TRICENTENNIAL OF FILIPINO CLERGY – CEBU

John N. Schumacher

The lecture was delivered during an alumni homecoming of the San Carlos Major Seminary in 1998 on the occasion of the formal turning over of the Major Seminary to the Filipino diocesan clergy in Cebu. The year also marked the tercentenary of the Filipino clergy and the centennial year of the Philippine revolution.

It deftly interweaves the three milestones into an interesting story of the life of the Church in the Philippines and the Filipino clergy, with Cebu as its focus and locus. Complete with the individuals who were instrumental to its evolution in the midst of the historical twists and turns, the history of the Church in Cebu is replete with artifacts and lessons for reflection. History often echoes important and still-relevant vibrations for the present times.

I feel more than a little honored to be invited to be the speaker at this threefold celebration – of the tercentenary of the Filipino clergy, of the centennial of our national declaration of independence, and of the turning over of the administration of the major seminary this year to the Filipino diocesan clergy. This is for me practically my first real acquaintance with Cebu, certainly with the new Cebu. In the 50 years since I came to the Philippines, I have only been here twice – once in 1954 overnight at the former Berchmans College while waiting for the boat to continue to Mindanao, and again about 1970, when I made my retreat at Banawa Hills, likewise on my way to Mindanao. One does not get to know a place, much less a people, in such brief transits.

Hapag 9, No. 2 (2012) 161-179

I hope you will not think that it was because I did not want to come here, but I had no excuse to do so, and have spent my whole Philippine life in the seminaries of Metro Manila. Least of all do I think like the most famous, or perhaps we should say, the most infamous bishop of Cebu, Pedro Saenz de la Vega Landaverde Perulero, or as he is listed in Bishop Lagdameo's handy list of Cebu bishops, Pedro Saenz de la Vega. Belonging to the Mercedarian order, or as they were often called by the other orders, "Los Mercenarios," a title which in his case certainly fitted him perfectly, he had the dubious distinction of being bishop of Cebu for 22 years without ever having set foot on the soil of Cebu, or even of the Philippines.

Bishop Landaverde was presented by the king to the pope, given consistorial promotion in 1705, and set out for Mexico, there to be consecrated and then presumably continue to his diocese in Cebu. He was indeed consecrated bishop in Mexico, but for the next 21 years until his death, he refused to go a step farther. He had an infinitude of excuses – ill-health, lack of funds for the journey, his need to remain in Mexico to pay debts he had contracted, and endless other pretexts to prevent him from setting out for the Philippines. As Dr. Domingo Abella recounts his case:

> Neither repeated royal decrees, nor the urgings of the viceroy and other high officials of New Spain, not the threat of incarceration, nor even its actual imposition availed to make him proceed to Cebu. In 1716 Pope Clement XI, upon representations of the king of Spain, issued a brief authorizing Archbishop Lanciega of Mexico to impose on the stubborn prelate "the canonical sanctions...including the suspension of all his episcopal prerogatives and deprivation of his see, in accordance with law".

In spite of the subsequent proceedings against him in the archiepiscopal court, he refused to acknowledge their validity, while all the time insisting that he was the only valid bishop of Cebu. For by now, the king, seeing that it would take years to settle the case, decided that Cebu needed a bishop in the meantime. In 1721 he presented Father Sebastian Foronda, an Augustinian, to the Holy

See. The next year Foronda was given consistorial promotion as "Bishop of Calidonia *in partibus* and Ecclesiastical Administrator of the See of Cebu in the absence of its residential bishop." Since Bishop Landaverde died in 1727 without ever conceding his claim, and Bishop Foronda died in 1728, too soon for word to get to Rome and bring about his canonical promotion to the See of Cebu, we have the ironic result that Bishop Landaverde was canonically the proprietary bishop until his death while the man who governed the diocese so admirably for so many years, Bishop Foronda, never came to be actually named more than the administrator of the diocese of Cebu.

As reported in a juridical text some years later, urging that bishops not be consecrated until they reached their dioceses, Landaverde's arguments justifying his refusal were summed up as follows:

> [He said] that Zebu was a bishopric *in partibus* and hence not what he had expected to get. According to the Venerable Bishop, it was not simply a distant bishopric, it was not even an existing one. Rather it belonged to the category of the possibles, and even so, whatever being it had depended, like that of other worlds, on the sheer omnipotence of God. This opinion he maintained until death.

His successor, Romualdo Jimeno, O.P., was of even sterner stuff. As a missionary in what is now Vietnam, he and another Dominican had been consecrated bishops in the midst of persecution. Had he stayed, it is very likely that he would have suffered martyrdom, as his fellow bishop did. But because of the breaking of diplomatic relations between Spain and the Holy See, the only bishop left in the Philippines was the aged Archbishop Segui of Manila, who could die at any time. Unable to appoint a bishop to the Philippines under the Patronato Real, the Holy See resorted to the stratagem of transferring Bishop Jimeno from Vietnam to auxiliary of Manila, shortly before the death of Archbishop Segui. With the improvement of relations between Spain and the Holy

See it became possible to appoint ordinaries to all the dioceses, and very likely because of his courage and stamina, Bishop Romualdo Jimeno became ordinary of Cebu. He outdid his predecessor in his visitations, finally visiting the entire diocese, but only by arriving at the Marianas after a 38-day journey, the first bishop ever to do so. Of Micronesia he says nothing, since there were neither missionaries nor Spanish government there until 1885, by which time the erection of the diocese of Jaro had finally deprived Cebu of the dubious distinction of being by far the largest diocese in the world.

Bishop Jimeno was a reformer in many respects, but undoubtedly greatest was his constitution of the Real Seminario Conciliar de San Carlos into a real seminary by securing the services of the Vincentians to administer it. It is true that there had been a seminary in existence since 1782, when the diocese was given the half-ruined former Jesuit college of San Ildefonso. But with a lack of competent professors, the level went steadily downward. Though we have no direct evidence about Cebu, we can gather some idea of the situation from the derogatory message of the *ayuntamiento* of Manila to the king in 1804:

> In the three provincial capitals which are adorned with Episcopal sees, there are no seminaries in which a young man can be trained with firmness and prudence since what are called seminaries consist practically of the mere material edifice. In them one or two Indio secular priests, who speak Spanish only with difficulty, are barely teaching a very bad Latin and a little of Larraga.

Larraga was a slender book, which was published a hundred years earlier, in which moral theology was taught in question and answer form. It would seem from other seminaries that chant was also taught. Not a very substantial curriculum, but at least Cebu had a building, half ruined though it might be, while Naga and Vigan seemed to have had merely nipa-roofed structures.

Things did not improve after 1782, since the inadequately trained seminarians became the professors of the next generation, and so it continued in a downward spiral until Bishop Jimeno was able to get the Vincentians who had come for the Manila seminary to aid

him as well. At that time the curriculum was no better than sixty years earlier, for the first thing the Vincentians did was to introduce dogmatic theology, and little by little other theological disciplines. No doubt they substituted something better for moral theology than the Larraga catechetical work.

Most important, however, in the Vincentian tradition was the formation of a priestly spirituality and fidelity to the work of the priest. What their coming meant to the clergy of Cebu and of the other dioceses where they took charge of the seminaries may be gathered from the way that Bishop Maranon had described his clergy 40 years earlier – how they abandoned the former Jesuit churches and conventos in ruins, how they failed to teach catechism and left their people in ignorance, so that the majority scarcely practiced their religious duties anymore.

Yet Bishop Maranon was not one of those racist Spanish friars who were so common in late 19th century Philippines, especially in their contempt for the Filipino clergy. He recognized the problem of lack of training and the dilemma of there being no older priest to provide an example or role model to the young of what a real priest should be. Hence he asked for some good religious to take various parishes in Leyte and Negros to serve as examples because, as he said, "I have observed that when the Filipino clergy are at the side of European religious, they try to fulfill their obligations, all of which goes to show that not all the secular clergy are bad just as not all the religious are saints." As we will see, the second half of the century would prove the correctness of Bishop Maranon's judgment.

Up until now, we have not mentioned much of the 18th century Cebuano clergy. The simple reason for that is that these first Filipino priests ordained were not Cebuanos at all, but Tagalogs and Pampanguenos, though some of these later came here from Manila. The reason is obvious. There was no place in Cebu where Filipinos could be trained for the priesthood. It is true you had the Jesuit college of San Ildefonso, whose building would later provide the site of the Seminario de San Carlos. But San Ildefonso had had only a brief period as a secondary school, and by the time the idea of ordaining Filipinos to the priesthood had matured, it was no more than a primary school. It was the Universities of San Ignacio

and Santo Tomas, and the colleges of San Jose and San Juan de Letran which trained the exemplary Spanish and Filipino clergy of the 18th century, together with the short-lived seminaries of San Felipe and San Clemente, which were rather residences for seminarians than academic institutions.

Nonetheless, the first Filipino to be ordained by Archbishop Camacho in 1698, Bachiller Don Francisco Baluyot, a Pampangueño, was sent to Cebu a year after his ordination, where the Franciscan bishop Miguel Bayot, had not yet been consecrated. In his valuable book, *The Hidden Light,* Dr. Luciano Santiago has unearthed what would seem to be all the Filipino priests ordained in the subsequent quarter of a century, all educated in Manila, but of whom five served in the diocese of Cebu alongside the Spanish diocesan priests and religious. The most famous of them all, and one of the two extraordinary Filipino priests that Fr. Juan Delgado, S.J. singled out when writing in 1754 was the Pampangueno B.D. Eugenio de Sta. Cruz y Mercado, who by that time held the impressive positions of *Juez Provisor, Oficial y Vicario General de este Obispado de la Ciudad del Santisimo Nombre de Jesus, de Zebu, Examinador Synodal de el, Comissario del Santo Oficio, y Cura propietario del Partido de Ajuy e Interino de esta Parrochia de S. Juan Bauptista del Parian de dicha Ciudad.* Certainly I have not found any other priest with similar high positions other than possible his contemporary, also signalled as a model by Fr. Delgado, Fr. Bartolome Saguinsin from Antipolo, rector of Quiapo church and interim treasurer of the archdiocese. Clearly Fr. Eugenio de Sta. Cruz was only a step below being a bishop, had the prejudices of the time allowed it, and as far as I can tell, the only Filipino vicar-general before Fr. Pedro Pelaez for Manila in the 1860s.

Though the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1768 was a catastrophe for the slowly growing Filipino diocesan clergy of the vast diocese of Cebu, and even to an extent for that of Manila, this situation was compounded by the crash-program to create a Filipino clergy and to drive the friars from the parishes. In his seminary, Archbishop Basilio Sancho de Sta. Justa y Rufina of Manila attempted to create a clergy in one year, and in the process, making the diocesan clergy the laughing stock of Manila. Needless to say, the edifying and gradually growing clergy of the generation of Frs. Sta. Cruz and

Saguinsin were swallowed up in the general contempt for the Filipino clergy. Nor did any more clergy come to Cebu to alleviate the shortage there, and it would be twenty years before Bishop Mateo Rubio de Arevalo was able to obtain the half-ruined former college of the Jesuits to begin a seminary. But as we have remarked before, the main difficulty was not to get seminarians, but to get competent professors to teach them. That would not be achieved until the coming of the Vincentians in 1867.

As far as we know, until that time the situation remained the same or became worse as far as the diocesan clergy was concerned, as we have seen in the judgment of Bishop Santos Maranon that I quoted early in the paper. Cebu was fortunate in having zealous and conscientious bishops during the 19th century. One can see it in their efforts to visit their enormous diocese; one can see it in the lack of race prejudice in Santos Maranon, where after narrating the inevitable facts, he concluded that there were good and zealous Filipino diocesan priests, in spite of their lack of training, capable of being not only coadjutors but also parish priests. And he did not hesitate to add that not all friars are saints - statements you would hardly find in the friar bishops of the other dioceses.

After Bishop Maranon we have Bishop Romualdo Jimeno, O.P., whom we have mentioned before. There is little doubt that he did more for the diocese of Cebu than any of his predecessors, visiting the entire diocese, giving retreats and recollections to his clergy, obtaining the separation of the diocese of Jaro from Cebu so as to make it at least more manageable, and finally, bringing the Vincentians to give new life to the seminary. This latter move was perhaps to be the most important. As we have mentioned, the Vincentians did try to improve the theological studies to a certain extent, but there was a limit to what they could do outside of Manila where they could take advantage of courses at the University of Santo Tomas. They were always short of personnel, and in one case, the same man was rector both of Jaro and Naga. That would be a major feat even in these days of planes, but when the boat trip took a week or more, it could hardly make for good administration. But, if their academic success was only moderate, in accordance with their tradition, the Vincentians placed most emphasis on the spiritual training of

seminarians, attempting to form in them a priest after the model of Christ. A good measure of their success in the 30 to 40 years before the Revolution and in the schism of Fr. Gregorio Aglipay, is the statistics of those Catholic priests who became Aglipayan. In Cebu there were only two, one a Tagalog, and the other, Fr. Vicente Escalante, who quickly retracted his momentary adhesion to the schism. In Nueva Caceres there was only one, in Manila three, including Aglipay, who had not studied with the Vincentians and had been expelled from the Vigan seminary, in Jaro four, in spite of the semi-schism provoked by the foolish appointment of a friar on the very eve of the Revolution. Only in Nueva Segovia, where the stay of the Vincentians had been only four tumultuous years, was there the substantial number of 26. Of course there were other factors such as the Ilocano character of the movement, but there seems little reason to doubt that the training imparted by the Vincentians in those 30-40 years was a major factor in the loyalty of the great majority of Filipino priests to the Church.

At the time of the Revolution, which caused such crisis in other dioceses, we see how fortunate Cebu had been in its 19th century bishops and diocesan priests, and how they cooperated together to preserve the structure of the church and the city, while at the same time giving loyalty to the aspirations of the Filipino people for freedom. We have already spoken of Bishops Santos Maranon and Jimeno and their concern for their priests. Of Bishop Benito Romero de Madridejos, O.F.M., who was bishop from 1876 to 1885, I must confess that I know nothing substantial, except that he seems to have continued the policies of Bishop Jimeno.

This brings us to the Revolution itself, a crisis which tested severely the ability of both Spanish bishop and Filipino priests to maintain not only their priestly character, but their loyalty to their nations. In this they were helped considerably by the attitude of the Cebuano laity, in what is certainly the unique event in the Revolution and the war against the Americans.

The bishop in question was also a Franciscan, Martin Garcia Alcocer. As you will remember, the first brief stage of the Revolution in Cebu took place in San Nicolas in April 1896. Given the small number and inadequate arms of the *revolucionarios,* they were easily

put down by the Spaniards. However in the second phase in 1898, it became clear that the Spaniards could not hold out against the Revolution and the Americans. When the Spanish troops departed for their last stronghold of Zamboanga in Christmas 1899, the bishop refused to accompany them, choosing to entrust his personal safety to the flock which had been entrusted to him. This is more striking when the other bishops were either behind American lines, or in the case of the bishop of Nueva Segovia, a badly-treated prisoner in northern Luzon.

Alcocer's trust was not disappointed. Not only was he not harmed, but he immediately sent two trusted priests, Fathers Mercado and Paras, to the president of the revolutionary committee, Luis Flores, asking to negotiate for the safety of those who had remained in the city. The next day Flores slipped into the city incognito to talk to the bishop, and promised him that he would wait the few days the bishop requested, and that there would be no vengeance taken on those who had not joined the revolution earlier, a promise which was apparently kept, to the credit of both men.

Alcocer could undoubtedly have remained in his diocese, were it not for the arrival of the viciously anti-clerical General Vicente Lukban and his troops in Samar. Lukban looted the churches of Samar, and demanded that Flores imprison the bishop. When Flores refused to do so, Lukban sent men to Cebu to kidnap the bishop. In the face of this threat the Cebuanos persuaded the bishop that he ought to leave, as he did in a German ship bound for Colombo, from which he returned to Manila to confer with the Apostolic Delegate Archbishop Placide Chapelle, who had recently arrived.

A group of Filipino priests actually went to Malolos in early February to ask Aguinaldo to allow the Bishop to remain in his diocese, as did two or three groups of women, but by that time the Filipino-American war had broken out, and Aguinaldo had no time for them.

Nonetheless, the trusted priests he had left behind to govern the diocese in his stead did not fail him. He had appointed Fr. Pablo Singzon to be ecclesiastical governor, and Fr. Juan Gorordo to be his secretary. Like the bishop, they would carry out both the bishop's spiritual care of his people, and to the extent possible, protect them from the war as well.

The Cebuanos did not maintain for long their government under the Malolos Republic. On 21 February 1899, the American warship *Petrel* arrived in Cebu, demanding the surrender of the city. A commission went out to negotiate, headed by Julio Llorente, Aguinaldo's delegate, and including Juan Climaco, Pablo Mejia, Segundo Singson, and the two priests, Frs. Pablo Singzon and Juan Gorordo. The Americans gave them little choice, demanding the acceptance of American sovereignty within fourteen hours or the city would be bombarded.

The commission did not give in so easily. On returning to a general meeting in the city, they saw the impossibility of battle against the Americans, since there were less than 200 guns in the city. A radical faction was for burning the city, as had been partially attempted in Iloilo, clearly a tactic which would cause more suffering to the Cebuanos than to the Americans. According to an American navy officer afterward, in order to prevent the burning of the city "two Filipino priests secured all the coal-oil in town and have had it under lock and key ever since." If the story is true, we can only speculate on who the priests might have been. But it is clear that the clergy were a moderating force in the discussions.

Both sides had their weaknesses and thus a compromise was achieved. The Americans were too occupied in Panay and in other parts of the Visayas to be able to take the island of Cebu, and contented themselves with the offices of the Captain of the Port and the Collector of Customs, leaving the provincial government under Luis Flores in control of the internal affairs of the city and the rest of the island. The Filipinos in their turn agreed to yield to the American demand:

> In view of the superiority of the American arms, but without failing to make it clear that neither the [provincial] government nor all its inhabitants united has power to execute acts strictly prohibited by the Honorable President of the Philippine Republic, whom we acknowledge in view of his unquestionable ability to justly govern, and his general worth

Again they insisted that the Americans must deal with Aguinaldo, "without whose acquiescence the act required of this government cannot be legally valid." The Cebuanos did not want a war which could only be destructive of the island, but neither were they ready to surrender their independence simply at the demand of some American officer or by virtue of the Treaty of Paris on which he based himself. It is clear that the Revolution was a national one, and not merely a "rebelion tagala," as the Spaniards and Americans liked to insist, and which even some Filipino historians continue to maintain today.

Even more impressive is the statement of Fr. Singzon to Rome, because it came from a confidential letter addressed to the papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Mariano Rampolla, announcing the departure of the bishop and his own designation as ecclesiastical governor of the diocese, and offering his homage and obedience to the Holy Father. In it, in the absence of any canon lawyer in the diocese, he asked for the necessary dispensation for himself to exercise such functions. What is more interesting in the letter is that despite deploring the abuses that have been perpetrated by Lukban, and the decree of Aguinaldo expelling the friars, he still showed his adherence to the Republic. The paragraph is worth quoting,

> The state of these islands was quite abnormal and critical. On the one hand the North Americans were arming themselves to the teeth, seeking an opportunity to dominate the principal provinces. These provinces found themselves possessed by a horrible panic, but were disposed to struggle even to death. On the other hand, since the Republican government was not yet well organized, abuses occurred and even oppressive acts by those who should be models of morality and culture.

In the succeeding months he would continue to support the provincial government, until it disbanded itself in May. In all his denunciations of Lukban's atrocities, he based himself on the provisions of the Malolos constitution and of Aguinaldo's decrees, clearly alluding to Lukban as one of those who under the guise of "pseudo-patriotism ... have wanted to cover over the confiscation

of church funds in this diocese, especially in the provinces of Samar and Leyte." He continued to be outspoken on abuses against the Church and no doubt with some danger to himself, to proclaim the rights of the Church, clearly alluding to the one responsible for violating them in the diocese. At one point all the priests of Samar with the exception of one old man, withdrew from the island until the abuses should stop. It is sadly ironic that the priests of Samar, who suffered so much from Lukban should be the ones who were later tortured, even to permanent injuries and insanity by the Americans on the grounds that they were supporting Lukban.

Indeed a few priests did get involved in military activities in Cebu, though none like Aglipay. One of the few known cases involved a Fr. Francisco Blanco, who was sending supplies, including gin and rum, to the guerrillas in the mountains.

When a case did come to Singzon's notice that there was evidence that Fr. Cecilio Sanchez, the priest of Sogod, had informed the guerrillas of the presence of Americans and made it possible for them to ambush them, he sent him a series of questions to be answered under oath. In view of Sanchez' denials he apparently accepted them, but took the precaution of sending him to the parish of Ronda on the other side of the island.

Clearly Singzon kept the Church out of political or military affairs once there was fighting between the Filipinos and the Americans. He called - somewhat ambiguously – for prayers that God might enlighten those who rule us (*nuestros gobernantes),* making them desist from persecuting the Church, His beloved spouse, her ministers, and true Catholics, giving to all the peace which we desire.

One might think that this was directed only against Lukban, but in fact the persecution of the Church to which he referred to was also directed against the influx of Protestants which disturbed him deeply. He urged the priests to show the greatest prudence and harmony with the local authorities, more than ever necessary in these calamitous times. He concluded: "Once more I repeat the graphic expression of our venerable Prelate: 'Our mission is a mission of peace.'"

Secretly, however, in the meantime, an event was taking place in Manila which must rank as one of the greatest scandals in Philippine

church history, but whose details should now be available in the Vatican Archives. It concerns not Lukban, nor any Filipino priest, but the bishops of the Philippines and some at least of the provincials of the religious orders. I bring it out, because only in this way can we understand the resentment of the Filipino clergy against the friars, and the courage and high-mindedness of the best of the diocesan clergy in spite of the way they were treated.

We can only quote part of it, but the text has been published in *Philippiniana Sacra.* At the meeting of the bishops with the Delegate, the archbishop of Manila insisted on the absolute need of European clergy in the Philippines (apparently non-Spaniards), not only because of numbers, but because of the character of the Filipino clergy. That is, he said:

> The unanimous agreement of our predecessors as well as our own daily experience make manifest that the Filipino priest labors under following grave defects: (a) very great irresponsibility, and uncontrolled propensity to the vices of the flesh, lack of talent which prevents his being able to obtain for himself the proper thorough instruction, at least that which a priest of ordinary formation should possess; (b) the total subordination to material interests which possesses the native priest... From this comes the unbridled avarice of the clergy, from this come the factions and rivalries in the towns, from this it not rarely happens that the priest and his relatives with his assistance become the owners and possessors of almost all the property of the town.

To the question of whether a Filipino clergy should exist in the future, the archbishop asserted that there had always been a Filipino clergy, and the reason for this was the lack of European clergy.

Considering that Archbishop Nozaleda had been a professor at the University of Santo Tomas, a Filipino priest might have answered that the archbishop had not studied very well the documents of the Church, including one for Asia, printed in his own *Boletin Eclesiastico* in 1893, " Ad extremas Orientis oras," which insisted that the prime priority of the local churches should be to promote a

native clergy. Listening to the archbishop, one had to wonder how he had dared to ordain any Filipino, if he considered all the ordinations sacrilegious, as his generalizations imply.

To the assertion of the archbishop, Bishop Alcocer replied in a way which must be taken seriously, but which seems somewhat in conflict with his relations with his own diocese. He said:

> It is better not to act rashly in this matter. I am convinced the Filipino priests will disappear of themselves. This opinion of mine is based on the following reasons: (1) The whole life of a priest should be devoted to work and sacrifice, especially in the present; but the Filipino clergy lacks abnegation and the desire to work. (2) The pious donations formerly made to the Church have greatly diminished and the parish incomes have greatly decreased. When this condition of affairs becomes clear to the Filipino clergy, who put so much emphasis on the profit to be gotten out of the parishes, very many will flee from embracing the priestly life.

No doubt there were many Filipino priests of whom such accusations could be made, just as there were many friars of whom the same could be said. And the archbishop's remarks came strangely from a man who was paid a salary exceeded only by that of the governor-general, and who on his resignation would be presented by the government for the wealthy archbishopric of Valencia.

We know from other sources that the remarks of the archbishop about a priest's family monopolizing the whole town were not without foundation, at least in some places. We know also of friars in the late 19th century, when travel overseas had become much easier, who brought their relatives to the Philippines to do the same illegitimate offspring to do so.

Bishop Alcocer's remarks were much less harsh and also had some truth to them. Yet he must have known that in priests like Frs. Singzon and Gorordo there were those against whom such accusations could not be made. And as a matter of fact, after a temporary drop in the number of seminarians due to the Revolution, his prediction proved not to be true. We must also put it next to the

statement of his successor, Bishop Thomas Hendrick, in a letter of 1904:

> I have found the native priests almost without exception to be good men, beloved by their people, and doing very good work, considering the great number of persons in each parish.

Finally we may add that according to the Vincentian historians, Fr. Rolando Delagoza and Fr. Jesus Ma. Cavanna, in what was apparently another meeting with the provincials of the religious orders, the Vincentian Provincial, admitting the failures which occurred in all parts of the church, gave a spirited defense of the Filipino diocesan clergy;

> The Vincentian Provincial spoke at length and authoritatively in favor of the Filipino Clergy, placing it in the right perspective: a heroic clergy in those circumstances. Some 800 Spanish Missionary Friars had left their parish and around 600 Filipino secular priests had remained, faithful to their duty, dedicated to the pastoral ministry, taking charge of most vacant posts, and each one doing the work of two.

It appears that Fr. Singzon remained administrator of Cebu until sometime in 1904. The Apostolic Delegate, the archbishop of Manila and the bishop of Nueva Segovia had left in 1901 for Europe. Moreover, the bishop of Nueva Caceres had long since gone back to Europe in protest when his priests were tortured and executed by the Spaniards, as part of the almost certainly innocent Fifteen Bikol Martyrs. The bishop of Jaro was rejected by the majority of his priests, who would not even let him enter the cathedral. Hence, the only bishop left in the Philippines was Bishop Alcocer, administering all the dioceses from Manila.

Very gradually the Holy See named American bishops for four dioceses, with Father Jorge Barlin the administrator of Nueva Caceres. The last bishop to be named was Bishop Thomas Hendrick, a parish priest of Rochester, New York, and brother of President Theodore Roosevelt's chief political leader in New York State.

Roosevelt requested, secretly of course, that he be named archbishop of Manila. Typically of Vatican diplomacy, they partly satisfied the president by making Hendrick bishop, but so as not to seem to be yielding to secular power, made him bishop of Cebu instead.

Arriving in 1904, he was to be bishop for only five years, dying in 1909, but his influence from Cebu must have made Roosevelt regret that he had ever manipulated the appointment of his friend. Their correspondence which still existed, for all its familiar tone, showed a hard-hitting bishop. His targets were many — Protestant proselytism, Masonic influence in local officials, both Filipino and American, hostility to the Church on the part of public school teachers and superintendents, Aglipayan seizures of Catholic churches left without priests, Governor Taft's honoring Obispo Maximo Aglipay (whom Taft privately despised). Roosevelt was kept busy writing both to Taft and Hendrick. The bishop, out of friendship did not make most of his accusations public, but he made it very clear that unless there were remedies soon, he would not hesitate to do so. For Roosevelt, who depended much on Catholic votes, this was no idle threat.

Since Hendrick did not speak Spanish, and presumably none of the Filipino priests spoke English, he was much dependent on a Spanish-speaking American priest he had brought with him as secretary. Nonetheless, he seemed to have had good relations with his Filipino priests, and defended them with vigor. He had some accompany him to the parts of the diocese where there was still unrest due to American atrocities, especially in Samar, among whom were priests who had been tortured by the Americans. In burning tones he wrote to Roosevelt of a Captain Glenn, who had used the water-cure torture on a number of priests, among other people, killing one, causing permanent physical injuries to another and insanity to another. This Glenn, incidentally was likewise the water-cure expert in Panay. To show how the military protected their own, he was fined and reprimanded, but later rose to be brigadier general, fortunately for Bishop Hendrick, only alter the latter's death. The usual US army method when an atrocity became public, was to send the man back to the United States, where he could not be extradited to stand trial for crimes committed in the Philippines.

Hendrick was always high in praise of Singzon and Gorordo, and as his health began to deteriorate, he asked for Gorordo as an auxiliary. When he died in 1909, the Holy See was just about to create a series of new dioceses. Gorordo, as auxiliary, and administrator of the diocese was named bishop of Cebu in 1910; and Singzon, a native of Samar, that of Calbayog, including both Samar and Leyte, in that same year. By that year, Bishop Hendrick and his diocesan clergy had stabilized the situation as far as possible with their inadequate numbers. For of religious there were only the Vincentians in the seminary, a tiny handful of newly-arrived Redemptorists, the Jesuits in Mindanao, which became the separate diocese of Zamboanga in 1910, and some Franciscans in Samar, who would however leave in 1914, shortly after the diocese of Calbayog was created. I do not have statistics for the diocesan clergy, but they must have been woefully inadequate for the number of parishes.

What must have been even more discouraging for the Filipino clergy, as well as the bishop, was finding themselves in a new and strange cultural situation, one which not only denied independence, but which operated on norms and principles quite different from those in which they had been trained. Perhaps not all shared the pessimism shown in a pastoral letter of Bishop Gorordo in 1916, but it gives us an insight into an attitude which must have been widely shared.

After denouncing at length the public schools as sources of Protestantism and even atheism, which he saw as destroying the coming generation, he continued with a passage which showed how his unreal, but no doubt sincere, romanticizing of a past which had never really existed, paralyzed him, and no doubt many other priests, from dealing with the present and the future. His conclusion reads in part:

> I am a Catholic bishop, by the mercy of God and grace of the Holy See, and nothing is more sad for my priestly soul than to see the loss of faith and the perversion of souls. .. My sorrow is increased when I consider the past glories of the Church. I have seen her once in the past illumined by the splendid sun of one single faith and under the

> obedience of her legitimate shepherds, marching along joyfully on the path of true civilization and of all legitimate progress. Our country was then beautiful, without stain or defect. All who visited her were enamored of her beauty, but now she presents a sight which is even repugnant, with that variety of beliefs and diversity of customs, with that multitude of publications of every kind, and those theaters, those movie houses, those immoral dances, and a thousand other dens of perdition which are found spread throughout the Archipelago. How can I not be pained to see my motherland so deformed?

Nonetheless, Bishop Gorordo and his clergy did not let themselves be completely paralyzed by the past, and during his episcopacy, dormitories for girls, the College of San Carlos after its separation from the seminary, and many parishes were built or rehabilitated, and I gather that he left behind him many remembrances.

One unclear fact remains, concerning which perhaps some of you know more than I. In June 1929 Fr. Joaquin Vilallonga, former rector of the Ateneo de Manila, superior of the Jesuit Philippine mission, and provincial of the Spanish Jesuit province of Aragon, to which the Philippines had been subject, came with delegation from the Holy See as apostolic visitor of the Philippine church, in spite of the fact that there was already in the Philippines an apostolic delegate, Archbishop Guglielmo Piani. He spent some 13 months before returning by ship to Rome. Less than a year later, Bishop Gorordo retired on the grounds of health, though he was only 68 years old. There was a gap of two years before Fr. Gabriel Reyes was appointed bishop of Cebu in 1932, and two years later, became a very active archbishop as Cebu was raised to an archdiocese. In passing, we might note that if the Irish bishop O'Doherty had had any *delicadeza*, he would have retired at the beginning of the Commonwealth to give way to Archbishop Reyes' being promoted to the see of Manila, as he was at the death of O'Doherty in 1949. Though I did not have the privilege of knowing him, I understand that he was an active promoter of many projects in Cebu, and perhaps preferred to remain here.

With his succession by Cardinal Rosales and the separation of Bohol, one can say that Cebu was no longer a diocese *in partibus* — one of so many parts that only the omnipotence of God could bring it together, as Bishop Landaverde had claimed, but that together with its close neighbors Bantayan and the Camotes Islands, it formed not only one archdiocese, but headed its own metropolitan province. That achievement was the work of many dedicated men, including the Filipino diocesan priests so despised by most friars, and its seminaries promised to carry on that work in the future.

(This lecture was delivered on the occasion of the alumni homecoming of San Carlos Major Seminary on November 4, 1998.)

John N. Schumacher, S.J.
Society of Jesus
Philippine Province