

# **Preparations for the Re-opening of Fu Jen University as Seen by Benedictine Father Hugh Wilt**

by

Nicholas Koss\*

This year is the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the setting up of Fu Jen University in Taipei. In this essay, I will discuss the presence of Fr. Hugh Wilt, O.S.B. in Taiwan the year before the re-opening of the University. He had been sent to Taipei to assist Archbishop Paul Yu-Pin in preparing for the re-opening. Much attention will be given to what Fr. Hugh reported to Archabbot Denis Strittmatter, O.S.B. about the preparations for having once again a Fu Jen University. Archabbot Denis was the Archabbot of St. Vincent Archabbey (1896—1971; archabbot 1949-1963) in Latrobe, Pennsylvania, which had founded the Fu Jen

---

\* Distinguished Professor, Fu Jen Catholic University and Peking University.

University in Beijing and was now helping its re-opening.

Fr. Hugh Wilt, O.S. B. (1904-1987) was one of the Benedictines who had worked at Fu Jen University in Beijing during the Benedictine years. At the time he was a cleric, and his ordination to the priesthood took place there too. Upon his return to St. Vincent he studied history at Columbia University and then taught it at St. Vincent College for many years. In the 1960s, he was also Prior of St. Vincent Archabbey, which means he was second in command.

On October 2, 1961, Fr. Hugh wrote to Archabbot Denis about the opening of Fu Jen University in Taipei:

After many months of doubts and fears the Catholic University finally got under way. With appropriate ceremonies we opened last Wednesday with full governmental approval. For this year, at least, we will strictly limit all activities to the graduate school and accept only a token number of students. The Archbishop [Yu-Pin] is most anxious to have the school approved and registered so that officially for the record we can claim to be functioning again.

First to be noted here is Archbishop Yu-Pin's concern to "have the school approved and registered." As we will see, the government allowed Fu Jen University simply to be "re-opened" on Taiwan so the University did not have to go through the paperwork of registering as a new university.

Fr. Hugh also mentions the Board of Trustees meeting that was held the same day as the opening as going "smoothly," which apparently was not always the case. And he goes on to add:

A few days later, however, friction broke out between the Religious Orders and the Archbishop over the land question in Kaohsiung, the

southern section of the University. They will be solved in time but building is being held up.

More about this problem of the university's location will be discussed later, but for now it should be pointed out that, as with the establishment of almost any large educational undertaking, there were many controversies and debates, or much "friction," to use Fr. Hugh's word, involved in the setting up of Fu Jen, one type of which was between the religious orders involved in the project and Archbishop Yu-Pin.

Finally, Fr. Hugh explains that Archbishop Yu-Pin has become ill and cannot leave for New York as originally scheduled after the opening.. The toll on the Archbishop in working to bring about this day must have been very great.

Now allow me to go over the letters and other material in the St. Vincent Archives that deal with the events leading up to the re-opening of Fu Jen in September of 1961. After the Chinese Communists first took control of the Chinese Mainland, Archbishop Paul Yu-Pin was in Washington, D.C. and soon established contact with the Benedictines at St. Vincent Archabbey. On March 25, 1950, he wrote a letter from the Institute of Chinese Culture in Washington, asking if he could spend Holy Week at St. Vincent Archabbey with his secretary Fr. John Niu and another secretary named Bernard Yoh. The coadjutor Archabbot at the time, Denis Strittmatter, O.S.B, warmly responded with a letter of welcome. St. Vincent at this time was a monastery with over 200 monks. Then, in November of 1951, Archbishop Yu-Pin wrote a letter of condolences to Archabbot Denis on the death of his predecessor Archabbot Alfred Koch, saying:

Archabbot Koch was one of the pioneers of the Catholic University of Peiping. He was the second Chancellor of that University from 1932 to 1934. His departure for his eternal reward at this moment when the

Catholic University in Peiping as well as the whole Catholic Church in China are under one of the most severe and systematical anti-religious persecution in China's history, is indeed a heavy blow to us Chinese. Although we well realize that he will not cease praying for China in Heaven, but his physical absence at this crucial moment is felt by all of us. (Letter of November 16, 1951)

Those familiar with the early history of Fu Jen University in Beijing will know that Archabbot Alfred was elected abbot after the death of Archabbot Aurelius, who had worked so hard to establish Fu Jen. (Endnote 1) One of the reasons why Archabbot Alfred, a former member of the Society of the Divine Word, was elected archabbot was because he was strongly in favor of St. Vincent withdrawing from Fu Jen University given the tremendous financial problems following the Great American Depression. Needless to say, Archbishop Yu Pin, being the great diplomat that he is, mentions none of this and only has good things to say about Archabbot Alfred.

Nothing more happens about Fu Jen University and St. Vincent Archabbey until the end of the 1950s. On October 28, 1958 John XXIII was elected pope. He had great interest in the missions as can be seen in his second encyclical *Princeps Pastorum* that was promulgated on November 28, 1959, and emphasized the need of Catholics to be mission-oriented. It was also about this time when he decided that Fu Jen University should be re-opened. Fr. Hugh has recorded what happened to him, then Prior at St. Vincent, at that time:

In November 1959 Bishop Hugh Lamb of Greensburg, Pa., [the diocese where St. Vincent Archabbey is] having received a copy of the general letter sent from Rome to the American Hierarchy [about setting up Fu Jen University in Taiwan], sent the letter to me with a

footnote—"perhaps you will be interested in this". Frankly, I was not, for I still considered the time inopportune since all Asia is deeply restless and unsettled third of the world—and will probably remain so for fully fifty years or so.... Some six or seven weeks later Archabbot Denis Strittmatter received a copy of the same letter from Rome which he read to the Senior or Small Chapter and asked for the comments of the members. I again remarked that I thought it was too early since the matter had only recently been decided upon. I did suggest, however, that the Archabbey should not flatly reject the letter. I recommended that the Archabbot write the Cardinal [Tien] that we were pleased to learn of the reopening of Fu Jen and would be interested in future developments. Thomas Cardinal Tien, who had meanwhile been appointed Chancellor and Chairman of the Board of Trustees for the University, responded at once with the assurance that Archbishop Paul Yu Pin would visit the Archabbey shortly. ("The Fu Jen Catholic University of China" 6)

Fr Hugh also gives an interesting account as to why Fu Jen University was to be opened in Taiwan:

When the mainland fell to the Communists hope persisted for many months that the various governmental and missionary forces might possibly return in the near future. Unfortunately this false hope led to a period of inaction both in Taiwan where large numbers of refugees fled, as well as in other areas. Yet the alumni and friends of Fu Jen continued their appeals for the reopening of the University in Taiwan. By 1955 and 1956 numerous appeals had been received in Rome and at the headquarters of the Divine Word Society. The leaders of the Church in Taiwan likewise became concerned as years passed without any leaders being trained for the future. ("The Fu Jen Catholic University of China" 5)

Most of us are aware of the work of the Fu Jen alumni in re-opening Fu Jen University but I, at least, did not know of the concern of the leaders of the Church that the University was to be a place to train future Church leaders.

On December 10, 1959, Archbishop Yu-Pin writes to Archabbot Denis explaining his appointment of as the *rector magnificus* of the Fu-Jen Catholic University to be “restored” in Taiwan. He furthers states:

I am most interested in having your Order to participate in its restoration in Taiwan. There are seven religious orders and societies which have been invited to take part in the university, and the Society of [the] Divine Word is one of them and the assignment given to and accepted by the SVD is a College of Sciences.

To your Order we propose either a School of Music, or a Department of Journalism and Literature. To build a separate School or a College will cost about \$100,000 while to assume the responsibility of a Department in the College of Arts will cost \$20,000 to build it. You are given priority of choice in the above mentioned three subjects, that is Music, Journalism, and Literature. Of course, when you assume the expense of building a part of the university, you will have also to send an equivalent personnels [sic] to teach in it. (Letter of December 10, 1959)

Archbishop Yu-Pin lost no time in inviting the Benedictines to participate in the new Fu Jen University. His proposal, however, is directed to the Benedictine Order. The Benedictines, unlike the Jesuits and other orders, are not directed by a superior general at the top with full authority to make decisions. Rather, each Benedictine monastery is fully independent and makes its own decisions. Archabbot Denis was in charge of St. Vincent and also President of the congregation of Benedictines to which it belongs, but he could only be directly

involved with decisions related to St. Vincent. This organizational structure of the Benedictines was one of the major problems related to their running the Fu Jen in Beijing.

Besides this letter to Archabbot Denis, Archbishop Yu-Pin also wrote to Fr. Gregory Schramm, O.S.B., a monk of St. Mary’s Abbey in Newark, N.J., who was one of the Benedictines who had served at Fu Jen University in Beijing when it was still run by the Benedictines. Fr. Gregory was in contact with Archbishop Yu-Pin when the latter was in the States. On March 11, 1960, Archbishop Yu-Pin wrote him and first mentions that Fr. Gregory had “played a very important role in the establishment of the Department of Education therein . . .”.

Then the Archbishop continues:

You are hereby appointed to be my personal representative, with full power, to negotiate with any or all the Benedictine Abbey for the purpose of inviting them to establish and administer the College of Education for the Fu Jen Catholic University.” (Letter of March 11, 1960)

Fr. Gregory responds with a long list of questions (Letter of March 29) and says the matter will be brought up at the “Chicago Meeting of Abbots, April 21, 1960.” What happened to this proposal can be seen in the minutes for the Council of Seniors (Endnote 2) on May 27, 1960:

The formation of a Catholic University in Formosa was discussed. It had previously been mentioned that American Benedictines would be asked to take over the school of Education. (cf. Oct. 28, 1959) However, since then Cardinal Tien has advised us that the School of Education must be under the control of natives, although individual departments may take in foreigners. The Cardinal’s letter suggested that St. Procopius

Abbey take charge of the College of Agriculture. He also suggested that it would be more feasible and more advantageous for the Chinese if we would operate a School of Western Studies.

What is to be noticed here is that we now have Cardinal Tien taking part in planning for the organization of the new Fu Jen University, and it seems that he and Archbishop Yu-Pin are not sufficiently discussing matters before making offers to religious orders to participate in the undertaking. These minutes are also the first mention of the Benedictines taking on “a School of Western Studies.”

In September 1960, because the Archbishop was not able to schedule a visit to St. Vincent, Archabbot Denis and Fr. Hugh go to New York to have supper with him and talk about Fu Jen University: Here is Fr. Hugh’s account of this meeting:

Quite suddenly in early September Abbot Denis asked me to be ready to leave for New York at short notice. A few days later I flew to New York with him to have dinner with Archbishop Yu Pin.... Later that evening, with Father Gregory [Schramm], a few lay friends and about six Chinese priests, the Archabbot and I had dinner with Archbishop Yu Pin at the Manhattan Hotel.

The Archbishop, Archabbot Denis and I, sat at the top of the table and for fully two hours we discussed every possible angle and problem to be met in the reopening of Fu Jen. Everything seemed quite uncertain and indefinite.....

Early the following morning I dropped in to see Abbot Denis and when he asked for my impressions I told him very frankly that I felt the whole question was still too nebulous. And when I said, “I think the Archbishop seemed quite confused and uncertain. He didn’t seem to have any clear

ideas as to when and how the entire project is to be started”. Archabbot Denis’ response to my remark ended the discussion. He said—“That is quite true. He is quite lost and confused and that is why he wants you to go with him as early as possible.” (“The Fu Jen Catholic University of China” 6-7)

I’m not sure if “quite confused and uncertain” are accurate ways to describe the Archbishop’s condition then, but that was at least the impression given. Apparently during the dinner Archbishop Yu-Pin must have taken Abbot Denis aside and asked for the help of Fr. Hugh. If his intention was to get Benedictine help, this was certainly a good way of going about doing it.

Two weeks after the dinner in New York, Abbot Denis presented the matter to large chapter. The minutes read:

The business presented to the Chapter was the Catholic University of Formosa. Cardinal Tien and Archbishop Paul Yu-Pin [have] been designated by Rome to form this University. The Benedictines were offered the school of “Western Studies,” i.e. History, Literature and modern language. This offer was first presented to the American Cassinese Congregation but the Archbishop felt that a single abbey could operate the school more efficiently. The Archbishop had also requested that Fr. Hugh because of his previous experience at the University of Fu-Jen in Peking, China, accompany the Archbishop within the next few months to help develop the University.

Father Archabbot then asked for a consultive vote on the question: Whether Fr. Hugh should be sent to Formosa to investigate the project. The result of the vote was 42 affirmative votes, 4 negative and 4 indifferent votes. (Large Chapter, September 27, 1960)

That the Benedictines were here being offered “modern languages” suggests that at this time the Society of the Divine Word had not yet agreed to be in charge of this part of the University. In his letters from this period Fr. Hugh refers to the S.V.D.’s as being in charge of the College of Science. It is also clear with this letter that the Archbishop is now better familiar with the Benedictine structure of each monastery being fully independent, so he asks that only one monastery be in charge of the School of Western Studies.

By December 8, 1960, Fr. Hugh was in Taiwan. He and Miss Anne Katz, the English secretary of Archbishop Yu-Pin had sailed there together. They were met by Monsignor John Niu and Fr. Lawrence Wei. Fr. Hugh also has described an interesting situation related to the Archbishop:

President Kennedy had been elected President of the United States while I was enroute to China. His election was a shock and disappointment to the government of Taiwan—who had bet heavily on the election of Nixon. Archbishop Yu Pin met us the morning after our arrival with the news that he had to hurry back to Washington. He has been a close friend of Speaker John McCormick for years and he was being sent over the Chinese government “to mend some fences”. (“The Fu Jen Catholic University of China” 8)

After his arrival, Fr. Hugh wrote two letters to Abbot Denis in December of 1960. In the first one, he mentions the problems in general: “Conditions here are anything but practical and promising. The Cardinal and Archbishop have been gracious and kind and they are under heavy hardships” (Letter of December 11, 1960). In the second he makes special mention of Cardinal Tien: “Tomorrow I am driving out to the area where the University is to be built. I likewise have a meeting with the Cardinal in a few days—he is most kind and considerate” (Letter of

December 16, 1960). At the end of the month, Abbot Denis gives this report to the Large Chapter:

Fr. Hugh had written to the Archabbot from Formosa. He indicated that there is a great discouragement in Formosa and he feels that a Benedictine Priory would be a source of encouragement. However, since he has been there only a short time he does not feel ready to give a full report on the conditions. (Minutes of the [large] Chapter of December 30, 1960)

In early January, Abbot Denis responds to Fr. Hugh’s two letters, but he is a bit surprised that Archbishop has not found much work for Fr. Hugh to do (Letter of January 7, 1961). Less than two weeks later, Fr. Hugh is finally able to give a more thorough report on the situation regarding planning for the university:

We had an official dinner last night with the University officers and secretaries which gave me a fuller picture of the situation and a more determined stand on an independent position with the staff. As you know Archbishop Yu is not expected back here until the first week of February. The staff is quite divided in its loyalties—between three forces, the government, the Cardinal, and the Archbishop. Unless he is here more permanently [he won’t] hold the staff together. The funds are just not available for some of his dreams. The Cardinal, on the other hand, while hesitant and somewhat fearful by nature is far more dependable. I spent a very pleasant hour with him last week. The man really on the spot is the Internuncio or Apostolic Delegate. He wants action but can do little to hurry the Chinese government. On this point he needs the full support of Archbishop Yu Pin who still holds his position in the National Assembly. (January 16, 1961)

Clearly the absence of Archbishop Yu-Pin from Taiwan is creating problems in terms of getting the university started. Here, for the first time, Fr. Hugh is able to describe the three factions among those working for the starting up the university as related to whom they are loyal: “the government, the Cardinal, and the Archbishop.” Fr. Hugh also characterizes the Archbishop as having “dreams” and the Cardinal as “hesitant and somewhat fearful by nature” but “far more dependable” The third person at the center of the planning for the University is the Internuncio who ‘wants action but can do little to hurry the Chinese government. On this point he needs the full support of Archbishop Yu Pin....” In this letter, Fr. Hugh is also critical of the land in Shih-lin to be given by government for the University as too mountainous.

Apparently, Fr. Hugh developed a very good relationship with Cardinal Tien while the Archbishop Yu-Pin was away, and on January 21, 1961 asks permission from Abbot Denis “to open a Monastic house here in Taiwan, completely independent of the Fu Jen Catholic University” adding, “The full permission of Cardinal Tien is assured; in fact he is most anxious to second the request.” Abbot Denis responds on January 31, 1961 saying: “I took the matter to the small chapter, and they felt that we should follow along with the original commitment for a reasonably longer time. The first point is to gain information for our Congregation as to the possibility and advisability of participating in the development of the University. The second point is to assist the Archbishop in the development of the university. At least that is the way he proposed it to me.”

In his next letter (February 7, 1961), Fr. Hugh again mentions the problem with Archbishop Yu-Pin being away. He also explains how the university will be in three different parts of Taiwan:

Building plans are being developed at the moment for the College only

here in the Taipei area. Meanwhile the Divine Word is going ahead with the College in Kaohsiung and the Madames of the Sacred Heart have begun their building of the Women’s College. The Jesuits have changed their plans and are coming north to join the Taipei group.....

It is interesting to see that the Sisters of the Sacred Heart are at this time working on a Women’s College for Fu Jen. Fr. Hugh also describes the conflicts going on among the various factions:

There is an inner conflict going on at the moment and I am not able to get a clear picture of all the factions. Archbishop Yu Pin’s group seems to be dodging the Roman group..... But his prolonged absences naturally weaken his group badly—and perhaps wisely for the Roman authorities in the long run are the most important as they represent the Church directly—and they control all of the funds.

After the return of Archbishop Yu-Pin to Taiwan, on March 2, 1961, Fr. Hugh writes again to Abbot Denis and says that the original site of the University in Shihlin was voted down as being too “expensive to develop.” He further states one of the main problems facing the Archbishop, the Archbishop “is anxious to give Rome some proof that the Catholic University is actually getting under way.” Then related to this, Fr. Hugh explains that the Archbishop has

been urging me to be ready to open a research center this fall. I have asked him to clear the matter with you first but personally I am not too much in favor of such as action at this time. Before I would open a graduate level center I would like to have some assurance that the College will eventually get started. He has so far given us no guarantees of the future development nor of income. Rome is sending all funds through the Delegate.”

With this letter, Fr. Hugh also includes a picture that appeared in the Hong Kong *Sunday Examiner*, February 10, 1961, of proposed Fu Jen chapel in shape of Tiantai, the Altar to Heaven, in Beijing.

Getting the land for the university was of course another problem for the Archbishop and the others involved with the university. Fr. Hugh gives this description as to what was happening in March 1961:

During the Archbishop's absence we could do very little beyond getting acquainted with people and places and we did have a chance to see the various sites suggested for the campus of the proposed University. This was one of the first major problems facing the new Board of Trustees. Various areas were suggested and as soon as the Archbishop returned in March, 1961, the long and tedious process was begun. The Shih Lin areas was the first to be abandoned after months of serious meetings. Another five months were lost in trying to get an area on the Keelung Lung road south of the U.S. air base. The Divine Word Fathers finally voted to split the campuses having their own section in the south of Taiwan near Kaohsiung where they had land and the promise of more. This move really costs us a great deal of time and effort and mainly in vain for by early 1962 the Roman authorities were wondering just what was happening after the bright promises of the beginning. ("The Fu Jen Catholic University of China" 8)

In a letter from April 13, 1961, Fr. Hugh describes "a very decisive meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Catholic University [that] was held under the Chairmanship of the Apostolic Delegate." The determination of the Apostolic Delegate to get things moving is seen when Fr. Hugh notes: "Under no uncertain terms he [the Apostolic Delegate] kept hammering away for nearly four hours until the main issues were settled." Later in this letter, Fr. Hugh explains that the Board

of Trustees was composed of the bishops in Taiwan. Although not on the Board, Fr. Hugh apparently was permitted to attend the board meetings. At this meeting it was decided that the S.V.D. and Jesuit section of the University would be in Kaohsiung and the Dominican College of Medicine in Tainan.

As for the College of Liberal Arts, the

decision was to keep [it] here in Taipei and to maintain the graduate schools here where possible. Since the Fu Jen Catholic University is but a continuation of an older University the government has authorized the opening of the graduate school first. These classes will begin in September 1961. Land for this section will be bought here in the city and the Apostolic Delegate has authorized the spending of over \$60,000.00 for land and the opening of the graduate school.

The Board then asked Fr. Hugh

"What part will the Benedictines be willing to take in the graduate school or any other section of the University?" And secondly—"Will the Benedictines join the other Communities in buying the land proposed for a Catholic center of the city—of which the University will be a part?"

To these questions Fr. Hugh responded in this way: "I assured the Delegate and the Board (the Bishops of the island) that I would send the questions on to you [Abbot Denis] with my recommendations." Fr. Hugh's recommendations were:

First—I do heartily recommend that the Benedictines accept the invitation to assist with the development of the University. To avoid far reaching commitments I would recommend a minor section of the graduate school—history or literature and western languages—which would oblige us to no dormitories, discipline or maintenance problems."

He also discusses the cost. "The University itself has bought three acres for the library, class rooms, and Administration building." He further adds: "It is the



wish of the Board that the Benedictines will be able to begin work with the graduate school on a limited basis by Sept. 1961 but definite land or building commitments would not be expected before September 1962.” As to where this land is, it must be the current site of Tien Hospital. In a later letter Fr. Hugh writes: “The Cardinal is expected to buy land in the Center for the Catholic Hospital but he had been ill of late and we have no final decision from him” (Letter May 27, 1961).

Abbot Denis took the proposal for the Benedictines to run a research center quite seriously. In his letter of May 17, 1961, he asks Fr. Hugh to get information on the following questions:

- a) Is Taipei the place for the research center, or for a school of history or literature and western languages. . . .
- b) If the research center were set in motion, what added personnel would be required.
- c) Do you think we should do this alone, and just what could be done for a beginning on September of 1961.
- d) Would the \$35,000.00 be for the ground and the building including the library and faculty housing right in the Catholic center.
- e) Would there be a proper section nearby for future monastic development, or should that be elsewhere, considerably removed from the part of the University to which the center is attached.

In his response of May 26, 1961, Fr. Hugh first gives a report on the situation of getting land for the University, saying there have been “many disappointments and problems.” He also mentions for the first time that the College of Liberal Arts will be “with the secular clergy, with whatever help they can get.” He also explains more about the circumstances under which Fu Jen University will open:

Since Fu Jen is really being “reopened” rather than founded we are

permitted to open the Graduate School without the undergraduate. September 1961 has been agreed upon for the opening of classes in philosophy. History could follow when we are ready.

These comments suggest that what we should be celebrating this year is the “re-opening” of Fu Jen University. As to what he thinks the Benedictines should do, he cautiously writes:

I have strongly recommended that the American Benedictines take part in the Catholic University but to be a part of the project with the most minimum demands as to men and money. I recommend ONLY a department of the graduate school. If and when circumstances warrant such a move it is always easy to increase our commitment but never easy to cut back. . . .

And he recommends purchasing a half acre of land in the Catholic Center.

The following day Fr. Hugh writes another letter explaining the Archbishop needs a decision within ten days about the land and the money for it within 90 days. Then on the next day, May 29, 1961, Archbishop Yu-Pin writes to Abbot Denis, first thanking him for the services of Fr. Hugh saying that Fr. Hugh “is in charge of the Bulletin for the University, and we expect to put out the first issue in about three months.” He also says, “We hope to be able to inaugurate the Research Institute of Western History in the Graduate School early next year.” He concludes: “Any assistance you can give us in carrying out the wishes of the Holy See for Fu-Jen will be deeply appreciated.

Abbot Denis, in his letter of July 10, 1961 to Fr. Hugh, is puzzled by the Archbishop’s letter as it does not mention the Benedictines purchasing any property but nonetheless agrees to take it to chapter. I am, however, unable to find any record of this at the chapter meetings held at that time. The next letter from Fr.

Hugh is the description of the opening of Fu Jen that was quoted at the beginning of this presentation. Accordingly, when Fu Jen was re-opened in September 1961, the Benedictines were being asked to open a Research Institute of Western History a year later in September of 1962. What happened that this did not transpire will be the topic of my next essay on the Benedictines and the Taiwan Fu Jen University. But, for now, I should mention that the following year saw the opening of the Second Vatican Council on October 11, 1962, which was the beginning of many changes in the Church. Furthermore, St. Vincent Archabbey suffered a disastrous fire on January 9, 1963 which destroyed many of the monastery buildings and soon occasioned the resignation of Archabbot Denis.

## WORKS CITED AND CONSULTED

### PRIMARY SOURCES

RB: 1980: *The Rule of St. Benedict: In Latin and English with Notes.* Ed. by Timothy Fry, O.S.B. Collegeville: The Liturgical P, 1981.

#### MATERIAL IN THE ARCHIVES OF ST. VINCENT ARCHABBEY

Letters between then Archbishop Paul Yu-Pin and Denis Strittmatter, O.S.B., the Archabbot of St. Vincent.

Letters between Archabbot Denis and Fr. Hugh Wilt, O.S.B.

A ten-page typed manuscript by Fr. Hugh entitled "The Fu Jen Catholic University of China" describing the founding of Fu Jen in Beijing and its continuance in Taipei.

Minutes of the council of seniors and of the large chapter of St. Vincent Archabbey

### SECONDARY SOURCES

Oetgen, Jerome. *Mission to America: A History of St. Vincent Archabbey, The First Benedictine Monastery in the United States.* Washington DC: The Catholic University of America P, 2000.

### ENDNOTES

1. For the history of the foundation of Fu Jen University by the Benedictines of St. Vincent Archabbey, see Jerome Oetgen's *Mission to America: A History of St. Vincent Archabbey.*

2. A brief explanation about “council of seniors” and “large chapter” or “chapter meeting.” Chapter 3 of the Rule of Benedict is entitled “Summoning the brothers for Counsel,” and explains how the abbot is to call the community together to discuss major matters: “As often as anything important is to be done in the monastery, the abbot shall call the whole community together and himself explain what the business is; and after hearing the advice of the brothers, let him ponder it and follow what he judges the wiser course” (179). This meeting is called a “chapter” and those of your familiar with European monasteries will know they often have a “chapter house” where such meetings are to be held. For other matters that need discussion, the abbot should meet with the seniors of the monastery: “If less important business of the monastery is to be transacted, he [the Abbot] shall take counsel with the seniors only . . .” (181). This group is now called “council of seniors” and half the members are elected by the community and half appointed by the abbot..

St. Vincent Archabbey and most Benedictine monasteries throughout the world follow these practices. At St. Vincent, the chapter meetings are usually every two months or so and the “counsel of seniors” meets once a month. Now, however, in most cases decisions of the chapter must be followed by the abbot. Among other things, the “council of seniors” goes over matters to be presented to the chapter.

## 本篤會士韋休神父所見輔仁大學復校之預備事宜

—康士林—

今年，輔仁大學慶祝在台復校五十周年。在本篇論文中，我要論述在輔仁大學復校前一年本篤會士韋休神父 (Fr. Hugh Wilt, O.S.B.) 在台的身影言談。是時，韋神父銜命前往台灣，協助于斌總主教籌備復校事宜。本文將多所著墨多封韋休神父呈總會院院長丹尼斯·史崔梅特 (Denis Strittmatter, O.S.B.) 之書信，報告輔仁大學在台復校之預備工作。丹尼斯·史崔梅特為賓州拉特若比 (Latrobe) 聖文森總會院院長 (Archabbot of St. Vincent)，聖文森總會院先前曾創建北京輔仁大學，此刻亦協助大學在台復校。

聖本篤會士韋休神父 (1904-1987) 是北京輔仁大學本篤會時代曾親身奉獻的本篤會士之一。在彼時他為神學院生，而他的神職授任也正是在此地。在他回到聖文森後，前往哥倫比亞大學研究歷史，然後在聖文森學院教授歷史多年。在一九六〇年代，他亦是聖文森總會院的副院長，此意謂他是一人之下。

一九六一年十月二日，韋神父書信呈丹尼斯總會長，談及輔仁大學在台北的建校事宜：

在多月來的疑慮、徬徨後，輔仁大學最後總算邁出一步。典禮如儀，政府

完全同意，上週三學校終於成立。至少，在今年，我們將嚴格執行把所有活動規限在研究所，而且只招收少數象徵性的學生。總主教〈于斌〉念茲在茲於政府同意學校設立，正式登記有案，如此我們可以聲言學校已再開始運作。

首先，此處要注意的是于斌總主教「念茲在茲於政府同意學校設立」並「登記有案」。隨後我們將瞭解，政府同意輔仁大學單純在台灣「復學」，如此輔仁大學即可不必如同申請設立新大學一般，省卻註冊登記等文書作業。

韋神父亦提到，復校同一日，董事會會議進行「順暢」，顯然大有別於以往一般情況。他又說道：「然而，幾天過後，不同的修會和總主教的磨擦分裂爆發，主要是高雄的土地問題，南部分校的事宜。事情日後會解決，然而校舍興建暫緩」。關乎大學選址的問題隨後會討論。然而，此處有待指出者在於，如同籌辦創設任何大型的教育工程，論辯爭議所在都是，或者套用韋神父的話——「摩擦分裂」；在關於輔仁大學的創建上，此種分裂是出現在和辦學大業相關的各修會會院和于斌總主教之間。

最後，韋神父解釋于斌總主教身體有恙，未能如先前規劃般，在學校復校後前往紐約。總主教積極籌劃此日良久，想必已投入相當多心力和代價。

在此，且允許我檢視這些書信以及聖文森檔案中的其他資料，探討直到一九六一年九月輔仁復校過程中的諸多事件。中國共產黨掌控中國大陸後，于斌總主教身在華盛頓特區，他隨即接觸聖文森總院的本篤會士。一九五〇年三月二十五日，他從華盛頓中國文化中心修書一封，詢問他是否可偕同秘書牛若望神父及另外名為 Bernard Yoh 的秘書在聖文森總會院渡過聖週（Holy Week）。彼時襄理總會院的院長丹尼斯回信一封竭誠歡迎。此時，聖文森會院的規模超過二百位會士。然後，在一九五一年十一月，于斌總主教修書一封致丹尼斯總院長，弔唁他的前任總院長艾佛烈·柯區(Alfred Koch)之辭世，曰：

艾佛烈·柯區總院長是創辦北京輔仁大學的先驅者之一。他是一九三二年至一九三四年間北京輔仁大學的第二監督。總院長此時辭世，歸返永恆天國；當下北京輔仁大學及中國的整個天主教會正面臨中國歷史上最嚴厲最有組織

的反宗教迫害，兩相對照，對吾等中國人誠然是嚴重打擊。雖然，我們深知，他在天堂仍將一如往昔為中國禱告；然而，於此關鍵時刻，他的身影不再，我們深有感觸。（1951年11月16日書信）

在座熟悉早期北京輔仁大學歷史者將得知，司泰萊（Aurelius Stehle, OSB）總院長曾經辛勤劬勞建設輔仁大學，辭世後，艾佛烈被選為總院長。艾佛烈總院長本是聖言會會士，之所以會被選任總院長，乃是因為他強烈支持聖文森撤出輔仁大學，彼時正逢美國大蕭條後，聖文森財務問題非等同小可。無須贅言，于斌總主教本質上是個大外交家，隻字片語不提此事，對艾佛烈總院長只有好話出口。

直至一九五〇年代末，輔仁大學和聖文森總院會間沉靜無事。一九五八年十月二十八日，若望二十三世(John XXIII) 被選為教宗。他對傳教任務深感興趣，可見諸於第二封通告。此文告發佈於一九五九年十一月二十八日，強調天主教徒傳教任務導向之必要。也正是在此時，若望二十三決定輔仁大學應行復校。韋休神父曾記述他之與聞此事，彼時他為聖文森副院長，在其時：

一九五九年十一月，賓州格林堡休·蘭姆主教(Bishop Hugh Lamb of Greensburg, Pa.) (聖文森總會院教區)接獲羅馬寄往美國總教區的書信拷貝本（關乎輔仁大學在台灣復校事宜），此信送交我手上，附言曰「你可能對此事有興趣」。坦白說，我對此事沒興趣；我認為此時時機不宜，緣於整個亞洲仍是草叢不安、諸事未定的第三世界，而且可能整整五十年左右局面仍是如此…。約略在六或七周過後，丹尼斯總會院長接獲來自羅馬的同封書信，他將此信在長者會議（附註1）上朗讀，徵詢與會諸人士的意見。我再次說明，我認為此事言之過早，緣於此事定案未久。可是，我也提議，總院長不宜直接回絕此信所言。我建議總院長修書呈田樞機主教，曰吾等樂見輔仁大學在台復校，並對日後發展也有興趣。此時田樞機主教已被提名為監督和大學董事會董事長；他隨即回信，確認于總主教不日內將啟程拜訪總會院。（〈中國天主教輔仁大學 6〉）

韋休神父亦留下頗堪玩味之記錄，敘述何以輔仁大學將在台灣復校：

中國大陸落於共產黨手上後，多月以來一直有個希望，認為在不遠的未來，不同的政府和宗教組織或可恢復。不幸的是，這個空無的希望導致一段時期的無所作為，不管是在大量難民避居的台灣，或是在其他地區皆然。然而，輔仁的校友和諸多同道持續輔仁大學在台復校的訴求。到一九五五、一九五六年，羅馬接到為數頗多的訴請，聖言會的總部亦然。同樣的，台灣的教會領袖變成關注的所在，因為隨著年歲消逝，無有領袖儲訓為未來之用（〈中國天主教輔仁大學 5〉）

我們大多數人知道輔仁大學在復校過程中輔仁校友之勞心勞力。然而，至少我不知道有此一念，認為輔仁大學是訓練未來教會領袖之所在。

一九五九年十二月十日，于斌總主教修書丹尼斯總院長，說明他被任命為輔仁大學在台「復」校的校長。他還說明：

我竭誠邀請您們的修會參與輔仁大學在台復校事宜。目前已有七個修會組織受邀參與輔仁大學在台復校事宜，聖言會是其中之一，聖言會同意分配成立理學院。

對您們的修會而言，吾等建議成立音樂學院或一個新聞和文學科系。要單獨成立一個學院，費用約十萬美元，單獨一個文學院的科系約二萬美元。前面提及三個科系，音樂或新聞或文學科系，您們可優先考慮。當然，您們在考慮成立某個學院或科系的費用時，也要同時考量等同的教學人力。（一九五九年十二月十日書信）

于斌總主教分秒不容遲疑邀請聖文森本篤會士參與新輔仁大學之創設。然而，他的建議對象直接是本篤會。本篤會未若耶穌會和其他修會，並非由一個最高決策教長掌握完全權力做出決定。而是，每個本篤修道院完全獨立，自作決定。彼時，丹尼斯總院長主掌聖文森，並且是聖文森所屬本篤會聯會

之長。然而他只能直接參與和聖文森相關之決定。就本篤會和其經營北京輔仁大學一事而言，本篤會的組織結構是主要的問題之一。

除了此封致丹尼斯總院長之書信，于斌總主教亦修書本篤會士師立模神父（Fr. Gregory Schramm, O.S.B.），師神父為紐澤西牛瓦克（Newark）聖瑪利修道院（St. Mary's Abbey）會士，本身為北京輔仁大學仍由本篤會經營時，曾在其間服務的本篤會士之一。于斌總主教在美停留期間，師神父與其接觸。一九六〇年三月十一日，總主教于斌修書予師神父，首次提及神父「在創辦立教育系的過程中扮演重要角色…」。

于總主教又說：有關輔仁大學在台復校之事，您在此被指派為我的個人代表，完全授權，與任何或所有本篤會會院協商成立及經營教育學院之事宜。（一九六〇年三月十一日書信）。師神父回函，提列長串問題（三月二十九日函），言明此事提交「一九六〇年四月二十一日芝加哥本篤會院長會議」討論。此建議後續事項可見諸於一九六〇年五月二十七日長者會議之記載：

台灣天主教大學之創設已提交討論。先前已提及，美國本篤會受邀主管教育學院。（參閱一九五九年十月二十八日文）。然而，彼時田樞機主教提醒吾等，曰教育學院裡當由本地人士主持，即或個別科系可能考慮外國人士擔任。田樞機之書信也建議 St Procopius Abbey 主管農學院。他也提議，如果我們經營西方研究學院，對中國人而言較為可行、有利。

此處要注意的是，此時出現田樞機主教參與籌畫輔仁大學新校的組織。而且，看來田樞機和于總主教在邀請各修道院參與此辦學大事之前，並未充分討論諸多事宜。這些會議記錄也初次提到本篤會主掌「西方研究學院」。

一九六〇年九月，緣於于總主教無法規劃聖文森訪問之行，韋休神父和丹尼斯總院長前往紐約與之共餐，討論輔仁大學諸事。以下為韋神父對此次會面之記錄：

事出相當突然，九月初，丹尼斯總院長簡短告知我隨時準備好前往紐約。數日後，我偕同他飛往紐約與于總主教共餐…。同晚稍晚些，偕同師神父，幾

位俗家朋友，以及約略六個中國神職人員，總院長和我在曼哈頓旅店和于總主教同餐共敘。

于總主教、丹尼斯總院長和我坐在桌子上端，整整兩個小時我們討論輔仁復校可能面臨的種種問題。諸事看來皆相當不明確、不肯定……

隔天早上一大早，我和丹尼斯總碰頭，當他問我晚餐印象如何，我坦白以告，說我覺得整件事仍太模糊。于總主教也沒什麼太清楚的觀念，比如整個計畫何時開始、如何開始。丹尼斯總對我此言下註，結束討論。他說：「你所言極是。于總主教在此事仍無頭緒，此正是他要你盡早與之同行之故。」（〈中國天主教輔仁大學 6-7〉）

我不確定用「相當不明確、不肯定」形容總主教當時的狀況是否正確，然而這至少是總主教給人的印象。顯然，在晚宴期間，總主教一定把丹尼斯總院長帶到一旁，同時請求韋神父協助。如果總主教意欲得到本篤會的支援，這的確是很好的方式。

此次紐約晚餐後二週，丹尼斯總院長將此事提交大會會議。會議記錄如下：

提交會議討論的事宜為台灣的天主教大學。田樞機和于總主教已被羅馬當局指派創辦此大學。本篤會被建議成立「西方研究學院」，此即是歷史、文學和現代語言諸領域。此建議首先是呈交美國加西尼聯會(American Cassinese Congregation)，然而總主教認為單一修道院更能有效經營這個學院。總主教也請求韋休神父，鑑於神父先前在北京輔仁大學之經驗，希望他能在隨後幾個月陪同于樞機，協助籌辦輔仁大學。」

總院長隨後要求就此問題進行諮詢投票：韋休神父是否該被派到台灣調查事件的始末，投票結果四十二票贊成，四票否決，四票不表示意見。（大會，一九六〇年九月二十七日）

本篤會被規畫提供「現代語言」教學，如此意味著此時聖言會尚未同意主掌大學的此部門。在現階段的書信中，韋神父提到聖言會正主掌理學院。明題可見的是，這封信表示總主教目前較熟悉本篤會每個修道院完全獨立的結構，

所以他請求只由一個修道院來主掌西方研究學院。

一九六〇年十二月八日，韋神父來到台灣。他偕同總主教于斌的英文秘書 Ann Katz 小姐乘船同行。牛若望蒙席和魏欽一神父面會迎接。韋神父也談到和總主教相關的情況：

當我前往中國之際，甘迺迪被選為美國總統。台灣政府當局對甘迺迪當選一事深感震驚和失望，他們狠下賭注，賭的是尼克森當選。我們抵達後當天早上于斌總主教和我們見了一面，告知他得匆忙趕回華盛頓。于斌是參議員 John McCormick 的多年密友，他受中國政府派遣「修補一些嫌隙」。（〈中國天主教輔仁大學 8〉）

韋休神父抵台後，於一九六〇十二月修書兩封致丹尼斯總院長。在首封信，他概略提及一般問題：此處情況堪虞，毫不實際，看不到未來。樞機主教和總主教皆仁慈寬宏，工作亦十分勤奮、辛勞。」（一九六〇年十二月十一日書信）。第二封，他特別提及田樞機主教「明日我要出門前往大學建校所在地區。不日內將和田樞機有個會晤——他最是仁慈體貼。」（一九六〇十二月十六日函）

在是月月底，丹尼斯總院長將以下報告提交大會：韋神父從台灣修書呈總院長。他指出台灣行十分沮喪，認為興建一個本篤修道院將十足振奮人心。然而，因為他抵台時間仍短，不認為自己已準備好能對諸般狀況做充分報告（一九六〇年十二月三〇日大會紀錄）。

一月初，丹尼斯總院長就韋神父兩封來函回信。他幾分訝異何以總主教尚未交付韋神父許多工作（一九六一年一月七日函）。未及兩周過後，韋神父終能交付一份較詳盡的報告，記述有關復校計畫之狀況：

昨晚我們和學校諸位官員和秘書有個正式晚宴，讓我較全面瞭解情況，如同你之所知，在二月第一周之前，于斌總主教不會回到此地。學校工作人員心各有屬，一分為三股勢力，分別是政府、樞機主教和總主教。除非他在此停留較久，否則（他不能）團結整個團隊。經費並非只用在在他的一些夢想上。另者，

樞機主教雖然猶疑，生性也幾分疑懼，卻遠較為可靠。上周我和他相處一個小時，頗稱愉快。此刻真正關鍵的是教廷公使或宗座代表。他想要行動，然而就敦促中國政府而言，能做的有限。就此，他需要于斌總主教的全力支持。總主教至今在國會仍有職位。（一九六一年一月十六日）

顯然，就讓大學開始成立、運作而言，于斌總主教之不在台灣，就已造成問題。此處，韋神父首度能提及輔仁在台復校諸多工作人員分成三股勢力，每股人馬各有效忠對象，分別是政府、樞機主教和總主教。韋神父亦形容總主教有「夢想」，而樞機主教「猶疑」而「生性也幾分疑懼」，但是「遠較為可靠」。籌劃大學核心團體的第三號人物是使徒代表，他「想要行動然而就敦促中國政府而言，能做的有限。就此，他需要于斌總主教的全力支持。」在此信中，韋神父也批評政府提供位於士林供興建大學的土地皆是山區。

顯然，在于斌總主教不在台灣期間，韋神父和田樞機建立良好的關係。一九六一年一月二十一日，韋神父請求丹尼斯總院長同意「在台灣本地此處成立一個修道院，完全獨立於輔仁大學之外」，同時加上「確定田樞機完全同意，事實上，他最是在乎贊同這個請求。」丹尼斯總院長於一九六一年六月三十一日回信，寫道：「我把此議交付長者會議討論，眾人認為我們當依循初衷，再等待相當一段時間。首先要務是為我們聯會獲取足夠訊息，看看參與大學發展的可能性和建言為何？其次是襄助總主教在此時大學發展的過程中盡力。至少這是他當初向我如是建議。」

在隨後一封信中（一九六一年二月七日）韋神父再度提及于斌總主教不在台灣的問題。他亦解釋此所大學將如何分於台灣三地：只有此刻在台北一地才有興建校舍的計畫。同時，聖言會忙於高雄的學院，而聖心修女會已開始婦女學院的建築。耶穌會已改變計劃，正打算北上加入台北的團體……

有趣的是，此處我們可以看出聖心修女會此時在籌劃在輔仁成立婦女學院。韋神父亦形容不同派系間的衝突：

此時內部正有些衝突，我不能明顯知道其中詳情及整體狀況。于斌總主教

的人馬似乎搪塞躲閃羅馬當局派的人士……可是，他久久不在此處，似乎自然而然消蝕他人馬的力量—明智之舉應是一羅馬當局最終最是舉足輕重，因為他們直接代表教會—而且他們控制所有經費。

一九六一年三月二日，于斌總主教回到台灣後，韋神父再修書予丹尼斯總院長，說明輔仁大學在土林的原始校址因「開發經費昂貴」而被表決推翻。他又說明面對總主教時的主要問題之一。他說總主教「急於給羅馬某種保證，天主教大學實際上正在復校過程中。」然後，與此相關的是，韋神父解釋總主教

一直敦促我準備今秋開設一個研究中心。我請他先將此事和你言明，然就我個人而言，此時我不甚認同此等行動。在我開設研究所階段的研究中心前，我要某種保證，確信學院最終將開始運作。至今，對於未來發展或收入，他沒給我們任何保證。羅馬正透過宗座代表送來所有的經費。

在此信內，韋神父亦附上一張相片，此相片出現在一九六一年二月十日香港的天主教英文報紙 *Sunday Examiner* 上，相片是提議中輔仁大學教堂的仿天壇建築。

對總主教和其他大學成立發展的相關人士而言，取得大學校址當然是另一問題。就此，韋神父描寫一九六一年三月發生之事：

在總主教離台的期間，我們所做之事非常有限，無非是先熟悉一些人士、地方，而我們也的確有機會看看校園設址的諸多可能地點。這也正是面對新的董事會成員時主要的問題之一。校園用地建議中的地點甚多，而在總主教於一九六一年三月回來後，冗長的勘址選址過程於焉開始。在經歷數月來的正式會議後，士林地區首先不列入考慮。勘查其基隆路美國空軍基地南方土地的過程又耗掉了五個月。聖言會的神父們最終投票表決把校園分為幾個校區，他們則選取位於南台灣高雄附近的區塊，此地區他們自有土地，也有拿到更多土地的承諾。這種更動的確浪費我們很多時間和力氣，最後好像都徒勞無功。因為，在一九六二年初，羅馬當局懷疑事情初始的堂皇承諾畢竟於今為何？（〈中國天主教輔仁大學 8〉）

一九六一年四月十三日，韋休神父寫有一信，形容「天主教大學董事會在宗座代表主席列席下召開一個非常關鍵性的會議」。教廷公使決定讓事情進行，此見諸於韋神父的文字：「在諸般條件一清二楚的情況下，他〈宗座代表〉持續斟酌拿捏，整整幾乎四小時，直到諸多重大議題底定。」在此信稍後，韋神父解釋說董事會成員為台灣的主教。雖然不是董事會一員，韋神父顯然被允許列席參加董事會議。此會議決定輔仁大學聖言會和耶穌會的校區坐落於高雄，而道明會的醫學院則設於台南。

至於文學院，決定是將文學院留在台北，而且盡可能維持此處研究所的運作。既然輔仁大學在台復校，是北京老輔仁大學的延續，政府當局已許可先行開設研究所。這些課程將在一九六一年九月開始。此學區的土地將在市中心區覓購，宗座代表已允諾購地和開辦研究所經費超過六萬〈美金〉。

董事會徵詢韋神父「本篤會願意主掌哪個研究所？或大學的哪個部分？」其次本篤會是否願意加入其他的團體，買下計劃在市區成立一個天主教中心的土地？一其間，學校將是其中一部分？」就此些問題，韋休神父因應如下：「我向宗座代表和董事會〈成員為島上主教〉保證，我會將此問題及我的建議程諸於您〈丹尼斯院長〉。」韋神父的建議如下：「首先，我衷心建議本篤會接收邀請，協助發展此所大學。為了避免不切實際的承諾，我建議接下研究所的一小部分—歷史研究所或文學和西洋語言。這些不會為我們帶來宿舍、訓練或維護的問題。」他亦討論到費用。「大學本身買了三甲地作為圖書館、教室和行政中心建築之用」。他又說「董事會希望本篤會能夠在一九六一年九月前開始小規模運作研究所，但是確切的土地或建築承諾在一九六二年九月前皆不會定案。」至於土地在何處，很可能是目前耕莘醫院所在地。在隨後的一封信，韋神父寫道：「樞機被期待在天主教醫院中心購地，但是他爾來身體有恙，我們也沒有他的最後決定」〈一九六一年五月二十七日函〉

丹尼斯院長慎重考慮本篤會經營一個研究所的建議。在一九六一年五月十七日的信函中，他請韋神父就以下問題提供資料：

1. 台北是否為研究所的所在地，或是歷史學院或文學院及西洋語言學院所在地？……
2. 如果眼前設立研究所……需要增設哪些人員？
3. 你認為我們是否單獨進行此事？只做一六一年九月一日開學當做之事？
4. 三萬五千美金作為基礎和建築費用夠否？包括圖書館和正位於天主教中心的教職員宿舍？
5. 附近是否有適合的區域以發展未來的修道院設施，抑或有某個其他區域，距此研究中心所屬的大學區塊有相當距離？

在一九六一年五月二十六日的回信中，休·威特神父提出一個報告，就為大學尋覓校地之情況有所說明，聲稱有「許多的失望和問題」。他也首度提到文學院將是「將和教區神父共事，與任何能得到的支援共謀」，他也解釋輔仁大學將在何種情況下開學：

因為輔仁實際上是「復校」而非重新創辦，當局允許我們逕行開辦研究所，暫且不收大學部學生。目前決定一九六一年九月哲學課程開始上課。一旦我們就緒，歷史課程也能開課。

至於他認為本篤會該當何為，他謹慎寫道：

我強烈建議美國本篤會參與天主教大學，然僅限於此辦學大計中的一部分，只需最低限度的人員和資金。我「僅」建議只負責其中一個研究所。如果、或是何時情況變異，增加承諾與付出一向不是難事，但取消或縮手一向非易事。

他建議在天主教中心購置半甲地。

隔天，韋休神父再修書一封，說明總主教在十天內須下決定，購置校地問題，九十多天內則得決定購地資金的問題。隔日，亦即是一九六一年五月二十九日，于斌總主教修書呈丹尼斯院長，首先對韋休神父的奉獻言謝，告知韋神父「負責大學的學報，我們希望大約在三個月後推出第一期。」他也說：「我們希望明年初能夠在研究部開設西洋歷史研究中心」。他結語道：「你所給予的



任何支持、協助輔仁之辦學大業者，我們皆深表感激。」

丹尼斯總院長在一九六一年七月十日致韋休神父的書信中，表明對總主教的書信幾分疑惑，書信並未提及本篤會購置任何財產，然而丹尼斯總院長同意將此議題交付大會討論。可是，我沒找到彼時諸次大會上關於此議題的討論記錄。下一封韋休神父捎來的書信則是記述輔仁的復校開學典禮，我此篇報告開頭的引文已提及。因之，當輔仁在一九六一年九月復校之際，本篤會被請求一年之後，也就是一九六二年九月，開設西洋歷史研究中心。此事最後沒有下文，因緣始末我將在下篇論本篤會和台灣輔仁大學的文章中探討。然而，現今而言，我要提及隔年亦即是一九六二年十月七日的梵蒂岡第二次會議，此會議為教會諸多變革之始。還有，一九六三年六月九日，聖文森總會院遭逢火劫，燒毀許多修道院建築，隨即又引發丹尼斯總院長辭卻了職務。

## 引用和參考著作

### 一手資料

RB: 1980: *The Rule of St. Benedict: In Latin and English with Notes.* Ed. by Timothy Fry, O.S.B. Collegeville: The Liturgical P, 1981.

### 聖文森總會院檔案資料

于斌總主教和聖文森總院長 Denis Strittmatter, O.S.B. 書信

總院長 Denis Strittmatter, O.S.B.和 韋休神父(Fr. Hugh Wilt, O.S.B.)書信

韋休神父(Fr. Hugh Wilt, O.S.B)十頁打字稿 題曰 中國的天主教輔仁大學  
敘述輔仁大學初始創建於北京庚續於台灣之種種

聖文森總會院大會和長者會議記錄

### 二手資料

Oetgen, Jerome. *Mission to America: A History of St. Vincent Archabbey, The First Benedictine Monastery in the United States.* Washington DC: The Catholic University of America P, 2000.

附註 1: 在此簡短解釋何謂「長者會議」(Council of Seniors)，以及大會(large chapter)或(chapter meeting)。聖本篤會規的第三章提名為「召集弟兄們開會」，解釋會父如何召喚諸會士討論重要事項：

「會院中每當有任何重要事務需要處理，會父便應該召集所有會士，向他們陳述將行之事。待他聽過了弟兄們的意見後，就該把整個事件獨自斟酌，然後照他認為最好的去做」(179)。此種會議就稱

做「大會」。在座諸位熟悉歐洲修道院者應當知道，修道院通常有一個「會議室」〈chapter house〉，此即是舉行此種會議之處。至於其他需要討論之事項，會父則召集修道院中的長者討論：「至於，處理一些對會院有利而較次要的事情，他 [會父] 也會徵詢院中長者們的意見…」〈181〉。此種聚談稱之「長者會議」，其中與會半數成員由團體相舉，半數

## 聖言會士蔣百鍊神父與輔仁大學在臺 復校的關係

—柯博識—\*

- 一、前言
  - 二、1948 年萌生遷校臺灣的意念
  - 三、輔仁校友會接觸輔仁大學以往的教職員
  - 四、傳信部支持在臺灣建立輔仁大學
  - 五、輔仁復校的準備
  - 六、高雄大貝湖校區
  - 七、購置臺北共同校區的校地
  - 八、聖言會和耶穌會的關係
  - 九、兩修會和于斌的關係
  - 十、蔣百鍊與聖言會單位
  - 十一、結語
- 附錄

---

\* 聖言會士。