

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

OFFICIAL INTERDIOCESAN ORGAN

● THE PHILIPPINE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW ●

CHURCH AND SOCIAL DISORDERS
● SPIRIT OF COMMUNITY ● AN-
SWEARS TO QUESTIONS ON POPULA-
TION ● THE MASS WE ALWAYS
KNEW ● CONSTITUTIONAL CON-
VENTION SERMONS ● SPECIAL
REVIEW ON CHURCH AS MISSION

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

EDITORIAL STAFF

EDITOR	LEONARDO Z. LEGASPI, 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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL	
The Church and Social Disorders	260
THE POPE SPEAKS	
The Spirit of Community	263
DOCUMENTATION	
Answers to Questions on Population	270
Priestly Celibacy	284
LITURGICAL SECTION	
The Mass We Always Knew	288
NOTES AND COMMENTS	
Mixed Priestly Training (continued) by JESUS MA. CAVANNA, C.M.	294
PASTORAL SECTION	
Homiletics — 5th Sunday after Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, Trinity, Corpus Christi Sundays by FERNANDO YUSINGCO, C.S.S.R.	302
Constitutional Convention Sermons	310
De Colores — You and Your Service Sheet by GUILLERMO TEJON, O.P.	317
HISTORICAL SECTION	
History of the Church in the Philippines 1521-1898 (continued) by Pablo Fernandez, O.P.	322
CASES AND QUERIES	
Stockholding and Board of Directors by BERNABE ALONSO, O.P.	330
Prayers, Baptismal Water, and Creed by H. J. GRAF, S.V.D.	331
SPECIAL REVIEW	
The Church as Mission	335
THE CHURCH HERE AND THERE	342

The Church And Social Disorders

There is a certain amount of amusing tragedy in seeing the pattern of history unveiling before our eyes. When things go to men's satisfaction they are quite willing to dispense with the guidance of God. But when, left to their own resources, they have thoroughly mismanaged their affairs, they turn to Him, that is, to His living voice on earth, to put order into the confusion they have created. But when the Church begins to be faulted as responsible for these social evils, the whole thing ceases to be amusing.

This current is fast becoming the favorite of a large segment of national reformists. The Church is being accused as the cause of the social and economic disorders so widely prevalent in the country today. She is pictured as not playing her due part in striving to remedy these evils. Her political and social encyclicals are hailed as brilliant and magnificent, but condemned as without practical repercussion in the real life. It is normally assumed, within the reformists' circle, that the Church is faithfully aligned with the social and economic establishments which are practically unjust.

These accusations are not totally fair, but neither are they to be dismissed as without any objective basis. In the first place it is unfair to accuse the Church of shying away from social involvement. The Second Vatican Council tells us that the social shaping of our world is part of our duty to God: "Christ's redemptive work... involves also the renewal of the whole temporal order... the Church's mission is to penetrate and perfect the temporal sphere with the spirit of the Gospel." (AA. 5); "God's plan for the world is that men should march together to restore the temporal sphere of things and develop it unceasingly" (*ibid.* 7).

The Church must be socially "involved" in the restoration of justice in our social structure — but with a style uniquely her own. Her involvement, it must be said, in social order should not be seen as the *only* and the *all* of her existence in the world. The Church is not a purely earthly society, formed to attain ends

of a temporal order. She is and must remain before all else what her Founder intended: the instrument of mankind's eternal salvation. Her primary concern is with spiritual and not temporal interests; not to busy itself with economic or political reforms, but to save civilization from itself by revealing to men the true end of life and the true nature of reality; not to reform or devise new economic systems, but to *transform the economists and social workers themselves*. It is man she undertakes to change not systems. If man became what he ought, systems will become what they ought too. What good will a change of system be if after all the people do not change?

In a more concrete level, the priest is not a priest to reform society, but to save souls. He is not given the task of increasing material welfare among men, but of providing for their spiritual nourishment. Whatever the time and the place in which he carries out his ministry, if he wishes to remain equal to his sublime function, he must always and above all consider himself as the man of the spiritual order, the mediator between God and men.

For this reason the accusations against the Church are unfair; but they are not completely baseless.

It has been rightly pointed out that the Church after all is not the hierarchy nor only the priests nor only the doctrines. 'The baptized laity are also the Church. As Pope Pius XII said twenty-five years ago: "laymen and women must become increasingly aware of the fact that they do not simply belong to the Church. *They are the Church.*" Now to be the Church means to live the life of the Church, and to live the life of the Church is to assume the mission of the Church, to be alive to the concern of the Church. Her maternal concern manifested so acutely in her social teachings must be realized in concrete situations *through her individual members*. The laity with their special training and condition in secular affairs have a decisive role to play in realizing the Church preoccupations for a fruitful, effective, and just temporal order animated by Christian ideals (LG 36).

In the light of this conciliar teachings, it will not be amiss to observe that the existing evils are largely due to the abandonment of Christian social principles by those people who call themselves Christians. The Church is not criticized for her encyclicals and social teachings—they are all sound and acceptable. It is for the lukewarm response and the indifference of her children to translate these social principles into practice. The real culprits

of social disorders in our country are those people who apply to the solutions of life's problems and the regulation of life's conduct, principles that deviated from the principles taught by Christ and echoed by the living magisterium of Christ — the Church. They are responsible to the exact degree of that deviation. This fact provides the basis for the afore-mentioned accusations against the Church, and it also points to the solution.

If only rulers and ruled alike listen to Her voice, follow her teachings, this country might not cease to be a country of tears, but it will most certainly cease to be a vale of savage strife; not a country of earthly paradise, but one in which we can see the realization of man's dreams of a satisfying order of things.

THE POPE SPEAKS

THE SPIRIT OF COMMUNITY*

This yearly meeting seems to Us to be assuming extraordinary importance, because it is our meeting. Therefore it is charged with all desires, all problems and all experiences. They seek to be expressed here and to obtain judgment, comfort, guidance. Each one of you will notice that change of perspective is imposed on this discourse by a spontaneous demand connected with the present moment in the Church's life.

We will not turn Our attention to the many and far from out of date themes of Lenten preaching and preparation for Easter, which custom calls for and which are the origin and reason for this discourse. Instead, We feel obliged to reflect about the persons here present, about you, about the problem of your ministry. In this way the discourse can be a conversation: trust can give it that character, and affection can give it spirit. In other words, We feel gripped by this audience, as by something of major interest to us. Questions concerning Our clergy are at present taking precedence over those concerning the field in which they exercise their priestly and pastoral functions.

Last year We addressed Our attention to the same topic, if We remember correctly when on this occasion We spoke about the controversial sociological position of the priest in the contemporary world. And this year too, We shall only speak about what affects you directly. We certainly do not yield to this inner prompting in order to simplify what We have to say with these simple words and so lighten the burden of Our ministry. Rather We do it in order to be closer to Our responsibility and to give you proof of the place you have in Our mind and in Our charity.

* Pope Paul VI's speech to parish priests and lenten preachers of Rome in the Sistine Chapel, on February 9, 1970.

We will choose among the many themes which crowd into Our mind, and speak to you about only one thing: the spirit of community. Community spirit in this community of ours which is the diocese of Rome. There is talk of increasing it. We very willingly acknowledge that it already exists. It ought to be developed, it ought to be deepened, it ought to be the mark of spirituality, it ought to be expressed in our pastoral work, it ought to become trust, collaboration and friendship.

Outward community relationships already exist: living in the same place, belonging officially to the Church of Rome, membership of its organic, ministerial and hierarchical structure. The ecclesial community exists. But is it always at the level of perfect communion of minds, purposes and work?

Are we not sometimes solitary men in the great crowd, whereas we ought to be brothers and form a family? Do we not sometimes prefer to be isolated, to be ourselves, distinct, different, also separated, perhaps a bit dissociated and even unfriendly, in the midst of our ecclesiastical structure? Do we really feel ourselves to be ministers united in the same ministry of Christ? Is fraternal affection always alive amongst us; does it make us humbly and holily proud of our calling to be in the ranks of the Roman clergy?

Fraternal Unity

The current revision was inspired by the Council. It raises certain problems, which are made all the more pressing by the fact that many members of different kinds come to join our diocesan community. They vary very much among themselves, by reason of differences in origin, in training, in function, and spiritual and cultural characteristics. There is need to fuse these ranks of priests, religious and Prelates, if we wish really to be a "church," that is, a congregation, a family, Christ's body, a multitude inspired with the same faith, and the same charity, as that multitude of the first believers was, "one heart and one mind" (*Acts* 4, 32).

There is no doubt that this is how Christ thought. *Unum sint* was his greatest desire (*Jn.* 17). Before he extended this messianic (cf. *Jn.* 11, 52) and divine (cf. 1 *Tim.* 2, 4) desire to the whole of humanity, he expressed it directly to his disciples (*Jn.* 13, 34). Before

he asks for ecumenical unity of the Church, the Lord asks us to have fraternal, community unity in the Church. It seems to Us that one of the clearest bearing given by the recent Council is exactly that in which it brings out the communitarian nature of all mankind, especially manifested in the intentions of the supernatural divine plan (cf. *Gaudium et Spes*, nn. 23-24). By virtue of the Holy Spirit, the Catholic Church already accomplishes this constitutional design of its Founder, but we still have a duty to work at putting into practice more and more.

Hierarchical Communion

It seems to Us that two factors come to our aid in the first effort to perfect unity and charity, that is, to achieve perfect community in priestly life. The first is the emphasis which the Council's Decree on "the ministry and the life of priests" places on the subordinate participation of the priestly Order in the mission of the Episcopal Order. This is a well-known truth, but the Council threw light upon it, in such a way that "from now on anyone who wishes to know what the priest is cannot but refer to the episcopal priesthood, in which the priest participates and shares, and to the exercise of which he is called to make a contribution" (*Presbyterium Ordinis*, nn. 2, 6, 7; Cardinal Garrone, *Le Concile*, p. 78).

Communion in the Church is hierarchical. This characteristic constitutes a stricter and more vital principle of cohesion. The second factor is a renewed and clarified notion of the solidarity which unites the priestly and the episcopal orders. That solidarity has been given back its name, *presbyterium*, and together with that name goes a structure and a function. The Council tells us that "priests, prudent cooperators with the episcopal order, as well as its aids and instruments, are called to serve the People of God. They constitute one priesthood with their bishop, although that priesthood is composed of different functions" (*Lumen Gentium*, n. 28).

Some would like to see a more open and active spiritual presence arise under the form of association and the juridical form which the ecclesiastical order thus takes on. Such a spirit does not make ecclesiastical authority rise democratically from the base to the summit, nor does it try to impose arguments based on numbers, in other words, impose

plurality of opinions, so paralyzing the charismatic and responsible exercise of that authority. It aims rather at making communion and cooperation between Bishop and his priests more vital, conscientious and harmonious, and to do the same for the union of priests among themselves.

Common Pastorate

It seems to Us that the right moment has come for giving the ecclesial community spirit better awareness, greater effectiveness, especially among priests and even more so among those, whether diocesan clergy or religious, who are engaged in a pastoral ministry.

Priests have recently been elected to the Presbyteral Council here in Rome. We see importance, significance and effectiveness in this new organism. We think that Our venerated zealous Cardinal Vicar takes the same view. This group of priests should not become separated from their fellow priests; even less should it become the representative of a current of opinion that will break up the Clergy into mutually antagonistic factions. May it rather be a sign and means of concord and collaboration, solidarity and friendship amongst Our priests. May it feed that spirit of community, of unity and of charity of which We speak. We Ourselves shall be delighted to foster such fusion of minds and works to the extent that We are made aware of and approve your common aims, and give aid for your common needs.

Such spiritual and practical concord should result in a programme of combined and harmonious pastoral action ("joint pastoral work," as they say today). There will be greater saving and use of personnel, undertakings and means, and with more effective results.

Vocations to the Church

A number of matters connected with simultaneous and concerted pastoral work at once spring to Our mind. Very first in line is the question of vocations to the Church!

We do not resign Ourselves to the thought that our field of pastoral labour is barren of youthful and adult souls capable of understanding the call to the heroic service of the kingdom of God. We think that the scarcity of vocations in big cities does indeed depend to a large degree on family and social conditions, which make the consciences of new

generations unresponsive to the urging of Christ's voice; but We also trust that a priest will have the virtue, rather the grace in him to light in other souls the flame which burns in his own, the fire of love for Christ the Lord, and that he will be able to do this if he be a true priest, neither sanctimonious, nor worldly, but a priest living his priesthood with intense wisdom and sacrifice in contact with the community, especially the young.

We believe that greater attraction to embrace the ecclesiastical state will be exercised by presenting the priestly life through living it in full dedication, together with the sacred celibacy which it entails, to the sole and total love of Jesus the Master and Lord, the High and sole Redeeming Lamb, together with the complete and exclusive following of him in pastoral service to God's People. All this will have greater effect than a more natural and apparently easier formula, from the human point of view, in which dedication to Christ and self-sacrifice are no longer perfectly and sublimely linked together.

It is all a matter of understanding. This is the charism which conditions the life. Shall we doubt that the Holy Spirit will grant it to the more generous spirits in the new generation? Moral fortitude, gift of self, sacred and superhuman love for Christ, most true, most vital and most sweet love (cf. *Mt.* 19, 29), in a word, the cross accepted for one's own and others' salvation, have greater and more effective influence upon the human heart than has an invitation to take on a priesthood which has been eased by combining natural with supernatural love.

Even though there is a pressing need for vocations to the Church, We believe that transfigured and transfiguring celibacy is a better incentive to qualitative and quantitative recruitment than an easing of the canon law which prescribes celibacy firm and entire, and sets it as a seal on the loyalty and love for the kingdom of God, on the historical experience and ascetic and mystic struggle of our Latin Church. You know this, and with Us you also wish it. May you be blessed.

The Seminary

Together with the problem of vocations we must take up the problem of the Seminary, study it and solve it. The Seminary too should be more than ever before a centre of agreement for our ecclesial community, through the affection, the trust and the support which each and everyone

gives it. A tradition which must not die out has made our seminary a family circle for very many most worthy ecclesiastics who were students and teachers there — so much so that it is more a pedagogical arena than a school of knowledge.

The seminary has been and continues to be the home of our incomparable Mother, our Church, a home of affections that never die, of memories that are always green, of resolutions that have directed whole lives. So it is still and so it should ever be, through your collective, cordial loyalty. You religious, will also derive merit and benefit from it.

The Vicariate of Rome

And then, how many problems are waiting to be dealt with in the spirit of community, through more systematic and more organic thought about modern and broader solutions; problems of the clergy's finances, common life for priests, renewal of preaching, religious instruction of youth and adults, Catholic Action, new churches, assistance to poor districts, Catholic newspapers, methodical application of liturgical reform, religious chant, sacred art, spiritual exercises, and so on. The moment has come for united and vigorous relaunching of every form of apostolate, every way of exercising the ministry, every kind of pastoral care. All must set to work. All must set to work together. There are many differing instruments in the orchestra, and everyone plays his own, but the music is only one, and it must be harmony, the sum of all efforts pitched together. Our Vicariate is unfortunately seen by some as only a bureaucratic and disciplinary institution, but you can see how it can become the centre of fervour, concord, zeal and diocesan charity.

Personal Spirituality

Before ending this exhortation for an increase of community spirit, We would remind you that, as you already know, there is an intrinsic relationship between community spirit and personal spirituality, that one presupposes and fosters the other.

If increase of community spirit is not linked with intense, deep and punctual interior religiousness, we shall fall into externalism, purely sociological calculation, and legalism.

Some Comfort in Love

The apostolate would lose its interior roots and its best and original forms, together with its highest ends, if the apostle were not a man of prayer and meditation. The texture of the people educated in participation in the liturgy would lack true spiritual cohesion and true fruits from communion with the divine mysteries being celebrated, if the minister and the individual faithful themselves did not acquire a religious fervour of their own from the rite and put some of their own into it. The Church would no longer be the Church, if divine charity were not put before the practice of fraternal charity and also infused into it. This requires the soul to have a silent colloquy, listening and contemplating within itself, imploring, exultant and singing words, but its own words, secret words, perhaps comprehensible only by God, words uttered in an indescribable manner alone with the Spirit and perhaps by the Spirit himself in us: *gemitibus inenarrabilibus* (Rom. 8 26). There are no substitutes for the spiritual life. For us especially who are the Lord's ministers, it cannot, it must not be lacking.

Let us end with the following "liturgy of the word," St. Paul's words to the Philippians (2, 1-5). Sons and Brothers; "If there be therefore any consolation in Christ, if any comfort of love, if any fellowship of the spirit, if any feeling of mercy, fill up my joy by thinking alike, having the same charity, with one soul and one mind. Do nothing out of contentiousness or out of vain glory, but in humility let each regard others as better than himself, each one looking not to his own interests, but to those of others. Let this mind be in you which was also Jesus Christ."

So may it be, with Our Apostolic Blessing.

DOCUMENTATION

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON POPULATION*

The concern expressed by the 69 signatories to the questionnaire of December 1969, on Philippine Society and Population Problems, and addressed to Philippine theologians, is one more encouraging manifestation of the involvement of the intelligentsia in matters of deep contemporary significance. It is another hopeful sign that those in positions, in which they can be influential, are disposed to devote themselves and their energies in seeking solutions to the dilemmas that confront Philippine society today. In their list of seven questions relating to the population problem in this country, they raise legitimate issues which should be deeply considered and answered satisfactorily so that the issues involved — whether economic, social, cultural, or moral — might be clear in the minds of all and so that, further, based on this clarity, realistic programs of action might be organized and implemented.

The questions set forth and addressed to the Philippine theologians are not theological in character. They are rather of a pastoral nature, and the answers to them should be sought, not from the theologians, but from the Hierarchy, which is entrusted with proposing the practical guidelines to action in terms of Christian morality, which is, in short,

* The population problem is a very complex problem, and consequently a problem difficult to solve. Great efforts must be exerted, without delay, individually as well as collectively, to give it the right ethical solution, i.e. one in keeping with the dignity of man, in conformity with the laws of reality. At the root of most social, economic and political problems the nation is facing and anxiously awaiting a satisfactory solution, there lies a moral problem and it may well be said, that if these pressing problems have not received as yet a satisfactory answer, it is because the solutions thus far given are not in full accordance with the moral order, with the law of reality. The laws of morality, like the laws that govern our body and our mind, are written into our nature, but the moral laws are harder to discover and they are moral essential to be known. By submitting freely to these laws man has everything to gain.

entrusted with the pastoral care of their flock. The Roman Catholic Bishops, on July 4, 1969, issued a statement concerning the population issue. It is their prerogative, their right, their responsibility, and their authority to exercise the Magisterium or teaching mission of the Church, as Paul VI points out: "The role of the Hierarchy is to teach and to interpret authentically the norms of morality. This is echoed by the Constitution on the Church and the Modern World when it entrusts to Bishops "the task of ruling the Church of God." The Magisterium of the Church is exercised when the hierarchy speaks in an official and authentic manner, to interpret for the faithful, the true and valid teaching of the Church. This, the signatories seem to recognize, in the context of their question, referring to national groups of Bishops.

As a point of fact, the Church has already spoken on the matter.¹ The Magisterium has been exercised through the Papal pronouncements

¹ It may be of interest to many of our readers to know what the mind of theologians, physicians, bishops throughout the world, was in pre-war days, concerning the much talked about "contraceptive practice."

In 1935, a "*Casus Moralis*" was submitted to five theologians. They were among the most prominent in the world, at that time. Moreover, they represented four or five different nationalities, and were acquainted with conditions in their respective countries. They were: Frs. A. Vermeersch, S.J., F. Capello, S.J., B. H. Merkelbach, O.P., M. Lopez, S.J., and F. Hurth, S.J., professor at the Ignatius-Kolleg, Valkenburg, Limburg, Holland, and considered by many as among the foremost theologians of S.J., at that time.

The solution to the "*Casus Moralis*" calls for an answer to 6 questions, the first of which reads as follows — "*May marital onanism be ever permitted?*"

— Here are the answers of the five mentioned theologians:

A. Vermeersch: "*Onanism conjugal is numquam permitti potest. Est res intrinsece mala.*"

F. Capello: "*Negative*" (i.e. numquam permitti potest.)

H. B. Merkelbach: "*Negative.*"

M. Lopez: "*Onanism*" conjugal, utpote contra ipsam naturam, est intrinsece malus: numquam ergo, permitti potest."

F. Hurth: "*Ipse onanism conjugal et omnis ad eum cooperatio formalis, est semper illicita.*" Cfr. The Eccl. Review, June 1936, pp. 587-593.

The Roman Catholic Medical Association of the Netherlands convoked a convention for June, 1935, for the sole purpose of discussing the specific problem, "Biological sterility and fertility in Women." A summary of the conclusions and recommendations was published in the most widely read organ

related to these issue, through the documents of the Second Vatican Council, and through the statement of the Philippine hierarchy most particularly the statement of July 4, 1969, interpreting the Papal teaching for the Philippines. This document the signatories of the questionnaire invoke as the invitation for their reflections and the questions posed. Truly, the statement referred to, urges full discussion and open dialogue on all aspects of the question, pointing out particularly the "urgent need for critical examination of the premises basic to the formulation of population policies." It adds that this is specially so in matters "economic and social, where conclusions are open to dispute." Yet, at the same time, the statement re-affirms "the basic rights of spouses which both the United Nations and Vatican II insisted as setting limits to what government can do," adding that matters which touch on personal fertility control are "best left to the initiative of appropriate private agencies, those of humanitarian or religious character."

It is not the role of the theologian precisely to serve in this matter as arbiter of morals and of ethics. While it is true that this may be their field of specialization, theologians serve a special function within the Church, as technocrats, as professional consultants, as advisers, as academicians, so to speak, whose role it is to serve the Church in formulating its magisterium, in clarifying the doctrines of the Church for the faithful, in speculation even as to the implications of church doctrine — but

of the German-speaking priesthood, "Linzer Quartalschrift" in its first issue of 1936. Here are two of the most pertinent recommendations:

1. — "Married people must regard the procreation of children as the principal object of marriage,"
2. — "Birth-control is mortally sinful, if it involves the abuse of the act, or any other seriously sinful, unnatural means" (Cfr. *The Eccl. Review*, June 1936, p. 582).

This Guild reflects well the mind of Catholic Physicians Guilds in the West, at that time.

As to the stand of Catholic bishops throughout the world, on this matter, the June issue of "Periodica," 1967, M. Zalba, S.J. gives a summary of his survey "Circa ordinem rectum in usu matrimonii, episcopi per orbem, quid tradiderint" (pp. 61-87). Many of our readers will find this resume enlightening and inspiring. It is the real moral teaching on marriage (and the right use of marriage) proposed with constant firmness by the teaching authority of the Church, solemnly confirmed by Pope Paul VI in the encyclical "Humanae Vitae" of July 25, 1968.

all this, and always, within the context of the Magisterium of the Church.² The authority is not theirs to propose practical moral guidelines for the faithful independently of the Magisterium as exercised by the Hierarchy. It is only through the Hierarchy that they function and their opinions are valid, in so far as these are meant to be practical guidelines for the faithful. It would seem regrettable, therefore, that the signatories of the questionnaire, "in the hope of continuing the fruitful dialogue begun by the Hierarchy," should address the questions "to theologians" instead of the Hierarchy itself. And it would be more regrettable still if conflicting personal views of individual theologians were interpreted to mean that the Church has no mind in these matters, and that therefore, cannot contribute effectively and adequately to the solution of the problems solved. This is so, particularly since it seems clear that the Magisterium of the Church on these issues has already been expressed repeatedly.

² What the nature of theology, what the function of the Catholic theologian is, Paul VI stated in clear, unambiguous words, in his address to participants in the First International Congress, on the theology of Vatican Council II — Oct. 1, 1966, Rome. Here are some pertinent paragraphs:

"Sacred theology, in fact, by means of intelligence illumined by faith and not without a certain illumination from the Holy Spirit, to which the theologians must be attentive and docile, has the task of bringing greater understanding and penetrating to the truths of revelation; of communicating to the Christian community and particularly to the magisterium itself the fruits of its research, so that thru the teaching transmitted thru the Church's hierarchy, it may illuminate the whole Christian people. Finally, it has the task of cooperating in illustrating, justifying and defending the truth authoritatively taught by the magisterium."

"Their task forms part of the Church's great task of saving souls... They will therefore take care to study above all problems and questions that more closely concern the salvation of souls, and will share with the magisterium the preoccupation of bringing to the knowledge of the faithful *no so much their own* truths, but the truth of Jesus, such as it is universally believed in the Church under the guidance of its magisterium"...

"If in your search for truth you wander away from this magisterium, there will be the danger that you will be teachers without disciples, separated from all, or that you will waste your labor without producing fruits for the community of the faithful. It might even expose you to the danger of deviating from the right path, choosing your own judgment, not the thinking of the Church (*"sensus ecclesiae"*) as the criterion of Truth. This would be an arbitrary choice — *"airesis,"* the road to heresy." (Cfr. B.E., XL (1966) Dec. pp. 759 ff. ,

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

Paul VI in his encyclical *Populorum Progressio* defines the role of the Church in matters such as this by quoting the Vatican II Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World which says that She "ought to scrutinize the signs of the times and interpret them in the light of the gospels . . . in language intelligible to each generation (to respond) to the questions . . . about this present life and the life to come, and about the relationship of one to the other." The purpose of the Church, says the Constitution is a religious one, primarily, (AA,n. 2) one of teaching the moral issues involved in matters related to the question of population and the solutions proposed. This, the Philippine Hierarchy had done at various times, as it did in its declaration of July 4, 1969, and in its pastoral letter of October 12, 1968. It might be added that although this is the principal role of the church "when circumstances of time and place produce the need, She can and indeed should initiate activities in behalf of all men, specially those designed for the needy, such as the works of mercy and similar undertakings."³

³ An *Adequate* answer to the question "How to *define* the role of the Church in coping with population problems of the Philippines?" would call for the insertion here of the Constitution of Vatican II — "The Church Today," part I, ch. 4, and part II, ch. 1, 3,4. and of the Decree on the "Apostolate of the Laity" (A.A.). 1965. Vatican II doctrine is briefly and clearly stated, and up-to-date to necessitate a comment; but this is *not* within the scope of this paper.

The population problem, we have stated is a very *complex* problem. Its *social, economic and political* aspects are not the *proper mission or sphere of activity of the Church*, and consequently, to the extent population problems are social, economic and political, they are rather within the sphere action of human institutions to solve them; it is a work left to man's own thought, man's creative spirit and invention. The Church does not wish to *supersede* these human institutions, rather she wishes to do as much as it is within her power, to *stimulate nations, organizations, economic, social and cultural in purpose*, to perform their work and achieve their objectives in such a manner, that man's perfecting of himself, both in the natural and in the supernatural order, is rendered less arduous.

Facile answers to complex and difficult problems are far worse than useless. One of the unwise of human acts is to grasp the handiest and easiest solution and leave it to the following generations to discover how perverse has been

2. Question: 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 responsibility of the Church in this regard is the presentation of its doctrine in its fullness, pointing out the positive as well as the negative aspects of her teaching, and consequently the ethical and moral responsibilities of individuals in terms of current conditions. As *Humanae Vitae* itself points out, conjugal love requires in husband and wife an awareness of their mission of responsible parenthood, meaning by this, "knowledge and respect for their functions," the development of "that necessary dominion which reason and will must exercise over" instincts and passions, so that in terms of "physical, economic, psychological and social conditions" parenthood is exercised by deliberate and generous decision. Above all she should emphasize that responsible parenthood, "implies a more profound relationship to the objective moral order established by God." *Humanae Vitae* continues: "The responsible exercise of parenthood implies... that husband and wife recognize fully their own duties towards God, towards themselves, towards the family, and towards society, in a correct hierarchy of values. The Church must therefore teach the faithful all those elements that are necessary for the husband and wife to exercise parenthood responsibility, not merely the social and personal advantages of limiting their family size, but the entire Christian doctrine in these matters. As the Constitution on the Church in the Modern World points out: Presentday conditions of life, in many ways different from those of the past, and differing in various countries ... call for mature decision, which recognizes all aspects of the question, particularly, educational responsibility, while seeking the greater good."*

the error, how great the price that has to be paid for such fickleness. Blunders are all the more common in this field because the characteristics of population growth and the decline, and the factors involved, manifest themselves but *slowly*.

* The Constitution "The Church Today" n. 87. says: "For in keeping with man's inalienable right to marry and to generate children, a decision concerning the number of children they will have, depends on the right judgment of the parents, and it cannot in anyway be left to the judgment of public authority.

3. Question: How do you define the role of the State in coping with the population problem of the Philippines?

The answer to this question is clearly stated in the statement of the Catholic Bishops published on January 17, 1970, as "supportive."⁴ The

But since the judgment of the parents presupposes a rightly formed conscience it is of the utmost importance that the way be opened for everyone to develop a correct and genuinely human responsibility, which respects the Divine law and takes into consideration the circumstances of the situation and the time. But, sometimes this requires an improvement in education and social condition, and above all formation in religion, or at least a complete moral training.

Men should discreetly be informed furthermore of scientific advances in exploiting methods whereby spouses can be helped in *regulating* the number of of their children, and whose safeness has been ascertained."

In the encyclical "Humanae Vitae" Paul VI expressed the same thought: It is particularly desirable that according to the wish already expressed by Pius XII, medical science succeed in providing a sufficiently secure basis for a *regulation of birth*, founded on the observance of *natural rhythms*" (n. 24). On the licitness of recourse to infecund periods see N. 16, of the same papal document.

⁴ Pope Paul VI, in the "Populorum Progressio" n. 37 answers this same question thus: "It is true that too frequently as accelerated demographic increase adds its own difficulties to the problem of the development: the size of the population increases more rapidly than available resources, and things are found to have reached apparently an impasse. From that moment the temptation is great to check the demographic increase by means of a radical measure. It is certain that public authorities can intervene within the limit of their competence, by favouring the availability of appropriate information and by adopting suitable measures, provided that these be in conformity with the moral laws, and that they respect the rightful freedom of married couples. Where the inalienable right to marriage and procreation is lacking, human dignity has ceased to exist. Finally it is for the parents to decide, with full knowledge of the matter, on the number of their children, taking into account their responsibilities toward God, themselves, the children they have already brought into the world and the community to which they belong. In all this, they must follow the demands of their conscience enlightened by God's law *authentically interpreted*, and sustained by confidence in Him."

A population program must be viewed as an integral part of — rather than as an alternative to — efforts towards social and economic development of the country. It is often stated (*incorrectly*, one may well say) that no effort should be devoted to population planning or to fertility reduction, because such effort would slow up program of industrialization, agricultural development,

earlier statement issued July 4, 1969, categorically justifies the consideration of the demographic factor in long-range national planning and, because adequate national development or its maintenance may require the need for the Government to form a Commission on Population. Then it adds: "It is the competence of the Government to undertake 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; a system of pensions for old age to minimize dependence on children for security; the expansion of recreational facilities; the control of internal migration." The encyclical *Humanae Vitae* itself points out that "public authority can and must contribute to the solution of the demographic problem, not by permitting that, by legal means, "practices contrary to the natural and the divine law be introduced into that fundamental cell, the family, but rather by way of a provident policy for the family, of a wise education of peoples in respect of the moral law and the liberty of citizens." It quotes the encyclical of John XXIII *Mater et Magistra*, which pointed out that no solution to these difficulties is acceptable "which does violence to man's essential dignity."

4. Question: 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 technique are morally objectionable to some?

The state is bound to respect the plan of God as already pointed out in the quotations from the encyclicals *Humanae Vitae* and *Mater et Magistra* and *Populorum Progressio*, in relation to the previous question. In the event that it does make available family planning techniques which are morally objectionable to a sector of the community, but which others of different religious persuasion may consider legitimate, the State may not be held censurable since it is not an arbiter of morals. In prudence, however, the State should not sponsor, through legislation or

health improvement and educational expansion. On the other it is sometimes claimed (equally "falsely") by extreme advocates of family planning, that resources devoted to social and economical development, in the absence of effective birth-limitation or control are completely wasted. It seems reasonable to believe that the ultimate aim of a population program is to accelerate economic development to improve health and nutrition, to increase both the quality and

favorable recommendation, methods morally offensive to the religious standards of the majority of the population.

5. Question: 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?

It is clear from the Hierarchy's reaction to the questionnaire that should such a program be adopted, none are "bound to obey those directive in the program that do violence to their consciences." A leader, or an employee, may, in such a case consider himself a conscientious objector and should refuse to become a part of the program violative of his religious convictions. It would be the duty of the State to respect these objections on moral grounds, and not require leaders or employees to play an active role in such a program. While the purely voluntary nature of participation in such a program has been emphasized, it should also be kept in mind that there are many different ways in which an individual can be made to suffer consequences for his objections on moral grounds. A constant and alert vigilance on the part of all is essential to preserve the true freedom of such a participation.

6. Question: 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?

There are no real fundamental differences of opinion in the Church as manifested in the various responses to *Humanae Vitae* given by various National Conferences of Bishops.⁵ The apparent differences arise from the various ways in which National Hierarchies have interpreted the encyclical's directive expressed in the following terms: "To diminish in no way the saving teaching of Christ constitutes an eminent form of charity for souls. But this must even be accompanied by

the coverage of education, and to help provide more universal, more productive, and more rewarding employment ... a sound population policy and the other elements of a development program are *mutually re-inforcing*.

⁵ As far as we know *Holland is alone in criticizing the encyclical Humanae Vitae*. — Many feel sad it did! — One must point out the text and context in the statements of Bishops of other countries expressing disagreement with the doctrine contained in the Encyclical of July 25, 1968, if any. It isn't a question of "either" the Pope "or" the bishops, but rather "the Pope and the

patience and goodness, such as the Lord Himself gave example of in dealing with men. Having come not to condemn, but to save, He was indeed intransigent with evil, but merciful towards individuals. In any case, the guidelines set down by the Philippine Hierarchy should constitute the authoritative rules for this country, just as the guidelines set forth by another National Hierarchy are authoritative for the faithful of that country. The "differences" usually reflect the special conditions and mores of each national culture, and has not been wondered at in the past, e.g., the rules of fasting and abstinence, etc. It is, to repeat, the Philippine Hierarchy that holds this authority for the Philippines.

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

Rightfully, the question implies recognition of the fact that the encyclical *Humanae Vitae* places certain restrictions on the means of conception control that may be utilized by couples legitimately. *Humanae Vitae* itself exhorts them to "face up to the efforts needed", recognizing as it does the fact that the problems of married life may often be difficult. And to priests, it addresses the admonition to "be the first to give, in the exercise of your ministry, the example of loyal internal and external obedience to the teaching authority of the Church".⁶

bishops" both can and, as far as many of the documents referred to are known to us, *are true*; there is no contradiction.

⁶ The words just quoted from the encyclical "*Humanae Vitae*" n. 28, voice Vatican II teaching (Const. *Lumen gentium*, n. 25). "In matters of faith and morals, the bishops speak in the name of Christ, and the faithful are to accept their teaching and adhere to it with a religious assent of soul. This religious submission of will and of mind must be shown in a special way to the authentic teaching authority of the Roman Pontiff even when he is not speaking of cathedra. That is, it must be shown in such a way that his supreme magisterium is acknowledged with reverence, the judgments made by him are sincerely adhered to, according to his manifest mind and will. His mind and will in the matter maybe known chiefly either from the character, or from his manner of speaking or from a further elucidation on the subject, or and by subsequent statements and declarations. Writes F.S. Sheed: "I have already quoted twice the text of St. Paul Hebrews 5:8-9 although Christ was Son, he learned *obedience* through what he suffered; and being made perfect he became the source of eternal salvation to all who *obey* him."

Unfortunately, there has been considerable dissent and confusion, not entirely unanticipated by the encyclical itself, because individual members of the ministry have expressed views divergent from those of the encyclical, and have done so publicly, advising the faithful to follow their own consciences in questions where "doubt" exists. This is particularly regrettable because as representatives of the Church, they are exercising their ministry as a public function, as representatives of an authority whose views they do not only not reflect, but oftentimes run counter to. Had this situation occurred in the political sphere, it would very probably be followed by serious repercussions.⁷

The problem of the individual conscience in relation to *Humanae Vitae* is discussed extensively in the Pastoral Letter of the Catholic Hierarchy of the Philippines of October 12, 1968. It points out that "refusal to accept (the prohibition contained in the encyclical) is a

Obedience at one end — whether His to His Father, or ours to Him, implies authority at the other and an authority made known to us. How are we to obey Christ, if we do not know what His commands are?

"Even if the New Testament contained all the details of His "Whatever I have commanded you", which it does not and could not — the *words* would not be enough, given the vast variety of meanings men have somehow managed to draw from those we have got. If we had only the words, we would be reduced to following our own best opinion of what He would have wanted and *that is not what obedience means*" (F.J. Sheen, op. c. fr. 97); J. Rickaby, s.j., "The Lord is my Light" pp. 51-65, on "Private Judgment" and "Pope Conscience"; "Private judgment says Rickaby, in our days means no teaching Church, in our Lord's day it meant no teaching Christ. Any day it means no Revelation, that we are to hearken to and accept; and no Faith" (p. 56)

⁷In the words of the foremost Evidence Guild's speaker, "I keep being reminded of the beaming face of the lecturer long ago who told us that we had all begun our existence as polymorphous sexual perverts. "That beam is now part of the Catholic landscape. As I have said, (p. 191) *I find it hard to think of a doctrine I have not heard denied by a priest*" ("Is it the same Church?" pp. 212). "I get the feeling", says Mr. Sheed, "that the Pope isn't infallible, and the Council isn't but half the Catholics I meet, are!"... (p. 6). After all is said and done, instead of "progressing", we are rather "retrogressing" to the XVI century slogan — *private judgment versus Church authority*. "Whither goes Thou Churchman?... (Cfr. NRT, June, 1969).

serious matter of disobedience because by its nature (the encyclical) is an authoritative teaching which commands assent". The letter acknowledges the fact that a man is bound to follow his conscience at all times, as the Vatican Council pointed out in the Constitution on the Church in the Modern World, but stresses, as the conciliar document does, the importance of a correct conscience, particularly in the exercise of parenthood where spouses "must always be governed according to a conscience dutifully conformed to the Divine Law itself, and should be submissive towards the Church's teaching office, which authentically interprets the Law in the light of the Gospel".

Again, sustaining the supremacy of the individual's conscience, the Philippine Bishops do point out nevertheless, that, if abused, "the objective moral order may be totally scrapped", and quote the Vatican Council document on Religious Freedom: "In the formation of their consciences the Christian faithful ought carefully to attend to the sacred and certain doctrine of the Church, the teacher of truth. The Church is, by the will of Christ, the teacher of truth. It is Her duty to give utterance to, and authoritatively to teach, that truth which is Christ Himself, and also to declare and confirm by Her authority those principles of the moral order which have their origin in human nature itself."

As the Pastoral Letter of the Philippine Bishops points out "Any sensible person should have the humility to accept the fact that he can err", and this is particularly significant when large segments of the population lack religious training and adequate education and information to form a well-founded and reasoned judgment of conscience. The fallibility of the individual human conscience is well-known. The great poet and Anglican thinker T.S. Eliot expressed these very fears when his Church changed its position on artificial birth control. He wrote: "I regret... that the Bishops have placed so much reliance on the individual conscience. Certainly, anyone who is sincere and pure in heart, may seek for guidance from the Holy Spirit; but who of us is always sincere, especially where the most imperative of instincts may be strong enough to simulate, to perfection the voice of the Holy Spirit."

No less than the eminent Jesuit theologian Karl Rahner chides confessors who are fond of telling their penitents to follow their own cons-

ciences, with the thought that they are doing so "as if the penitent were not precisely asking, and rightly asking, which of the thousand voices of his conscience is the authentic word of God". And he adds: "When is the voice of God more easy to recognize than when He speaks through the mouth of His Church? It is indeed only when the judgment of conscience coincides with this word that one can be sure of hearing truly the voice of conscience rather than the voice of one's own culpable self-deception."

Rahner reflects: "If we Christians, when faced with a moral decision, really realized that the world is under the Cross on which God himself hung nailed and pierced, that obedience to God's law can also entail man's death, that we may not do evil in order that good may come of it, that it is an error and heresy of this eudemonic modern age, to hold that the morally right thing can never lead to a tragic situation from which in this world there is no way out; if we really realized that as Christians we must expect almost to take for granted that at some time in our life our Christianity will involve us in a situation in which we must either sacrifice everything or lose our soul, that we cannot expect always to avoid a 'heroic' situation, then there would indeed be fewer Christians who think that their situation requires a special ruling which is not so harsh as the laws proclaimed as God's laws by the Church,..."

Karl Rahner elsewhere "Catholic Christians and decent people, we have no right to give a doctrine Church an 'interpretation' of our own that we know has been condemned, or will or would be condemned, by the Magisterium as a perversion of the Faith. The Second Vatican Council recognizes that there can be such a thing as invincible, guiltless error which will make a man dissent from the Church's teaching and yet not cost him his salvation. But on that very account the Church today has less reason than ever to tolerate heterodox teaching within Herself merely so that a heterodox teacher can be 'saved'. So a man, whose consciousness of the truth locks him in irreconcilable opposition to a set doctrine, in fairness to the Catholic community, must have the intellectual honesty and courage to leave the old Church that is "no longer his, not to try to infiltrate it by Modernist methods".

The question of conscience is the thorn in the issue.⁸ It is like that of a man who looks at his watch to tell time, and practical indeed is he. But he would not be wise if every so often, he did not pause to check if this watch is telling him the right time, for if it did fail him, he would be in a void by himself.

(Sgd.) Vicente J.A. Rosales, M.D.

(Sgd.) Fr. Leonardo Legaspi, O.P., S.T.D.

(Sgd.) Felix Estrada, M.D.

(Sgd.) Fr. Francisco del Rio, O.P., S.T.D. S.T. Mag.

(Sgd.) Bienvenido Z. Angeles, M.D.

(Sgd.) Fr. Manuel Piñon, O.P., S.T.D., Ph.D.

(Sgd.) Fr. Francisco Mendoza, O.P., S.T.D.

⁸ It has been rightly observed, that while Vatican Council II speaks most lucidly upon the rights of men, *outside the Church*, to follow their conscience, it has not been found that it discusses the relation of the *Catholic* conscience to her own teachings or commands, if it feels them to be contrary to it. The Church (Catholic) is not one in which every member is his own theologian.

The ultimate objective of the overemphasis on *freedom of conscience* is to render null and void the teaching authority of the Church, of the Pope, and "without the Pope, the Catholic Church would no longer be Catholic..." ("Ecclesiam Suam" n. 114). The biting remarks of Heinrich Weinstock, "that the Westerner who *still* refuses to unmask autonomous and arbitrary freedom for what it is,—a *frightful illusion*—is beyond help" (Cfr. *God on Trial* by G. Siegmund, p. 437). The modern world is largely a Westernized world, "The taproot of all forms of atheism now plaguing this world is *the will to autonomy*. Because self-assertion, and self-creation conflict with a God whose super-abundance includes all freedom, thereby seemingly abrogating all human freedom, *God must go...*" (ib. p. 400). The superman has arrived. God's must go! European atheism means the dethronement of God for the sake of the freedom of man! Characteristic of our day is not envy or hate, which have always been important elements of social existence, but the *joy of hating, hate as a creative power and unifying element*. In 1957, no less than 350 experts on atheistic propaganda from all parts of the Soviet Union were invited to a congress in Moscow. ...

ARCHDIOCESE OF CEBU
P. O. Box 52
Cebu City, Philippines

PRIESTLY CELIBACY

To our Beloved Clergy of the
Ecclesiastical Province of Cebu

Grace and Peace from Christ Jesus:

Last December 24, 1969, the Holy Father said in a letter to Cardinal B. Alfrink and the Hierarchy of Holland: "Whether it is a question of doctrine or of discipline, We are certain, Venerable Brothers, that the best service you can render to your priests and to your faithful at the present time... will be to affirm serenely your total and unreserved accord with the universal Church on the points contested." One of these points he mentions is the question of the celibacy of priests.

Circumstances in our Ecclesiastical Province are of course not identical with those of other countries. But the exhortation of the Holy Father may be applicable to all countries: the best service we the Bishops can render to our priests and to our faithful at the present time is to reaffirm in no uncertain terms our support of the insistence of the Holy Father, among other things, of maintaining the discipline of the Latin Church concerning priestly celibacy.

Our own Hierarchy, in a joint Letter addressed last year to you, the reverend Clergy of our country, invited you to reflect upon the principal reason why the celibacy of priests cannot be abolished in the Latin Church: we priests have to continue our life of total and complete dedication to the service of our Lord and His people.

The Holy Father once more emphasized this reason in his letter to his Cardinal Secretary of State last January when he said: "Are we, who have been called to follow Jesus, incapable of accepting a law

which has been tried and proved by such a long experience? Are we incapable of giving up all, family and nets, to follow Him and bring the Good News of the Savior? (cf. Mk. 1) Who could better transmit, with fullness of grace and force (cf. Acts 6, 8) this liberating message to the people of our times than the pastors who consecrate themselves without reservation and irrevocably to the exclusive service of the Gospel?"

Beloved priests, Holy Week is approaching and with it the commemoration on Holy Thursday of the Last Supper wherein our Lord conferred upon his Apostles the power to consecrate and offer His Body and Blood, the chief function of our cultic priesthood. This is why Holy Thursday is a special day for priests. It is the Priests' Day. It is the day when Christ associated us in a special manner with His eternal priesthood. For it is the day when those most solemn words were uttered: "Do this (do what I have just done) in memory of me."

For this reason We invite you all, dear priests, to set aside this coming Holy Thursday as a more thorough meditation on the meaning of our priesthood. We know that when the Bishop imposed his hands upon us during our ordination ceremonies, he was conferring on us not the "holy and royal priesthood" that St. Peter mentions in his First Epistle, for we already received that in our baptism, but the consecratory priesthood of his Church. We also know that this priesthood and celibacy are not inseparable in themselves, but what better witness can we, his consecratory priests, give to what Jesus calls "the one thing necessary than the renunciation even of the most legitimate of human pleasures and fulfillment, the love of one's own wife and children, for the sake of His service?"

To us, the priests of this Ecclesiastical Province, our pastoral work during the Holy Week cannot fail to remind us of our total dedication to our mission in the Church. The very long hours spent at the confession box, the thousands and thousands of communions we have to distribute, the preparation of our homilies, the processions we have to preside, the liturgical ceremonies at which we have to officiate specially during the Holy Triduum, cannot but make us aware of the fact that for us the whole year is only an extension of Holy Week for it is the Paschal Mystery that has to dominate every moment of our life as we

go through the days from the first day of Advent to the last week after Pentecost. We then realize that in this kind of life there is no place for another exacting office, like that of a husband and father of a family.

We remain celibate because we want to honor our commitment to the special service of God demanded from us by the Church and freely accepted by our own will, at an age when the Church had reasons to presume that we knew what we were doing. We remain celibate because we deny the assertion that no commitment can last the whole lifetime of a man, for we know the life testimony of innumerable priests in the history of the Church who remained faithful to the honor of their celibacy. We remain celibate, not because we have a low regard for the Sacrament of matrimony for we know it to be a holy institution of God, but because, like Jesus, we want to be free from any bond however legitimate, in order to be bound only to Him who begged us to bring his Gospel to every man on earth, an all-absorbing task that would not admit of any sharing with another equally all-absorbing responsibility. We remain celibate because, like Paul VI, we believe "that the link between the priesthood and celibacy, as established for centuries by the Latin Church, constitutes for the Church a supremely precious and irreplaceable good" and we love the Church so much that we do not want to deprive her of this benefit and joy.

Allow Us to reiterate our plea, dearly beloved priests. Renew the consecration of yourself to your priesthood on Holy Thursday. As you make your holy hour before Jesus Christ present in the Repository that day, let everyone pledge once more his fidelity to the promises of his ordination. With a full realization of its implications let everyone pronounce once again the formula of his entrance into clerical life: "The Lord is the portion of my inheritance and of my cup." Let everyone ponder deeply upon the fact that when he made freely the gift of himself to God and His people the day he was ordained, that act of supreme generosity must remain irreversible because the gift was accepted by God and we must never commit the disloyalty of reaching out to retrieve it from His hands in order to give a part of it to the service of wife and children. Let everyone realize that if our people love and respect us, it is because they know that we have no interests other than

the interests of Christ our Savior, that we have no preoccupations other than their welfare and their salvations, that we never work for a better social standing of our family for we have none of our own, but solely to bear witness to the truth of the Gospel.

Let us make this coming Holy Thursday really our Day, the Priests' Day.

Cebu City, March 13, 1970.

(SGD) ✠ JULIO R. CARDINAL ROSALES
Archbishop of Cebu

(SGD) ✠ MANUEL MASCARIÑAS, D.D.
Bishop of Tagbilaran

(SGD) ✠ EPIFANIA B. SURBAN, D.D.
Bishop of Dumaguete

(SGD) ✠ CIPRIANO V. URGEL, D.D.
Bishop of Calbayog

(SGD) ✠ MANUEL S. SALVADOR, D.D.
Bishop of Palo

(SGD) ✠ GODOFREDO P. PEDERNAL, D.D.
Bishop of Borongan

(SGD) ✠ VICENTE T. ATAVIADO, D.D.
Bishop of Maasin

(SGD) ✠ BIENVENIDO TUDTUD, D.D.
Auxiliary Bishop of Dumaguete

LITURGICAL SECTION

THE MASS WE ALWAYS KNEW

The liturgical reform, which the II Vatican Council called for and which His Holiness Pope Paul VI is carrying through, includes simple, almost decorative elements, and solid basic ones. The way the latter are shaped and "laid down" is of "historic" importance for the Church.

One of the main elements in the revision of the rite of the Mass was laid down on March 7, 1965. The second dates from November 30, 1969. On the former occasion the Church as a whole, but simple and humble people more particularly, rediscovered the spoken language and a truer face of the Mass. It became more comprehensible both through its gestures and words. On this second occasion we find that the work of restoration is complete. We see more clearly than ever before with that care and wealth of meaning the Church has always surrounded and safeguarded that most precious commandment received from Jesus: "Do this in commemoration of me." That commemoration is the sacrifice of the altar, the celebration of the Supper of the Lord, the Mass.

A new epoch is beginning in the Church's life. It began with the words which Pope Paul uttered in the Audience of November 19 still echoing in our ears. It is not a new Mass, because nothing essential or genuinely traditional has been altered. In the new rite the Church can without any mistake hear the voice, listen to the words, and see the gestures, watch the "signs" which have been creating a halo of faith, of art, of glory around the Mass for twenty centuries. The voice of today is the voice of yesterday, the voice of always.

A penitential act

The work of reform has been nothing else than a delicate, attentive and respectful labour of "restoration" of the Mass.

Take the beginning of the rite as an example. The Mass used to begin with a psalm said at the foot of the altar in preparation for the "Confession," and that was followed by a number of prayers.

In a low Mass the rite went forward as a dialogue between the priest and the server. The whole congregation seldom responded. In a high or sung Mass, the rite became a dialogue between the celebrant and the ministers. The people remained silent and outside of it.

But should not the whole Christian community take part, devotedly and consciously; should it not go to meet Christ, receive him, be fed by him? If so, why exclude the assembly from that "purification" of spirit before beginning to celebrate that fascinating and tremendous mystery?

The act of penitence which begins the Mass will therefore from now on be always performed, in all Masses, by all present, priest and faithful. And by all together, because all constitute one single family. Each will acknowledge before God and his brethren that he sinned. Each will ask pardon, because we are all poor and little before the Lord, and have need of his mercy.

The Offertory

The "Offertory" is another example. Both the term and the concept are inaccurate. The real offering to God in the Mass is that of the Victim of the Cross, Christ. Christ offers himself to the Father through the sacerdotal ministry for the redemption of the world.

But is there no "offering?" Yes, in a way. There is a *symbolic* offering of the bread and the wine, the fruit of man's labour, that they may become Christ's Body and Blood. But, as regards the rite, nothing is offered. The material of the sacrifice is brought and laid upon the altar. We might therefore more accurately speak of the preparation and deposition of the gifts.

You do not feel convinced about this? Let us look at the description of the Mass in Justin's *Apology*, which belongs to the middle of the 2nd century. "On the Sunday," we read, "those living in town and country gather in a single place. The memorials of the Apostles and the

writing of the Prophets are read . . . Then, when the reader has finished, the president begins to speak, to admonish those present and exhort them to imitate the good lessons which they have just heard. Then we all rise to our feet and raise up prayers, *and the bread and the wine and the water* are brought; the president raises up prayers and thanksgiving as best he may and the people reply: Amen" (*Apology*, I. chap. 66)

A very simple, very meaningful act. The elements of the sacrifice are brought to the president and are placed on the table before the priest. This simple act was "enriched" during the following centuries. It was enlarged, stylized, dramatized: the whole assembly went up to the priest with its offering . . . not just a few ministers of a few of the faithful. The faithful were no longer content to place them on the altar; they took to putting them in the priest's hands and at the same time uttering words of homage and augury: "Suscipe, pater; offerimus, pater . . ." Then they stated the intentions of the offerings: "In honorem SS. Trinitatis, in honorem SS. Petri et Pauli . . . pro negligentiis meis, pro peccatis meis, pro fidelibus defunctis, pro mundi salute."

The liturgical *Summae* of the middle ages are full of formulas, lists of intentions and prayers of this kind. St. Pius V drew some bounds, but left the pattern of the "offertory" as celebrated at Rome essentially unaltered.

New things are old

Even the least erudite of students knows that logic was not always respected in that jumble of formulas; nor was the essential always saved, the text always made comprehensible. The reformer therefore approaches it with a skilled hand, as a restorer approaches a venerable fresco. He gently removes the incrustations and "refreshes" the original. He will not hesitate to insert some fresh "piece" where devotion had too boldly applied formulas which were out of place and detrimental to the work as a whole.

This was the case with the two prayers for the deposition of the offerings. Are these really new formulas? Not substantially. If we consult the *Didache*, which belongs to the first century, and reread the prayers in chapters 9 and 10, we already hear the sound of our own

Ordo Missae: "Blessed be thou, O Lord, God of the universe, from whose goodness we have received this bread (this wine), the fruit of the earth and of our labour. We present it to thee, so that it may become food of eternal life for us."

Fruit of the earth and of our labour: just as in the whole world today. Our shaken and weary world, the whole world of labour in this consumer society, this welfare state, struggling violently in breathless search for a human way of living, is brought into Christ's mystery by the Church, that all may be consummated "in one," and learn from Christ how human works are sanctifying and redemptive.

The "offertory" has been given back its real meaning. The new formulas will speak with as much sweetness and tenderness, but with greater spiritual incisiveness, if the celebrant has gone to the trouble of preparing the people, and takes care to recite the new formulas with as much piety as the old ones required, but with more calm, more meaningfulness, more priestly expressiveness. We may then say farewell without regret to the dear and venerable formulas. The Church now puts them back in her treasury of new and old ways of speaking to God.

The "sign" of peace

As regard that part of the Mass which comes before the Communion, scholars are agreed that in old rite it was a typical example of incomprehensible stratification of heterogeneous elements belonging to various periods. Duchesne, Batiffol, Callewaert, Capelle, Righetti, Jungmann — to mention only a few names — repeatedly proposed giving a logical order to the whole sector lying between the *Oratio dominica* and the communion. This has now been done. Account has been taken of tradition and of pastoral needs; guidance has been sought from masters of liturgical science, some of whom were personally involved in the work of shaping the new rite.

So, after the embolism of the *Pater*, there now comes an eschatological reference such as was formerly lacking in the Roman Missal. And the ancient acclamation, so dear to the early Christians: "For thine is the kingdom, the power and glory for ever and ever" (cf. *Didache* 9 & 10), has been replaced after the Our Father.

The "sign" of peace has now regained its full place. Its full spiritual significance ought to come back with it. After he has recited the prayer, "Lord Jesus Christ..." aloud, the priest asks all to show peace to each other, because we cannot go peacefully to Jesus while we have something in our heart against our brethren. We ought therefore first be reconciled with our brother. If we have nothing against him, we can show our charity by the "sign" of peace: the sign that we are Christian.

How new this will seem to many people! How old it really is! How much in the spirit of the Gospel! Before meeting Christ in the host, every Christian meets him in the eyes and in the embrace of his neighbour!

The last great reform

It is for the Episcopal Conference to decide how the "kiss of peace" may be given. There have been a few experiments already here and there. With a little patience and progress in liturgical feeling, this *pretiosa margarita*, lost for centuries, but now found again, will be properly incorporated and understood by the faithful. It will give congregations a more intense and more lively sense of fraternal joy.

The Mass is therefore still the Mass of all the centuries that have gone before us: it is the Mass of always. There is no "Tridentine Mass" and no "Vatican Mass." The Church of today is the same Church as in the sixteenth century. The Holy Spirit guided the Church then as it does today. In his light the Fathers at Trent drew up and approved the Doctrine and the Canons of Session XXII, under Paul IV in 1562. Again in his light, the Fathers of the II Vatican Council gave approval to the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy of December 4, 1963, and Paul VI promulgated the Apostolic Constitution *Missale Romanum*, on Holy Thursday, "*In Cena Domini*," April 2, 1969. There has been no break no deviation, no change of substance. There is continuity and pastoral care for wise change.

Instructions

The *Ordo* is accompanied by an *Institutio generalis*, which sets out norms for the celebration of the rite. It too is the work of experts and

pastors chosen from "various parts of the world" (Liturgical Constitution, Art. 25), in conformity with what the Council desired.

The *Institutio* faithfully summarizes and applies the doctrinal principles and practical rules concerning the worship of the Eucharistic mystery, contained in the council's Constitution On the Sacred Liturgy (Dec. 4, 1963), in Pope Paul VI's Encyclical *Mysterium fidei* (Sept., 3, 1965), and in the Instruction *Eucharisticum mysterium* (May 25, 1967).

Is it necessary to point out that the *Institutio* is not doctrinal or dogmatic document? It is a ritual and pastoral instruction, in which celebration of the several parts of the rite of the Mass is described, naturally not without some reference to doctrinal principles contained in the documents just mentioned. The rite issues from the doctrine and demonstrates it.

The *Institutio* therefore outlines the catechesis which ought to be imparted to the people, together with the principal norms for celebration of the Eucharist which will be needed by those who take part in one degree or another.

• A. Bugnini

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 experience that have failed yesterday.

● **JESUS MA. CAVANNA, C.M.**
(Continued)

VIII *Epilogue*

The aim of the study made in the previous chapters was not indeed to preclude sound reforms towards an opportune and prudent "openness" of our Seminaries to the world, so as to provide the young candidates to the Priesthood with a useful and salutary knowledge of the world they are called to save. But we are definitely opposed to certain experiments undertaken commonly under the guise of "aggiornamento" and renewal, which seem to ignore or disparage the lessons of history and of the Church Magisterium. Such experiments are surely doomed to failure, and what is worse, they will certainly cause incalculable harm to the clergy and the faithful. It is our belief that the sinister mistake of these experiments will become glaringly evident in a near future. Then, we will have to retrace our steps and try to regain the wisdom of past lessons, but it will be too late to repair the damage already done to the Church. We consider it our duty to spare her the distress portended by such ill-fated experiments. That is why I dwelt minutely on this subject of *mixed priestly training*.

At the end of this study there seems nothing more opportune than to quote here the most recent and authoritative reflections on the matter discussed, made by Cardinal Pericle Felici, Secretary of the Vatican

II Central Postconciliar Commission, and the Holy Father Pope Paul VI. Nowhere can be found better expressed what we all should keep in mind about this momentous subject.

Vatican Radio faced this delicate problem, especially in what concerns authentic "openness" to the world of which so much is said today: it organized a symposium at the beginning of the year 1967. L'OSSERVATORE ROMANO in its issue of February 9 of the same year published the reflections of Cardinal FELICI on the matter. We translate from the original Italian text:

"It seems to me logical that the priest, who is a man and not an angel, and who has to exercise his ministry among men, should be educated in such a way that he may know fittingly the world and men with their individual and collective problems, with their virtues and vices.

"But the problem is not here: it is in the measure and manner in which that 'openness' to the world must be carried out.

"The world, in reality, is not only that fair creature that came from the hands of God. It is also the world of sin, that refuses to acknowledge Christ, and for which Christ does not pray. On the other hand, the young seminarian, notwithstanding all his good will cannot remain insensible to, or immune from, the snares of evil. We should not forget that the *exceptional* nature of the priestly vocation, ministry and commitment does not allow to place in the same level those called to the priesthood and those who are not.

"For this reason it is difficult to give norms of 'openness' to the world, which may be valid for all, for all times and for all peoples.

"But I ask myself: Is this after all the most important problem in the formation of seminarians?

"I do not believe that the dearth of vocations or lack of perseverance among some priest, even among the young, should be attributed precisely to the insufficient 'openness' of the Seminaries of yesterday towards the world, or to the question of the cassock which could alienate or isolate the seminarians from the rest of men. I would rather say that MANY VOCATIONS ARE LOST OR DASH UPON THE

ROCKS, JUST BECAUSE OF IMPRUDENT CONTACT WITH THE WORLD, OR BECAUSE OF THE INTENT TO 'SECULARIZE' OR LAICIZE' PRIESTLY LIFE AND MINISTRY.

"I would be more concerned with the intellectual, *moral and spiritual formation* of the Seminarian. I would give him the best superiors and professors, capable of guiding him in the difficult path that leads to the priesthood and of training him with prudence, love and open spirit; directors who could dialogue with him, without paternalism but with kindly authority that comes from one who feels to be a father in the name of the Lord; one who can accept whatever good may come from the mind, heart or experience, however short but intensely lived, of the young seminarian. This, on his part, should study his vocation, and give to the work of his formation that authenticity which finds its highest expression in the imitation of that Christ who was humble, obedient, long-suffering, pure and burning with charity.

"About charity, which is the sum and substance of priestly life and ministry, most strange ideas are sometimes heard. Under the pretext of exercising a sort of charity understood in an absolutely subjective sense, some people undervalue and openly disregard the other virtues.

"Perhaps it is timely to recall that Christ showed his great love towards God and towards men by doing the Will of the Father, and by suffering and dying for mankind; and the precept of love, being the first and greatest commandment of the Lord, constitutes the acme of perfection, which one cannot reach without climbing patiently and perseveringly the flight of steps which are the other commandments. In each one of them, as in the everyday acts of self-denial to keep oneself away from sin, there is alive and operative an act of love.

"But let us go back to the question of 'openness'. With a spiritual training thus well established, I am of the opinion that the seminarian maintain contacts with his own family, especially during vacations. The fourth commandment does not vanish at the threshold of the Seminary: rather it is ennobled and rendered sublime in the Seminary.

"I also welcome the forms of apostolate which we might call of experiment or initiation, for instance, in the parishes, under the pastor's

guidance. Likewise I approved other timely contacts approved by the Superiors.

"There can be no doubt that seminarians must be wisely trained in the use of modern mass media of communication which are so important in the apostolate. But let us bear in mind that *use* is not the same as *abuse*.

"An 'openness' that is *sound, moderate, PRUDENT* and therefore *GRADUAL* will help the seminarian solve certain delicate spiritual problems, as that of personal affectivity, which must be however brought up in harmony with the ideals of a total dedication to the Lord and to the Church, with a full understanding of whatever is not permitted in the Priesthood, however good and holy it may be in other states of life.

"Let us not think that such grave and hazardous problems that venture the whole life of a priest may find simply their solution in this overrated 'openness' to the world. There is ANOTHER 'OPENNESS', MUCH MORE IMPORTANT, WHICH WE OUGHT TO DEVELOP: 'OPENNESS' TO GOD, from Whom comes all grace, strength and blessing. With His help, the seminarian will become the '*homo Dei*'-the man of God — and only in His Name shall he be able to open a heart big enough to embrace all men as brothers."

Here end the wise remarks of His Eminence Cardinal Pericle Felici. Let us listen now the words of the Vicar of Christ. Pope Paul VI in his usual Lenten Address to the clergy of Rome on 17 February 1969 offers us most relevant considerations and warnings about the ambiguously vaunted "openness" to the world:²⁰

"In the first place we must recall some dynamic ideas, which are travelling through the whole Church today, and which are upsetting ecclesiastics particularly. The first of these ideas concerns the figure of the priest. He is nearly always considered from the outside, in his sociological position, in the framework of contemporary society, which as everyone knows, is completely in movement, completely in transformation.

²⁰ Original Italian text in L'OSSERVATORE ROMANO, 17-18 February issue of 1969. English translation in the English edition of the same L'OSSERVATORE ROMANO, 27 February 1969. Cf. CHRIST TO THE WORLD, 1969 Vol. XIV — No. 3, pp. 186-192.

"The priest, remaining in his place, has seen himself *abandoned by his traditional community*; in many places there is emptiness around him; in others the pastoral clientele has changed; *it is difficult to approach them*, difficult to understand them, difficult to interest them in religious matters, difficult to reassemble them in a friendly, faithful, praying community.

"The priest, then, has begun to ask himself what he is doing in a world so different from the world he used to assist. Who is listening to him? *And how can he make himself heard?*...

"And then the new dynamic idea came to him: he must do something: he must *do his utmost to draw near to the people again, to understand them, evangelize them*. The idea, in itself, is an excellent one; and we have seen it germinate from the charity in the desolate heart of the priest, who felt excluded from the world in which he should have been the central figure, the teacher and pastor...

"The incongruity and the suffering of this fate have become intolerable. The priest has sought inspiration and energy in the depth and essence of his vocation. We must move, he said, and take up the 'mission' again; and he *sometimes* said so **TO THE DETRIMENT EVEN OF THE CELEBRATION OF DIVINE WORSHIP AND THE NORMAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS.**

"The idea, We say, is excellent and the sign of a noble priestly conscience. *The priest is not for himself, he is for others; the priest must go in pursuit of men to turn them into faithful*, and not just wait for men to come to him; if his church is empty, he will have to "go out into the streets and lanes of the city" in search of poor people... This apostolic urgency is weighing on the hearts of so many priest, whose churches have become deserted. And when it is so, how can we fail to admire them? How can we fail to support them?

"But **LET US BE CAREFUL**, keeping in mind the experimental and positive character of the apostolate. In the first place: **IT IS NOT ALWAYS LIKE THIS.** *There are still communities of faithful overflowing with people and EAGER FOR NORMAL OBSERVANCE*: why should we leave them? why *change the method of ministry* for them, when the latter is *still authentic, valid and magnificently*

fruitful? Would we not be wronging the fidelity of so many good Christians to embark on adventures the outcome of which is uncertain?

"WE MUST BE CAREFUL. *The need, nay the duty, of an efficacious mission inserted in the reality of social life may produce other drawbacks, such as that of DEPRECIATING THE SACRAMENTAL AND LITURGICAL MINISTRY, as if it were a curb and an obstacle as regards the direct evangelization of the modern world; or the attempt, rather widespread today, to MAKE THE PRIEST A MAN LIKE ANY OTHER, in dress, in secular profession, in going to places of entertainment, in WORLDLY EXPERIENCE, in social and political commitment, in the formation of a family of his own WITH RENUNCIATION OF HOLY CELIBACY.* People say this is an attempt TO INTEGRATE THE PRIEST INTO SOCIETY.

"Is this the way to understand the masterly word of Jesus, *Who wants us IN THE WORLD, BUT NOT OF THE WORLD?* Did He not call and choose His disciples, those who were to extend and continue the announcement of the kingdom of God, DISTINGUISHING THEM, IN FACT SEPARATING THEM FROM THE ORDINARY WAY OF LIFE, and asking them to LEAVE EVERYTHING TO FOLLOW HIM ALONE?

"*The whole Gospel speaks of this qualification, this "SPECIALIZATION" of the disciples who were afterwards to act as apostles. JESUS TOOK THEM AWAY, not without their radical sacrifice, from their everyday occupations, from their sacrosanct affections; and He wished them to be dedicated to Himself WITH THE COMPLETE GIFT OF THEMSELVES, COMMITTING THEMSELVES FOR EVER, and although this response was to be free and spontaneous, He expected it to be one of TOTAL RENUNCIATION AND HEROIC IMMOLATION.* Let us listen again to the list of what we must relinquish *from the lips of Jesus Himself: EVERYONE WHO HAS LEFT HOUSES, BROTHERS, SISTERS, FATHER, MOTHER, CHILDREN OR LAND FOR THE SAKE OF MY NAME...*" (Matth. 19, 29). And the disciples were aware of this personal and paradoxical condition of theirs; Peter says: "WE HAVE LEFT EVERYTHING AND FOLLOWED YOU" (Ib. 27)

"Can the disciple, the apostle, THE PRIEST, THE AUTHENTIC MINISTER OF THE GOSPEL BE A MAN SOCIALLY LIKE OTHER MEN? He can indeed be poor, like others, a brother, for others; a servant, of others; a victim, for others; but *at the same time* HE IS ENDOWED WITH A LOFTY AND VERY SPECIAL FUNCTION. *"You are the salt of the earth... You are light of the world"*! And it is clear, if we have the concept of the organic composition of the body of the Church. St. Paul could not be more explicit in this connection... *"Nor is the body to be identified with any one of its many parts... If all the parts were the same, how could it be a body? As it is, the parts are many but the body is one..."* (I Cor. 12, 14-21 ss.)

"The diversity of functions is a constitutional principle in the Church of God; and IT CONCERNS FIRSTLY THE MINISTERIAL PRIESTHOOD. Let us take care NOT TO LOSE THIS SPECIFIC FUNCTION OUT OF A MISTAKEN INTENTION OF ASSIMILATION, OF "DEMOCRATIZATION" as is said today, in the society around us: *"IF SALT LOSES ITS TASTE, WHAT IS THERE LEFT TO GIVE TASTE TO IT? THERE IS NO MORE TO BE DONE WITH IT, BUT THROW IT OUT OF DOORS FOR MEN TO THREAD IT UNDER FOOT."* (Mt. 5, 13)

"These are the words of the Lord, which must make us reflect on the discernment necessary in the application of the formula quoted: TO BE IN THE WORLD, BUT NOT OF THE WORLD. The lack of this discernment, of which ECCLESIASTICAL EDUCATION, ASCETIC TRADITION, CANON LAW HAVE SPOKEN TO US SO MUCH, may lead to just the opposite effect from the one we had hoped to obtain when we imprudently abandoned it: effectiveness, renewal, modernity. IN THIS WAY, IN FACT, THE EFFICACY OF THE PRIEST'S PRESENCE AND ACTION IN THE WORLD MAY BE WIPED OUT: that very efficacy which we hoped to obtain when we imprudently reacted to the separation of the priest from the rest of society. WIPED OUT: IN THE ESTEEM AND CONFIDENCE OF THE PEOPLE, and by the practical necessity of dedicating to secular occupations and human affections: time, heart,

freedom, superiority of spirit (cfr. I Cor. 2, 15), which SHOULD HAVE BEEN KEPT FOR THE PRIESTLY MINISTRY.

"We repeat, venerated and beloved brothers, WE MUST BE CAREFUL. THIS DESIRE TO INSERT THE PRIEST IN THE SOCIAL SETTING in which his life and his ministry take place, IS GOOD IN ITSELF, but *from being a generous intention to emerge from the shell of a crystallized and privileged condition*, IT MAY BECOME A GRAVE ERROR WHICH MAY PARALYZE THE PRIESTLY VOCATION *in its most intimate, its most charismatic, its most fruitful aspects*; and IT MAY SUDDENLY DEMOLISH THE EDIFICE OF PASTORAL FUNCTIONALITY.

"As IT MAY ALSO EXPOSE GOOD PRIESTS, YOUNG ONES PARTICULARLY, TO THE INFLUENCES OF THE MOST QUESTIONABLE AND DANGEROUS MOVEMENTS OF THOUGHT FASHIONABLE IN THE WORLD, IT MAY THEREFORE MAKE THEM VULNERABLE FROM THE OUTSIDE AND EXPOSE THEM TO SUPINE ACCEPTANCE OF OTHER PEOPLE'S IDEAS AT THEIR FACE VALUE. *Ideological and practical GREGARIOUSNESS has become contagious*. In a serious report on the events of last May in French university circles, we could read, for example: "It has also been pointed out that *certain student chaplains were impregnated with Maoist thought*."

"WE MUST BE CAREFUL. Another dynamic idea, which is also basically praiseworthy but *often intemperate in its formulation and explosive in its application to problems*, is that of the so-called 'structures' . . . People would like to change the structures, and many of them, when they say this, are thinking of *the vexation of authority in the Church*. They wish to abolish it, and they cannot; they wish to trace its source to the community; and they are violating a constitutional character of the Church, which Christ willed to be apostolic; they wish it to be service, and this is all right provided it is the rightful service of the pastoral authority; they wish to ignore it, but how can a Christianity remain authentic WITHOUT A MAGISTERIUM, *without a ministry*, without the unity and authority derived from Christ? (cfr. Gal. 1, 8-9; 2 Cor. 1, 24; 2 Cor. 10, 5; etc.; St. Ignatius of A., to the Magnesii, c. IV).

(to be continued)

PASTORAL SECTION

HOMILETICS

• **Fernando Yusingco, C.SS.R.**

5th Sunday after Easter (May 3)

EGOISM

Someone wrote these lines, "When the only really important thing in the world is ME — the world is too small to live in." It sounds so self-evident a truth; so simple. We may miss just why it is so true. Really, when our whole striving, acting, doing, wishing are within ourselves, we get locked up within our own world. And that world is a small world because it is only one person's world — ME. It is living in isolation though physically we meet and talk with people. Yet those people count for nothing because they are not really important. They are things for us. I am important — nobody else.

In isolation we are the only ones important. Until we discover that other people's misery, other people's pain, other people's happiness, other people's joys mean something to us, then we stay our own prisoners in the prison of our selfishness. When we say, "Who cares? So what? I don't see why? I don't have time. He does not fit with us. She dresses funny. They talk queer. They are lazy. They are pathetic." We build walls of isolation. And these walls of self-isolation manifest themselves in actually physical walls that we see everywhere. Selfishness is the creator of isolation. Love, the kind of love that is centered on others, is the creator of smiles and tears, anger and frustration, of pain and joy. Love creates real living.

That is why a wife is not a wife who says, "How much can I neglect my husband before he gets angry." No wife who really loves takes that

attitude. Of course, no wife really and consciously says that to herself. But she could just love to keep playing mahjong till she becomes a can opener instead of a cook, or until the maid does all the functions of a housewife except that of sex.

That is why a landowner is not a Christian, or a businessman for that matter, who says, "How far can I save on my workers' salaries, or how much can I gain on my tenants' share before they cry out loud." Of course, again, no landowner or businessman says that outright even to himself. He does throw in an occasional morsel at Christmas time or on his birthday to keep his tenants or workers contented. It is like giving a rubber nipple to a crying baby. The poor baby sucks in nothing really but air.

We are very sure you agree with the first example or statement, "A wife is no wife who says, 'How much can I neglect my husband before he gets angry.'" But we do unreservedly agree with the second statement, "a landowner or a business man is not a Christian who says, 'How far can I save on my workers' salaries or how much can I gain on my tenants' share before they cry out.'" Well! Let us be honest with ourselves at least. How many businessmen now pay a just wage to their workers, fulfill the law? Do not say you cannot afford it. If you cannot afford it. If you cannot afford, why — is it due to lack of management skill? Or would it mean less profit for yourself. How many here do fulfill the law on tenancy — give a just share to tenants — 70-30 in favor of tenants with expenses shared. Is there anyone here who has agreed to the leasehold system — the rental system?

Really, let us be honest for a change. Why do we agree with the first statement — "A wife is no wife who says how much can I neglect my husband before he gets angry." But why do we not unreservedly agree with the second — "No landowner or businessman is a Christian who says, 'How far can I save on my workers' salaries or how much can I gain on my tenants, share before they cry out.'" Perhaps it is because "the only really important thing in the world is ME." So, everything that I can get for myself is alright.

Now just compare that "Me Only" attitude with Christ's words I have just read in this Sunday's gospel, listen — "This is my Commandment;

love one another as I have loved you." And how did Christ love you? "A man can have no greater love than to lay down his life for his friends."

Well, what think you?

Ascension Day (May 10)

HUMAN DIGNITY

I just came across this question — "If there has been a decline of decency in the modern world and a revolt against law and fair dealing, it is precisely because of the decline in the belief in each man as something precious."

For each one of us to know our worth and value, and the worth and value of each human being is the first and indispensable foundation of love for others. This is the essential attitude of any Christian loving and action. This is attitude summed in the Psalm: "You have made him little less than the angels and crowned him with glory and honor." Man is little less than the angels. Man is crowned with glory and honor. It is precisely because man is not treated as a man but as a thing to be used for profit and pleasure that injustices flourishes. Take the case of the worker — he must realize his work — the worth of his work; he must give his utmost in his work. He must be no man's slave. He must be worthy of respect. There must be no slipshod, hap-hazard work that is unworthy of him. But his employer must also realize the worth of his worker. He must give him the wages that will allow him to live as man who is little less than the angels — who is crowned with glory and honor. A good many employers think that their workers are angels — pure spirits that need no food, nor drink. Man has a body to feed and clothe.

Our Lord has respect for us man. He gave us the earth to live in and to live by. He gave us the respect due to us men by leaving us alone to live by the truths he left us. He ascended back to heaven and left us because he has faith in man that we would treat each other as human beings — as He treated us.

If the landowner gives to his tenants what is due to him as a human being — his rights as one — such rights as to a decent human life — the right to a just compensation for his labor. And his labor should earn a decent living also for his family. If the landowner believes as a Christian should believe — that his tenants are men — human beings — little less than the angels — crowned with glory and honor, then he, the landowner, will not hesitate to give him the lease of the land the tenants till.

Once again, I risk being obviously obvious — we need our landowner and employer people to treat our worker — farmer people as people, as human beings. This attitude of giving VIP treatment to all people cannot be just tuned on and off like an electric current. It must be sincere and constant and towards all.

Pentecost Sunday (May 17)

CHRISTIAN REVOLUTION

When the first Pentecost Sunday came things were never the same again, certainly not for a small group of Christians. The small group of Christians headed by the Apostles appointed by Christ was a revolutionary group. They were in revolt against the Roman Empire and its values. They were in revolt against Judaism and its values. They were preaching the revolution of love. They were for change. They instituted the change, they formed a community of prayer and common possession of earthly goods. They distributed their tasks according to each one's abilities. Everyone shared in the goods that each received. That community grew, that community was persecuted. The community was baptized in blood and suffering. Today, if we look around, we still find such Christian communities existing in various parts of the world.

But here in the Philippines Christianity, as Karl Marx often said, has become the opium of the people. We have picked and chosen the Christian principles we would like to adapt and to practise. We pick and choose principles that do not create a revolutionary community, a community for change towards hope and love. That's why we can see a Christian taking refuge in the external rites of the Church and not heed the message which the external rites symbolizes. We can see a Christian go

give respect, then we would get respect. It will mean that we will abhor any "utang na loob" relationship. No doubt this relationship as part of the relationship and not abuse it, or capitalize on it, then it is kept in its place. There is Christian humility also, true Christian love because we do not seek ourselves but we seek the other. In today's Gospel Christ said to us: Go therefore, make disciples of all nations. He says: "Go to people, go baptize them, go teach them." In other words to open out, go to people, to persons and make them disciples of the God of love, by being yourself the agents of love. And it must be love not based on a respectful attitude, a respect for the human person in everyone, yes, in all and each one.

Corpus Christi Sunday (May 31)

GIFT OF SELF

Last Christmas I sent a card. It is homemade card which says: "this is my best Christmas gift to you — ME."

Yes, the first Christmas gift was precisely that. The first Christmas gift was the giver Himself. God gave Himself to us in human form that is acceptable and visible to us. When He went back home to his father, he still gave us Himself. He said to us; "Take this, it is my Body, drink this, This is my Blood." His Body, his Blood he gives to us, Himself, in the form of food, food for ourself, food to be digested and to become one within us. We use things to express the giving of ourselves to others, hence gifts, things but there must be the giving of ourselves. So often we have people in business, people who own land, who give out, who dole out gift to the tenants to the employees but to them these gifts, are meaningless because they don't give of themselves, their gifts only tie down their people, their tenants and their employees, to themselves. Often, we have heard these words coming from business people and land-owners and others; "Sure, I know what they are like, good for nothing, always wanting to have everything done for them, this I know what they are like, they are opportunists." Once we talked like that, then we eliminate any possibility of discovering who they are, we eliminate the possibility of being friends, we eliminate dialogue. A solution to a social problem is certainly this: to start to think of people as who, and not as what, as persons not as things, not as votes, not as savings on expenses, not

as sources of cheap labors. The first step is to go to them, not to do things for them but to be someone to them, as friends, then we will find out that they are just people looking for security, looking for joy.

This suggests very strongly, not only suggests but whatever authority we can invoke, we command the landowners, our business owners those with money and power to do just that for a change, to be someone, not somebody, not some tin God to those under them. Then if they try to be someone their heart will be open and consequently the minds will be open then we can bridge the social gap, made friends, we cannot be unjust to them, we will seek only their good, their good is our good, Why? because they have become our friends. Relationship is personalized — is not just anymore boss and worker, landlord and tenants, rich and poor, we know who they are not just what they are. Then, all landowners, then all employers will begin to live, really live, real life.

Perhaps this quotation can be useful for a little bit of deep thinking for all of us: "Life is the constant, painfilled cry of every human being to be heard, to be noticed and loved. Joy is the rare moments when the cry breaks through and someone momentarily hears it." All along the streets all in our land, the barrios and the slums, life is certainly the constant pain-filled cry of farther away. The cry to be secure, to be free, to leave as decent human beings, to have future for themselves, for their children, those who have the power to change this painfilled cry into joy have not listened to them in a deeper level. Yes, those who have the power to change this cry of pain to joy, you who have plenty, you who have the power, you who own big land, you have not listened to a very fundamental need of a human being, to be totally secured in their own home, to own a kingdom on earth called a home, to look up across the horizons and see there the visions of their sons and daughters lifted from the mire of poverty. On the contrary, they have only heard great filled selfish cry of power, power, power and more power. But then their cry of pain, of frustration would challenge their cry for power with an equally powerful cry for justice, social justice. Remember this, when you come to the communion rail we are related to Christ in a personal way, we accept Him, His body, His blood. We must also accept our neighbor, everyone, our tenants, our workers, his body, his blood, his person and let him live as a human being.

Constitutional Convention

Sermons*

OUR CONSTITUTION

There was a prominent layman, a lawyer who felt very deeply about the *constitutional convention*. He felt very deeply about the new *constitution*. He spoke about this very often, at all occasions in the community: to the rotarians, to the K of C, to the Jaycees, to other parish organizations. He spoke about it passionately wherever he was a guest speaker.

He was earnest, sincere, eloquent, and he made a deep impression everywhere... until he got to his housemaid. The housemaid was serving him at table. "Inday" he said, "you must be *interested* in this new *constitution*! You must be *involved*. You must work so that we will have an honest election for the constitutional Convention."

Inday said: "Why?"

The lawyer choked. "Why?" he said. "Why? Because we *need* a new *constitution*!"

Inday was quiet. She thought about it. Then she mustered her courage, and said to the lawyer: "But Sir, in my humble opinion we already *have* a constitution!"

The lawyer grew red in the face. "Of course, we already have a constitution!" he roared. "But we have to *change* it!"

Inday said: "Why? ... Why change? The constitution we have already — very good! Given to us by the Americans! Stateside! Blue seal!"

* (These 10-minute talks are prepared for delivery in all churches and chapels on the Sundays indicated. They can be given before, during or after the Mass by a priest or a layman. They are composed on request of the Hierarchy by representatives of the Major Superiors of the Philippines and the Philippine Priests, Inc., under the auspices of the Episcopal Committee on the Constitutional Convention.)

The lawyer stood up and advanced on the housemaid. "A constitution can not be given to us by somebody else!" he roared. It has to be ours! We must make it ourselves!"

The housemaid was backing up against the wall, frightened, but she said: "Why must we make it ourselves? Shoes — best when they are Stateside. Cigarettes best when they are blue seal. Our constitution — blue seal, already."

The lawyer was so angry that he could not talk anymore, and he stormed out of the room. The mistress took the trembling housemaid into the kitchen. "Inday!" she said, "Do not argue! Just look up at the moon, and say yes!"

This is our real task over the next few months: to convince our people — our simple, honest, lovable people — down to the last housemaid — that we need a constitution which is all our own.

The Constitution which we have now is excellent, brilliantly and beautifully composed by good men — but it was written at a time when our new nation was striving with all its power to be like the United States. Our constitution was modeled on the constitution of the United States.

It was a splendid model. Perhaps the finest model in the world.

But it was not our own.

We are a poor people — not only in the wealth of the earth, but even in the wealth of the spirit. We have no Shakespeare, as England has. We have no Goethe, like the Germans. We have no Michaelangelo, like the Italians. No one has ever expressed in the written word, or even in marble or on canvass, what is most ourselves, most our own.

Even our language is borrowed, very often, from somebody else.

But we *do have a personality!* We are *unique* among the nations of the world! We *are* the only Christian country in the Orient! We *are* the outpost of democracy in the Far East! We *do have ideas and ideals.* We *do have* our own way of doing things. We have our own way of *feeling*, our own way of *expressing* what we feel. We *do love*

our own land, and our people, and our children, in a way that is all our own.

The Constitution should reflect this. The basic law of the land, upon which all our institutions will be built, should be *Filipino!* It should be *Christian*, and *democratic*, and *Filipino!*

The Constitution should be... *our own!*

Take one instance of what I mean: our educational system. Our present constitution, with sweeping phrases, included in its composition a system of the American colonial government of the Philippines. The system might have been valid for American school children, in the United States, but it was *not valid here!*

We copied it.

We included it because it was Stateside, blue seal.

But it does not fit *us!* It does not fit our children!

We are a Christian country. We love our children, and we want our children to love God. We want them to *know God*. We cannot be content with a textbook on manners, which was written in Brooklyn. We really want much more for our children.

The Constitution should reflect us, as we are, and our children, as they are. We say the Angelus in the morning; we say grace before meals; we believe in God — and this belief should be part of the classroom, because it is part of our life!

And so it is with many other things. The time has come for us, the quiet people, to speak!

The time has come for us, the gentle people, to be strong.

The time has come for us to write our own laws — and this is what we will do in the constitutional convention.

What the lawyer said to Inday was true! We must be *interested!* We *must* be *involved!* Precisely because we want to express the heart of the Filipino in the fundamental law of the land.

This new constitution must be *ours!*

CHANGE OF HEART

The students are marching.

Restlessly.

They are storming Malacañang, protesting in the plazas, carrying placards in the streets, demonstrating in front of the palaces of Bishops, crying out — everywhere — for change.

The constitutional convention will try to change the *law*... but the real change in the country must be deeper than that. It must be a change of *heart*.

There must be a redistribution of *wealth*, a sharing of property, a sharing of what we have. We must change our economic structure, so that the poor can earn more, and own more, and live in a way that is more *human*.

We must change our political structure, so that all power does not belong to the rich; so that a poor man's voice can be heard; so that elections will be determined by *merit*, and not by money.

But this is not enough. To change the law, to change our economics, even to change our *politics* — this will be sound and fury, signifying nothing, unless we also change our hearts. The law, economics, wealth, politics — these are like *robes*, which can be rich and royal, or ragged and poor. But it is not the clothing that counts. It is not the royal robes that make a king. It is the man!

A king would still be a king, even if he were dressed like a beggar.

And a nation can be great, even if it is dressed in rags. Without industry, without gold, even without written laws, a people could be a royal nation. Nobility is in the soul.

And this is what the students are crying for — a change that is real! A change that is *internal*! A change in the *spirit*! A change of heart!

And the new constitutional convention hopes to embody that spirit in the basic law of the land.

Let us take only *one example*, of a change in our country. Let us take that what is *needed is honesty*.

If a mature man in Manila — let us say a *business man*, 43 years old, with a wife and children — if he is stopped in the street by a policeman, in the morning, when he is driving to work in his car... what does he do? He gives the policemen two pesos.

His reason is very *practical*. He says: "I was doing no wrong. I was not speeding. I was not violating any law. He has no right to stop me. But if I do *not* give him two pesos, I'll be late for *work*! He'll keep me here all day! It is like a gangster putting a gun in your ribs, and saying: 'Give me your money. I give the two pesos to free myself from *unjust vexation*!'"

If the same man is importing goods, he bribes the inspectors on the pier. He says: "If I do *not* give the money, I will not get my *goods*! It's the system — the *whole system*! If you don't *pay*, you don't get what is right-fully yours!"

When this man asks for a housing loan, from the bank, he gives a gift to the banker who approves the application. He says, later: "I don't know what that money is. Is it a *tax*? Is it a *payment*? Is it a *gift*? Is it a *bribe*? I don't know. All I know is — if you don't give the money, you don't get the *loan*!"

So he surrenders to the system. To the crooked system.

If the man gets a government contract, he kicks back 10% or 15%. He says: "What else can I do? It is the *system*! If you don't give the kick back, you don't get the contract!"

The older man, the practical man, has grown too weary to fight the system. If he *refuses* to give the policeman two pesos, and goes to court, he pays *fifty*! The man on the bench is as crooked as the policeman on the corner. There is no escape from the system.

The older man pays the inspector on the pier; he gives the "gift" to the banker; he gets the government contract by paying under the table... but the marching students — they want to *change* all this!

The older man says: "My God! To change this, you would have to rip the country up by the roots! The dishonesty is woven through the whole system!"

The students are willing to unravel the whole system. They *want* to rip the country up by the roots!

But there are two ways of doing this: the first is by *violence* — a bloody revolution. A small Communistic core — this is what they want. They say "You can not clean up the corruption in the capitalistic system. Therefore you must abolish the system! . . . You can not *extract* the graft from the democratic government. Therefore you must abolish democracy. . . . You can not even clean up the Church. The only solution is to wipe it out."

But there is another way. The peaceful way. Violence in the spirit. The sweeping change of heart.

And this will be externalized, portrayed, in the change of *law* — the change in the constitution. The changes could even be radical and revolutionary — if this were *necessary* — but accomplished peacefully, in accordance with the law.

And this second way is the way the Catholic Church has chosen. We want a change. We want — for instance — *honesty*. Top to bottom. Honesty in the policeman. Honesty in the banker. Honesty in the business man. Honesty in the politician.

Integrity. *Personal* integrity!

And we want to accomplish this in the only practical way in which it *can* be accomplished — by bringing about an interior change in *people* — a real change of heart.

We don't want to overthrow democracy; we want to *purify it*!

We don't want to abolish business; we don't want to execute the land-owners; we just want justice! Justice, and charity!

We don't want to wipe out the clergy; we want the priest to love the children of God as Christ loved them.

And these things *can be done*! Peacefully. *Efficiently*. Even swiftly.

This is why we are so interested in the new constitution, and in the constitutional convention. It is not because we hope to legislate morality. We know that you can not change a country by changing a *law*.

But you *can* change a country, if all the people *want to change!* If the *heart* changes first, and then all the people change the law — then we can reach the goal toward which the students are marching. And we can reach that goal without violence.

If the passion of the students could only be harnessed to the wisdom of those who are older — then we might change the face of the Philippines, and perhaps we might change the face of the world.

All of this is symbolized in the constitutional convention:

a change of structure

a change of law

a change of heart

You And Your Service Sheet

— Sixth of a Series —

• **Guillermo Tejon, O.P.**

YOUR PIETY (Continued)

13. — Your Confession

Probably your Service Sheet has a blank space for "Others"; that is, other spiritual exercises that can help you in your spiritual life. Of special importance among "Others" is Confession. Therefore, counting on your indulgence, I will say something about it.

When you made the Cursillo you went to Confession. Perhaps it was your first Confession after many years of separation from the Sacraments. At any rate, you were happy that you did, because in Confession you found Grace, advice, happiness...

Speaking of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, we said that you do not have to go to Confession every time you go to Communion, as long as you are in a state of Grace.

However, this does not mean that you should not go to Confession often; for instance, once a month.

Confession forgives not only mortal but also venial sins. Therefore, if you have venial sins — and who hasn't? — you can go to Confession.

Confession not only forgives sins and restores lost grace. It also increases the sanctifying grace that you already have in your soul. Don't you want to increase your sanctifying grace?...

Confession not only gives and increases sanctifying grace. It also gives you Sacramental Grace; that is, the strength you need to resist

temptations and avoid sin. Don't you think you need this additional strength...?

You have had this experience! After a good confession, you feel happy, strong, confident that, with the help of God, you will be able to lead a good Christian life. But after some days your strength begins to decrease, temptations look stronger, occasions of sin seem to be more difficult to avoid, your confidence falters... If you do not do something about it your soul will grow weaker and weaker until you may find yourself in real danger of losing your grace.

Do you want to do something about it? — Go to Confession!

Frequent Confession recharges your soul, increases your fervour, renews your strength, and keeps you away from many sins!

Of course, in order to derive all these benefits from the Sacrament of Penance, your Confession has to be good; not just a mechanical repetition of the same sins month after month.

You know how to make a good Confession.

First, you find out when was the last time you went to Confession, and what sins you have committed since then. For this, you make an Examination of Conscience. Ask yourself if you have kept the Commandments of God, the Commandments of the Church, the duties of your state of life, the ethics of your profession; if you have practised the virtues taught to us by Christ (justice, charity, patience, resignation to God's Will, humility, etc.), if you have fulfilled your obligations towards others, etc... And try to discover how many times you have failed, and the reasons why you have failed.

With your sin before you, think about them; and then think of Christ. Think of how much He loves you, of the Cross where He died for you. Think of how you have repaid Him!...

But when you think of Christ, think of Him with confidence, without fear. Remember the parable of the Prodigal Son of your Cursillo. Remember that He is all-merciful, that He is ready to welcome you and to forgive your sins as long as, truly repentant, you go back to Him.

And then do just that. Go back to Him! Tell Him that you are sorry; that you do not want to offend again a God who loves you so much; that you will do your very best in the future. And make sure that you mean what you say.

Once you have done this, go to the confessional box, and tell your sins to Christ's representative, the priest. Begin by letting him know how long ago your last confession was. And then enumerate your sins.

When you enumerate your sins do not waste your — and the priest's — time with details of no consequence. Explain briefly the nature of your sins and how many times you have committed them. If you do not remember the exact number, give an approximate number. All your mortal sins should be confessed. It is not necessary to confess venial sins; but, for the reasons explained above, it is most convenient to do so.

Neither fear nor shame should keep us from confessing all our mortal sins. A penitent has to be sorry for all his sins, not for just a few. To leave out a mortal sin intentionally is the same as to say that we are not sorry for it. When a man does this, his confession becomes an act of hypocrisy, and, instead of bringing grace to his soul, it increases his guilt. It is an insult to Christ. Let us remember that we can deceive the priest, but we cannot deceive God. He knows everything. Besides, why would you be afraid or ashamed? — Because the priest knows you? . . . Don't you know that he is there not only as a judge, but also as a spiritual physician, as a father? And he knows that he is also a human being, with his own sins. At any rate, if that is your reason, you can always look for a priest who does not know you.

It is you who are making a confession. Therefore you should confess your own sins; not the sins of other people. Actually, you should not talk about other people unless — and only to the extent — that it is necessary for the integrity of your Confession.

If you have any doubts or questions about your sins or anything related to them, ask your confessor. But please keep in mind that the confessional is not the place to talk about everything. Other penitents may be waiting; and if your confession is unduly prolonged, they may be inconvenienced. In general, questions and problems of spiritual life, not related to the matter of your confession and which call for lengthy dis-

cussions, belong to Spiritual Direction, and they should be taken care of outside the confessional. If you think that this has to be done in the confessional, look for an occasion when the priest has enough time to attend to you and when no other penitents are waiting.

After you have confessed your sins, listen to what Christ — through His priest — has to tell you. If the priest asks any questions, answer them clearly and truthfully.

Then comes the absolution. Christ tells you that your sins are forgiven. While the priest pronounces the words of the absolution you say, with all the sincerity and fervor you can muster, the act of contrition, or some other prayer, to tell the Lord that you are sorry for the sins you have confessed and for all the sins of your life.

When the priest says "go in peace", you stand up and go back to your pew. There — or at some other convenient time — you fulfill the penance given to you by the priest. Such penance, gladly accepted and carried out, is a sign of true repentance on your part.

Before you leave the Church, give thanks to the Lord for having granted you the grace of a good Confession, and ask for His help for the future.

Sometimes we find many excuses for not going to confession. "What is the use" — we say — ; "no matter how many times I go to confession I always commit the same sins!" When we feel like talking in this way, let us ask ourselves these questions: "Are my confessions good? Are my examinations of conscience thorough? Is my repentance sincere, true? Am I really doing my best?"... And we should keep trying in earnest and with all seriousness!

At times we get discouraged: "I go to Confession and Communion often; and I am still the same!" — Let me ask you this: Do you think that you can become a saint overnight? You are not as good as you would like to be; but how good would you be if you did not go to Confession and Communion often?

The best way to make sure that you do not miss your Confession is to set aside a definite day and time for it, and to ask yourself about it in your daily Examination of Conscience.

Here I am speaking of the regular reception of the Sacrament of Penance by those who usually live in a state of grace. Needless to say, if we happen to commit a mortal sin, we should not postpone receiving the Sacrament on the ground that it is not our Confession Day. On the contrary, we should go to Confession immediately.

You can go to confession to any priest in any church. But it is advisable to go always to the same priest; to have your own confessor. Knowing your soul well, he will be in a position to advise you better and to help you get the full benefits of the Sacrament of Penance.

It is convenient, although not necessary, that your confessor be at the same time your spiritual director. "Not necessary", because confession and spiritual direction are two different things. "Convenient", because these two practices of piety are intimately related to each other and in many ways cover the same ground. Therefore, if you can combine both; that is, if you find a priest who can and is willing to be both your director and your confessor, you will in all probability make faster progress in your spiritual life.

By the way, as it was explained to you in *Life in Grace*, the commitments of your Service Sheet do not bind you under penalty of sin. You do not commit a sin — not even a venial one — if you do not fulfill your Morning Offering, your Meditation, etc. These are not moral obligations. These are acts of Piety you decided to practise in order to improve your spiritual life. Therefore, your Service Sheet failures are not to be confessed. They should, however, be taken up with your Spiritual Director, in or outside the confessional.

HISTORICAL SECTION

Notes on

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

● Pablo Fernandez, O.P.

Chapter Four

DIOCESES

A. The Archdiocese of Manila

1. Before the hierarchy was established in the islands, the Church in the Philippines was governed by a deputy judge of the Order of Saint Augustine, in accordance with the privilege granted by Pope Paul III to the religious missionaries to the Indies. But the Archbishop of Mexico, Ordinary of the Philippines, unmindful of this privilege, appointed as deputy judges two secular priests resident in the Islands, the licentiates Luís Barruelo and Juan de Vivero, so that they could govern the Philippines spiritually in his name.

The Augustinian fathers contested this arrangement as an infringement of their privileges, and appealed to the Governor General who, as Royal Vice-Patron, could confirm them in the use of their rights. Not long

* 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.

after by a disposition of the Governor, the provincial of the Augustinians, Fray Agustín de Albuquerque, resigned as deputy judge in September 27, 1578 in favor of Fray Pedro Alfaro, Commissar of the Franciscan Province of Saint Gregory. He and Frs. Juan de Ayora and Agustín de Tordesillas successively acted in this capacity until the arrival of the first bishop of the Philippines, Fray Domingo de Salazar.¹

2. Erection of the Diocese of Manila

In 1578 Fray Domingo de Salazar was presented by Philip II as bishop of Manila, but he was consecrated in 1579, upon receiving the bulls of nomination. Arriving in the Philippines in September 1581, he erected the episcopal see of Manila, suffragan to Mexico, by virtue of the bull *Illius fulti praesidio* signed by Gregory XIII on 6 February 1578. Of 27 prebends proposed by Salazar, the king approved only the strictly necessary: 5 dignitaries, the Dean, the Archdean, the Precentor, the School Master and the Treasurer; 3 canonries, magisterial, doctoral and penitentiary; 2 full prebends and 2 half-prebends. Their stipends were charged against the royal funds. In a royal cedula dated 2 June 1604 King Philip III fixed the stipends for the ecclesiastical chapter of Manila in this way: the Dean, 600.00 pesos; the five dignitaries, 400.00 pesos each; each canon, 400.00 pesos; 300.00 pesos for each prebend, and 200.00 for the half-prebends.² On 28 May 1680, Charles II allotted 5,000 pesos in gold to the Archbishop of Manila and raised by 100 pesos the salary of each dignitary.³ Construction of the cathedral began in 1581 and it was finished four years later. Ruined by earthquakes in 1645, it was rebuilt by Archbishop Miguel Poblete. The new edifice crashed to the earth during the earthquake of 1863. A third cathedral, inaugurated by Archbishop Pedro Payo (1876-89), was destroyed during the battle for the liberation of Manila from the Japanese in 1945.

¹ Cfr. "Anales eclesiásticos," *Philippiniana Sacra* II, No. 4 (January-April 1967) 193-201; Gómez Platero, O.F.M., *Catálogo Biográfico de los religiosos franciscanos* (Manila, 1880), 14,15,23.

² *Philippiniana Sacra* III, No. 7 (January-April, 1968) 153.

³ Blair and Robertson, XVIII, p. 110.

3. The Division of the Diocese of Manila

In 1951 Bishop Salazar journeyed to Spain to picture personally before King Philip II the spiritual condition of the Philippines and petition a remedy for several abuses. One of the many concessions obtained from the king was the raising of his farflung diocese into an archbishopric, with its see in Manila and with three suffragan dioceses, that of Nueva Segovia, of Nueva Caceres and of Cebu. In a brief dated 14 August 1595, Pope Clement VIII approved the promotion of Manila into a see and the others as suffragan sees. Bishop Salazar would certainly have become the first archbishop of Manila, but he died on 4 December 1594. Fray Ignacio de Santibañez, a Franciscan, was named in his place; he too, died, having occupied his see for only a few months in 1598.

4. The more salient events

Throughout the three long centuries of Spanish rule, the archdiocese of Manila was the scene of many memorable events which we shall recall in their proper places. Suffice it now to mention the three quarrels between three archbishops and as many governors-general, ending with the imprisonment of the former — more exactly, the imprisonment and exile of archbishop Hernando Guerrero in 1636 by Governor Sebastian Hurtado de Corcuera; the imprisonment and exile of Archbishop Felipe Pardo in 1683 by Governor Juan de Vargas y Hurtado; and lastly the imprisonment of Archbishop Francisco de la Cuesta in 1719 by Governor Fernando Bustamante y Bustillo.

5. Extent of the Archdiocese

The territorial jurisdiction of the old archdiocese of Manila included the actual civil provinces of Nueva Ecija, the southern half of Tarlac, Zambales, Pampanga, Bulacan, Rizal, Cavite, Batangas, Laguna, and the islands of Mindoro and Marinduque.

6. Prerogatives of the Archbishop

The archbishop of Manila, as the Metropolitan of the Philippines, enjoyed, among others, the following prerogatives:

- a) He was the subdelegate and the military Vicar General of the islands, with full spiritual authority over any and all who belonged in any way to the army or the navy.
- b) The governor-general had to seek his advice before granting the faculty to any religious to return to the peninsula.
- c) The governor-general could not, without the advice and consent of the archbishop, forbid public processions, even if there were grave reasons to the contrary.
- d) If the governor-general failed to comply with his duty to present candidates for provisional nomination to the dignitaries or prebendaries of the Cathedral, the archbishop enjoyed the faculty to make these appointments.
- e) Finally, the archbishop of Manila was the ecclesiastical governor, *sede vacante*, of the suffragan sees.⁴

B. The Diocese of Cebu

The diocese of Cebu, under the patronage of the Most Holy Name of Jesus, was created by Pope Clement VIII by the bull *Super specula militantis ecclesiae*, dated 26 August 1595. The first bishop was Fray Pedro Agurto of the Order of Saint Augustine.

This was the most extensive and the most taxing of the four dioceses in the Philippines. It included the Visayan Islands, Mindanao and the Marianas Islands. It is no surprise then that the bishops made their visitations rarely, amid no mean share of difficulties and dangers. No prelate visited the Marianas Islands until the bishopric of Romualdo Jimeno (1847-1872).

Because of the vast spread of his jurisdiction and the many problems encountered during his visitation, this prelate succeeded, after repeated

⁴ Tamayo, Serapio, O.P., *Idea general de la disciplina eclesiástica en Filipinas, durante la dominación española* (Manila, 1906), 41-42.

requests, in getting the Spanish government to petition the Holy See for the creation of the diocese of Jaro in 1865, as we shall soon see.⁵

C. The Diocese of Nueva Caceres

Created at the same time as Cebu, it bore the name of Nueva Caceres since the beginning, in memory of the city of Cáceres in Spain. It included the present provinces of Quezon, Camarines Norte, Camarines Sur, Albay and Sorsogon, and the islands of Catanduanes, Masbate, Burias and Ticao.

Its first bishop should have been Fray Luís de Maldonado, formerly Lector in Salamanca and later Commissar in the Philippines. Appointed by the Sacred Congregation of the Consistory on 14 August 1595, he died before receiving the nomination. Some historians think that St. Peter Bautista was appointed bishop of Nueva Caceres; but the latest exhaustive research done by the Filipino historian Domingo Abella, denies this. Francisco de Ortega, an Augustinian, was the second appointed bishop (13 September 1599). He also died in Mexico before taking possession of his diocese.⁶

D. The Diocese of Nueva Segovia

It owes its creation to Pope Clement VIII who erected it on 26 August 1595 together with the diocese of Cebu. Its first bishop was Fray Miguel de Benavides, a Dominican, who chose Nueva Segovia (now, Lal-loc) as the see. But because Vigan was better situated, the latter became the capital of the diocese provisionally, until, in answer to the petition of Bishop Juan de la Fuente y Yepes, King Ferdinand VI authorized the definite transfer to Vigan in a royal cedula dated from Villaviciosa, 7 September 1758. From 1762, through the continued efforts of

⁵ Redondo y Sendino, Felipe, Pbro., *Breve reseña de lo que fué y de lo que es la diócesis de Cebú en las islas Filipinas* (Manila; Establecimiento tipografico del colegio de Santo Tomas, 1886) 7 ff.; Jimeno, Ilmo, Romualdo, *Relación del estado de la diócesis de Cebú a su santidad Pio IX en 1863*, Ms in AUST, Sección de libros, tomo 112, No. 43.

⁶ Abella, Domingo, *Bikol Annals* (Manila, Philippines) 30-37.

Bishop Bernardo Ustariz, successor of Bishop de la Fuente, the town of Vigan became legally the capital city of the diocese of Nueva Segovia.⁷

E. The Diocese of Jaro

Already in 1831, Bishop Santos Gomez Marañon of Cebu had requested the Holy See to divide in two the diocese of the Most Holy Name of Jesus. But the suggestion fell on the deaf ears of the government. Twenty years later, in 1851, we see Bishop Romualdo Jimeno, the successor of Marañon, initiate a series of steps towards the same end. Finally, after many difficulties, he obtained a government decree from Spain, dated 17 January 1865, creating the diocese, of Jaro under the patronage of Saint Elizabeth. The new diocese, according to the first two articles of the decree, would include the provinces of Iloilo, Capiz, Antique, Calamianes islands, Negros, Zamboanga and Nueva Guipuzcoa (the present Davao provinces). On 27 May of the same year, the Holy See announced through a brief, *Qui ab initio*, that Pope Pius IX had recognized the government action.

The first bishop of Jaro, nominated on 20 September 1867 and consecrated on 30 November of that year, was Bishop Mariano Cuartero, O.P. He took possession of his diocese in 1868 and he spared no effort to provide the new see with the necessary buildings, as the episcopal palace, which he finished in a year; the cathedral church, begun in 1869 and inaugurated on 1 February 1874; and lastly, the conciliar seminary, dedicated to Saint Vincent Ferrer, finished in 1874.⁸

F. Nomination of Bishops Under the Spanish Royal Patronage

Under the Spanish regime, the nomination of bishops for the Philippines was the duty of the Royal Patron, as were all the benefices, ac-

⁷ Garcia, Ilmo Miguel, *Relación del estado de la iglesia de Nueva Segovia, en las Islas Filipinas, remitida al Rey y Supremo Consejo de Indias*, Mss in APSR, Sección HEF, "Nueva Segovia," 1774, folios 1-2.

⁸ Villaroel, Fidel, O.P., "The Making of a Diocese in the Philippines, Jaro 1865," *Boletín Eclesiástico*, 1965, pp. 538-555; Cuartero, Ilmo. Mariano *Relación del estado de la diócesis de Jaro, hecha a su santidad Pio IX, hacia 1870*, Ms in AUST, seccion de libros, tomo 112, no. 45.

ording to the Laws of the Indies: "Archbishoprics, Bishoprics, Abbacies of our Indies shall be provided for through our presentation before our most holy Father, whoever at the time he may be, as has been done until now.' (*Recopilación de Leyes de Indias*, libro 1, título 6, ley 3).

This was the procedure. When a diocese in the Indies fell vacant, the Supreme Council of the Indies presented a list of candidates to the king. The monarch in turn selected one of these; or, if he thought otherwise, he chose someone not included in the list. He then forwarded the name to the Spanish Ambassador to the Holy See for presentation to the Pope and for confirmation and canonical investiture of the bishop-elect.

Although it was severely forbidden in the Decretals that a chosen or presented candidate for any episcopal see should assume its government before he received papal canonical investiture, and showing to the chapter of the ecclesiastical governors the bulls of his appointment, it was for a time the accepted practice, set up by royal cédulas, that those so presented to the Holy See for the bishoprics in the Philippines could assume legally and canonically the government of their churches, with the condition only that he had been notified that the cédula of his nomination had already been sent and accepted.

By virtue of a provision in a brief of Pope Innocent XI on 24 April 1679, the ecclesiastical governor or the chapter, *sede vacante*, did not have to subdelegate authority to the bishop-elect, on the supposition that full authority or jurisdiction had been transferred to him by the mere act of presentation by the king and acceptance by the Holy See, even before the nominee had received either the papal letters or episcopal consecration. By the same brief, too, the Pontiff ordained that the nearest bishop should administer the diocese, *sede vacante*.⁹

G. The Cathedral Chapters

To govern their diocese properly, bishops need auxiliaries. Some of these are a *college* who form one moral person, like the *Cathedral* chapter;

⁹ Tamayo, *op. cit.*, 35-36.

others are individuals. Among the latter, we can count, in the first place the Provisor, or Vicar General; the Capitular Vicar, the Fiscal, and the Ecclesiastical Notary. They help the prelate govern the diocese and form the diocesan Curia. In the second place, we have the Vicars forane, and the parish priests who aid the bishop in the exercise of his authority over a part of the diocese. As historians, we are here especially concerned with the Cathedral and the parish priest. The latter we will discuss in the next chapter.

Although from their respective bulls of erection the dioceses in the Philippines should have had their corresponding cathedral chapters, the fact is, outside of the archdiocese of Manila, the rest have never had their chapter for lack of funds. This was noted in a royal cedula of 18 August 1853: "Seventh. With particular attention to the fact that the state of the royal funds of these islands do not permit for the present the establishment of chapters in the suffragan churches..."¹⁰

In Salazar's original plan, disapproved by Philip II, the Manila cathedral chapter was to be constituted by these persons: 5 dignitaries, 10 canons, 6 prebendaries and 6 half-prebendaries. We have already seen how the chapter was actually constituted. Towards the end of the Spanish regime, the chapter included 5 dignitaries — the dean, arch-dean, precentor, master of the school, and treasurer; 5 canons, two of which were by appointment and there *ex-officio*, doctoral, magisterial, and penitentiary; and 6 prebends with the necessary substitute for each one.

In the other dioceses, instead of the chapter, the bishop had as his auxiliaries three chaplains obliged to assist at the pontifical throne, with an annual stipend of 400 pesos each; one sacristan, with 200 pesos, and a master of ceremonies, with 150 pesos.¹¹

(to be continued)

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, 45, note 1.

¹¹ *Constituciones formadas por el Ilmo. y Rmo. Sr. D. Basilio Sancho de Santa Justa y Rufina, Arzobispo de Manila, para la Observancia, del Venerable Cabildo de su Santa Metropolitana Iglesia* (Manila: Imprenta "La Patria," 1917).

CASES AND QUERIES

STOCKHOLDING AND BOARD OF DIRECTORS

1. *According to Canon Law can a Parish Priest be a stockholder of a Rural Bank? If the answer is no, will it be possible for him to ask permission from a higher authority? If the answer is yes, from whom will he seek that permission? From the Ordinary of the Diocese, from the Papal Nuncio, or from the Holy Father?*

A Parish Priest can be a stockholder of the Rural Bank, or of any other enterprise, industrial or commercial, provided it is honest as regards the ends proposed and the means used.

This is the common doctrine of authors commenting on Canon 142, which prohibits clerics to engage in trade.

Some authors distinguish between being a stockholder of industrial enterprises and commercial enterprises, and they express their doubt as to the lawfulness of ecclesiastics being stockholders of *commercial* enterprises: they base their doubt on the text of the answer given by the Holy Office on the 15th of April, 1885. For our part, we find reason to exclude the doubt in the same text of the answer. And no distinction is made in the Code, although in more than one occasion it could have been done with a few words (cf. Can. 549, 1539 par 2).¹

2. *According to Canon Law can a Parish Priest be a member of the Board of Directors in a Rural Bank? If the answer is no, will it be possible for him to ask permission from the higher authority? And if the answer is yes, from whom will he ask this permission? From the Ordinary of the Diocese, from the Papal Nuncio, or from the Holy Father?*

¹ "Juxta exposita, et attentis peculiaribus temporum circumstantiis, personas ecclesiasticas non esse inquietandas, si emerint aut emant actiones seu titulos mensae nummulariae..." *Codicis Iuris Canonici Fontes*, vol. IV, N. 1091. S.C.S. Off., 15 apr., 1885. — Cf. Vol. VII, n. 4925. S.C. de Prop. Fide, 7 iul., 1893.

The above consultant cannot be a member of the Board of Directors of the Rural Bank. The same document cited before says as regard to this: "As regards priest who took part in the administration, or would take part in it, such a thing cannot be permitted."² It is a common doctrine among authors that in the prohibition to engage in trade or business in Canon 142, the prohibition for clerics to be members of the Board of Directors in commercial enterprises is included.

Dispensation from this prohibition is reserved to the Roman Pontiff according to the *Motu Proprio De Episcoporum Muneribus* of the 15th of June, 1966, (n. IX 3, d.).

On asking dispensation from the Roman Pontiff, explaining the causes or reasons for asking it, it is convenient to send the petition through the proper Ordinary, who may add his recommendation that the favor requested be granted, if he considers it convenient to be granted.

● Bernabe Alonso, O.P.

PRAYERS, BAPTISMAL WATER, AND CREED

1. *It is now an established rule in the Roman Rite that the number of presidential prayers in the Mass (collect, prayer over the gifts, prayer after communion) should never exceed one. But during the weekdays of Lent we have always to say two prayers after Communion. I heard, priests simply leave out the second.*

The second prayer of which the questioner speaks is not a "prayer after Communion" but is the so-called "prayer over the people." It was originally a blessing over the people and asked God's blessing upon the congregation. Later on the distinction between the postcommunion and the prayer over the people was lost. While originally almost every Mass had its prayer over the people, it was subsequently restricted to the weekdays of Lent. In the Leonine Sacramentary, which has been pre-

² "Quoad sacerdotes, qui partem in administratione susceperunt, vel suscepturi sunt, non esse permittendum."

served only in fragmentary form, the prayer over the people appears at the end of more than 160 Masses; and this document does not even contain the Lenten Masses. In the Tridentine Missal, of the 37 prayers over the people 17 have lost the aspect of a blessing and are now exactly alike the collects of the Mass in structure. In the Order of the Mass of 1969 we find the guideline that "on certain days or occasions another, more solemn form of blessing or prayer over the people may be used as the rubrics direct." In the wedding Mass and in the Mass for religious profession we find already such "more solemn forms of blessing," the sevenfold or threefold blessing. The new Missal will contain a number of prayers over the people (no longer restricted to Lent or penitential days) which the celebrant may use in accordance with his own free choice.

According to the rubrics of the Roman Missal, the prayer over the people should be inserted after the "Dominus vobiscum" of the concluding rite of the Mass without a conclusion (Per Christum...). It should be followed by the usual blessing formula (May almighty God bless you...) and the "Ite, missa est."

2. *When I was on supply in a parish I was given a very small bottle with baptismal water and some cotton for the baptism of several children. At first I thought the water was just sufficient for the baptism of one child. What should I have done?*

As a sacrament Baptism is a sacred sign which should clearly express the holy things that it signifies. It is the cleansing with water by the power of the living word (cf. Eph. 5,26). Therefore, "the celebration of the sacrament is performed by washing in water, by way of immersion or infusion" (Ritual of Infant Baptism, guidelines, # 18,2). Our faithful should be able to understand the sign with ease. But this is impossible if the cotton is only soaked with a few drops of baptismal water to be pressed out over the head of the infant so that just a few drops of water flow down over the head of the child. This hardly satisfies the barest minimum for the validity of the sacrament. We should not permit the sacramental signs to shrink to just rudimentary forms, to tokens or bare rites. They ought to be meaningful; they ought to be truly functional signs.

The difficulty as to the quantity of baptismal water can now be easily overcome because, according to the reformed baptismal rite for both infants and adults, the water is ordinarily to be blessed during the ceremonies that immediately precede baptism, according to the — usually very short — formulas from among which the priest may freely choose one (nos. 222-224 in the Ritual for Infant Baptism).

3. *In a parish where I said Mass on Sunday they sang the song "I believe" instead of the Nicene Apostles' Creed. Is this allowed?*

The song "I believe" is certainly not a Christian profession of faith as can be seen from its text:

I believe
for every drop of rain that falls
a flower grows.

I believe
that somewhere in the darkest night
a candle glows.

I believe
for everyone who goes astray
someone will come
to show the way.

I believe, I believe.

I believe
above the storm
the smallest prayer
will still be heard.

I believe
that Someone
in the great somewhere
hears every word.

Everytime
I hear a newborn baby cry,
or touch a leaf,
or see the sky,
then I know why
I believe.

This song expresses belief in the natural goodness of man. It is at the same time an admission that there exists some higher principle that takes notice of the affairs of nature and of human beings. Who is this principle? No answer is given. It is not even given the name of God.

Everything remains vague and obscure.

This is certainly not a Christian profession of faith in the One and Triune God, the Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ, who sent His Son into the world "for us and our salvation." The profession of faith in the song "I believe" admits some higher being in the line of the God of theodicy.

In view of this the practice of that parish to substitute the Creed with the song "I believe" is not allowed, because in the context of the Mass it is an abuse.

As a matter of fact, the song "I believe" is not the only unsuitable one that invaded the celebration of holy Mass in a number of places. A widely distributed booklet of the new Order of the Mass contained songs as "No man is an island" and "Spirit of God." The publisher claimed that these songs had been inserted on recommendation of the Subcommittee on Sacred Music, but no bishop-member of this committee knew anything about the approval of these texts.

● H J. Graf, SVD

SPECIAL REVIEW

THE CHURCH AS MISSION*

As Father Karl Rahner points out in the Foreword, "The thoughts offered for consideration in this book are of great importance." The conclusions arrived at can stand on their own merits. The fact that the author is an experienced and active missionary authenticates them still more. It is not a large book. It is rather small, but rich in content, and the contribution it makes to a theology of the Missions is significant.

Father Hillman places the problem of the Missions in its proper context, namely, in the sphere of theology. He shows clearly that the Missions not only have problems, but that they are themselves a problem — not one principally of finances, nor more personnel, nor new methods, but rather theological. To clarify the right theological foundation of the Church's mission is of supreme importance for the Church's existence and its work of service.

Developing a theology of the Church as "the universal sacrament of salvation," he shows convincingly that there is a very real difference between the missionary activity of the Church among non-Christian peoples and the pastoral care of Christian peoples (even though these may be very much de-christianized). He defines the purpose of the Church's specific missionary activity — to become, in an historical and tangible way the efficacious sign of redeemed humanity among and for the peoples and nations where the Church has not been established. In carrying out this mission in this final period of salvation history the Church proclaims the Kingdom of God and hastens the day when all the nations will be gathered together to "form one People of God, . . . joined in one Body of Christ, . . . built up together in one Temple of the Holy Spirit." This is the author's main thesis. It draws from

* by Eugene Hillman, S.S.Sp.

and is supported by the decree of Vatican II on the Church's missionary activity. (Ad Gentes).

This thesis is proposed in contrast to the concept of mission advocated particularly by some French writers... He points to the great deal of confusion which has arisen in recent years over the notion of "mission," and to the harm which has resulted from this confusion. In some countries, there is growing up a tendency to pay less and less attention to the other tribes and tongues and peoples outside of western Christianity. This tendency has been the fruit of an intense and almost total pre-occupation with the parish, together with a lack of distinction between the de-christianized peoples and the pagan masses of the world. Theoretically, the concept of mission has been broadened to include every individual whether in so-called christian countries or in pagan lands. In practice, however, the scope has been narrowed drastically. Catholics, exhorted to be missionaries in their own milieu, are failing to advert to their obligation to participate in the universal mission of the Church. The priority of the home apostolate is almost exclusive. To substantiate this charge, Father Hillman draws attention to the serious disproportion between the pastoral and missionary activity of various nations. Nearly 400,000 priests serve 1/3 of the world's people (i.e. the Christian and de-christianized peoples.) Only 30,000 are vainly trying to cope with the other 2/3 of the world's population, and of these about 1000 priests are directly concerned with bringing the gospel to the non-evangelized. If these figures are accurate, or even if they are only a very rough approximation, the result is obvious. The image that the Church presents is that it is an affair of Europe and the Americas. Even in Africa and Asia, the tendency is to absorb personnel exclusively into areas where the Church already has been established. This new concept of mission advocated by some European authors calls for more and more missionaries to be sent to those communities without priests at the expense of the non-evangelized.

The concept of mission outlined above differs considerably from the traditional concept. The custom has been to reserve the term "missionary activity" to the foreign missions, especially to the apostolate to the non-evangelized. Missionary activity ought to be distinguished from pastoral activity. The work of raising up the sign of salvation among

a people who have not believed in Christ differs from the work of maintaining the clarity of this sign once it has been set up so that it will become meaningful and salutary for all those who live in the nation. Missionary activity and pastoral activity are two functions of the one mission of the Church. They are equally essential to the life of the Church everywhere. Where one of these functions is being neglected in practice, the mission of the Church is not being served there.

Although these two functions are distinct, they are also complementary. Missionary activity establishes an indigenous Church. This Church, in its need to expand, will send out missionaries and so on. This is a vital process, a process that does not wait to begin only when its own area is thoroughly evangelized. If it waits for this then there is a fair chance that it will never begin to send out missionaries. Pope Pius XII said, "Their own growth in holiness will be in proportion to their active interest in the holy missions."

Perhaps, in the light of what has been said already, we may have reason for a little soul-searching. If our growth in holiness is in proportion to our active interest in the missions, surely we have cause for a little apprehension. If the missionary and pastoral functions of the Church are equally essential, why have we concentrated our resources, our efforts and our personnel almost exclusively to pastoral activity? Are de-christianized areas so much worse off than the non-evangelized areas? Finally, what did Christ really mean when He gave the command to preach the gospel to every creature? All these questions demand answers and those answers, in turn, demand appropriate action.

Referring to Our Lord's apostolic mandate, Father Hilman delineates further the terms of the problem. Does "every creature" refer to each individual quantitatively or to the whole of creation in its totality? In other words, what is the aim of the Church, solely to build up the number of the faithful, or to establish itself as a sacramental and symbolic sign among the nations, a symbol that does not depend on numbers nor on historical perseverance among any one people?

With compelling quotations from the Acts of the Apostles and from the encyclicals and allocutions of some of the modern Popes, he declares that the missionary work of the Church is not concerned directly and primarily with saving souls. Rather, it consists in bringing

to the sight and hearing of all men the one salutary work already accomplished historically for all men by Christ. To illustrate the point, he draws our attention to St. Paul. St. Paul regarded his missionary work as complete once he had established the Church amongst a people. We do not find him engaged in the work of bringing every individual in the neighbourhood into the Church. His aim was to set up the Church as soon as possible. Then he moved on elsewhere. In this way he hoped to hasten Christ's return. His missionary work had an eschatological motive. The motive of the Church's missionary work remains eschatological.

At this point, it might be well to introduce a concept which is very important for a full understanding of Fr. Hillman's thesis — the concept of ethnic-culture units and their relationship to the missionary work of the Church, which is to establish an indigenous Church among "every tribe, tongue, people and nation." The custom has been to interpret this phrase according to geographical or political groupings. Others have attempted to break away from this pattern. Fr. Schillebeeckx suggests "pagan cultures." Fr. Rahner thinks it means "everywhere." Both suggestions are somewhat vague and inadequate. Any alternative must express the notion of the solidarity of mankind and its implications in terms of Christian life and corporate salvation. To speak of the solidarity of mankind is not to deny the obvious differences and divisions that exist among men. These differences and divisions are natural. They are the result of the isolation of groups and the need to adapt to varying conditions. The sum total of all these differences (physical, psychological, linguistic, political, etc.,) developed by countless generations is the historical reality by which mankind is divided into distinctive units of people. Each unit reflects, in a unique way, the One Goodness, Truth and Beauty. We call these units of men "ethnic-culture units." To its members, the ethnic-culture unit is "the people." It is the symbolic body of mankind, signifying to its members the solidarity of mankind. In such a group, (as in the Trinity), an individual never stands alone. He stands always and only with an essential relationship to his community. — i.e. to the ethnic-culture unit. Since no man goes to God alone, salvation will come to establish herself within each of these groups and to recapitulate with the groups into one visible symbol which is herself.

The Parousia will not come until the Church has made Christ sacramentally present in every land, to every "people;" until there has been a corporate confrontation between Christ and the peoples who constitute mankind. Admittedly, the Church has spread to every continent, but her mission is far from accomplished. It has yet to spread to every ethnic-culture unit of men, doing sacramentally among one people after another what Christ already has done historically once for all, and what he does eternally in the souls of the saved.

A brief summary of the points treated so far will give some idea of the significance of this book. The Church's missionary activity is prior in both time and urgency to its pastoral activity. The Church's primary mission is not directed indiscriminately towards an increase of numbers, but, rather, to establishing the Church among each of the natural divisions of peoples, and it is to such groups that Christ's mandate refers.

This book is significant for another reason. Father Karl Rahner has been vigorously attacked by some writers for his theology of "anonymous Christianity" with its positive evaluation of the role of the non-Christian religions in the history of salvation. In recent years, this subject has been the focus of much controversy. Hans Kung and others who participated in the theological seminar of November, 1964, held in Bombav, were criticized for many of the expressions they used in reference to the value of non-christian religions and to the aim of the missions. In "Christ to the World," No. 3., 1965, there is a summary of the papers delivered at the seminar and the conclusions arrived at, together with comments from people who disagreed with particular expressions and proposals. A criticism made against the theologians at Bombay has also been levelled against Rahner. It is claimed that the theology which Rahner and others present seriously undermines the work of the missions and missionary motivation. They claim that missionaries are asking themselves, "What is the use of the missions if non-christians can be saved without Christianity?" Others just disregard such liberal theories and point out that they have been developed by armchair theologians in Europe who have little or no knowledge of the concrete situation in the mission field. Yet, here is a missionary, the

first priest sent to evangelize the nomadic Masai in Northern Tanzania, who, after years of missionary experience, accepts and develops Fr. Rahner's basic positions. Fr. Hillman shows that this theology, when it is rightly understood and when it is seen in relation to the Church as the dynamic and universal sacrament of salvation, in no way destroys the necessity nor the urgency of the Church's missionary activity.

At the risk of being superficial, I shall try to summarize Fr. Hillman's presentation of God's salvific action. It is not created grace, primarily, which constitutes salvation. Rather, it is the living presence of God in those whom He wishes to justify by created grace whereby creatures may respond to His presence in a personal communion of love. The One Word of God Who has redeemed mankind is present to all men in their inner being. He reveals himself to them in an experimental dialogue. Their knowledge of God need not be either explicit nor implicit. It may be unformulated, arising from conformity to a morally good impulse; i.e. to the voice of nature, which is the voice of God revealing Himself. Each act of man places him in dialogue with God, and, according to his moral decision in the situation, either accepts or rejects God's call. Therefore, many people who are living a life inwardly open to God in the events of their daily life, are Christians without their explicitly knowing it. For the Mercy of God, incarnate in Christ, transforms men into the likeness of Christ, even though they may have no historically explicit knowledge of Christ. As Fr. Schillebeeckx has said, 'This is not an extra-ordinary way of grace.' Through their communal religions, they signify their dependence on God and offer him homage. They have a moral code handed down through generations. For them, it is a guide to human behaviour with relation to God as they understand him. All this is not the result of natural reason alone. It is also the result of grace. Although such religions may be judged to be inadequate, they may be seen as a preparation, a prefiguring of what is to come historically in the visible Church. From this it is quite clear that such people are not saved because of their tribal religion. They are saved because they are already "unconscious" Christians.

An outline of salvation as given above ought not to discourage missionaries. The knowledge that God's grace usually precedes their

preaching should not lessen their motivation. Their task is to form among every people an active indigenous Church which, in turn, will send out its own missionaries. Their work is important. On it depends the realization of the Church's mission to gather all these peoples into one visible symbol of unity. The Parousia, Christ's return, is linked with the spreading of the "Good News" to every people. When it is completed, Christ will return. This was St. Paul's prime motivation. Surely, it is sufficient for the missionary of today.

I find it difficult to criticize a book with which I agree so wholeheartedly. My attitude towards this book is one of appreciation rather than criticism. Fr. Hillman is to be commended for his summing up, in a clear light and so concisely, matter which would require an otherwise extensive reading. Basing his study upon the Scriptures, magisterial pronouncements, especially the decrees of Vatican II, upon the best of modern theological thought concerning the Church and God's salvific acts, further authenticating his studies by years in the mission field, he expresses his thoughts with balance, restraint and conviction. His conviction and his sense of urgency are contagious.

If this book has any great defect, it is one of which the author is aware, himself. It does not present a complete theology of the missions. Probably, such a complete treatment is not possible at present. Nor does it suggest practical guidelines for a revised attitude towards the missions. However, following so closely on the decrees of the Council, it should serve as a powerful incentive for further reflection and discussion in this neglected field of theology.

Touching the very heart and core of the Church and its ecclesiology, this book presents two serious challenges which cannot be ignored — the urgency of developing a truly missionary theology which the Church in general and the missionaries in particular are crying out for — and the practical necessity of entering into closer dialogue with the two billion non-evangelized people of the world.

A fitting conclusion to this paper is the one which Karl Rahner uses in the Foreword, "The questions discussed and the conclusions reached in this book are very, very important."

THE CHURCH HERE AND THERE

BUT NOT OF THIS WORLD

On Ash Wednesday in the basilica of S. Sabina, the Pope's address made a profound impression on his hearers. He dwelt on the themes which for some time now have been dominant in his pastoral thinking. "In these our times," he said, "we are all subject to the great temptation of modelling ourselves on others — on men, on the world about us — under the influence of the cinema, of fashion, of literature. Should one blend with this world? Should one try to avoid 'religious alienation?' The Church does not speak like that. One must, while living in the world, avoid acquiring what is the so-called worldly spirit. It is not a question of converting oneself to the world, but of converting oneself, of turning to Christ. That is the great lesson of Christian anthropology. Holiness is not an utopia."

A STUDY AND RESEARCH CENTRE ON ST. THOMAS

In accordance with the directives of the Constitutions to renew the doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas and to enrich it with ever new treasures of wisdom, both sacred and human, the Dominican Order is setting up in Rome a study and research centre at the highest scientific level. It will concentrate on the anthropological doctrine of the Saint, the actuality of whose subject is obvious. In these days at the end of the 20th century, what engages the attention of all thinkers is the future of man; in these days when scientists have the power to manipulate man, either by biological discoveries, or by psychological techniques, or by social conditions, or by the sense they wish to give — or wish not to give to human life and the development of the present day world. This anthropological perspective, however, will not close the door on other problems. For St. Thomas, the question of man was the definitive of all sacred doctrine.

The new centre will be headed by Father Raymond Sigmond and will start to function at the beginning of the 1971-72 scholastic year.

FALLING RATIO OF PRIESTS

The number of priests is failing to keep pace with the growth of the world's Catholic population, and the situation is likely to become worse before it becomes better, according to statistics supplied in the Holy See's newly-published yearbook. There were 1,379 Catholics per priest in 1965, 1,401 Catholics per priest in 1966, and 1,437 Catholics per priest the following year.

The figures were taken from 41 nations of the western world and do not include mission countries or states with Communist regimes.

Over that three-year period the number of Catholics in the cited nations grew to 507,505,420 from 493,632,180. Priests grew in number by 639, to 352,691. However, the number of seminarians, both minor and major dropped by 8,913 to 146,996.

In mission countries the prospects seemed to be brighter, with the number of entries into major seminaries growing from 1,433 in 1965 to 1,704 in 1968. However during the same period the number of ordinations dropped from 460 to 438.

WOMEN IN VATICAN POSTS

The 1970 edition of the *Annuario Pontificio* has the names of five women, including two nuns and three laywomen, employees of the Secretariat of State. Two other nuns are listed as employees of another office connected with the state secretariat, the Council for Public Affairs.

A Vatican spokesman confirmed that women have been employed in various Vatican offices for a long time and that there are 66 women employees on the payrolls of Vatican offices.

The names of our nuns named to staff positions on the Congregation for Religious and Secular Institutes have been carried in the *Annuario* for several years. The spokesman said that a few nuns have been working for the past three years in the secret archives of the Holy See, which comes under the jurisdiction of the state secretariat, helping

in the preparation of a series of volumes on the activities of the Church and Pope Pius XII during World War II.

The five listed as working in the State Secretariat in the 1970 *Annuario* are Sisters Luciana Mariani of the Ursuline Sisters and Rosa Pierina Turco of the Daughters of Mary Immaculate, and three laywomen: Maria Fortini, Laura Serfini, and Angela Zanetti. The two nuns employed in the Council for Public Affairs are Sisters Maria Aristondo and Maria Luisa Dominguez of the Handmaidens of the Sacred Heart.

Last month, the Holy See turned down the nomination of a new counsellor in the German embassy for the Vatican because she is a woman. At that time, an official at the German embassy said the Holy See had "expressed reserves" about the nomination of Dr. Elizabeth Mueller as a counsellor at the embassy.

BISHOP LOUIS L.R. MORROW

After thirty years of fruitful labour in Bengal, Bishop Louis Morrow has now retired from the residential episcopal See of Krishnagar and is transferred to the Titular Episcopal See of Valliposita.

In 1922, Father Morrow came to the Philippines as secretary to H.E. Most Rev. William Piani, Apostolic Delegate, and remained for over sixteen years. Previous to this assignment, when he was in Puebla, Mexico, he found a centre called "La Buena Prensa" (The Good Press), to promote wholesome literature and motion pictures. In Manila, the Puebla "La Buena Prensa" became the Catholic Truth Society, with the address of the Apostolic Delegation. It had its beginning in the distribution, throughout the country, of Catholic and other wholesome magazines that were mailed to him by friends and admirers in the U.S.

Later, he published his first book, MY FRIEND, a prayerbook for children — and MY FIRST COMMUNION. Both have since gone over the thirteen million mark. Translations have been made all over the world, in forty languages and dialects. These were followed

by a series of catechetical books, especially MY CATHOLIC FAITH (which has become OUR CATHOLIC FAITH) — and a series of Catholic readers entitled MY READER, which are still used in most of the Catholic schools in the Philippines.

His popular vocational literature spread throughout the Philippines, Mexico, India, and also in Europe. His QUESTIONS ON VOCATION was translated in Flemish (Ben Ik Geroepen), and bears the imprimature of H. Em. Cardinal Suenens, then Vicar General of the Archdiocese of Malines.

Father Morrow took an active part in the organization of the International Eucharistic Congress in Manila held in February, 1937, because of the fact that H.E. Msgr. Piani, the Apostolic Delegate, spent the entire year of 1936 in Mexico as Extraordinary Visitor.

On May 25, 1939, Fr. Morrow was appointed Bishop of Krishnagar and was consecrated in Rome by H.H. Pope Pius XII in the Basilica of St. Peter.

POOR NATIONS GETTING POORER

According to the 1969 Year Book of Labour Statistics issued by the International Labour Office, the rich nations are still getting richer while the poor remain poor and get even poorer.

It states that though threats of unemployment in industrialized countries "receded and a revival of prosperity was noted," in developing countries "workers remained at a low standard of living which fell increasingly behind."

In these countries "unemployment and underemployment continue to be wide-spread, the labour surplus is increasing and monetary difficulties in these countries are reflected in deteriorating terms of trade which diminish further their limited chances of creating enough productive jobs." Compared to the figures for 1967 and 1968, employment in 1969 was up "in virtually every country" supplying information to the ILO. However, most of the information comes from the indus-

trialized countries, of which 24 out of 25 reported increases. The European countries did best, only Switzerland reporting a loss. The United States and the United Kingdom were close to the bottom of the employment list with less than one per cent higher than past year.

Unemployment rose in 10 countries reporting, including Burma, Chile, India, and Sierra Leone. Consumer prices rose by more than 15 per cent in Brazil, Chile, South Korea, South Vietnam, Uruguay, Colombia, the Congo (Kinshasa), Iraq, Ireland, Liberia, Niger, Nigeria, Uganda, Portugal, and Sudan.

Average wage in 30 countries, most of them industrialized, increased in 1969 and wages for women increased faster than for men but "they were still 20 to 40 per cent below the average wages for men except in France, where the difference was only 16 per cent."