have to say precisely? It said that “the Catholic schools... keeps its supreme importance in the present circumstances” (*Ib.* n. 8).

We repeat these words because a doubt is spreading about whether the Catholic school still has a proper function in our time. The question is raised because the public or State school — that founded by the civil authorities — has developed so much and has so much to offer in the way of satisfying society's schooling need, that it undoubtedly deserves praise and trust.

Is there still room for the denominational or private school? Our answer is Yes. We give this reply through respect for social freedom, which is so much called for today, and the complementary and to some extent competitive part which confessional schools play; but above all through respect for the originality of the Catholic school, the wealth and steadiness of religious and educational principles which it fosters, derived from the Divine Teacher, Christ, and professed by that “*Mater et Magistra*” which the Church is. Those principles are capable of giving shape to the whole of her art of teaching, of educating and training pupils logically and firmly for life.



### Should schools be shut down?

The Catholic school is necessary today, even though its usefulness has fallen off from the statistical point of view, and even though we have to acknowledge sometimes quite remarkable merits in State or public schools.

The Catholic school is necessary for those who desire to obtain coherent and complete Catholic education. It is necessary as a complementary experience in the conditions of modern society. It is necessary in places where other schools are lacking (less so than in the past). We would even dare to say that it is necessary for the Church not to fall short of the effort and competence needed for exercising her fundamental ministry, which is to teach.

We know the objection. We know the difficulties which are ranged against keeping a school system going with private resources in the face of needs for building developments, economic and assistential facilities and increases in organizational structures such as the public funds are able to provide for public schools.

Fresh sacrifices will be needed. Some Institutes and special courses will have to be reduced. Will there have to be closures? God forbid. We hope that your constancy will enable the Catholic school to go on its honourable way and through its merits provide justification for its existence. Its existence not only benefits the Church: it also benefits families which give it their trust; it benefits the State, and gives it loyal service.

But this reference to the necessity for Catholic schools and their increasing difficulties suggests a warning. It is a bold and difficult thing that We are going to suggest, yet it has already been raised in your enthusiastic programmes. Our schools have to be renewed. The troubles which they are experiencing should not be allowed to slow down plans for future activity. We give Our encouragement, to this effort towards renewing programmes and methods. Guidelines towards this hoped for renewal will be suggested by new legislation and experimentation in both your own and other countries, by trust in your own educational traditions, by watchful social sense, and finally by study of the youthful mind and how it is developing under the influence of modern life.

## THE VALUES OF CHILDHOOD

Speech delivered before the  
"Angelus" on January 4, 1970.

**"The life of every child, even the unborn, is sacred"**

The ancients held childhood in great reverence, and Christianity says more, that the life of every child as sacred, whether it is still in its mother's womb, or in our homes, our schools, our churches, and especially when it is hungry and suffering. The love of Christ for children transcends natural love, illuminates and idealizes it. "Christ" says St. Leo the Great, "loves childhood, which he himself experienced, in both body and soul." Note that: in body and soul. Then he made it the teacher, the example, the mysterious reflection of his mystic, characteristic and imploring presence: "Unless you become as little children, you shall not enter the Kingdom of Heaven..." and the good "that you have done to the least of my brethren, you have done unto me."

Therefore this is the time of love, in Christ, babies, young children, adolescents. It is the time to pray for them, for their parents, for the family. You know how greatly it is needed.

And let us pray for all who love children, for their teachers and educators and especially for catechists; for all organizations that work for the benefit of children, whose aim is the healthy, true and Christian training of the young. Mary, most fortunate of mothers, be at our side.

## **DOCUMENTATION**

### **PONTIFICAL BULLS**

**Most Rev. Salvador L. Lazo, D.D.**

**PAULUS EPISCOPUS SERVUS SERVORUM DEI**

dilecto filio SALVATORI LAZO, hactenus Curioni in pago vulgari sermone Lallo appellato, electo Episcopo titulo Seljensi atque Auxiliari sacri Praesulis Tuguegaraoani, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Qui Dei supremo atque secreto consilio munus suscepimus regendae atque gubernandae Ecclesiae, officia Nostra magnam partem tunc explevisse censemus, cum sacris per terrarum orbem Praesulibus, fratribus Nostreis, Apostolis Ecclesiarum, gloriae Christi — cfr. II Cor. 8, 23 — iusta auxilia atque necessaria subsidia submisserimus: non enim hodie, gliscentibus ubique negotiis, vires unius, quamvis diligentissimi, Antistitis semper satis sunt ad populum Dei tuendum, docendum, ad omne christianae vitae partes instruendum. Quae cum ita sint, cum venerabilis frater Theodulfus Domingo et Sabugal, Episcopus Tuguegaraoanus, cumulo negotiorum pressus, talem petierit virum, qui in negotiis explicandis abesset, censuimus bene esse si Te ad id detinaverimus, virum non solum pietate nitentem, ingenio praestatem, doctrina abundantem, verum etiam usu rerum praeditum, ad regendum perutili. Qua re, consilio petito a venerabilibus fratribus Nostreis S. R. E. Cardinalibus Sacrae Congregationi pro Episcopis Praepositis, Te simul Episcopum Seljensis Sedis nominamus, per promotionem Eduardi Machéner ad Ecclesiam Salisburgensem vacantis, simul Auxiliarem venerabilis fratris Episcopi Tuguegaraoani, quem diximus, renuntiamus, cum iuribus atque oneribus. Tuo autem commodo studentes facultatem facimus episcopalis consecrationis etiam extra urbem Romam excipiendae a quolibet catholico Praesule, cui assistant duo aequalis dignitatis viri et ipsi consecratores, qui omnes sint cum hac Petre Cathedra fidei vinculis coniuncti. Non tamen haec ante fieri poterunt, quam tum fidei professionem fecisti tum ius iurandum fidelitatis dedisti erga Nos, teste nempe aliquo Episcopo qui et ipse Nobis sit sancta religione obligatus. Quarum rerum acta conscribantur, eademque recte subscripta a Te et ab eo qui astitit iuranti, ad Sacram Congregationem pro Episcopis sinceris exemplis mittantur. Ceterum, dilecte fili, patrum tuorum fidem et religionem cum animo tuo reputans quam vivax fuerit, Tu quoque dignitatem tuam conversatione sancta tuere. In quod Maria assit, Christi Mater, sidus lucentissimum iter ad portum collustrans. Datum Romae, apud S. Petrum, die primo mensis decembris, anno Domini millesimo nongentesimo sexagesimo nono, Pontificatus Nostri septimo. — J.T. —

Aloisius Card. Traglia  
S.R.E. Cancellarius

Josephus Del Ton, Proton. Apost.  
Josephus Massimi, Proton. Apost.  
In Canc. Ap. tab. Vol. CXXXIII N. 95

Franciscus Tinello  
Apostolicam Cancellariam Regens  
Expedita die X Jan. Pont. VII M. Orsini Plumbator

Most Rev. Emmanuel S. Salvador, D.D.

PAULUS EPISCOPUS SERVUS SERVORUM DEI

Venerabili Fratri *Emmanueli S. Salvador*, adhuc episcopo titulo Nasbincensi, ad Ecclesiam Palensem translato, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. De eorum omnium fidelium bono solliciti, quos pascendos divino mandato suscepimus, numquam sane intermittimus quin missis ad eos Episcopis, opportuna ad aeternam salutem assequendam subsidia praebeamus. Quam ob rem, cum dioecesi Palensi esset sacer Antistes praeficiendus, vacanti post translato venerabilem fratrem Theotimum Pacis ad cathedralem Ecclesiam Legaspiensem, censuimus Te posse, venerabilis frater, ei Sedi assignari, non solum sanctorum Christi Apostolorum dignitate heredem, sed eorum etiam laborum et operum. De sententia ideo venerabilis fratris Nostri S.R.E. Cardinalis Sacrae Congregationis pro Episcopis Praefecti, deque suprema Nostra potestate vinculo Te solvimus Ecclesiae titulo Nasbinsensis, et ad diocesim *Palensem* regendam atque gubernandam transferimus, datis iuribus officiisque impositis, — quae dignitatem tuam minusque consequuntur. Ab iteranda autem catholicae fidei professione, legibus canonicis praescripta, Te eximimus, contrariis quibuslibet non obstantibus, ius vero iurandum fidelitatis erga Nos et Successores Nostros dabis, ante quem volueris Episcopum, qui sit Nobiscum sinceris fidei vinculis coniunctus, iuxta statutam formulam, quam de more signatam sigilloque impressam ad Sacram Congregationem pro Episcopis quan primus mittes. Mandamus praeterea ut hae Litterae Nostrae clero et populo in cathedrali dioecesis tuae templo legantur, primo post eas acceptas die recurrente festo de praecepto; quos dilectos filios monitas volumus, ut non solum Te libenter accipiant, sed etiam tuis mandatis pareant, quae dederis, coeptis faveant, quae inieris: maximopera enim oportet ut Episcopi industriae par respondeat subditorum fidelium planeque studiosa voluntas. Extremum, venerabilis frater, hortamus ut, ad maiora in Ecclesia obeunda officia vocatus, sic impiger opereris, ut bonum decet ministrum Christi Deique mysteriorum dispensatorem — cf. 1 Cor. 4,1. Datum Romae, apud S. Petrum, die vicesimo primo mensis Octobris, anno Domini millesimo nongentesimo sexagesimo nono, Pontificatus Nostri septimo.

Aloisius Card. Traglia  
S.R.E. Cancellarius

Joannes Callej, Proton. Apost.  
Eugenius Levi, Proton. Apost.

Franciscus Tinello  
Apostolicam Cancellariam Regens

In Canc. Ap. tab. vol. CXXXIII  
n. 65

Expedita die XXII Roma Pontif. VII  
M. Orsini Plumbator



## APOSTOLIC NUNCIATURE

Manila, Philippines

N. 5544

January 26, 1970

Your Excellency:

With the letter Prot. N. 1858/69, the S. Congregation for the Discipline of the Sacraments, as directed by the Holy Father, provides the insertion of the directives which empower the Ordinary of the Place to designate "per modum actus" the extraordinary minister of Holy Communion in N. 6 bis of the Instruction "Fidei Custos."

The Holy Father has likewise ordered that the Rites prepared by the competent S. Congregation for Divine Worship and pertinent to the institution of the same particular minister, be made part of the above mentioned Instruction.

In transmitting this communication from Rome, I avail myself of this occasion to congratulate Your Excellency on your election as President of the CBCP and to renew my sentiments of fraternal esteem and personal regards.

Cordially yours in Christ,

(Sgd.) ✠ CARMINE ROCCO, D.D.  
Apostolic Nuncio

H. E. Msgr. Teopisto Alberto, D.D.  
President, Catholic Bishops' Conference  
of the Philippines

P. O. Box 1160, Manila

Encl.a/s

SACRA CONGREGATIO  
DE SACRAMENTIS  
Prot. n. 1858/69

Romae, die 10 Ian. 1970

Excellentissime ac Reverendiissime Domine,

Textum novae facultatis, qua Ss. mae Eucharistiae administratio extraordinariis ministris ad modum actus deputatis, permittitur, ac sub n. 6 bis Instructionis "Fidei Custos" inserendum, iuxta instructiones a Secretaria Papali datas, haec Congregatio diligenti cura redegit.

Interea, a S. Congregatione pro Cultu Divino confectus, huc advenit definitivus ordo ad eundem extraordinarium ministrum rite instituendum.

Honori mihi est utrumque documentum Tibi remittere pro norma et intelligentia istius Conferentiae Episcopalis cui Excellentia Tua Reverendissima praees.

Haec dum renuntio, quo par est obsequio, me profiteor,

Excellentiae Tuae Reverendissimae,  
addictissimum,

(Sgd.) Antonium Card. Samoré  
Paref.

/s/ Jos. Casoria, Secr.

Excellentissimo ac Rev. mo Domino  
D. no LINO R. GONZAGA Y RASDESALES  
Praesidi Conferentiae Episcopalis Insul. Philippin.  
(cum adnexis)

#### SACRA CONGREGATIO DE SACRAMENTIS

FACULTAS DEPUTANDI MINISTRUM, QUI, AD ACTUM  
SS. MAM COMMUNIONEM DISTRIBUERE VALEAT.

"Pastores de quibus sub n. 1 assequi etiam possunt a praefatis Congregationibus facultatem permittendi parochis, quasi-parochis, vicariis paroecialibus, rectoribus ecclesiarum aliisque sacerdotibus curam animarum habentibus ut personam idoneam, iuxta ordinem sub n. 3 statutum, deputare valeant, quae, *ad actum*, SS.mam Communionem distribuere possit, in casibus necessitatis."

Praefata norma, textui Instructionis "Fidei Custos" H.S.C. diei 30 Aprilis 1969, sub n. 6 bis, interponenda est.

#### SACRA CONGREGATIO PRO CULTU DIVINO

RITUS AD DEPUTANDUM MINISTRUM, QUI, AD ACTUM  
SACERDOTEM IN DISTRIBUENDA COMMUNIONE INFRA  
MISSAM ADIUVABIT.

1. Dum fractio Panis et immixtio peraguntur, qui sanctam Communionem distribuere debet, veste huic sacro ministerio convenienti indutus, ad presbyterium accedit et coram sacerdote se sistit. Expleta invocatione *Agnus Dei*, sacerdos eum benedicit his

verbis: "*Benedicat et custodiat te Dominus ad Corpus Christi fratribus tuis hodie ministrandum.*" Omnes respondent: "*Amen.*"

2. Postquam vero sacerdos de more ipse Sacramentum sumpsit, sanctae Communionis ministrum, si hic communicandus sit, communicat; ac deinde pyxidem vel vas cum hostiis ei porrigit, et uterque ad Communionem fidelibus ministrandam accedit.
3. Sanctam Communionem distribuens, minister dicit singulis: "*Corpus Christi,*" cui communicandus respondet: "*Amen.*"
4. Distributione Communionis expleta, minister manus abluit, ac deinde ad locum suum in coetu fidelium revertitur.

## DECREE OF SUSPENSION

For the information of all those concerned We wish to make this known to all that Rev. Fr. PABLO HILARIO of Malolos Diocese is prohibited from exercising any ecclesiastical ministry and deprived of all clerical privileges.

(Signed)

Most Rev. MANUEL P. DEL ROSARIO, D.D.  
Bishop of Malolos

Malolos, Bulacan  
January 16, 1970

## **FOR A NON-PARTISAN CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION**

*An appeal of the Catholic  
Bishops of the Philippines  
to the Members of Congress.*

We, as citizens of the Philippines, deem it a matter of conscience to support openly the movement for a non-partisan Constitutional Convention.

We recognize the competence of our politicians on Constitutional matters. But the people have spoken. And we voice anew that clear mandate that they overwhelmingly expressed in the 1967 plebiscite for a non-partisan Constitutional Convention. Because we firmly believe that in a democracy, sovereignty resides in the people.

We are encouraged by the statement of Senator Emmanuel Pelaez, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Codes and Constitutional Amendments, that members of Congress should not seek delegate seats in the 1971 Constitutional Convention. We also praise the position of the other Senators who authorized him to announce that they were not running for delegate positions as published in the Metropolitan dailies, 23 January 1970.

Our people expressed the will for a non-partisan Constitutional Convention by an overwhelming majority because they are aware of the immoral practices that in the past two decades or so have been employed to win elections: ready-made ballots, the employment of armed goons, the tampering of ballot boxes, fake election returns, mass vote-buying. Our people are beginning to fear that money and power, not competence, integrity and dedication, are fast becoming the accepted arbiters of national destiny. And that the norm of conscience is dead. We notice therefore that among our people there prevails skepticism, even cynicism, about our elections.

The incredible suppression of the free ballot in Batanes is a glaring example of these anomalies. The news about these unfortunate events have been confirmed by one of the members of our Conference. At this point, we, the Catholic Bishops of the Philippines, as citizens of this country, congratulate the Batanes teachers for their courage, the students for their civic-mindedness, and the Mass Media people for their vigilance.

We likewise give deserved recognition to the positive action taken by His Excellency, the President of the Republic, in assuring the reign of justice in that troubled province.

Our people do not want the candidates to our Constitutional Convention to win through these anomalous means. Because then these men would be apt to work in public office not for the common good but rather for their personal interests. Our people want as delegates to this Convention men who are dedicated to their total welfare — moral, spiritual, economic, social, cultural and political.

We turn to you, our lawmakers, leaders of our National community. It is imperative that we maintain the confidence and belief of our people in democracy. It is vital to our national life that their freedom and dignity be respected.

We in turn pledge you our support. We pledge our share of the work. For we all — public officials, religious and civic leaders, and citizens in general — will have to stand before the searing judgment of God.

Respectfully yours in the Name of God  
for the Church Bishops Conference of the  
Philippines.

(Signed)

(Most Rev.) Teopisto V. Alberto, DD  
President

On the Eve of the Opening of the Seventh Congress 25, January 1970

## LITURGICAL SECTION

### APPLYING AND ADAPTING THE REFORMED FUNERAL RITES

H. J. Graef, S.V.D.

We have to get ready for the introduction of the reformed funeral rites. They are the fruit of long and serious work of experts and pastors from all over the world, because the draft of the new funeral ritual had been offered for experimentation on May 16, 1967, also to the bishops and priests of the Philippines. It is sad to note, however, that some bishops did not inform their priests of what was offered them, while in other cases the priests themselves were slow to study the papers and make use of them. The general reaction was that the rite was too long and complicated — an indication that it had not yet been studied when this judgment was made. Only few reports on the results of experiments reached the National Liturgical Commission (cf. *Lit. Inform. Bulletin of the Philippines*, March 1968, pp. 26-28).

It would be wrong, however, to simply shy away from a look at the new ritual because it has to be used soon. Nobody expects the busy parish priest to work through the 90 pages of the Latin original (*Ordo Exsequiarum, Typis polyglottis Vaticanis*, 1969, 91 pp.). But some attempts should be made to get acquainted with those rites.

From among the three types of funeral celebrations in the reformed ritual we select here the first which, in its full form provides for three stations: the first in the home of the deceased, the second in the church and the third in the cemetery. To be added to this form are two intervening processions so that the whole rite comprises the station in the home of the deceased, a procession from there to the church, the station in the church, a procession from the church to the cemetery and a last



station at the grave. The two published reports on experiments in the Philippines obviously preferred this first type of funeral celebrations.

Immediately the objection will be raised that because of the limited number of clergy in this country and the great distances from the church to the cemetery in many places, this rite, at least in its full form, cannot be applied.

In view of preceding experimentations these objections have been found to be true. The new ritual takes them into consideration and allows the eventual omission of both the liturgical rite in the home of the deceased and also the rite in the cemetery. Of the long and somewhat complicated ritual for the first type of funeral services there remains then only the station in the church. The ritual however, grants the permission to the faithful — it even exhorts them — to recite the prayers of the first and the third station in the absence of a priest or deacon.

How, then, is this rite to be performed in the one remaining station, in the church? Ideally, the Mass should be the central part of this celebration. But the number of priests is small and that of the funerals great. Hence, the celebration of the Mass may be substituted by a Liturgy of the Word which is to be followed by the rite that was formerly called "responso" in this country, whose name in the future will be "final commendation and farewell".

Particularly in rural areas parish priests may still raise the objection that "in the station in the church, without Mass, the Liturgy of the Word... tends to distract the people because of the length, and because of the parts that have less meaning for them" (*Lit. Inform. Bulletin*, March 1968, p. 28). As a result of experiments also in this country the wish had been expressed and directed to Rome that the Liturgy of the Word "when there is no Mass, be replaced by a simple Bible Service, e. g., one Scripture reading, a short homily, and the Prayers of the Faithful" (*Ibid*). Rome granted these petitions: the possibility of a Bible Service, with but one reading was inserted as an optional adaptation in the reformed funeral ritual.

In view of this concession and for the benefit of those concerned we offer here the texts and rites of such a funeral service, consisting of one single station in the church, comprising a simple Bible Service, a short

homily, the prayer of the faithful and the "final commendation and farewell." Before we present this rite, a few words are to be added on this "final commendation and farewell."

Before the body is taken away, the Christian community salutes its member for a last time and commends him to God. In Baptism he had been made a member of the Mystical Body of Christ, the community of faithful. This is the reason why the reformed rite of infant Baptism urges that a community of Christians as representatives of the Church, be present for the reception of a new member of the Church in Baptism.

Similarly, in a last farewell, the same community salutes its member in a special rite in the funeral celebration. Baptism and the Christian funeral are illustrations of the psalm verse that is found in many funeral rituals: "The Lord will guard your *going-out* and your *coming-in*, now and forever" (Ps 121 (120), 8).

Fittingly connected with this farewell in Christ is the sprinkling with holy water which recalls Baptism; it is a reminder that in Baptism the Christian got his direction to eternal life. It is equally a reminder that because of Baptism, despite the separation that death always means, there remain communion and unity. We are today very much aware of the bonds which link the whole Mystical Body of Christ (cf. Vatican II, Const. on the Church, art. 50). In the last analysis we shall never be completely separated from one another in death. We say "Farewell in the Lord" in the hope of eternal life, in the hope of meeting one another again.<sup>1</sup>

## FUNERAL RITE

### 1. Reception at the church door

*The priest, vested in surplice and stole (or also with a cope), goes to the entrance of the church and there greets the people accompanying the funeral cortege, especially the members of the family of the deceased, with a few sympathetic words. He may offer them the consolation of faith, using words from*

<sup>1</sup> On the foregoing cf. NOTITIAE 2 (1966) 353-363; 5 (1969) 431-435.

Sacred Scripture (optional)

Mt 11,28: The Lord says: Come to me, all you who are tired from carrying your heavy loads, and I will give you rest.

Sir 2,6: Trust in the Lord, and he will help you; follow a straight path and hope for him. Fear the Lord and wait for his mercy.

2 Cor 1,3-4: Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the merciful Father and the God of all consolation. He comforts us in all our afflictions.

*He may then sprinkle the coffin with holy water and say (if he so wishes) the following*

Prayer (optional)

Priest: The Lord be with you.

All: And also with you.

Priest: Let us pray.

Lord, listen to our prayers as we plead for your mercy on the soul of your servant N., whom you have summoned to leave this mortal life. Set him in a place of peace and light, and make him one in the company of peace and light, and make him one in the company of your saints. This we ask through Christ our Lord (33).<sup>2</sup>

All: Amen.

## 2. Entrance into the church

*While the funeral procession enters the church an entrance song is sung, which follows the rules laid down for these songs in the general guidelines for the Introit of the Roman Missal.*

*The place of the coffin in the church may be adorned with some candles. One may also place the Easter Candle near the head of the deceased. One may also put on the coffin a crucifix, a copy of the Gospels or a volume of Sacred Scripture.*

---

<sup>2</sup> The numbers in parentheses indicate the numbers of prayers and rites in the Roman funeral ritual. This is a private translation, not an official one.

*The priest goes to his seat. In the usual way there begins the celebration.*

### 3. Liturgy of the Word

Priest: In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

All: Amen.

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

All: And also with you.

*The priest may also use one of the other usual greetings. If the priest does not prefer to address the community in a short admonition, he says the following prayer:*

Let us pray.

God, all things that die live in you. Through you our bodies do not perish by death; they are gloriously changed. We ask you to command that the soul of your servant N. may be carried into the company of your friend, the patriarch Abraham, to be raised up again at the last day of the great judgment. By your love absolve him from every fault that he has committed during his life on earth. This we ask you through Christ our Lord (174).

All: Amen.

*In the subsequent liturgy of the word one may read three lessons, of which the first should be from the Old Testament and last one from the gospels. But pastoral reasons may eventually suggest only one reading, to be freely chosen from among those offered in the appendix of the ritual, e.g.*

Dan 12, 1-3: Those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake.

1 Jn 3,1-2: We shall see him as he is.

Jn 6,37-40: Every one who believes in the Son should have eternal life and I will raise him up at the last day.

Jn 14, 1-6: There are many rooms in my Father's house.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> There are 42 lessons from Sacred Scripture for these occasions in the funeral ritual: 7 from the Old Testament, 18 from the New Testament and 17 from the Epistles.

*After the reading a short homily is to be given, but without any kind of funeral eulogy.*

#### **4. Prayer of the Faithful**

Priest: Let us pray with confidence to God, the almighty Father, who raised Christ his Son from the dead, for the salvation of the living and the dead.

Leader: That N., given the seed of immortal life in baptism, may be granted eternal fellowship with the saints, let us pray to the lord.

ALL: Lord, graciously hear us.<sup>4</sup>

Leader: That N., whose food was the body of Christ, the bread of eternal life, may be raised up on the last day, let us pray to the Lord.

ALL: Lord, graciously hear us.

Leader: That God reward our deceased brethren, relatives and benefactors for the work they have done, let us pray to the Lord.

ALL: Lord, graciously hear us.

Leader: That God may welcome into the light of his presence all who have died in the hope of the resurrection, let us pray to the Lord.

ALL: Lord, graciously hear us.

Leader: That God may gather into his glorious kingdom all of us, assembled here in faith and devotion, let us pray to the Lord.

ALL: Lord, graciously hear us.

Priest: Lord, may the prayer of this congregation that humbly implores you, avail the souls of your deceased servants. Forgive them all their sins; make them share in the redemption you have procured for them. This we ask you through Christ our Lord (200).

ALL: Amen.

---

<sup>4</sup> One may freely take any of the approved invocations instead.

*Instead of this concluding prayer, the priest may introduce the Lord's Prayer to be said by all present:*

Priest: Let us now pray in the words our Lord Jesus Christ gave us:

ALL: Our Father...

### 5. Final Commendation and Farewell

*Accompanied by servers with holy water and incense, the priest takes his place near the bier, facing the people. First he pronounces an invitation, with these, or similar words:*

Priest: As is the custom of believers,  
we bring the human body to burial.  
To God all things are bound.  
Let us pray that he will raise again  
this body of our brother (sister),  
which we must bury in its imperfection,  
to the perfection and condition of the saints;  
and that he will summon his (her) soul  
to take its place with the saints and believers.  
May God grant him (her) mercy when he (she) is judged.  
May he (she) be redeemed from death and forgiven his (her)  
sins.  
May he (she) be at peace with the Father,  
and brought home on the shoulder of the Good Shepherd.  
My he (she) deserve everlasting joy,  
and the companionship of the saints  
in the court of the eternal king (46).

*Now all pray in silence for a short while.*

*The bishops' conference may decree that, according to local customs, after the silence for personal prayer, words of greeting be added by the relatives of the deceased.*

*Then the body is sprinkled with holy water and incensed, which may be done also after the chant of farewell.*



(Subvenite) Come to his aid, you saints of God; hasten to meet him, you angels of the Lord. \* Take his soul and offer it in the sight of the Most High.

¶ May Christ who called you, take you to himself; may angels escort you to Abraham's side. \* Take his soul and offer it in the sight of the Most High.

R/ Lord, grant that he may have eternal rest forever in the radiance of your light. \* Take his soul and offer it in the sight of the Most High.

*Other responsories may be sung, e.g., "Rogamus te", or: "Antequam nasceretur", or: "Credo quod Redemptor meus vivit", or: "Qui Lazarum resuscitasti", or: "Libera me, Domine, de viis inferi", or any other suitable chant.*

*If there is no possibility to have a chant, all present should at least pray in common for the deceased, in some invocations like the following (cf. 187):*

Priest: You shed your blood for N. We ask you: grant that he (she) may have eternal rest.

ALL: In the radiance of your light.

Priest: Before his (her) birth, O Lord, you knew him (her), and made him (her) in your image. We ask you: grant that he (she) may have eternal rest.

ALL: In the radiance of your light.

Priest: To you, O Lord, he (she) gave back his (her) soul. We ask you: grant that he (she) may have eternal rest.

ALL: In the radiance of your light.

Priest: He (she) was sorry for the sins he (she) has committed against you. We ask you: grant that he (she) may have eternal rest.

ALL: In the radiance of your light.

Priest: You destined him (her) to be raised up from the dead and see you, God, his (her) savior. We ask you: grant that he (she) may have eternal rest.

ALL: In the radiance of your light.

*After the responsory or communal invocations the priest says the following prayer of final commendation.*

Priest: Most merciful Father,  
into your hands we commend the soul of our brother (sister),  
for we are sustained by the sure hope  
that he (she) will rise again on the last day  
with all those who have died in Christ.  
(We give you thanks  
for all the good things you heaped upon your servant  
in this mortal life  
as signs for us of your goodness  
and of the communion of saints in Christ.)<sup>5</sup>  
Lord, in your great pity accept our prayer  
that the gates of paradise may be opened for your servant.  
And in our turn,  
may we too be comforted by the words of faith  
(until we hasten to meet Christ  
when we may all be for ever with the Lord  
and with our brother.)<sup>5</sup>  
This we ask you through Christ our Lord (48).

ALL: Amen.

## 6. Conclusion

*The priest concludes the ceremony with the words:*

Priest: Lord, grant that he (she) may have eternal rest

ALL: In the radiance of your light.

*While the body is taken away, the following (or any other suitable chant) may be sung:*

(In paradisum) May the angels lead you into paradise. Martyrs await your coming and escort you to Jerusalem, the holy city.

Or:

The choir of angels welcome you, and with Lazarus who once was poor, may you enjoy eternal rest.

---

<sup>5</sup>The parts in parentheses may be left out.

## **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.

#### **VII**

#### *Church Magisterium Speaks*

We said in the previous chapter that towards the end of the XIX century, the history of *three hundred years* was ready to pronounce at last its final verdict against mixed priestly training in the Seminaries. We could have rather affirmed that, even aside of Trent's decree, it was the history of *twenty centuries* of Christianity that has come to condemn unreservedly such fatal system of clerical formation. The data we have found in the course of this study are ample proof for this.

But the lessons of history are not always within the reach of all. In this matter a clearer, more explicit, more authoritative voice was needed: the voice of the Supreme Magisterium of the Church. This voice was finally heard, solemn and sure, reiterated and unequivocal, in the last half of the XIX century and in the first quarter of our XX century.

Under Pope Gregory XVI, the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars in a Circular Letter dated 2 October 1842 on LA EDUCAZIONE ECCLESIASTICA said:

"The ecclesiastical and scientific education of the youths who are to join the ranks of the clergy and dedicate themselves to the Lord's

service, has always been promoted with tireless solicitude by the Church. The aim is to form competent and worthy ministers of the sanctuary, so that, equipped with science and virtue, with their doctrine, prudence and holiness of life they may edify and be useful to the Christian people in the exercise of their sacred ministry.

"To achieve this aim THE ESTABLISHMENT OF SEMINARIES HAS BEEN RECOGNIZED AS A SURE AND EFFECTIVE MEANS. In them the youths, SHELTERED AT AN EARLY AGE FROM WORLDLY PLEASURES TO WHICH THEY WOULD EASILY YIELD, are trained in piety, virtue and ecclesiastical discipline.

"For this reason the Fathers of the COUNCIL OF TRENT ORDERED THE ERECTION OF SEMINARIES AND THE DISCIPLINE THAT MUST BE OBSERVED THEREIN. WITHOUT SUCH DISCIPLINE THESE SACRED PLACES, INSTEAD OF BEING SEEDBEDS OF PLANTS CHOSEN FOR THE SANCTUARY, WOULD BE CONVERTED INTO USELESS AND HARMFUL MEETING HALLS (residences, "convictoria" or "internates") OF UNDISCIPLINED YOUTHS."<sup>1</sup>

And the Letter adds: "Let there be admitted in the Seminaries... YOUTHS... OF SUCH DISPOSITION AND CHARACTER THAT COULD PROBABLY PERSEVERE IN THE ECCLESIASTICAL LIFE."<sup>2</sup> These words, which simply reecho the Tridentine decree, indicate obviously that the Seminaries (even the *Minor*, to which the text evidently refers) should be *exclusively* destined to candidates for the priesthood, and should deny admission to youths who intend to follow civil careers.

Leo XIII spoke more clearly and more forcefully. In his Epistle PATERNÆ PROVIDÆQUE of 18 September 1899 he was emphatic in stating:

"In the organization of Seminary discipline, we must begin by putting up a SEPARATE building for the students *who offer hopes to*

---

<sup>1</sup> Cenacchi, op. cit., pp. 108-109.

<sup>2</sup> S. C. de Sem. op. cit., p. 150.

dedicate themselves to the service of God in the priesthood; and this building should be called SEMINARY.

"In ANOTHER building which may be called *residence or Episcopal COLLEGE*, have the youths who prepare themselves for civil careers, reside.

"THE EXPERIENCE, INDEED, OF EVERY DAY TEACHES THAT '*MIXED SEMINARIES*' DO NOT ANSWER THE MIND AND CONCERN OF THE CHURCH. LIVING TOGETHER WITH LAYMEN IS THE REASON WHY SEMINARIANS MOST OFTEN GIVE UP THEIR HOLY RESOLUTION."<sup>3</sup>

In his Apostolic Constitution QUAE MARI SINICO addressed to the Philippine Hierarchy on 17 September 1902, Leo XIII expressly orders:

"UNDER NO PRETEXT SHOULD BISHOPS ALLOW THAT THE SEMINARY BUILDING OPEN TO OTHERS BUT TO THE YOUTHS WHO OFFER SOME HOPES OF

---

<sup>3</sup> Encycl. ad Archiep. et Episc. Brasiliae, PATERNAE PROVIDAEQUE, die 18 Sept. 1899: "In eorum Seminariorum...disciplina instauranda illud IN PRIMIS CORDI EST...UT SEPARATIS AEDIBUS, SUIQUE SEORSIM INSTITUTIS AC LEGIBUS DEGANT ALUMNI QUI SPEM AFFERANT SESE DEO MANCIPANDI PER SACROS ORDINES, EORUMQUE DOMUS RETINEANT SEMINARII NOMEN. aliae instituendis ad civilia munia adolescentibus *Convictus vel Collegia* Episcopalia nuncupentur.

"QUOTIDIANO ENIM USU CONSTAT MIXTA SEMINARIA ECCLISIAE CONSILIO AC PROVIDENTIAE MINUS RESPONDERE: EA CONTUBERNIA CUM LAICIS CAUSAM ESSE QUAMOBREM CLERICI PLERUMQUE A SANCTO PROPOSITO DIMOVEANTUR. "HOS DECET VEL A PRIMA AETATE IUGO DOMINI ASSUESCERE, PIETATIS VACARE PLURIMUM, INSERVIRE SACRIS MINISTERIIS, VITAE SACERDOTALI EXEMPLO CONFORMARI. ARCENDI ERGO MATURE A PERICULIS, SEIUNGENDI A PROFANIS, INSTITUENDI IUXTA PROPOSITAS A S. CAROLO BORROMAEI LEGES."

cf. Micheletti, op. cit., p. 73; S. C. de Sem., op. cit., p. 150; L. G. García, op. cit., p. 54.

DEDICATING THEMSELVES TO GOD IN THE PRIESTHOOD. For those who wish to pursue civil professions other buildings should be erected, if so possible, which are to be called "convictus" or Episcopal COLLEGES."<sup>4</sup> These provisions were just a re-enactment of what the Encyclical PATERNAE PROVIDAEQUE, above mentioned, had prescribed for the dioceses of Brazil.<sup>5</sup>

Lastly, in his Encyclical FIN DA PRINCIPIO addressed on 8 December 1902 to the Bishops of Italy, the same immortal Pontiff Leo XIII declared: "By dint of these considerations (*Note: The Pope has just expressed fear that the spirit of naturalism which was spreading everywhere, would infiltrate the ranks of the clergy.*C.) *We deem it necessary to recommend once more and with much greater earnest that* THE SEMINARIES SHOULD BE CAREFULLY MAINTAINED IN THEIR PROPER SPIRIT, in regard to the training of the mind as well as of the heart. WE SHOULD NEVER LOSE SIGHT OF THE FACT THAT THEIR EXCLUSIVE AIM IS TO FORM YOUTHS, NOT FOR CIVIL PROFESSIONS, however legitimate and honorable these may be, BUT FOR THE SUBLIME MISSION OF MINISTERS OF CHRIST AND DISPENSERS OF THE MYSTERIES OF GOD." Thereafter the Pope orders that *admission in the Seminary be strictly limited to those youths who offer well-grounded hopes of their willingness to dedicate themselves to the ecclesiastical ministry; and that THEY SHOULD BE SEPARATED FROM*

---

<sup>4</sup> In the Bull DE RE SACRA IN PHILIPPINIS, entitled "QUAE MARI SINICO," Tit. VIII, art. 761: "opportuna providentia statutum est, ut NULLA DE CAUSA IN SEMINARIO RECIPIANTUR II, QUORUM INDOLES ET VOLUNTAS ECCLESIASTICAM VOCATIONEM NON DEMONSTRENT; etiamsi iuvenes praedicti propriis expensis alantur, sive sumptibus, quos pro eorum institutione Seminarium erogaverit, sese integros satisfacturos, ad hoc etiam data cautione, promittant."

"NULLA INSUPER RATIONE PERMITTANT EPISCOPI UT SEMINARII AEDES ULLI PATEANT, NISI IIS ADOLESCENTIBUS QUI SPEM AFFERANT SESE DEO PER SACROS ORDINES MANCIPANDI. Qui vero ad civilia munia institui volunt, alias, si res sinunt, obtineant, aedes, quae convictus vel *colegia* episcopalia nuncupantur."

cf. *Enchiridion Clericorum*, Romae 1938, n. 616; Micheletti, op. cit., p. 73.

<sup>5</sup> cf. Micheletti, op. cit., loc. cit.



FREQUENT CONTACT, AND MUCH SO FROM LIVING TOGETHER WITH ADOLESCENTS WHO DO NOT ASPIRE TO THE PRIESTHOOD.<sup>6</sup>

Why did the Vicar of Christ insist so much on this particular point? It was doubtlessly due to the system of "mixed Seminaries" or College-Seminaries, which was quite in vogue and commonly accepted in those days for the motives already explained in our previous chapter. In view of the difficulties created by the turbulent conditions of those times, mixed priestly training was being tolerated at least in the *Minor* Seminaries until the Theology course. All possible measures were taken to prevent the ill effects of the system; but the results were so damaging for priestly vocations that the Supreme Pastor did not think it useless to insist *three times* in official documents of great importance, addressed to Bishops from all the corners of the world, on the mind of the Church Magisterium about the matter. This took place at the close of the XIX century and the early dawn of our XX century.

But the evil that was afflicting the Seminaries seemed to present the symptoms of a chronic and incurable disease. Everybody was willing to abide by the papal directives; but in actual practice motives were always found for putting off their implementation. Hence the successors of Leo XIII had to proclaim again the urgency of doing away with "mixed Seminaries" in virtue of the Church's unmistakable verdict against them.

St. Pius X in his Encyclical Letter E SUPREMI APOSTOLATUS of 4 October 1903 said again:

"THE SEMINARIES SHOULD DEFINITELY SERVE THEIR OWN PURPOSE. THEY SHOULD NOT EDUCATE YOUTHS FOR A PURPOSE OTHER THAN THE PRIESTHOOD AND THE SERVICE OF GOD."<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> cf. *Enchiridion Clericorum*, op. cit., n. 862; L. G. García, op. cit., p. 54; Cenacchi, op. cit., pp. 128-129.

<sup>7</sup> "Seminaria, suo palam consilio serviant, NEQUE IUVENES AD ALIUD QUAM AD SACERDOTIUM ERUDIANT ET AD MINISTERIUM DEI." Cf. Micheletti, op. cit., p. 73; *Enchiridion Clericorum*, op. cit., n. 714; Cenacchi, op. cit., p. 119; Pii X Acta 1, 8 s.; C.I.C. Fontes, 3, 604 s.

In his Letter LA RISTORAZIONE dated on 5 May 1904 the holy Pontiff declared: "The *instauration of all things in Christ* which we have resolved to accomplish with God's help in the government of the Church, DEMANDS, as we have oftentimes manifested, THE GOOD TRAINING OF THE CLERGY, the screening of vocations, the test on the candidates' integrity of life, and the *cautiousness in not opening to them so easily the doors of the sanctuary*."<sup>8</sup>

On 4 April 1906 the Secretary of State and close collaborator of St. Pius X, His Eminence Raphael Cardinal Merry del Val, of saintly memory, in a Brief of the Holy See addressed to the Provincial of the Dominican Order in the Philippines enjoined that in the Pontifical University of Santo Tomas (Manila) the seminarians in the Faculty of Theology and Canon Law IN NO WAY SHOULD MIX WITH THE LAY STUDENTS enrolled in the civil Faculties of the same University: "In order to obtain academic degrees in Theology or Canon Law the students sent by the suffragan Bishops SHALL LIVE COMPLETELY SEPARATED FROM LAY PERSONS, AND RESIDE AS INTERNS IN THE SAME UNIVERSITY, IN THE STYLE AND WITH THE DISCIPLINE OF A TRUE SEMINARY EXCLUSIVE FOR CLERICS."<sup>9</sup>

The same Pontiff in the Encyclical Letter PIENI L'ANIMO of 28 July 1906 definitely states: "THE SEMINARIANS SHALL BE MAINTAINED ZEALOUSLY IN THEIR OWN SPIRIT AND REMAIN EXCLUSIVELY DESTINED TO PREPARE YOUTHS, not for civil careers, but FOR THE SUBLIME MISSION OF MINISTERS OF CHRIST."<sup>10</sup>

<sup>8</sup> "La ristorazione d'ogni cosa in Cristo, che Ci siamo proposti con l'aiuto del Cielo nel governo della Chiesa, esige, come più volte abbiamo già manifestato, la buona istituzione del clero, la prova delle vocazioni, l'esame sull'integrità della vita degli aspiranti e la cautela per non aspir loro con troppa indulgenza le porte del santuario." Cf. Cenacchi, op. cit., pp. 119-120; *Enchiridion Clericorum*, op. cit., n. 722; Pii X Acta 1, 257 s.; C.I.C. Fontes 3, 624 s.

<sup>9</sup> A.A.S. XL (1907-1908), pp. 467-468.

<sup>10</sup> In this Encyclical St. Pius X remarks that it is spreading among the clergy a certain "spirito d'insubordinazione e d'idipenza", and deplores that the cause of such evil "è la facilità infatti nell' ammettere alle sacre ordinaizioni quella, che apre la via ad un *moltiplicarsi di gente* nel santuario, che poi non

The Exhortation *HAERENT ANIMO* of St. Pius X, dated 4 August 1908, was the most beautiful legacy of his love for priests. Speaking there of seminaries the Vicar of Christ declared: "The Church strives with assiduous and never interrupted solicitude to foster holiness of life among her priests. With this aim in view she has instituted Seminaries where, if those who are the hope of the Church must be trained in humanities and science, at the same time and still with greater care they must be formed FROM THEIR EARLIEST YEARS in a sincere piety towards the Lord."<sup>11</sup>

Approving the Rules drafted by the Sacred Congregation for Bishops and Religious for the Seminaries of Italy, St. Pius X in the Letter *CON L'INTENTO* of 18 January 1908 reiterated the injunction of his predecessor Leo XIII that in the Seminaries none should be received but the youths who offered well-grounded hopes of willingness to dedicate themselves forever to the ecclesiastical ministry.<sup>12</sup>

On 16 July 1912, through the Sacred Consistorial Congregation the Pope published a Circular Letter *LE VISITE APOSTOLICHE* addressed to the Ordinaries of Italy. Some points therein are relevant to the subject we are treating:

"NEVER ADMIT IN THE SEMINARY, EVEN IN THE FIRST YEARS OF STUDY, young boys who CLEARLY DO NOT

---

*accresce letizia* (Is. 9,3). Promuovano dunque i Vescovi non secondo le brame e le pretese di chi aspira, ma, come prescrive il Tridentino, secondo la necessità della diocesi; e nel promuovere di tal guisa, potranno scegliere SOLAMENTE COLORO CHE SONO VERAMENTE IDONEI, RIMANDANDO QUELLI CHE MOSTRASSERO INCLINAZIONI CONTRARIE ALLA VOCAZIONE SACERDOTALE, PRECIPUA FRA ESSE LE INDISCIPLINATEZZA E CIO CHE LA GENERA, L'ORGOGGIO DELLA MENTE...."

"I SEMINARI SIANO GELOSAMENTE MANTENUTI NELLO SPIRITO PROPRIO, E RIMANGONO *EXCLUSIVAMENTE* DESTINATI A PREPARARE I GIOVANI, NON A CIVILI CARRIERE, MA ALL'ALTA MISSIONE DI *MINISTRI DI CRISTO*." Cf. Cenacchi, op. cit., p. 121; Pii X Acta 3, 163 s.; C.I.C. Fontes 3, 676 s.; *Enchiridion Clericorum*, op. cit., n. 783.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Genacchi, op. cit., pp. 121-122.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. L. G. García, op. cit., p. 54; Cenacchi, op. cit., p. 126.

WANT TO BE PRIESTS; for these A COLLEGE may be established, but SEPARATE FROM THE SEMINARY. TO BE ADMITTED IN THE SEMINARY, IT SHOULD BE A REQUIREMENT THAT THE BOYS SHOW AT LEAST AN INITIAL INCLINATION TO THE PRIESTHOOD.

"THOSE POSITIVELY INTENDING TO REMAIN IN THE LAY STATE, WILL NECESSARILY FEEL A DISLIKE FOR THE SEMINARY WHERE EVERYTHING IS ORIENTED, AS IT SHOULD BE, NOT TO MERE TEMPORAL VALUES, BUT TO THE ECCLESIASTICAL FORMATION, TO PIETY AND TO RECOLLECTION.

"MOREOVER, THAT MIXTURE (of seminarians and lay students) IS THE CAUSE OF THE LOSS OF MANY VOCATIONS, AS SHOWN BY EXPERIENCE."<sup>13</sup>

Indeed, the verdict of the Church Magisterium against "mixed Seminaries" and mixed clerical education, could not be clearer.

But the final sentence, the last word, the most solemn pronouncement on the matter was to be issued by Pope Pius XI. Even before him, under Pope Benedict XV, we find in the Code of Canon Law—promulgated on 27 May 1917—the canons 972, 1353 and 1363 which openly confirm the mind of the Church on the matter; and again in the ORDINAMENTO DEI SEMINARI published on 26 April 1920 by the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities, the injunctions of Trent, of Leo XIII, of St. Pius X and of the new Code of Canon Law about this matter are re-enacted.<sup>14</sup> But the real death blow was reserved, as we said, to Pius XI, who just a few months after his election to the Chair of Peter, sent to Cardinal Bisleti, Prefect of the Congregation of Seminaries, the momentous Apostolic Letter OFFICIORUM OMNIUM dated on 1 August 1922.<sup>15</sup> In this papal document the Holy Father vigorously expresses himself thus:

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Cenacchi, pp. 128-129; L. G. García, op. cit., p. 55; Litt. Circ. S.C. Cons., LE VISITE APOSTOLICHE: ap. *Enchiridion Clericorum*, op. cit., n. 862.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Cenacchi, op. cit., p. 146.

<sup>15</sup> A.A.S., 14 (1922), pp. 449-458. Cf. Cenacchi, op. cit., p. 152.

"One thing stands uppermost in Our mind's solicitude. IT IS NECESSARY TO DO BY ALL MEANS what Our predecessors Leo VIII and Pius X have so often commanded: THAT ECCLESIASTICAL SEMINARIES SHOULD SERVE NO OTHER PURPOSE THAN THAT FOR WHICH THEY WERE FOUNDED, namely, TO FORM, AS IT IS FITTING, THE SACRED MINISTERS.

"For this reason, THERE SHOULD BE NO PLACE IN THEM FOR BOYS AND YOUTHS WHO DO NOT FEEL ANY INCLINATION TO THE PRIESTHOOD; NOT ONLY BECAUSE COMPANIONSHIP OF THESE WITH THE SEMINARIANS IS VERY HARMFUL, but also because *all the acts of piety* (methods of instruction and discipline) *have to be oriented exclusively towards the adequate formation of the students' character for the sacred ministry.*

"LET THIS BE THE MOST SACRED LAW OF ALL SEMINARIES, WITHOUT ANY EXCEPTION. HAD THIS BEEN COMPLIED WITH, MORE FAITHFULLY, UP TO THE PRESENT, THERE WOULD NOT BE SUCH A GREAT DEARTH OF PRIESTS, ALMOST EVERYWHERE. It has been noticed as a common tendency that *Seminaries are not being run in accordance to their specific nature.* They retain the name of *Seminaries.* In reality however while they render much good to the civil society, *they are of little worth or totally useless for the sacred ministry.*"<sup>16</sup>

<sup>16</sup> "Illud enimvero maxime Nobis est curae, MODISQUE OMNIBUS EFFICIENDUM EST, quod decessores Nostri Leo XIII et Pius X saepius praeceperunt, UT SACRA SEMINARIA, NISI AD EAM REM, CUIUS CAUSA CONDITA SUNT, NE ADHIBENTUR, ID EST, AD SACRORUM ADMINISTROS, UT OPORTET, INSTITUENDOS. QUARE NON MODO IN EIS LOCUS ESSE NON DEBET PUERIS VEL ADOLESCENTULIS, QUI NULLAM AD SACERDOTIUM PRAESEFERANT PROPENSIONEM VOLUNTATIS, — HORUM ENIM CUM PIETATIS EXERCITATIONIBUS GENUS HUC OMNINO SPECTENT OPORTET, UT AD PERFUNCTIONEM DIVINI MUNERIS ACCOMODATE ALUMNORUM ANIMI PRAEPARENTUR.

"HAEC ESTO SEMINARIORUM OMNIUM, NULLO EXCEPTO, SANCTISSIMA LEX; CUI QUIDEM SI RELIGIOSIUS USQUE AD-

The great Pope made this forceful pronouncement on the ill that plagued for so long clerical formation began his pontificate by announcing in the same aforesaid document that he considered as "the greatest and most urgent duty of his immense apostolic office to procure and provide the Church with sufficient number of good ministers"<sup>17</sup>; later, on 21 December 1935 he issued the Magna Charta of the Catholic Priesthood in his masterful Encyclical AD CATHOLICI SACERDOTII; and a few days before his death, in his last posthumous Letter addressed to the Episcopate of the Philippines on 18 January 1939 he affirmed that he regarded that Encyclical as "the most important document" of his entire pontificate. He was the first Pope, and up to the present the only one, who, prompted by his interest in priests and their adequate formation, reserved to himself the office of Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries.<sup>18</sup> Pius XI deserves indeed to be reckoned in Church history as one of the greatest champions of priestly formation. And with the words quoted above from OFFICIORUM OMNIUM he put the official and definitive seal to the verdict of the Magisterium that stigmatized *mixed priestly training* as contrary to the nature proper of the authentic Seminary and harmful to the promotion of priestly vocations.

The Church has spoken in such a way that no excuse can be alleged to circumvent the law of seminarians' segregation from lay students. Later on, as we have already said elsewhere, Pope Pius XII tried to rectify certain deviations or misinterpretations of that law, and pointed out the mistake of educating future diocesan priests in *excessive* isolation from the world. In his great Encyclical MENTI NOSTRAE of 23 September 1950 the Supreme Pontiff made clear the disadvantages

---

HUC OBTEMPERATUM ESSET, TANTA FERE UBIQUE NON ESSET PAUCITAS SACERDOTUM."

"Nam hoc est in proclivi, quae non congruenter suae propriae naturae regantur Seminaria, ea suum quidem retinere nomen, re autem vera societati civili multum prodesse posse, at sacro ordini vix aliquid aut omnino nihil proficere." Cf. Cenacchi, op. cit., pp. 152-153; L.G. García, op. cit., pp. 55-56; *Enchiridion Clericorum*, op. cit., n. 1151.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Epist. Apost. OFFICIORUM OMNIUM, 1 Aug. 1922: ap. Cenacchi, op. cit., p. 152.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. S.C. de Sem., op. cit., p. 249.



of Seminary training "in an environment *too isolated* from the world"; and so he cautioned "that the students come in *closer contact*, GRADUALLY AND PRUDENTLY, with the judgments and tastes of the people in order that when they begin their ministry they will not feel themselves disorientated".<sup>19</sup> We underlined the words TOO ISOLATED and CLOSER CONTACT because they show the unfair exaggeration incurred by those who accused our Seminaries of yesterday as *absolutely* closed to the world, and their methods of education *identical* to those of a monastic novitiate. The Pope indicates that there was an *excessive* isolation (at least in *some* or *many* Seminaries), and *not enough* contact with the world: that is all. Let us not make him say what he did not. And we stress also the words GRADUALLY AND PRUDENTLY, because these two qualifying adverbs are precisely what modern innovators seem to ignore or forget in advocating an *indiscriminate* and *unreserved* "openness" and "insertion" in the world. From the very words of the Pope we must conclude that a certain separation (more properly called *segregation*) of seminarians from the world OUGHT TO EXIST. Their lofty vocation, and the *special* (not abnormal, but out of the ordinary) way of life they will have to live, demands it. Pius XII does not contradict the doctrine of his predecessors, Leo XIII, Pius X and Pius XI. All he wants is to correct the defects of narrow and rigorous interpretations which confuse diocesan seminaries with religious novitiates, the formation of a clergy called to active life with the training of a clergy called to the contemplative life.

But the mind of Pius XII was certainly alien to the rash and unjustified "openness to or insertion in the world" which is being advocated these days, because such type of mixed priestly training if not completely identical with what prevailed in the past to the great harm of the Church, has so many points of similarity that, to our judgment, it will bring upon the Church the same baneful effects today as it did yesterday.

---

<sup>19</sup> A.A.S., 42 (1950), pp. 686-687: trans. Abbey Press, St. Meinrad, Indiana, "The Popes and the Priesthood" (*Seven Papal Documents*), Revised 7th edition, 1963, St. Meinrad Archabbey, p. 120.

The reason is simple. In spite of the much vaunted "age of maturity" of our times, human nature, whether we like it or not, is the same. The passions of inexperienced youth and the seductions of the world do not change: or if they do, they do from bad to worse. Our youths would not be *normal* if they did not undergo the risks inherent to the crisis of puberty. It is absurd to treat them as if they have already acquired maturity and self-dominion necessary to overcome that crisis, when actually they are still in the period of growth and in the process of formation. It is by means of a sound Christian education and discipline that they will acquire the real maturity and self-control which, with the help of God's grace, can make them persevere in the conquest of their natural instincts or disorderly appetites, and come up to the sublime demands of a total commitment in the priestly life.

*(to be continued in the next issue)*

## **PASTORAL SECTION**

### **HOMILETICS**

**D. Tither, C.SS.R**

**2nd Sunday of Easter-tide (April 5)**

#### **PEACE THROUGH ANGUISH**

The fifty days after Easter are considered as one big Feast-day of joy and praise. What Sunday is to the week, Easter-tide is to the year. During this time, the first reading at Mass is taken from the Acts of the Apostles, the inspired and inspiring account of the earliest days of Christianity. Today (Acts 4.32-34) we remember the joyful union and charity that reigned among the first Christians. We recall that this charity, today as then, is produced by the Holy Spirit, and that He is sent to us by the Risen Savior. And in the Gospel (Jo. 20.19-31) we relive two quite dramatic appearances of the Risen Lord and His first recorded imparting of the Holy Spirit.

Imagine we're witnessing this scene on the first Easter night. Earlier in the day the Lord has appeared to Magdalena, to Peter and to the disciples at Emmaus. But the reports are not fully believed, they are literally "too good to be true." The time is night, the place quite likely the Cenaculo. The city is buzzing with the news of the empty tomb, but circulating too is the bogus fabrication that the body has been stolen (Mt. 28.13). In terror the Apostles have locked themselves in. Only Thomas is absent, maybe he is pessimistic, even skeptical after Good Friday's events.

Suddenly, the Risen Lord is among them! But the doors are still locked! He has new and amazing qualities, He is independent of time and space. He can still be touched (v. 20); St. Luke adds the detail that He looked for something to eat. He commissions them, exactly

as He has been sent by the Father. They and their successors are to continue His work, be His other selves (v. 21). Then He breathes on them (a symbolic gesture of handing over power): "Receive the Holy Spirit," He says (v. 22).

This fulness of power from the Holy Spirit is to be over *sin*. Each Sacrament derives its power from the Holy Spirit, and that goes for Confession too. Since His Ascension, we can't ask Our Lord directly for pardon. His forgiveness is still available, from the Apostles and their successor. The Holy Spirit works through Christ's priests, His other selves. Confession was instituted on the most joyful day of the world's history, and it was given to us precisely to bring us peace—never look on it in any other light.

When Thomas joined the other Apostles, he met their joyful announcement: "We have seen the Lord" with a most exacting demand for proof (v. 25). And he remained stubborn and obstinate for a full week till Jesus again appears and asks Thomas to apply his tests. No need, absolutely none. Thomas cry of faith: "My Lord and my God" is as explicit as any in the N.T. And Jesus tells him and us that the more our faith is independent of natural arguments, the better it is (v. 29).

What have these two apparitions in common? The lesson about how to achieve peace (vv. 19,21,26). The precious gift of peace is acquired, not by retreating from the world's turmoil, but by getting right into it, and striving to the point of anguish, to straighten it out. To stand by or hide away during injustice is to make ourselves "consentidores".

Jesus came into the Cenaculo that first Easter night as a Victor. He had triumphed over death, over selfish sin and cruel brutality on a far higher plane than war or bitter hatred.

His Apostles had still to learn about this. They were looking for peace in safe isolation. They cowered behind locked doors, hoping to be free from trouble and disturbance. "Peace at all costs"—that would be legitimate. But they wanted peace at *any* cost, even that of avoiding all human involvement.

Their doors, their locks are useless. With splendid freedom, the Lord is there, showing what peace should mean. As a true Hero who has overcome evil, He announces the first fruits of His victory: "Peace be to you." Perhaps there is no more reassuring word in any language than the very word He kept repeating: "Shalom"

It must have sounded like a general pardon, and it was that. Their cowardice, their refusal to believe those who had seen Him risen, all was forgiven and forgotten as if it had never happened. But it was much more than an absolution, it was a profound expression of all He had endured, and what He had achieved.

The Psalms tell us: "Seek after peace and pursue it." You won't find it if you remain huddled behind locked doors, you'll only get it by straining every nerve to get rid of injustice and misery. Go out like the dove from Noe's ark — out from protective shelter into the chaos of the deluge.

Open the doors! Out into the thick of it! Then, like the Risen Savior, we'll bring a message of peace to an insecure world, we'll stir the disheartened with the vision that peace is truly possible, that the Resurrection has happened!

The Risen Lord told Magdalene not to hold Him back. He tells us the same. If we refuse to be involved, if we refuse to do His work, we are indeed restraining Him. "As often as you refused it to one of these My little ones, it was to Me that you refuse it." Peace be with you my brethren.

### 3rd Sunday of Easter-tide (April 12)

#### RISEN AND PREACHED

On the afternoon of the first Easter Sunday, two of Christ's disciples left Jerusalem to go to Emmaus. Naturally they were discussing the tragic events of the last few days. They had such high hopes of Jesus. And now He had been killed, and to add to their sorrow, it was rumoured that His body had been stolen — at least His tomb was

empty. A Stranger joins them, asks them why they are so sad, and they tell Him all. So deep is their grief and disappointment that they do not recognize this Stranger. He hears them out and then proceeds to recall all the O.T. prophecies about Himself, that it was necessary that He suffer these things and so enter into His glory.

When they reach Emmaus, the two disciples urge the kind Stranger to be their guest. During supper He takes bread, blesses and breaks it and they suddenly recognize a familiar gesture (or maybe they notice the marks of the nails) and at that He disappears. Leaving the meal, they hurry back to Jerusalem. As they go, they relive the moments when their hearts had almost burst as He recounted God's plan for Himself. Arrived at the Cenaculo they find the Apostles exclaiming that the Lord had indeed risen and appeared to Peter!

It is at this point that today's Gospel extract takes over. (Lk. 26. 31-68). The two disciples are relating their experience at Emmaus when Jesus appears to all of them. "Peace be to you" He says, "it is I, fear not." How often He had spoken of peace, the keynote of His preaching: "These things I have spoken to you, that you may have peace (Jo. 16.33). How He praised the peacemakers, those who struggle and strive to make the world peaceful (Mt. 5.9). For all of us to be of one mind, to have peace, as far as possible, with all men (Rom. 12.18), to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace (Eph. 4.3), this is Christian living.

At His request, the disciples examine and even touch His wounded hands and feet. He eats with them. Again, as He had earlier done on the way to Emmaus, He recalls from the O.T. how the Divine Plan has been fulfilled in His life and now especially in His death and resurrection. "Thus it is written that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead, and that repentance and forgiveness of sins should be preached in His Name to all nations" (vv. 46-47).

Notice that the Risen Lord stresses *three* things—the necessity of His death, then His resurrection, and lastly, but equally stressed, the necessity of *preaching* this. Yes, Christ crucified, risen and *preached*—this is the theme of the last words of Jesus recorded in St. Luke's Gospel.

What is this preaching to be? It is the proclaiming, with solemnity and authority, of the good news that God our Father loves us in Christ, and has raised us to life, a new and everlasting life, in His Son. It is not a history of past events that is proclaimed, but a living message, having an impact on our lives *now*.

We see a sample of Apostolic preaching in the first reading (Acts 3. 13-18). It was occasioned by a miracle, the instantaneous cure of a well-known cripple in the name of the Risen Jesus. A crowd gathers, amazed and astonished. While the cured man clings to Peter, he directs their attention to the true source of the spectacular cure—the Risen Lord working through His Church.

Remember Peter is speaking to Jews, who know well the O.T. prophecies about the Redeemer. Reminding them of God's interventions in their history, beginning with Abraham, he proclaims the latest and greatest of all God's wonderful works—the Resurrection. The Apostles are the official witnesses of this stupendous fact (v. 15). He calls Jesus the Author of life—both because, glorified and empowered to send the Holy Spirit, He is the source of our sharing in the divine life.

The crucifixion ought not have been a scandal to the Jews. The prophets had described it in vivid details. Isaias 53 is so accurate a prediction of the Passion that it is sometimes called a 5th Gospel. Psalm 21, quoted by Jesus on the cross, describes Him mocked and defied as He hangs there (vv. 6-8), even the very piercing of His hands and feet (v. 16). All was foretold, and all, says Peter, is now fulfilled.

The climax of the preaching is an earnest exhortation to repentance, a complete change of heart (v.19). Imagine we have been listening to that sermon. We see Peter, the cured man clinging to him; the people, many quite interested, some just curious, a few hostile. We hear Peter's bold and daring challenge, and contrast it with his former cowardice and timidity. We realize that He has a burning message to tell, that God loves us infinitely, and has raised us to a new life. We sense the urgency of that message, its demands, the force with which it overrides any and every difficulty. And we, like Peter's hearers,



respond, promising to "repent and turn again, so that our sins maybe blotted out, and that we may be refreshed from the presence of the Lord" (v. 19).

#### 4th Sunday of Easter-tide (April 19)

### THE GOOD SHEPHERD

Last Sunday, you remember, we listened to St. Peter preaching, proclaiming Jesus' Resurrection and calling on us to throw in our lot with Him for good, to go "all out" for Him. We've just heard part of the sequel to that (Acts 4.8-12). Like any sermon, it had a mixed reception. Many gave themselves wholly over to Christ, bringing the total of men converts to 5,000 (v. 4). But the Temple authorities, Sadducees who refused to believe in survival after death, arrested Peter and John and left them in jail overnight. Next morning they were summoned and asked in whose name they had done such a sensational cure.

The cured cripple, who the day before had been leaping about and praising God, and was clinging to the Apostles at the time of their arrest, was right there with them (v. 10). He was a familiar figure, as he used to be carried daily to the Temple gate and used to spend the whole day begging from the worshippers coming and going (3.10). The spectacular miracle had the same purpose as those done directly by Jesus — to show God's majesty in intimacy with human misery.

Peter, who had trembled before a servant maid, is fearless before the High Priest and his court. What had transformed him? The Holy Spirit, none other (v. 8). Jesus had said of coming persecutions — no need to prepare a defence; what we are to say will be given us in that hour, it will not be ourselves, but the Holy Spirit who will speak (Mt. 10.19-20).

Peter, declares that it is the Risen Savior who has worked this wonder. He repeats Our Lord's teaching (Lk. 20.17-18), that Christ is the cornerstone of the new house of Israel, and those who reject Him reject

their inheritance (v. 11). This was a favorite O.T. (Ps. 117.22) quotation with Peter—he quotes it again in his first papal encyclical 1 Pet. 2.7. Salvation, he declares, comes through unshakeable loyalty to the Person of Jesus Christ (v. 12).

We are given, in today's Gospel, Jo. 10.11-18, a picture of the Savior in His own words. The title He selects for Himself is that of the Good Shepherd. He pictures Himself as a Shepherd, He calls Himself a Shepherd.

So, incidentally does the O.T. Ps. 22 is well known, as it is often sung during communion: "The Lord is my Shepherd, I shall want for nothing. He makes me lie down in green pastures, He leads me beside still waters, He restores my soul, etc." (vv. 1-3). Ps. 79 also: "O Shepherd of Israel, leading your people like a flock... come to save us" (vv. 1-2). Even more touching is the prophecy of Isaias: "He will feed His flock like a shepherd, He will gather the lambs in His arms, He will carry them in His bosom" (Is. 40.11). And, one last quotation from the Prophet Ezechiel: "Thus says the Lord God: 'Behold I, I Myself will search for My sheep... I will feed them... I Myself will be the Shepherd of My sheep... I will seek the lost and I will bring back the strayed, and I will bind up the crippled and I will strengthen the weak'" (E. 3.34).

Over and over again when describing Himself, Jesus uses the title and the picture of a shepherd. Many call the 15th Chapter of St. Luke "the Gospel within the Gospel." There Jesus faces those who charge Him with being too merciful to sinners. He asks them: "Which man of you, having a hundred sheep, if he has lost one of them, does not leave the 99 in the wilderness and go after the one which is lost until he finds it? And when he has found it, he takes it on his shoulders, rejoicing." He goes on to describe such a shepherd calling his friends to share his joy, and adds that every genuine conversion causes just such joy in heaven.

Since this is Jesus' favorite picture of Himself (as it was of the early Christians), it calls for reflection. Jesus' love for us His sheep is such that He is ready to give His life for us (v. 11). A hired man whose only interest is his salary abandons the sheep in face of danger.

Not so Jesus, the Good Shepherd (v.12). He has loving personal intimate knowledge of each one of His sheep (v. 14). This is the sublime ideal of pastoral self-forgetfulness set up for us priests — pray that we may constantly strive to have it realized in our lives. Then will His wish be fulfilled — one flock, one Shepherd (v. 16).

Here in the Philippines, since we have no first-hand knowledge of sheep and shepherds, we perhaps miss the full significance of the title Jesus chose for Himself. As animal go, sheep are somewhat dumb, they are timid, they panic easily. We are like that, too, even the smartest of us, if truth be told. We need a shepherd, to protect us, to see we don't die of starvation. Jesus is our Shepherd, and He will do all of these things for us. We have only one thing to do — shut off our pride, listen to Him, heed His voice (Jo. 10.3).

I'd like to conclude with a prayer from the Letter to the Hebrews: "May the God of peace, Who brought back from the dead our Lord Jesus the great Shepherd of the sheep, equip you with everything good" (Heb. 13.26).

### 5th Sunday of Easter-tide (April 26)

#### VINE AND VINEDRESSER

The Acts of the Apostles, into which we are delving these days (Acts 9, 26-31) could well be called the Acts of the Holy Spirit. It is not a systematic history of the early Church, it is more a description of the Holy Spirit at work, founding it and keeping it together as its divine life-giving Principle. St. Paul, who qualified as an Apostle because he had seen and heard the Risen Lord (v. 27), was an energetic herald of the power of the Spirit. And the spectacular spread of the Church is attributed to the same Holy Spirit (v. 31).

One of Jesus' images for Himself and His Church is that of a vine (Jo. VX, 1-8). We are all familiar with fruit-trees in which the life-producing sap comes up from the roots through the trunk, producing leaves and fruit in the healthy branches.

The Old Testament abounds in such examples. For instance, the Patriarch Jacob foretelling the expansion of his descendants, likens the tribe of Joseph to "a fruitful branch by a stream, his branches run over the wall" (Gen. 49,22). In the Prophet Isaias, God describes His people thus: "A vineyard on a very fertile hill, He digged it and cleared it of stones and planted it with choice vines, and He looked for it to yield grapes, but it yielded wild grapes" (Is. V, 1-2). He reproaches the useless vines: "What more was there to do for My vineyard that I have not done in it?" (v. 4)

The Psalms, too, take up the theme of God as a farmer devotedly tending a vine — His people. "You brought a vine out of Egypt... You cleared the land for it, it took deep root and filled the land... The mountains were covered with its shade, the mighty cedars with its branches, it sent out its branches to the sea" (Ps. 79. 8-11). As I said last Sunday of shepherds and sheep, it's a pity grapes don't grow here — we could then see at first hand how prolific a vine is, and how it responds to devoted cultivation. And how rightly a vinedresser is disappointed, if the vine degenerates. "I planted you a choice vine, wholly of pure seed. How then have you degenerated to become a wild vine?" (Jer. 2,21).

It is not surprising then that Jesus took the vine as His own image of His Church, the extension of Himself, the whole Christ. Its cultivation He attributes to His Father, the Vinedresser (v. 1). A barren branch, like Judas, is lopped off, the fruit-bearing branches are pruned by the pruning knife of trials. Relieved of useless and harmful excrescences, the vine grows more fruitful (v. 2). This had taken place in the Apostles through the words of Jesus throughout His ministry. (v.3). The essential condition for our producing fruit, or indeed possessing the Divine life at all, is our being vitally inserted in Christ. We know that a lopped-off branch begins immediately to wither — its only hope is to be re-ingrafted into the tree (v.4). A year before, Jesus told us that the Eucharist is to be the means of intensifying this vital adhesion to Himself and to one another (Jo. 6, 57).

Jesus' words: "Apart from Me, you can do nothing" i.e. nothing of value in the eyes of God, remind us that we cannot go it alone" (v.5) "No one comes to the Father but by Me." "No one knows the

Father except the Son, and those to whom the Son reveals Him." If we fail to remain incorporated into Christ, or should we have cut ourselves off from Him and fail to consent to our re-incorporation, we will wither to death, and be fit only for Hell (v. 6). "Aut vitis, aut ignis" (St. Augustine).

The Lord reminds us that *effective prayer* is the result of our union with Him, and then, it in its turn, is the indispensable means of growing in intimacy with him (v. 7). We abide in Him and He in us—it is not our weak voice that the Father hears, but the voice of His beloved Son, with Whom we are one. This is how we secure the Father's glory (v. 8), going to Him in prayer with and through Christ our Brother in Whom He is well pleased.

Prayer—intimacy with an Almighty God, would be a formidable idea if it were not for one thing. That thing is the prayer of Jesus. There is in Him the closest union of what is God and what is man. His manhood is what unites Him with us, making Him our Brother. But because He is also God, it is no problem for Him to think human thoughts of what His and our Father is like.

We are branches in the Vine, we are one with Christ, He longs to put us in touch with our Father. He leads us on to that God with Whom we could never become truly acquainted if left to ourselves.

The Holy Spirit, sent by the Risen Lord to sustain us, takes over our prayer. "For we know not what to pray for as we ought. But the Spirit prays in us, with groanings beyond all utterance". To be branches in the Vine, to be one with Christ is to be one with Christ's Spirit, praying in His Name and with His own prayer.

May His prayer weld us into a community of love, abiding in Him, and worshipping the Father in Spirit and in truth. Amen.

## **HISTORICAL SECTION**

### **Notes on**

# **THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH IN THE PHILIPPINES\* 1521-1898 (continued)**

● **Pablo Fernandez, O.P.**

## **Chapter Three**

### **THE APOSTOLIC WORK OF THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS**

NOTE: We would like to make a prenote at the start of this chapter by saying that we shall treat only the missionary activity of the religious orders in the Philippines, leaving for a later discussion their work in education and their role in the wider socio-economic field. It might be good to point out that many of the ministries established or maintained by the orders went from the care of one to that of another order, or transferred from a religious order to the diocesan clergy and vice-versa. We shall mention only the more important of these changes for it would be too long and tedious to list them all. We shall discuss the orders according to the date of their arrival in the Philippines: the Augustinians first, then the Franciscans, followed by the Jesuits, the Dominicans and the Recollects.

#### **A. The Augustinians.**

The Augustinians came to the Philippines with Legazpi's expedition. There were five of them, eminently apostolic men: Andrés de Urdaneta,

---

\* 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.

Martín de Rada, Andrés de Aguirre, Diego de Herrera and Pedro de Gamboa. After Legazpi took possession of Cebu City, he allotted a piece of land to them where they later erected a church and convent dedicated to the Holy Infant. This foundation was the center of their apostolic journeys throughout the Visayas and Mindanao in the years that followed.

Soon they began to administer baptism to the natives, infrequently at first and with caution. The first to accept baptism was a niece of Tupas who received the name Isabel. Tupas himself obtained the same grace on 21 March 1568. From Cebú, the Augustinians went on to Panay (Iloilo), Masbate and Camarines.

When Legazpi founded Manila in 1571, he gave them an extensive lot there beside the sea. Here they raised the beginning in bamboo, wood and nipa of what would be the church and convent of Saint Paul, popularly known by the name "San Agustín."

From this mother house and center of their Apostolate they went forth to several provinces in Luzon and the Visayas. But in the beginning they had no seat or permanent basis of work since they were too few for so many towns. And thus in the first years of their missionary activity we find them preaching in Tondo and around Manila, in Batangas, Laguna, Pampanga, Pangasinan, Ilocos and Cagayan.

After the official division of the provinces among the religious orders working in the Philippines at the time (*Royal Cedula*, 27 April 1594),<sup>1</sup> the Augustinians were engaged more or less permanently in the following missions: the surrounding area of Manila, Tondo, Tambobong, Tinajeros, Navotas, Novaliches, Malate, Parañaque, Pasig, Cainta, Caloocan and others. These provinces in Luzon were allotted to them: Batangas, north Bulacan, all of Pampanga, some towns in east Tarlac, a good part of Nueva Ecija, La Union, Ilocos Sur, Ilocos Norte, Abra; and in the nineteenth century, the districts of Lepanto, Bontoc, Benguet, the military post at Amburayan. In the Visayas they evangelized Cebu island, some towns in Negros which they later handed over to the secular clergy, Iloilo, Capiz, Antique. In 1768 when the Jesuits

<sup>1</sup> de la Guardia Miguel, *Las Leyes de Indias*, Madrid, Establecimiento tipográfico de Pedro Nuñez, 1889, page 267.



were expelled, they administered some of the towns in Leyte, which in 1804 passed on to the secular clergy and later to the Franciscans. At the outbreak of the revolution in 1898 the Augustinians had under their care 2,320,667 souls, distributed among 231 parishes and missions in 22 provinces.

In 333 years of Spanish rule in the islands a total of 2830 Augustinian friars came to the Philippines. Besides being emissaries of the gospel — the common task of the five religious families — they distinguished themselves in erecting magnificent churches, as the church of San Agustin in Intramuros, Manila, that of Taal, Batangas, of Oton, Iloilo, as well as in the literary endeavours and programs of material improvement.<sup>2</sup>

## B. The Franciscans.

The Franciscans arrived in Manila on 24 June 1577. They were housed with the Augustinians for a while until they finished a convent of light materials dedicated to our Lady of the Angels. From here they spread around Manila and the provinces. Among others, they either established or received the missions around the capital — Santa Ana, Paco, Sampaloc, San Juan del Monte, San Francisco del Monte and Pandacan. They also evangelized the province of Laguna Bay and the towns east and south of the lake which formerly belonged to the district of Morong. Further south they were entrusted with the provinces of Quezon, Camarines Norte, Camarines Sur, Albay and Sorsogon. East of Quezon province, they evangelized certain regions along the coast — the ancient districts of Infanta and Principe, extending as far as Palanan, Isabela. Likewise, they founded some towns in Mindoro and Marinduque. In 1768 the government assigned to them the Jesuit missions in Samar and, in 1843, they took care of certain towns in Leyte.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Galende, Pedro G., O.S.A., "The Augustinians in the Philippines, 1665-1890," *Boletín Eclesiástico de Filipinas*, Enero-Febrero, 1965, page 35 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Pastrana, Apolinar, O.F.M., "The Franciscans and the Evangelization of the Philippines," *Boletín Eclesiástico de Filipinas*, Enero-Febrero 1965, page 80 ff.; De Huerta, Felix, O.F.M., *Estado geográfico, topográfico, estadístico, historia-religioso de la santa y apostólica provincia de San Gregorio Magno de Filipinas*, Binondo, 1865.

By the end of the past century, the Franciscans were ministering to 1,096,659 souls in 103 towns of 15 provinces.

The Franciscans were noted above all for many outstanding institutions of charity which they founded or administered. They were strict observants of the religious vow of poverty and, in contrast to other religious orders, they did not acquire property.

### C. The Jesuits.

The first Jesuits who arrived in Manila on 17 September 1581 were Fathers Antonio Sedeño and Alonso Sanchez, and Brother Nicolás Gallardo. At first they lived in a temporary residence at Lagyo, the section between the present districts of Ermita and Malate. Later they moved to Intramuros, in a house near the southeast gate, the Royal Gate (*Puerta real*). Their first missions, Taytay and Antipolo of the modern province of Rizal, date from 1593. About this time too, they included Panay Island (Tibauan) in their apostolate. During the next years they set up fixed residences in Leyte and Samar, while Father Chirino opened a central mission house in Cebu (1595). Before the end of the sixteenth century, they had established permanent missions in Bohol. They also took charge of some towns in Negros, besides starting or accepting other ministries near Manila, like San Miguel, Santa Cruz, Quiapo and, in the province of Cavite, Silang, Maragondong and Kawit.

Raised to a province in 1605 the Jesuits could look with confidence to the future. And so, we find them in the seventeenth century opening the missions of Mindanao which caused them so much difficulty. They first founded Dapitan mission in the north coast; next, in 1635, Zamboanga and, finally, in 1639, Jolo, under the shadow of a Hispano-Filipino military garrison whose job it was to keep the Moslems in check. In general, these missions shared the good or the bad fate of the garrisons that shielded them. The garrison at Zamboanga, recalled by Governor Manrique de Lara in 1635, was not reestablished until 1718. It was in the eighteenth century that the sons of Saint Ignatius, unabating in their missionary effort reached the present site of Cotabato City. Unfortunately everything came to a stop when the Jesuits were expelled from the Philippines in 1768, and their missions were transferred to other hands: those in central Luzon to the diocesan clergy; Samar and

and in 1843 Leyte to the Franciscans; Bohol, with some centers in Cebu, Negros, Panay and all of Mindanao to the Recollects; four missions in Negros and four others in Panay to the Dominicans.

The Society of Jesus, restored in 1814, did not return to the Philippines until 1859. The bishop of Cebu petitioned the Spanish government for them to work in the Mindanao missions. And so, from 1860 on the Jesuits established their missions, first in Cotabato, then in Zamboanga, and finally in Basilan island.

Meanwhile the Recollect fathers, through government intervention, handed over to them all their missions, except seven. In 1896, the number of Christians ministered to by the Jesuits totalled 213,065 in 36 mission parishes in Mindanao.

However, despite the efforts exerted by the Jesuits in Mindanao, despite their excellent missionary methods, progress was slow, because of the stubborn resistance of the Moslems to Christianity. Nonetheless, their zeal won over to the Faith sizable communities of natives in the north-western coast of the island.<sup>4</sup> Not only this, but the Jesuits spared no efforts in the educational apostolate, where they won here and elsewhere much renown. In this aspect, they distinguished themselves from the other orders, except the Dominican.

#### D. The Dominicans.

On 21 July 1587 the first Dominicans, the founding fathers of the Religious Province of the Most Holy Rosary of the Philippines, arrived in Cavite. Of these, five stayed in the Manila residence that would be called the Convento of Santo Domingo. Four left for Bataan, and the remaining six took the trail to Pangasinan. The missions that the Dominicans established or administered were: Baybay, Binondo, and the Parian located near Manila for the Chinese; almost the whole province of Bataan; the province of Pangasinan; some towns in north Tarlac; the entire Cagayan Valley, i.e., the present provinces of Cagayan, Isabela,

---

<sup>4</sup> de la Costa, Horacio, S.J. *The Jesuits in the Philippines 1581-1768*, Cambridge, 1961, page 116 ff.; Saderra-Masó, Miguel, S.J., *Misiones Jesuíticas de Filipinas*, Manila, Tip. Pontificia de la Universidad de Santo Tomas, 1924.

and Nueva Vizcaya, including the eastern slopes of Central Cordillera and the western side of Sierra Madre mountain range, the Babuyan Islands, with interruptions from 1619 on; and the Batanes Islands, a permanent mission since 1783.

After initial difficulties, the missions near Manila and those in Bataan and Pangasinan flourished peacefully with only a slight interruption, as Binondo, Parian, and Bataan, which were under the care of the secular clergy for about seventy years, from 1768 until the middle of the nineteenth century more or less. In Pangasinan, we might mention among other events, the uprising of 1763 which cost so much blood, destruction and hatred. The Cagayan Valley missions were dearly paid for in human life, money and sacrifice, mainly because of unfavorable climatic conditions and long distances, but likewise due to the heathenish mountain tribes who generally were indifferent to Christianity and committed frequent killings and robberies in the open, forcing the missionaries to seek protection from military escorts.

The Dominicans conquered for Christ practically all of Cagayan and north Isabela towards the last years of the sixteenth, and the beginning of the seventeenth, century. The conversion of south Isabela took several long years, from 1673 to about the middle of the eighteenth century. It was much harder bringing into the fold of the Church Nueva Vizcaya province; but it was done finally about the middle of the eighteenth century, thanks in great part to the aid of the Augustinians who, starting from the south, had preached and spread the good news until Bayombong from 1716 to 1740. The missions on the eastern slopes of Central Cordillera were established — with scant success — in the second half of the nineteenth century. By the end of this century the evangelization of the Ilongots began.

The Babuyan and Batanes missions proved to be the grave of several Dominicans, due to the deadly climate of the islands.

These were the provinces that the Dominicans evangelized and administered as their specific section in the Philippines. For various reasons they had to assume charge of Zambales province for a while (1678-1712),

---

<sup>5</sup> Fernandez, Pablo, O.P., "Dominican Apostolate in the Philippines," *Boletín Eclesiástico de Filipinas*, Enero-Febrero, 1965, page 149 ff.

eight towns briefly in the Visayas, as we have already noted, and some towns in Cavite and Laguna during the second half of the nineteenth century. When the revolution forced the Dominicans to abandon their parishes and mission centers, they were caring for 735,396 souls in 73 parishes and 36 missions in 10 provinces. The Dominicans also excelled principally in their educational endeavors and famous missions abroad.

### **E. The Recollects.**

In May 1606, the first Recollect mission of ten priests and four lay brothers disembarked at Cebu. The following June they proceeded to Manila. They lived for a few days in Santo Domingo, then in San Agustín, until they had their own house in Bagumbayan (the present Luneta: Rizal Park) near Intramuros. Finally they transferred to the walled city. The next year, three Recollect fathers left to open the Zambales mission which they administered until the end of the nineteenth century, with the interruption noted and another from 1754 to 1837. During this interregnum, they took charge of the towns of Mabalacat, Capas, Bamban, and laid the foundations of the missions of O'Donnell and Moriones in central Luzon.

In 1622 the Recollect fathers were charged with Palawan and Calamianes, and Caraga district in eastern Mindanao, where they often had to erect forts and arm the Christians for defense against the Moro depredations. But repeated Moro assaults forced them to give up these missions. However, on petition by the Royal Audencia, they had to stay put. Palawan entered a period of peace and prosperity in the second half of the nineteenth century. The mission and subsequent town of Puerto Princesa date from 1881. After the revolution, the Recollects returned to Palawan. They still administer it as an Apostolic Vicariate.

The evangelization of Romblon by the Recollects began in 1635. Besides Moro hostility, they met with other difficulties, as the isolation of one island from another and the poverty of the soil. But all this was overcome by those brave and long-suffering missionaries.

In 1679 they took charge of Mindoro in exchange for the loss of Zambales which had passed to the hands of the Dominicans, as was said. In Mindoro they met the same difficulties they found elsewhere which

had tested their patience and heroism, especially the attacks of the devotees of Mohammed. However, it must be admitted that other religious groups, including the diocesan clergy, helped evangelize this island; but none persevered with the firmness and permanence of the Recollects.

They also evangelized, with the labor that it demanded, the islands of Ticao, Masbate and Burias from 1688. But in 1791 they abandoned these to strengthen the ministries in Bohol, Mindanao and the Marianas Islands which the government had entrusted to them after the expulsion of the Jesuit fathers.

Their residence in Cebu, the central house of their Visayan missions, was founded in 1621. However, the Recollect missions in this island date from a much later period, from 1744. They gradually spread along the coast from the city of Cebu until Catmon.

In 1768, because of the expulsion of the Society of Jesus, the Recollects had to assume charge of Bohol. At that time, it had practically separated itself from Spain after an internal uprising. In the end, after long years of laborious negotiation, they were able to pacify the island and initiate its progress in all aspects.

But the Order of Augustinian Recollects showed its truly remarkable and fruitful zeal especially in the island of Negros, which the government had entrusted to it in 1848. Suffice it to say that from this date until 1896, the population increased from 30,000 inhabitants to 363,255, and the centers of ministerial work from 11 to 77. The parish and missionary work of the Recollects reached out in 1896 to 1,249,399 souls in 203 towns of 20 provinces.

To honor these truly self-denying religious, let it be said that it fell to their lot, in general, to minister to the poorer and more hazardous islands, and that they were able, at cost of so much sacrifice, to keep them for Christ and for Spain. Their special glory lies in this, that they were able to overcome the sectaries of Islam, with the enthusiastic cooperation of their Filipino faithful and the dedication of their religious who lost their lives in the effort.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Herce, Pedro, O.R.S.A., "The Recollects in the Philippines," *Ibid.*, page 200 ff.; Marin y Morales Valentin, O.P., *Ensayo de una síntesis de los*



These five religious orders which for the duration of three centuries carried the brunt of the task of evangelizing the Philippines, drew their mission personnel and their teachers from Spain and elsewhere. But, beginning with the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, they had to seriously consider ways and means to avail themselves of their own resources, inasmuch as it had become harder and harder to recruit personnel from other religious provinces of Europe and America. And so, we find the Augustinians founding the Colegio de la Vid (1743); the Recollects, the Colleges of Alfaro (1824), Monteagudo (1829) and San Millan de la Cogulla (1878); the Dominicans, the Colleges of Ocaña (1830) and Santo Tomás de Avila (1876); and the Franciscans, the Colleges of Pastrana (1855) and Consuegra (1867).

Let us mention here, otherwise this chapter will be incomplete, the arrival of the Fathers of San Juan de Dios in 1641, of the Vincentians (*Paúles*) in 1862, and at the eleventh hour, of the Capuchins and Benedictines in 1886 and 1895 respectively.

(to be continued)

---

*trabajos realizados por las corporaciones religiosas españolas de Filipinas, Manila, Imprenta de Santo Tomas, 1901, Volume II, page 175 ff.; Ruíz, Licinio, Sinopsis histórica de la provincia de San Nicolas de Tolentino, Manila, Tip. Pont. de la Univ. de Santo Tomas, 1925.*



## **SEVEN QUESTIONS ON ARTIFICIAL BIRTH CONTROL**

*My query refers to the article published in the Manila Sunday Times, January 18, under the title: 7 QUESTIONS. POPULATION ISSUE AND THE CHURCH. With due respect to the "seventy-one" signatories, I think the title is misleading. Except the first one, the rest of the seven questions do not refer to the Church's stand on population but rather on artificial contraception. The whole tenor of the seven questions, as they have been formulated, seem to cast doubt on a doctrine which is most definite after Humanae Vitae. As College professors my colleagues and I, have adhered to the Pope's Encyclical to the Pastoral Letter of the Philippine bishops which we read in the 1969 January issue of your BOLETIN. But now the signatories of these seven questions have taken the matter to "theologians at the Loyola House of Studies, Sto. Tomas Seminary and other similar institutions". Is it possible that a solemn teaching of the Pope, so formally endorsed by the Philippine hierarchy may need support from theologians? To our discomfort, after the publication of these seven questions, our students have been demanding from us answers to these very points. Could we ask the BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO for brief, clear-cut answers to these seven queries, answers that may satisfy our students?*

### **OBSERVATIONS**

Before we attempt to answer the questions, some observations are in order.

#### **1. Publicity and signatories**

It is perhaps difficult to question the sincerity of the seemingly candid presentation of these seven questions. Among the signatories we find men of such probity that no challenge can be raised about their

sincerity. Whatever means might have been used for the soliciting or obtaining of the signatures, since the matter in question has been under public discussion for years, and even under strong attacks from the press ever since the issuance of *Humanae Vitae*, July 25, 1968, one marvels at such questions at this late hour. Also, in order that everyone in the Philippines should accept the papal teaching as all Catholics are expected to, the Philippine bishops published a pastoral letter in which, while adhering to *Humanae Vitae*, they instruct the faithful on the duty of accepting the Holy Father's indubious doctrine. Is it possible that such prominent names, some of them identified as educators and priests, press editors or contributors, economists and professionals, have only now become aware of an obligation toward the Christian conscience? Equally puzzling is the manner in which these questions have been bluntly presented to the public. If the perplexed signatories have approached the theologians with the intention of publishing their findings, why did they not wait for the answers before going to the press?

## 2. Intrinsic incompetence of theologians on this matter

A recourse to theologians is essentially, from the start, a wrong way to answer the seven questions. The validity of the Church's magisterium does not rest on the wisdom of any theologian. Nor is it derived from the consensus of any body in the world. The teaching mission of the Church is based on Christ's command:

Go, therefore, make disciples of all the nations; ... and teach them to observe all the commands I gave you. And know that I am with you always; yes, to the end of the world. Mt. 28:20.

Hence, the charism of truth of the magisterium rests on Jesus' presence and on His guiding Spirit. Both command and charism of truth in *teaching and commanding to observe* were promised and given alone and exclusively to Peter and to the apostles as well as to their successors, the Pope and the bishops. From Jesus' command emanates their obligation to teach and command and, consequently, the obligation too of their hearers to accept in faith and to observe their teaching, or else, "*qui vero non crediderit, condemnabitur*" (Mk. 16:16). All these

principles are at the root of the most elementary theology, yet, they are essential postulates for the right answer to our questions. A writer, M. Brugarola, S.J., puts it this way:

Not even the unanimous opinion of all the theologians can invalidate a doctrine which the Church's magisterium teaches as true, since they do not constitute said magisterium as the Pope does notwithstanding the significant role of the theologians in the Church.

And Cardinal Heenan:

Between sessions of this Council, the Church of God has suffered a great deal from the writings and speeches of some of the Specialists ... These few specialists care nothing for the ordinary teaching authority of the bishops nor, I regret to say, for that of the Pope ... Until now it has not been a doctrine of the Church that the theologians admitted to the council are infallible.

Note that the statement from this Archbishop did precipitate the exit of one so-called "theologian", Charles Davis.

On this field of teaching faith and conduct, even of him who was preeminent in theology, Augustine, Pius XI said: "non ita scilicet... ut Augustini loquentis auctoritas suprema ipsi Ecclesiae docentis auctoritati anreferatur" (AAS, (1930), p. 204).

And of one of Augustine's disciples, Aquinas, we read in the process of his canonization:

He suffered his this (last) illness with great patience, reverently and devotedly received the Sacraments of the Church... Before receiving the Body of Christ, he spoke many fitting words concerning the Body of Christ ... In the midst of this discourse, he uttered these words: "I have taught and written a great deal about this most holy Body and the other sacraments, in the faith of Christ and the holy Roman Church, to whose correction I submit and leave it all" (Aquinas' *Search for Wisdom* by V. J. Bourke, 1965. The Bruce Publ. Co., Milwaukee. p. 212).

Note Aquinas' words: "*to whose correction I submit and leave it all*". Fortunately, no one is more aware of the essential need of teaching with the Church than the true theologian. Thus, our inquirer may await their verdict with peace of mind. If it comes in accord with Paul VI and the Philippine bishops, it will be theology. If, God forbid, it goes to variance with Paul VI and our bishops, it shall be a mock theology.

### **3. Intrinsic incompetence of any "national group of bishops" at variance with the Pope**

We are aware of the equivocal stance taken "by some national groups of bishops". But if the theologians need to teach with the Pope to produce a genuine theology, the bishops too, either individually or in groups, even all of them collegially, need to teach with the Pope if their teaching is to be genuine in matters of faith and morals. Unfortunately, heresy and schism of entire nations is a sad lesson of history on this matter.

In the words of the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Vatican II, the episcopal college of bishops should teach "in conjunction with its head, the Roman Pontiff, and never without this head" (n. 22). And this same concept, in different terms, is repeated seven times in the same paragraph by the conciliar Fathers. Any group of bishops, therefore, who dare to act at variance with the papal teaching cannot be said to produce any genuine teaching in the Catholic Church.

But it is surprising that such a question is raised here in the Philippines. All know that, under the Pope, only the local bishop has the authority and the duty to teach, sanctify, and rule or govern in his diocese, with certain extension to national hierarchies in matters of common concern, according to the rules of the National Episcopal Conferences. For the Philippines, therefore, only the diocesan bishops and the Philippine hierarchy have a say in this matter, to the exclusion of any other "national group of bishops" of any other nation. As it is, the very inclusion of this catchy question cannot be honestly justified. Or is it that the composers of these questions wish us in the Philippines to be subject to any group of bishops except those of our own hierarchy?

### **4. Brief and clear-cut answers**

Our questioner asks for answers of this description. The students, indeed, are intelligent and when answers are not clear or are evasive we should not complain if they are demanding. Clear-cut answers are possible for such is the clarity of the Church's stand! But not brief answers. These seven questions cover the whole range of the Church's doctrines, ethical, social and economic, to individual rights, and also

to the family and marriage morality. Each one of the questions may well need volumes. For this reason we will attempt to answer the questions in short with a view of prompting our interrogator and his other companions, through personal research, to evolve more complete explanations for their pupils.

### ANSWERS

1. *How do you define the role of the Church in coping with the population problems of the Philippines?*

#### a) In general

The expression "population problems" is pregnant with meaning. The whole range of private and common property; of individuals' and community rights towards temporal administration, progress, and development; all means of capital, labor, industry and economy on the private, national and international level; and other essentials for the handling of *temporal* goods and resources are to be considered when the "population problems" of any country are at stake. The responsibility for all these matters rest not on the Church, but on human individuals and on human society. And that is so by virtue of God's original order:

God blessed them, saying to them, 'Be fruitful, multiply, fill the earth, and conquer it. Be Masters of the fish of the sea, the birds of heaven and of the living animals on the earth.' **Gen. 1:28.**

Competence here belongs to legitimate social authorities, from family to government. In classical theology, the only limits placed to legitimate authority are those marked by *natural law*, which is God's very law as known by *right reason* and which is the root of man's dignity, conscience and moral responsibility. The Gospel did not change an iota from this plan of God's creation. In fact the Gospel, God's revelation, the Church, — call it whatever you like — belongs to a different level, that of men's redemption, God's helping grace, and man's eternal destiny. From the start the Lord Jesus made it very clear:

A man in the crowd said to him, 'Master, tell my brother to give me a share in our inheritance.' 'My friend,' he replied, 'who appointed me your judge, or the arbitrator of your claims?.' **Luke, 12:13-14.**

Jesus' mandate to the apostles, quoted above, is limited to the spiritual field. No interference, meddling or manipulation on matters of temporal government was therein included by Christ. *Salvific truth* alone, both *revealed* and *natural*, marks the limits of the Church's role in all temporal matters. The apostles did understand Jesus' compelling orders and soon they applied them to the very temporalities of their own early community. Read St. Luke's account:

When the number of disciples was increasing, the Hellenists made a complaint against the Hebrews... So the Twelve called a full meeting of the disciples and addressed them, 'It would not be right for us **to neglect the word of God so as to give out food**: you, brothers, must select from among yourselves...; we will hand over this duty to them, and continue **to devote ourselves to prayer and to the service of the word**. Acts, 6:1-3.

These biblical data possess eternal value. They map out the competence and legitimate action of the Church. Any attempt from the Church towards intrusion into the temporal business of society will be considered as usurpation and the public authority should resist it. On this point classical theology has rendered a splendid service to humanity through the admirable treaties of the great masters on all aspects of justice, beneficence, cooperation, contracts, rights and obligations of all persons — individuals groups, nations. But the business of the Fathers and the Doctors of the Church aims only at doctrine and guidance from the field of both faith and reason.

So well marked is the essential division of competence here that, even at such humanitarian endeavours as those of the International Labor Organization (ILO), Paul VI, opened his Address to the Organization's representatives in Geneva with this basic statement:

We do not belong to this international organization; We are unacquainted with the specific questions which have their study offices and discussion rooms here, and **Our spiritual mission is not intended to intervene in matters outside its proper domain**. (The Pope Speaks, Vol. 14, 2., p. 137).

True, the Pope was emphatic in exhorting the ILO members towards all legitimate ways of promoting social justice for all men, on all aspects



of human life and dignity, specially toward the working and the poor classes. The Pope, in his exhortations and directives to the bishops of Latin America in Bagotá had likewise mapped out the norms for the bishops and for the Church's action in the field of social, economic and land reforms, with emphasis, however, on the avoidance of violence. Violence, in the Pope's view, is diametrically opposed to Christ's teaching and conduct in the Gospel, and it is contrary too to all men's fraternity and to the very meaning of the Church as spiritual *Mater et Magistra*.

Fidelity to the Church's very constitution is culled from the so-called social encyclicals *Rerum Novarum*, *Libertas*, *Quadragesimo Anno*, *Mater et Magistra*, *Populorum Progressio* and the truly inspired Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World of Vatican II. Read how the Council expressed the role of the Church:

Regarding institutions and programs directed to the secular order, the duty of the Church's **hierarchy** is to teach and provide an authentic explanation of the moral principle to be applied in the secular order. They also have the right, after enlisting the help of experts and weighing the matter carefully, to make judgment on whether such programs and institutions conform to moral principles, and to decide what is required to protect and promote supernatural values. (**The Decree on Apostolate of the Laity, n. 19 & 24**).

The reader may see that this *competence* belongs to the *hierarchy* and not to *theologians*.

## b) Population in particular

What the social encyclicals did for social and economic matters was aimed at and obtained by *Humanae Vitae* for the all important field of birth regulation, or, as it is called, *responsible parenthood*. After an exhaustive study, the Holy Father, "by virtue of the mandate entrusted to Us by Christ" (n.6), issued *Humanae Vitae*. True to his spiritual duty as the Vicar of Christ, the Pope has declared *immoral the practice of all acts of artificial contraception* and also the licitness of rhythm under *due* conditions. This doctrine rests on faith and also on reason, or natural law. For this reason he addressed his encyclical to "all men of good will," and not only to his subjects.



2. *Given the emphasis in "Humanae Vitae" on responsible parenthood, what obligation does the Church have to disseminate information, especially among the poor, about the social and personal advantages of family planning?*

The Church has no business in disseminating such information, for two main reasons. First of all, the issue of overpopulation on a world level is too controversial. The diverse opinions were manifested very conspicuously at Belgrade, in the International Conference on Population, not so long ago. There the United States firmly sounded the alarm concerning overpopulation. But the delegates of Soviet Russia, no less firmly, and the delegates from Africa, at least for the African continent, contended that question was one of *under* population. As for the Philippines, opinions are far from being uniform.

On the other hand, the Church has clearly stated the intrinsic immorality of every act of *artificial* contraception, whether through abortion and direct sterilization, or through *any other action* which *artificially* renders procreation impossible. In addition, the Pope has stated the licitness of having recourse to the infecund periods when serious reasons warrant such practice. It only remains for public authorities and all members of the Church to comply with the doctrine that the Vicar of Christ proposes. Actually the encyclical points to the members of the Church from whom cooperation is expected: men of science, husbands and wives, priests and bishops, doctors and medical personnel, and all men of good will.

3. *How do you define the role of the State in coping with the population problems of the Philippines?*

We take no sides regarding the issue of *overpopulation* in the Philippines. But, *if* and *when* the problem comes to existence then the government should avoid a *defeatist stand*. A negative approach to the problem would even endanger the confidence and creative efforts of the people who must rely on their own capabilities in imaginative creativity. The words of Paul VI to the United Nations do apply here:

You must strive to multiply bread so that it suffices for the tables of mankind and not rather favor an artificial control of birth, which would be irrational, in order to diminish the number of guests at the banquet of life.

The positive approach has been favored by the bishops of the Philippines in their *Statement on Issue of Population control from Baguio*, in July, 1969. It reads in part:

It is the competence of the government to take necessary macro-measures of population control. To name a few: the concerted effort of state and society to raise the minimum age of marriage or to delay it through social, economic or juridical means; the integration of sex education on all levels of formal education; a system of pensions for old age to minimize the dependence of children for security; the expansion of recreational facilities; the control of internal migration. ... When we deal with micro-measures of fertility control, however, the role of government is subsidiary. There are involved here those basic rights of spouses which both the United Nations and Vatican II insisted as setting limits to what the government can do. One such right is the right to determine the size of one's family.

*4. Is the State morally justified in initiating a population program that would make available a variety of family planning techniques, even though a number of these techniques are morally objectionable to some?*

No. The negative answer becomes evident from the very formulation of the question. When a "number of techniques are morally objectionable," those techniques cannot be morally justified. And, as we have said above, all artificial means or techniques, short of rhythm, are objectionable by Church's standards.

*5. If the State should initiate such a program, how should the individual react:*

*a) as a civic leader?*

*b) as an employee who is asked to become directly involved in it?*

*c) as a volunteer worker?*

If the state should initiate such a program, in which the "morally objectionable techniques" are included, the following considerations are valid:

All the persons therein involved, promoters, initiators and those who helped it established are actors and efficient cooperators to an *intrinsically immoral kind of activity*. Consequently, they are responsible for all immoral acts which are committed by those who accept the immoral practice. The amount of responsibility is in proportion to the influence of each person on the project and on its development and operation. In itself this project is highly more immoral than outright prostitution, in as-much-as the latter remains always considered sinful by all; while *artificial contraception* is here proposed as something morally licit in marriage. Thus, this project by itself does introduce *real* immorality into a sacrament of the Church. All collaborators should be affected as follows:

- a) The civic leader should actively oppose such real, though camouflaged, immorality at the secret origin of human life.
- b) All employees become directly involved in the activities of the project. Thus, each of them shares in the very serious responsibilities of his co-workers according to the extent of his cooperation. All doctors, interns, nurses and clinical personnel would do well to consider the consequences of such an immoral conduct.
- c) The volunteer worker, if he is a true Catholic who accepts the Pope as the Vicar of Christ, will, of course, never volunteer for such a sinful project.

6. *How are married couples to react to the differences of opinion in the Church concerning "artificial" contraception, as manifested in the varied responses to "Humanae Vitae" given by some national groups of bishops?*

The answer to this question has already been given above. In all honesty, what business is it of any foreign "national group of bishops" to say anything for Catholics in the Philippines? Besides,

considering the unmistakable stand of the Philippine hierarchy, at unison with Paul VI and with *Humanae Vitae*, one cannot see how such a question could be asked without an effrontery to our bishops.

7. *How are married couples to resolve a conflict of conscience between their considered convictions and the teaching of "Humanae Vitae" on conception control?*

This last question is wholly artificial. It is possibly asked only by the dissenting position of false theologians who have dared to challenge the supreme authority of the Pope. The harm to Christian morality, however, has been great. This mock theology has also been detrimental, as the reader may see from the controversy among doctors on the seriously ill side effects of the pill.

If not for this opposition, no Catholic married couple would have been deceived in such serious matter of conscience. All Catholics accept the directives of Vatican II that in order to form a right conscience, the norms of the Pope's teaching should be accepted, even when the Pope does not speak *ex cathedra*.

In this matter the duty of the priests is rather to help the Christian couples. The encyclical asks for the cooperation of all members of the Church, most of all for the cooperation of the priests, who are the ministers of the word of faith, of prayer and of the sacraments. Therein lies the almighty grace that renders acceptable, even sweet, the greatest sacrifices taken all so silently in sacrificial love.

● Quintin M. Garcia, O.P.

## HOLY WEEK 1970

### Question

*Our parish has eight Masses on Sundays. Only a very few of those who attend Mass on Palm Sunday can take part in the blessing of palms and the procession. May we not repeat the blessing of palms and the procession?*

### Answer

Actually, the Lord's entrance into the Holy City should be celebrated in *every* Mass on Palm Sunday, but only the principal Mass has the privilege of the solemn procession. If a procession cannot be held outside the church, the entrance of the Lord may be celebrated before the main Mass with a less elaborate rite, the *solemn entrance*. In other, equally well-attended Masses this solemn entrance may be repeated. If you have eight Masses in your parish, this could be done in every Mass. What does this solemn entrance look like?

1. The faithful with their palm branches assemble either at the main door of the church, or (preferably) already within the church at their places. The priest, together with the servers and some representatives of the faithful, enter in a small procession and go to some part of the church that can be seen easily by most of the people assembled in the church, but outside the sanctuary. One could think of the place of reposition on Holy Thursday.
2. When the little procession arrives at that place the antiphon "Hosanna Filio David" is sung or any other suitable hymn in the vernacular, eventually a kind of Sanctus hymn (because of the acclamation, "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord").
3. Then the priest gives a brief explanation. It should contain a short *greeting* and an *invitation* to take part in an intelligent way in this celebration which commemorates the event of the Lord's triumphant entrance into Jerusalem. He came to complete his work as Messiah, i.e., to suffer, to die and to rise again. We are supposed to unite ourselves with his sufferings so that we may also share his resurrection and the life of glory.

4. This explanation is followed by the prayer for the blessing of branches. Without saying anything the priest sprinkles afterwards the palms with holy water.
5. Then he proclaims the gospel of the Lord's entrance. In 1970 this gospel is Mk. 11,1-10.
6. After the proclamation of the gospel the priest and his entourage go in procession, "per longiorem" preferably, to the sanctuary. During this procession one may sing the antiphon "Pueri Hebraeorum" or any other suitable song, e.g., "All glory praise and honor."
7. After his arrival in the sanctuary, the priest kisses the altar, goes to his chair, and *omitting* the penitential act, begins directly with the "Let us pray" of the collect of the Mass.

If you think, even this form of blessing and procession of palms is too long, then, following the permission of the lectionary, you may on this day *omit the epistle* and the subsequent *responsorial psalm* and only read the Passion as gospel of this day, even in its shortened form. This is Mk 15,1-39 for 1970 (cf. Ordo for the Philippines for 1970 p. 33, n. 7).

Also in other Masses of Palm Sunday, the Lord's entrance should be commemorated though in an even more simple form. While the priest approaches the altar the entrance antiphon is sung or any other suitable hymn (e.g., "All glory praise and honor"). After he kissed the altar the priest goes to his chair, greets the people (e.g., saying "The Lord be with you"). Omitting the penitential rite he begins the Mass with the "Oremus" of the collect of the day. This form of entrance has the added advantage that the Mass will not last too long, because of the Passion. It has the disadvantage, that there is no blessing of palms.

### Question

*The Ordo 1970 says on p. 30 that "the statues and crosses are not to be covered during the next two weeks," i.e., during the time from the fifth Sunday in Lent until Good Friday. Why do we then still unveil the crucifix on Good Friday?*

**Answer**

On Holy Thursday, as a part of the stripping of the altars, all crosses should be removed from the churches, if possible. If crosses cannot be removed, they may be covered. Thus the rite of unveiling can take place on Good Friday.

**Question**

*In some parishes I observed that they ended the adoration in the night between Holy Thursday and Good Friday. Is this permissible?*

**Answer**

The reform of Holy Week in 1956 prescribed that the adoration before the Holy Eucharist should continue *at least* until midnight. Therefore, these parishes followed the permission of a rubric. The latest reform of the Holy Week rites even discourages the continuation of the adoration after midnight. Holy Thursday celebrates in a special way the institution of the Holy Eucharist. The celebrations on Good Friday are preoccupied with the commemoration of the Lord's Passion and Death. Therefore, the celebration and adoration of the Eucharist should come to an end at midnight.

**Question**

*Is it allowed to celebrate the Easter Vigil, twice once in the evening, and eventually in the early morning hours of Easter Sunday, because in my parish I have two different chapels where people gather for holy Mass on Sunday?*

**Answer**

With the permission of the local Ordinary you may do so, since, as you specified you want to celebrate the Easter Vigil in two different places, and not in the same chapel. Please, keep in mind that the Easter Vigil is to be held at *night*. Therefore, you should not start in the first place before nightfall, and see to it that you end the second celebration of the Easter Vigil before the first light on Sunday morning. If you start at about 4 o'clock A.M. or a little earlier, you can finish shortly after five o'clock, since the rite has been shortened considerably.



**Question**

*Is the Ordo for 1970 not mistaken when it says on p. 41 that for those who took part in the Easter Vigil "the Office, then, of Easter Sunday begins with Lauds?"*

**Answer**

The Ordo is not mistaken, because it takes into consideration the new Holy Week rites. According to the new rite the Mass of the Easter Vigil ends in the normal way: after the postcommunion there follows the blessing and the dismissal with the double Alleluja. The concluding part of the Mass does not contain any longer the shortened form of Lauds. Therefore, also those who took part in the Easter Vigil have to say in the morning their usual Lauds.

● H. J. Graef, S.V.D.

## SPECIAL OFFERS

### THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS

by Nicholas Halligan, O.P.

P25.00

This is a competent up-to-date guide for priests and seminarians, who have long awaited a handy reference work devoted exclusively to the administration of the sacraments.

The need for such a work is obvious, as sacramental administration is governed by a complexity of moral principles and a vast body of canonical legislation. This volume covers each sacrament separately, and is edited in such a way that information on any problem can be located quickly.

The author is an expert in his field and his work should prove invaluable to today's priest who encounters so many perplexing problems in the course of his sacramental ministry.

## STUDIES IN PHILIPPINE CHURCH HISTORY <sup>1</sup>

• Leonardo Z. Legaspi, O.P.

Philippine history is always an interesting subject; but Philippine Church history, besides being interesting is always fascinatingly challenging and attractively delicate. One has only to review the increasingly growing output of books, articles and reviews touching upon the history of the Church in the country.

The present volume "Studies in Philippine Church History" had taken the challenge and painstakingly unraveled the delicate. The result is a truly informative, excellent historical volume both for merely informative readings and for research in depth.

The best recommendation of this book is the impressionable list of historians writing on their respective field of specialty, boldly touching on the controversial historical questions affecting the life of the various touchy questions about the church in the Philippines. The clarity and frankness demanded by the various questions about the Church in the Philippines can only be explained by the competence of each author.

Paradoxically, this very strength of the book constitutes its one vital weakness. A team-approach to history is very susceptible to many pitfalls: over-lapping or repetition, by-passing of important topics where study and detailed discussions are necessary, etc. The present volume contains overly emphasized points. A typical case is the *anti-friar movement*. While at the same time transcendental subject-matters are completely left out or mentioned only in passing. We do not know whether there is a plan to continue these studies; we certainly look forward however to another volume of Studies in Philippine Church History. One which will contain studies on the teaching activity of the Church, charitable ecclesiastical institutions, Synods and Councils, the spiritual, religious,

---

<sup>1</sup> Edited by Gerald H. Anderson, Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press, 1969. Pp. ixiv, 421. Price: \$14.50-net.

devotional and social life of the people in relation to the life of the Church, pious associations, the Church and the social welfare, positive and lasting contributions to the nation during the Muslim's period of expansion, foreign missions, cultural developments, etc.

It is not possible to comment on each of the points raised and studied in this volume. It is not even necessary. There are, however, two vital topics which deserved to be commented upon in a very special way, namely, *the development of the native clergy and the disentanglement of the Church and State during the early part of the American regime in the Philippines.*

### The Native Clergy Question

One of the most challenging studies is that of Fr. Horacio de la Costa, S.J. —“Development of the Native Clergy.” Once again he returns to his favorite topic, the native clergy question.

In page 77, Fr. de la Costa writes: “Three main causes combined to retard the formation of a native clergy in the Philippines. The first was the primitive condition of society, which had first to be raised to that level of cultural maturity required before it could provide suitable aspirants to the Catholic priesthood... The second cause was the framework of the ecclesiastical establishment constructed by the *patronato* in the colony, a framework which provided no suitable room for a native clergy even when the mission was ready for it... And the third was the conciliar and (p.78) synodal legislation of Spanish America, extended without modification to the Philippines, legislation which, while it effectively prevented the ordination of unworthy candidates, did so by excluding even the worthy from the priesthood.”

It is the first of these causes which I should like to supplement here and confirm with additional documentations.

Theoretically, the problem of whether to admit or to refuse admission of orientals to sacred orders and to the religious orders was resolved quite early here in favor of the orientals. This, in essence, is the burden of the answers given by a dominican, Fr. Domingo Gonzalez, and an augustinian, Fr. Alonso Carvajal to a pertinent case-question proposed to them.

The case reads thus:

Pregúntase si, así como son dispensados y admitidos a los órdenes sacros y las sagradas religiones los nuevos cristianos de nación de japones, podrán también ser admitidos los de la nación chinos, mayormente habiendo sido bautizados en su niñez y criados por mano de religiosos en la fe, virtud y buenas costumbres, con la probación de los religiosos, en cuya compañía sean criados y que los tales religiosos tengan larga experiencia de que tienen fortaleza en las cosas de nuestra santa fe, habiéndolo experimentado en muchos ejemplares, y que las cosas de virtud, e specialmente en la castidad, han tenido mucha fortaleza y defendidos con la ayuda del Señor en ocasiones apretadas en que hayan sido convidados, y que junto con esto tengan suficiencia de latinidad, etc.<sup>2</sup>

The answer of Fr. Domingo González reads:

Por vía de nación ninguno está excluido de los órdenes sacros, ni de las sagradas religiones, si las costumbres son buenas, y así los chinos que tuvieron las cualidades que en este caso se refieren, pueden sin dispensación ser ordenados de órdenes sacros y admitidos a las sagradas religiones. Fecha en este colegio de Santo Tomás de Manila, a 28 de julio de 1643 años. Fr. Domingo González.<sup>3</sup>

Fr. Alonso Carvajal, OSA, gives an identical answer:

Como tenga las condiciones que las constituciones y estatutos que los religiosos disponen, ninguno por ser de esta o aquella nación, esta excluido ser religioso. Este es mi parecer. En este Convento de San Agustín, en veinte y cuatro de agosto de mil y seiscientos cuarenta y tres años. Fr. Alonso de Carvajal.<sup>4</sup>

As a matter of fact, around the middle of XVIIth century, there were already chinese mestizos admitted to the sacred order of priesthood, although the great majority did not measure up to the standard. This can be gathered from the following exposition prepared by Fr. Alberto Collares to the Archbishop of Manila:

---

<sup>2</sup> Dominican archives (Sto. Domingo Convent, Q.C., P.I.) MSS, Section CHINOS, vol. 1, document 18.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

Y es que ha habido y hay mestizos de sangley que se les ha antojado ordenarse de sacerdotes a titulo que saben medianamente la lengua china, pero es menester saber que los mestizos tienen la misma sangre chinchea (de Amoy) que sus padres; y, aunque para ordinarios cristianos indios pueden pasar, pero para el sacerdocio son del todo inhabiles, no tanto por falta de entendimiento sino porque quemadmodum patres eorum conversi sunt in arcum pravum.<sup>5</sup>

He then cites the case of a chinese mestizo from Binondo who caused so much scandal due to his excesses in the matter of chastity. Fr. Collares ends his report saying:

... finalmente, si a estos tales se ordenara de sacerdotes, me parece se verificará lo que hizo Julio Cesar, según refiere Cicerón, el cual dio dignidades a algunos que no las merecían, y dice San Jeronimo que *non illos decoravit sed dignitatem deturpavit*.<sup>6</sup>

The historical conclusion which crystallizes from these documents is that, although *theoretically* there could be no objection to the admission of the natives to sacred orders and to the religious orders, the natives were, in practice, and as a matter of policy refused admission. It was not due to *intellectual incapacity* or insufficiency (7), but due to spiritual immaturity. That during the XVIIth century the European clergy which had the control of religious government of the country, refused to ordain the natives on the belief that the natives were still new in faith, too prone to the temptation of the flesh.

There were two factors which were instrumental in confirming in holding on to this unfortunate policy. The *first* was that even during that time, some creoles were being prepared to the priestly ministry. And quite expectedly, although wrongly, the religious superiors thought that the creoles would provide the compromise solution. It was only too

<sup>5</sup> *Dominican Archives*, MSS, Section CHINOS, vol. 1, document 26.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> "También tiéne otro colegio de San Juan de Letrán... y algunos indios nobles llevan allí a sus hijos para la buena educación, y de estos han llegado a sustentar con lucimiento conclusiones de Teología" (Fr. Polanco, OP, *Memorial to Doña Mariana de Austria*, 1768, *cfr.* *Dominican Archives*, MSS, Section PROVINCIA, vol. 2, document 4a, p. 5, year 1668).

late when they realized how unfounded the basis of their assumption was: the number of these creoles ordained to priesthood at the turn of the XVIIth century was not adequate; it was very much equivalent to almost zero. Archbishop Camacho emphatically underlined this fact in his report to the King of Spain, Philip V:

Por este modelo parece que también corren los otros dos colegios de San José, a cargo de jesuitas, y de Santo Tomás a cargo de dominicos, por el poco fruto que visiblemente se consigue de su educación, pues en nueve años que con este he servido en esta Iglesia, solo cuatro sujetos colegiales se han podido sacar para sacerdotes del dicho colegio de Santo Tomás, que los nombro nominalmente para verificación del caso; que son el doctor Luis Campaña, dos hermanos del sobrenombre de Ibarra, y de ellos el uno ya es difunto, y el bachiller Jose de Robles que tambien es difunto. Y del Colegio de San José han salido solos catorce sacerdotes, que todos viven. Y del Colegio de San Juan de Letran solo uno, que es el bachiller Sebastián del Rio.<sup>8</sup>

The second was the only too human fear from the part of the Spanish clergy that the natives, if and when admitted into the priestly ministry, would in due time take away the parishes from them. This is mentioned also by Fr. de la Costa, (p. 93), and attested by two statements drawn from the writings of Archbishop Camacho. In a letter to the King, dated June 14, 1705, he complains:

... y tendrá (la obra del Seminario) sin duda mucha contradicción en los regulares que con dicho Gobernador han profesado siempre estrechísima union por las mutuas convivencias con que se contribuyen para sus intereses y respetos presentes y futuros de que he tocado a V.M. en otros despachos... y que con cautela y doblez trataran de infundir y sugerir informes para derribar la intención pia de V.M., la fundación y conservación de dicho seminario, que con el tiempo ha de ser la piedra silla que echara por tierra toda esta tan elevada y soberbia maquina y estatua de Nabucchodonosor que de si mismo han formado y erigido en estas Islas para (ilegible) de todas ellas.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Letter of archbishop Diego de Avila y Camacho to the King, dated in Manila, on October 11th 1705 (UST Archives, Section LIBROS, vol. 59, fol. 312)

<sup>9</sup> Letter to the King, 14th of June 1705, MS, UST Archives, vol. 59, Section BECERROS, fols. 294-295.

There is a slight correction which I should like to make in page 86 of the book under review. Fr. de la Costa, talking about a concrete attempt to construct a seminary for the natives writes: "The College of San Clemente was duly torn down and the construction of a completely new seminary was begun on another site, a seminary which would be of the right size, for eight and only eight seminarians, and which would bear when finished the more appropriate name of San Felipe. Was it ever finished? Apparently not, for a royal letter of 1720 inquires of the governor whether it would not be a good idea if the site and foundations of the proposed seminary were to be used instead for the "creation of a building for the Royal Exchequer, the Royal Treasury, and an armory with lodgings for the infantry." Thus the seminary for native priests did not advance beyond the paper stage until 1772, when Archbishop Sancho de Santa Justa y Rufina transformed the University of San Ignacio, after the expulsion of the Jesuits, into the diocesan seminary of San Carlos."

However, by going over vol. XXVIII of Blair and Robertson collection, we come across the narrations of Fr. Juan Francisco de San Antonio, Fr. Juan Delgado and Mr. Le Gentil, who writing at different times and years of the XVIIIth century, clearly testify that the seminary of San Felipe went on, but in a different building, although, due to lack of funds and of competent personnel it had to exist in a very precarious and difficult situation.

The seminary of San Felipe functioned, it must be admitted, more like a *convictorio* similar to that of Letran College during those days, rather than a seminary in the proper and technical sense of the word. But the important fact is that it continued to function for fifty long years.<sup>10</sup>

### Nationalism, Dissent, and Disentanglement

Three studies stand out among the various articles on the preparation, development and consequences of the Philippine Revolution. The most controversial among which deserving special attention is that of

---

<sup>10</sup> Cfr. Emma Helen Blair James Alexander, and Robertson, eds., *The Philippine Islands*, 1493-1898, XXVIII, pp. 117-22, 190-98..



Mr. Peter G. Gowing's "The Disentanglement of Church and State early in the American Regime in the Philippines," pp. 203-12.

By and large, it is a very informative study, containing adequate data, most especially about the sale of the friars' haciendas. It is a bold study of a subject which is both interesting and controversial. It requires a great deal of courage to write on this matter; a greater tact in the evaluation of its history. It is for these reasons that Mr. Gowing's article should be judged as a real positive contribution to our Philippine Church history.

Unfortunately however, I feel constrained to express my disagreement to the main thesis of Mr. Gowing and his evaluation of facts pertaining to the Philippine Revolution.

The thesis of Mr. Gowing seems to lead fatally to this affirmation: the friars were *the* cause of that social upheaval. It is sad to say, and definitely surprising to find a serious historian of the Philippines still advocating this unfair theory. It is not my intention to deny that the friars were *one* of the causes of the Philippine Revolution. But there is a world of difference between being *the* cause and that of being *one* of the causes. Any failure to see this distinction can spell disaster in the process of drawing conclusions.

To begin with, the friars were certainly *one* of the causes of the Philippine Revolution, but only in an *indirect* way. And this for a number of reasons. The enemies of Spain saw in the friars the strongest single factor of Spanish continuous hold over the people, and they zeroed on the friars to insure the downfall of the Spanish government. The scandalous examples of some friars were also indirectly responsible for the social upsurge. The vast and extensive possessions of the friars invited at first envy from many quarters and then, hatred from others. One can also mention the system of too close a connection between the Church and the State, giving ground thereby to impute the faults of one to the other.

The Propaganda Movement is a very complicated historical event. When narrowed down to the anti-friar movement, we may describe it as a barrage of truths, half-truths and lies hurled against the Religious Orders in order to undermine and weaken their power and influence, and eventually to cause the downfall of the Spanish dominion.

In order to come out with a fairly just study on the Propaganda Movement of this country, the historian must bear in mind four essential principles. First, *avoid generalizations*. The faults of some should not be made to appear as the faults of everyone in that social group. That some friars behaved in an unworthy manner should not be denied; and I do not deny it here. But we should not thereby say that because some did not live up to the sanctity of their calling, we should point an accusing finger to *all the friars*. This would certainly be unacceptable and unfair.

Second, avoid concentrating on the dark and negative sides of their actuations. There are good things — many excellent contributions in every field of human endeavor — which the friars had given to this nation. Justice and charity oblige us not to forget this.

Third, in drawing our conclusions from historical facts, we should situate ourselves in the context of the time within which our personages were moving, the type and import of the then prevailing mentality. Thus unjust imputations and deductions would be avoided.

Finally, the historian must read the writings of both sides. Any historical investigation is only as good as its sources, and only as objective as its authors. To deliberately concentrate on one side, and to select only those documents which confirm that side would be an unpardonable breach of the sacred duty of a historian: that of veracity. That would make the author and the study disgustingly impartial. The written documents are the clear and unrefutable witnesses of thoughts and consequently dependable guides to the meaning of their actuations.

It is along this line that I invite Mr. Gowing's attention to a confidential letter written by Fr. Evaristo Arias. The letter is dated 1897, and was directed to a friend. Writing in a *no-holds-barred* style (*duela a quien duela*), he tells his friend about the causes of the Revolution. He says:

En los transcendentales sucesos que lamentamos, todos tenemos culpa, todos en le pusisteis vuestras manos<sup>11</sup>

But who were the first ones to have a hand in this matter? The Masonry — both Spanish and Filipinos through the Katipunan. Mason-

<sup>11</sup> *Archivo de Santo Tomas, folletos*, vol. 95, fol. 8 v.)

ry is the only single efficacious cause of the Movement; all the other causes played a very subsidiary role.

No la ha promovido ni sido autor de ella ningún español, para satisfacción nuestra; es obra exclusiva de los masones y libre pensadores filipinos, estando ajena a su preparacion y desarrollo la gran masa de país, pues, incluso los indios tagalos que a ella se han adherido y que ahora luchan como fieras, no tienen culpa en su preparación, y no han hecho sino seguir las ordenes de sus jefes, los venerables de las logias y de los Katipunans<sup>12</sup>.

*Telesforo Canseco* an eyewitness of the Cavite uprising confirms this very same conclusion:

Ya he dicho que en la insurrección fue trabajada en las logias masonicas, segun confesión de los mismos cabecillas. Estas logias estaban permitidas por el gobernador Don Fernando de Parga, siendo el mismo el venerable de la logia de Cavite... Tambien debian estar protegidos por el gobernador general Blanco, puesto que públicamente decian los insurrectos que dicho señor era también hermano mason.<sup>13</sup>

In this connection we must also mention the fact that a segment of the native clergy participated in the movement. The eyewitness tells us:

Todos los clérigos de la provincia han trabajado, quien más quien menos, por la insurrección, si bien es verdad que algunos lo hicieron llevados del miedo que tenían a los jefes insurrectos... Lo dicho no se entiende más que del clero indígena de esta provincia. Ya sabe V.R. que en las demas provincias tagales, en donde esta la insurrección, ha habido clérigos que se han portado como verdaderos españoles, y han trabajado cuanto han podido contra la insurrección.<sup>14</sup>

During one of the meetings of all the Philippine bishops in 1900, presided over by the Apostolic Delegate, Mons. Chapelle, we find Mons. Nozaleda speaking in the same vein as Canseco:

The clergy helped with all the means at their disposal the society "Katipunan", which is masonic. I know for a fact that there were

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>13</sup> CANSECO, TELESFORO, *Historia de la insurrección filipina en Cavite*, 1896. MS in the Dominican Archives, Section HISTORIA CIVIL DE FILIPINAS, vol. 7, p. 94.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 84.

clergy members of this wicked society, and others who supported its goals. The periodical pamphlet "Filipino Libre" was patronized by clerics from the very beginning up to this time. The so-called pamphlet "Democracia" and other similarly ferocious periodicals enjoyed the protection of the clergy. Finally, it was the clergy who founded and still support the openly masonic periodical called "La Patria".<sup>15</sup>

There is no presumption here to pass any judgment on the moral nature of this clerical participation in the Movement. My contention here is simply to point out that we can find no ground to put the whole blame on the friars *alone*.

### Inaccuracies and Generalizations

Mr. Gowing tells us in his article, p. 204 of the book: "For many Filipinos the Spanish friars had become the symbols of tyranny and oppression." This would be a valid statement of an objective fact, had he said instead of *many*, "for some Filipinos," as we shall show later.

In the same page, he continues: "During the fighting the majority were able to escape to Manila, but better than 300 of their less fortunate brothers were taken prisoners, and some fifty of them were killed." This is not entirely accurate. The fact was that only a handful were able to escape to Manilá from Visayas and from the neighboring Tagalog provinces. Most probably around 400 became prisoners, of which 115 were dominicans, some Jesuits and Benedictines from Mindanao. The others escaped to Hong Kong from Dagupan, Iloilo and

---

<sup>15</sup> "Clerici foverunt mediis omnibus societatem "Katipunan," quae massonica est. Certo scio non deesse clericos qui membra sunt illius improbae societatis, et alios illius proposita secundare. Immundum folium periodicum "Filipino Libre" ab ortu ad finem usque a clericis fuit sustentatum. Illorum vixit protectione aliud ejusdem furfuris folium "Democracia" nuncupatum. Et clerici denique sunt qui fundaverunt et sustinent periodicum aperte masonicum "La Patria" nominatum." *Acta Collationum Quas Episcopi Philippinarum habuerunt in civitate de Manila*, preside Rdm. D. Delegato P.L. Chapelle, sessione quinta, numeris tertio et quarto (Documentum reservatum in archivis Ordinis Praedicatorum in civitate Quezon.)

Cebu, while the rest, like the religious of Panay were hardly molested. After the period of captivity and before the exodus for Spain, Manila had almost 500 friars.

"At Imus, Cavite, for example," again Mr. Gowing in the same page, "thirteen were savagely put to death, one by being burned alive, another by being hacked to pieces and still another by being roasted on a bamboo pole." There are some inaccuracies in this statement. There were *nine*, not thirteen, namely: *Fr. Learte*, parish priest of Imus, *Fr. Herrero*, administrator of the Imus Hacienda, brothers *Angos*, *Zueco*, *Caballero*, *Goñi* and *Lopez*, Herrero's assistants, brothers *Garbayo* and *Umbon* of Salitran, who were then staying in Imus. Some were killed near the boundary line between Imus and Bacoar while on their way to Manila, others in barrio Sampaloc near Silang. Only one died in the hacienda, brother Caballero. They were shot or boloed to death, but no record of anyone "being burned alive" and much less of "being roasted on a bamboo pole."<sup>16</sup>

The death list of friars gathered from different sources reads as follows: 28 Recollects, 13 Augustinians, 1 Dominican, and no Franciscan.

All these inaccurate data given to us by Mr. Gowing were meant to support his conclusion as stated in p. 205: "In general however, the devoutly religious Filipino people were antifriar without being anti-Church or anti-Catholics, though many of the ilustrados (native intelligentsia) advocated separation of church and state."

This statement seems not according to objective fact. Contemporary documents contradict this, while upholding one consistent fact: the Filipino people, by and large, were not anti-friar. We have the testimony of the *Actas de Junta*:

A most consoling fact, which greatly honors the Catholic Filipino people took place during the captivity of the Religious. Many of them, being in poor health, could not in any way bear the torments and privations of their imprisonment, if it were not for persons of both

<sup>16</sup> RUIZ, *Licinio*, *Sinopsis historica de la Provincia de San Nicolas de Tolentino*, vol. II, Manila, 1925, pp. 346 ff.

sexes, but mainly women, who not frightened by any dangers, succoured them with a generous hand.<sup>17</sup>

In page 211, Mr. Gowing asserts: "The people do not want the friars back, and peace and order were threatened by the mere suggestion of their return."

Let us see why "peace and order were threatened:"

Pedro de Tavera, is responsible for all abuses committed against the friars in the provinces, for hardly was it known that the Archbishop of Manila or the bishop of any diocese sent friars to a parish, Pedro de Tavera gave orders that trouble should be excited among the people, with the object in mind of attributing these hostile manifestations to the presence of the friars.<sup>18</sup>

An identical method was applied in the case of the Dominicans during their return to Tuguegarao in order to open new schools there. The Federal Party, very much opposed to the friars, greeted them with a considerably well organized opposition and even went to the extent of forcing the people to follow suit.<sup>19</sup>

It is truly unfortunate that an otherwise excellent study like that of Mr. Gowing could be spoiled by this marked anti-friar attitude. His was, I would want to believe, a sincere and considerable effort to make a substantial contribution towards the ever growing interest in the history of the Church in the Philippines. In this I share with my whole heart his purpose, and for this I took pain to offer my comments and observations.

---

<sup>17</sup> "Factum magnopere consolatorium, quod valde honorat populum catholicum philippinum, locum habuit durante captivitate religiosorum. Multi ex iis valetudine infirmi ferre nullo modo potuissent termenta atque privationes carceris, defuissent personae utriusque sexus, praecipue vero mulieres, quae, nullis territae periculis, illis larga succurrerunt manu." *Acta de Juta*, sessione quinta, numero secundo.

<sup>18</sup> *The Attitude of Gov. Taft and his fellow Commissioners to the Catholic Religion*, MS in the Dominican Archives Section PROVINCIA, vol. 8, document 5, p. 2, 1900.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.



## THE CHURCH HERE AND THERE

### HOLY FATHER CREATES NEW RP DIOCESE

The Catholic Bishops Conference of the Philippines has officially announced the creation of the province of San Fernando, La Union to a diocese by the Holy See. Until recently, the archdiocese of Nueva Segovia comprises the civil province of Ilocos Sur and La Union.

At the same time, the Holy Father has named His excellency Monsignor Victorino Ligot as the Bishop of the new diocese. A native of Laoag, Ilocos Norte, Bishop Ligot served in the parishes of Ilocos Norte and became the first Vicar General when the diocese of Laoag was created in 1961. He was appointed auxiliary bishop of Nueva Segovia on February 14, 1969.

### SERVANT OF THE DYING CANONIZED

The Pope on January 25 canonized Maria Soledad Torres Acosta, foundress of the Sisters Servants of Mary, who dedicated her life to caring for the most hopelessly ill.

At the canonization ceremony the Pope celebrated Mass, distributed Communion and pronounced the solemn words recognizing in the Church's name the holiness of Blessed Maria.

Maria Soledad Torres Acosta was born in Madrid in 1826. In her youth she made the solemn vow to dedicate her life to those so desperately ill that even the hospitals refused to care for them. At the age of 25 she convinced six other women to join in this work, but they soon left her because they could not endure the hardships. Her bishop, noting the exemplary virtues of Maria, put her under his protection. She was thus able to found the Sisters Servants of Mary. She died in 1887.

Today her congregation has 122 houses and 2,650 members throughout the world.

### PRIESTLY LIFE AND PARISH

The Senate of Priests of the Christchurch diocese (New Zealand) has adopted an important report on the priesthood and parish life made by a special committee and has sent a series of recommendations to its bishop.



The recommendations range over most facets of priestly life, from leadership in the parish community to disputes with parish councils — and pay particular attention to establishing close relations between pastors and their assistants.

### *Priests and leadership*

The priest's exercise of leadership is increasingly inspirational and non-directive the report said. The priest is concerned with supporting the efforts of the people in carrying out their mission. Despite the changing role and functions of the priests today, the new situation that faces him offers a challenging and rewarding life for dedicated priests.

"As always he is called on to lead his people in the community, expressing its faith in its official worship. Although not specifically trained for this new role, we will find added strength in adapting to it if we explore together our understanding of our new role and if we support one another in discharging it," the report said.

The report did not proffer any solutions, but quoting from the theological review *Concilium*, it said that, in acting, priests should bear in mind that the "question facing the Church today as a whole, that is, its hierarchy and its faithful, is simply this: Is it ready to read the signs of the times and to study the problem while it still has thousands of priests in its service, or will it sit back and wait until the problem has taken on the proportions of a major crisis?"

In the past, it said, ideas, suggestions and initiatives came from the leader. Now leadership comes not from above but from within. It is a shared responsibility.

"Today we recognize that there is a variety of roles, functions and ministries within a parish, "Rather than any one person being more responsible than all the others, all together have a shared responsibility ... for the mission of the parish."

In this situation, the report saw the role of the priest as a unifying influence, the exercise of this influence is the greatest act of leadership needed from him.

At the same time, the priest must be out in front of the parish community, pointing the way, challenging the assumptions of parishioners and endeavoring to discern where the Gospel demands are leading the community.

### *Settlement of disputes*

There may well arise times of tension, especially when priest and parish council cannot agree. Here the report suggests that, where there is a deadlock, representatives of both, and possibly a third and independent person, should discuss the deadlock and seek a decision.

What should not be done is to attempt to diminish the meaning of the partnership and shared responsibility between priest and people by immediate recourse to legal authority. Where conciliation is agreed on, parties should bind themselves to accept the decision.

In cases in which an appeal is made to authority, both sides should agree to approach the authority; neither side should make the approach without the agreement of the other.

All parishioners should have a responsible part in the decision-making and structures. Specially selected councils must be set up to foster this.

Turning to their own problems, the priests made a series of recommendations including the following:

Priests should reflect on their style of life — their cars, personal possessions and recreations — to see whether they do in fact witness to the Gospel values. For instance, "priests should take care, in the light of being the Church of the poor, to have second thoughts on buying large cars ... In an age of affluence the witness of poverty is a positive affirmation of the Gospel values. "Priests are called, like all Christians, to witness to poverty in their lives. It would seem that the modern witness is not one of deprivation or indigence, but a real and genuine detachment from material possessions. And this should also apply to the Church as an institution in buildings and property."

- Priests' appointments are critical in their lives and they should be consulted on them.

- Personal fulfillment must be found to a significant degree in a priest's work "because if the structures within which he lives diminish his responsibility and dignity as a man, they diminish also his life and effectiveness as a priest. He who is not fully a man is not able to be fully a priest ... The Church in developing its organization must take this into account."

- The Priests' relationship with their bishop "should be that of brothers and collaborators in a shared responsibility for the Church's mission.

- Priests should not be made to conform to a single priestly pattern.

- The special importance of the spiritual director in a seminary in the formation of priests should be noted.

### *Presbytery life*

The final section of the report looked at tensions within rectories, and suggested that there be "structured dialogue" in each and suggested staff meetings as a way of achieving this.

Priests, should be free to choose where they will go for their annual holidays; the rectory should be the home of all priests, and assistant pastors should be able to entertain their friends there.

Assistants, should be free to set up organizations approved in the diocese after discussing them with the pastor, and they should also feel free to experiment with forms of the apostolate after discussing them with other priests.

This report will almost certainly be implemented: Bishop Brian P. Ashby of Christ church has an outstanding record of cooperation with his priests and people.

### AGREEMENT ON BAPTISM REACHED IN SCOTLAND

The Catholic Church and the Episcopal Church in Scotland have agreed to honour each other's baptism rite and to appoint liturgical commissions to draw up a common rite of baptism.

Father James Quinn, S.J., of Edinburgh, a consultor for the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, described the joint report on baptism as "an ecumenical landmark of wide importance. The report will have an impact beyond the two Churches immediately concerned."

The Very Rev. Provost A. I. M. Haggart of the Episcopal Church said: "We found ourselves talking the same language, with no emotional overtones. The report is a definite step forward. Agreement on baptism is a fundamental prerequisite for a continued growing together of the two Churches."

The report prepared by a joint study group of 24 clergy and laymen, was approved by the provincial synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church and by the Scottish Bishops' Conference.

Each Church has recognized the reality of the other's baptism, unless there is proved individual "eccentricity" on the part of the person administering the sacrament.

Liturgical commissions are to explore a common text for a common rite of baptism to be used separately in each Church. Approval has been given for the preparation of a common certificate of baptism, which can be used when either Church requests the other to provide official evidence of baptism.

### CATHOLIC PRESS DUTIES

A summary of preliminary consensus and recommendations for further discussion was drawn at a meeting of bishops and editors at Bergamo Centre on December 3-5, 1969.

The basic purpose of the diocesan press is to enlighten the Catholic about his world and his role in it. The diocesan press fulfill this purpose:

1. By interpreting fully, fairly and accurately the events of the day as they relate to the Christian in his community.

2. By helping to create that community.
3. By informing and instructing its readers.
4. By reflecting the prophetic mission of the Church, through exhortation and inspiration.
5. By helping readers to see God speaking to man in the events of the times.
6. By a process of continuing education leading to an enlightened public opinion.
7. By providing a forum for dialogue within the body of the Church.
8. By helping to fulfill the bishop's obligation to teach and instruct the people of God... and to hear them in return.
9. By striving to convey the Christian meaning of human events to all segments of the general community.

In order to achieve the above, there must be a definition of the roles of publisher and editor, a mutual trust and understanding and frequent direct communication between them. It was recommended that the bishop-publisher consider sharing his responsibility through establishment of a board, widely representative of the diocese as a whole, to assist both publisher and editor in producing a better newspaper. The editor must recognize the bishop's pastoral responsibility and bishop must recognize the editor's necessary freedom. Both should recognize that the right to information is a right of the reader which should not be abridged.

Reporting news involves good news and bad, joys and sorrows, order and disorder. In this regard Pope Paul VI told members of the Catholic Press: "Your professional conscience can impose on you the duty of reporting untoward happenings which occur in certain areas of the ecclesial community. But it also obliges you to put them in proper perspective and not to exaggerate them, and above all not to give the impression that you approve them, or that you try to justify them, especially when the magisterium (the teaching authority of the Church) and the entire tradition of the Church reproves them."

---