

Vatican II in Action: Cardinal Humberto Medeiros in Boston, 1970-1983

Richard Gribble, CSC
Stonehill College
Department of Religious Studies and Theology
480 Washington St.
North Easton, Massachusetts 02356, USA.

Abstract

While many scholarly studies have reviewed the impact of the Council on the Church worldwide, especially in the wake of the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the end of Vatican II, analyses of the implementation of its teachings on local levels have not been prominent. Cardinal Humberto Medeiros, who served as Archbishop of Boston from 1970 to 1983, was a peritus at all four sessions as a priest in Fall River, Massachusetts and was the driving force for implementation of the Council's teachings and new programs during his time as Archbishop. Spearheading ecumenical efforts in Boston and his strong advocacy for the permanent diaconate and lay participation in the celebration of the Eucharist were hallmarks of his work. His efforts show how a theologically conservative Bishop was able to implement the teachings of a rather progressive Ecumenical Council on the local level.

Essay:

The year 2015 marked the 50th anniversary of the close of the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965). As was appropriate to mark this commemoration of arguably the most important event in Catholic history during the second millennium, many monographs and scholarly articles, addressing both the specifics of the Council and its interpretation over the past half-century were published. Additionally, many scholarly conferences were convened, and papers presented, all to expand scholarship associated with this Council, whose teaching continues to guide the Church on a daily basis.

Overlooked, due in large measure to his humble and self-effacing personality and his absence in the scholarly literature, Cardinal Humberto Medeiros, who served as Archbishop of Boston from 1970 to 1983, made great strides in the promotion of Vatican II by instituting the Council's teachings and many programs that have become standard in the Church today. Medeiros was clearly a theological conservative, but nevertheless he supported the more progressive teachings of the Council, including overt outreach to non-Catholics and non-Christians, instituting liturgical changes, and initiating new programs, including the permanent diaconate. Medeiros' ministry is a demonstration of how Vatican II was successfully instituted on the local level, meeting both the letter and the spirit of the Council's teachings.¹

I. Humberto Medeiros: Background

Humberto Medeiros came to prominence in the American Church from humble immigrant origins. He was born in 1915 on the island of Sao Miguel in the Portuguese Azores, the eldest of four children.

¹ Richard Gribble, CSC is priest in the Congregation of Holy Cross and serves as a Professor in the Department of Religious Studies and Theology at Stonehill College. He is the author of several biographies, most recently *Navy Priest: The Life of Captain Jake Laboon S.J.* (Catholic University Press, 2015). His articles have appeared in *American Catholic Studies*, *The Catholic Historical Review*, and *Journal of Church and State*.

The entire Medeiros family immigrated to the United States in 1931 (his father having been in the US several previous times to earn money) and settled in Fall River, Massachusetts. Due to family need Medeiros quit school only one year later to work in one of Fall River's many textile mills. Returning to school after one year, he still managed to graduate first in a class of 651 from Durfee High School, achieving the highest academic record to date at the school. Medeiros attended The Catholic University of America, receiving his STL in 1946; he was ordained that year on June 15. After his initial assignments in Fall River he returned to Catholic University where he completed a doctorate in theology in 1952. He distinguished himself in the Fall River diocese, being appointed chancellor in 1955 by Bishop James L. Connolly; he was later elevated to monsignor in 1958. From 1960-65 he also served as pastor of St. Michael Parish in Fall River.²

II. Vatican II--Background

On January 25, 1959, Pope John XXIII, who had been elected only three months prior, shocked the Catholic world in a speech made at the Basilica of St. Paul outside the Walls. While calling for a revision of canon law and a local synod, his major proclamation was summoning an ecumenical council. In his comments the Pontiff gave three specific reasons for calling the Council: promotion of ecumenism, presenting a pastoral face to the Council (and by extension the Church), and *aggiornamento*, or an updating of the Church. Pope John's message was shocking for a few reasons. First, historically ecumenical councils had been called only when a significant issue, internal or external to the Church, was causing problems for the faithful and needed to be rectified. In the post-World War II era of 1959 neither of these situations existed. Yes, the Cold War between East and West was ongoing, Communism was seen by the West as a great international threat, and the Middle East remained tense in the wake of the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948. However, from the perspective of the Church, at least from empirical data, things seemed to be in excellent condition. Participation in sacraments, especially Sunday Mass, was high, enrollments at Catholic schools were never greater, and priests and religious were abundant, with formation programs continuing to grow. Dissent in the Church was minimal and not vocal. Catholics were on the same page. Thus, John XXIII, who was considered by many to be an "interim Pope" due to his advanced age, created quite a stir, especially among more traditional Catholics who lived by the adage, "If it isn't broke, don't fix it."

In many ways Roman Catholicism had lived in a vacuum with respect to society for some 400 years. Other than Vatican I (1869-70), called by Pope Pius IX expressly to declare the dogma of papal infallibility as an "antidote" to the threats of Gallicanism and to give credence to the Ultramontane Church, the hierarchy had not met in an ecumenical council since Trent (1545-63), the crowning event of the Counter Reformation. The Church had weathered the seas of Jansenism and Modernism, as well as the French Revolution, by maintaining its traditional stance. Thus, when Pope John called Vatican II, during a time of great Church strength, conservatives were shocked and asked, "Why?" Few perceived any need to interact or engage the modern world. Some then and now have argued that such a reticence to engage the world was a sign of intellectual backwardness, a situation that Pope John wanted to correct.

Pope John's clarion call for Vatican II put into motion the initial steps, collectively called the ante-preparatory period, that eventually led to the Council's opening in the fall of 1962. On May 17, 1959 the pontiff appointed the Vatican Secretary of State, Cardinal Domenico Tardini, to coordinate the preparatory events. On June 18, Tardini invited bishops, nuncios, vicars, prefects apostolic, and superiors general to submit their suggestions and recommendations for issues to be discussed at the future Council. By May 30, 1960 some 2000 responses have been received. These, added to the reports from the Roman Curia and representatives of Catholic universities, formed the base of data, the Acta, to be used in the creation of working documents. With this collection of data completed, the ante-preparatory phase of the Council ended. Six days later, on June 5, Pentecost Sunday, Pope John issued a constitution establishing 10 preparatory commissions, two secretariats, and a Central Commission with its purpose to coordinate the work of the other groups. The Central Commission, under the direction of Cardinal Alfredo Ottaviani, was to study the pre-conciliar Acta and to prepare schemata for the Holy Father and ultimately the Council Fathers. This preparatory phase officially opened on November 13 when the Pope held an audience with members of the preparatory commissions.

² J. Anthony Lukas *Common Ground: A Turbulent Decade in the Lives of Three American Families* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985), 391-93; James E. Glinski, "Church in Crisis: The Role of the Archdiocese of Boston in the Effort to Desegregate Boston's Schools," (M.A. Thesis: University of Massachusetts, Boston, 1987), 2-4.

These commissions were initially composed of 25 members appointed by the Pope. Eventually the membership grew to 30 with each commission assigned certain *periti*, academic experts. Each commission received a list of questions and comments for discussion, with the Central Commission serving as the focal point to which questions might be addressed. Between June 1961 and June 1962, the preparatory commissions met, generating 73 schemata.³

III. Medeiros and Vatican II in Fall River

When Vatican II opened on October 11, 1962, Humberto Medeiros had been engaged with the events of the Council for some time. In August 1959 he traveled to Rome with his local ordinary, Bishop James Connolly, to discuss with officials their ideas pertinent to the forthcoming Council. Medeiros accompanied his Bishop, not only because he was Chancellor but more importantly because of this theological expertise which would translate later into his status as a *peritus* for all four sessions. After consulting with Medeiros, Connolly wrote to Cardinal Tardini suggesting that the Council should address “the rightful role of the layman in God’s plan for the salvation of all men.” Additionally, he wrote, “We deem it opportune for the Sacred Council to discuss the problem of the vernacular and arrive at definite conclusions and directives.”⁴

While according to the Vatican II scholar, Vincent Yzermans, Bishop Connolly made no specific interventions during that Council sessions,⁵ this did not mean that Humberto Medeiros was idle. Vatican II historian, Francois Weiser suggests that American *periti* played a significant role at the Council by shaping the actions of their bishops. Many held doctorates in theology or canon law. Most were seminary or university professors or held high positions in their diocese.⁶ Weiser wrote, “Whether [their role was] as a guide to the city, interpreter, or doing behind-the-scenes networking, gathering information or writing texts and commentaries, the *periti* were far from confined to a secondary role.⁷ *Periti* were given a *tessera* or pass that allowed them to circulate in the Vatican. They could attend all debates and had access to all texts circulated to the bishops for their review and consideration.⁸

In the case of Humberto Medeiros, Weiser’s comments were verified. Father John Driscoll commented that Medeiros was helpful to many bishops at the Council not simply to his local ordinary. His mastery of Latin allowed him to explain things that were said on the floor of the assembly.⁹

³ Aram Berard, S.J. (trans.) *Preparatory Reports Second Vatican Council* (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1965), 21-22; PSCB v. 33 Edward Heston Notes on Vatican II, p.8-9, Archives of the University of Notre Dame (hereafter AUND), Notre Dame, Indiana. The ten special commissions were: (1) Theological Problems, (2) Bishops and Government of Dioceses, (3) The Discipline of the Clergy and Christian People, (4) Religious, (5) Sacraments, (6) Liturgy, (7) Studies and Seminaries, (8) Oriental Churches, (9) Mission Activity and (10) Apostolate of the Laity. The two Secretariats set up were: (1) Christian Unity and (2) Press, Radio and Television. The latter was not intended as a publicity or press office for Council activities.

⁴ James Connolly to Cardinal Domenico Tardini, August 24, 1959, plus enclosure, Vatican II Files, Connolly Papers, Archives of the Diocese of Fall River (hereafter ADFR), Fall River, Massachusetts.

⁵ Medeiros kept meticulous notes of his daily attendance at the Council sessions, especially the latter three sessions. This material verifies the idea that US bishops in general were not major participants in the discussions. Exceptions to this general comment were debates on religious liberty and the drafting of the Declaration on the Relationship of the Church to Non-Christians. Periodic interventions were noted by Medeiros from Cardinals Meyer, Ritter, O’Boyle, Sheehan and Spellman. See Humberto Medeiros, Notebooks, 1963-1965, Miscellaneous Materials, Box #39, Boston, Medeiros Papers, Archives of the Archdiocese of Boston (hereafter AABO), Braintree, Massachusetts.

⁶ Francois Weiser, “The *Periti* of the United States and the Second Vatican Council: Prosopography of a Groups of Theologians,” *U.S. Catholic Historian* 30(3) (Summer 2012): 74.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 88. Weiser provides some interesting statistics about the Vatican II *periti*. In total 480 priests were appointed *periti* with 20 of them selected to be bishops. None of the 87 US *periti* was selected a bishop during the Council.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 75.

⁹ Many bishops were not conversant in Latin and thus literally only remotely understood the details being discussed on the Council floor. Driscoll, Interview, October 24, 2016. In a letter to Connolly, Medeiros described his basic daily schedule: “We do not go out much to eat. We have breakfast in our room like last year. Two- or three-times Bishop Gerrard and I have had some bouillon in our room, prepared by me (!) because we want to go to the press conference at 3 pm. As a rule, we eat lunch in the hotel, a bowl of soup with fruit. At night we have dinner in the hotel, but have gone several times to the Caminetto, which is much cheaper and almost better.” See Humberto Medeiros to James Connolly, October 3, 1965, Vatican II File, Connolly Papers, ADFR.

Almost underhandedly, Medeiros took homemade movies during some of the Council sessions. The Fall River Diocese's former archivist, Fr. Barry Wall, remembers watching these "movies" at clergy sessions on the Council hosted by Medeiros. Wall recalls Medeiros stating, "I put on my choir robes, pushed my way through and hoped they would think I was a bishop."¹⁰ Connolly described Medeiros' influence: "Monsignor ... Medeiros has contributed to the Council. He has been there for all four sessions. He knows the mind. He expresses the details of the Constitutions, Decrees and Declarations to the full."¹¹

The final session in the fall of 1965 was unique for Medeiros. First, a combination of personal illness and Connolly's belief that his presence was necessary to oversee the final contract negotiations for the construction of Memorial (later Connolly) High School, prompted him to ask his Auxiliary, Bishop James Gerrard, to attend the initial days of this last session for him. Nonetheless, Medeiros kept Connolly informed, telling him that he hoped that commissions would be created to devise practical methods to implement the changes decreed by the Council. Additionally, he informed the Bishop that many documents were under revision and being re-written.¹² Medeiros gave his overall impressions at the outset of the Fourth Session: "The Council of revision was to be first a Council of renewal; because only when other men see in the face of the Church the simple lines of the Holy Face will they be drawn to her saving and sacramental unity."¹³ Medeiros saw the Fourth Session as the culmination of the Council's overall task of renewal of the Church:

It is this Church which must be renewed today and every day in order to show to men of all times and places the simple and lovable features of the Son of God made man and thus draw to Him and through Him to the Father of all the children of God. This renewal is the tremendous task of the Vatican Council.¹⁴

The fourth session was also unusual for Medeiros because of the opportunities he was given to travel. He journeyed with Bishop Gerrard to Assisi for a mini pilgrimage to the Basilica of Saint Francis. He also went with his auxiliary to the catacombs of San Calisto and San Sebastiano and visited the Scala Santa (near St. John Lateran), the Coliseum and San Clemente Church. Medeiros also accompanied several bishops on a journey to the Holy Land.¹⁵

The greatest insight to Medeiros' understanding of and participation in Vatican II can be gleaned by a thorough review of the copious notes he kept on all the sessions he attended. One of the most contentious issues and certainly the document which generated the most American participation in its discussion was religious liberty. Discussions on the concept of religious freedom began on the Council floor during the third session in the fall of 1964. For many Council Fathers the topic of religious liberty raised "red flags" because to allow people one to follow their conscience and not the Church's traditional approach of "falling in step with the magisterium," raised the specter of Theological Modernism, condemned in 1907 as the "synthesis of all heresies." Additionally, it suggested that the Church in the past may have been in error.¹⁶ American bishops, on the other hand, as Medeiros commented in his notes, were generally supportive, based quite obviously on the reality that Catholicism had matured and come to prominence in the United States where religious liberty was enshrined in the Constitution. Medeiros described interventions by Cardinal Richard Cushing of Boston (who unknowingly at the time Medeiros would succeed). Archbishop Karl Alter of Cincinnati and Cardinal John Wright, formerly from Pittsburgh, but now serving at the Vatican.¹⁷

¹⁰ Fr. Barry Wall, Interview with the author, August 3, 2019.

¹¹ James Connolly, Statement, *Anchor*, (Fall River) Volume #10, #16, April 21, 1966.

¹² Humberto Medeiros to James Connolly, September 25, 1965, Vatican II File, Connolly Papers, ADFR.

¹³ *Anchor*, Volume #9, #41, October 14, 1965.

¹⁴ *Anchor*, Vol #9, #47, November 25, 1965.

¹⁵ Humberto Medeiros to James Connolly, September 25, 1965, Vatican II File, Connolly Papers, ADFR; *Anchor*, Vol #9 #45, November 11, 1965.

¹⁶ In 1907 St. Pope Pius X issued two encyclicals on Modernism. *Lamentabili sane exitu* presented 65 propositions that attacked the twin pillars of Theological Modernism: (1) Historical-Critical method of the study of Scripture and (2) The Development of Doctrine. The Holy Father considered these errors. *Pascendi Dominici Gregis*, written in a narrative format continued the attack describing Modernism as the "synthesis of all heresies."

¹⁷ For examples Medeiros summarized Cushing's comments: "[The document] should remain intact in its essential sense. [The] Catholic Church should be [the] first agent in [the] world of liberty, especially religious liberty." Similarly, he

Reporting to Connolly during the fourth session, Medeiros admitted that the theological and scriptural foundation for religious liberty should be more directly addressed in the document.¹⁸ However, he concluded that *Dignitatis humanae*, “The Declaration on Religious Liberty,” was an essential ingredient for the Church to move forward in the more modern world. He wrote,

This Declaration has seen more than 20 revisions, two of which have been presented to the Fathers in Council. All this rethinking and revising are sufficient evidence that the subject treated is most grave and complex. It is said that without this Declaration, the dialogue between the Church and the rest of the world cannot continue and that the Church will fail to remove the greatest obstacle to the fulfillment of her mission in the world today.¹⁹

Medeiros ultimately concluded concerning this contentious issue that the Church’s continual search for the truth was paramount. He commented,

Only the truth can make us free. The Fathers want to present to mankind a guide for our day in this complex and thorny problem of religious freedom. Their search for truth is difficult, but their love for man inspires them to take up the cross each day, in prayer and study, [to] find the answer which the Spirit of the Lord sees fit in its wisdom to give them at this point in the life of the Church of God.²⁰

Two other significant issues addressed by the Council were prominent in Medeiros’ notes. He understood the significance of the Mass in the daily lives of Catholics and, thus, the Council’s deliberations on changes in the liturgy were significant in his mind. He enthusiastically supported “The Constitution on the Liturgy,” describing it as “a profound act of love for God.”²¹ Moreover, he suggested that the spirit of the Council could be found best in the liturgy: The better to catch the spirit, we should try to see it through the eyes of the Church, and I believe the place where we can sense it most is in the liturgy.²² Ecumenism and the relationship of Catholics to non-Christians also generated comments from Medeiros. Writing to Connolly he critiqued the bishops who spoke against the “Declaration on the Relations of the Church to Non-Christian Religions,” especially those who rejected comments in the document that admitted historical prejudice and previous anti-Semitic attitudes: “It is a very specious and evil thing, and another strong reason for passing the Declaration. It seems that anti-Semitism is not dead among some Catholics. God help us!”²³

Medeiros also commented on the only document generated from the floor of the Council, Schema 13, which was eventually issued as *Gaudium et spes*, “The Pastoral Constitution of the Church in the Modern World.” He agreed with American bishops, such as Cardinal Francis Spellman of New York, that a sincere statement of the position of the Church in the modern world was needed. More directly, as would always be his position, Medeiros professed strong support for traditional Church values and teachings, while simultaneously upholding the basic anti-Communist U.S. foreign policy. He wrote:

Today as in the past there is more than one form of atheism, but it seems that Marxism is the most dangerous that has ever appeared on earth because of its “organization,” its diffusion, its doctrine which can be popularized rather easily, its fighting spirit and the enthusiasm which animates it. It is Marxism which claims to be the supreme form of atheism.²⁴

synthesized the thought of Alter: “Government is not competent to judge on religious matters. Immunity from coercion in religious matters must be universal.”

¹⁸ Humberto Medeiros to James Connolly, September 25, 1965, Vatican II File, Connolly Papers, ADFR.

¹⁹ Humberto Medeiros, “Reflections on the Council,” n.d. Reflections on the Council File, Box #7, Brownsville, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ *Anchor*, Vol #10 #17, April 28, 1966.

²² Humberto Medeiros, “Reflections on the Council,” n.d. Reflections on the Council File, Box #7, Brownsville, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

²³ Humberto Medeiros to James Connolly, October 15, 1965, Vatican II File, Connolly Papers, ADFR.

²⁴ *Anchor*, Vol #9 #47, November 25, 1965.

The Pastoral Constitution addressed atheism: “Taken as a whole, atheism is not a spontaneous development but stems from a variety of causes, including a critical reaction against religious beliefs, and in some places against the Christian religion in particular. Hence believers can have more than a little to do with the birth of atheism.”²⁵

Medeiros’ overall impression of Vatican II was positive, viewing it as an opportunity for both the Church and its bishops to discover greater relevance in the modern world. The theme of renewal was prominent in Medeiros’ thinking with respect to the Council, but this renewal could only happen and be efficacious through the acceptance of the cross. The changes the Council Fathers mandated through the 16 documents they produced required a new understanding of the Church that for some might be painful. Medeiros commented,

Through renewal, the Church— Pope, bishops, religious [, and] laity need to personally, freely and willingly take up the cross of sacrifice and [the] ever more accurate and perfect reflexion [*sic*] of Christ.²⁶

He further stated, “Renewal, then, will not be so much a casting away of the past, but the self-disciplining of the present with Christ’s wishes as the only real guide.”²⁷ He offered the idea that the Council was a manifestation of a three-fold act of love for God, Church and for all humanity. He suggested that the 16 documents were “works of love, involving countless hours of work, prayer, and penance.”²⁸ Reflecting a positive spirit and open to the future, he concluded,

The Second Vatican Council it seems to me, is a definite stage in the constant advancement of the Church towards perfection and fulfillment in the Lord as it wanders like a Pilgrim on earth in search of its everlasting home in heaven.²⁹

It is accurate to conclude, based on his overall impressions of Vatican II that Humberto Medeiros was fully supportive of the work of the Council Fathers. Several people who knew and worked with Medeiros testify to his unwavering defense of the Council. His close friend, John Driscoll, commented that Medeiros “felt the bishops were going in the right direction. He believed his role was to follow their lead.”³⁰ The Fall River diocesan paper, the *Anchor*, commented that Medeiros “lives the Council,”³¹ Ron Anderson, who worked with Medeiros during his time as Bishop of Brownsville, Texas (1966-1970), commented: “For him the Council was the new order of things. His experience of the Council informed the way he approached pastoral ministry.”³² Medeiros offered his own understanding: “Catholics are bound in conscience to listen to the living voice of the authorized teachers of the Church, and the voice of the Council is the most authorized voice of all.”³³

Medeiros’ enthusiastic support for the Council and implementation of its teachings was consistent with and conducted in conjunction with the progressive policy of Bishop Connolly. Connolly believed the liturgical changes to be the most obvious and pressing and it was clear that the faithful in the Diocese held great interest. The spring clergy conference, held on April 7, 1964 centered about implementation of the new liturgy and the proper way to instruct the faithful. Earlier that year, Connolly had written to his priests telling them that once the Holy Father issues the *motu proprio* changes can be implemented.³⁴

Medeiros’ personal interest in the implementation of the Council’s liturgical changes were clear from his actions. As Chancellor he wrote to pastors who were slow in their implementation of the changes.

²⁵ *Gaudium et Spes*, #19.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, Vol #10 #17, April 28, 1966.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ Humberto Medeiros, “Reflections on the Council,” n.d. Reflections on the Council File, Box #7, Brownsville, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

²⁹ Humberto Medeiros, “Restlessness and Life,” n.d [1965], Education Addresses File, Box #1, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

³⁰ Driscoll, Interview, October 24, 2016.

³¹ *Anchor*, Volume #10, #17 April 28, 1966.

³² Ron Anderson, Interview with the author, March 10, 2017.

³³ Humberto Medeiros, “Our Common Mission,” n.d. [July 1967] Our Common Mission File, Box #7, Brownsville, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

³⁴ James Connolly to “Reverend Dear Father,” January 24, 1964; James Connolly to “Reverend Dear Father,” March 3, 1964,” Bishops Correspondence 1963-64, Moderator/Chancellor Papers, ADFR.

A typical letter read in part: "I write to inform you that your report on efforts to promote active participation in the Sacred Liturgy in your parish has not yet been received in this office."³⁵ Working with Connolly, he instructed priests in the Diocese to prepare a series of five sermons on the Council.³⁶ Medeiros also gave several talks to various groups, from high school students to assorted fraternal organizations, as well as conferences to religious, all as a means to educate the faithful in the Council's teachings. Additionally, he personally spoke and encouraged catechists to instruct youth about the Council.³⁷

IV. Medeiros and Vatican II in Boston

In October 1970, Humberto Medeiros was installed as the fourth Archbishop (the seventh Bishop) of Boston. He arrived in the city after serving four years as the Bishop of Brownsville, Texas, an assignment in which he organized the diocese, becoming well known nationally through his support of migrant workers, both locally and through his work on the National Conference of Catholic Bishops' (NCCB) *Ad Hoc* Committee on Farm Labor. In Boston, Medeiros found himself in a difficult position of leading a local Church through the morass, uncertainty and divisions that were central features of the contemporary environment, both in society in general and the Church more specifically.

The theological position that Medeiros exercised in implementing Vatican II in Boston flowed directly from his spirituality, which acknowledged the ills of society but with the understanding that the light of Christ could conquer all of these problems. Serving as a bishop in the post-Vatican II era, he had to contend with the divide between those who are fundamentally conservative in their religious perspective and those who are basically liberal.³⁸ Although he was more conservative, as the Shepherd of all, he sought to be attentive to both perspectives. He understood it was his duty to speak out on issues that impacted the Church, but never to compromise in his defense of Catholic doctrine. The faith of the Church and its members needed to be guided by theology. In an address at the Catholic University of Portugal Medeiros stated, "One cannot believe firmly without some understanding of what we believe. Our faith is not unreasonable or totally incomprehensible, since it is the light from God. Because of this light, we know what we believe, in whom we believe, and why we believe."³⁹

Like many of his contemporaries in the episcopacy, Medeiros was socially progressive but theologically conservative. He fully supported Church teaching on all issues and was distressed when priests or other Church officials would "break ranks" and present opinions that were contrary to the accepted norms.⁴⁰ He once stated, "Whatever the Church has been teaching is the truth. The truth is the truth whether we like it or not."⁴¹ He critiqued those who publicly disagreed or seemed indifferent to Church doctrine. In response to a letter that critiqued the teaching of *Humanae Vitae*, Medeiros wrote,

I do not know what the percentage of Catholics is who accept or reject this teaching, but as you know, our acceptance of the Church's teaching on any matter is based not in percentages but on our faith in the presence of the Holy Spirit within the Church to safeguard the integrity of the magisterium.⁴²

³⁵ Humberto Medeiros to "Dear Reverend Father," April 2, 1964, Bishops Correspondence Moderator/Chancellor Papers, ADFR.

³⁶ The topics for the five sermons were: (1) The Church is a Mystery and The people of God, (2) The Structures of the Church, (3) The Church's Mission—Her Inner Growth (4) The Church's Mission—Her Extension in Time and Space—That All May be One, and (5) The Church's Mission—Her Extension in Time and Space—God Make Disciples of All Nations." See Vatican Jubilee Sermons, February 2, 1966, Bishops Correspondence Moderator/Chancellor Papers, ADFR.

³⁷ *Anchor*, Vol #10 #5, February 3, 1966, Vol #10, #10, March 13, 1966, Vol #10 #3, January 20, 1966.

³⁸ Robert Wuthnow, *Rough Country: How Texas Became America's Most Powerful Bible Belt State* (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2014), 321.

³⁹ *Pilot*, May 27, 1977.

⁴⁰ Michael Walsh Lescault. "In Season and Out of Season: The Boston Years of Humberto Cardinal Medeiros, 1970-1983." Ph.D. Diss. Providence College, 1992, 187, 190-91.

⁴¹ *Boston Globe*, March 4, 1973.

⁴² Humberto Medeiros to Robert Feeney, September 1, 1977 Correspondence with Laity, Fa-Fe File, Box #81, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

Similarly, he critiqued those who are indifferent toward the Church since such an attitude led to confusion. He believed it was his task to present a clear and straightforward message that articulated the Church's theological position. He wrote,

As your Archbishop, it is my great obligation to defend the integrity of the Catholic Church's Faith against ... the erosion of its divinely given morality. Look to the authentic teaching of the Church and your vision will be: clear as crystal.⁴³

As the defender of the faith, Medeiros scrutinized things carefully; he was very exacting in what he said, doing his best to speak clearly so that misinterpretation of his words would be minimal. His exacting theological perspective earned him the respect and admiration of the Holy See.⁴⁴

Medeiros' more conservative theological perspective, both in general and with respect women, did not mean that he was opposed to the reform that was the clear mind of the bishops at Vatican II. He sought to implement the directives of the Council Fathers in an effort to make Jesus Christ better known, loved, and served. He realized that change was difficult for some, but that careful and deliberate thought was placed into all the updates and reforms articulated in the Council documents.⁴⁵ Speaking to a group of Catholic women Medeiros stated,

Vatican II, and the developments since that time have certainly changed the "look" of much that once was familiar to us. In this sense at least, we can say that for us the "old time religion" has given way to renewal, *aggiornamento* and a kind of new look. This, however, should not be a matter of dismay; we should instead seek to understand why these changes were made and what was expected from them in our lives as Catholics. The proper changes that have been inaugurated, we must remember, did not just happen; they were set in motion by Church authorities for what were considered valid and important considerations. The basic reason, in its simplest terms, was to make more effective our religious life as an acting and worshipping community.⁴⁶

Medeiros firmly believed that the Church needed to adapt herself to the widespread social and cultural changes evident in the contemporary environment of the day. This must be accomplished, however, while simultaneously preserving the divine message the Church had always proclaimed. The Church has always met the needs of the day. Thus, "to do anything less [than adapt] would make the Church unfaithful to itself."⁴⁷ In short, he claimed an *aggiornamento* was necessary.⁴⁸

Cardinal Medeiros' role in the implementation of Vatican II was key to the modernization of the Church in Boston. Writing during Medeiros' time as Archbishop, the historian James O'Toole commented: "It has been the work of Cardinal Medeiros to ensure that the Church of his predecessors adapts to the needs of today's ethnic and racial immigrants and that it acts both as their solace and their defender."⁴⁹ The years of his service as Archbishop were pivotal; he strongly advocated for the implementation of the Council's ideas, but also discouraged those who sought to exceed its directives.⁵⁰ He believed it was his responsibility to implement the Council's teachings. He always sought to be in harmony with the Council, but clearly its letter, not its "spirit."⁵¹

⁴³ Humberto Medeiros, Pastoral Letter on Authority, July 5, 1977, Statement on Authority File, Box #57, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁴⁴ Lescault, "In Season and Out of Season," 188; Thomas O'Connor, *Boston Catholics: A History of the Church and Its People* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1998), 296.

⁴⁵ His Secretary, Monsignor William Helmick stated, "He [Medeiros] understood that the implementation of the Council was not as good as it should have been and caused some pain and disruption in the life of the Church,"

⁴⁶ Humberto Medeiros, Address, May 9, 1972, League of Catholic Women Congress File, Box #55, Boston, Medeiros Papers AABO.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*

⁴⁸ Humberto Medeiros, "Attacks Eastern Allegiance," Pastoral Letter on Sexuality, July 5, 1977 in "*Whatever God Wants*": Pastoral and Addresses by His Eminence Humberto Cardinal Medeiros (Boston: St. Paul Editions, 1984), 643.

⁴⁹ James O'Toole, *From Generation to Generation: Stories in Catholic History from the Archives of the Archdiocese of Boston* (Boston: Daughters of St. Paul, 1983), 133.

⁵⁰ Lescault, "In Season and Out of Season," 195.

⁵¹ Archbishop Hughes, Interview with the author, August 6, 2019.

V. Ecumenical Initiatives

One of the most significant concepts promoted by Vatican II was ecumenical and inter-faith dialogue. The Council published two significant documents, “The Decree on Ecumenism,” *Unitatis redintegratio* and “The Declaration on the Relations of the Church to Non-Christian Religions,” *Nostra aetate*, that addressed these critical issues. Following the lead of Jesus’ words in John’s Gospel (17:21), “That they may all be one, as you Father, are in me and I in you, that they also be one in us, that the world may believe that you sent me,” the Council sought to reach out to all peoples of faith. Yet, in so doing, the Church must never compromise its position as possessing the fullness of the truth. Medeiros clearly articulated this view, writing:

I believe that the fullness of the Church “subsists” in the Roman Catholic Church as Vatican II clearly states. But I also believe with that same Council that we Catholics must work for the day when the Christian churches will be one as Jesus prayed. This long arduous task according to Popes John XXIII and Paul VI will be accomplished by religious conversion on the part of individuals and theological convergence on the part of the ecclesial bodies separated from the Roman Catholic Church.⁵²

He suggested that a goal of reconciliation among all peoples of faith, while a truly challenging task, must be one from which all cannot shrink. He wrote “We must try to eliminate all the barriers that divide men.”⁵³

He committed himself to the mission of the restoration of full unity among all Christians.⁵⁴ He identified three essential elements that were critical to the ecumenical movement: (1) Honestly addressing the divisions existing among churches with regard to moral and ethical matters, (2) Churches must educate their congregations that God wants them to be one, and (3) Prayer. In support of the latter, Medeiros stated, “This [religious unity] will come in God’s good and gracious time; but it will not come without prayer, our dialogue and our hard, hard work.”⁵⁵ These goals could not be achieved, he believed, without personal conversion, an idea as we saw earlier that was part of his general spirituality. He emphasized this point in an address:

The Second Vatican Council put in a single simple sentence, but a sentence fraught with meaning: “There is no genuine ecumenism without an inward conversion.” Unless we are willing to intensify our inner spiritual lives through prayer and sacrifice—through constant striving for holiness then, I fear that our ecumenical activities will only be sounding brass and tinkling cymbal.⁵⁶

For Medeiros ecumenism was not a mere passing fad and, therefore, should not be addressed in any perfunctory way. He suggested that that no one could excuse himself from the task of ecumenical dialogue “without doing damage to the Word of God and the will of Christ.”⁵⁷ In the present environment ecumenism was an integral part of the Church. He acknowledged that there would be difficulties and challenges; the journey would be a rocky road. Thus, he stated, “Unless our efforts are marked by perseverance and sacrifice of time, talent, and money, they are doomed to failure. We must re-commit ourselves to the task.”⁵⁸ He also realized that there were some “hard” issues, and he was not so idealistic to simply forget the past. He also understood that secularism was a major problem that impeded the path toward unity. Therefore, the movement needed to proceed forward with humility and truth as shield and sword.⁵⁹

⁵² Humberto Medeiros to David F. Noonan, June 10, 1977, Correspondence with Priests, 1976 N-Z, 1977 A-Z, N File, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁵³ Humberto Medeiros, Christ Our Victory, " Pastoral Letter 1974, #59 found in Humberto Medeiros, *Whatever God Wants*, 36.

⁵⁴ Humberto Medeiros, Speech, “Looking Ahead 25 Years,” Looking Ahead 25 Years File, Box #57, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁵⁵ Lescault, “In Season and Out of Season,” 201.

⁵⁶ Humberto Medeiros, Address, March 1-3, 1971, TCC File, Box #55, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁵⁷ Humberto Medeiros, Speech, “Looking Ahead 25 Years,” Looking Ahead 25 Years File, Box #57, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁵⁸ Humberto Medeiros Address, n.d. [1970s], Ecumenism: Encounter or Escape File, Box #58, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁵⁹ Boston Archdiocesan Statement Re: Edelin Trial, n.d. [February 1975]. Dr. Edelin File, Box #76, Humberto Medeiros, Address to Texas Conference of Churches, n.d. [1970s] Ecumenism: Encounter or Escape File, Box #58, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO; *Pilot*, March 6, 1971.

Despite the challenges Medeiros could proudly proclaim that significant positive steps had been made in ecumenical dialogue in Boston. In a speech celebrating the patron of Boston, Saint Botolph, Medeiros commented,

The religious community in Boston has taken gigantic steps to keep pace ecumenically in numerous activities. Catholic, Orthodox, Protestants, Jews, and Islam have given each other the hand of brotherhood. We are united in a variety of ways in many charitable endeavors for alleviating the plight of the needy and the suffering. We do pray together to our common Father and we have entered a covenant of justice, equity, and harmony for peace in our midst.⁶⁰

Medeiros believed that the key ingredient to ecumenism was dialogue. He once stated, "Dialogue promotes intimacy and friendship on both sides. It unites them in a mutual adherence to the Good and thus excludes all self-seeking."⁶¹ Dialogue, he maintained required four basic ingredients: (1) Clarity before all else, (2) Must be accompanied by actions, (3) Need for trust, and (4) Prudence. He also stressed the need for absolute truth in all conversations. He stated

If our dialogue is sincere, we must be utterly candid with one another. ... Let me state with all frankness that it would be nothing short of dishonest and hypocritical of me or any to lead our non-Catholic Christian brothers to believe that the claims of charity are advanced when the claims of truth are denied.⁶²

For Medeiros truth was defined as Catholic doctrine. He sought unity with other traditions as much as possible, but not at the expense of "watering down" the faith or compromising belief. In an address Medeiros stated:

The Church meets the world in every generation, but it meets the world on its own terms not on those of the world. To do anything less would make the Church unfaithful to itself and to its invisible head, Our Lord Jesus Christ.⁶³

He further proclaimed that it was wrong for Catholic theologians to suggest that the teachings of Vatican II opened the door for a completely new formulation of the faith. In this vein he wrote: "What Vatican II teaches is to be interpreted and applied not by individual theologians but by the magisterial authority of the Church, which convoked the Council and teaches through the Council."⁶⁴ Archbishop Alfred Hughes, at the time one of Medeiros' auxiliaries, commented on Medeiros' adherence to Catholic tradition, "His [Medeiros'] impulse was to reconcile, while remaining faithful to the truth. He wanted to do everything he could to promote greater unity within the Church and with other Christian churches while remaining utterly faithful to God's teaching."⁶⁵

Several have commented on the ecumenical spirit Medeiros exhibited as Archbishop of Boston. The historian Michael Lescault wrote that Medeiros' more conservative stance did not impede his support for the Council:

Medeiros' orthodox [stance] ... in no way precluded a genuine desire to advance the goals of ecumenism. Ardently devoted to the ecumenical movement ... he spent a considerable amount of time and energy on ecumenical affairs, vigorously supporting interfaith groups formed to combat religious prejudice.⁶⁶

⁶⁰ Humberto Medeiros, St. Botolph's Day Homily, June 12, 1980 Priest Correspondence 1980 M-Z, 1981 A-H, Ma-Md File, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁶¹ Humberto Medeiros, Address to Texas Catholic Conference, March 1-3, 1971, 1971 TCC File, Box #55, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ *Pilot* (Boston), May 13, 1972.

⁶⁴ Humberto Medeiros, "Attacks Eastern Allegiance," Pastoral Letter on Sexuality, July 5, 1977 in *Whatever God Wants*, 643-44.

⁶⁵ Alfred Hughes, Homily, September 22, 1983, "Cardinal Medeiros Remembered," n.d [1983], Personal Papers of Gerry Silva (hereafter PPGS), Tiverton, Rhode Island. In a similar tone, Fr. Tim Shea stated: "He [Medeiros] encouraged ecumenical dialogue ... but he counseled *sentire cum ecclesia*. [To think with the Church.] See Fr. Tim Shea to author, August 19, 2019.

⁶⁶ Lescault, "In Season and Out of Season," 195.

Medeiros' longtime secretary, Monsignor William Helmick, commented, "He [Medeiros] had warm relationships with people of all faiths. He did whatever he could and attended events to foster ecumenical harmony."⁶⁷ Archbishop Hughes claimed that ecumenism was not one of Medeiros' top priorities but nonetheless "he was faithful in getting together ecumenically with leaders from other churches."⁶⁸

Medeiros' ecumenical efforts were formalized through the Archdiocesan Ecumenical Commission. This body, established by Cardinal Cushing on September 10, 1963, stated its purpose: "To further religious understanding among all Christians and to inform Catholics of the history, purpose and goals of the ecumenical movement." Headed by Commission President Thomas Riley, the original composition of the group was 12 clerics and three laymen.⁶⁹ Medeiros met with Commission members in December 1971 to discuss new guidelines for its work. The proposal of the Commission members were: (1) Apprise the Archbishop of any ecumenical developments within the Christian and non-Christian traditions, (2) Help to facilitate a working relationship between the Archbishop and representatives of other faiths, and (3) Advise the Archbishop on ecumenical implications of questions which come before the NCCB, the Bishops of the Boston Province, and the Massachusetts Catholic Conference.⁷⁰ Medeiros responded to the proposed guidelines, but his critique was not well received by Commission members:

It was with no little discouragement that we read the 8-page critique that you have drawn up on the proposed organizational guidelines for the Ecumenical Commission of the Archdiocese of Boston. The overall tone of the critique is quite disturbing. It communicates an attitude of no-confidence, or lack of trust in the officers and members of the Commission. Many of the comments offered reflect a fear that the Commission is not, or might not, exercise its responsibility with your approval.⁷¹

Despite the internal disagreement, discussions between the Archbishop and Commission members pertinent to the guidelines continued with Medeiros eventually agreeing to implement interim policies so that open positions on the Commission could be filled.

Medeiros' most active ecumenical outreach was to the Episcopal community. In June 1975 Medeiros and the Anglican Bishop of Massachusetts, John Burgess, sponsored a two-day conference at Emmanuel College that sought to promote Catholic and Anglican dialogue. The conference reviewed the Windsor and Canterbury statements on priestly ministry and Holy Eucharist, produced by the International Anglican-Roman Catholic dialogue. It was also hoped that through the conference an Anglican-Roman Catholic resource center could be opened.⁷² The keynote speakers at the conference were Archbishop William Baum of Washington, D.C. and Bishop John Harris Burt of the Episcopal Diocese of Ohio.⁷³ In his comments at the Conference, Medeiros spoke of the "utter urgency of the ecumenical imperative."⁷⁴ At the conclusion of the conference, the two bishops published a common pastoral letter, "Bless These Beginnings." The Pastoral stated that despite historical divisions and the continuing separation between these religious traditions, there was still great desire and goodwill toward a movement of unity. The document also recognized the many links between the two faiths, including Biblical studies and liturgical renewal. In a challenging way the Pastoral spoke to both communions: "There is need for the world to see this common witness as there is need for us to manifest it."⁷⁵ Medeiros was very pleased with the Conference. Writing to his Ecumenical representative, Medeiros stated,

⁶⁷ Monsignor William Helmick, Interview with the author, October 12, 2018.

⁶⁸ Hughes, Interview, August 6, 2019.

⁶⁹ "Fellowship," Vol 1 #1, May 1964, Ecumenism File, M2649 Chancellor Records, AABO.

⁷⁰ Organizational Guidelines for Ecumenical Commission of the Archdiocese of Boston, n.d.[1972], Archdiocesan Ecumenical Commission 1972 File, Box #59, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁷¹ Matthew Stapleton and James Hickey to Humberto Medeiros, March 31, 1972, Archdiocesan Ecumenical Commission File, Box #59, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁷² Archdiocesan News Bureau, May 5, 1975, Boston Pilot Offices (hereafter BPO), Braintree, Massachusetts.

⁷³ *Pilot*, June 13, 1975.

⁷⁴ Humberto Medeiros, Address, June 6, 1975, Roman Catholic-Episcopal Conference File, Box #56, Boston, Medeiros, AABO.

⁷⁵ Humberto Medeiros and John Burgess, "Bless These Beginnings" Joint Pastoral Letter, June 6, 1975, Chancery Memos 1975 File, Box #110, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

I felt the Conference was successful, and please God, it will have been at least one more small step toward that day we also earnestly hope and pray for when "all may be one."⁷⁶

Dialogue between the two communions continued over the ensuing years. May 22, 1977 was celebrated as "Anglican-Roman Catholic Sunday." As part of the festivities another joint Pastoral was issued, this time after a meeting between Medeiros and Bishop John Coburn. The letter read in part:

There is much cause to rejoice. There is inspiration and confidence to press on, that we may be one as we, even as Jesus and His Father are one. These days convince us that we are at an ecumenical moment of which we must now take advantage. We do not know what changes in our outer structures this will involve nor what changes in our inner judgments. But the Father in whom we continue to place our trust, will not abandon us in our attempt to respond to Christ's prayer.⁷⁷

The ecumenical drive between these two communions was also furthered by the 1982 meeting between Pope John Paul II and the Archbishop of Canterbury, Robert Runcie. Medeiros wrote to Coburn suggesting that the historic meeting could be ecumenically profitable and should be recognized in some way locally. He wrote, "It seems to me that this dialogue with both its huge successes and serious limitations, should be made more widely known among the clergy and laity in our parishes."⁷⁸ The two prelates agreed to a joint prayer service at the Episcopal Cathedral of St. Paul. On that occasion Medeiros stated,

This is more than a personal visit between old and good friends. It is rather a celebration of the distance our two churches have traveled over 450 years of silence, suspicion and separation. Although we have quite a journey ahead of us, the visit of the Holy Father to Canterbury and me to St. Paul's, has to be seen as an act of thanksgiving to God for having brought us to this happy day.⁷⁹

Medeiros' outreach to the Episcopal community, while viewed very positively by many, was critiqued by others. Fr. David Noonan, Chaplain at Framingham State College, attacked Medeiros for his common pastoral with Bishop Coburn. He wrote "I feel it is tragic that a Bishop of your stature allows yourself to be trapped into signing your name to such garbage as this." He went on to rant that "confused and conniving ecclesiastics were more concerned with the advancement of their careers than with commitment to the truth."⁸⁰

Beyond the Episcopal community, Medeiros sought to engage his Protestant brothers and sisters in general and specific ways. He offered general comments on the concept of ecumenism, lamenting the past, but looking in a positive direction to the future. Speaking to a Baptist congregation in Medford he commented,

We can sum up the achievement of the past with a few observations; no matter how we may explain the historical causes of our disunity in the past, we all lament them now. No matter how bitter the acrimony of the past understanding, forgiveness is the mark of today. No matter how we differ in belief and practice, our common treasury of Scripture, Baptism and Eucharist gives us the degree of unity upon which we must and will build.⁸¹

⁷⁶ Humberto Medeiros to Peter Conley. June 10, 1975, Priest Correspondence 1974 M-Z, 1975 A-O. Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁷⁷ *Pilot*, May 20, 1977.

⁷⁸ Humberto Medeiros to John Coburn, May 10, 1982 Non-Catholic File, box #92, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁷⁹ *Pilot*, June 4, 1982.

⁸⁰ David Noonan to Humberto Medeiros, May 22, 1977, Priest Correspondence 1976 P-Z, 1977 A-Z, N File, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁸¹ Humberto Medeiros, Speech, "Looking Ahead 25 Years," Looking Ahead 25 Years File, Box #57, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

In an interview, Medeiros spoke of the relations between Protestants and Catholics in Boston:

It is our common prayer with Christ that all may be one in time. Finally I would add that this effort toward unity is not only the work of the churches themselves, but also the mission of all men who live side-by-side. Every effort we make to reconcile our prejudices against others and to live with them in harmony and peace represents another step toward that unity willed for all men by Christ⁸²

Similarly, in an address to students at Gordon College, Medeiros stressed that ecumenism was a “comprehensive conversation and an understanding and appreciation of one another’s values and strengths.” While great strides have been made in ecumenical dialogue, he returned to a familiar theme that compromise of one’s beliefs was not the goal:

Know too your faith. Never compromise it. Beware of that false ecumenism which too easily shouts “unity unity!”—when there is no full unity. If as Dietrich Bonhoeffer has written, there is such a thing as “cheap grace,” there is also “cheap ecumenism.” It is born of impatience. It breeds indifference. It is easily discouraged, and it accomplishes little or nothing.⁸³

Cardinal Medeiros was engaged in several additional ecumenical efforts. He was a member of the Massachusetts Commission on Christian Unity, which was founded in 1967 with representatives of the Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox faiths. He was also a member of the New England Conference of Church Leaders and participated on occasions with the New England Consultation of Church Leaders. Addressing the Salvation Army on its 85th anniversary, Medeiros lauded the organization for its social consciousness, yet at the same time lamenting with sadness the divisions that continue to be a barrier to making Jesus’ prayer for unity a reality⁸⁴ Medeiros was a regular participant in ecumenical prayer breakfasts and celebrated the annual week of Christian unity. In a joint 1983 Easter statement Medeiros and other church leaders wrote: “Every social and economic issue which affects human well-being—whether the nuclear arms race or the unemployment rate, or pollution—is simultaneously a moral and spiritual matter and, therefore an issue on the Church’s agenda of compassion.”⁸⁵

Medeiros conducted ecumenical dialogue with other mainline Protestant traditions. He was an active participant in the Lutheran-Roman Catholic dialogue of New England. His contribution was noted in a letter of gratitude:

Your graciousness, openness, and solid encouragement have moved us another significant step closer to our common quest for the oneness of Christ’s Church. For these acts of kindness, the Committee stands deeply in your debt.⁸⁶

As a member of this same dialogue group, Medeiros was asked to comment on a pamphlet prepared for a celebration of the 450th anniversary of the Augsburg Confession. He also participated in panel discussions involving Catholic and Lutheran bishops. His relationship with Lutheran clergy was very positive. On the occasion of a Lutheran Bishop leaving the area, Medeiros wrote to him:

The Dialogue [between Lutherans and Catholics] has been a great help in keeping clergy and laity aware of the ecumenical mission of both Lutherans and Catholics. There is every hope that it will continue to flourish.⁸⁷

⁸² Humberto Medeiros, Interview with Maxine Shaw *National Catholic Reporter* June 8, 1972 Interview with Maxine Shaw File, Box #55, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁸³ Humberto Medeiros, Address, February 13, 1981, Gordon College File, Box #58, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁸⁴ James Hickey to Humberto Medeiros, September 18, 1971, Massachusetts Commission on Christian Unity File, Box #66; Medeiros, Address, April 16, 1975, Salvation Army Banquet File, Box #56, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO; Lescault, “In Season and Out of Season,” 196.

⁸⁵ Humberto Medeiros, *et al* Easter Message, March 25, 1983, Common Easter Statement File, Box #58, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁸⁶ Rev. Karl Donfried to Humberto Medeiros, May 17, 1979, Non-Catholic Clergy Correspondence File, Box #111, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁸⁷ Humberto Medeiros to Bishop Eugene Brodeen, 29, 1982 Archdiocesan Ecumenical Commission 1979-82 File, Box #59, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

Medeiros was thanked for his ecumenical outreach to the Lutheran community: "We are pleased and grateful for the expressions of reconciliation and growing unity that the people of our church bodies, especially in New England, are experiencing."⁸⁸ As the featured speaker at an event in Methuen to mark the 250th anniversary of the Congregational Covenant, he championed the advancement of the ecumenical movement, stating that we need to examine "what we hold in common and what divides us yet."⁸⁹ Writing to a local Methodist minister, Medeiros expressed his gratitude: "May I also take the opportunity to express my gratitude for all that you have done over the years to help create the ecumenical atmosphere for which Massachusetts has received wide acclaim."⁹⁰

Medeiros' relationship with the Orthodox community, as one might expect, was also very positive. He worked with Bishop Mark Lipa of the Albanian Orthodox Diocese of America in producing a joint statement asking for the re-opening of churches, mosques and religious institutions in Albania.⁹¹ Additionally, in 1981 an agreement was made that would allow Catholic and Greek Orthodox marriages to be recognized by both communions.⁹² Writing on behalf of the Orthodox community more generally, Lipa thanked Medeiros:

May we add that the spirit generated by our conversations is both promising and positive from our viewpoint. Furthermore, let us assure your Eminence of our support and agreement to help in whatever way possible to promote the aims of greater cooperation so vital to an effective Christian and ecumenical witness in today's society.⁹³

Moving beyond ecumenism into the realm of inter-faith dialogue, Medeiros also held a generally good relationship with the Jewish community. Medeiros forcefully and regularly spoke out against anti-Semitic rhetoric of any kind. He once wrote, "My abhorrence for anti-Semitism is deep-seated."⁹⁴ The Catholic-Jewish Committee of the Archdiocese rejected the then popular notion that Zionism was a form of racism or racial discrimination.⁹⁵ Medeiros' affection for the Jewish community was clear:

I do love the Jewish people. I love them deeply. Regularly I ask our common Father in heaven to bless and guide them. I sympathize with them in these critical times and I pray that peace will soon come to Israel and all peoples of the Near East.⁹⁶

Even more importantly from an inter-faith perspective, Medeiros spoke very positively about the efforts between Catholics and Jews to find reconciliation:

⁸⁸ Robert Feldmann to Humberto Medeiros, December 3, 1980, Non-Catholic Clergy Correspondence File, Box #111, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁸⁹ Humberto Medeiros, Speech, October 25, 1979, Ecumenical Clergy Luncheon File, Box #57, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁹⁰ Humberto Medeiros to Rev. Forrest Knapp, Non-Catholic Clergy Correspondence File, Box #111, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁹¹ Humberto Medeiros and Mark Lipa, "Albania: Declaration for Religious Freedom," *The Ecumenical Review* 34(2) (April 1982): 180-81.

⁹² "Agreement on Orthodox-Roman Catholic Marriages," *Origins* 10(40) (April 30, 1981: 734-35. The agreement allowed Catholic and Greek Orthodox marriages for earlier years to be recognized by both faith communities, allowing each party to have full communion within their respective tradition.

⁹³ Bishop Mark Lipa to Humberto Medeiros, February 29, 1972, Bishops Correspondence 1971-1974 L File, Box #96, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁹⁴ Humberto Medeiros to David Segal, April 2, 1982, Correspondence Se-Sy File, Box #92, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁹⁵ Statement of the Catholic-Jewish Committee of the Archdiocese of Boston, November 9, 1975, Archdiocesan Ecumenical Commission 1975 File, Box #59, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO. The statement in part read: "The Catholic-Jewish Committee of the Archdiocese of Boston rejects the notion that Zionism is a form of racism and social discrimination. The Jewish people have survived over 4000 years of uniquely hazardous history, share a common future, and the natural right that all peoples have to a national homeland. Therefore, the Catholic-Jewish Committee firmly supports the statement of the United States Delegation to the United Nations, noting the injustice of equating Zionism with racism and racial discrimination."

⁹⁶ Humberto Medeiros to Albert Schlossberg, November 16, 1973, Correspondence Sa-Sd File, Box #73, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

To some dialogue is wearisome and fruitless. They see it as just a matter of words spoken, or documents issued when a broken world cries out for healing, correction or support. I do not share this activist pessimism. The recent history of our cooperation has in fact given strong evidence that we have begun to walk a new path, less divergent and more parallel. We have begun to reverse our past and create a future that is promising in its possibilities. To continue to do this we must be willing first to be faithful to the riches of our own traditions. We must speak frankly and candidly one to another on the most difficult subjects that still divide us. And, lastly, we must be sure that history will hold us responsible and that the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the Father of Jesus Christ, will hold us accountable. Remembering this, we cannot but go forward together.⁹⁷

VI. Vatican II in Other Applications

Evangelization, another significant issue raised at Vatican II, was another part of Medeiros' agenda during his tenure in Boston. He once stated in an interview,

Evangelization demands total engagement of the Christian in the mission of the Church in the manner of the gifts given to him. Responsible stewardship is the key to evangelization for both clergy and laity.⁹⁸

Beginning in the fall of 1976 Medeiros made a significant effort to evangelize local Bostonians. He dedicated the clergy conference at that time to the subject. He proposed four questions that he wanted his priests to consider individually: (1) What new efforts should be made in our parishes to reach the lapsed and unchurched? How can we involve the laity in our efforts? (2) What efforts should be made toward young people who are alienated from the Church? (3) In our preaching, are we presenting the person of Jesus? Is the content of revelation lacking in our homilies? (4) What are the main obstacles to a fruitful hearing of the Word of God encountered by our people in their daily lives?⁹⁹

Inspired by Pope Paul VI's encyclical *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, and working with his auxiliary Bishop, Daniel Hart, Medeiros developed a pastoral plan for evangelization that could be used in Boston. The program was initiated with a retreat for Archdiocesan leaders, held September 12-16, 1977 at St. Francis Retreat House, in Rye, New Hampshire. Sixty-seven participants examined various methods of evangelization and made a plan to make the Holy Father's vision a reality. As a result of the retreat, Medeiros accepted a plan which called for a "Year of Learning about Pastoral Planning for Evangelization." The plan was designed as a year to find and create better ways for renewal of faith in the Archdiocese; it envisioned formation programs for parishes to train people to become better evangelizers. Unfortunately, the "Year of Learning" did not receive the enthusiastic support Medeiros expected, and even in some cases, the plan was opposed. Additionally, many priests never became involved or understood the program.¹⁰⁰

While evangelization was certainly important to Medeiros, Roman Catholics who lived through the changes of Vatican II almost to a person point to the liturgical changes as those that were most obvious and significant. As we recall Medeiros was a champion of liturgical change in Fall River; he continued the same attitude in Brownsville. Nonetheless, he was cautious, understanding that the centrality of the Mass necessitated the Church to maintain order and control over liturgical celebration. The historian Thomas O'Connor has commented:

Although he was conscientious about vigorously implementing the liturgical changes called by Vatican II, Cardinal Medeiros was equally vigorous in establishing clear boundaries beyond which experiments in doctrine and innovations in teaching would not be tolerated.¹⁰¹

⁹⁷ Humberto Medeiros, Address, March 23, 1979, Jewish Community Council Luncheon File, Box #57, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁹⁸ *Episcopal Times*, January 1978, Anglican-Roman Catholic Medeiros Interview File, Box #57, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

⁹⁹ Humberto Medeiros, Address, October 19, 1976, Fall Clergy Conference File, Box #56, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

¹⁰⁰ Lescault, "In Season and Out of Season," 213-19.

¹⁰¹ Thomas O'Connor, *Boston Catholics*, 295.

Despite his reservations, Medeiros was committed to implementing the reforms in the sacred liturgy:

I would like to assure you that I am doing everything in my power together with the Auxiliary Bishops and priests of the Archdiocese of Boston, as well as competent religious and lay people, to implement the reforms of the sacred liturgy promulgated by the Fathers of the Vatican II Council, and continued in subsequent documents from the Holy See.¹⁰²

On the other hand, Medeiros was very clear that any diminution of obligatory participation was wrong, stating that people should be encouraged toward greater participation in the life of the Church.¹⁰³ He was also wary of instituting the Saturday vigil Mass as a means of meeting Sunday obligation. He wrote to the Chairman of the Bishops' Committee on the Liturgy (NCCB) concerned that young people see little difference between Saturday and Sunday with respect to religious significance.¹⁰⁴ For Medeiros the centrality of the Eucharist was paramount. In a Pastoral Letter, "Christ our Victory," he strongly emphasized the responsibility of priests to act as a guiding light to others, helping them "to appreciate the essential richness of the Church as a most treasured gift."¹⁰⁵ In a letter to his priests, the Cardinal concluded,

I cannot bring this letter to a close without once again reminding you, my brother priests of the centrality of the Holy Eucharist in the life of an ordained priest, and of the necessity incumbent upon all of us, to strive continuously to increase our fervor and devotion to the Holy Eucharist.¹⁰⁶

Several issues relevant to the celebration of the Eucharist, all in some sense derivatives from Vatican II, required Medeiros' response. Some people, both clergy and laity, who were not enamored by the change to the vernacular, pressed the Cardinal for permission to celebrate Mass in Latin using the pre-Vatican II (Pope Pius V) rite. Seeking counsel on the question, Medeiros was informed by the General Secretary of the NCCB, James Rausch, that the Holy See had ordered that only the *novus ordo*, the rite of Pope Paul VI, was allowed. Thus, Medeiros informed those who inquired that Mass could be celebrated in Latin but only using the post-Vatican II ritual.

Another significant issue with respect to the celebration of the Eucharist was allowing the laity to receive, the body and the blood of Christ. This issue was addressed theologically in the 16th century by the Council of Trent,¹⁰⁷ but in the light of Vatican II the privilege of the priest alone to receive both species was challenged. In 1969 permission had been granted by the Holy See for the laity to receive from the chalice, allowing national conferences of bishops and local ordinaries to set rules in their areas of authority. However, the NCCB initially balked, unable to gather the necessary two thirds vote of the bishops to petition the Vatican for this privilege.¹⁰⁸ Eventually experimentation in some parishes in various dioceses, including Boston was allowed. Medeiros wrote to his priests, "It is expected that each priest will pastorally judge the particular situation locally in the understanding of the people."¹⁰⁹ After a period of brief experimentation the privilege was discontinued in 1973; eventually in 1979 on the Feast of *Corpus Christi* Medeiros granted general permission.¹¹⁰

¹⁰² Humberto Medeiros to Carol Ann Kramer, October 15, 1977, Correspondence with Laity, Kn-Kz File, Box #81, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

¹⁰³ Humberto Medeiros to Rembert Weakland. June 11, 1980, Meeting of Cardinal with Auxiliary Bishops File, Box #115, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO. Some bishops were suggesting that "Holy Days" should be optional. In his usual defense of the traditional Church, Medeiros totally rejected this idea.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁵ Humberto Medeiros, "Christ Our Victory," Pastoral Letter 1974, #47 in Medeiros, *Whatever God Wants*, 28.

¹⁰⁶ Humberto Medeiros to "My Dear Brother Priests," n.d. [1980], Meeting of Cardinal with Auxiliary Bishops, November 6, 1980 File, Box #115, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

¹⁰⁷ The Protestant reformer, Martin Luther, in his famous treatise, "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church," have challenged church teaching, suggesting that the laity should be able to receive the blood of Christ. Trent responded stating that the whole Christ, body and blood, our present in both species, the bread and the wine.

¹⁰⁸ *Boston Globe*, July 27, 1977.

¹⁰⁹ William Helmick to Humberto Medeiros to "Dear Father," March 8, 1971, Chancery Circulars Folder #8, Box #11, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO. He wrote to the priests and religious in the Archdiocese: "Receiving Holy Communion from the cup should not be considered a novelty or just another change for the sake of change; it is neither of these. It signifies, rather, the fullness of our participation in the Eucharistic be held and, therefore, is a more complete expression of our Holy Faith."

¹¹⁰ In November 1978 the NCCB granted permission for the reception of communion under both species on all Sundays and Holy Days of Obligation. See William Helmick to Humberto Medeiros, Memorandum, March 2, 1979; Humberto Medeiros

Especially cognizant of the Council's emphasis on lay participation, a second issue raised was the use of lay (extraordinary) ministers of the Eucharistic. The papal instruction *Immensae Caritatis*, issued on March 29, 1973, gave permission for "suitable persons to serve as extraordinary ministers of Holy Communion. These may be chosen for a specific location, or for a time, or in the case of necessity even in a permanent manner." Both men and women were eligible but "they must be duly instructed and distinguished by their practice of the faith."¹¹¹ Medeiros wasted no time, publishing a directive in late May 1973, instructing his priests to appoint many people to be Eucharistic ministers. At the same time the Archdiocese inaugurated a series of regional training programs for Extraordinary Ministers of the Eucharist. At the same time the archdiocese issued its guidelines for lay Eucharistic ministers.¹¹² Thus, on September 23, 1973 Medeiros invested 800 laymen and lay women as Eucharistic ministers.¹¹³ Several years later Medeiros commented on his enthusiastic support for extraordinary lay ministers of Eucharist:

It has always been my desire that we continue to work in the Boston Archdiocese for the full conscious and active participation of all people in the Holy Eucharist which is the summit and source of the Church's life.¹¹⁴

The one area of lay participation that Medeiros rejected was female acolytes. Numerous extant letters exist from young women asking why they cannot serve as "altar servers?" Medeiros basic response, displaying his traditional side, was basically the same in all cases. One typical letter read:

Although you have read and observed that in other areas altar girls are permitted, we have not given such permission here in the Archdiocese of Boston. One reason is that here in the Archdiocese there have always been more than enough young men who want to assist the priest during the celebration of the Holy Mass. More important than that, however, is the fact that the activities, especially in preparation for Holy Mass, are not suited for boys but are more suited for young ladies. This would include, of course, the preparation of vestments, altar linens, the linens for the priest, order of the sacristy etc.¹¹⁵

Beyond the celebration of the Eucharist, the revised sacrament of penance and his three rites of reconciliation were also introduced by Medeiros. The new rite was being utilized by November 1976; it became mandatory on the First Sunday of Lent 1977. Medeiros, however, did not allow the use of general absolution for he could not foresee any situation within the Archdiocese when it might be necessary.¹¹⁶

Certainly, one of the most significant teachings of Vatican II was the re-institution of the permanent diaconate. Both "The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church" *Lumen Gentium* (#29) and "The Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity" *Ad Gentes Divinitus* (#16) called for the restoration of this ancient ministry in the Church. In June 1967, in response, Pope Paul VI issued a *motu proprio*, *Sacrum Diaconatus Ordinem*, which restored the permanent diaconate, but only in those countries where it was desired. Cushing was queried about initiating the program in Boston but he felt that there was no need at the time.¹¹⁷ Medeiros was certainly open to the permanent diaconate. He articulated his understanding of the restored ministry:

to Reverend and Dear Fathers, n.d. [April 1979], Liturgical Commission 1978-79 File, Box #65, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

¹¹¹ Quoted in the *Pilot*, June 6, 1973.

¹¹² Humberto Medeiros to Reverend Dear Father, May 28, 1973, Chancery Circulars, Folder #5, Box #12; Guidelines for Extraordinary Ministers of the Eucharist, n.d. [1982]. Meeting of Cardinal with Auxiliaries, June 4, 1982 File, Box #115, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO; Archdiocesan News Service, August 2, 1980, BPO.

¹¹³ *Boston Globe*, September 24, 1973.

¹¹⁴ Humberto Medeiros to Francis Strahan, February 1, 1980. Liturgical Commission File, Box #65, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

¹¹⁵ Humberto Medeiros to Daria Dulskis, February 8, 1973, Correspondence with Laity Du-Dz File, Box #72, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

¹¹⁶ *Pilot*, March 34, 1977; Humberto Medeiros to "My Dear Brother Priest," November 1, 1976, Chancery Office File, Box #62, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO. The Sacrament of Penance has three rites: (1) Individual confession with absolution, (2) Reconciliation services with (if desired) individual confession and (3) General Absolution.

¹¹⁷ "Proposal for the Permanent Diaconate Program, Archdiocese of Boston." n.d. [1971]; Joseph Reilly to "Your Excellency," [Medeiros], September 17, 1971, Permanent Diaconate File, Box #67, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

Deacons should most of all recognize that their service is first of all to the household of the faith in order that the Church may serve the world. Their ministry must be oriented toward building the Church of God into a vibrant, dedicated servant of God and the world.¹¹⁸

In March 1971 the Priest Senate passed a resolution to set up the permanent diaconate training program with the appointment of a director. In response Medeiros set up an *Ad Hoc* committee to research the initiation of a permanent diaconate program.¹¹⁹ The committee submitted its report, giving full support for the program and providing a rationale:

Since the Church is diaconal, a servant community after the example of Her Shepherd, we envision the Restored Order of [the] Permanent Diaconate in Boston as a new opportunity whereby mature men of faith may, by the laying on of hands, give a permanent visible witness to their response to the God who calls them and with the Sacramental Grace of the Diaconate, take their proper place in the ministry of Jesus Christ.¹²⁰

The Committee also provided details on requirements for candidates and outlined an academic program.¹²¹ The proposal called for a three-year academic training program, taking four courses per semester. The Committee believed that the deacons should have strong sacramental ministry as well as that of public witness to the Church's concern for the needs of all peoples. Lastly, the Committee believed that deacons could be especially effective in the Black and Hispanic communities. Thus, it was believed that the recruitment of possible candidates should concentrate in geographic areas populated by these groups.¹²²

Based on the Committee's recommendations, the work of a small committee of researchers,¹²³ and his own ideas, Cardinal Medeiros authorized a new permanent diaconate program in 1972. He stated that the Archdiocese was ready to begin implementation, but that he was open to suggestions for improvements along the way. He wrote to his priests, "I feel that the program has much to offer the Church and I am anxious to see it implemented in the Archdiocese of Boston."¹²⁴ The program received his first candidates in 1973. Initially 160 men in the Archdiocese applied and 38 entered the first-class. Medeiros appointed Fr. William C Burckart as the first Director of the Permanent Diaconate Program.¹²⁵ Medeiros was closely linked to the program and supportive for its future success. The first 34 deacons were ordained on May 22, 1976.

Over the remaining years of Medeiros' tenure as Archbishop the permanent diaconate continued to evolve. Medeiros understood that some priests had difficulty accepting the permanent diaconate as a ministry. He suggested that priests must first accept their own vocation as a Shepherd so as to be able to better understand the content of the deacon's vocation, as one complementary to yet different from that of the presbyterate.¹²⁶ In March 1978, as a means to evaluate and improve the program, Medeiros formed a committee to assess the curriculum. The 15 members of the committee, priests and religious sisters, made a few recommendations.

¹¹⁸ Humberto Medeiros to Joseph Bernardin, July 2, 1971, Permanent Diaconate File, Box #67, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*

¹²⁰ "Proposal for the Permanent Diaconate Program, Archdiocese of Boston," Permanent Diaconate File, Box #67, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, The basic qualifications to enter the diaconate program were: (1) At least 32 years old, (2) Good moral character, (3) Firm faith and sense of vocation, (4) Good intelligence, (5) Attuned to Vatican II (6) Possessing basic ministerial skills—relating to people, ability to speak well, leadership involvement in parishes. See "Proposal for the Permanent Diaconate Program, Archdiocese of Boston." n.d. [1971]; Permanent Diaconate File, Box #67, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

¹²² *Ibid.*

¹²³ Medeiros asked Fathers Edwin Condon, Bob Banks and Frank O'Hare to work out a proposal for implementing the permanent Diaconate Program in Boston. See Edwin Condon to Humberto Medeiros, February 5, 1972, Permanent Diaconate File, Box #67, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO

¹²⁴ Humberto Medeiros to "Dear Father," June 6, 1973, Chancery Circulars, Folder #5, Box #12, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

¹²⁵ Archdiocesan News Service, July 6, 1973, December 15, 1974, BPO. The average age of the initial 38 men class was 46. One was single, one widowed and 36 married.

¹²⁶ Humberto Medeiros, Address, April 29, 1981 Permanent Diaconate Directors Convention File, Box #58, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

First, the committee suggested that a more substantial introductory program prior to entrance into formation must be required. Secondly, more emphasis should be placed on spiritual development. Third, the initial part of the program needs an intensive seminar on spiritual direction.¹²⁷ In June 1981 Medeiros wrote to the director of the program, Thomas Foley, suggesting that a Permanent Board of Appeals be set up to deal with candidates who were rejected but were seeking redress.¹²⁸

Although not a sacramental outgrowth from Vatican II, the establishment of parish councils was another Council teaching that Medeiros strongly promoted. Both the “Decree on the Pastoral Office of the Bishops in the Church” *Christus Dominus* (#27) and the “Decree on the Church’s Missionary Activity,” *Ad Gentes Divinitus* (#30) address the need for parish councils. Thus, in 1966 through his *motu proprio Ecclesiae Sanctae* Pope Paul VI called for the creation of parish councils.¹²⁹ In Boston a handbook that provided guidelines for parish councils was published. It provided both a rationale and purpose for this new advisory body:

The parish Council is a democratic process whereby priests, religious and laity work together to continue the Church’s work among men. ... [I]t is the purpose of the Parish Council to coordinate, encourage and promote every apostolic activity through which the parish community discharges its common responsibility of making the Gospel known and aiding men to the sanctification of life.¹³⁰

Medeiros backed the concept of parish councils, although he did not mandate their establishment in every parish.¹³¹

VII. Conclusion

The Second Vatican Council (1962-1965), arguably the most significant event in the second millennium of Roman Catholicism, became the platform that allowed Humberto Medeiros to exercise his creative spirit as leader of the Church in Boston. Medeiros was an active participant at all four sessions of the Council, serving as a *peritus* for Bishop James Connolly, during his time as chancellor in Fall River. Later, he championed Vatican II ideas, especially the promotion of lay involvement and participation during his time as Bishop of Brownsville. It was in Boston, however, that his Vatican II spirit manifested itself to its greatest degree. His defense of ecumenism through his outreach to Orthodox and Protestant Christians, as well as his defense of Judaism, was evident throughout his tenure. He actively implemented liturgical changes and championed lay participation in the celebration of the Eucharist. Lastly, he was at the forefront of the establishment of the permanent diaconate in Boston. Medeiros’ institution of innovative ecclesiastical policies and programs demonstrates in important ways the implementation of Vatican II in local contexts and the positive impact such action had on the advancement of the faith.

¹²⁷ William Burckhart To Evaluation Board Members, June 1978, Permanent Diaconate File, Box #67, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO. Auxiliary Bishop John D’Arcy was concerned that the permanent deacons were not being effectively utilized. He suggested to Medeiros that a priest might be assigned to work with deacons on an individual basis and at times collectively to help deacons to have a more effective ministry. See John D’Arcy to “Auxiliary Bishops,” February 6, 1981, Meeting of Cardinal and Auxiliary Bishops, February 12, 1981 File, Box #115, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

¹²⁸ Humberto Medeiros to Thomas Foley, June 11, 1981, Permanent Diaconate Program File, Box #67, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO

¹²⁹ Avery Dulles, S.J. “The Theological Rationale for Parish Councils,” March 13, 1972, Parish Council Sharing Responsibility File, Box #59, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

¹³⁰ Handbook on Parish Councils, n.d.[1972] Commission for Parish Councils File, Box #59, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.

¹³¹ Parish Council Norms, December 1, 1973, Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Men and Women 1971-73 File, Box #59, Boston, Medeiros Papers, AABO.