

It might interest our readers to know a few statistics about the Order of the Friars Minor. The *Acta Ordinis Fratrum Minorum*, the official journal of the Order publishes for quite some time the statistics as to October 4 of each year.

On October 4, 1958, the Order had 26,162 members. The five biggest Provinces were: The Netherlands, with 1,335 members; Holy Name Province, New York: 969; Venice Province of Saint Anthony: 861; Sacred Heart Province, St. Louis: 755; Province of St. Joseph (Northern half of Belgium): 714. The five countries with the greatest number of Friars are: Italy: 6,229; U. S. A.: 3,586; Spain: 2,270; Germany: 1,748; The Netherlands: 1,335. The Province of Corsica is the smallest with only 30 members. On October 4, 1957, the Order had 26,330 members or 168 more than in 1958.

By way of comparison, in 1768, with a Catholic world much smaller than it is now, we had some 77,000 members distributed over 167 Provinces; right now we have 82 Provinces and Custodies. At the end of the nineteenth century the Order had some 14,000 members, in 1907 17,000.

To complete the picture of the English-speaking Friars as of today: England has 271 Friars, Australia, 257, Ireland 372.

The total membership of the Third Order Secular was, on October 4, 1958, some 1,173,175. The French Canadian Province had by far the strongest Tertiary sodalities with 109,700 members. The most famous tertiary alive is Pope John XXIII.



### INDULGENCES FOR READING HOLY SCRIPTURE

The Sacred Congregation of Indulgences and Relics (December 13, 1894) and the Sacred Penitentiary (March 21 and April 24, 1945) have granted the following indulgences.

1. To the faithful who shall read the books of Sacred Scripture at least a quarter of an hour with reverence due to the Divine Word as spiritual reading, there is granted an indulgence of 3 years.

2. To those, moreover, who have read at least some verses of the Gospel with a devout mind and have, furthermore, devoutly recited the following invocations, kissing the Gospel: *By the word of the Lord our sins be blotted out; the reading of the Gospel be to us a source of consolation and protection; May Christ the Son of God teach us the words of the Holy Gospel*, there is granted:

*an indulgence of 500 days;*  
*a plenary indulgence* on the usual conditions, provided that they shall read the same daily for a whole month;  
*a plenary indulgence in the hour of death*, if they shall have carried out some pious exercise often during life, provided that, having confessed and been strengthened with the Holy Communion, or at least contrite, they shall have devoutly invoked the Most Holy Name of Jesus with their lips, if capable of this, or at least in their hearts, and shall have patiently accepted death from the hand of God as the wages of sin.

# The Blessed Virgin

## PART II. SOME CONTEMPORARY PROTESTANT ATTITUDES TOWARD OUR LADY

Fr. Alexander A. Di Lella, O.F.M.

At first when we think about such a subject as Protestant attitudes, our tendency is to shrug our shoulders and mutter: "So what? Who cares what the Protestants think anyhow?" As genuine and as sincere as such sentiments may be, I think that we make a grave mistake when we fail to consider the teaching of our Protestant brethren. In fact, in the encyclical *Humani generis*, Pope Pius XII counsels Catholic theologians to know the teaching of non-Catholic thinkers. The Pope writes: "(Catholic theologians and philosophers) have a grave responsibility for defending truth, both divine and human, and for instilling it into men's minds; they must needs acquaint themselves with all these speculations, to a more or less extent erroneous; they must needs take them into account. Nay it is their duty to have a thorough understanding of them." The Holy Father's words, I think apply also in, at least, a limited extent, to the friars who have to deal with souls. That is why we have decided on this subject for this afternoon's discussion. I hope it will prove of some interest.

I—Some American Protestant Ideas on the Divine Maternity. During the Marian year, 1954, Fr. Kenneth F. Dougherty, S.A., conducted a survey of the opinions of 100 Protestant ministers on the question of Mary's divine maternity. I would like to present, in summary, the results of that survey.

As could be expected, Protestant attitudes toward Mary range from the awesome bewilderment of the Baptists to the reverent emotions of Anglo-Catholics, Anglicans and Episcopalians. Episcopalians build churches and hospitals in honor of St. Mary. High Church Episcopalians recite the rosary to procure favors through Mary's intercessions. Moderate and low church Episcopalians regard all devotion to Mary as "papish superstition," and affirm that Mary is simply a woman to whom no cult is owed because she is the mother of man, not the Mother of God.

Some Lutheran pastors faithfully recite the *Angelus* and believe in Mary, the Mother of God, whereas others pay homage because there is "the one mediator between God and our Lord Jesus Christ." Baptists in general also refuse to give to Mary, and very often regard Mariology as Mariolatry-worship. Presbyterians, Methodists and smaller sects believe that she is the mother of the man, Christ, but not the Mother of God. They believe that the Catholic teaching on the divine maternity of the Lady is unscriptural and a human, papish invention. Unitarian Congregationalists look upon Mary as a good woman, and nothing more.

There is no one formula that can sum up contemporary Protestant opinion concerning Mary, the Mother of God. Although the Protestants of the 16th century were quite unanimous in their revolt against the cult of our Lady, we cannot say that most of the current ideas are directly influenced by the 16th century revolters. For a day high church Anglican would be repelled by the Calvinist sermons of Elizabethan clergymen of that Anglican Church. On the other hand, a contemporary Missouri Synod Lutheran would no doubt be quite in accord with Luther's sermon on the Nativity of our Lady in which he opposed any devotion to Mary on grounds that he believed it would put Christ in the background.

The Catholic who defends the cult of Mary against a Protestant charge that Catholics adore Mary, could expect to receive a similar reply from a Presbyterian minister of our day, given by John Calvin himself. Calvin taught that the distinction by Catholics between *latria* and *hyperdulia* is purely a verbal fiction.

A more or less general observation regarding Protestant thought and practice would be that American Protestant ministers are for the most part opposed to the title: Mary, the Mother of God. In giving the actual statistics of this survey, we should say a word of how the survey was conducted.

In order to get at least a representative cross-section of American Protestant thinking on Mary's divine maternity, Fr. Dougherty sent a questionnaire to 270 ministers of 17 different denominations in the States and the District of Columbia. He received 100 replies from 270 who wrote to. Though these 100 replies are not a statistical sample in the technical sense, I think those answers do give us a good idea of what to expect from Protestants on the doctrine of the divine maternity.

The questionnaire read:

Rev. and dear Sir:

I am composing a study concerning American Protestant beliefs about Mary, the Mother of God. Would you be kind enough to answer the questions on the remainder of this letter and post it to the address on the envelope inclosed. No personal names shall be mentioned in this study. With kindest regards to you,

Sincerely,

Kenneth F. Dougherty, S.A.

Do you believe that Mary is the Mother of God?

(Yes or no)

What reasons do you give for this belief or disbelief?

If you believe in Mary as the Mother of God, what devotions, if any, do you have in her honor?

The answers received were very interesting. Very few letters were openly abusive. For the most part, the letters were objectively written with the purpose of answering the questions asked. Some ministers were especially grateful that they had been asked to participate in the survey. A few desired information on Catholic Mariology.

In answering the question: Do you believe that Mary is the Mother of God? the following answers were received from the 100 ministers who wrote:

	yes	no	uncertain
Episcopalians .....	11	7	0
Baptists .....	2	9	5
Lutherans .....	5	12	0
Presbyterians .....	0	9	0
Methodists .....	3	14	4
Smaller Sects .....	1	12	2
Totals .....	22	63	15

In response to the question: If you believe in Mary as the Mother of God, what devotions, if any, do you have in her honor? Episcopalians affirmed that they had such devotions as the rosary, the *Angelus*, novenas in Mary's honor as well as Masses and offices of breviary. One Lutheran minister said that he recited the *Angelus* and another Lutheran said that he kept Candlemas, the Feasts of the Annunciation and "other Bible-founded festivities of our Lady." A northern Baptist minister said he recited the rosary privately. Eighty-six of the 100 ministers reported no devotion to Mary.

The common reason why 63 ministers in this survey denied that Mary is the Mother of God is to be found in their belief that the Catholic Church divinizes our Lady by that title. Frequently through the letters there was a definite attempt to give scriptural evidence that Mary was a human being and also that she belonged to the human race. The ministers appealed to the testimony of the Scriptures that there is only one Saviour and Mediator between God and man, Lord Jesus, and that Mary cannot be for us another saviour or mediator. They argued, furthermore, that Mary's maternity is essentially human in that she is only the mother of Christ, the man, and not the Mother of God, because God cannot have a beginning, as the Scriptures continually remind us.

In general, the reasoning employed in these negative replies showed a lack of correct information concerning Catholic teaching on the divine Maternity. The charge that the Church divinized our Lady and regards her as a saviour and mediator is certainly a product of gross misunderstanding. These ministers assumed that this is a traditional Catholic doctrine, and proceeded to disprove its conformity with Scripture by establishing the humanity of Mary and the belief that Mary is simply the Christotokos, the mother of the man Christ. The mode of reasoning was deficient in the definition of terms employed, such as the terms "person" and "nature"—terms essential to a correct understanding of Catholic teaching on the divine maternity. The ministers' conclusion was generally reached by the assertion that the Bible does not literally call Mary the Mother of God, but that the Bible, they asserted, has ample literal proofs that she is human like any other of us.

There was no concern shown in the negative replies concerning the Christological dualism that resulted from such a position. The fact that that conclusion is not compatible with the Hypostatic Union of Christ in their affirmation of Mary as the mother of the human nature of Christ, but not the Mother of the Son of God, was not explicitly brought out in the general replies. Their main concern was to pre-

vent against an alleged Roman invention, namely, the divinization of Mary and the addition of another saviour for mankind. One minister, a professor from Hamma Divinity School saw in the title, Mother of God, a kind of deification of Mary, when he wrote: "The New Testament present (Mary) as another woman . . . (The title, Mother of God) suggests a Holy Quartet, instead of a Holy Trinity." Such a statement, if we presume good will on the part of the author, can arise only from a complete lack of understanding of Catholic teaching.

II—Protestant Reaction to the Definition of the Dogma of the Assumption in 1950. It is difficult to ascertain precisely the reaction of the non-Catholic world to recent dogmatic definition. As in other matters, one author appropriately observes, unity is not the mark of the Christian world outside the Catholic Church. In general, however, the reactions of our separated brethren were hardly favorable.

In Holland, the bishops of the Old Catholics voiced their protests by way of a pastoral. In this letter, they claimed to retain cult to our Lady, but they rejected, along with papal infallibility, the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and of the Assumption.

In a declaration of the evangelical churches of Germany, a certain professor Schlink rejected the Roman definition as an obstacle on the road toward a reconciliation between the Christian confessions. But as someone once remarked: "Not only the dogma of Mary's Assumption, but any other truth concerned with faith and morals which Protestants would like to see dropped from the body of Catholic teaching for the sake of unity's sake, would prove to be just as serious an obstacle." So the old bogey of widening the gap separating us from our Protestant brethren should hardly be the cause of much concern when talking about Mary.

Dr. Robert J. McCracken, Pastor of Manhattan's Riverside Church and Bishop Henry Knox Sherrill, presiding Bishop of the U. S. Protestant Episcopal Church, together with the Anglican Archbishops of Canterbury and York, made the claim that the doctrine of the Assumption is without a shred of biblical evidence to support it and is not ascertainable as an historical fact. In his attack on the Assumption, Dr. McCracken goes to the ridiculous; he charged that our devotion to Mary, since it contains, as he says, an element of superstition and, perhaps, of idolatry, is largely responsible for the death struggle between Catholicism and Communism. Such a statement stands self-condemned, as one author writes, since it is based on false presupposition and an erroneous diagnosis.

The Anglican reaction to the recent definition was what could be expected: loud, unfavorable, and unfair, at least, insofar as the Anglican

Archbishops of Canterbury and York are concerned. But as G. C. C. noted at the time: the papal definition has probably made many Anglicans think about our Lady and her place in the scheme of Redemption than has anything since Lourdes. Both Canterbury and York have made solemn pronouncements about the Assumption; but that is not the point; they have talked about the subject as an object to dogma; but that is not the point; they have talked about it and in so doing, they have also provoked some of their people not to think about it but also to contradict them.

For example, in a letter to the *Catholic Herald*, an Anglican wrote in 1950:

Sir:

May I state through the medium of your paper that as a member of the Church of England I do not agree with the Archbishops of Canterbury and York's rejection of the bodily Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary into heaven. The Pope is to be praised and censured for his reverence for our Lady."

As we all know, in the Church of England, we can distinguish three main divisions in the matter of doctrine: the high, the moderate and the low church. The most notable are the high church Anglicans who are prepared to accept, and often do accept, but *as individuals* the whole of the Church's teaching on faith and morals. The moderate church together with the moderate, seems to insist that one should believe in the Assumption. The low church is satisfyingly detached regarding dogmatic definition. There are not hairpin bends in the line of thought. For them the dogma is false and the definition is false. "Rome hath erred" is part of their faith. In defining the Assumption they said, Rome has merely added insult to injury.

Mention has been made of Canterbury and of York. A few words from each will summarize the more vociferous reaction of the Church of England.

Dr. Geoffrey Fisher, Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, foolishly referred to the Assumption as a doctrine completely foreign to the Bible and to ancient universal beliefs. He and the Anglican Archbishop of York, Dr. Cyril Foster Garbett, issued a joint statement wherein they positively assert: The Church of England does not and cannot hold this doctrine to be a necessary part of the Catholic faith.

Fr. Lawrence Everett took Dr. Fisher to task for stating that the Assumption is a doctrine completely foreign to ancient beliefs. He noted that devotion to the feast of the Assumption in England dates back at least 1340 years—to the time of St. Augustine, the archbishop of Canterbury. Everett likewise points out that he had read Dr. Fisher but hurriedly glanced through the pages of history before

made his remark, he would have found that a predecessor of his in the See of Canterbury by almost 900 years, the Catholic Archbishop Lanfranc (d. 1089), placed the feast of the Assumption of Mary among the principal Marian feasts in the Canterbury Church calendar. Finally, long before the tome of Archbishop Lanfranc, England's King Alfred (d. 901), made the Assumption not only a legal holiday, but decreed that there was to be no work for the seven days preceding it. As for Dr. Garbett, Everett continues, he must have been terribly embarrassed when he found that there is a 500 year old monument in his own York cathedral depicting the Assumption of our Blessed Mother into heaven.

III—Some Orthodox Views of Mary by Protestant Theologians. A typical high church Anglican attitude toward Mary and devotion to Mary is the following excerpt written by T. M. Parker, an Anglican. It is not only theologically sound but beautifully written. I think this excerpt could serve as a basis for showing the Protestant themselves the legitimacy and fittingness and quasi-necessity of devotion to Mary.

"... The real danger is not that men should think too highly of Mary, but that they should think too lowly of her, or rather that they should think too lowly of Christ. It is, I think, no accident that absence of devotion to Mary commonly goes with lukewarmness of devotion to her Son. For I suspect that some of the objections to the words, Mother of God, springs unconsciously from a lack of deep conviction about the Deity of Christ. This is more frequently met with than we think. I said just now that the laity can be trusted if well instructed; but in the Church of England they are often not well instructed. And I sometimes wonder what the honest answer would be if one pressed upon certain Anglicans, not ordinarily suspected of unorthodoxy, the question, 'When you say that Christ is God, do you really mean that he is so in just the same sense as the Father is God?' Would they hedge, or at least hesitate? Too many do not realize that the logical consequence of the Incarnation is that Jesus of Nazareth, a character in history, was and is personally God in the fullest sense of the word, and therefore to be worshipped as such . . . Not to be clear about this not only obscures the unique privilege of Mary and so makes men niggardly in honouring her. It also creates the risk that the throne which should be given to the Son, in place of his rightful one. That is to say, our Lord, in men's minds, instead of occupying his place as the Son, is merely the highest of beings *after* God. The way to keep the proportion of devotion to Mary is, not to measure out nervously the devotion you give to Mary, but to be quite sure first that you have given to God the things that are due to God's. Just as, only if you do this, can you be quite sure of not being deceived by a frauding Caesar, so equally you can be certain that, when God has

been given his due, Mary will automatically take her proper place in the universe . . . Newman once spoke of the Arian Christ as usurping a throne in God's plan reserved for her who is really the highest created beings, as the Arians thought their Saviour to be . . ."

E. L. Macsall, an Anglican minister, gives, I think, a correct diagnosis of the Protestant position regarding Mary, when he writes as follows.

"I am convinced that the main reason why so many professing Christians today look upon Mariology as either an extravagance or an inessential luxury in theology is that, whether the words 'adoptionism' and 'docetism' mean anything to them or not, they do in fact have what is fundamentally either an adoptionist or a docetic view of Christ.  
Conclusion.

As a practical conclusion to our discussion on Mary, we should realize that we are living in an age that has been called Marian. The Immaculate Conception was defined in 1854, the Assumption in 1950. Various Marian feasts have been added to the breviary and Mass. The most notable feast added to the liturgy in our day, is that of the universal queenship of our Lady. The modern friars whose predecessors have always spearheaded the Mariological advance, as they have attempted to show this morning, must not relinquish his rightful place as champion of our Lady.

Nor need we be reminded that the science of Mary is not a science reserved for the pin-point discussion of experts, nor is it to be kept under lock and key and administered in small doses to a preferred few. After all, Mary is the mother of all men; so she belongs to everybody. Barring the mystery of grace which encompassed her and the operation of the power of the Most High which caused her to conceive the Son of God, Mary is far more capable of being understood than is the Divine Son. Though entirely at home in the ivy, and sometimes in the halls of the universities, the true Friar is out on the street with God's little sheep who perhaps never heard the name of John Duns Scotus, who wouldn't know the difference between the formal distinction and nuclear fissions. The friar must speak to those people in their own language, for as St. Paul says: "If, then, I do not know the meaning of the language, I shall be the one to speak, a foreigner . . ."

As someone once remarked, seldom does Marian knowledge measure up to the Marian devotion of the people. And where there is a deficiency of sound theology, Mary is likely to become the victim of an unbalanced, sentimental devotion. With this in mind, Pope Pius XII addressed a letter to a Marian Assembly held at Milan in September, 1953, in which he stressed the necessity of bridging over

lamentable chasm existing between Marian piety and Marian theology. In underlining the function of Mary in the Church and in designating her purpose and place in the economy of salvation as the Mother of God, the Coredemptrix, the Mediatrix of all graces, the Spiritual Mother of all men, the Holy Father insists on coordinating Mariological studies with a bearing on pastoral duties. "Far from being an end in itself," the Pope writes, "Marian piety conforms to the traditional formula *per Mariam ad Jesum*, and is a medium essentially ordained to orientate souls to Christ and thereby unite them to the Father in the love of the Holy Spirit." The pope urged further that Marian teaching whether oral or written, must be prepared and animated with dogmatic doctrine so that the faithful may learn to separate what is certain or commonly accepted doctrine, from that which is questionable or only probable.

And in closing we should state the present, practical reason for intensifying our study of Mary, namely the necessity of securing, what one author called, a *conquistadora* to lead us against the onslaughts of the godless philosophy which is threatening the annihilation of Christian civilization. And I don't mean only Communism, but also, and perhaps even more, the illogical materialism practiced by the peoples of the West when they invert the sense of values we have constantly referred to in this synthesis of Franciscan Theology. It was Mary who brought medieval man out of the chaos of the Dark Ages as so many cathedrals erected in her honor so eloquently testify. It was Mary who effected victory at Lepanto and lifted the siege of Vienna. It was Mary, too, who, to show her delight at the definition of the Immaculate Conception, put an end to atheistic anarchism in France. And if the modern friar wants to do his part in making others see the true sense of values proposed in God's Masterplan of creation, as lived by St. Francis and as explained by Scotus and other thinkers, then that friar in humble supplication should call upon Mary, the Immaculate Virgin Mother of God and our Mother, to whom St. Francis prayed in these simple, beautiful words:

Holy Virgin Mary,  
 There is none like you  
 Born in the world among women!  
 Daughter and handmaid  
 Of the most high King  
 And heavenly Father,  
 Mother of our most holy Lord  
 Jesus Christ,  
 Spouse of the Holy Spirit—  
 Pray for us  
 With St. Michael the Archangel  
 And all the Virtues of heaven  
 And all the Saints  
 To your most holy Son,  
 Our Lord and Master!

## Crosses Over Nagasaki

*Fr. Gerard Huber, O.F.M.*

### II. A Decree From Rome

*(Continued)*

The first Franciscan to set foot on Japan was the lay brother, Juan Pobre, John the Poor. In the world he called himself Diaz Pardo. He came from San Lucar de Barrameda, and belonged to the noble family of the Gomes Perez de las Marinas. In early youth (1565) he went to the Philippine Islands as a soldier in the service of the governor, Michel Lopez de Lagaspe, and took part in the conquest of Zebou, Manila, and Llocos. In the early part of July, 1577, the first Franciscans came to Manila, and Diaz Pardo immediately made friends with them. The poor sons of Saint Francis impressed him so deeply that in 1579 he decided to accompany Fr. Pedro Alfaro to China as a lay helper. The plan to establish a new Franciscan mission in China failed, however, and both had to return to Manila.

Shortly after returning, Diaz Pardo asked to be received into the Franciscan Order as a lay brother. His petition was granted. After completing his novitiate and professing solemn vows, he was sent on a second trip to China, this time to serve in the monastery at Macao. But as a consequence of the unhappy political intrigues that were then setting Spaniard and Portuguese at sword's points, the monastery in Macao had to be abandoned. Brother John could do nothing better, under the circumstances, than try to make his way back to Manila. Providentially, a Portuguese merchant with whom he was on friendly terms offered him passage on his ship as far as Japan. With the assurance that he would find it relatively easy to reach Manila from Japan, Brother John accepted the offer. Thus it hapened that he remained in Japan for several months—until December 1582—before going back to the Philippines. His brief stay bore fruit almost immediately. As soon as the presence of a Franciscan friar became known among the Japanese Christians, many came to see him and to talk to him. His simple way of life delighted and impressed them so profoundly that they promptly fell in love with the Order of Saint Francis. When he left Japan, it was with the firm hope that he would be permitted to return.

In the August of 1854 Brother John, who had meanwhile safely reached Manila, was sent back to Japan together with a confrere Didacus Bernal. Once again the poor and humble appearance of two Friars Minor won the admiration of Christians and pagans alike. "The people all but adore them," wrote the Dominican Father Aduar. From all sides came the petitions for more Friars Minor to labor in this flourishing Japanese mission field. On September 11, 1584, Father Caspar Coelho, vice-provincial of the Jesuits in Japan, sent a request to the governor of the Philippines urging that more Franciscans be assigned to Japan, and in January 24, 1585, he sent the same petition to the bishop of Manila. The daimio Matsura Shigenbou of Hirado and Otomo Yoshishige of Bungo directed the same plea to the custodian of the Franciscans in Manila. There was one disapproving voice, however, in the general chorus of praise—the voice of Father Alexander Valignani, visitor of the Jesuit missions. In a letter dated 1585, he soundly scolded the Jesuit missionaries for having asked for Spanish Franciscans.

In the same year, 1585, a Christian Japanese merchant arrived in Manila. He fulfilled his religious duties at the Franciscan friary there and consequently came to a clearer understanding of the Franciscan way of life. When he returned to Japan he spoke with glowing admiration of the apostolic life of the Friars Minor and of the spiritual charm of their poor friary. His account so impressed his friends that they determined to have a Franciscan friary in Japan also. In 1585 eleven Christians from Bungo repeated the request for more Franciscan missionaries.

Preparations for sending the missionaries were already under way when news of the brief of Gregory XIII (January 28, 1585) reached Manila. The brief stated that missionary work in Japan was reserved to the Jesuits only and forbidden to all other religious Orders. To understand the proximate reason for this somewhat strange papal ordinance, the contemporary political situation in Spain and Portugal has to be kept in mind.

In the year 1580, with the death of the aged Cardinal K. Henry, the crown of Portugal passed, through a devious route, to Philip II of Spain. Philip pledged himself in the Cortes of Thomar (1581) to preserve the full political integrity and independence of Portugal. The rights and liberties of the Portuguese people were to be fully maintained, all office at home and in the colonies were to be held exclusively by Portuguese, and the Cortes was pledged to confer with the king on all Portuguese affairs. A special article of the Portuguese alliance with the Spanish crown restricted trade with Japan solely to

Portugal, and as a further effect of this article, Philip II, exercising his privilege as protector of the Church in the Portuguese Orient, gave his consent to the brief of Gregory XIII in which the evangelization of Japan was restricted to the Society of Jesus, since the missions of the Society had in fact been under Portuguese patronage from the beginning.

The first opposition to Portuguese monopolization of Japan came from Spanish merchants on the Philippine Islands, who felt their commercial interests in the Island Empire, which had as yet been hardly touched by European trade, were being unjustly restrained. The Dominicans and Franciscans in the Philippines also complained of injustice in being thus excluded from missionary work in Japan, particularly after 1587 when the Jesuits were expelled from Japan and the false rumor was spread in Manila that Christianity in Japan had been completely destroyed, that all but six Japanese Christians had denied their faith and that all this added up to prove the missionary methods of the Jesuits a total failure. The Dominicans and the Franciscans would have liked to take up the cause, but the papal brief forbade any legal action under penalty of excommunication.

At this time there lived in Osaka one Harada Kiemon. He had been converted to Christianity by the Jesuits and given the name Paul in baptism. Eager at first in the fulfillment of his religious obligations, he gradually went astray through dishonesty in business and unrestrained profiteering. Turning from the things of the spirit, he became thoroughly worldly, seeking the ultimate in luxurious living, and using his wealth to gain access to nobles and men of high position. But he was soon to experience the fickleness of fortune. An unlucky business venture left him suddenly impoverished, and with the loss of wealth went also the loss of prestige. Desperately he wandered about Japan, seeking a new foothold, but his efforts were in vain. Eventually, in some way or another, he landed in Manila where he found a situation that lent itself perfectly to what he had in mind. He knew that his best chance for regaining lost prestige lay in skillful political maneuvering. He knew also the pathological megalomania of Hideyoshi as well as his easy susceptibility; and he observed with intense satisfaction both the wealth of the Philippines and the weakness of the Spanish garrisons. On these two bases—the pride of Hideyoshi and the weakness of the Spanish colonials—Harada formed his plans.

Returning to Japan, Harada sought the acquaintance of a certain Hasegawa, a court official, to whom he explained his designs on the Philippines. Hasegawa related the plan to Hideyoshi, and immediately Harada was summoned for an audience. Harada, a gifted rhetorician,

described for his sovereign in thrilling terms the beauty and boundless wealth of the Philippines, and how easy it would be to wrest them from the Spaniards. Hideyoshi, who had just subdued the obstinate daimio and completed the unification of the country, agreed to the cunning plans of Harada. The conquest of the Philippines he thought, would not only serve to his personal aggrandizement but would also give his restless, war-loving vassals a genuine enemy to battle with and to gain for Japan her first distant conquest. In the full heat of enthusiasm he commissioned Harada to make the plan. "Go first to the Spanish governor of the Islands as ambassador," he commanded, "inform him of my intention, and bring back his answer. Depending on how things stand at your return, I will decide when to launch the conquest and colonization of the Islands." Hideyoshi then wrote to the governor of the Philippines, Don Cristobal Perez de las Marinas, an absurdly proud and insolent letter, commanding him to acknowledge the ruler of united Japan as his sovereign. This was the letter Harada was commissioned to deliver. It bore the date 1591.

Harada immediately set about preparing himself for the role of ambassador and making ready for the voyage. But to guarantee success, he felt it necessary to secure the influence of the Christian priests. He therefore presented himself to Father Organtino and asked him for a letter of recommendation to the Jesuits in Manila. Father Organtino, however, knew Harada for the crafty, unprincipled man he was, and he had also been warned against him from an outside source. Accordingly he refused the request and referred Harada instead to the visitor, Father Valignani, in Nagasaki. At the same time he sent word to Father Valignani through a courier, advising him to proceed with caution. Thus forewarned, Father Valignani also refused Harada's request for a letter of recommendation, and wrote at once to the provincial of the Jesuits in Manila, explaining the whole affair and entreating him to warn the governor.

Harada, who knew perfectly well that he could not hope for success in Manila without a recommendation—since this would be the first time Japan sought political contact with the Spanish crown—was definitely embarrassed. He could readily suspect that the Jesuits were completely distrustful of him, an apostate of malodorous reputation; yet he knew that his head was forfeit if his mission failed. It was clearly a dangerous game he had begun with Hideyoshi. But the sly intriguer soon found a shift. He would win the favor of the Franciscans. With this in view he wrote a letter, emphasizing his intimate friendship with the sovereign of Japan and promising to introduce the Franciscans into the Japanese

mission field where they would be able to do great work for the kingdom of God. But as a renegade Christian, he was afraid—reasonably enough—that the Franciscans would be as suspicious of him as the Jesuits obviously were. He therefore persuaded a relative of his, Caspar Harada Magoshichiro, to go to Manila in his place, deliver his letter to the Franciscans, and present Hideyoshi's diplomatic note to the governor of the Islands.

On May 29, 1592, Caspar Harada arrived in Manila. Neither he nor his relative's letter seems to have made a favorable impression on the Friars Minor, for there is no record of their having acted on it in any way. The arrogant letter of Hideyoshi to the governor, however, caused Spanish blood to boil. It began with a boast and a threat: "I, at whose birth of my mother dreamed that she stood in the center of a large wheel of fire, have united all of Japan under my power, and I am now preparing for the conquest of China. As yet there is no reason for me to send warships to the Philippine Islands; for the present it suffices that I make my will known to you through my ambassador. It will be wise for you to submit at once." The letter went on at considerable length, abounding in presumption and proclaiming the inaccessible majesty of the writer, and finally closed with another ominous threat: "If you should delay to pay homage to me and prostrate yourself before me, then I shall certainly command that you be destroyed. Take care, lest repentance come too late. I have nothing further to impart to you."

The governor, taken off guard by the crude challenge, was about to tear Hideyoshi's letter to shreds before the eyes of his tiny ambassador; but recovering self-control, he considered the immense power of Hideyoshi and the present weakness of the Spanish garrisons on the islands and decided against any antagonistic action. A false move on his part could bring disaster upon the Philippines, the most distant and most vulnerable possession of the Spanish Crown. Compromise, however distasteful, seemed the safest way out of the situation. Accordingly he proposed to offer Japan terms of friendly relations. He hoped by prolonged negotiations with Hideyoshi to gain time to prepare for eventual attack. He convoked the Council of the Islands and explained his point of view. The Council agreed that it would be better to try for friendly relations with Japan than to provoke hostilities. Following this line the governor wrote a letter to Hideyoshi in which he courteously but firmly declined to yield to the demands of the Japanese sovereign, and in terms that could suggest no sign of fear or weakness offered him friendship. The delivery of this letter he entrusted to the Dominican friar-priest, John Cobo. He also sent rich gifts to Hideyoshi



including twelve swords, twelve daggers, a watch, and goblets cut glass.

Father John Cobo was born in Spain. After his entrance into Dominican Order, he was first assigned to Avila as a teacher. From there he was sent to New Spain (Mexico), where he was engaged in teaching and preaching. Fearlessly and irrespective of persons, he castigated in his sermons the immorality of the royal officials, especially their shameless exploitation of the Indians, whom he loved and seen with paternal tenderness. Eventually he aroused the wrath of the great to such a pitch that he was forced to leave New Spain. He was sent to the Philippines where again he took up missionary work among the native inhabitants. Here, too, he became an apostle of the poor in the truest sense of the word. He built hospitals, for them, served them as priest, teacher, and physician, and soon won the esteem of the natives and colonials alike. When he heard that Japan was threatening to bring the horrors of conquest upon his beloved people, he gladly consented to serve as ambassador to Japan. He was indeed aware of the difficulties and responsibilities involved, but he had never been one to tremble before the princes of this world, especially when there was question of justice and morality. He had no fear of standing before Hideyoshi, representative of the just cause of Spain.

The ship that was to carry Father Cobo to Japan was under the command of Captain Llano, a skillful and courageous seaman. Shortly before sailing time, an unknown man approached Father Cobo and warned him not to undertake the voyage without another priest for companion, since the ocean was especially stormy and treacherous at that time of the year. In case of shipwreck, there would be no one to absolve him from his sins. Smiling gently, Father Cobo replied: "I shall surely be as careful at sea as I am on land not to fall into sin, so I shall need no one to absolve me. Moreover, I firmly hope for God's grace to support my will to avoid sin." This was the last reported conversation of Father John Cobo in Manila. His beloved city would never see him again.

In October, 1592, after a calm and uneventful voyage, the ship landed in Satsuma. When Harada Kiemon heard of it he hastened there at once and resumed his role of ambassador. He led Father Cobo to Nagoya in the province of Hizen, where Hideyoshi, who had meanwhile assumed the title of Taiko, had established headquarters for the Korean campaign. He lived there himself in order to give personal attention to the preparations for war. Thousands of soldiers, numerous daimio dignitaries of the country were assembled in the city, and the streets were teemed with the color and wealth of the orient. In the midst of

brilliant and powerful military pomp walked the humble Father Cobo, clad in his austere Dominican garb. At once he obtained an audience with Hideyoshi, presented to him the governor's letter, and added a few pertinent explanations. As modesty and virtue never fail to impress even the most barbaric mind, Hideyoshi—who was by no means uncultured—responded to the friar with an air of sincere friendliness, thanked him for risking the dangerous voyage and lauded his attempt to establish mutual good will between Japan and the colonies of Spain. But in spite of this, Hideyoshi seems to have regarded the embassy as a token of submission, for he added: "If you Spaniards pay tribute regularly and punctually and send me the produce of your country, I shall gladly maintain peaceful relations with you. But should you forget your obligation, I shall send a million soldiers upon you, to pillage your land and punish you."

Father Cobo was immediately aware that Hideyoshi had missed the point of the governor's letter and was viewing his presence at court as an official token of submission. Obviously, he could not permit so basic an error to pass uncorrected. Once more he explained, clearly and frankly, the reason for his coming to Japan, pointing out the ways and means for establishing a friendly policy between the two countries. Hideyoshi marvelled at the courage and direct frankness of the priest, and finally declared himself willing to negotiate with the governor of the Philippines on a basis of friendship. He then gave to the friar a silk garment and other rich gifts, and asked him to deliver his reply to the governor. Harada Kiemon also came in for his share of praise on this occasion. In addition to this, he received his commission to go once more as ambassador to Manila. The Spanish vessel was given a Japanese convoy, and it was on this ship that Harada sailed. In November 1592 the two ships put to sea from Kagoshima. Near Formosa a typhoon struck them, and the Spanish vessel was dashed to pieces on the coast of Formosa. Though Father Cobo and most of the ship's crew managed to reach land, they were attacked and slain by the headhunters of Formosa. Hideyoshi's letter to the governor of the Philippine Islands perished with Father Cobo.

In April 1593, Harada Keimon finally reached Manila. Since he had no papers to identify him as ambassador of the Japanese sovereign, the Spaniards were highly suspicious of him and considered him a spy rather than a representative of Hideyoshi. His arrival, moreover, caused something close to panic among the people of Manila—since the approach of the Japanese fleet was a daily fear—and they began to erect strong fortifications around the city. After some delay, Harada was received in audience by the governor. "I come as ambassador

from Japan to the Philippine Islands," Harada announced. "I depart from Japan with Father Cobo, but his ship was wrecked on the coast of Formosa. Although Father Cobo was the official bearer of the letter of the taikosama, I know the contents of the letter and also the mind of our sovereign. He demands from the Spaniards payment of annual tribute. Besides this message, I am commissioned to deliver a letter to you." Harada drew out a letter from the folds of his gown and handed it ceremoniously to the governor.

The governor read the letter with mixed feelings. Through a desire of Hideyoshi, the letter explained, the missionary work of the Jesuit Fathers had been brought to a stop. But if other priests would consent, especially the Friars Minor, certainly they would be allowed to work for the Church in Japan. This plea for more missionaries was signed by the Christians of Yamaguchi, Amakusa, Hirado, Shimonoseki, and other cities. Certainly this was good news, and it seemed to speak for future relations between Japan and the Christian world, but the governor was too angry over Harada's distorted version of Hideyoshi's letter to be mollified by a call for missionaries. "Tell your taikosama," he shouted at Harada, "that our tribute to Japan will consist not in the produce of our islands, nor in gold or silver, but in cannon—cannon which will hardly be relished by your tribute-hungry ruler. Make this clear to him at your return."

With that Harada was dismissed. Frightened and disheartened, he returned to his lodgings. Realizing that he dared not appear before Hideyoshi with such a reply from the governor, he decided to remain in Manila in the hope that a more favorable opportunity for negotiations might arise.

Fifteen days after the stormy interview with Harada, the governor received news that the rebellious Dutch had suddenly attacked the Moluccas, a group of islands south of the Philippines. A penal expedition had to be sent out at once. Obviously, it would not be prudent under the circumstances for the governor to make an enemy of the Japanese sovereign. The best way out of this embarrassing situation, he concluded, would be to send a second ambassador to Hideyoshi and to permit direct communication with the Spanish crown regarding peaceful trade relations not only with the Philippines but with all the eastern colonies of Spain. Such a commercial pact, reasoned the governor, would be of enormous profit not only to Japan but to Spain as well. But to whom should he entrust the commission? The best man seemed to him, was Father Peter Baptist, guardian of the Franciscan monastery of Saint Gregory in Manila. Father Peter Baptist had been in the Philippines six years previously and was esteemed as a learned

and saintly friar. He possessed all the qualifications needed for the delicate task of meeting Hideyoshi in the name of Spain, but when the governor approached him, he flatly refused the commission. The governor could not afford to take no for an answer. He needed the best man possible to handle this highly dangerous and delicate mission, and there was no better man than Father Peter Baptist. Determined to force the matter through, he convoked the Council of the Islands and explained his proposed strategy. The Council unanimously approved, and a government order was sent to Father Peter Baptist commanding him to accept the commission. As a Spanish subject he could no longer refuse the appointment, but as a last ditch stand he advanced weighty objections as a religious. In an official communication to the governor, he wrote in frank humility that he regarded himself as totally unfit for any kind of diplomatic mission. Then he brought out the technical reason for still feeling obliged to refuse the appointment. "According to the Brief of the Holy Father, Gregory XIII," he wrote, "the preaching of the Gospel and the performance of all ecclesiastical functions in Japan has been reserved exclusively to the Fathers of the Society of Jesus and forbidden under censure to all persons of all other orders, states, and dignities. We are obliged to render obedience to the regulations of the Holy See."

The governor replied to this letter by convoking all the lawyers and theologians in Manila, representing the religious orders and the secular clergy, to a meeting which took place in April 28, 1593.

Since the bishop of Manila had just died, the vicar of the diocese, Christobal Salvadiera, presided. First the letter of Father Peter Baptist was submitted for discussion, followed by the Brief of Gregory XIII and the petition of the Japanese Christians. After prolonged deliberations, the Council reached a decision: there was no binding ecclesiastical law against sending Franciscans to Japan, since the Brief of Gregory XIII had already been superseded by the Brief "Dum ad uberes" of Sixtus V, dated November 15, 1586. By this brief the Franciscan jurisdiction in the Philippines was raised to the status of province, and the Franciscans were granted authority to work "in all countries and places of India and the empires called China, in which they can labor for the conversion of pagans." Now in Europe, at that time, it was customary to refer to all countries east of India as the "Chinese empires;" hence Japan could be included and there would be nothing against Franciscans there as missionaries. Father Peter Baptist accepted the opinion of the theologians and jurists as final, and without objection he agreed to serve as ambassador to Japan.

He no sooner gave his consent than the Provincial of the Jesuits,

Father Antonio Sedeno, rose and embraced him, saying: "My Father, the thought that in the future other religious will also be to labor in Japan, and that the honor of achieving this settlement belongs to the sons of Saint Francis, gives me the greatest pleasure. If you are able to remain in the empire, I am certain that you will not refuse fraternal love to the members of the Society of Jesus who will be your fellow-laborers there."

By way of parenthesis, this courageous decision of the theologians and lawyers of Manila was acknowledged in the Bull of Canonization issued by Pius IX in 1862 as having been juridically correct.

Aware of the importance of his commission, Father Peter Baptist gave thorough consideration to selecting the most suitable among the confreres as companions. He finally chose the priest Bartholomeo Ruiz, and the brothers Gonzales Garcia and Francis of Saint Martin. The credentials given him by the governor read as follows: "Don Juan Perez, Governor of the Philippine Islands, imparts by these presents to the Franciscan Father Peter Baptist the following instructions. The priest travels as ambassador to the Emperor of Japan. After his arrival in that country he shall find suitable men to come to the Philippine Islands with trading vessels, land here, and engage in commerce under our protection. The said priest shall have the authority to sign contracts with the Emperor of Japan. Moreover, to establish friendly political relations, Harada Keimon shall come again to the Philippine Islands and exchange proposals between the Islands and Japan, and be granted the right of negotiation. On condition that the above be dependent upon the consent of the Spanish Crown, the said rights are granted. Manila, May 20, 1593."

The letter was read publicly in the convent of the Franciscans before the friars' departure. With especially deep affection Father Peter Baptist took leave of Brother Juan Pobre, the first Franciscan to reach Japan and the one who had worked so successfully through his saintly example.

On May 26, 1593, two ships set sail from the port of Manila. The first ship were Father Peter Baptist and Father Bartholomeo Ruiz together with layman Peter Gonzales de Carvahais, who was commissioned to act as vicarious ambassador and bring back to Manila the reply of Hideyoshi, since the Franciscans were to remain as missionaries in Japan. The second vessel bore Brother Gonzales Garcia as interpreter for the embassy, and Brother Francis of Saint Martin and Harada Keimon.

(To be continued)

Trans. by Sr. M. Hildemar, S.M.I.C. and  
Sr. M. Frances, S.M.I.C.

## Franciscan Briefs

### Franciscan Sanctity

April 12, 1959 was a history-making day for the Franciscan Family. Another son of St. Francis, St. Charles of Sezze, was officially declared by the Pope to be in heaven. He was canonized with St. Joaquin of Vedruma de Mas, who, it is said, is a member of the Third Order of St. Francis. The canonization of a child of the Church is proclaimed through one of the most splendid and magnificent ceremonies of the Church. Now is a good time to review the processes that precede a formal declaration of Sainthood. It may also be timely to take an inventory of all the sons and daughters of St. Francis who have been honored with the title of *Blessed* or *Saint*, and of those whose causes have been introduced.

### Process of Canonization

First let us very briefly consider the process of canonization. Any Catholic may ask the bishop to begin the proceedings to have a person canonized. The bishop seeks a postulator (a priest in Rome) whose duties it is to make the formal request to the competent ecclesiastical court for the introduction of the cause, to eagerly promote the cause, to seek financial support, etc.

During the preparatory process at the competent judicial court (usually the diocesan court where the person lived or died), three things are examined: 1) all the writings of the holy person whose cause is being tried; 2) testimony of his reputation of sanctity, his virtues, the miracles said to have been obtained through him, or if he is martyr, the fact of his martyrdom; 3) testimony that no public scandal was given to the Servant of God without permission of the Holy See.

When finished, all of these acts are forwarded to Rome—to the Sacred Congregation of Rites. The above three processes are studied and if their decision is favorable, the Holy Father approves of the opening of the Apostolic Process. It is "Apostolic" because it is held by the authority of the Holy See and governed by its instructions.

Two processes are again held in the diocesan court. The first process concerns the reputation of holiness of life, miracles, or martyrdom (if the person is a martyr). The second process is to show that the servant of God exercised each of the theological and moral virtues in a heroic degree. If he is a martyr, only the fact and cause of his martyrdom need be proven. During the process the body usually

is exhumed and examined. Two miracles must be proven to be authentic.

These acts are forwarded to the Sacred Congregation of Rites. They examine and study if their instructions have been carried out. If so, the testimony submitted for evidence of heroic virtue of the Servant of God or his martyrdom is scrutinized. These are submitted to three different committees for examination. At the last meeting the Holy Father presides, and if all is favorable, he may confer the title of *Venerable* upon the Servant of God.

Then the miracles are submitted to the scrutiny of three meetings of the Sacred Congregation. If all is favorable a fourth meeting is held in the presence of the Pope. Here it shall be decided if it is to proceed to the beatification of the Venerable. If the answer is affirmative, the Venerable will be given the title of *Blessed*.

The direct procedure for canonization may then be initiated. The production of an authentic document of beatification must be submitted; secondly, processes to prove two or three miracles after his beatification are instigated. Just as in previous procedure the process begins in the diocesan court and then is discussed in the sessions of the Congregation of Rites in Rome. If all has gone well a "De Tuto" session is held, after which the Pope, if he thinks it advisable, sets the date for the official canonization of the Blessed.

The preceding is modified for persons to whom, before 1634, honor was paid with toleration of the Holy See. If the process is completed, the Servant of God is equivalently beatified or equivalently canonized.

#### *Saints, Blessed's and Causes*

Now let us take inventory of the numerous sons and daughters of St. Francis who have been officially given the title of *Blessed* or *Venerable* and those whose causes for beatification and eventually canonization have been introduced in Rome. Here we do not list the names of more than 5600 holy persons—"Blesseds", Venerables and Servants of God—who are mentioned through the centuries by the *Historical* and *Martyrologies* of the Order. We are noting only those whose causes have been introduced.

#### *Bibliography*

*A Bibliographical Dictionary of the Saints* (BDS), by Holweck (Herder, St. Louis, 1924).

*Catalogus Causarum Beatificationis et Canonizationis atque Elenchus Sancto-  
rum Beatorum Ordinis Minorum* (Quarachi, 1957).

This is the main reference for most of the I, II, III Order members and is referred to simply as: *n*.

*Franciscan Herald* (FH) or *Franciscan Herald and Forum* (FHF) (Chicago).  
*Glories of the Franciscan Order* (GFO), by F. Steck, ofm. (Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1945).

*Il Beato Francesco Antonio Fasani dei Frati Minori Conventuali* (15 Aprile 1951); main reference for the Friars Minor Conventual.

*Index ac Status Causarum Beatificationis Servorum Dei et Canonizationis Beatorum* (Sacra Rituum Congregatio, Kalendis anuarii, 1953).  
(Index). It was brought up to date through the *Acta Apostolica Sedis*.

*The Poverello's Round Table* (PRT), by A. Barth (Joliet, 1939).  
*The Saints and the Blessed's of the Third Order of St. Francis* (SBT), by Biersack (New Jersey: St. Anthony Guild, 1943).

*These Made Peace* (TMP), by Hallack & Anson (Paterson: St. Anthony Guild, 1957).

*Round Table of Franciscan Research*. Vol. 23, no. 3, 1958, pp. 101-105.

This article by Father Jude Hahn, ofm. cap. is the main source for the Capuchins. (RTFR).

#### *13th Century*

#### SAINTS

##### *I Order*

1. *S. Berard* (-1220), priest, martyred in Morocco; Can: Sixtus IV, Aug. 7, 1481; feast: Jan. 16. (n:7).
2. *S. Peter* (-1220), priest, martyred in Morocco; Can: Sixtus IV, Aug. 7, 1481; feast: Jan. 16. (n:7).
3. *S. Otto* (-1220), priest, martyred in Morocco; Can: Sixtus IV, Aug. 7, 1481; feast: Jan. 16. (n:8).
4. *S. Accursius* (-1220), brother, martyred in Morocco; Can: Sixtus IV, Aug. 7, 1481; feast: Jan. 16. (n:9).
5. *S. Adjute* (-1220), brother, martyred in Morocco; Can: Sixtus IV, Aug. 7, 1481; feast: Jan. 16. (n:10).
6. *S. Francis of Assisi* (1181/2-1226), deacon, Founder of the I, II and III Orders of St. Francis, Confessor; Can: Gregory IX, July 16, 1228; feast: Oct. 4. (n:1).
7. *S. Daniel* (-1227), priest, martyred at Ceuta; Can: Leo X, Jan. 22, 1516; feast: Oct. 10. (n:12).
8. *S. Samuel* (-1227), priest, martyred at Ceuta; Can: Leo X, Jan. 22, 1516; feast: Oct. 10. (n:13).
9. *S. Angelus* (-1227), priest, martyred at Ceuta; Can: Leo X, Jan. 22, 1516; feast: Oct. 10. (n:14).
10. *S. Leo* (-1227), priest, martyred at Ceuta; Can: Leo X, Jan. 1516; feast: Oct. 10. (n:15).
11. *S. Nicholas* (-1227), priest, martyred at Ceuta; Can: Leo X, Jan. 22, 1516; feast: Oct. 10. (n:16).
12. *S. Hugolin* (-1227), priest, martyred at Ceuta; Can: Leo X, Jan. 22, 1516; feast: Oct. 10. (n:17).
13. *S. Domnus* (-1227), priest, martyred at Ceuta; Can: Leo X, Jan. 22,

1516; feast: Oct. 10. (n:18).

14. *S. Anthony of Padua* (1195-1231), priest, Doctor, confessor; Gregory IX, May 30, 1232; feast: June 13. (n:2).
15. *St. Bonaventure* (1221-1274), bishop, cardinal, Doctor, confessor; Can: Sixtus IV, April 14, 1482; feast: July 14. (n:11).
16. *S. Benvenute of Osimo* (1188-1282), bishop, confessor; Martin IV, 1284 (cult approved); feast: March 22. (n:3).
17. *S. Louis of Toulouse* (1274-1297), bishop, confessor; Can: XXII, April 7, 1317; feast: Aug. 19. (n:4).

#### II Order

1. *S. Clare of Assisi* (1194-1253), virgin, foundress with S. Francis the II Order of St. Francis; Can: Aug. 15, 1255 by Alexander IV; feast: Aug. 12. (n:1).
2. *Agnes of Assisi* (1198-1253), virgin, sister of S. Clare; Can: Benedict XIV, Nov. 6, 1751 (Office & Mass conceded); feast: 16. (n:3).

#### III Order

1. *S. Dominic* (1221), priest, founder of the Order of Preachers—"cord-bearer" of St. Francis—Francis upon request granted record to St. Dominic; Can: Gregory IX; feast: Aug. 4. (n:150).
2. *S. Elizabeth of Hungary* (1207-1231), widow; Can: Gregory IX, May 27, 1235; feast: Nov. 19. (n:1).
3. *S. Ferdinand, the King of Castile*, (1199-1252), confessor; Alexander VII, May 31, 1655; feast: May 30. (n:11).
4. *S. Rose of Viterbo* (1234c-1252), Virgin, Can: Callistus III, feast: Sept. 4. (n:6).
5. *S. Louis IX, the King of France*, (1215-1270), confessor; Boniface VII, Aug. 21, 1297; feast: Aug. 25. (n:2).
6. *S. Zita of Lucca* (1218-1278), virgin, said to be a II Order member; cult approved: Innocent XII, 1696; feast in Lucca: August 17 (TMP: 43; SBT: 176).
7. *S. Margaret of Cortona* (1247-1297), penitent; Can: Benedict XIV, May 16, 1728; feast: Feb. 22. (n:12).

#### BLESSEDS

##### I Order

1. *B. John of Perguia* (-1231), martyred at Valencia, priest; Clement XI, Jan. 31, 1705; feast: Sept. 1. (n:8).
2. *B. Peter of Sassoferrato* (-1231), martyred at Valencia, brother; Beat: Clement XI, Jan. 31, 1705; feast: Sept. 1. (n:9).
3. *B. Bentivolius of Bonis* (-1232), priest, confessor; Beat: Pius VI, Sept. 30, 1852; feast: Dec. 1. (n:48).

4. *B. Benevenute of Gubbio* (1232c), brother, confessor; Beat: Innocent XII, 1697 (Office & Mass conceded); feast: June 27. (n:1).
5. *B. Peregrin of Falerone* (1233c), brother, confessor, disciple of St. Francis; Beat: Pius XII, July 31, 1821; feast: Sept. 6. (n:41).
6. *B. Angellus of Pisa* (1194-1236), priest, confessor; Beat: Leo XIII, Sept. 4, 1892; feast: March 11. (n:82).
7. *B. Rizzerius of Muscia* (-1236), priest, confessor, disciple of St. Francis; Beat: Gregory XVI, Dec. 14, 1838; feast: Feb. 7. (n:45).
8. *Roger of Todi* (-1237), priest, confessor, disciple of St. Francis; Beat: Benedict XIV, April 24, 1751 (Office & Mass conceded); feast: Jan. 14. (n:2).
9. *B. Stephan of Narbonne* (-1242), priest, martyred in France by the Albigenses; Beat: Pius IX, Sept. 6, 1866; feast: May 29. (n:51).
10. *Raymond of Carbona* (-1242), priest, martyred in France by the Albigenses; Beat: Pius IX, Sept. 6, 1866; feast: May 29. (n:50).
11. *B. Guy of Cortona* (1190c-1250), priest, confessor, disciple of St. Francis; Beat: Gregory XIII, 1583 (Office & Mass conceded); feast: June 27. (n:3).
12. *B. Andrew Caccioli of Spello* (1194-1250), priest, confessor, disciple of S. Francis; Beat: Clement XII, July 25, 1738; feast: June 9. (n:153).
13. *B. Liberatus of Lauro* (1214c-1258), priest, confessor; Beat: Pius IX, Sept. 26, 1868 (Office & Mass conceded); feast: Sept. 6. (n:70).
14. *B. Gandolph of Binasco* (-1260), priest, confessor; Beat: Leo XIII, March 10 1881; feast: April 3. (n:75).
15. *B. Giles of Assisi* (1262), cleric, companion of S. Francis; Beat: Pius VI, July 4, 1777; feast: April 23. (n:27).
16. *B. John of Penna* (-1271), priest, confessor; Beat: Pius VII, Nov. 20, 1806 (Office & Mass conceded); feast: April 3. (n:39).
17. *B. Christopher of Romagnola* (1772c-1272), priest, confessor, companion of S. Francis; Beat: Pius X, April 12, 1905; feast: Oct. 25. (n:88).
18. *B. Luke Belludi* (1220c-1285), priest, confessor, companion of St. Anthony of Padua; Beat: Pius XI, May 18, 1927; feast: Feb. 17. (n:101).
19. *B. Conrad of Ascoli* (1234-1289), priest, confessor; Beat: Pius VI, Aug. 30, 1783; feast: April 19. (n:28).
20. *B. John Buralli of Parma* (1208-1289), priest, confessor, Minister General; Beat: Pius VI, March 1777; feast: March 20. (n:26).

21. *B. Benevenute Mareri* (-1289), brother, confessor; Beat: Pius IX, Sept. 17, 1796; feast: May 23. (n:57).

#### II Order

1. *B. Philippa Mareri* (1190c-1236), virgin; Beat: Pius VII, Apr. 1806; (Office & Mass conceded); feast: Feb. 16. (n:9).
2. *B. Helen Enselmini of Padua* (1208c-1242), virgin; Beat: Innocent XII, Oct. 29, 1695; feast: Nov. 7. (n:4).
3. *B. Salome of Cracow* (1201-1268), virgin; Beat: Clement X, Apr. 17, 1673; feast: Nov. 17. (n:2).
4. *B. Isabel of France* (1225-1270), virgin; Beat: Leo X, Jan. 11, 1517; (Office & Mass conceded); feast: June 8. (n:1).
5. *B. Margaret of Colonna* (-1280), virgin, Beat: Pius IX, Sep. 1847; feast: Nov. 7. (n:15).
6. *B. Agnes of Prague* (1205-1282), virgin; Beat: Pius IX, Dec. 1874; feast: June 8. (n:18).
7. *B. Kinga (Cunegunda) Princess* (1224c-1292), virgin; Beat: Alexander VIII, June 11, 1690; feast: July 24. (n:3).
8. *B. Jolenta Princess* (1235-1298), widow; Beat: Leo XIII, Sep. 1827; feast: June 15. (n:11).

#### III Order

1. *B. Veridiana of Castelfiorentino* (1178-1242c), virgin; Beat: Clement VII, Sept. 20, 1533 (Office & Mass conceded) feast: Feb. 17. (n:2).
2. *B. Gerard Mecatti of Villamagna* (1174c-1245), confessor; Beat: Gregory XVI, March 18, 1833; feast: May 23. (n:16).
3. *B. Humiliana of Cerchi* (1219-1246), widow; Beat: Innocent VIII, July 24, 1694; feast: June 15. (n:8).
4. *B. Luchsius of Poggibonsi* (Lucius) (1181-1260), confessor, first III Order member; Beat: Innocent XII, 1794; feast: Apr. 17. (n:6).
5. *B. Judith of Germany* (Jutta) (-1264), said to be III Order member; virgin; feast: May 5. (TMP: 238; SBT: 181; PRT: 100; GFO: 100).
6. *B. Gregory X* (1210-1276), confessor, Pope, said to be III Order member; Beat: Clement XI, 1713; feast: Jan. 19 in 1713. (TMP: 238).
7. *B. Novelon of Faenza* (Napoleon) (-1280), confessor; Beat: Pius VII, June 4, 1817; feast: Aug. 13. (n:14).
8. *B. Torello of Poppi* (1202-1282), hermit, penitent; Beat: Benedict XIV (cult approved); feast: March 16 by III Order Regular (TMP: 29f).
9. *B. Peter Tecelano of Siena* (-1289), confessor; Beat: Pius

- Jan. 2, 1802 (Office & Mass conceded); feast: Dec. 11. (n:13).
10. *B. Gerard of Lunel* (1275-1299), hermit, confessor; Beat: Benedict XIV, 1743; feast: July 2 by III Order Regular (TMP: 125; SBT: 66; BDS: 426).

#### CAUSES FOR BEATIFICATION

##### I Order

1. *B. Albert of Pisa* (-1240), brother, confessor, Minister General; (Cult confirmed). (n:16).

##### II Order

1. *B. Agnes of Bohemia* (-1281), (Cult confirmed), (n:104).

##### III Order

1. *B. Davanzato* (1200-1295), priest, (Cult confirmed), (n:148).  
Franciscan Martyrologies and Histories mention 674 sons and daughters of St. Francis who were noted for their sanctity and who lived in the XIII century.

#### 14th Century

#### SAINTS

##### III Order

8. *S. Ivo of Brittany* (Yvo) (1253-1303), confessor, lawyer; Can: Clement VI, May 19 (June 16?), 1347; feast: June 17. (n3).
9. *S. Clare of Montefalco* (1286c-1308), virgin, first III Order member, then an Augustinian nun; Can: Leo XIII, Dec. 8, 1881; feast: Aug. 18. (TMP: 109f).
10. *S. Elzear of Sabran* (1285-1323), confessor; can: Urban V, April 15, 1369; feast: Sept. 27. (n:4).
11. *S. Roch of Montpellier* (1295-1327), confessor; Can: Urban VIII, July 4, 1627; feast: Aug. 17. (n:10).
12. *S. Elizabeth, Queen of Portugal* (1271-1336), widow; Can: Urban VIII, May 25, 1626; feast: July 8. (n:8).
13. *S. Conrad of Piacenza* (1290-1351), confessor, hermit; Can: Urban VIII, Sept. 12, 1625; feast: Feb. 19. (n:9).
14. *S. John Columbini*, (1300-1367), confessor, founder of the Jesuates; feast: July 21. (FO: 102; TMP: 239).
15. *S. Bridget, Queen of Sweden* (1302-1373), widow; foundress of the Brigittines; Can: Boniface IX, Oct. 7, 1391; feast: Oct. 8. (n:5).

#### BLESSEDS

##### I Order

2. *B. Andrew Segni* (1240-1302), priest, confessor; Beat: Innocent XIII, Feb. 15, 1724; feast: Feb. 17. (n:10).

23. *B. Peter of Treja* (-1304), priest, confessor; Beat: Pius VI, S 11, 1893; feast: Feb. 17. (n:35).
24. *B. Rayner of Arezzo* (-1304), brother, confessor; Beat: Pius Dec. 18, 1802; feast: Nov. 12. (n:38).
25. *B. Conrad of Offida* (1241-1306), priest, confessor; Beat: Pius April 21, 1817 (Office & Mass conceded); feast: Dec. 14. (n:39).
26. *B. Thomas of Tolentino* (1261-1321), priest, martyred in I Beat: Leo XIII, July 23, 1894; feast: Sept. 5. (n:84).
27. *B. Francis Venimbene of Fabrino* (1251c-1322), priest, confessor; Beat: Pius VI, April 1, 1775; feast: April 22. (n:25).
28. *B. John of La Verna* (1249-1322), priest, confessor; Beat: Leo June 24, 1880; feast: Aug. 13. (n:73).
29. *B. Bartholomew Pucci* (-1330), priest, confessor; Beat: Leo June 24, 1880; feast: May 23. (n:72).
30. *B. Odoric Mattiuzzi of Portu Naone* (1285-1331), priest, confessor; Beat: Benedict XIV, July 2, 1755; feast: Jan. 14. (n:20).
31. *B. Gentilis Finiguerra of Matelica* (-1340), priest, martyred by Mohammedans in Persia; Beat: Pius VI, Feb. 23, 1795; (Office & Mass conceded); feast: Sept. 5. (n:363).
32. *B. Gerard Cagnoli* (1270c-1345), brother, confessor; Beat: Pius May 13, 1908; feast: Dec. 1. (n:90).
33. *B. Julian Cesarello of Valle* (-1349c), priest, confessor; Beat: Pius X, Feb. 23, 1910; feast: May 14. (n:91).
34. *B. Nicholas Tavelich* (1348-1391), priest, martyred in the Land by the Mohammedans; Beat: Leo XIII, July 6, 1881; feast: Dec. 5. (n:80).
35. *B. Sanctos Brancosini a Monte Fabrorum* (1343-1392c), brother, confessor; Beat: Clement XIV, Aug. 18, 1770; feast: Sept. 1. (n:23).
36. *B. John of Cetina* (1397), priest, martyred at Granada by Mohammedans; Beat: Clement XII, Aug. 29, 1731; feast: Aug. 24. (n:12).
37. *B. Peter of Duenas* (1380c-1397), brother, martyred at Granada by the Mohammedans; Beat: Clement XII, Aug. 29, 1731; feast: May 24. (n:13).

#### II Order

9. *B. Mattha of Nazzarei* (1225c-1320), virgin; Beat: Clement X, July 27, 1765; feast: Nov. 7. (n:6).
10. *B. Clare Agolanti of Rimini* (1260c-1326), widow; Beat: Pius Dec. 22, 1784; feast: Feb. 10. (n:8).
11. *B. Petronilla of Troy* (-1355), virgin; Beat: Pius IX, 1854 (O

& Mass conceded); feast: July 24. (n:16).

#### III Order

11. *B. Bartholus of S. Geminiano* (1227-1300), priest, confessor; Beat: Pius X, April 27, 1910; Feast: Dec. 14. (n:53).
12. *B. John Pelingotto* (1240-1304), confessor; Beat: Benedict XV, Nov. 13, 1918; feast: June 2. (n:54).
13. *B. James of Citta della Pieve* (1304), priest; Beat: Pius VII; Feast: April 1 by III Order Regular. (TMP: 12; GFO: 101; PRAT: 51).
14. *B. Amatus Ronconi of Saldezzo* (1238-1304), hermit, confessor; Beat: Pius VI (cult approved) feast: May 15 at Rimini. (TMP: 42; SBT: 3).
15. *B. Jane of Signa* (1226-1307), virgin; Beat: Pius VI, Sept. 7, 1798; (Office and Mass conceded) feast: Nov. 17. (n:12).
16. *B. Angela of Foligno in Umbria* (1248-1309), widow; Beat: Clement XI, May 7, 1701; (Office & Mass conceded) feast: Feb. 28. (n:9).
17. *B. Gregory Celli of Verucchio* (1225-1313), confessor, hermit, maybe a III Order Member; Beat: Innocent VI (1358) & Clement XIV (1769); feast at Rimini on Oct. 23. (TMP: 238; SBT: 181; BDS: 452).
18. *B. Raymond Lull* (1235-1316), Martyred by the Mussulman in Africa, but died in Majorca; Beat: Leo X & Clement XIII, Feb. 19, 1763 (Office & Mass conceded); feast: Sept. 5. (n:1).
19. *B. Vivaldo (Waldo) of S. Geminio* (1250c-1320), confessor, hermit; Beat: Pius X, Feb. 13, 1908; feast: May 21. (n:52).
20. *B. John Cini of Pisa* (1270c-1340), hermit; Beat: Pius IX, Sept. 10, 1857; feast: Nov. 12. (n:19).
21. *B. Francis (Cico) Zanferdini* (1270-1350), confessor; Beat: Pius IX, March 31, 1859; feast: Oct. 1. (n:20).
22. *B. Michelina of Pesaro* (1300-1356), widow; Beat: Clement XII, April 24, 1737; feast: Sept. 9. (n:10).
23. *B. Delphina of Glandeves* (1284c-1358), virgin, wife of S. Elezear (d. 1323) Beat: Innocent XII, July 24, 1694; (Office & Mass conceded); feast: Sept. 26. (n:7).
24. *B. Charles of Blois* (1320c-1364), confessor; Beat: Pius X, Dec. 14, 1904; feast: Oct. 3 in some places. (n:51).
25. *B. Julia of Certaldo* (1367), virgin, later an Augustinian nun; Beat: Pius VII, 1821; feast: Feb. 15 by the Augustinians. (TMP: 238; SBT: 181; BDS: 568).
26. *B. Hugolin Magalotti of Camerino* (-1373), hermit, confessor; Beat: Pius IX, Dec. 4, 1856; feast: Dec. 11. (n:18).

27. *B. Anthony of Hungary* (1399) said to be a III Order member  
Feast: Sept. 19 (SBT: 181; TMP: 238; GFO: 101; BDS: 9)

### CAUSES FOR BEATIFICATION

#### I Order

2. *B. John Duns Scotus* (1266-1308), priest, confessor; Doctor of the Church; Doctor Subtilis; (Cult confirmed); (n:62).
3. *B. Jacoponi di Todi* (-1310), brother, confessor, poet; (Cult confirmed). (n:56).
4. *B. Anthony of Tigrini* (1313), brother, confessor; (Cult confirmed). (n:16).
5. *B. John of Montecorvino* (1247-1328), confessor, Archbishop of Peking, China. (n:59).
6. *B. John Discalceatus* (1280-1349c) priest, confessor; (Cult confirmed). (n:61).

#### II Order

2. *B. Clara* (-1319), virgin, (cult confirmed). (n:104).
3. *B. Agnes* (-1352), virgin; (cult confirmed). (n:103).

There are 350 sons and daughters of St. Francis noted for their sanctity during the XIV Century and mentioned by the Franciscan Martyrologies and Histories.

(To be continued)

†

### RESURGAM

A tree was hewn His Cross to make:  
Its fair, proud branches hacked and stripped.  
Its life was gone; and yet to-day  
No other wood is praised so oft,  
Its purpled splinters held aloft.

Resurgam.

Last winter roughly robbed the trees.  
We stripped the fruit, winds whipped the leaves.  
All life seemed gone: and yet to-day  
We see gay blossoms, buds and shoots.  
Another season yields its fruits.

Resurgam.

Our Saviour died a shameful death,  
His body torn, His strong heart wrung.  
His life had gone: and yet to-day  
In Heaven's height, an Altar-throne  
He lives, and makes our heart's His own.

Resurgam.

My vows would strip me, bind me fast.  
My heart and will must learn the Cross.  
Myself must die: and yet one day  
Mine eyes shall see His wounds and Face  
His Mother's sweet and matchless grace.

Resurgam.

Sister Francis Agnes, O.S.F.



## BOOK REVIEW

### THE WORLD'S MAJESTIC QUEEN.

Kathryn Morris Bastian. New York: Pageant Press, Inc., 1958. Pp. 80. \$2.50.

This is a life of Our Blessed Mother written with the express purpose of inspiring the reader to have greater devotion to the Mother of our Redeemer." Mrs. Bastian, the author, has especially in mind the young girls of our own day. However modern they may be, they should find much in the way of food or meditation in this account of the life of the Virgin.

The book consists of a group of meditations in the virtues of "our Majestic Queen" loosely woven together

with the threads of the known incidents of her life drawn from the Gospels and with some legendary happenings drawn from the Apocrypha. Meaningful interpretation of these facts and fancies in light of the virtues make up the book.

Mary is shown particularly as Mediatrix: "Mary is a gate . . . built to swing both ways; she brings us to Love to us and leads us back to Him and as "the woman wrapped in silence a silence which enabled her to live a life of humble seclusion for Almighty God and His Divine Son, Who was her Way, her Light, and her Life."

M.

## FOR RELIGIOUS

### IT IS THE WILL IN THE HEART THAT COUNTS

Regardless of what your charge may be,

Think not that another is hard or easy,

It is not the work that gives account

It's the will in the heart that fills the fount.

We all arise same time each day,

We all have the very same prayers to say.

All the other minutes we must fill—

To live for God, to do His Will.

So whether you wash, or whether you sew—

Whether you dust; or whether mix dough,

If you do it for love—for Him alone

It matters not whether you work to the bone,

The work that you do just has to be done

If not by you, by some other one.

There is no charge that gains merit the most,

If there was, we would all want to have the post.

But the merit goes to him who loves the best,

To him who gives all with heart felt zest.

Rise, eat, work, play and pray

Without counting the cost at the close of each day.

Give your all, fighting life's strife with your might

Then rest on the Sacred Heart, when you repose at night.

Sister M. Winifred Denise, O.S.F.

## MONTHLY CONFERENCE

# Allocution of Pope John XXIII

The Essence of the Teachings of Saint Francis

*The following is the speech which the Holy Father delivered April 16, 1959, on the occasion of the 750th anniversary of the approval of the Seraphic Rule. Translated from "L'Osservatore Romano", April 18, 1959.*

Venerable Brethren and Beloved Sons. These initial months of your Apostolic service as successor of Saint Peter in the Roman Bishopric are marked by the anniversary of some historical and religious dates. This promises happy things.

Today's meeting in Christian brotherhood of priests and laymen of different tongues, different styles of external garments, but of equal simplicity and liveliness of memory and heart, is among them one of the most characteristic and one of the happiest.

It is not because of the Apostles that we gather here at the Lateran, in the Basilica which is the mother and head of the City and of the world; but because of Saint Francis of Assisi, the man Catholic and wholly Apostolic, who has been gathering his children around him for more than seven centuries.

From the large bronze statue in the vast square (before the Lateran), he invites us to the contemplation of the magnificent and mysterious residence of Popes and Patriarchs.

Here (in the basilica) he is in the central mosaic, brilliant in his place of honor between the Madonna and Saint Peter while his great son, Saint Anthony of Padua, stands between Saints John the Baptist and the Evangelist. His blessed name and the souvenir of the illustrious events of his visit to this sanctified hill most venerated throughout the centuries, appear here and there in the old grave-stones such as in the inscription of Pope Nicolaus, first son of Francis, of the Order of Friars Minor, the first of the five Franciscan Popes.

It is the remembrance of his Rule that has brought us here tonight. One might say that the image of Pope Innocent III of incomparable memory, resting here in his noble and magnificent mausoleum, has awakened from his rest to reaffirm the reality of his dream, a wonder of heavenly Providence. It was through him that the Rule, approved at first with hesitation, and later by divine inspiration recognized as the

VOL. 9 NO. 7, JULY 1959