

Bishop Francisco Gaínza, O.P. Obispo de Nueva Caceres (1862-1879)

REX ANDREW C. ALARCON

Francisco Gaínza was one of the important personages belonging to the ecclesiastical camp who had a significant role in the turn of events in the history of the Philippine Church during the second half of the nineteenth century. Gaínza's was then Bishop of Nueva Caceres. He was an extraordinary bishop of Nueva Caceres whose interest and influence were far from being provincial. It is not surprising therefore that his name, along with those of Pelaez, Burgos, Gomez, Zamora, Archbishop Martinez, find a conspicuous place in the writings of historians who deal with this period.

The present article proceeds with three ends in mind. The first is to present a survey on the historiography about Gaínza. The second is to arrive at a biography that considers his years as a missionary, as professor at the Universidad de Santo Tomas and as bishop of Nueva Caceres. And third, the article endeavours to present Gaínza's attitude in relation to the *Patronato Real*.

1. HISTORIOGRAPHY ABOUT GAÍNZA

While Francisco Gaínza holds a significant place in history, the historiography regarding him is not much and is varied. Here we cite three camps on the historiography of Gaínza.

1.1. *In Praise of Gaínza*

In general, Gaínza has often been presented as an extraordinary personality. For example, the Bikol historian Domingo Abella, in his *Bikol Annals*,¹ an episcopology, that is a study of the bishops who were assigned to the Diocese of Nueva Caceres², had high praises for Gaínza. Comparing Gaínza with the other bishops, he describes him as "*the greatest of them all*," a description which later, not without reason, had also been taken by other historians. Such description is further illustrated by the following lines:

He was great as a bishop, but greater as a man. In this diocese he left a shining memory as a brilliant administrator and a farsighted planner, a builder of resourceful enterprise, a patron of education, and a prolific writer. Nay, he was a statesman, a diplomat, and above all, a saintly apostle. He was not an ordinary man, judging by his accomplishments before and during his episcopate. A colossus in all phases of human endeavour which he undertook, a man with a mind of razor-edge precision, extensive horizons and terrible strength, he would have been notable in any assemblage of scholars.³

Abella further adds: "As an executive, he was a man of action. There was no empty period in his stirring and busy life. He executed his plans with sureness of insight, firmness of resolution and tenacity of purpose."⁴ The same author further supports the foregoing praise by citing Dr. T. H. Pardo de Tavera, an erudite scholar who is not pro-friar, yet spoke of Gaínza thus: "An untiring, hard-working

¹ Domingo Abella, *Bikol Annals*, Manila, 1954.

² Abella's study, however, pertained only to those who have been canonically accepted by the Holy See. It is to be remembered that there also have been bishops-elect, and some of these did administer the diocese without being officially approved by the Holy See. This had been mentioned briefly in the previous chapter. See Domingo Abella, "Episcopal succession in the Philippines", in *Philippine Studies*, 7 (Oct., 1959), pp. 435-447. See also Manuel Gonzalez Pola, O.P., *Obispos Dominicanos en Filipinas*, Madrid: Institutos Pontificios de Filosofía y Teología, 1991.

³ Abella, p. 171.

⁴ Abella, p. 171.

man, full of patriotism and religiousness, his name will forever be regarded with respect in the Philippines.”⁵

The Dominican historian Fidel Villarroel, in his reproduction of Gaínza's observation of the missions, *Cruzada Española en Vietnam, Campaña de Cochinchina*, recognizes the qualities of Gaínza in his introduction to his brief biography:

La figura del P. Francisco Gaínza no puede abarcarse totalmente en los reducidos límites de una reseña biográfica como la presente. Por grande que nos haya de parecer su labor en la expedición de Cochinchina, su intervención en aquel episodio sólo llenó directamente dos años de su vida, e indirectamente cinco, quedando sumergida casi invisiblemente entre al resto de una multitud de notables empresas que llevó a cabo. Su biografía aún está por escribir, y es lástima que no tengamos una que nos le presente de cuerpo entero, con su gran silueta de uno de los personajes más extraordinarios que pasaron por Filipinas en el siglo XIX. De constitución físicamente débil, fue un hombre de increíble capacidad para el trabajo y de una mente privilegiada, un escritor fecundísimo y profundo, un profesor brillante y competente en todas las ciencias eclesiásticas y varias profanas, un organizador, un celoso apóstol y el más grande quizás de todos los obispos⁶ que ocuparon la sede de Nueva Cáceres (hoy Diócesis de Cáceres).⁷

Another Dominican historian, Pablo Fernández, in the final section of his *History of the Church in the Philippines (1521-1898)*, presents Gaínza, among the prominent canon lawyers, as “the most prolific Dominican author in the Philippines, an eminent canonist and a man sought by all kinds of people for his advice.”⁸ He continues:

⁵ Biblioteca Filipina, Washington, D.C., 1903, as cited by Abella, p. 183. Villarroel would also presents the same citation in his biography.

⁶ This seems to be a re-statement of what Abella said of Gaínza.

⁷ Francisco Gaínza, O.P. et Fidel Villarroel, O.P., *Cruzada Española en Vietnam, Campaña de Cochinchina*, Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1972, p. 46. Hereafter cited as Gaínza et Villarroel.

⁸ Pablo Fernández, *History of the Church in the Philippines (1521-1898)*, Manila, Life Today Publications, 1977, p. 445. “People high in both government and church offices consulted him in their perplexities and doubts. This is proven by

"Indeed, Bishop Gaínza was perhaps the ideal Dominican missionary who has ever been in the Philippines, the person who left the deepest impact on the men and the society of the late nineteenth century, a canonist, historian, botanist, diplomat, administrator, missionary and university professor all rolled into one."⁹

Such admiration for Gaínza is not simply posthumous. Fernandez cites a contemporary of Gaínza, Mariano Velasco, O.P. who wrote about him:

"He is a man of deep piety, great virtue, extraordinary talent, and wonderful insight, prudence, eloquence, self control, firmness of character, etc. He is tireless and has the gift of discharging well and satisfactorily three or more heavy responsibilities at the same time, without omitting the ordinary cares, and he is of such seriousness and maturity that he never is rushed or seems to change his pace. He is in sum a faultless religious, excellent, well rounded, praiseworthy, still young and with great future."¹⁰

Other writers have spoken of Gaínza with such high regard. The *Philippine Encyclopedia* mentions him as the bishop in the 19th century who had contributed significantly to Philippine science.¹¹

the 22 volumes still in manuscript preserved in the UST archives. Some of them carry his signature, others were written under his supervision. We might mention some of their titles: *Facultades de los obispos de ultramar*, published in Manila in 1860 and reprinted in Madrid in 1871; *Disertación canónico-legal sobre todo lo relativo a esponsales y matrimonios de las diferentes castas que viven en estas islas*; *Disertación canónico-practica sobre dispensas matrimoniales y sus ejecucion*. And finally, his *Institutiones iuris canonici*, work of two volumes in manuscript, quarto size, of 500 pages each, should give an idea of the scope of this scholar's writings." Fernández, p. 446.

⁹ Fernández, p. 446.

¹⁰ Mariano Velasco, *Ensayo Bio-Bibliográfico*, IV, 194, MS en APSR, Sección "Bibliografía," as cited by Fernández, p. 446.

¹¹ *Encyclopedia of the Philippines*, X, Versonco, 1936, p. 360. Gaínza has been written about as a man of many interests. See also Jose BARRAMEDA, Francisco Gainza's The Lady of Peñafrancia, Manila, Synergetic Communications System, 1981, p. iii.

1.2. *A Reproach on Gaínza*

Not everyone, however, is in praise of Gaínza. The Jesuit historian, John Schumacher, writing about the travails of the Filipino Clergy, was not so generous with praise on Gaínza. In the very few times he mentions Gaínza in his work, *The Revolutionary Clergy*,¹² he notes Gaínza's low regard for the secular clergy.

Though Gaínza shared so many of the reform ideas of Pelaez,¹³ he was of the conviction that the secular clergy, because Filipino, should gradually be replaced as parish priests by Spanish regular clergy. Hence he warned the archbishop against involving himself in the defense of the secular clergy and thus putting himself in conflict with government policy.¹⁴

Schumacher further alludes to the idea that Gaínza was not so decisive in pursuing reforms. One instance was when Gaínza and Pelaez proposed to the nuncio in Madrid reforms in the Philippine Church. They made a series of proposals which were drawn up chiefly by Gaínza and was presented to the government by Archbishop Martinez on the occasion of Gaínza's consecration in Manila. Two of the proposals provoked bitter reactions from the religious. They were: the '*amovilidad*' of parish priests by the bishop or by the religious superior without trial and the imposition of the rule of the cloister. The author relates that when Jimeno¹⁵ and Gaínza saw the storm of resentment they withdrew their signatures.¹⁶

In another work, *Readings in Philippine Church History*,¹⁷ Schumacher, citing Gaínza's pastoral letter of 1863,¹⁸ asserts that

¹² John N. Schumacher, S.J., *Revolutionary Clergy*, Quezon City, Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1981.

¹³ Pedro Pelaez a Filipino Secular priest who was appointed Vicar Capitular of Manila on April 23, 1861.

¹⁴ Schumacher, *Revolutionary Clergy*, p. 12, footnote 45.

¹⁵ The Bishop of Cebu.

¹⁶ Schumacher, *Revolutionary Clergy*, p. 10.

¹⁷ John Schumacher, *Readings in Philippine Church History*, Quezon City, Ateneo de Manila University, 1987, p. 255.

¹⁸ This pastoral letter is titled: *Carta pastoral que el Ilmo. Y Rmo. Sr. Dr. D. Fr. Francisco Gaínza del Sagrado Orden de Predicadores, Obispo de Nueva*

the bishop is guilty of exaggerating the degraded state of Filipinos before the coming of the Spaniards in order to inculcate gratitude to Spain.¹⁹ While, Schumacher, somehow recognizes the “progressive contributions of Gaínza to his diocese and the sincere interest he had in his people,” he is of the opinion that Gaínza espouses a dangerous role for the parish priests, when in his pastoral letter he suggested that parish priests should take on a mediatory role towards the government. The reason being is that “Filipinos were wondering more and more to what extent the government was still capable of providing the needs of the Filipino people rather than just exploiting them.”²⁰

1.3. A Two-Sided Presentation of Gaínza

Among the studies that dealt with the person of Gaínza, Antolin Uy’s study *“The State of the Church in the Philippines, 1850-1875. The Correspondence between the Bishops in the Philippines and the Nuncio in Madrid,”*²¹ presents the two sides of Gaínza. He did not occupy himself with the early part of Gaínza’s life – his years as missionary and professor.

He describes Gaínza as a *Unanimous Choice*. A sure candidate for Nueva Caceres, he had been included before in the list of nominees for Nueva Segovia and for Manila. And for Caceres he was the only candidate, one thing which even the nuncio referred to as extraordinary. He was an *Informative Reformer*. He informed the Nuncio not only about the State of affairs in the Philippines but also his desire for reform in the Philippine Church. He was an *Anxious Pastor*. Upon his entrance to his diocese, he immediately embarked on a pastoral visit being able to reach places which the bishops who preceded him were not able to visit. He pursued projects for his diocese. He was a *Resourceful Bishop* who sought and main-

Caceres, dirige a sus muy amados diocesanos con motivo de su consagración, Manila, 1863, pp. 6-7. Hereafter cited as Carta Pastoral of 1863.

¹⁹ Schumacher, *Readings*, p. 255.

²⁰ Schumacher, *Readings*, p. 253.

²¹ Antolin Uy, *The State of the Church in the Philippines, 1850-1875. The Correspondence between the Bishops in the Philippines and the Nuncio in Madrid*, Tagaytay City, Divine Word Seminary, 1984.

tained good relations with the government in order to realize his projects for the diocese.²²

Uy likewise, cites what Gaínza's contemporaries said of him like Jimeno who spoke of Gaínza as "zealous, rigid and eager for prompt action."²³ And Archbishop Martinez considers him "an expert on the laws, customs and character of the country."²⁴ However, Martinez' admiration for Gaínza is not full, for he related to the nuncio:

Actually the Most Reverend Bishop Francisco Gaínza is of irreproachable conduct, in good health, proficient in canon law, a man of inexhaustible energy that the climate there requires, acquainted with the affairs and persons... The liveliness of his temper prejudices him somewhat. Sometimes he is rough in his expression and inclined to repress abuses with severity. For these reasons the religious of other dioceses and some of his own did not like him; and at same time give me the most probable suspicion that they would try to create an unfavorable climate against him at the Ministry of Ultramar. [The *pros* and *contras* having been exposed, I abandon them to your prudent judgment of Your Excellency.]²⁵

Even the nuncio knew his character flaws and authoritarian comportment. Uy, certainly does quote Gaínza himself:

I am still young, full of enthusiasm, vigor and strength. I want to work not just by reason of conscience but by temperament, even as a recourse – if I may say so. Nothing will dishearten me so much as not having regular work to do, especially during the months of interminable storms and in the sad seclusion of the provincial towns.²⁶

But the same author does not overlook criticisms on Gaínza. He mentions Gaínza's 'love for himself.' Gaínza tells the nuncio that he couldn't think of someone fit for Manila.

²² Uy, pp. 112-127.

²³ Uy, p. 130.

²⁴ Uy, p. 113.

²⁵ Uy, p. 184.

²⁶ Uy, p. 124.

And that Manila was very difficult to govern. Uy, moreover, affirms Gaínza's low regard for the clergy. He says that while the four bishops,²⁷ were in accord on the inferiority and incapacity of the indigenous clergy, it was Martinez who traced its root of the malady and sought to cure it. None of the three bishops, "and certainly not Gaínza, put up a fairly creditable dissent to government insolence and provocations, or spoke out for equal treatment and adequate motivation in the development of the native clergy."²⁸ Thus, Uy's summary on Gaínza goes:

The man who seemingly had an eye on the see of Manila, Gaínza, possessed the best credentials to become the successor of the late Archbishop Aranguren. Well versed in civil and canon law, influential in ecclesiastical and government circles, he was the best informant and possible the best adviser of the Papal Nuncio on Philippine affairs. Unlike the other and older Dominican bishop of Cebu, Gaínza had push and drive, and was able to introduce reforms and to set up projects in his own diocese. He presumably exercised a not insignificant personal influence on Pélaez, Burgos and other leaders of the Filipino clergy. *But his low regard of the native clergy, somewhat casts a shadow of reproach upon an otherwise brilliant and episcopal career.*²⁹

2. FRANCISCO GAÍNZA IN THREE PERIODS

We shall now present a biography of Bishop Francisco Gaínza. The presentation will be divided in three main periods: his years in Spain, his years as missionary in the Philippines, as university professor at the University of Santo Tomas and finally his years as bishop of the diocese of Nueva Caceres.

²⁷ Martinez of Manila, Jimeno of Cebu, Aragones of Nueva Segovia and Gainza of Nueva Caceres.

²⁸ Uy, p. 253.

²⁹ Uy, p. 253. Emphasis mine.

2.1. First Period: A Young Religious in Spain (1818-1840)

Francisco Caracciolo Ureta Vizcaya de Gaínza y Escobes³⁰ was born in the nineteenth-century Spain. He was a witness to the radical changes in the social and political atmosphere of the nation at that time. The 4th of June of 1818 marks his birth at Calahorra, Logroño, Spain.³¹ His parents were Don Juan de la Cruz Urreta Vizcaya de Gaínza and Doña Ana Escobes. He was baptized at the old chapel of the Holy Martyrs in the Cathedral Church of Logroño³² the day after his birth. On June 8, he was confirmed by the bishop of Calahorra, Bishop Anastacio Puyal y Pobeda.³³

He came from a religious family. He had seven brothers and sisters. Among his brothers, two became Capuchin Friars and one a

³⁰ See Gaínza et Villarroel, pp. 45-50; Hilario Ma. Ocio, *Compendio de la Reseña Biográfica de los Religiosos de la Provincia del Santísimo Rosario de Filipinas desde su fundación hasta nuestros días*, Manila, 1985, pp. 732-737 in Archivo de la Universidad de Santo Tomas (AUST); Domingo Abella, *Bikol Annals*, pp. 171-181; Julian Malumbres, O.P., *Historia de Isabela*, Manila, Tip. Linotype del Colegio de Santo Tomás, 1918, pp. 361-377.

Francisco Gaínza, O.P., *El Santuario de Nuestra Señora de la Peña de Francia de la Ciudad de Nueva Cáceres en las Islas Filipinas*, Manila, Imprenta Pilarica, 1921, pp. 6-22. Hereafter cited as *El Santuario*. This was first published in the Bikol dialect 1867 according to Retana. There were other editions, cf. Wenceslao Retana, *Aparato Bibliográfico de la Historia General de Filipinas*, II, Madrid, Imprenta de la sucesora de M. Minuesa de los Rios, 1964, no. 1805. This 1921 edition is a Spanish translation from the Bikol original by a priest. It includes a biography of Bishop Gainza. In 1981, José Barrameda published an English translation from the Bikol original, see Jose V. Barrameda, Jr., *Bishop Francisco Gaínza's The Lady of Peña de Francia*, Manila, Synergetic Communications System, 1981. Barrameda dates the Bikol original in 1866. The original version is, however, unavailable.

Manuel Artigas y Cuerva, *Reseña histórica de la Real y Pontificia Universidad de Santo Tomás de Manila*, Manila, 1911, pp. 195-204.

Villarroel also cites P. Jose Recorder, C.M., *Apuntes biográficos del Excmo, y Ilmo. y Revdmo. Sr. Dr. Fr. Francisco Carracciolo Gaínza y Escobes, dignísimo obispo de Nueva Cáceres* (APSR., T. 35); *Reseña histórica de la Real y Pontificia Universidad de Santo Tomás de Manila*, Manila, 1911, pp. 195-204.

³¹ Now La Rioja, Spain.

³² Gaínza, *El Santuario*, p. 7.

³³ Malumbres, p. 361.

Calced Carmelite. Of his sisters, three became Dominican Nuns.³⁴ Francisco himself joined the Dominican Order when he was about to complete his 15th year of age. A year after his entrance into the order, on October 15, 1834, feast of St. Teresa de Jesus, he made his solemn profession at the convent of Santiago de Pamplona.

The early years of his religious life were not easy. For just as he was beginning a new way of life, the attacks to the religious life also began. The government, in an effort to suppress the religious, banished the members of the religious from their convents through the decree of *exclaustración*. This forced the Dominican community in Pamplona to disband.

On January 18, 1837, he found himself exclaustrated. He stayed in Miranda de Arga. He earned his living by being a writer until he decided to pursue his vocation to the religious life as a seminarian.³⁵

On September 20, 1839, he received his first tonsure and the four minor orders. The next day, feast of St. Matthew, he received the Subdiaconate. All these were conferred on him by the Archbishop of Burgos. It was on January of 1840 that he was admitted to the convent of the Dominican order in Ocaña which was during the time a center for missionary expansion. It was the only convent of the order which was not disturbed by the rabid revolutionary decrees of Mendizabal.³⁶ This was due to the reason that the said convent like other convents of the Augustinians, Franciscans and Recollects, was intended for the formation of missionaries for the colonies of *Ultramar* specifically in Asia. His transfer to the Dominican convent in Ocaña meant that he will be sent for the missions. Thus, on the 9th of September of 1840, Gaínza, with seven other Dominicans, headed by Mariano Cuartero,³⁷ left Cadiz for the

³⁴ Malumbres, p. 361. See Abella, *Bikol Annals*, p. 179; and "El Oriente", *Revista Semanal Ilustrada de Ciencias, Artes Industria, Comercio, Noticias*, etc. D. Antonio Vasquez de Aldana (dir.), March 5, 1876, Archivo de la Universidad de Santo Tomas.

³⁵ "El Oriente," March 5, 1876, p. 6.

³⁶ Pablo Fernández, O.P., et Jose Arcilla, S.J., "The Diocese of Jaro," *Philippiniana Sacra*, 7 (1972), pp. 114-115.

³⁷ Mariano Cuartero later became the first bishop of the Diocese of Jaro.

Philippines. They arrived in Manila on February 23, 1841 aboard the frigate "*Victoria*."

2.2. *Second Period: A Missionary and University Professor in the Philippines (1841-1861)*

Upon arriving in Manila, he was assigned to the convent of Santo Domingo in Manila. He was asked to teach at the College of Santo Tomas. He was given the title *Lector de Humanidades* on April 10, 1841. Two days later, he was ordained Deacon by the Archbishop of Manila José Seguí. On July 2, he enrolled in sacred theology.³⁸ Two months passed and on the ember days of September, the 18th, he was ordained priest. He celebrated his first mass at the Church of Santo Domingo on the feast of the Most Holy Rosary.

He continued to teach humanities in the College. The higher class of humanities was given to his charge after his ordination. In March of 1843, he started to write a new "*Arte Gramatica Latina*"³⁹ which he finished on December of the same year. This grammar came to be prescribed as text in seminaries, colleges and in other educational institutions in the Philippines and in Spain.⁴⁰ However, his teaching career was interrupted since he was designated for a mission in Tungking⁴¹ on January 23, 1844. In April of the same

³⁸ Unpublished notes of Fr. Villarroel.

³⁹ Francisco Gaínza, O.P., *Gramatica latina para uso de la juventud Filipina*, Manila, Establecimiento tipografico del Colegio de Santo Tomas, 1844.

It was printed in 1845 and was reprinted in 1846 and several other times during the last century and beginning of the present. "This was approved by a Royal Decree on April 18, 1857. *"It was enforced as textbook in all latinity schools of the country, as its author engaged in a vigorous drive, through repeated representations to the government, to correct the abuses existing in many a private school run by dropout students. Gaínza's grammar became so popular that it vied with the better known grammar of Raimundo Miguel for the honors of textbook in the Peninsula."* Cf. Fidel Villarroel, *Fr. Jose Burgos, University Student*, Manila, Corporacion de PP. Dominicos, 1972, p. 11.

⁴⁰ Gaínza, *El Sanctuario*, p. 10; see also Gaínza et Villarroel, p. 48.

⁴¹ At the time of Gaínza, what is Vietnam today was divided into different kingdoms. There were two main divisions. The north was normally called Tunking. The south, Cochinchina. In the last century, the middle of Vietnam was called Annam with the imperial capital in Hue. France, the colonial power, united all of them into what came to be known as French Indochina.

year, he embarked for China and on the 25th of the same month he arrived in Macao. Not long after, he was recalled to the Philippines due to his poor health. In his place, José María Diaz Sanjurjo, a man of learning and virtuous life and dedicated to study, was sent.⁴² In mid-December of 1844, he found himself back in Manila serving as a professor.

The following year saw the Chapter of the Dominicans, where he was named *Lector de Lógica*. He began teaching Logic, Physics, Metaphysics and Morals. Then on March 6, 1845, he was given the title *Lector de Filosofía*. On February 19 of 1846, he was given the office of *procurador ad lites*,⁴³ a task he carried out until he became bishop. A year later, on January 9, 1847, his work in the university again had to slow down for he was elected to succeed Fr. Juan de Santa Maria when the latter resigned from the Vicariate of San Gabriel for the Chinese in Binondo. He served the Chinese community for almost a year. On April 6 of the same year he received his Doctorate in Philosophy. After which, he was given the directorship of the Third Order of St. Dominic. It was probably during this period that he wrote the manual for the tertaries of St. Dominic, *Manual de los hermanos y hermanas de la tercera orden de la penitencia de Santo Domingo*.⁴⁴ At the end of the year, on the 12th of December, he was reassigned to the College of Santo Tomas. The incoming year would provide him another missionary activity in the north.

On June 30 of 1848, he was assigned to Cauayan, Nueva Vizcaya.⁴⁵ There he accompanied Col. Manuel Oscariz in his expeditions against the fierce Igorots. As he kept himself busy with the needs of the people, he managed to spare time for scientific and

⁴² Thirteen years later, José María Sanjurjo was martyred for the faith. Cf. Gaínza et Villarroel, p. 45. Sanjurjo was canonized in June of 1978 by Pope John Paul II.

⁴³ The "*procurador ad lites*" was the one who took charge of the legal matters that concern the community.

⁴⁴ Francisco Gaínza, O.P., *Manual de los hermanos y hermanas de la tercera orden de la penitencia de Santo Domingo*, Manila, Establecimiento Tipográfico del Colegio de Santo Tomás, 1859.

⁴⁵ During Gaínza's time, Cauayan was part of Nueva Vizcaya. But by 1856 till the present it has become part of Isabela.

cultural investigations. His writings regarding the ethnography, geology, history and customs of the natives are preserved in his book "*Memoria sobre Nueva Vizcaya*,"⁴⁶ a book recognized by cultural organizations in the Archipelago.⁴⁷

He contracted a disease in the hills due to the bad climate. Thus after two years, he was once again recalled to Manila at Santo Tomas where he received academic responsibilities. At the end of the year 1850, he received the degree of Licentiate in Canon Law and was given a chair in the same faculty. He also received the appointment of *Examinador Sinodal*⁴⁸ of the Archdiocese of Manila and of the Diocese of Nueva Segovia. He was re-appointed as the director of the Third Order of Saint Dominic. On the 25th of November of 1852, he obtained his Doctorate in Canon Law.

In June of 1852, he was elected prior of Santo Domingo. By September of this year, he started the restoration of the Santo Domingo Church.⁴⁹ It was a period marked by his efforts on reforms in the order. And when in 1855, the Dominicans had their chapter, he presided in the absence of the Provincial-Elect.

His labors were not merely confined to his order. The *Real Sociedad Económica de amigos del Pais* made him an associate and member of the Commission for the development of agriculture. He made two studies, one regarding the cultivation of pepper and the other, the cultivation of white poppy and the effects of opium. Both gained acclaim in similar scientific associations in London. A year later, Governor General Manuel Crespo named him a voter of a board of censorship of Books, for which, Gaínza composed the statutes of the board as the guidelines for censorship. Such statutes directed the Philippines for many years.⁵⁰

⁴⁶ Francisco Gaínza, O.P., *Memoria sobre Nueva Vizcaya*, Manila, Establecimiento Tipográfico de los Amigos del Pais, 1849.

⁴⁷ Gaínza et Villarroel, p. 47.

⁴⁸ "*Examinador Sinodal*" is the one who examines candidates for the priesthood and the candidates for confessors.

⁴⁹ On the 12th of the following month, he was appointed a member of the Board of the *Beaterio de Santa Rosa*. He held this post as prior till 1855. See Gaínza, *El Santuario*, p. 12.

⁵⁰ Gaínza et Villarroel, p. 47.

In 1858, a year after Sanjurjo's martyrdom, Gaínza accompanied the French-Spanish expedition to Cochinchina, as a representative of the *Corporacion Dominicana de Filipinas* and as attaché of the *Estado Mayor del Almirante Frances*. His task was to plead for the cause of the missionaries and Christians. He was also to chronicle the work.⁵¹ His account of the expedition was "unbiased, constructive, highly critical of both the French and the Spaniards."⁵² When he returned to Manila in 1859, he took again the task of the chair of Canon Law of the University of Santo Tomas. He was further named Vice-Rector. He continued to have considerable influence on people. Officials both civil and ecclesiastical consulted him regarding legal and canonical matters.⁵³

In his last years in the University, he still acted as Fr. Jose Burgos' *padrino* when the latter had to pass his licentiate in Philosophy.⁵⁴ The following year, his work in the university had to end because he was nominated to the See of Nueva Caceres.

Gaínza's years as a university professor and missionary were characterized by a considerable amount of literary output. Aside from the "*Gramática Latina*" and his work on the acclimatization of pepper,⁵⁵ he wrote a textbook for students of Canon Law, *Cursus iuris canonici ad usum juventutis Insularum Philippinarum*;⁵⁶ a study of the privileges given by the Holy See to the bishops in the Philippines, *Facultades de los Obispos de Ultramar*;⁵⁷ an account

⁵¹ Gaínza et Villarroel, p. 45.

⁵² See Abella, p. 181.

⁵³ See '*Consultas con sus soluciones*,' Fr. Francisco Gaínza, Folletos, Tomo 108, AUST, M.S.

⁵⁴ Villarroel, p. 32.

⁵⁵ Francisco Gaínza, O.P., *Informe sobre la aclimatación de la pimienta en la isla de Balabac*, Manila: Imprenta y Litog. De Ramirez y Giraudier, 1858.

⁵⁶ Francisco Gaínza, O.P., *Cursus iuris canonici ad usum juventutis Insularum Philippinarum*, Manila, Establecimiento Tipográfico del Colegio de Santo Tomás, 1859.

⁵⁷ Francisco Gaínza, O.P., *Facultades de los Obispos de Ultramar y disertacion canónico-legal sobre todo lo relativo o esponsales y matrimonios de las diferentes castas que viven in estas islas; y disertacion canónico-práctica sobre dispensas matrimoniales y su ejecución*, Manila, Establecimiento Tipográfico del Colegio de Santo Tomás, 1860.

of the wars in Jolo and Mindanao from the 16th century to 1851, *Memorias y antecedentes sobre las expediciones de Balanguingui y Jolo*.⁵⁸ He prepared an edition of the *Actas de los Capítulos Provinciales de la Provincia Dominicana de Filipinas* and collaborated with Fr. Juan Ferrando in his renowned history regarding the Dominicans in the Orient.⁵⁹ He likewise wrote a wide collection of manuscripts which include personal notes and articles he wrote for the different periodicals of the capital of the Philippines and Spain.⁶⁰ Added to these are consultations regarding canonical legislation, rules and statutes, canonical dissertations, biographies of important personages of the Philippines and edited opinions and judgments.⁶¹

Gáinza's appointment to the bishopric of Nueva Caceres meant a great loss to the University especially to the Faculty of Canon Law. Indeed he was one of the respected and esteemed professors as one student of his remembers:

My venerated professors, the most respectable as well as unassuming priests and lawyers whom in our youth, with the intimacy and fondness then reigning between professor and pupil, we simply called Fathers Zeferino, Gáinza, Villa and Corominas and Sres. Arrieta, Pardo and Marcaida.⁶²

⁵⁸ Francisco Gáinza, O.P., *Memorias y antecedentes sobre las expediciones de Balanguingui y Jolo*, Manila, Establecimiento Tipográfico del Colegio de Santo Tomás, 1851.

⁵⁹ Cf. Gáinza et Villarroel, 48. See *Acta Capitulum Provinciae Ssmi. Rosarii, ordinis Praedicatorum*. Collegit R.P. Joannes Ferrando; addidit Fr. Franciscus Gáinza, O.P., Ab anno 1825-1855, Manilae, 1858, Folletos Tomo 106, AUST, MS.

⁶⁰ In the Philippines, *El Diario de Manila*, *El Boletín Oficial* and *El Católico Filipino*. In Spain, *La Esperanza*, *La Regeneración*, *La España*, and the review of *La Cruz*. Cf. Gáinza et Villarroel, p. 48.

⁶¹ Gáinza et Villarroel, p. 63.

⁶² Jose Basa y Enriquez, *Reglamento de Galleras*, Manila, 1894 as quoted by W.E. Retana, *Aparato Bibliográfico de la Historia General de Filipinas*, II, Madrid, Imprenta de la sucesora de M. Minuesa de los Ríos, 1906, n. 3449, 1292.

This, nevertheless, was not the end of his accomplishments but a beginning of another period, as a bishop. And for Nueva Caceres and the Church in the Philippines it was a gain.

2.3. *Third Period: A Bishop of the See of Nueva Caceres (1862-1879)*

On November 21, 1861, the See of Nueva Caceres became vacant due to the death of Bishop Manuel Grijalvo, O.S.A. (1848-1861). Francisco Gaínza was nominated to succeed him. Uy says that from the start he was a sure successor of Bishop Grijalvo. It was not the first time that he was nominated. He was formerly included in the list of candidates for Nueva Segovia in 1857, and in the *terna* submitted for the See of Manila. This time however, for the Bishopric of Nueva Caceres, he was the only candidate.⁶³ His qualification as bishop of Caceres could hardly be questioned.

The Ex-Governor General Lemery informed Nuncio Barili there could not be any better choice, while to the Nuncio the nomination by Her Majesty was no surprise at all. The new archbishop of Manila is ready to avail himself of the help of Gaínza who is an expert on the laws, customs and character of this country.⁶⁴

Yet not wanting such a position, he planned to resign. When he learned of his nomination, he wrote a letter of renunciation which he was unable to send. He would have declined the nomination again but Fr. Fernando Checa, the Dominican procurator in Rome, accepted the nomination on his behalf.⁶⁵

He was elected by the Queen, Isabel II, on March 5, 1862. Pope Pius IX preconized him on September 25, 1862. On February 22, 1863, Archbishop Meliton Martinez ordained him to the episcopate. The Archbishop was assisted by Romualdo Jimeno, Bishop of Cebu, and Fr. Justo Aguilar, coadjutor of the Apostolic Vicariate of Fookien in China, both Dominicans.

⁶³ Uy, p. 113.

⁶⁴ Uy, p. 113.

⁶⁵ Cf. Abella, p. 164; see also Ocio, p. 736.

Being the 25th bishop of the diocese, he was preceded by nine Franciscans, seven Augustinians, three Seculars, two Dominicans, one Minim⁶⁶ and 1 Mercedarian.⁶⁷ Gaínza had the distinction of being the first bishop-elect who went against the anti-canonical tradition of entering into the diocese before being consecrated bishop.⁶⁸ Later in his *Reseña* of the Diocesan Hospital he relates: "Although I was designated bishop March 5, of 1862, I did not want to govern as elect, and I only came already consecrated in March of 1863."⁶⁹ The intervening full year he remained in Manila waiting for the bulls. It was only after the bulls had arrived and after his consecration that he entered his diocese. He took possession of his diocese on the 19th of March of 1863, feast of St. Joseph.⁷⁰

Upon his arrival, he found that the seminary, the cathedral, the shrine of Our Lady of Peña de Francia⁷¹ were in disrepair. He soon started their repairs. Barely had he stayed in his diocese for two months, on April 29, he begun his first pastoral visit. The difficulties of travel were great. Four months after, he sent his report to Rome.⁷² This same year he issued a pastoral letter on the occasion of his consecration.⁷³

⁶⁶ The members of the religious order of Hermits of St. Francis of Assisi (founded by St. Francis de Paula in 1435 and approved by Sixtus IV in 1474) commonly known as Order of Minims. See Abella, p. 52.

⁶⁷ See Abella's "Chronological List of Bishops of the *"Ecclesia de Caceres in Indiis Orientalibus"*", in *Bikol Annals*, pp. 28-29. It is to be noted however, that *"Ecclesia de Caceres in Indiis Orientalibus"* is a combination of Latin and Spanish.

⁶⁸ See Domingo Abella's "Episcopal Succession in the Philippines," in *Philippine Studies*, 7 (Oct., 1959), pp. 435-447.

⁶⁹ Francisco Gaínza, O.P., *Reseña sobre el hospital diocesano*, Manila, Establecimiento Tipográfico del Colegio de Santo Tomás, 1873, p. 30. Hereafter cited as *Reseña sobre el Hospital*.

⁷⁰ *Ocio*, pp. 735-736.

⁷¹ Now more commonly called *PEÑAFRANCIA*.

⁷² *Reseña sobre el Hospital*, p. 14; Uy, p. 123.

⁷³ Francisco Gaínza, *Carta Pastoral que el Obispo de Nueva Cáceres dirige a sus muy amados diocesanos con motivo de su consagración*, Manila, Establecimiento Tipográfico del Colegio de Santo Tomás, 1863.

By 1865, he started the repair of the episcopal palace. On this same year, May 9, he inaugurated the newly built seminary and handed over its scientific and religious direction to the Vincentian Fathers whom he requested to take charge of the seminary. During this occasion he promulgated the Statutes of the Seminary⁷⁴ which he himself authored.

Two years later, on the occasion of the centenary of the martyrdom of St. Peter, he left for Rome to make his decennial *ad limina visit*. He was the first bishop after three centuries to obtain permission from the Spanish government to go to Rome.⁷⁵ During this visit he informed the Nuncio and *Ultramar* of the situation in the Philippines.⁷⁶ He likewise met the Queen personally and discussed with her his projects and his plan of erecting a diocesan college for girls.⁷⁷ Of this meeting, Gaínza related that he was well received and his plan well considered by the Queen. He departed from Marseilles and came back to Manila on the 15th of March of 1868. With him were the Vincentian and Dominican missionaries, and some sisters of the Daughters of Charity. Bishop Mariano Cuartero, O.P.,⁷⁸ was also with them. Four days later he celebrated a solemn mass at the newly blessed Santo Domingo Church.

In the year 1870, at the advise of four doctors, he left for Spain due to health reasons. His illness was grave that in the

⁷⁴ Francisco Gaínza, *Estatutos de Seminario Conciliar de Nueva Cáceres*, Manila: Establecimiento Tipografico de Santo Tomas, 1874.

⁷⁵ Uy, p. 60.

⁷⁶ Uy, p. 127.

⁷⁷ Francisco Gaínza, O.P., *Carta Pastoral que el Obispo de Nueva Cáceres dirige a su clero y feligreses con motivo de su regreso de Europa*, Manila, Establecimiento Tipográfico de Santo Tomás, 1868, p. 7. AUST, foll. 47.

During this trip of 1867-1868, Gainza also thought of asking some sisters from the congregation that Fr. Coll, O.P. founded to work in his diocese. Cf. Vito T. Gomez Garcia, O.P., *Francisco Coll, O.P. (Testimonios 1812-1931)*, Valencia, H.H. Dominicas de la Anunciata, 1993, p. 599. For what reason and as to why it did not push through, we do not know.

⁷⁸ Mariano Cuartero was then recently consecrated bishop in Ocaña. Gainza was one of the co-consecrators, cf. UY, p. 173.

opinion of the doctors it would find no cure in the islands.⁷⁹ He stayed there for two years. When he left he had already accomplished the reconstruction of the Cathedral and its parochial house, the seminary, the episcopal palace, and almost completed his third diocesan visit. On September 19, 1870, the *Colegio de Sta. Isabel* was blessed.⁸⁰ Two years later, on the month of September, the diocesan hospital for lepers was blessed. It is probable that by the following year the work on the abandoned canal which was to connect Naga and Pasacao was already in its initial stages.⁸¹

In the year 1875, September 18-20, during the festivities of Peña de Francia, he opened the first agricultural and industrial fair, the first of its kind in Bicol.⁸² By the year 1877, the renovation of the shrine of the Virgin of Peña de Francia was finished. Occupied with much work, his health began to fail. He decided to go to Europe to regain strength, but when he arrived in Manila, his health deteriorated. He died on July 31, 1879 at the age of 61 at the convent of Santo Domingo at 10 o'clock in the evening surrounded by his Dominican confreres.⁸³ He was buried on the 1st of August at the chapel of Our Lady of the Holy Rosary at Santo Domingo, in the same church where he celebrated his first mass 38 years before. The next day, solemn funeral rites were held. It was officiated by Bishop Pedro Payo, the Dominican Archbishop of Manila, and attended by Authorities, Corporations in the Capital, and a great number of faithful.

In Nueva Caceres, the funeral rites were held in the Cathedral on the 13th of August. The city manifested publicly its grief over the death of a beloved and revered prelate. During the previous day,

⁷⁹ *Reseña del Colegio*, p. 51; see also Uy, pp. 126-127, footnote no. 216.

⁸⁰ Fermin Llorente, *Discurso que en la Solemne Bendicion del Colegio / Diocesano de Niñas de Nueva Caceres dirigido por las Hermanas de la Caridad pronunció el 19 de Setiembre de 1870*. Manila, Establecimiento Tipográfico del Colegio de Santo Tomás, 1870, AUST.

⁸¹ Cf. *Reseña sobre el Hospital Diocesano*, p. 125. Here Gaínza mentions that the plan of the hospital was made by the "comandante de ingenieros" D. Manuel Cano y Ugarte, the director of the works of the Canal de Pasacao.

⁸² Abella, p. 174.

⁸³ Uy, p. 118.

the priests of the general Vicariate came together to administer the sacrament of Penance. The following day, 13th, the rite was presided by the governor of the province and by a nephew of the late bishop; all the religious of the Seraphic Order and of the vicariate, the secular clergy; the missionaries of Saint Vincent de Paul, the directors and the professors of the seminary, the students of the seminary, the Sisters of Charity and the students of the *Colegio*, the resident Spaniards of the seat, and a great multitude of people gathered with those from the nearby places to give their last respects to the bishop.⁸⁴ The rites were officiated by the recently elected *Provisor* and Vicar General D. Antonio Santonja, Superior of the Vincentians and the Rector of Conciliar Seminary. The funeral oration was given by Fr. Carlos Cabido of the Franciscans who spoke of the notable virtues, the eminent qualities which the late prelate possessed.⁸⁵

It may seem that he spent his years in the diocese building and repairing these important edifices. True, these occupied much of his time, but he did not neglect his more essential duties as bishop. These constructions were in fact the external structures that supported his ministry in line with his pastoral work in the diocese. He had at the end of his episcopate, tried to reform his clergy, had improved the state of education with the assistance of the Vincentian Fathers and the Daughters of Charity, he had provided a diocesan hospital for lepers which he entrusted to the Franciscans, he had completed four diocesan visits, issued pastoral letters by which he instructed and corrected the clergy and the faithful. He had also published a sizable amount of religious and devotional materials in the Bikol dialect, and propagated the devotion to Our Lady of Peña de Francia. He had untiringly ministered to his flock with the helped of his regular and secular clergy.

3. GAÍNZA AND THE *PATRONATO REAL*

Gáinza was certainly not unaware of the disadvantages and the consequences of the *Patronato*, which was still existent during

⁸⁴ *El Santuario*, p. 21-22.

⁸⁵ *El Santuario*, p. 21-22.

the second half of the 19th century. He knew of the influence that the government had on the Church. In 1861, he even informed the Nuncio Barili that the government wanted servile bishops.⁸⁶ He himself was nominated to the episcopate in the context of the same *Patronato* system.

It is to be noted that even before his nomination he already clamored for reforms. His *Reflexiones*⁸⁷ showed the unjustifiable claims of the monarch for they were excessive. He considered the monarchs simply as patrons of the churches in the Indies and not legates nor apostolic delegates. And for him the re-establishment of the Vicar General in Rome for the Spanish speaking regulars was destructive to the unity and dependence of the religious orders on their Father General in Rome.⁸⁸

He was determined to pursue the reforms he had in mind. When he learned of his nomination, he did not want to take possession of the diocese without having received the '*preconizacion*.'⁸⁹ Despite his desire for reforms, he maintained good relations with the government, an attitude which was not necessarily representative of the attitudes of other bishops, especially that of Archbishop of Manila, Martínez. Gaínza was so careful as to avoid conflicts with the government. When he wrote to the nuncio in Madrid about his decision to stay in Manila, one of the reasons was to avoid conflict with the government. His behavior towards the government was marked with prudence and deference. He took a middle path. Thus he was both loyal to Spain and to the Holy See.

This spirit he tried to inculcate into his clergy in Nueva Cáceres as can be gleaned in his first pastoral letter in 1863, where he advised the parish priests in this way:

⁸⁶ See Letter of Gainza to Barili, October 6, 1861, A.S.V., N.M., 447, pp. 525-526.

⁸⁷ *Reflexiones sobre la reforma de regulares de Ultramar dedicadas al Excmo Sr. Nuncio de su Santidad por Fr. Francisco Gaínza, Dominico*, A.S.V., N.M., 447, pp. 1117-1172.

⁸⁸ Uy, p. 118.

⁸⁹ The correct canonical term is 'canonical appointment.'

El párroco no se limita á ser aquí como en los pueblos de Europa, el médico de las almas, el maestro del espíritu, el director de las conciencias, y el guardian de las puertas del Santuario; él debe ser además un auxiliar decidido y abnegado del Gobierno, el conciliador intermediario entre la autoridad y los pueblos respectivos, el iniciador ó promovedor aun del bienestar puramente temporal, el interventor obligado en muchos ramos y en ciertas cosas, que si bien parecen ajenas á su sagrado carácter, no lo son en Filipinas por las tradiciones, por las leyes, por la organizacion misma del gobierno del pais... Y pues el Gobierno de S.M. dispensa á la Iglesia y sus ministros una proteccion ilimitada, y nos guarda la deferencia que exige nuestro carácter, justo es que despues de llenar los deberes esenciales del ministerio, de los cuales otro dia os hablaremos, nos pongamos á su lado, le ofrezcamos nuestro apoyo, secundemos sus esfuerzos, y cooperemos con él á elevar á estas islas á la altura, que reclaman la feracidad de sus comarcas, la variedad de sus frutos, la bondad de su clima, la riqueza de su suelo, y su inmejorable situacion bajo el doble punto de vista militar y mercantil.⁹⁰

This middle path did not hinder his efforts to achieve some reforms. He was quite successful in obtaining reforms while at the same time maintaining good relations with the government. He succeeded not to enter the diocese as bishop-elect. He waited for the bulls. He broke with the policy of non-communication imposed by the *Patronato Real*. As bishop he continued his correspondence with Nuncio Barili in Madrid. As a result, Gaínza had a close relationship with the Nuncio. Being the best informant of the Nuncio, he also informed the nuncio of his reform ideas. In turn, the nuncio wanted and expected from him to be the principle of unity among the bishops. Early in 1861 he already expressed to the nuncio:

Por el R.P. Manzano del Colegio de Ocaña me permiti la libertad de remitir a V.E. un ejemplar de la obrita que con el titulo de "Facultades de los Obispos de Ultramar" publique el año pasado bajo los auspicios de este Sr. Arzobispo. Ojala que no halle en ella cosa algun reprehensible, pues mis deseos son

⁹⁰ *Carta Pastoral of 1863*, pp. 6-7.

ante todo la union del Episcopado con el Soberano Pontefice, piedra fundamental de la Iglesia nuestra madre. En este sentido estoy trabajando con este Arzobispo, y mas especialmente con el Sr. Obispo de Zebu, que me honran con su confianza y se valen de mi insuficiencia poniendolos en constantes relaciones con la Santa Sede, y aun alguna vez con V.E., *inaugurando una nueva marcha en este pais, en donde estamos poco menos que completamente aislados de Roma y de lo restante del mundo Catolico*, bastando nos á nosotros mismos, y contentos con nuestros antiguos privilegios y viejas tradiciones, conducta, que hoy menos que nunca deben sostenerse, pues las afflicciones y alegrías, los triunfos y los ataques de la Yglesia deben ser a todas las naciones, y aun a todos los Catolicos, solidarios y comunes.⁹¹

One may wonder for what reason Gaínza maintains such kind of relationship with the government. Uy gives an explanation from Gaínza himself:

Bishop Gaínza's rapport with the Manila and Madrid government was excellent, and he was not unaware of the dangers involved. *'I have wanted to remain in good terms with the government', he states to secure for myself a good place for future plans.* His approach was realistic. First the feasible and economical, then the rest. Always imaginative, Gaínza obtained government help for many other undertakings in the diocese. He was also instrumental in stopping the press from further printing tendentious and rationalistic articles.⁹²

A practical motivation can be seen in these words. To be able to pursue a project or that the Church may profit from this relationship, was his conviction. Whether such relationship that Gaínza maintained with the government became profitable for the Church, the Diocese of Nueva Caceres in particular, this will be discussed in future articles. □

⁹¹ Letter of Gaínza to Barili, April 8, 1861, A.S.V., N.M., 447, p. 527.

⁹² Uy, p. 126. Emphasis mine.