

the CORD

VOL. VI, No. 6, JUNE, 1956

CONTENTS

THE MONTHLY CONFERENCE	161 ✓
<i>Fr. Allan B. Wolter, O.F.M.</i>	
THE IMPORTANCE OF CHARITY	170 ✓
<i>Fr. James Heerinckx, O.F.M.</i>	
THE HOLY FRIARS OF SAXONY	178 ✓
<i>Fr. Ignatius Brady, O.F.M. (transl.)</i>	
RUBRICS AND LITTLE OFFICE	181 ✓
<i>Fr. Ignatius Brady, O.F.M.</i>	
A NEW ROMANO-SERAPHIC RITUAL	184 ✓
<i>Fr. Ignatius Brady, O.F.M.</i>	
SISTERS OF IMMACULATE CONCEPTION	196
SUMMER SCHOOL SCHEDULE	199
FRANCISCAN BRIEFS & BOOK REVIEW	191



The CORD, a monthly magazine specifically devoted to Franciscan spirituality, is published under the sponsorship of the Franciscan Educational Conference by The Franciscan Institute, St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure P. O., New York. Editor: Eligius Buytaert, O. F. M., Assistant Editor: St. Francis, S. M. I. C. Managing Editor: Innocent Dam, O.F.M. Editorial Board: Ignatius Brady, O.F.M., Columban Duffy, O.F.M., Allan Wolter, O.F.M. Annual subscription, \$2.00. Entered as second class matter on November 25, 1950, at St. Bonaventure P. O., New York, under Act of March 3, 1879. All communications, whether of a business or a literary nature, should be addressed to The CORD, St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure P. O., New York. *Cum permissu superiorum.*

THE MONTHLY CONFERENCE

SIN, THE BETRAYAL OF LOVE

In previous conferences we analyzed some of the positive implications of that pithy line from Saint John: *God is love and he who abides in love abides in God and God in him* (I Jn. 4:16). Because love is Trinity and we are framed in its image, our destiny as human beings, as children of God, and as religious can be summed up in a single line. We were created by Love to fall in love with Love itself. Such is our destiny.

True love, however, is an outward movement, a giving and sharing of what we have and are with others. As such it broadens and matures us, vivifies and sanctifies us. As love grows, our horizon and interests expand until only an infinitely lovable God can exhaust our capacity to give.

But if unselfish love leads to life, happiness, and the ultimate ecstasy that is heaven, by the same logic sin should lead to death, misery, and the utter loneliness that is hell. For basically sin is but a betrayal of true love, a yielding to self when God and duty require the exercise of that charity which *is not self-seeking* (I Cor. 13: 5). In the present conference we shall review some of the consequences of this refusal to *abide in love*. They are illustrated graphically in the first record of human sin, the story of Eve.

I. Eve's Test of Love

That love should be tested is but fitting. For the paradoxical thing about it is that we cannot share or give ourselves completely without being loved in return. Why, for instance, does God require our love? Because it profits Him? Hardly; for then He would not be infinitely perfect. As Aquinas explains: "God seeks His glory not for His own sake but for ours" (*Sum theol.* II. II, q.132, a. 1 ad 1). For unless we give our hearts to Him, He can never thrill us someday with the eternal gift of Himself.

This reciprocal character of love creates a dilemma which each lover must solve for himself. Does he love merely because he is loved or would he continue to love even if he received nothing in

return? The test is simple. If he continues to be faithful even when others appear to withdraw their love, his own is genuine. That is why Christ made the love of enemies the test of Christian charity. If you love those who love you what reward shall you have? He asks, implying that such love has already received its recompense. You therefore are to be perfect, even as your heavenly Father is perfect (Mt. 5: 48). But God loves us not for what He can get out of us but for what He can give us.

Once we have grasped this, we can understand the significance of Eve's temptation. The biblical account (Gen. 3: 1-6) is enlightening. Why had God commanded you, that you should not eat of every tree in paradise? asks the devil. Of the fruit of the trees that are in paradise we do eat, replies Eve in surprise. So bounteous were God's benefits, so great His generosity, so distracting the delights of His garden, that Eve even forgot there was a tree they must not touch. But the devil is careful to call it to her attention. Even when she remembered the forbidden fruit, however, Eve recognized instinctively that God was good. He would not hold back anything from them, she reasoned, were it not dangerous or harmful. God hath commanded us that we should not eat [its fruit] and that we should not touch it, she explained, lest perhaps we die. But the devil sows the seed of doubt. No, you shall not die, he declares. He will tell her the real reason. God doth know that in what day soever you shall eat thereof, your eyes shall be opened: and you shall be as Gods, knowing good and evil. Eve looks at the tree. It does not look dangerous, but good to eat, and fair to the eyes, and delightful to behold. The seed of doubt takes root. Could the serpent be right? Is God holding out on them? Suspicion grows like an ugly cloud, blacking out every remembrance of God's myriad proofs of love. God cannot keep her from becoming like to Him, she thinks indignantly. And reaching up, she plucks the fruit and eats. Then the horrible truth breaks upon her. She has been tricked. Like every sinner after her, she finds the forbidden fruit as bitter as wormwood (Prov. 5:4).

Eve is sorry; but not because she has offended God or created a painfully difficult situation for her husband. She is only sorry and frightened for herself. Her love is still self-centered. In failing God she can no longer be true to man. And so her first sin of selfishness

leads to another. Pretending to have found happiness, she reaches up from her fallen state to drag Adam down with her. Having lost God and heaven, she is determined not to lose her husband, even if it means taking him to hell. And so the great downward movement of selfishness begins. We cannot disrupt one of the bonds binding man to God, or man to his fellowman, without weakening or imperiling the other. Had Eve remained faithful, Adam could have loved both God and Eve; but in committing what may have seemed to her a purely personal sin, she makes Adam choose between her and God, between her pleasure and grace-life for her children. For well she knows that if Adam falls, the whole human race will be blighted with original sin. But because the wickedness of a woman is all evil (Ecclus. 25: 18), she does not hesitate to seduce him and through him to betray their unborn children. She, whose very name means mother of all the living, belied that name and brought death to her offspring. Truly might John say: He who does not love abides in death (I Jn. 3, 14).

Here we see the frightening consequences of sin. Not only does Eve fail to become as God. Through her selfish act in seeking to become like God despite God, she loses the very sanctifying grace that made her a partaker of the divine nature (2 Peter 1:4), together with the preternatural gifts of bodily immortality and perfect voluntary control of those instincts of nature that prompt her to seek only her own good. She becomes a creature of death. Having tasted evil, her will is weakened. And understandably enough. For if the will be our power of altruistic love, the faculty which frees us from seeking only our own good, then Eve, by deliberately and freely seeking herself in defiance of her obligations to God, husband, and children perverted her will. No wonder God in punishment permitted her natural cravings to grow strong and rebellious. She no longer finds it easy to fulfil her natural destiny of perfect love, for she is always in danger of being dominated by a selfish possessiveness and craving for affection. Her greater power to love becomes a greater power to enslave, so that there is scarce any evil like that in a woman (Sirach 25:18). Her mind, once used solely to discover how to help her husband and serve God, becomes an instrument of selfishness. This so-called darkening of the intellect does not make it less clever, only its cleverness is no longer what

Christ called the *prudence of the children of light* (Lk. 16:8), but what Paul pictures as the *wisdom of the flesh* (Rom. 8:7). Far from finding heaven, Eve loses even her earthly paradise and is condemned to pain and distress (Gen. 3: 16).

II. Sin as Selfishness

In every sin, Eve's tragedy is somehow re-enacted. For like hers, all sin is the sordid story of selfishness, a search for one's immediate or apparent good at the expense of God or fellowman. Like hers too, all sin is anti-social. It leaves its scars on the human race; indeed, it is not content until it has crucified the Son of God Himself. And having betrayed the very purpose of his existence, the sinner *abides in death* (I Jn. 3:14) and asks to be sent to hell.

That sin, the antithesis of love, is ultimately selfishness hardly requires proof. It is clear from what Christ said of the Last Judgment. (Mt. 25:42-46). If we are damned it will be because we have refused to feed Christ in the person of the hungry, or have turned a deaf ear to the needy, to those in prison, the homeless, the poor, the naked, those physically, mentally, or spiritually sick; in short, because all wrapped up in our own concerns, we have neglected the spiritual and corporal works of mercy. Or consider the capital sins in detail: pride, covetousness, lust, anger, gluttony, envy and sloth. Do they not all stem from inordinate self-love with its threefold concupiscence? Or examine your own conscience. Study those oft-repeated sins and imperfections that mar the perfection of the gift of yourself to God. Why do you tend to cut corners in your worship of God? Why so careless or listless in recting your Office, in attending or celebrating Mass, in performing your prescribed prayers or community exercises? Why are you given to vanity, jealousy or envy? Why are you so prone to indulge your taste for food or drink at the expense of your spiritual health? Examine any fault, great or small, and you will find selfishness at the hub of the trouble.

III. Consequences of Sin

As Eve discovered, sin is no shortcut to happiness. It only leads to misery, death, and the utter loneliness of hell. Misery comes in

its wake, for as Paul warns: *Tribulation and anguish shall be visited on the soul of every man who works evil* (Rom. 2:9). Where the natural law is concerned, which even pagans have *written in their hearts* (Rom. 2:14), much of the sinner's sorry plight stems in great measure from the nature of the violation itself. It was this truth that prompted the Stoic maxim: "Virtue is its own reward and vice its own punishment." But in a broader sense, it is true perhaps to some degree of every sin. For if man's very destiny is to love, and love is the fulfillment of the law (Gal. 5:14), how can the human heart find true happiness by stifling the most divine element in itself, its capacity for unselfish love? As Eve's sin cost her paradise, so personal sin robs the soul of the deep peace and joy that comes to those who walk with God as once our protoparents did in the cool of the garden.

But the sinner not only hurts himself, he hurts others; for all sin it anti-social. Like Eve's selfishness, it leaves its scars on the human race as such. It can initiate a chain reaction more devastating than an atomic or hydrogen bomb. Both sacred and profane history give us such striking examples. David's unguarded glance, for instance, led to adultery, then deceit, corruption, the betrayal of loyal soldiers, finally murder and the death of an innocent child (2 Kings 11-12); Amnon's ravishing of his sister Tamar with all its sad consequences (*ibid.*, 13); or Henry VIII, that "defender of the faith," whose private affair with Anne Boleyn lost all England to the Church. No sin, in the last analysis, is purely personal or affects the individual alone. Even interior sins are reflected on one's countenance; and if nothing else the Mystical Body is weakened.

To show what sin has done and continues to do to the human race, God gave us the frightening object lesson of Calvary. For as we have said elsewhere, "What is the story of Christ's career on earth but the case history of the interaction between a perfect human nature and an environment tainted with sin? Not that the Jewish nation of Christ's day was particularly degenerate. Quite the contrary, the Jews had been specially favored by God. Taught by His prophets, enlightened by His Law, protected by His providence, they possessed an enviable standard of morality that set them above any pagan civilization of their day. Yet the shadow of original and actual sin also blighted their race. Their mental outlook,

their moral behavior, their vices and virtues reflected the influence of the sins of the parents, grandparents, and great-grandparents all the way back to man's first defection in the Garden of Eden. Sin, we might say, created the culture-loving Sadducees, the warped spirituality of the Pharisees, the misinterpretations of the Rabbis, the school system of the Scribes. It gave us the weakling Pilate, the greedy Judas, the brutal temple guard. It produced Cai-phas, that parody on the priesthood. It turned the Sanhedrin court of justice into a living lie. Sin plaited the crown of thorns, knotted the bloody scourge, and hewed the beams of the cross. Here was a milieu created by sin. And into this world, God sent His beloved Son as a perfect man. And what happened? The devilish logic of sin pushed on to its inevitable conclusion. It nailed Christ to the cross. This is the terrible, frightening lesson of the Passion. In the anguished mind, the tortured soul, the broken heart, the disfigured body of Christ, we read what sin—yes, our sin—does and is still doing: ravaging the Mystical Body of Christ." (*Book of Life*, p. 71). The passion of Christ is a ghastly reminder that human sin has cosmic consequences.

And because the sinner denies his destiny, becoming a detriment to his fellowmen, he deserves to die. And if God does not strike him down at once, it is only because in His mercy, as He tells us, *I desire not the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live* (Ezech. 33: 11). But where the individual continues to provoke the wrath of God by continuing in his sin, there is a progressive growth in selfishness. For to remain apart from God, one must continually repulse the advances of divine grace, and with each act the sinner grows more selfish. With each successive step, the sinner, like Eve, becomes more calloused towards the consequences of his sin for others. There is a progressive narrowing of horizons and interests, a kind of spiritual introversion whereby the sinner becomes completely and hopelessly self-centered. If Judas is any norm for judging the patience of divine mercy, then no man is damned that God has not looked full in the face, over and over again entreating him to return, but he deliberately turns his back on God and his fellowman's interest and walks into eternity refusing to love. Perhaps we are not far wrong in believing that no man is in hell today who has not made himself either hope-

lessly or dangerously selfish. Hopelessly selfish, because by his habitual self-seeking and continual refusal of grace, he so conditions himself that he no longer cares to convert; dangerously selfish, because the social consequences of his sin make him a positive menace to his fellowman. When such a point is reached he forfeits his right to live; indeed he has lost the whole reason for his existence, so God takes him from this earth and gives him just what he always wanted and deliberately sought—his miserable tiny self. And that is hell, where everyone is utterly alone because everyone is wrapped up in himself. The very creatures the sinner once sought for the happiness they would bring, become hateful and disgusting. Once instruments of pleasure, now they but torture and burn. But the maddeing thing about hell is not the pain of its mysterious fire, which paradoxically enough, a human soul might endure and even be ecstatically happy, if only it still possessed the loving vision of God; no, it is the loss of God who can be possessed only through the unselfishness of true love, that drives the dammed soul to despair. And that is why even were God to open hell, the sinner could never escape for he has never learned to love unselfishly. He has corrupted the innate goodness of the will as a faculty of altruistic love by repeated acts of selfishness until like a warped and twisted limb it is no longer capable of reaching out to God. His only reason for hating hell is the discomfort it brings to himself, so that even if God were to unlock its gates, the sinner would still be chained by his own selfishness. He would carry hell with him.

But even where the selfishness of sin stops short of such corruption, it still wreaks its havoc. Nor are the cloistered walls immune to its ravages. Some of the worst examples of selfishness can be found at times among those who by profession have dedicated themselves to the more perfect observance of Christ's dual law of charity. If a community where charity rules recreates something of earthly paradise, as Saint Augustine declared, then the religious wrapped up in his own selfishness can create a little hell within the monastery. "There are false monks," wrote Augustine, "and I know several. Reprobates are they in whom the charity of Christ has no part, who while living in community with others are hateful, spiteful, turbulent, disturbing by their raucous conduct the peace of their brethren, seeking always for a chance to speak against them, just

as a fractious horse in double-harness not only does not help to pull the wagon, but torments his team-mate with his kicks" (*Enar. in ps. 119, 3*). Such might well ponder those words of John: *He who does not love abides in death* (I Jn. 3:14).

But sin not only crucifies man by bringing misery to the individual and pain to the human race. It also crucifies divine love.

Sometimes the sinner tries to delude himself into believing that sin cannot matter to God, for how can an infinitely perfect being be hurt? For in anthropomorphic fashion he can only conceive something mattering if its absence produces pain or hurt. It is true of course that we cannot take anything from God, and in this sense sin cannot hurt Him. But we can keep Him from giving Himself in love to others, and nothing in this whole wide world is so important, or matters so much to God as that. For if the Three Divine Persons, to assume the impossible, could no longer share the divine essence in that inner give-and-take that is their very life, they would cease to exist, they would die. Neither man's creation nor supernatural destiny, it is true, result from any intrinsic necessity. They are free gifts of divine altruism. Still, nothing is closer to the heart of the Trinity, to use a human metaphor, nothing so like, and therefore so much a participation in, their inner life as the gift of the grace-life to a created soul. No wonder then that Paul could warn the sinner: *It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God* (Hebr. 10: 31).

Indeed our love matters to God! When a soul not only refuses Him love but prevents Him from giving Himself to others, it incurs the terrible wrath of God. If divine anger ever flashed in the eyes of the gentle Christ, it was when He spoke of those who destroyed the faith of His little ones by scandal. He would tie a millstone about their necks and drown them in the depths of the sea. He knotted a scourge for the temple profiteers who made the practice of religion a burden for the common people. His terrible curse fell upon the Scribes learned in the law who educated unto death instead of unto eternal life (Lk. 11, 45-52).

And not only is God concerned about what we do to others; He is vitally interested in the love of our own heart. *I have loved thee with an everlasting love; therefore have I drawn thee taking pity on thee* (Jer. 31,3). In his beautiful autobiographical poem

the "Hound of Heaven," Francis Thompson relates how divine love pursued him relentlessly, till it finally caught up with him, a derelict of the gutter, and made a man of him again. Or take the story of Saint Peter, Magdalene, or Judas. Was anyone more madly in love with human souls than the Divine Shepherd? No mother, He assures us, loved her child more than He loves us. The ardent love between a bride and her husband cannot compare with God's love for us, as we learn from the Cantic of Canticles. Can we claim our love does not matter?

But it is almost as if God were afraid someone might accuse Him. "You are infinitely happy in the possession of the divine essence. How then can you be hurt?" So what did God do? He gave us the power to hurt Him in the literal and real sense of the term. He took to Himself a human heart that we might break it, human eyes that we might cause them to fill with tears, a human soul that could run the whole gamut of human emotions. And all this to prove that our love does matter. He loves us so much that He gives us the power to make Him sorrowful or glad. In more than one sense, the crucifixion is an object lesson. Not only does it dramatize what sin does to human nature, but it is the poignant story of how our sin cuts the heart of God. Our sin blinds His eyes lest they find us out; it presses a crown of thorns on His brow to take His mind off us; it spikes His arms to the cross lest they embrace us; pegs His feet lest they pursue us; lances His heart lest it imprison us.

And the inexplicable proof of His love is this, that God does not strike us down but lets us stumble on in our self-chosen misery, until we discover our mistake and come back conscience-stricken like Magdalene to weep at His feet. The cross shows us better than anything else that God is love, and that sin can crucify one who is God Himself.

As the bride of Christ, or His intimate friend, abhor all deliberate sin for the ugly thing it is. To seek our own pleasure or passing enjoyment at the cost of His pain is a kind of spiritual sadism. *Let us therefore love, because God first loved us* (I Jn. 4: 19).

Fr. Allan B. Wolter, O.F.M.

THE IMPORTANCE OF CHARITY IN FRANCISCAN SPIRITUALITY (II)

II. THE THEOLOGICAL VIRTUE OF CHARITY

Charity is the supernatural virtue by which we love God above all things for His own sake and our neighbor because of God. It will not be necessary to consider here those things which are handled by theologians regarding the nature of charity. It will suffice for our present purpose to discuss briefly the things that pertain to the subject we are examining, that is, charity and its perfection through active exercise.

The Object and Nature of Charity

The Franciscan school, as has already been pointed out, considers God primarily as perfection and infinite goodness, continually abounding in all good. Saint Francis viewed God as He is described in the synoptic gospels, as the heavenly Father of the immense human family, Who embraced all His children in the vast sweep of His merciful providence.

Love of God has the dual nature of friendship and of desire. The first has as its formal object the goodness or absolute perfection of God. It deals with the good in itself, without any relation at all to creatures. The second considers God as our own personal good, as loving us and communicating Himself to us. In this form of love great emphasis is laid on the tremendous benefits of God by which He manifests His love for us. He has shown this by "creating us, by redeeming us, and by preparing and disposing us for the Beatific Vision."¹

According to Catholic theology, the motive or aim of charity, at least in the final analysis, must be the infinite perfection of God and not the good received or expected from God. For Saint Bonaventure, however, charity includes not just love of friendship (*amor amicitiae*) alone, but also love of desire (*amor concupiscentiae*) by which one longs to see and possess God. To love God because of Himself is not simply to love Him without any hope of reward; it is also to desire union with Him and to desire to possess Him as our final end and beatitude, and not some other secondary good. The formal object of charity is God, the highest good, under the aspect of goodness. Hence

¹Scotus, *Oxon.*, III, d. 27, b. un., n.8, XXV, 361a.

it not only includes the absolute goodness of God, but also His relative goodness.

Blessed John Duns Scotus, and many Franciscan theologians after him, proposed a stricter and more precise teaching on the formal object of charity. According to Scotus, love concerns friendship only, a friendship by which we love God as goodness in Himself without reference to creatures; for Scotus this is charity *sui juris*. He defines it accordingly: "That affective virtue which perfects the will in so far as it has the affection of justice (*affectio iustitiae*) I call charity."² Scotus, however, does not exclude the desire that strives for God as good in Himself, but only the desire that seeks our own good. According to him, the love by which we strive for God as our own good is not charity but the virtue of hope.

The renowned mystic, Blessed Angela of Foligno, speaks of this pure and perfect love that contemplates God solely as the absolute good, in the following words: "I do not want to serve or love because of some reward; I want to serve and love because of the incomprehensible goodness of God."³

Yet, the love we render to God Who first loves us must be duly considered; for this love prepares and disposes us for the pure love of friendship.⁴ The love God manifests to us and the benefits He unceasingly showers upon us should move us to love Him and to ascend to the love of friendship. For this reason the spiritual writers of our Order frequently recommend this kind of love as a means of enkindling perfect charity.

A beautiful example of this occurs in the twenty-third chapter of the First Rule of the Friars Minor, where our Seraphic Father exhorts his friars to love God with their whole heart because of the benefits received from Him. From this they should proceed to the love of friendship, however, for he goes on to say: "Therefore we should desire and wish for nothing, and nothing should please and delight us, except our Creator and Redeemer and Saviour, Who alone is the true God, Who is our complete good, and every good, and all-good, the true and highest good, Who alone is good (Lk. 18:19). . . Who alone is holy, just, true, and upright."

Scotus himself accepts this motive—which is only secondarily necessary for charity—as well as the primary motive which impels us to

²*Ox.*, III, d. 27, q.un., n. 2, XV, 356a.

³Sainte Angele de Foligno, *Le livre de l'Experience des vrais Fideles*, ed. M.J. Ferre, (Paris, 1927), 354.

⁴*Cf. Rep. Par.*, III, d. 27, q. un., n. 9, XXIII, 482b-483a.

love God as goodness in Himself, for he says that "both of these (motives) must be present for the most perfect kind of love."⁵

The virtue of charity inclines us to love not only God but also the God-Man, Jesus Christ. At the time of Saint Francis, Christian theology and iconography were quite reserved toward the sacred humanity of Christ as the Incarnate Word and the King of Glory. Saint Bernard of Clairvaux and the Cistercians were almost the only exceptions. But Francis of Assisi, as everyone knows, cherished a tender devotion and a deep personal love toward the humanity of Christ, especially His suffering and rejected humanity. Just as Francis loved God as his Father, so he loved Christ as his older Brother Who assumed a human body for us, redeemed us from the bondage of sin by His passion and death, and interceded with the Father for us, even in our guilt.

Following closely in the footsteps of Our Seraphic Father, Franciscan writers, perhaps more than any others, urge devotion to the humanity of Christ. The three traditional forms of this devotion are to the passion, to the Holy Eucharist and to Mary the Mother of Christ. But in addition to the aspect of piety here involved, it is also necessary to consider the aspect of dogma. In Seraphic spirituality, Jesus Christ holds first place, and He is considered—and in an absolute sense—the only Mediator between God and man. Consequently the Franciscan school reduces all things to Christ, and is pre-eminently Christocentric.

Whoever loves God with a genuine love must of necessity want Him to be loved by all men. Saint Bonaventure says: "Love does not merely desire to enjoy God's sweetness and to be close to Him, but it also wishes and longs for the fulfillment of His will, for the spreading of His worship, for the exaltation of His glory. For love wishes that God be known by all, loved by all, served by all, and honored above all things."⁶ All men are members of one great family, whose God is the Father and His Only-Begotten Son, Jesus Christ, together with the Paraclete. Therefore all men are "*sons of the Most High* (Lk. 6:35), brothers of Jesus Christ and consequently brothers of one another. Following the example of Jesus Christ, therefore, each one of us has the duty to help his fellowmen so that throughout the entire human family a union of filial charity toward the Father and fraternal charity among men may be restored, fostered, and preserved.

To love someone means to wish him well; accordingly we must desire every good for our neighbor. On this point Saint Bonaventure is explicit: "Love of neighbor not only desires his corporal welfare and

⁵Rep. Par., III, d. 27, q. un., n. 9, XXIII, 483a.

⁶De sex alis Seraphim, c. 2, n. 5, VIII, 133b.

temporal prosperity, but also and above all his eternal salvation."⁷ According to the Scotistic school, charity toward ourselves and toward our neighbor consists in this, that we wish and desire that we ourselves and our neighbor may come to love God as infinitely perfect in Himself. We wish this love of God however, neither for our own nor for our neighbor's benefit but solely that God may receive the glory that is due His absolute perfection. In like manner, the virtue of charity does not rest in one's neighbor as an ultimate end, for creatures can be loved properly only as a kind of intermediary object and indirectly, as a means toward the love of the infinite Good to Whom every act of true charity directly tends.⁸

On this account we can say that charity toward God and charity toward our neighbor are specifically identical. For as Scotus says: "The *habitus* of a direct act (*actus directus*) and of the indirect act (*actus reflexus* is the same."⁹ According to the Subtle Doctor, therefore, the reason for the specific unity of charity toward God and charity toward our neighbor is not the divine goodness in Itself in so far as it is the object of glorification in eternal beatitude in which our neighbor becomes or is able to become a partaker—as Saint Thomas and Saint Bonaventure hold.

The Franciscan Order is essentially apostolic. "Saint Francis. . . wished to live not for himself alone, but led by zeal for God, he wished to help others."¹⁰ For this reason he set up a way of life that would be not only contemplative but also active. Thus the Friars Minor, imbued with the spirit of Francis, have as their ideal the so-called "mixed life"—a life of contemplation that overflows into apostolic activity. It is on this account that our Order has always shown a special love for the common people, for all who are in misery and need help, for all who reflect the poor, lowly, suffering, and rejected Christ. Another characteristic of our Order that follows from its apostolic form is love and devotion toward the Church, which is the family of God on earth and the mystical spouse of Jesus Christ.

The State of Friendship with God

All theologians teach that the state of friendship between God and man which is produced by the infused virtue of charity, is brought about by sanctifying grace. As Saint Bonaventure puts it: "Charity is

⁷Ibid.

⁸Oxon. III, d. 26, q. un., n. 2s, XV, 379ab.

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Brev. Rom.-Seraphicum, 4 oct. ad Laudes.

joined with the grace that renders one pleasing, and which is consequently called *gratum faciens*, for it renders man acceptable to God. Hence it is called charity (*caritas*) not simply because it possesses something which is dearly loved (*carum amatum*), but also because it makes man dear to God (*carum Deo*).¹¹ And the Subtle Doctor affirms this: "Through grace, or charity, the soul is formally made acceptable to God and in a very special manner."¹² Many other Franciscan writers follow this line of thought, insisting that the theological virtue of charity and sanctifying grace are really the same. But we shall discuss this point later.

Now, the love of friendship demands a certain equality among friends, for friendship makes men equal. There must be something in common among friends, something that places them on some kind of equal plane. In the same manner, divine charity also calls for an equality, though a relative one, between God and man.

This bond of love that exists between God and a just man is called by Duns Scotus a super-friendship (*superamicitia*) rather than an ordinary friendship. The Subtle Doctor speaks in such terms, however, not because he denies that there is no union of the good, or of the mutual love of benevolence between God and man, but because he takes the word "friendship" in a strict, Aristotelian sense which posits equality from the very notion of friendship. But equality in its proper signification is impossible between God and created beings. Still, according to Scotus, a kind of friendship is possible. "In an even more excellent manner is God lovable, possessing goodness as He does and returning love for love, so that it is possible to have a friendship with Him that could be called a superior or super-friendship."¹³

Moreover, for true friendship love must be gratuitous, that is, a person must love his friend for himself and not for any personal advantage or utilitarian motive. Thus in the Scotistic school charity is described as gratuitous and pure, more insistently, perhaps, than in any other school. For according to Scotus, charity properly so-called requires that God be loved because of His own absolute perfection, without any reference to creatures.

The Virtue of Charity and Sanctifying Grace Are the Same

Charity is always connected with sanctifying grace, and thus it renders a man dear to God and makes him a friend of God. Many theolo-

¹¹*Sent.*, d. 17, p.1, art. un., q. 3, I, 299a.

¹²*Oxon.* IV, d.1, q.k. n. 31, XVI, 94a.

¹³*Ibid.*, II, d. 27, q. un., n.4, XIII, 249a. (Assisi codex 137).

gians of the thirteenth century stated that charity and sanctifying grace are the same. Saint Bonaventure did not deny the probability of this opinion, yet he followed those who placed a real distinction between the infused virtue of charity and habitual grace.

According to the judgment of Scotus, however, the virtue of charity and sanctifying grace are really the same. "Grace is a virtue and is identical in reality with charity itself."¹⁴ "Both," argues Scotus, "as such are offered equally to the children of the kingdom and the sons of perdition. . . , both enliven virtues as their [supernatural] form, neither can be [supernaturally] dead; both unite us perfectly to our ultimate end, in so far as it is possible in this life. If they were assumed to be distinct, one of the two would be superfluous, in as much as the other would suffice."¹⁵

There is, however, a formal distinction between the two. For, to quote Scotus again: "Charity is said to be that which makes God dear to the one possessing it, but in such a way that God is regarded as lovable rather than as loving, whereas grace makes God pleased with someone so that grace regards God as loving and accepting one rather than as someone who is loved."¹⁶

This, briefly, is the opinion of Scotus on the identity of charity and grace.

Charity, the Queen of Virtues

From what has already been said, it is clear that charity is the most eminent of the virtues. Franciscan writers have often discussed its excellence, but none more emphatically than Scotus. "Charity," he says, "since it is the most excellent virtue of all, perfects the will according to its most perfect act, which is to love."¹⁷ And he goes on to explain that ". . . since the theological virtues have as their object that which is uncreated, they are the more perfect the more intimately they are united and joined to that object. And moreover, the spiritual edifice is said to be founded on faith, raised up through hope, and completed by charity, for all the theological virtues, charity has the greatest power of uniting and hence its acts make men more like God."¹⁸

Charity is the queen of virtues. Just as the will has command over all the other powers of the soul, so charity rules over all the other virtues. Saint Bernardine of Siena writes: "Charity is the queen of vir-

¹⁴*Rep. Par.*, II, d. 27, q. un., n.3, XXIII, 135a.

¹⁵*Oxon.* II, d. 27, q. un., n.4, XIII, 249a.

¹⁶*Ibid.*

¹⁷*Rep. Par.*, III, d. 26, q. un., n. 19, XXIII, 475b.

¹⁸*III Sent.*, d. 27, a.2, q.1 ad 6, III, 604b.

tues. She can in fact be called the empress of the virtues, for she governs all the others. Charity has this supereminence over all other virtues because, even though she does not elicit the acts proper to the others, she nevertheless commands them and renders them meritorious."¹⁹ And Saint Bonaventure has this to say: "Just as a tree derives its nourishment, life, and vigor from moisture, so the entire spiritual development of man derives the same from love. Love is infused in so far as it is received within us, and it is diffused in so far as proceeding from within us, it broadens the affections to include the love of many things and moves all the powers of the soul to perform good works."²⁰

Furthermore, according to Saint Bonaventure, "love is the root, the form, and the end of the virtues."²¹ "For charity unites, conforms, and links our will to God Himself as our moving principle, our guiding norm, and our peaceful end. Therefore, just as God is the efficient cause in so far as He moves us, the formal cause in so far as He guides us, and the final cause in so far as He gives us peace, so charity itself, by reason of its operation, has the office of the three causes."²²

Without charity the virtues are perfect only *secundum quid* and only as regards being, but not *simpliciter* and as regards well-being. For they must ordain and guide man to his final end, but they cannot do so without charity, which is their directive form, giving them help in ordaining and regulating. This is the opinion of the Seraphic Doctor. "For charity," he says, "is the weight that inclines and brings about the operations of all the virtues toward a good end."²³ And "just as heavy bodies tend toward a central point through the force of their weight, so the spirit tends toward the highest good through the weight of love."²⁴

The Subtle Doctor is in perfect agreement with the beautiful teaching of the Seraphic Doctor. "If charity alone regards the ultimate end immediately," he explains, "the other virtues will not regard the ultimate end except through the medium of charity. . . and therefore are imperfect without charity, for they cannot be directed (toward the ultimate end) without charity."²⁵

It follows, then, that all the virtues are nothing more than different manifestations of the one virtue, charity, which contains all the other

¹⁹Quadragesimale de Evangelio aeterno, sermo 3, De excellentia divini amoris, a.2, c.2, *Opera*, (Venetiis, 1745), II, 19a.

²⁰I Sent., d. 14, dub. 1, 6, I, 255ab.

²¹Brevil. p.5, c. 8, V, 262a.

²²II Sent., d. 28, a. 1, q.2 ad 6, II, 885b.

²³III Sent. d. 27, a. k, q. 3, III, 598a.

²⁴Ibid., d. 36, a. un., q. 6, III, 806b.

²⁵Oxon., III, d. 36, q. un., n. 26, XV, 684b.

virtues. Thus David of Augsburg says: "Charity is one virtue possessing in itself all other virtues; but because it has so many different effects which are brought about by circumstances and causes from without, and which it opposes when bad or tends toward when good, it takes on diverse offices or names."²⁶

Obviously, charity is the supreme virtue according to the Franciscan school of spirituality.

²⁶*De exterioris et interioris Hominis Compositione libri tres*, (Ad Claras Aquas, 1899) 226s.

(To be continued)

Fr. James Heerinckx, O.F.M.

Fr. Marvin Woelffer, O.F.M. (Transl.)

THE HOLY FRIARS OF SAXONY

HOLY FRIAR ROBERT

I. His life of work and prayer

67. So intensely did the ancient members of our Order cultivate the spirit that manual or external work never interfered with holy prayer; instead, it made them even more eager to keep silence and carry out other works of piety.

68. In the province of Saxony there was a certain laybrother by the name of Robert.¹⁶ By trade he was a stonemason and almost daily he was occupied in the service of the friars. Yet, even in his daily labors he did not allow his spirit of devotion to grow cool, but rather, by continually arousing the inner man, he arrived at the height of perfection.

While he was still a novice he built for the friars of Halberstadt an ambulatory connecting the refectory and infirmary with the guest house near the kitchen. In all things which pertained to his work of building he was aided and encouraged by the good will of his superiors. I knew this friar and was greatly concerned about him lest his external labor might quench in him the spirit of holy devotion and draw him away from his spiritual exercises. But God, who always looks out for the humble, saw the services of charity and the humility which he showed the friars in his labors. And because of his prompt obedience God not only increased in him the grace and spirit of devotion, but also gave him so much grace that even more than all the other friars in the convent he was fervent in prayer and desirous of praying always. Even when he was taken up with his manual labor he would curb his tongue so carefully that rarely, if ever, would he speak an idle word all day, much less a harmful one. And when he climbed down from his building in the evening, he set things in order as he could and hurried to prayer with a certain anxiety of mind. In the evenings he kept a long watch in prayer and spent a long time in meditation. I heard many good reports about this laybrother, especially from another laybrother who had known him well before he entered the Order and to whom Robert in turn with all the trustfulness of friendship told many details of his experiences in the Order.

¹⁶In recounting the vision of Friar Robert (numbers 69ff, below), the *Liber Miraculorum et Visionum* calls him Rupert (A.F.H., II (1909), p. 78). Since the final number of our account (n. 73) speaks of the choir he built at Erfurt, Robert must have done this in 1232. The building was destroyed by fire in 1291, and not completely rebuilt until 1316; by that time Robert or Rupert was long since dead and his memory enshrined in the *Liber Miraculorum*.

II. How Holy Obedience merited for him to see Christ on Christmas Day.

69. After he had made his profession in the Order and had finished the new building, he was appointed to look after the friars' kitchen and to cook for them. He also very willingly performed whatever his superiors commanded him, and in all his duties he showed himself the servant of everyone.

70. One time during the fast after the Feast of All Saints it occurred to him that he should dispose himself in a special way for the Feast of Christmas and prepare diligently for the graces he hoped to receive. So he began his fast by cleansing his heart thoroughly by a good confession and by probing deeply to see whether anything was hidden there that might offend the eyes of the divine Majesty. His confessor was Friar Siegfried von Dorstat to whom he made a general confession of all his sins which he could call to mind and which might disquiet him in any way in his devotion. After he had made his confession he begged the guardian not to send him out for Christmas, but to leave him in the convent, that he might more easily give himself up to prayer and devotion. With great kindness the guardian told him that he would gladly comply with the request, provided the lack of friars did not necessitate his being sent out; and that in the meantime he would think it over carefully, since it was quite some time before the friars would go out. The guardian added that if he could not help sending him out, he should go willingly with a ready soul and in the merit of holy obedience, and if he bowed his head humbly in holy obedience God would give him greater grace on the feastday and increase the fervor of his spirit. When Friar Robert thought it over, he felt remorse that he had asked the guardian not to send him out; he feared that in this request he had sought merely his own will and had transgressed his vow. He therefore resolved in his heart that he would leave the matter entirely to Divine Providence and would not pester the guardian again about leaving him in the convent.

71. But when the feast was near at hand, Divine Providence disposed the guardian to send him out as companion to Friar Conrad von Poppendorff, a devout and religious man. When they arrived in the town called Brucoscherleve, Robert gave himself to devotion and prayed much while his companion was busy hearing confessions. Since he had chosen to contemplate the Holy Infancy, his mind was wholly taken up with the boundless love which God had shown toward sinful and mortal man in the Incarnation. Nor did he weary of this meditation, and so it happened that in the evening on the feast of Saint Thomas the Apostle,

when his companion had retired, Friar Robert continued to watch and pray. Then the Blessed Virgin appeared to him and placed into his hands her Son our Lord Jesus Christ in the form of a most beautiful Boy. But when he had seen the Boy, he was so pleased with His incredible loveliness that he paid but little attention to the most Blessed Mother. While Friar Robert was finding great joy in the pleasing appearance of the Boy, His Mother after a short while took the Boy back from his hands with some impatience, and immediately disappeared. At this poor Robert was greatly disturbed and was fearful lest he had offended either Mother or Son, and had been robbed of Christ's presence because of his sins. He therefore redoubled his devotion and began to devote himself to prayer with great fervor, hoping that on Christmas Day God would deign to look upon him and grant him once more some such sweet and heavenly consolation.

III. *The great consolation he received from the apparition of Christ.*

72. On the Feast of the Holy Innocents, when his companion, who had busied himself all day with preaching and hearing confessions, was thoroughly tired and had hurried to bed, Friar Robert remained at his devotions and continued in his fervent prayers. As he was persevering untiringly in his prayers, Our Lord Jesus Christ appeared to him with His wounds all afresh and showed him such warm familiarity that in the sweetness of his soul he could not refrain from breaking forth into sonorous song and joyful jubilation.

His companion, however, awakened by this loud noise and rejoicing, did not know that Friar Robert was taken up in the sweetness of contemplation. He therefore asked him how long he intended to stay up and why he did not lie down and go to sleep. Later Friar Robert told a dear friend among his confreres that he had received such great interior consolation from that vision and every day still felt it within himself that he would prefer to hop on the ground like a frog all the rest of his life and never live under a roof rather than sadly lack that divine consolation.

IV. *His honored death.*

73. This same Friar Robert was later transferred to Erfurt where he built a beautiful and impressive choir for the friars. He died in this convent while chapter was being celebrated, just as many of the friars were arriving for it. He was laid to rest with great pomp and his funeral was attended by great numbers of friars and of laypeople of both sexes.

I who compiled this for you was also present and saw this funeral; I ascribed it to Friar Robert's sanctity that by God's Providence he was buried so gloriously, because in this way God gave him special honor.

After his death I saw the iron chain which in the spirit of penance he used to fasten on each arm.

(To be continued)
Fr. Ignatius Brady, O.F.M. (transl.)

THE NEW RUBRICS AND THE LITTLE OFFICE OF OUR LADY

When the Sacred Congregation of Rites issued a General Decree March 23, 1955, "On Reducing the Rubrics to a Simpler Form" (effective this past January 1), no mention was made therein of its application to the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary. As a result, there has been considerable discussion, controversy, and doubt among canonists, rubricists, and the Sisters themselves who would be primarily concerned in the question. Even in Rome, an informed source tells us, there has been a difference of opinion on the part of authorities and jurists. More than one question in ecclesiastical journals bears witness to the division of answers.

Thus the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* (November, 1955) carried a comment to the effect that the new Decree does not in any way touch upon the Little Office. The author, G. Montague, argues from the silence of the Decree, to conclude that it concerns only the Divine Office of the Roman Rite. Besides, it expressly states that "what things are not expressly mentioned here are considered to be unchanged." On the other hand, a recent number of the *Review for Religious* with equally sound logic claims that the Decree does apply, since the Little Office is a part of the text of the Roman Breviary. We can bolster this argument by mentioning that the new edition of the Romano-Seraphic Breviary, to be issued this coming year with embodiment of the new rubrics, will omit the Aves, etc., in connection with the text of the Little Office.

However, it is now quite certain that the Sacred Congregation intends the new breviary changes to apply to the Little Office, even though it has not issued a formal decree to that effect. The Superior General of the Sisters of the Poor of Saint Francis (Frascati-Rome; Hartwell, Ohio) presented a list of questions (drawn up by Fr. John de Deo Oldegeering, OFM, Cincinnati) to the Sacred Congregation. After some delay an audience was granted to Sister Paula, the Assistant General, by Monsignor Enrico Dante, Prefect of the Ceremoniere Pontificia, in the name of

the Sacred Congregation. In this audience, November 26, 1955, the Monsignor explained that he would answer the questions orally, since anything in writing from the Congregation would have to bear the seal of the Cardinal-Prefect, and this was not considered necessary in this case.

Accordingly, it is evident that the following changes are to be introduced into the recitation of the Little Office.

1. Omit the *Aperi Domine* (which does not seem to have been customary in the Little Office anyway) and the *Sacrosanctae*.
2. Omit the *Aves* at the beginning of the various Hours.
3. Omit the *Pater* at the close of Matins (when this Hour is separated from Lauds in private recitation) and at the end of Lauds (together with *Dominus det, etc.*).
4. Omit the *Pater, Ave, Credo* after the Final Antiphon following Compline.
5. Omit the Commemoration of the Saints. However, as will be evident below, Franciscans may retain the commemoration of Saint Francis.
6. Omit the Final Antiphon of Our Lady except after Compline. Therefore Lauds, Prime, etc. end simply with *Fidelium, etc.*

In the interest of clarity we present that portion of the questions and answers which affect the Little Office used by the majority of Sisters. Other questions touch more directly on the edition of the *Officium Marianum* prepared by Father A. Bea, S. J. (translated by Fr. Aurelian Scharf, O.F.M., Newman Press), which the Frascati-Hartwell Sisters have adopted as a Community. The text is very explicit, to leave no point overlooked:

1. Does the new Decree of March 23, 1955, governing the recitation of the Divine Office, affect the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary? *Yes.*
2. If the Decree affects the Little Office, then:
Will the *Ave Maria* at the beginning of the Hours be omitted? *Yes.*
Will the *Pater Noster* at the close of Matins and Lauds and the Little Hours be omitted? *Yes.*
3. Will the Commemoration of the Saints be omitted? *Yes.*
If so, must the Commemoration of Saint Francis (for which we have an Indult) be omitted? *No. You may insert it in the Office where you now have it, as something special for your Congregation. Make a conclusion after "participatione gaudere" in the Oremus, using "Per Dominum nostrum" (long conclusion).*
4. If the Commemoration of All Saints is omitted, will the Oration after the *Benedictus* of Lauds and the *Magnificat* of Vespers be

followed by all the usual versicles (*Domine, exaudi orationem. . .*), and will the versicle *Fidelium animae* close Lauds and Vespers? *Yes.*
Will Prime, Tierce, Sext and None close with the versicle *Fidelium animae*? *Yes.*

Will Compline close with *Benedicat*, the Final Anthem of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and *Divinum Auxilium*? *Yes.*

After several questions on the Bea edition, the text continues:

5. When the Office is said in common, who intones the *Te Deum, Benedictus, Magnificat*, and *Nunc Dimittis*: the Chanter or the Hebdomadary? *Do as you wish.*
—Is the Sign of the Cross to be made at the beginning of the *Benedictus, Magnificat*, and *Nunc Dimittis*? *Yes.*
—If the Office closes with the versicle *Fidelium animae* and the choirs are in a standing position, will it be correct to kneel just before this versicle in order to finish the Office kneeling, or should the choirs remain standing? *Do as you wish. It is correct to keep the position you are in when saying this versicle at the close of Matins and Lauds and the Little Hours, and the Regina Caeli after Compline.*
6. Finally, Monsignor Dante said: "This is the substance of the whole matter. The new Decree does affect the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary. However, it is not obligatory, so you can continue in your old way or follow the New Decree, but it is *either or*; the two may not be mixed. I would advise you to follow the new Decree and go along with the Church." Monsignor Marchetta, who was also present at this conference, remarked later: "When this New Decree is declared a law, all will be obliged to follow it, as the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin Mary is part of the Breviary."

From a practical viewpoint, toward implementing this questionnaire (which seems to decide the question definitely enough), it is in order for the Mother Provincial (or the Superior General) to decide whether or not her jurisdiction will or will not adopt the changes. The individual houses should not make the change of their own initiative, to achieve uniformity within the whole Province or Congregation. Once adopted, it should be followed completely, since a mixture of the old and the new is expressly prohibited. At the same time, should a group decide not to use the new Rubrics but wait for a more official pronouncement, I should think the individual Sister in private recitation might of her own initiative make use of the new rubrics, provided again that she is consistent in this.

Fr. Ignatius Brady, O.F.M.

A NEW ROMANO-SERAPHIC RITUAL

Bound in red leather and embossed with a symbol of the Holy Spirit and the Tau of Saint Francis, the new (third) edition of the Romano-Seraphic Ritual presents a most pleasing appearance. Issued this past November with the approval of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, it embodies almost all the latest changes in the blessings of the Church and includes several variations in the Ritual of the Friars Minor and those families subject to the Minister General of the latter. Unfortunately, its printing was just too early to include some of the changes of Holy Week, such as the Blessing at Table for the closing days of Lent. One of the omissions already apparent was the blessing for the chalk on Epiphany; another, the revision of the ceremony for the renewal of vows this past April 16.

Several new features will undoubtedly be of interest to the Sisters as well as the Friars. Among these is an annual Consecration of the Seraphic Order to its special Patroness, Mary Immaculate, to be made either on December 8 or on the Feast of Mary Queen of the Franciscan Order (December 15). There is a new rite for the celebration of a priestly Jubilee, even a rite for wedding Jubilees (for use in parishes), new forms proper to the Second Order for a renewal of vows on March 18 (the anniversary of the reception and profession of Saint Clare) and for the celebration of profession-jubilees. In imitation of the Transitus of Saint Francis, and appendix to the Ritual now contains a similar ceremony for the Death of Saint Clare, which (according to the *Acta Ordinis*, 1956, p. 42) is not limited to the exclusive use of the Poor Clare Nuns but can be used also by Friars and Sisters.

Older rites and ceremonies have been revised and somewhat shortened, with the result that the Manuals of Prayer for the various Provinces and Congregations will likely need revision. Thus the annual Consecration on the Feast of the Sacred Heart omits the *Veni Creator* and the *Magnificat* and more clearly separates the Act of Consecration from the Act of Reparation; both can now be recited in the vernacular in an approved translation (General Norms, n. 9, p. 2). A corresponding revision has been made for the Consecration on the Feast of Christ the King. The renewal of vows (April 16), the departure-ceremony for missionaries, and the rite used in celebrating the profession-jubilee of a Friar have received some abbreviation. In regard to the latter, most Friars will likely be relieved to know that the Jubilarian is no longer burdened or festooned with a flowery head-gear and need not receive the staff. In this ceremony and several others English may now be used for the petitions, the act of renewal of profession, etc.

Some of the changes introduced affect the wording of formulae essential to the Franciscan life. Masters of clerics will welcome the revised form of the oath before Solemn Profession, since it no longer carries reference to the Subdiaconate. Tertiary Brothers of the First Order are no longer called Oblates; and their profession is made according to a new wording. In the formula for simple (temporary) profession in both the First and Second Orders (and that of cloistered Tertiaries) the familiar *sine proprio* is replaced by *in paupertate*, another instance of more express legislation for the state of poverty of the simply professed Religious, who indeed lives in poverty but still has his *proprium* to some extent.

All who use the Romano-Seraphic Litany for Rogation Days and otherwise, will find the list of Saints identical with the revision of the latest Seraphic Breviary, but with several additions, including Saint Pius X. Choir-directors may note that the General Norms (n. 5, p. 1) remind us that the Order has the custom of standing for all hymns, responsories and psalms, even when the Most Blessed Sacrament is exposed, unless otherwise noted (which is certainly noted for the *Tantum Ergo*); and (n. 7, p. 2) that the *O Salutaris* or another similar liturgical hymn at Benediction is to be begun as soon as the priest or deacon opens the tabernacle.

According to a decree of the Most Reverend Augustin Sépinski, O.F.M., which prefaces the work, the Ritual must be used by all Friars and Nuns subject to the jurisdiction of the Minister General of the Order of Friars Minor. The use of the Ritual is both permitted and recommended to Nuns of the Second and Third Order subject to the jurisdiction of the local Ordinary, and also to the Friars and Sisters of Franciscan Congregations aggregated to the First Order. The Constitutions of the latter groups will no doubt state whether or not the Ritual is of obligation among them.

Fr. Ignatius Brady, O.F.M.



THE SISTERS OF SAINT FRANCIS OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION

A few years after the Right Reverend J. L. Spalding set about organizing the Peoria diocese in central and northern Illinois, he found among his multitudinous tasks the urgent one of providing for the new diocese's orphans who looked to him as father and sole provider. In November of 1890 Sister Mary Pacifica Forrestal heard the request of the prelate and travelled with three companions to Metamora, Illinois, where the diocesan orphanage was to be opened. Metamora is a historical Illinois town about eighteen miles from Peoria.

By 1895 ten other women had joined Sister Pacifica and the band gained approval of their constitutions to found a new and independent branch of the Franciscan family; the official title of the Congregation is The Sisters of Saint Francis of the Immaculate Conception. That same year the new community added to its original charity the work of caring for the aged of the diocese. The first residence for the aged was established in Peoria as Saint Joseph's Home. Likewise, that year saw the novitiate of the new order opened with its headquarters in the new home.

The orphans, the aged; next came the children, as the Sisters answered the call to help teach the children of the diocese. The first school staffed was Saint Mary's at Metamora. Other schools were accepted at intervals during the past half century.

The years 1901 and 1904 saw the Peoria home for the aged enlarged. In 1903 the community answered a call coming from outside the Peoria diocese and opened a second home for the aged at Springfield, Illinois. Springfield was both the see city of that diocese and also the state capital. The new Saint Joseph's Home there was opened in two old mansions on the present site of the Immaculate Conception Cathedral and rectory of that city. Later the home residents moved into a new structure located on a scenic farm south of the city. In 1954 a new wing was completed providing quarters for the Sisters and for more residents.

The community opened two more houses outside the diocese after the home venture; a school at Palmyra, Missouri, and another at Quincy, Illinois. The care of these two missions was relinquished when the work of the Sisters became increasingly heavy within the Peoria diocese.

The Sisters had no motherhouse as such until 1914 when the

present motherhouse on the west bluff of Peoria was built. An additional building, Sitio Hall, was added in 1937. At present, the motherhouse provides space for the novitiate, the Aspirant school, a private nursery and kindergarten, and a private music school.

The year 1917 saw the beginning of an added field of work for the Sisters. That year Saint Mark's Hall was built on the west bluff in Peoria and opened as a residence for working girls. A second similar residence in downtown Peoria was staffed by the Sisters for a brief time. Saint Mark's Hall's facilities have been expanded and the residence is still maintained by the community.

The most recent field of work that the Sisters have entered is catechetical instruction at Aledo, Illinois, where a center was established in 1938 to care for the instruction of the Catholic children attending public schools within a radius of some 500 square miles. The instructional needs of this particular mission produced the nationally known and used Peoria-Aledo Plan of religious instruction. The work sheets which, together with the Pflaum Messenger publications form the basic texts of the plan, originally were written and mimeographed at the Aledo center by the Sisters in residence there. News of the success of the plan spread rapidly; today, the sheets are sent from the Aledo center to every state in the Union, to Alaska and to the Hawaiian Islands—wherever children need instruction in the Faith and cannot attend a parochial school. Other similar centers have been established in the diocese. The Sisters at the Aledo center also conduct a private kindergarten to help support the work.

The community today numbers about one hundred and fifty active members. While continuing the care of the diocesan orphans (the present orphanage is named Guardian Angel Home and is located near the motherhouse in Peoria), providing homes for the aged and working girls, and maintaining catechetical centers, the community's members are now chiefly engaged in teaching throughout the schools of the diocese. During the first half of the present century the Sisters accepted call after call to the poorest of the diocese's parishes, often teaching without compensation. Only recently have a few Sisters been assigned to high school teaching.

The foundress, Sister Mary Pacifica, became the first Mother General and lived to watch her community grow and expand under her successors, the late Mother Mary Catherine, the late Mother Mary Benedict and the present Mother Mary Ursula. The community has continued as a diocesan organization and has worked under the guid-

SISTERS OF IMMACULATE CONCEPTION

ance of Archbishop Spalding and his successors—Bishop Edmund Dunne, Archbishop J. H. Schlarmann, and the present Bishop William Cousins.

For the teenage girls who early feel the call to serve Christ in one of the many charities of the community, the Sisters conduct a private high school at the motherhouse which is accredited by the Catholic University of America. These girls are known as Aspirants to the religious life. The school's curriculum is similar to that of the local high schools. The extra-curricular program includes music, sports, and similar activities found in other high schools, but it also includes activities specifically planned to help nurture the potential vocations. The students spend their vacations with their families. Girls may enter during any year of high school.

After the completion of the high school work or its equivalent, girls of normal physical, mental and moral health may enter the community as candidates. The period of candidature lasts from six to nine months. When this period has been successfully completed the candidates receive the habit—a simple black dress, scapular and veil with a white headband, coif, collar and cord—and their names in religion, and begin two years of further religious training as novices. At the end of this period the novices may take temporary vows for three years and renew them for two more years before making final profession.

While the spiritual training of the beginners to the life of the community has been easily provided, the professional training of the future teachers has posed a problem. Before the years when the demand for college credits became widespread, the Sisters were trained by professional women who came to the motherhouse to conduct classes. Later, the professed Sisters would attend summer sessions at various colleges and universities. In 1938 the novitiate was transferred to Springfield, Illinois, so that the young Sisters might receive instruction at the local Catholic college there. However, in 1951 the Catholic University of America approved the establishment of a teacher training college at the motherhouse and the novitiate was reestablished at the motherhouse in Peoria. The present program permits the prospective teachers of the order to complete a large portion of their college work before beginning their active assignments and subsequently continuing their studies while in service and during the summer sessions.

Like their spiritual father, Saint Francis, these religious have seen the need of their own time and have tried as he did and under his inspiration to answer the local call to restore all things to Christ.

ATTEND SUMMER SCHOOL AT THE FRANCISCAN INSTITUTE

July 2 - August 10

SCHEDULE

PHILOSOPHY

- 505 Philosophy of St. Bonaventure.....Fr. Allan Wolter
505a Itinerarium of St. BonaventureInstructor

THEOLOGY

- 502 Palaeography.....Fr. Gaudens Mohan
525 Theology of Alexander of Hales and his Collaborators.....
Fr. Kilian Lynch
527 Theology of Aureoli and Ockham.....Fr. Eligius Buytaert

FRANCISCAN PRACTICAL THEOLOGY

- 730 Franciscan Spirituality Part III: Franciscan Action.....
Instructor
731 Commentary on the Rule of the Third Order Regular
Part III.....Fr. Innocent Dám
733 Franciscan Spanish Mystics.....Fr. Joseph Montalverne
734 Sources of St. Francis.....Fr. Innocent Dám
735 Itinerarium of St. Bonaventure (Seminar).....Instructor

NOTICE

The Franciscan Institute offers a CERTIFICATE IN FRANCISCAN STUDIES to those students who fulfill the following requirements.

- I. M.A. degree (or doctorate), obtained before the candidate starts working toward the certificate. If the candidate has followed lectures at the Institute for his M.A. or Ph.D. and some of these lectures coincide with these listed below, it is understood that the courses followed previously cannot be taken a second time as leading toward the Certificate.
- II. Full-time attendance of a selection of the following courses, during not less than three Summer Sessions, and adding

up to eighteen credits. (The numbers refer to the section "The Franciscan Institute" of the *Announcements* of St. Bonaventure University Bulletin, School of Graduate Studies):

- 1) Theology: History of the Franciscan School, Parts I-VI, listed under nos. 525, 625, 725, 527, 627, 727;
- 2) Franciscan Practical Theology: all courses listed in the *Announcements*;
- 3) History: History of the Franciscan Order, Parts I-III, listed under nos. 540, 640, 740.

III. Successful passing of the corresponding examinations.



FRANCISCAN BRIEFS

THE THIRTY-SEVENTH MEETING OF THE FRANCISCAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE

The Friars Minor of Saint Anthony's Seminary, Santa Barbara, California, together with those of the Old Mission, will be hosts to the Thirty-Seventh Annual Meeting of the Franciscan Educational Conference, August 12-14, 1956. The meeting will open Sunday evening, the Feast of St. Clare, and close on Tuesday evening. The annual (civic) Fiesta of Santa Barbara will open in front of the Old Mission on the evening of August 15th; the Friars attending the conference are cordially invited to remain the rest of the week and enjoy the Fiesta.

TOPIC: The Executive Board of the FEC, at its meeting in Indianapolis, November 25, 1955, chose as the topic for 1956:

FRANCISCAN LIFE TODAY

The goal of the meeting and the individual papers and discussions will be, more specifically, to study our Franciscan life and rule in the light of official, papal (and other) directives for religious life today. The Holy Father has called for a RENOVATIO ACCOMMODATA of the religious spirit and life, observance and apostolate. We in the United States have not, perhaps, beyond a National Congress of Religious in 1952, given full and due consideration to such an ideal or the specific directives it has elicited. We hope that the Santa Barbara meeting will prove one step in that direction. Perhaps future meetings can consider more particular phases of our Franciscan life and its needs in our modern setting.

BOOK REVIEW

Works of Saint Bonaventure
Volume I: *De Reductione Artium ad Theologiam*
Sister Emma Therese Healy, C.S.J.
The Franciscan Institute, St. Bonaventure,
N. Y., 1955
pp. 158; \$2.25

Under the title of the Works of Saint Bonaventure, edited by the Rev. Philotheus Boehner, O.F.M. and Sr. M. Frances Laughlin, S.M.I.C., a new series of translations of St. Bonaventure's works have made their initial appearance. In Volume I, the skillful translation of the *De Reductione Artium ad Theologiam* is rendered by Sister Emma Therese Healy, C.S.J. The *Itinerarium Mentis in Deum* now in press will soon be available in Volume II.

In Volume I the Latin text of the *De Reductione*, accompanying the English translation, is prefaced by an introduction and followed by a commentary. This volume is divided into four parts: Introduction, Text with Translation and Graph, Commentary on the Four Lights, and the "Lumen Exterior, Inferius et Interius" in the light of the "Lumen Superius."

The Introduction in Part One elucidates the occasion and the inspiration of the work, assuming some of its possible sources. An explanation of the terms of the title follows in a concise and clear epitome. In Part Two, the translation evidences scholarly precision in declaring the Seraphic Doctor's doctrine. Part Three analyzes the "Lumen" according to the mind of St. Bonaventure. Part IV culminates

the thesis, which intends to "prove that the arts or all secular studies must be grouped under theology." This is shown in the three chapters: the Relation of Philosophy to Theology, the Theory of the "Reductio" and the "Reductio" proper.

The present reviewer enthusiastically

received and perused this delightful volume. Nor was he disappointed—either in the pleasant appearance of the cover or the careful and attentive presentation of Bonaventurian doctrine. May others derive similar pleasure in accepting this new volume of the *Works of Saint Bonaventure*.

Fr. Edward M. Wilson, T.O.F.



1906 CONGRATULATIONS TO FR. THOMAS 1956

The Editors of the CORD wish to extend sincere congratulations to the Very Reverend Father Thomas B. Plassmann, O.F.M., on the occasion of his Golden Sacerdotal Jubilee. May God grant him many more years of fruitful labor in the Master's service.

•

NOW READY!

ST. BONAVENTURE'S DE REDUCTIONE ARTIUM AD THEOLOGIAM

Translated and edited by Sister Emma Terese Healy, S.S.J., with commentary; this is the first volume of the **WORKS OF ST. BONAVENTURE** in English translation with Latin text.

Subscriptions for the entire collection are welcome.

Pp. 158

\$2.75