



BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO de FILIPINAS

THE OFFICIAL INTERDIOCESAN BULLETIN

ENCYCLICAL
OF THE SUPREME PONTIFF
JOHN PAUL II
ON HUMAN WORK
ON THE NINETIETH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE ENCYCLICAL RERUM NOVARUM

John Paul II

INVOLVEMENT OF THE DOMINICANS IN THE
FOUNDATION AND PROGRESS OF FILIPINO TOWNS

Pablo Fernandez, O.P.

COMMUNION TWICE A DAY

H. J. Graf, S.V.D.

THE PRIVATE RECITATION OF THE LITURGY
OF THE HOURS

Florencio Testera, O.P.

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO de FILIPINAS

THE OFFICIAL INTERDIOCESAN ORGAN

EDITOR	EFREN RIVERA, O.P.
ASSOCIATE EDITORS	PEDRO LUIS GONZALEZ, O.P. JOSE MA. B. TINOKO, O.P.
EDITORIAL CONSULTANTS	FRANCISCO DEL RIO, O.P. JESUS MA. MERINO, O.P. PABLO FERNANDEZ, O.P. BONIFACIO SOLIS, O.P.
PUBLICATION ASSISTANT	AMELITA M. HERRERA

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS Official Interdiocesan Organ, is published bi-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 (Effective January, 1982). Yearly subscription in the Philippines.

	1 Year	2 Years	3 Years
Newsprint	P45	P85	P125
Bookpaper	P55	P100	P150

Price per copy: Newsprint — P8.00. Bookpaper — P10.00. Back issue, P8.00. Abroad, \$25.00 per year. Back issue, \$6.00. Subscriptions are paid in advance.

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

Address all communications to:

BOLETIN ECLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

Fathers' Residence
University of Santo Tomas
Manila, Philippines

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

- 2 THE FAMILY TODAY: LIGHT AND DARKNESS

DOCUMENTATION I

- John Paul II 5 ENCYCLICAL OF THE SUPREME PONTIFF JOHN PAUL II ON HUMAN WORK ON THE NINETIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENCYCLICAL RERUM NOVARUM

HISTORY

- Pablo Fernandez, O.P. 59 INVOLVEMENT OF THE DOMINICANS IN THE FOUNDATION AND PROGRESS OF FILIPINO TOWNS
- 62 FOUNDATION OF THE PROVINCE OF OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY OF THE PHILIPPINES

LITURGY

- H. J. Graf, S.V.D. 68 COMMUNION TWICE A DAY
- Florencio Testera, O.P. 71 THE PRIVATE RECITATION OF THE LITURGY OF THE HOURS

HOMILETICS

- Herman Mueller, S.V.D. 79 BIBLICAL NOTES AND HOMILIES

DOCUMENTATION II

- ON THE MARTYRS BEATIFIED IN MANILA (February 18, 1981), p. 132; TITLE OF "MINOR BASILICA" GRANTED TO MANILA CATHEDRAL, p. 136; APPROVAL OF LITURGICAL TEXTS FOR THE COMMEMORATION OF LORENZO RUIZ, p. 138; MSGR. PATRICIO ALO, AUXILIARY BISHOP OF DAVAO. (April 14, 1981); BISHOP PEDRO MAGUGAT, M.S.C., IS APPOINTED MILITARY VICAR (December 9, 1981). p. 140; FR. DEOGRACIAS YÑIGUES APPOINTED APOSTOLIC VISITATOR FOR MINOR SEMINARIES (March 30, 1981)

BOOKS

- 142 SHORT NOTICES ON BOOKS

EDITORIAL

The Family Today:

LIGHT AND DARKNESS

To commemorate Pope John Paul II's visit to our land, the Catholic Bishops' Conference of the Philippines has circulated a Pastoral Letter. As the *Boletín* joins the hierarchy in recalling the graces our people received when the Vicar of Christ was among us, we would like to invite our readers to go one step further. Let us link the words of the Pope on the family at Lahug, airport in Cebu City with his most recent Apostolic Exhortation, *Familiaris Consortio*, regarding the role of the Christian Family in the modern world.

In Cebu City the Pope expressed his happiness in knowing that all over the Philippines the Family Apostolate has received enthusiastic endorsement and support. He praised the Catholic Bishops' Conference "The Decade of the Family" and for having prepared a comprehensive pastoral program for this purpose.

This editorial page will best serve its purpose if we now quote the Pope as he says, in number 6 of *Familiaris Consortio*.

"The situation in which the family finds itself presents positive and negative aspects: the first are a sign of the salvation of Christ operating in the world, the second, a sign of the refusal that man gives to the love of God."

"On the one hand, in fact, there is a more lively awareness of personal freedom and greater attention to the quality of interpersonal relationships in marriage, to promoting the dig-

nity of women, to responsible procreation, to the education of children. There is also an awareness of the need for the development of interfamily relationships, for reciprocal spiritual and material assistance, the rediscovery of the ecclesial mission proper to the family and its responsibility for the building of a more just society. On the other hand, however, signs are not lacking of a disturbing degradation of some fundamental values: a mistaken theoretical and practical concept of the independence of the spouses in relation to each other; serious misconceptions regarding the relationship of authority between parents and children; the concrete difficulties that the family itself experiences in the transmission of values; the growing number of divorces; the scourge of abortion; the ever more frequent recourse to sterilization; the appearance of a truly contraceptive mentality."

"At the root of these negative phenomena there frequently lies a corruption of the idea and the experience of freedom, conceived not as a capacity for realizing the truth of God's plan for marriage and the family, but as an autonomous power of self-affirmation, often against others, for one's own selfish well-being."

"Worthy of our attention also is the fact that, in the countries of the so-called Third World, families often lack both the means necessary for survival, such as food, work, housing and medicine, and the most elementary freedoms. In the richer countries, on the contrary, excessive prosperity and the consumer mentality, paradoxically joined to a certain anguish and uncertainty about the future, deprive married couples of the generosity and courage needed for raising up new human life: thus life is often perceived not as a blessing, but as a danger from which to defend oneself."

"The historical situation in which the family lives therefore appears as an interplay of light and darkness."

"This shows that history is not simply a fixed progression towards what is better, but rather an event of freedom, and even a struggle between freedom that are in mutual conflict, that is, according to the well-known expression of Saint Augustine, a conflict between two loves: the love of God to the point of disregarding self, and the love of self to the point of disregarding God."

"It follows that only an education for love rooted in faith can lead to the capacity of interpreting "the signs of the times", which are the historical expression of this twofold love."

The exhortation has a total of 86 numbers. What we have quoted here serves to point out that the Church in the Philippines has in this document the ways of the journey it has to take during its decade of the family.

**ENCYCLICAL
OF THE SUPREME PONTIFF
JOHN PAUL II
ON HUMAN WORK
ON THE NINETIETH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE ENCYCLICAL RERUM NOVARUM**

*Venerable Brothers
and Dear Sons and Daughters
Greetings and the Apostolic Blessing*

Through work man must earn his daily bread¹ and contribute to the continual advance of science and technology and, above all, to elevating unceasingly the cultural and moral level of the society within which he lives in community with those who belong to the same family. And work means any activity by man, whether manual or intellectual, whatever its nature or circumstances; it means any human activity that can and must be recognized as work, in the midst of all the many activities of which man is capable and to which he is predisposed by his very nature, by virtue of humanity itself. Man is made to be in the visible universe an image and likeness of God himself,² and he is placed in it in order to subdue the earth.³ From the beginning therefore he is *called to work*. Work is one of the characteristics that distinguish man from the rest of creatures, whose activity for sustaining their lives cannot be called work. Only man is capable of work, and only man works, at the same time by work occupying his existence on earth. Thus work bears a particular mark of man and of humanity, the mark of a person operating within a community of persons. And this mark decides its interior characteristics; in a sense it constitutes its very nature.

¹ Cf. Ps. 127 (128): 2; cf. also Gen. 3:17-19; Prov. 10:22; Ex. 1:8-14; Jer. 22:13.

² Cf. Gen. 1:26.

³ Cf. Gen. 1:28.

I

INTRODUCTION

1. HUMAN WORK ON THE NINETIETH ANNIVERSARY OF RERUM NOVARUM

Since 15 May of the present year was the ninetieth anniversary of the publication by the great Pope of the "social question", Leo XIII, of the decisively important Encyclical which begins with the words *Rerum Novarum*. I wish to devote this document to *human work* and, even *more*, to man in the vast context of the reality of work. As I said in the Encyclical *Redemptor Hominis*, published at the beginning of my service in the See of Saint Peter in Rome, man "is the primary and fundamental way of the Church",⁴ precisely because of the inscrutable mystery of Redemption in Christ; and so it is necessary to return constantly to this way and to follow it ever anew in the various aspects in which it shows us all the wealth and at the same time all the toil of human existence on earth.

Work is one of these aspects, a perennial and fundamental one, one that is always relevant and constantly demands renewed attention and decisive witness. Because fresh *questions* and *problems* are always arising, there are always fresh hopes, but also fresh fears and threats, connected with this basic dimension of human existence: man's life is built up every day from work, from work it derives its specific dignity, but at the same time work contains the unceasing measure of human toil and suffering, and also of the harm and injustice which penetrate deeply into social life within individual nations and on the international level. While it is true that man eats the bread produced by the work of his hands⁵ — and this means not only the daily bread by which his body keeps alive but also the bread of science and progress, civilization and culture — it is also a perennial truth that he eats this bread by "the sweat of his face",⁶ that is to say, not only by personal effort and toil but also in the midst of many tensions, conflicts and crises, which, in relationship with the reality of work, disturb the life of individual societies and also of all humanity.

⁴ Encyclical *Redemptor Hominis*, 14: AAS 71 (1979), p. 284.

⁵ Cf. Ps. 127(128):2.

⁶ Gen. 3:19.

We are celebrating the ninetieth anniversary of the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* on the eve of new developments in technological, economic and political conditions which, according to many experts, will influence the world of work and production no less than the industrial revolution of the last century. There are many factors of a general nature: the widespread introduction of automation into many spheres of production, the increase in the cost of energy and raw materials, the growing realization that the heritage of nature is limited and that it is being intolerably polluted, and the emergence on the political scene of peoples who, after centuries of subjection, are demanding their rightful place among the nations and in international decision-making. These new conditions and demands will require a reordering and adjustment of the structures of the modern economy and of the distribution of work. Unfortunately, for millions of skilled workers these changes may perhaps mean unemployment, at least for a time, or the need for retraining. They will very probably involve a reduction or a less rapid increase in material well-being for the more developed countries. But they can also bring relief and hope to the millions who today live in conditions of shameful and unworthy poverty.

It is not for the Church to analyze scientifically the consequences that these changes may have on human society. But the Church considers it her task always to call attention to the dignity and rights of those who work, to condemn situations in which that dignity and those rights are violated, and to help to guide the above-mentioned changes so as to ensure authentic progress by man and society.

2. IN THE ORGANIC DEVELOPMENT OF THE CHURCH'S SOCIAL ACTION AND TEACHING

It is certainly true that work, as a human issue, is at the very centre of the "social question" to which, for almost a hundred years, since the publication of the above-mentioned Encyclical, the Church's teaching and the many undertakings connected with her apostolic mission have been especially directed. The present reflections on work are not intended to follow a different line, but rather to be in organic connection with the whole tradition of this teaching and activity. At the same time, however, I am making them, according to the indication in the Gospel, in order to bring out *from the heritage of the Gospel "what is new and what is old"*.⁷ Certainly, work is part of "what

⁷ Cf. Mt. 13:52.

8 BOLETIN ECCLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

is old" — as old as man and his life on earth. Nevertheless, the general situation of man in the modern world, studied and analyzed in its various aspects of geography, culture and civilization, calls for the discovery of the *new meanings of human work*. It likewise calls for the formulation of the *new tasks* that in this sector face each individual, the family, each country, the whole human race, and, finally, the Church herself.

During the years that separate us from the publication of the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, the social question has not ceased to engage the Church's attention. Evidence of this are the many documents of the Magisterium issued by the Popes and by the Second Vatican Council, pronouncements by individual Episcopates, and the activity of the various centres of thought and of practical apostolic initiatives, both on the international level and at the level of the local Churches. It is difficult to list here in detail all the manifestations of the commitment of the Church and of Christians in the social question, for they are too numerous. As a result of the Council, the main coordinating centre in this field is the *Pontifical Commission Justice and Peace*, which has corresponding bodies within the individual Bishops' Conferences. The name of this institution is very significant. It indicates that the social question must be dealt with in its whole complex dimension. Commitment to justice must be closely linked with commitment to peace in the modern world. This twofold commitment is certainly supported by the painful experience of the two great world wars which in the course of the last ninety years have convulsed many European countries and, at least partially, countries in other continents. It is supported, especially since the Second World War, by the permanent threat of a nuclear war and the prospect of the terrible self-destruction that emerges from it.

If we follow the *main line of development of the documents* of the supreme Magisterium of the Church, we find in them an explicit confirmation of precisely such a statement of the question. The key position, as regards the question of world peace, is that of John XXIII's Encyclical *Pacem in Terris*. However, if one studies the development of the question of social justice, one cannot fail to note that, whereas during the period between *Rerum Novarum* and Pius XI's *Quadragesimo Anno* the Church' teaching concentrates mainly on the just solution of the "labour question" within individual nations, in the next period the Church's teaching widens its horizon to take in the whole world. The disproportionate distribution of wealth and poverty and the existence of some countries and continents that are

ENCYCLICAL ON HUMAN WORK 9

developed and of others that are not call for a levelling out and for a search for ways to ensure just development for all. This is the direction of the teaching in John XXIII's Encyclical *Mater et Magistra*, in the Pastoral Constitution *Gaudium et Spes* of the Second Vatican Council, and in Paul VI's Encyclical *Populorum Progressio*.

This trend of development of the Church's teaching and commitment in the social question exactly corresponds to the objective recognition of the state of affairs. While in the past the "class" question was especially highlighted as the centre of this issue, in more recent times it is the "world" question that is emphasized. Thus, not only the sphere of class is taken into consideration but also the world sphere of inequality and injustice, and as a consequence, not only the class dimension but also the world dimension of the tasks involved in the path towards the achievement of justice in the modern world. A complete analysis of the situation of the world today shows in an even deeper and fuller way the meaning of the previous analysis of social injustices; and it is the meaning that must be given today to efforts to build justice on earth, not concealing thereby unjust structures but demanding that they be examined and transformed on a more universal scale.

3. THE QUESTION OF WORK, THE KEY TO THE SOCIAL QUESTION

In the midst of all these processes — those of the diagnosis of objective social reality and also those of the Church's teaching in the sphere of the complex and many-sided social question — the question of human work naturally appears many times. This issue is, in a way, a constant factor both of social life and of the Church's teaching. Furthermore, in this teaching attention to the question goes back much further than the last ninety years. In fact the Church's social teaching finds its source in Sacred Scripture, beginning with the Book of Genesis and especially in the Gospel and the writings of the Apostles. From the beginning it was part of the Church's teaching, her concept of man and life in society, and, especially, the social morality which she worked out according to the needs of the different ages. This traditional patrimony was then inherited and developed by the teaching of the Popes on the modern "social question", beginning with the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*. In this context, study of the question of work, as we have seen, has continually been brought up to date while maintaining that Christian basis of truth which can be called ageless.

While in the present document we return to this question once more — without however any intention of touching on all the topics that concern it — this is not merely in order to gather together and repeat what is already contained in the Church's teaching. It is rather in order to highlight — perhaps more than has been done before — the fact that human work is a *key*, probably *the essential key*, to the whole social question, if we try to see that question really from the point of view of man's good. And if the solution — or rather the gradual solution — of the social question, which keeps coming up and becomes ever more complex, must be sought in the direction of "making life more human",⁸ then the key, namely human work, acquires fundamental and decisive importance.

II

WORK AND MAN

4. IN THE BOOK OF GENESIS

The Church is convinced that work is a fundamental dimension of man's existence on earth. She is confirmed in this conviction by considering the whole heritage of the many sciences devoted to man: anthropology, palaeontology, history, sociology, psychology and so on; they all seem to bear witness to this reality in an irrefutable way. But the source of the Church's conviction is above all the revealed word of God, and therefore what is a *conviction of the intellect* is also a *conviction of faith*. The reason is that the Church — and it is worthwhile stating it at this point — believes in man: she *thinks of man* and addresses herself to him *not only* in the light of historical experience, not only with the aid of the many methods of scientific knowledge, but in the first place in the light of the revealed word of the living God. Relating herself to man, she seeks to *express the eternal designs and transcendent destiny which the living God, the Creator and Redeemer, has linked with him*.

The Church finds *in the very first pages of the Book of Genesis* the source of her conviction that work is a fundamental dimension of human existence on earth. An analysis of these

⁸ Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World *Gaudium et Spes*, 38: AAS 58 (1966), p. 1055.

texts makes us aware that they express — sometimes in an archaic way of manifesting thought — the fundamental truths about man, in the context of the mystery of creation itself. These truths are decisive for man from the very beginning, and at the same time they trace out the main lines of his earthly existence, both in the state of original justice and also after the breaking, caused by sin, of the Creator's original covenant with creation in man. When man, who had been created 'in the image of God . . . male and female',⁹ hears the words: "Be fruitful and *multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it*",¹⁰ even though these words do not refer directly and explicitly to work, beyond any doubt they indirectly indicate it as an activity for man to carry out in the world. Indeed, they show its very deepest essence. Man is the image of God partly through the mandate received from his Creator to subdue, to dominate, the earth. In carrying out this mandate, man, every human being, reflects the very action of the Creator of the universe.

Work understood as a "transitive" activity, that is to say an activity beginning in the human subject and directed towards an external object, presupposes a specific dominion by man over "the earth", and in its turn it confirms and develops this dominion. It is clear that the term "the earth" of which the biblical text speaks is to be understood in the first place as that fragment of the visible universe that man inhabits. By extension, however, it can be understood as the whole of the visible world insofar as it comes within the range of man's influence and of his striving to satisfy his needs. The expression "subdue the earth" has an immense range. It means all the resources that the earth (and indirectly the visible world) contains and which, through the conscious activity of man, can be discovered and used for his ends. And so these words, placed at the beginning of the Bible, *never cease to be relevant*. They embrace equally the past ages of civilization and economy, as also the whole of modern reality and future phases of development, which are perhaps already to some extent beginning to take shape, though for the most part they are still almost unknown to man and hidden from him.

While people sometimes speaks of period of "acceleration" in the economic life and civilization of humanity or of individual nations, linking these periods to the progress of science and technology and especially to discoveries which are decisive for social and economic life, at the same time it can be said that none of

⁹ Gen. 1:27.

¹⁰ Gen. 1:28.

12 BOLETIN ECCLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

these phenomena of "acceleration" exceeds the essential content of what was said in that most ancient of biblical texts. As man, through his work, becomes more and more the master of the earth, and as he confirms his dominion over the visible world, again through his work, he nevertheless remains in every case and at every phase of this process within the Creator's original ordering. And this ordering remains necessarily and indissolubly linked with the fact that man was created, as male and female, "in the image of God". This *process* is, at the same time, *universal*: it embraces all human beings, every generation, every phase of economic and cultural development, and *at the same time* it is a process that takes place *within each human being*, in each conscious human subject. Each and every individual, to the proper extent and in an incalculable number of ways, takes part in the giant process whereby man "subdues the earth" through his work.

5. WORK IN THE OBJECTIVE SENSE: TECHNOLOGY

This universality and, at the same time, this multiplicity of the process of "subduing the earth" throw light upon human work, because man's dominion over the earth is achieved in and by means of work. There thus emerges the meaning of *work in an objective sense*, which finds expression in the various epochs of culture and civilization. Man dominates the earth by the very fact of domesticating animals, rearing them and obtaining from them the food and clothing he needs, and by the fact of being able to extract various natural resources from the earth and the seas. But man "subdues the earth" much more when he begins to cultivate it and then to transform its products, adapting them to his own use. Thus agriculture constitutes through human work a primary field of economic activity and an indispensable factor of production. Industry in its turn will always consist in linking the earth's riches — whether nature's living resources, or the products of agriculture, or the mineral or chemical resources — with man's work, whether physical or intellectual. This is also in a sense true in the sphere of what are called service industries, and also in the sphere of research, pure or applied.

In industry and agriculture man's work has today in many cases ceased to be mainly manual, for the toil of human hands and muscles is aided by *more and more highly perfected machinery*. Not only in industry but also in agriculture we are witnessing the transformations made possible by the gradual deve-

lopment of science and technology. Historically speaking, this, taken as a whole, has caused great changes in civilization, from the beginning of the "industrial era" to the successive phases of development through new technologies, such as the electronics and the microprocessor technology in recent years.

While it may seem that in the industrial process it is the machine that "works" and man merely supervises it, making it function and keeping it going in various ways, it is also true that for this very reason industrial development provides grounds for reproposing in new ways the question of human work. Both the original industrialization that gave rise to what is called the worker question and the subsequent industrial and post-industrial changes show in an eloquent manner that, even in the age of ever more mechanized "work", *the proper subject of work continues to be man.*

The development of industry and of the various sectors connected with it, even the most modern electronics technology, especially in the fields of miniaturization, communications and telecommunications and so forth, shows how vast is the role of technology, that ally of work that human thought has produced, in the interaction between the subject and object of work (in the widest sense of the word). Understood in this case not as a capacity or aptitude for work, but rather as *a whole set of instruments* which man uses in his work, technology is undoubtedly man's ally. It facilitates his work, perfects, accelerates and augments it. It leads to an increase in the quantity of things produced by work, and in many cases improves their quality. However, it is also a fact that, in some instances, technology can cease to be man's ally and become almost his enemy, as when the mechanization of work "supplants" him, taking away all personal satisfaction and the incentive to creativity and responsibility, when it deprives many workers of their previous employment, or when, through exalting the machine, it reduces man to the status of its slave.

If the biblical words "subdue the earth" addressed to man from the very beginning are understood in the context of the whole modern age, industrial and post-industrial, then they undoubtedly include also *a relationship with technology*, with the world of machinery which is the fruit of the work of the human intellect and a historical confirmation of man's dominion over nature.

The recent stage of human history, especially that of certain societies, brings a correct affirmation of technology as a basic

coefficient of economic progress; but, at the same time, this affirmation has been accompanied by and continues to be accompanied by the raising of essential questions concerning human work in relationship to its subject, which is man. These questions are particularly charged with *content and tension of an ethical and an ethical and social character*. They therefore constitute a continual challenge for institutions of many kinds, for States and governments, for systems and international organizations; they also constitute a challenge for the Church.

6. WORK IN THE SUBJECTIVE SENSE: MAN AS THE SUBJECT OF WORK

In order to continue our analysis of work, an analysis linked with the word of the Bible telling man that he is to subdue the earth, we must concentrate our attention on *work in the subjective sense*, much more than we did on the objective significance, barely touching upon the vast range of problems known intimately and in detail to scholars in various fields and also, according to their specializations, to those who work. If the words of the Book of Genesis to which we refer in this analysis of ours speaks of work in the objective sense in an indirect way, they also speak only indirectly of the subject of work; but what they say is very eloquent and is full of great significance.

Man has to subdue the earth and dominate it, because as the "image of God" he is a person that is to say, a subjective being capable of acting in a planned and rational way, capable of deciding about himself, and with a tendency to self-realization. *As a person, man is therefore the subject of work*. As a person he works, he performs various actions belonging to the work process; independently of their objective content, these actions must all serve to realize his humanity, to fulfill the calling to be a person that in truths concerning this theme were recently recalled by the Second Vatican Council in the Constitution *Gaudium et Spes*, especially in Chapter One, which is devoted to man's calling.

And so this "dominion" spoken of in the biblical text being meditated upon here refers not only to the objective dimension of work but at the same time introduces us to an understanding of its subjective dimension. Understood as a process whereby man and the human race subdue the earth, work corresponds to this basic biblical concept only when throughout the process man manifests himself and confirms himself *as the one who*

"*dominates*". This dominion, in a certain sense, refers to the subjective dimension even more than to the objective one: this dimension conditions *the very ethical nature* of work. In fact there is no doubt that human work has an ethical value of its own, which clearly and directly remain linked to the fact that the one who carries it out is a person, a conscious and free subject, that is to say a subject that decides about himself.

This truth, which in a sense constitutes the fundamental and perennial heart of Christian teaching on human work, has had and continues to have primary significance for the formulation of the important social problems characterizing whole ages.

The ancient world introduced its own typical differentiation of people into classes according to the type of work done. Work which demanded from the worker the exercise of physical strength, the work of muscles and hands, was considered unworthy of free men, and was therefore given to slaves. By broadening certain aspects that already belonged to the Old Testament, Christianity brought about a fundamental change of ideas in this field, taking the whole content of the Gospel message as its point of departure, especially the fact that the one who, while *being God*, became like us in all things¹¹ devoted most of the years of his life on earth to *manual work* at the carpenter's bench. This circumstance constitutes in itself the most eloquent "Gospel of work", showing that the basis for determining the value of human work is not primarily the kind of work being done but the fact that the one who is doing it is a person. The sources of the dignity of work are to be sought primarily in the subjective dimension, not in the objective one.

Such a concept practically does away with the very basis of the ancient differentiation of people into classes according to the kind of work done. This does not mean that, from the objective point of view, human work cannot and must not be rated and qualified in any way. It only means that *the primary basis of the value of work is man himself*, who is its subject. This leads immediately to a very important conclusion of an ethical nature: however true it may be that man is destined for work and called to it, in the first place work is "for man" and not man "for work". Through this conclusion one rightly comes to recognize the pre-eminence of the subjective meaning of work over the objective one. Given this way of understanding things, and presupposing that different sorts of work that people do can have greater or lesser objective value, let us try neverthe-

¹¹ Cf. Heb. 2:17; Phil. 2:5-8.

less to show that each sort is judged above all by the *measure of the dignity* of the subject of work, that is to say the person, *the individual who carries it out*. On the other hand: independently of the work that every man does, and presupposing that this work constitutes a purpose — at times a very demanding one — of his activity, this purpose does not possess a definitive meaning in itself. In fact, in the final analysis it is always man who is *the purpose of the work*, whatever work it is that is done by man — even if the common scale of values rates it as the merest “service”, as the most monotonous, even the most alienating work.

7. A THREAT TO THE RIGHT ORDER OF VALUES

It is precisely these fundamental affirmations about work that always emerged from the wealth of Christian truth, especially from the very message of the “Gospel of work”, thus creating the basis for a new way of thinking, judging and acting. In the modern period, from the beginning of the industrial age, the Christian truth about work had to oppose the various trends of *materialistic and economic* thought.

For certain supporters of such ideas, work was understood and treated as a sort of “merchandise” that the worker — especially the industrial worker — sells to the employer, who at the same time is the possessor of the capital, that is to say, of all the working tools and means that make production possible. This way of looking at work was widespread especially in the first half of the nineteenth century. Since then, explicit expressions of this sort have almost disappeared, and have given way to more human ways of thinking about work and evaluating it. The interaction between the worker and the tools and means of production has given rise to the development of various forms of capitalism — parallel with various forms of collectivism — into which other socioeconomic elements have entered as a consequence of new concrete circumstances, of the activity of workers’ associations and public authorities, and of the emergence of large transnational enterprises. Nevertheless, the *danger* of treating work as a special kind of “merchandise”, or as an impersonal “force” needed for production (the expression “workforce” is in fact in common use) *always exists*, especially when the whole way of looking at the question of economics is marked by the premises of materialistic economism.

A systematic opportunity for thinking and evaluating in this way, and in a certain sense a stimulus for doing so, is pro-

vided by the quickening process of the development of a one-sidedly materialistic civilization, which gives prime importance to the objective dimension of work, while the subjective dimension — everything in direct or indirect relationship with the subject of work — remains on a secondary level. In all cases of this sort, in every social situation of this type, there is a confusion or even a reversal of the order laid down from the beginning by the words of the Book of Genesis: *man is treated as an instrument of production*,¹² whereas he — he alone, independently of the work he does — ought to be treated as the effective subject of work and its true maker and creator. Precisely this reversal of order, whatever the programme or name under which it occurs, should rightly be called “capitalism” — in the sense more fully explained below. Everybody knows that capitalism has a definite historical meaning as a system, an economic and social system, opposed to “socialism” or “communism”. But in the light of the analysis of the fundamental reality of the whole economic process — first and foremost of the production structure that work is — it should be recognized that the error of early capitalism can be repeated wherever man is in a way treated on the same level as the whole complex of the material means of production, as an instrument and not in accordance with the true dignity of his work — that is to say, where he is not treated as subject and maker, and for this very reason as the true purpose of the whole process of production.

This explains why the analysis of human work in the light of the words concerning man's “dominion” over the earth goes to the very heart of the ethical and social question. This concept should also find a *central place* in the whole *sphere of social and economic policy*, both within individual countries and in the wider field of international and intercontinental relationships, particularly with reference to the tensions making themselves felt in the world not only between East and West but also between North and South. Both John XXIII in the Encyclical *Mater et Magistra* and Paul VI in the Encyclical *Populorum Progressio* gave special attention to these dimensions of the modern ethical and social question.

8. WORKER SOLIDARITY

When dealing with human work in the fundamental dimension of its subject, that is to say, the human person doing the work, one must make at least a summary evaluation of develop-

¹² Cf. Pope Pius XI, Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*: AAS 23 (1931), p. 221.

ments during the ninety years since *Rerum Novarum* in relation to the subjective dimension of work. Although the subject of work is always the same, that is to say man, nevertheless wide-ranging changes take place in the objective aspect. While one can say that, by reason of its subject, *work is one single thing* (one and unrepeatable every time), yet when one takes into consideration its objective directions one is forced to admit that *there exist many works*, many different sorts of work. The development of human civilization brings continual enrichment in this field. But at the same time, one cannot fail to note that in the process of this development not only do new forms of work appear but also others disappear. Even if one accepts that on the whole this is a normal phenomenon, it must still be seen whether certain ethically and socially dangerous irregularities creep in, and to that extent.

It was precisely one such *wide-ranging anomaly* that gave rise in the last century to what has been called "the worker question", sometimes described as "the proletariat question". This question and the problems connected with it gave rise to a just social reaction and caused the impetus emergence of a great burst of solidarity between workers, first and foremost industrial workers. The call to solidarity and common action addressed to the workers — especially to those engaged in narrowly specialized, monotonous and depersonalized work in industrial plants, when the machine tends to dominate man — was important and eloquent from the point of view of social ethics. It was the reaction *against the degradation of man as the subject of work*, and against the unheard — of accompanying exploitation in the field of wages, working conditions and social security for the worker. This reaction united the working world in a community marked by great solidarity.

Following the lines laid down by the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* and many later documents of the Church's Magisterium, it must be frankly recognized that the reaction against the system of injustice and harm that cried to heaven for vengeance" and that weighed heavily upon workers in that period of rapid industrialization was justified *from the point of view of social morality*. This state of affairs was favoured by the liberal socio-political system, which, in accordance with its "economistic" premises, strengthened and safeguarded economic initiative by the possessors of capital alone, but did not pay sufficient attention to the rights of the workers, on the grounds that human work is solely an instrument of production, and that capital is the basis, efficient factor and purpose of production.

ENCYCLICAL ON HUMAN WORK 19

From that time, worker solidarity, together with a clearer and more committed realization by others of workers' rights, has in many cases brought about profound changes. Various forms of neo-capitalism or collectivism have developed. Various new systems have been thought out. Workers can often share in running businesses and in controlling their productivity, and in fact do so. Through appropriate associations, they exercise influence over conditions of work and pay, and also over social legislation. But at the same time various ideological or power systems, and new relationships which have arisen at various levels of society, *have allowed flagrant injustices to persist or have created new ones.* On the word level, the development of civilization and of communications has made possible a more complete diagnosis of the living and working conditions of man globally, but it has also revealed other forms of injustice, much more extensive than those which in the last century stimulated unity between workers for particular solidarity in the working world. This is true in countries which have completed a certain process of industrial revolution. It is also true in countries where the main working milieu continues to be *agriculture* or other similar occupations.

Movements of solidarity in the sphere of work — a solidarity that must never mean being closed to dialogue and collaboration with others — can be necessary also with reference to the condition of social groups that were not previously included in such movements but which, in changing social systems and conditions of living, are undergoing *what is in effect "proletarianization"* or which actually already find themselves in a "proletariat" situation, one which, even if not yet given that name, in fact deserves it. This can be true of certain categories or groups of the working "intelligentsia", especially when ever wider access to education and an ever increasing number of people with degrees or diplomas in the fields of their cultural preparation are accompanied by a drop in demand for their labour. This *unemployment of intellectuals* occurs or increases when the education available is not oriented towards the types of employment or service required by the true needs of society, or when there is less demand for work which requires education, at least professional education, than for manual labour, or when it is less well paid. Of course, education in itself is always valuable and an important enrichment of the human person; but in spite of that, "proletarianization" processes remain possible.

20 BOLETIN ECCLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

For this reason, *there must be continued study of the subject of work* and of the subject's living conditions. In order to achieve social justice in the various parts of the world, in the various countries, and in the relationships between them, there is a need for ever new *movements of solidarity* of the workers and *with* the workers. This solidarity must be present whenever it is called for by the social degrading of the of the subject of work, by exploitation of the workers, and by the growing areas of poverty and even hunger. The Church is firmly committed to this cause, for she considers it her mission, her service, a proof of her fidelity to Christ, so that she can truly be the "Church of the poor". And the "poor" appear under various forms; they appear in various places and at various times; in many cases they appear as a *result of the violation of the dignity of human work*: either because the opportunities for human work are limited as a result of the scourge of unemployment, or because a low value is put on work and the rights that flow from it, especially the right to a just wages and to the personal security of the worker and his or her family.

9. WORK AND PERSONAL DIGNITY

Remaining within the context of man as the subject of work, it is now appropriate to touch upon, at least in a summary way, certain problems that *more closely define the dignity of human work*, in that they make it possible to characterize more fully its specific moral value. In doing this we must always keep in mind the biblical calling to "subdue the earth",¹⁴ in which is expressed the will of the Creator that work should enable man to achieve that "dominion" in the visible world that is proper to him.

God's fundamental and original intention with regard to man, whom he created in his image and after his likeness,¹⁵ was not withdrawn or cancelled out even when man, having broken the original covenant with God, heard the words: "In the sweat of your face you shall eat bread".¹⁶ These words refer to *the sometimes heavy toil* that from then onwards has accompanied human work; but they do not alter the fact that work is the means whereby man *achieves that "dominion"*

¹⁴ Cf. Gen. 1:28.

¹⁵ Cf. Gen. 1:26-27.

¹⁶ Gen. 3:19.

which is proper to him over the visible world, by "subjecting" the earth. Toil is something that is universally known, for it is universally experienced. It is familiar to those doing physical work under sometimes exceptionally laborious conditions. It is familiar not only to agricultural workers, who spend long days working the land, which sometimes "bears thorns and thistles",¹⁷ but also to those who work in mines and quarries, to steel-workers at their blast-furnaces, to those who work in builders' yards and in construction work, often in danger of injury or death. It is likewise familiar to those at an intellectual workbench; to scientists; to those who bear the burden of grave responsibility for decisions that will have a vast impact on society. It is familiar to doctors and nurses, who spend days and nights at their patients' bedside. It is familiar to women, who, sometimes without proper recognition on the part of society and even of their own families, bear the daily burden and responsibility for their homes and the upbringing of their children. *It is familiar to all workers* and, since work is a universal calling, it is familiar to everyone.

And yet, in spite of all this toil — perhaps, in a sense, because of it — work is a good thing for man. Even though it bears the mark of a bonum arduum, in the terminology of Saint Thomas,¹⁸ this does not take away the fact that as such, it is a good thing for man. It is not only good in the sense that it is useful or something to enjoy; it is also good as being something worthy, that is to say, something that corresponds to man's dignity, that expresses this dignity and increases it. If one wishes to define more clearly the ethical meaning of work, it is this truth that one must particularly keep in mind. Work is a good thing for man — a good thing for this humanity — because through work man *not only transforms nature, adapting it to his own needs, but he also achieves fulfilment as a human being and indeed, in a sense, becomes "more a human being"*.

Without this consideration it is impossible to understand the meaning of the virtue of industriousness, and more particularly it is impossible to understand why industriousness should be a virtue: for virtue, as a moral habit, is something whereby man becomes good as man.¹⁹ This fact in no way alters our justifiable anxiety that in work, whereby *matter* gains in nobility, *man* himself should not experience a lowering

¹⁷ Heb. 6:8; cf. Gen. 3:18.

¹⁸ Cf. *Summa Th.* I-II, q. 40, a.1, c.; I-II, q. 34, a.2, ad 1.

¹⁹ Cf. *Summa Th.*, I-II, q. 40, a.1, c.; I-II, q. 34, a.2, ad 1.

of his own dignity.²⁰ Again, it is well known that is possible to use work in various ways *against man*, that it is possible man with the system of forced labour in concentration camps, that work can be made into a means for oppressing man, and that in various ways it is possible to exploit human labour, that is to say the worker. All this pleads in favor of the moral obligation to link industriousness as a virtue with *the social order of work*, which will enable man to become, in work, "more a human being" and not be degraded by it not only because of the wearing out of his physical strength (which, at least up to a certain point, is inevitable), but especially through damage to the dignity and subjectivity that are proper to him.

10. WORK AND SOCIETY: FAMILY AND NATION

Having thus confirmed the personal dimension of human work, we must go on to the second *sphere of values* which is necessarily linked to work. Work constitutes a foundation for the formation of *family life*, which is a natural right and something that man is called to. These two spheres of values — one linked to work and the other consequent on the family nature of human life — must be properly united and must properly permeate each other. In a way, work is a condition for making it possible to found a family, since the family requires the means of subsistence which man normally gains through work. Work and industriousness also influence the whole *process of education* in the family, for the very reason that everyone "becomes a human being" through, among other things, work, and becoming a human being is precisely the main purpose of the whole process of education. Obviously, two aspects of work in a sense come into play here: the one making family life and its upkeep possible, and the other making possible the achievement of the purposes of the family, especially education. Nevertheless, these two aspects of work are linked to one another and are mutually complementary in various points.

It must be remembered and affirmed that the family constitutes one of the most important terms of reference for shaping the social and ethical order of human work. The teaching of the Church has always devoted special attention to this question, and in the present document we shall have to

²⁰ Cf. Pope Pius XI, Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*: AAS 23(1931), pp. 221-222.

return to it. In fact, the family is simultaneously a *community made possible by work* and the first *school of work*, within the home, for every person.

The third sphere of values that emerges from this point of view — that of the subject of work — concerns the *great society* to which man belongs on the basis of particular cultural and historical links. This society — even when it has not yet taken on the mature form of a nation — is not only the great “educator” of every man, even though an indirect one (because each individual absorbs within the family the contents and values that go to make up the culture of a given nation); it is also a great historical and social incarnation of the work of all generations. All of this brings it about that man combines his deepest human identity with membership of a nation, and intends his work also to increase the common good developed together with his compatriots, thus realizing that in this way work serves to add to the heritage of the whole human family, of all the people living in the world.

These three spheres are always *important for human work* in its subjective dimension. And this dimension, that is to say, the concrete reality of the worker, takes precedence over the objective dimension. In the subjective dimension there is realized first of all, that “dominion” over the world of nature to which man is called from the beginning according to the words of the Book of Genesis. The very process of “subduing the earth”, that is to say work, is marked in the course of history, and especially in recent centuries, by an immense development of technological means. This is an advantageous and positive phenomenon, on condition that the objective dimension of work does not gain the upper hand over the subjective dimension, depriving man of his dignity and inalienable rights or reducing them.

III

CONFLICT BETWEEN LABOUR AND CAPITAL IN THE PRESENT PHASE OF HISTORY

11. DIMENSIONS OF THE CONFLICT

The sketch of the basic problems of work outlined above draws inspiration from the texts at the beginning of the Bible and in a sense forms the very framework of the Church's teach-

ing, which has remained unchanged throughout the centuries within the context of different historical experiences. However, the experiences preceding and following the publication of the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum* form a background that endows that teaching with particular expressiveness and the eloquence of living relevance. In this analysis, work is seen as a great reality with a fundamental influence on the shaping in a human way of the world that the Creator has entrusted to man; it is a reality closely linked with man as the subject of work and with man's rational activity. In the normal course of events this reality fills human life and strongly affects its value and meaning. Even when it is accompanied by toil and effort, work is still something good, and so man develops through love for work. This entirely *positive and creative, educational and meritorious character of man's work* must be the basis for the judgments and decisions being made today in its regard in spheres that include *human rights*, as in evidenced by the international *declarations* on work and the many labour codes prepared either by the competent legislative institutions in the various countries or by organizations devoting their social, or scientific and social, activity to the problems of work. One organization fostering such initiatives on the international level is the International Labour Organization, the oldest specialized agency of the United Nations Organization.

In the following part of these considerations I intend to return in greater detail to these important questions, recalling at least the basic elements of the Church's teaching on the matter. I must however first touch on a very important field of questions in which her teaching has taken shape in this latest period, the one marked and in a sense symbolized by the publication of the *Encyclical Rerum Novarum*.

Throughout this period, which is by no means yet over, the issue of work has of course been posed on the basis of the great *conflict* that in the age of, and together with, industrial development emerged *between "capital" and "labour"*, that is to say between the small but highly influential group of entrepreneurs, owners or holders of the means of production, and the broader multitude of people who lacked these means and who shared in the process of production solely by their labour. The conflict originated in the fact that the workers put in their powers at the disposal of the entrepreneurs, and these, following the principle of maximum profit, tried to establish the lowest possible wages for the work done by the employees. In addition there

were other elements of exploitation, connected with the lack of safety at work and of safeguards regarding the health and living conditions of the workers and their families.

This conflict, interpreted by some as a socio-economic *class conflict*, between liberalism, understood as the ideology of capitalism, and Marxism, understood as the ideology of scientific socialism and communism, which professes to act as the spokesman for the working class and the world-wide proletariat. Thus the real conflict between labour and capital was transformed into a *systematic class struggle*, conducted not only by ideological means but also and chiefly by political means. We are familiar with the history of this conflict and with the demands of both sides. The Marxist programme, based on the philosophy of Marx and Engels, sees in class struggle the only way to eliminate class injustices in society and to eliminate the classes themselves. Putting this programme into practice presupposes *the collectivization of the means of production* so that, through the transfer of these means from private hands to the collectivity, human labour will be preserved from exploitation.

This is the goal of the struggle carried on by political as well as ideological means. In accordance with the principle of "the dictatorship of the proletariat", the groups that as political parties follow the guidance of Marxist ideology aim by the use of various kinds of influence, including revolutionary pressure, to win *a monopoly of power in each society*, in order to introduce the collectivist system into it by eliminating private ownership of the means of production. According to the principal ideologists and leaders of this broad international movement, the purpose of this programme of action is to achieve the social revolution and to introduce socialism and, finally, the communist system throughout the world.

As we touch on this extremely important field of issues, which constitute not only a theory but a whole fabric of socio-economic, political, and international life in our age, we cannot *go into the details*, nor is this necessary, for they are known both from the vast literature on the subject and by experience. Instead, we must leave the context of these issues and go back to the fundamental issue of human work, which is the main subject of the considerations in this document. It is clear, indeed, that this issue, which is of such importance for man — it constitutes one of the fundamental dimensions of his earthly existence and of his vocation — can also be explained only by taking into account the full context of the contemporary situation.

12. THE PRIORITY OF LABOUR

The structure of the present-day situation is deeply marked by many conflicts caused by man, and the technological means produced by human work play a primary role in it. We should also consider here the prospect of worldwide catastrophe in the case of a nuclear war, which would have almost unimaginable possibilities of destruction. In view of this situation we must first of all recall a principle that has always been taught by the Church: *the principle of the priority of labour over capital*. This principle directly concerns the process of production: in this process labour is always a primary *efficient cause*, while capital, the whole collection of means of production, remains a mere *instrument* or instrumental cause. This principle is an evident truth that emerges from the whole of man's historical experience.

When we read in the first chapter of the Bible that man is to subdue the earth, we know that these words refer to all the resources contained in the visible world and placed at man's disposal. However, these resources *can serve man only through work*. From the beginning there is also linked with work the question of ownership, for the only means that man has for causing the resources hidden in nature to serve himself and others is his work. And to be able through his work to make these resources bear fruit, man takes over ownership of small parts of the various riches of nature: those beneath the ground, those in the sea, on land, or in space. He takes all these things over by making them his work-bench. He takes them over through work and for work.

The same principle applies in the successive phases of this process, in which the *first phase* always remains the relationship of man with *the resources and riches of nature*. The whole of the effort to acquire knowledge with the aim of discovering these riches and specifying the various ways in which they can be used by man and for man teaches us that everything that comes from man throughout the whole process of economic production, whether labour or the whole collection of means of production and the technology connected with these means (meaning the capability to use them in work), presupposes these riches and resources of the visible world, riches and resources *that man finds* and does not create. In a sense man finds them already prepared, ready for him to discover them and to use them correctly in the productive process. In every phase of the development of his work man comes up against the leading role of *the gift made* by "nature", that is to say, in the final

analysis, *by the Creator*. And the beginning of man's work is the mystery of creation. This affirmation, already indicated as my starting point, is the guiding thread of this document, and will be further developed in the last part of these reflections.

Further consideration of this question should confirm our conviction of *the priority of human labour over what in the course of time we have grown accustomed to calling capital*. Since the concept of capital includes not only the natural resources placed at man's disposal but also the whole collection of means by which man appropriates natural resources and transforms them in accordance with his needs (and thus in a sense humanizes them), it must immediately be noted that *all these means are the result of the historical heritage of human labour*. All the means of production, from the most primitive to the ultramodern ones — it is man that has gradually developed them: man's experience and intellect. In this way there have appeared not only the simplest instrument for cultivating the earth but also, through adequate progress in science and technology, the more modern and complex ones: machines, factories, laboratories, and computers. Thus *everything that is at the service of work, everything that in the present state of technology constitutes its ever more highly perfected "instrument", is the result of work*.

This gigantic and powerful instrument — the whole collection of means of production that in a sense are considered synonymous with "capital" — is the result of work and bears the signs of human labour. At the present stage of technological advance, when man, who is the subject of work, wishes to make use of this collection of modern instruments, the means of production, he must first assimilate cognitively the result of the work of the people who invented those instruments, who planned them, built them and perfected them, and who continue to do so. *Capacity for work* — that is to say, for sharing efficiently in the modern production process — demands greater and greater *preparation* and, before all else, proper *training*. Obviously, it remains clear that every human being sharing in the production process, even if he or she is only doing the kind of work for which no special training or qualifications are required, is the real efficient subject in this production process, while the whole collection of instruments, no matter how perfect they may be in themselves, are only a mere instrument subordinate to human labour.

This truth, which is part of the abiding heritage of the Church's teaching, must always be emphasized with reference to the question of the labour system and with regard to the whole socio-economic system. We must emphasize and give prominence to the primacy of man in the production process, *the primacy of man over things*. Everything contained in the concept of capital in the strict sense is only a collection of things. Man, as the subject of work, and independently of the work that he does — man alone is a person. This truth has important and decisive consequences.

13. ECONOMISM AND MATERIALISM

In the light of the above truth we see clearly, first of all, that capital cannot be separated from labour; in no way can labour be opposed to capital or capital to labour, and still less can the actual people behind these concepts be opposed to each other, as will be explained later. A labour system can be right, in the sense of being in conformity with the very essence of the issue, and in the sense of being intrinsically true and also morally legitimate, if in its very basis *it overcomes the opposition between labour and capital* through an effort at being shaped in accordance with the principle put forward above: the principle of the substantial and real priority of labour, of the subjectivity of human labour and its effective participation in the whole production process, independently of the nature of the services provided by the worker.

Opposition between labour and capital does not spring from the structure of the production process or from the structure of the economic process. In general the latter process demonstrates that labour and what we are accustomed to call capital are intermingled; it shows that they are inseparably linked. Working at any work-bench, whether a relatively primitive or an ultramodern one, a man can easily see that *through his work he enters into two inheritances*: the inheritance of what is given to the whole of humanity in the resources of nature, and the inheritance of what others have already developed on the basis of those resources, primarily by developing technology, that is to say, by producing a whole collection of increasingly perfect instruments for work. In working, man also "enters into the labour of others".²¹ Guided both by our intelligence and by the faith that draws light from the word of God, we have no dif-

²¹ Cf. Jn. 4:38.

ficulty in accepting this image of the sphere and process of man's labour. It is a consistent image, one that is humanistic as well as theological. In it man is the master of the creature placed at his disposal in the visible world. If some dependence is discovered in the work process, it is dependence on the Giver of all the resources of creation, and also on other human beings, those to whose work and initiative we owe the perfected and increased possibilities of our own work. All that we can say of everything in the production process which constitutes a whole collection of "things", the instruments, the capital, is that it conditions man's work; we cannot assert that it constitutes as it were an impersonal "subject" putting man and man's work into a position of dependence.

This consistent image, in which the principle of the primacy of person over things is strictly preserved, was broken up in human thought, sometimes after a long period of incubation in practical living. The break occurred in such a way that labour was separated from capital and set in opposition to it, and capital was set in opposition to labour, as though they were two impersonal forces, two production factors juxtaposed in the same "economistic" perspective. This way of stating the issue contained a fundamental error, what we can call the error of economism, that of considering human labour solely according to its economic purpose. This fundamental error of thought can and must be called an error of materialism, in the economism directly or indirectly includes a conviction of the primacy and superiority of the material, and directly or indirectly places the spiritual and the personal (man's activity, moral values and such matters) in a position of subordination to material reality. This is still not theoretical materialism in the full sense of the term, but it is certainly practical materialism, a materialism judged capable of satisfying man's needs, not so much on the grounds of premises derived from materialist theory, as on the grounds of a particular way of evaluating things, and so on the grounds of a certain hierarchy of goods based on the greater immediate attractiveness of what is material.

The error of thinking in the categories of economism went hand in hand with the formation of a materialist philosophy, as this philosophy developed from the most elementary and common phase (also called common materialism, because it professes to reduce spiritual reality to a superfluous phenomenon) to the phase of what is called dialectical materialism. However, within the framework of the present consideration, it seems that economism had a decisive importance for the fundamental issue of human work, in particular for the separation of labour and

capital and for setting them up in opposition as two production factors viewed in the above mentioned economic perspective; and it seems that economism influenced this non-humanistic way of stating the issue before the materialist philosophical system did. Nevertheless it is obvious that materialism, including its dialectical form, is incapable of providing sufficient and definitive bases for thinking about human work, in order that the primacy of man over the capital instrument, the primacy of the person over things, may find in it adequate and irrefutable *confirmation and support*. In dialectical materialism too man is not first and foremost the subject of work and the efficient cause of the production process, but continues to be understood and treated, independence on what is material, as a kind of "resultant" of the economic or production relations prevailing at a given period.

Obviously, the antinomy between labour and capital under consideration here — *the antinomy in which labour was separated from capital and set up in opposition to it*, in a certain sense on the ontic level, as if it were just an element like any other in the economic process — did not originate merely in the philosophy and economic theories of the eighteenth century; rather it originated in the whole of the *economic and social practice* of that time, the time of the birth and rapid development of industrialization, in which what was mainly seen was the possibility of vastly increasing material wealth, means, while the end, that is to say, man, who should be served by the means, was ignored. It was this practical error that *struck a blow* first and foremost against human labour, against *the working man*, and caused the ethically just social reaction already spoken of above. The same error, which is now part of history, and which was connected with the period of primitive capitalism and liberalism, can nevertheless be repeated in other circumstances of time and place, if people's thinking starts from the same theoretical or practical premises. The only chance there seems to be for radically overcoming this error is through adequate changes both in theory and in practice, changes *in line with* the definite *conviction of the primacy of the person over things*, and of *human labour over capital* as a whole collection of means of production.

14. WORK AND OWNERSHIP

The historical process briefly presented here has certainly gone beyond its initial phase, but it is still taking place and indeed is spreading in the relationships between nations and

continents. It needs to be specified further from another point of view. It is obvious that, when we speak of opposition between labour and capital, we are not dealing only with abstract concepts on "impersonal forces" operating in economic production. Behind both concepts there are people, living, actual people: on the one side are those who do the work without being the owners of the means of production, and on the other side those who act as entrepreneurs and who own these means or represent the owners. Thus *the issue of ownership or property* enters from the beginning into the whole of this difficult historical process. The Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, which has the social question as its theme, stresses this issue also, recalling and confirming the Church's teaching on ownership, on the right to private property even when it is a question of the means of production. The Encyclical *Mater et Magistra* did the same.

The above principle, as it was then stated and as it is still taught by the Church, *diverges* radically from the programme of *collectivism* as proclaimed by Marxism and put into practice in various countries in the decades following the time of Leo XIII's Encyclical. At the same time it differs from the programme of *capitalism* practised by liberalism and by the political systems inspired by it. In the latter case, the difference consist in the way the right to ownership or property is understood. Christian tradition has never upheld this right as absolute and untouchable. On the contrary, it has always understood this right within the broader context of the right common to all to use the goods of the whole of creation: *the right to private property is subordinated to the right to common use*, to the fact that goods are meant for everyone.

Furthermore, in the Church's teaching, ownership has never been understood in a way that could constitute grounds for social conflict in labour. As mentioned above, property is acquired first of all through work in order that it may serve work. This concerns in a special way ownership of the means of production. Isolating these means as a separate property in order to set it up in the form of "capital" in opposition to "labour" — and even to practice exploitation of labour — is contrary to the very nature of these means and their possession. They cannot be *possessed against labour*, they cannot even be *posses for possession's sake*, because the only legitimate title to their possession — whether in the form of private ownership or in the form of public or collective ownership — is *that they should serve labour*, and thus, by serving labour, that they should make possible the achievement of the first principle of

this order, namely, the universal destination of goods and the right to common use of them. From this point of view, therefore, in consideration of human labour and of common access to the goods meant for man, one cannot exclude the *socialization*, in suitable conditions, of certain means of production. In the course of the decades since the publication of the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, the Church's teaching has always recalled all these principles, going back to the arguments formulated in a much older tradition, for example, the well-known arguments of the *Summa Theologiae* of Saint Thomas Aquinas.²²

In the present document, which has human work as its main theme, it is right to confirm all the effort with which the Church's teaching has striven and continues to strive always to ensure the priority of work and, thereby, man's character as a *subject* in social life and, especially, in the dynamic *structure of the whole economic process*. From this point of view the position of "rigid" capitalism continues to remain unacceptable, namely the position that defends the exclusive right to private ownership of the means of production as an untouchable "dogma" of economic life. The principle of respect for work demands that this right should undergo a constructive revision, both in theory and in practice. If it is true that capital, as the whole of the means of production, is at the same time the product of the work of generations, it is equally true that capital is being unceasingly created through the work done with the help of all these means of production, and these means can be seen as a great workbench at which the present generation of workers is working day after day. Obviously we are dealing here with different kinds of work, not only so-called manual labour but also the many forms of intellectual work, including white-collar work and management.

In the light of the above, the many proposals put forward by experts in Catholic social teaching and by the highest Magisterium of the Church take on special significance:²³ *proposals for joint ownership of the means of work*, sharing by the workers in the management and/or profits of businesses, so-called shareholding by labour, etc. Whether these various proposals can or cannot be applied concretely, it is clear that recognition of

²² On the right to property see *Summa Th.*, II-II, q. 66, arts. 2 and 6; *De regimine Principum*, book 1, chapters 15 and 17. On the social function of property see *Summa Th.*, II-II, q. 134, art. 1, ad 3.

²³Cf. Pope Pius XI, Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*: AAS 23 (1931), p. 199; Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World *Gaudium et Spes*, 68: AAS 58 (1966), pp. 1089-1090.

the proper position of labour and the worker in the production process demands various adaptations in the sphere of the right to ownership of the means of production. This is so not only in view of older situations but also, first and foremost, in view of the whole of the situation and the problems in the second half of the present century with regard to the so-called Third World and the various new independent countries that have arisen, especially in Africa but elsewhere as well, in place of the colonial territories of the past.

Therefore, while the position of "rigid" capitalism must undergo continual revision, in order to be reformed from the point of view of human rights, both human rights in the widest sense and those linked with man's work, it must be stated that, from the same point of view, these many deeply desired reforms cannot be achieved by a *prior elimination of private ownership of the means of production*. For it must be noted that merely taking these means of production (capital) out of the hands of their private owners is not enough to ensure their satisfactory socialization. They cease to be the property of a certain social group, namely the private owners, is not enough to ensure their satisfactory socialization. They cease to be the property of a certain social group, namely the private owners, and become the property of organized society, coming under the administration and direct control of another group of people, namely those who, through not owning them, from the fact of exercising power in society *manage* them on the level of the whole national or the local economy.

This group in authority may carry out its task satisfactorily from the point of view of the priority of labour; but it may also carry it out badly by claiming for itself a *monopoly of the administration and disposal* of the means of production and not refraining even from offending basic human rights. Thus, merely converting the means of production into State property in the collectivist system is by no means equivalent to "socializing" that property. We can speak of socializing only when the subject character of society is ensured, that is to say, when on the basis of his work each person is fully entitled to consider himself a part-owner of the great work bench at which he is working with every one else. A way towards that goal could be found by associating labour with the ownership of capital, as far as possible, and by producing a wide range of intermediate bodies with economic, social and cultural purposes; they would be bodies enjoying real autonomy with regard to the public powers, pursuing their specific aims in honest collabora-

tion with each other and in subordination to the demands of the common good, and they would be living communities both in form and in substance, in the sense that the members of each body would be looked upon and treated as persons and encouraged to take an active part in the life of the body.²⁴

15. THE "PERSONALIST" ARGUMENT

Thus, *the principle of the priority of labour over capital* is a postulate of the order of social morality. It has key importance both in the system built on the principle of private ownership of the means of production and also in the system in which private ownership of these means has been limited even in a radical way. Labour is in a sense inseparable from capital; in no way does it accept the antinomy, that is to say, the separation and opposition with regard to the means of production that has weighed upon, human life in recent centuries as a result of merely economic premises. When man works, using all the means of production, he also wishes the fruit of this work to be used by himself and others, and he wishes to be able to take part in the very work process as a sharer in responsibility and creativity at the workbench to which he applies himself.

From this spring certain specific rights of workers, corresponding to the obligation of work. They will be discussed later. But here it must be emphasized, in general terms, that the person who works desires *not only due remuneration* for his work; he also wishes that, within the production process, provision be made for him to be able to *know* that in his work, even on something that is owned in common, he is working "for himself". This awareness is extinguished within him in a system of excessive bureaucratic centralization, which makes the worker feel that he is just a cog in a huge machine moved from above, that he is for more reasons than one a mere production instrument rather than a true subject of work with an initiative of his own. The church's teaching has always expressed the strong and deep conviction that man's work concerns *not only* the economy but also, and especially, personal values. The economic system itself and the production process benefit precisely when these personal values are fully respected. In the mind of Saint Thomas Aquinas,²⁵ this is the principal reason in favour of

²⁴ Cf. Pope John XXIII, Encyclical *Mater et Magistra*: AAS 53 (1961), p. 419.

²⁵ Cf. *Summa Th.*, II-II, q. 65, a. 2.

private ownership of the means of production. While we accept that for certain well founded reasons exceptions can be made to the principle of private ownership — in our own time we even see that the system of “socialized ownership” has been introduced — nevertheless the personalist *argument still holds* good both on the level of principles and *on the practical level*. If it is to be rational and fruitful, any socialization of the means of production must take this argument into consideration. Every effort must be made to ensure that in this kind of system also the human person can preserve his awareness of working “for himself”. If this is not done, incalculable damage is inevitably done throughout the economic process, not only economic damage but first and foremost damage to man.

IV

RIGHTS OF WORKERS

16. *WITHIN THE BROAD CONTEXT OF HUMAN RIGHTS*

While work, in all its many senses, is an obligation, that is to say a duty, it is also a source of rights on the part of the *worker*. These rights must be examined in the broad *context of human rights as a whole*, which are connatural with man, and many of which are proclaimed by various international organizations and increasingly guaranteed by the individual States for their citizens. Respect for this broad range of human rights constitutes the fundamental condition for peace in the modern world: peace both within individual countries and societies and in international relations, as the Church’s Magisterium has several times noted, especially since the Encyclical *Pacem in Terris*. The *human rights that flow from work* are part of the broader context of those fundamental rights of the person.

However, within this context they have a specific character corresponding to the specific nature of human-work as outlined above. It is in keeping with this character that we must view them. Work is, as has been said, *an obligation*, that is to say, *a duty, on the part of man*. This is true *in all the many meanings of the word*. Man must work, both because the Creator **has** commanded it and because of his own humanity, which

requires work in order to be maintained and developed. Man must work out of regard for others, especially his own family, but also for the society he belongs to, the country of which he is a child, and the whole human family of which he is a member, since he is the heir to the work of generation and at the same time a sharer in building the future of those who will come after him in the succession of history. All this constitutes the moral obligation of work, understood in its wide sense. When we have to consider the moral rights, corresponding to this obligation, of every person with regard to work, we must always keep before our eyes the whole vast range of points of reference in which the labour of every working subject is manifested.

For when we speak of the obligation of work and of the rights of the worker that correspond to this obligation, we think in the first place of the relationship between *the employer, direct or indirect, and the worker*.

The distinction between the direct and the indirect employer is seen to be very important when one considers both the way in which labour is actually organized and the possibility of the formation of just or unjust relationships in the field of labour.

Since *the direct employer* is the person or institution with whom the worker enters directly into a work contract in accordance with definite conditions, we must understand as *the indirect employer* many different factors, other than the direct employer, that exercise a determining influence on the shaping both of the work contract and, consequently, of just or unjust relationships in the field of human labour.

17. DIRECT AND INDIRECT EMPLOYER

The concept of indirect employer includes both persons and institutions of various kinds, and also collective labour contracts and the *principles* of conduct which are laid down by these persons and institutions and which determine the whole socio-economic *system* or are its result. The concept of "indirect employer" thus refers to many different elements. The responsibility of the indirect employer differs from that of the direct employer — the term itself indicates that the responsibility is less direct — but it remains a true responsibility: the indirect employer substantially determines one or other facet of the labour relationship, thus conditioning the conduct of the direct employer when the latter determines in concrete terms the actual work contract and labour relations. This is not to absolve the direct

employer from the own responsibility, but only to draw attention to the whole network of influences that condition his conduct. When it is a question of establishing *an ethically correct labour policy*, all these influences must be kept in mind. A policy is correct when the objective rights of the worker are fully respected.

The concept of indirect employer is applicable to every society, and in the first place to the State. For it is the State that must conduct a just labour policy. However, it is common knowledge that in the present system of economic relations in the world there are numerous *links between individuals States*, links that find expression, for instance, in the important and exports process, that is to say, in the mutual exchange of economic goods, whether raw materials, semi-manufactured goods, or finished industrial products. These links also create mutual *dependence*, and as a result it would be difficult to speak, in case of any State, even the economically most powerful, of complete self-sufficiency or autarky.

Such a system of mutual dependence is in itself normal. However, it can easily become an occasion for various forms of exploitation or injustice and as a result influence the labour policy of individual States; and finally it can influence the individual worker, who is the proper subject of labour. For instance the *highly industrialized countries*, and even more the business that direct on a large scale the means of industrial production (the companies referred to as multinational or transnational), fix the highest possible prices for their products, while trying at the same time to fix the lowest possible prices for raw materials or semi-manufactured goods. This is one of the causes of an ever increasing disproportion between national incomes. The gap between most of the richest countries and the poorest ones is not diminishing or being stabilized but is increasing more and more, to the detriment, obviously, of the poor countries. Evidently this must have an effect on local labour policy and on the worker's situation in the economically disadvantaged societies. Finding himself in a system thus conditioned, the direct employer fixes working conditions below the objective requirements of the workers, especially if he himself wishes to obtain the highest possible profits from the business which he runs (or from the businesses which he runs, in the case of a situation of "socialized" ownership of the means of production).

It is easy to see that this framework of forms of dependence linked with the concept of the indirect employer is enormously

extensive and complicated. It is determined, in a sense, by all the elements that are decisive for economic life *within a given society and state*, but also by much wider links and forms of dependence. The attainment of the worker's rights cannot however be doomed to be merely a result of economic systems on a larger or smaller scale are guided chiefly by the criterion of maximum profit. On the contrary, it is respect for the objective rights of the worker — every kind of worker: manual or intellectual, industrial or agricultural, etc. — that must constitute *the adequate and fundamental criterion* for shaping the whole economy, both on the level of the individual society and State and within the whole of the world economic policy and of the system of international relationships that derive from it.

Influence in this direction should be exercised by all *the International Organizations* whose concern it is, beginning with the United Nations and other bodies to have fresh contributions to offer on this point in particular. Within the individual States there are ministries or *public departments* and also various *social institutions* set up for this purpose. All of this effectively indicates the importance of the indirect employer — as has been said above — in achieving full respect for the worker's rights, since the rights of the human person are the key element in the whole of the social moral order.

18. THE EMPLOYMENT ISSUE

When we consider the rights of workers in relation to the "indirect employer", that is to say, all the agents at the national and international level that are responsible for the whole orientation of labour policy, we must first direct our attention to a *fundamental issue*: the question of finding work, or, in other words, the issue of *suitable employment for all who are capable of it*. The opposite of a just and right situation in this field is unemployment, that is to say the lack of work for those who are capable of it. It can be a question of general unemployment or of unemployment in certain sectors of work. The role of the agents included under the title of indirect employer is *to act against unemployment*, which in all cases is an evil, and which, when it reaches a certain level, can become a real social disaster. It is particularly painful when it especially affects young people, who after appropriate cultural, technical and professional preparation fail to find work, and see their sincere wish to work and their readiness to take on their own responsibility for the economic and social development of the community sadly frus-

trated. The obligation to provide unemployment benefits, that is to say, the duty to make suitable grants indispensable for the subsistence of unemployed workers and their families, is a duty springing from the fundamental principle of the moral order in this sphere, namely the principle of the common use of goods or, to put it in another and still simpler way, the right to life and subsistence.

In order to meet the danger of unemployment and to ensure employment for all, the agents defined here as "indirect employer" must make provision for *overall planning* with regard to the different kinds of work by which not only the economic life but also the cultural life of a given society is shaped; they must also give attention to organizing that work in a correct and rational way. In the final analysis this overall concern weighs on the shoulders of the State, but it cannot mean one-sided centralization by the public authorities. Instead, what is in question is a just and rational *coordination*, within the framework of which the *initiative of individuals*, free groups and local work centres and complexes must be *safeguarded*, keeping in mind what has been said above with regard to the subject character of human labour.

The fact of the mutual dependence of societies and States and the need to collaborate in various areas mean that, while preserving the sovereign rights of each society and State in the field of planning and organizing labour in its own society, action in this important area must also be taken in the dimension of *international collaboration* by means of the necessary treaties and agreements. Here too the criterion for these pacts and agreements must more and more be the criterion of human work considered as a fundamental right of all human beings, work which gives similar rights to all those who work, in such a way that the living standard of the workers in the different societies will *less and less show those disturbing differences* which are unjust and are apt to provoke even violent reactions. The International Organizations have an enormous part to play in this area. They must let themselves be guided by an exact diagnosis of the complex situations and of the influence exercised by natural, historical, civil and other such circumstances. They must also be more highly operative with regard to plans for action jointly decided on, that is to say, they must be more effective in carrying them out.

In this direction it is possible to actuate a plan for universal and proportionate progress by all, in accordance with the guidelines of Paul VI's Encyclical *Populorum Progressio*. It must

be stressed that the constitutive element in this progress and also the most adequate *way to verify it* in a spirit of justice and peace, which the Church proclaims and for which she does not cease to pray to the Father of all individuals and of all peoples, is *the continual reappraisal of man's work*, both in the aspect of its objective finality and in the aspect of the dignity of the subject of all work, that is to say, man. The progress in question must be made through man and for man and it must produce its fruit in man. A test of this progress will be the increasingly mature recognition of the purpose of work and increasingly universal respect for the rights inherent in work in conformity with the dignity of man, the subject of work.

Rational planning and the proper organization of human labour in keeping with individual societies and States should also facilitate the discovery of the right proportions between the different kinds of employment: work on the land, in industry, in the various services, white-collar work and scientific or artistic work, in accordance with the capacities of individuals and for the common good of each society and of the whole of mankind. The organization of human life in accordance with the many possibilities of labour should be matched by a suitable *system of instruction* and education, aimed first of all at developing mature human beings, but also aimed at preparing people specifically for assuming to good advantage an appropriate place in the vast and socially differentiated world of work.

As we view the whole human family throughout the world, we cannot fail to be struck by a *disconcerting fact* of immense proportions: the fact that, while conspicuous natural resources remain unused, there are huge numbers of people who are unemployed or under-employed and countless multitudes of people suffering from hunger. This is a fact that without any doubt demonstrates that both within the individual political communities and in their relationships on the continental and world level there is something wrong with the organization of work and employment, precisely at the most critical and socially most important points.

19. WAGES AND OTHER SOCIAL BENEFITS

After outlining the important role that concern for providing employment for all workers plays in safeguarding respect for the inalienable rights of man in view of his work, it is worthwhile taking a closer look at these rights, which in the final

analysis are formed within the relationship between *worker and direct employer*. All that has been said above on the subject of the indirect employer is aimed at defining these relationships more exactly, by showing the many forms of conditioning within which these relationships are indirectly formed. This consideration does not however have a purely descriptive purpose; it is not a brief treatise on economics or politics. It is a matter of highlighting the *deontological and moral aspect*. The key problem of social ethics in this case is that of just *remuneration* for work done. In the context of the present there is no more important way for securing a just relationship between the worker and the employer than that constituted by remuneration for work. Whether the work is done in a system of private ownership of the means of production or in a system where ownership has undergone a certain "socialization", the relationships between the employer (first and foremost the direct employer) and the worker is resolved on the basis of the wage, that is through just remuneration for work done.

It should also be noted that the justice of a socioeconomic system and, in each case, its just functioning, deserve in the final analysis to be evaluated by the way in which man's work is properly remunerated in the system. Here we return once more to the first principle of the whole ethical and social order, namely *the principle of the common use of goods*. In every system, regardless of the fundamental relationships within it between capital and labour, wages, that is to say *remuneration for work*, are still a *practical means* whereby the vast majority of people can have access to those goods which are intended for common use: both the goods of nature and manufactured goods. Both kinds of goods become accessible to the worker through the wage which he receives as remuneration for his work. Hence, in every case, a just wage is the concrete means of *verifying the justice* of the whole socioeconomic system and, in every case, a just wage is the concrete means of *verifying the justice* of the whole socioeconomic system and, in any case, of checking that it is functioning justly. It is not the only means of checking, but it is a particularly important one and, in a sense, the key means.

This means of checking concerns above all the family. Just remuneration for the work of an adult who is responsible for a family means remuneration which will suffice for establishing and properly maintaining a family and for providing security for its future. Such remuneration can be given either through what is called a *family wage* — that is, a single salary given

to the head of the family for his work, sufficient for the needs of the family without the other spouse having to take up gainful employment outside the home — or through *other social measures* such as family allowances or grants to mothers devoting themselves exclusively to their families. These grants should correspond to the actual needs, that is, to the number of dependents for as long as they are not in a position to assume proper responsibility for their own lives.

Experience confirms that there must be a *social re-evaluation of the mother's role*, of the toil connected with it, and of the need that children have for care, love and affection in order that they may develop into responsible, morally and religiously mature and psychologically stable persons. It will redound to the credit of society to make it possible for a mother — without inhibiting her freedom, without psychological or practical discrimination, and without penalizing her as compared with other women — to devote herself to taking care of her children and educating them in accordance with their needs, which vary with age. Having to abandon these tasks in order to take up paid work outside the home is wrong from the point of view of the good of society and of the family when it contradicts or hinders these primary goals of the mission of a mother.²⁶

In this content it should be emphasized that, on a more general level, the whole labour process must be organized and adapted in such a way as to respect the requirements of the person and his or her forms of life, above all life in the home, taking into account the individual's age and sex. It is a fact that in many societies women work in nearly every sector of life. But it is fitting that they should be able to fulfill their tasks *in accordance with their own nature*, without being discriminated against and without being excluded from jobs for which they are capable, but also without lack of respect for their family aspirations and for their specific role in contributing, together with men, to the good of society. The *true advancement of women* requires that labour should be structured in such a way that women do not have to pay for their advancement by abandoning what is specific to them and at the expense of the family, in which women as mothers have an irreplaceable role.

Besides wages, various *social benefits* intended to ensure the life and health of workers and their families play a part

²⁶ Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World *Gaudium et Spes*, 67 AAS 58 (1966), p. 1089.

here. The expenses involved in health care, especially in the case of accidents at work, demand that medical assistance should be easily available for workers, and that as far as possible it should be cheap or even free of charge. Another sector regarding benefits is the sector associated with the *right to rest*. In comprising at least Sunday, and also a longer period of rest, namely the holiday or vacation taken once a year or possibly in several shorter periods during the year. A third sector concerns the right to a pension and to insurance for old age and in case of accidents at work. Within the sphere of these principal rights, there develops a whole system of particular rights which, together with remuneration for work, determine the correct relationship between worker and employer. Among these rights there should never be overlooked the right to a working environment and to manufacturing processes which are not harmful to the workers' physical health or to their moral integrity.

20. IMPORTANCE OF UNIONS

All these rights, together with the need for the workers themselves to secure them, give rise to yet another right: *the right of association*, that is to form associations for the purpose of defending the vital interests of those employed in the various professions. These associations are called *labour or trade unions*. The vital interests of the workers are to a certain extent common for all of them; at the same time however each type of work, each profession, has its own specific character which should find a particular reflection in these organizations.

In a sense, unions go back to the medieval guilds of artisans, insofar as those organizations brought together people belonging to the same craft and thus *on the basis of their work*. However, unions differ from the guilds on this essential point: the modern unions grip up from the struggle of the workers — to protect their *just rights* vis-a-vis the entrepreneurs and the owners of the means of production. Their task is to defend the existential interests of workers in all sectors in which their rights are concerned. The experience of history teaches that organizations of this type are an indispensable *element of social life*, especially in modern industrialized societies. Obviously, this does not mean that only industrial workers can set up associations of this type. Representatives of every profession can use them to ensure their own rights. Thus there are unions of agricultural workers and of white-collar workers; there are

also employers' associations. All, as has been said above, are further divided into groups or subgroups according to particular professional specializations.

Catholic social teaching does not hold that unions are no more than a reflection of the "class" structure of society and that they are a mouthpiece for a class struggle which inevitably governs social life. They are indeed a *mouthpiece for the struggle for social justice*, for the just rights of working people in accordance with their individual professions. However, this struggle should be seen as a normal endeavour "for" the just good: in the present case, for the good which corresponds to the needs and merits of working people associated by profession; but it is *not a struggle "against" others*. Even if in controversial questions the struggle takes on a character of opposition towards others, this is because it aims at the good of social justice, not for the sake of "struggle" or in order to eliminate the opponent. It is characteristic of work that it first and foremost unites people. In this consists its social power: the power to build a community. In the final analysis, both those who work and those who manage the means of production or who own them must in some way be united in this community. *In the light of this fundamental structure of all work* — in the light of the fact that, in the final analysis, labour and capital are indispensable components of the process of production in any social system — it is clear that, even if it is because of their work needs that people unite to secure their rights, their union remains a constructive factor of *social order and solidarity*, and it is impossible to ignore it.

Just efforts to secure the rights of workers who are united by the same profession should always take into account the limitations imposed by the general economic situation of the country. Union demands cannot be turned into a kind of *group or class "egoism"*, although they can and should also aim at correcting — with a view to the common good of the whole of society — everything defective in the system of ownership of the means of production or in the way these are managed. Social and socioeconomic life is certainly like a system of "connected vessels", and every social activity directed towards safeguarding the rights of particular groups should adapt itself to this system.

In this sense, union activity undoubtedly enters the field of *politics*, understood as *prudent concern for the common good*. However, the role of unions is not to "play politics" in the sense that the expression is commonly understood today. Unions do

not have the character of political parties struggling for power; they should not be subjected to the decision of political parties or have too close links with them. In fact, in such a situation they easily lose contact with their specific role, which is to secure the just rights of workers within the framework of the common good of the whole of society; instead they become *an instrument used for other purposes*.

Speaking of the protection of the just rights of workers according to their individual professions, we must of course always keep in mind that which determines the subjective character of work in each profession, but at the same time, indeed before all else, we must keep in mind that which conditions the specific dignity of the subject of the work. The activity of union organizations opens up many possibilities in this respect, including *their efforts to instruct and educate the workers and to foster their self-education*. Praise is due to the work of the schools, what are known as workers' or people's universities and the training programmes and courses which have developed and are still developing this field of activity. It is always to be hoped that, thanks to the work of their unions, workers will not only *have* more, but above all *be* more: in other words, that they will realize their humanity more fully in every respect.

One method used by unions in pursuing the just rights of their members is *the strike* or work stoppage, as a kind of ultimatum to the competent bodies, especially the employers. This method is recognized by Catholic social teaching as legitimate in the proper conditions and within just limits. In this connection workers should be assured the *right to strike*, without being subjected to personal penal sanctions for taking part in a strike. While admitting that it is a legitimate means, we must at the same time emphasize that a strike remains, in a sense, an extreme means. *It must not be abused*; it must not be abused especially for "political" purposes. Furthermore it must never be forgotten that, when essential community services are in question, they must in every case be ensured, if necessary by means of appropriate legislation. Abuse of the strike weapon can lead to the paralysis of the whole of socioeconomic life, and this is contrary to the requirements of the common good of society, which also corresponds to the properly understood nature of work itself.

21. DIGNITY OF AGRICULTURAL WORK

All that has been said thus far on the dignity of work, on the objective and subjective dimension of human work, can be directly applied to the question of agricultural work and to the situation of the person who cultivates the earth by toiling in the fields. This is a vast sector of work on our planet, a sector not restricted to one or other continent, nor limited to the societies which have already attained a certain level of development and progress. The world of agriculture, which provides society with the goods it needs for its daily sustenance, is of *fundamental importance*. The conditions of the rural population and of agricultural work vary from place to place, and social position of agricultural workers differs from country to country. This depends not only on the level of development of agricultural technology but also, and perhaps more, on the recognition of the just rights of agricultural workers and, finally, on the level of awareness regarding the social ethics of work.

Agricultural work involves considerable difficulties, including unremitting and sometimes exhausting physical effort and a lack of appreciation on the part of society, to the point of making agricultural people feel that they are social outcasts of speeding up the phenomenon of their mass exodus from the countryside to the cities and unfortunately to still more dehumanizing living conditions. Added to this are the lack of adequate professional training and of proper equipment, the spread of a certain individualism, and also *objectively unjust situations*. In certain developing countries, millions of people are forced to cultivate the land belonging to others and are exploited by the big landowners, without any hope of ever being able to gain possession of even a small piece of land of their own. There is a lack of forms of legal protection for the agricultural workers themselves and for their families in case of old age, sickness or unemployment. Long days of hard physical work are paid miserably. Land which could be cultivated is left abandoned by the owners. Legal titles to possession of a small portion of land that someone has personally cultivated for years are disregarded or left defenceless against the "land in the economically developed countries, where scientific research, technological achievements and state policy have brought agriculture to a very advanced level, the right to work can be infringed when the farm workers are denied the possibility of

sharing in decisions concerning their services, or when they are denied the right to free association with a view to their just advancement socially, culturally and economically.

In many situations radical and urgent changes are therefore needed in order to restore to agriculture — and to rural people — their just value *as the basis for a healthy economy*, within the social community's development as a whole. Thus it is necessary to proclaim and promote the dignity of work, of all work but especially of agricultural work, in which man so eloquently "subdues" the earth he has received as a gift from God and affirms his "dominion" in the visible world.

22. THE DISABLED PERSON AND WORK

Recently, national communities and international organizations have turned their attention to another question connected with work, one full of implications: the question of disabled people. They too are fully human subjects with corresponding innate, sacred and inviolable rights, and, in spite of the limitations and sufferings affecting their bodies and faculties, they point up more clearly the dignity and greatness of man. Since disabled people are subjects with all their rights, they should be helped to participate in the life of society in all its aspects and at all the levels accessible to their capacities. The disabled person is one of us and participates fully in the same humanity that we possess. It would be radically unworthy of man, and a denial of our common humanity, to admit to the life of the community, and thus admit to work, only those who are fully functional. To do so would be to practice a *serious form of discrimination*, that of the strong and healthy against the weak and sick. Work in the objective sense should be subordinated, in this circumstance too, to the dignity of man, to the subject of work and not to economic advantage.

The various bodies involved in the world of labour, both the direct and the indirect employer, should therefore by means of effective and appropriate measures foster the right of disabled people to professional training and work, so that they can be given a productive activity suited to them. Many practical problems arise at this point, as well as legal and economic ones; but the community, that is to say, the public authorities, associations and intermediate groups, business enterprises and the disabled themselves should pool their ideas and resources so as to attain this goal that must not be shirked: *that disabled people may be offered work according to their capabilities, for*

this is demanded by their dignity as persons and as subjects of work. Each community will be able to set up suitable structures for finding or creating jobs such people both in the usual public or private enterprises, by offering them ordinary or suitably adapted jobs, and in what are called "protected" enterprises and surroundings.

Careful attention must be devoted to the physical and psychological working conditions of disabled people — as for all workers — to their just remuneration, to the possibility of their just remuneration, to the possibility of their promotion, and to the elimination of various obstacles. Without hiding the fact that this is a complex and difficult task, it is to be hoped that a *correct concept of labour in the subjective sense* will produce a situation which will make it possible for disabled people to feel that they are not cut off from the working world or dependent upon society, but that they are full-scale subjects of work, useful, respected for their human dignity and called to contribute to the progress and welfare of their families and of the community according to their particular capacities.

23. WORK AND THE EMIGRATION QUESTION

Finally, we must say at least a few words on the subject of *emigration in search of work*. This is an age-old phenomenon which nevertheless continues to be repeated and is still today very widespread as a result of the complexities of modern life. Man has the right to leave his native land for various motives — and also the right to return — in order to seek better conditions of life in another country. This fact is certainly not without difficulties of various kinds. Above all which is left behind. It is the departure of a person who is also a member of a great community united by history, tradition and culture; and that person must begin life in the midst of another society united by a different culture and very often by a different language. In this case, it is the loss of a *subject of work*, whose efforts of mind and body could contribute to the common good of his own country, but these efforts, this contribution, are instead offered to another society which in a sense has less right to them than the person's country of origin.

Nevertheless, even if emigration is in some aspects an evil, in certain circumstances it is, as the phrase goes, a **necessary evil**. Everything should be done — and certainly much is **being** done to this end — to prevent this material evil from **causing greater moral harm**; indeed every possible effort **should be** made to ensure that it may bring benefit to the **emigrant's**

personal, family and social life, both for the country to which he goes and the country which he leaves. In this area much depends on just legislation, in particular with regard to the rights of workers. It is obvious that the question of just legislation enters into the context of the present considerations, especially from the point of view of these rights.

The most important thing is that the person working away from his native land, whether as a permanent emigrant or as a seasonal worker, should not be *placed at a disadvantage* in comparison with the other workers in that society in the matter of working rights. Emigration in search of work must in no way become an opportunity for financial or social exploitation. As regards the work relationship, the same criteria should be applied to immigrant workers as to all other workers in the society concerned. The value of work should be measured by the same standard and not according to the difference in nationality, religion or race. For even greater reason the *situation of constraint* in which the emigrant may find himself *should not be exploited*. All these circumstances should categorically give way, after special qualifications have of course been taken into consideration, to the fundamental value of work, which is bound up with the dignity of the human person. Once more the fundamental principle must be repeated: the hierarchy of values and the profound meaning of work itself require that capital should be at the service of labour and not labour at the service of capital.

V

ELEMENTS FOR A SPIRITUALITY OF WORK

24. A PARTICULAR TASK FOR THE CHURCH

It is right to devote the last part of these reflections about human work, on the occasion of the ninetieth anniversary of the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, to the spirituality of work in the Christian sense. Since work in its subjective aspect is always a personal action, an *actus personae*, it follows that *the whole person, body and spirit*, participates in it, whether it is manual or intellectual work. It is also to the whole person that the word of the living God is directed, the evangelical message of

salvation, in which we find many points which concern human work and which throw particular light on it. These points need to be properly assimilated: an inner effort on the part of the human spirit, guided by faith, hope and charity, is needed in order that through these points the *work* of the individual human being may be given the meaning which it has in the eyes of God and by means of which work enters into the salvation process on a par with the other ordinary yet particularly important components of its texture.

The Church considers it her duty to speak out on work from the viewpoint of its human value and of the moral order to which it belongs, and she sees this as one of her important tasks within the service that she renders to the evangelical message as a whole. At the same time she sees it as her particular duty to form a spirituality of work which will help all people to come closer, through work, to God, the Creator and Redeemer, to participate in his salvific plan for man and the world and to deepen their friendship with Christ in their lives by accepting, through faith, a living participation in his threefold mission as Priest, Prophet and King, as the Second Vatican Council so eloquently teaches.

25. WORK AS A SHARING IN THE ACTIVITY OF THE CREATOR

As the Second Vatican Council says, "throughout the course of the centuries, men have laboured to better the circumstances of their lives through a monumental amount of individual and collective effort. To believers, this point is settled: considered in itself, such human activity accords with God's will. For man, created to God's image, received a mandate to subject to himself the earth and all that it contains, and to govern the world with justice and holiness; a mandate to relate himself and the totality of things to him who was to be acknowledged as the Lord and Creator of all. Thus, by the subjection of all things to man, the name of God would be wonderful in all the earth".²⁷

The word of God's revelation is profoundly marked by the fundamental truth that *man*, created in the image of God, *shares by his work in the activity of the Creator* and that, within the limits of his own human capabilities, man in a sense continues

²⁷ Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World *Gaudium et Spes*, 34: AAS 58 (1966), pp. 1052-1053.

to develop that activity, and perfects it as he advances further and further in the discovery of the resources and values contained in the whole of creation. We find this truth at the very beginning of Sacred Scripture, in the Book of Genesis, where the creation activity itself is presented in the form of "work" done by God during "six days",²⁸ "resting" on the seventh day,²⁹ besides, the last book of Sacred Scripture echoes the same respect for what God has done through his creative "work" when it proclaims: "Great and wonderful are your deeds, O Lord God the Almighty";³⁰ this is similar to the Book of Genesis, which concludes the description of each day of creation with the statement: "And God saw that it was good".³¹

This description of creation, which we find in the very first chapter of the Book of Genesis, is also *in a sense the first* "gospel of work". For it shows what the dignity of work consists of: it teaches that man ought to imitate God, his Creator, in working, because man alone has the unique characteristic of likeness to God. Man ought to imitate God both in working and also in resting, since God himself wished to present his own creative activity under the form of *work* and *rest*. This activity by God is the working still...":³² he works with creative power by sustaining in existence the world that he called into being from nothing, and he works with salvific power in the hearts of those whom from the beginning he has destined for "rest"³³ in union with himself in his "Father's house".³⁴ Therefore man's work too not only requires a rest every "seventh day",³⁵ but also cannot consist in the mere exercise of human strength in external action; it must leave room for man to prepare himself, by becoming more and more what in the will of God he ought to be, for the "rest" that the Lord reserves for his servants and friends.³⁶

Awareness that man's work is a participation in God's activity ought to permeate, as the Council teaches, even "*the most ordinary everyday activities*". For, while providing the substance of life for themselves and their families, men and women are performing their activities in a way which appro-

²⁸ Cf. Gen. 2:2, Ex. 20:8, 11; Dt. 5:12-14.

²⁹ Cf. Gen. 2:3.

³⁰ Gen. 1:4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31.

³¹ Gen. 1:4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31.

³² Jn. 5:17.

³³ Cf. Heb. 4:1, 9-10.

³⁴ Jn. 14:2.

³⁵ Cf. Dt. 5:12-14; Ex. 20:8-12.

³⁶ Cf. Mt. 25:21.

privately benefits society. They can justly consider that by their labour they are unfolding the Creator's work, consulting the advantages of their brothers and sisters, and contributing by their personal industry to the realization in history of the divine plan".³⁷

This Christian spirituality of work should be a heritage shared by all. Especially in the modern age, the *spirituality* of work should show the *maturity* called for by the tensions and restlessness of mind and heart. "Far from thinking that works produced by man's own talent and energy are in opposition to God's power, and that the rational creature exists as a kind of rival to the Creator, Christians are convinced that the triumphs of the human race are a sign of God's greatness and the flowering of his own mysterious design. For the greater man's power becomes, the farther his individual and community responsibility extends. . . . People are not deterred by the *Christian message* from building up the world, or impelled to neglect the welfare of their fellows. They are, rather, more stringently bound to do these very things."³⁸

The knowledge that by means of work man shares in the work of creation constitutes the most profound *motive* for undertaking it in various sectors. "The faithful, therefore," we read in the Constitution *Lumen Gentium*, "must learn the deepest meaning and the value of all creation, and its orientation to the praise of God. Even by their secular activity they must assist one another to live holier lives. In this way the world will be permeated by the spirit of Christ and more effectively achieve its purpose in justice, charity and peace . . . Therefore, by their competence in secular fields and by their personal activity, elevated from within by the grace of Christ, let them work vigorously so that by human labour, technical skill, and civil culture created goods may be perfected according to the design of the Creator and the light of his Word".³⁹

26. CHRIST, THE MAN OF WORK

The truth that by means of work man participates in the activity of God himself, his Creator, was *given particular prominence by Jesus Christ* — the Jesus at whom many of his

³⁷ Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World *Gaudium et Spes*, 34: AAS 58 (1966), pp. 1052-1053.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church *Lumen Gentium*, 36: ASS 57 (1965), p. 41.

first listeners in Nazareth "were astonished, saying, 'Where did this man get all this? What is the wisdom given to him? ... Is not this the carpenter?' ".⁴⁰ For Jesus not only proclaimed but first and foremost fulfilled by his deeds the "gospel", the word of eternal Wisdom, that had been entrusted to him. Therefore this was also "the gospel of work", because *he who proclaimed it was himself a man of work*, a craftsman like Joseph of Nazareth.⁴¹ And if we do not find in his words a special command to work — but rather on one occasion a prohibition against too much anxiety about work and life⁴² — at the same time the eloquence of the life of Christ is unequivocal: he belongs to the "working world", he has appreciation and respect for human work. It can indeed be said that *he looks with love upon human work* and the different forms that it takes, seeing in each one of these forms a particular facet of man's likeness with God, the Creator and Father. It is not he who says: "My Father is the vinedresser",⁴³ and in various ways puts *into his teaching* the fundamental truth about work which is already expressed in the whole tradition of the Old Testament, beginning with the Book of Genesis?

The books of the Old Testament contain many references to human work and to the individual professions exercised by man: for example, the doctor,⁴⁴ the pharmacist,⁴⁵ the craftsman or artist,⁴⁶ the blacksmith⁴⁷ — we could apply these words to today's foundry-workers — the potter,⁴⁸ the farmer,⁴⁹ the scholar,⁵⁰ the sailor,⁵¹ the builder,⁵² the musician,⁵³ the shepherd,⁵⁴ and the fisherman.⁵⁵ The words of praise for the work of women are well known.⁵⁶ *In his parables on the Kingdom* of God Jesus Christ constantly refers to human work: that of

⁴⁰ Mk. 6:2-3.

⁴¹ Cf. Mt. 13:55.

⁴² Cf. Mt. 6:25-34.

⁴³ Jn. 15:1.

⁴⁴ Cf. Sir. 38:1-3.

⁴⁵ Cf. Sir. 38:4-8.

⁴⁶ Cf. Ex. 31:1-5; Sir. 38:27.

⁴⁷ Cf. Gen. 4:22; Is. 44:12.

⁴⁸ Cf. Jer. 18:3-4; Sir. 38:29-30.

⁴⁹ Cf. Gen. 9:20; Is. 5:1-2.

⁵⁰ Cf. Eccles 12:9-12; Sir. 39:1-8.

⁵¹ Cf. Ps. 107(108):23-30; Wis. 14:2-3a.

⁵² Cf. Gen. 11:3; 2 Kings 12:12-13; 22:5-6.

⁵³ Cf. Gen. 4:21.

⁵⁴ Cf. Gen. 4:2; 37:3; Ex. 3:1; 1 Sam. 16:11; et passim.

⁵⁵ Cf. Ezk. 47:10.

⁵⁶ Cf. Prov. 31:15-27.

the shepherd,⁵⁷ the farmer,⁵⁸ the doctor,⁵⁹ the sower,⁶⁰ the householder,⁶¹ the servant,⁶² the steward,⁶³ the fisherman,⁶⁴ the merchant,⁶⁵ the labourer.⁶⁶ He also speaks of the various form of woman's work.⁶⁷ He compares the apostolate to the manual work of harvesters⁶⁸ or fisherman.⁶⁹ He refers to the work of scholars too.⁷⁰

This teaching of Christ on work, based on the example of his life during his years in Nazareth, finds a particularly lively echo in the teaching of the Apostle Paul. Paul boasts of working at the trade (he was probably a tent-maker),⁷¹ and thanks to that work he was able even as an Apostle to earn his own bread.⁷² "With toil and labour we worked night and day, that we might not burden any of you".⁷³ Hence his instructions, in the form of *exhortation and command*, on the subject of work: "Now such persons we command and exhort in the Lord Jesus Christ to do their work in quietness and to earn their own living", he writes to the Thessalonians.⁷⁴ In fact, nothing that some "are living in idleness... not doing any work".⁷⁵ the Apostle does not hesitate to say in the same context: "If any one will not work, let him not eat".⁷⁶ In another passage *he encourages* his readers: "Whatever your task, work heartily, as serving the Lord and not men, knowing that from the Lord you will receive the inheritance as your reward".⁷⁷

The teachings of the Apostle of the Gentiles obviously have key importance for the morality and spirituality of human

⁵⁷ E.g. Jn. 10:1-16.

⁵⁸ Cf. Mk. 12:1-12.

⁵⁹ Cf. Lk. 4:23.

⁶⁰ Cf. Mk. 4:1-9.

⁶¹ Cf. Mt. 13:52.

⁶² Cf. Mt. 24:45; Lk. 12:42-48.

⁶³ Cf. Lk. 16:1-8.

⁶⁴ Cf. Mt. 13:47-50.

⁶⁵ Cf. Mt. 13:45-46.

⁶⁶ Cf. Mt. 20:1-16.

⁶⁷ Cf. Mt. 13:33; Lk. 15:8-9.

⁶⁸ Cf. Mt. 9:37; Jn. 4:35-38.

⁶⁹ Cf. Mt. 4:19.

⁷⁰ Cf. Mt. 13:52.

⁷¹ Cf. Acts 18:3.

⁷² Cf. Acts 20:34-35.

⁷³ 2 Thess 3:8. Saint Paul recognizes that missionaries have a right to their keep: 1 Cor. 9:6-14; Gal. 6:6; 2 Thess 3:9; cf. Lk. 10:7.

⁷⁴ Thess 3:12.

⁷⁵ 2 Thess 3:11.

⁷⁶ 2 Thess 3:10.

⁷⁷ Col. 3:23-24.

work. They are an important complement to the great though discreet gospel of work that we find in the life and parables of Christ, in what Jesus "did and taught".⁷⁸

On the basis of these illuminations emanating from the Source himself, the Church has always proclaimed what we find *expressed in modern terms* in the teaching of the Second Vatican Council: "Just as human activity proceeds from man, so it is ordered towards man. For when a man works he not only alters things and society, he develops himself as well. He learns much, he cultivates his resources, he goes outside of himself and beyond himself. Rightly understood, this kind of growth is of greater value than any external riches which can be garnered . . . Hence, the norm of human activity is this: that in accord with the divine plan and will, it should harmonize with the genuine good of the human race, and allow people as individuals and as members of society to pursue their total vocation and fulfill it".⁷⁹

Such a *vision of the values of human work*, or in other words such a spirituality of work, fully explains what we read in the same section of the Council's Pastoral Constitution with regard to the right *meaning of progress*: "A person is more precious for what he is than for what he has. Similarly, all that people do to obtain greater justice, wider brotherhood, and a more humane ordering of social relationships has greater worth than technical advances. For these advances can supply the material for human progress, but of themselves alone they can never actually bring it about".⁸⁰

This teaching on the question of progress and development — a subject that dominates present day thought — can be understood only as the fruit of a tested spirituality of human work; and it is *only on the basis of such a spirituality* that it can be realized and put into practice. This is the teaching, and also the programme, that has its roots in "the gospel of work".

27. HUMAN WORK IN THE LIGHT OF THE CROSS AND THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST

There is yet another aspect of human work, an essential dimension of it, that is profoundly imbued with the spirituality based on the Gospel. All *work*, whether manual or intellectual,

⁷⁸ Cf. Acts 1:1.

⁷⁹ Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World *Gaudium et Spes*, 35: AAS 58 (1966), p. 1053.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

is inevitably linked with *toil*. The Book of Genesis expresses it in a truly penetrating manner: the original *blessing* of work contained in the very mystery of creation and connected with man's elevation as the image of God is contrasted with the *curse* that *sin* brought with it: "Cursed is the ground because of you; in toil you shall eat of it all the days of your life".⁸¹ This toil connected with work marks the way of human life on earth and constitutes *an announcement of death*: "In the sweat of your face you shall eat bread till you return to the ground, for out of it you were taken".⁸² Almost as an echo of these words, the author of one of the Wisdom books says: "Then I considered all that my hands had done and the toil I had spent in doing it".⁸³ There is no one on earth who could not apply these words to himself.

In a sense, the final word of the Gospel on this matter as on others is found in the Paschal Mystery of Jesus Christ. It is here that we must seek an answer to these problems so important for the spirituality of human work. *The Paschal Mystery* contains the *Cross* of Christ and his obedience unto death, which the Apostle contrasts with the disobedience which from the beginning has burdened man's history on earth.⁸⁴ It also contains the *elevation* of Christ, who by means of death on a Cross returns to his disciples in the *Resurrection* with the power of the Holy Spirit.

Sweat and toil, which work necessarily involves in the present condition of the human race, present the Christian and everyone who is called to follow Christ with the possibility of sharing lovingly in the work that Christ came to do.⁸⁵ This work of salvation came about through suffering and death on a Cross. By enduring the toil of work in union with Christ crucified for us, man in a way collaborates with the Son of God for the redemption of humanity. He shows himself a true disciple of Christ by carrying the cross in his turn every day⁸⁶ in the activity that he is called upon to perform.

Christ, "undergoing death itself for all of us sinners, taught us by example that we too must shoulder that cross which the world and the flesh inflict upon those who pursue peace and justice"; but also, at the same time, "appointed Lord *by his*

⁸¹ Gen. 3:17.

⁸² Gen. 3:19.

⁸³ Eccles. 2:11.

⁸⁴ Cf. Rom. 5:19.

⁸⁵ Cf. Jn. 17:4.

⁸⁶ Cf. Lk. 9:23.

Resurrection and given all authority in heaven and on earth, Christ is now at work in people's hearts through the power of his Spirit... He animates, purifies, and strengthens those noble longings too by which the human family strives *to make its life more human* and to render the whole earth submissive to this goal".⁸⁷

The christian finds in human work a small part of the Cross of Christ and accepts it in the same spirit of redemption in which Christ accepted his Cross for us. In work, thanks to the light that penetrates us from the Resurrection of Christ, we always find a *glimmer* of new life, of the *new good*, as if it were an announcement of "the new heavens and the new earth"⁸⁸ in which man and the world participate precisely through the toil that goes with work. Through toil — and never without it. On the one hand this confirms the indispensability of the Cross in the spirituality of human work; on the other hand the Cross which this toil constitutes reveals a new good springing from work itself, from work understood in depth and in all its aspects and never apart from work.

Is this *new good* — the fruit of human work — already a small part of that "new earth" where justice dwells?⁸⁹ If it is true that the many forms of toil that go with man's work are a small part of the Cross of Christ, what is the relationship of this new good to *the Resurrection of Christ*? The Council seeks to reply to this question also, drawing light from the very sources of the revealed word: "Therefore, while we are warned that it profits a man nothing if he gains the whole world and loses himself (cf. Lk. 9:2), the expectation of a new earth must not weaken but rather stimulate our concern for cultivating this one. For here grows the body of a new human family, a body which even now is able to give some kind of foreshadowing of the new age. Earthly progress must be carefully distinguished from the growth of Christ's kingdom. Nevertheless, to the extent that the former can contribute to the better ordering of human society, it is of vital concern to the Kingdom of God".⁹⁰

⁸⁷ Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World *Gaudium et Spes*, 38: AAS 58 (1966), pp. 1055-1056.

⁸⁸ Cf. 2 Pt. 3:13; Rev. 21:1.

⁸⁹ Cf. 2 Pt. 3:13.

⁹⁰ Second Vatican Ecumenical Council, Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World *Gaudium et Spes*, 39: AAS 58 (1966), p. 1057.

In these present reflections devoted to human work we have tried to emphasize everything that seemed essential to it, since it is through man's labour that not only "the fruits of our activity" but also "human dignity, brotherhood and freedom" must increase on earth.⁹¹ Let the Christian who listens to the word of the living God, uniting work with prayer, know the place that his work has not only in *earthly progress* but also in *the development of the Kingdom of God*, to which we are all called through the power of the Holy Spirit and through the word of the Gospel.

In concluding these reflections, I gladly impart the Apostolic Blessing to all of you, venerable Brothers and beloved sons and daughters.

I prepared this document for publication on 15 May last, on the ninetieth anniversary of the Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, but it is only after my stay in hospital that I have been able to revise it definitively.

Given at Castel Gandolfo, on the fourteenth day of September, the Feast of the Triumph of the Cross, in the year 1981, the third of the Pontificate.

JOANNES PAULUS PP. II

HISTORY

INVOLVEMENT OF THE DOMINICANS IN THE FOUNDATION AND PROGRESS OF FILIPINO TOWNS

By

Fr. Pablo Fernandez, O.P.

Under this caption we start with the January issue of the *Boletín Eclesiástico* of 1982 a series of articles about the towns which the Dominicans founded in the Philippines from the year of their arrival, 1587 until that fated day when compelled by adverse circumstances, they had to abandon them all — in 1898.

When the first Dominican missionaries arrived in the field of their labours they found clusters of small nipa and bamboo houses — not dissimilar from those of the “barrios” or *barangays* of today —; and at once, with praiseworthy patience and indomitable courage they began, in spite of painful setbacks, the task of gathering them into organized towns. Thus, sprang the thriving communities which we admire today.

And we embark on this endeavor with the hope that once our task is finished, someday a member of another Religious family would pick the thread of the narrative from where we leave it and continue it, so that through a common effort we may present to our readers a complete history of the foundation and development of the Filipino towns under the aegis of the Gospel.

In recounting how the missionaries — and later parish priests — labored for the well-being of their flocks, we shall not limit ourselves exclusively to the material or physical dimension, but rather, we wish to include within such term also the spiritual, religious, cultural and educational phases, with emphasis, however, on the social effort.

At any rate, it must not be forgotten that the missionaries were first and above all heralds of the Gospel; and only

secondarily dedicated men, who spent a good deal of their energies and spare time in promoting the temporal welfare of the people entrusted to their zeal and pastoral care.

Our plan is as follows: first, we shall devote an article to the foundation in the Philippines of the Dominican province of Our Lady of the Rosary, followed by a brief history of the convent of Santo Domingo — formerly located in Intramuros or Walled City and now in Quezon City, —, from which the apostolic men of the past sallied forth to carry the torch of the Faith into the provinces, from where they often returned to gather fresh physical and spiritual vigor or to spend the remainder of their lives in the silence of the cloisters as a fitting preparation for their passing into eternity.

And from Santo Domingo we shall follow them, in chronological order, to Bataan (1587), Pangasinan (1587), the Cagayan Valley (1595), Babuyan (1619), Batanes (1783), where they stayed on a permanent basis for centuries; and to Zambales (1679-1712), to Ilocos (1772-1790), Panay and Negros (1769), Cavite and Laguna (1851) which they administered for shorter periods of time.

Now let us say a word about our guides, sources or reference in this historical essay.

The Dominican who wrote most systematically and exhaustively about the Dominican towns in the Philippines, was, without a shade of a doubt, the well-known Father Hilario Maria Ocio. He upon request of the General Chapter of Avila (1895) bequeathed to us a work, still in typescript form, entitled *Monumento Dominicano, o sea, Memorial de las Casas que ha adquirido la provincia del Santisimo Rosario de Filipinas, desde 1587 a 1898*. It gives a summarized description of every town — no matter how unimportant or how short-lived it may have been, founded by the Dominicans from the very start up to 1898.

More in particular, coming to the specific fields of their apostolate, we have, in regard to Pangasinan, the printed work of Father José Ma. González *Labor Evangelizadora y Civiliza-*

dora de los Religiosos Dominicanos en Pangasinán, and earlier than his, Father's Ramón Suárez unpublished work: *Apuntes curiosos sobre los pueblos de Pangasinán*, 1869.

In delving into the past of the towns founded by the Dominicans in the extensive Cagayan Valley (provinces of Cagayan, Isabela and Nueva Vizcaya, Mountain Province, and sub-province of Quirino) and the Babuyan and Batanes Islands, our main guides—sources and references—shall be: Father Julián Malumbres through his three books *Historia de Nueva Vizcaya*, *Historia de la Isabela* and *Historia de la Nueva Vizcaya y Provincia Montañosa*, and the manuscript of Father José Brugués, O.P., *El Valle de Cagayán*.

In addition to these primary and basic sources, we shall make use of the countless bits of information scattered in hundreds of documents in the Dominican archives, as classified systematically under the sections "Bataán", "Pangasinán", "Cagayán", etc.

I

FOUNDATION OF THE PROVINCE OF OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY OF THE PHILIPPINES¹

By

Fr. Pablo Fernandez, O.P.

The first steps

For a long while, it seemed that the conquest of the Philippines would never be accomplished. On four separate occasions, Spanish expeditions sent to the "Islands of the West" — as the Philippines were then called — had failed and the advisers of King Philip II balked at outfitting new ones, claiming that they were a heavy burden on the Royal Treasury.

But Philip II was not a man to be easily discouraged by reverses. Moreover, this pious monarch refused to recognize any obstacle that stood in the way of his dream: the liberation of pagan souls from the slavery of idolatry. Thus it was that he ordered yet another expedition, this time to be led by Miguel Lopez de Legaspi. And Legaspi succeeded where his predecessors had failed.

With Legaspi's forces were five Agustinian friars who lost no time in establishing themselves in Cebu and later in Manila. Soon after, they expanded their evangelization work to the surrounding provinces. But though they worked tirelessly and with great devotion, there were so few of them that it was impossible to set up a truly methodical apostolate.

It was not until much later that the fledgling Church in the Philippines would be blessed with reinforcements that would augur a more promising future with the arrival of the Franciscans in 1578.²

Then fresh additions came in 1581. They arrived with Msgr. Domingo de Salazar, the illustrious first bishop of Manila. They

¹ This article, originally written in Spanish, was translated into English by Mr. and Mrs. Felix Bautista.

² UNCILLA, FERMIN DE, *Urdaneta y la Conquista de Filipinas*, San Sebastián, 1907, pp. 306-315.

included several Franciscans, three Jesuits and one Dominican, Fr. Cristóbal de Salvatierra. To understand why there was only one Dominican in the group, it is necessary to delve into some background material.

When Msgr. Salazar, a religious from the province of Santiago in Mexico, received his appointment as bishop of Manila in 1579, he happened to be in Madrid on some business concerning the spiritual well-being of the natives of the New Spain. Upon accepting the Manila bishopric, the bishop-elect sought an audience with the Spanish king and received permission to go to Manila with a group of Dominican missionaries who would do evangelization work.

He forthwith set about selecting twenty Dominican priests for the important task that lay ahead. But the joy that he felt in leaving Spain for Mexico — preparatory to boarding a Manila-bound galleon — was short-lived.

An epidemic broke out aboard the ship and exacted an appalling toll. Even before Mexico was in sight, twelve of the gallant twenty died. Six more passed away upon arrival in Mexico.

Of the two who survived, only one — the aforementioned Fr. Cristóbal de Salvatierra — had sufficient strength to get to the Philippines with Bishop Salazar. He was immediately assigned to discharge the duties of Vicar General and Chancellor of the Diocese of Manila.³

If circumstances had been different, if fate had been kinder to the original twenty Dominicans, perhaps the Province of Our Lady of the Rosary would have been organized earlier. And perhaps to Bishop Salazar would have gone the honor of being the founder of the province. As it was, the establishment of the new Dominican province had to wait until 1587.

The move to organize the province was started long before Bishop Salazar arrived in the Philippines. A zealous Dominican missionary, Fr. Domingo Betanzos, aware of the need to convert the pagan tribesmen of the Philippines, started preparations for the founding of the province. He did this with the consent of Don Antonio de Mendoza, the viceroy of Mexico.⁴

³ ADUARTE, DIEGO, *Historia de la Provincia del Santísimo Rosario de Filipinas, Japón y China*, Zaragoza, 1693, p. 181, col. 2;

REMESAL, ANTONIO DE, *Historia de la Provincia de Chiapa y Guatemala*, Madrid, 1619, pp. 672-673

⁴ In effect, in the year 1543, Emperor Charles V extended to Fr. Bartolomé de las Casas, who at the time was in Spain after one of his

Before Bishop Salazar left for the Philippines, he asked the priests of the Province of Santiago to take all the necessary steps to set up a province in the Islands. The province, he declared, would have for its prime objective the preaching of the Gospel in the Orient.⁵

The superior of the Province of Santiago proved receptive to the pleas of Bishop Salazar. After mature deliberation, they dispatched Fr. Juan Crisóstomo to Rome and to Madrid to secure the needed permission for the undertaking (1581).

Father Crisóstomo, an exemplary priest well known for his tact and prudence, was a most happy choice. If anyone could obtain the required permission from both the civil and ecclesiastical authorities, he was the man.

In Madrid, the illustrious priest was received favorably and he accomplished his mission without too much difficulty. He then proceeded to Bologna to see the Rev. Pablo Constable de Ferrara, the Master General of the Dominican Order, and to communicate the desires of the priests of the Province of Santiago.⁶

The supreme hierarch of the Dominicans was most sympathetic. He granted permission for the recruiting of a group of thirty Dominican missionaries for assignment to the Orient. He likewise authorized Father Crisóstomo to designate a substitute should he, by death or other impediment, be unable to discharge his duties as a Vicar.⁷

From Bologna, Father Crisóstomo went to Rome. And again, he was successful. His Holiness, Pope Gregory XIII, extended apostolic approval to the establishment of the new Dominican

trips from the Americas in behalf of the material and spiritual welfare of the natives, the necessary permit to prepare an expedition to the coasts of Japan and China. This grandiose enterprise, however, was never realized. Behind it were Msgr. Juan de Zumárraga, the Franciscan bishop, Fr. de las Casas and Fr. Domingo Betanzos. The latter two, like good Dominicans, seriously considered establishing a province of the order in those remote lands. But their plans went for naught even though the viceroy, Don Antonio de Mendoza, had already made a boat available for the expedition. This was because the Pope would not allow Bishop Zumárraga to resign his bishopric. And Fr. Betanzos, much against his will, was elected Provincial. According to Fr. Zumárraga, Fr. Bartolomé de las Casas had offered "to come with us in this conquest for our captain and commander." (MANZANO, JUAN, *La Incorporación de las Indias a la corona de Castilla*, Madrid, 1948, pp. 137-147).

⁵ ADUARTE, *Op. cit.*, p. 1, col. 2; p. 2, col. — ; 469, col. 1.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 2, col. 2.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 3, col. 1.

province. The approval was contained in two "Briefs" the first dated September 15, 1582, and the second one dated October 20, 1582.⁸

Flushed with his successes, Father Crisóstomo returned to Madrid. He no doubt anticipated no further difficulty, and it was with high hopes that he sought out the royal advisers for authority to send a mission of religious to the Orient. But the royal advisers denied his request.⁹

Three years later, moved by a secret impulse, Father Crisóstomo renewed his request. This time, the response was favorable.¹⁰ The King, by "Real Cédula" issued in Tortosa on September 20, 1585, approved the sending of a mission of twenty-four Dominicans to the Philippines.¹¹

A few months later, in response to the invitation of Father Crisóstomo, thirty-one Dominicans from different convents in Spain volunteered their services to Seville prior to their departure for Mexico.

In the meantime, Father Crisóstomo, in accordance with the authority vested on him by the Dominican Master General, relinquished his title as Vicar General and conferred it on Fr. Juan de Castro.¹²

On route to the Philippines

On July 17, 1586, the gallant band of Dominicans set sail for Mexico from the port of Cádiz in Spain. During the hazardous crossing of the Atlantic, the group adhered as much as possible to the regular routine of the Dominican community, getting as much as rest as possible in between spells of prayer, study and lectures.¹³

Disembarking at Vera Cruz, where they first set foot on Mexico soil, they proceeded to the Dominican convent at Puebla de los Angeles where they expected to rest up and recuperate from the rigors of the voyage.¹⁴

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 5, col. 2; p. 6, col. 1.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 7, col. 1.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, col. 2.

¹¹ HILARIO MA. OCIO, O.P., *Reseña Biográfica de los religiosos de la Provincia del Santísimo Rosario de Filipinas*, Manila, 1891, p. 14.

¹² REMESAL, *Op. cit.*, pp. 674-675.

¹³ ADUARTE, p. 13.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 14, col. 2.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 15, col. 2; pp. 16-18.

Quite a number of them fell sick at the convent, and three passed on to a better life in spite of the care that was lavished on them by the fathers of the province of Santiago.¹⁵ Some stayed in Mexico, a few others returned to Spain, and the rest eventually proceeded to Acapulco where the galleon, which was to bring them to the scene of their apostolate, awaited.¹⁶

Actually, only twenty-one of the original group survived the dangers of the voyage, the illnesses and the discouragements. Of this number, fifteen set sail for Manila on April 6, 1587. Three others left for Macao, and the remaining three — Frs. Juan Crisóstomo, Juan Cobo and a brother — stayed behind in Mexico.¹⁷

The fifteen Dominicans bound for the Philippines crossed the Pacific Ocean without incident. On July 21, the vigil of the feast of St. Mary Magdelene, they entered the Manila Bay. And four days later, they entered Manila where they were welcomed with considerable enthusiasm by both the authorities and the populace.¹⁸

Proofs of Fraternity and the First Dispersion

The illustrious Bishop Salazar received the founders of the Province of the Most Holy Rosary with brotherly affection. He welcomed them at the episcopal palace and ordered that lodgings, more comfortable and roomy, be prepared for them there.¹⁹

A little later, with the Bishop's consent, the Dominicans left the palace and split into two groups. One group transferred to Bataan and the other went to the convent of San Francisco where, it was felt, the facilities were more conducive to a life of study and prayer.²⁰

It was at this convent where the first dispersion took place. This dispersion was a virtual reenactment of the scene, staged three centuries earlier at the monastery in Prouille, when St. Dominic first distributed his sons all over Europe.

The Dominicans were aware of the difficulties of the task ahead of them. The Philippines, at that time, was almost completely under the dominion of Spain, but the natives hardly recognized the empire of Christ and of His Church. While it

¹⁶ REMESAL, *Op. cit.*, p. 678, col. 1.

¹⁷ ADUARTE, p. 22, col. 2; p. 23, col. 1.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 23-24.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 27, col. 1.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 28, col. 1.

was true that missionaries from the other orders — the Augustinians, the Franciscans and some Jesuits — had evangelized in the archipelago, there were still quite a number of provinces which had not yet heard the Word.

With the approval of the governor-general, Fr. Juan de Castro divided the missionaries into three groups. The first group, which was assigned to Bataan, was made up of Fr. Juan Ormaza, who was designated vicar, Fr. Alonso Jiménez, Fr. Pedro Bodaños and Brother Domingo de Nieva, still a deacon.

The second group, which would spread the Word in Pangasinan, was composed of Fr. Bernardo Navarro de Santa Catalina, who was named Vicar Provincial, Fr. Gregorio Ochoa de San Vicente, Fr. Juan de Castro (the nephew of the Vicar General), Fr. Pedro de Soto, Fr. Marcos Soria de San Antonio, and Fr. Juan de la Cruz.

The third group, which would stay in Manila, had Fr. Miguel de Benavides, the Vicar General, Fr. Diego de Soria, Fr. Juan Maldonado and Brother Pedro Rodríguez. This last group was charged with the task of founding a convent of the strictest observance, a convent which, in the future, would become the center of all activities for the Province of Our Lady of the Rosary.²¹

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 28, col. 2; PEGUERO, JUAN, O.P., *Compendio historial de la Provincia del Santísimo Rosario*, MS in the Archives of the University of Santo Tomás, Section "Provincia", fol. 4.

LITURGY

COMMUNION TWICE A DAY

By

H. J. Graf, S.V.D.

The following exposition has been occasioned by the letter of a chaplain of contemplative nuns. He writes: "Whatever is a second Mass in our chapel the nuns want to receive communion a second time on the same day. Because of this I had repeatedly a slight altercation with mother superior. Can they receive communion in the second Mass?"

During the years after the second Vatican Council not only religious but also some of the simple faithful in the parishes occasionally ask the question why they should be forbidden to receive holy communion when they attend Mass a second time on the same day. They point to the fact that the Church has granted this permission explicitly as a privilege on some occasions. Over the years these permissions were gradually extended in number and frequency. First, people were allowed to go to communion a second time on Christmas day even though they had received communion in the midnight Mass of the same day. They could receive communion in the Chrism Mass of Holy Thursday, and in the Mass of the Lord's Supper again. They were permitted to go to communion in the celebration of the Easter Vigil, even if this had been held after midnight, and again in one of the Masses of the Easter day itself.

A Question of Legislation — not of Dogma

From a dogmatic point of view the full participation of the faithful in the celebration of the Eucharist includes the reception of sacramental communion. This is the reason why the Constitution on the Liturgy of Vatican II insisted repeatedly, on sacramental communion in the Mass. It is "the goal of apostolic works" that "all who are made sons of God by faith and baptism should come together to praise God in the midst of the Church, to take part in her sacrifice and to *eat the Lord's Supper*" (art. 10). When they take part in the eucharistic celebration the faithful "should be instructed by God's word and be *refreshed at the Table of the Lord's Body*" (art. 48). "Heartily

endorsement is given to that closer form of participation in the Mass, whereby the faithful, after the priest's communion, *receive the Lord's Body* under elements consecrated at that very sacrifice" (art. 55).

The restriction to receive holy communion only once a day is, therefore, a positive ecclesiastical law, given, most probably, in order not to burden the celebrating priest too much with the distribution of holy communion. As long as only priests were allowed to distribute holy communion this was a real problem. But now, priests are assisted by deacons, acolytes and other extraordinary ministers of holy communion. In case of need, a priest may even appoint before communion some person to assist him in the distribution of communion for this single Mass. Therefore, the distribution of holy communion ought not to prolong unduly the celebration nor burden the celebrating priest too much.

Different Celebrations on the Same Day

The first reaction to the concession of communion twice a day on certain occasions was: why only on these few days? Why not every day? Rome answered by saying that on those liturgical days, when the Church celebrates two completely different offices or mysteries for the entire community, she allows the faithful who participate in both celebrations, to receive communion in both. This is very obvious on Holy Thursday. The Chrism Mass in the morning belongs still to Lent, while the Mass of the Lord's Supper in the evening is part of the Sacred Paschal Triduum, the highest celebration of the Church's Year. The same principle is correctly applied to the Mass on Saturday evening, when people, who attended Mass in the morning, may also go in the evening to holy communion. The Mass in the morning belonged, for instance, to the Office of Our Lady's Saturday, while the evening Mass is that of Sunday, since the Liturgy of the Hours begins with the first evening prayer. If, however, on the same day, there are repeated celebrations of the same liturgical office or mystery, only in *one* Mass, holy communion may be received.¹

But does this same principle not allow communion a second time, if, on a weekday one priest says the Mass of the ferial day, and another priest says the Mass of an optional memorial celebrated on the same day, as it happens on May 25 during

¹ *Notitiae* 1 (1965) 137.

the Easter season? This day has a ferial Mass of its own, and offers three optional memorials, those of St. Bede the Venerable, of St. Gregory VII, Pope, and of St. Mary Magdalene of Pazzi.

Concessions for Individuals

While the concessions mentioned so far were given to entire communities (parishes, dioceses, religious communities), the subsequent concessions to receive communion twice a day were more for individuals. When, in addition to the Mass of the day, they attend a second Mass in which a sacrament or one of the major sacramentals is celebrated (a wedding Mass, a Mass in which religious profession takes place, at the dedication or blessing of a church or an altar, at a funeral Mass, etc.) they may go to communion in the second Mass also. If, on the solemnity of Corpus Christi (or on that of Christ the King) they may go to communion a second time in this special Mass. Further cases are mentioned in the Instruction "Immensae caritatis" on sacramental communion in particular circumstances, issued on January 29, 1973. A summary of this document is found in the foreword of the Sacramentary in English.²

In addition to the cases mentioned so far, the local Ordinary may grant communion twice a day "per modum actus" when he thinks it justified by reason of special circumstances, in line with the norms laid down by the Instruction "Immensae caritatis".

More recently, the Pontifical Commission for the Revision of the Code of Canon Law published its plans to revise some of the regulations affecting holy communion, in this case proposing to alter Canon 857. As announced in the journal *Communicationes*, the new Canon Law is to retain the customary prohibition against the reception of communion more than once a day, except in defined cases and "unless within the eucharistic celebration which takes place with some solemnity."³

This norm would provide a very simple and general pattern, permitting a second reception of communion whenever some degree of solemnity would be found in the second Mass. This is, of course, a projected regulation at the present time, but it shows a tendency, a kind of trend, initiated by the ecclesiastical authorities when they permitted communion twice, under certain circumstances, on three of the highest celebrations of the Church's Year.

² Catholic Trade, Manila, edition, p. 15*.

³ Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy, Study Text 1. Holy Communion (Washington D.C., 1973) p. 20.

THE PRIVATE RECITATION OF THE LITURGY OF THE HOURS

By

Fr. Florencio Testera, O.P.

The command of the Lord to every christian to pray with perseverance (Math., 5:44; 7:7; 26:41; Mark: 13:13; 14:38 Luke 6:28...) concerns in a very special manner the clergy which by reason of their ministry are the mediators between God and men. In their role of mediators, sacred ministers are commissioned by the Church to carry out regularly and reliably the prayer-duty of the whole community through the daily recitation of the official prayer of the Church — the divine Office or Canonical Hours. Thus since time immemorial this obligation of reciting the divine Office has been rightly considered a serious duty incumbent upon clerics in major orders.

The revision of the official prayer-book of the Church — the Breviary — carried out by the initiative and under the directives of Vatican II (*Const. on the Lit.*, nn. 87-90), has produced the new Liturgy of the Hours which has replaced and altered substantially the previous pattern of the Canonical Hours. The Office has been considerably shortened in length. A greater variety of ways for its celebration has been provided for. Dispensations for adequate reasons are given rather easily. Extensive faculties to vary or substitute offices are frequently granted....

The flexibility and understanding shown by the Church in this new arrangement of the Liturgy of the Hours coupled with the erroneous — though widespread — opinion that all Church laws are to be held in abeyance till a new Code of Canon Law be completed, have been misinterpreted as a relaxation of the centuries-old obligation of saying the divine Office daily. Hence questions such as the following are often raised:

Is the daily recitation of the divine Office still a grave duty of the clergy? Are all the Canonical Hours equally binding? Can the Office be substituted with another type or form of prayer? When should the recitation take place?

This brief study tries to find suitable answers to these and related questions.

I. *Is the Daily Recitation of the Office still Binding*

The duty of clerics in major orders to recite the Office daily either in common or in private is based on law, immemorial custom and ancient tradition. The contention that things have changed after Vatican II, and thus the Breviary law too, does not seem to offer much of a relief from the Office obligation. Though meaningful variations have been introduced as to the degree of importance and the corresponding binding force of each Canonical Hour, still the pre-Vatican law remains in full force. As a matter of fact, post-conciliar documents, instead of abrogating the existing law binding all clerics in major orders to the daily recitation of the Canonical Hours in its entirety (CIC., c. 135), have rather reaffirmed its obligatory force. The *Const. "Laudis Canticum"* promulgating the revised Liturgy of the Hours has this to say:

"Those who have received from the Church a mandate to celebrate the Liturgy of the Hours are to complete its entire course dutifully each day"... (Paul VI, *Const.*, "*Laudis Canticum*", 1 nov., 1970; AAS., 1971, p. 572; *Canon Law Digest* (CLD), VII, p. 102).

The General Instruction on the Liturgy of the Hours (GILH) is still more definite on the matter thus:

"Hence bishops, priests and other sacred ministers, who have received from the Church the mandate of celebrating the Liturgy of the Hours (n. 17), should recite the full sequence of the Hours each day, as far as possible at the appropriate times" (GILH, n. 29).

The Schema of the new CIC simply restates the ancient custom binding those in major orders (SN-CIC., c. 134, §2, n. 3).

The Church, therefore, has not relieved its clerics from the Breviary duty. It has just revised the Liturgy of the Hours in an attempt to bless and dedicate to the Lord each period of the natural day in a more fruitful and effective manner. That is why the recitation of the Office should not be seen as a purely legal obligation. As stated in the *Const. "Laudis Canticum"*, "those who are in holy orders... should not only be moved to celebrate the Hours through obedience to law, but should also feel themselves drawn to them because of their intrinsic excellence and their pastoral and ascetical value" (n. 8).

2. *Is it a Serious Obligation?*

There are a number of ways whereby one can determine the degree of obligation of a given law, such as the wording of the law itself, its objective and importance, the sanctions imposed for its non-observance...

In the present case, the wording of current laws leaves no doubt as to the serious nature of the obligation imposed: Clerics in major orders ... "are bound — *obligatione tenentur* — to recite everyday the Canonical Hours in their entirety" (CIC., c. 135); "should recite the full sequence of the Hours each day ... — *integrum eius cursum cotidie persolvant* — (GILH., n. 29).

The main objective of the Liturgy of the Hours — the sanctification of the day and the whole range of human activity — being one of capital importance, shows likewise that the recitation of the Breviary can not be taken lightly:

"Christ has taught us the necessity of praying at all times without losing heart... The Church satisfies this requirement not only by the celebration of the Eucharist, but in other ways also, especially through the Liturgy of the Hours, which is distinguished from other liturgical actions by the fact that it consecrates to God the whole cycle of the day and night, as it has done from early christian times" (GILH, n. 10).

On the other side of the picture one finds that the non-observance of the law in this case carries no external sanction. Is this not demeaning of the prayer value and, therefore, the obligation of the Office? Not really so. The Church in so doing seeks to do away with an unsound and unhealthy attitude that looks at the Breviary as a legal, disciplinary measure imposed from without. When this happens and the Office is said out of blind obedience to the law and or for fear of an impending penalty, the duty of reading the Breviary becomes just a heavy burden instead of being the basis of the prayer-life of the clergy, which is what the Church intends in enforcing the Breviary law.

From the aforesaid, it seems quite obvious that the Breviary law is still binding and that the corresponding obligation of saying it each day is *objectively* grave. The statement is not intended to imply that any violation of the law is necessarily sinful. Whether the non-observance of a law is sinful or not

depends on the person's insights, intentions and motivations, factors which lie well beyond the scope of a human, ecclesiastical law such as the Church's mandate of reciting the Breviary.

Moreover, today one can not be nearly as strict as moralists of the past in judging the gravity of the violation of the Breviary law, especially in cases of a single violation or partial non-observance of the law (Paul VI, *Const. "Poenitemini"*, II, §2; AAS, 1966, p. 177; CLD, VI, 675).

3. *Are all the Canonical Hours equally Binding?*

The relative importance assigned to each of the Canonical Hours is undoubtedly one of the salient innovations introduced by the Liturgy of the Hours. The degree of importance among the Hours is paralleled by the corresponding degree of obligation regarding their recitation as follows:

— The Morning and Evening Prayers — Lauds and Vespers — are of primary importance as they form a double hinge of the Liturgy of the Hours, and as such should not be omitted except for a serious reason.

— The Office of the Readings — Matins — is the principal celebration of the word of God, outside the Eucharist, which sacred ministers should faithfully perform — *fideliter peragant* —.

— The recitation of the Daytime Hour — the Little Hours — and Night Prayer — Compline — should be taken in earnest by clerics in order to sanctify the whole day more perfectly and to commend themselves to God before retiring (GILH, n. 29).

The fact that not all the Hours are equally binding should not be construed as a valid reason for the cleric to excuse himself from saying the less important parts of the Office at will. The canonical obligation of reading the Office in its entirety still remains. The degree of importance of each Hour, however, ought to be considered when it comes to determine the proportionate reason which may justify the non-observance of the law in a given case, or in securing a commutation or dispensation from proper authorities. Obviously, a cleric needs a more serious reason to legitimately omit the Morning or Evening Prayer than, say, to excuse himself from the recitation of the Daytime Prayer.

4. *Can the Obligation be Dispensed or Commuted to other Forms of Prayer?*

In current law it is fairly easy to obtain a dispensation from the Breviary obligation and or its commutation to other types of prayer. As a matter of fact, Ordinaries enjoy today extensive faculties in this regard and need no longer limit their dispensing powers to doubtful cases and emergency situations (CIC, cc. 15,81). *The Const. on the Liturgy* states clearly the ample powers of Ordinaries in the following terms:

"In particular cases — *in casibus singularibus* —, and for a just reason, Ordinaries can dispense their subjects wholly or in part from the obligation of reciting the divine Office, or may commute the obligation" (n. 97).

This same faculty has been extended to major superiors of non-exempt clerical religious institutes and societies living in common without vows (SRC, *Instr.*, "Inter Oecumenici", 26 sept., 1964, n., 74; AAS, 1964, p. 877; CLD, VI, 73).

Local religious superiors of regular orders — whose members are in solemn vows (CIC, c. 488,7) — may likewise dispense their subjects from the Office or commute it to other forms of prayer in cases of sickness or whenever necessary for the pursuit of sacred studies, preaching, hearing confessions... (SCHAEFER, T., "De Religiosis", Rome 1947, n. 1213). The privilege may be used by nuns or religious women in solemn vows (CIC, c. 488,7).

A dispensation from an ecclesiastical law can not be validly without a just and reasonable cause, proportionate to the gravity of the law which is the object of the dispensation. Both intrinsic and extrinsic reasons may justify the relaxation of a law in particular cases. In the case under discussion, the following instances may be considered as a proportionate reason for a valid dispensation from the Office: bad eyesight, a long journey, sickness, pressing work, fatigue resulting from the apostolic ministry, the existence of a scrupulous conscience... The superior or person granting the dispensation ought to judge whether a sufficient cause exists to ask for and or to grant the dispensation, which shall hold on as long as the motivating reason for the dispensation persists (CIC, cc. 60, 71, 72, 86...).

In addition to the dispensing or commuting powers granted to all Ordinaries (CIC, c. 198), in virtue of the Const. of the

Lit., residential bishops may also commute the Office recitation in favor of groups of clerics who have gathered together on the occasion, say, of a congress, a pilgrimage... In such cases, the whole or a part of the Office may be substituted with the five decades of the Rosary or any other appropriate and proportionate prayer (*Mot. Propr.*, "Pastorale Munus" n. 26).

There are other instances in which, as determined by the rubrics, it is appropriate to substitute a liturgical service for the Office (*Const. on the Lit.*, art. 97). Thus, clerics who partake in the evening Mass of the Lord's Supper, in the afternoon celebration of Good Friday, in the Paschal Vigil of Easter Sunday or in the Christmas Vigil, may omit the corresponding Hour of the Office.

Furthermore, in any particular case, one may choose for the Office texts different from those assigned in the Breviary for the day, provided that the general arrangement of the Office is not disturbed and certain rules laid down therein are observed (GILH, nn.246-252).

The priest who substitutes the Office for other type of prayer of his choice just because the Breviary is not his favorite way of praying, can not legitimately presume, we believe, to have a valid reason for the commutation. The Office is not just a way of praying, it is, above all, the official prayer of the Church for its clergy. Thus its substitution or commutation must be sanctioned by the proper authority.

5. *The Time for the Recitation of the Office.*

The Office was not conceived or structured as a single prayer to be completed at one sitting. On the contrary, since the Liturgy of the Hours is the means of dedicating to the Lord the various periods or hours of the natural day, the Breviary has been revised in such a way that the Canonical Hours could be readily related to the hours of the day in the circumstances of contemporary life (GILH, n. 11).

Hence, "in order that the day be truly sanctified and the Hours themselves recited with spiritual profit, it is preferable that they be recited at the chronological hour nearest to the one indicated by each Canonical Hour" (GILH, n. 11).

The obligation imposed here is not as rigid as to include every case. There could indeed be many excusing reasons and causes which could justify the recitation of a part or even the

entire Office at an hour that does not correspond closely with its true canonical time. All that is required by law for the compliance of the Office duty is that it be said within the period of twenty-four hours, from midnight to midnight (CIC, c. 33).

On the other hand, the New Liturgy of the Hours is quite specific in pointing out the appropriate time at which each Canonical Hour is preferably to be said, to wit:

—The Office of Readings, while retaining its character as night office for those who celebrate it at night, is suitable for recitation at any hour of the day (GILH, n. 57).

—The Morning Prayer is intended and arranged for the sanctification of the morning 'in order that the first stirrings of our mind and will may be consecrated to God' (GILH, n. 38).

—The Daytime Hours belong properly to midmorning, noon or midafternoon. In private recitation it is permitted to choose from the three hours that which is most appropriate to the time of the day (GILH, n. 77).

—The Evening Prayer is celebrated in order "that we may give thanks for what has been given us, or what we have done well, during the day." It must be said when the evening approaches and the day is already far spent (GILH, n. 39).

—The Night Prayer, as the final prayer of the day, should of course be said before retiring at night, even after midnight (GILH, n. 84).

In the past, the anticipation of some of the Canonical Hours in case of individual recitation was rather a common occurrence. The practice was even recommended as a prudent measure by spiritual directors. Thus it was not uncommon to recite the entire Office at one sitting either at the beginning or at the end of the day. Vespers was usually anticipated to the midmorning or midday. Likewise Lauds was commonly said on the previous evening.

Today, the time-sequence of the Office is of primary importance. With the exception of the Office of Readings, which may be anticipated to the night hours of the previous day after

Evening Prayer has been said (GILH, n. 59), and the Night Prayer that may be said even after midnight (GILH, n. 84), all Canonical Hours, when not recited at the corresponding chronological time, must be said within the natural day which goes from midnight to midnight. Therefore, the anticipation of the Morning Prayer to the afternoon or evening of the previous day is prohibited as an undesirable practice totally discordant with the nature of the Morning Prayer. The Church considers it a matter of capital importance to make its official prayer something sincere and vital. In the case of the Morning Prayer this can only be achieved when it becomes an act of dedication and of oblation of the first fruits of the day's labor to the Lord, in the hope that the entire day be pleasing in His sight.

HOMILETICS

by

Herman Mueller, S.V.D.

FIFTH SUNDAY IN ORDINARY TIME (February 7, 1981)

Life especially sickness is a drudgery (first reading). Jesus came to heal the sick (gospel). This is one theme. Paul tells us that he considers preaching his vocation (second reading). And so does our Lord (gospel). This is a second theme of today's liturgy.

First Reading: Job 7:1-4.6-7

The Book of Job deals with the problem of how God can permit that a just man suffers. Up to that time it was traditional Jewish belief that God rewards the good and punishes the bad people already here on earth. Suffering thus was considered a punishment for sins. The unknown author of the Book of Job lets the three friends of Job hold on to this traditional belief, while Job himself, who is the one who has suffered the loss of all his possessions, his children, and his health, although he was virtuous as nobody else, even according to God's judgment (Job 1:8), and thus knows from experience that this traditional belief cannot be true, wrestles for a true answer. Is God cruel, is God absent minded, is God high above men that he does not care or see? Would a mediator between him and us solve the problem? The author does not know much about the life hereafter, since God revealed this only at a later time more clearly (the time of the Book of Wisdom and the Books of the Macabees and in the New Testament). Ever since Christ suffered vicariously for us and redeemed us the last answer of why a just man has to suffer is: He shall help Christ co-redeem mankind, making up (subjectively) what is missing in the suffering of Christ (cf. Col. 1:24). Not that Christ's redemption is not complete. It is. But his perfect objective redemption has to be channeled to people through our own participation in Christ's suffering.

This answer, the author of the Book of Job could not yet give. He lets God give this answer to Job: Can you argue with the Almighty? Can you do what he does? Can you understand his works? Since you do not, leave it up to him, also the problem of why a just man has to suffer. You will not understand it now. But do not doubt God's justice and fairness.

Another answer is given by the younger, the fourth friend, Elihu: Suffering can be preventive medicine, preventing us from sinning.

Today's reading sets in after the Prologue (Job 1:1-2:13) which described the two trials of Job, wherein he lost his flocks and children (Job 1:13-22) and his good health (2:7-10). Part 1 (Job 2:11-31:40) brings three series of speeches of the three friends: Eliphaz, Bildad and Zophar, and Job's reply to each of this speeches. Basically the friends harp on the traditional doctrine that God rewards and punishes already here on earth, whereas Job questions this. Job 4:1-5:27 contains the first speech of Eliphaz to which Job answers, describing his present situation, sitting on a dungheap, smitten with boils all over. His life is a drudgery like (1) the one of a day-labourer, (2) forced military service, and (3) simple slavery. His life is like the wind. He shall not see happiness again. Few people have such a bleak outlook on life.

Second Reading: 1 Corinthians 9:16-19.22-23

In the first part of 1 Corinthians (1 Cor. 1:10-6:20) Paul speaks about factions and abuses in the Corinthians community. In the second part (1 Cor. 7:1-15:18) he answers five questions Corinthians had asked him. After comparing marriage and virginity (7:1-40) he goes on talking about the eating of meat offered to idols (8:1-11:1). A great part of meat offered to idols was sold to customers, often with a discount. The question was: Could Christians buy such meat or was this idolatry? The apostle makes clear that eating such meat is not idolatry. And yet, since wrongly Jews and many Jewish Christians hold it to be idolatry; out of charity Christians coming paganism, and thus the Corinthians, shall forego the privilege of eating such meat, in order not to give scandal to Jewish Christians.

To motivate the Corinthians to forego this privilege, Paul tells them how he as apostle does not use his privilege of being supported by his communities. There is no doubt that every apostle, every preacher of the gospel, has a right to be supported

by those to whom he preaches the good news. After all, a farmer feeds the oxen, with which he plows, well. How much more does a missionary deserve to be supported by his community he serves (1 Cor. 9:9,14).

Paul has no reason to boast about preaching the gospel. He is acting in obedience (Acts 26:16ff; Rom. 1:14). He is not free to do otherwise. His glory, therefore, consists in preaching without insisting on his maintenance by his communities. If he were preaching willingly, i.e., without being commanded and thus of his own choice, he would receive a special reward. But since he preaches under necessity, fulfilling the commission entrusted to him, he does not deserve of anything but the ordinary reward due to the fulfillment of one's obligation. His special reward consists in foregoing his right to temporal support by the faithful and in preaching the gospel without charge (9:18).

The apostle takes upon himself a second privation: He could live and act as he pleases so long as he is in conformity with his mission. But he gives up this liberty. When he is with the Jews, he lives and acts like one of them, observing the Law and its ceremonies (Acts 16:3; 18:18; 21:23-26), although he knows these are not necessary. He does this in order to win the Jews more easily to the gospel. When he lives with the pagans, he conducts himself as if he also knew not the Law of Moses. To the weak he becomes weak (i.e. the Jews who wrongly think eating meat offered to idols be idolatry). He adapts himself to everybody (becomes all things to all men) in order to win them over to the gospel.

Reading of the Good News: Mark 1:29-39

In this pericope there are clearly four parts: (1) the healing of Peter's mother-in-law (1:29-31), (2) the healing of the many after sunset (1:32-34), (3) the withdrawing of Jesus from the multitude in order to pray (1:35-38), (4) a summary: Christ preaches in the synagogues and casts out demons (1:39).

(1) After Jesus taught in the synagogue of Capernaum and cast out a demon (the first miracle, in public, on a man), he now goes to the house of Peter (and Andrew) and heals Peter's mother-in-law (the second miracle in Mark, in private, on a woman). She suffers from a fever (Luke calls it a high fever). The Lord performs the miracle simply by taking her by the hand.

No magic formula and rites are needed. The healing is sudden and complete: she is able to wait on Christ and the apostles right away. The Lord helps us that we may help others.

(2) After sunset people bring their sick people to Jesus that he may heal them. Before sunset they could not do it, since one was not allowed to carry heavy things or persons on a Sabbath according to the Talmud. According to Jewish belief, sickness is often a sign of the power of the devil. Thus Jesus heals people and casts out demons. They often confess him as Messiah. But Christ does not let them talk: A confession from their mouth is not wanted and furthermore, people are inclined to take Christ too much as a miracle worker and do not understand that he has to suffer and then only can be glorified. This is the reason for the "Messianic Secret", the reason why Jesus does not let anybody confess him as the Messiah.

(3) And thus Jesus withdraws from people, in order to reflect on his real mission as preacher. For this he has been sent by the Father. Miracles are something secondary. If one wants to spend oneself for others, one must always take in spiritual energy by reflection and prayer. Work must not become an obsession.

(4) So Jesus goes on and preaches in the synagogues of Galilee and casts out demons, thus breaking their power.

HOMILY

LIFE AND SUFFERING A DRUDGERY? — SUFFERING ACCORDING TO THE BOOK OF JOB

1. The Book of Job is a piece of world literature and is most outstanding for its topic: "Why does a just man have to suffer?" Till that time it was traditional belief that God rewards the good and punishes the bad man already here on earth. Consequently, if somebody suffers, it can only be because he sinned. This is then also the opinion of the three friends of Job, but not of the author of the book nor of Job himself.

2. In a first draft (containing only Job 1:1-2:10 without 2:11-13), Prologue; 3 Job's lament; 29-31 Job's monologue;

38-39 Yahweh's first speech; 40:3-5 Apology of Job; 40:6-41:26 Second speech of Yahweh; 42:1-6 Job's answer; 42:9d.10-17 Restoration of Job) the *meaning of suffering* is described as a *test* (which Job himself, however does not know; only God knows). Job shall become a real man. He is "blameless and upright, fearing God and avoiding evil" (Job 1:8). Thus God allows Satan to test him by making Job loose his seven thousand sheep, three thousand camels, five hundred yoke of oxen, five hundred she-asses and a great number of work animals, and then also his seven sons and three daughters. But Job still prays: "Naked I came forth from my mother's womb, and naked I shall go back again. The Lord gave and the Lord has taken away, blessed be the name of the Lord" (Job 1:21). And in a second test Job looses his health and suffers a horrible disease which makes him unclean and incurable so that he has to sit outside of the house on a dungheap. But still he prays: "We accept good things from God. Should we not accept evil" (Job 2:10)?

Only slowly, when everything sinks in, Job curses the hour of his birth: 'Perish the day on which I was born, the night when they said, 'The child is a boy!' May that day be darkness; let not God above call for it...' (Job 3:3ff). But by and large he does not complain against God, but only laments his present state and looks back to the past with nostalgia. God answers by showing Job that we cannot understand God's plans and that weak man cannot compete with the almighty God. Suffering is mysterious. We shall leave it up to God (Job 38:2.512: 39:1: 40:2). Job humbly submits (42:3), and God restores Job's flocks and children. And the later days of his life are happier than the earlier (42:10-17).

Suffering is a *test* for all of us too to make of us the real man, the real lady. God is tested in fire (Sir. 2:5). But had Job known this, the test would have been much easier for him. But he did not know. The same is true in our life: We often do not think that God just tests us.

The first draft of the Book of Job thus presents a relatively simple piece of theology. And the question why the just man has to suffer is answered with a restoration of the *status quo*. And we all think: If suffering would be that simple I would not complain.

3. Consequently also the author of the Book of Job realized this and said to himself: It is just not true that God always

restores everything to the just man who suffers. Often enough he suffers the loss of many goods and does not receive anything in return. It is just not true that God (always) rewards (and punishes) already here on earth. Thus the author comes up with a second draft (which later was worked in with the final work). And so he brings the dialogues of Job with the three friends (Job 2:11-31:40), where the three friends hold on to the traditional doctrine that God rewards and punishes already the good resp. the bad here on earth; whereas Job wrestles for other answers.

The answer of the three friends of Job to the question why Job suffers can only be: It's because he has *sinned*, and sinned mightily since his suffering is so horrible. His friend Zophar states: "If you remove all iniquity from your conduct, and let not injustice dwell in your tent, surely then you may lift up your face in innocence" (11:14-15). Job's friend Eliphaz is even massive, to the point of being offensive: "Is it because of your piety that he reproves you?... Is not your wickedness manifold? Are not your iniquities endless? You have unjustly kept your kinsmen's good in pawn... To the thirsty you have given no water to drink, and from the hungry you have withheld bread... You have sent widows away emptyhanded" (22:4-9). Elihu, the fourth friend, is hardly less blunt: "What man is like Job? He drinks in blasphemies like water, keeps company with evildoers and goes along with wicked men" (34:7-8). It is, of course, true that every man is a sinner, and this also Job has to admit: "What is man that he should be blameless, one born of a woman that he should be righteous? If in his holy ones God places no confidence, and if the heavens are not clean in his sight, how much less so is the abominable, the corrupt" (15:14-16). But these are all small faults. Job has not committed the big sins his friends attribute to him. What he says in 31:5-37 ("If I have walked in falsehood... refused justice to my manservant or to my maid... denied anything to the poor... raised my hand against the innocent... rejoiced at the destruction of my enemy... I should present myself before God") is backed up by God himself in 1:8 ("There is no one on earth like (Job), blameless and upright").

Since we all sin, suffering often enough will be punishment for our sins, especially since we are greater sinners than Job was. And yet we should not loose too much time asking ourselves, whenever disaster strikes: "What did I do wrong that God punishes me so?" Often enough just the good people ask

this question, not the real sinners. Even if suffering would be punishment, God never just punishes. He rather blesses at the same time as we see in the case of the muteness of Zechariah (Lk. 1:22.64-66) : God restores his speech.

4. If therefore Job's suffering is not a real punishment for his sins, the question arises in his mind: "Why do I have to suffer?" And here the real problem starts which makes the Book of Job so timelessly valid since it is our problem who are sinners but not *that* big sinners either.

We are often tempted to feel the same way: My life is like the wind. I shall not see happiness again.

5. Looking for an answer Job is tempted to think that God is *capricious*, perhaps even *cruel*, enjoying his high position; whereas we are so small and little. Job knows of course that God is good and that God is *high above us*. And that makes Job feel hopelessly lonely and alone. God is *absent*, it seems.

Here are some texts:

"Is it a pleasure (Job says to God) for you to oppress, to spurn the work of your hands, and smile on the plan of the wicked? Have you eyes of flesh? Do you see as man sees. Are your days as the days of a mortal, and are your years as a man's lifetime, that you seek for guilt in me and search after my sins, even though you know that I am not wicked, and that none can deliver me out of your hand" (10:3-7) ?

"All my intimate friends hold me in horror; those whom I loved have turned against me. My bones cleave to my skin, and I have escaped with my flesh between my teeth" (19:19-20).

"Oh, that today I might find him, that I might come to his judgment seat." I would set out my cause before him... But if I go to the east, he is not there; or to the west, I cannot perceive him; where the north unfolds him, I behold him not; by the south he is veiled, and I see him not." (23:3.8-9).

6. In spite of the darkness there is one hope in Job: God knows him, and God has been with him ever since his conception, ever since his birth. Could God give up what he formed and thus liked!

"Yet he knows my way; if he proved me. I should come forth as gold" (23:10).

"Your hands have formed me and fashioned me; will you then turn and destroy me. Oh, remember that you fashioned me from clay! Will you then bring me down to dust again? Did you not pour me out as milk, and thicken me like cheese" (10:8-10). The last is probably a fine description of the conception in the womb of the mother.

And thus there is *hope*, even if Job does not clearly see it yet:

"I know that my vindicator lives and that he will at last stand forth upon the dust" (19:25).

At the latest, at Job's death, God will restore him. This we also can say in our life.

7. That suffering is *didactic* and *disciplinary* the friends of Job bring out:

"Happy the man whom God reproves! The Almighty's chastening do not reject. For he wounds, but he binds up; he smites, but his hands give healing" (5:17-18) says Eliphaz.

And this thought is even more brought out in the third draft of the book, in the speeches of the fourth Elihu (32:1-37:24):

"He (God) saves the unfortunate through their affliction, and instructs them through distress" (36:15).

Suffering is, as it were, preventive medicine, preventing man from greater illness of the soul.

Who of us knows how often God kept us from spiritual disaster by certain hardships and sicknesses, how often God prevented the eternal ruin of somebody by letting him die early!

8. The last answer the author gives to the problem of a just man suffering is, since the author places it in the mouth of God: Suffering is *mysterious*. We do not know what God has mind with it. We can only believe that God knows what he is doing and that God is fair. The real last answer why he sent suffering we will find out only later. The Lord tells Job:

"Where were you when I founded the earth... Who determined its size... Have you ever in your lifetime commanded the morning and shown the dawn its place... Have you entered into the sources of the sea... Have the gates of death been shown to you...

Have you comprehended the breath of the earth... Have you entered the storehouse of the snow... Have you fitted a curb to the Pleiades, or loosened the bonds of Orion?... Who counts the clouds in his wisdom... Have you an arm like that of God, or can you thunder with a voice like his" (38:4.5.12.16.22.31.37; 40:9).

To all this Job can, of course, only answer:

"I know that you can do all things, and that no purpose of yours can be hindered. I have dealt with great things that I do not understand... Therefore I disown what I have said, and repent" (42:6).

We have to leave it up to the Lord also why we have to suffer, being convinced that suffering makes sense, although we do not understand the reason. That answer may not quite satisfy our inquisitive mind. But the author of the Book of Job had no other answer yet. God had not yet more revealed to him, especially not about the life hereafter.

9. A deeper answer came only with Deutero Isaiah, followed up by the New Testament: The Servant of Yahweh and thus Jesus Christ redeems us by his suffering. Suffering is *vicarious*:

"Our infirmities he bore... He was pierced for our offenses, crushed for our sins... By his strips we are healed... The Lord laid upon him the guilt of us all... He gives his life as an offering for sin... Through his suffering my servant shall justify many... Because he surrendered himself to death... he shall take away the sins of many and win pardon for their offenses" (Is. 53:4.5.6.10.11.12).

10. Christ's death has infinite value for all of us. His redemption is complete once and for all. And yet, according to God's design it shall be channeled to us through our own participation in Christ's suffering. Ever since Christ died for us, for our redemption, our suffering shall be apostolic and *vicarious* too. This is the deepest answer to the question why a just man has to suffer:

"I find my joy in the suffering I endure for you. In my own flesh I fill up what is lacking in the sufferings of Christ for the sake of his body, the church" (Col. 1:24).

SIXTH SUNDAY IN ORDINARY TIME
(February 14, 1982)

We are unclean, we are lepers. The unclean person must live alone (first reading). But the Lord says: "I will. Be cured" (gospel)! The independent theme of the second reading is: Whatever we do, we shall do for the honor of God, imitating Christ.

First Reading: Leviticus 13:1-2.44-46

The Book of Leviticus is one of the little-read books of the Old Testament, since it deals predominantly with cultic matters in a way which seems very monotonous. Yet, a closer look shows a living variety and historical development of the whole system of worship in Ancient Israel, a cultic worship which was a central element in her life. Part I speaks about the ritual of sacrifice (Num. 1:1-7:38). Part II explains the ceremony of ordination (8:1-10:20). Part III describes legal purity (11:1-16:34): 1. Clean and unclean food is outlined (11:1-47). 2. Uncleaness of childbirth is explained (12:1-8). 3. Leprosy in the different forms is singled out (13:1-59). 4. Purification after leprosy follows (14:1-32).

Today's first reading brings just the beginning of the different forms of leprosy and states the main feature of a leper: He must live alone. It is selected as background for the gospel. Leprosy was often enough no real leprosy but a skin disease, which was curable, but had to be certified afterwards by the priest (Lev. 13:2ff). There are three kinds of real leprosy: (1) Nodular or tubercular leprosy. Unaccountable lethargy and pains in the joints develop into little nodules, especially in the folds of the cheek, nose, lips, and forehead. The nodules grow larger and ulcerate. It ends in mental decay, coma and death. (2) Anaesthetic leprosy: Here the nerve trunks are affected. The infected area loses all sensation. The muscles waste away. Slowly the leper loses fingers and toes, then hand and foot. (3) The third kind is a mixture of the first and the second.

To protect healthy people, the lepers had to present themselves to a priest who declared people clean or unclean (Lev. 13). Once declared unclean the leper had to dwell alone outside of the camp. He had to wear rent garments, his head had to be bare, and his beard muffled. And whenever a healthy person would come close, the leper had to warn him by shouting: "Unclean, unclean."

Second Reading: 1 Corinthians 10:31-11:1

Today's second readings sums up Paul's teaching on the permissibility of eating meat which had been offered to idols (1 Cor. 8:1-11:1). Since idols do not exist, something offered to something that does not exist changes nothing. Therefore one may eat such meat. Only at sacrificial pagan banquets one may not participate (1 Cor. 10:21), nor may one eat such meat when somebody explicitly mentions that this meat has been offered to idols (10:28). And above all one must avoid giving scandal. Out of charity for Jewish Christians who wrongly think that such eating would be tantamount to idolatry, one would not eat such meat either, although objectively speaking it is allowed.

Here the conclusion sets in: "Whenever you eat or drink you should do all for the glory of God. Give no offense to Jew or Greek or to the Church of God" (10:31-32). Paul himself gives the best example of foregoing a privilege, as this eating of meat offered to idols is: He does not insist on being supported by his community (9:15-18). He tries to please Jews and Greek to win them both (9:20-23). And that he can do and the Corinthians will be able to do by imitating Christ (10:33). Then they do, whatever they do, for the glory of God (10:31).

Reading of the Good News: Mark 1:40-45

The healing of the leper is reported by all three Synoptic gospels; each one has it, however, in a slightly different context. The biggest difference is the one of Matthew: After he has shown how Jesus is great in word, delivering the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. 5-7), he outlines how Jesus is great in deed, performing ten miracles (Mt. 8-9), of which the healing of the leper is the first one.

For Mark this miracle is an introduction to the five cases of conflict, where Jesus is more and more accused of breaking the Sabbath law (Mk. 2:1-3:6). This miracle of healing the leper shows that Jesus does not break the Law of Moses on principle or out of contempt (but only where men place small regulations higher than the well being of men). After all, Jesus sends the healed leper to the priest to fulfill what Moses prescribed in Lev. 14:2-20.

According to a principle of text criticism that the most difficult reading is the most likeable one, Mt. 1:41 should read:

"Being angry (instead of "Moved with pity") Jesus stretched out his hand, touched him..." Jesus was not angry at the leper but because leprosy showed the dominion of Satan which Jesus now is going to break.

HOMILY

WE ARE UNCLEAN AS THE LEPER

I. 1. Probably no other diseases was and is regarded with more terror and pity than leprosy, since it reduces a human being for so many years to a hideous wreck.

a. The leper is first a *burden to himself*. Slowly, but steadily he becomes disabled, in the measure the unbearable itching sets in, the disease becomes incurable, the extremities of the body fall off: his fingers, toes, finally the hands, the feet. The leper can only hardly help himself, and would need help so much.

b. And yet, nobody helps him, since *he is cast out from society*. He is separated from others. He is alone. *Where* he would need consolation, there is nobody to turn to. *Where* he would enjoy a consoling word, a helping hand, all shun him; and he himself has to avoid houses of healthy people. And should they ever come close to him, the leper would have to warn them and shout: "Unclean, unclean!" We are social beings by nature. But the leper is alone; at the most he can share the company of other lepers, which in many cases will only increase the misery by seeing others who are perhaps even worse off.

c. If we are alone, if we are a burden to ourselves, there is still somebody left to turn to: the Lord himself. But in a way, a *leper was even separated from the Lord*, since he was not allowed to attend the religious services in the synagogue, since he was levitically unclean by his leprosy. We all have experienced how common prayer and songs help us to see our suffering in the right proportion, how they give us courage to carry it, in case we cannot be healed. How many sick people have experienced such blessing in Lourdes, where there are special processions and Masses just for the sick in their wheel-chairs. Voluntary helpers wheel them in. They receive Holy Communion, sometimes even the sacrament of the sick. And

weekly there is a procession and benediction with the Blessed Sacrament: a priest blesses the sick individually with the monstrance. Many sick came to Lourdes in order to be healed. Some few are miraculously healed. But the big majority go home unhealed. But in most a big change has taken place, after all. They go home happy, although not healed bodily. But they are healed spiritually. They understand the apostolic meaning of their suffering and offer their suffering now up for others.

Such consolation the lepers never got. They were excluded from any public worship, and thus they must have felt forsake even by God, although, of course, God forsake nobody.

d. The leper knows that there is no way out of his sickness. He knows only that onl yone man can heal him: Jesus of Nazareth. Thus he disregards the regulation of staying away from healthy people, of shouting "unclean, unclean". He approaches Jesus. It was not that Jesus just by chance ran into the leper. The leper came to Jesus with full intention, with faith.

e. And he *humbly* expresses that faith by kneeling down and saying modestly: "If you will to do so, you can cure me" (Mk. 1:40).

2. Jesus cures the leper.

a. He does not bawl him out, he does not reject him and give him a scolding because of transgressing the law. He does not run away from him either, fearing to be infected by him. Jesus takes the leper as he is and for what he is: a human person.

b. Lepers resent and are hurt if a healthy person shows that he is shocked by the sight of a leper or fears to be contaminated by them. The more naturally the healthy persons behave the more the lepers will like it. Jesus even touches the leper. Such a tender sign nobody had given him for years. It does the leper a lot of good. His ego rises and at the same time his confidence in Christ is stimulated.

c. The Lord takes up the request of the leper. With a simple word of authority and power he says: "I do will it. Be cured" (Mk. 1:41).

d. Jesus sends the cured leper to the priest, following the Law of Moses which he usually observed inasmuch it contained God's will. After all, the leper had been officially excluded

from the community and only a priest could take him back into the community. Thus, it was the only reasonable thing to do to present oneself to the priest to be declared cured.

At the same time, Jesus wanted to give the priest, if he was of good will, a sign, whereby the priest could find the Messiah.

3. The reaction of the leper is joy and thankfulness. It may seem strange to us that the Lord forbids him to spread the good news of his being healed. Jesus performed his miracles in order to prove that he is the Messiah. Thus it would have been just logical that healed people would spread the good news.

a. But the fact was that most contemporaries of the Lord expected the Messiah too much as a political hero, the one who would free them from the yoke of the Romans. Jesus, however, had been sent to redeem mankind by his suffering. And consequently, his miracles would be rightly understood as guide to his Messiahship, to his divine sonship, only after his resurrection, and so he enjoined the "Messianic Secret" on cured people, on demons and on his disciples.

b. To thank the Lord for his benefits is certainly what the Lord wants us to do. But one can easily talk about something one has experienced from the Lord and dwell more on his own thrill than on God's benefit. This is probably also what happened to the cured leper.

II. 1. Jesus performed his miracles not just for the benefit of the healed person concerned, but as a sign for a higher reality. We are spiritual lepers, we are sinners, in different degrees.

a. *Sin makes life hard for ourselves.* Where we had been working with elan and enthusiasm, sins hamper our efforts. If we, for instance develop an attitude of distrusting people and see everywhere base motives, we cannot work properly with people. If we have no confidence in ourselves, in God nor in people, we are crippled. In spite of double efforts we accomplish very little. Any abnormal drive (sex, power, possession) can make us obsessed and thus blind for the higher realities of life and supernature.

b. Sin is not just something private that only hurts us. *Every sin affects also the community* in which we live. Every sin has a social aspect, even the most hidden sin we might commit. And every sin alienates us from others, every sin does some damage to the whole community.

c. *Sin alienates us from God*, more in the sense that we run away from God than that he excludes us. The first men were already hiding from God in the garden of Eden because they were ashamed before him.

2. Only God, only Christ can heal us from sin.

a. We have to have the courage to admit that we sin. There can be no healing, no forgiving without this admission that we did something wrong, that we are sinners, spiritual lepers.

b. We must have confidence in Christ's healing power: "If you will, you can heal me."

3. Christ takes us the way we are, with our good and bad qualities. We do not have to hide anything. The more open we show our faults, the easier he can heal us.

4. a. We shall be thankful to the Lord for all he does for us. And it is not the smallest part of thankfulness to praise the Lord for what he has done by telling other people the story of our healing. *Verba movent, exempla trahunt*: Words move, but (told) examples pull, as one can see it with all the symbolic gifts of crutches at pilgrimage places.

b. But whatever we say must be in honor of the Lord not for our self-gratification and glamor. We can easily deceive ourselves.

SEVENTH SUNDAY IN ORDINARY TIME (February 21, 1982)

God forgives sins as the return from exile shows (first reading). The fact that Christ forgives sins proves that he is God (gospel). — The independent theme of the second reading is: Christ is the "yes" to the Father and to all prophecies. Thus Paul can only try to be as reliable as the Son is.

First Reading: Isaiah 43:18-19.21-22.24-25

Deutero Isaiah speaks to the Jews in exile and consoles them by telling them that the new exodus will come soon. God is doing a new thing (43:19), the new exodus, which is more impressive than the things of long ago, the first exodus (43:18).

As God during the exodus from Egypt killed the Egyptians in the Red Sea (Ex. 14; Is. 43:16-21) and provided for them a way through the sea and the desert and as he provided water from the rock for his people (Ex. 17:1-7) so he will lead his people in a new exodus out of Babel. People shall completely look to this new event and stop mournfully looking back and clinging to the past exodus (v. 18). God will give water in the wilderness so abundantly that even the wild creatures living there share in it (v. 20).

It is God's pure grace, not Israel's merit, that she is going to be redeemed now (vv. 22-25). During the exile Israel cared very little for God. She did not call upon him, nor offer any sacrifices (this was not possible in Babylonia without a temple). In spite of this, God takes Israel again to himself as his people (cf. 54:6) and forgives her sins, not because of Israel, but because of His own honor.

Israel did not serve God with sacrifices (literally: "I (God) did not make you serve (me) (in Hebrew: *lo' he' ebadtika*) with sacrifices"). But God serves Israel by taking away her sins (literally: "You made me serve (in Hebrew: *ak he' ebadtāni*) with your sins). These verses would indicate that Servant of Yahweh Songs where in the light of later fulfillment Christ is pictured as the *Ebed Yahweh* (Is. 42:1-9; 49:1-9; 50:4-9; 52:13-53:12) are written by Deutero Isaiah. God makes everything new by letting his Son, the Servant of God, take away the sin of Israel, the sin of mankind.

Second Reading: 2 Corinthians 1:18-22

The semi-continuous reading of the second reading on the seventh till the fourteenth Sunday of cycle B is taken from Paul's Second Letter to the Corinthians. The apostle's first letter to the Corinthians had full success in Corinth. Paul remained in Ephesus longer than he foresaw. Meanwhile new adversaries arrived in Corinth, Judaizers (11:22), who attacked the apostle's authority, denying his apostolate, calling him unreliable. Thus Paul came to Corinth for a personal visit ("the intermediate visit"). But he did not have full success and therefore promised to come back for a longer time (cf. 2 Cor. 1:15f). Either during this short visit, or probably after, one of Paul's associates (most likely not Paul himself) was gravely offended (2:5; 7:12). Returned to Ephesus Paul wrote "the letter written with tears" (2:3ff; 7:8ff), asking for reparation, sending Titus to Corinth with this letter. After the uprising

of the silver smiths Paul left Ephesus (Acts 19:23-40) and went to Macedonia. Here he met Titus who reported favorably about the Corinthians (7:5-7): The community had become loyal to Paul again and had punished the offender (7:7-11). Paul sent Titus to Corinth to prepare the collection for the community in Jerusalem (8:16-24). Finally he wrote the Second Letter to the Corinthians (which is in historical reality the fourth letter Paul wrote) in 57 A.D. Different arguments and apparent inconsistencies make some scholars believe that we have here a collection of letters. (2 Cor. 6:14-7:1 would interrupt to continuity between 6:13 and 7:2; 2 Cor. 9 would be a doublet of chapter 8; 2 Cor. 10-13 would be too different, sharp in tone, from the rest of the epistle). But such changes of arguments and tone are possible in a Pauline Letter, and one better leaves the letter as it is.

In Part I (1:12-7:16) Paul defends himself against charges and praises the greatness of the apostolic office. In Part II (8-9) the apostle motivates the Corinthians to give generously for the poor in the mother church of Jerusalem. In Part III (10-13) Paul attacks his adversaries before he goes to Corinth.

In today's reading the apostle defends himself against the charge of being unreliable. It was not his fault that he had to change his travel plans at times. He can honestly say that he tries to be as reliable as possible. And who could be a better model than Christ himself! He is the "yes" to the Father, the response to the Word the Father pronounces. And in particular he fulfills all the prophecies of old. The prayer "Amen" means "yes" to all the Father wants from us. One could hardly deeper motivate reliability in word and action.

Reading of the Good News: Mark 2:1-12

This is the first of the five conflict stories (Mk. 2:1-3:6), a collection which probably (at least partly) already existed before Mark wrote his gospel, showing Christ's power above sin and law. In the first section (Mk. 1:14-45) Mark shows the beginning of Christ's activity in Galilee. People are far from really understanding his mission. But at least they are impressed by his word and especially his miracles (although they are running too much after the miracles, not understanding them as signs). But now (Mk. 2:1-3:6) the scene changes. Suddenly Christ's adversaries are there, watching his increasing influence skeptically and attacking him slowly even openly. If

Jesus does not succeed in winning them over, there will be open conflict which he cannot avoid. And at the end (3:6) we even read: "The Pharisees began to plot with the Herodians how they might destroy him", although that may not have been the case that early.

The following five conflict stories differ from the preceding narrations inasmuch as they do not place the miracles in the center of the attention but a word of Jesus (2:10f.17.19.27f; 3:4). And thus the point of the story is not the miracle as such, but the word of Jesus. The hostility of Jesus' adversaries becomes bigger and bigger and his word always more pointed. At the end he even attacks. The five pericopies are only a selection and do not reflect the *exact* historical sequence or happenings.

Mark wants to show the increasing hostility of Jesus' adversaries which will lead to his death. In the first conflict story (today's reading) Jesus claim to have power to forgive sins (2:10); in the second he asserts to have come as physician to heal sick people (2:17) in the third he pronounces a new order of things, connected with his person: people will fast, when he is gone (2:19) he is lord of the Sabbath, and thus the Sabbath shall be for men, not men for the Sabbath (2:27-28); the commandment to love stands higher than the Sabbath law (3:4).

Houses in Palestine often had one room, and most only one floor. Often enough a stair went to the top of the roof, or one could even climb on it, when it was half built into a hill. The ceiling consisted of beams some three feet apart. In between there were rushes and twigs, packed tight with clay. The roof often was made of clay which was renewed before the rainy season. Thus it was easy for the four carriers, who could not enter the house because of the crowd, to go on top of the roof, dig a hole into the clay, and let down the mat with the paralytic.

Moved by the faith of the carriage which probably had an impact on the sick) Jesus forgives first the sins of the paralytic and then cures his sickness as proof that he has the power to forgive sins. People are amazed, but the adversaries become only more stubborn.

HOMILY

CHRIST THE HEALER OF SOUL AND BODY

1. This is one of the most vividly depicted miracles which certainly makes the impression of going back to an eyewitness. We may assume that Peter is this eyewitness. The healing of the paralytic took place in his house. The Lord wanted to escape the crowd and have a little privacy and thus he went to the house of Peter, which Christ for some time used as headquarters for his activity in Capernaum and neighborhood. But since people do not quite understand his mission and even less his being the Son of God they are attracted by his miracles. Soon the house is crowded. This, however, does not discourage the four friends of a paralytic. Carrying their friend on a mat, they climb the staircase to the roof, dig a hole through the clay of the roof and let the mat down between two beams of the ceiling, just in front of Jesus, trusting that the Lord will heal their friend. We may assume that their faith is carrying over on the sick, but it is not clearly said.

But here now comes the great surprise. Jesus does not say: "Take your mat and walk," but "my son, your sins are forgiven." Christ's enemies call this blasphemy, since only God (justly) can forgive sins. Only somebody who knows by faith that Christ is more than a man, i.e. God-man can see in his word the expression of his divine being. And of this he wants to convince his adversaries and all the people.

Jesus' answer sounds strange, but psychologically good. As such one needs more power to forgive sins than to heal bodily. For sin is worse than sickness, sin enters the metaphysical dimension of men, his religious sphere, his relation with God. This is something man cannot regulate himself. Sin is like falling down from a mountain. But a person who falls down and is seriously hurt cannot lift himself up. Bodily healing, however, is not completely beyond human endeavour. Only to do it with one single word, as it is done here, is beyond human strength. But for people it seems easier to say "your sins are forgiven" (since one cannot check the corresponding reality) than to say: "Get up take your mat, and walk", since here everybody can check. Therefore Jesus says: "What is easier to say: your sins are forgiven, or to say: get up and walk?" Jesus says now that which is harder to say that they may see

that he can also say what is easier to say. Thus the healing of the paralytic becomes a proof and a sign for them of Christ's power to forgive sins: Whoever can say the harder thing can also say the easier thing.

2. Christ's healing of the paralytic reminds us of the relation between sin and sickness.

a. There is a relation. For sickness came into this world through sin, at least sickness in its vastness as it is now. We do not have to believe that without sin no man would have to suffer. A human body is limited and that means also that it is prone to sickness. But there are many sickness clearly caused by sin: venereal disease, consequences of alcohol, diseases caused by too much smoking, derangement of our nerves by a life in crime. And that God permits Satan to test men by sickness we see from the Book of Job and the Book of Revelation.

b. But sickness is not always punishment for sin. And we have to be slow in drawing such a conclusion if we see a sick person. The Jews believed that the man born blind sinned before his birth or in his mother's womb, or that the parents sinned (Jn. 9:2). But Jesus had to tell them that neither the blind man or his parents had sinned. The blindness God permitted to show his mercy to the blind whom Christ healed (Jn. 9:3), and to make out of him a follower of Jesus.

We saw last Sunday that God often uses sickness as a means of preventive medicine and as a way of our participation in Christ's vicarious suffering.

c. Sickness of the body is bad enough, but sickness of the soul is much worse. Thus Jesus heals the soul first before he heals the body. The latter he does almost on a sideline. We men do not always have the same priorities as Jesus has. For bodily health we often spend big sums, for a regular check-up as well as for recovery from small and bigger maladies.

(1) To be cured from our spiritual sickness we have to present ourselves to the Lord. We have to want to be healed. Some checkups come rather late so that the doctor can only state that it is too late now. Would the patient have come earlier the sickness could have been avoided or been healed earlier and with less effort. And some people go rather late to the hospital when the sickness is already so much advanced.

(2) The Church requires such a spiritual checkup once a year at Easter time, called sacrament of reconciliation. And this is according to the letter only necessary if we are in the state of mortal sin. In such a case we have to go to confession before we receive our Easter communion. But if the sacrament of reconciliation is the most important (not the only) means of healing it would make little sense to go to confession just once a year. Some people do not like to go to the doctor and put it off and off. Similarly some people do not like to go to the priest for confession either. They want to confess to God directly. We can and should confess to God directly and repent for our sins. Without this sorrow there is no forgiveness. But God wants us also to confess to a priest, at least the traditionally called "mortal sins". Without the sacrament of reconciliation such sins would be forgiven only through an act of perfect contrition by which we are sorry for our sins because of pure love of God, not because we fear that God may punish us or put us into hell. But who knows, how often we have such a pure sorrow. If we go to the sacrament of reconciliation an act of attrition, by which we are sorry for mixed reasons, also because of fear of hell or punishment, suffices. The sacrament raises this act of attrition to an act of contrition and the sin is taken away.

(3) But we also receive increase of sanctifying grace with every absolution, our divine life is strengthened and increased. We receive more power to resist sin and sinfulness, spiritual sickness.

(4) And as every checkup tells us where we stand, every confession tells us where we stand before God. We refine our conscience and are more sensitive for any spiritual sickness, for any sin, even sins of omission and try to avoid them.

d. The perfect man is healthy with body and soul. This is what Jesus demonstrates with his miracle. And this what we will be at the end of times. But as long as we live on earth this will never be reached completely. The saint does not necessarily have a healthy body. It is God's mystery why he makes some saintly people suffer more. They become saint just because of their physical suffering.

And God can even permit his saints to suffer psychologically. St. Alphonses of Ligouri was much sought for as confessor and adviser. But he himself was suffering from scruples quite a bit.

3. All in all, this pericope shows us what Christ wants to be for us: the healer of body and soul.

FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT**(February 28, 1982)**

Lent shall prepare us for participation in the Easter Feast. The first readings, taken from the Old Testament, focus on Israel's salvation history as presupposition, preparation and prefigurement of the redemption by Christ. They recapitulate five stages in salvation: (1) the beginning of salvation (Noah), (2) the call of Abraham, (3) the old covenant mediated by Moses, (4) the exile, (5) prophecy of the new covenant.

The second readings explain the meaning of the cross and the believers participation in salvation through baptism.

The gospel theme of the first two Sundays is traditionally (in all three years) the temptation and transfiguration of Jesus (penitential themes), whereas Sundays three through five picture the future glory of Christ through his passion and death according to the gospel of John. In other words, we learn much about the meaning of the cross.

As Noah went through the flood and was saved in the ark and started a new life sealed by the covenant (first reading), we have been renewed through the waters of baptism (second reading). We are a new creation, but we still have to conquer the old man and devil (gospel).

First Reading: Genesis 9:8-15

The first reading tells us how God made a new beginning with Noah after he had destroyed mankind by the flood (Gen. 9:1-17). The report is taken from the Priestly Source (P), which mentions also the other covenants God made: with Adam (Gen. 1:26-31), Abraham (Gen. 17:1-27), Moses (Ex. 19). When God created man he blessed him saying: "Be fruitful"! In spite of all sins God has renewed this command for the generation of Noah too (Gen. 9:1). Through all the violence the harmony between men and animals has been disturbed. God renews man's right over the animals (Gen. 9:2-4). New is that God will also allow man's deadly intervention: He may eat flesh as long as he does not touch the blood, which the ancients considered to be the special seat of life. Human life, however, is God's sovereign domain (Gen. 9:5-7). Nobody must kill man because he is created according to God's image and likeness.

To solemnize all this God makes a covenant with Noah (Gen. 9:8-17). (This forms our first reading with the exception of

the last two verses.) A covenant is meant to clarify the legal situation between two groups or individuals. In the covenant with Abraham and Moses the individual or the nation is called quite personally into a relation of fellowship with God and must affirm this ordinance. Here in the covenant with Noah the human partner does not have to appropriate his obligations. God unilaterally promises never to destroy all mankind and animals as a whole. God's gracious will shall be made visible to mankind, terrified by the chaotic elements: The rainbow shall serve as a sign that God has placed the "bow of war" for all future aside (which is an etiological story). "The natural orders, fixed by God's word, mysteriously guarantee a world in which in his own time God's historical saving activity will begin" (Gerhard von Rad. *Genesis*, p. 135)

Second Reading: 1 Peter 3:18-22

The First Letter of Peter in content probably goes back to St. Peter, but the writing may have been done by his companion Silvanus (1 Peter 5:12) in ca. 64 A.D. since the style seems to be a bit high for a simple fisherman from Galilee. The letter wants to console the Christians of Asia Minor and strengthen them in the new life to which they have been introduced by baptism. The persecution does not seem to be a persecution by the government but the pagan neighbors who revile them for "the name of Christ" (4:14).

The principal topic is a discussion of the nature of Christian life began in baptism as a regeneration. It shows how a Christian should conduct himself among the pagan neighbors in the face of persecution. The whole letter is a baptismal exhortation. Part I (1:13-2:10) brings admonitions of a general nature. Part II (2:11-4:6) gives injunctions for particular states of life. Part III (4:7-5:11) exhorts in view of the time of suffering which has befallen the Christians and of the coming judgment.

In Part II we learn that suffering rightly endured brings great blessings. In today's second reading the author shows his readers the blessings of Christ's innocent suffering: No, the Just, died for the unjust, meriting us eternal life which is given to us in baptism. Here is one of the most discussed texts of the New Testament. The core is probably an early Christological hymn:

- 1 (Christ) suffered once for our sins
- 2 that he might bring us to God,
- 3 being put to death in the flesh
- 4 but made alive in the spirit,
- 5 in which also he preached to the spirits in prison
- 6 and having gone into heaven sat down
- at the right hand of God
- 7 angels and authorities and powers having been made
- subject to him.

(So Reginald Fuller. *Preaching the New Lectionary*, p. 333).

In this hymn Christ does not go to the fore-hell or limbo to preach the good news to the just of the Old Testament (as we have it in the Apostle's Creed) but the risen Lord preaches his triumph to the imprisoned spirits as he passes through the heavens to the seventh heaven, to his throne (according to mythology) as we find it also in Phil. 2:10; 1 Cor. 15:24,27; Rom. 8:38; Col. 2:10,15; Eph. 1:21; 3:10; 6:12). Then these spirits would be (partly at least) to be identified with the angels who tried to seduce men in Gen. 6:4. That happened in the time of Noah.

Others, however explain the insertion of Peter differently: In the time of the flood at least some people repented the last moment before they died in the flood. To them Christ preached the good news of salvation after his death. The Mishna (Sanhedrin 10:3) states that the generation of the flood has no part in the future world and will not rise at the last judgment. Peter, however, who himself had sinned grievely and received forgiveness, had a milder outlook: Some at least found forgiveness.

Whatever the exact explanation of this detail might be, clear is the analogy between the saving of Noah, his wife, his three daughters with their husbands, thus eight, through the water of the flood (the water carried the ark and so, at least indirectly, saved the persons) and our being saved through the water of baptism.

We are made new through baptism. It is more than just a mere (physical) washing. Yet, we have still to do something to live accordingly. We pledge ourselves to an irreproachable conscience.

Reading of the Good News: Mark 1:12-15

There are clearly two parts (1) Christ's temptation (1:12-13), and (2) the beginning of Christ's preaching (1:14-15) which we saw on the Third Sunday of the year B (Mk. 1:14-20).

The story of the temptations of Christ are in all three Synoptic Gospels. Mark has only a summary, Matthew and Luke report three temptations in detail (the sequence of the second and third is changed).

The Spirit sent (literally: threw out) Jesus into the desert. It did not just happen. And with this there was already the guarantee that Jesus will win the battle against Satan, the tempter, for that was the purpose of Christ's stay. He was there forty days, a round figure as Moses (Jesus is the true Moses) was forty days and nights on Mt. Sinai (Ex. 24:18) where he fasted (Ex. 34:28). Similarly the Jews wandered through the desert for forty years (Deut. 8:2f.15.f, and Elijah, strengthened by the angel's food walked forty days to Mount Noreb (1 Kgs. 19:8). In Mark it would seem as if the temptations lasted forty days not just a short time as one could have the impression in Matthew and Luke.

Jesus was with the wild beasts. This could mean: the place was so desolate. But probably Mark has more in mind the peace between animals and men which is restored by Christ's victory over Satan and sin, the paradisiac order which was disturbed by the first man's sin. Is 11:6ff pictures that peace: "Then the wolf shall be a guest of the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid. The calf and the young lion shall browse together with a little child to guide them... The baby shall play by the cobra's den." Similarly Ps. 91:13 expresses the same reality: "You shall tread upon the asp and the viper; you shall trample down the lion and the dragon."

This would also fit in with the reference that "angels waited on him (Christ)", as it is stated in the same psalm (Ps. 91:11-12): "To his angels he has given command about you, that they guard you in all your ways. Upon their hands they shall bear you up, lest you dash your foot against a stone." According to Mt. 4:11 angels served food after the temptation. In Mark one could have the impression that they served Jesus during the forty years. Thus Jesus' life extends between angels and animals, comprising the whole universe and establishing complete peace by his victory over Satan.

Mt. 1:14-15 marks the beginning of Christ's preaching. According to Mark Jesus preaches only after the arrest of the Baptist. In Christ's person the time is fulfilled, the kingdom is at hand. Thus we must make an about face (*metanoein* and place Christ in the center of our life.

HOMILY

SAVED THROUGH THE WATERS OF BAPTISM WE STILL HAVE TO BE TESTED

1. Lenten time wanted to prepare the catechumens for their baptism and wants to remind those who have been baptized of their great day in life to live their Christian life more fully. After all, we live a new life since baptism but at the same time we still are a long way off our final goal. We are exposed to many trials and temptations.

a. The first reading of today pictures how Noah escaped the flood and after forty days started a new life. Corruption was so widespread that God humanly speaking repented of having created mankind and resolved to wipe mankind off:

When the Lord saw how great was man's wickedness on earth, and how evil their thoughts are, he regretted that he had made man on the earth, and his heart was grieved. So the Lord said: 'I will wipe out from the earth the men whom I have created, and not only the men, but also the beasts.' But Noah found favor with the Lord (Gen. 6:5-8).

Thus the water destroys mankind, as later again people would die through the water, i.e., the Egyptians in the Red Sea:

Moses stretched out his hand over the sea, and at dawn the sea flowed back to its normal depth. The Egyptians were fleeing head on toward the sea, when the Lord hurled them into its midst. As the water flowed back, it covered the chariots and the charioteers of Pharaoh's whole army which had followed the Israelites into the sea. Not a single one of them escaped (Ex. 14:27-29).

But the water also saved, i.e., Moses, his wife, his three daughters and his three sons-in-law. The water saved inasfar it carried the ark in which the eight persons found shelter during the forty days of rain.

b. Noah and his family came out of the ark a changed person after this forty days of rain. They had received a lease on life and thus started living a new life as it were. This new life was sealed with a sacrifice:

Then Noah built an altar to the Lord, and choosing from every clean animal and every clean bird, he offered holocausts on the altar. When the Lord smelled the sweet odor, he said to himself: 'Never again will I doom the earth because of man' (Gen. 8:20-21).

God accepted the sacrifice of Noah and on his part made a covenant, binding only himself and not demanding a return service:

God said to Noah and to his sons with him: 'See, I am now establishing my covenant with you and your descendants after you . . . I will establish my covenant with you, that never again shall all bodily creatures be destroyed by the waters of a flood . . . This is the sign that I am giving for all ages to come, of the covenant between me and you and every living creature with you: I set my bow in the clouds to serve as a sign of the covenant (Gen. 9:8-13).

That Noah and his children will live a new life is guaranteed by God's renewed blessing:

God blessed Noah and his sons and said to them: 'Be fertile and multiply and fill the earth' (Gen. 9:1).

2. We are not surprised that St. Peter and after him many Fathers of the Church took Noah's lease on life through the flood as a symbol for our new life in baptism. Many catechumens in earlier years of the Church prepared themselves for baptism especially through the season of Lent of forty days. As at the time of Noah "a few persons, eight in all, escaped in the ark through the waters, so you now are saved by a baptismal bath which corresponds to this exactly" (1 Peter 3:20-21). This baptism does not just remove external stain but sin and gives new life: These details are unfolded by St. Paul: "You have been washed, consecrated, justified in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God" (1 Cor.

11b). "He saved us through the baptism of new birth and renewal by the Holy Spirit. This Spirit he lavished on us through Jesus Christ our Savior" (Tit. 3:5b-6). "If anyone is in Christ he is a new creation" (2 Cor. 5:17).

In our baptism we have put on Christ: "All of you who have been baptized into Christ have clothed yourselves with him" (Gal. 3:27). And "thus not I live but Christ lives in me" (Gal. 2:20a).

Most of us have been baptized as a small child. We grew up in a Catholic environment. So we do not have much of a feeling of having been saved from sin and death. That was different for the first Christians and is different for those who come to the Church from paganism: from the bad environment and the life of vices they turned to Christ to start a new life. And the ceremony of baptism, administered by immersion, symbolized this dying to sin and vices and rising with Christ. The going down into the baptismal font symbolized the death to sin and the coming up from the font the rising to the new life in Christ. St. Paul describes it in Rom. 6:4-5: "When we were baptized we went into the tomb with Christ and joined him in death, so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the Father's glory, we too might live a new life."

3. Christ prepared himself for his public ministry, which marked the beginning of a new phase in his life with a baptism too. It was, of course, not the sacrament of baptism since Christ as Son of God is without sin. But he was filled with the *Holy Spirit* in a special way to start his new phase of life as preacher of the good news. Isaiah 11:2 had already foretold it: "The spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him: a spirit of wisdom and of understanding, a spirit of counsel and of strength, a spirit of knowledge and of fear of the Lord." And again we find it in Deutero Isaiah (Is. 42:1): "Here is my servant whom I uphold, my chosen one with whom I am pleased, upon whom I have put my Spirit. He shall bring justice to the nations." And a third time the prophet pictures the Messiah as the man upon whom the spirit of the Lord rests, "because the Lord has anointed me. He has sent me to bring glad tidings to the lowly, to heal the brokenhearted" (Is. 61:1). Christ accepted this call wholeheartedly.

4. Noah lived a new life since the flood, we live a new life since baptism, Christ lived a new life since he was filled with the Holy Spirit in the Jordan. But Christ had to prove himself and thus he was tested by the devil. Temptations can be

an evil, if we fall. But they can and shall be for our good to bring the real man or lady out in us. Thus we understand why Mark says: "The Spirit sent him (Christ) out toward the desert" (Mk. 1:12). The literal expression in Greek for "sent" is "threw": the Spirit threw Christ into the desert. The Spirit guarantees that Christ will win and that he will conquer the devil.

No wonder that the wild beasts were there also. As such, this could be a description of the loneliness of the place and the wilderness. But it is more likely a description of the peace which Christ effected by his victory over the devil. The first man in paradise had once named all animals (Gen. 2:20). He knew their essence. And he who can name somebody or an animal has power over them. Thus there was complete oneness and harmony between man and animal. This harmony was destroyed by man's sin, by his disobedience to the Father. Christ restored it by his victory over the devil and his complete obedience to the Father.

Angels waited on Christ (Mk. 1:13). In Matthew it looks as if they waited on Jesus after his victory. In Mark, however, it could look as if they waited on Christ all the time. In any case, this is another picture of the wonderful peace and harmony.

We shall be tested in our life also that the real personality comes out. Often we will be tempted by the devil, as Christ was. But since we are under the influence of original sin still, although the guilt has been taken away in baptism, we are often also tempted by our own evil desires, by our inordinate appetites for power, love and possessions. If we realize that we are not more human but carry also the Holy Spirit in our heart since baptism, and if we allow him to penetrate us and rule our life we also will be able to overcome all temptations and slowly grow to full spiritual maturity in our life.

SECOND SUNDAY IN LENT (March 7, 1981)

All readings of today center around the Son, the Son who suffered, the Son who on his way to suffering was transfigured. As Abraham was willing to sacrifice his son (first reading) so God gave his Son for our sake (second reading). That same Son who had foretold his suffering was transfigured to offset the scandal of suffering (gospel).

First Reading: Genesis 22:1-2.9.10-13.15-18

God had called Abraham out to Ur to go to Canaan to make of him a great nation and to bless in him all communities of the earth (Gen. 12). Abraham followed God's call. To be the founder of a race, however, the patriarch needed to have a son. But God let Abraham wait for twenty-four years before Isaac was born. A great test for the patriarch's faith. But God had one more test for him. When his son Isaac had grown to boyhood, God asked Abraham to offer him in sacrifice at an appointed place in the land of Moriah. Abraham obeyed promptly once more, but God intervened as Abraham was ready to slay his son.

Today's first reading is an abridged version of the Elohist report (E) in Gen. 22. The origin of this narrative probably was a polemic against the human sacrifice which the Canaanites practiced now and then. The offering of a firstborn son was a practice in time of crisis as ultimate means of placing the angry gods. Thus the king of Moab, faced with defeat at the hands of the Israelites "took his firstborn, his heir apparent, and offered him as a holocaust upon the wall" (2 Kgs. 3:27). Hiel from Bethel offered his first-born son Abiram as a "foundation sacrifice to obtain the divine blessing upon his project of rebuilding Jericho (1 Kgs. 16:34). King Ahaz of Judah "immolated his son by fire" (2 Kgs. 16:3). And King Manasseh did the same with his son (2 Kgs. 21:6).

But the way the story is now in the Book of Genesis and the way it has been explained by NT authors, Genesis 22 marks the climax of Abraham's faith. His heroic example has been held up to us by St. Paul: "Hoping against hope, Abraham believed and so became the father of many nations... His faith was credited to him as justice" (Rom. 4:18.22). And the author of the Letter to the Hebrews sums it up by saying: "By faith Abraham, when put to the test, offered up Isaac; he who had received the promises was ready to sacrifice his only son, of whom it was said, 'Through Isaac shall your descendants be called'" (Hebr. 11:17-18).

Second Reading: Romans 8:31-34

As Abraham did not spare his only son, God the Father did not hesitate to give his only Son into death for us (Rom. 8:32). This verse 32 is the idea which connects the first and second

reading. Thus God is for us and consequently nothing can be against us. The Father who gave his own Son for us, for our redemption, will give us everything besides.

But not only the Father will not condemn us; the Son will not do it either. The Son who

1. was not spared by the Father (Rom. 8:32),
2. died for us (cf. Cor. 15:4),
3. was raised from the dead (1 Cor. 15:4),
4. is at the right hand of God (Acts 2:33; 5:31; 7:55; Rom. 8:34).
5. and intercedes for us (Rom. 8:34).

Reading of the Good News: Mark 9:2-10

This report all three Synoptic gospels have in common, each one with slight modifications. The Marcan features are:

1. Mark only says that Jesus was transfigured, not that his face changed (Lk.) and became brilliant as the sun (Mt.).
2. Mark stresses the whiteness of Jesus' garments, "whiter than the work of any bleacher could make them" (v. 3b).
3. The name of Eliah comes before that of Moses (v. 4a).
4. To the statement "Peter hardly knew what to say, which also Lk. has, Mark adds: "for they were all overcome with awe" (v. 6).
5. The three disciples continued to discuss what to "rise from the dead" meant (v. 10).

The transfiguration comes after six days (counting from the first prediction of Christ's passion. Jesus takes the same three apostles Peter, James and John who will witness his agony in the garden of Gethsemani. The memory of the transfiguration would serve as safeguard against the scandal of the agony as it should now serve as a safeguard against the scandal of the prediction of the cross. Passion and death is one side, Easter glory the other.

The mountain of transfiguration is according to an old tradition Mount Tabor, near Nazareth, 560 meters high, where there is a church today. Others favor Mount Hermon, north of Caesarea Philippi, ca. 3,000 meters high.

The transfiguration is inaccessible to the historian's critical investigation. It discloses its meaning only to faith.

Moses and Elijah appear as representatives of the Law and the Prophets. Both prepared the way for Christ. Jesus is the fulfilment of the Old Testament and the foundation of the New Testament of which the three apostles are the representatives. Moses and Elijah suffered. So must Christ as their fulfilment (Mt. 17:10-13).

Peter is happy and perplexed at the same time. Thus he does not know what to say. He would like to hold on to the happiness and build three tents (as during the Feast of the Booths) for Christ and the two prophets. The apostles as servants would sleep outside of the tents.

From the Shokinah, the cloud, the sign of God's presence, comes the answer to this suggestion: "This is my Son, my beloved. Listen to him" (Mk. 9:7)! This theophany thus reveals Christ as the Servant of Yahweh (Is. 42; Is. 52-13-52:12), who preaches and suffers.

Since the transfiguration is only anticipated Easter glory and only Christ's resurrection makes his suffering appear as something reasonable, something that makes sense and is no scandal any more, the apostles shall not talk about the transfiguration till after Easter. Here we have one more text of the Messianic Secret in Mark. The disciples, the demons and the healed people shall not speak about Christ as Messiah, shall not report his miracles since people do not understand (yet) that Jesus wants to be no political here or miracle worker, but the Son of Man who has to suffer and thus become Lord.

HOMILY

SUFFERING SIGN OF GOD'S DEMANDING JUSTICE OR GOD'S LOVE?

1. Often enough, when we speak about Christ's passion we think that he offered himself in order to expiate for our sins. We had sinned and still sin. For those sins however, justice has to be done. But since we human persons cannot do that (we have offended the infinite God and we people are only finite, also in our expiation), Jesus Christ volunteered to do it in our stead. But the Father had to require strict justice and thus he had to require the cruel death for Christ.

a. Thus we find the expressions of *ransom* (in Greek *lytrōsis*: the buying free of a slave by paying a definite price, here the price of Christ's life. Thus we sing in the *Exultet* on Holy Saturday: "Christ has ransomed us with his blood and paid for us the price of Adam's sin to our eternal Father . . . Christ the true lamb was slain."

b. And the other related expression is "*to buy*" (in Greek *agorazein*): Christ saved us, redeemed us, by buying us free. This again looks like a strict price as we find it in 1 Cor. 6:20; 7:23: "You were bought with a price." "By your blood did you ransom men for God" (Rev. 5:9). And it could look as if the old practice of freeing a slave served as a model: A slave who wanted to be free, saved money over the years and brought it to a good in the temple. After he had saved the necessary sum, the god of the temple, so to speak, bought the slave free, taking the money which the slave had saved.

c. Even more could the concept "*expiation*" (in Greek *hilasmos*) look like a strict price that the strict Father required in order to be placated. St. Paul in Rom. 3:25 refers to the Propitiatory in the Holy of Holies in the Temple (in Hebrew *kapporet* in Lev. 16:14-16) as the place of this expiation. The propitiatory was on top of the ark, where Yahweh lived in a mysterious way. Only once a year the high priest alone was permitted to enter the Holy of Holies and sprinkle the propitiatory with the blood of the sacrificed bullock (Lev. 16:2.13ff). St. Paul applies this to Christ: "Through his (Christ's) blood, God made him the means of expiation for all who believe. He did so to manifest his own justice, for the sake of remitting sins committed in the past" (Rom. 3:25).

But is it really the idea of all these texts that the Father demands strict justice done, that he is almost cruel toward his own Son?

2. The story of Abraham and his son Isaac could look like a story of a strictly demanding God. Rarely was man ever called upon to offer a more convincing evidence of faith and obedience than Abraham. Abraham came to believe that the God who had called him was now asking him to offer up his only son. Probably God only permitted him to think mistakenly that the sacrifice of his son was demanded. Nevertheless God willed that Abraham face this particular trial, and Abraham had no way of knowing that it was only a trial. His was the struggle of believe in the goodness and fidelity of a God whose

will could only seem to man to be cruel and capricious. Why had God built up his hope only to destroy it? Or why had God put him through the anguish of thinking (or allow him to think wrongly) that he must sacrifice his son, when God never really wished this at all? Only in faith could he trust in the goodness and love of God and believe that God would bring good from that, which for the moment seemed to be only cruel.

a. Abraham went through the test and came to know that God is not cruel when he requires something hard from us. He has the right to demand everything of us, our total dedication to Him, our faith and obedience. We must be willing to sacrifice the most precious, as precious as the firstborn son. Abraham did, and thus God revealed himself to Abraham as the loving Father who gave him back his son and made a covenant with him, the covenant of eternal friendship that in Abraham all peoples should be blessed. The meaning of any sacrifice is in the last analysis this covenant with God, the pact of friendship.

b. Abraham was fine feeling with his son Isaac, sparing the son's feeling by not telling him the cruel reality that he, the son, should be offered as holocaust. When Isaac asked: "Father, here are the fire and the wood, but where is the sheep for the holocaust" (Gen. 22:7)? Abraham would only answer: "Son, God himself will provide the sheep for the holocaust" (Gen. 22:8).

Yet, we may assume (the tradition stresses just this point) that Isaac finally consented to be sacrificed. And just because of this offering of himself Isaac became the type of Christ who offered himself.

3. God the Father "did not spare his own Son, but handed him over for the sake of us" Paul tells us in Rom. 8:32. But this is not cruelty of the Father, requiring strict justice, but rather love. This we learn from the Gospel of John: "God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, that whoever believes in him may not die but may have eternal life" (Jn. 3:16).

a. It is interesting to see that Jesus as true man wants to avoid his suffering and is even sweating blood in the garden of Gethsemane, when he fully realizes the cruelty of the cross. But just then and there in the garden when he prays: "Take this cup away from me. But let it be as you would have it, not as I" (Mark 14:36), he introduces this prayer with "Abba, O Father!" (Mk. 14:36). It is the only time in the gospels where the Aramaic world is preserved, which Jesus used in praying

to his Father. The other two times the address "Abba" is found in the New Testament, is in Rom. 8:15 and Gal. 4:6. Christ, therefore, in the hour of his deepest distress called upon God as his Papa, knowing that the cross was a sign of the Father's love and that he the Son, wanted to die for all mankind out of love to bring us all back to the Father.

b. As God made a covenant with Abraham after he had passed the test of offering his son Isaac, so Christ established a covenant between the Father and us through his death on the cross. He made us one with the Father. He atoned for us by making us one with God and one another. Thus it is true: atone-ment comes about by at-one-ment. The purpose of the paschal lamb (and Jesus is the true paschal lamb) was not to placate God but to designate the members of the chosen people (Ex. 11:4-8; 12:7, 12-14, 21-27). The covenant sacrifice unified the two partners. The blood of the one was mixed with the blood of the other, so to speak (Ex. 24:3-8). And this is also true with the new covenant (Lk. 22:20; Jn. 6. The blood of Christ is sprinkled not so much to placate God but to make us clean and thus one with God.

c. The main idea behind all sacrifices and suffering is therefore the covenant, the idea of union with God. They atone by achieving at-one-ment with God. It is of course true that at the same time God is also placated, but not so much because something on God's side changes, but because the sin on our part ceases.

4. All this gives us an idea about our own suffering. It is not a sign of God's strict justice, demanding reparation from us. Rather, it shall make us one with God. It shall be an expression of our love, showing that we love God above everything, that we are willing to part from everything and everybody but Him. Him we love above everything and everybody. This we want to demonstrate by our suffering.

THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT **(March 14, 1982)**

It is not easy to bring all three readings under one heading. Clearly, the second reading and the gospel belong together: Christ will die (the temple of his body will be destroyed, but rise again (gospel)). This suffering of Jesus is a scandal and foolishness for Jews and Greeks, but power and wisdom for

those who are saved (second reading). —The law was given by Moses (first reading). Possible one could combine the first reading with the gospel by pointing out that in the laws there is also talk about true worship.

First Reading: Exodus 20:1-17

The Decalogue, or Ten Words, has come down to us in two forms: in the Priestly recension (P) here in the Book of Exodus (Ex. 20:1-17) and in the Deuteronomic recension (D) in Deut. 5:6-21. Perhaps, originally the ten commandments were all short, as now the fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth commandments are. Later the editor enlarged the other commandments. The Decalogue differs from other Oriental codes in form, since it is apodictic ("Thou shall, thou shalt not!"), whereas the others are casuistic ("if someone accuses somebody and cannot prove it he shall die") as in the Codex Hammurabi, the Laws of Lipit-Ishtar, the Laws of Eshnunna, a form, however, which we also find in the Book of the Covenant (Ex. 20:22-23:33).

The priestly recension, followed by St. Augustine and by Catholics takes the first two commandments ("you shall have no gods except me! You shall not make yourself a carved image!") as one commandment and takes the last two (you shall not covet your neighbor's wife! You shall not desire your neighbour's house or field nor his male or female slave) as two different commandments, whereas the Priestly recension, followed by the Protestants takes the first two commandments as two different ones and the last two commandments one commandment. The other difference is that in Ex. 20:17, first comes: "You shall not covet your neighbor's house!" And then follows in 17b: "You shall not covet your neighbor's wife, or his servant, man or woman, or his ox, or his donkey, or anything that is his!" In other words, in the Priestly Source the wife belongs to the house. In the Deuteronomic Source, however (Deut. 5:21a) comes first: "You shall not covet your neighbor's wife." Then follows: "You shall not set your heart on his house, his field, his servant — man or woman — his ox, his donkey or anything that is his." The woman is clearly set apart from anything else that belongs to the owner.

On Mt. Sinai God made the covenant with Israel by which God wanted to be Israel's God and Israel should be his people. The Ten Commandments are the covenant stipulations which

Israel promised to keep. What other nation had such clear-cut laws, such a clear way of life! On the first tablet are the three first commandments dealing with the relation between God and us, in other words, the love of God. Yahweh wants to be the only God. On the second tablet we find the laws regulating our relation with our neighbors, in other words, the commandment to love our neighbors.

Second Reading: 1 Corinthians 1:22-25

What scandal a crucified founder of a religion is, is for us not so clear anymore as it was for the first Christians since we have never witnessed a crucifixion. For the contemporaries of Christ and the apostles it was the death for slaves and rebellious people, designed to discourage them from any attempt to start a revolution or an uproar against the government.

Thus one main part of the teaching of the New Testament consisted in removing or trying to overcome that scandal of the cross in the eyes of the converts. The apostles could only do it by looking that scandal square into the face: Christ's death was not unavoidable accident or happening, where Christ had miscalculated his chances and the impact and success of his preaching. Rather, it was the Father's design. It was foretold long ago by the prophets.

Yes, it will be the mystery of all times: Christianity is a religion of the cross: for the Jews a scandal and for the Greeks foolishness, but for all those who are called: God's power and wisdom that saves them from death and gives them (eternal) life. The message of Christianity is therefore: Christ has died for us on the cross and, of course, he has risen for us to take away our sins and give us eternal life.

And thus, when the gospel of the cross is preached, we do not only hear something about Christ crucified, but Christ is present in this gospel and thus his power that saves us. The message of Christ crucified saves us.

Reading of the Good News: John 2:13-25

The report of Christ's cleansing of the Temple is found in all four gospels. The Synoptics place it shortly before Christ's death. The happening angered Christ's enemies so that they finally made up their mind to kill him. There is one distorted

version of Christ's word during his trial: "We heard him declare, 'I will destroy this temple made by human hands,' and 'In three days I will construct another not made by human hands'" (Mk. 14:58). Probably this placing of it shortly before his death is the more likely historical setting of the cleansing. John places the pericope at the beginning of Christ's public activity to underline the topic of his gospel. "He came into his own, yet his own did not accept him" (Jn. 1:11). Thus John's arrangement is more theological than historical. It is not very likely that Jesus could have enraged his adversaries so early and then could have gone on preaching for so long.

Jesus opposes the abuses done in the temple. Every adult male Jew living within twenty miles of Jerusalem was bound to come to the Passover Feast in Jerusalem. But all Jews, scattered throughout the world had as dream and aim to celebrate at least one Passover in Jerusalem. Every Jew, however, had to pay the Temple tax, half a shekel (two days wages). But this Temple tax had to be paid either in Galilean shekels or in shekels of the sanctuary. Thus many had to change their money. For the convenience of the pilgrims this was done in the Temple courts. In a similar way pilgrims could buy animals for sacrifices in the Temple courts. Necessary and helpful and convenient this trade was for the pilgrims, there were many abuses, since money changers took almost fifty percent gain for the change (much more than they would have been entitled to). Similarly the animals were sold at a much higher price in the Temple courts than outside. Furthermore, the noise was often so great that it disturbed non-Jewish pilgrims who wanted to pray (the only place allowed for them) in the court of the Gentiles. And naturally, the noise was also heard in the court of the women.

But this is not all. Especially in the first four chapters the theme of John is "replacement": The old order is replaced by the new one. Here the old temple is replaced by the new temple. Not this temple of Herod is the place where God shall be worshipped, but the Temple of Christ's Body will be the true sanctuary, where God is worshipped in spirit and in truth (Jn. 4:21).

But before this can happen in the fullest sense, Christ has to die, the temple of his body has to be destroyed. But in three days it will be rebuilt: Christ will rise.

HOMILY

**DESTROY THIS TEMPLE
AND IN THREE DAYS I WILL REBUILD IT!**

1. Few insitutions were closer to the heart of the Jews than their temple. Its origin reached back to its very foundation as the people of God. The temple was heir to the tabernacle, the portable desert sanctuary which the Jews carried with them during their wanderings in the desert and which housed the ark of the covenant. The ark contained the stone tablets of the law which God had given to Moses and was the seat of Yahweh, where, between the figures of the cherubim, the invisible God was enthroned.

Exodus 25:1-31:17 tells us how God himself commanded the building of the sanctuary and its ritual apparatus, even to drafting detailed architectural plans. David brought the ark to the new capital Jerusalem. Jerusalem should be the national as well as the religious center of the twelve tribes. The construction of the temple by Solomon, performed at God's command (2 Sam. 7), brought this movement to completion. Slowly the entire legitimate sacrificial cult of Israel was centralized in the temple. It was the house of God, an earthly counterpart of the heavenly sanctuary (Ex. 25:40). The fact that it was rebuilt three times attests to the importance of its material presence. At the time of Christ, the third temple begun by Herod the Great (ca. 20 A.D.) was still in the process of construction. It had become an archetypal religious symbol: With God's visible presence in their midst nothing could happen to the Jews. Destruction of the Temple would mean the end of the world as we can see in the eschatological discourse when Jesus speaks about the end of the Temple. For the apostles this is tantamount to the end of the world: "When will this happen (ie. when will the temple be destroyed)? When will the end of the world come" (Mt. 24:3)?

But Jeremiah had already told his fellow Jews that a superstitious confidence in the temple would not save anybody, if the Jews continued mingling cultus with idolatry and other sins (Jer. 7:11-14). As God had rejected his sanctuary at Shiloh because of these sins, so God rejected the first temple (Jer. 4:14).

Tob 14:5-6 had said that with the coming of the Messiah an ideal temple would appear on earth, to which Zech. 14:21 added "there shall no longer be a trader in the house of the Lord of hosts on that day". All nations would be welcome. "I will bring them (the aliens) to my holy mountain... for my house shall be called a house of prayer for all the peoples" (Is. 56:7). This time was here with the arrival of Christ.

2. What was supposed to be true worship of Yahweh had slowly developed into a mixture of religion and business. "You shall not have other gods besides me. You shall not carve idols for yourselves in the shape of anything" (Ex. 20:4) the Jews had heard on Mt. Sinai. But did the merchants who changed the money for the Temple tax for fifty percent gain not make money their god? Did those who sold the animals for the sacrifices in the Temple at a much higher price than merchants demanded outside of the temple not attach their heart to possessions instead to God. And did these merchants and changers with all their voices raised in bargaining, their rattle of coins, with the lowing of their oxen, the bleating of the sheep and the cooing of the doves make it not impossible for the pagans who wanted to pray in the court of the pagans, the only place allotted to them in the Temple to worship Yahweh?

No wonder that Jesus uses the whip of cords to drive the sellers out of the temple court, sheep and oxen alike and knocks over the money-changers' tables with the words: "Get them out of here! Stop turning my Father's house into a marketplace" (Jn. 2:16). One can see that the zeal for the Father's house consumes Jesus (cf. Ps. 69:9).

3. But it is not just the abuses of the temple and of the worship which causes Jesus to step in. We saw already that Jeremiah had foretold that one good day the time of the old temple and its worship would be over altogether. And this time is now here, with the arriving of Christ. He would bring about that new worship in spirit and in truth (Jn. 4:24). He would start with the new sacrifice of which Malachi 1:11 speaks: "For from the rising of the sun, even to its setting, my name is great among the nations. And everywhere they bring sacrifice to my name, and a pure offering; for great is my name among nations."

This new sacrifice, however, could come about only through Christ's death. His death would be this new sacrifice which would be timelessly set present in every Mass. This way we have to understand Christ's word, when he is asked with what

authority he cleanses the temple: "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up" (Jn. 2:19). The new temple is Christ's humanity. Here God is perfectly worshipped. But Jesus wanted to give honor and glory to the Father mainly and fully by taking upon himself the death on the cross. There he would say "yes" to the Father. The Jewish highpriest entered the Holy of Holies once a year to sprinkle blood at the propitiatory to atone for the sins (Lev. 16:11-14), and this had to be repeated. Christ opened the way to God by the blood of his own immolation. He was the victim. He entered the sanctuary, the heavens, once and for all by his sacrifice on the cross (Hebr. 9:11-23). Thus there is no need any more for the old temple, nor for the sacrifices in the old temple. Christ himself is the new temple and the new sacrifice. But he has to die before he be in full reality this new temple and this new sacrifice.

The sacrifices in the old temple had to be repeated quite often. Christ offered himself once and for ever. The sacrifice of the Mass is no new sacrifice, but in every Mass the sacrificial act of Christ on Calvary is timelessly held present in the presence of the Father in heaven.

4. For Christ then his death is not just an accident, something which he unfortunately incurred by miscalculating the effect and impact of his preaching. It is not that he had hoped to win the Jews over all together and take the whole Jewish "hierarchy" into his Church, but unfortunately failed. Rather, it was the Father's design that the Son should die for us. Jesus was handed over to death for our sins and raised up for our justification" (Rom. 4:25).

For the natural man, however, the cross is a scandal and a foolishness and will always be one. The first Christians experienced this scandal still more than we do. They had seen many crucifixions, even of relative and friends. The Romans would at times crucify many hundreds or one or two thousand completely naked along the highways so that everybody could see how the crucified slowly would die a horribly agonizing death. Every witness should be warned not to rebel against the Roman government.

The fact however is that they are redeemed by Christ's death on the cross and his resurrection, and that this death and its fruits are given to us in re-enactment of this sacrifice, in the Mass.

Christianity is basically a religion of the cross.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT
(March 21, 1982)

Today we learn: God is a loving God. The destruction of Jerusalem and the exile were only the preparation for the return and a new beginning (first reading). When we were dead through sin God brought us new life raising us up with Christ (second reading). And to top it all, God loved us so much that he gave his only Son (unto death) for us (gospel). God's love demands a response from us: faith which becomes active in love.

First Reading: 2 Chronicles 36:14-17.19-23

1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah form one work, the Chronicler's History, proven by the same language and style and the same theology of history. The Hebrew name for Chronicle is *dibre hayyamin* = the things of the days, i.e. the events of the past, or: "the chronicle of the whole of sacred history" as St. Jerome put it, the history from Adam till the end of Jerusalem. In the Septuagint (and thus Vulgate) the title is: Paralipomena = the things omitted, because the two books are a supplement to 1 and 2 Samuel and 1 and 2 Kings, written ca. 300 B.C.

Looking back over the history of the infidelity of kings as recorded in the Books of Kings the Chronicler finds hope that another Davidic king will reign in Judah and over the world who will compensate for all the shortcomings of David and his successors. Thus he brings together in one synthesis past, present, and future, projecting into the age of David the whole cultic organization of his own time while he omits everything that might lessen the standing of his hero David, who is the type of the Messianic king for whom he longs.

Today's first reading gives a summary of the destruction of Jerusalem and the exile. Both were a punishment for Israel's infidelity, in particular because priests and laymen did not listen to the prophets, whom God sent so often, and in particular again, because the Sabbaths were not observed. Thus for seventy years the Jews have to "rest" in exile for not having rested on the Sabbath.

But the book does not want to end with a somber note. The last three verses show that God does not just want to punish. Cyrus let the Jews go home from exile and the Jews could make a new beginning.

Second Reading: Ephesians 2:4-10

In the first part of the Letter to the Ephesians (Eph. 1:3-3:21) Paul (or perhaps one of his disciples) writes about the mystery of the recapitulation of Jews and Gentiles in Christ: He is the head, we are the members. (1) This mystery to make men members of God's family and to give them a share in His eternal inheritance was conceived by God from all eternity (1:3-14). (2) This mystery was revealed in the Church, because Christ broke down the barrier between Jews and Gentiles. Therefore there must be no hatred among people but perfect equality (1:15-2:22).

Today's pericope meditates on the fact that God is rich in mercy, for he loved us by bringing us to life, after the death in sin, by Christ's death for us. Christ merited this divine life for us since he rose from the dead and thus gave us a place in the heaven also.

This is obviously a baptismal text. In baptism we have died and risen with Christ (cf. Rom. 6:1-7). A similar baptismal text we find in Col. 2:12. But in opposition to Rom. 6:1-7 and Col. 2:12, Eph. 2:4-10 has us already translated into heaven with Christ (not only risen). But this is for the apostle no reason for self-congratulation, nor a false sense of security. First, we have been placed there by God's grace, not by our own merit or a secret knowledge, as the Gnostics would want us to believe. Second, we have to imitate Christ in strenuous moral efforts to do the good works which God has prepared for us. But they have to be there as a consequence of justification.

Reading of the Good News: John 3:14-21

In the first chapters of the fourth gospel the evangelist speaks about replacement of the old order and old institutions by the new order and new institutions. Jn. 3:1-21 elaborates on the replacement of birth into the chosen people and the new existence: By the rebirth of baptism we become children of the chosen people. We can distinguish the following parts: (1) Israel's wisdom (Nicodemus) meets the wisdom of God (3:1-2). (2) Main part: Salvation comes by re-birth: (a) Regeneration is generation from above, is the work of the Holy Spirit (3:3-8). (b) This generation is brought about by means of faith in Jesus Christ who died for us (3:16-21). As one can see, the gospel of today has only the second half of this pericope. From 3:1-15 we have a dialogue between Jesus and

Nicodemus. Thus many consider these verses the words of Jesus. 3:16-21 turns into a monologue, and thus many consider these words as a reflection of the evangelist. But nothing forbids us to take them as words of Christ too, at least in a larger sense. All the discourses in the fourth gospel are lastly the redactory work of the evangelist and his style, but the essence of the content is Christ's.

We are reborn by faith in Christ who died for us. This dying of Christ for us on the cross and this looking on him with faith is compared with the looking of the Jews in the desert on the bronze serpent. This a little superstitious story we find in Num 21:4-9 and 2 Kgs. 18:4. The latter text tells us that King Hezekiah "removed the high places, shattered the pillars, and cut down the sacred poles. He smashed the bronze serpent called Nehustan which Moses had made because up to that time the Israelites were burning incense to it. The serpent was a well-known feature of the fertility cults in Canaan. People believed that fertility comes from Baal and Baalaath. And to help along that fertility, people would have "sacred intercourse" with temple prostitutes. This was a great danger to monotheism. Thus the prophets preached against fertility cult and King Hezekiah abolished it in all forms. It would seem that the narrative of Num. 21:6-9 wanted to justify the dubious cult-object as if to say: "What do you want, even Moses tolerated the use of such an object. So it cannot be all that bad." Whatever the theology of the incident might be: John took it over to say: As the Jews who complained in the desert and were bitten by poisonous snakes, but healed by looking with faith in God in the presence of Moses upon the bronze snake on a pole which Moses upon God's order erected, so everybody who looks with faith on Christ crucified will be saved.

Christ's death on the cross (and resurrection) is called exaltation.

The most striking news is: God does not condemn us, does not judge us, but saves us. He loved the world so much that he sent his only Son into the world to save us by his death on the cross.

Christ's presence, however demands an answer from us. Nobody can remain neutral. Everybody has to take a stand. Accepting Christ he is already saved now, rejecting Christ he already condemned himself.

HOMILY

**GOD LOVED THE WORLD SO MUCH
THAT HE GAVE HIS ONLY SON**

Eternal life comes to us through faith in Christ lifted up. This would be in short the message of the readings of today. Christ puts it in these words: "Just as Moses lifted up the serpent in the desert, so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that all who believe may have eternal life in him" (Jn. 3:14).

1. Christ must be *lifted up*.

a. In Greek we have the Verb *hypsōō*, which means "to lift up", "to raise on high", "to exalt" both in the literal and transformative sense. In the fourth gospel *hypsōō* has intentionally a double sense. It means both exaltation on the cross and also exaltation to heaven. So in Jn. 3:13; 8:28; 12:32,34. In the discourse with the unbelievers Jesus says: "When you lift up the Son of Man, you will come to realize that I AM and that I do nothing by myself" (Jn. 8:28). And the last text we will see next Sunday: "I, once I am lifted up from the earth, will draw all men to myself" Jesus says shortly before his suffering" (Jn. 12:32). For John therefore, crucifixion is not only a material being pulled up on the cross (after all a crucified person was pulled up on the cross high enough that people could see him even in a big crowd and would be frightened and deterred). Rather, it is also a moral exaltation, a glorification.

b. St. John is not sarcastic by saying this. For him Christ's death is at the same time Christ's exaltation. He sees deeper than the natural reality of the crucifixion. That he can do only with eyes of faith. He is far from being sentimental as sometimes talks about the cross are. He knew the bloody reality of crucifixion from his own experience. He stood under the cross of the Lord. He perhaps had liked to persuade Christ, as Peter did, to forget about the cross, when he foretold it three times (Mk. 8:31-33; 9:30-32; 10:32-34 par.). But in opposition to Peter he had not fled altogether, but had followed the Lord till under the cross, as the only disciple. He must have been impressed by Christ's heroic suffering and seen for himself that this Jesus was more than a man. He is God, he is Yahweh, he is the I AM. He has life in himself (Jn. 8:28).

And consequently he can draw all people to himself (Jn. 12:32). The three predictions of Christ's suffering become for John three predictions of being exalted (*hypsōō*) (Jn. 3:13; 8:28; 12:32).

c. The very moment Christ died he went already to heaven and is seated at the right hand of the Father ever since it is true that suffering and resurrection (ascension) belong together. There is no crucifixion without resurrection and ascension. But viceversa, it is also true: there can be no resurrection without crucifixion. Whoever wants to participate in Christ's resurrection must also participate in his crucifixion.

2. Christ's death reveals more than any other thing that God loves us, that *God is a God of love*.

a. *God is not* a God who has to be placated, who is angry and demands full justice done to him, although God is just. Even when God punished as it was done in the exile of the Jews, as we see in the first reading today, the return from exile was in God's mind more than anything else the new beginning of the Jews afterwards. With mercy and love God brought us back to life, the apostle insists in Eph. 2:4.

b. God's love is *agapē*, not *eros*. It is not erotic love which springs from a desire for an attractive object. It is rather an agapic love which imposes no conditions on the other. It is born not of desire, but of God. At its source is God. Upon this love the world can make no claim. This love is a pure gift, not a right. We were rather alienated from God, estranged from him and we were waiting for reconciliation.

c. God loves us *first*, without condition. We could not have loved him first. But since he loved us first we can love him back. We can and must return this love.

d. God loved the *world*, not just some few people. He loves all without condition. He loves the good and the bad people, the lovable and the unlovable; those who are alone, those who have nobody to turn to, those of whom people are scared, whom people avoid. And he loves those who rest in God, those who love him as well as those who never think of him. God loves us as if there was only one of us to love, St. Augustine tells us. And this verse: "God loved the world so much that he gave his only Son" has become everybody's verse, the most liked verse of Scripture.

e. God does not want to condemn us, to judge us but to save us. It is up to us if we want to be saved or not. God revealed himself in the Old Testament as Yahweh, as I AM, as I AM close to save. Christ in the gospel of John takes up this revelation and applies it to himself. He is THE I AM in the New Testament. And mainly by his death on the cross people will recognize that he is the I AM, the one who gives life. And thus he will draw all people to himself.

3. Christ cannot force us to accept God's and his love, cannot force us to be saved. *Only by faith in Christ can we be saved.*

a. Christ has come into this world not to judge, but as somebody towards whom we have to take a stand. And the way we take our stand, the way we judge Christ, we judge ourselves. Since he is the bringer of divine life, the only one who knows the Father and has his own divine life, our attitude toward Christ cannot be neutral. It affects us.

b. If I would want to introduce somebody to pieces of fine arts, sculpture or music, and that friend of mine would not appreciate these pieces, he would judge himself and clearly show that he is not worthy of them because he does not understand them and thus not appreciate them. The pieces of art would not have to condemn him. He condemned himself. But somebody could perhaps still go through life (although something important would be missing) without appreciation of art. But nobody can go through life without Christ. Nobody receives eternal life without Christ.

c. When Christ was here on earth his hearers had to make the decision: either to accept Christ's claim to be the Son of God and the bringer of life or to reject him. Those who accepted his word were already here and now saved. Those who rejected his word had already condemned themselves on the spot.

d. The same holds true now. Whenever we read the gospel, or it is preached to us, we hear Christ speaking to us. And this word is not just information which can leave us cold and neutral and uninterested. We have to take a stand right then. If we accept Christ in his word we have eternal life right then. If we refuse to listen to him and to accept him in faith, we have condemned ourselves that very moment.

FIFTH SUNDAY IN LENT**(March 28, 1982)**

Like a grain of wheat Christ had to die in order to yield a rich harvest (gospel). This harvest is the new covenant he established (first reading). Through his death he learned obedience and became for us the source of eternal salvation (second reading) and draws all people to himself (gospel).

First Reading: Jeremiah 31:31-34

The third part of Jeremiah (Jer. 26-35) contains a series of prophecies of restoration addressed to the exiles. The exile was a punishment for the Jews for breaking the old covenant. In Jer. 30-31 the prophet speaks about the new covenant God is going to establish, especially in 31:31-34. Other texts about the new covenant we find in Ez. 11:19-20; 36:26-27.

The covenant is new in opposition to the covenant made with Moses: (1) it is written on human hearts, not on stone tablets, from inside and not from outside. (2) Thus all people have complete knowledge, not only the prophets and the elite. (3) The covenant brings about forgiveness of sins. (4) It empowers man to observe the law by the Holy Spirit.

Second Reading: Hebrews 5:7-19

The Letter to the Hebrews, written by an unknown author around 85-90 A.D. has as theme "Jesus the True High Priest". Hebr. 5:1-6 gives a definition of a high priest: (1) He is called by God, although taken from among men. (2) He offers gifts and sacrifices for sins. (3) He deals patiently with erring sinners, since he himself is beset with weakness and must offer sacrifices for himself. (4) He is a priest like Melchizedek.

Today's second reading continues: Christ "offered prayers and loud cries and tears to God, who was able to save him from death, and he was heard because of his reverence." This refers to Christ in the garden of Gethsemani. There Jesus asked the Father to let the chalice pass him by. He was heard, not in the sense that he did not have to die, but in the sense that he became the high priest, succeeding in offering his sacrifice. When he was perfected (5:9), not in the moral sense, but in the sense that he became high priest by his resurrection, he became the source of eternal salvation for all who obey him.

Now here in the Letter to the Hebrews is that Christ was also really human: He learned obedience by his death, although he was God's Son and thus divine. And precisely through his obedience Christ redeemed us in opposition to Adam's disobedience which brought death to all of us.

Reading of the Good News: John 12:20-33

Today's periscope marks the end of Christ's public life. As usual, an incident from the life of Jesus is the springboard for a Johannine discourse in which it will not be easy to say what are the words of Christ and what is the formulation of the evangelist.

Some Greeks, probably proselytes, full-fledged converts to Judaism who had been circumcised and who observed the other tenets of the Mosaic Law had come to worship at the feast of the Passover. They want to see Jesus and thus contact Philip, who, as Andrew has a Greek name and thus for the Greeks seemed to be an openminded man. Philip asks his friend Andrew. And Andrew goes to Jesus, knowing that the Lord is available for all. It is not said if Jesus granted the petition. But the words of Jesus, addressed to Philip and Andrew, could have been said in the presence of the Greeks as well.

Jesus sees the hour at hand, the hour of his death and resurrection, of which John speaks in 2:4; 7:6.8.30; 8:20; 12:23; 13:31; 17:1, by which he and thus the Father is glorified.

"Unless the grain of wheat falls to the earth and dies, it remains just a grain of wheat" is apparently no answer to the request of the Greeks. In reality however, it is: Jesus has to die first before his gospel can be brought to the pagans. It was the Father's design that the Son should restrict his activity practically to the Jews (Mt. 15:24). With his hour at hand that should be changed. This is one of the many paradoxes: Christ had to die that his message and his life should reach the many, all nations.

And that principle holds good for our own life: If we want to gain eternal life, we have to be willing to lose our natural life, if God wills it so. A man becomes great by serving.

This is all reason for Christ to rejoice. And yet his heart is troubled. John anticipates here Christ's agony which the Synoptics report in the garden of Gethsemani. After all, who

wants (humanly speaking) to die so early, and to die the most shameful death on the cross. Even Christ's heart rebels against the thought. And thus for a moment Jesus wishes to be spared from that shameful death. But he knows, he has come into this world to die for us and in that way to glorify the Father. And so he accepts (in thoughts) his death and that very moment the Father is glorified as his voice (which non-believers mistake for thunder or an angel) confirms. Christ has glorified the Father by doing God's will, by accepting his own death, and he will glorify it further by actually dying and rising from the death.

Christ's death will be judgment for the devil since the Lord conquers him on the cross. Jesus' death will be an exaltation (as we saw already last Sunday). And by it he will draw all people to himself.

HOMILY

CHRIST DEATH YIELDS A RICE HARVEST — BRING ABOUT THE NEW COVENANT

1. It was one of the great mysteries that Jesus should restrict his activity to the house of Israel and should not preach to the pagans. To non-Jews he went very seldom, and always with certain reluctance, as it seems.

a. The first incident we find in Mt. 8:5-13, the story of the centurion's servant. The centurion is a Roman and asks Jesus to heal his servant, who is paralyzed and suffers painfully. — The Lord does it from a distance, impressing everybody by the power of his word and stimulating the faith of the centurion who trusts that Jesus can heal from a distance, being master over all sicknesses as he, the centurion, is over his soldiers. And the centurion's word: "I am not worthy to have you under my roof. Just give an order and my boy will get better" (Mt. 8:8) has become the word of faith for all of us, in every Mass, before Holy Communion. Yet, it could also be that Jesus did not go to the house of the centurion to underline that this miracle was supposed to be an exception.

b. Clearly is this expressed in the second incident where Jesus goes to pagans, the story of the Canaanite Woman (Mt. 15:21-28, par). The woman asks for the cure of her daughter

who is possessed by a demon. But the Lord simply ignores her and gives her to answer. Only when the asking of the woman becomes posturing for the disciples and they intercede for her in order to get rid of her does the Lord answer, but with a harsh word: "It is not right to take the food of sons and daughters and throw it to the dogs" (Mt. 15:26). The woman takes the insult: "Even the dogs eat the leavings that fall from their masters' tables" (Mt. 15:27). In other words, the Jews are the children of God, the pagans are the dogs. And Jesus says explicitly: "It is not right to take the food of sons and daughters and throw it to the dogs" (Mt. 15:26). The woman is satisfied with receiving a crumb of Jesus' favors, meant for the Israelites.

c. When Jesus sends out his disciples on the first mission trip, he tells them: "Do not visit pagan territory and do not enter a Samaritan town. Go instead after the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Mt. 10:6).

d. The answer why this is so we find in the gospel of today. Greek proselytes come and want to see and talk to Jesus. It is not clear if he granted their request. In any case he gives as answer the cryptic word: "Unless the grain of wheat falls to the earth and dies, it remains just a grain of wheat. But if it dies, it produces much fruit" (Jn. 12:24). The gospel cannot be preached to the pagans before Christ dies. The Church will become Catholic and thus universal only through Christ's death. His death was not annihilation, but only a transformation process, which one can compare to the grain of wheat. It has to be sown into the ground, otherwise it remains just one single grain. But sown into the ground (which looks like dying) it undergoes the mysterious process of transformation. It is slowly budding into a plant that produces many grains.

c. The meaning of sacrifice is therefore not to crush a person, but to transform him into something higher. And thus it is also true for us: "Whoever loses his life will win it. We have to spend it for others in order to get it back a hundredfold. Whoever holds on to his own plans in a selfish way will lose everything. But whoever is willing to sacrifice his own selfish ideas and do what God wants him to do will unfold his talents in a marvelous way.

(1) That is true with our *talents*. We can share ideas and help others in many unselfish ways, having apparently no time to develop our own talents. But in reality by helping develop other people's talents we develop to the fullest our own.

(2) We have our exact schedule and use our *time* well. After all, we want to accomplish something in our life. We think, we have no time left. But we soon discover that by giving other people part of our time, we have more time for ourselves, since we plan better and use our time more fruitfully and in a better planned manner.

(3) That we can share our *treasure* and thus become richer ourselves is another paradox of our life which only generous people find out.

2. By his death Christ becomes the grain of wheat that produces a rich harvest; he attracts all people by being lifted up on the cross. Through his death all nations will find the way to him. By his death Christ brings also about the *new* covenant. This is another insight of today's liturgy.

a. The old covenant God was made with Moses on Mt. Sinai (Ex. 19:24; Deut. 5:1-22). Moses wrote the ten commandments on stone tablets. These stone tablets were kept in the ark of the covenant. But in spite of the good will, the Jews would and could not keep the commandments, especially when the Scribes unfolded the laws and applied them to all conditions of life, coming up with always new regulations.

b. After all, the laws were clearly written on stone tablets. But they were written on the outside, were something external for the Jews, which was held before their eyes, telling them what they had to do and what they had to omit. But it never became second nature with them.

c. Furthermore, to know what is right and wrong is something very important, but it does not help one yet to do it or to omit (something bad).

d. Thus the prophets, especially Jeremiah and Ezekiel, promised a new covenant God would establish one day with his people (Jer. 31:31-34; Ez. 11:19-20; 36:26-27).

e. In opposition to the old covenant the new covenant will not be written on stone tablets, but on human hearts (2 Cor. 3:3). The stone tablets become suddenly a symbol for the *stony heart*. This stony heart God will remove and will give

people a real human heart, a fine-feeling heart, a heart of flesh (Ez. 11:10-20), a heart that is heroic as Christ's heart, who died for us on the cross.

f. People with such a heart consider God's law as their second nature. It is close to them, written on their heart, from inside, not from outside as it was on Mt. Sinai. And thus they will observe it, do God's will, even if it should be hard, as it was hard for Christ. His heart impelled him to do the Father's will. Thus everybody in the time of the new covenant knows and thus does God's will, not only the elite, not only the scribes.

Christ's death is not just an unavoidable accident. He had to die so that his good news could reach all nations. By his death he becomes the grain that yields rich fruit. He had to die in order to bring about the new covenant between God and us.

ON THE MARTYRS BEATIFIED IN MANILA
(February 18, 1981)

LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE

**DOMINICO IBÁÑEZ DE ERQUICIA,
LACOB KYUSHEI TOMONAGA,
SACERDOTIBUS ORDINIS FRATRUM PRAEDICATORUM,
LAURENTIO RUIZ, LAICO, ATQUE XIII SOCIIS
HONORES BEATORUM DECERNUNTUR**

IOANNES PAULUS PP. II

AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM

« QUOD AIT APOSTOLUS PETRUS: Christus pro nobis passus est, relinquens nobis exemplum, ut sequamur vestigia eius (cf. 1 Petr. 2, 21), hoc beati martyres ardenti dilectione fecerunt, quia impleverunt ipsi caritatem qua Dominus dixit non posse esse maiorem (cf. Io. 15, 13). Talia enim suis fratribus exhibuerunt, qualia de Domini mensa pariter acceperunt » (Aug. *Tract.* 84, 1-2; *CCL* 36, 536-537).

Ita prorsus affirmandum de sexdecim servis Dei, quorum est hic sermo et agitur causa, quorumque, si ad verbi ministerium atque confessionis locum respicias, eadem fuit beata sors, quae sex atque viginti Protomartyrum atque ducentorum quinque Beatorum Iaponiensium, quos Pius IX, venerabilis Decessor Noster, glorificavit.

Fidelissimi autem hi Dei famuli, natione quidem Europaei et Asiatici, religione vero fere omnes ex Ordine Fratrum Praedicatorum quamvis alii alia condicione, fidem christianam per Insulas Philippinas, Formosam atque Iaponicas disseminarunt, suamque erga caelestem Patrem fidelitatem, a quo descendit omnis veritas lux (cf. *Iac.* 1. 17-18), confirmarunt Nagasakii per patibulum atque fossam, iuxta decreta contra christianos facta annis MDCXXXIII-MDCXXXVI a supremo duce illorum Tokugawa Yemitsu.

Primus autem omnium, ratione habita temporis ac dignitatis, venerabilis Dominicus Ibáñez de Erquicia in medium venit, Hispanus, sacerdos ex Ordine Fratrum Praedicatorum, per

decem annos Vicarius Provincialis missionis Iaponicae; qui martyrium subiit die quarto decimo mensis Augusti, anno MDCXXXIII, una cum Francisco Shoyemon, Iaponiensi, christianae doctrinae institutore, eodemque novicio atque eiusdem Ordinis fratre adiutore.

Brevi, id est die decimo septimo eiusdem mensis augusti, eos, quos diximus, secutus est passione ac morte Iacobus Kyushei Gorobioye Tomonaga, item sacerdos, Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum sodalis, atque ex omnibus maior natu, qui cum Michaële Kurobioye institutore immolatus est. Horum autem uterque Iaponiensis fuit.

Eodem anno, die decimo nono mensis Octobris, cruciati sunt Lucas Alonso, sacerdos ex Ordine Fratrum Praedicatorum, natione Hispanus, qui decem per annos sacrosancam fidem nostram ad usque septemtrionalem partem Insulae Honshu strenue praedicavit; Matthaeus Kohioye a Rosario, institutor atque novicius in eodem Ordine adiutor, e Iaponia, vix duodeviginti annos natus.

Anno vero MDCXXXIV vel duae virgines mortem fortiter oppetierunt, condicione Tertiariae Dominicanae eademque Missionariorum adiutrices. Fuerunt autem hae: Magdalena, Nagasakiensis, quae fuisset antea Tertiaria Augustiniana, quaeque medio mense Octobri, post supplicia tredecim dierum obiit; atque Marina, ex urbe Omura, die undecima mensis Novembris lento igne absumpta.

Continuant claram hanc martyrum seriem Iordanus Ansalone, Siculus, atque Thomas Hioji Rokuzayemon Nishi, Iaponiensis; quorum alter in urbe Manila sex annos curam animorum gesserat, alter vero egregius Evangelii praeco fuerat in superioribus partibus Insulae Formosae atque in regione Nagasakiensi. Sacerdotes Dominicani ambo mortem subierunt die decimo septimo mensis Novembris, anno MDCXXXIV.

Tempore ultimi ex omnibus sex fuere martyres qui, duce Antonio González, ex Ordine Fratrum Praedicatorum, sacerdote Hispano eodemque theologiae doctore ac rectore Collegii a S. Thoma, e quo Studiorum Universitas Manilensis exorta est, relictis Insulis Philippinis anno MDCXXXVI, Iaponiam petierunt; ubi mox capti — haec fuit eorum fortuna — ultra annum in carcere languerunt in Insula Okinawa, postea Nagasakium ad iudicium translati sunt. Quorum profecto Antonius González, cruciatibus atque febris interfectus, in carcere enectus est, die quarto et vicesimo mensis Septembris, anno MDCXXXVII; ceteri,

excruciati tormentis, die septimo et vicesimo eiusdem mensis patibulum subierunt, qua fine Christi amore mortem occubuerunt. Iuvat sane et eorum subicere nomina, in Dei laudem perpetuam. Sunt ergo: Vilelmus Courtet, Gallus, doctor theologiae, atque virtute paenitentiae illustris; Michaël de Aozaraza, ex pago Hispanico Oñate, minister animarum fidelissimus; atque Vincentius Shiwozuka, Iaponiensis, qui sacrum ministerium in Philippinis Insulis exercuerant: omnes Dominicani Sacerdotes. Quos non satis fuit carnificibus supplicio crucis absumi, sed et decapitari iusserunt. Factum est ergo ut quos una Fratrum Praedicatorum religio agglutinauisset, eorum etiam eadem sors ac fortuna in morte esset.

Horum autem trium, quos diximus, interpretes Lazarus fuit ex urbe Kyoto, laicus, olim a suis in exsilium, sic ut Vincentius, pulcus, fidei christianae causa. Qui, tametsi brevissime ambo, cruciatibus heu confecti, cesserunt, statim tamen in Dei gratiam reconciliati, martyrium fecerunt.

Sextus autem et horum omnium ultimus Laurentius Ruiz fuit, Manilensis, pater familias, e Sodalitate Rosarii, atque adiutor Fratrum Praedicatorum degentium Binondi, in Manilae suburbio. Qui, primo dubius, postea vero iter simul cum Missionariis perrexit, atque carcerem, poenas, ac vel ultima fata pro fide implevit.

Iamvero si ad beatum Augustinum revertamur a quo digressi sumus, in haec eius incidimus verba: « Multi patiuntur tribulationes; parem habent poenam: sed parem non habent causam... non facit martyrem poena, sed causa » (*Serm.* 327, 1-2). Cum autem nostrorum martyrum causa esset certissima, id est Christi fides ac religio, idcirco de illorum beatificatione statim agitatum est, quamvis primum de sacerdotum tantum. Qua re processus informativi, quos dicunt, instructi sunt Manilae ac Macai, annis videlicet MDCXXXVI-MDCXXXVII, rite. Quorum tamen cum acta periissent, causa stetit ad nostra usque tempora. Actis autem illis luci redditis, anno MCMLIX iterum causa agi coepta est, novis adiunctis documentis, sive sacerdotes illos sive laicos respicientibus ad historicam fidem.

Omnibus ergo apud Sacram Congregationem pro Causis Sanctorum feliciter absolutis, quae sacri canones poscerent, tandem die undecimo m. Octobris, anno MCMLXXX, sollemne decretum a Nobis factum est, quo, probato historica atque theologica ratione martyrio, sexdecim horum Dei servorum, iam iter patuit ad sollemnem illorum beatificationem.

Quae locum habuit Manilae, hac ipsa die, occasione itineris Nostri ad Extremum Orientem: Manilae, inquit sic ut Venerabiles Fratres Episcopi Philippini poposcerant, ea praesertim de causa, quod Laurentius Ruiz, primus huius nationis beatus, ac ceteri martyres pastoralia munia in nobilissima hac terra tuiti essent,

Hodie ergo, stipati populi multitudine, inter Sacrum formulam quae sequitur pronuntiavimus, qua illos beatos declaravimus: « In fulfillment of the desires of my brothers, Cardinal Joseph Asajiro Satowaki, Archbishop of Nagasaki, Arquimino Rodrigues da Costa, Bishop of Macau, and Cardinal Jaime Sin, Archbishop of Manila, and of several other brothers in the Episcopate and of numerous faithful, and after consulting the Sacred Congregation for the Causes of Saints, I by my apostolic authority, authorize that the venerable Servants of God, Domingo Ibáñez de Erquicia and Jacobo Kyushei Tomonaga, priests of the Order of Preachers, the layman Lorenzo Ruiz, and their thirteen companions be given in future the title of Blessed and that their feast be celebrated annually on the day of their heavenly birth, in the places and in the manner established by law. In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen. »

Post haec et venerati sumus gloriosam hanc militum Christi manum et primi invocavimus, ut Ecclesiae universae sua intercessione prosint.

Hae vero Litterae sive nunc sive in posterum firmæ sint suamque vim in perpetuum habeant.

Datum Manilae, sub anulo Piscatoris, die XVIII mensis Februarii, anno MCMLXXI, Pontificatus Nostri tertio.

APOSTOLIC LETTER

**TITLE OF "MINOR BASILICA"
GRANTED TO MANILA CATHEDRAL**

SACRA CONGREGATIO
PRO SACRAMENTIS
ET CULTU DIVINO

Prot. CD 559/81

MANILENSIS

Instante Eminentissimo Domino Iacobo L. Sin, Archiepiscopo Manilensi, litteris die 13 aprilis 1981 datis, preces et vota cleri atque christifidelium expromente, Sacra Congregatio pro Sacramentis et Cultu Divino, vigore facultatum peculiarium sibi a Summo Pontifice IOANNE PAULO II tributarum, ecclesiam cathedralem, Immaculatae Conceptioni Beatae Mariae Virginis dicatam, titulo ac dignitate BASILICAE MINORIS, omnibus cum iuribus atque liturgicis concessionibus, rite competentibus, exornavit: servatis vero iis quae, iuxta Decretum "de titulo Basilicae Minoris" die 6 iunii 1968 evulgatum, servanda sunt.

Per Apostolicas Litteras in forma Brevis expediendas.

Contrariis quibuslibet minime obstantibus.

Ex aedibus Sacrae Congregationis pro Sacramentis et Cultu Divino, die 27 aprilis 1981.

(Sgd.) IACOBUS R. CARD. KNOX
Praefectus

(Sgd.) VERGILIUS NOE
a Secretis a.

IOANNES PAULUS PP. II

ad perpetuam rei memoriam.

Quod ipsum Manilensis Archidioecesis sextum numero cathedrale templum – Immaculatae Conceptionis – nomine insignitum praesentes ibidem Nos Febuario mense perlustravimus atque singulari prorsus beatificationis ritu Laurentii Ruiz martyris volentes cohonestavimus, item eo tempore quasi vivae vocis oraculo dignissimum sane pronuntiavimus cui perhonorificus adnecteretur Basilicae Minoris decor splendorque liturgicus novus. Cunctis itaque convenienter interea investigatis illis postulatis et confirmatis, quae tum Episcoporum Conferentiae in Philippianis Insulis tum Sacrae Congregationi pro Sacramentis et Cultu Divino antea fuerant legitime quidem expedienda, iuvat maximopere iam his Litteris usos Nostrae que plenitudine apostolicae potestatis sancire atque edicere ut quod memoravimus Deo dicatum aedificium in cultum Beatae Virginis Mariae – Immaculatae Conceptionis – appellatione invocatae evehatur lege ad gradum statumque Basilicae Minoris et ut universis proin iuribus augeatur ac privilegiis quae eodem nomine decoratis aedibus congruunt. Jubemus autem ea omnia nihili minus diligenter adservari quae secundum Decretum – De titulo Basilicae Minoris – die VI mensis Junii anno MCMLXVIII foras datum adserventur oportet. Rebus quibusvis nequitiam obstantibus. Datum Romae, apud Sanctum Petrum, sub anulo Piscatoris die XXVII mensis, Aprilis, anno MCMLXXXI, Pontificatus Nostri tertio.

✠ AUGUSTINUS CARD. CASAROLI
A Publicis Eccl. Negotiis

**APPROVAL OF LITURGICAL TEXTS FOR THE
COMMEMORATION OF LORENZO RUIZ**

**The celebration may be transferred
to September 28**

Bishop's Residence
P.O. Box 55
Baguio City 0201
September 15, 1981

Your Eminencies/Excellencies:

I am happy to inform you that the Sacred Congregation for the Sacraments and for Divine Worship, by Prot. CD 926/81, has approved and confirmed the texts of the Mass and the Liturgy of the Hours of Blessed Lorenzo Ruiz and Companions in English and Tagalog. The English and Tagalog texts for Mass and Liturgy of the Hours of Blessed Lorenzo Ruiz and Companions are already available at the TRADE SCHOOL, Manila.

The same Sacred Congregation, by Prot. CD 926/81, granted also that the date of celebration for Blessed Lorenzo Ruiz and Companions in the Philippines be transferred from September 27 to September 28, as requested during the last CBCP meeting in Baguio City.

With sincere greetings, I am

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd.) † W. BRASSEUR, CICM
*Vicar Apostolic of the
Mountain Provinces*

MSGR. PATRICIO ALO
Auxiliary Bishop of Davao
(April 14, 1981)

JOANNES PAULUS EPISCOPUS SERVUS SERVORUM DEI

DILECTO FILIO PATRICIO ALO, curioni in urbe Caebuana, electo Auxiliari Praesulis Davaensis atque Episcopo titulo Tybiucensi, salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem. Hisce constat temporibus archidioecesim Davaensem religiosis civilibusque ita floruisse incrementis ut ibidem pastoralis operis necessitudines in dies auctae multiplicentur. Quo plenius igitur spirituali bono atque regimini Christifidelium sibi commissorum posset consulere, Venerabilis frater Antonius Mabutas y Lloren, Archiepiscopus Davaensis, nuper ab hac Apostolica Sede postulavit Auxiliarem. Nos autem illius precibus cupientes annuere Pastoris, censuimus te, dilecte fili, eidem posse destinari ob egregias animi ingenuque tui dotes necnon rerum agendarum peritiam haud minimam. De consilio ergo Venerabilium fratrum Nostrorum S.R.E. Cardinalium qui Sacrae Congregationi pro Episcopis praepositi sunt, Apostolica Nostra potestate usi te nominamus his que sub plumbo litteris renuntiamus Auxiliarem praesulis, quem diximus, simulque Episcopum vacantis sedis titulo Thibiucensis, factis iuribus congruisque impositis obligationibus sicut explicatur in Apostolicis Litteris Ecclesiae Sanctae a Paulo VI, Decessore Nostro, die VI mensis Augusti motu proprio datis, anno MCMLXVI. Permittimus ut episcopalem ordinationem a quolibet catholico Episcopo extra urbem Roman accipias, cui duo assint eiusdem episcopalis ordinis viri consecratores, ad liturgicas normas. Antea tamen tuum erit catholicae fidei professionem facere atque iusiurandum fidelitatis erga nos et successores nostras, teste quovis rectae fidei episcopo, formulasque iuxta quas iuraveris ad Sacram Congregationem pro Episcopis mittere, de more signatas sigilloque impressas. Te denique, dilecte fili hostamur ut omni stadeas diligentia operari quo promptius sive Archiepiscopo Davaensi sive fidelibus eiusdem curae concredit is inservias maximam adhibens caritatem. Datum Romae, apud S. Petrum, die quarto decimo mensis Aprilis, anno Domini millesimo nongentesimo octogesimo primo, Pontificatus Nostri tertio.

✠ AUGUSTINUS CARD. CASAROLI
A Publicis Eccl. Negotiis

MARCELLUS ROSSETTI, *Protonot. Apost.*

BISHOP PEDRO MAGUGAT, M.S.C.
Appointed Military Vicar
(December 9, 1981)

Prot. n. 670/80

SACRA CONGREGATIO PRO EPISCOPIS

REIPUBLICAE INSULARUM PHILIPPINARUM

D E C R E T U M

Nominationis Vicarii Castrensis

Ad consulendum spirituali curae catholicorum qui sub Reipublicae Insularum Philippinarum vexillis terra marique et aëria classe stipendia merentur, Summus Pontifex JOANNES PAULUS Divina Providentia PP. II, praesenti Decreta nominat ac constituit Vicarium Castrensem Insularum Philippinarum Exc.mum P.D. Petrum Magugat, M.S.C., Episcopum titularem Scilitanum, cum omnibus iuribus, facultatibus et privilegiis, muneribus et oneribus quae huic officio competunt ad normam iuris communis, Instructionis de Vicariis Castrensibus "Sollemne semper" die 23 aprilis 1951 a Sacra Congregatione Consistoriali editae, necnon Decreti Consistorialis de erectione Vicariatus Castrensis Reipublicae Insularum Philippinarum diei 8 Decembris 1950.

Contrariis quibuslibet minime obstantibus.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus Sacrae Congregationis pro Episcopis, die 9 mensis Decembris anno 1981.

FR. DEOGRACIAS YÑIGUES

**Appointed Apostolic Visitor for Minor Seminaries
(March 30, 1981)**

D E C R E T U M

SACRA CONGREGATIO PRO INSTITUTIONE CATHOLICA, peculiari Philippinae Reipublicae Seminaria prosequens dilectione, quo instantius eorum necessitatibus occurrat, Exc. rum Praesulum optatis attentis,

Rev. dum Dominum DEOGRACIAS YÑIGUES
Sacerdotem Dioecesis Malolosinae

VISITATOREM APOSTOLICUM
Seminariorum Minorum eiusdem Reipublicae

nominat atque renuntiat ad triennium, peculiarem eidem tribuens facultatem studia, disciplinam, et spiritualem efformationem in praefatis piis Institutis invigilandi atque fovendi: facta eidem potestate res minoris momenti directe componendi; maioris vero per hanc Sacram Congregationem; consulto semper Excell. mo Nuntio Apostolico; servatis de iure servandis; contrariis quibuslibet minime obstantibus.

Romae, ex aedibus Sacrae Congregationis, d.d. XXX
m. martii A.D. MCMLXXXI

P R A E F E C T U S

F.to William Card. Baum, Pref..

A S E C R E T I S

F.to † A. M. JAVIERRE, Segret.

SHORT NOTICES ON BOOKS

CAZELLES, HENRI, et al.; *Introducción crítica al Antiguo Testamento, tomo II. — Versión castellana de Jem Canaes. Biblioteca Herder, Barcelona, 1980 — 916 págs., 9 mapas — Rústica 3,000 pesetas; tela 3,200 pesetas.*

The first French edition of this work appeared in 1957, which was rendered into Spanish in 1965, and again in 1972. It has become a classic; but after several decades after it first appeared, it has been re-edited to keep it up in step with the latest advances in scholarship.

The present volume avails of the latest findings in archeology and other biblical researches as contributed by such biblical luminaries as E. Cavaignac, P. Grelot, J. Briand, H. Cazelles, J. Delorme, A. Gelin, L. Monloubou, T. Chary, P. Auvray, H. Lusseau, A. Lefevre, M. Dolcor, Pierre Grelot, etc.

SOLE ROMA, JOSE MARIA, O.M.F.; *Ministros de la Palabra, 3 tomos, 2a. edición. — Editorial Herder, Barcelona, 1979 — 832 págs. — Rústica 1,000 pesetas.*

Authored by a very competent exegete and translator of the Bible who has had a long and wide exposure to pastoral ministry, these three volumes contain authoritative, exhaustive, sound and up-to-date commentaries of the liturgical readings of the three-cycle ecclesiastical year. Immensely useful as a source-book for the busy priests sermons, and for the layman's spiritual reading fare.

BOROS, LADISLAUS: *Decisión Liberadora: Los Ejercicios de San Ignacio en su dimensión actual. — Versión castellana de Claudio Gancho. Editorial Herder, Barcelona, 1979. — 216 págs. — Rústica 480 pesetas.*

The author, well-known especially in Spanish-speaking countries, sees as the main theme and purpose of the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius the restoration to every Christian of the "freedom of the glory of the sons of God" (Rom. 8:21). This book adapts the opus of St. Ignatius to the modern venue, without tempering with its essential elements. It is very useful for spiritual reading in private or in common.

BOROS, LADISLAUS: *Ser cristiano hoy. — Versión castellana de Claudio Gancho. Editorial Herder, Barcelona, 1979. — 136 págs. — Rústica 300 pesetas.*

While the doctrine of Jesus Christ is apt and necessary for all places and times and peoples as to its dogmatic and moral content, it admits of some adjustment or adaptation to different cultures, venues and civilizations.

This book discusses how a citizen of the 20th century should live joyfully and adequately the teachings of the Second Person made man.

SHORT NOTICES ON BOOKS 143

BLANK, JOSEF: *El Evangelio según San Juan*, tomo II. — Versión castellana de Claudio Gancho. Editorial Herder, Barcelona, 1979. — 300 págs. — Rústica 580 pesetas.

This commentary strives to bring the reader back to the ambience of primitive tradition of the first century, when many of the readers of the fourth gospel were those who did not know Christ in person, especially the Greeks and other nationalities than Jew. Thus in a way the fourth gospel is close to us more than the first three gospels, and this commentary is highly instructive and inspirational.

FRANKL, VIKTOR E.: *El hombre en busca de sentido*. — Versión castellana de Diorki. Editorial Herder, Barcelona, 1980. — 132 págs. — Rústica 350 pesetas.

Viktor E. Frankl had been a prisoner for many years in concentration camps. His wife, parents, a brother and some relatives had died in gas chambers. Thus he knew suffering at its rawest, was at the brink of death many a time, and all this and his active brilliant mind led him to the discovery of "logotherapy" which is the third Viennese school of psycho-therapy (the first two are Freudian psychoanalysis and Adlerian individual psychology).

He has been the director of the neurological polyclinic of Vienna, and the present president of the Medical Society of Psychotherapy of Austria.

He is presently a professor of neurology and psychiatry in the University of Vienna and of logotherapy at the San Diego (California) International University, and a lecturer at Harvard, Stanford, Dallas, Pittsburgh and 170 other universities and institutions the world over. He has published to date 26 works which have been translated to 18 languages, including Japanese, Chinese and Korean.

The American edition of the present opus, "Man's Search for Meaning," has sold two million copies. A best seller that must be read to be appreciated.

SCHNACKENBURG, RUDOLF: *Cartas de San Juan: versión, introducción y comentario*. — Versión castellana de Claudio Gancho. Biblioteca Herder, Barcelona, 1980. — 412 págs. — Rústica 1,300 pesetas; tela 1,500 pesetas.

This is a definitive work by this specialist in the Bible. It is an exhaustive, authoritative and up-to-date exposition of the Letters of St. John, clarifying such Johannine topics as "the union with God," "fraternal charity," "love as the essence of God," "the Christian and sin," "divine filiation," "gnosis," and so forth.

TRESMONTANT, CLAUDE: *La Mistica cristiana y el porvenir del hombre*. — Versión castellana de Joan Llopis. Biblioteca Herder, Barcelona, 1980. — 204 págs. — Rústica 580 pesetas.

Mystique or mystical life is a very imprecise term to mean something mysterious, hidden, secret, spontaneous and even illogical, neurotic or psychotic.

144 BOLETIN ECCLESIASTICO DE FILIPINAS

This well-known author clarifies the Christian Mystique as expounded by three super-mystics — St. Paul, St. John of the Cross and St. Teresa of Avila, according to which ascesis goes hand-in-hand with mystical praxis, the outcome of which is the Union with God initially here on earth and finally in heaven.

FRERE ROGER (Taizé): Asembro de un amor. Primera parte. Diario 1974-1978. Biblioteca Herder, Barcelona, 1980. — 156 págs. — Rústica 320 pesetas.

This diary of Brother Roger contains daily reflections, insights and information on his apostolate with the poor in Chile and Calcutta. As interesting as if not more than the other works of this ecumenical Christian, such as:

El concilio de los jóvenes, ¿para qué? (220 pesetas)

Una audaz aventura (200 pesetas)

La regla de Taizé (150 pesetas)

La violencia de los pacíficos (240 pesetas)

Lucha y contemplación (170 pesetas)

Que tu fiesta no tenga fin (180 pesetas)

Vivir el hoy de Dios (210 pesetas)

Vivir lo inesperado (250 pesetas).