SILLIMAN JOURNAL

Fourth Quarter, 1963

A QUARTERLY DEVOTED TO DISCUSSION AND INVESTIGATION
PUBLISHED BY SILLIMAN UNIVERSITY, DUMAGUETE CITY, PHILIPPINES

A QUARTERLY DEVOTED TO DISCUSSION AND INVESTIGATION IN THE HUMANITIES AND THE SCIENCES

* * * * *

SILLIMAN JOURNAL is published quarterly in March, June, September, and December by Silliman University under the auspices of the James W. Chapman Research Foundation, Dumaguete City, Philippines. Subscription in the Philippines, ₱8.00 a year, ₱2.25 per copy; U.S. and foreign countries, US$5.00 a year, US$1.50 per copy. Entered as second class mail matter at the Dumaguete City Post Office on September 1, 1954.

SILLIMAN JOURNAL

CONTENTS

VOLUME X, NUMBER 4 FOURTH QUARTER (OCTOBER-DECEMBER) 1963

EDITOR'S PAGE

A small, informal conference of veteran U. S. Peace Corps Volunteers at Pendle Hill, Pennsylvania, in December of this year provided the main source for the illuminating article by Lawrence Howard and Paul Hare. In 1961-63, the Philippines saw the largest single concentration of Peace Corps Volunteers—and more than half of the returnees present at the conference were from the Philippine Project.

We are pleased to republish another fine article by Mr. William Henry Scott. Though not professionally an anthropologist, Mr. Scott has earned a well-deserved reputation as an authority on the life and culture of Mountain Province, particularly in the Bontoc area. His article "Boyhood in Sagada" is reprinted with permission from the July 1958 issue of *Anthropological Quarterly*.

My "Scripture and Tradition: Trends in Protestant Theology Today" is a slightly expanded (to include the July Montreal Faith and Order discussions) version of a paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the Philippine Theological Society which met at St. Andrew's Theological Seminary in Quezon City in May of this year. Father H. Ellsworth Chandlee, of the St. Andrew's faculty, substantially expanded on the theme of the paper and it is a privilege to publish his comments in these pages.

The *Silliman Journal* sees itself as a "Quarterly devoted to discussion and investigation in the humanities and the sciences". Just how well the *Journal* has lived up to that image of itself can be seen in the Decennial Index painstakingly prepared by Mr. Eliseo P. Bañas of the Library staff. We are grateful to Mr. Bañas for this service which should prove a real boon to scholars in locating the valuable studies published in the first decade of the *Journal's* existence.

We would like to have presented a bound set of ten volumes of the *Silliman Journal* to Dr. James W. Chapman, long-time distinguished member of the University faculty whose name honors the Research Foundation which has helped finance the *Journal* for the past ten years. Unfortunately, Dr. Chapman, who with Mrs. Chapman retired from Silliman in 1950, was accidentally killed near his home in San Mateo, California, in February of 1964, before this issue went to press.

PETER G. GOWING

THE PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER RETURNS HOME

Lawrence C. Howard and Paul Hare

AFTER service abroad the Peace Corps Volunteer is supposed to return and share his experience with his fellow Americans. Now that six months beyond the two-year tour have passed for the first volunteers, what are the returned volunteers doing? What differences in outlook has service abroad brought? These questions were discussed at a meeting of former volunteers held December 7-8, 1963, at Pendle Hill (the Quaker Center of Study and Contemplation) in Wallingford, Pennsylvania. Thirty-one former Peace Corps Volunteers and two former staff members representing service in Ghana, Pakistan (East and West), India, Tanganyika, Columbia, Nigeria, and the Philippines were present. They were joined by three volunteers from VISA (Volunteer International Service Assignments sponsored by the American Friends Service Committee) who had completed comparable service in India and Mexico. This fairly representative meeting of former volunteers is the first of its kind to be held. The conference was made possible by a grant from the Danforth Foundation.

Despite age, sex, skill, religious and marital status differences, the group had much in common. All had volunteered to work abroad for little pay in "less developed" areas. Both the Peace Corps and VISA were committed to service and peace efforts. All participants had lived abroad on a people-to-people basis, at a substantially reduced economic standard, with the intention of facillitating intercultural exchange.

The meeting was without formal agenda, being mainly an unstructured conversation. This provided a glimpse into what these volunteers are thinking now. Some opinions of individuals have been reproduced below as part II of this paper. Despite some difference in emphasis there was considerable acceptance of the points of view that have been quoted. The members of this group cherish their Peace Corps experience, are finding some difficulty in readjusting to

American life, and have a strong desire to find outlets to share their experiences for the benefit of America.

I. Volunteers Six Months After Completion of Service

Since almost half of the volunteers attending the meeting (15) had been part of the Peace Corps Philippines Project (working in rural elementary schools as aides to teachers in English and science), it was possible to assemble information on what most of the returnees from this project are now doing. The first portion of this report reviews these data. The Philippines Project was the largest Peace Corps overseas program; it contained one volunteer in ten. The project permitted the use of volunteers who had had only a liberal arts background. It was planned by Warren Wiggins who subsequently became the Peace Corps Associate Director for Programming. In 1961 the Philippines Project was considered the prototype of what Peace Corps was to become. The volunteers who are now back from the Philippines are Groups I and II (Group XI is now in training for the Project); 184 in all, they were trained at Pennsylvania State University in 1961 and ended their overseas tours in June and July of 1963.

Of the 184 volunteers who went out to the Philippines for the 1961-63 tour, data are available for only 100. Eighteen volunteers did not complete their overseas tours; 1 died abroad of amoebic dysentery; 6 were returned to the States early for reasons of ill-health; 5 female volunteers left the Project to consummate stateside marriages; 2 despaired of the Peace Corps and resigned; and the Peace Corps found the work of 5 others unsatisfactory and separated them from the Corps. No data were available for 7 others who, although they completed their tours, are still enroute home, having spent the last six months traveling. Eight other female volunteers remain abroad with new husbands, five of whom are Filipinos. Thirteen other females are also recently married and have been excluded as they described themselves as "stateside housewives." Another 28 remain in the Philippines; 22 are still in the Peace Corps and 6 are reportedly either working or studying in Manila. For a final group of 10 volunteers now back in the states there was no information available as to what they were doing.

The 100 returnees for whom there is information can be divided into two large groups. Fifty-three, or about half, are engaged in

graduate study and the rest are working. Information was available on 39 of the 53 doing graduate work. Fifteen are working for advanced degrees in education and 7 are in the social sciences studying Southeast Asia in some way as an outgrowth of their Peace Corps service. The graduate programs of the others are in philosophy, English, architecture, languages, science and law.

Forty-seven returnees are working. Twenty-two are teaching, mostly at the elementary level. The next largest group (5) has been drafted into the Armed Services. The rest are in private business, the government (Federal, state or local), or are employed by some private social agency. To this group of 47 could be added the six volunteers who are employed by the Peace Corps in staff positions in Washington, Puerto Rico training, or some overseas project.

This inventory permits some generalization. First the overall figures for this one project are not very different from those released in October by the Peace Corps for all returnees—they said 223 of 413 returnees were continuing their education. The slightly higher overall figure for those in education included 41 completing their B.A. degrees. All returnees from the Philippines Project already had their undergraduate degree. The main thing, therefore, that volunteers are doing six months later is continuing their education, primarily at the graduate level. A second generalization is that Peace Corps service tends to be an overall gain for the teaching profession. Not only are all former teachers going back into the profession but many others as indicated above are now seeking necessary credits for certification. Those studying for advanced degrees in the social sciences plus most of the volunteers still in the Philippines project are also likely to go into teaching. Volunteers extending their tours had to submit a project in elementary education which would require an additional stay to complete. In general, extensions were granted only to those who had strongly indicated an interest in teaching as a career. There was considerable agreement with the following comment:

> Volunteer: My experience over the past two years was a clear indication to me that I would never be happy with a passive, contemp'ative existence. I function best when deeply involved with people and living. I have returned home to do graduate work in education, and hopefully I will concentrate on the problems of the 'lesser developed' and spend my life working in this area.

The expectation that Peace Corps would be a training ground

for the Foreign Service has not materialized. Only one returnee to date has been recruited. This number may grow as many volunteers indicated a strong desire to go abroad again to live. The prevailing sentiment seemed closer, however, to the comment by one volunteer: "The difficulty with working for the Foreign Service is that while it's foreign, it offers little opportunity for service!" There is one important exception to this: the possibility that former volunteers who go on to Peace Corps staff positions may enter AID or the Foreign Service through lateral transfer. A number from the original Peace Corps staff contingent have elected to continue in the government.

The statement made when the Peace Corps was first organized that, "Peace Corps service will not mean an avoidance of military service," may also need some revision. Only 5 of 90 males of draft age have been called up. Service in the Peace Corps brought an initial deferment. Now for most PCVs there has been a second deferment to complete graduate study, and soon for an increasing number there may be a change in marital status, and perhaps an increase in the number of dependents. This may become a pattern through which military service becomes indefinitely postponed.

II. *The Outlook Six Months After Completion of Service*

Conversations at Pendle Hill covered three areas in which Peace Corps experience seems to have brought a different outlook: the former volunteer's view of himself, his view of the Peace Corps, and his view of the America to which he returns.

A. The Personal Dimension

"These were the best two years of my life." This statement, in one form or another, was uttered by almost every participant—Peace Corps or VISA volunteer. It could be equally affirmed in the "End of Tour" questionnaires completed by volunteers prior to their departure from the Philippines where 9 out of 10 indicated they would gladly repeat the two-year experience. This personal endorsement of Peace Corps experience seldom came in the context of the value of world travel or the importance of the service rendered to the host country. It was rather a way of stressing how the volunteers had matured as individuals. The following quotes suggest something of the quality of this feeling:

Volunteer: I think that I wasn't strong enough before to accept my own values. Now I know what I believe and have confidence in these beliefs.

Staff: Are you suggesting that this change has been for the better?

Volunteer: Yes. I'm more alone now but I'm stronger. My values are more in line with human things, perhaps because I sorted out my beliefs through living with people whose values were quite different from those prevalent here in America. But it's more than what I believe—it's why I do. Truth here (in the United States) is so often impersonal. I accept this kind of passive truth much less now. For me the greater truth comes after personally living through something.

Volunteer: Let me add to that. Before Peace Corps service I was afraid to express my individuality; it remained unspoken, lost in the group. Now I am more confident and I express my own individuality, but it seems equally lost as the group seems to have little interest in what I am saying. I think it is because I now express my own convictions rather than relating group norms.

The content of these new views differed with each individual but many volunteers mentioned particular ideals and preferred relationships with others which did add up to a new personal dimension. As a result of Peace Corps or VISA service (although perhaps this was a reason for joining), volunteers felt that they were now more interested in advancing peace, de-emphasing material standards, and obtaining cross-cultural experiences. They seemed to have developed a new outlook on poverty, especially when experienced by themselves voluntarily. The group was strongly service-oriented but put more emphasis on shared experiences than on the completion of specific tasks. The relationships considered important were those arising out of individual rather than organizational efforts and there was a preference for voluntary activity requiring self-discipline and de-emphasizing external rawards or punishments. "As contrasted with graduate students of the same age," one volunteer put it, "I find former volunteers stressing more 'openness' in their outlook and more self-discovery in their approach. They are searching after the higher purposes for self and society."

B. The View of the Peace Corps.

Personal satisfaction in their service abroad has brought strong support for the Peace Corps from among the returnees. There is, however, a considerable desire to share their views of the Peace Corps with Washington officials. Volunteers raised the following

questions about Peace Corps operation:

1. Is the Peace Corps accurately representing itself to the American people? Many indicated that the service they rendered abroad was much less important than what they had learned. The help that was extended, others added, was not so much doing things that would directly meet the needs of others as the establishment of personal relationships, the product of which was a mutual feeling of greater confidence. As one volunteer put it: "Sharing had outdistanced service. We did more learning than prompting of social or economic change. Thus if we are to present the Peace Corps as an aid program, should not we stress aid to the United States?"

2. Is Peace Corps supporting efforts by other Americans working more directly in the foreign aid field? Since the needs of peoples abroad are great and Peace Corps efforts do not generally work directly to meet these needs, are we supporting the efforts of public agencies like AID and the work of private groups, e.g., missionaries? How vauable are our efforts to make the Peace Corps have a 'separate image' from other Americans abroad? By presenting ourselves as different, have we lent the prestige of the Peace Corps—through our silence—to the undercutting of other efforts in the foreign aid field? Is it not imperative that the efforts of volunteers to assist others not be understated? Is it possible that the success of the Peace Corps may bring a net decline in assistance being extended by America abroad? Similar comments could be made about Peace Corps support for the United Nations.

3. Are we still saying that Peace Corps service is hard or explaining what that means in the light of our accumulated experiences? Do we say that living conditions abroad are on the whole pleasant? Do volunteers know that the biggest frustrations arise not out of what will be missed in comfort abroad but what will be found in confronting self? Surely there is little value in talking about personal financial sacrifice when Peace Corps service is for most a time of saving and a period of opportunity.

4. Are Washington administrators aware that many of the early ideals in the Peace Corps have worked well in practice, e.g., volunteers are preferable to employees; living with people surpasses doing things for them; inspiration leadership is more functional than occupational example in staff qualifications; host country project supervision is more productive than Peace Corps supervision of hosts; our pool of American spirit is generally appropriate while our alleged reservoir of skills is generally inappropriate; and that the important relationships in the Peace Corps are between volunteers and others overseas and not between the PC directors in Washington and Congress or the press at home.

The basic question that volunteers seemed to be asking Washington was "Do you know what Peace Corps really is—and have you valid reasons for permitting America to think something else—or have

you too come to believe the myth of the Peace Corps instead of its reality?" It was not so much a balanced picture—one which would include mistakes—that volunteers seemed to seek, but rather they asked that Americans be allowed to learn what Peace Corps experience had to teach.

Former volunteers also had something to say about the people they had come to know abroad; these people should not be considered so backward or we so advanced as recruiting, training, and reporting materials seemed to imply. Our recognition of the world's needs should not be presented as being solved so easily. Poverty abroad is abject, particularly when one returns to America's overpowering affluence. Nostalgia for the spiritual resources of the pastoral folk abroad seemed to rise when volunteers feel an absence of purpose in America.

C. The America to which the Volunteer Returns

The training of volunteers for overseas service made preparation for "cultural shock," but the release of volunteers after the two-year experience did not take into account the dislocations that would accompany readjustment. The conversations touched on the preparation.

Staff: (a member of the training staff for the Philippines project): With full recognition of the dangers of 'retrospective falsification' let me mention our framework for training. Basic was a 'Second Culture Participation', i.e., we took our analogy from the ideas in second language teaching—volunteers should learn to function within Philippine cultural patterns. Fundamental was the awareness of your own or first culture in order to know what were the obstacles and assets in your own make-up that would hinder or help your coming to be a participant in the culture of the Philippines. We generally thought it was more important to be able to get along in Philippine society than to try to do some kind of job on it.

Volunteer. I recall that this irritated me—there being little in training related to the job. My orientation for joining was a strong interest in doing something. We got little of practical value in training about the job. I recall with distinct displeasure the suggestion that we carry on some project on the side.

Volunteer: Training brings back memories of the word 'learning' with a capital 'L'. "This is to be a learning experience," you reiterated in many ways. I find it interesting that in training this idea was rejected. We wanted to be up and doing. You emphasized our learning and cultural involvement.

Staff: We misread the intensity of the volunteer's motivation to be doing

something 'useful', and to do it in a demonstrable way. We were mislead by the fact that less than 10% of you in your undergraduate majors gave indication of heading towards a specific career.

Volunteer: Let me add that we volunteers misread the strength of that job motivation in ourselves.

Volunteer: The Ministry of Education, in our case, had the job all neatly prepared for us. We had a job that had to be done. I'm not sure we ever did solve the problem of a satisfactory contact with the culture.

Volunteer: Yes, but what I'm saying is that we came to feel that involvement in the culture was a thousand times more important than the job.

While most volunteers present indicated that there had been little 'cultural shock' abroad, they did mention some difficulties in adjusting since their return.

Volunteer: My first impression upon returning as I sat in the Seattle airport was what elephantine monsters we are; before in the Philippines I recalled early thoughts on how short Filipinos are. My next impression was how meager was the dollar in the U.S. I later managed to adjust to all this and did not find us so rich or so awkward. What lasted longer was the rediscovery of our psychological make-up here at home. We are driven here. Relaxation comes so seldom and at such a premium. I also found myself forced to accept the fact that we are the most prosperous, most advanced technological society known. I recalled that one of the startling things about being abroad in the Peace Corps was the pleasant realization that just because my neighbors didn't live in the United States did not mean that God or whatever hadn't just 'left them out in the cold.'

Volunteer: I suppose the biggest shock any of us went through on leaving the Peace Corps and the Philippines was simply the absolute diminution of emotional involvement and concern. No matter whether you hated it or loved it you were there and it was probably the most intense continuous period of existence any of us have ever had.

One complete session turned out to be a discussion of problems these returnees were having in communicating with friends and relatives here at home. They spoke of an "interest gap" that had grown up between themselves and those they had been close to before service abroad. This interchange started one session.

Volunteer: How do you adjust to the American culture? I'm bored! Only my work at Cardoza (a study-teaching program using former Peace Corps volunteers which is now in progress at Cardoza High School, Washington D.C.) *offers*

relief. I have social problems; I feel that few people my age are interesting. I seem to gravitate whenever possible to those who have been in the Peace Corps. Am I a snob?

Volunteer: Is it necessary to adjust? If you do, are you in danger of losing the value of the experience?

Volunteer: In one sense it's been easy to adjust since we've been back; after all, we were nurtured here. We were able to get back in quickly. The problems arose after we had returned. We found difficulty in communicating what we felt deepest about, and unable to change our situation so that those physically near but attitudinally removed would think a little more the way we did and see why we felt our thoughts were important too. Life here is much more complicated.

Volunteer: It's hard to put your finger on what makes me so uncomfortable about my old group—it's a 'creeping meatballism' you find all around. It turns you to seek out Peace Corps peop'e who have more in common with you. Adjustment is hard because we can't communicate with those we thought we liked best.

Volunteer: My frustrations are not so much the communicating ones as they are related to the sudden transition from there where I was for 24 hours a day in public life to here, where the emphasis is upon things private.

Volunteer: It's not a problem in telling people about the experience; it's our difference in outlook about life in general. It's this interest and value gap that concerns me.

Some of the differences in values which volunteers feel that they observe between themselves and their fellow Americans are indicated in the following quotations.

Volunteer: We joined the Peace Corps because we were discontented with the way things were going. We didn't think, for example, that the government was properly pursuing the campaign for peace. We wanted to get personally involved.

Volunteer: I can see now that an important tone in American society is to have change. Both slum and suburbia residents know that there is a primitivism about the way we do things. The way we bring up our children even though with the best of intentions, often turns out to cripple them.

Volunteer: A small town in the Philippines is much like a small town in the States. Both have their problems and opportunities which are often best seen by the outsider who has a fresh point of view and who can often serve as a catalyst of change. Since returning home I can see that there is much to be

done and yet there is underemployment of our resources. The problems confronting those called developed are essentially the same as those facing peoples called underdeveloped.

Volunteer: After coming back from Mexico where we were working with Indians I can see that we have the same need in Philadelphia to develop local leadership. We learned in Mexico that to jump in and to try to do things for the Indians can often be more harmful than good. We also knew that the status quo of poverty could not be permitted to remain.

Volunteer: The difference between our urban renewal program and the community development I met abroad was that there they were mainly interested in people and here we seem to put primary emphasis on buildings. They have much to learn from us and we have much to get from them.

Volunteer: I really miss the Philippines and the Peace Corps. That's one reason that I want to go to Washington. I want to know some people again who are concerned with things that happen beyond their own little, small-town world. I've really got culture shock in reverse, but since I know what it is, I hope I'll be able to cope with it.

Where From Here?

The Pendle Hill conversations were both enjoyable and valuable. Others should be held. Judgments about the experience six months later could supplement the "end of tour" interviews held abroad before volunteers return home. What this group of volunteers are thinking now might also be conveyed to subsequent groups now about to end their overseas tours.

BOYHOOD IN SAGADA[1]

William Henry Scott

IGOROT parents are very likely to present their sons to the Principal of a mission school in Sagada in the Mountain Province of the Philippines for enrollment in the dormitory with the statement: "We don't beat him but we want you to." That this is not an isolated situation is indicated in the "spanking a la Igorot" reported by former Governor Samuel E. Kane: an old Bontoc warrior presented his daughter at the capitol with the admonition, "I want my girl to go to school and learn how to weave blankets and gee-strings. You, Apo, give her a licking. I can not do it because it is not our custom to strike our children."[2] If the whipping of children is actually foreign to native techniques of child training and was only introduced by extra-montane teachers and officials, one wonders how it came to be so quickly and so highly esteemed.

This presumed incapacity for whipping, however, seems to be only an extreme example of lack of parental authority. To the same school principal come letters that run like this: "Dear Sir: I want my son to stay in your school so he will get an education. But he does not like. So what can I do? Please dismiss him." This situation is evidently not restricted to the people of Northern Luzon; Landgraf writes of a tribe in British North Borneo that "parents in Murut society do not have the authority over the persons of their children that is true of Europeans and Chinese. Even a toddling infant cannot be forced by his parent in the villages. Surprising as it may seem to the western mind, a Murut man cannot make his son go to school."[3]

Observation of Sagada society indicates that the actual beating of boys, at least, is a normal part of the practices by which the

---

[1] Republished with permission from *Anthropological Quarterly*, Vol. 31, No. 3 (July, 1958).

[2] *Thirty Years with the Philippine Headhunters*, ch. xxvii (1933).

[3] Landgraf, John L., *Interim Report to the Government of the Colony of the Department of Medical Services*, 1954-55, para. 3.20 (1956).

Igorot youth is taught to be a good Igorot adult. But there is a significant difference: the beating is not administered by the parents; instead it is sanctioned by the village elders and applied by adolescent boys. Although a father is reportedly respected for administering such corporal correctives when his son is old enough to endure a paternal caning without rousing the pity of neighbors, the infrequency with which such respect is won by Sagada fathers suggests that real embarrassment over this failing stems from extra-Igorot educational influences. The norm of parental responsibility for child training requires such things as nourishment, protection and affection; society has provided other techniques for instilling male discipline.

Life in Sagada requires stern physical labor and the Igorot farmer accepts it stoically. The pain of often cruel work in rice fields and forest he endures as unavoidable for the man who hopes to raise a family and enjoy a good old age. But he does not voluntarily undertake any such exertions as he can avoid. He spends little time dreaming of goals he considers less than essential and the expression "I do not like" is valid reason for any inactivity or indecision. The Igorot father thus sees a basic conflict between loving a child and inflicting any displeasure upon it and his relations with his offspring are characterized by the warmest sort of affections.

Igorots do not have as many children as they would like—though certainly not for lack of trying—and probably the first lesson a baby learns from the society about him is that he is wanted. From his earliest days he is fondled and handled, and he gets his first exercise clambering over the bodies of lounging, doting relatives. What he wants, he cries for, and what he cries for, he gets. If he takes hold of something which actually threatens his safety, he is distracted by being offered something else, and if he obstinately resists all such blandishments, his attention will be directed to anything so conveniently shocking as a big dog or carabao, the "one who vaccinates" or, in the case of a few villages blessed with such modern bogeymen, "Look out, here comes an American!" But he doesn't hear the command, "Don't," and if mother is too busy cooking to hold him, eager pairs of hands reach out for him. In Igorot-land, the child is the toy of the adult.

Folklore keeps reminding parents of their duty to provide the best of food and fond attentions for their children, and the child soon learns these tales. His questions about where the birds came

from or who made the first monkey are answered with grim accounts of children who turned into beasts because cruel parents overworked or underfed them or both. A boy throws down his own bones as firewood from a tree and flies off a hawk; a girl becomes a fish because her parents won't let her marry the young man of her choice. If there were an Igorot Noah's Ark, it would be filled with pairs of snails and leeches and sparrows who preferred that life to enduring the abuses of irritable parents given to nagging and quick temper. Few parents in Sagada today seem likely to bring down such calamity on their heads, nourishing their offspring with such tender acts as bringing home special treats of which they do not themselves partake, like wild blueberries and corn-on-the-cob, or perhaps even such "store-bought" luxuries as that cake and bread which forms the ambrosia off which the godlike Americans feed.

The Sagada house is a dark smokey den designed to defend its occupants against the raw midnight temperatures of the winter months, and the child scampers off to join the sunny world of his contemporaries as soon and as often as possible. In that world he must learn to get along without the patronage or protection of his parents, for the Igorot adult holds himself aloof from the play of children or even from commenting upon it. Such interference as is made by school teachers or foreign missionaries in this line is noted with mild interest by parents trying to adjust themselves to a changing world but with bitter if secret resentment by children exposed to it. Among his playmates, the boy quickly learns that approval is given to the one most inclined to do what the group wants to do—even as he learned at home that he could pretty well do what he wanted if he insisted on it vigorously enough. The marks in adult Sagada personalities of those who learned the one lesson better than the other are not difficult to recognize.

The play of little children reflects directly and indirectly their parents' preoccupation with food-getting, so directly indeed that the distinction between work and play in this aspect is completely blurred. In addition to making those toy rice terraces which is the favorite play of the male child, he soon learns to weave fish traps with which he considerably augments the family larder, although these catches are always considered his own property and he is free to barter them for other things he may fancy; when he brings them home too few for the whole family, they are cooked for him and his young brothers and sisters. In villages with access to a river, this

childhood activity keeps boys so long in the water that it is not until they are mud-besmeared adults toiling in the terraces that they learn.

The personalities of his elders are not discussed with the child and only rarely are the alternatives called to his attention. He might be encouraged to eat his food so he'll grow up big and strong like Pedro, but he would not often be warned against wearing two shirts like Juan who tucks a red flower back of his ear and puts on airs like a rich man's son. Certainly it would never be pointed out that four-foot Julian carried a smaller load than three-and-a-half-foot Miguel; only behind his back would the lazy boy be so spoken of by others and only in the privacy of his home by his parents. Whoever says "Shame on you" to an Igorot boy or calls him a "sissy" is a member of his own age group. But with this group he identifies himself so early and so firmly that what he values is, by and large, what the group values. Old Igorots querried on the subject recall their childhood motives for donning their G-string as "My playmates all had G-strings." In Bontoc villages the same sanction is extended to even such considerable matters as circumcision. A group of small boys who may have hung back in timid fascination during such operations in the past, get together and decide to approach whichever old gentleman's techniques have recommended themselves to them; only after the unceremonial operation has been performed do the boys' fathers learn of it by being called upon to compensate the surgeon for his labors.

Revenge for slights against family or village honor has been such an integral part of the headtaking warfare which Igorot society has only recently put behind it that it is considered perfectly natural for a boy defeated by his playmate in any quarrel to seek bitter redress through a rematch. But however natural they consider it, they abhor it as endangering village safety and everything is done to spare the child a humiliating experience. An adult scrupulously avoids embarrassing a child, and wise oldsters point out, "It's our observation children don't like to be embarrassed." Children choose sides and play games for hours on end without keeping score, and adults either ignore the outcome of such games or discourage any rivalry which results. In modern Igorot society, a teacher fails a student who did no homework and averaged 30% on his exams with a mark of 72%, and if called upon to judge a singing contest is not content merely to select the winner but extends the glory to all the contestants by awarding 380 points for first place, 378 for second,[4]

[4] Called

and so on. Somebody may lose the contest but nobody loses face.

Parental affection is reinforced in establishing the family group by teaching the child early to share responsibility and advantages with younger brothers and sisters. The Igorot is hardly able to walk himself before he is carrying the next younger member of the family on his back or solemnly breaking in two some prized goodie like a boiled sweet potato to share with baby sister. He also early learns which groups he does not belong to by virtue of his sex and consanguinity. From his fifth or sixth year on he must not play with his sister, and during his whole adolescence he will avoid her under any circumstance suggestive of their difference in sex and much of his every boyish conversation would be obscene in her presence. In more conservative villages, such avoidance includes his mother, too: in Tetep-an, brothers will not join the same working party in groups exchanging field labor, and in central Bontoc they will not even sleep near one another. A vestige of this pattern appears in Sagada in the fact that brothers of courting age who happen to find themselves at the same petting party will separate.

Except for occasional excursions to the blacksmith with his father or tagging along with the older boys to pasture the carabao, the growing boy interrupts his activities with playmates only to come home to eat and sleep. For seven or eight years this carefree life goes on. Then comes the sudden shock of leaving home to go and sleep in one of the *dap-ay*.[4] Until this time he has slept in the same house with his parents, as a baby actually snuggled in between them as he fell asleep and later at any place, or at any time, he felt like curling up and dropping off. But his elder brothers and sisters never slept at home with him; at nighttime they went off to sleep someplace else. Now he, too, must with one blow give up both the womblike security of his parents' house and the birdlike freedom of his daily playtime: he must go off to sleep with the other boys in the *dap-ay*.

The *dap-ay* is a sort of male clubhouse and the young boy already knows it well for it is here that he has always found his father's and grandfathers' relaxed bodies most available for scrambling over and their caresses most free; and here, too, he used to come in short-lived fascination to hear a few minutes of adult legal talk so complicated he soon ran scurrying off again to play. But,

[4] Called *ato* in Bontoc; cf A. E. Jenks, *The Bontic Igorot* (1905).

whatever the *dap-ay* may have meant in his life in the past or will mean in the future, at the moment it looms foremost in his mind as his new sleeping place, for the *dap-ay* is the dormitory for unmarried males.

The *dap-ay* usually stands on a slight elevation and its most prominent physical feature is a flat stone platform about ten feet across; indeed, the word *dap-ay* in central Bontoc means just that: a stone-paved area. Surrounding this paving are upright stones set in the ground at an angle which renders them convenient as backrests, and from place to place are stone or ferntree posts as memorials of successful headtaking forays in the past, occasionally decorated by being carved in the crude semblance of a human head. Adjoining or opening onto this platform is the *abong*, the actual dormitory, a building especially suited for sleeping and for nothing else. Too low to stand erect in, it is built of tightly packed, mud-chinked stones, a style of architecture which enables it to be almost hermetically sealed at nighttime against the low temperatures and distinguishes it from the tall wooden houses of married families.[5] The bed itself is a row of boards—in villages at lower altitude often a woven roll of reeds—loose enough to enable them to be picked up and dropped in a rather vain attempt to dislodge vermin, with an identically shaped headrest and footrest at opposite ends which elevate about two inches the head and some portion of the leg or foot dependent upon the height of the sleeper. The bed, or beds, is raised off the floor where, at one end or in the center, a small fire of reeds is kept burning or smoldering all night, warming and smoking the naked bodies of the occupants. Although nowadays men and boys generally wrap themselves in those thin cotton coverings the Igorot calls "blankets" in English, just a generation ago any such impediment to leaping out in battle trim during the middle of the night was forbidden.

Keeping this reed fire alive during the night is the job assigned the smallest boys in the *dap-ay* who are as a class called *mama-o* to distinguish them from the bigger boys whose job it is to collect real firewood for the early morning *dap-ay* fires in the center of the stone platform around which the men warm themselves on waking, and

[5]A *dap-ay* with many members may have two such dormitories, in which case the "senior" one frequented by the older men and housing certain religious paraphanelia belonging to the *dap-ay* may be called an *along*.

who are called *mangmong*. Igorots move about a great deal in their sleep, a whole row of sleepers unconsciously turning when one wedged into their midst turns over, and old men with poor circulation are wakened frequently enough by the cold or the pressure of their body against the hard boards to keep demanding fire-kindling services from the hapless *mama-o* on duty. To the boy of pre-*dap-ay* freedom, this particular aspect of the new life about to be forced upon him recommends itself so distastefully as to inspire some real resistance to the change, and in the old days actual coercion was often necessary in obstinate cases.

All Mountain Province peoples consider it obscene for a child beyond the earliest innocence to be present during the conception of his younger brothers and sisters, and even in Benguet where all unmarried members of one family may sleep in the same small house their parents carefully wait until they are all asleep before indulging that pleasure whose intention is to make the family still larger. In Banko it is believed that a child witnessing the sexual union of his parents will sicken and die, and in Sagada it is the concensus that such intercourse will be fruitless. Nowadays a growing number of "modern" Sagada families, especially those in houses of a typically spacious design, do not force their boys to join their contemporaries sleeping in the *dap-ay*, but as little as ten years ago the older sanctions were still being invoked. The younger boys of the *dap-ay* in which the offending boy should be sleeping but was not would be dispatched at daybreak to assemble outside the house where he was sleeping in the same room with his parents and sing a song beginning with the words: "Sot sot, ak ak sot," one of which words is an obscene term for copulation and the other an onomatopoeic term for the accompanying sound, a song which also suggests to the offender that he make a bird-snare out of one of his mother's long pubic hairs. This treatment is reported to have been 100% efficacious.

The qualifications for *dap-ay* entrance—as for advancement to the *mangmong* class, the donning of G-string or, indeed, the taking of wives—do not depend upon age but rather upon a sort of public opinion based on various considerations, not the least of which is the personality of the boy in question. All boys want to move to the age group above them and their behaviour and expressed desires can influence the time when a group of old men decides that they are big boys now and ought to make the next move. It may be suggested to a boy promoted to the wood-carrying class that he now bring into

the organization a younger brother to replace him as reed-gatherer. Throughout boyhood, youth and manhood, the Igorot behaves with the levity or lightness appropriate to his time of life, but movement from one stage to the next is not marked by necessary ceremonies or a fixed schedule of ages or sizes. A schoolboy once being interviewed by a western student of his dialect found it difficult to say why he called himself but not certain of his contemporaries by the term which suggested the English word "mature"; it wasn't height, it wasn't age, it wasn't grade in school. Soon thereafter this boy left school upon becoming the father of a seventh-grade classmate's child.

For the first years of his *dap-ay* life, consideration is given to the new boy's youth and many indiscretions are permitted him which will later evoke censure or actual corporal punishment. The fear of the dark ghost-filled night which moves the very young to deficate nearer the *dap-ay* site than the interests of public hygiene will permit is considered normal but undesirable, and the older boy will be beaten for giving way to it at an unbecoming age.[6] There is an inverse proportion between this sort of consideration, however, and the age of the *dap-ay* member exhibiting it, and the new boy's exact contemporaries see themselves as all being in the same boat together and expect him to pull his weight. The anguished howl that shattered any resistance to the childish whim at home in the *dap-ay* not only does not facilitate getting one's own way, it isn't even tolerated. The boy who used to cry "I won't!" and scamper off, leaving a resigned father to murmur to sympathetic bystanders, "What can I do?" is now run down like a deer in the chase by his fleet-footed *dap-ay* mates who find such athletic diversion not at all unwelcome. When he is considered to be big enough that the large muscles of the back of his body and legs can endure beating without damage, such beatings are administered by older boys either at the behest or with the approval of the old men. Not only is failure to bring in the allotted fuel or direct disobedience punished in this way, but the older boys also take it upon themselves to chastise any who cause the little ones to cry over such practical jokes as applying hot pepper to tender parts of their person or forcing them to masturbate. The

[6]Every age of youth seems to have particular misdemeanors tolerated as appropriate; in Bontoc the rather serious crime of breaking into a granary and stealing wine is laughed off if committed by a boy at an age when an interest in wine is expected to develop.

laying of hands on another person is not a light matter among Igorots, and corporal punishment is a carefully legalized procedure. The only boyhood fight which has the sanction of the adult group is an annual sort of mock fight left over from warring days when it simulated the actual conditions of battle as closely as was compatible with sparing the lives and limbs of the participants. Ordinarily, the exchange of blows leads to bad blood between families and is therefore to be avoided at all costs.

The boy in the *dap-ay* has other tasks besides the gathering of fuel. One of his most common assignments upon coming back to the *dap-ay* for the night is scratching the old men's feet. A lifetime of barefoot labor in rice fields and mountainsides equips the Igorot with a thick-skinned foot and it is his pleasure to have this leathery sole scratched with sticks before falling asleep at night. Men coming in from a hard day at work also require their backs, legs, feet and fingers to be massaged, big boys rendering this service to men, and little boys to big boys. Some of the smaller boys' chores are connected with the practice of religion: they are sent round the village to declare holidays during which labor and travel are forbidden, and to sieze chickens as fines levied on those who do not keep such holidays. They are sometimes called on to assist their priestly elders in the performance of pig or chicken sacrifices and for this duty there is compensation in the form of certain specified portions of the meat so provided. So specific indeed is the schedule by which this sacrificial meat is alloted that no envious older boy would demean himself by stealing it from a younger, although the lucky assistant to the sacrifice takes pain to avoid his age-mates who would have no such hesitation.

It is to be expected that boys who sleep together every night should develop a certain comaradarie, yet neither the aim nor the result of *dap-ay* activities is to develop any real *dap-ay espirit de corps*. During the day *dap-ay* members go their own ways and take their food in the homes of parents or relatives, and they are inclined to play around a *dap-ay* that happens to have a lot of children their own age. In the more conservative villages of central Bontoc, the fact that brothers belonging to their father's *dap-ay* would neither sleep nor play together actually mililates against any such *dap-ay* group spirit. If boys gang up for occasional group fights or contests, several *dap-ays* close together challenge a combination of *dap-ays* from another part of town. After such a contest, the elated winners can-

not expect to be lauded for their team spirit when they come in for the night; instead, their seniors will look up from their contemplative pipe-smoking or the levity of some serious adult conversation to comment adversely on such hooliganism: "Suppose it was one of your own cousins who got hurt?"

Much of the religious life of the village centers around the *dap-ay,* and boys living there are exposed to the texts of prayers and long myths and the details of a series of sacrifices that hark back to headhunting days. There was a day when the *dap-ay* was the sacred courtyard where community wisdom on the subject of warfare was pooled, and it was the only place in which a freshly taken enemy head, virtually radioactive with black magic, could be subjected to spiritual prophylaxis prior to burial beneath one of the *dap-ay* paving stones. Even now that headhunting is three generations gone, the sacred aura still clings to that platform whose very stones can be addressed directly in prayers of petition for the welfare of the members qualified to congregate on them. The fact that the *dap-ay* was once the barracks of a town defense corps on perpetual duty is reflected in the sternness with which boyish noise and commotion is discouraged by old men not so far removed from a day when the male adult loitering in the *dap-ay* might be expected to respond to a woman's cry of danger from the nearby fields.

Little or no instruction is given the growing Igorot boy and he acquires those skills necessary to successful adult life by imitation. Likewise, his seniors do not deliberately pass on to him such knowledge of the world as they have accumulated; instead, he collects this information for himself by listening to adult conversation, and the validity of the particulars which he extracts from the general varies with his personal astuteness. There is one subject, however, which is never discussed in his presence and that is the matter of procreation. He has already been dependent upon his adolescent contemporaries for companionship and assistance in autoerotic expression, and when his curiosity is sufficiently roused on this more mature subject, he has to turn to the least amateur of the courting young men as authorities. The silence maintained by married men on this subject is not an incidental part of Igorot adult aloofness from the affairs of children. In the Mountain Province, part of the pattern of courtship is sexual intercourse and toward this part the various parties involved have different attitudes. Parents see this contact as the sensible beginning of a child-bearing marriage

and young girls are advised by their elder sisters how best to avoid the advances of young men who may not have serious intentions. The young men, on the other hand, frequently nurse hopes of enjoying some experiences along this line before committing themselves to the responsibilities of fatherhood and so are eager seekers after such biological knowledge as would enable them to attain this end. Any male adult who discussed this subject with young unmarried men would risk public condemnation as promoting moral looseness, preventing the birth of babies, circumventing the basic purpose of marriage, and inviting on the village actual biological extinction.

Lacking formal textbooks on Igorot civics, in every level of his *dap-ay* training the Sagada youth learns better one lesson he first learned among his earliest childhood playmates: highest esteem is given the one who wants to do what the group wants to do. The commonest adjective of opprobrium is *kedse* usually translated as "cruel" but covering equally well situations which in English would be described as brash, headstrong, recalcitrant or aggressive. People who are *makedse* frequently have their own way but the price they pay in society is no small one. Although insult ranks next to striking a blow in the local list of crimes, the man who "tries to be center," who's "too big for his britches" runs the risk of being publicly twitted about some past blunder or even reminded of some moral failing of his ancestors by some older man with enough social stature to register this communal opinion with impunity.

If the *dap-ay* is the classroom in which the Igorot youth is schooled, his senior lesson is one of jurisprudence: he must learn to sit closemouthed and unmoved when legal decisions of the council of old men are handed down against his father or some other member of his family. Although some modern Christian converts have been able to break away from the economic control of the society, the ideal remains that all adult men belong to one of the *dap-ays* in town—usually the one closest to their house—and support it by contributing to whatever animal sacrifices it requires throughout the ceremonial year and by joining its council of old men in later life, and all members of their families are expected to submit to the jurisdiction of the *dap-ay* council. In the case of litigants from different *dap-ays,* a council will be convened from both *dap-ays* to judge the case. The Igorot grows up with the often bitter taste in his mouth of subjugating his family loyalty before a body whose interest is presumably the welfare of the entire community, but he

is aware that blood relationship with members of the council is nothing to be overlooked in considering the outcome of a case. Indeed, litigants often agree to submit their case to an old man before whose reputed impartiality they feel they stand a better chance for fair trial than before a council which may contain an undue number of judges related to their opponent. But the old time Igorot was also aware that it was just this submission to village discipline which allowed him to pursue his livelihood without fear of treachery from his neighbor, to direct his full headhunting zeal against enemies on the other side of the mountain, and to send his children out to play between the village houses secure in the knowledge that they would not become victims of lingering intravillage feuds.

SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION: TRENDS IN PROTESTANT THEOLOGY TODAY

Peter G. Gowing

Introduction

THIS paper is concerned with pointing out the trends apparent in contemporary Protestant theology with respect to the important matter of the relation of Scripture and tradition, and their respective authority in the Church. There is general awareness that Catholics affirm that divine truth comes through both Scripture and tradition while Protestants tend to insist that Scripture has a primacy over any and all other channels of revelation.

A full discussion of the subject of this paper would prove very helpful in the Philippine Protestant community for at least two reasons:

First, Protestant denominations in the Philippines are sometimes under the illusion that the faith they confess is based solely on Scripture—that unlike their Roman Catholic brothers, they are comparatively and happily free from traditions. Deeper reflection on the meaning of tradition and on the historical background and development of their confessional life would reveal that this is simply not so. Protestants in the Philippines need to become more aware of how very much tradition, both that imported from the Occident and that which has grown from Philippine soil, has influenced the faith they confess, the interpretations of Scripture they prize and, indeed, the divisions which keep them separate from their Christian brothers in other denominations. A realistic appraisal of this fact might help the various denominations in the Philippines to become more ecumenical in character if it leads them to study not only the traditions which have contributed to their particular witness but also those major traditions which lie in back of and beyond the history of the separated Christian bodies.[1]

[1] See Tetsutaro Ariga's discussion of this with respect to the Japanese scene in his "Christian Tradition in a Non-Christian Land," *Ecumenical Review*, XII, No. 2 (January, 1960), 199-205.

And second, Evangelical Protestant theology in the Philippines, especially, needs to be rescued from the tendency to Biblicism—the compulsion to tie whatever one says or believes as a Christian to some literally interpreted text of Scripture. It has not yet come to fully appreciate the implications of the truth that the New Testament is the product of the Christian community (which also claimed the Old Testament as its inheritance) and derives its authority from its acceptance in that community. Philippine Evangelical theology needs to recognize that the New Testament is the record of only a part of the experience of the Christian community and the whole Bible must be read in the context of the *total* experience of the community, which includes to day as well as yesterday.[2]

Before we proceed, let us be clear as to what we mean when we use the terms "Scripture" and "tradition." Though the Church has never known agreement as to the exact number of books included in the canon of Scripture (thus we have a "Catholic Bible" and a "Protestant Bible"), still, all Christians affirm that the Word of God has a written form recognized as Sacred Scripture and regarded as canonical, that is, as authoritative in the life of the Church. All agree that Scripture is divided into the canons of the Old and New Testaments—the former representing the documents inherited from the Jewish Church and the latter being the primary and classical documents of the Apostolic Church. It is to the Word of God in its written form, and as such recognized as canonical, that we refer in using the term "Scripture", no matter how many books are regarded as belonging to it by this or that body of Christians.

The Second World Conference on Faith and Order at Edinburgh, Scotland, in 1937, defined tradition broadly as "the living stream of the Church's life".[3] We shall make our definition only a little more precise by saying that tradition is the Word of God revealed in the whole life of the whole Church. Three conclusions may be drawn immediately from this definition. First, it is quite correct to say, as most Christians nowadays readily admit, that the written form of the Word of God—the Sacred Scripture—is the product of tradition. The Word of God was before as well as after the formation of Scripture. Scripture and the Word of God are not co-extensive. Second,

[2] See my "Unwholesome Tendencies In Philippine Evangelical Theology," *Silliman Christian Leader*, V, No. 1 (September, 1962), 14-17.

[3] Hugh Martin, *Edinburgh* 1937, (London: SCM Press, 1938), p. 43.

every expression of the Church's spiritual activity forms a part of tradition in which the Word of God is revealed—which is not to say, however, that everything the Church does reveals the Word of God, for we are aware that the Church (defined as the organized body of believers) has in its history done some manifestly evil things. Still, in the Church's confessions of faith, services of worship, prayers, ethics, and so forth, the Word of God has continued to be made plain for all who have had eyes to see and ears to hear. And third, tradition is like history in that it is even now being made. The revelation of the Word of God is an on-going process, though, of course, in the past the Church has paused to actually define, for purposes of clarity, this or that as belonging to tradition.

Historical Background

Professor John S. Whale has pointed out that tradition was regarded in the Apostolic Age and in the ancient undivided Catholic Church as a living link with the teachings of Christ and the testimony of the Apostles.[4] It was regarded as the unfolding of the gospel in the life of the Church, an unfolding that was partly continuous from, interpretive of, and consistent with the gospel as recorded in Scripture. This is still the way tradition is viewed in the Catholic churches, though, as we shall see, the Roman Catholic Church has deviated somewhat from the classical view. Writing in Richardson and Schweitzer's *Biblical Authority for Today,* Professor Panagiotis I. Bratsiotis affirmed:

> For the Bible is, so to speak, the Lydian stone for the accurate ascertainment of the truth of tradition. . .Moreover, according to the Orthodox conception, the sacred tradition contains nothing contrary to the Bible, with the content of which the content of the tradition essentially coincides. . .because. . .both are the product of the same Divine Spirit, who dwells in the Church.[5]

The Roman Catholic Church has introduced a radical element in

---

[4] J. S. Whale, *The Protestant Tradition,* (Cambridge: University Press, 1955), p. 255.

[5] Alan Richardson and Wolfgang Schweitzer (eds.), *Biblical Authority for Today,* (London: SCM Press, 1951), p. 21. For an excellent discussion of what tradition meant to the Fathers of the Ancient Church, see the first chapter in G. L. Prestige, *Fathers and Heretics,* (London: S.P.C.K., 1958).

its conception of tradition. Professor Whale outlines four main stages in the development of the Roman Catholic conception.

First, from the emergence of the papacy proper in the sixth century till the middle of the twelfth century, Roman canon law was largely theological in emphasis and was based mostly on Scripture and on interpretations of Scripture by the Fathers of the Church and the great Ecumenical Councils.

The second stage began towards the close of the twelfth century when there came about a change from a theological to a juristic emphasis in Roman canon law. The Roman Church began thinking of itself as a State (or Superstate) with the Pontiff as its lawgiver. The idea emerged that Christ ruled his earthly kingdom through the Church, and canon law started to take on the characteristics of civil law. Much was added to the body of canon law which had no essential relation to Scripture.

The third stage began with the Council of Trent and the Counter-Reformation. Trent formalized a tendency which had been growing in the Church to put non-Scriptural tradition on the same level as Scripture itself and to affirm that the context, text and meaning of Scripture were subject to the interpretive authority of the Church in the name of tradition. The Protestant Reformers attacked this notion with zeal.

The fourth and latest stage opened with the decree of the Vatican Council of 1870 on Papal Infallibility, reaching its climax in 1918 with the publication of the new edition of *Corpus juris canonici*. The whole body of Roman Catholic dogma was declared subject to the papal jurisdictional power and the Pope was declared able to create new dogmas 'of himself' without reference to General Council, Cardinalate or Episcopate.

Professor Whale summarizes his analysis of the concept of tradition in the Roman Catholic Church by saying:

> In short, tradition no longer means what it meant for St. Irenaeus or St. Augustine; namely, an unbroken chain of testimony linking each age of the Church to the controlling 'givenness' of apostolic experience and teaching. It has come to mean an absolute monarchy legislating *de jure*.[6]

It was this emerging tendency on the part of the Roman Catholic Church to establish tradition as a parallel source of divine truth,

[6] Whale, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

separate and independent from Scripture, which aroused the ire of the sixteenth century Reformers. Luther and Calvin looked about them and saw all manner of institutions, doctrines, canon laws, customs and practices having no basis at all in Scripture and, indeed, often contrary to Scripture. The Roman Catholic Church defended them on the ground of tradition; the Reformers condemned them on the ground of Scripture. At the Council of Trent, the Roman Catholic Church defined its position:

> . . . following the example of the orthodox Fathers, this Synod receives and venerates, with equal pious affection and reverence, all the books of the New and Old Testaments, since one God is the author of both, together with the said Traditions, as well those pertaining to faith as those pertaining to morals, as having been given either from the lips of Christ or by the dictation of the Holy Spirit and preserved by unbroken succession in the Catholic Church. . . .[7]

Against this, the Reformation churches affirmed their doctrine and attitude of *sola scriptura*—all things necessary for salvation were to be found in Scripture alone. Article VI of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion* expressed it:

> Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.

The sixteenth century Reformation never went so far as to assert that tradition was valueless. Martin Luther held Ecumenical Councils in high respect, particularly the early ones, for their defense of Biblical doctrine;[8] and Article XV of the Augsburg Confession explained that minor traditional usages are permissible if they "promote peace and good order in the Church". Again, Article XXXIV of the Anglican *Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion* declared:

> . . . Whosoever, through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break the Traditions and Ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common

[7] Henry Bettenson (ed), *Documents of the Christian Church,* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1948), p. 367.

[8] See Jaroslav Pelikan's "Luther's Attitude Towards Councils," in *The Papal Council and the Gospel,* edited by K. E. Skydsgaard, (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1961), pp. 37-60.

> authority, ought to be rebuked openly, (that others may fear to do the like), as he that offendeth against the common order of the Church. . . .

The chief quarrel of the Reformation with the Roman Catholic Church on this subject was over the Roman Catholic belief that teachings based on tradition alone (without reference to Scripture) could be elevated to the status of dogmas, acceptance of which was necessary to salvation.

Later Protestantism was willing to throw out the baby with the bath: it attacked the whole principle of tradition, and fancied that in so doing it was being fiercely loyal to Scripture as the fountainhead of divine truth. As Protestants and Roman Catholics moved further apart, the word "tradition" brought to Protestant minds the Roman Catholic concept of it—an evil thing that would distort and undermine the authority of Scripture, therefore a thing to be despised.

Protestant Re-discovery of the Importance of Tradition

In recent years there has come about a marked change in the Protestant attitude towards the principle of tradition. There is now a new appreciation of the meaning and importance of tradition as a medium for the transmission of the Word of God, supplementary to Scripture. We can, perhaps, point to three or four factors which have contributed to this change in attitude.[9]

First, the Ecumenical Movement has brought Protestants into rather close contact with non-Roman Catholics who hold the classical view of tradition in contrast to the deviant Roman Catholic view. Protestants find the interpretations of tradition offered by Eastern Orthodox Christians, Old Catholics and Anglo-Catholics at least discussable and not entirely incompatible with their historical convictions about the primacy of Scripture. Indeed, the main issue which remains between Protestants and non-Roman Catholics on this subject is the question of the relative authority of tradition in deciding questions of faith.

Second, a reappraisal (prompted by contacts with Catholics in the Ecumenical Movement) of the Catholic doctrine of the Church as the mystical body of Christ has helped Protestants to appreciate

[9] Cf. Daniel Jenkins' treatment in his *Tradition and the Spirit*, (London: Faber and Faber; ca 1951), pp. 15-19.

anew the truth that the on-going life of the Church is closely linked with its living Lord. The life and experience of the Church today and yesterday has afforded a field for God's revelational activity as surely as the life and experience of the Church in New Testament times. The living Lord is still, and always has been, with His church (thought of as His body) and has spoken in it and through it.

Third, Biblical criticism has helped Protestants to see that Sacred Scripture is less a theological text and more an expression of the "living stream of the Church's life". Form criticism, for example, has called attention to the earliest apostolic period when the gospel was transmitted by oral tradition alone. Today no serious student of the New Testament fails to recognize the important role which the notion of tradition played in the letters of St. Paul. Biblical criticism, accompanied by a renewed interest in patristic studies, has greatly helped Protestants to see that the Bible is part of an on-going tradition.

And fourth, Protestants, again prompted by the Ecumenical Movement to examine their separate confessional histories, have become increasingly aware of the peculiar traditions—springing not only from the sixteenth century Reformation, but from other and later developments as well—to which they have given their allegiance. They have been surprised to discover the extent to which traditions four hundreds years old, or less, have influenced their denominational characteristics. Some have been honest enough to inquire whether loyalty to traditions four hundred years old are any more or less justified than loyalty to traditions a thousand years old, or nineteen hundred years old!

Some Representative Contemporary Protestant Views on Scripture and Tradition

It might be instructive for us to examine briefly the ideas of certain contemporary Protestant thinkers on the subject of Scripture and tradition. In general, there is now a consensus among Protestants that tradition has an important and positive part to play in Christian teaching.

C. H. Dodd, the distinguished English Congregationalist and Biblical scholar, has pointed out that in fact all religious readers go to the Bible with pre-suppositions—prior beliefs (part of the tradition of their denomination, perhaps) which pre-determine their in-

terpretation of the Bible. Dodd affirms that tradition is necessary to preserve the Church from an irresponsible individualism which is not Christian. But he warns that we must guard against tradition which is a static finality in religion. He pleads for a tradition of life and experience rather than dogma, of religion rather than theology. Tradition, he says, is progressive. Dodd directs us to John 16:13 wherein our Lord says: "I have much still to say to you, but at present you cannot bear the weight of it. When however *He* comes, who is the Breath of the Truth, He will lead you into the whole Truth." That leading, Dodd asserts, was not confined to the New Testament period, for the "faith once delivered" has actually grown and developed as it has encountered life and experience in a changing world.[10]

Another English Congregationalist, Hubert Cunliffe-Jones, has emphasized that tradition is important not as an additional source to determine what the gospel is, but as the fruit of the working of the gospel in the life of the Church. He also points out that the Bible must be understood in the context of the Church and is judged and renewed by that revelation to which the Bible testifies. There is a difference, says Cunliffe-Jones, between the authority of the Bible and the authority of tradition. The Bible gives us the content of revelation; tradition shows us how the gospel was applied under specific conditions. Cunliffe-Jones waxes mystical at this point and affirms that the Holy Spirit helps us to know whether or not, under specific conditions, tradition is the guidance of God.[11]

An American Congregationalist, Dr. James Muilenburg, the noted Old Testament scholar and professor at Union Seminary in New York, once defined tradition as "the teaching of the fathers of the Christian community", and went on to affirm that the Church has always regarded tradition as one of the most important, if not the most important, bridge between the past and the present. While Protestants and Catholics differ sharply over the relative authority which tradition has in deciding questions of faith, both have nevertheless made great use of it in determining the meaning of Scripture

---

10 C. H. Dodd, *The Authority of the Bible,* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1962), pp. 21, 273.

11 Cunliffe-Jones, "A Congregationalist Contribution," in Richardson and Schweitzer, p. 55.

for the contemporary Church.[12]

Bishop Gustaf Aulén, the well-known Swedish Lutheran theologian and ecumenist, has stated that systematic theology must be positively, but not legalistically, dependent upon the continuous testimony of faith given through the ages—that is, on tradition. But he also affirms that within this tradition the writings of the New Testament occupy a special place because, though they were originally part of the primitive tradition of the Church, they are "the first and decisive testimony to that deed of the Christ which is the fundamental fact of Christianity". Aulén feels that the fundamental testimony of the New Testament must act as a regulative principle; that is, what appears within Christianity in the later development (tradition) must be in inner harmony with that conception of God and relationship to God which is revealed in the work of Christ and proclaimed in the New Testament.[13]

Edmund Schlink, a German Lutheran and professor of systematic theology at the University of Heidelberg, has flatly pointed out that whether one accepts the principle of tradition or not, the fact remains that every Christian inherits a definite historical tradition, and that, indeed, the New Testament itself reflects a variety of traditions. "Our main concern," he writes, "must be to discover the spiritual wealth conceded in the different traditions, and to seek the unity of the Church not in uniformity but in a fellowship of different traditions."[14]

The late Dr. James Moffatt, the renowned Scottish Biblical scholar, and a Presbyterian, urged an understanding of tradition in what he felt was its original and broader sense: a witness to the living Lord. He wrote: "We cannot disinherit ourselves by declining to take account of its function during the long interval between ourselves and its first phases within the Church of our fathers." But Moffatt would have us test the tradition by Scripture and the present leading of the Holy Spirit, and challenge false claimants.[15]

---

[12] Muilenburg, "The Interpretation of the Bible," in Richardson and Schweitzer, p. 221.

[13] Aulén, *The Faith of the Christian Church*, (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1948), pp. 90 91. The distinguished English Congregationalist and scholar, Daniel Jenkins, adopts precisely the same point of view. Cf. Jenkins, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

[14] Schlink, "The Significance of the Eastern and Western Traditions for the Christian Church," *Ecumenical Review*, XII, No. 2 (January, 1960), 133, 142.

[15] Moffatt, *The Thrill of Tradition*, (New York: Macmillan Co., 1944), p. 56.

for the contemporary Church.[12]

Bishop Gustaf Aulén, the well-known Swedish Lutheran theologian and ecumenist, has stated that systematic theology must be positively, but not legalistically, dependent upon the continuous testimony of faith given through the ages—that is, on tradition. But he also affirms that within this tradition the writings of the New Testament occupy a special place because, though they were originally part of the primitive tradition of the Church, they are "the first and decisive testimony to that deed of the Christ which is the fundamental fact of Christianity". Aulén feels that the fundamental testimony of the New Testament must act as a regulative principle; that is, what appears within Christianity in the later development (tradition) must be in inner harmony with that conception of God and relationship to God which is revealed in the work of Christ and proclaimed in the New Testament.[13]

Edmund Schlink, a German Lutheran and professor of systematic theology at the University of Heidelberg, has flatly pointed out that whether one accepts the principle of tradition or not, the fact remains that every Christian inherits a definite historical tradition, and that, indeed, the New Testament itself reflects a variety of traditions. "Our main concern," he writes, "must be to discover the spiritual wealth conceded in the different traditions, and to seek the unity of the Church not in uniformity but in a fellowship of different traditions."[14]

The late Dr. James Moffatt, the renowned Scottish Biblical scholar, and a Presbyterian, urged an understanding of tradition in what he felt was its original and broader sense: a witness to the living Lord. He wrote: "We cannot disinherit ourselves by declining to take account of its function during the long interval between ourselves and its first phases within the Church of our fathers." But Moffatt would have us test the tradition by Scripture and the present leading of the Holy Spirit, and challenge false claimants.[15]

---

[12] Muilenburg, "The Interpretation of the Bible," in Richardson and Schweitzer, p. 221.

[13] Aulén, *The Faith of the Christian Church*, (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1948), pp. 90 91. The distinguished English Congregationalist and scholar, Daniel Jenkins, adopts precisely the same point of view. Cf. Jenkins, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

[14] Schlink, "The Significance of the Eastern and Western Traditions for the Christian Church," *Ecumenical Review*, XII, No. 2 (January, 1960), 133, 142.

[15] Moffatt, *The Thrill of Tradition*, (New York: Macmillan Co., 1944), p. 56.

Clarence Tucker Craig, before his death in 1953 a leading American Methodist New Testament scholar, theologian and ecumenist, affirmed his belief that God speaks his will in at least three other channels besides Scripture: natural law, tradition and the internal witness of the Holy Spirit. With respect to tradition, Craig reminded Protestants of the obvious fact that it was not the New Testament which authorized the Church, but the Church which authorized the New Testament as containing a sufficient guide to faith and action. He made clear his conviction that the later teaching of the Church should be as binding upon members as the letter of Scripture. Professor Craig was fond of pointing out that even those Christians who claim to be guided only by Scripture are nevertheless fond of quoting authorities (Luther or Calvin, for instance) to support their interpretations. In his essay for Richardson and Schweitzer's symposium on *Biblical Authority for Today,* Craig concluded:

> The Church of every age stands under the judgment of the written Word which comes to us from the past. But in the interpretation of valid standards, the Church never can and never should disregard the accumulated experiences of the continuous fellowship of believers. . . . Church history will not afford "solutions" any more than the Bible will directly, but it will offer "guidance" for all who retain the inquiring spirit.[16]

Professor Tetsutaro Ariga, a member of the *Kyodan,* the United Church of Japan, has introduced a new note in the discussion by speaking of Christian tradition as a paradox. He points out that we are tradition-bound, like it or not. But Christian tradition is not simply something handed down from the past; it brings us to Christ who liberates man from the bondage of the past. It is in this paradox that any church tradition finds its *dynamis.* As for Scripture, Professor Ariga affirms that in reading the Bible we come to know Christ, the eternal Word of God. "Traditions are valuable," he writes, "and worthy of respect in so far as they help us to understand and interpret the meaning of the Gospel better."[17]

---

[16] Craig, "A Methodist Contribution," in Richardson and Schweitzer, pp. 35-40. For a brief discussion of the problem of tradition vs. traditionalism among American Methodists, see Gerald H. Anderson "The Challenge of the Ecumenical Movement to Methodism," *The Asbury Seminarian,* XIV, No. 2 (Spring-Summer, 1960), pp. 25-28.

[17] Ariga, *op. cit.,* p. 205.

Anglicans have had a great deal to say in recent years on the subject of Scripture and tradition and have sought to discuss and interpret the matter to both their Protestant and Catholic brothers in the Ecumenical Movement. Ecclesiologically they are in an especially strategic position to do this, as we all know. Let us ponder briefly the ideas of two prominent English Anglicans on this subject.

R. R. Williams has a rather mystical turn of mind and much of what he has to say about Scripture and tradition corresponds with the views of Cunliffe-Jones.[18] In his *Authority in the Apostolic Age,* Williams writes:

> It is the Holy Spirit who brings home to Church and Christian the authority of God in Christ. The Lord is the Spirit. His voice does not come to us always in unmistakable tones. We walk by faith and not by sight. If in doubt, the individual will pay great attention to the voice of the Church. The Church will always try to move in loyalty to the Scriptures. And both the Church and the individual will be ready to leave room for the contemporary living voice of God the Holy Spirit. . . Scripture, antiquity and reason will all have their message if we have ears to hear and eyes to see. . . by loyalty to the historic Church, by loyalty to the Word of God in the Bible, and by the honest following of whatever light God vouchsafes to our minds and hearts, we may at least be in the way of hearing God's authoritative Word for ourselves, the Church and the world.[19]

Alan Richardson, in an essay for the symposium he helped to edit, summarizes what might be regarded not only as the predominant position held by Anglicans but also as the growing consensus of Protestant thought generally on the subject of Scripture and tradition. He affirms that tradition represents the mind of the Universal Church and is the best guide for interpreting the sense of Scripture, especially where Scripture is ambiguous. But tradition is not a separate authority to be set alongside the Bible. Rather, tradition supplements the Bible and Biblical teaching is to be interpreted by both reason and tradition.[20]

Important Recent Ecumenical Pronouncements on Scripture and Tradition

As has already been suggested, the problem of the relation of

---

[18] See text and note 11 above.

[19] (London: SCM Press, 1950), pp. 141-142.

[20] "An Anglican Contribution," in Richardson and Schweitzer, p. 118.

Scripture and tradition and their respective authority in the Church has been a matter of considerable discussion in the Ecumenical Movement, particularly in Faith and Order deliberations. The Second World Conference of Faith and Order at Edinburgh, Scotland, in 1937, was very clear in recognizing that the living Word precedes and creates the Church, and the Church's life and tradition precedes and creates the written Word:

> A testimony by *words* is by divine ordering provided for the revelation uttered by the *Word*. This testimony is given in Holy Scripture, which thus affords the primary norm for the Church's teaching, worship and life. . . . We are at one in recognizing that the Church, enlightened by the Holy Spirit, has been instrumental in the formation of the Bible.[21]

Edinburgh did not reconcile all the differences the delegates represented on the subject, of course. Protestants could not subscribe to much of the *content* of tradition as interpreted by Eastern Orthodox Christians and others who valued certain beliefs which did not rest on Scripture. Nor could most of the Protestants go along with the Eastern Orthodox and others who regarded Scripture and tradition as equally authoritative. The majority of the Protestant delegates at Edinburgh felt that the Church

> . . . is bound exclusively by the Bible as the only rule of faith and practice and, while accepting the relative authority of tradition, would consider it authoritative only in so far as it is founded on the Bible itself.[22]

The Third World Conference on Faith and Order held at Lund, Sweden, in 1952, revealed that the sharp contrast present at Edinburgh had not much changed. The Catholic and Protestant delegates at Lund reported from one of the sections:

> All accepted the Holy Scriptures as either the sole authority for doctrine or the primary and decisive part of those authorities to which they would appeal. . . All Churches represented among us recognize the traditions of their Christian past with gratitude and pride. . . There are, however, among us two distinct emphases upon the relation between Scripture and Tradition. Some would regard Tradition as a living process, whether embodied in written documents or not, continuous with, though not necessarily additional to, the biblical revelation, while others would restrict its character to a clarification

---

[21] Quoted from Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

and exposition of the biblical Gospel.[23]

The "Consultation on Church Union" which met at Oberlin College in Ohio on March 19-21, 1963, to continue deliberations on the proposed union of six Protestant denominations in the United States (Protestant Episcopal, United Presbyterian, Methodist, United Church of Christ, Evangelical United Brethren and Disciples of Christ) produced a remarkable statement on the subject of Scripture and tradition which was quoted in the *Christian Century*. The members of the Consultation defined tradition as "the whole life of the Church, ever guided and nourished by the Holy Spirit, and expressed in its worship, witness, way of life, and its order." Tradition thus defined is regarded as both the act of delivery by which the gospel is made known and transmitted as well as the teaching and practice handed on from one generation to another. The Consultation then went on to say that the Church confronts not only Scripture and *Tradition* but *traditions* as well. *Traditions* are individual expressions of the *Tradition* which more or less characterize particular churches at various times and places. These *traditions* must ever be brought under the judgment of Scripture, for Scripture is the norm of the Church's total life. "To bring its traditions under the judgment of the Scriptures is an inescapable obligation of the church."[24]

Only time will tell how helpful the distinction between *Tradition* and *traditions* will be—but it is certainly pregnant with possibilities. The distinction was, of course, not original with the Consultation. The Commission on Faith and Order, on the recommendation of the Lund Conference, established a Theological Commission on Tradition and Traditions to "explore more deeply the resources for further ecumenical discussion to be found in that common history we have as Christians and which we have discovered to be longer, larger and richer than any our separate histories in our divided churches."[25]

---

[23] *The Third World Conference on Faith and Order: Lund,* 1952, edited by Oliver S. Tomkins, (London: SCM Press, 1953), pp. 251-252.

[24] Kyle Haselden, "Fusion at Oberlin," *Christian Century,* LXXX, No. 14 (April 3, 1963), p. 423.

[25] *The Third World Conference on Faith and Order,* p. 27. See Professor Chrysostomos Konstantinides' interesting use of the distinction in his "The Significance of the Eastern and Western Traditions Within Christendom," *Ecumenical Review,* XII, No. 2 (January, 1960), 143-153. See also J. Robert Nelson "Tradition and Traditions as an Ecumenical Problem," *Theology Today,* XIII (July, 1956), 151-165.

The Fourth World Conference on Faith and Order which met at Montreal, Canada, in July of 1963, contributed to the discussion by maintaining that the Christian Tradition (capital T) is the gospel itself, transmitted from generation to generation in and by the Church. It is Christ himself present in the life of the Church. This Tradition is the work of the Holy Spirit and is embodied in the *traditions* which are "the expressions and manifestations in diverse historical forms of the one truth and reality which is Christ."[26]

The Montreal deliberations on Scripture, Tradition and Traditions (Section II) helped to bring ecumenical conversation to the point of beginning to appreciate the determinative place of Tradition in the life of the Church—as something upon which all our traditions are dependent and as something which has operated from the very beginning of the Church's history even before the New Testament was written. An important paragraph of the Report of Section II reads:

> Our starting point is that we are all living in a tradition which goes back to our Lord and has its roots in the Old Testament, and are all indebted to that tradition inasmuch as we have received the revealed truth, the Gospel, through its being transmitted from one generation to another. Thus we can say that we exist as Christians by the Tradition of the Gospel (the *paradosis* of the *keryma*) testified in Scripture, transmitted in and by the Church through the power of the Holy Spirit. Tradition taken in this sense is actualized in the preaching of the Word, in the administration of the Sacraments and worship, in Christian teaching and theology, in mission and witness to Christ in the lives of the members of the Church.[27]

Prospects for Advance

The question remains as to whether or not there is any prospect for a complete Catholic-Protestant reconciliation with respect to the relation and authority of Scripture and tradition. Eastern Orthodox Christians, Roman Catholics and others regard them as equally authoritative, while Protestants insist on the primacy of Scripture even though they are coming incrasingly to appreciate the authoritative character of tradition. The Roman Catholic Church,

---

[26] World Council of Churches, Division of Studies, Commission on Faith and Order, "Fourth World Conference of Faith and Order, Montreal, July, 1963: Report of Section II" (13 pp. mimeographed), pp. 1, 3.

[27] *Ibid.*, pp. 2-3.

as we pointed out earlier, has gone to the extreme of regarding tradition as a separate authority for divine truth, independent of Scripture. Can there ever be a reconciliation of these views?

The Report of Section II at Montreal lifted up certain recommendations which it felt would at least help create a climate of understanding in which progress in discussions on Scripture and tradition might be possible. Specifically, it recommended that the divided churches through their theological representatives do the following:

1. Study the Filioque.
2. Study the Councils of the Early Church and their implications.
3. Study the history of exegesis.
4. Engage in joint study of the various Christian traditions of Spirituality and Prayer, whereby a proper understanding of our common heritage may be reached.
5. Engage in joint study of catechetical documents in the light of ecumenical concern.
6. Study the problem of hermeneutics.
7. Encourage the Churches to train clergy in close acquaintance with the original languages of the Bible, for without this ecumenical dialogue is without a common terminology.[28]

Walter Marshall Horton sees hope in the fact that non-Roman Catholics are now generally agreed that traditions contrary to Scripture cannot be sound traditions, and that even among Roman Catholics one of the two "permitted opinions" is that tradition is not a parallel source of divine truth separate from Scripture but is simply the authorized churchly interpretation of Scripture in its wholeness. Horton asserts that many Catholic thinkers (Roman and otherwise) would agree that the New Testament is "that part of the Christian tradition which gives the norm to all the rest."[29]

Daniel Jenkins has pointed out that one of the interesting and hopeful features of the present situation is that at the same moment Protestantism is realizing how closely Scripture and tradition are intertwined, Roman Catholicism is beginning to realize, partly under the influence of the Biblical revival in Protestantism, the full magnitude of the claim of Scripture to authority. And Father Hans Küng, the rising star in contemporary Roman Catholic theological

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

[29] Walter M. Horton, *Christian Theology: An Ecumenical Approach*, (New York: Harper & Bros., 1958), pp. 49-52.

as we pointed out earlier, has gone to the extreme of regarding tradition as a separate authority for divine truth, independent of Scripture. Can there ever be a reconciliation of these views?

The Report of Section II at Montreal lifted up certain recommendations which it felt would at least help create a climate of understanding in which progress in discussions on Scripture and tradition might be possible. Specifically, it recommended that the divided churches through their theological representatives do the following:

1. Study the Filioque.
2. Study the Councils of the Early Church and their implications.
3. Study the history of exegesis.
4. Engage in joint study of the various Christian traditions of Spirituality and Prayer, whereby a proper understanding of our common heritage may be reached.
5. Engage in joint study of catechetical documents in the light of ecumenical concern.
6. Study the problem of hermeneutics.
7. Encourage the Churches to train clergy in close acquaintance with the original languages of the Bible, for without this ecumenical dialogue is without a common terminology.[28]

Walter Marshall Horton sees hope in the fact that non-Roman Catholics are now generally agreed that traditions contrary to Scripture cannot be sound traditions, and that even among Roman Catholics one of the two "permitted opinions" is that tradition is not a parallel source of divine truth separate from Scripture but is simply the authorized churchly interpretation of Scripture in its wholeness. Horton asserts that many Catholic thinkers (Roman and otherwise) would agree that the New Testament is "that part of the Christian tradition which gives the norm to all the rest."[29]

Daniel Jenkins has pointed out that one of the interesting and hopeful features of the present situation is that at the same moment Protestantism is realizing how closely Scripture and tradition are intertwined, Roman Catholicism is beginning to realize, partly under the influence of the Biblical revival in Protestantism, the full magnitude of the claim of Scripture to authority. And Father Hans Küng, the rising star in contemporary Roman Catholic theological

[28] *Ibid.*, p. 13.

[29] Walter M. Horton, *Christian Theology: An Ecumenical Approach*, (New York: Harper & Bros., 1958), pp. 49-52.

thought, has described with approval the growing regard for Biblical studies in his Church, stimulated in large measure by Pope Pius XII's encyclical of 1943 *Divino afflante Spiritu.*

Perhaps it is too much to hope for a complete Protestant-Catholic reconciliation on the question of the authority of tradition, but surely George Tavard and Hans Küng have marked out the avenue of advance in understanding and accord. Father Tavard, a French Roman Cathloic priest and noted irenical scholar, now teaching theology in the United States, would have his fellow Catholics remember that tradition is man's encounter with the Word in the Church and that it cannot be divorced from Scripture, which is the very backbone of tradition. "Tradition," he says, "is not superadded to another 'source'. For it is guided by the inspired expression of the earliest Tradition, which is also the model of all Tradition, Holy Scripture."[30]

And Father Hans Küng, the young professor of theology at the University of Tübingen in Germany, whose recent (1961) book *The Council, Reform and Reunion* has been enthusiastically received by Roman Catholics and Protestants alike, would have the hierarchy of his Church confess its faith in the Word of God, leaving aside all controversies over the relation of Scripture to tradition, and proclaim the pre-eminent significance of the Word of God over every word of man. Father Küng would have the hierarchy of his Church declare unequivocally that the Word of God has power to pardon, to save, to illuminate, to strengthen, to console. The effect, Küng feels, would be extraordinarily beneficial.[31]

---

[30] George Tavard, "The Problem of Tradition Today," *The Ecumenist,* I, No. 3 (February-March, 1963), 35-36.

[31] Hans Küng, *The Council, Reform and Reunion,* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961), pp. 181-182.

AN ANGLICAN RESPONSE TO GOWING'S "SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION"

H. Ellsworth Chandlee

IT is a most difficult task to attempt a critique of so excellent a paper as that which Dr. Gowing has presented. He has said so much of what this writer is convinced is right and necessary to be said that there is scant room for disagreement with the contents of the paper. Dr. Gowing writes so like a good Episcopalian that one in that tradition hesitates to criticise what has been said in the paper lest he find himself at variance with his own tradition! I would therefore wish to underscore most of what Dr. Gowing has said, and to confine myself to the expansion and elucidation of some of the points which he has made.

When those in the Protestant tradition enter into dialogue with those in the Catholic tradition of Christianity in regard to Scripture and Tradition and the relative authority of the two, it has doubtless often seemed to Protestants that Catholics in their appeal to the authority of the Holy Tradition of the Church and in their insistance upon its authority have been guilty of placing the Scriptures in a vastly inferior position; of dethroning, as it were, the supreme Word of God—indeed, of attempting to substitute the traditions and teachings of men for the commandments of God. But Catholics, on the other hand, have been quite equally suspicious of Protestants in an appeal to *sola scriptura* as the rule of faith and order. Catholics have thought that Protestants intend to insist that nothing at all is valid and of authority in the life of the Church which is not explicitly stated in the Scriptures. We have felt that Protestantism is seeking the rejection of the historic Church of the Apostles and Fathers, and in its place setting up a man-made organization—in effect taking the position that the true Church had been unknown or at best so immersed in sin as to be unrecognisable from the time of the writing of the last New Testament document until the 16th Century, when the Protestant Reformation got everything all straightened out and restored the pure Bible religion. Happily, as

Dr. Gowing pointed out, we are coming to understand each other more and more, and as we do so we are coming more and more deeply to realise that the Church is a continuity, and that we cannot escape Tradition even if we would when we consider the Church as an historic institution. By means of our continuing dialogue along the lines pointed up in Dr. Gowing's paper we shall, please God, grow in deeper understanding and shall perhaps find we are not so far apart as we had supposed.

While most of us are agreed upon what we mean by the term *Scripture,*[1] it has been the experience of the writer that we have by no means the same amount of agreement about what is meant by the term *Tradition*. It may therefore serve our discussion to expand somewhat Dr. Gowing's definition of tradition, and the understanding of the place and authority of tradition in the life of the Church generally held by those who are in what I would call the classical Catholic tradition. If a personal reference may be made, I rather feel that in some of the ecumenical dialogues we have been at times talking at cross purposes because we do not always mean the same thing by the same word. When an Anglican—and here I think we may say generally when a Catholic—speaks of the Tradition of the Church, he means the continuous transmission of the Faith in all its varied forms and lines and the content of what is transmitted.[2] The Church by her very nature as the Body of Christ is continuous. Being one organic entity, she does not change and assume new forms and teaching from age to age and place to place.[3] There are certain marks by which the Church is known and recognized everywhere and at all times.[4] The Holy Tradition shows clearly these marks, and it is the adherance to the Holy Tradition which guarantees the continuity of the Church, bears witness to the fact that the Church today is the Church which Jesus Christ founded; it is adherance to the Tradition which enables the Church to be the same and teach

1. The Anglican definition of Scripture will be found in *Article VI* of the *Thirty Nine Articles.* These are printed in the American *Book of Common Prayer* beginning on page 603. Cf. F.J. Hall, *Authority, Ecclesiastical and Biblical,* New York, 1918, page 194ff.
2. J. A. Pike and W.N. Pittenger, *The Faith of the Church,* New York, 1951, page 19. See also Pittenger, *His Body the Church,* New York, 1945, Chapter VII.
3. *Ibid.* Cf. Hall, *op cit.,* especially Chapter 9.
4. These are the four points of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral. An excellent discussion is to be found in Hebert, *The Form of the Church,* London, 1944, under the Credal Notes of the Church.

the same truth to all peoples and in all ages. Thus classical Anglicanism has never appealed to the Scriptures alone as the rule of faith and order.[5] As it has been put, Anglicanism appeals to the Faith once delivered to the Saints, contained in Holy Scripture, summed up and stated in the Creeds, affirmed and defined by the great Ecumenical Councils, taught by the Fathers of the Church—in other words, the Faith as it has been transmitted to us through the Holy Tradition.[6] Another way of stating this, and at the same time of guaranteeing against unwarranted additions to or substractions from the wholeness of the Faith as transmitted by the Tradition, and of testing the integrity of the tradition which we have received, is the canon of Catholic Consent: what has been believed by all, everywhere, always.[7] Faithfulness to the Tradition—to what is indeed the apostolic *paradosis* transmitted and preserved in the ongoing and continuing life of the Church is the continuing in the Apostles' teaching and the guarantee that what we meet in the Church today, or at any time, here, or at any place, is the true Catholic Faith and Order, the Church in its fullness and wholeness, and not a man-made organization nor a creation of someone's personal convictions, valuable as these may be. One of the hymns in the Hymnal of the Episcopal Church puts all this in a remarkably concise manner:

> "Let what apostles learned of the thee
> Be ours from age to age:
> Their steadfast faith our unity,
> Their peace our heritage."[8]

Perhaps this will serve to explain the Anglican and Catholic view of Tradition and show why we consider it so vital and indeed so fundamental in a truly Catholic Church.

Another point in the paper may well be expanded. Dr. Gowing has most aptly pointed out that there is a growing recognition that the writers of Scripture wrote from an ecclesiastical point of view. What had been received from the Lord has been embodied in these writings. But it was the Church which took *these* writings from

5. Cf. *Doctrine in the Church of England,* New York, 1938, page 32. Note also the extracts in More and Cross, *Anglicanism,* London, 1935, IV and V.
6. This summary was in a Syllabus for a course in Dogmatic Theology given by the late Marshall Bowyer Stewart.
7. Hall, *op. cit., page* 258. This is the so-called "Vincentian Canon."
8. Hymnal 1940, No. 380. The words are by Howard Chandler Robbins.

among others and made of them the Sacred Canon.[9] Historically, the fact that this was done was the result of the need to define just what was the true and authoritative Tradition in the face of Gnostic distortions of it. *These* writings contained the true and authoritive Tradition; therefore, they are the Scriptures. It is the Church which both preserves and transmits the Canon, for therein she finds the true authoritative Tradition, the true *paradosis*. Thus it is to the Scriptures the Church looks and must ever look for the normative deposit of the faith; it is by the Scriptures the Church constantly judges her life, teaching, and doctrines, so that there may always be brought before men and mediated to them the basic and fundamental experience of the mighty acts of God for us men and for our salvation—those mighty acts upon which the whole life of the Church rests. It is by means of Scripture that the Church tests the purity of her Holy Tradition.[10] But a word of caution here: Catholic consent has not accorded this testing and judging, what we may call the interpretation of the Scriptures as they pertain to faith and order, to private judgment. The Council in Trullo in 690 A.D. stated the classical Catholic position:

> And if any controversy in regard to Scripture shall have been raised, let them not interpret it otherwise than as the lights and doctors of the Church in their writings have expounded it.[11]

Thus even for interpretation of Scripture, the Church appeals to Tradition. Those of the Catholic persuasion have suspected that Protestants deny this appeal, and that they subscribe to the untrammelled right of private judgment to decide what the Scriptures say in matters of faith and order. Catholics accordingly fear that Protestants in so doing are leading inevitably to the admission of strange and erroneous teachings and indeed contributing to the fragmentation of the Church into sects based upon some particular interpretation. This, one feels, needs to be faced quite frankly; needs to be fully discussed and clarified.

Anglican, and for that matter classical Catholic thought if we except post-Tridentine Roman thought for the most part, refuses to maintain that there is any real antithesis whatever between Scrip-

9. Hall, *op. cit.*, page 191ff.
10. Moss, *The Christian Faith*, London, 1954, pages 216ff.
11. Quoted in Hall, *op. cit.*, page 120.

ture and Tradition, or to set them up as a double source of authority. This Dr. Gowing has pointed out, and I would underscore it. The two are complementary each to the other and are not to be considered as in opposition to each other. They are parts of the same thing, as it were.[12] The result of failing to see this is the separation of biblical from ecclesiastical authority, to the detriment of both and at the expense of one or the other, and to the weakening of the necessary hold upon both. Anglicanism, then, and Catholic consent generally looks upon the Scriptures as the *fundamental part* of the Holy Tradition, as normative to it, as of supreme authority in it. But the Scriptures are by no means the whole of the *paradosis*. Dr. Gowing's point in this respect deserves further discussion. Space does not permit us to here detail the many facets of the Tradition which are not Scriptural, except perhaps seminally. There is the great dogmatic tradition. We would not seek to deny the supremely important place of the Creeds and the great affirmations of Christian Dogma. Yet these are of the Tradition and are transmitted through it. They may indeed be proven by Scripture, but they are not explicit in their details in Scripture. And so it is with the Liturgical Tradition—there is a tradition and a Catholic consent in this as well. There is a tradition of Church Order, and of many other aspects of the life of the Church. These are not an inchoate body of ideas and opinions, but they bear a recognisable and definable form and content, and they are the property of no one part of the Church nor did they take their authority from any one part of it—they derive from the Tradition, and claim the authority of Tradition. One would wish further to illustrate all this, and perhaps future discussion of it will prove very fruitful.

There is one other point which Dr. Gowing made, the discussion of which will be most productive and may make for future clarification. At one place in his paper, Dr. Gowing gave us a brief discussion and a quotation from the results of the Consultation on Church Union held this past March in Oberlin, Ohio. The consultants pointed out that the Church today confronts not only Scripture and Tradition, but also traditions: individual expressions of the Tradition. The writer believes that the study and clarification of these traditions and the ascertaining of their relation to the Tradition itself,

12. Pike and Pittenger, page 19.

and indeed the submission of them to the judgment of the Tradition, will be a great advance in our ecumenical understanding. In closing, the writer would state one or two points not mentioned in the paper, but points which need frank investigation and discussion: (1) the role of the historic Episcopate as witness to the integrity of the Tradition and as living guarantee of the continuity of the *paradosis;* (2) the economy of the Holy Spirit in his continuous guidance of the Church into all truth, ever bringing into fuller realization the Word of God, and the Tradition as the voice of the Spirit in the Church. The writer is most grateful to Dr. Gowing for a very illuminating paper, and particularly for the full bibliography which he has indicated in his footnotes.

BOOK REVIEW

Eugene A. Hessel. *The Religious Thought of José Rizal.* Manila: Philippine Education Company, 1961. xii, 289 pp. ₱8.00

The sources for a study of Rizal's religious thought are his two novels, *Noli Me Tangere* and *El Filibusterismo;* a satirical essay, *La Vision de Fr. Rodriguez;* two untitled and unfinished note-book essays subsequently labeled "Friars and Filipinos" and "The State of Religiosity in the Philippines"; his brief correspondence with Father Pablo Pastells, S.J., of Ateneo de Manila, one of the hero's former teachers there; and several other scattered writings and letters. In these sources we see clearly how Rizal came to repudiate the worst features of the Spanish Roman Catholicism he knew in his fatherland and accept certain emancipating and liberal concepts to which his keen mind was exposed in Europe. Lacking the precision and resources of a trained theologian, José Rizal none the-less developed a theology that was for the most part consistent, carefully reasoned and mature. In the process he adopted views that were unequivocally heretical in the eyes of the Roman Catholic Church and even of orthodox Protestantism. Still, Rizal considered himself a Catholic and, indeed, once remarked to his friend Ferdinand Blumentritt that Catholicism "is Christianity made poetic and beautiful, much finer than insipid Protestantism" (p. 235).

A champion of the Filipinos against the abuses and oppression of the Spanish friars, José Rizal not only attacked them on moral grounds but on theological grounds as well. He rejected the doctrine of the infallibility of Church and Pope and asserted that the friars should not claim to speak or govern in God's name. He argued for a separation of Church and State, saying that the Church should not seek to dominate secular affairs—nor should it exercise control over men's minds. Rizal repudiated the doctrine of purgatory and attacked as superstitious such customs as exorcism, saint and image worship, indulgences and the like. He also rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation and criticised loose ideas about the efficacy of confession. It is little wonder the friars hated Rizal and the Roman Catholic Church sought to get him to recant before his death.

It is what Rizal affirmed, more than what he repudiated, that makes his religious thought attractive, however. He held that reason—a gift of God—is a source of religious truth and that a study of history and of nature can lead to religious knowledge. Knowledge of God, he believed, is not confined to a single religion—and, indeed, knowledge of absolute truth is impossible in religion and morals. Rizal felt that even though historians have distorted the meaning of Jesus' teachings, God's purpose of love can be known in them. Man, in Rizal's view, is made in the image of God, created to be free of external restraint, given free will, endowed with intelligence and conscience (to tell right from wrong), and blessed with an immortal soul—all of which provides him with an innate dignity and worth. A unitarian of the First Person of the Trinity, Rizal loved God whom he regarded as the "All", the "infinitely perfect", the "Highest Good", omniscient and omnipotent. Jesus Christ he thought of as revelatory of God's love, a teacher of pure religion and true doctrine and "one of the greatest founders of religion."

José Rizal sounded for all the world like a 19th Century Protestant liberal who studied in Germany under Ritschl and Harnack. Of course, he did sojourn in Germany and very likely picked up some of his ideas there. It is certain that he was influenced by the writings of the 18th Century French deist, Voltaire, and the simple teachings and elemental ethics of Freemasonry. Thus, because he was caught up in the spirit of an entirely different age, Rizal will not be widely hailed as having much to say to the religious spirit of our age. Dr. Hessel regards the following as the abiding worth of the hero's religious thought: his passionate yearning for the Truth; his appreciation for the "existential" element in all true religion; his insistence upon sincerity in religion; and his call to all men to reach for the best.

Eugene A. Hessel, Professor of New Testament at Union Theological Seminary, Dasmariñas, Cavite, has given us a really significant book, written originally as a dissertation for his doctorate in theology at the San Francisco Theological Seminary. It represents the very best in thorough scholarship combined with lucid style and clarity of expression. The many tables summarizing the religious ideas found in Rizal's various writings are positively ingenious. No collection of Rizalania is complete without this book and the fact that it has not been widely advertized amounts almost to criminal negligence!

The single word of criticism—and it is a light word—that this reviewer would offer concerns Dr. Hessel's too brief treatment (on pp. 258-259) of Rizal's alleged retraction before his execution on December 30, 1896. It would have been edifying and relevant to his study if the author had presented the evidence pro and con. One has the feeling that Dr. Hessel does not accept the retraction as authentic, but for some reason hesitates to say why.

Don't wait any longer! Buy this book!

PETER G. GOWING

BOOKS RECEIVED

Bentley and Driver. *Qualitative Chemical Analysis.* (Revised by J. E. Driver). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1962. (Sixth Edition). 51 pp. HK$5.00.

Copeman, George. *Promotion and Pay for Executives.* London Business Publications, Ltd. 2nd Ed. 1960 (1962 Second Impression). x, 258 pp. 35/—

Copeman, George. *The Challenge of Employee Shareholding: How to Close the Gap Between Capital and Labor.* London: Business Publications, Ltd. 1958, viii, 200 pp. 18/—

Deschampsneuffs, Henry. *Selling In Africa.* London: Business Publications, Ltd. 1961, 239 pp. 75/—

Elliott, Blanche B. *A History of English Advertising.* London: Business Publications, Ltd. 1962. xvi, 231 pp. 35/—

Gregg, D. W. A. *Brand Names For the Investor: A Guide to Manufacturers' Trade and Brand Names.* London: Business Publications, Ltd. 1963, viii, 320 pp. 55/—

Harris, Leonard M. and Ulric M. Spencer. *Profit and Personality in Retailing.* London: Business Publications, Ltd. 1961. xi, 193 pp. 35/—

Henderson, Norman K. *Educational Developments and Research With Special Reference to Hong Kong.* Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1963. v, 44 pp. HK$2.50.

Karlgren, Bernhard. *Sound and Symbol in Chinese.* Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1962. 99 pp. HK$6.00.

O'Connor, Lillian. *Philippine Speech Manual of English Sounds.* Manila: Philippine Education Company, 1955. vi, 86 pp. ₱2.75.

Szczepanik, Edward (ed). *Symposium on Economics and Social Problems of the Far East.* Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 1962. ix, 508 pp. HK$50.00.

Thornton, N. *Retail Budgetary Control and Costing: An Introduction.* London: Business Publications, Ltd. 1960. x, 166 pp. 35/—

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

LAWRENCE C. HOWARD and PAUL HARE are former officials of the U.S. Peace Corps. Indeed, Dr. Howard resided a year at Silliman Farm while serving as Peace Corps Representative in the Western Visayas. Dr. Howard is now employed by the New York State Department of Education and Mr. Hare serves on the faculty of Haverford College.

WILLIAM HENRY SCOTT is a lay missionary of the Protestant Episcopal Church and serves as Director of the Aglipay Institute in Laoag, Ilocos Norte. Having served nine years on the faculty of St. Mary's School at Sagada, Bontoc, Mr. Scott developed a special interest in the anthropology of Mountain Province people and his published studies are widely known.

PETER G. GOWING, Editor of the *Silliman Journal*, is Associate Professor of Church History and Christian Doctrine in the College of Theology. A fraternal worker of the United Church Board for World Ministries, Dr. Gowing has been at Silliman since 1960.

H. ELLSWORTH CHANDLEE is a priest of the Protestant Episcopal Church and serves as Professor of Old Testament and Liturgics at St. Andrew's Theological Seminary in Quezon City.

GREGONIO D. SIEGA is the Librarian of Silliman University and ELISEO P. BAÑAS is head of the Processing Section of the University Library.

SELECTED

Philippine Periodical Index

October–December, 1963

Gorgonio D. Siega and Eliseo P. Bañas

PUBLICATIONS INDEXED

CCJ	*Coffee & Cacao Journal*	PCC	*Philippines Caltex Circle*
CM	*Chronicle Magazine*	PEB	*Philippine Economy Bulletin*
CT	*Catholic Teacher*	PEF	*Philippine Educational Forum*
ERJ	*Economic Research Journal*	PGJ	*Philippine Geographical Journal*
EC	*Education Currents*	PJE	*Philippine Journal of Education*
EQ	*Education Quarterly*	PJN	*Philippine Journal of Nutrition*
ES	*Esso Silangan*	PJP	*Phil. Journal of Public Health*
FA	*Filipino Athlete*	PL	*Philippine Labor*
FF	*Filipino Farmer*	PS	*Philippine Studies*
FCL	*Filipino Child Life*	PFP	*Philippines Free Press*
FT	*Filipino Teacher*	PHM	*Philippines Herald Magazine*
FAN	*Flying "A" News*	Sc Rev	*Science Review*
FW	*Free World*	SJ	*Silliman Journal*
IP	*Industrial Philippines*	SR	*Statistical Reporter*
JES	*Journal of East Asiatic Studies*	SN	*Sugar News*
MM	*Marcelo Magazine*	STM	*Sunday Times Magazine*
MST	*MST English Quarterly*	WG	*Weekly Graphic*
PA	*Philippine Agriculturist*	WW	*Weekly Women's Magazine*
		WH	*Woman and the Home*

EXPLANATION

RETAIL Trade

American-Philippine collaboration in Philippine economic development, by D. M. Macapagal. PEB, Sept-Oct 1963. V. 2, No. 1, p. 26-31.

The above entry shows that the article, "American-Philippine collaboration in Philippine economic development," by D. M. Macapagal, is to be found in the PHILIPPINE ECONOMIC BULLETIN issue of September-October 1963, Vol. 2, No. 1, pages 26-31.

A

C

D

E

F

G

H

J

K

M

N

O

P

S

T

U

V

W

Y

Z

SILLIMAN JOURNAL INDEX

VOLUME X (Pp. 1—526) January-December 1963

ARTICLES

EDITORIALS

BOOK REVIEWS AND SPECIAL REPORTS

INDICES

Decennial Index

to the

SILLIMAN JOURNAL

1954-1963

Eliseo P. Bañas

Dumaguete City

SILLIMAN UNIVERSITY

ABBREVIATIONS USED

Jan	January	bk.	book
Mar	March	ed.	edited, editor
Apr	April	edit'l	editorial
Jun	June	illus.	illustration(s)
Jul	July	p.	page(s)
Sep	September	rev.	review
Oct	October	tab(s).	tables(s)
Dec	December		

EXPLANATIONS

This index shows, among other things, (a) *Who* has published about what in the *Silliman Journal* during the last ten years; and (b) *What* materials about given topics have been published by whom in the Journal during the same period. The following are sample *author* and *subject* entries, respectively:

CALDERON, Cicero D.
Silliman University and its mission.
Jul-Sep. 1962. IX:3, p. 299-304.

EDUCATION, Higher
New frontiers for Silliman, by Merton D. Munn. Apr-Jun, 1962. IX:2, p. 105-119.

The first entry shows that (President) Cicero D. Calderon published an article entitled "Silliman University and Its Mission" in the *Silliman Journal,* which article is to be found on pages 299-304, in the 3d number of Volume 9. The second entry shows that an article on higher education was published by (Dean) Merton D. Munn in the *Journal,* the said article being found on pages 105-119, in the 2d number of Volume 9.

A

B

BOOK reviews—*Continued*

A half-century of Philippine agriculture; by D. V. Hart. Apr, 1954. I:2, p. 107-108.

Hawley: *Papers in demography and public administration;* by F. delor M. Angeles. Jul, 1955. II:3, p. 250.

Herre: *Check list of Philippine fishes;* by D. V. Hart. Oct, 1954. I:4, p. 68-69.

He sell: *The religious thought of Jose Rizal;* by P. G. Gowing. Oct-Dec, 1963. X:4, p. 421-423.

Hunt, et al: *Sociology in the Philippine setting;* by T. S. Oracion. Apr, 1955. II:2, p. 168-171.

Information Service of India: *India 1954: annual review;* by F. delor M. Angeles. Oct, 1955. II:4, p. 326.

Inger: *Systematics and zoogeography of Philippine amphibia;* by W. C. Brown. Jan, 1955. II:1, p. 82-83.

Kahin: *Nationalism and revolution in Indonesia;* by F. delor M. Angeles. Jul-Sep, 1956. III:3, p. 247-249.

Knox: *The early church and the coming great church;* by O. R. Buchwalter. Jul-Sep, 1956. III:3, p. 240-247.

Landicho: *The Mindoro yearbook:* by D. V. Hart. Oct, 1954. I:4, p. 67.

Lim Sian Tek: *The Fookien times yearbook;* by D. V. Hart. Oct, 1954. I:4, p. 67.

McDaniel, et al, *Readings in guidance;* by L. Q. Arquiza. Jul-Sep, 1960. VII:3, p. 236-237.

McDonald: *Educational psychology;* by L. Q. Arquiza. Jan-Mar, 1960. VII:1, p. 85-86.

Magsaysay Committee on General Education: *Toward general education in the Philippines;* by L. Q. Arquiza. Oct-Dec, 1960. VII:4, p. 325-327.

Millan and Porfirio: *Cotabato: 1952 Guidebook;* by D. V. Hart. Apr, 1954. I:2, p. 108-109.

Molen: *Bahasa Indonesia;* by F. delor M. Angeles. Oct, 1955. II:4, p. 326.

Montagu: *Anthropology and human nature;* by R. W. Lieban. Apr-Jun, 1958. V:2, p. 179-180.

Montagu: *Man: his first million years;* by R. W. Lieban. Apr-Jun, 1958. V:2, p. 179-180.

Mothershead: *Ethics;* by C. C. Amen. Jul-Sep, 1959. VI:3, p. 244-245.

Ortigas: *Planting rice is never fun;* by D. V. Hart. Oct, 1954. I:4, p. 66-67.

Phelan: *The Hispanization of the Philippines;* by P. V. Flores. Apr-Jun, 1961. VIII:2, p. 118-120.

Pittman, et al: *Notes on the dialect geography of the Philippines;* by D. V. Hart. Oct, 1954. I:4, p. 69.

Polson and Pal: *The status of rural life in the Dumaguete City trade area, Philippines, 1952;* by D. V. Hart. Oct-Dec, 1956. III:4, p. 344-345.

Publication notes, by F. D. M. Angeles and G. D. Siega. Jan-Mar, 1957. IV:1, p. 75-79.

Ramos and Valera: *Philippine harvest;* by D. S. Feria. Jan, 1954. I:1, p. 94-95.

Risley: *The ceramic industry in the Philippines;* by D. V. Hart. Oct, 1954. I:4, p. 68.

Robinson: *Honest to God;* by D. J. Elwood. Jul-Sep, 1963. X:3, p. 315-318.

Schnapper: *New frontiers of knowledge;* by J. S. Jacinto. Apr-Jun, 1957. IV:2, p. 152-155.

Schweitzer: *J. S. Bach,* 2 vols.; by A. Faurot. Apr-Jun, 1958. V:2, p. 175-178.

C

D

E

F

H

J

K

L

M

N

O

P

Q

R

S

T

U

V

W

Y

Republic of the Philippines
Department of Public Works and Communications
BUREAU OF POSTS
Manila

SWORN STATEMENT
(Required by Act 2580)

The undersigned, PETER G. GOWING, *Editor* of the *SILLIMAN JOURNAL*, published *quarterly* in English at *Silliman University*, after having been duly sworn in accordance with law, hereby submits the following statement of ownership, management, circulation, etc., which is required by Act 2580, as amended by Commonwealth Act No. 201:

Name	*Address*
Editor: PETER G. GOWING	SU, Dumaguete City
Business Manager: VIRGILIA BASOLIÑA	SU, Dumaguete City
Owner: SILLIMAN UNIVERSITY	Dumaguete City
Publisher: SILLIMAN UNIVERSITY	Dumaguete City
Printer: UNIVERSITY PRESS, INC.	Dumaguete City
Office of Publication: SILLIMAN UNIVERSITY	Dumaguete City

In case of publication other than daily, total number of copies printed and circulated of the last issue dated March 1963:

1. Sent to paid subscribers 50
2. Sent to others than paid subscribers 650

T o t a l 700

(Sgd.) PETER G. GOWING
Editor

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this 1st day of April, 1964, at Dumaguete City, the affiant exhibiting his Residence Certificate No. A-1494615, issued at Dumaguete City, on January 3, 1964.

(Sgd.) JOSE V. MONTEBON, JR.
Notary Public
Until December 31, 1965

Doc. No. 75
Page No. 98
Book No. IV
Series of 1964

NOTE: This form is exempt from the payment of documentary stamp tax.